

2.9 & 2.9.1: Satisfactory Academic Progress

I confirmed the US Department of Education requires 67%, but we can round up. Therefore, it has to be **66.66%**. We cannot set it at a flat 66%. - Kristi L'Alier

Before Steve left, we had a conversation about the new completion rate for SAP being proposed at 66.66%. However, in the attached proposed policy I notice it's rounded down to a flat 66%. I just wanted to confirm if the 66% is the correct proposed rate or if it is truly supposed to be 66.66%?

As an advisor, I believe many of us were surprised by the new change on SAP completion rate from 66.6% to 66%. Not that I disagree with it, but many of us felt that we should have been notified on the change or perhaps consulted as we discuss this issue with students very often.

Upon talking with Kristi I think that perhaps my wish would be to include a phrase like "Financial aid suspensions may occur without a warning semester under certain circumstances".

We added this language to the Procedure Part 4, Subpart A.

Federal regulations say we cannot use 66, it has to be 66.667 or higher

Thanks to all who commented, we've updated to 66.67%

Satisfactory academic progress policy responses broken down by document and subpart for your ease 😊

2.9:

Part 2

C: Part C incorrectly states that students on probation must earn a 100% completion rate. It is 75%

G: Subpart G incorrectly states that suspension occurs when students on warning do not meet both measures while on warning. It basically just needs to include the word cumulative somewhere as it could otherwise mean a student meeting both on in the warning term while still falling short cumulatively would avoid suspension.

We updated both parts.

2.9.1

Part 2.

Subpart A: Now real problem with the wording but my sense is that we would have liked to see this one coming a little further off and been consulted about it (the shift to 66% CR that is). We have a lot of questions about this one-why the 66%? And not 66.67%, why the change at all? How does this affect Financial Aid? Is there a process plan to update our communication about CR (website, all of our documents, things we haven't even thought of yet)?

Subpart B: My understanding of this text is that students with dual majors get more than 90 total before max time triggers? Is that true? I'm just unsure on this but it

should be looked at somewhat carefully to be worded right. It could also mean 150% of whichever the second major is, but I would be even less sure about what that means.

Fixed the 66% issue. Student have 150% for all programs they pursue.

Part 4.

Subpart A: It is not always the case for Financial Aid that students are allowed a warning semester prior to going on suspension. Subpart D could possibly solve this but does not speak to it directly. It should be added that financial aid suspensions could occur without a warning semester (in consultation with the financial aid dept).

Adjusted language

Part 5.

Subpart A, bullet 4: It is not really the case that they are considered by the different departments. The appeals are considered separately but often by staff members of either department. This could just say the appeals are considered separately without defining who does that consideration.

Adjusted language to reflect practice

Subpart A last 2 bullets: I'm not really sure a public rubric for situations under which an appeal might be approved is either necessary, or wise. The last one in particular really just states what is already the common probation conditions, so all approvals SHOULD expect that.

We discussed this and decided that we like the redundancy. It's beneficial for responding to students.

Subpart B: The only glaring problem here that needs addressing is the fact that not all students on probation can receive financial aid as many folks receive academic probation but continued financial aid suspension. I suppose the argument could be made that this policy is implying that probation is the status for their financial aid too but some better wording to remind that the 2 suspensions are genuinely separate would help in that case as there is not one unified "probation" between them. It is also a little awkward in that it makes probation sound like it is only one semester long where it really lasts until a student is in good standing. Here too I can see where it is technically correct in that it is one semester at a time. At any rate, some wordsmithing might do well here.

Added language.

Part 7.

Academic suspensions, but not financial aid suspensions, now actually time out and can therefore be lifted without an appeal if a student sits out long enough. This claims otherwise.

Added language.

Part 8. --just as a general note too, here it is broken down by numbers, elsewhere by bullets, elsewhere by letter, some standardization would be helpful.

Thanks, we went to numbers

9. Replace ESOL with EAP

Changed, thanks!

3.1: Student Rights & Responsibilities

3.4 & 3.4.1: Admissions

I noticed an issue in the Admissions P doc.

Take a look at Part 1. Number 3. It should say that students must attain passing scores on both tests (not all three).

Fixed

Also, in Part 6 I just want to confirm that we still want to include the specific verbage regarding a placement tool in English.

Fixed

Jessa Dahmes

Looks good- Sean Olson

I found the following changes to be made under the Admission Procedure:

Subpart A, #3: A student must attain passing scores on ~~all three tests~~ each test (*since there are only two now*) in order to be admitted to the college.

Fixed

Subpart B, #4.C.: PSEO students are limited to a maximum of 16 credits per semester.

This is currently as written

Subpart C: Qualified high school students who attend a Minnesota high school ~~that participates in the North Hennepin Community College's Perkins Consortium~~ that partners with North Hennepin Community College in this program, have the opportunity to enroll in NHCC courses offered at their high schools. Concurrent Enrollment requires a separate application, process and admission requirements.

