

Speaker 1:

(silence)

Speaker 1:

I think we're going to give folks a few more minutes to join and then we'll get started.

Speaker 1:

(silence)

Speaker 1:

I think we'd like to get started. Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you for taking the time to meet with us this afternoon. We hope that this meeting will be a productive use of time for both parties. We want to establish clearly from the beginning that our intentions for this meeting are to get resolutions for our remaining questions, with the goal of ending the strike. Similarly to the town hall, we will be going demand by demand and making sure that each one has had all questions answered before we move on to the next. At the same time, we hope that this meeting can be less formal than the town hall and more of an open discussion about where we go from here.

Speaker 2:

But firstly, we wanted to clear up the narrative that we as strike organizers have been uncooperative and unwilling to meet. So to that, we have this to offer you. Attending Haverford is incredibly suffocating. We have offered for years our voices and experiences through forums such as WeSpeak, op-ed articles in The Clerk, the Clearness Committee Reports and conversations with admin and faculty which have time and time again led to no meaningful and material change. It has become clear that no matter how much listening and learning you claim to do, that personal narrative was not enough. Traumasplaining is exhausting and we would not subject ourselves to any more conversations in which the main goal was to listen without action.

Speaker 3:

In a recent statement from the president, it was said, "Destruction is easy. Creation is hard." Whether or not it was intentional, this paints the strike and especially organizers as destructive, when we have been fighting to create sustainable change for generations. This statement blatantly ignored the constant efforts of BIPOC students to create spaces of support and genuine community in an institution that fundamentally fails to support us. This strike has been successful because the reality is that this institution relies on BIPOC emotional and physical labor and in our refusal to continue, institution has had to halt with us. Through our demands and action plans, we have actively and tirelessly worked on creating a new vision of equity that this institution failed to create for itself.

Speaker 4:

It was also stated, "Calling out is easy, calling in takes compassion." Indifference is the opposition of love. There is no calling in without first calling out the issues at hand and by every definition of the phrase calling in, the strike has fulfilled it. How Haverford as a community has defined calling in shifts the responsibility solely on to marginalized groups to educate our more privileged peers. This is grueling, thankless work that only increases the burden on overtaxed, marginalized students. We have hosted

discussions, teachings and have advocated for structural change. We've asked people to examine how they may have contributed to structural violence and to join us in reforming our community and culture.

**Speaker 5:**

Right, and the strike has revealed the true colors of many members of the Haverford "community." So he read the footnotes on the BSRI letter from back in June, many of you would realize that the term community is fraught in and of itself. The rhetoric surrounding the strike and strike organizers has rehashed many of those same frustrations. You cannot love and light your way out of anti-black racism, white supremacy, and the history is of hegemony that exists very much as the foundational backbone of Haverford, and that have now brought us to this breaking point.

**Speaker 6:**

We want to reiterate that it is not just your original email or even administrative violence that we are responding to. We are actively resisting a centuries long colonial project predicated on the destruction and devaluation of black life that ultimately murdered Walter Wallace Jr. All the work we have done for this strike is more than just an attempt to make this institution safer for BIPOC students. We also hope to honor the lives taken from the system of white supremacist racial capitalism that Haverford itself continues to benefit from.

**Speaker 7:**

We hope that in today's meeting and moving forward, the administration understands that over the duration of this strike, we have done the work that not only you, President Raymond, have refused to do, but also the generations of white people and white men in power who have found it morally and ethically acceptable to ignore the demands and the needs of the most marginalized people, not only at Haverford, but the global community at large. If there's anything you can learn from this moment, it is that you have been complicit in upholding the structures of white supremacy, and if you truly want to commit to fostering an anti-racist institution, you have a lot of internal work to do before you can ever transformatively help anyone else.

**Speaker 8:**

Let this meeting and our recommendations on your revisions be a reminder that not just Wendy, but every single so-called leader of this institution, that BIPOC students will always be ready to mobilize and fight for change when you fail us.

**Speaker 1:**

Moving forward, I'll be sharing our comments via our Google doc.

**Wendy Raymond:**

Thank you so much for coming together today. I really greatly appreciate this opportunity to have voice to voice conversation and thank you for your opening remarks, which I will not engage in directly here today, but to say I appreciate your straightforward manner, your analytical capacity to bring it to us in this way, and to thank you for your pathbreaking leadership that has ushered us to this historic opportunity for institutional transformation. I'm happy to pass it over to you to talk about where you think we can go this afternoon, where you'd like us to go this afternoon together.

Speaker:

So to start with our first demand regarding indigenous communities, we do accept the response as meeting the demand. So we do approve of that response.

Jess Lord:

If I can just jump in, I just want to, again, say thank you and appreciation for all the feedback, including the questions that you asked, even though you've just noted you accepted as having met the demands. Just to update you that actually immediately we followed through with what we said we would do and reached out to the organization College Horizons to initiate becoming a partner with that organization, which does significant work supporting native students in their pursuit of higher education. Also, really agree, completely agree that there are definitely ... feeling optimistic that there are models that we can look to or creatively come up with, including drawing from models that exist in Haverford like the Padín scholarship, the Ira Reid scholarship, the Philadelphia scholarship as methods of being an opportunity for different kind of financial aid approach. So just want to affirm those pieces and again, say thanks.

Speaker 5:

Thank you. We will be moving on to the second demand regarding chief diversity officer. We acknowledge this demand as met with qualifications and really right now we just have questions that we sent to you previously, but weren't really answered. So with the first question, we are wondering at which date will the 3126, 2631 fund would be available, and when will the \$10,000 from that fund be available?

Linda Strong-Leek:

That funding is available now, and you can let me know if you have projects that you'd like for me to work on with you. I'd be happy to do that. The funds are available.

Joyce Bylander:

The other funds are also available and we're just awaiting student input.

Speaker 5:

Our second question is how will the ... so questioning kind of the role with the co-CDO and will that only be for students and chosen by students, or will there be any admin input for that co-structure?

Wendy Raymond:

Yes, there will be administrative input into the structure because this is a personnel decision and those do lie with staff and I understand that you have objections to that. So I'd love to talk about are there ways that we can, in terms of your goals, help meet your goals about the request to have it be solely student appointed, which I'm saying isn't a possibility, but is there an intermediate, is there an effective way that you see to have student input that would allow student leadership to have an enormous say in that? Formally it needs to be an administrative appointment. So many of the processes that we have come from recommendations from groups, hiring committees, for example, that are formal recommendations to the person that makes the appointment.

Wendy Raymond:

So in this case I would be the person to make the appointment, but we could put together a group with students on it, and I hear you saying you want it to be all students. Is that the best way to go? I don't know if, say for example, the presence of faculty advisors here is helpful. You might want faculty or staff advisors, you might not. Then that recommendation comes to me and I would ... Because I'd be in those conversations about hiring or appointing ... because it might not be a new person. It could be somebody here. It could be a structure that is reliant on people here and people from the outside, or et cetera, all kinds of possibilities. Then you'd make a recommendation to me and I make the formal appointment.

Wendy Raymond:

There are faculty members on this call that have been in such situations. There's always a possibility formally that a recommendation isn't accepted by the person that makes the appointment. I have not, since I've been here or previously in my professional life, been in a situation where that kind of recommendation was overruled. So I'm looking to find common ground with you in a process that does involve an administrative appointment.

Speaker:

Yes, moving forward, we suggest having the personnel that have been chosen by admin be given to students to then elect from that pool on who should be the person that goes in that co-structure with the CDO.

Wendy Raymond:

Thank you. So I heard you say that it would be the students in whatever group we have. I guess I'm not clear too on the group. I should probably ... Okay. Students will be in any CDO search committee, yes. Oh, wait, this is our writing. So that's not helpful. Okay. Sorry. If I heard you correctly, you would like students in a group to make a recommendation that is ... that you would pick that person and I would say, yes. You'd have a priority person and I would say yes, and we'd offer it to them, and they would either say yes or no, and then we'd go to your next choice. I'm just trying to gain clarity on what you're recommending or asking.

Speaker 11:

I think what we're trying to recommend is that there's a student group that filters potential applicants from whatever pool that the administration wants to use, and then eventually from that pool, there is an election as to who ... with the whole student body as to who is [inaudible 00:18:27] within that role.

Wendy Raymond:

Okay. Thank you for clarifying that. I didn't understand the election of the whole student body. So a couple questions back. Definitely that a student group can be, as with every hiring committee, composing part of the hiring committee or all ... I don't know if you're saying all or whole, or also with faculty or staff that you would co-agree to have on that group. So maybe can I ask that first, do you truly want this to be only students thinking through how to do this when I know that you regularly receive in your Haverford lives great input from faculty and staff? So would there be faculty and staff also on this group?

Speaker:

I think right now, we're just saying that it would be an election for the students to vote on after kind of the faculty and staff pick who they're wanting to appoint. So that way all students kind of are able to make that decision.

Wendy Raymond:

That is a really interesting model to me and I'd like to know why you'd like it to be a full student body election, rather than a group of students, which would have BIPOC and Figley students and representative ... not representative of. It would be people really invested in this process of getting a co-CDO, which I'd be happy to have student leadership decide your student leadership, help decide who's in there, relative to a full student election of who the co-CDO should be. So I'm just trying to understand why the whole body of the students' election is your favorite mechanism.

Chris Mills:

Chris here. I'm just wondering, maybe I'm misunderstanding things. Am I hearing you to say that administration might surface a number of names who may be willing and able to serve on a search committee and students would then choose from among those names going forward to actually provide that service and sit on the committee?

Speaker 11:

I think that really our main focus here is having more student agency throughout the whole process. I think something like a smaller group of students could be an option that we use as long as students both have the ability to choose the options and also to veto options that the administration presents. So, it's something that we'd be open to.

Wendy Raymond:

I fully agree with more student agency in the process of ... or significant, let's say. More could be not very much, but significant student involvement in the process of determining who the next co-CDO will be, or if there's a different model that students would like to see enacted. So yes, increasing significance of student involvement in the process. I would prefer to have students who are really invested in the process of getting us a terrific co-CDO to be involved, rather than a whole student election or a general student input, actually. So to me, that advances our working in equity across all intersecting identities. So veto, absolutely from that small group and choosing in context of that I have to actually make the appointment, that works. With faculty and staff advisors, but with increased student agency, I think that would be a good model. I mean, I think that our goals are the same. I absolutely share the goal of more student involvement or significant student involvement in this process of getting us the person from student life who will work as co-CDO.

Wendy Raymond:

I am not following the chat, but I see there are some suggestions there, if anybody would like to bring them forth.

Speaker 1:

I think the chat is just reiterating that we agree and we're open to that structure. So I think we should be able to move on from here, if there are any further comments or questions.

Speaker 12:

Oh, can I just ask, sorry. President Wendy, have you thought of whether you'll have structures to maybe find, hire the students or are you planning to just assign?

