Greetings,

I apologize for the delay in delivering this report. As Mr. Theo shared in his weekly update on July 22, I had not anticipated how the events of the last several weeks would significantly affect my ability to work on multiple and competing demands effectively, efficiently, and with the quality that I expect of myself.

After discussion of the preliminary report with Dr. Jeffords and Mr. Theo on July 22, I have revised this report to provide more specific recommendations for the Chancellor’s Diversity Council and discussed other issues in greater detail. I know that the Steering Committee will read this report thoroughly and generate many questions for discussion. I look forward to discussing those issues further with the committee during the week of August 8.
I have been charged with helping the University of Washington, Bothell (UWB) to move forward with fulfilling demands by student activists for the establishment of a student diversity center on campus.¹ As I begin this report, I would like to reiterate how I approach my role as an independent consultant and the principles and values which inform my approach to this work.

I see my role as an independent consultant as three-fold: a) to bring content expertise² to inform our conversations; b) to listen and ask questions that help groups get “unstuck” and moving forward toward a collective vision; c) to equip local institutional actors to implement that collective vision and provide short-term ongoing support and resources.

The following principles and values guide my approach:

1. Vision, mission, and metrics of success must prioritize and be informed by an intersectional understanding of minoritized groups and their needs, hopes, and lived experiences.
2. Dialogue must be transparent and connect heads and hearts in order to broker collaboration and collective action across different parties in the institution.
3. Institutional systems, structures, and processes are more determinative of producing outcomes leading to greater equity and inclusion than an institution’s compositional diversity.
4. Any process meant to initiate institutional reform and transformation must be grounded in critical hope, believing that “institutions and individuals can and do grow and change.”
5. Institutional attempts to respond to students’ demands for greater equity and inclusion that require competition over scarce resources will lead to frustration, less equity, and limited inclusion.

¹ For the purposes of this report, the center will be referenced as the “Diversity Center” (DC), not as a presumptive final name of the center but to acquiesce with students’ requests to refer to it in this way.
² I have 20 years of experience in higher education institutions as a professional in multicultural affairs and preparing for and engaged in work teaching, researching, and engaged in professional service and consultancies related to issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion in U.S. higher education, particularly focused on race, ethnicity, sexuality, gender, social class, and religion/faith/spirituality; institutional systems and organizational transformation. My teaching and research have focused on student experiences and outcomes, institutional systems and organizational transformation. Intersectionality, as articulated through critical race and feminist theorists, is the primary lens through which I understand, analyze, and engage with these issues.
6. Equity and inclusion are not commodities, but guiding principles that must inform system-wide institutional decision-making.
7. Institutional reform and transformation requires strong, consistent, and unequivocal support of senior-level institutional leadership and the cooperation and involvement of local institutional actors.

The process I have engendered and continue to carry forward reflects the strategic deployment of these principles and values to facilitate a process that will lead UWB to answer or affirm existing answers to the following questions:
1. What do we want from the Diversity Center at UWB?
2. Who is the UWB Diversity Center for and what will it do?
3. How will it be funded?
4. How will it be staffed?
5. What shall it be called?
6. Where shall it be located?

June 27th Conversations

I recognize that conversations about the DC have been ongoing since 2015 and many parties have contributed a great deal of information toward the aforementioned six questions. However, it is also clear that there is not campus-wide agreement on the answers to these questions or even, in some quarters, that these are the correct questions. Moreover, I also recognize that there has been little dialogue between and across different stakeholder groups on campus and there is a desire for collective dialogue. I agree with this as a necessary component of cultivating the institutional cultural change that establishing a DC represents. Therefore, it was important for me to hear for myself what the ideas, questions, and concerns were of various constituencies on campus, unfiltered through well-intentioned third-parties.

The groups and individuals who were invited to take part in conversations with me on 27 June 2016 were selected based on multiple conversations with Mr. Theo and with a request for input from the steering committee. These groups and individuals are key stakeholders in the DC conversation, either because they were involved in the initial activism for the DC, will play a role in the DC’s establishment (e.g., authorizing/providing funding, space, staffing, etc.), have oversight and insight into issues of diversity at UWB, or prior discussions have implicated their work and/or space as relevant to the DC.

