

## Diversity Committee meeting Sept 30 2020

### Attendees:

Ann, Peaches, Sue Theolass, AJ, Britannia, Diane, Iana, Joanne Mirayama (?), Jon S., Mark Prankratz, Melisa, Palmer, Thom, Tim Nakayama, Wally, Spirit, Sandra Bauer, Lisa P., Crystalyn, Ayisha

### Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Agree on facilitator and note-taker
3. Agenda review, priorities, and objective for today's meeting
4. Old Business: RFPs update
5. Old Business: Equity and Inclusion Advisement Team
6. Old Business: Diversity Census
7. Old Business: DEI fundraising - restricted donations - invite Fundraising group
8. New Business: Craft Committee
9. Review next steps
10. Next meeting
11. Meeting evaluation

### Abbreviations:

RFP (Request for Proposals for DEI consultants to the fair)

DEI, Diversity, equity and inclusion

BOD, the board of directors

DC Diversity committee

DAT (the Diversity Advisement Team proposed to assist the BOD)

CA cultural appropriation

ED the executive director of OCF

Jon- agenda review

Wally RFP update: sent out about 15-20 RFPs recently. A few replies reflecting interest & saying that they will respond back to the RFP.

Sandra asks what was included in the RFP, mainly to see the difference between what's covered in the Advisement team proposal and what we're asking the consultant to do. Whether or not there's crossover- it would help for BOD members to see a copy of the RFPs to get clarity on what their content is. We have just started to do the budget for this term, this is a large budget request that is included in these efforts around 30k a year. We don't know what we will be able to spend especially with what's already been put down for the consultants thus far. Are you looking for a total of 30k a year?

Jon- In terms of the budget for the Diversity Advisement Team We were starting with 15k for the first 6 months and then we can revisit the financial need for the next 6 months, it could be another 15k depending on what the general consultant feels we're in need of.

Brooks: some of the things we talked about in the DAT planning meeting last week were the consultant recommendations. We may not feel a need for the DAT beyond 6 months. Once we get into all the details of the amount of time we would be asking the DAT to go through, with meetings and extra board sessions we actually low balled the price averaging around \$50/hr. even thought someone in this

position would generally be receiving \$150-500/hr. for similar work. This 15k number may or may not be flexible.

AJ: one question that came up is, is this something that the fair sees as an important thing? If it's a matter of 15k, considering money we've spent in other places over the years of fair, is this really too much? Over 6 months, if we're saying this work is necessary then we will find the funds to make it worth it.

Spirit: I was surprised about the closed session piece of this, at the breakout session we also talked about it and we heard the points on why DC folks thought it was important for DAT to be included in the closed sessions. Then we also brought it up in the board meeting because I didn't see it in the proposal, Aisha was very clear that this wasn't supposed to actually include the board closed session. So I feel confused as to why this is brought up now as a part of the proposal, I was also surprised to see the \$ amount rather than the stipend that was loosely written in. I probably wouldn't have voted for it in the BOD Meeting if that had been in there. I'd like to know how that came back up again?

Jon: We met as a subcommittee last week to prepare what we would focus on tonight. we discussed it, we put in some details around the possibility of confidentiality contracts. We also did ask Jack to put it to the lawyer to review this proposal in terms of confidentiality in closed sessions.

Iana- the importance behind it has always been there, the reason we've gone back and forth is because of some insecurity around the legal requirements and details that the attorneys and BOD may have in terms of what's allowed legally for those sessions. This feels like it goes beyond the DC committee's responsibility and into the BOD or attorney's hands- whoever knows the business side of it to make sure it's being done correctly. I would assume we all know the importance of having a DAT on your side in order to make sure the actions of the board are up to par with things that concern diverse communities. We don't want it to be something that is making the BOD work harder, but rather offering assistance as an organization to have the clarity and process to attempt to cover all the bases in case we're in a situation where we have a mainly white or heterosexual representation of the BOD and we want to ensure a level of inclusivity and awareness around diversity issues. I know the budget is separate, and was the second part of your question. That' is part of the reason we feel it's important to have a budget that can cover professionals in this field because they are more likely to be used and willing to sign confidentiality contracts or whatever ya'll need to allow that representation in the closed sessions.

Brooks- In the subcommittee we did talk for like 3 hours on this and went around a lot. There are some reasons why we would want the DAT in closed sessions. In your opinion does the confidentiality agreement statement address any of your issues in having them there at all?

