**CoEnv Diversity Committee Agenda**

 Thursday January 21st, 2016 3pm-430pm FSH 203

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Title** | **Sponsor** | **Info/Action** | **Min.** |
| 1 | Call to Order | Brian Tracey | Action | 1 |
| 2 | Approval of Agenda | Brian Tracey | Action | 1 |
| 3 | Approval of Minutes | Lisa S./Ashley M. | Action | 1 |
| 4 | Check-in | Brian Tracey | Action | 10 |
| 5 | Review of Ralina Joseph talk and CoE involvement | Natalie Lowell and Erica Escajeda | Information | 15 |
| 6 | Event Opportunities and REI update | Jill Rand | Information | 10 |
| 7 | REI Update | Brian Tracey | Information | 5 |
| 8 | Review of ADDA Rubric | All | Information | 10 |
| 9 | Racial Slur Discussion | Brian Tracey | Information | 25 |
| 10 | Officer Reports | Officers | Information | 5 |
| 11 | Announcements | All | Information | 5 |

REI- Race and Equity Initiative: <https://www.washington.edu/raceequity/>

See <https://youtu.be/9uWxEJhehjM> for address by Ana Mari Cauce April 2015

See <http://www.washington.edu/alumni/equity/> for more conversations

Notes:

1. Meeting called to order by Fritz Stahr @ 3:05pm
2. Agenda approved unanimous voice approval
3. Minutes approved by lack of objection (no one really read them, need to send out with minutes and put in “Home” at catalyst site)
4. Checkin – Kirsten, Bob, Dana, Andrea, Kristina V., Mark W, Ashley, Fritz, Christina, Natalie (guest: Fisheries Grad Student), Rick, Brian, Eddie, Lisa, Megan (replacement for Sarah), Sarah (last day tomorrow), Kyle (just got $10k for SMESA program – raises endowment to $50k for scholarships), Jill, Naomi
5. Natalie re: Ralina Joseph REI presentation (Jan 14th) and the facilitated dialogue which was “uncomfortably great” at the **wǝɫǝbʔaltxʷ** Intellectual House. Natalie asks a question about interactions between REI and CoEnv DCM. Jill responds that we’re getting Ed (chair REI) and Jenette James (OoP’s Diversity manager) [Wed Feb 4th 12:00 OSB 425 – facilitated dialog for CoEnv grad students]. Natalie continues, saying that workshop style for the REI conversations at the Intellectual House was better than Defining Diversity events.
	1. Ashley attended and presented about our diversity committee at TOASTeR this past weekend so now ocean grads are aware of CoEnv and University level REI efforts.
	2. Rick: worried that these events are more preaching to the choir as attendance by choice – how to get to faculty making decisions now other than by going to something required?
	3. Natalie: President Anna Marie Cauce made a bad comment, was made aware of it after talk, then called herself out and corrected it and said leaders need to do that. Talked at tables and learned to listen. Presentation “What’s the Difference with Difference” (<http://www.grad.washington.edu/lectures/ralina-joseph.shtml> ) and Q&A were excellent, including interaction with president. President was open to talking about the issues. The lecture addressing the power structure on language such as minority vs. minoritized and the movement #blacklivesmatter vs the ugly retort #alllivesmatter. Liked how the President said that “she wasn’t proud of the state of diversity at our University. These are the things we’ve done right, but there’s all this room.”
	4. Ashley talked about experiences at her discussion table, including I-200 effects, use of derogatory language in a fraternity, two Muslim students but soup with bacon in it. There’s all these things that we don’t think about that could cause a conflict. Didn’t know the difference between black-lives-matter vs. all-lives-matter until this event. Her take-away = need to do more listening and asking questions re: how to be good ally.
	5. Natalie took away the same things. There is a diversity committee in SAFS but no faculty on it, went to FINS group and reached grad students. Re-broadcast emails to all students. “Any email that has purple in it, I just don’t read.”
	6. Ashley is working on way to have events/training for faculty re: micro-aggressions, etc. but Ginger said ‘can’t make them’ but want to do it anyways – not a good reason not have this thing. Looking for a way to post it and encourage our faculty and them know it’s important to us that they go.
	7. Rick asks if they can do it at a faculty meeting – capture the audience.
	8. Eddie says you can get someone to come in to a faculty meeting and talk to them.
	9. Kristina – sometimes that doesn’t even work as people may just listen and ‘check the box’, need some ways to make more of a difference in faculty that’s more active – true at Yale too, need to be clever…forced training it isn’t really going to be effective – how can you effect change? A person is a certain kind of individual – it is going to take more than just a talk to make them change. Administration doesn’t know how to deal with it.
