Oregon State University
Finance and Administration

Diversity, Equity & Inclusion Action Planning Workgroup

March 30, 2022
9:00-10:30 am

MEETING SUMMARY

1. Welcome

Co-chairs Keahi McFadden and Tom Fenske welcomed everyone, and reminded the group that the meeting cadence to 90 minutes every other week. They noted a few people who have had to leave the workgroup for reasons related to work. Co-chairs reviewed the roadmap with the workgroup and noted that this is a natural transition time as the workgroup moves from vision stage to next stage of data/stakeholder input. The former workgroup people will be involved as stakeholders, and other members may join the workgroup in the future.

Assessment and data collection stage
Workgroup members asked for more information about the coming data collection and assessment stage. Co-chairs explained that the group will have a shared learning on April 13 about equity data—how to collect and analyze relevant data on this subject. Then the workgroup group will review existing data, such as that from OSU's climate surveys, and collect additional data and stakeholder input to inform the development of the action plan.

Stakeholder vision input surveys
Workgroup members discussed refinements to the stakeholder surveys about the workgroup's DEI vision, which are under development.

- Suggestion to add a question asking if different kinds of resources and/or services need to be made available in languages other than English to increase accessibility.
- Since the current survey is focused on feedback about the workgroup's DEI vision, and not broader needs, the group discussed keeping it simple and offering this initial survey in both English and Spanish. That will at least reflect an initial commitment that the input of non-English speakers is important to the workgroup.
- A future survey may include a question about what kinds of language resources are needed for DFA materials and services. The workgroup will seek advice from OID about translating resources into multiple languages, and members discussed existing resources that offer translation services that the workgroup can utilize.

The group discussed the need to create subcommittees to keep things moving between meetings. Co-chairs asked people to think about their skills and interests for working on different tasks, like translation.

2. Feedback about DEI Workgroup members' survey

Co-chairs discussed feedback received from workgroup members about the functioning of the group. One thing that arose was the need to share information farther in advance of meetings, so workgroup

members have time to digest and think about different topics. Co-chairs Tom and Keahi are incorporating different approaches to help achieve this. One thing is that draft meeting agendas for the next few sessions will be shared in the Box folder. Those are subject to change depending on how fast the group makes progress. Tom and Keahi invited additional ideas and suggestions as they arise.

Part of the feedback discussion included the perception by at least one member that the workgroup is not advancing DEI work quickly enough or having deep enough discussions about issues and solutions. In response, co-chairs have been having one-on-one conversations about these concerns. After reflection and discussion with colleagues in the Office of Institutional Diversity, the co-chairs were assured that this group is making progress, toward the collective goal and as individual professionals. There are many ways to approach DEI and social justice work. This workgroup is using the adaptive strategic planning framework recommended by OID. Perhaps the DFA's approach looks different than some people think it should.

The co-chairs reiterated the goal of this workgroup—to recommend a set of actions that units and people across the division can participate in. The workgroup chairs have regular discussions with division senior leaders to avoid any surprises about the recommendations at the end. This group will work with the senior leadership team to move the actions into an implementation plan, where the division's DEI goals will be advanced through educational opportunities, projects and methods.

Another point of input was the workgroup meeting summaries. Co-chairs stated that these are meant to be high-level summaries of the group's discussions, which can be shared with the community. They are not intended to be detailed minutes. In the feedback survey, some members expressed concern that the meeting summaries "flatten" discussions too much or don't correctly capture the intent of someone's statement. Co-chairs will start sharing meeting summaries in "draft" form so members can comment and make corrections before the documents are posted to the website on a monthly basis.

The workgroup broke into small groups to discuss the need for more detailed meeting notes or minutes, and ways to accomplish note-taking. Some points that were shared in debrief session with the full group included:

- Small group discussed the feeling of safety and how hard it is sometimes for people to speak up in the group. They talked about individual members contributing more to discussions, and how it takes time to build up a sense of trust with others.
- We are making progress when we have rich and messy discussions; there should be more time for discussion and engagement in small groups. May help with lack of comfort.
- A lot of those rich discussions happen in the small groups—how can we share that information for the consideration of the whole group?
- When people know notes are being recorded, they may hesitate to contribute thoughts that may be unintentionally offensive or just not well-thought out. That's part of the fear of stepping forward
- We could use Zoom transcripts to record meetings, but that is also uncomfortable for people who may be feeling vulnerable in discussions; they may not fully express statements.
- The meeting summaries that are shared have a more "official" feel. Perhaps workgroup members can take and share our own notes that can help when people miss a meeting.
- Have someone record discussion items, action items, responsible person, parking lot comments, next steps—then review the meeting notes together at the beginning of each meeting.