Spirit: It doesn't matter to me if it's a paid professional or a volunteer for me that doesn't have a basis in the realm of confidentiality concerns for me. It's a sensitive topic I don't think there's relevance in the professional aspect of these people. I think we should always be looking with an equity lens in all things. However, if it was matters of personnel issues and such I don't think it would be necessary or appropriate to add extra people in the room on these issues. I'm a bit thrown off that it's a part of the proposal as we were hesitant on this part at the board meeting and I think it was the only hesitation.

Brooks: Just to clarify, the idea is that if you don't have someone in the room that has that lens than you don't know the things that are occurring that might be harmful. Even in sensitive personnel issues. If it was a hiring decision let's say and there was A person of color or a queer person involved in the hiring

decision, it is so helpful for the people making those decisions to have another tool or lens to look through for that choice. As a white person I might not know if something is being harmful to indigenous communities for instance, if I'm used to only white people making decisions about things, so it's more about elucidating things about the unknown unknowns because there's no one in the room that would know it. Or because there's no way to know what the things are that might negatively affect those communities that aren't represented. So that was the reason why it was added. It isn't so that that information in closed sessions could leave that room, it's more to add a lens and shine a light on things people may not see because of our positioning. The reason was really to ensure that someone with the lens of equality could help in case those sensitive situations needed an eye that you would not have otherwise. It was a long long meeting that we talked about this and that's where we landed with the confidentiality or talking to the attorneys and also get feedback from the BOD as to whether you felt it was appropriate to have some sort of statement that would be signed to ensure confidentiality in those sessions.

Sandra: the closed meetings have to do with legal, real estate or personnel. I have some concerns about having more than the board and officers a part of these meetings. All three of those issues are sensitive and privileged conversations. I appreciate the equity lens and the resource but I Think that could be done as easily by referring issues that are brought up in closed sessions to the DAT committee and getting feedback on things that should be going through that lens. I would also like to see the RFP, because if you are having confusion yourself on what the consultant may be including in the package that they deliver I'm wondering about. how inclusive of a program they are going to be coming up with at this point. It may be premature to add this point to the proposal. I certainly don't want to say that this effort is not worth the money, we are doing our best during unsure budget times to at least get the education piece going. We don't know where that's going to go financially and we do have to consider how to allocate limited funds. If we had our full event and normal fundraising income, then it may be different but we're finding new ways to do fundraising and are in the unknown. We financially need to get through for the next new event with the funding that we have right now. I'm certainly not saying it's not worth it, and I like having access to this program but my issues are the budget and the closed meetings being included in this package.

Tom: let me echo AJ, and say simply the advisement team is important and necessary. This is the case because the problem specifically of white privilege is acute especially in closed meetings and BOD meetings. If you're saying you're not willing to have the DAT in the closed session it is in effect saying you are not willing to have a DAT. The legal issues that have been brought up at this point have been at best dubious. I would like it if we were able to read rules in the way that rules are meant to be read. I have been able to turn no's into yes's because I can actually read rules and talk to lawyers because of all my court experience. We have considered that the budget may not be available in this calendar year, again, this is not big money and it could be found if the board wants it to be. It is important that we start this work now. I have said this before and I say it again: You guys keep wanting to go slow, what go slow means is stonewalling until it isn't done, delaying, this is a constant issue and has been all my life. When I hear no we have financial issues, or that you can't tell the difference between the DAT and the general consultant, all I hear is I don't want to do this and I'm looking for reasons not to.

Palmer: I want to check terminology, the executive session is no longer, the closed session is. It's my understanding that the 3 reasons for a closed session are personnel, real estate, and legal, and there's no limitation on why a closed session may be called. It could be any subject at all. Thom I feel educated in your definition of what go slow means, I don't agree with your perception as going slow, my definition

of go slow is you cross your t's and dot your i's and check with legal, it feels like we are heading over all in the direction the DC would like.

AJ- thanks Thom for saying that the way you said it, it's what I feel, I would add that I understand the questions being asked but I've heard them before and they have been a delay tactic in past experiences with nonprofits I've had. For instance, when one says I'm not sure about the DAT in closes BOD sessions, in my mind I'm yet to hear an example of an issue where an Equity lens would not be important or make sense. That's exactly when you would want it in a closed session because the outcome of those directly affect the community. I understand we have a lot going on right now, we also have a lot going on that makes a lot of sense for this to happen sooner than later. We need to put our feet on the gas right now, communities around us and our own are struggling and it's only going to get worse over the next few months and we need to start with this right away.