Wendy Raymond:

I am happy to find your best ways, students recommended ways to find students to serve on that committee. Normally we're doing that through students' council nominations, and that may not be the preferred way to do it and I'm completely open to your recommendations on that. I think some of you, if you're willing and interested, would be excellent leaders to be in this work. You have done so much incredible labor already. You may not wish to do that, but I'll ask again, what is the best process? Then the question will students be compensated for this labor? I think we need to ... we, us here today, we need to have a much larger conversation about student compensation. There is movement on that as you know in this past year, through last year's taskforce, on work in service that led to compensation of students in ways we had not previously had that is in customs.

Wendy Raymond:

That has also increased this year for customs students and we in the administration and with students need to take that on for the entirety of the campus around what will be paid and what won't be paid, if anything. I think that that's a really important, huge topic. So I don't want to answer that topic by topic here, will students be compensated for this labor, but we would need to answer ... Yes, we need to answer that for all hiring committees that students serve on. What is the compensation for that, and I don't have an answer now.

Speaker:

Sorry. Dean Bylander, if I could ask one more question about the money being made available. So is there a structure in place for how students should request that money? Is there a form or a process by which money is either set with a debit card or with transfer? I'm thinking about students council and how students council treasury runs, and it's very complex in terms of how you ask for the money and how they decide who gets what. So I'm just wondering if there's any kind of structure in place for that.

Joyce Bylander:

We hadn't put a structure in place for that and one of the things that the presidential intern was going to work with us on is to develop such a structure. How will this be allocated? What will be the categories that can be accessed? So we are hopeful that when we are able to move forward again, that we will be able to have good conversations and make fast progress about setting up a structure and having students be able to access funds.

Speaker:

Great. So that makes a lot of sense. So then the phones aren't available right now. So I think all that we ask then is that when money is available to be given to students, that it be publicized broadly.

Speaker 12:

So sorry, just to get back to the point on structures and hiring students. Maybe a possibility could be who has administration can come up with different structures on how to hire students or how to assign

students and then we can offer sessions as well. I think maybe that might be helpful, so not all the labors fall onto us as well.

Wendy Raymond:

That sounds excellent. Thank you. Yes.

Speaker 11:

Just to add onto this discussion about compensation, it's something that we've highlighted, especially when it comes to hiring and especially when it calls on marginalized students to be on these hiring committees, because it's an important role for those students as far as increasing things like retention in that position for the college. So there are real structural benefits from the college that come from these students being on these committees, and so it's very important that they get paid for those things.

Wendy Raymond:

I look forward to figuring this out for the college. Not me alone, but that we will continue to make progress on this because I agree with you that it's important.

Speaker 1:

So moving on to our third demand for a paid holiday for staff on election day.

Speaker 2:

I'm having trouble hearing.

Speaker 1:

Sorry. Going over our third demand in which we demanded a paid holiday for staff on election day, and we recognize that demand as being met.

Speaker 11:

Moving on to the fourth demand for academic leniency for BIPOC and first gen low income students, one thing that we are calling on for the college is more transparency about the different roles that CSSP, FAPC and EPC, the different roles that they have, how they work together and how their communications can sometimes be stifled, or methods to enact change can be stifled through these administrative bodies. So we're asking for more transparency about those structures, but we're in ongoing conversation with CSSP and FAPC surrounding the parts of the demand that are up to faculty governance. So as far as that goes, we're talking with people, but yeah. I mean, if you have anything that you'd want to add about the different faculty groups and the ways in which ... and some of them, like in EPC with the provost, how there's more administrative input, but sort of how do these groups work together and what ways can that be improved?

Joyce Bylander:

I would like to speak about CSSP, and I think you all may have received some communication from them. They intend to send out more. I'm on that committee. So they heard clearly the concerns raised in the demands about the work that they do, and while their intention is to support students, they recognize

the ways in which their actions may have been perceived as non-supportive and have really had good conversations. I think if you had an opportunity to speak with Alex Norquist, I hope that you also recognize the ways that that committee is listening to your concerns and making constructive changes. They're hopeful that students will join that committee soon so that any changes that we discussed can be bedded by students. So I hope that you have been engaged with Professor Norquist and that the students will soon engage with the committee so that it can be better.

PART 1 OF 5 ENDS [00:32:04]

Speaker 13:

Each with the committee so that it can be better.

Linda Strong-Leek:

And I'll just speak a little bit about FAPC and EPC. I do understand, and I see in the chat that you have met with FAPC multiple times and I'm hoping that those continue to be really productive conversations. In terms of EPC, we do have student reps on EPC. They are full members of EPC. We turn to them many times to ask about student perspectives on issues in terms of curriculum in particular. And that's what we've been discussing this fall. If there are other ways, if maybe you would like a report from the students, if there are other ways in which we can be more transparent, EPC is definitely open to having that conversation.

Speaker 14:

I just do want to add a small comment. We did meet with both CSSP and FAPC earlier today and it was a really productive conversation. And I'm in complete agreement with you Dean Bylander, but I just do want to add, because they brought up the concerns that the departments don't really interact, that they don't communicate a lot of information between both EPC, FAPC and CSSP, and I would also maybe suggest to listening to CSSP and FAPC on how to improve the EPC, just because I have heard a lot of concerns about the EPC. Personally, I didn't even know about EPC before this day, so just like, I just think that should also be something to keep in mind.

Linda Strong-Leek:

Yes, thank you. FAPC is actually reviewing the structure of EPC this year for several of the reasons that you indicate, so thank you, we are... Yes, thanks.

Speaker 15:

And one thing that we talked about that might help improve openness and transparency with students and these committees would have, once a semester an open meeting with these bodies and the students so they know what their functions are, what power that they hold, if they have a problem which body they would head to. So having more open and frequent communication between students and these committees.

Speaker 13:

That's a good idea.

Linda Strong-Leek:

I think that's a great idea, and we'd definitely be open to that.

Wendy Raymond:

Just to be clear, each of those committees is chaired by a faculty person and this in... But all three are firmly in faculty shared governance, so I'm glad that you're in those conversations with faculty because they're the ones that would call those meetings and make those happen. We're happy to support that and yet, we wouldn't be able to just say, yes, that's going to happen. So you're talking to the right people in EPC, FAPC and CSSP.

Speaker 16:

Okay. Moving on to demand five about student supporting, student participation, director action. We acknowledge that Haverford as an institution, as part of the larger hegemonic systems in play will not directly assist local communities. So we'll move on regardless of whether or not there are institutional structures in place to support our efforts. Despite the bureaucratic limitations, they expect the college to commit to, and encouraged members of the community to think creatively about ways that we can leverage the college's resources in support of organizers on the ground. This includes, but is not limited to, arranging for the safety of all students involved with these local actions, making public statements in support of set organizers wherever possible. So we're willing to move on even though this demand was not met, as we intended it to be.

Wendy Raymond:

I would love to engage in conversations about this at a later time, since we would like to move on. But I think there may be common ground there that we haven't yet found, that we could make happen.

Speaker 17:

Well then, onto demand six about surveillance and policing. We acknowledge that this demand is met with qualifications. We just want to reiterate that one of their requests was, how officers reporting will be held accountable. I know that in the demand when we did indicate that there would be a new system that would be regularly reviewed in order to guard against racial profiling, but we did want to present once again. What happens when an officer is reported? How will they be held accountable? What are the plans in place for that?

Mitch Wein:

Wendy, did you want me to add to that? Okay, thank you. Hi, this is Mitch Wein. There are policies and protocols in place that all employees, including campus safety, are responsible to adhere to. And depending upon the nature of the error, the college has protocols and processes to talk with that employee and to understand what happened and to do what we can to correct it such that it doesn't happen again. And depending upon the nature of the error, and within our employee handbook, it outlines that there are issues that occur that can be up to termination and it depends upon what those issues are. So there are pretty specific policies in place for all employees about how we want to operate as a community, how we expect employees to follow our policies, how we look into the issue, how we investigate the issue, how we make sure that we're operating in an appropriate way and then have a series of remedies in place based on the specific action.

Speaker 17:

I'm just bringing up a comment that was brought up in the chat which is, where can we find these protocols and processes? And will the administration be willing to sit down and talk further about them just because historically, there has been a lack of accountability on part of the institution when folks do racially profile or taken any other harmful actions. So, are those public and is there a way to discuss further where they're effective?

Mitch Wein:

Let me take the second question first. Absolutely, I would welcome the chance to talk to students, to learn and to understand more of the specifics and to also have an open door to be available, and there are other folks that would be available but myself, absolutely. Secondly, and too, many of the policies and protocols are available and shortly thereafter, we can point out where those are and their... I think behind the Haverford firewall, but you would be available to see them and sure, they're not hidden documents and we do want everybody, most importantly have an understanding of our expectations, of our community's expectations, of how we want to operate as a community and that we work hard to make sure that folks can, and if they can't, we want to talk to them about that. So, absolutely, what those expectations are and policies and protocols are. And then when there's work to be done about policies and protocols, I would encourage request and be thankful for more student direct conversation so that we could improve those.

Speaker 18:

And I just wanted to address a quick point about some of the language in the response that was found in column 16, that said that campus will move towards collecting data and uses data to inform efforts to guard against racial profiling. And while this is something that is moving forward and it's good to understand the patterns and trends that exist on campus, just to reiterate that, the structure of data as it exists is currently racist, especially data on surveillance and policing. This comes from both reporting of data, reporting bias and on the ways that it is used to inform action. There's a lot of studies out there that we could link to as well, but I just think that when we're moving forward, this isn't [inaudible 00:09:35], just to make sure that as we continue to work through, this question of surveillance and policing on campus that we do not rely too heavily on.

Mitch Wein:

Thank you. And both for me directly in students to be in contact with me after this call and going forward. I also know that campus safety would be interested and anxious for direct student conversation, and there've been other good models where there was some advisory and direct conversation with campus safety leadership and talking with them, they'd be anxious to have that in place as well so that the dialogue is open, available and transparent.

Wendy Raymond:

Mitch, there's a question in the chat that..

Mitch Wein:

Okay.

Wendy Raymond:

"How do you recommend students get in conversation with you?" Is that active outreach? You will comment on your part or is this just an invitation for students to email you and have one-on-one meetings?

Mitch Wein:

Both. Thank you. One is clearly email me and confidentially or otherwise and we'll have one-on-one conversations Zoom or one-on-a-few conversations, I'm interested and able to do that. I could also then invite campus safety leadership to the conversation based on the request of the students or otherwise how it makes sense to advance the conversation. And then secondly, actually I will be talking with campus safety, and campus safety does have an interest in having some formal arrangement so that there is a student group selected by students to participate in direct conversations. So, it will be some work on our end to create that opportunity, then we'll talk with the student leadership to create the campus safety conversation, also the one-on-one or one-on-few conversation directly with me. So I think it's both, and I'll probably follow them. Jessie's direct conversation with students on this call and others.