Although there are others on campus who have an interest in the DC and need to be involved as the conversation moves forward (e.g., faculty, general student body), the following groups and individuals were considered to be the key students, administrators, and faculty whose studies and work will be affected by the DC’s creation and who will have influence on the creation and success of the DC.

- Chancellor Wolf Yeigh & Vice Chancellor Susan Jeffords
- Diversity Center Steering Committee
- Drs. Wayne Au and Kari Lerum, Chancellor’s Diversity Council Co-Chairs

7/25/16
• Dr. Terryl Ross, Director of Diversity
• Student Affairs Staff
• Student Success Center—Professional Staff
• Student Success Center—Student Employees
• Student Diversity Leadership & ASUWB³
• Dean George Theo

The purpose of these meetings was for me to listen and discern these constituencies’ intentions and concerns for and about the DC and from that to identify opportunities and possibilities for reconciliation, resolution, and collaboration that will inform the final design of the DC and better ensure its short-term and long-term success.

The following guiding questions guided my conversations with the above groups and individuals:

1. What 3 words or short phrases come to mind when you learned that UWB was going to have a Diversity Center?

2. What 3 things do you want to be different about UWB because there is a Diversity Center?

3. What 3 things do you want to make sure stays the same about UWB because there is a Diversity Center?

4. What 3 concerns do you have about the creation of the Diversity Center at UWB?

5. What role do you think your area [unit, office] will have in supporting the work of the Diversity Center at UWB? How do you feel about that?

6. What role do you think you as an individual will have in supporting the work of the Diversity Center at UWB? How do you feel about that?

7. Do you believe that the Diversity Center will be a space that will support you and others like you at UWB? Why or why not?

8. Is there anything else regarding your thoughts, feelings, or beliefs about the Diversity Center at UWB that you want to make sure I understand before I leave?

9. What is it about you, your experiences at UWB, or your experiences prior to coming to UWB that particularly informs your thoughts, feelings, or beliefs about the Diversity Center at UWB?

Not all questions were asked in every session due to time constraints and/or relevance for a particular group. However, all those who participated in the conversations on 27 June and

---

³ This session, which was never intended to be representative of the general student body at Bothell, included both current students and alumni, members of the Student Diversity Council and ASUWB, as well as several dozen students who were engaged online through a Facebook Live video link created by the Student Diversity Council leadership.
anyone who did not have the opportunity to participate were invited to submit additional
thoughts and feedback through Google form links that were sent out two days after my visit and
which remained open for responses until July 10. There were approximately over 80 individuals,
about half of those students, who participated in conversations with me on 27 June.
Approximately two dozen submitted handwritten or typed responses after the sessions were over.
Twelve individuals, who were involved in sessions that day, provided additional feedback online
and another 14 people who were not present also submitted responses online.

This report, therefore, reflects the opinions and perspectives of well over 100 UWB community
members, including senior administrators, mid-level and entry-level staff, faculty across ranks,
students, and alumni. Transcripts of my notes and compilation of the online feedback generated
66 pages of comments. These raw data have not been shared in this report to protect the
confidentiality of responders and sensitive personnel issues that were raised. An appendix of
redacted, anonymized comments, identified only by the groups from which they emerged, has
been delivered to Vice Chancellor Jeffords and Dean Theo.

Through those conversations, several points of agreement and synergy emerged. Multiple issues
to be resolved were also evidenced, reflecting confusion, conflict, and challenges. The
remainder of this report enumerates these points and offers my recommendations for moving
forward.

Points of Synergy and Agreement

As noted, I was encouraged by the amount of substantive agreement concerning some of the core
questions related to establishing a DC at UWB. There is also agreement about some concerns
that will need to be acknowledged and competently addressed.

1) Need for a Diversity Center at UWB. There was widespread agreement expressed in every
single session that the time had come—and was long past due—for a DC at UWB. Faculty,
staff, and students participating in these conversations expressed excitement about this initiative
and a desire to help bring it about. This need for a diversity center was identified as separate
from and complementary of existing resources, offices, and personnel whose work supports
students on campus.