Iana- I agree with you AJ in that it's a statement to a degree to ensure that the BOD is doing the work that you already want to be doing as we know you want to have this lens anyway. You do your best and we know you to be allies, the DAT is a security blanket of sorts. Perhaps we can put it to you all, as we've asked people to check in with legal, to see how we can make it comfortable. What needs to be done in order to make it legally safe and a reasonable situation for those closed sessions so that community members have that representation that you may not even know they need for support. Maybe you need it too and many situations may arise to interpret something said that seemed racist as what it was intended to say that was not racist. Who knows. If you can help us to figure out a way where it doesn't look like an attack on the BOD or a mistrust but a way that ensures safety to you and all participants, that would speed this process up. If you can bring something else to the table that helps to ensure that some member of the professional DAT is to be a part of all aspects of what the BOD Is doing for everybody's benefit.

Jon- I know Aisha is an advocate of having more than one person, even if it's just 3. To paraphrase what she said-this can be an emotionally challenging thing, we are asking people to step into a challenging professional situation - if you've seen what's been posted on fb or said in BOD meetings- it is important to have a team that can support each other in this work. That's why it's significant to have it be a team and not just one person. That's why it's important to have professional level expertise to this because if it's a contractual agreement with the DAT, then that is one way it can be safe for the legal questions. Establishing a contractual relationship between them and the fair that can have a confidentiality clause and a damages clause. That's one way we discussed to address one of the concerns with someone in the room discussing confidential things. In terms of budget, it might not be 15k, we may not know until we talk to the people that are willing to do this work for us and take on this roll for the organization. that is what we ask for to start this project.

Melissa- I want to emphasize the thing about the closed meetings that we discussed in depth- personnel, hiring, real estate, these are especially sensitive matters that would be high need situations for this equity lens. They are specific situations when you may want to have that perspective, when it comes to grievances and issues like that because those are really issues that we're dealing with at the fair as a whole with lack of DEI support systems. That's why we wanted to emphasize those situations because they would specifically be helpful.

Jon- A question for Sandra and or spirit is there a price tag that you may feel more comfortable with.

Spirit- at BOD meeting Hillary stated that a stipend of \$600 is the standard for a volunteer role. Our budget is so unsure right now so we really don't know what we can afford. I would personally be ok with the \$600/yr. stipend, volunteer work and closed sessions when the BOD feels it is appropriate but I would not state it to be at every closed session. I have to disagree with what I heard Thom talk about. When I go back and look at specific meetings and Aisha stated as she fielded questions and very specifically said this was not about closed sessions but to be covering something else that is in the notes I can't find right now. This feels contradictory to what we discussed It would be appropriate in certain situations but not in every situation.

Jon - I want to let Wally say his goodbyes

Wally- thank you everyone for showing up I appreciate your work; this is a healthy conversation I appreciate everyone sharing their opinions on all sides. sorry I have to jump off, thank you all.

Peaches- I feel like with the DAT, I may not know when I need the advisement team...there's issues around skin color, gender, age...so many things that could come up under the idea of inclusion and equity. I would like an advisor to help us with that. I don't think that's my call to decide when they're needed. I think that's when the advisement role comes in. I like the idea of the contract so that the confidentiality can be upheld, I think we need the guidance when we think we don't. I would be super welcoming even in closed sessions that we think we don't need advisement in. This is an attempt to get us to help see the things we do and how we do them and that we may not be taking everything into account I would be happy to have someone give that lens when we don't have it in place. Sometimes we think we have it all in mind but really we don't.

Jon- If the team is only going into BOD meetings when the BOD thinks they're going to need it; those could be situations when the BOD is applying an equity lens themselves. The important of the team is for the situations when it's not obvious there's a need for the lens. If anybody is deciding if the team is not needed for a specific topic, then it is the team that should decide that. I would hesitate to have that evaluation of whether the team is needed be the BOD's evaluation at this time.