Wendy Raymond:

I'm also going to read that comment in the chat. Welcoming student input is a gray area to the person stating this and I'll just take that for a moment. I hear you on that. There can be... And so, how can we make that more clear? It's one thing of course, to reach out to Mitch or have him know who to reach out to, but if electronic forms are more helpful, we should think about ways to put those or additionally helpful to put those in place.

Mitch Wein:

Thank you, Wendy, and thank you to the students. Open to the best way to solicit that information, to communicate those forms, electronic forms, but we will also take the initiative to begin to create the structures and make that available to students. Announce these boards, work with student council to make sure that everyone's aware that we're interested in student engagement with campus safety and then the one-on-one conversation and how that's done, e-forms or emails, we're open to that. But I think e-forms make sense to me.

Chris Mills:

Also, I wonder whether this is a gateway to this larger conversation about student input, and what mechanisms and means do we want to set up to formalize, unify, standardize and make known ways of doing that consistently.

Mitch Wein:

That'd be great, Chris, thank you.

Jesse Lytle:

Can I start clarifying question about this one? So I know the language around this demand has shifted since we first saw it, but it was first framed in the context of COVID-19 and so, the colleges as you know, put in lots of different new practices because of our current pandemic and that includes anonymous tip

lines, all the various ways to try to figure out whether the community is being safe in a pandemic sense, in a public health sense, not just a campus safety sense. So I just want to make sure we're addressing the demand as you... Is this really a campus safety question? Or when you say surveillance, because we sometimes use the word surveillance in a public health sense like COVID testing and I just want to make sure we're on the right spot here.

Speaker 20:

I think it's always been about both. Even in the initial demands, we did stay explicitly about COVID-19. The COVID-19 surveillance surrounding public health and people coming on and off campus has exacerbated the issue, but there's long been spaces, especially for people in Ardmore, for students from nearby colleges where rules can be selectively applied and selectively applied in ways that only apply to black people that visit our campus. And those are really the things that we're trying to address.

Jesse Lytle:

Thank you. That's very helpful. Just because sometimes it's not campus safety that's doing the monitoring or the enforcement, right? So I just don't want to limit this to a group that's too small, but we've asked everybody, group effort, like, 'Hey, let's all be looking out for each other when a contractor isn't wearing a mask', right? "Let's give that feedback to facilities and then somebody will close the loop that way." So, one of the reasons we had invoked the operations planning group is because that covers a broader range of administrative functions, health services and facilities, and so all these groups that might be looking out for safety risks that might involve exactly what you're saying, that there might be profiling or bias involved in any of the reporting function. So, we're planning to take that holistic look, but I just really wanted to hear again, but that's what you're looking for, so this is helpful.

Mitch Wein:

And I noticed in chat and just to close the loop. I don't mean to cut short the conversation but to answer the question really. Is the question about the timeline, is I did speak to campus safety and they were very interested in that and continued to do an engagement, enhancing engagement, new student engagement, additional student engagement and where you expect to do that before the end of the semester and have that outreach in place, and systems in place. So, yes. They're equally and proactively interested in just the things we spoke about.

Speaker 15:

I think, well, not explicitly stated in the demands, it was reiterated in several comments and discussions in both the town hall and in document form. We also need to take a look at how campus safety has been used by other students to weaponize against BiPAP students and calling campus safety as forms of social retaliation. And so, those need to... Those kinds of calls need to be qualified within the data and expanded upon and looked out again with campus safety.

Wendy Raymond:

Confirmed. We'll do that. Mitch... I see Mitch shaking his hand but I'm not saying yes.

Mitch Wein:

No, yes. Thank you. There was... Oh, absolutely. That's exactly the type of student engagement comment, the data that we're... You've been referencing that we want to have the conversation with the students to understand that so that we could react appropriately to those real concerns. Thank you. Yes, in short.

Speaker 20:

And just to close this out with something potentially that the college could commit to doing, is basically encouraging people to report and having anonymous report lines or incidents. Like they say they witnessed or are personally affected by... Yeah. Having a place where that data can be made more... I guess were students themselves can contribute to the data that the college has on incidents like this.

Wendy Raymond:

Yes, that sounds great. Thank you. Yes. And we'll need to work iteratively on this. I'm confident we won't get it perfect or even maybe excellent the first time through, so please... As always with student agency and staff and faculty too, let Mitch know or however, let my office know. Myself or Jesse Lytle, when things are not working as you anticipated or you have a constructive suggestion for how it can be improved, great.

Speaker 18:

Moving on to demand seven, crediting the work of black women. Although we do recognize this demand as met, this is not a demand that can be met once but requires deep and constant reflection. We expect that everyone on this call ask themselves regularly if they are giving credit where credit is due, both in individual moments and historically. Additionally, for strike eight, accountability for problematic professors, we acknowledge this demand as met as the conversation we're having with FAPC is ongoing and will continue for some time. For demand nine, pay for striking students. We also acknowledge that demand as met.

Speaker 15:

Moving to demand 10, protection for strike participants. We ask for full transparency, making a public statement made by senior staff and faculty about academic flexibility in the moving forward in fall 2020 to all students and faculty. And we also ask that the college move to commit to protecting both organizers and student strikers from retaliation, from... What we've seen so far is a very small group of students and a concern... A conservatively large group of parents who have threatened both legal and physical action.

Jesse Lytle:

I'm sorry, just for clarification. Physical action, what does that mean?

Speaker 15:

As of right now, we have had students sending... Students and some parents on parent chats on Facebook saying that students should be forcibly removed from the college and a couple of nights ago, a member of the community crumpled up strike posters that were across Haverford and placed them in a pile at the door at the Women of Color House.

Jesse Lytle:

Thank you.

Wendy Raymond:

So there will be no forcible removal of students from this campus who have been involved in, or supporting the strike. Whether it's you as leaders or others who have supported the strike, if I understood that point correctly. Legal action, the college will be taking no legal action against you. There's no retaliation by the college will happen. I cannot guarantee what an individual in the world will do in terms of legal action against any other individual, so I think that's a concern for you, and so I need to hear, I think, more about that, and Mitch, have you weigh in.

Speaker 15:

I would like to clarify quickly that we are asking for the college to release a public statement saying that they will protect us from said nonmembers of the community asking for legal action or forcible removal. We know the college will not be enacting it, we're asking that the college pledge its protection against those who are asking for it.

Wendy Raymond:

Mitch.

Mitch Wein:

I think it... I understand the request is the that the college not do those things and I think we need to understand that more and more about the concerns and to... This is a new request for me. I think I need to ask more questions and understand it better and get a more complete and accurate answer. I'm not in a great position at this very moment to understand the specific concerns and how the college can specifically address those, other than what the college can do itself.

Speaker 13:

Can I ask a question?

Mitch Wein:

Yeah.

Joyce Bylander:

What would this protection look like? You are speaking of specific situations that you are happy to... What would you... What would the protection look like? What is it that you believe the college can do or that you would like the college to do?

Speaker 15:

I think first and foremost, and this will probably be the most effective, is the college releasing a statement discouraging such kinds of legal or physical action against the organizers. So just the college taking a stance of, we are not going to put organizers or striking students in harm's way and you as parents of community members or community members yourself should not either.

Joyce Bylander:

Thank you.

Speaker 15:

And then on the terrible off chance that there is a parent or an alum who decides to go forward with legal action, though I'm not sure what actions could even be taken, would the college be open to providing the funds for any sort of legal defense for the students?

Joyce Bylander:

Thank you. That's important clarification and I don't think we can answer the second, but this is important.

Speaker 20:

Just to address some comments from chat. If they haven't prepared [inaudible 00:56:49] students, what can the college do to help? Can they offer free legal counsel? And we've also asked administration multiple times to put out statements regarding accusations of bullying or harassment that have been unfounded, which I don't think the administration ever responded to. So, I think what we're asking is more active effort on behalf of the college.

Wendy Raymond:

Well, good. I'm just going to go back to the very first part of this which is, the language changed from lenience to flexibility and that we can put out a note from senior staff and faculty for academic flexibility for all students in this situation that we're in and in this semester. In terms... I think we're all trying to adjust to this request and so releasing a statement that would discourage any individual from taking any action against organizers... Communications from a college president are... I'm just not sure that I would put that in a full communication to the full campus to this point. I'm just trying to think that through, so I'm not trying to put up a wall against that. I think I need to know more or have my colleagues ask other questions or offer comments, or students and supporters.

Chris Mills:

I just think we need to think it through. No, it's not something that could be answered right now.

Wendy Raymond:

I see a question from Gus Stadler. Aren't the organizers asking for protection by the college lawyers? And several saying yes. That is not something that we do. We don't offer le... Mitch, can you help me out here?

Mitch Wein:

Sure. I think... Thank you for Joyce asking the question for clarity. I wasn't necessarily answering the question exactly perhaps than it was being asked. Clearly, the college doesn't want... Safety and wellbeing of our students, you guys know for everything we'll be doing is at the highest priority. I think I understand particularly the way that Joyce helped clarify it for me because my first comments that may have been answering something differently or struggling to understand what the question was. So I agree with Chris, thank you for raising it and we will talk more about that. Not sure what the range of

options might be. Wellbeing of students and the community is always a highest priority for everything that we're doing, obviously you guys can see that. So, thank you for asking the question. I agree for the way that Joyce helped clarify and what Chris said, and it's new, 60 seconds ago, so we'll definitely talk about it some more. What's possible, what's practical, what's available, what's not and to be helpful in continuing to support students.

Speaker 15:

I would like to clarify. So the college cannot commit at this point to releasing a statement of discouragement or they can?

Jesse Lytle:

I think we need more time with that. It's hard to know what a statement of discouragement means. Yeah. And then, so the tricky part of this question and I'm now... Like Mitch understanding where it's coming from because there's so many hypotheticals within it, it's very hard to think about how we would... Yeah. Sorry, it's still... I don't have clarity.

Chris Mills:

I think that there's likely an upward facing way to regard that. It's looking toward healing. Harassment is inconsistent with that. I think there are ways to encourage people to do the right and best things and you got to think through how we can do that effectively. I'm looking at the chat here. I don't want to target anybody, ever.

Jesse Lytle:

Yeah, I can jump in. And so you used the word harassment, and that has a particular definition, and so we would never... This is being recorded. Harassment is something the college will not abide. We have policies and processes about that, so that... I don't want to make an off the cuff statement about that other than harassment is something we take seriously and respond to. But to the chat, we have policies about that. So we can point people to the policies.

Mitch Wein:

Yep. I believe in the things in the chat. Thank you for sharing those comments.

Speaker 20:

Yeah. That question from the chat, somebody else want to ask formally. Will the president and senior staff issue a statement of any kind to describing the work achieved through the strike? And might there be a statement discouraging legal action included in such a statement? This might reduce the feeling of discomfort I hear regarding issuing a freestanding statement discouraging legal action.

