

Committee on Diversity (CoD) November 5, 2019 Meeting Minutes

Present: Tim Beyer, Joel Elliott, Lea Fortmann, Carrie Woods, Ariela Tubert and Steven Zopfi, Julie Christoph (guest), Simone Moore (guest), Priyanki Vora (guest), Christina Mills, Kelly Brown.

Chair Zopfi called the meeting to order at 8:30am and distributed meeting agenda.

- I. Approval of minutes
- II. Welcome new member
- III. Reports from Liaisons
- IV. Simone Moore/ASUPS cultural competency training
- V. Mentoring plan
- VI. Other business

Due to time constraints of the guests, the committee opted to skip ahead to agenda item IV.

IV. Simone Moore/ASUPS cultural competency training

Simone Moore and Priyanki Vora attended the meeting as guests coming to speak about their efforts to host two workshops on cultural competency training at the university. They noted that the workshops are not affiliated with ASUPS, just the two of them. They hosted small workshops with two groups, STEM and Music faculty based on their respective majors and interests. The idea for the workshop was due to increasing recognition that students were feeling they had concerns but not a way to voice them to professors or staff in a way that was comfortable for them. Their objective was to facilitate a discussion between faculty, staff, and students so all sides could come together, voice their concerns, and learn from each other (e.g STEM visible spectrum mtg).

One CoD member asked about plans to go beyond music and STEM fields – but they explained that it was hard to manage additional workshops, especially outside their departments, as both students are seniors.

Moore and Vora explained that they ideally would like to move the workshops to a more professional level. Their intention was to engage faculty and show them how it could be done with the ultimate goal of passing it on to faculty to take over. A CoD member requested the materials used during the workshop from the students who said they would be happy to share.

Julie Christoph (guest) brought up two things she has been working on that intersect with the project. The first one is a STEM grant (HHMI) she is working on to promote diversity and inclusion and mentioned that these workshops could be an example of demonstrated capacity to do this work and requested a meeting with the students and the institutional review board to share their work.

The students then shared more about the structure for the workshops. They had separate questionnaires for students and faculty. Example questions for faculty included: How

comfortable do you feel having difficult or controversial conversations with colleagues? How comfortable are you facilitating conversations in the classroom? Example questions for students included: What things have been adversely affecting you that you would like to share with faculty and staff? Have professors or the university prepared you to have these conversations?

At the final presentation they showed the data from surveys then gave out lists of student experiences and let people read and digest them, then used those things to frame discussions moving forward. The students noted that they ran the workshop to allow students to speak first which seemed key to encouraging student engagement in the conversation and also promoted discussion between faculty as well.

As the students' time concluded, Chair Zopfi said he would reach out and gather materials.

Discussion that followed included the recognition of the importance of making sure the students are part of the workshop and allowing the students to have a stronger voice talking first and faculty listening. However, it was also noted that the students should not have to carry too much responsibility for organizing or planning. Other considerations were for getting an outside person to facilitate the discussion or having a faculty only workshop using the student perspective from the survey results. However, it was recognized that having students in the room, voicing their stories of when they felt marginalized, was powerful.

Carrie Woods volunteered to look into next steps on how to facilitate this moving forward.

The committee then resumed with the original order of the agenda.

I. Approved the minutes from prior meeting.

II. New members introduced – Christine Mills who is a sophomore and Kelly Brown, the new director for CHAWS.

III. Reports from Liaisons

BHERT (Bias and Hate Education Response Team) update from liaison on their meeting two Fridays ago. Most of the meeting was talking with Sandra, the new title IX coordinator who has plans to streamline the forms for reporting harassment and discrimination complaints. Currently there are three forms with different procedures for reporting but they all go to Sandra.

At the next BHERT meeting there are plans to discuss what role of BHERT will play moving forward since complaints go to Sandra and not BHERT. BHERT is more focused on looking at aggregate data and reports and the educational outreach piece. Now is a good time for BHERT to rethink its role under the changes. BHERT has done open sessions and videos in the past and there are current plans for some open sessions in the spring on how to report cases of bias, hate, and discrimination.

It was suggested that BHERT or DAC could drive the cultural competency meeting.

Next was the update from DAC (Diversity Advisory Council) liaison. The DAC is currently in the process of meeting with groups on campus to share the results from the campus climate survey conducted in February of 2018 and get feedback on the results from various constituent groups across campus. There are currently 20 meetings scheduled between now and mid-December.

It was brought up that the DAC should consider trying to do a session with the CoD, which resulted in scheduling an additional meeting for Tuesday November 19th from 8:30am-9:20am.

V. Mentoring plan

Next the discussion moved mentoring, referring to the data from Sarah and Melvin who were on a subcommittee last year that researched different mentoring plans including the NW5, academic literature, different types of mentoring plans for underrepresented faculty, etc.

One CoD member asked whether the mentoring plan is part of a broader program for all faculty or separate just for underrepresented faculty. Another commented that the survey results say all people want some form of mentoring, but the question is what form, one-on-one, group mentoring, etc.

One person commented that faculty want more informal group mentoring e.g. group lunches, organized by the administration. And they do not want senior faculty only mentoring junior faculty mentoring to avoid power dynamics.

Julie Christoph shared that she interviewed over coffee ten new faculty over the past year asking what they would like to do and developed a plan for coffee breaks where the Associate Dean's office pays for lunch to provide a chance for peer to peer to connections drawing in different offices across campus to come share information and join in the discussion.

It was also noted that faculty involved as mentors want guidance and training on how to be a mentor. The Whitman model was discussed where new faculty fill out a questionnaire along with on-going faculty to build mentor-mentee relationship that are not formal, but include things such as going out to lunch once a month. Mentors get some training at beginning and there are sessions throughout the year with just mentors.

It was noted that this year under the leadership of Regina Duthely and Erin Colbert White, organized by the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, a faculty of color social hour was started. At the first meeting there was a signup sheet if people wanted to go to lunch with a faculty member, which has been reported to be successful with good turnouts at the social hours thus far.

The meeting adjourned at 9:22am.

Respectfully submitted by

Lea Fortmann