Brooks- I really want to emphasize that the focus needs to remain on why we're doing this, it's not for the benefit of the board it's for the benefit of the community and especially the marginalized communities. It is about power in a way and if the power is centered on protecting the BOD it's not focused on these communities feeling more welcome at the fair. The whole point that they're in the room is that we've proven as an organization that we have blind spots and we acted in ways that have been harmful to marginalized communities and we're trying to correct that, that's the whole purpose right?! If we've already proven that we've been taking actions that have been harmful, how are we going to know in the future what actions we're taking that are harmful then. If we are keeping the deciding of when the DAT is in the room with the people who have caused harm in the past. Of course I would include myself in that group as any of us could potentially cause harm in these situations. The point is to support marginalized communities so we need them in the room to say that and if they're not there than we're missing the point of the DAT. To empower the Marginalized communities within the fair.

Iana- I want to appreciate spirit checking the minutes and I don't want this to sound like an excuse but to go off minutes especially if it was from the working session breakouts, may not be accurate. This has been a fluid process and at that point things were still pending board approval. I know that Aisha who originally came up with the DAT idea, has mentioned many times that what it looks like now is very

different than what she intended it to be originally. We have had to change it a lot in order to fit the desires of the BOD and the OCF already. So I don't want it to feel like we've gone against an agreement that was stated in stone about what would happen in terms of these closed sessions. We have thrown out a lot of ideas and are really attempting to be fluid and get the OCF the support that it needs without undermining issues legally or whatever they might be. So I just want to reiterate that or apologize if you felt mislead and we got you to vote on something that you didn't want to, that feels like dangerous territory we're heading into with that conversation, definitely we are not trying to slip anything under the door, we are just trying to be as accurate in this work for your benefit and all of our benefit as we can be. The motions continue to change in this process likewise we have to be open to the changes that may come from the consultant or the DAT as those professionals may see angles we haven't thought of as well.

Spirit- direct -point of clarity- I was going off the minutes in the BOD meeting minutes when this was approved. What I'm hearing now sounds more like the original proposal. This is something I want to look at more, I've heard stated that this may be something that we can run by the DAT to see what involvement we may need on various issues. I am just going off what was said at the BOD Meeting. I'm not saying this is a hard no for me, the budget definitely I have some concerns about to mull over and check with the treasurer etc. I'm just going off what was discussed at the BOD Meeting, so that's why I'm thrown off.

Sandra- in the RFP what is the timeline of completion on the consultant's proposal? I need to read that over, I understand what you're saying and why. Trying to balance all the things we need to think through isn't easy. Covering everything the fair needs isn't easy and I know this is paramount important. What is the deliverable time frame?

Jon- there are 2 RFPs, the one for the educational program we figured from now to next June we'd have something back. For the Consultant it's more fluid, we want them to look at our budget and see what work they think can be accomplished with that budget and in what timeline. Possibly May or June. Also looking at work that's needed that cannot be accomplished with that money we've budgeted so far. That's really what we're asking of both forms of the consultants, to see what's needed and what it will take to meet those needs.

Sandra- so nothing will be happening soon then?

Jon-realistically if we're able to get the contracts awarded by December then we doubt much work will get rolling until January so while we're hopeful for it to be sooner it may not be in the planning phase until 2021. We're going to look at the RFPs as they come in, there may be some back and forth in that decision process that will take some time.

Sandra- so this proposal is almost an interim proposal until the consultant gives their proposal so that 15k cost for 6 months is what you're expecting?

Jon- That was a rough estimate base on the hours they may be needed. We calculated 1 BOD Meeting/month, 1 closed session/mo., 1 staff meeting/mo., 1 ED meeting/mo., and some interaction in between. We estimated what hours that may be for 3 people for 6 months and priced it at \$50/hr. for that time. we were looking at 6 months for the DAT right now as part of the DC initiatives, it could be that the consultant thinks the DAT should be continued or perhaps working with the BOD will shift the roll of the DAT.

Brooks- the consultant piece is the long term goal; the DAT is the shorter term goal. Especially as we evaluate the consultant it could help us and the BOD to have the DAT as a resource for incites that many of us don't have personally and as an organization. It's something we can do immediately to provide that crucial lens right now for OCF.