Mitch Wein:

Yep. Understood. And that's when obviously we're going to, perhaps right after this conversation, get back to... And I think that the

PART 2 OF 5 ENDS [01:04:04]

Mitch Wein:

... conversation get back to and I think that the principles of the institution about being a community and looking for these for opportunities to advance the institution, working collaboratively together are ones that I know the president and the organizers have been consistent with. And I think there's a thematic statement there that would make sense to continue to make those statements. So, I think there's an opportunity for a statement that talks about obviously the progress that's been made as well as the work still to do and I think there's opportunities to make those statements.

Chris Mills:

I think one of the challenges just from a communication standpoint, is not speaking for someone else and that's one of the difficulties of this context.

Chris Mills:

But there are absolutely tons of great things emerging from this experience that I think we do want to hold, did someone use the term hold up? I think we do want to hold that up and we do want to point to that. Lots of progress and there's no reason we wouldn't want to do that, I just-

Mitch Wein:

Agreed. [inaudible 00:01:21].

Jesse Lytle:

And I think we have done that. I hope that's been evident in our communications that this work really matters and the gratitude that we owe for the work behind it. So that messaging, it's been there and it won't stop.

Chris Mills:

Yeah. I mean, I know, I sure feel that.

Mitch Wein:

Agreed.

Wendy Raymond:

Agreed and I'm going to read from the chat. There is one issue with this, the conversation about us issuing a statement, asking people not to take legal action. This is from Hortense Spiller though.

Wendy Raymond:

Such a statement might also suggest to people the idea of legal action. Annah West replies agree with Hortense the choice to include it might be informed by an assessment of the scale of current threat, how much deterrence is achieved versus how much it might say. The strikers haven't necessarily felt that says Isaac Sharpless. That is actually part of my concern. In a communication from a president, which is read by students, staff, faculty, families, perhaps alumni, there is a greater weight given to every word or every phrase or every sentence et cetera, then is necessarily what we want. And so by

raising this, it frames something that I haven't fully absorbed yet as something that should be included in a presidential letter to everybody.

Wendy Raymond:

I hear your concern. None of this lack of commitment right now reflects a sense that we don't want to support you in your health and wellbeing at all and we certainly have seen no evidence of action, although certainly we haven't been there in all the action or all of the social media or all the interactions, but we've seen no evidence to suggest that there is grounds for legal action. I don't know the nature of the threats you've received other than what you've reported here or what I've seen in a couple of angry parental emails of general threat, not a specific threat and that's because they felt they have been afraid. These couple of parents emails that I've seen of their students not getting their full education.

Wendy Raymond:

I have not seen a threat against an organizer. These would be legal threats against the college, that's what I've seen. So that's different and I just want you to know that that category is not something we're worried about at all. If someone wants to take legal action against the college, they will take legal action against the college. That's simply the world that we live in and it happens with some frequency that people take legal action against us. We cannot fully protect you if you committed a crime as an individual person, and there was legal action taken against you. That's not something that the college can protect you from and I don't think that's the context that you're asking in. So I wanted to say that out loud, that part, we don't have a role in, but if there's something... I'm just trying to understand better what the situation is that it feels so threatening to you, which I hear you feel you've been threatened or you have been threatened, what is [crosstalk 00:05:18].

Joyce Bylander:

They're going to share more information with us after this meeting so that we understand better [crosstalk 01:09:25] in facing. [crosstalk 01:09:27]

Chris Mills:

I have felt that myself, in my work, in the news business I was threatened with death a few times and I hear you and I understand why that is scary and frightening and threatening and understood and Archibald, please feel free to forward that.

Wendy Raymond:

Also, there's a comment in the thread about destruction is easy, creation is hard and I heard that in the beginning as well. I apologize that I said that and in the sense that you interpreted it as something against you, that's not what I meant at all. I think that what I meant is that... I do not think that what you are doing is destructive. What you are doing is creative. You are doing the creative work. It is the creativity of moving an institution that needs systems, policies, practices, norms and cultures destroyed to the creative place of change. I understand some would favor abolition, but it's the creation of moving forward that is hard and I am sorry that, that statement was taken by you as a criticism of your work. That is the furthest from my mind. I think that your work has been work of creation.

Speaker 26:

I would also like to reiterate what is in the chat from Isaac Sharpless. I have been threatened by my teammates, parents and people who have reported me to be athletic director who has done nothing one way or another. We simply would like to discourage this demonization and I personally have had my name connected in print and publications to the organization and have received legal threats and students asking for me to remove myself from this campus through email, that will all be sent at the end of this call, I guess. I hope that you meet right after this to discuss this because I do not believe there is time before students and non-community members start escalating.

Chris Mills:

Yeah. I'm all on board with discouraging demonization. You've got my vote there. Why would anybody not want to do that? I hear you.

Wendy Raymond:

Is there a mechanism where we can, we'll go through disrupt Gmail's address then to work with you on actual texts that we would... or Chris Mills will work on that with you about what the words will be, that we will write. Is that helpful because I don't want to get this wrong. I mean, we could get it wrong, but how about, I want to get it in a place that is satisfying your request and something that I would be happy to send out as president. With the caveats that you've heard us at least try to communicate. But you heard Chris, you saw Jesse's thumbs up about, yes we're happy to discourage demonization. My goodness gracious. But yes we want to be sure that when we write this language, you had a chance to see it and say that's sufficient, could be better this way. Does that work as a mechanism to email that to disrupt?

Wendy Raymond:

Yes. Great. Thank you.

Speaker 27:

Additionally quickly, before we move on, there have been a lot of concerns. There've been a lot of concerns from international students and students with different kinds of visas about contact hours, about whether or not their visa is in jeopardy. And a lot of these questions have been coming to us and we clearly cannot officially say one way or the other, whether or not these students continue to be in jeopardy. We're asking you what is going on with that? Whether or not an explicit statement can be sent out to the campus about should the strike theoretically end in the next day or so if the students will still have concerns. Should still have worry for concern.

Joyce Bylander:

I can answer that Natasha Weiss has been working on a detailed statement to answer many of these questions. She had one that could go out before this meeting, but can update that if at the end of this meeting, we are poised to move forward. That can go out tomorrow to all international students.

Speaker 27:

Thank you.

Speaker 26:

And we have been in contact with several professors who have either gone through student visas themselves or deemed to have worked with students who have visas. And some of them suggested that teachings be counted towards contact hours. If there is a need to make them up.

Wendy Raymond:

We did have a conversation about that yesterday, a group met with the registrar. We are working on that.

Jesse Lytle:

Right it sounded like in your document, maybe you've seen the memo we sent to faculty about moving forward in fall 2020, which we can share more broadly, it was sort of academic policy stuff, but we did talk about the ability to be creative with assignments. Teachings would count and just to be clear, and I think this logic is self-evident, but it has to be for the student who was in the course for the faculty member to be able to give them credit in that course. So that's on the ground, how it has to work out.

Jesse Lytle:

(Silence)

Speaker 26:

I think we can move to demand 11, which we have acknowledged that it is met with qualifications. First, according to 11C, which is basically committing ADS to continue in their current capacity. We think it needs to be reiterated. It has been an issue before, and they need to be better about communicating the processes that they go through to receive accommodations, the process that are in place to receive funding, to get diagnosis for these accommodations, because a lot of students are unaware of both of these. And second, and this would be in conjunction with ADS and CAPS mostly, is changing the culture around disability to broaden what disabilities receive accommodation and how these accommodations may look. There are currently at least four options that exist that have been taken to federal court and it is in comparison to the general population, in comparison to the average person with comparable training skills and abilities, in comparison to the average unimpaired student and a disparity between inherent capacity and performance.

Speaker 26:

And I think all four of those cases that have been brought to and justified within federal court could be used as maybe a framework to move forward and what ADSL accepts as a diagnosis and what can be worked around that in terms of accommodations, because currently there are some diagnoses such as recurring migraines or like blood disorders where the college does not have the appropriate accommodations set in place of like, Oh, you get this many amount of absences on top of what the professor has, or you just have to be in communication. There isn't a broad structure that accounts for the wide array of disabilities that students can have and right now it is currently very narrow and that needs to be expanded and how we talk about disability and how we work with it.

Joyce Bylander:

Can I ask a question really? I know that you have been in contact in conversation. Students have been in conversation with Phil Rosen [inaudible 01:19:16] in CAPS. Has Sherry Barofsky reached out to begin any conversations with you around the issues associated with ADS?

Speaker 28:

Yes. We reached out to her.

Joyce Bylander:

Okay.

Speaker 28:

She didn't reach out to us.

Joyce Bylander:

Okay. Well, we'll make sure that outreach happens and conversations can begin or continue.

Speaker 25:

(Silence)

Wendy Raymond:

Does that satisfy the situation, the opening of dialogue between Sherry Barofsky and you or is there something missing here? I just wanted to clarify.

Speaker 27:

We would like to talk a little bit about the work that's being done with the student to restructure CAPS, but I think there's another student on this call who is more involved in that process that can talk about it further.

Speaker 28:

Yeah. So we wanted to kind of emphasize and share some of the work that's being done regarding CAPS. A few of us talked with caps leadership yesterday to discuss the use of emergency contacts during a mental health crisis, rather than campus safety and CAPS was open to this with a few qualifications. And then also as mentioned previously, we also discussed with CAPS leadership, the lack of a preexisting relationship, really between CAPS and ADS. And they were also open to us opening that line of communication as well. In relation to some of our other points we wanted to address the use of the practice that some faculty have of requiring doctor's notes for excused absences, which is actually not required by law. So we were wondering about either the provost or someone else to direct faculty to stop requiring them and also generally how to ensure less reliance on a doctor's note by faculty.

Speaker 27:

So I'm not sure if you spoke with [Fapsy 01:22:05] about this, but the provost can not direct faculty to do that. It really is under their individual purview, their individual classrooms. We did have a conversation with Fapsy about it and one of the solutions that they provided was kind of a new education and

culturation around accommodations. So with intake of new faculty and repeating training sessions with faculty kind of almost drilling it into them, that these are prohibitive to low-income students. It is not beneficial and with the culture at Haverford of trust, concern and respect. If a student tells you that they're sick, it should be taken at face value and so we acknowledged that, that will be a cultural change within the college in terms of training and intake rather than a decree.

Speaker 27:

(Silence)

Speaker 28:

So in the chat one person said if Fapsy makes an announcement that requiring a doctor's note is against the law, then faculty would hear that. Someone else said, if the provost cannot direct them, with providing a formal recommendation or suggestion still be appropriate?

Speaker 26:

I'm happy to provide a suggestion.

Speaker 28:

One of the final points you wanted to address was the possibility of hiring another full-time psychiatrist to reduce wait time for students needing aid beyond therapy, especially in relation to accommodations, as we're opening up the relationship between CAPS and the ADS. And of course in this, we want to ensure the retention of these hires through comprehensive benefits and packages.

