

**Seattle Women's Commission**  
Monday, February 28, 2022, 5:30-7:30 pm

Facilitator: Abriel  
Note taker: Rachel  
Timekeeper: Jamilah

Attendees: Abriel Johnny\*, Rebecca Bryant\*, Rachel Morowitz\*, Morgan Cain\*, Jema Turk\*, Whitney Nakamura\*, Sarah Liu\*, Jamilah Williams\*, Zoe True\*, Marta Idowu, Tana Yasu\*, Ophelia Parker\*, Kyla Evans, Natasha Bennett (Human Rights Commissioner), Andrew Ashiofu, Brett (LGBTQ Commissioner), Patricia Goodwin, Kyana Wheeler (SOCR), Marta Idowu (SOCR)

\*denotes SWC commissioners

Time	Topic	Lead
5:37-5:54	<p>Welcome Land acknowledgement Introductions Approve minutes for December &amp; January meetings</p> <p>Abriel provided the land acknowledgement and encouraged the SWC to consider using this language moving forward.</p> <p>Attendees introduced themselves.</p>	A. Johnny
5:54-5:56	<p>Attendance check-in</p> <p>Tana indicated that we want to commit ourselves to being better about attendance. Attendance is required by our bylaws. Asked that commissioners refresh themselves on the bylaws and provisions relating to attendance.</p> <p>Tana also asked that people taking minutes send the minutes immediately after the meeting.</p> <p>Tana asked if there were any questions. No questions were asked.</p>	T. Yasu
5:56-6:18 6:51-6:52 7:11-7:27	<p>Bylaws approval</p> <p>Kyla opened up the discussion. Noted that we have discussed the bylaws at a couple of meetings. Past discussions have touched on our use of the word "women" and whether we are being inclusive; do we want to change our name? SWC brought this discussion to the 5-chair meeting. Kyla clarified that we are not proposing a name change of the commission, we are looking at our language and moving towards more inclusive language. Past discussions touched</p>	K. Evans

on inserting a footnote.

Current language: "The Seattle Women's Commission prioritizes issues experienced by all women and those most impacted by gender bias, including transgender, non-binary, and gender nonconforming people who may not identify as women."

Kyla opened up the floor for discussion.

Rebecca acknowledged Brett and Natasha's presence and asked if they had any feedback. Natasha indicated in the chat that she did not have any feedback.

Rebecca: tonight we need a motion for approval for the bylaws in general.

Jamilah indicated her approval of the language in the chat. Jema, Morgan, and Zoe joined.

Brett expressed appreciation for why the SWC wants to address the use of "women" by the SWC. It feels odd to have the SWC represent people who are not women because of discussions around femininity and womanhood. Discussions of womanhood and women's rights in the trans community can be difficult. The idea of being lumped under a woman's commission feels odd. Wonder how changing the language will lead to other changes - women's history month? For example, when we talk about the experience of womanhood, how do we talk about pregnancy? Brett paused for questions.

Abriel had a question for Brett. Is your concern that we are maintaining the name of SWC or that we should expand the name?

Brett not sure if pro-name change. Concern more about what the commission is doing beyond language.

Tana noted that the idea was to be more inclusive.

Rebecca noted that we discussed the language at our retreat. We don't have a great answer for Brett's other questions right now. Miscommunication about what was discussed at larger meeting. Apologize that there was miscommunication about what was discussed at the 5-chair meeting.

Zoe in the chat noted that men can and have been commissioners on this commission before. Expressed appreciation about language and how it relates to our actions.

Kyla noted that the language was aspirational about what we want to do.

Morgan in that chat stated that as a nonbinary person, I appreciate the addition of this language. I am someone both personally impacted by gender bias, as well as someone that cares about gender equity, even though I do not identify as a woman.

Kyana in the chat stated that as a collective commissions are questioning power. "If you have come to help me, you are wasting your time. But if you have come because your liberation is bound to mine, then let us work together."

Kyla, would it make sense to move the approval and discussion of the bylaws to March? Rebecca agreed to move it to March. I think we should take time to get it right. Rebecca asked for others' input. Ophelia is okay with coming back to this and not making a decision on this in haste.

Zoe asked in the chat what more do we expect to learn this month and Rebecca explained that there are additions to the bylaws that we haven't discussed.

