Judge: ... of the San Jose State University Special Task Force on Racial Discrimination. I’m Judge Cordell and I’m the Chair of the Task Force. First we’re going to have introductions and we’ll start with Anthony Ross.

Male: All right, good evening. Tony Roth, Vice President of Student Affairs, California State University, Los Angeles.

Female: Maria Luisa Alaniz, Faculty Member, San Jose State University Department of Sociology and Interdisciplinary Social Science.

Male: Chris Cox, Lecturer of Faculty Member, Department of Sociology and Interdisciplinary Social Sciences.

Female: Bernadette Cheyne, Former CSU Faculty Trustee and Faculty of [Merita] from Humboldt State University.

Female: Diana Zhen, a fifth year nursing student.

Female: Delorme Mckee-Stovall, alumni and the Director of Office of Human Relations for Santa Clara County.

Judge: Can everyone who is in the audience hear everything? If not, just raise a hand and then that’s a signal to kind of bring it up for everybody, okay? Thank you. We have one hand raised.

Female: Gabriella Gonzales, fourth year justice studies major.

Male: Gabriel Rodriguez, sociology student and AS Director of Intercultural Affairs.

Male: Uh, good evening. Rick Callender, Vice President, California/Hawaii, State Conference of the NAACP.

Male: Gary Daniels, fourth year political science major, philosophy, African-American studies minor.

Male: I’m Marcos Pizarro, Chair of Mexican-American studies.

Female: Ellen Lin, Director of Counseling Services.

Judge: All right. Thank you. We have, um, two, I guess, four people who are not here. Hopefully they will be here. Um, an agenda, uh, we sent out an agenda earlier this week, actually I think it was yesterday, and, uh, we will
start off with hearing some remarks from Dr. Rona Halualani. She’s not yet here because there was a parking issue. She will be here shortly to talk about the Inclusive Excellence/Diversity Master Plan that was, uh, initiated in 2009. Uh, we'll then have Q&A among us until 6:15 and then from 6:15 to 7:30 we will review the remaining twenty-eight recommendations on campus climate and also review the resident life recommendations that we talked about that I hopefully got, accurately put in all the edits and there are a few of them we still need to hash out.

Um, as we get started, um, I sent out an email to task force members, uh, about the residence life staffing changes on the campus. Um, and just to reiterate, uh, we’re not going to talk about the changes. That means we’re going to use our time for something other than that because, two reasons, one is that all personnel matters are confidential by law. Uh, the university cannot give names, cannot give reasons and cannot say anything about those actions that were taken without violating the law. And secondly, the university has advised not just me but everyone because they put out an email, uh, that the changes in staffing in residence life were unrelated to the hate crime incident and unrelated to the issues that we’re working on, uh, here on the task force. So for that reason, uh, and primarily because everything is confidential, we’re not going to have that as a subject of conversation. Uh, before I move forward, anybody have any issues/concerns about that right now?

Okay. Um, an article just came out in, uh, it’s the San Jose Mercury News. And it, it said, uh, in that article, and actually I have it here, it will be in tomorrow’s paper, but it says that their sources are saying that the reasons these staff changes were made is because of underage drinking. So, anyway. Um, Marcos.

Male: The only comment I had was that if the changes in staffing at all were reflective of a future direction, you know, a change in vision or something like that, it would be really important for us to know that. If it was simply, you know, personnel matters, somebody didn’t do their job, then that’s a different story.

Judge: And that we don’t know.

Male: Yeah.

Judge: The implication is that that’s the, the, uh, the latter, that, that it was a personnel change because of some discipline, uh, area, uh, discipline action. Um, we’re moving on.
Second, I sent to you all a letter from a San Jose State student, uh, who asked that, the student asked that the student’s name not be put on the letter. I hope everyone got it. It was emailed to everyone and, um, it, it’s, it’s informative, again, about campus climate issues. Is there anybody that doesn’t have the letter, didn’t see it? Okay. All right.

Um, and finally, uh, you have before you a document brief chron--chronology of campus climate issues at SJSU. Um, today at around three o’clock, thinking about this task force meeting, I was just getting, just confused about what’s going on here with campus climate and trying to get a sense of everything. My concern is that we get so busy looking at the trees, we don’t see the forest. Uh, so we’ll, we need to know what happened, we need to get a picture where this university has been and where, to where it has come. So this might not be accurate. I’ve already had one correction, and thank you Dr. Rodriguez, Consuelo Rodriguez who told me that with respect to the 1978 to 1991 tenure of President Fullerton, there is a, uh, one, two, a fifth bullet that which was the creation of the Educational Opportunity Program. There was an office there, so EOP, uh, and I used as my sources, as you can see at the bottom, all of the documents that we’ve been given and trying to put them all together to see where we have been. Uh, and I, I do think this is, as far as if it’s accurate, I think it’s very informative, um, and I will just make a comment here before we begin talking about, uh, campus climate, that its clear to me that leadership determines, sets the tone and really informs campus climate and if you look as tenures have changed since 1978 to 2011 and look at the changes that have occurred, uh, there was a lot going on between 1978 and 2003 and that was only tenures of two university presidents and then you start to see other things happening. Um, so it’s just, I think, critical when we talk about campus climate, that whatever recommendation we make that they be recommendations that change the institution for the better and that are not determined by who sits in the high office, if you know what I mean. So, um, just, just, this is informative and again, we can, we can bring this in as as we talk about these issues. I don’t see our speaker here yet. Hi, Peter. Want to tell us who you are?

Male: Hello. My name is Peter. I’m a third year student and Vice President of Associated Students.

Judge: Okay, thank you. So let’s just jump right on into campus climate, the recommendations, of which there are twenty-eight and then we’ll stop to, uh, when our speaker arrives and then we’ll pick it back up and then go over our recommendations, uh, that we discussed last week. And Marcos, you had your hand up. I don’t want to-- okay, all right, so here we go. All right, there are twenty-eight recommendations and why don’t we do as we did last time, we just go down and knock them out. Okay?
Uh, recommendation one, uh, “Create an office of campus diversity led by a vice president for diversity who reports directly to the president and whose authority is to coordinate and oversee diversity with respect to students, faculty, staff and administration.” I think it’s important to note this recommendation came from Professor Susan Murray who did the Murray Report which is, really kicked off our task force meetings. Okay, um, and interesting, chronology, there was something like that back in the day. Uh, there was an office of, uh, what did they call it then? So, okay, there was a special, it was an office for, campus climate office that was, a campus climate office within a special assistant reporting directly to the president. Okay, so all right. So, uh, comments? Should we move forward on this recommendation one?

Male: (inaudible) . . .

Judge: Yeah, we’re, we’re going to do that, that same kind of thing and see if they’re connected. So recommendation one you think is linked to ten and here is recommendation ten. “An office of campus diversity led by a diversity officer be established to oversee, manage and assess the campus wide, uh, bias incident reports and all diversity efforts, including but not limited to the recently created commission on diversity, the forthcoming recommendation from the Special Task Force, the Assembly Select Committee and the task force is to facilitate graduation of black, African-American, Chicano, Latino students.” So it's all part of the same thing. Uh, is there any others that are part of this? Rick?

Male: Well, not if there’s any other part of this. What I was going to address is actually combining those twos because I think, I definitely liked what Professor Murray had to say, but it’s not just oversee diversity. I wanted to expand that to diversity and campus climate and I think number ten does actually a good job of doing it but I don’t want it to be just limited to those things there, so if we could combine and not lose any of that language.

Judge: That’s fine. So we have one, ten and also look at twenty-four, “Establish an office of campus diversity,” combine that one. And okay, so those are the three that deal with that and so, uh, the sense I get, we’re going to combine three. I’ll come up with the language that we’ll have it and we’re saying this is an office that will report directly to the president, correct? With someone heading it, a vice president actually, which is good.

Okay. Uh, number two, “Conduct periodic campus climate surveys akin to the Murray Survey every four years under the auspices of the Office of Campus Diversity with studies available to the public, utilized by
faculty staff, administrators and students to determine what, if any, programs are necessary to promote diversity on the campus.” Anybody? Okay. Okay, hearing nothing, I’m going to move on and say that’s a yes. Okay. Um, got it.

Number three, “Give formal university recognition to the groundbreaking work by Professor Murray on the 2011 Campus Climate Research Project and ensure that her study remains available on the San Jose State University website.”

Male: Can we add studies because there was the one study that was available which is on the students, but the faculty staff one was definite –

Judge: Yeah, she didn’t do that. That was not the Murray Study, my understanding. So I’m, I’m interested, right now my focus was, this was a study done in 2011 and my view, again just my view, got absolutely no recognition by, uh, the administration and until we brought it forward, because it informed what we were doing, and I think someone who spent three years of her life working on this in addition to everything else here, uh, should be recognized. Now I have no idea what kind of recognition there should be but I believe it should come from the highest level in the university. We good? All right.

Um, uh, number four, “Undertake a study to determine why graduation rates for African-American and Latinos males are low and take immediate steps to improve these rates.” Now that came from the WASC report. There was a, uh, a second, I’ll pull it out for you, um, and it was a little shocking. This was the report that came out in 2007 and it was, uh, to San Jose State on Educational Effectiveness Review, and I made a note of this in my recommendation on page twenty-six. The report observes that “Graduation rates, particularly for some groups, African American and Latino males most notably are a cause for serious concern,” and then it goes on to show how low the rates are. And there’s one that really stuck me, “Disaggregated data analyzed for this report also revealed that the four year graduation rate for African-American males is zero.” Four years, zero. Zero percent. And that was from a report, um, to San Jose State, 2007. So that’s why I’ve made this recommendation because it appears that, that continues still to be the case, meaning the low graduation rates. Gary?

Male: Um, I’m confused as to what that actually means by zero. Uh, what does that mean?

Judge: That means that black male students are not graduation in four years.
Male: Okay.

Judge: And that was of concern to the committee looking at it. Plus it also noted the very low graduation rates of Latinos, generally males, and African-American males, generally. No matter how long they’re here. The numbers are very, very low and they are cited in the report. Um, so how do we feel?

Female: I’m certainly in favor of it. I’m wondering, however, if there is any updated information on that or if the best we have is six or seven years old?

Judge: Well, I don’t know how frequently this group comes here. It’s for certification purposes, so I have no idea. This is the information that I found and, um, I, I don’t know. Doesn’t anybody think the graduation rates have now leveled out? Everybody is doing fine?

Male: Judge, I would say that, no, the graduation rates certainly haven’t increased significantly and the WASC accreditation, the review, uh, occurs about every ten years for all the campuses. So they come through, it’s the Western Association of Schools and Colleges and, uh, --

Judge: Thank you.

Male: -- they come through and they accredit all the universities in about a ten year cycle.

Judge: So this one was in 2007.

Male: Correct.

Judge: The next will be 2017.

Male: Correct.

Judge: And this group noted in 20-- , 2007 that they were very concerned about the low graduation rates and I don’t know what has been done since then, um, but I’m asking that something be done. We look at it today so we don’t want for them to come back in 2017 and say, you know, there’s still a problem.

Male: Um, as far as whether the situation has changed or not, um, as an African-American male currently in my fourth year, um, I’m certainly not graduating this year. I’m also thinking of other African-American males who came through within my cohort, I can’t think of any who have
graduated. I can definitely say that far more have dropped out than have graduated, if there’s even any that graduated at all.

Judge: Okay. So are we okay on number four, undertake the study?

Male: Yeah. And I just would also --

Judge: Please, Tony.

Male: -- note that, uh, the, the standard for, um, measuring graduation rates these days is a six-year rate and not necessarily the four-year but since they cited it, I think it is important to note and follow-up in terms of the data, uh, as it relates to 2014 with the student success rate.

Judge: Right, I’m not making an assumption --

Male: Yeah.

Judge: -- that those numbers are the same, but I’m, I want us to find out if they are dismally low and if they are, then, then we have to do something and everybody is, you’re saying they are but we need to, you now, confirm that.

Male: You know, we have the data. I don’t know the exact number right now but I have --

Judge: Okay.

Male: -- it in my office and the data is available and the provost, in a recent meeting with me mentioned that those numbers are related, dismally low.

Judge: And maybe we shouldn’t just focus on the males but that’s what came through on the report, that males do particularly poorly here.

Male: Yes, I would going to say that, uh, during the time when Don Kassing was president, that was after the 2007 information came out, and he actually pulled together, uh, a, you know, group to actually work on that issue of the graduation retention rates for students. Uh, Dr. Halualani, can probably give more information and better information about that, but he actually did convene, uh, there was a, there was a push to actually address that issue and then of course we’ve had a lot of administrative changes in that time period, so I don’t think --

Judge: Okay, great.
Male: -- it's the current staff.

Judge: All right, uh, Dr. Halualani is here.

Dr. Halualani: Sorry, I co-teach a course offsite, so I was --

Judge: It's all right. Thank you so much. Um, so what we'd like to do is ask you to, if you'll just briefly tell us who you are, your connection to the university and you'll have fifteen minutes, if you'd like, to talk to us and then we're going to have some questions and we'll see if we can have those questions done within thirty minutes.

