

Monday, November 26, 2018, 12:00 – 1:30 p.m. | Cline Library, Room 131 (Student Media area)

**Minutes**

1. Welcome and Roll Call
	1. In attendance
		1. Debra Edgerton
		2. Karen Renner
		3. Megan Trout
		4. Michele Lee
		5. Kate Carey via BBCollaborate
		6. Emily Allen
		7. Maya Allen
		8. Stephanie Winters
		9. Bo Schwabacher
		10. Danielle Gervasio
		11. Michele Benedict
		12. Heidi Feigenbaum
		13. Pamela Powell
		14. Jennifer Koehmstedt
		15. Calvin Legassie
2. Announcements
	1. Follow up to the All Commission mixer (Karen)
		1. Karen shared that it went well. Representation from all of the commissions.
	2. BlacKkKlansman Q&A with Kevin Willmott (Debra)
		1. Debra shared it is going well. Originally some funding from Office of Equity and Access, and now Sun Entertainment is providing support (location, marketing, etc.) and funding. Debra presented a proposal to SPAC for funding and it was funded. The only remaining funding needed is for food and additional marketing. This past week, Debra discussed with Kathleen the director of the theater department which will donate funds as well, and Kevin will present to several classes (playwriting and ethnic studies). IMQ will be doing a brown bag lunch on Thursday prior. Main event is February 1st. Kevin will stay at Debra’s house, so the saving will be used towards the food at the reception. Kevin has signed the contract, so now it is just waiting on NAU to sign and finalize.
	3. Meeting with HR Director Josh Mackey and how it might affect our sub-committees (Debra)
		1. Debra shared it was a good discussion. Josh provided information about the exit interview. They are planning to do a survey of staff members this year to make things more equitable, based on titles of positions and pay. Debra inquired about data regarding gender equity and parity; nothing provided yet. Josh mentioned that they should have a central location for the data in HR, and he will follow up with Debra. He encouraged the commission to stay in contact with him.
	4. Finding someone to transition into the HR Benefits Committee. Sharon Gorman is currently our Representative and they will start meeting again early in spring semester
		1. Debra shared that Sharon was able to fight for the family package, which is the one package that did not increase in cost this year. They are thinking about transitioning to start meeting in January. Sharon needs to phase out, so a new person is needed to work with her during the transition and replace her. Debra invited volunteers to contact Sharon if interested. They had previously met only in summer. Discussion of being unsure of the meeting schedule going forward.
	5. Other announcements
		1. None
3. **Presentation and Discussion:** Emily McCarthy, Director of Career Development will discuss a possible workshop for CSW members in the art of interviewing and negotiation. I have had casual conversations with a number of members who have lost out on promotions or a change in job positions. Emily will discuss what the workshop would offer in order to better represent oneself. (20 mins)
	1. Debra shared that Career Development usually works with students, but Debra is hoping to do a workshop for staff/faculty in the spring.
	2. Emily shared that they work with students of all levels to explore many things such as resume development and interview skills. Debra had approached her a while ago about the difficulty some women have with moving up. She shared there is an interviewing workshop for students that is three pronged: dress, body language, and behavioral interviewing practice. Behavioral interviewing is scenario placed (e.g. “tell me about a time you had to deal with conflict on a team”). There is a recommended formula for answering these types of questions. If you don’t address all of the areas, then it can negatively impact the scoring of the interview. Research shows that women will only apply if they think they have every qualification including preferred, whereas men will apply when they meet only 60% of the qualifications. Emily shared an idea of having a workshop focused on this as well as salary negotiation in a university setting. The starting point is critical because there is not much opportunity after the start of the job to move up in salary. Emily invited feedback about the idea, and there was support from the attendees. The SPAC representative (Calvin) shared that SPAC was hoping to invite Career Development to do a lunch workshop, so maybe they could partner with CSW on this. Emily concurred that could work well. Emily shared the benchmark for student training is 75-90 minutes. She emphasized the need to go in-depth and have the opportunity to practice. The more you practice, the fewer nerves/anxiety someone will have. Emily invited if there were any other topics that would be a valuable addition. Discussion of differences in modes of interview (written, phone, Skype, etc.) and search committees. Screenings are primarily done by phone. Emily agreed that frontrunners on the phone don’t do as well in person whereas people who don’t do as well on the phone often can do better in person. Debra requested covering how to deal with pauses while formulating responses, and how to get an idea of what anticipated questions might be. What can anyone looking at a job look at in the job description to help prepare? Emily shared that it’s more important to focus on the answers and experiences you want to share and less on the questions themselves during preparation. Discussion of women appearing confident and empowered, and strategies for deciding if it is a good fit. Emily shared there are red/yellow flags that can be evaluated during the interview process to decide if it’s the best fit. Debra brought up the question of how men’s behavior is interpreted differently and avoiding appearing too “aggressive” as women. Emily shared that filler language (uhm) and leg crossing may be interpreted negatively. Discussion of how to approach your supervisor about raises, without needing to have another offer. Discussion of considering faculty timelines (phone interviews Dec-Feb, in person Feb-April, and then offers/negotiations in April/May). Discussion of timing of the workshop. Consensus was that earlier will be better, maybe late January. Debra and Emily will meet to discuss. Debra will reach out via email to others who cannot attend CSW meetings to see about schedule. Consensus to discuss partnering with SPAC via email. Discussion of year-to-year contracts coming up in April. Michele requested including graduate students because it would be helpful for those looking into academia. Discussion of attendee limit based on the available space. Emily shared that this has been done with over 100, which is a lot but everything is scalable. Debra shared concern with a January timeline is a short turnaround and people have to respond and help right away. Emily shared she preferred CSW to set up the details. Debra shared concern given her and Karen’s full plates. SPAC (Calvin) can help find a space. Discussion of Friday being the best day, over the lunch hour.
4. **Presentation and Discussion:** Emily Allen, Assistant Vice President for Community Relations will give us an overview of her office and duties. She will let us know what the defeat of Proposition 422 means in terms of the housing situation in Flagstaff for both students and community.