2) Desire for Coordinated and Collaborative Efforts. There was also significant agreement
demanding that existing resources, offices, and personnel whose work support diversity and
provide diversity education and advocacy (including race and ethnicity, sexuality, gender
identity) not be substituted or reduced for the establishment of a DC. Instead, participants across
groups overwhelmingly asserted a desire for a new partner in coordinated, collaborative, and
intentional efforts to support students from minoritized groups, as well as provide education for
greater diversity and cultural competency to the campus, including faculty, staff, and students.
Participants in two different groups used the language of “hub” to describe the role of the DC on
campus in connecting and radiating these initiatives.

3) Recognition of Need to Attend to Intersectional Identities. Across all groups, there was
recognition of the need to pay specific attention to the intersectional identities of students and to
attend to minoritized groups both beyond and within racial and ethnic minoritized groups. Various participants raised the needs of English Language Learners (ELL); undocumented students; those who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, and/or queer; as well as women, transgender, and gender non-conforming students. It is important to emphasize that this recognition was shared by all groups and individuals with whom I met during my visit. There is no one group of people more interested in attending to intersectional identities than another.

4) Student-Centered and Student-Led. Also oft-repeated during the day, particularly from Student Affairs staff, students in the SSC, and students in student government leadership was a mandate that the DC be centered on students’ needs. In addition, these groups were coalesced around the assertion that students be intimately involved in the leadership, operation, and selection of professional staff for the DC. The DC was seen as having the potential to expand student employment opportunities and to cultivate and generate students’ organizational leadership skills and talents.

5) Mistrust of Key Administrators & Student Leaders. At several times throughout the day, participants expressed both out loud and in confidential communications, serious and substantive distrust of key administrators and/or student leadership in this effort. This is deeply concerning and reflective of the lack of communication and transparency that has informed these discussions up to this point.

Related to administration, the mistrust seems to be rooted in an unreliable track record related to past initiatives (e.g., The Spot) and awareness of initial opposition to the establishment of a DC. The primary foci of this mistrust were Chancellor Yeigh, Vice Chancellor Jeffords, Dean Theo, and Dr. Ross. Each of these administrators was charged by various staff and students with not really wanting the DC and seeking to undermine it despite their current expressions of support and financial commitments made to helping to realize the DC (e.g., hiring an independent consultant). One respondent even called for a public apology from the Chancellor for his resistance to the students’ demands.

A mistrust of motives was not limited to these administrative personnel, however. Multiple students and staff—and it is important to note that this generally was not expressed by those administrators who were just named—shared that they were mistrustful of the motives of the student leadership primarily responsible for advocating for a DC. Significant concerns were expressed that students were just looking to “leave a legacy” and disinterested in really including other students’ perspectives and needs. This could be resolved by more intentional dialogue between the Student Diversity Council leaders and other student constituency groups.

Issues to be Resolved

The conversations during my visit also illuminated some issues needing resolution. There were six key issues or themes that came through: communication and trust, role of faculty and staff, scope of center’s mission and activities, timing and development, resources, and commitment.

1) Communication and Trust. There was a deep-seated concern about how the DC has evolved and the fractured nature of the communication to various stakeholders, particularly the staff of
the Student Success Center. This is feeding into the mistrust discussed above. Participants asked for dialogue across groups that would help to build trust, clarify intentions and motives, and help build positive momentum.

2) Role of Faculty and Staff. There are differing opinions across the groups with whom I spoke last month about the role of faculty and staff in the Diversity Center. In particular, some faculty and staff want the DC to provide resources to help them improve their teaching and advising of minoritized students. Other faculty and staff are looking to the DC to provide an opportunity to connect with students with whom they share minoritized identities. Still others seem to want to be able to access the perspectives and ideas of minoritized students in a centralized space. Students on the other hand want faculty and staff involvement primarily focused on serving students through mentoring, supervising undergraduate research, and supporting—but not leading—student activism. There is a desire for faculty and staff to receive training toward expanding their multicultural competence. Further, some students want all staff in the DC to come from the students, either as current students or as alumni hired to staff the center.