Dr. Halualani: Okay, great.

Judge: So thank you so much for joining us.

Dr. Halualani: No problem. Um, my name is Dr. Rona Halualani. I'm currently a full professor in the Department of Communication Studies here at San Jose State. Uh, I am here because I think you're interested in the last role I occupied. From 2007 to 2009 I was the San Jose States last official diversity role in terms of leadership. I was Special Assistant to the President, Director of Inclusive Excellence in the Institutional Planning for President Don Kassing and then President Jon Whitmore and I returned to my department in 2009. Uh, the comments that I have today are really in terms of the capacity that my role filled, the office, its connection to the plan, um, and I'm also a national consultant for this issue for other campuses so I can speak to what happens at other CSUs and what I see are the best practices. Sound good?

Female: Yeah.

Judge: Fantastic.

Dr. Halualani: So in my role, it happened at about the time of, uh, 2007. And at the time there was, uh, some presidents reading groups and there was a presidents reading group on diversity, some of which you have members here on your taskforce, and they met with president Don Kassing at the time to talk about diversity and talk about our campus climate and there was an idea that came out of that group to create a Diversity Master Plan. So San Jose State at the time in 2007 didn’t want diversity just to be the marketing public relations ploy. They just didn’t want to just have a pretty website about diversity, they really wanted to mean it. So this group went to the president, this president was part of that group, and said, “We really need to do something. We need an action plan. We want it campus wide. We don’t want it just in student affairs. We want it, uh, filtered throughout
the entire, uh, university, every level, teaching, learning, staff, faculty employee, alumni and whatnot.” So at the time in 2007, uh, I was tasked to work directly for the president. That is key, that is key, any type of diversity role that makes a difference should be directly attached to the president and to the president’s office. So I was his direct report and I was charged to work with the campus to put together a Diversity Master Plan. Some of you have seen it. It’s on the website. It’s dated 2009. Uh, a hundred, about a hundred, ninety-three to a hundred campus members worked on it with me. It was definitely an organic campus process.

There were three main goals of that Diversity Master Plan. Number one, which is still a key issue for this university, is diversifying faculty. That was the number one initiative. The second initiative was campus climate and how to strengthen the campus climate in the community. And number three was “How do we engage the campus in terms of diversity and learning and differences and constructive interactions.”

I think it’s really important to know that the plan was something that, that presidents group, which was a core of faculty staff and leadership, had a really, really terrific idea because they, they had seen San Jose State constantly create things in reaction to negative incidents, to things that had happened. And of course that does happen, but the plan was really to be a proactive ongoing recurring model for the university with regards to diversity and inclusive excellence.

Uh, upon my entry back to my department, the plan was completed in about ten months. There were action steps, there were assessment measures, there were owners, um, there were whole divisions and offices that were joining the cause and were happy to do so. And they did and they received some budget lines and, um, there was a sense that there was going to be the continuation of the work once I had left that role. That was not the case. Um, I was on maternity leave. I had twins in the meantime and then it wasn’t until, um, the following six months after the plan had been implemented for 2009 that I would get emails from some of the members saying, “We haven’t heard anything about the plan. We’re doing our part but we want to know where the president stands on this.” And in 2011 I was brought back to evaluate and assess the progress of the plan, um, since its inception.

So I came back in 2011 and, uh, with the grad students I had worked with and evaluated and assessed the plan, looked at what worked and what did not work. In my role, in the working for the president, it was just myself and, uh, about four graduate students, four terrific graduate students who had helped me with things. Uh, because I was a direct line to the president, whatever I needed, I could go to the president, ask for
operating budget money to help with regard, not just to the plan but I worked with the Chair of, uh, Campus Climate, (inaudible) . ., on campus climate issues that came up and there were, there’s always climate issues not matter what. Um, whether it’s campus community members of color, religious difference was a really big top--., big, uh, aspect at that time, in addition to the retention of graduation task forces that were developed as well. And so we were trying to kind of connect all of these pieces together and make a meaningful action plan.

At the time, there was no diversity leader at any other CSU. Since then there are about five CSUs that now, they don’t have an Office of Diversity, they have a person like, like I was, maybe with one staff member. Uh, the best practice for me is if you want this office to matter or this role to matter, they need to have a direct reporting line to the president. They need to be on the president’s cabinet where they have the ear of the leadership. They need to be connected to the president because often times that role is often situated either in student affairs only or an academic affairs only and I think that that does not, I think it diminishes the authority of not just the role but of the commitment to diversity.

So if you look at San Diego State University for example or you look at Cal Poly, which just instituted a director of diversity, direct line to the president in the last six months, you’ll see that there is one person usually with a staff member and there are resources. And campus climate is not in student affairs, it’s actually connected directly to the byline of the president. That’s a national model, um, because that’s important. If there’s something wrong in the community, uh, the leadership needs to know so that direct action can take, can take place. Am I on time?

Judge: Yeah. You have actually eight more minutes.

Dr. Halualani: Oh, okay. If not, I can open up to Q&A as well.

Judge: You have seven more minutes if there’s anything else you want to tell us.

Dr. Halualani: I think, I think that’s it. I, there are specific things about the plan and the future that I can also answer but I’m not sure if it’d be better served.

Judge: All right. So we’re going to, you’re fantastic. Thank you so much.

Dr. Halualani: Oh.

Judge: So we’re going to jump in and ask questions. I’m going to kick one off here. If, if you had a choice, uh, assuming an office were established as
you recommended, direct report to the president, the person who runs the office is the member of the cabinet --

Dr. Halualani: Yes.

Judge: -- um, for this university --

Dr. Halualani: Yes.

Judge: -- how big an office do you envision it? If you could just, this is, you know, have it any way you wanted it to be --

Dr. Halualani: Yes.

Judge: -- tell us what it would look like and what would its name be? Are we talking diversity? Are we talking campus climate? So kind of give us --

Dr. Halualani: Okay.

Judge: -- your idea.

Dr. Halualani: Um, just my idea, just Rona Halualani’s idea. Uh, for me, I, I, would love for this university, my home, to have an office that had, um, uh, definitely a leader, a diversity leader who was a leader for the entire campus, a thought leader, um, a leader about strategic planning with regard to diversity inclusion, the proactive notions. Uh, usually in many of the diversity and inclusion offices, there’s also the equity EOO, affirmative action type of aspect in case there are incidents or that there are issues that need to be dealt with. Often times those two functions are often put in one person. I caution San Jose State for not doing that. I think that it diminishes either side of those functions and in a way that is not healthy for the institution. I know that human resources and faculty affairs have a hand in those roles and so if there is a way to kind of coordinate that, that would be great. I, I would love a solid operational budget. I always felt like I had to go and, um, uh, you know, go and ask for money. I would love to have a healthy, for this individual, this office, to have a healthy budget where it’s, um, --

Judge: How many, how many staff?

Dr. Halualani: Uh, two to three to start.

Judge: And how many to end? I mean, I want to know if this were running the way you’d want it to run make a difference here.
Dr. Halualani: If this is the way I would want it to run, I would want it to look like Penn State.

Judge: Which is?

Dr. Halualani: Sorry. Penn State has a, a very large division, I know, um, but a very large division but it also has, um, not just a couple of vice chancellors of diversity but they also have staff members and they also have assessment analysis on aspects of diversity and retention and graduation. So they have upwards of fifteen to sixteen. That's my dream. Go big or go home, right? Um, and they've just done a fine job of it, uh, in the last twenty-five years. There's other models as well. But even, even if this does not, uh, become a large staff office, it should be one that's given the commitment, the authority and the resources to start out with to create that kind of momentum.

Judge: And where do you see it located on the campus?

Dr. Halualani: Oh, physically?

Judge: If you can pick it anywhere you want it, yes.

Dr. Halualani: Oh, gosh. Uh, right in Tower Hall.

Judge: Tower Hall?

Dr. Halualani: Yes, that's where my office was.

Judge: All right. Okay.

Male: I have a question.

Judge: Other questions? We'll go around here. Maria and then we'll go to Bernadette.

Female: Hello, Rona.

Dr. Halualani: Hi, Maria.

Female: You know, I was a, a part of the Inclusive Excellence and there were, as you said, about a hundred people --

Dr. Halualani: Yes.

Female: -- who were enthusiastic and very --
Dr. Halualani: Wonderful.

Female: -- helpful and it was a wonderful process. Um, you completed the reporting. Can you tell me what happened? Uh, why was it not fully implemented?

Dr. Halualani: Yes. Uh, in 2009 it was, it was actually created August, I think, 15th, 2009 and I think that there was no, um, they didn’t fill my role and I don’t know why they didn’t fill my role in that capacity.

Judge: Who is they?

Dr. Halualani: Um, the president at the time, President Whitmore and his cabinet. I personally believe it wasn’t fully implemented enough because there just wasn’t presidential commitment to it. That’s my opinion. Um, each of the assigned owners kept doing the work though of the plan. I had, I made sure right before I went, uh, of the role, that everybody knew what they were doing and they were doing it, they just weren’t doing it with any sense of captain steering the ship. That’s how great this university is, is you got these hundred people that are on board and not only that, they’re emailing me saying, “We haven’t heard anything about it. We know what we’re doing but we want to know that we’re doing it right.” So I think the great thing for you all to know is you have a cadre of people, many people on this campus that supports this, that supports you and, and I just think there was, there was no presidential commitment to it. And at the time the issue was sustainability and environmental justice, and there’s nothing wrong with that, but it definitely, um, the notion was that diversity wasn’t important. I believe folks dropped the ball.

Judge: Uh, Bernadette.

Female: Thank you. Uh, as someone coming from the outside, I really want to acknowledge your, your commitment and really the fine work that you did.

Dr. Halualani: Oh, thank you.

Female: Uh, you also –

Dr. Halualani: Work of a lot of people, too.

Female: Yes, and the hundred plus.

Dr. Halualani: A hundred people.
Female: I'm sure there's more than that.

Dr. Halualani: Yeah.

Female: Um, you indicated that you, in 2011 you did an assessment of the plan. Could you summarize what that assessment led you to conclude?

Dr. Halualani: Yes, we did so an assessment, uh, there were several of my former graduate students that helped with that, that were part of that. Uh, we created an info graphic that summarized those results as, as well as a, kind of a report. We found that overall, about three quarters of the plan had been implemented, had been assessed but nobody knew about it, um, and the budget monies to keep it going were not replenished. We realized that the action steps that did not survive were because those individuals, and again this is why it's important to have the infrastructure and a structural plan, because we had some champions attached to steps and they retired or they moved on and so when that happens, those efforts don't become sustainable. So, um, we learned that the hard way. But at the time we thought that there was definitely institutional commitment for it. So it kind of came down to that and I had a meeting with the current president, President Qayoumi, uh, in 2011 sharing the results, sharing my findings, sharing my strong recommendations that a role, an office, that if this were to be continued, and it doesn't have to look the way it does now, it can be better because this was just a first iteration, and I shared all of these same notions at the time and in my opinion there didn't seem to be interest.

Judge: What is your view about having the person, assuming this office exists, uh, as a vice president?

Dr. Halualani: I would love that.

Judge: I mean, how, how important – I'm sorry I cut you. Go ahead.

Dr. Halualani: Uh, I think that would be, um, yeah, if it's given kind of an authority line, if it's given, uh, you know, that particular role, that particular title, I think that that really helps. The issue with kind of having a diversity leader is I think that it's a Catch-22, while that's awesome because it shows the commitment and it shows that there is authority to it, it often times doesn't work on the integrated model approach which is, "Oh, you know, Rona is gonna take care of it. I don't know to take care of it as the VP on this section." So there's that issue, too, and that's not lost on me. Um, and I think it's, a VP could work but there also needs to be a way where the commitment is also intersperse into every leadership role at the cabinet level.
Judge: Since you have an expertise in this area --

Dr. Halualani: Yes.

Judge: -- how, how long would it take you to give us a description of the ideal diversity office for this university?

Dr. Halualani: How long would it take me?

Judge: Yes, to just write it down and say, “This is my idea of an ideal office for either . . .” whatever it is. By the way, would you call it diversity, campus climate or what would you call it?

Dr. Halualani: I would do, I would call it either diversity or an inclusive excellence. I still believe in that notion, the philosophy of inclusive excellence.

Judge: Okay.

Dr. Halualani: Yeah.

Judge: Whatever you call it, how long would it take you to just draft for us a description.

Dr. Halualani: Not long.

Judge: Well, what does that mean? Could you have it --

Dr. Halualani: Early, I could have it by, I could do it by Monday.

Judge: All right, will you do that, please?

Dr. Halualani: Yes.

Judge: Thank you. And when it’s done you just need to --

Dr. Halualani: Send it to --

Judge: You can email it to me and to Dorothy.

Dr. Halualani: Okay.

Judge: Okay?

Dr. Halualani: Sure.
Male: I have a question.

Judge: Yes, Gary.

Male: Um, I have a question and I want to get your perspective on a couple things. So earlier you stated that the office of diversity should have a, resources --

Dr. Halualani: Yes.