Language adjusted

Looks good!

Faculty

1. In the Admissions policy, it mentions “Early Middle College” (and I can’t imagine how that makes any sense) that allows students from alternative learning centers to be PSEO students at NHCC to enroll in “specified courses.” I had one such student and the experience was not lovely. I’m wondering which classes are these “specified courses,” where that information is available and who makes the determination of which courses should be specified. I’m also thinking that that information should maybe be included in the policy or procedure so that it’s not just an arbitrary process. I’m also concerned that the departments that have these “specified courses” be consulted before a courses is added to the list. Who can help me with this?

Early Middle College is determined by Minnesota Department of Education, we added the link under regulatory info. Added statement about classes offered after consultation with department.

Just one other thing about the "early middle college" program. The procedure says it requires a separate application and has different requirements. I see that the regular PSEO requirements are spelled out in the procedure and wonder why the "early middle college" requirements aren't spelled out as well. It seems like since the regular PSEO requirements are spelled out in the procedure, it would only make sense to spell out the "early middle college" requirements. Sorry I'm stuck on that part of the policy/procedure. In my only experience with the program, I feel like I was kept in the dark and that my toes were stepped on.

Requirements change on a regular basis, depending on grants and student success, so it doesn't make sense to solidify in procedure. We added the names of the offices that keep the eligibility requirements to the procedure.

2. Under Part 1 - Subpart A - part 3 - why was "once a year" added? Students do not have to retake the placement test every year. Why was the "Arithmetic" score changed to 38 - or is this in reference to the number given to the "Arithmetic" Accuplacer exam? Regardless this will have to change when the Accuplacer NextGen comes on line next year.

Ability to Benefit has always been once per year. The scores for Ability to Benefit has different cut scores. Once NextGen is in place, we will have to make the changes.

3. Under Part 1 - Subpart B - 2 -a - ii. I had always been under the impression that they also need to place into college-level math. Is this a state level rule? Because this also explains why I get PSEO students in my developmental math classes which always blows my mind because developmental math IS high school math but faster so they should just f*ing take it in high school!!! Sorry - this one gets me angry. Also why can't MCAs be used to waive Accuplacaer for PSEO students? That doesn't' make sense to me.

Students cannot take developmental classes under PSEO. However anyone at any age can register, pay for and take any class, including developmental classes. It's possible to have high-school age students who are not PSEO in your class.

The MCA cannot be used to waive Accuplacer for PSEO students because of Minnesota Legislation.

4. Under Part 1 - Subpart D - 6 - same question about the "arithmetic" test

See above.

5. Under Part 1 - Subpart E - what is "early middle college students" and what classes are involved and who makes those decisions?

See above.

4.4.2: Weather and Short-Term Closings

Faculty

1. My only comment would be to set the notification time for weather and short-term emergencies to 5:00 a.m. Students departing from the St. Michael region or beyond may be on the road by 5:00 a.m. for 7:30/8:00 a.m. class when the weather is bad. Likewise, 3:00 p.m. is cutting it a bit close for students in 5:00 p.m. start evening classes. A 2:30 p.m. heads up may be a bit better.
1. For the school delay/closing, I would support the night before for late start. That has become the K-12 expectation. For closing, by 5:30 a.m., and for closing/cancelling night classes, by NOON. Students are on the road by 3:00—and so are faculty.
2. I feel strongly that the time the president makes the decision to close the college be 4-4:30am. I know of many students that drive an hour to get to class on time (normal weather) but it may be longer in bad road and visibility conditions only to get to college and it is closed. I agree that we need to get all students on the StarAlert System. It works great for me! If we make the time of decision 4-4:30 then students have time to wake up and check the status of the college. If open on a snowy morning they will have time to make the drive safely. And if college is closed and they know it, back to bed for them. This is important to me for our students' safety!
3. On the weather-related closures Part 3 last paragraph, although 5 a.m. and 5:30 a.m. deadlines are an improvement over 6 a.m., I think it's important to note that we offer classes that begin at 7 a.m., which means some faculty, staff, and students may need to know before 5 a.m. in order to make childcare arrangements and/or to allow for drive time to campus for a 7 a.m. arrival. The same potentially applies to 8 a.m. classes, of which NHCC offers many.
4. I am concerned about the wording in Part 3. It reads that NHCC will give "considerable weight" to the "considerable distances" that students must travel to attend night classes and/or Buffalo location classes. Apparently, NHCC is not concerned about its employees who travel

“considerable distances” to get to work? So, day classes cancelled by 5am and night classes cancelled by 3pm – both OK. Why is the decision to close or delay opening NHCC that day made by 5:30am? What am I not getting? Why not 5am to keep the timing aligned with the day class cancellation time specified?

5. Cancelling classes for the day and not closing the College just sends the message that NHCC does not value the welfare and safety of its employees as much as it does its students.