- Why don't people feel safe putting the deep work of this group in our public-facing documents? How do we built trust and the capacity for everyone to take risks and make mistakes?

Co-chairs will provide a "live" version of the agenda available in the Box where volunteers can record notes and ideas for the use of workgroup members.

Co-chairs asked for discussion: How do we make it safe for people to speak more freely in the large group, not just in small breakouts where it is hard to capture the meaty conversations.

- We have to take risks, and support each other in making mistakes with grace. Perhaps that is easier within the smaller groups, and risky or more challenging discussion should happen at that level.
- This group consists of volunteers – we should all be willing to stretch our comfort zones.
- Better incorporating small group discussion notes within the meeting summary would be helpful.
- Consider meeting in person as way to increase engagement and have a tangible place for ideas to be shared and recorded. Perhaps meeting in person would increase levels of comfort and trust as people get to know each other more.
- Even if we don't know each other well now, why do we not feel safe, and what will people need to feel safe in engaging with the larger group whether in person or via Zoom? Perhaps it is more difficult because we are discussing promoting DEI at a broad policy level, and we need to include such a wide range of perspectives. People become concerned they are not thinking of things in the right way and it can be uncomfortable.
- Sometimes white people feel like it is not for them to speak about certain topics that they don't have first-hand experience with. But white people must engage in this work if advances are to be made. Is the workgroup itself diverse enough? Can we be sure to hear from the people most impacted by challenges and issues?
- The workgroup needs to be open to hearing from people about their challenges and experiences. In our group's discussions, it is clear that people one workgroup have experienced biases and discrimination. We need to hear about times when people are having difficult experiences.

Co-chairs agreed that having robust conversations in small groups is important to advancing the workgroup goals. They will incorporate approaches into future meetings that will help small groups share important discussions and perspectives for incorporation into the action plan.

Workgroup members expressed a desire to continue a discussion about how and when to meet in person or in hybrid ways.

3. Finalize DEI vision statement for stakeholder input

The workgroup created a DEI vision statement to guide development of the action plan, and we will collect stakeholder input on the vision through a survey. Feedback from the last round of discussion was incorporated into a revised statement. Because of time constraints, co-chairs will send the current iteration of the vision statement by email for input before it is finalized.

4. Review updated stakeholder survey plan

Co-chairs will also share the final stakeholder input surveys (one for DFA employees and one for other OSU stakeholders) via email. They asked for a volunteer to help get them translated into Spanish for distribution.

5. Next steps for the workgroup—Move to the Assessment and Data Collection Stage

The next workgroup session will be a shared learning with Jeff Kenney from the Office of Institutional Diversity. Jeff will educate the group about equity data—how to ethically use qualitative and quantitative data to answer questions about gaps, needs and barriers to access.

DFA DEI Action Planning Workgroup Members

Teresita Alvarez-Cortez, Acting Assistant Vice President, Strategic Diversity Initiatives, Office of Institutional Diversity (***workgroup advisor***)
Christine Atwood, Administrative & Diversity Manager; Procurement, Contracts & Materials Management
Machelle Bamberger, Hazardous Waste Safety Officer, Environmental Health & Safety
Kirsten Bradley, Project Manager, Enterprise Project Portfolio Management Office
Jonathan Champney, Buyer 2, Facilities Services
Todd Cross, Trades Maintenance Coordinator, Facilities Services
Tracy Elmshaeuser, Executive Assistant to the Senior Associate Vice President for Administration
Tom Fenske, Business Center Manager (HSBC, BEBC), Controller's Unit (***workgroup co-chair***)
Keith Foster, Insurance Contract Specialist, Insurance & Risk Management
Anne Gillies, Search Advocate Program Director, University Human Resources
Jessica King, Travel & Expense Support Specialist, Controller's Unit
Mary Macy, Fiscal Coordinator 1 (HSBC), Controller's Unit
Daniel Mahoney, Academic Liaison, University Human Resources
Melissa Medina, Retirement Officer, University Human Resources
Keahi McFadden, Executive Assistant to AVP of University Facilities, Infrastructure & Operations (***workgroup co-chair***)
Christina McKnight, Director, Insurance & Risk Management
Stephen Nelson, Chief Procurement Officer; Procurement, Contracts & Materials Management
Bob Richardson, University Land Use Planning Manager, Capital Planning & Development
Aviva Rivera, Business Center Manager (FOBC, CEOAS), Controller's Unit
Melanie Rose, Manager of DFA Strategic Initiatives (***workgroup administrator***)
Justin Schaffer, Accountant 2 (FOBC), Controller's Unit
Stephanie Smith, Fiscal Coordinator 2 / Travel Administrator, Controller's Unit
Sudie Swader, Fiscal Coordinator 1 (AMBC), Controller's Unit
Ben Wessel, Director, DFA Information Technology