Joyce Bylander:

I am aware that we have increased psychiatric hours this fall and I have been in conversation with the leadership of CAPS and also [Kelly Wilcox 00:20:30] who oversees the health and wellness group talking about needs about hiring and about personnel needs and so we will continue to have those conversations. I cannot make a commitment to hiring a full-time psychiatrist at this moment because that's a budgetary issue and also we need to make the case for that. But I do know and can say that I have not, when I've asked for any additional help this fall in CAPS or in the health center, that cost money, I have been able to secure that. And so we will continue to have conversations about this.

Speaker 25:

(Silence)

Speaker 21:

Moving on to demand 12 more support for group, queer and trans students of color. This is a demand that we acknowledged as met with qualifications. One of the things that went back to this is I think it was explicitly outlined in the response from the college that students on the hiring committee for the new CAPS group would be not paid and that was something that we wanted to address. I know that we've been in conversation about this as far as what compensation can look like, but I'm wondering if we can get a commitment from the college that there will be some type of compensation for this work.

Wendy Raymond:

Think back to the overarching question of will students on hiring committees in general be paid, that I think is the question we need to take on and I don't mean to dodge it in terms of this singular hiring committee, but I think that, rather than we took a moment away from this meeting and I mean as in I don't know...

Wendy Raymond:

A couple of months to figure out, are we going to pay every student that serves on a hiring committee. So those are hiring committees for faculty, those are hiring committees for staff because I think to me, this is a general principle for the college and we haven't yet had that large scale conversation and the financial commitment that would go behind it in order to be able to say yes yet. And I'm hearing that in multiple ways, you're asking for students to be paid to serve on hiring committees. Rob Manning, the then interim provost this summer was working on ways to figure that out for students serving on hiring committees for faculty hiring. And I think if we can come to that yes, for the whole campus than it will be yes for here. And that's where I'd like to lean, but I can't do that analysis now.

Wendy Raymond:

And we haven't done the analysis to date and then I have to work with Mitch around finances. So what would be a reasonable date from your point of view for me to answer that question to you. Are we going to go forward with paying students on all hiring committees or not for now? I mean, at least an interim assessment of that, if the answer is no, if the answer is yes, great, but it is made complex by what other aspects of student labor will we increase pay for example, or add pay for. And so I don't also know if we can just take this hiring committee thing and isolate, but it's a possibility.

Speaker 27:

One thing that I think it's just important as to restate as to why we are asking for this and it is almost identical to the reasons why we were asking for compensation for customs. It is that low-income students either have to sacrifice valuable work hours, that they would be making money, that they in turn, send back to their family or what allows them to even stay on campus in the first place. Serving on that committee would take up those work hours and so a lot of low-income students cannot commit to a committee like that unless they know that they are going to be financially secure. And so without payment, it is just going to kind of continue and snowball into having no low-income students on these committees and that is a group of students that need to be represented.

Wendy Raymond:

Yes. Thank you and so what date would be fair for me to round up with Mitch and colleagues here to bring an answer to this? I mean, not fair, what date would be acceptable to you to get us on a timeline that we'll agree on here?

Speaker 27:

I guess the question is when do you think you can meet soonest by, and then at least providing updates on where the conversation is going and hopefully have a form of a resolution by the end of the academic year?

Wendy Raymond:

Yes, we can absolutely do that and we can meet early next week to bring this to the conversation with Mitch's analysis about financial... what the costs would be to the college and then, yes. So we'll begin that process, whatever next Tuesday is and we can absolutely commit to giving you updates or giving, I don't know, disrupt updates for sure by December 1st and then with a decision by December 15th. Does that work? December 1st update, December 15th decision?

Speaker 27:

That works.

Speaker 21:

I also think in the immediate term, this type of dialogue was not what we received in the communications in the response to the demands. It was explicitly stated that students on this CAPS hiring committee would not be paid. I think in the immediate term, I understand that those larger conversations about universal compensation for students on hiring committees, but in the immediate term with these demands, I think it's important that students are paid, especially since we're calling explicitly on low-income BiPAP students to be on these committees.

Jesse Lytle:

So in the spirit of giving credit where credit is due, we had a task force on student work and service for... thought long and hard about a lot of these questions and I personally would feel uncomfortable on the spot, taking a position without weighing all of that work, knowing that they're a matrix of factors that we're considering here.

New Speaker:

(Silence)

Linda Strong-Leek:

And while I'm just seeing this question in the chat about arguments against paying students on a hiring committee, I'm not arguing against that. I can't speak to that, I can speak to the second question, faculty are not paid on hiring committees because it's considered a part of their regular job. We don't often hire faculty either. So we are a small college. So faculty may participate in a hiring committee, it's an infrequent assignment, but it is considered a part of your regular work as a faculty member.

Jesse Lytle:

And the same as true of staff.

Mitch Wein:

One of the things that I hope that many students have seen as being hopefully improvements that have been made in this last summer into the year from the work of the task force and through human resources and CCPA and IETS and others to make more and more jobs available for all folks to post them at the same time. To have really great position descriptions and part of that process and how we incorporate that and just not only the mechanics, but just the process of having all positions open to all folks. Just one of the things that we'll talk through, but clearly understand the point and the continued progress in this area as what we're focused on.

Speaker 21:

I just want to ask a clarifying question. I don't think I fully understand the hesitation to commit to paying students in specific regard to the two committees from these demands, which would be for the chief diversity officer and for the new CAPS hires. I don't really understand that, how it would be stepping on the toes of the task force, considering that these are new and temporary positions.

Jesse Lytle:

Sure. I am clarifying where I'm coming from and others can weigh in. I think it's a category question and these are two particular committees, but there are many groups on campus doing similar work and so we're thinking about equity across these opportunities.

Wendy Raymond:

That said, I think it's a completely fair question and I think about precedent and I would rather be consistent across the board and yet I think I'm perfectly happy to compromise here and say, we can do that in these two instances, which you have brought before us as priorities for you and we will make exceptions there to pay students on those search committees. I'm fine to do that and at the same time, keep our commitment to working on this as a general principle and question about paying students in general.

#### PART 3 OF 5 ENDS [01:36:04]

Jesse Lytle:

... general principle. And question about paying students, in general, on search committees. So, I appreciate your question, Henry Drinker, except you're not Henry Drinker, but behind that black box. In raising this, when the word equity was brought forward. I think this is about equity, this is not about equality here. And so, the equity move is to say, yes, we'll pay you for these really important positions for our BIPOC and FGCI students, and continue to work on whether this is across the board, to make these opportunities open, equitably, to people, to students across Haverford.

Chris Mills:

I like what Professor West has added to the chat about piloting schemes, creating opportunities to learn. That's a great idea.

Chris Mills:

(silence)

Wendy Raymond:

Thank you everybody. Thank you, Anna, for that.

Speaker 31:

So, just to clarify and make sure I'm understanding correctly, so you are committing to paying students on the two committees that we've highlighted?

Wendy Raymond:

Yes.

Speaker 30:

(silence)

Speaker 31:

So, going forward, a lot of the concerns that we had about this demand came from responsibilities that were more aligned with EPC, CSSP, FAPC, and we're in ongoing conversation with those people. However, a lot of conversations that have been had surrounding individual departments and their ability to hire faculty of color, LGBTQ+ faculty, come down to questions surrounding hiring lines, tenure lines, all of these different things that are under the purview of the EPC. And so, you're wondering whether or not the college could establish transparency protocols and requirements for EPC actions or decisions, that could include things like publishing all applications for tenure track or visiting professor hires, and having those documented for people to be able to see.

Linda Strong-Leek:

May I just ask for a clarification, when you say publishing, because all tenure track positions are publicly listed. May I just have a bit of clarification? So, they are all posted, but just a bit of clarification there.

Speaker 31:

Yeah. I think it's specifically about different departmental requests for tenure track lines or proposals surrounding bringing in new faculty into a department.

Linda Strong-Leek:

So, publishing the request?

Speaker 31:

Yeah. Just to increase transparency throughout the process. And yeah.

Linda Strong-Leek:

So, again, this is a faculty issue and we will have to discuss this with EPC.

Speaker 31:

As somebody who's on EPC, I'm wondering if you think this is something that they would be willing to do or interested in doing, or if there would be, what, if any, barriers are there to doing this?

Linda Strong-Leek:

Yeah. I honestly don't know. This is my... I've been in about six EPC meetings and we haven't actually gotten to the faculty positions yet. We've just been talking about curriculum up until this time. Curriculum and of course the pass-fail piece, so I am learning the process. And so, I don't feel like I can speak for EPC in that way, because I haven't gone through that process with them yet.

Wendy Raymond:

If I may, I'll jump in because I find this proposal really intriguing and I think it doesn't just require a conversation with EPC, but this really affects faculty departments too, and we can make a decision about it without faculty departments weighing in, of course. And then it will impact, I think, how they write their proposals in a way that may bring a better process to this, or certainly different. And I really think this is a good proposal. I am at the end of the decision-making process in that process. So, just so you know, formally, the president approves whether a position request for a tenure track position, sorry, the president approves any requests for a tenure track position that gets approved. And I deny the other ones, and that's with a recommendation from the Educational Policy Committee, from all of the requests that come forward, to the Provost, and then to the President. I talk with the Provost about it.

Wendy Raymond:

And I may talk with the EPC chair. I've only done this once because of the timing. So, there are those parts of it also that are not transparent. And I think we could talk about that, should the President write... Does the EPC chair write a memo that says why EPC is recommending these positions forward? And that memo goes to the whole of Haverford College. And then the President will write a memo to say I'm approving X and not Y. And I could leave it at that, or I could offer some rationale. I think in this context of moving towards racial equity, which includes our curriculum in a big way, this opening up of the process could be a big improvement for us. So, while we still have to confer, you have my, I think that's an excellent proposal. I'd be happy to participate in it.

Speaker 36:

I'd like to bring up [inaudible 01:42:43] what's happening with Chad. There are some faculty departments who would also support the transparency plus there's precedent at Brinmar. I believe it is standard practice that some of our peers as a one-time cherub EPC, I can't remember any obstacles to publicizing or being transparent about the proposals presented by faculty and individual departments. In addition, may welcome student input in the planning of such proposals.

Wendy Raymond:

Thumbs up. I think the only process that we don't have purview over is the educational policy committee, which is chaired in the faculty and faculty shared governance. So we need to make sure that, EPC also agrees with this, the faculty shared governance buys into this. Okay. So how about process and timeline? I'm not on educational policy committee, so Linda and Joyce I'll leave that recommendation up to you.

Speaker 32:

We'll make sure it gets there.

Wendy Raymond:

Timeline? And so proposals don't come through till the spring. So because of the compressed nature of the semester, could we say a timeline of not February 1st, I guess, February 15th for confirmation about moving forward or lack thereof.

Speaker 32:

Yes.

Wendy Raymond:

Does that work for students?

Speaker 31:

Yeah, that works.

Wendy Raymond:

Thank you. Great. Thank you for that proposal.