Male: -- uh, it should have its own operating budget, uh, um, and also that, that national standard is that the campus climate is from the president’s budget, um, for most universities across the nation. Uh, the president is a responsible for campus climate, right? Is that what you said?

Dr. Halualani: Usually campus climate is, is typically at most institutions, um, and I have more specific information usually attached to the office of the president in some way.

Male: Right. So when it comes to campus climate and about the environment for students, particular student experience, um, so is that something that will fall under, um, the office of diversity since the president is responsible for campus climate? Like --

Dr. Halualani: Um, it could be a both/and approach as opposed to either/or. So there could be, uh, that office then works or that individual or role works with all of the relevant roles on campus that are about facilitating student experience because I think it’s just, not just in one office but that it involves a lot of different roles. That, that’s how I typically seen it. That’s how I typically think it will work.

Male: Right. Okay, because --

Dr. Halualani: Yeah, but there may be very specific attention to student experience, like let’s say for this campus for the next several years out. So, yes, that could be a commitment in that role right now.

Male: Okay. Well, last thing I want to get your perspective on, so, um, say if there were to be, um, resource centers for, you know, unrepresented students, for example, African-American males who have a zero percent effective graduation rate or whatever the, uh, statistic were, um, if there were to be resource centers, um, would that go under this office of diversity, um, considering, a lot of the issue is that, um, this university can’t seem to find funding for, um, it’s underrepresented minority students
so if the president, um, if the president is responsible for, um, campus climate, uh, so do you think, you know, the president himself or, you know, that funding for resource center should come out of the president’s budget?

Dr. Halualani: Uh, I think that there should be support for what I refer to as specific group focus retention and graduation initiatives. That’s a, that’s a best practice. Um, I think it needs to be at a high level. You know, there’s a, it could either be, it through the office of the president, but typically you see it on the academic affairs side because it’s affiliated then with the colleges and the academic excellence part. So, I, I mean it could go either way in terms of that. Um, and if, at the time, I think, when I was in the role, there were retention and graduation initiatives and the president worked really hard with the provost on those and those were university wide kind of monies, permanent based monies and they were university wide or they’re shared between the divisions but it was at a high level of commitment. So I think as long as you have that high level of commitment wherever you place that and what budget monies are their base or whatnot would be key.

Judge: Okay. I’m going to see if anybody else has any questions. I want to follow up on something. Would such an office also deal with diversity with respect to the faculty, tension, hiring, tenure, promotion?

Dr. Halualani: Yeah, I, I would think that they would work very closely with faculty affairs. We used to have a diversifying faculty initiative, uh, as recent as last year, um, with all of the departments and the programs but then they said there was a commission coming out and they were going to do other things and it wasn’t. But, yes, they would be taking the lead on that and they would be working really heavily with the provost and the dean on that.

Judge: So that’s all going to be in your description --

Dr. Halualani: Yes.

Judge: -- when you write it up. Thank you.

Dr. Halualani: Yes.

Judge: All right. Any other questions for the professor? Yes, Maria.

Female: Well, adding to that, what about diversifying administration? I mean, since the leadership has such a major influence on organizational culture.
Dr. Halualani: Yes. Uh, and there are programs at other universities where they have a, kind of a leadership development program with regard to diversify our leadership and, and how does that work and, uh, letting people know about that, but yeah. And that is something that should there be a second iteration of the plan, which should be a key-key factor in that because, uh, this university has struggled with that, as you know, in particular.

Judge: Okay. Thank you. Rick?

Male: So this kind of ties into the diversification faculty and the administration. What would be the role of human resources and how do you envision that would tie into this position?

Dr. Halualani: Diversifying faculty or diversifying of administration?

Male: Well, just overall ‘cause what, ‘cause what --

Dr. Halualani: Yeah.

Male: -- you’re describing, you know, my mind immediately goes to, um, HR being potentially a component of, of who this vice president would oversee.

Dr. Halualani: Yes, it’s a good point. Um, often times kind of a role like diversity is often put in a human resources division because their focus is on, uh, the diversifying faculty hires, diversifying leadership hires. Um, I think that that might be a little bit tricky on this campus given the, how shall I put this, um, the different roles and the history between HR and faculty affairs, um, but I would not want the office of diversity, let me put it this way, to be so overwhelmed by multiple large scale functions where it takes the eye off the ball, off of diversity. And let me put it this way, I, I know, and it’s to not fault of anyone because this was new terrain for San Jose State, there’s always a sense of, “We can put this on Rona’s plate. We can put this on Rona’s plate, we can put this on Rona’s plate, we can put this on Rona’s plate.” Um, but the diversity aspect and everything that went along with it was so big and it, it required such care and attention I often felt like, “I’m dropping the ball here. I got like five other multiple functions.” I was in charge of school strategic planning for the university in addition to kind of the diversity planning, facilitating that process. That’s huge. So for me, keep in mind, and it will be in my, my, my description to you all is to keep that role focused, to keep it, um, so that the eye on the ball is never ever lost and, and that person isn’t overwhelmed.

Judge: Okay. Tony.
Male: Yes, I just wanted to say, and I appreciate your comments, certainly your reports, that, uh, there are many models out there --

Dr. Halualani: Yes.

Male: -- in terms of how to, to structure such an office and, you know, looking forward to what you will share with us to be able to then put together, uh, a recommendation because I do believe there are a lot of different ways to look at it and I would want us not to get stuck on just one model but as you indicated, there are a lot of models --

Dr. Halualani: Yes.

Male: -- certainly from a national perspective in addition to what needs to be unique to San Jose State.

Dr. Halualani: Great comments. Let a thousand flowers bloom. There's a lot of models and it has to fit our history, our context.

Judge: Which is why I think you're perfectly positioned to give us a description. You know this place, you know the history, you've been in the eye of the storm, so to speak, so who better than you to put your thoughts down and say, “Okay, if I could create an office and have the resources, here's what I think should be here for this university and why.” So that's what I'm hoping that we'll get from you. Yes, Linda.

Female: Uh, just, just a comment. Is it on? Uh, because I was looking, because I remember we have an Office for Equal Opportunity, so I was trying to figure out, but their role really is primary, primarily around complaints and legal issues, not around the development that, that you're describing and that we very much need.

Dr. Halualani: Yeah.

Female: So I just thought I'd clarify that. Human resources serve a different kind of function here, when somebody asked about human resources, they tend to do more of that kind of work rather than the kind of work you're describing as a standalone office.

Dr. Halualani: Yeah. There's usually two sides of the house. There's usually a compliance, uh, incident, response, uh, um, rapid response notion on this side and then there's diversity in terms of proactive long term planning, keeping the community engaged, that's really, really important, and so those two functions are really, really important. But I think HR is important because I would often work with folks in HR, especially about diversifying
administrators. We’d be like, “We only have this much in the pool. Is that enough? Is this diverse enough? Is this internal? Is this external? What do we do here?” And, and we have to follow protocol and have to keep in mind about how do we broaden that net and cast it wide.

Judge: Rick.

Male: Yeah, this is just a, a quick question, at any point when you were the diversity officer, did you request additional staff? It was very telling to me that you said you had four students that were supporting you and immediately my thought went to exactly what (inaudible) . . . said, you know, what would your ideal situation look like. Had you requested staff and what was the response like if you had?

Dr. Halualani: Uh, you know, uh, the, the individual who brought me in and kind of allowed me to have this opportunity, it was Don Kassing and he was great, whatever I needed, I wanted, and he said, “Do you want me to bring one or two staff, uh, people in here? What do you need?” And, and I had never experienced that from anybody else, just him. Um, but I, I wanted four of, um, our graduate students. They were all of different backgrounds. They were first generation, they knew students, they were on the pulse and they were great researchers and this role had to be something where we were able to talk to a lot of people, we gathered a lot of research and so that’s why I chose them and they, they’re, they were the best team ever and they really cared. So, uh, and they were, and they were also TAs at the time so that’s why I chose them. If I wanted in the first year one or two or three individual staff, um, I, I probably could have but at the time, that team was what I needed.

Judge: Okay, I hope in your description you’ll also kind of talk staff.

Dr. Halualani: Yeah.

Judge: The staffing. Uh, I want to make one observation. I’ll get to you Gabriel, is that, um, I was the Affirmative Action Officer at Stanford and that work is very different --

Dr. Halualani: Yeah.

Judge: -- from doing this kind of work in a diversity --

Dr. Halualani: Exactly.

Judge: -- office because I was concerned about staff, uh, representation and getting numbers and reporting to the feds and all that, so --
Dr. Halualani: Right.

Judge: -- it’s a, it’s a different issue entirely.

Dr. Halualani: Um-hm.

Judge: So I wouldn’t want to see those --

Dr. Halualani: Exactly.

Judge: You can’t combine them.

Dr. Halualani: Exactly.

Judge: They’re very, very different issues.

Dr. Halualani: Yeah.

Judge: Okay.

Dr. Halualani: I agree.

Judge: Gabriel.

Male: Uh, in regards to staff, what would be the role of students in this office? Would there be a student assistant? What would be the role of their, yeah.

Dr. Halualani: That’s who my graduate students were, they were my student assistants. Um, and they, they, they would work with me on staff. They wouldn’t just answer phones or anything. We were creating things together, doing research together. But, yeah, student assistants would be terrific because especially those students in areas where they’re, they’re studying diversity and social justice, what a better learning lab than a role or an office like this. That was kind of how I approached it as a faculty member. But you’re going to need staff members maybe to help in terms of, um, not unlike MOSAICS where there’s events or coordination, um, in a lot of places now, universities now, uh, have one staff level position that just focuses on diversity assessment, goes in, tracks how many faculty, how many staff, how many students of all these different backgrounds, of different sexual orientations, of different, you know, generations, do we have in here, and they create dashboard and they really work with leadership to say, because we got an inst--, we got an institution research site, institutional effectiveness and analytics but do we have a site that
really spells out all the diversity dashboards? No. Should we? Yes. And that’s what the person would help facilitate.

Judge: Would your diversity office be a place where students who had complaints, say about racism or whatever, would come to that office?

Dr. Halualani: Um, I think that there could be a, there could be, certainly there could be a, a role for that but I, I have a feeling that role also is served in multiple other sites of the campus, so as long as it’s not closed off anywhere else. Uh, students would come to our events and they would share us their stories and they would, um, we did a little bit of a study where, where a lot of students came to us because we actually studied for the Asilomar retreat, um, students who had dropped out, students of color who had dropped out of San Jose State University, and we went and we found them and we spoke to them and we spoke to them in their neighborhoods and in their communities and they wanted to share their stories with us. So I think that that’s always going to be part of an office or a role of diversity having, having a place where you can come to if needed.

Male: A quick comment.

Judge: Okay, we have one minute and that’s it. So who, is that you Gary? I’m sorry, Delorme, one minute.

Female: You indicated several times that, uh, the success of what you were intending to do really depended upon the leadership of the president and in the absence of the president’s support things kind of faded away.

Dr. Halualani: Yes.

Female: So, uh, I see that as human nature. So if you develop such a plan in the future, I’m programmatic about this, and you still had a hundred people that were very interested implementing this and wanted to carry forward and third quarters of the plan was still operational, in the absence of presidential leadership, is it viable?

Dr. Halualani: I think it is as long as there is shared responsibility and commitment for those action steps. And I, at some point the plan was able to actually keep going for like a year and a half, almost two years without huge presidential support. I think it’s possible, I think it makes it difficult. You always maybe want to plan that institutionalized or embedded very deeply into the organizational structure because, as you know, we have a constant flow of leadership here, right? So for me, the notion was how can we get embedded in the organizational structure and that was always tricky. So I think if you do that, if your focus is on that but you also need to
have the presidential commitment, those two together are a powerful and if a presidential authority is not there, then at least you have some time to and then get the community rallied up to make that right again is my notion. Yeah.

Judge: All right. Thank you so much --

Dr. Halualani: Thank you.

Judge: -- for spending your with us.

Dr. Halualani: Thank you for waiting for me.

Judge: We great, greatly appreciate it and we look forward to getting your description of your ideal office of diversity.

Dr. Halualani: Okay.

Judge: All right.

Dr. Halualani: Thank you very much.

Judge: Thank you so much.

Dr. Halualani: Thank you for all your work.

Judge: Wow, okay. Uh, we're going to go back to our, going down our campus climate recommendations. We're up to number five. “Include explicit discussion about race in all diversity programming.” Comments? Diana.

Female: That actually ties into my, uh, number six.

Judge: Number six, uh, “First year course taught by professors or counselors. Included in the curriculum should be a module for each diverse group that's represented. An example may be something like this from Stanford, the geriatrics at Stanford.”

Female: Yeah.

Judge: Go ahead.

Female: Let me elaborate on that.

Judge: Sure.
Female: So in my nursing classes this semester, um, we actually had an assignment where there was a module, a website, um, that, that's on Stanford. It's, it's designed for medical professionals but it can be something that's in education and it's a module about, uh, older Americans, geriatrics, and there is a background on almost every major racial category, not racial, or cultural category. Um, it's very specific. That's what we've all been talking about. We want to go directly for it and not dance around with the idea of it. So, um, something like that. It's a module about each, um, each group and it's peer reviewed, only peer reviewed. So it's something that can be incorporated in a curriculum so that they can increase dialogue in classrooms.