	1. Emily shared that she started in April. She is a department of 1. She is constantly asking for support between the City and NAU communities. Emily shared her history in Fort Collin for 15 years working on relationship between Colorado State University and the city. Her position is what NAU’s position was modeled on. She has been with the International Town Association for 10 years. She shared that housing conversation is occuring at an international level. At first, her job at NAU was to work with all communities NAU interfaces with, however it has been scaled to be just Flagstaff now. Emily meets with City and County regularly including attending council meetings. She is the lead for NAU for the Census 2020. NAU goes grossly underreported, and federal funding decreases by $1900 per underreported person. Emily is also working on community engagement, and institutionalize the way NAU does it. She shared that NAU has great individual level relationship building (e.g. Calvin at Adrey) versus integrating that great work so that no matter who is in that position there is a system to continue and be repeatable. Emily has also had to “cure some wounds”; NAU has a rough relationship in the community right now. Emily shared that she thinks we as an institution are hurting ourselves by how we talk about NAU in the community (e.g. at a backyard barbeque). NAU employees do a disservice to the institution as a whole when people are “trash talking” or expressing displeasure publicly. However, people overwhelming have a positive experience working at NAU but do not share that in stories. Emily shared that prop 422 was put on the ballot to address affordable housing; it was put together quickly. Those against prop 422 shared that they did not like that it was not thought out and there were too many gaps and holes that left it up for interpretation by council/elected officials. It would have provided affordable housing, housing assistance, and work with incentivizing developers to create affordable housing. Emily shared that the Mayor, Coral Evans, brought up it has been a Flagstaff issue on record since the 1950s. The mayor also referenced that it is 25% second-homes and 20% VRBO/vacation rentals. So, 45% of our housing market is taken offline to be available for affordable housing, etc. Emily shared that she is trying to get NAU to own the impact on the community. There is much more about the conversation than just NAU. Many in Flagstaff miss the “old” Flagstaff, whereas newer people moved here based on how the city is now. The conversation is very values based.
	2. Emily opened to questions. Debra asked if the City is going to put together a new packet about their energies for affordable housing in the future. Emily shared she guesses that the new council will task City staff members with looking into it more in the future. It was requested Emily share more about her role. She shared that her role is primarily focused on the relationship between NAU and City and how to correct many things. Emily brought up the subject of parking and misconceptions about it (e.g. the idea that NAU is driving up parking in neighborhoods because it charges for parking, however NAU does actually have parking available). Emily is also working with the administration to understand and communicate about the impact. She sits on the ECONA and workforce committees about what NAU can come to the table with about housing. NAU is about t0 unveil the master plan for campus about how we use land (e.g. old Granny’s Closet, Mandarin Buffet on route 66). Debra brought up the subject of child care, faculty/staff retention, and how CSW can shine a light on looking at this subject, in consideration of available properties. Emily shared that now is the time to share the story/need as the master plan is being developed. Emily suggested working with Josh in HR to perhaps includes questions about child care in a survey (perhaps the survey about to come out). Emily shared there will be multiple spots for campus input about the master plan. Discussion of the last survey 8 years ago, and how this is a larger discussion of community impact of child care. Discussion of difficulty especially of infant care and if women are leaving NAU because of it; could this be included in the exit survey?
5. **Presentation and Discussion**: Discussion about the changes to the Diversity Awards dinner/reception. Thought from CED and whether CSW should write a letter to the President about the changes.
	1. Debra shared that it has always been a dinner, but this year it is being changed to a stand-up reception by the President’s office. Debra shared that this is a big incentive to be a dinner and perhaps the decision is due to cost. She is trying to get co-chairs to get involved on the subject. Debra invited discussion about idea of sending a letter about it. Debra shared about how in the past the awards were handled and managed by the commissions. Calvin shared that he thinks it is a good idea to send a joint letter from the co-chairs of all commissions. Karen suggested it should be data driven in some way; what kind of data could show the importance? Debra shared that all of the co-chairs stated they feel similar about it. Debra suggested that data driven could be referring back to the strategic plan and how to incentivize people to serve. Debra discussed how this sends the message that the work people put in is not as valued. Discussion that if this is a cost-saving measure, suggest that the cost saving from a dinner should go back into diversity on campus rather than diverting the funds to general funding. Debra shared that this is an incentive based event in line with the strategic plan; the plan needs to specific about the incentives. Discussion of the new change management program (ADKAR model) and how it can be used as a tool for communicating about it by using the same language (e.g. we are unsure about why this change was made without a basis). Karen agreed that using the same kind of language about the importance of recognition would be important.
6. **Presentation and Discussion**: Melissa Griffin, Director of Health Promotion will discuss the comprehensive sexual violence prevention training program that Campus Health Services offers as a resource on campus. (10 mins)
	1. Melissa shared that they are part of Campus Health Services, to support the health and well being of students around campus on a wide variety of issues including sexual violence prevention. They have ramped up their trainings for students about supporting survivors, consent, bystander training, etc. They are wondering about collaborating to get into classrooms. Melissa shared their funding has increased to provide a new tiered training approach. A handout was provided (“Sexual Violence Prevention and Education Programs, Northern Arizona University 2018-2019”). For Tier 1, they are filming tomorrow a new bystander training video for students who do not have any background in it. Tier 2 would be next about healthy relationships and consent. Tier 3 would be a 2-hour STEP UP bystander training that started at U of A. Tier 4 is about training activists and making informed decisions to address rape culture. There are 2 graduate assistants and 5 peer educators who come out in pairs to classrooms or student organizations that might be interested. The bigger reach they have, the bigger support network available for students. They would like to get in front of as many students as possible. Melissa also shared flyers and magnets developed for “what to do” resources. Melissa also shared a flyer with tips for how to respond to people who share they have survived.
	2. Questions were addressed. What is the timeline? There is a requirement for all new students to complete a training “My Student Body”, and there is an entire module on sexual violence that meet legislative requirements. It addresses healthy relationships, title IX, etc. The Tier 1 “Creating a Culture of Caring”, the office is hoping to incorporate into required freshman courses. Tier 2 would be for freshman or sophomores who have already completed the Tier 1 training. The Tier 3 is focused on students groups, so it can be any time in a students’ career. Tier 3 is focused on higher risk groups such as fraternities. The Tier 4 is designed for older students who have at least had the Tier 3 bystander training.
	3. Melissa’s office will be back at a future meeting to discuss birth control.
7. **Report Out and Possible Discussion:**  Status on 3-4 CSW priorities for this year