Speaker 37:

Okay. Moving on to demand 13 police and prison abolition, we acknowledged this demand as not being met, nothing was done with this demand and seeing that police violence is what prompted the strike. We expected for there to be more consideration as to how the college's relationship and relationships with the police can be terminated. The demand for police and prison abolition has been our call to acknowledge the larger racist and violent structures that have been brought to us in this current moment.

Speaker 32:

Further, it illuminates the college's hesitancy to critique, the inherent violence of policing. It's quite ironic. And that it brings us back to what catalyzed the strike after President Raman and Dean Bylander's email, initially failed to pinpoint that police violence in a way that was appropriate and the violence that murdered Walter Wallace jr, which took place 10 minutes from campus. So here we are running into the same issue that has yet to be confronted, right?

Speaker:

Haverford has repeatedly claimed a minimal connection or ownership of assets related to the prison industrial complex. In your specific words. The college is not aware of any such partnerships. The endowment has no direct or indirect exposure to prison companies based in the US and underlying holdings of an international equity index fund, which has meant to provide broad exposure to all international equities and holds approximately 4,000 companies results in effectively zero or about 0.001% exposure to internationally based prison companies in the endowment. This can be called into question as currently, there is no system to vet the lack of connection to the prison industrial complex, via donations and individual giving. In addition, the college does have financial exposure to the prison industrial complex through other means through the entire retirement plans that are offered to Haverford employees to TIAA, which is the teacher insurance annuity association of America, the TIAA CREF plan, which is their college retirement plan for how however college includes TIAACREF social choice fund, which adds various iterations and allocations has assets connected to the prison industry, incarceration and detention facilities.

Speaker:

This is sourced from information from prison free funds and Morningstar reporting. In addition, the TIAACREF stock account made available to Harvard employees as holdings in core civic to say private

prison firm based in America and Sodexo, a private prison manager within Europe and the service provider for private prisons in the term of food services. So clearly there are financial connections between Haverford and their retirement plans offered to Haverford employees to the prison industrial complex. So looking forward. We'd like to see having to make a greater effort to look into all financial connections indirect or directly, not just through the endowment, but through individual donations, institutional donations and financial offerings made to have referred employees. We'd like to hear any feedback on this.

Speaker 34:

I can respond with regard to the additional question on the Haverford retirement plan. The retirement plan has a committee that oversees the options in that plan with faculty and staff representation. And that committee has a fiduciary responsibility to the participants in the plan to offer various options for their retirement choices. And so that's really the means and group that, would take up this concern and discuss that as we have, as that group has, with other concerns that have been raised such as fossil fuels, but that's the group that would have to discuss this additional comment with regard to the retirement plan.

Speaker:

In reference to that, would that group be willing to put out a publication to the community admitting their fault and not recognizing that two of the funds and two of the plans offered to Haverford employees, have direct exposure to the present industrial complex, would there be a commitment going forward possibly, that could be made that all plans offered to hire for employees will be vetted, or all donations, this extends past the retirement plans that donations to Haverford college will be vetted or to be some sort of vetting process in terms of how money is coming to college employees or the institution as a whole, as far as their connections to the prison industrial complex. Is that something that Haverford can commit to?

Mike Casel:

So in terms of the retirement plan, which I can speak to, really issues of divestment, are a bigger discussion in terms of who has purview over that decision to actually divest from whether it's the prison complex or fossil fuels. And we've had a lot of very good discussions regarding divestment over the years. And we welcome more discussions in terms of divestment, but I don't think I can speak for the committee or the broader community, which is all a part of the retirement plan in terms of their participants in the plan, in terms of their views on what options they would like in their retirement plan. So I think that requires more discussions.

Speaker:

Now, in the case of more discussions, being required to make a final decision on what plans to offer to employees. I understand that point. Will the college, as a whole be willing to put out a statement regarding their connections to the prison industrial complex, through the plans offered to their employees, not necessarily now of course, making the decision as to whether those plans can be offered in the future. I'm aware of that actually divesting from certain plans of retirement funds offered by TIAA may be a complex process. I don't want to assume that these things are easy, but will the college be willing to come forward as a college that preaches its quaker values and commitments to investments in certain areas that don't, how do you say contradict those values? Will they be willing to put out a

statement that admits their failures and providing financial plans and offering details and systems that vet their financial giving in accordance to the prison industrial complex. And anybody other than Mr. Castell can also answer this. Cause this is not necessarily a financial question. This is a matter of principle and values.

Jesse Lytle:

Yeah, let me jump on that for a sec. So you might remember I do sustainability at the college too. So you've had similar conversations with the fossil fuel industry, and it's really hard to make a categorical statement. We are all so implicated, and I think you've made this really, you've made this point brilliantly and in lots of your language, right, by being part of a capitalist system. Almost everything that we do is wrapped up in other systems. So with fossil fuels, every company has some exposure to fossil fuels, whether they're extracting, or servicing, or just part of an economic system. So this is super complicated to single out one fund or two funds as breaking our principles. And somehow imagining that everything else we do is maybe free of that ethical burden. So this seems like this is, it seems really complicated to jump on with one statement right now.

Speaker:

I am not in the belief that one statement would be entirely too complex. So I am aware that the understanding, the exposure to one, to the prison industrial complex and other things as well, such as that same funds, you were talking about the social choice fund, receiving a terrible grade from prison free funds and Morningstar in connection to its deforestation and to its connections, to banks, that finance deforestation, and also help finance companies that are included within the process of law in areas like the Amazon and the Western United States. So on and so forth. So I'm understanding that there is definitely a painful discussion, painful realization that the Haverford college is exposed in many, many areas to unfavorable investments, an unfavorable assets. However, this is not present, prevent the college from coming forward to admit their failings within this regard. I think now more than ever is the time for institutions to hold themselves accountable for their actions, particularly their financial ones, money speaks louder than simply words.

Speaker:

And Haverford has said a lot of things, a lot of things about values, a lot of things about it's... How do you say, principles. However, the direction, the vetting, the observing of their finances does not speak to these principles. So what I'm asking is that can Haverford's administration, Haverford's corporation, come forward to admit their failings publicly to the community in this regard and move forward to a process that allows specifically as a specific goal, move forward to a process that's and tries to, how do you say, examine the money coming into the institution and financial plans offered by institution in direct relation to the prison industrial complex, and as someone yourself who works on sustainability further to things like deforestation, other environmental concerns, which I know are of high concern to our primarily white campus.

Chris Mills:

I think your point about the 403B is really interesting and important. And when we are counting for the many benefits of this engagement, I think that's one of them raising that question and asking what choices do we make? What decisions can we make in order to, in order to live our values. And that would be a terrific example of that. I don't know that I can say, that I can say it on behalf of all the folks

who may be involved in the investment decisions about taking responsibility for you use the term taking blame for things on their behalf here and now. But I certainly think that we want to raise this and identify it as someplace we want to go.

Mitch Wein:

Sure. So I, and adding to what Chris and Mike has said, thank you for bringing it forward. The 403B committee that Mike has mentioned that he chairs has faculty and staff on it, fresh variety of staff and faculty representation. And I think what we, while the college does not direct where individual participants allocate their funds, it's helpful to hear this information. I know the committee's always anxious to hear this information and then talk about the range of options in front of it, such that all participants have a full range of information to allocate their funds as to, in places that they want to allocate them. And I think this is helpful information, and I'm sure as also the committee member on that committee, that it's additional information that we definitely want to talk more about as we understand that the college doesn't direct the dollars, the range of the choices is one that we'd want to talk about as we have spoken about it around fossil fuel divestment and other progress that has been made.

Speaker:

Yeah. Speaking to, I'm glad to hear that there is a belief that this information is important. Another, another fact about this information is that it is public. This information was sourced from the SEC form and cue available to the public, with a simple Google search. The fact that a student is able to find this information through something, no better than just basic accounting knowledge and knowledge of economic education, I received here at Haverford, funny enough. And Google is something that is, speaks to the lack of responsibility that has been taken upon by the groups are worrying about having friends, financial investments and their planning. You know, I understand that this is a difficult and complex work, but some of it simply is not. And I think that people have to admit to that, people have to own up to the failure within that regard.

Speaker:

I'd like to address something that was brought up by professor Wiley, I believe in the chat. Announce non complicity as the goal, account for your shortcoming and do better in the future. I think this is a great example of what could be brought forward by again, someone to my knowledge was even involved with the financial dealings of Haverford, just a person with the realization that Haverford is not lived up to its standards and to the principles that it puts forward. So now again, I'd like to ask specifically other administrators to come forward at this point, again this is not a matter of necessarily financial jargon or financial nonsense. I'm not really getting into that. Now. It's a matter of administrators who stand by these values, who preach these values, who sell these values as Haverford, ones of trust, concern, and respect of oneself.

Speaker:

A non-violence the Quaker essence that runs through, or at least we believe runs through Haverford goes into direct contradiction to any sort of direct asset management under the prison industrial complex, or any investment within adjacent to or included within the prison industrial complex. So again, I would like to hear hopefully a commitment from any leading administrator to the public about

Haverford's shortcomings and its financial management. And of course also a timeline for when that announcement could be made. Thank you.

Jesse Lytle:

Can I just clarify that I wasn't disagreeing with you? We are complicit. I was just saying that there are many issues we would want to speak out about our complicity and that was my point. So we, I fully agree. We are implicated complicit in these systems.

Speaker:

I am glad to hear that we are in agreement, Mr. Lytle, I'm very glad to hear that. As far as any other administrators, would you be willing to make a public statement regarding the college's investments or connections through their financial offerings or lack of fundamental screening processes towards their donations and connection to the prison industrial complex? Would you be willing to put out a statement on that shortcoming?

Speaker:

Again, that's something that I have now asked three times and has not been directly addressed. I'm not asking you necessarily, whether you will not offer those plans, what or what methods you will go through to deny those plans. Possibly. Obviously I understand that's something that you have an established committee to do. When I know I want to obviously respect those processes. However, I have asked three times and not been answered once, will the college be willing to put out a public statement regarding its shortcomings in regards to its financial connections to the prison industrial complex is just to draw attention to something in a chat made by Henry Drinker. You made a public statement regarding the lack of prison industrial complex and investments in the endowment, why shouldn't you be clear about investments in PIC made in other areas by the college? I think that's a great, great question.

Jesse Lytle:

Sure. And I promise I'll stop talking. I don't think we're trying to hide any of that. So I just want to say you're looking for a positive assertion, and I hear that. And you found the information about the funds, which you should, because it's public information and all of our community members, anybody who's looking should. So I just want to get past the point that you have referred as not hiding these dealings, but I hear your point that you would like us to be vocal and explicit about them beyond the sort of disclosure level stuff that we do.