Judge: Okay.

Female: About some of that in the first year course.

Judge: Okay. Any other comments on these two? We'll put six and, five and six together. All right.

Male: I think it will be difficult to put five and six together because she talked about a curriculum.

Judge: Right.

Male: Or a course and I think you also talked --

Judge: That is true.

Male: -- about diversity programming.

Judge: Okay.

Male: So it would be inclusive of race so I think it would be okay to separate those but --

Judge: All right. Let’s separate.

Male: -- when you’re talking course work, I think it’s a little bit --

Judge: Okay.

Male: -- difficult.

Judge: So let's separate them. Let's talk about five. Thank you, Tony. So what's the feeling about five, should we go forward with it or not? Gabriel?
Male: Uh, I really like it but, um, I wish that we could include, if we’re, if we’re going to solely focus on that, we should also focus on sexuality and different things like that. So it’s just going to be hard to focus on one certain thing. Maybe we can have different programs focused on the top eight.

Judge: Right.

Male: The top eight oppressions.

Judge: So I think we talked a little about this before. It isn’t meant to exclude anyone else, that we, we, remember there was some sort of, oh, it was orientation or something when on and they talked, you know, sexual orientation but they never talked about race, so I just want to make sure it’s included in the program, not to the exclusion of anything else but it really just didn’t happen one year. So, um, so again I can work on the language to make sure it’s to be included and not excluded along with everything else. Okay? Should we move on? Okay. Uh, six, that was Diana’s. Comments? Silence means yes? No?

Female: No.

Judge: Yes? Linda.

Female: It’s, it’s a little bit complicated. I think it’s, I think it fits as a recommendation. Uh, I think there needs to be awareness that there is, when you talk about curriculum, there’s a process and, um, you know, there are a lot of issues like academic freedom and, you know, all the rest of it. So keeping that in mind, there may be some wording that could be modified a little bit. Uh, I’m not doing that off the top of my head. I mean I’m not sure I can do that right now but I think that could help but still be recommending the same thing.

Judge: Delorme.

Female: Um, would you consider it a, uh, a resource like Kaiser as posted on their website? Um, like the office of, uh, our office, we published a document --

Judge: And tell people again what your office is.

Female: Our Office of Human Relations in Santa Clara County, where we study immigrants for example and we’ve done extensive research on the results in this community and we’ve documented their needs and contributions and their concerns and issues. If we could have a website that posted
research about all those websites, like Kaiser has a document. They have a major initiative on their (inaudible) .

Female: Yes, um, the wording definitely needs to be more descriptive and I think, um, what I meant to, as adding in a curriculum, as, as we just need to have direct communication about race since that’s what we’re all talking about, so, yeah, it could be a resource and also part of the curriculum where it needs to be discussed and also taught.

Judge: So I need, I need a rewording and I need somebody --

Female: Yes.

Judge: -- to try to, who is going to reword it. You don’t have to do it right now, but I need it reworded sometime next week.

Female: How about Diana and I work on it together?

Judge: All right. So I’d like to have something-- today is Thursday. Can I have it by Tuesday?

Female: Yeah.

Judge: All right. Okay, great. So this will be reworded. And thank you both for doing that. Seven, “Institute an ethic studies requirement for all students that use the participatory pedagogy and provides students with the opportunity to get to know each other through structured group interaction in the classroom. Classes should be taught by diverse faculty.” We talked about that. Maria, it’s yours.

Female: The reason I recommended an ethnic studies requirement specifically is because ethnic studies is taught from the perspective of the group that has been excluded or marginalized and I think every student needs to have that experience before they, um, before they graduate. In, in the particular issue that prompted this task force, I think with the, with the confederate flag, I think if students had had, um, ethnic studies course and they knew what that symbolizes, maybe they would have acted sooner.

Judge: Your, your recommendation presupposes that there will be ethnic studies departments because I understand there was a concern about, at one point, about at least in ethnic studies department with African-American and ethnics, right, study department maybe was going away. So that kind of presupposes that these exist. So comments? Gary and then Linda.
Male: Um, I just, um, I want to first, uh, speak in support of, uh, this, uh, this recommendation. I definitely think, uh, uh, a new core diversity or core ethnic studies, um, a GE requirement should be implemented. I also think that’s related to, um, one of Marcos’s recommendations. I don’t know if you can combine something. Um, but, um, that’s something that, um, students have been, um, been talking about for awhile. Um, but I just wanted to, uh, make the point that, uh, lately, um, new developments in regards to just having, um, ethnic studies were also were, um, thinking about including women’s studies and human sexuality, um, into that core diversity requirement so not just, but like pretty much like all the, you know, issues, whatever. So basically ethnic, for example, in my mind, and obviously there can be more suggestions, but for me the big five would be African-American studies, Asian-American studies, uh, Latino, Latino studies and, um, human sexuality and women’s studies. So that would be the main five and if there is other ways to do that, I think those five should definitely be targeted.

Judge: Okay. Let’s see, Maria, what’s your response to that?

Female: Um, I’m in agreement with that. It would be more of a diversity course but I would also include Native American.

Judge: So, uh, is there any rewording that needs to be – Oh, Linda, you had a comment. Go right ahead. Sorry.

Female: Uh, to clarify in terms of, uh, African, African-American studies, the proposal was not to eliminate the program but rather to move it, uh, from being a department to being a program. Uh, which changes the administrative structure but the same courses could be offered, major still there, minor still there, all of that. So I think that is important to state that it’s never been proposed to eliminate.

Judge: Okay. Bernadette and then Tony.

Female: I, I do really see the value of this. I, I am concerned about, uh, what might be left out when we begin to take diversity and focus it down into only a few things. There is so many others, there’s ages, um, excuse me, there’s, um, uh, there’s disabilities, the list goes on and, um, so I just want to express that concern and that maybe there should be something more inclusive here.

Judge: I also don’t want us to lose sight. The reason we’re all sitting in this room is because of race, right? So, I mean, it’s, let’s not let that get lost in the discussion. Um, so it was Tony and then, uh, Marcos and Gary.
Male: Okay, I just want to, um, for those that don’t know, there is a CSU wide, uh, task force on ethnic studies and, uh, the Chancellor White has, uh, put together that and along the way, uh, there is a moratorium on any action taken as it relates to even the creation or the elimination or the reduction of any courses related to diversity and ethnic, uh, ethnic studies. So while it can be a recommendation, uh, it would be so in light of the fact that there is a system wide discussion, uh, taking place at the chancellor’s office level.

Judge: Okay. So where are we? On number seven. You want to go ahead? I’m sorry, Marcos.

Male: Yeah, yeah.

Judge: I’m sorry.

Male: It’s okay. Um, just, just one more thought is that I sent, and it may not be in the list people have, but I sent one that, that was an updated list which was, um, having a diversity requirement in lower division GE.

Judge: Yes, it was included. It was an email that went out.

Male: Yeah, so I think that can be connected to this. And I was trying to be explicit about it and so I understand the concern about not leaving anything out, but I think as Judge Cordell said a few times, we’re making recommendations. Um, we want to make the strongest recommendations we can. And one of the issues with GE is that in several of the GE areas they, they say, um, “Diversity shall be incorporated in appropriate manner,” which means it is.

Judge: So your recommendation is, I’m reading from your email, “The university should institute a diversity course requirement in lower division GE,” right? So we don’t get into details, we just say, “This is what we’re saying you need to do.”

Male: Whether it needs to be, um, --

Judge: Gary.

Male: Um, so when we’re talking about rewording, combining things, I do, um, want to emphasize that well in regards to my perspective, um, I was actually specifically talking about upper division GE. Um, you know how, um, well, you wouldn’t know, but we have area R and S which is supposed to talk about society, civilization, etcetera. Um, and the reason, well, number one, there are no African-American studies courses for a
particular section, whether Latino or Chicano studies or Asian-American studies. But, um, anyway, more importantly is that for that particular section, I want to say is area S. There actually are like thirty courses, wide, wide ranging courses that honestly it, like that section would, would do a lot better if it was, um, kind of, um, uh, shortened or, or made smaller but I’m not suggesting, um, editing, uh, area S. I’m suggesting making an entirely new, I would suggest making an entirely new, um, GE requirement, uh, upper division.

Judge: I’m just a little confused. So right now I have Marcos, “University should institute a diversity course requirement in lower division GE.” So now that’s one. So is everybody okay on that, that language? Diana.

Female: Um, I just have a question, is this, we’re, we’re making two recommendations right now, one where it’s the lower course GE where --

Judge: That’s, that’s what we’re talking about now, just that right now.

Female: Okay. But does that --

Judge: So --

Female: -- cancel out other classes that we’re making recommendations of? Because we’re recommending the first year courses as well.

Judge: No, you and Linda are going to reword your thing. That’s different, right?

Female: No, no.

Judge: So how --

Female: Yeah, there’s a little bit of difficulty because the ideas can be really, really great but the, there are broader issues. Um, like GE is actually a very complex thing, okay, very, very complex and when you try to say to someone, ”Now, you have to add this requirement,” that’s not simple because there’s a limit on how many units students, uh, can be given to graduate so --

Judge: Okay.

Female: -- this is very complicated.

Judge: So how, so what’s your suggestion?
Female: My suggestion is to, and I was planning to work with her on that, you know, as academic senate, that's where those things happen --

Judge: Right.

Female: -- and, uh, there’s certain kinds of language. Uh, for example when you’re suggesting that you make a new requirement that’s mandatory, uh, that, it’s, it’s actually, it’s so complex it’s actually very hard to come up with a sentence or two that explains that. But we discussed that a little bit, Gary, and those things typically are, are requested by the department that wants to be included in the GE requirements. That has not happened, uh, for these so that's what makes it very difficult. You're trying to impose something that people are free to ask for at anytime already.

Judge: So let me understand. So if we make a recommendation saying, you know, something should be required, it isn’t--, then there’s this process and it isn’t about just imposing a requirement. Is that what you’re saying? I mean it’s just not going to happen like that?

Female: Yeah, it sounds like -- yeah, see, I think what I’m trying to think of is when we make recommendations we want to make them, as Marcos said, that this is made in a way that maximizes success, that the recommendation is, is considering the context in which the recommendation is made.

Judge: So what is wrong with the recommendation she is making? “Should institute a diversity course requirement in lower division,” that’s the recommendation. So then the process is --

Male: I think the practical concern is how does it actually happen when the academic senate says, you know, “We’re not going to add requirements. We’re not going to add units.” We've got all these problems.

Judge: Got it.

Female: No, it’s, I don’t think that’s actually, that’s not, not the concern I’m trying to state. What I’m trying to state is there are already procedures in place where that can be requested by a department and the senate cannot sit around and make a department do something they don’t want to do. And so unless the department require --

Male: Right but this is, this is thinking bigger picture though, right? It’s not saying a department comes up with an idea that, you know, it’s saying that the university is making a decision but this is what we want.
Judge: All right.

Male: If I might --

Judge: Tony then Chris.

Male: I agree with the notion of having the recommendation and let the process play out because I --

Judge: Chris.

Male: -- I think it’s important for the process --

Judge: Let’s keep moving. Chris.

Male: Yeah, I think we have to be careful to not try to do too many of the same things, so having a first year requirement course and, you know, a recommendation for a GE, lower division GE course and a recommendation for an upper GE course.

Judge: So what do you recommend?

Male: What I recommend is going with Marcos’s recommendation and while I, while I definitely appreciate the notion of having a first year experience course, I think that that could be something that kind of fits in with Marcos is describing as having a general ED requirements for a diversity course.

Judge: All right, so are you saying don’t go forward on recommendation six but go forward with seven but do it with the language that I, with the one sentence?

Male: Yes.

Judge: All right. So let me go to Gary and then to Maria.

Male: So I just want to say, so in regards to any, um, suggestions to, um, change or update a GE, a course requirement, I just want to emphasize from a student’s perspective who has dealt with campus climate, protesting, etcetera, students should not graduate without taking at least African-American studies, Latinos studies, Asian studies, human sexuality, women’s studies. Like, so that’s basically where I’m coming from in regards to my comment on any --

Judge: Got it.
Male: -- suggestion.

Judge: All right. Maria.

Female: Whether the recommendation goes forward or not, I just feel that every student who graduates from San Jose State should take a course on race and ethnic relations.

Judge: So --

Female: Whether it’s GE, whether it’s not, but --

Judge: Okay. All right.

Female: -- I just think every student should take a course focused on race and ethnicity.

Judge: Thank you. So here’s where we may be. We don’t go forward on six. Instead we look at seven that says, “University should institute a diversity,” and then we can put a slash, “ethnic studies,” so we’re covering it all, “course requirement in lower division GE.”

Female: Ut-uh. It won’t be every student because we have transfer students who will never take those lower division courses.

Judge: Okay, so?

Female: So when you said GE, it probably should be upper division.

Judge: So do we want to not put the word lower division in?