Might come back to bylaws if we have time at the end of the meeting

*Circle back:*

Marta indicated that the legal team needs to look at our bylaws before we vote on them. We can't vote on our bylaws tonight.

*Circle back:*

Rachel reported on the idea behind an advisory vote and why commissioners might want to consider using it. Rebecca also provided the rationale for an advisory vote. Empowers people that can't attend the meeting, provides a formal avenue for lodging a non-binding vote.

Jema, is this more about how someone who isn't at the meeting can make a record? Rebecca, not necessarily, but it can be! Jema expressed support for having a formal procedure for advisory votes. Rachel also explained why the word "vote" was used - we have advisory votes in WA elections, in shareholder context there are proxy and advisory votes. The phrase "advisory vote" has meaning.

Tana expressed concern for how this would relate to our concerns regarding attendance.

Marta also expressed concern for the use of abstentions" could you change it to "Marta expressed concern for the use of advisory vote" and expressed that law department may have concerns with its use with having the advisory vote

Kyla opened up a discussion about the executive committee's ability

	<p>to conduct administrative affairs of the commission between regular meetings. Rachel indicated her support for this edit in the chat.</p> <p>Kyla going to send the bylaws to Marta so legal can review.</p>	
6:18-6:28	<p>Legislative update &amp; discussion</p> <p>Rebecca opened up with how we have a great system in place for what we want to do for next year. However, this was a shorter session so the majority of bills that we would want to engage with were passed out of committee before we could do anything.</p> <p>Rebecca shared spreadsheet re WA Leg 2022 Session Bills for SWC Vote.</p> <p>Line 15 - HB 1956 - bill where our support was solicited. The rest of the bills were added because commissioners did their research and added these in.</p> <p>With a short session it can be really tricky. Rebecca proposes that we mention our support for some of these bills on social media. Or, because that might not be the most effective, we can do a longer blog post about what we see as wins this legislative session. Hoping that we can still use this work as momentum moving forward. Rebecca asked for thoughts on the proposal.</p> <p>Rachel indicated that the idea of a blogpost would be a great idea.</p> <p>Rebecca indicated that she would appreciate if someone from the communications subcommittee would take that on. Jamilah said that this is doable but we'll need to discuss more. Also if there are any groups that are sharing information that can be reshared by the commission to send to the communications subcomm.</p> <p>Rebecca, probably a question for Marta: since we are not engaging in the legislative process do we need to have a motion for this?  Jamilah: I don't think we do. Did we do a motion to decide what we were focusing on? Rebecca: no, this is more about transparency. Rebecca and Jamilah agreed that we don't need a motion for bills that have passed.</p> <p>Rebecca: a lot of groups are planning on doing lookbacks so if you see anything please share with the listserv.</p>	R. Bryant
6:28-6:30	<p>Outreach Committee</p> <p>Abriel shared a survey monkey link re outreach. How we can be intentional about our bylaws, membership, etc. How do we work all of this into our recruitment process?</p>	A.Johnny

	<p>Links for outreach committee and land acknowledgement work group. The latter is more of a long term project.</p> <p>Abriel asked that we respond by next week</p>	
<p>6:30-6:42</p>	<p>Workplan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Review final work plan</li> <li>- Review timeline of events</li> </ul> <p>[Review final work plan]</p> <p>Kyla opened up the discussion by sharing the combined workplan for the website. Kyla combined subcommittee workplans and that went out in the digest that went out last week. Kyla shared the 2022 SWC Work Plan on her screen.</p> <p>Rebecca asked if this would go on the city website, which Kyla confirmed.</p> <p>Sarah Liu noted that she had a couple of questions. How did we listen to the respective communities in deciding on our focus areas. Kyla responded that she has been thinking about that. We didn't use a systematic or formal process where we collected community feedback about this. How these priorities came about we had commissioners share their priorities based on what they are hearing in their communities. Basically went through and tallied which areas appeared to be the most significant.</p> <p>Rebecca indicated that we are trying to be more transparent about what our goals are. The government and community relations subcommittee will probably work on this for the rest of year to determine how we can better engage with the community. Having folks bring their experiences to the committee. Doing outreach to different communities.</p> <p>Natasha indicated in the chat that equitable access to housing is also a human rights commission area of focus.</p> <p>Kyla moves to make a motion to approve the workplan. Whitney seconded. The motion is approved.</p> <p>Vote held re approval to post the workplan in its current form on the website. There were no abstentions and no votes against. The motion passed.</p> <p>[Review timeline of events]</p> <p>Rebecca asked Tana to talk about events beyond March and April. Tana declined.</p>	<p>K. Evans &amp; E&amp;C Co-Chairs</p>