3) Scope of Mission and Activities. The scope of the DC’s mission and its activities were highly differentiated across constituency groups. All of the following came out in meetings and additional correspondence as desired activities in which the DC should be involved or purposes it should serve:

- meeting space for minoritized student organizations,
- support groups for minoritized students,
- counseling,
- academic advising,
- mentoring,
- scholarships,
- coordination of undergraduate research,
- trainings for greater competency available to faculty, staff, and other students
- undocumented student support services and trainings
- sexual assault prevention and trainings
- reproductive health
- expanding representation of diversity in the curriculum
- inclusion of disability services
- inclusion of veterans’ services
- inclusion of women’s center services
- childcare
- be for “everybody” not just one group
- A “hub” coordinating diversity and inclusion efforts across campus
- Help with training of student paraprofessional and professional staff in residence life

This highly differentiated set of purposes and activities reflects the general lack of infrastructure for diversity and inclusion at UWB. I address this in greater detail in my recommendations below.
4) **Timing and Development.** There were concerns expressed that this process was taking too long, as well as concerns that it was too rushed and ill-conceived. Few participants seem to be recognizing the need for both short-term and long-term planning and many have become hyper-focused on just one issue (e.g., space).

5) **Resources.** Throughout the day, participants spoke to the need to resolve issues regarding space, staffing, and operating and programing budgets. Some possible resources were suggested (e.g., system-wide resources to support the initiation of a DC, phase two planning for the ARC expansion), but concerns about the role of student fees would play in supporting the DC were voiced repeatedly, and not just by students. Specifically, there were fears that raising student fees solely as a means to pay for the DC would push out the very students who have advocated for and most need the support of the DC.

6) **Commitment.** Multiple participants and respondents also raised the need for the administration to be in this for the long-haul and to withstand the inevitable backlash that will come from more conservative faculty, staff, and students. This is another outcome of the mistrust that was generally felt.

**Recommendations for Moving Forward**

As I have reflected on my conversations during my first visit to Bothell, I have several recommendations that I believe can assist UWB with moving forward with establishing the DC in a more productive manner.

**Communication**
1) I believe that a meeting of Chancellor Yeigh, Vice Chancellor Jeffords, and Dean Theo with the student leaders in the Student Diversity Council and/or the Steering Committee is necessary and important.

2) Weekly updates about what is going on with the DC and sharing key issues discussed and resolved in steering committee meetings with the campus community, and particularly with the Student Diversity Council are essential.

3) I strongly recommend that the Student Diversity Council seek to meet with student employees in the Student Success Center and other student leaders to hear concerns and help to clarify goals and motives regarding establishing a DC at UWB.

4) As the campus moves forward, all-campus community conversations about the DC will be necessary and should be convened.

**Infrastructure of DC**
UWB is a young institution and as such as not yet built up many of the supports and resources that began to come into existence at older institutions during the 1980s and 1990s. However, I firmly believe that the most sure-fire way to disable the DC and undermine its effectiveness would be to attempt to make the DC the sole place on campus where all diversity, inclusion, and equity efforts are coordinated. This would have the effect of unwittingly making the DC an
albatross incapable of doing anything well, but with responsibility for doing everything. One of
the clearest insights I left Bothell with on 27 June was the need for comprehensive, institution-
wide transformation for the inclusion of diversity and equity within a number of key units, and
not just in student affairs and other “student-facing” teams and offices.

Scope and mission. A campus DC can serve, meaningfully, three primary roles:

• Provide support and resources for minoritized students;
• Offer educational opportunities to the broader campus about minoritized identities and
  social justice issues both independently and through partnerships;
• Advocate and support institutional transformation in policy and practice toward greater
  diversity, equity, and liberation.

Such a triad of purposes reflects a DC that is in fact “for everybody” but does not serve everyone
in the same way.

Minoritized identities and intersectionality. The focus on “minoritized students” usually
includes recognition of the oppression and subjection of those who are minoritized by race,
ethnicity, nationality/immigration status, sexuality, gender/gender identity, dis/Ability, and/or
religion/faith/spirituality. The most effective DCs recognize the intersections of students within
and across those groups, such that support and programming focused on Latinx students, for
example, includes awareness and inclusion of undocu students, ELLs, queer and transgender
Latinx, and issues of sexism and machismo in Latinx culture. Also, the most effective DCs offer
support and programming of undocu, queer, and transgender and genderqueer students that
intentionally includes undocu populations that are not just from Central and South America, that
transgender and genderqueer students are not just White and have and express a range of
sexualities, and that women’s issues between White women and Women of Color are not
synonymous.