Responding to 4 & 5, we understand the perception of mixed messages. We do have to balance safety of all our employees with the need to have weather essential employees on campus. We also need to acknowledge that our employees are on multiple contracts with different stipulations about weather-related closes. We do feel it's important to encourage people to work with their supervisors to determine realistic options.

6. Part 5 sub-part A states that faculty must take personal leave or make appropriate curricular adjustments when classes are cancelled but NHCC remains open. More clarity is needed for this and what the “OR” means. This is very confusing.

We are cross-referencing Class Cancellation Policy and Procedure

7. So many faculty, myself included, work incredibly hard to keep their classes on pace regardless of how many NHCC closings and/or class cancellations occur. Every faculty member I know worked hours and hours over the Polar Vortex (when NHCC was closed). To my knowledge, no faculty member has asked to be paid for their work during that time. There seems to be a lack of understanding that faculty WORK all the time – whether the College is open or not and classes are in session or not.

Faculty are paid for 171 days, regardless of whether the campus is closed for weather emergencies.

8. I don't think faculty, myself included, are expecting to be required to take personal leave when NHCC is open, yet classes are cancelled. (Obvious noted exception of mandatory duty days.) If NHCC cancels classes and remains open, I juggle course content accordingly (like creating and posting videos online so content pace stays on target for the course and answering student emails the entire day) so does that constitute “appropriate curricular adjustments” or not? Who makes that decision? Am I to report to my Dean all that I am doing? And, personal leave is only in whole day and half-day increments. What would a faculty member do if they needed to take 60 minutes personal leave (only had one 60 minute obligation on campus that day and cancelled it). Does this require them to take a half-day increment of personal leave? I can think of many permutations of this scenario and none seem reasonable. Are faculty expected to take personal leave OR be on campus when NHCC is open and classes are cancelled?

See response above about Class Cancellation Policy & Procedure.

9. I would recommend considering a larger and consistent amount of time for notice of campus closings/class cancellations. While not ideal, notifying people of evening closings by 3pm gives a 3-hour window to prepare, arrange any child care, etc. This does not work for our students nor does it “meet them where they're at.” I would suggest at least the same window in the morning as well (so by 4am to account for 7am classes). Ideally, I would prefer an 8-hour window for notification of closings, delays, or cancellations. This gives our students and employees who are

parents time to make childcare arrangements if necessary and allows faculty time to plan for alternative content delivery options if needed. Holding class when 2/3 of my students can't make it in means we have to cover that content again anyway, so it isn't an effective use of time, but a planned outside of class activity could help prepare the class for discussions the next meeting.

We understand how frustrating class cancellation has been this semester. Exec team begins discussing cancellation at 2:30 am, so we're already asking people to not sleep the night before when there are storms. There are a lot of factors that go into making a decision, and leadership is trying to balance learning outcomes and safety, and there is no way we can write a policy that meets everyone's needs. (Please note the wide variety of suggested times above). We understand the recommendation for more time and notice, and we are very sympathetic. The counter argument is that the earlier we make a decision, the more likely we could close unnecessarily. Another issue to keep in mind is that K-12 has the option of using snow days, however, the faculty contract will not allow us to do this.

We are very sensitive to the various work arrangements that different employees have available to them. Not everyone has the same contractual flexibility, and we have to respect all the different contracts. We tried to insert flexibility where appropriate.

5.33 & 5.33.1: Tobacco Use & Sale

5.35 & 5.351 Service Animals on Campus

Staff

Thanks for the language clarifying service animals. All else looks good. Thanks to you and the committee for your work on this.

Faculty

1. Regarding Policy & Procedure 5.35, I would like that it to be clear that I am not ever required to have a dog in my classroom. I, like an estimated 2% of my fellow humans, am a cynophobe. I have a debilitating fear of dogs. I've noticed more dogs on campus lately and I'm worried that I may be required, at some point, to let one of them into my classroom. I would not be able to function under that circumstance and would probably have to retire. Number 3 under part 1 of the procedure mentions that the use of a service animal in training may be prohibited if it would alter the educational program or activity. That says to me that I can prohibit service animals that are in training, but I cannot prohibit service animals once they are fully trained. Can the procedure be altered to say that I can prohibit dogs from coming into my classroom under any circumstances? Even ones that are fully trained?

There are options for faculty who suffer from phobias. The cleanest option when we have competing ADA accommodations is to have HR and Access Services navigate the situation with both parties involved.

2. I understand people with allergies and fear of animals deserve a safe workplace but I am sorry to see a blanket policy concerning animals on campus. I think that therapy dogs and well-behaved pets can make the campus more friendly. There is a service dog in one of my classes and I have to remind students (and faculty) regularly that he can't interact with them; they would LOVE if there was a therapy dog in the classroom.