Female: Yes, we don’t want to put lower in.

Judge: That’s what I’m hearing, just upper division. First Marcos and then Michael.

Female: (inaudible) . .

Judge: I got ya.

Male: So the, the issue that came up that led us here was freshman coming in on campus and, and, you know, creating this, this community. So can we do this when they first get here? That’s the idea, have them early in their experience, have this opportunity. That’s the thinking of lower division GE.
Judge: All right. Michael.

Male: I'm good.

Judge: Okay. All right, so where are we now? Gary, very quickly and then we're--

Male: So what if we just have both? Um, because also, um, upper division courses are obviously more informative, more complex than lower division courses so a little intro and then upper division.

Judge: So what are you proposing?

Male: I'm proposing we have a lower division and upper division.

Judge: All right. So the proposal is now “University should institute a diversity slash ethnic studies course requirement in both lower division and upper division GE.”

Female: I don’t agree.

Judge: Okay, Linda says no. Michael?

Male: The very first part of your sentence again?

Judge: Sure. “The university should institute a diversity slash ethnic studies course requirement.”

Male: Period. And where, wherever it lands.

Female: For all students.

Male: For all students.

Judge: Gary, period, right?

Female: Period.

Judge: All right, that’s what I like about this group. Okay, “For all students,” that covers and then they figure out how to do it, right. All right, that’s our number seven. What about number six? Do we want to keep that? I’ve heard a suggestion, like, “No, we’re doing too much.” Too little? What’s the sense?
Female: To me, I think, uh, it would be very difficult because the context right now is that the chancellor’s office is requiring many programs to drop, as many as twelve, twelve units from their major. So that’s a reality so I --

Judge: So what’s your, what are you suggesting?

Female: My suggestion is that first year can be available. I, I think it would be hard to pass both of those as requirements.

Judge: All right, so you’re saying delete six. So I’m trying to get --

Female: No, I’m saying that, not make it a requirement. Make it available but not make it a requirement.

Judge: All right, Diana this was your proposal. So Linda is suggesting make it, making it available but not a requirement, your number six.

Female: Um, yeah, we can do that. I --

Judge: That’s what she is saying.

Female: -- I like that.

Judge: Okay, quickly I’m sorry, Diana, go ahead.

Female: I was also reading, um, I think it was, um, it was one of the RAs when they, um, when they recommended the, um, syllabus, so the syllabus for that first year course, it doesn’t have to be a class. It could be a six week class that’s offered throughout certain times in the, um, semester.

Judge: Okay, so but what are we saying about six? Are we saying, is there --, you still want to work with Linda on rewording it?

Linda: Yeah, we can work on rewording it.

Judge: Okay, so it won’t be required but it will, you’ll come up with that language.

Female: Okay.

Judge: All right.

Female: And we can (inaudible) ..

Male: I think --
Male: Judge --

Judge: We got to move forward. We got to move.

Male: I would say, if we look at, fast forward to number eleven, it says the same thing.

Judge: All right.

Male: So I want to make sure we strike one off.

Judge: Thank you, Tony. Number eleven says a “First year FYE class mandated for all entering students." So --

Male: And that would be --

Judge: So we'll combine number six and number eleven. Thank you so much.

Male: I just want to say I think --

Judge: Hold on. And number nineteen, Michael. Number nineteen says “Expand to accommodate more students.” Is that the same?

Male: (inaudible) . .

Judge: All right.

Male: -- that we already have everything and done everything that we're sitting here talking about.

Judge: All right. Six, uh, eleven and nineteen.

Male: Twenty-three.

Judge: Nineteen. Twenty-three, “Create a first year experience,” okay, and twenty-three. All right.

Female: Six, eleven, nineteen, twenty-three?

Judge: Yep, six, eleven, nineteen and twenty-three. They're all kind of put together. You all are going to reword something, get it to me by Tuesday.

Male: Uh, I really, um, I really just emphasize that there needs to be some discussion and work that out as far as it being, um, required or not because I think that if it's not required people just most likely aren't going
to take the class. People who need to take the class aren’t going to take it. The people who already want to take ethnic studies are going to take it.

Judge: Right, but, but that’s our number seven. It says --

Male: Oh, we’re talking about two different --

Judge: -- “Institute a diversity course requirement --

Male: Okay.

Judge: -- for all students.”

Male: So --

Judge: You were talking about number six.

Male: So, so we then added number seven and not make it required?

Judge: No, no, seven is –

Male: Great. Cool.

Judge: Okay, Gabriel.

Male: Um, I don’t know if we talked about the MUSE program that was here like, uh, four years ago and it was the exact same thing the First Year Experience and it kind of died so if the people who are going to reword the First Year Experience course could look into the MUSE program and why it died and all of that too.

Female: It died because of money and effectiveness. So I, I was here, so, uh, --

Judge: Let’s keep moving. Number eight, “Create a reporting mechanism for bias incidents. There needs to be a reporting mechanism for microaggressions and bias incidents.” This brings up the letter that I sent to you all from the student who asked not to be named who said she witnessed something in a classroom, plus she said she had to wait. Uh, she said a white professor, uh, she was there first and two white students came in and the professor met an hour or so, kept her waiting and then said she didn’t have, the professor didn’t have time to meet with that student. That’s her perception of what happened. So we can call it whatever you want, microaggression, bias, whatever, where does a person, a student go who had those, that kind of an experience?
Female: Currently, although I doubt it is well publicized or whatever, but that Office of Equal Opportunity supposedly handles that, that, as, as it is. I’m not addressing effectiveness or availability or any of that but officially right now that’s where it is.

Judge: Well, clearly this student didn’t know that. You know, didn’t -- you know?

Female: (inaudible) . .

Judge: Right, so if there is such an office, it’s not doing what it should be doing in terms of getting out there. But is that what we want? Uh, or as our speaker said, maybe there should be a number of places where a person could go, one of them being a diversity office and the other an EO. Uh, Gary.

Male: I want to say that I definitely think it needs to be a well-known place, um, ‘cause obviously our task force has clearly received numerous reports, incidents, as we’re the people to report to and, uh, offline I’ve had people ask me where should they go when something happens when a professor, you know, says something racist and they’re waiting (inaudible) . .

Judge: Okay. But I noticed the wording, uh, and this is, Ellen, this is yours, “Create a reporting mechanism,” and I’m talking, you know, I went to a place. So what, what did you mean in yours, if you would?

Female: Well, yeah, not only a place but like you said, it’s not, whatever it is, it needs to be publicized. But the student and not just students, too, faculty staff and everyone on campus needs to know how to report it, where to go, what’s going to happen, the time line and the whole thing.

Judge: Okay, so our recommendation is that the university should identify places to which people can report, uh, these kinds of incidents. We can come up with the words, bias incidents or, you know, racisms, whatever, and the university should well publicize these places and the reporting mechanisms throughout the university. So is it all right if I add that language? Okay. Uh, --

Female: I would suggest also adding that it be included in freshman orientation.

Judge: Okay, I’m putting all that in. Hold on.

Male: We had the previous set of recommendations with reporting procedures and policies, correct?

Judge: Yep. That’s fine, I got it. I still think we can call it out.
Male: Sure.

Judge: Okay, I’ve got the Frosh Orientation.

Female: Could we add that, expand that to be all orientation because you have transfer students, grad students, anybody who comes here --

Male: Faculty and staff orientation.

Female: You can put faculty, everybody.

Judge: Okay, so all orientations and that would be students, faculty, staff, administrators, right? Okay, got it. Number nine, “Create . . .” Oh, Maria.

Female: I wanted to, uh, support the recommendation that Tony just made, that it’s not just students, it’s also faculty and staff. A Latina administrator recently told me that a major donor to the university made explicitly racist comments. Uh, there were two AVPs present who did not speak up and, um, she spoke up. She’s a, she’s a Latina. She spoke up and the two AVPs, um, did not make any statement to coun--, counter what this woman said. So it’s, I’m sharing this because it’s at all levels, staff, administrator and students.

Judge: Much work to be done. All right, thank you. Um, so we’re moving on to number nine, “Create a sustainable campus,” I guess it’s campus wide, “diversity education program for faculty, staff, administrators and students.” I think we, I think we, did we cover that? Have we? Have we covered that? Yeah, number nine, has that already been, I’m saying is it already in some recommendations?

Male: In the, yeah, in the first page of our recommendations.

Judge: The first page of the --

Male: (inaudible) . .

Judge: Okay, so I’m going to take this nine out.

Male: Yes.

Judge: Okay. All right, that’s only because it’s already somewhere else. Okay, so now we’re over to, uh, number twelve, “Review the 2011 Campus Climate Study as a basis for understanding first person points of view.” I don’t know what more we’re going to do with that. Uh, I don’t know who
you want, I think this was yours, Delorme, to review it. It’s online now. We want the person who authored it to be recognized by university. Okay, so I’m going to take that one out.

Thirteen, “Engage faculty, senate, campus staff and the interest of student leaders in the development of the Campus Climate Plan of Action.” Um, I need to see something. We have, um, yeah, I, I don’t know. What do you all think? I was thinking of campus climate studies, that’s one of our recommendations, that they be done periodically, right. This is a campus climate plan. Wouldn’t that be with the, the diversity office? That’s their --

Male: Yeah.

Female: Yeah, I agree.

Judge: -- job, the plan. So.

Female: Yeah.

Male: I feel like what we’re, where we’re heading is taking Rona’s suggestion, flushing that out and creating concept components to that and this would be one of those subcomponents.

Judge: We don’t have her description yet and it will be nice to get that because I just don’t want to, you know.

Male: Yeah.

Judge: So why don’t we hold thirteen in advance until we get her description and if we find that that needs to be supplemented with this, we can add it. Is that all right?

Male: Yeah.

Judge: Okay, so we’re going to, let me just make a note.

Male: And I just like the phrasing, “Plan of action” because it’s that idea that we actually have to act on the thing that we’re researching.

Judge: Got it. Fourteen, “Throughout the year the campus should maintain a published website and calendar that reaffirms campus pride and its diversity.”

Female: (inaudible) . .
Judge: That would, again, things that come under “The diversity office should be the responsibility,” I am going to again bracket that. “The activity, the Campus Climate Committee Model should be employed and expanded to include an opportunity for every member of administration, faculty, staff and student leadership to rotate through the committee as a contributing member.”

Male: Uh, I think that’s another wait for Rona’s recommendations to see how it’s established, the office.

Judge: Here we go, sixteen, “All administrators, faculty, staff and students should be provided a handbook and a link to a video exercise that introduces and allows for the practice of recognizing and interrupting prejudice in a variety of campus settings, housing, classrooms, general socialization.” Again, diversity – yes, Peter.

Male: So is this maybe like a piece that will fit into the orientation process because that’s kind of how I would imagine that at the orientation you get a pamphlet.

Judge: Well, what do you want to do with it? What are we saying? Gabriella.

Female: I’m just not sure how enforceable that is, uh, you know, with giving students a pamphlet or a website because, um, you just don’t know if they’re going to do it. So I think maybe include it, um, I think we’ve talked about this before, just, uh, in person, these sort of orientations but to go on face to face not necessarily on (inaudible). or it could be there but, um, --

Judge: So what, what’s your, what’s your pleasure here? Tony.

Male: I think we keep it. We have a variety of, uh, training that’s both online and in person for, uh, the entire campus community. So I think that there are ways to incorporate the idea behind it.

Judge: So I’m going to again bracket this as part of this whole package that might go under the kinds of things that the diversity office might do.

Male: It feels like it fits in that training thing that we just, one of the recommendations that we just did a few minutes ago, the training and the students, staff, administrators.

Judge: Okay, and that would have been -- Let’s see. It was probably under the earlier recommendations. Not the ones that we got today.
Male: It was, it was something you were writing down. You said, “I’m writing it down.”

Judge: I don’t think so. Uh, so what do we want to do with number sixteen? Put it under training?

Female: Yeah, I think so. It’s a skill set.

Judge: See if you can find, what, under train-- under where? Under one of early recommendations?

Female: I think so.

Male: Yeah.

Judge: I mean do you want to include it in it, meaning add it just as another number under the other ones? What? I’m trying --

Male: Yeah, I’m sorry, I, I figured it out.

Judge: Go ahead.

Male: So it was number nine that we, that we changed. You were writing notes under number nine, which is actually page, uh, it was on page one.

Judge: Yeah. So I, I crossed it out.

Male: Yeah, that’s number four on page one and under that you were listing, um, faculty, staff, transfer students.

Judge: Okay, so your page one, what are you talking about? Are you talking about --

Male: Page one --

Judge: -- our, our first --

Male: Yeah.

Judge: -- our revised recommendations?

Male: Yeah, page one of the initiation recommendations we had.

Judge: Yes, okay.
Male: Yeah. There, there was this one, “Create a sustainable campus by diversity education program.”

Judge: Okay. Well, we -- are you looking at the revised ones?

Male: I'm looking at the original ones. Sorry.

Judge: Well, you got to look at the revised because --

Male: Okay.

Judge: -- revised, there is, uh, “Link faculty engagement and diversity training.” No, okay. “Create a sustainable diversity education program campus wide for faculty staff and administrators.”