AJ- I was in a meeting recently where the 2021 budget was discussed and my concern is in us talking about us not having money in the budget. The budget committee gave a very low ball expectation of the money that may come in this next year. Some of the idea that came out of that looked like perhaps there would be more money than we thought we would have. The various budget options with fundraising and pre sales I would hate to stall this process on 15k considering that this isn't an immediate cost or an all at once cost, it's over months. This is an area where a survey to the membership would be important as far as what they think in terms of inclusion efforts and funding. It seems there may be more money than is being said, it's frustrating to me we spoke about some of the financial decisions that have been made like the funds that went to the winery \$750,000. That was funds in our bank that we chose to spend just a year or two ago so 15 k seems like not too much to get us started on this DEI work.

Sue- In regards to pre sales Anthony, my memory of that meeting is that we may do some presale tickets in December of 2021 for 2022. We don't know if we're having a fair yet so we're not talking about presale tickets in 2021.

Jon- speaking to funding, the BOD did authorize the fair to accept donations dedicated to DEI to increase funding for DEI work. It's on our DC agenda to meet with the fundraising group that Wally has put together. The BOD or the DC can work with the fundraising committee to initiate a campaign to raise the funds to go to DEI efforts. That has potential to raise a lot of money for these issues because a lot of people in OCF really support these efforts. If we want the DAT to be in place, then we need to make a decision to move forward with that now. I think we can resource funds to pay for the DAT and all our DEI efforts over the next year. We may not have the funds in advance but if we don't we can work on fundraising

Iana- I agree and echo that we can fundraise for anything always, I want to re iterate that that 15k/6 months was a super low ball. We are not paying these people what they're worth or what they're getting from anyone else- even nonprofits pay 250/hr. for this type of work. Of course the DAT is a bit different so we did start the number low because we just want to see the work happening. We just can't get too scared at a number that is way lower than what "normal" organizations are paying for this work right now in the world. Right now during a white supremacist regime. It's super important to come down on the right side of this, and to do what we can to raise whatever money to make it possible. If that means highlighting our brown artists, or BLM OCF t-shirts or whatever it is, we can figure it out. we are smart hippies- we got this! we can't be afraid of the money when it's so low, we're talking \$50/hr. rather than \$150 \$250, \$ 500... these normal numbers for the same work.

AJ- I have to say that when I was talking earlier I got really distracted by some reactions to everything I was saying, they weren't positive reactions. So I would encourage people to remember that your face is visible on these video meetings, if someone is speaking they can see your reactions and it can be very disruptive to what people are saying. I want to say that I was very hurt by seeing that and that's why I had a hard time speaking. I just want to put that out there, be sure that if you have a negative reaction to what someone is saying that it is not appropriate to show it heavily on your face.

Brooks- just to emphasize what Iana was saying- you know we could always sell the winery, I mean there are a lot of ways to make money, I now that's not the most PC thing to say, we have a lot of assets a lot of resources- if we value DEI we will find a way to do it.

Britania- I want to stop and check in with AJ about the hurt that you just experienced. Did you sharing that feel sufficient at this point or is there's anything further that we can do around this harm that was just caused.

AJ- I just wanted people to be aware, and the person to be aware that that was happening and I saw it while I was speaking. When you don't have the context as to why I was fumbling with my words, it may seem different to you, I don't want to call any one out by name, I don't think it needs to go any further. I just want to express how that interaction happened in a meeting like this and how it can be distracting. I just want people to know that it's inappropriate.

Anne- I hope it wasn't me, I was talking to my husband on the side and I was muted. I had to leave this meeting because I was talking to a close friend of mine who's brother was killed January 2nd 2019 as an unarmed black man in Ohio, I didn't mean to offend anyone if that was what was going on. If you're interested in more information you can google Matthew Burroughs, Ohio. I'm sorry if it was me.

Jon- I have a question for the committee based on the discussion and what I've heard is there anything that we would like to change in the draft proposal that we have. My only suggestion change would be to put a procedure in where the DAT would be notified of the topics for closed sessions and they would attend those sessions that they felt it would be fruitful for them to attend. So giving them an option of not attending a closed session if they really felt whatever the topic, it was not relevant for their advisement.

Brooks- I agree with that change and I wonder if Sandra and spirit would agree with that change.

Sandra-I think that's a good idea. It's a simple way to make sure it's relevant information that's worth their time and our time.

Jon - if we were to change it from: The Diversity Committee recommends that this team be present and able to offer its viewpoint at all open and closed meetings of the Board of Directors and adhere to the same confidentiality requirements as Board members (see next paragraph).

