**Diversity Council**

**Minutes**

**April 5, 2019**

**Attendance**: Anna, Drew, Rosa, Gina, Sarah, Cameron, Deborah, Matt, Briselda, Marsha, D’Ante, Mark

**Guest**: Tammie Stark, Elizabeth Andrade, Anna Kate Malloris

Gender Sexuality Alliance student advocate - Cameron Santiago (new member) joined DC

**Agenda** **approval**: vote: unanimous

**Minutes 2.1.19 Meeting approval: Motion to approve, first by Gina; second by Sarah; Vote:** 8 yes; 3 abstained: Anna, Deborah, Cameron

1. Accreditation invitation (Tammie Stark)
	1. Explaining accreditation coordination team and accreditation leadership team opportunities. Seeking p/t and f/t leadership team members to join workgroups based on subject matters. There’s an application process.
	2. Other opportunities: communication team - recruitment underway for pt/, f/t and student involvement. Asked for help with word of mouth to recruit students for paid opportunities
	3. Hiring a faculty technical writer
	4. Changes to NWCCU standards and asked if DC would be interested in learning more.
2. COPPS [Policies](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1VfW0E2VoKPMN5ulo1mR1grZu5uKCXHw3eNSxdYXZkJ0) updates (Anna)
	1. Suggested that DC go through exercise on whether DC should have oversight of related policies. Example: policy on hiring consultants and hiring of underrepresented groups is not assigned to any governance council.
		1. Rosa suggested would be better conversation to have with Paul and Dennis in the room
		2. Matt - if we could generate data and reporting could be helpful
		3. Drew - asked if this will be reviewed when accreditors come? Is it a best practice for policies to be assigned to a governance council? (Rosa explained accreditation more about mission fulfillment and policy/governance not part of that review.)
		4. Anna: harassment-related policies could be policies that the DC review implementation of (Rosa suggested could be similar to Matt’s suggestion that we report out information.)
		5. Policy related to organizations (Student Affairs Council is currently assigned, but should there be cross-council representation.)
		6. Mark: re: affinity groups and other examples where we should go beyond the federal regulations/law through our own policies (“another case where the law is lame.”) Example: if your bargaining unit is racist and you feel that you are not adequately represented. If you don’t have an affinity group to support you and give you “assistive technology” to help you until the law catches up. (Anna - could be need of an interstitial group.)
		7. Rosa: DC still needs to decide how to move forward with policies.
		8. Sarah: NWCCU new standards could impact policies/governance, so we should have another meeting with Tammie, and/or Paul, Jen
		9. Gina: big project, have meeting with those with insights and should be on next year’s work plan.
		10. **Rosa: will invite accreditation folks to the next meeting: Tammie, Paul/other related guests.**
	2. Rosa suggested that the review could be done in subcommittee and/or more substantive review/discussion could be part of our work plan for next year.

III. Governance update (Elizabeth Andrade)

1. Governance committee grew too large (31 people) - disbanded and there’s now a governance task force: four or five people (union leadership and Members of College Council) . Groups did work and presentations. She was part of data group, but she is no longer part of the governance work. She says there was a Her personal opinion is that the unions wanted to control the process.
2. Anna: was part of the governance task force. She received clarification that the governance task force sunsetted and the governance subcommittee was formed and it is a subcommittee of the College Council.
3. Gina: how can we get some clarity and recent information on the process
4. Sarah: ask Paul for a update when he joins the meeting?
5. Gina: more transparency needed
6. Rosa: ask Paul and if we don’t get to see Paul today, Rosa will request information from College Council

IV. Bias policy (Anna Kate Malloris, D’Ante Carter, and Sarah Lushia)

1. Anna Kate: Reviewed attorney version of policy and considered some areas of first draft and made improvements. “We worked to balance the fact that there is some real ugly law that surrounds these areas. That is fact, so we don’t get to play with that.”
2. D’Ante: wanted to ensure that bias incidents were defined, so that when things happen in the workplace that there is a reference. No chance for a loophole and ensures accountability.
3. Rosa wants to include opportunities for education, suggested: the college will ensure there is a procedure implemented to provide guidance to the witness or victims of the acts …
4. Anna Kate: when talking about process/procedure, that’s phase 2. She did initially weave the implementation piece into the policy, but removed it.
5. Gina: (agreed) need the policy to create the procedure.
6. Cameron: it’s not disciplinary to expect faculty, staff within consistent contact to be educated about issues that pertain t those students to rectify incidents of bias they’ve perpetuated against someone.
7. Anna Kate: (agreed) there’s a fine line of how you approach it because it’s law
8. Mark: restorative justice recognized as potential solution and could be education (between perpetrator and the target). Focus education on target to strengthen their protection. Example: workplace sabotage in the form of spreading feces on workplaces of people of color is decades-long practice here. If this happened in the city, a haz-mat team would participate in the removal. Could take DNA evidence and test that evidence to find the perpetrator, that is the law. Could penalize the perpertrator. At same time, the target could have some strength-building (exercise) …
9. Anna Kate: that’s an act of harassment, not bias. Let us not confuse the two cliffs in the sinking hole. There’s a legal remedy of those issues. This is to fill that chasm. If I could bring us back and move this forward …
10. Elizabeth: the cultural competency policy passed in 2014 … now have equity lens. Meanwhile, people who look like me are being harassed and we feel that we have no protection. The language of the policy is to educate every staff member and that’s not happening.
11. Anna Kate: this requires public reporting to the board. Will help drive action if publicly reported to the board.
12. MOTION: Anna: move to a vote to accept draft to college council for its approval and DC should show up to College Council to show support when it’s considered; seconded by Drew
13. DISCUSSION: Rosa -still wants to see what educational piece will be (Anna Kate relayed again that piece comes with implementation/procedure piece.)
14. VOTE: Unanimous (12-0)
15. Sarah: clarification that Cultural Competency and Equity Lens are separate and EL not intended to replace CCPD. (In response to Elizabeth’s comments) Issue is that training is not mandatory for employees
16. Drew: shared story of being admonished along with NASA members because kitchen was left in a mess after Pow Wow; it’s a practice of accountability. You can make it necessary for everyone if you make it for the whole group and it’s not deferential

V. Bathroom policy (Sarah)

1. Sarah is asking for input from other campus groups and will bring back to DC
2. MOTION: Anna and Gina for approval
3. Discussion: Anna suggested connecting with related sustainability/facilities policies. Matt: include language that new bathrooms adhere to policy
4. VOTE: unanimous (12-0)

VI. Equity Lens

1. Rosa: before it gets implemented, is that tool going to get reviewed for questions that have been missed? Other people need to see the questions before it’s implemented
2. Gina: would be great to have tools to support ongoing work.
3. Sarah: disconnect from conversations we had and when they’ve started. Access components were going to get built in implementation team and rolled out.

VII. Announcements

1. Anna: Shane Turner joined staff as compliance officer. She invited him to DC meeting
2. IEC Core Theme 2 group (Anna) — on access and equitable learning opportunities …