Male: Yes, that's it.

Judge: Okay, so what do you want to do with number sixteen?

Male: I want to put it in there.

Judge: So you want to add it as another recommendation?

Male: I want to include it in what you just said.

Judge: Okay.

Male: As part of it.

Judge: All right. All right. I got you now. I'm good. Add to number two.

Female: I agree because diversity, learning to appreciate diversity is very different from learning the skills that's interrupting prejudice.

Judge: Okay, I got it. And we'll add it to number two. Um, we'll add it to number one on our first recommendations. Okay.

Male: Thank you.

Judge: Sorry I was kind of thick on that.

Male: I'm sorry I got --

Judge: Number seventeen, "Rules of discourse." Yes, Bernadette.
Female: Yes, I, I’ve been, uh, thinking about the previous three, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen --

Judge: Yes.

Female: -- where we we’re thinking about waiting to see what Rona came up with. There might be a value in emailing to her in advance the ones that we are thinking about so that she can consider them beforehand.

Judge: That’s an excellent suggestion. I’ve just written it down and I will see that that happens tomorrow. Thank you. Excellent. Number seventeen, “Rules of discourse in the classroom should be established that promotes ability, discernment, reasoning and spirited debate, absent personal dimensions that demean, disrespect or deny the perspective of all parties.” Now here we are in the classroom. We’re telling people how to – talk, talk, say what you want to say. Go ahead.

Female: When we’re talking about best practices and civility, we know civility is not working right now so the school needs to establish I think some basic ground rules about discourse in the classroom.

Judge: They’re academics. What, how do you feel about this?

Female: They’re actually, they’re, they’re already there, uh, so I don’t think it’s an issue of having to establish new ones but I think it’s kind of like the reporting, the information isn’t getting out there. So I think it probably has more to do with conveying than it does actually (inaudible) .

Judge: I want to hear more from faculty. Is there, is there, are there rules of discourse in the classroom?

Male: Um, I --

Judge: Let, let me hear from faculty first. Ellen, Marcos, Chris, what’s happening in the classroom? And then I’ll hear from the students’ perspective. Let’s go.

Male: Okay. Uh, uh, first of all, I think Linda is right, that there are some things that are already kind of in place and written down. I think this is a tricky one and I definitely agree with the spirit of this recommendation. Uh, I, I think that the problem could be in implementation because I think that there are probably people in their classroom that outsiders may perceive that there isn’t respect and, you know, in terms of the things that you write but from their perspective, they may see themselves as engaging in their respectful discourse. So I think that’s actually one of the, the issues to be
kind of grabbed and I, I don’t have an answer for this because I don’t necessarily know how to get everybody on, you know, at least getting close to the same page about how to interpret what respectful discourse means. I do think, however, that this recommendation, what I would like to see is if we’re talking about having, you know, with the first year experience course and also with having a, you know, diversity requirement course, that there be some consideration for this recommendation in terms of, uh, what’s kind of written into some of the expectations of what we hope to get out of such courses, so for first year requirement course, for example.

Judge: So what’s your recommendation? If any, what are, what are you saying?

Male: I, I, I don’t know. I’m actually going to kind of back out of saying a recommendation just because --

Judge: All right.

Male: -- I think the issue is a little bit tangly.

Judge: Michael.

Male: My recommendation is that we scrap it and I will tell you why.

Judge: Okay.

Male: Uh, a faculty member should be responsible for the environment within their, their classroom. So this sounds like something that would be on a green sheet. It doesn’t sound like something that the institution establishes it quite that way. Uh, now --

Judge: All right, you got thirty more seconds.

Male: Okay, that’s my recommendation.

Judge: Okay. Anybody else on this one? Gary and then Linda.

Male: Um, well, I just wanted to, uh, nevermind.

Judge: Okay, Linda.

Female: Uh, for anyone interested, if they look on the senate website, it’s [SL113] and it’s very descriptive about things like providing an environment where diversity is viewed broadly and it includes all the, what would be broad, actively recruiting, ensuring --
Judge: Okay, and what is that now? That is --

Female: This is a senate document. It was signed by President Caret (inaudible) . .

Judge: Okay. So, Ellen.

Female: So it's a standing (inaudible) . .

Judge: Got it.

Female: But I do think there is a problem with things getting out.

Female: Yeah, I actually thank you for sending that out, Linda. And I don't think that's strong enough actually. I don't agree with just, just scraping this one. I would recommend actually to not only have it in the classroom but even beyond the classroom, too. There is some initiative within, I can't remember which unit in student affairs, of having, creating some kind of civility value statement that everybody actually signs onto on campus and it's not, I think the idea at this point is for students, but I can see that, uh, statement being adopted by faculty staff and administrators and become more of a cultural shift on campus and I agree with Delorme that even with that, it's not working.

Judge: All right, Tony and then Gary.

Male: Okay.

Judge: Tony, Tony and then Gary.

Male: I would say that it, it definitely, when you talk about the classroom, that's the (inaudible) . . of the faculty member and I think it's a training issue for faculty and a, and a reminder of what civil discourse is all about and to help create the climate that allows the people to learn how to agree to disagree because it's not there in many cases.

Judge: So, so what's your recommendation?

Male: My recommendation is that we create, uh, there's got to be, and, and I don't know what San Jose has on the campus, but there typically is a center for effective teaching and learning and I'll throw that out. Okay, and that's where the training should come to the faculty and I would, I would say utilize that, uh, --

Judge: Okay.
Male: -- that mod--, that, uh, --

Judge: Can somebody give me some language real quick?

Female: Center for Faculty Development.

Male: Okay.

Female: And develop training.

Male: (inaudible) . .

Judge: That's all right. The Center for Faculty Development.

Female: The Center for Faculty Development --

Judge: Uh-huh.

Female: -- provide training for faculty.

Judge: Um-hm.

Female: That would be pretty extensive.

Male: Around the areas of classroom management, uh, open discourse, things of that nature.

Judge: Well, I’d like Delorme’s language. I’d like to keep a language.

Female: Yeah.

Judge: “Rules of discourse,” okay. All right, so I’ll add that language to it. Can we move on? All right. Okay, uh, eighteen, “Any publication of opinions that challenge the culture, customs, practices, etcetera, of another culture should be balanced with a counter opinion that promotes the campus best practice of discernment, reasoning and debate.” I’m not sure what that means because I don’t know who should do what. Go ahead, Michael.

Male: But that’s kind of my point. My concern is that we get to trying to, and I understand what we’re trying go by, but I get concerned when you try to micromanage behavior because on the one hand we just through taking about rules of discourse but this is a, a panel to discuss diversity and the reality is those rules are, are diverse as well with respect to (inaudible) . . etcetera. So are we talking about your ideas, your idea is this? I’ve, I’ve
been in heated discussions with people where people think I am scream--, we’re fighting and then we go out for lunch afterwards and people are shocked. Uh, --

Judge: So --

Male: I’m -- So, anyway, --

Judge: What is, what is your view on eighteen? You want to scrap it, go forward, change the wording? What do you want to do?

Male: I’m open to changing the wording and if not than scrapping it.

Judge: Okay.

Male: We can’t (inaudible) . .

Judge: Okay. Gary.

Male: Uh, I just want to say that, uh, as a student of color, uh, my experience on this campus have varied widely. I’ve had very positive experiences and negative experiences. Uh, I personally can’t say that I’ve experienced, um, um, microaggressions, uh, weren’t necessarily directed at me, maybe directed at, you know, the situation, African-American as a whole, but I didn’t necessarily feel disrespected, but as far as talking about microaggression goes, um, like I said, I’ve had people express to me that these have happened. Obviously we had expressed in the task force so clearly these microaggressions is an issue that need to be targeted. Um, as far as, you know, my, uh, trying to micromanage, um, uh, the classroom, um, I’m neutral on that but I just think that, that microaggressions need to be addressed and handled.

Judge: Okay. So eighteen, but I, I’m, I’m against this one because it’s too nebulous. It just says any publication. I mean, we got a whole free speech thing going on here. I understand the concerns about hate speech, but it said “Should be balanced.” So I, I, I just don’t agree --

Male: Yeah, I agree with you and I think maybe an area that we could focus on is the trainings that we want to do, you know, and the nature of the training so as we look at these recommendations we can think about that.

Judge: Part of being a student is also experiencing the real world. You hear these opinions and then you’re going to hear stuff that doesn’t please you and people don’t come running to your rescue to give a counter opinion. I mean that’s kind what we’re trying to train people to do. Uh, what do we
want to do? My, my view is we scrap this one because it just doesn’t have, it --

Male: Uh, I think we need to look at the language when, when we’re talking about recommendations that are supposed to address microaggression. We need to look at the language that we, you know, that we use for this.

Judge: But we already did that.

Female: Number eighteen is saying --

Judge: Eighteen isn’t talking about microaggressions.

Female: I think we’re actually addressing different things.

Male: I think it’s related.

Judge: No, it says, “Publication of opinions”

Male: Oh.

Judge: -- “that challenge . . .” And I don’t --

Male: That constitutes microaggressions, too.

Judge: Right, but who, who is supposed to be responding?

Male: I mean, I’m, I’m not for or against this.

Judge: I don’t understand. Okay. Chris.

Male: Yeah, I just don’t, I, I while I appreciate the spirit of it, I don’t see how you could enforce it. First of all, if you’re talking about publications, if you’re publishing something in a journal, that’s between you and the journal and if you’re publishing something in the newspaper, that’s between you and the newspaper. How would the university enforce that? I, I just don’t see how it would be something that the university could enforce to say --

Judge: Well, I think Delorme is --

Male: - if you’re, if you’re publishing something that there has to be another publication or something that would come out to --

Judge: But I, I, I --
Male: -- counter balance it.

Judge: But I, I get it and I get what you’re saying, that, you know, when you see something, you read something that’s very hateful then it should be some sort of a response but you can’t mandate that. I don’t think you can. Yes.

Female: Yeah, I agree. I think it’s too amorphous. I think we should just, uh, eliminate it.

Judge: Okay. We’re in consensus, we’ll move on from that one. Number twenty, “Evaluate current efforts or planned efforts on campus to minimize duplication of efforts.” That’s a lot of effort in that sentence.

Male: We’re, we’re doing that with our recommendations.

Judge: Uh, so part of that has to do with Linda. By the way, I have two thank yous right now and I, I, forgive me for not doing it sooner. First of all, thank you to Marcos because it was Marcos who suggested having our speaker come today and I got your email and then we just jumped on it and thank you. Thank you. Thank you to Linda because Linda sent us all of these website links to all these (inaudible) . . because I’m trying to get a handle on what’s going on here and I counted twelve different websites that you gave us that have to do with these kinds of issues. Twelve, right? So there’s a lot. So this gets back to, um, “Evaluate current planned efforts on campus to minimize duplication of efforts.” So I don’t know what we’re supposed to do with that. I mean that’s why we’re --

Female: I think it’s basically, it, it was the last time that I brought the printout of the grid that Bill Nance provided, um, on what has, is already being done on campus. So primarily it was, I think, I think this could be solved by a diversity office actually because they would know what’s going on campus wide and the idea is not to duplicate --

Judge: So I’ll send that off to, uh, Rona as well.

Female: Yeah.

Judge: Okay.

Female: It, it, I think actually you don’t even need it.

Judge: I, I agree.

Female: I think you take care of it naturally.
I agree. Okay, so I’m going to take out twenty. Twenty-one, “Increase events such as showing of undocumented with opportunity for discussion, encourage faculty to provide extra credit for participation and written or oral presentation reflecting on the experience. Incorporate discussion about the event and to class discussions when appropriate.” That sounds good to me. It’s including faculty, I think. Chris.

I, I agree with this one. The only part that I am a little iffy on is the part about the extra credit.

It says encourage.

It says encourage.

Yeah.

They don’t have to, they can encourage.

Yeah.

I want to emphasize that.

Yeah.

All right. So --

I, I appreciate that, but I just am a little, I, I would personally, I would take it out but I will support this recommendation but I would --

All right. How many of you wanted to keep the extra credit part in? Anybody wants it in? Students want it in? Okay, that makes sense to me. All right. Um, and --

I didn’t say how much extra credit. I just said extra credit.

Right. Rick.

Yeah, and I definitely defer to the, you know, the, the (inaudible) . . on this issue, however, you know, that’s a little bit of honey and I figure sometimes when you get folks to go, you have to give a little bit of honey so I understand exactly. I see none of the faculty’s hands come up and I can understand exactly. I see none of the faculty’s hands come up and I can understand exactly.
about here. So, I mean, it’s good. All right, so twenty-one is in. Um, twenty-two, “Expand opportunities for student participation in leadership today.” Meaning that they’re not, you want it available to more students?

Female: Yes.

Judge: Is that what you mean?

Female: Yes.

Judge: Because right now it is not. Ellen.

Female: Can I add, um, or, yeah, instead of opportunities, put some resource like money because it costs a lot of money.

Female: I’m assuming when you expand opportunities it goes with money but if we want to be more explicit, that’d be great.