To

The Diversity Committee recommends that this team, at its discretion, is able to be present and able to offer its viewpoint at all open and closed meetings of the Board of Directors and adhere to the same confidentiality requirements as Board members (see next paragraph).

So that leaves it up to the discretion of the DAT.

Ann- should it say board members and officers?

Jon added that change

Jon- anything else that should be mentioned or added at this point?

Brooks- is there something that should put in to tie this to the budget process?

Jon- until the BOD includes it in the budget for next year, I'm not sure... do you have any wording for this? People will want to know how much or if they're getting paid for this.

Sandra- what if you started with a budget for one person and then it can go from there. We can add to the program once it's up and a happening.

Thom- this effort will be destroyed by underfunding. We've already seen in this meeting the desperate need for advice, fundraising is great but we're already low balling and trying to get the lowest number we can. If we take this to the budget committee, they will try to lower it more. Either we agree to do this or we get what we don't pay for. I can't emphasize enough that without this kind of advice, there's no wonder why you basically see all the same faces when you stroll the 8 at night. It will be a privileged small group until we do this work.

Brooks- It's good to remember there are positive budget implications not just negative.

AJ- I think that fundraising you can even put an fb thing out tomorrow and we could get funding happening.

Brooks- we raised money fast on FB too for performers for the virtual fair.

Iana- we also could use our budget now and then fundraise later for other things the fair wants to do because we actually want to support this work and we empower our community members that aren't seen as well and it's worth it to pay for it.

Jon- I'm not sensing a desire on the committee for any other changes for this budget wise. is there anything else we would want to add to this proposal?

(No response) ok so this is the proposal we want to put to the board, any objections?

None

Brooks thanks Jon for all the work he did to put together the proposal from our last planning meeting.

Aisha joined the meeting.

Brooks- what did you think of the proposal?

Aisha- I didn't comment on it because I didn't have any changes, did you change anything?

We went over the paragraph we changed.

Aisha approved

Jon- this is what we'll go with unless any one else has anything to add.

Iana- I have a weird question, do we want to put a sliding scale of 15k-50k so it's really clear that 15k is low ball and will get approved more likely. Because the math we did was that assumption of around 80 hours at \$50/hr., it's really easy to quantify that higher. Would it be helpful so that we don't have to keep having the budget discussion and people can understand that it is less already?

Jon- I think we should say that what we're recommending is a minimum requirement.

Someone- I think it's a valid point, ask high and negotiate low.

Jon- I'd rather not play that game, maybe add a sentence that this is the minimum possible budget allotment the committee feels is necessary to do this work.

Aisha- I agree it's good to make the point that this is a minimum and we can site sources where people get paid 3 times more for the same work. We really should drive this home that it's a minimum.

Jon- I'm assuming that one of our board liaisons will make a motion to adopt this proposal and the discussion of the 15k will come up and that's when we as a committee can make it clear that this is the minimum necessary.

Crystalyne- My experience with the budget committee tells me the ask more and negotiate for less tactic will not work, we should be upfront about it being the minimum and providing references of what similar situations cost that would be a better approach.

Jon- so would it be alright to add a sentence that says the DC feels this is the minimum necessary for this DAT to do this work.

Iana- yeah minimum or even up to \$450 less/ hr.

Brooks- yes if there's' some way we need to talk about it's not just minimum it's that we're not ethically comfortable to ask for this deepness of levels of work to be done at lower price than that. Otherwise it's insulting and actually causing more harm to say, "look we caused all this harm, now come fix it for us and we're going to pay you less or actually not pay you." It's going to burn more bridges in the community and make the fair look bad rather than help. I'd rather it not happen than to ask people who do this in their professional life and experience oppression in their own lives, to do it at an insulting rate. "Fix it for free, we might or might not listen to you, we'll tell you when you can and can't be there" That's disingenuous and I don't want to be a part of that.

Aisha- I second and third that.

Iana- We need to be honest with our embarrassment, we can say "we're the fair and we're so stressed with budget, we can't afford to pay what you're worth, even though we're a bunch of white people..." "we have to be honest and acknowledge the embarrassment that we can't pay what people are worth and that we hope to be able to in the future, if it is true that we're not willing to pay what they're worth currently. At least that way we're less a-holes, but trying to be upfront and aware enough to acknowledge the issues that we have but still get the work done which is the end goal.