Military veterans and active duty personnel. Moreover, the DC should include
recognition that military veterans, who are women and/or People of Color and/or queer and/or
transgender/gender non-conforming, have unique needs from military veterans who do not also
possess those other minoritized identities. Coordination of and facilitating access to federal
benefits through the G.I. Bill and VA services for military veterans is not best handled by a DC.
However, the DC, the SSC veterans’ students office, and the veteran students’ organization
should be in close collaboration in connecting students across these minoritized populations to
relevant resources. Staff should recognize that students may go first to the place they feel most
comfortable (whether the DC, the services office, or the student organization) and should from
there be assisted in making connections with the (possibly multiple) people and/or offices that
can help with the full-range of their needs.

Students with disabilities/disAbled students. The DC should also be a space that would
exhibit a non-ableist praxis by making sure that its physical location and programming would be
accessible to all students regardless of dis/Ability. Usually, the DC is not the best space for
coordinating testing and documentation of disabilities or ADA/Section 503-mandated
accommodations for students. These two purposes can be philosophically compatible, but their
resultant activities are not feasiably co-located in the same physical space where other support and
educational activities are being offered as well. Nevertheless, the work of the DC and the existing disability support services in the SSC should absolutely be coordinated and collaborative. Again, students may first appear in one space and need to be connected to other offices.

*Counseling needs for minoritized students.* At times, the issues with which minoritized students are confronted require professional counseling services. The psychological trauma of being directly targeted through both macro-level and microaggressive acts of racism, homophobia, and transphobia is real. Moreover, depression, anxiety, and other mental health illnesses that result from an individual’s identity (e.g., minoritized identities of sexuality and gender) or previous experience (e.g., military combat) require skilled professionals with training and expertise in those issues. It is untenable to expect that the staff of the DC be certified counselors. Yet, it is equally untenable to expect that minoritized students will have their mental health and personal counseling needs adequately met by a counseling staff that is almost entirely cisgender, heterosexual, and White. One White queer counselor is insufficient for the needs of such a diverse campus as UWB. Resources need to be provided to augment the diversity of the counseling center staff, who can then work with DC staff to offer support group needs as identified by the students. The Counseling Center could also possibly hold walk-in appointments in the DC center for a limited number of hours, making those services more accessible, reduce the stigma of being seen going into the actual Counseling Center, and foster collaboration opportunities.

*Childcare.* The need for childcare for parenting students was voiced by several students. There are liability issues for the institution to consider before formally offering childcare anywhere on campus. However, perhaps creative solutions could be imagined by partnering with the early childhood/elementary education faculty. Broader attention to the needs of parenting students should also include those who are lactating/nursing. Investigation of an appropriate space to offer a lactation/nursing room within the DC is recommended.

*Staffing and leadership.* I see no reason why student employment opportunities cannot be included in the DC or why students cannot be intimately involved with the hiring of professional staff. Proper training of those students would be necessary, as is the case with any search committee members. I agree with participants who asserted that the DC should be student-centered and student-led by new full-time staff.

*Space.* It is unequivocally clear to me that the SSC should not be moved or broken up to accommodate the establishment of the DC at UWB. Doing so would irrevocably damage existing support services, relationships between offices and staff, and relationships between students who otherwise agree on the need and desire for a DC. For the short-term (i.e., Spring 2017), creative and innovative consideration of existing space, not previously considered, must be put on the table. Although there is no space that would completely avoid relocating some staff, the displacement of the SSC would be sizeable and costly in multiple ways. A long-term opportunity may be feasible in the second-phase planning currently underway with the ARC.
Services for & Role of Faculty and Staff
Although this is also related to scope and mission, I am including it here since there are multiple recommendations to offer. As noted earlier, there are untapped synergies and resources that could be built up to augment other existing diversity initiatives and support the work of the DC.

Faculty development. A teaching and learning center, whose purview is faculty engagement and training, is usually the home for training faculty on how to diversify their curricula and to facilitate class discussions in ways that neither tokenize nor target minoritized students. Currently, this entity at UWB is in discussions about its leadership and mission. Support and resources for faculty to improve their teaching should include attention to diversity and inclusion and should be a part of efforts already coordinated by this entity. Support from the Chancellor and college deans would also be essential to encourage faculty to seek out and utilize this center for these purposes. Again, there are opportunities to coordinate programming and training with staff in the DC, but working with faculty and staff should not have to fall primarily to the DC.