Judge: And, and I think expand opportunities for students. I mean, come on, what do we mean? We want to increase student participation in Leadership Today and to do that you got to have money.

Female: That’s fine.

Judge: Is that cool?

Female: That’s fine.

Judge: I mean, I want to just --

Male: It’s just a question because Leadership Today is capitalized, is that a name of a program?

Female: Yes.

Female: Yes.

Female: Yeah, it’s a program that was described by --

Judge: Yeah, we talked about that.

Female: -- uh, housing and other people --

Male: Okay.
Female: -- that's been very, very successful.

Judge: So are you okay with the wording? Are you okay with the wording, "Increase student participation in Leadership Today," and with that comes the money. Got to have the money.

Male: How about if we say "With programs such as Leadership Today," because there are going to be a lot of other programs, but that's an example of one.

Judge: Oh, I'm not sure I follow. I mean, her specifically this program.

Female: Do you want that to be specific?

Judge: That, Diana, you're big on this?

Female: Um-hm.

Male: Um, --

Judge: Hold on. Uh, Diana and then Gary.

Female: Okay, so, um, yeah, to be more specific, I would say to increase it to two times a year instead of just once a year, that way there's two opportunities and that's increasing it more than just one.

Female: I would actually, the only reason I would be concern about that is I would want to limit it that much. I would actually, I'm not talking about just numbers of times, I'm talking about numbers of students who actually participate. So it's actually both. It could be times but it's also number of students.

Female: The reason why they limit it to say forty students is because it's harder for people to share when it's more than forty students.

Female: Oh, no, no, there could be two sections of forty. See what I mean? Two different parallel.

Female: So then that would be two times --

Female: Yeah.

Female: -- with Leadership Today.

Judge: But going on at the same time?
Female: exactly.

Judge: So in other words you have a forty group and then a forty group, but they’re being funded.

Female: Twice a year so now you have one hundred and sixty instead of eighty.

Judge: And it’s twice a year. So you got forty, forty and then forty and forty.

Female: And it would be groups no larger than forty, whatever is recommended that way.

Judge: All right. So right now we’re saying increase the number of students that participate in Leadership Today. That’s what we’re saying. Now how they formulate that, you know, it’s up to them.

Female: Okay. Well, I would want to be more descriptive just because it’s guarantees that there would be at least --

Female: Okay.

Female: -- two times because that’s, because I just don’t know how they’ll increase it. Like --

Judge: All right. Go ahead. Give me some language.

Female: So I would like to increase, uh, --

Judge: The student participation and what else?

Female: To at least --

Female: Frequency.

Female: -- frequency, to at least two times a year.

Judge: Give me, give me the whole wording. It’s not making sense.

Female: So “Expand opportunities for student participation.”

Judge: We will say “Increase student participation,” that’s how we’re going to change it.

Female: Right, “By holding Leadership Today . . .” What do they call them, workshops?
Female: Uh, it's --
Female: events, whatever.
Female: -- retreats.
Female: Retreats.
Female: Retreats.
Female: “Leadership Today retreats, uh, at least twice a year.”
Female: Yes.
Female: Sounds okay?
Judge: All right, got it.
Female: Thank you.
Male: Uh, before we move on.
Judge: Yes.
Male: Um, I want to go back to, to Anthony because --
Judge: I'm sorry, which one are we on?
Male: I had a comment. Well, here's, here's, um, the way he worded program, uh, because I'm aware of other things and other models, to be quite frank, African-American, Chicano, Latino task force’s input for or recommendations for the original one so I don't like the notion that there's only one way to do things and that's what we should recommended. So I'm comfortable with the idea that we increase opportunities for students to participate in things like, but just because folks only know one song, I don't want it to (inaudible) . .
Judge: All right. Uh, Gary.
Male: Yeah, um, definitely related to both those, uh, Anthony Ross comments and Michael Randle’s, um, I have been a student leader on this campus for four years now, I mean, obvious that’s compared to you all but, um, I have never heard of Leadership Today. I've never gone to Leadership Today and I'd like to think I made somewhat of an impact on this campus,
um, without going to Leadership Today, not to attack that program but if it’s something that you strongly feel that is a good program, I say we should support it and others like it. Um, and also in regard to leadership today, um, I don’t know if anyone from my community, um, has even participated in Leadership Today, any of that, because I work with people, like my friends. So again we need to either look at improving Leadership Today or improving programs like that.

Judge: Okay. Let’s pick up on it. Chris.

Male: I, I, I support the recommendation as it’s written but would like to just recommend an additional recommendation and that is to, to, you know, have the campus to develop other leadership type programs and then to work on those types of programs as well because I do agree with the spirit of what’s being said. I don’t want us to limit, you know, to say that Leadership Today is the only gig in town, the only thing that we can do.

Judge: All right. So --

Male: I think we should expand it but I do think we need it.

Judge: All right, so I have one recommendation that says “Increase student participation, uh, in Leadership Today by, uh, holding retreats, Leadership Today retreats at least twice a year.” That’s one recommendation. Now I’m hearing another one that says “Develop leadership programs .. .

Female: Or support.

Male: (inaudible) . .


Female: I, I, I think what, what he was saying, I think my request would be that that sentences stays as is and then add a sentence to the same recommendation about additional programs because I do think Leadership Today, uh, one of the reasons you say, Gary, you haven’t, because it’s so small and, and the whole idea is to have more students involved. It’s a pretty well accepted, I’ve heard lots of positive feedback from students (inaudible) . . that it’s transformative for them. So we know that already but that, that statement was never meant to be exclusive. So --

Judge: All right. So if we add language we can write “and” after we have “Increase the retreats at least twice a year and development more leadership training programs for . . .”
Male: Leadership and diversity training programs for students.

Judge: Diversity programs for students, I got it. All right. That will go on the end of twenty-two. All right. Yes.

Female: I don’t know if this is a problem but by changing the language to increasing the retreats and removing the word opportunities, uh, we are not really addressing the resources that students might need to participate in these programs. Is that an issue?

Female: It is. You do need to say something about resources because here it happens a lot on campuses when there are limited resources. Everybody thinks it’s a great idea but then the next thing they’ll say is there is no money. So you really --

Judge: Well, --

Female: It’s important to say that, that resource, financial resources, that financial resources be --

Judge: How about just “Provide funding for the program.”

Female: Okay. Great, whatever works. It’s, it’s been a long day, so, yeah.

Judge: Okay, “And provide funding,” got it. Okay, twenty-three, “Create a first . . .” We already did that one.

Male: We did that.

Judge: Twenty-four we did. Twenty-five, “Reestablish campus climate committee.”

Male: Done. That’s under the --

Judge: So that’s under the, taking that out. “Conduct and update a diversity study.” We have that. “Explore mandatory . . .” did that. “Reestablish a broad and diverse campus task force that meets on a regularly basis.”

Male: That wasn’t done.

Judge: No, it wasn’t.

Male: And I’d like to speak to that actually.
Judge: So here’s the last one. Let me just read it again so everyone hears it. “Reestablish a broad and diverse campus community task force which meets on a regular basis.” Rick.

Male: Uh, so to, to speak to that, so it was interesting, I actually did a search to see anywhere where we had the word community, we really instantly focused on what goes in a, what’s happening on the campus, however, what is the role of the community and coming back and, and involving itself. The, the community itself is such an integral part. The campus is such an integral part of the community, for a long time under Caret and under other presidents there were campus community task force. I’m not aware if anything of such exists today. Uh, does anyone know?

Judge: Rick, what was the purpose of the task force?

Male: Well, the, the purpose of the task force, so community members can raise concerns and you can basically be able to talk about things and the campus’ impact on, you know, the campus’ impact on the community. But, so, for example, if you were having an issue on the campus and the community folks knew about it, they had the ability to give the input and vice versa and I, I think if we have a task force that’s combining both, hopefully, we can use the resources in the community to address some of the issues that are currently on campus and vice versa.

Judge: All right. And, yeah, okay, was that the, I’m looking at the Campus Climate Advisory Committee. Was that what you’re talking about? This was under Caret.

Male: The Campus Climate Advisory Committee I believe is an internal committee. They had a, uh, President Caret had a, it was a campus community task force. They met quarterly, um, uh, to talk about issues that were occurring on campus and to, uh, to see community input.

Judge: Because I, yeah, I look back at, at doing his tenure and I saw the three ethnic community advisory councils and they had --

Male: Yes.

Judge: -- community members attached --

Male: Yes.

Judge: -- to them.

Male: Yeah. So there was a --
And then that, that's what --

Yeah, there was an African-American and Latino and --

And Asian, right.

-- and Asian-American, um, community.

They were called --

Yeah.

-- Community Advisory Councils --

Yes. Yeah.

-- that's reported to the president.

That's the one I'm talking about.

(inaudible) . . budget councils.

and it was very interesting because I noticed on the African-American Community Advisory Council there was only community. That was it.

Well, those are the ones I was talking about.

So --

Those are the ones that disappeared.

So, okay, so let's talk about this. So "Establish or reestablish a broad and diverse campus community task force."

I don't know if task force is the right word.

Advisory.

Advisory.

So how are we going to? Advisory council. Um, I think you should add something about to whom this council will report.
Male: Advisory to the president because that’s a typical, uh, I would say a typical committee or council that would be, uh, that would have discussed (inaudible) . . relationships.

Male: Correct.

Judge: Okay. So that’s going back to, that’s the way it was 1998. Okay, it reported directly to the president. They would meet, see what’s going on. All right? Okay, we have, uh, twenty minutes left and we still have to look at our recommendations that I took all of your edits, put them all together and emailed them to you all, uh, from our first talk and Marcos had two. He’s already taken care of one of his additional ones. So I emailed you on, uh, Dorothy did on March 24th with the edited recommendations from our March 20th task force meeting. And, uh, I’m going to look at page one, number four under faculty administration and staff and I have it in italics. It says, “Campus administration should reevaluate its role and relationship with faculty and students.” Delorme, you were to reword that.

Female: Okay.

Judge: All right. So --

Female: This is what I --

Judge: Can you use the microphone, please?

Female: “The roles and relationship between administration, faculty, staff and students regarding bias and discrimination and the promotion of the value of diversity should be clearly articulated and accessible to all.”

Judge: Read it again please.

Female: Okay. “The roles and relationships between administration, faculty, staff and students regarding bias, discrimination and the promotion of the value of diversity should be clearly articulated and accessible to all.”

Judge: Comments? How, how do you envision it being articulated?

Female: In writing on a webpage.

Judge: Well, I think that should be in there. You should write --

Female: Okay.

Judge: She wants in on a webpage in writing.
Male: The thing I'm not clear on is, is what the focus is on this. So the roles in --

Male: So, so that's more of a statement than an action.

Male: Yeah.

Female: Um-hm.

Male: Yeah.

Female: I'm saying, I'm saying they --

Judge: It's feeling it's too nebulous right now. I'm trying to get it --

Female: Okay. What I experienced here is that there is a lack of clarity between a lot of people that are working here and they're attending this school with regard to bias and diversity and discrimination. People don't know who, what the roles are. They don't know who does what, when, where, why and who's promoting then and who is responsible for that and that's just not clear and so all I wanted to do was articulate that. If it starts at the president, he's the one who is the key holder, then it should say that, okay? If the faculty are participating in this kind of a way, then it should say that. If the staff is doing it, it should say that, and what is expected of students, it should also say that.

Male: So, so when you say --

Judge: All right.

Male: -- roles and responsibility, are you talking, referring to, um, addressing diversity issues?

Female: Right.

Male: Okay.

Judge: Okay, so I have some language. So what about we start, "Clearly define the roles and responsibilities of administration, faculty and staff," I don't know if it's about students or not, uh, "with respect to," I'm, I know it's, the promotion of --

Female: Diversity.
Judge: -- diversity.

Male: (inaudible) . . I said that sounds like some stuff that would get folded under the, uh, diversity office. So as we’re working on that.

Female: I don’t have a problem with that. I was asked to do this before we had this conversation today.

Male: Yeah, that’s what I know.

Female: Okay?

Male: Yeah, it was before we had the conversation.

Judge: So is this with the word “Clearly defined the roles and responsibilities,” do you want me to send that on to, to --

Female: Yes.

Judge: -- Rona and say, “Look at this as well,” and see if this fits in?

Female: Exactly.

Judge: Okay. All right. May I use your overhead?

Female: No, that’s no problem.

Judge: Okay, so this one send to Rona. Okay, send it on and then we’ll see what happens. All right? Um, the, the next one that we were to look at was residential life. Number two, uh, hold for further considering and here it is, “Decrease the RA, the ALRA and the LRs,” excuse me, “The ALRC and the LRC student ratios, fewer students per staff members.” We want to talk about that some more. Right now it was one to fifty? Or RAs to, I don’t know. So my notion was that that number, that just needs to change. There need to be fewer number of students assigned to each one. Rick.

Male: Well, you know, just, when we started off the meeting you started off talking about the, uh, the personnel action that had concurred and that we couldn’t talk about it and, you know, the newspapers reported that it was due to incidents related to alcohol, so clearly there’s probably something wrong with the ratio that’s there if there’s not proper supervision and I’m just, uh, insinuating what could have occurred.