This policy is not replacing the Visitor and Animals on Campus Policy (5.34), which allows therapy animals on campus. We have noted that we need to reconcile these two policies. We do have to respect that we should not interacting with Service Animals

3. Part 1, number 2 refers to "Service animal or service animal in training" while part 3 only refers to "Service animal in training." Must be an omission in part 3.

A service animal in training is not part of an accommodation, whereas as service animal is part of an accommodation, so we cannot prevent a service animal in #3.

4. About 2% of people, including some faculty, are cynophobic. Every time a dog is allowed into a classroom it ruins the educational environment for someone. Personally, if I were forced to have a dog in my classroom, I would have very little choice but to retire.

Please see response to #1.

5. Re: **Service Animals on Campus Policy**

Animals have a very positive influence on students dealing with stress, a total restriction on non-service animals is way too harsh. Animals should be allowed to visit campus. Of course these animals should be kept under direct supervision by the owner and must be controlled and on a leash at all times. While a very small portion of the campus community are frightened, the majority can benefit from the stress relief that animals bring. Animals are allowed in many public and non-public places with no restrictions or negative consequences. I oppose this overly restrictive policy and would like a revision that allows animals on campus.

Sample of articles:

<http://animalsmart.org/species/dogs/dogs-help-reduce-stress>

<https://www.nbcnews.com/feature/college-game-plan/campus-therapy-dogs-offer-helping-paw-stressed-students-n556576>

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/canine-corner/201803/petting-away-pre-exam-stress-therapy-dogs-campus>

Thank you for providing this feedback. We are trying to balance multiple needs, and we do still have the Visitors and Animals on campus that allows for therapy dogs. See response above.

Racial Equity Policy & Procedure

The Racial Equity policy! THIS! Great job on it!

Faculty

1. I am in support of the Racial Equity Policy. I believe the work we just completed in the AASC addresses the question of pedagogy and continues to allow for academic freedom.

This policy does not only pertain to pedagogy, it's meant to be an institution wide procedure. It is not just about how we teach our students, but how we create a holistic experience for our students *as well as our fellow employees*. For example, we are trying to be inclusive with how we choose vendors and form partnerships with community members.

2. I strongly support the Racial Equity and Procedure Policies. Racism is a structural system of economic and social advantages. It really does take structural policies to interrupt this dehumanizing and destructive system.

Thanks for the feedback, this is one of the main drivers behind developing this policy.

3. **On Diversity and Equity Procedure: How can the diversity officer chair the committee when there's no longer a diversity officer?**

We do have a Diversity Officer, although the position is currently vacant. Whenever positions are vacant, someone is temporarily assigned to fulfill critical duties. The title has been revised, and we'll update throughout the policy.

4. On the Racial Equity Procedures definition of Racial Equity, "The condition that would be achieved if racial identity no longer predicted outcomes. This includes elimination of policies, practices, and messaging that reinforce differential outcomes by race, or fails to eliminate them." I think the language could be clearer. I assume the intent of this definition is that we should not continue with messaging that perpetuates differential outcomes by race—which I strongly support. But, I think the current wording could be interpreted to mean we won't talk about it either. I'm specifically thinking of classroom content that discusses differential outcomes in IQ tests, health outcomes, wealth, etc... Learning about those differential outcomes is going to cause stress for some students. And, I just worry that this policy might be used to stop that discussion.

Thanks for the feedback. We tightened the language to make it more clear.

5. For the racial p and p, I am not in favor of anti-anything as a policy or procedure. We need to be constructive: what do we want. We want equity. Then, let's promote equity for all—or will we develop a plethora of policies for gender, religious, abled, etc. Equity? This p and p counters the direction of the last 30 years in organizations; creating a respectful work environment for all have become the norm in this arena (unless this arena has changed appreciably with the anti-everything norm of our current USA president). Also, a strategic goal of 2 hours of training shouldn't be part of a policy or procedure; it should be an action item (at most) in a strategic plan.

This policy and procedure it is meant to a practice for inclusive excellence in regards to race. We are not excluding the other protected classes, but the purpose of this particular policy is to draw attention sociological construct of race and how it has

marginalized several groups on this campus. It is a major issue on campus that needs to be addressed. The intention is to create policies for all protected classes. This policy will serve as the framework for those policies. We are also working under the fact that racial equity is one of the current governor's priorities.

We removed the references to 2 hours of training from the procedure for the reasons you state.

6. I am concerned about Part 8 of the Racial Equity Procedure. It reads like ½ “blame the Dean” in Part 8 a and ½ “blame the faculty” in Part 8 b. I am uneasy about this wording. I am also concerned about how this Procedure plays out in real life. Can a student complain and get Administration/Dean to alter a course grade by blaming the faculty member? Academic freedom feels to be taking a back seat to racial equity in Part 8. What practices are faculty supposed to eliminate (in Part 8 b ii)?

