

## **MINUTES FROM SPECIAL MEETING**

**Racial Justice and Equity Commission**

**Thursday, September 9<sup>th</sup>, 2021, 7:30pm**

**Held Via Zoom**

**In attendance: Alina Bricklin-Goldstein, Deb Carroll, Tracy-Ann Johnson, Barret Katuna, Sue**

**Oppenheimer, Dave Peniston, Lillian Tanski, Jen Wang**

**Research Partner: Mike Vigeant, Great Blue Research**

### **Survey results**

MV: has Conducted 2 of 4 interviews (Neil Griffin, Dr. Bookman)

- Early to mid next week (no later than end of day Wed): Mike can present results to us.
- Mike's wife is having pretty major surgery on 9/22, Dan from GreatBlue - Senior Director of Research will be available to present. He's not an owner of the firm, and not a resident of Glastonbury - would provide nice objectivity. He will not oversell.
- Create couple of infographics + public comments + quantitative data → recommendations
- If we present the whole thing, people could pick things and meeting could get off track.
- So we ID which 5-7 bullets we want to talk about, agree on set of themes,
- We will refer to it as a draft every time we speak.
- Break down 800+ results between white and BIPOC. Significant oversampling of BIPOC (about twice)
- Be prepared for people to say I don't think the data is truly representative of what's happening.
- One of common themes will be: this is a benchmark. This may be 100% what the community thinks, it may be only 30% and people don't know us yet, don't have the trust yet.

### **Who should facilitate the meeting?**

DC: Can make argument for Dan to do it, or have RJEC member or external facilitator do it so it's not solely data-driven.

ABG: need to define goals.

MV: We're creating double edge sword by presenting results before finalizing them.

ABG: maybe ask what they expected?

LT: maybe invite public comment re: their interests?

DC: want to do convo right.

MV: just data would be 1.5 hour conversation. Eg when write PR, pick top 3 things that you did great at, pick bottom 3 things that need the most work. Release says we're happy to learn we're doing these 3 things well, we're also happy to learn we have work to do in these 3 areas. We want people to focus on themes, not on every specific question.

LT: with how the data is sliced, will we be able to see it from residents and others?

MV: yes. It's not split out that way currently, it's more from demographic side. Residents have talked about recently. Would like us as a body to ask as a question: what do you think we've missed, that's not represented in the convo we've had or an approach we should consider.

JW: not sure about Lillian's idea about public comment at beginning. This is our first in-person meeting as an RJEC and first time presenting results to public. Can imagine people have some basic questions about methodology, our process, our goals, or even the premise. May be better use of everyone's time for Dan to present that, maybe RJEC contextualizes it, then open it up to a very carefully timed convo. Maybe explore some index cards collected during the doors-open - we select a few to read out loud - say "here's what you're thinking." Anonymizes it, and streamlines it. What Mike just said: Start priming that in our communications promoting the event. That could be a frame at the end: "what should we be thinking about going forward"? Set the expectation.

DP: Frame it ahead of time, tell people we're going to be discussing the top 3 findings, etc. We need to advertise it. Index cards: let people know their voice counts. Maybe at the end, please fill out a card - this is just a taste, we want to have further convos.

MV: start out saying.. This is not GB, but Commission facilitated by GB.

Next steps:

- In marketing, make it clear that we're preparing our audience for format of meeting.
- Index card: "exit ticket" - one thing you learned, one thing you're still confused about? Frame it that way.
- Clear goal: Share initial data with the community, for us to understand community response to data in order for us to make informed recommendations.

Lois Kulas: I think it would be helpful to provide a big picture view of where you are going with this. What are the primary steps? What do you intend to accomplish after compiling opinions & views? What is the town prepared to DO?

LT: cards, goals make sense. Maybe plan to have 15 min of public comments.

JW: Can we plan to address Lois' question in promo or in opening remarks? Google doc for opening remarks.

TJ: Background: how Commission was formed, mission etc. Commission's voice.

MV: Could write up FAQ and have available at meeting.

DC: TALK is v anxious to help us with this. If we can pass along the invite to them - include the goal in that communication? Pull process statement from website.

MV: Rather than printing this stuff out and bringing to meeting, point everybody back to website. All of the background, Q&A.. "all of these things are/will be available on website"

Anne Bowman: There is confusion about RJEC and AHSC.

LT: have everyone review process statement. Tracy-Ann's point re: voice is important.

DP: if we will have someone from GB - if we designate someone from Commission to talk about our goals, how we were formed, etc. For more info go to our website.

JW:

- Inviting local leaders to 9/23 meeting?
- Live streaming?

Inviting local leaders

- TC, BOE, State reps/senators?
- Community orgs? TALK, TACT, faith leaders.

LT summary:

- Format
  - Open up with notecards
  - Opening remarks - could split it among multiple members to show diversity of the group. Discussion of voice - review process statement.
  - Say: throughout conversation, jot down thoughts. Have time at end for comments.
  - Presentation focused on areas we as Commission and GB identified - Danny
  - Collect notecards.
- A/V capabilities?