	10. Christina doesn’t know what level of diversity training faculty in CoEnv has now but wonders if it’s possible to do more? At least to reach a subset with this kind of thing?
	11. Kristina – environment within departments not good and that needs changing even without faculty change – older ones are entrenched and students are more powerful than you think. “I’m too pessimistic I don’t think it is going to work” We only have so many faculty – and only so many coming in – change the environment to make it conducive to a supportive atmosphere.
	12. Brian says that’s why we’re here. That’s the point. So that we can use our creative collective to try to come up with things that are better. Indicated we needed to move on to Jill. Agrees that indeed there’s an issue but all students have to deal with faculty because they set the tone. “If we go systematic, too big picture, it will fail every time, just like you’ve seen”
	13. Kristina thinks students are a lot more powerful than they think. “We saw it at Yale, programs develop because of students.” Believes students are future leaders, creative and more capable than any of us think.
	14. Brian agrees, we will definitely tap into our students. Thinks that the environment starts with faculty, one of the ways to make change is to address the faculty. We gotta move on to Jill.
6. Jill:
	1. Thur Feb 4th, 12pm talk from Ed Taylor (with Lisa) specifically for graduate students – short talk and then Q&A – airing of grievances (no advisors). The email didn’t have purple in it!
	2. We do Conversations on Defining Diversity. We do that once a quarter. We don’t have a plan yet in place for winter quarter. Jill would to turn to the committee for ideas for topics for Defining Diversity. It’s more of a Dean’s office event and Jill would love the committee to be more involved. Topics, panelists, Q and A, etc. Recent topics have been transfer students, active duty and other military students, assistant professors and family friendly policies around tenure and promotion, recruiting underrepresented minorities in our undergraduate program. We’ve not done international students.
		1. Brian feels this is an example of how we can directly interact with the rest of the college, he would prefer that someone else lead the conversation and take the lead on organizing it. The floor is open.
		2. Kyle: “So, you’re basically saying if we pitch an idea, we’re responsible for it?”
		3. Brian: “yeah. You’re going to have help in terms of how you can set up the discussion and different ways to do it, but it is your topic so I would expect that you would take the helm as to content. If you need help, you’ve got help.”
		4. Ashley ideas– Islamophobia? Another idea I heard recently, is hiring/training/mentoring people who are only like yourself is considered ‘violent behavior’ (hear at R. Joseph lecture)?
		5. Kristen – why ‘violence’?
		6. Ashley: perhaps because it’s mistreating all others who I did not mentor who did not look like me
		7. Brian: along the same lines as micro/macro aggression. It’s a form of aggression. It’s pretty heavy/intense language
		8. Rick: mentorship is important, the minority students here don’t have mentors that look like them, found students at last Defining Diversity conversation responsive to his mentorship as immigrant, brown-skinned, etc. “I would love to have a mentor in this college who looked like me and went through the same things as me.”
		9. Eddie: session on creating inclusive lab culture for students, advisees, techs, etc. Example seminar followed by beers (popular in Anglo-Saxon culture) on Friday afternoon doesn’t work in Muslim culture (coffee in morning ok). Getting lab leaders to attend with the goal of getting different kinds of students/personality types/ethnicities and help the more dominant extrovert students create an inclusive harmonious lab groups.
		10. Kirsten, as a female going out to beers with your male advisors is awkward and once you have a baby you are cut out of a whole social network.
		11. Brian asked Eddie & Rick to help, with Jill and Kirsten
7. REI update: 3 main goals – a) enriching personal UW experiences (3 campus-wide conversations each year – go to each college to identify, address and improve issues ), b) addressing inequities at institutional level (training at dean, VP, & chancellor level, bias and implementation hotline available – Brian worried re: follow-up), c) engaging communities (inventory documented programs & centers). Brian worried that a lot of this a plan to make a plan but at least moving forward main concern is reaching the groups that need it the most and how do you make people accountable to their actions?