This is not meant to blame anyone. We cleaned up the language to make it clear there should be intentional action towards achieving racial equity and closing the opportunity gap, and we're making it clear that there is administrative support for people wherever they are on their journey. This is policy does not override the grade appeal policy and procedure.

7. On the Racial Equity Procedure 3A, I think the Diversity & Affirmative Action roles are now separated (Affirmative Action is under HR)

Answered above 😊

8. On the Racial Equity Procedure 4A, the phrase “The college administrators and supervisors should consult the Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion . . .” seems vague. Does “consult with” mean seek approval? Gain input? Something else? I think it's important to clarify what that phrase means, especially when it comes to this policy and procedure's relationship to pedagogy. The same applies to item 4C's use of the phrase “been consulted and collaborated with.”

We tightened up the language for clarity, and made it clear this section does not refer to curriculum or pedagogy.

9. On the Racial Equity Procedure 4A, it seems contradictory to single out the American Indian group and its advisory committee without mentioning any other racial groups individually, since the policy and procedure are designed to create equity for all marginalized groups.

The Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee & the American Indian Advisory committee are the only two committees on campus that are specifically addressing marginalized. If other groups form, they can be added to that list.

10. There is an assumption in the proposed policy and procedure that achieving racial equity could be at odds with academic freedom. These are not contradictory concepts. One of the most important parts of teaching critical thinking, and modeling it for our students, is the ability to reflect on ideas and how those ideas change and evolve. My concern with the wording of this policy is that it assumes there is one correct solution to addressing the opportunity gap. There is little to allow for differences in approaches and pressure to conform to one way of thinking or

face discipline. Furthermore, have we assessed the potential impact on other student groups or are we assuming that they will continue to prosper in other ways?

We do believe that academic freedom has historically worked to create equity. We revised the language to allow diversity of approaches to equity and to protect academic freedom while still making it clear that we all need to engage in this work.

11. I do not support part 8 of the procedure as it is currently written. Which racially equitable outcomes are prioritized? There seems to be an underlying assumption that faculty do not incorporate culturally responsive practices or that there are a preferred set of practices. For part 9, we no longer have a diversity officer. I would like to allow for self-guided professional development in that area, not pre-selected trainings chosen from one perspective. We do not have a campus space where we can talk and disagree openly and respectfully with each other and the current wording seems combative.

We revised this (see comments above). We agree about the need for a campus space for respectful exchange of views, and the intent of this policy is to start building a culture that allows this to happen everywhere. We recognize that we have a lot of work to do, and this is a process.

12. It is incredibly disheartening to continue to read a racial policy that reflects such a narrow view of the impact that we as an institution could have on the larger systemic aspects of systemic racism. Does the current administration feel that understanding can be forced? If this is the case, I would suggest reflecting on the roles extrinsic and intrinsic motivation in creating genuine change. This entire policy from start to finish reads as though it is a politically motivated, reactive, and aggressively intended form of propaganda. As stated, I find no merit in adopting this policy, and strongly encourage my colleagues to consider that attacking a systemic problem cannot be solved through the simplest possible solutions. If this is meant to be a means for introducing disciplinary action, how can that possibly encompass pedagogical decisions that extend beyond the expertise of any one person or group of people? Would someone be subject to disciplinary action for suggesting that intersectionality is part of how their class should run? Should we introduce a practice of acknowledging that this land was originally occupied by native people? What is the implication if someone with documented Dakota heritage shows up and does take exception to our activities? I am through stating my objection in any other terms—this policy as stated is tone-deaf, encouraging power abuses while discouraging actual conversation, and ultimately one of the most asinine bits of reading I've had the displeasure to encounter at this college.

We've revised wording to be more developmental, recognizing that people are all in different spaces. We need to balance the need to encourage true personal growth while also making it clear we will not tolerate racist behavior. This is a difficult balancing act. We feel that the language revisions address these concerns and help us begin the work to create a respectful and inclusive community.

The majority of the policy is meant to be developmental, not disciplinary.

13. "Because it is a distortion of being more fully human, sooner or later being less human leads the oppressed to struggle against those who made them so. In order for this struggle to have meaning, the oppressed must not, in seeking to regain their humanity (which is a way to create it), become in turn oppressors of the oppressors, but rather restorers of the humanity of both."

Paulo Freire! We agree and this is the intent of the policy.

14. Part 3 - In the sentence "The goal of this policy is to institutionalize an approach to decision-making, pedagogy, program and policy development, implementation, and evaluation, which improves outcomes and reduces educational racial disparities and inequities for the people we serve."

The idea of institutionalizing any approach to pedagogy impinges on academic freedom - and though I agree with the goal of this policy and the goal of the sentence - academic freedom is necessary for us to actually do the work of closing the opportunity gap and must be protected. Overall however I like this policy a lot and support it.

Yes, to academic freedom, see comments above.