Gender, Equity/Parity Committee

* ***Career and Leadership Workshop and/or Student Mentoring*** (Paul/Sharon)
* ***Data Collection sub-committee*** (Karen)
	+ Debra invited others to get involved with this subcommittee because Karen is currently the only person involved.

Diversity, Health & Safety Committee

* ***Exit Interview*** (Michele Lee)
	+ Debra will post/email further information about the exit interview.
* ***Institutional Climate on Gender and Diversity*** - advocating for a harassment-free environment for faculty, staff, and students, recommendations for policy changes and improved communication processes

Work-Life Balance Committee

* ***New sub-committee (Archives ?)*** The collection of the history of CSW and committees we have worked on but was not able to move forward with a resolution. Much information is said to be housed in the library. We need a sub-committee chair. (Debra)
	+ Debra discussed wanting to get an idea of CSW history and what has been done. With the new diversity fellow, we need to know what we have looked at, what we have tried, and the level of success. Debra shared that the library has an archival system from 1991 and on with boxes of information. Debra shared that individuals involved would not need to meet but could instead look at boxes at the library. Debra looked at two boxes over several hours, and they have past minutes and information such as back in 2000, there used to be a budget of $8,000. But, we don’t know now how that budget has moved since then. Debra supposed it is centralized now. Debra reviewed annual reports that were professionally printed. Debra also shared there used to be a very active connection between NAU, ASU, and U of A with the CSWs, so not sure what happened there. Debra invited people to get involved to review boxes and take notes. Karen shared she is happy to chair the committee.
* ***Family Housing*** - Recommendations as a Report for continuing and sustaining family housing at NAU with supporting evidence