	1. Rick echoes the lack of response to complaints issue (once you make a complaint, who knows what goes on on the other side?).
	2. Brian notes that they also supports faculty training through CTL but no mention of OMAD.
8. Review of ADDA hiring rubric – today is last day to send any comments/suggestions. Applications close on Feb 15th so some time left to be heard.
	1. Christina question: there are a lot of descriptors, it would be phenomenal if a candidate excelled at all of them, but when grading are there categories that are more important than others, where do you flex?
	2. Mark: yes, committee discussed and top 3 are most important but don’t have a hard/fast rule on it… but don’t have to be especially strong in items they can learn. It would be hard to grow into being a leader. Discussed having blind evals - no names or other ID characteristics as much as possible to avoid bias, but won’t be perfect as much will be in their statements that tip off.
		1. Rick: most important is to know that biases exist.
	3. Brian asks how much ADDA will have with students.
	4. Eddie: a lot 50% of their job is to work with students and outreach - as will be faculty member and will interact with incoming students as well as current students.
		1. Brian suggests moving up list if possible. Does the placement represent importance?
		2. Mark agrees
		3. Eddie agrees
	5. Kyle notes that making the candidates aware that they themselves will diversify units.
	6. Kristina likes rubric as shows looking for whole candidate – hard to get from them even when they visit.
	7. Rick asks re: getting references –
		1. won’t until 2nd round of eval,
	8. Kristina suggests talking to departments to make sure faculty are supporting the candidate and realize they are adding to the diversity of the college and perhaps committee should chat with grad students also rather than just getting references from faculty.
	9. Rick asks about timeline
	10. Mark and Jill say July (shifted slightly because of holiday).
9. Brian: Racial slur discussion – The purpose is to have difficult conversations. All of us in here wants to make changes to the system or the institution, but in order to do this, we have to be honest with ourselves first. And then once we do that, we can venture outside and be honest with other people and hopefully encourage them to be honest with themselves. Change starts from within and radiates out. We go by the rules of oops, ouch and sorry. We should all know that no one is coming from a place of bad intentions.
	1. “lucky” e.g., ‘you’re so lucky to have this job, travel the world, etc.’ – micro-aggression for most but macro-aggression to him because he worked very hard to get where he is – has conversation with people when they say it – even friends
	2. “wop” – doesn’t actually mean “without papers” but when used with Italians – comes from ‘wap’ for thug, other people say what emigrants say when see Statue of Liberty – sound of stamp of immigration officer
	3. “injun” referring to native-americans – “honest injun” = lack of duplicity in NA person, then “indian giver” – NA asked for stuff back after gave it away when made drunk by Europeans – different sense of ‘property’ also of gifting
	4. “fob” = ‘fresh off the boat’ – derogatory for immigrants who often come by boat, she’s native Seattle but people use it around her, also “Asian” but not referring to her even those she is – lack of response even though micro-aggression –another mentions TV show “Fresh off the Boat” by Chinese American producer re: his experience. Hard to explain why it can be offensive – another offers that they didn’t think about that like some others because it doesn’t affect you. Another inputs – often matters who is saying it because those who it applies to often ‘reclaim’ term and defuse it (e.g., author of TV show) another person also notes important to know what relationship level is so can own up to insults to
	5. “kyke” for Jew - origin from Yiddish “kykle” – insult to eastern European Jews in US, when younger heard it as “kite”. “nigger” derived from Ethiopian term for royalty “negus” – but only came in terms with slaves in US
10. Brian: Dean wants us to be more involved with CoEnv Diversity award – will put up rubric on catalyst site
11. Jill: be on the lookout for Greendot training; OMAD (Office of Minority Affairs and Diversity: <http://www.washington.edu/omad/> ) book club gearing back up with new title
12. Adjourned 4:35pm