15. Racial Equity Procedure -

Part 1 - maybe I just don't know enough about policies and procedures but this feels like over-reach to me and that it is putting too much into a procedure.

We revised to make it less negative and more developmental.

Part 3 - Subpart A - a - This wording seems odd to me in this sentence "This committee will be charged with advising the responsible leadership of that administration on advancing equitable outcomes for all people we serve and the college employees." It's the "advising the responsible leadership of that administration" part that sounds weird but I'm not sure why or how to fix it - sorry that is super unhelpful.

We removed this part and revised the language.

Part 3 - Subpart A - b - I don't have any issue with this other than wondering why we have an American Indian Advisory Committee but not one for any other marginalized group. This isn't a criticism, just a question.

These are the only groups that have formed, the AIAC is required by state law. Other groups are more than welcome to form.

Part 3 - just in general are we to understand that the responsibilities of these two groups is only what is laid out in Part 3?

The full responsibilities are laid out in the groups' Charters; these are the most relevant responsibilities within the context of this policy.

Part 4 - a - what is a "racial equity analysis" and will we be given any training/guidance/support in this? If so, who is responsible for that and how will they give it?

We added clarifying language to help with this comment.

Part 4 both a and b refer to "consulting" the Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion Committee but do we want to pin that down to more defined terms or do we want it left this way to leave room for interpretation?

We revised the language to help with this comment.

Part 4 c - is this the "racial equity analysis" from part a? I'm okay with it, just wondering.

We revised the language to help with this comment.

Part 7 - this whole part is a little vague but I'm not sure that is a bad thing, it leaves room for interpretation and that may or may not be bad.

We revised the language to help with this comment.

Part 8 - a - what do they mean by "racially equitable degree outcomes" are they talking about the actual degree outcomes as in what a student will learn by completing the degree or are they talking about data related to the number of students who complete the degree? If they are talking about data they really should take the word "outcomes" out of the sentence and reword it to say something about the number of students completing the degree.

The intent is to eliminate differences in the retention and completion based on race. We revised to make it clear we're referring to the opportunity gap.

Part 8 - b - I'm okay with this but yet... how are they actually going to enforce this? How are they going to support this? What are they going to do if we don't do this? Do we want that all spelled out?

Supervisors will be working with their direct reports to ensure that they engage with this work in a developmentally appropriate manner.

Part 8 - b - ii - Could we change "eliminating" to "examine and modify." Here is where I have major concerns. We use placement test to place students into math courses - yes the test itself is garbage and we are we are actively working on finding a better option. However it is pretty clear that the "practice" of using placement tests leads to a larger number of students of color placing into developmental math courses so should we eliminate the practice of using placement tests? I don't think so - but we definitely need to examine and modify it.

We are quoting the Governor's Change Item Template in this section.

Part 9 - I don't like that the list is solely established by the Diversity Officer and would prefer if it was established by the Diversity Officer in collaboration with either Human Resources and/or the Diversity and Inclusion Committee

We modified this to address this comment.

16. Re: Racial Equity Policy

This policy is unnecessary as it exists in a variety of other places already. The definitions are widely available and the mission, commitment, and practice are already in place.

We're trying to create a centralized framework to ensure that we are supporting and continuing this work. We know people are doing this; we need to make sure that it is happening consistently. As we update policies in the future, this policy will help us remain consistent.

17. Re: Racial Equity Procedure

This procedure is a compilation of already existing procedures but with more extreme directives that will be almost impossible to monitor. Academic Freedom is part of our MSCF Contract and it is the right of every faculty member to create their own courses and what is presented in those courses. Interference from administration regarding course content WILL violate the contract. It will also create an increased negative college climate when individuals are questioned about their courses. This is an insult to all Faculty who have worked to eliminate racist content and will create a climate of mistrust as well as discourage discussion about racial equity. This creates an issue where no issue currently exists.

As with many policies and procedures there are no clear rules on what may violate the policy/procedure. The rules will be arbitrary and random based on the opinions of a few administrators who may or may not have any experience or training. What one may consider racist is never the same as what others think.

Part 3, The Diversity, Equity & Inclusion committee already has great input into all policies and procedures, another mandate is unnecessary.

Part 4, a & b. This already happens.

Part 4, c. This can be added to the AASC process without the need to have a separate procedure.

Part 5 Part 6 and Part 7. This already happens.

Part 8. This part is insulting to faculty. It implies that faculty need hand holding and that faculty need to do more when they are already voluntarily leading this charge. It also implies that only administrators can determine when faculty need to do more work on this issue. Administrators are NOT experts any more than faculty and in many cases are much less qualified. It also creates more divisiveness between administration and

faculty. If there is to be any equity on this campus we will need a diversity officer who has the respect of the faculty and the training and qualifications to communicate with faculty.

Part 9. The ultimate insult. This should be voluntary and not included in any performance evaluation. You are changing the conditions of employment laid out in the MSCF contract without negotiations. This is a grievance waiting to happen. In summary, this policy should be rejected.