Speaker:

Mr. Lytle. I am glad that you hear me, but I am worried that other administrators and other people in this call have been letting you take the heat for this question, which has now been not directly answered again. So what I am really asking, and I don't see what's very funny about this question. Why would you not, can you not commit to making a public statement that can be intact as I've just mentioned a chat, a statement about this can be folded into statements moving forward from the strike, or hopefully a separate statement as well. Why not commit to a statement admitting your shortcomings within this area? Again, I'm not asking you directly to make a choice now on what retirement plans you make.

Speaker:

I am not asking you to commit to a new process for vetting donations, whether institutional or individual, I am asking you as administrators and leaders of the college, as leaders of the principles that we hope Haverford would hold and it preaches to admit its shortcomings financially. So again, I'm going to ask, hopefully someone else will try to address this, Mr. Lytle. That will there be a public statement from Haverford college concerning its shortcomings financially.

Mitch Wein:

Mike, did you want to say anything first? I don't want to step on your toes as chair.

Mike Casel:

Whatever's fine, Mitch. I can, I mean, speaking to the endowment, we've provided that information and there's actually additional information that we are in process of gathering that we'll be able to provide, on the timeline that was reported. And I would highlight that again, this is focused on the endowment, but the investment committee is well aware of these issues and there have actually already been topics of discussion. If we had reported this data a year ago, we would have shown significant progress on that percentage that I reported to you where there was another index fund, where we were able to find a replacement for an exit that took that prison percentage down from a very small level to a extremely, extremely small level.

Mike Casel:

And, and we can report on that as, when we report on more information on what was already provided in terms of the retirement plan, I would need more input from colleagues and the group to understand what type of statement we're putting out. These are long standing retirement plans that we constantly look at and try to make progress on and provide options to the participants. But I'm not exactly sure what that statement would be without having more discussions about it. Mitch, maybe you want to add.

Mitch Wein:

Sure. And I think in some of the language about the college, having failings or shortcomings is one that obviously have a responsibility to participants. And I think transparency and understanding is critically important. I think there's also other ways forward, and I'm not suggesting that a statement isn't a good path forward, but also in many respects, the college has had a vocal voice in making its opinions and feelings known to investment managers about our expectations, about the vendors, about the financial institutions, about our expectations. And we've had those conversations. And I think it's important for us also to use this as an opportunity to where things don't equal our values or the way that we would like to operate, to have Haverford make those statements.

Mitch Wein:

And I would like to think about with this group and with Mike and with the committee the best way to, more fully as it's come forward, understand it, and then make a positive, affirmative statement of Haverford college and what it believes, including with folks that manage money, which we've done in the past and financial institutions to work with in the past where those letters, where we speak our values are directly made.

Mitch Wein:

So I think about, instead of crafting necessarily a statement in this moment, it makes sense to work with folks on this call, do the homework that you've asked us to do, and then make a statement that's thoughtful and forward looking and advances the goals that we have, and also continuing to meet the responsibilities that you guys have correctly said knows that goes through the committee. So I think there are good ways forward to talk about this very important issue as we've done in other cases. And I think that's a good model for us. So I wouldn't want this to add, we're not crafting a statement at this moment, but at the same, there's a statement to be made. Thank you.

Deb Strecker:

Hi again. This is Deb Strecker. I am currently on the institutional advancement team, the assistant vice president, and I'll be stepping into the senior staff role of interim vice president starting in January. And I would like to add that from the advancement side of things, we have a gift acceptance committee. So what I'm going to do is take this conversation to the gift acceptance committee. We have a number of gift acceptance policies that will open up and read through. And I would be more than happy for us to certainly have done that, to do some examination internally between now and the end of January of 21. And to be able to find a way to report out on at least where we are and starting the conversation to better dig into the topic at hand.

Chris Mills:

I can't say the people who run the 403(b)s. As I said before, I am very cautious around speaking on behalf of others, but I don't think it's hard to say that if we have been shortsighted and wrong in not certainly flagging this for investors, then filtering it out upstream from that. We should say that this is how we make change in institutional settings. And sometimes that means, you know what? This is the kind of thing that we need to look for, we should've looked for, and we're going to do better in this regard later. That's how we learn.

Jess Lord:

Yeah, I'll agree. I don't think what I hear you're fundamentally asking us to do is particularly controversial. And I appreciate many of the different frameworks perhaps that's been suggested that maybe it's holding his statements that I'm moving forward. And Terrence, I appreciate your suggestion and so on. I think that in terms of the goal of non complicity, and I think there are so many different ways, well, beyond investments that we can see the ways that we are complicit with larger systems. And I heard that from you, Jesse, but even thinking about something like admission and so on, and sort of expressing commitment to that examination of those points of complicity. I just don't think that's a controversial thing you're asking us to do.

Speaker 40:

Great. So moving on to demand number 14, physical spaces. We acknowledge this demand as met with qualifications. First, the timeline for the BCC and the Latinx Center, we think it would be most productive and most efficient for that timeline to be completed by May 2021, excuse me, rather than December 2021. The process has been ongoing for months for the Latinx Center and for years in terms of renovations for the BCC. So we're not quite clear as to why that timeline would take more than that amount of time to get to May 2021.

Mitch Wein:

Sure. So for the BCC, I think that's underway now and the improvements and list of specific requests and conversation has already been underway and clearly that will happen in the immediate term. And agreed, we're very anxious to have in-depth long-term planning conversations about that next center now, and we would agree that we would like to expedite that also. Joyce, I think I might've just interrupted you. I didn't mean to [crosstalk 02:11:47] stand in front of you and comment.

Joyce Bylander:

It's just that residents at the BCC shared with us the concerns they had about the building. And as soon as I received those, I worked with Denise to begin to move that forward. And I do believe that we are moving forward and moving forward expeditiously around the Ira Reid House and had just been in a conversation with ALAS about a Latin Center, it's clear the college needs to commit to, and that we need to have a timeline for it. And I know that's what students have asked for. And so, I will return to conversations about what that timeline can look like and should look like so that we can share that out to students and work with students.

Speaker 41:

The current timeline given for the Latin Center specifically was long-term planning, will conclude in December 2021 and someone else who was on the committee that started these talks in years prior, can speak further on this. But 2021 in December would mean a conclusion of three years of planning for this building, whereas several other buildings have concluded. They're planning, not even breaking ground is just concluding planning in 2021. A lot of other buildings have concluded they're planning a lot in less time than that.

Speaker 43:

Yeah, just to add a little bit more context on that subject. I did want to bring everyone's attention here to, I guess, a direct quote from February where he said, "We can do a library in 18 months, so we should be able to do a house in a reasonable timeframe." And he also said that the idea of a Latinx Center on campus could be cleared as early as next year, which I imagined he was referring to this academic school year. Then I guess, just to add one more thing, as far contextualizing the timing of this off, I did want to bring another direct quote, but this time from ALAS's meeting with President Raymond and Dean Bylander about three weeks ago, I think. And President Raymond said that a two year plan was not off the table at all. And the strategic planning has been delayed by a full year, which talk about strategic planning and I think it should be...

Speaker 43:

And the LatinX community, how space should could meet and be a part of the contingency planning, which I think the final date for that plan was set for April 2022. So I say that to say, it's already been recognized, I think by Dean Bylander that these conversations on the Latinx Center had been dragged on for far longer than they probably should have.

Speaker 43:

But I think in just thinking forward about this planning, I do want to offer that perhaps members of the administration, and this might be a direct request, sort of engage and commit to more input on behalf of

specifically the very basic elements of this plan. And one suggestion that I think I'll offer a sort of a personal note is to take on the task of having to do much of the model building, because I think that task is sort of been put on students. And so, I guess one suggestion of what sort of stops the college from offering these models, several models, then however many there might be, and having students provide input on that. I think this might be a point that we offered in the original demo or the second revised version demands, but just want to re-emphasize that students are not architects. Students are not trained in sort of building these models. And I think that might be the first recommendation for a step moving forward. But yeah, I think that's all I have to add to that point. I'm conceptualizing the timeline here.

Wendy Raymond:

Thanks a lot. I would like to just make a couple objective statements about interruption of the process that we've gone through around Latin Center, which has our commitment to create. And initially, that was not necessarily a brand new space and a brand new space as one of the possibilities. And that is that we were in communication prior to COVID-19 sending us home last March and that really disrupted communications, which were between Mitch and then Mike Elias. Now Joyce Bylander and Alice and those communications were further... And so COVID-19, I think was that issue. I'll just tell you that we struggle with understanding how much student input to wait for and how much to go forward on our own. And so, thank you so much for letting us know that what would be helpful is for us to build some models that is on paper and put those before you as a way to productively move this forward.

Wendy Raymond:

I will also say objectively the change in administrators on our side, on our part of the conversation around the Latinx Center over time from the time I've gotten here till now has been steep. And we've been working concertedly, I guess, that's not an objective statement, but I would say we've been working concertedly to tighten that up and we continue to have challenges. Now, I'll convert to where we are now with Alice working directly with Dean Bylander and Mitch Wein toward a resolution. And I'll leave it to them, to Mitch and Joyce to say whether the May 2021 can work with the knowledge that we have struggled with communication here. And to be fair because students have changed and students have lost traction because people have graduated who were really meaningful in these conversations. And I want to state that as well, that I'm very aware of that. This long preceded me coming here and the students have been terrific at this.

Wendy Raymond:

This is the statement about lack of communication challenges is not a criticism at all. It is really an objective statement. And I look to have Mitch and Joyce, ALAS leadership work together as you have been to get to a great plan. I don't know about timeline. I will defer to others.

Joyce Bylander:

I'm going to let Mitch tell us what's possible. But for me, after I had my meeting with you and heard the story of this, it was educational for me because it helped me understand. And it gave me more information about the ways in which why progress hasn't stuck here. And my colleagues, I've said this to them and so this is not news. It's because we can't just rely on students because students come and go. Where is the institutional champion for this? And so, we must have an institutional champion for this so that when people leave students, that the institution is still responsible. And so, that's my commitment

right now. And my commitment to move forward to whoever comes that we will make that kind of institutional commitment so that we don't keep covering the same ground over and over again. I know that has to be frustrating and disappointing for you.

Mitch Wein:

Thank you Just to add onto what Joyce has said. I think the timeline for development of a project if it's new construction, the development of a different choice if it's not different than what I mentioned in February. You've seen some of the projects and there's faculty and other members on the call that know that we've been successful in delivering projects on time and on scope that we expect and within the framework that we expected. And even though in many cases have taken many years of planning to get to that point, I don't want that to be the case here. And we would like to move this along more quickly, and I'm thrilled that there'll be great student life and student interaction to give us the guidance that we would like to move forward with. And with the plan in place so that everybody's excited about whatever the development is at the end, it creates that exciting new place, that exciting new home that I love to see move forward quickly.