<p>6:42-6:50</p>	<p>Events: March: Women’s History Month, Jeanette Williams Award</p> <p>Tana reported that we created a spreadsheet for nominations. The committee would vote on a nominee this year. Only 4 people were nominated. The nominees for the Jeanette Williams award are:</p> <p>Ruchika Tulshyan Nicole Grant Jessica Loche-Eggert And Nikkita Oliver</p> <p>Ruchika was listed 4 times.</p> <p>Whitney mentioned in the chat that she can create materials and contact Nona about the JW award blog post.</p> <p>April: Sexual Assault Awareness &amp; Prevention Month; #Denim Day</p> <p>Tana indicated that if we can get a jump on this from Nona that would be great. We used to get together at city hall but not sure we can do that. Tana suggested an online event.</p> <p>Tana suggested that we hold off on planning summer events for now.</p> <p>Tana asked if we should have a vote for the JW award</p> <p>A spreadsheet was created to solicit nominations and SWC held a vote.</p> <p>Tana moved for a motion to nominate Ruchika for the JW award. Jema seconded. Motion approved. No abstentions, no votes against. Motion approved.</p> <p>Marta does not have Ruchika’s information and we need to track down their information.</p> <p>Tana moved for a motion to make the funds available for a plaque. No abstentions and no votes against. Motion approved.</p>	
<p>6:55-7:11</p>	<p>5-Chair meeting report</p> <p>Rebecca reported that our report will relate most to the bylaws discussion. Rebecca said she really appreciated Kyana’s thoughts on this and asked if they would share them again here.</p> <p>Kyana: there is a continuum of the way that we think about anti-racism work. Diversity is literally just calculating and quantifying differences. It is different in general, what is different from the norm.</p>	<p>R. Bryant</p>

	<p>Once we have a diverse set of folks then the next thing we need to ask is, can they access the organization? Physical barriers? Language barriers?</p> <p>Do I belong? Do you acknowledge me when I show up?</p> <p>If you have a diverse audience that can access, noting that they belong = equity table. At this table the institution is still in control.</p> <p>The difference between anti-racism/racial equity and that next step is questioning power. Who actually owns this narrative? Who can actually reward or punish based on this narrative? That is where this institution is asking to be.</p> <p>Are we assimilating or are we saying let's find the things that bind us so we are connected as human beings and not social constructs.</p> <p>After anti-racism we move onto decolonization. Asking, is this a legitimate institution?</p> <p>Turning to the SWC, what is the power that holds us and defines us? Where are the areas that we disagree on?</p> <p>Rebecca, can you also share information about the Race and Justice Initiative training that you're working on? Kyana, I am getting a power and control pushback on that internally. There's a slowdown on that effort but it will be happening.</p> <p>Natasha reported that the HRC wants to engage the SWC because human rights can be so expansive. Natasha will be the liaison between HRC and SWC and is really interested in collaborating.</p> <p>First Thursday of every month 6-8 pm HRC meets.</p> <p>Rebecca asked Jema if we can add to the calendar information about other commission meetings.</p>	
7:28-7:34	<p>SOCR Updates</p> <p>Derrick Wheeler Smith has started and he wants to meet with the commissions for 45 minutes. Give him questions prior to the meeting so he can have a prepared answer.</p> <p>Bylaws need to be reviewed by legal.</p> <p>Plan for a presentation about a couple of things that we are going to be focused on. Do this with the City Council and Mayor. Marta needs to put in a written request for the Mayor's office. Will we be ready for the last meeting in April? Marta is going to put those</p>	M. Idowu

	<p>requests in.</p> <p>Disability commission has completed their workplan. HRC and LGBTQ are working on theirs.</p> <p>Recruitment. SWC needs to get their recruitment letter out. HRC is asking for a copy of our interview questions.</p>	
	<p>Adjourned</p> <p>Tana moved to adjourn the meeting. No abstentions no votes against. Meeting adjourned at 7:34.</p>	