We've adjusted language throughout to address these concerns. We understand that our campus has work to do and the revised policy is a step in that direction.

18. I want to state for the record that the ideals of academic freedom must be held up by the college, that faculty, who are experts in their fields, as well as expert instructors and educators, must not have the content of their courses dictated from outside entities who may have agendas that could even run counter to the proven expertise and knowledge of the faculty, and could very well impede the learning process of the students.

We've included language supporting academic freedom.

19. My comments concern the racial equity policy and procedures. I feel the policy should be tabled until the faculty have more time to discuss it in a variety of fashions. The current version is not tenable considering faculty rights of pedagogy and professional development.

Language is authoritarian, and it appears as if this policy could be easily weaponized against anyone based on the subjective opinions of the few. Further, despite great pains to define terms, the question of "what are examples of educational racial disparity and inequity" is so subjective that it is unanswerable.

Yet, this policy would enshrine into law a very select few people to wield great power over faculty and staff in terms of performance. In other words, if one Administrator feels a faculty member's pedagogy has racial disparity, then they can act on that.

This policy takes a very important issue, which is rooted in human heart change, and turns it into a linear/engineered process. It completely leaves behind the very real and necessary steps of addressing where faculty are, where they want to be, and how they can get there. Words throughout the policy such as "enforce", "performance review", and commands on what kind of pedagogy to teach do not bring about this needed heart change. You cannot engineer an inclusive campus...

A commitment to racial equity demands an emotionally intelligent policy that has a real chance of actually building inclusivity. As stated, this policy seems to advance the notion that inclusive culture can be engineered, and of course we all know it

cannot. And the byproduct of such a policy will leave employees acting compliant, and scoring linear points for diversity, but not actually building an inclusive campus.

I guess my overriding comment would be that we remove all language that has an element of prescription to it. And replace it with subjective language That leaves faculty autonomy intact. I have attached an example of such in the word document. The diversity policy needs major revision, and I strongly recommend we table it.

We should leave very gray the notion of heart change because that is what heart change is, and that is what is needed.

It seems also peculiar to move forward with this policy without a current diversity director. We do not have senior leadership in place that is capable of leading an initiative requiring such strong levels of emotional intelligence. Yes, we could enforce policy, and engineer some statistics, but it would be my recommendation further that someone with a strong track record or skillset of applying their emotional quotient be hired to revise this policy. Administration may want to consider re-investing diversity salaries and dollars into a consultancy that focuses on ethos change, versus enforcing a very linear policy such as this. Instead of hiring a replacement for Birchard, they should bridge "the next Birchard" with a two year consultancy that focuses on ethos change.

Regarding mandating professional development outside of a duty day...I believe this misses the spirit of professional development, and by itself is a red flag.

Encouraging professional development is one thing, mandating in a very specific area, with one or a handful of people who must approve this mandated training is another. I found it a bit authoritarian.

As for the mention of performance review, this is also of great concern. The policy mandates certain training, and mandates very subjective pedagogical elements with only the academic dean as the enforcer. I can only surmise that my performance will be judged accordingly. Instead, as I recommend on the attachment, faculty should share governance of this policy, whatever form it takes. An academic dean should not be solely responsible for enforcing a policy's effect on pedagogy.

It's better to not prescribe or enshrine into policy subjective things like this. Building an inclusive campus is not something Administration can engineer through policy. The fact that we now have a very linear/engineered mindset policy is proof we need a completely new direction in this area on campus. We should hire accordingly, and work on the subjective notion of heart change in relation to inclusivity.

I would ask policy makers. Can you force heart /ethos change on people who are all at varying degrees of inclusiveness? Is "inclusiveness" only percentages, "number of hours per year", and other quantitative measures?

And I mean no judgment. If we want to build an inclusive campus, I would urge faculty and policy makers to try again, with more qualified Diversity Directors that have a track record of changing ethos. I urge faculty to realize that this policy encroaches on our rights to develop pedagogy, to evaluate pedagogy in our respective departments, and to freely pursue professional development.

Again, my attached document demonstrates a different way to write some of the policies, but my main feedback is that it should all be stricken completely, and revised under leadership from someone with demonstrated EQ in leading initiatives that change an organization's ethos and culture.

Recommended Language Changes:

From Procedure Statement

Part 8. Academics and Pedagogy a. Academic Dean **in collaboration with department faculty** will be charged with ensuring that academic departments are advancing racially equitable degree outcomes.

~~b. Faculty will work together to increase their individual and collective capacity to effectively teach a racially and ethnically diverse and changing student population by: i. Collaborating as faculty to create and implement culturally responsive instructional practices, curriculum and assessments; and ii. Eliminating practices that lead to the over- or under- representation of any student racial group compared to peers.~~

Faculty will consciously work towards building individual and collective capacity to effectively teach a racially and ethnically diverse and changing student population.

