

Cultural Competency Professional Development and Implementation Committee Retreat

Thursday, June 26th, 2014

9:00 am – 3:00pm

Building 19 Room 214

Attended: Siv Serene Barnum, RJ Bell, Liz Coleman, Jim Garcia, Berri Hsiao, Maurice Hamington, Donna Koechig, Cilia Maimum, Manuel Mejia, Dean Middleton, Siskana Naynaha, Ahmad Rajabzaden, Patsy Raney, Stan Taylor, Michael Weed, Ruth Wren

Introductions

Each member was given 3 minutes, timed by Donna Koechig, to share the reason they volunteered and express what expertise they are contributing to the process.

How the committee was chosen

The committee members vocalized that transparency was vital during this process so as not to lose credibility with the campus community. There are 29-committee members chosen from over 40 applicants. There was a short discussion on possibly having all applicants participate, moving towards a self-select model. Members who have been in a self-select model indicated that decisions were hard to make and process extremely slow. It was noted that self-select groups struggle with working on issues that are time sensitive and short in duration. There would also be a danger in losing representation from across campus, that of the three work groups, and eliminating certain expertise. That the committee has a limited budget for reimbursing faculty and miscellaneous expenses was also taken into consideration during discussion. Members requested that the criteria for how committee members were chosen be sent out to members and posted on the blog set up by Siskanna Naynaha, *Engaging Diversity* <https://blogs.lanec.edu/engaging-diversity/>. This way, if the committee receives questions regarding how members were chosen they have a resource as and can provide a reference. All who applied received an email from or spoke directly with Donna Koechig. Those not on the committee will have the opportunity to participate through involvement on a team or task force focused on specific content areas of the training. It was stated there is a great deal of work to be done, that this committee is only working on phase one of a three-phase plan. The committee requested the blog have a calendar and that link be set up to open a new window. Members are to contact/request Siskanna (naynahas@lanec.edu) to be added as site administrators themselves or to simply request that items be added to the blog.

Voting

The meeting on June 26th 2014 was conducted using 100% consensus. Members discussed the validity of majority versus minority consensus. It was decided to establish a decision-making process for the summer, and then to revisit it the fall when new members join the committee. For the first meeting we determined to use a consensus model with 100% needed to move agenda items forward. At subsequent meetings, we have tentatively agreed to use a consensus model, working

for 100% consensus, noting where there may be differences within which the committee can still agree to move items forward. When 100% consensus cannot be reached on an item, the issue will be tabled until the next scheduled meeting with a minority report (articulation of objecting position[s] in written form to ensure that dissent is given space and time for clear communication and consideration) outlining diverging positions for the committee to consider and in order to help maintain a clear record of the decision-making processes of the committee. If consensus cannot be reached after consideration of minority reports, the committee will move to a supermajority vote for decision-making, with a minority report detailing and recording dissenting positions. The exact number needed to form a quorum and the percentage needed to pass votes by supermajority is to be decided at the next committee meeting. All members agreed there would be **no** proxy voting; members must be present to vote. A suggestion was made to have an attendance policy though at this time the committee would not implement one.

Confidentiality

Committee members agreed to work for transparency in all proceedings and actions with the provision that personal stories be considered and kept confidential. Members will state “this is off the record” when sharing a personal experience or example. Members were asked in moving forward to be mindful they do not break the confidentiality of members’ stories. Minutes of committee proceedings will be a summary of the events and discussions that take place therein rather than a detailed account of who said what and when. It was suggested that the meetings be audio recorded and downloaded, without edits, to the blog, but there were also objections to this as “off the record” statements would not be redacted from such files. It was also suggested that recordings could be kept and maintained without posting them to the blog.

Working Agreements/Ground Rules

The committee members reviewed the working agreements from several campus groups, including Diversity Council, Aspiring Leaders, and the Associated Students Lane Community College. The committee elected to combine the Touchstones (used in Aspiring Leaders) and those from ASLCC and make a table topper. The hope is to inspire members and help to remind folks to think critically and use ethical judgment during their work. The rules incorporate the members’ shared values of supporting each other in this learning community.

Guiding Framework/Foundational Vision

Everything points back to the institution’s Core Values and Mission, approved by the board, and reflects what and who we stand for. The committee members heard how the existing Diversity Plan was designed, discussed various aspects of the plan (located at <http://www.lanec.edu/diversity/diversity-plan>) and when this plan will be reviewed (2015) and updated. It was stated that language has power, that there is a need to respond to false logic and be vigilant of concealed stories and

move from students and staff feeling dehumanized to humanized. Curriculum development was considered an essential area for diversity awareness.

Charter Changes

The committee will align the language in the charter to that of the Governance System. The use of descriptive language is requested and a general statement of who is on the committee, though this would not be a list of names. It was also pointed out that the charter is not static, it will be ever changing, a dynamic charter. The following changes were made to the charter:

1) Goal

- a) The heading Goal is replaced with Purpose.
- b) The first sentence under *Purpose* must indicate that this charter for the institution. And the committee felt it was important to recognize and identify the strengths of the institution. Therefore the first sentence was adjusted to include: *institutional barriers and strengths related to the development of a culturally competent institution.....*

1) Scope of Work

- a) First bullet approved after discussion to draw from the Diversity Plan, support our core values and model social justice.
- b) Second bullet did not convey the type of review necessary. The committee settled on creating a second bullet. The new bullet would read, "Conduct a review of best practices in educational institutions and nonprofits." The members do not want to look at businesses for best practices. The original second bullet would now begin with "Develop a cultural competency..." Some members did not want the levels (e.g., beginning, intermediate, advanced) to be listed.
- c) The original third bullet was replaced with "Identify institutional barriers and strengths related to the development of a culturally competent organization." This ties into what was newly added in Purpose.
- d) For the fifth bullet (is the third bullet in the draft document dated June 26th 2014) the committee changed the word *staff* to *employees*. Upon discussion it was clarified that students are not being assisted. Further more, this bullet is concerned with identifying what tools to make available for employees self-assessment.
- e) Bullet six (four in draft dated June 26th 2014) went unchanged.
- f) Bullet seven (fifth in draft dated June 26th 2014) is considered phase 2. The committee requested an additional sentence be added that addressed 'recognized intersectional' which Siskana Nayanaha will provide before the next meeting. On the list of areas of focus Mental Health was moved up with Accessibility and Military Status was added to Veterans.
- g) Bullet eight (six in draft dated June 26th 2014) went unchanged.
- h) The original seventh bullet (now bullet nine) was adjusted removing the word *evaluate* employee completion. However, it was acknowledged that the

- union may not agree with a tracking system but this in itself could be seen as a possible institutional barrier.
- i) The original eight bullet (now bullet ten) went unchanged though it was noted that faculty are the only work group not to include cultural competency in their evaluations.
 - j) Bullet eleven (nine in draft dated June 26th 2014) was not inclusive enough for the members who were concerned that students would not be included in the creation of the trainings and activities. They also requested using the term 'employee groups' indicating that all will be participating. Lastly, as Lane is a public institution a report must not only be provided to the LCC Board but to the college community. Siskanna will develop a sentence that includes the above components.

Other Themes

The committee members approved that agenda items must be timed. If the further decision is needed on the agenda item the committee will vote to extend the time for that topic.

The committee will work over the summer. A doodle will be sent out to locate when the greatest number of participants can attend. These meetings will be 2 hours in length. This committee's work is to focus on phase 1, the Foundational phase of the charter. Phase 2 is considered the Content phase.

A sub-committee will create a session or short presentation for Fall inservice. This could include bringing a speaker to campus.

Submitted by
Siv Serene Barnum