

**Feedback, received as of October 1, 2009,
regarding the Hate Crimes/Bias-Motivated Incidents Protocol (Sept 2009 draft)**

**If you submitted any feedback and do not feel it is reflected here, or if you have additional feedback,
please submit your comments to diversity@grinnell.edu**

- Move the definitions and indicators into appendices.
- Move up the section on procedures for reporting.
- Expectations for a less vague, more “specific actions” policy.
- Include more information about the locations and phone numbers of offices that could be involved in a response
- Clarify the availability of mental health and other counseling services and explicitly state extended hours and staffing, as well as, how this will be funded/implemented.
- Add something like, “It is important for the community to be sensitive to the privacy needs of direct victims in responding to news that a hate crime or bias-motivated incident has taken place. Formal notification procedures are described below.” (I want this to apply to rumors in advance of any official notification—especially if the victim requests, in the consultations, that there be no such official announcement, in which case only rumors will be flying about.)
- Regarding the indicators section: more to address why people commit these acts so as to narrow down whether a questionable act was intentionally hurtful or not (sometimes we’re just clumsy)
- Good that it discusses our values in relation to why we won't tolerate such acts.
- Develop a section about preventative action and sustaining an inclusive campus.
- Clarify which professional staff members might be involved (e.g., RLC’s?).
- Include a section on the rights of the victims and to know when they have been victimized.
- Restorative justice component seems poorly thought out/vague.
- Mention of issues with police and security sensitivity-- more intentional intervention and mediation by the college between the Grinnell Police Department and the victims of a hate crime.
- Name the possibility of working with existing student groups that feel connected to the incident and want to organize around it for open forums, etc.
- Clarify the ability to bringing in outside professionals, for example mental health professionals or diversity trainers, if need be.
- Specify timelines for disseminating information.
- Distinguish incident that is done out of ignorance versus not malicious intent.
- Leave room for the positive learning experience, not just criminal reaction/adjudication.
- Define terms like “ageism, xenophobia, homophobia” for those who may not be familiar.
- Are the appropriate resources for staff delineated—further inclusion of HR or union?
- Distinguish “apparent” from “adjudicated” hate crimes, as both may require responses.
- Reduce "Us vs. Them" way of looking at diversity (can also be within minority groups or targeting a majority), be specific about the difference between an indicator and a definite cause of concern or wrongdoing.