Judge: I mean eighteen people.
Male: That's eight—, eighteen people so I'm, I’m just relating it to that situation and when, when the judge made the recommendation, it was saying, well, clearly there was a problem so clearly there’s a problem. So, so I think there needs to be an increase in, uh, an increase in the ratio of RAs, ALRCs and LRCs to student ratio and I think it’s evidence by what occurred today.

Judge: So I, you know, in my recommendation, I didn’t put a number because I don’t want to tell them, you know, “You have to put this many,” but I, that needs, but I just believe that that ratio is not working. Yeah.

Male: And I want to be clear, and Rick, I want to help you out there because the action that took place today was about a personnel action and so it was involving staff. It did not involve students that would be affected by this. So I think there’s a difference there because if I heard you, if I heard you correctly, you were concerned about the ratio of the staff members to the number of students on a hall and, and then you related it to the action taken today.

Male: The action taken today. So --

Male: And, but that was a personnel action as it was related to staff and it didn’t have anything to do with --

Female: No, there was, there are RAs and there are students and there are also hired by the university.

Male: Right.

Female: But they are students.

Judge: I’m sorry. A lot of (inaudible) . . in here. So Linda, you said something? Go ahead.

Female: Uh, you said that they’re staff, not students. They’re actually students hired by the university to be RAs.

Male: Well, if they’re, they’re student staff, paraprofessionals, but, yeah, they, they were acting in their capacity of staff and that’s why, that’s why the personnel action was allegedly taken today.

Male: So they, they --

Female: That’s true.
Male: -- were not RAs, ARLCs, or LRCs?

Judge: They were.

Male: Yeah, so, so that’s exactly the point I’m making.

Judge: Okay. All right, so, so let’s talk about what we want to do here. My recommendation is there needs to be a change and I’m not giving a number. I’m not telling them what they ought to do but we are giving a direction saying that there need to be fewer students with the staffers. Michael and then --

Male: I’d like to support that just as is without the number.

Judge: Right. There’s no number.

Male: No, I’m saying I’m supporting it.

Judge: Anybody else? Can we move on?

Male: Um, --

Judge: Yes?

Male: -- I just want to say that, um, I know that we aren’t like putting numbers on things but, uh, I just want to make a point that I believe either the A-- the ALRCs or the RLCs, um, one of those positions, um, they actually live in the dorms too, so if you’re talking about increasing, um, their number, which I’m hoping we are, we aren’t talking about firing RAs, or, um, then we, well, I mean, it’s not up to us to implement but, you know, um, the university will have to come up with housing for them. But --

Judge: Right, that’s up to them. But, but we want to solve the problem.

Male: No, def-- no, I’m just --

Judge: Gotcha. All right. Yes.

Male: Just one note is that, uh, ALRCs for example report to the LRCs and so there’s a concern about those ratios, too, so there may just want to be a little clarification in the, in the wording because we’re about, we’re also talking about the number of ALRCs --

Judge: Yes.
Male: -- for RLCs and the number of ARs according to LRCs, you know.

Judge: Yeah. So --

Male: It's great. It’s great.

Judge: All right.

Male: I just want that clarity.

Judge: Ellen.

Female: Just to clarify, the, it should be ARLC, it’s Assisted ResLife Coordinator, and the Assisted ResLife Coordinator is a graduate assistants. So they're also students.

Judge: So let me get the acronyms right. We got RAs.

Female: RAs.

Judge: Go ahead.

Female: ARLC.

Judge: ARLC.

Female: And RLC.

Judge: And RLC. Thank you.

Female: So my understanding is RLCs are not students, the other two are students.

Judge: Okay. All right. Okay, number four on the same page --

Female: Bernadette has a question.

Judge: Yes.

Female: In terms of the clarification that was suggested because it isn’t just fewer students per staff person, it’s few students per staff person and fewer, fewer of the upper level staff persons overseeing other staff persons.

Judge: I gotcha.
Female: So it's more supervisors. Higher ratio of supervisors to subordinate.

Judge: All right, I got it. Okay, thank you. I got it.

Male: Um, I'm actually --

Judge: Gotta keep, gotta keep moving.

Male: I'm somewhat concerned, um, because are we also talking about increasing the roles of the ARLCs and the RLCs? Because the RAs, they're responsible for most of the, the happenings in the dorms, so.

Judge: This is not roles. This is just numbers right now. So all we're talking about is ratios on this one, okay? So I want to move on. Uh, number four, uh, I reworded it and, you know, I'm not going to fight you all on it. If you don't want it, it's fine. But it's reworded as follows: “Ensure that residential life staff who most frequently interact with students including but not limited to RAs are aware of and sensitive to the perceived racial identities of the residents.” Not asking them to go in and ask you, "What are you?" but if they perceive, for example, the student in the case that brought this to the forefront was the only black student in that suite who want those working, at least I want them to be aware of that and sensitive to that so to ensure this person is not unduly isolated. That was my whole thing. So that's why I put perceived. I mean, you don't have to go ask anybody anything but if I see there's one Asian-American student and that's it, then you, you're aware of it. Anyway, so that's the wording. Tell me what you want to do and I'll do it. Okay, silence.

Female: Sorry.

Judge: That's all right. No, silence means agreements.

Male: Do you want to add, add self-identified in addition? So perceived and self-identified?

Judge: Sure. And/or self-identified.

Male: Yeah, there you go.

Judge: Yeah. “And/or self,” okay. All right. Um, we have a new one on, uh, page three. This was Marcos, uh, “The RLCs and . . .” This is number twelve on the ones I sent out. “The L, the RLC and the ARLC job requirement include demonstrated knowledge, skill and experience working with diverse students.” I think it’s terrific. Okay, are we good everybody? All
right. Um, so we're finished. Um, I will rewrite all these recommendations that we've gone through today. I'll send them out to you with your edits, uh, for your approval. Get back to me as quickly as you can if you have any concern on that. Hold on one second. And then at our final meeting I will, you will have the final recommendations and we will finish, have finished our work. Um, now I have some raised hands here. We have exactly seven minutes, so we have some time. Um, --

Male: Ten seconds here. The very bottom --

Judge: Go right ahead.

Male: -- we have G curriculum, a new one, “The university should institute a diversity course requirement.” Did we want to review that one or?

Male: We did it already. We did it already.

Judge: Sorry. We did it.

Male: Okay.

Judge: We, we did that.

Female: Uh, Judge Cordell.

Judge: Yes.

Female: Are we, um, me and Linda are going to work on that First Year Experience one --

Judge: That's right.

Female: -- and you're going to send it out after Tuesday then?

Judge: That's right. I'm going to wait on you all. All right, so you'll get that to me on Tuesday and, uh, Dr. Halualani, uh, will get me hers on Monday, so by midweek you'll have all the new edited, you'll have the whole package. I'm going to send you everything. All right? Gary.

Male: I just wanted to, um, I wanted to, I still wanted to make recommendations so hopefully there will be time to add, add my last recommendation in there along with the others.

Judge: You have a recommendation?
Male: Yes, I have a recommendation.

Judge: All right, go ahead Gary.

Male: Well, you want it right now?

Judge: Uh, Gary, we're wrapping up. We --

Male: Okay. Well, um, --

Judge: Go right ahead.

Male: I would like, um, for there to be resource and success centers that specifically target the, uh, the underrepresented minority students with the very poor graduation rates.

Judge: Okay, so say it again for us so I can, I have to get some wording here. So go ahead. So say it --

Male: Resource and success centers which specifically --

Judge: So they're resource centers and success centers? Are they --

Female: Student success centers.

Judge: I'm sorry. I'm sorry I'm not --

Male: Student resource and success centers which would specifically target underrepresented minority students with, uh, awful graduation rates.

Judge: I'm sorry you're gonna have to do it again. You just got to go through it. So student resource success centers.

Female: No, student resource and success centers. They're actually separate.

Male: No, no, no, no they're one.

Judge: They're not. He's saying they're one.


Judge: Is it one center, Gary?

Male: Yes.
Judge: All right, go right ahead.

Male: Which specifically targets underrepresented minority students.

Judge: Um-hm.

Male: With low graduation rates.

Female: (inaudible)

Male: Yes.

Judge: All right. And, uh, to support. Do you have a vision of who supervises the center?

Male: Um, the office of diversity that we want to implement.

Judge: Okay. All right. Um, is this, uh, okay. That’s fine. Should I send this to Rona or not?

Male: Yes.

Judge: Okay. All right. All right. Tony.

Male: I just had a question. Does that not closely align itself with the, the first one we started out with on the graduation rates earlier with the WASC Report?

Male: it should.

Male: It should mention that and so I wanted to be able to, to couple those two somehow because we did mention that earlier on in our discussions tonight.

Judge: Right. And just a second.

Male: Because it specifically low graduation rates.

Male: Yeah, in my vision it definitely relates.

Judge: Yeah, and, okay, so that was mine on, uh, number four, “Undertake a study to determine why graduation rates,” that was the study part.

Male: (inaudible)
Judge: So why don't we just put that as another recommendation right under there and then, you know, “Create student resources and success center to support, uh, underrepresented, uh, students with low graduation rates.” Something like that.

Female: And what I’d like to add --

Judge: Gary, is that all right?

Male: It sounds great.

Female: And I’d like to add, uh, “conduct outreach” too because that’s one of the issues that students don’t know these resources exist. So “Conduct outreach too and support.”

Judge: I’m going to have to ask you one second to just give me the wording. All right, so we’re going to add, okay, um, so do you want that to be a part of his, to create the center and --

Female: “And conduct outreach and support.” So just, so you’re just adding “and conduct outreach too and support.”

Judge: All right. All right.

Male: Thank you. (inaudible) . . letter. All right. Uh, I just want to say I’m going to work with Linda and Diana on the First Year Experience. And I just want to point and clarification on Marcos (inaudible) . . RLC and ARLC. The job (inaudible) . . So let’s play this out. I’m a freshman, I come here (inaudible) . . where, where, where is the expectation, the ability to accumulate this? So let’s just answer (inaudible) . .

Male: Well, if I’m answering, I’m going to say “Figure it out,” that’s what I’m going to say. And I, I know of incidents where people had similar experiences, came here and were like fish out of water trying to supervise people that they had no idea how to work with. And so I’m, I’m sorry, too bad.

Judge: Rick.

Male: And I have to really back Marcos up, Marcos up on that because if you come here, you’re a freshman, you want to be an RA in the dorm, just like in any other job, you should know what the job requirements are and go out and get them and if you refuse to affiliate or work with other people of color I do not want you supervising any other child on this campus. So
that's, you know, so it's, I have to say, "Figure it out. Go get, go get the requisite requirements in order to, to be an RA."

Male: Do you think (inaudible) . .

Judge: No, it's part of growing up.

Male: Yeah.

Judge: Chris.

Male: I mean, I, I understand that. I think that's something though that, you know, if you're looking at that from a freshman, part of what their, what their experience is going to be is limited compared to what faculty or staff will be. So to me I would say, if I was a freshman in that position, I wanted to do that, I would put things on my resume like, "I took such and such class that directly addressed diversity and I did well in that course. I worked at such and such other place on campus and as part of my work on campus I worked with a diverse group of people and this is my supervisor that can vouch for what I have done so far." And I don't really think that we have the highest set of expectations for somebody who is nineteen in terms of a long work history but I think those are the types of things that could actually be, you know, requirements or, excuse me, not requirements but things that could, you know, be on a student's resume that could count as part of their diversity training.

Male: Okay, so working at the bookstore, for example, okay, that's what I'm getting at.

Judge: All right, so we are, it is 7:20. Hold on, it's, uh, 7:30 on the dot. Our meeting is over. Yes, Marcos.

Male: Just one question on process, so you're going to get us all these, there's going to be some --

Judge: By next week.

Male: -- back and forth --

Judge: Yeah.

Male: -- email? Is that, is that cool?

Judge: Yeah, we'll see. I mean, I'm kind of playing this by ear right now.
Male: Yeah.

Judge: Uh, our next meeting, our last meeting is April 17th. Hopefully that’s the meeting where I’m going to give you these documents and we’re done. So --

Male: Okay.

Judge: -- I think you’re right that I'll get you something midweek once I get everything from Linda, Diana and Michael, uh, put all these edits in, send everything out midweek. We'll go back and forth. I don't want any new recommendations. We’re done, all right?

Male: Yes.

Judge: And then we'll, by the time we’re ready to meet, I should have the final document. I will have it ready for you and it’s --

Male: So I'll just --

Judge: -- not going to be a long meeting. We’re not going to be two hours here in the last meeting.

Male: So all of us should, should expect to read those carefully and provide feedback and, and get reply alls.

Judge: Yes, and I’ll do an email that says that. Okay?

Male: Thank you.

Judge: All right?

Female: In a timely manner.

Judge: Oh, yeah, because I got to, I’m the one doing, putting all this together. All right? Thank you all so much. It's 7:31. The meeting is adjourned.

Male: Thank you.

[End of Recording]