Mitch Wein:

So the process itself did not take long, and I'm excited that we have that initiative today. Even in a COVID-19 environment, that we could make that progress. And I know it's perhaps not quite as reassuring as I mean it, but there are times, sometimes it takes many years to get to a project. We're not going to let that be the case here. And I know what the reinvigoration of what we're talking about today, we're going to move this forward more quickly. So, me and the team are ready to proceed on the timeline that you guys have outlined. With student and ResLife support, we can proceed. There are some hurdles to go through, but we know what they are, and we can deliver projects on a relatively quick timeline with the scope that we expect.

Linda Strong-Leek:

If I may just share a little bit, in my former job, I worked with students, faculty, and staff to redesign the Black Cultural Center at Berea College, the Center for interracial education and the Latin center. And the student participation was so meaningful for us. We allowed the students to pick out the furniture, we wanted the students to really feel an ownership. They chose the colors for the paint. So when the students go into those spaces now, they really feel a keen ownership of those spaces.

Linda Strong-Leek:

And they got to see it from the beginning all the way through to fruition. And it was really a valuable experience for them and for us to see through the student eyes what was important. So I would just encourage you and I know this feels like extra labor. At the end of the day, that this will be your space and you will want it to play here to the needs that you all individually have. So I just want to encourage you to work with Dean Bylander and Mitch and all the people who are going to be working on the spaces. So that at the end of the day, it looks like a space you want to be in that it feels comfortable for you. And that it is a space that you can...

Speaker 45:

Thank you for those strong... I want to just go back to Mitch and confirm that you said that. So you're confirming that we will be able to reach these deadlines for both the BCC long term planning, which I have another question on that and the Latin Center by May 2021?

Mitch Wein:

I always focused more on, I think, need more information on the BCC. And I was talking about some of the conversations we've had about the Latin X Center. I would trust the guidance of Dean Bylander and the students as to how quickly it could make progress, but we will 100% be there being supportive and move this along. So I think in part, I was referring to the Latinx Center, but absolutely, if we can move BCC along at the same time and that's to newer conversation for me. But I think if we could do that in the same timeframe, that would be great. But I think I need to understand more of the conversation between student life and the students on that, those expectations of what that project might look like.

Speaker 45:

Thank you. Leading into the BCC on the document you all shared with us, it just said long-term planning for the BCC and we stated we want an entirely new building to be constructed. So, and that wasn't confirmed or denied, it just in long-term planning. So can you all elaborate on that?

Joyce Bylander:

Frankly, I think that and what I hope is that we can have more conversations about what would that center look like. I understand and I read your proposal about the current renovations to the IRA Reed house and the concerns raised about that house. And so, I genuinely think that we could have bigger conversations about structures that will be permanent, that will be visible, that will truly indicate that BiPAP students are on this campus. And I hope that we can have those conversations and have them soon so that we can begin to plan for those structures in a way that makes them real in many of your lifetimes in this institution.

Speaker 45:

Right.

Wendy Raymond:

Would these be conversations that would be perhaps assisted by young alums that you would like to bring into these conversations as we design those kinds of futures? I'm so aware of such pointy graduates, who were so invested in some of these conversations, for example. So just an open question, doesn't have to be resolved today or something to think about.

Mitch Wein:

Wendy, from our end, I know there was this talk about architects week. Obviously, that's the burden on our shoulders and from areas of the college that I work closely with, but everyone works closely with. And it's really in the buildings that we've done a very inclusive process where the occupants of the building really have a big say in what it looks like and where it's designed in a way that it makes sense. But that planning, that expertise, that's on us, right? And we create the venues for that. And we do a lot of listening to what the expectations are, and sometimes we have some realistic limitations of what those expectations could be, and there's a push and pull. But then, there's consensus to move forward

and then there's a timeline that's created from that. So that need not be long, but that planning process is on us.

Speaker 45:

So moving forward, what will be the next steps that you all would confirm just to create another meeting to discuss these future plans?

Joyce Bylander:

I commit to working with Mitch and with BCC and ALAS immediately to begin conversations and conversations that lead to planning.

Mitch Wein:

Agreed.

Joyce Bylander:

I will send outreach in an email

Speaker 42:

And just circling back to the question about the May 30th or the May deadline. I know that Mitch had said he would trust Dean Bylander and students with regard to that. So I'm wondering if Dean Bylander has any reservations about May 31st deadline.

Joyce Bylander:

Dean Bylander does not build buildings, I'm going to tell you. And so, I cannot answer that. Again, I want us to start talking and planning, and then we know what it is we're trying to achieve. And then people can give us realistic and genuine deadlines for when a thing can actually be manifested. I don't want to promise you things that I have no control over and, and really can't tell you when it would happen. I want us to really get together and plan and decide what it is that we want and get designs of what we want and move forward with the appropriate people so that we in fact can make this manifest. And we can stop just talking about it.

Wendy Raymond:

There was a suggestion in the chat awhile that and I apologize. I don't see who it was for perhaps a soft deadline. And I wondered if that would be helpful if we could commit to a soft deadline, not a hard deadline of May 2021 for a plan going forward, but not necessarily, a plan that we'll have. In other words, as Dean Bylander just outlined, there are so many steps to get together around understanding goals and then design options that Mitch and his team will bring to you. And then iterating on that, bringing others into that conversation who you wish to bring in, et cetera. So that by May 2021, there is a plan of action for going forward. But you all may decide in that process, that you want more time for any number of reasons. And I'm not suggesting that it would be on our side, that we would stop that process.

Wendy Raymond:

With buildings, we reach really a mutual understanding that the design process has been excellent and has asked and answered all the questions that we wanted to have asked and answered. In a design process as you're all aware, oftentimes, new questions arise that weren't there in the beginning. And if we don't give ourselves enough time to answer those questions collectively, that is the people involved in that conversation. Then we get a product of building at the end that isn't as ambitious or wonderful as it might've been. So those are my hesitations about giving a hard deadline to this process, because we want the best outcome within a reasonable time. And with advances that you all feel, student leaders feel are happening in a way that is moving this forward. I mean, you can see the progress, we're documenting the progress, et cetera.

Mitch Wein:

I think that makes a lot of sense having managed facilities that manages a lot of projects that... We can set early on a real benchmark for May 31st and what that benchmark is, but I think, will it be exactly what every floor plan looks like and whatever doorframe looks like? It shouldn't be, because then it's not going to be the program, the product that everybody would be excited with. It's really important to do this right and that does take time.

Mitch Wein:

It's iterative. And it gives a chance to people to read documents, to think about it, have questions to have our architects and others think about what that looks like. And I think if we don't give it the time to be done right, it won't be the program that we want. But I do think early on, we can set... You call it a soft deadline, but an actual benchmark that shows your progress and a plan ahead, even if the program isn't quite done then, but it looks like obviously we're on the path that we are agreeing to. So I think early in this process, let's set a benchmark of what we want to have accomplished by May 31st. And we should do that collectively with ResLife, student life and with students.

Speaker 46:

Just to add, we would like to make sure everything is publicized like the library construction plans. Everybody should know what the short term and long term planning of the BCC and Latinx Center are.

Wendy Raymond:

Yes. Agreed.

Mitch Wein:

Absolutely. Yes.

Speaker 42:

It's been a very long meeting, but we've gotten through everything. We have no additional comments about the extra demands or the extra things that you guys have laid out. But from this point on, I think we're good for the call to end. As a group, we'll be discussing the responses we've got today, and we'll be sending an update later tonight. I think if all the things that we've laid out today happen, which I feel like they will, we'd be willing to end the strike. But we also want to make sure that we have the ability to communicate to people. I think it would also be very beneficial to all of us if we could have access to

both the all students' listserv and the faculty listserv to be able to send out our response later tonight. Is that something that would be possible?

Chris Mills:

You would send it to the queue and we'll take a look at it. I mean, everything goes through that process.

Speaker 42:

So we should just send it to the faculty listserv?

Chris Mills:

Well, it's called Broadcast. If you just search Broadcast List in the Google search on the college's page, and it'll take you to the IITS page where it has those pieces. Linda can probably speak to the faculty piece. There's a separate list that Lisa and Linda use to communicate directly to faculty, but everything has to go into a queue.

Linda Strong-Leek:

You can either send that to me or Lisa Griffin, and I can let Lisa know, review it and share that with the faculty.

Wendy Raymond:

And shall we share with the staff as well? It seems that would be good.

Speaker 42:

Yeah. Just as many as possible.

Wendy Raymond:

Great.

Speaker 42:

Also, it was sometime in the chat, but I think the two student council representatives who have access to the HCL students listserv their access has been changed or altered. So it's a little bit unclear what happened there, but if that could be restorative and can also be very helpful,

Speaker 48:

We'd also like to ask if you would refrain from posting any announcement until we've sent our announcement out later tonight.

Wendy Raymond:

Yeah. No problem, we will refrain. Around Evan and Dex's access that was changed because of the emails that went out last night.

Joyce Bylander:

Two nights.

Wendy Raymond:

I'm sorry, two nights ago.

Jesse Lytle:

Evan and Dex had told us that they were in solidarity with a strike and not serving in their student's council roles, and that's what had them approving messages. If that changes, let us know.

Speaker 42:

Okay. Well, thank you guys for the productive meeting. We'll be sending out an update later tonight.

Speaker 42:

Much appreciated.

Wendy Raymond:

Yeah. Much appreciated you. I did. I want all of the comments in the chat about what incredible work you have done. And I thank you so much for that. Just you are a fantastic, students you're fantastic leaders. You're fantastic adults. I mean, I know you don't need all those superlatives now, but I just wanted to be sure to say how much I respect and honor the work that you have done, and thank you. It seemed to me that the one area we didn't get to as strong an agreement as, as in others, was the statement that you're looking for from us around full support and protection from legal action.

Wendy Raymond:

And I jotted part of what Roberto wrote, perhaps a statement of full support and protection could be supplemented later. I'd just offer that. And that seemed to me the one where we were in a way for information from you. And, but otherwise it seemed to me that verbally, at least, and I realize what we can confirm this in any ways that you wish we, we seem to come to agreement on all other matters. Does that seem right? Or I am happy not to know that right this minute, but that was my sense. That was the one area we still needed to get to clarity on about what that would look like.

Speaker 42:

Obviously, there were disagreements. I would say that all of the demands were met fully.

Wendy Raymond:

Okay. That's fair.

Speaker 42:

I do think that there is a point that needs to be addressed later on as well is to what the college will do as far as sending out a message of support and doing in their best efforts trying to make it clear to people, parents, or whoever are threatening these legal actions that we will also forward, that is something that college does not support. And on that note, I think we'll end the meeting, unless there's anybody else that has things they want to say.

Wendy Raymond:

Thank you.

Mitch Wein:

Thank you very much, everybody.

Joyce Bylander:

Thank you very much.

Speaker 42:

Thank you all.

Jess Lord:

Thank you.

Speaker 42:

Thank you all.

Wendy Raymond:

Thank you. Bye.

Speaker 50:

Is it just us? Are we safe?

Speaker 51:

Wait, wait, wait, let me stop recording.

PART 5 OF 5 ENDS [02:39:43]