Examples of this may include the following:

- i. Collaborating as faculty to create and implement culturally responsive instructional practices, curriculum and assessments; and
- ii. Eliminating practices that lead to the over- or under-representation of any student racial group compared to peers.
- iii. Attending diversity training of at least 2 hours per year. Diversity training may be selected from a list of opportunities provided by the Diversity Officer, or from any outside source.

~~Part 9. Training All staff and faculty will attend diversity training 2 hours/year, per the Diversity Strategic Goal. This will be noted on the employee's performance evaluation. Diversity Training may be selected from a list of opportunities, as established by the Diversity Officer. Outside trainings can be approved, including outside trainers on-campus, by the Diversity Officer.~~

From Policy Statement

~~Part 3. Campus Commitment North Hennepin Community College will provide resources to make racial equity an integral part of all programs, policies and procedures it implements. This policy requires that considerations of racial equity, that is, fairness and justice, are embedded in decisions at all levels of the college, including leadership, operations, classrooms, pedagogy, programming, investments, facilities, and policy development. The goal of this policy is to institutionalize an approach to decision-making, pedagogy, program and policy development, implementation, and evaluation, which improves outcomes and reduces educational racial disparities and inequities for the people we serve.~~

Thanks for your thoughtful response and suggestions. We have incorporated many of the recommendations throughout. We want this policy to support people's development, rather than impose "heart change" from above. We also want to ensure that the proper supports are in place. Like all policies, this policy can be reviewed at any time, and we could and should revisit to make sure it continues to meet the campus's needs.

20. I think the Racial Equity Policy and Procedure and both well-written and helpful, I am concerned that the segments of both that address pedagogy do not appear to recognize the contractual right of faculty to academic freedom. It goes without saying that sometimes balancing the need for culturally responsive instructional practices, curriculum and assessments with a faculty's right to academic freedom could be a difficult conversation and process. Certainly, academics writ large does has a history of - and in some cases a current practice of - exclusionary practices that fall disproportionately on underrepresented communities. Addressing the long-term impact of this history and changing current practices are an important commitment for institutions of higher learning to make and actually carry out. And we also cannot forget that academic freedom is a cornerstone of democracy and one of the front line protections against fascism. I would like to see language added to both the Racial Equity Policy and Procedure that acknowledges the existence of the academic freedom of faculty and commits all of us to the more difficult work of figuring out how to serve and respect both racial inclusion as well as academic freedom. All one has to do is look at our current president's attempts (and even successes) in terms of negatively impacting inclusivity on college campuses - e.g., his executive order concerning free speech on campus, Department of Education changes on how accusations of sexual assaults on campuses are managed, etc. - to understand that protecting academic freedom helps us to protect and promote racial (and gender) equity. We need to clearly protect and promote both racial equity and academic freedom - even if this means that the work of colleges, deans and faculty become more difficult when there are differences of opinion on pedagogical choices or approaches. To do any less would actually be a disservice to the goals outlined in this new Policy/Procedure. Including language that recognizes academic freedom does not have to be excessive or cumbersome or something that detracts from the importance of a policy/procedure whose main focus and purpose is

racial equity. Finding an appropriate place to insert something like, "while recognizing our commitment to academic freedom" or "while understanding a faculty right of academic freedom" into both Part 3. Campus Commitment of the Policy and Part 8. Academics and Pedagogy of the Procedure would be acceptable. I would even settle for clarifying language around academic freedom and pedagogy to be only included in Part 8. Academics and Pedagogy of the procedure - either as the insert discussed above or perhaps as a sub-point c.

Thanks for your thoughtful response, we've made a lot of changes to reflect your recommendations (see comments above).

21. I am still not satisfied with the Racial Equity Policy and Procedure. My broad concern is that academic freedom can still be infringed. If we ever have a conservative faculty member, he or she could say they do not agree with the goals of these documents but neither will work against them nor do anything to thwart any student's learning. If this is not an acceptable position for a faculty member to take, then we need to be much more forthright about who we will hire and who we will tenure. A more modest response to the policy and procedure would simply for a faculty member to say that he or she will address the goals by being the most effective teacher for all of her or his students. If there are specific things the administration wants faculty to do to satisfy these policies, they should be spelled out. Of course, this would potentially infringe on academic freedom. Consequently, the burden shifts to the faculty member to say how he or she will address these issues. But this puts faculty in a tenuous spot. What will be good enough? How will we know that deans are using consistent standards across the college? I make these comments not because I question the goals of the policy and procedure, but I do not think we have sufficiently thought this through at this point. If we are going to create a culture of faculty, staff, and administrators who are excited to close the opportunity gap, I do not believe our current course of action (and campus climate) are conducive to this goal.

Thanks for your thoughtful response, we've made a lot of changes to reflect your recommendations (see comments above).