Staff development. Human resources should continue its efforts to offer introductory and advanced training for faculty and other staff that go beyond compliance efforts with federal anti-discrimination and anti-harassment laws and institutional policies. Classified and non-student-facing staff should also be part of these efforts. It is vital to recognize that effectively transforming the campus requires a multifaceted effort that seeks to dismantle oppressive hierarchies throughout the institution, not just those that are most directly visible to students.

Faculty and staff diversity. Students need to see faculty and staff whose identities and backgrounds are similar to theirs. To that end, the Chancellor’s Diversity Council must utilize the Diversity Action Plan to strategically initiate plans to increase UWB’s faculty and staff diversity, with a particular focus on race and ethnicity. This is not to say that other aspects of diversity are less important or unimportant, but rather that they do not substitute for each other. Hiring more queer and transgender faculty who are all White does not resolve the issues of race and ethnic representation on the campus and neither would hiring Faculty of Color who are all cisgender and heterosexual resolve issues of queer and transgender representation. However, being intentional about hiring faculty whose racial, ethnic, sexual, and gender identities fall across the intersections of those groups, would resolve multiple representational gaps. The DC could work with faculty and staff groups to help make the presence of faculty and staff, who are members of minoritized groups more visible to each other, as well as to students. Receptions, support groups, and mentoring programs are all means of realizing those connections and relationships.

Supporting minoritized student scholars. Undergraduate research and scholarships are also programs sometimes coordinated through other departments on campus. However, there are DCs that include these initiatives among their range of services. It would be useful for UWB to review what existing offices could have their staffs built up or restructured to include these services. Even if these initiatives become a part of the DC, they should be connected to academic leadership and resources.
Chancellor’s Diversity Council. A number of the aforementioned recommendations parallel issues and initiatives identified by the Chancellors’ Diversity Council in their Diversity Action Plan. I strongly encourage the council to work during the 2016-2017 academic year on concretizing that plan for implementation. It is my recommendation that the council prioritize the areas above that have been identified by students as necessary to make UWB a more welcoming and inclusive diverse campus.

It also seems necessary for serious attention to be given to faculty and staff reward structures. Currently, pre-tenure faculty and entry-level staff feel vulnerable and unrewarded for their work to support students and advocate for institutional transformation. Yet, due to hiring patterns, faculty and staff from minoritized groups are often clustered in the most vulnerable positions within the institution. Minoritized faculty and staff are also the ones who have been most involved in providing direct support to minoritized students at UWB in the absence of trusted administrative leadership and infrastructure (like a DC would provide). The intersection of shouldering the brunt of this burden and employment insecurity is untenable, unjust, and unsustainable. Allowing this situation to continue risks the retention of current minoritized faculty and staff who are pre-tenure/entry-level, as well as the effective recruitment of new faculty and staff from minoritized groups. The Chancellor’s Diversity Council could provide meaningful, substantive recommendations to deans and the chancellor’s office for various means to recognize, reward, and set expectations for faculty and staff involvement in the institution’s diversity initiatives.

Commitment from Leadership
Clear, specific, and unwavering commitment for the DC must come from institutional leaders and communicated to the campus. The right people must be placed in the right seats on the bus in order to affect the most productive, effective, and welcoming response to the DC from the campus community. This may include realignment of staff responsibilities, reporting lines, and/or personnel.

Conclusion & Next Steps

There is much to be done to establish a DC on campus, however it is important to recognize the good work that has already been done by students. Their careful thinking, critical engagement of the issues, and desire to create an edifice that would meet the needs of their peers should be recognized. The plan they have developed is rich, weighty, and chock-full of good ideas. The student leaders who have pushed for this should be applauded for their innovation, creativity, and insistence thus far. Although needing amendments, to discard or disregard that work at this juncture would be an unnecessary and unwise mistake.

After reviewing this report with the steering committee, I would like to work with that committee to set up joint discussions with cross-sections of the campus faculty, staff, and students who have been involved in conversations up to this point. Perhaps, time in September before classes begin could be utilized for these meetings.