AJ- considering what we saw last night and the whole thing that's going on with the proud boys, I think we can't waste any more time. People's lives are at stake.

Aisha- always when it comes to race equity it's best to be unequivocal it's not really good to go back and forth over the fence. I'm with brooks, I appreciate what you said I'm not for it if we're going to try to manipulate the situation so that we don't have to raise more money. I don't want to be a part of that, It's not a good look.

Jon: does this capture it?

This amount is the minimum that the committee feels is necessary for the advisement team to be successful and that it is an amount that is well below what team members would normally receive as compensation for this type of work.

Ann- I just want to say that sometimes these types of groups that we contract with will consider in their portfolio doing thing for less for a nonprofit but it isn't in our place to ask them to do so. It sounds to me that in budgeting they want to push it down, but in reality we should respect these people.

Sue- I appreciate the amount; I think it would be helpful if there were some fundraising efforts that the DC could recommend for these projects. If they're added to the proposal that may be a way to get more people on board.

Peaches- I appreciate you all, thank you. goodnight

Editing thoughts and convo...

Final draft:

The Diversity Committee recommends that the Board of Directors allocate \$15,000 for potential team compensation for six months. With an understanding that this amount is well below what team members would normally receive as compensation for this type of work, the committee feels that this amount is the minimum necessary for the advisement team to be successful.

Jon -next agenda item diversity census

Ann- I just got the 4A disability adjustments, and I'm planning on re writing and putting their suggestions in. I'm thinking of moving the "race is a construct statement" to the top. I appreciate Emma for providing the info to us. The ability issue is the thing where everyone ends up disabled at one point in their life even temporarily, so it's very important. I have not contacted the survey committee yet.

Jon- DEI fundraising... I didn't invite the fundraising people to this meeting, I can do that next time. Maybe we can work with them to put out a plan as to how we're going to make the case for this work.

Jon- new biz craft committee

I had very interesting discussions with the craft committee, they want to look at things with a DEI lens, we got into a discussion about cultural appropriation. Because it's so subjective as to what is CA and what's not, the craft inventory person didn't think it would be useful or possible to try to enforce no CA at the fair. I pointed out that from a white perspective it's very easy to say that but for indigenous people coming o fair and feeling these are pieces of their culture that are stolen the experience will be so different. The discussion came down to that the Crafters committee and the DC should get together and meet.

Sue- I just want to let you know that the craft inventory person's opinion is not the opinion of even a minority of the crafters and we are looking into the CA issue and have been for a while. We are open to working on this through the jury of artists and other ways to accommodate people, I think we're on the road and it's a long conversation.

Jon- I didn't think that that was the opinion of the committee. It is the individual who organizes folks who run this and it's a situation where you can make policy but you need the people who operate that policy to be on board too. It was an example of the work that needs to be done here.

Ann- having gone through the OCF with a tribal representative, it's not just the crafts, it's some of the visible art that there was essentially a stolen family crest. I didn't feel like there was any method to deal with that issue.

Crystalline - (I missed what she said here, sorry!)

we looked into when the craft committee meets and will set up a meeting. Sue mentioned the November meeting as a good time for this discussion. Jon says we're also open to setting a separate meeting for this also.

Next steps

Jon- I'm going to send the DAT proposal to the BOD, it is on the agenda for next Monday's BOD Meeting, whether or not they get to it is up in the air, they have a lot on the menu. It would be good to have some DC members there. Brooks, Ann, Aisha can be there. Thom will be there. I will invite the fundraising committee people to come to the next DC meeting.

Ann is going to check with the survey people

Sue will check with the crafters about that meeting.

AJ- does anything need to be said to Aisha about the BOD Meeting and what spirit was saying.

Spirit- reiterated what threw her off in terms of the closed sessions....

Aisha- I would be confused if I said that as well, I definitely believe they should be there in closed sessions more than not, I'm also ok with it being at their discretion. So if I said that I must have misunderstood what we were talking about. I am one of the people on the DC that believes that the DAT needs to be present with the BOD as much as possible.

Next meeting is 4th Monday in October.

We may want to do more meetings before that about RFPs if we get any coming in before that.

We need to remember to send it out to the google diversity list if we change the meeting in the future.

Google list vs. committee dc list. Spreadsheet list etc.

Tim- I'm curious if I wanted to join the committee what's the process to that?

Jon- send an e-mail to the BOD and let the DC know

Peace out!