

City Council January 25 Item 3.5 racial equity

Joe V [REDACTED]

Thu 1/20/2022 4:01 PM

To: Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>

Cc: Joe V [REDACTED]

[External Email]

[REDACTED]
[important](#)

[External Email]

Dear City Council per memo/a/ ,

When are you going to come up with a definition for the systemic laziness that allows for a definition like this? Honestly, a small child could have done a better job! It's word salad at best!

Definition of Racial Equity

Both a process and an outcome, racial equity is designed to center anti-racism, eliminate systemic racial inequities, and rooted in the acknowledgement of the City of San Jose's historical and existing practices that have led to discrimination and injustices to Black, Indigenous, Latino/a/x, Asian, and Pacific Islander communities.

The racial equity process explicitly prioritizes communities that have been economically deprived and underserved, and establishes a practice for creating psychologically safe spaces for racial groups that have been most negatively impacted by policies and practices. It is action that prioritizes liberation and measurable change, and centers lived experiences of all impacted racial groups.

As an outcome, racial equity is achieved when race can no longer be used to predict life outcomes, and everyone can prosper and thrive.

Do better!

Constituento

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Racial Equity Definition; Item 3.5

Ruth Callahan [REDACTED]

Thu 1/20/2022 4:42 PM

To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov>

[External Email]

[E ternal Email]

I have read this declaration and I see a glaring error in the definition of the segments of the population that are protected by this edict What about GENDER! Women make up 53% of the population in SJC and we have universally been paid lower wages for our work and higher prices for our services. The pink tax is famous but the more blatant low wages, sexual harassments, lack of advancement compared to our male colleagues of all colors and races is certainly worthy of at least a mention. Don't you think? Surely Women of all races need just as much attention to their lack of "thriving" and needs for a "psychology of safe spaces" and a reparations for the disappointment of our lifetime "outcomes". I cant wait to be able to sue all of my SJ employers under our new Equity Definitions for all my back wages that this edict will entitle me too Don't for the Ladies

If I have submitted this to the wrong party please forward to those fine and discerning minds who are balancing and repairing the life of all the women who have been paid less for doing more

Respectfully,
Ruth A Callahan

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

This message is from outside the City email system Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Jan 25 agenda: Racial Equity Definition; Item 3.5

Tod <[redacted]>

Fri 1/21/2022 1:23 PM

To: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <[redacted]> Liccardo, Sam
 <[redacted]> Davis, Dev <[redacted]> Jones, Chappie <[redacted]>
 Esparza, Mava <[redacted]> Jimenez, Sergio <[redacted]> Peralez, Raul
 <[redacted]> Carrasco, Magdalena <[redacted]> Arenas, Sylvia
 <[redacted]> Cohen, David <[redacted]> Mahan, Matt <[redacted]>
 Foley, Pam <[redacted]> District1 <[redacted]> District2 <[redacted]> District3
 <[redacted]> District4 <[redacted]> District5 <[redacted]> District 6
 <[redacted]> District7 <[redacted]> District8 <[redacted]>

You don't often get email from [redacted] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

[E ternal Email]

Please review the attached letter and add to the letters from the public.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

This message is from outside the City email system Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources

January 21, 2022

Dear Mayor and City Council,

Equity is already defined as “the quality of being fair and impartial”.

Racial equity (or racial justice) is “the systematic fair treatment of all people, resulting in fair opportunities and outcomes for everyone. Racial equity is not just the absence of discrimination but also the presence of values and systems that ensure fairness and justice”. I believe it key that the definition includes “all people” rather than the proposed narrow and specific “discrimination and injustices to Black, Indigenous, Latino/a/x, Asian, and Pacific Islander communities”. Equity really should know no race and stand alone as a term that applies to any marginalized community.

I do not understand spending time (i.e. money) on *re-defining* racial equity. This time and money could be better spent on developing programs that actually address lingering equity issues (improving schools and/or strengthening neighborhood associations, etc.) or other pressing city issues rather than focusing on a definition. Also, some of the terms that were the consensus of the select community members are offensive. Additionally, I do not foresee the city having any actual monies for reparations any time soon so this seems to be a misleading suggestion. In the spirit of the memorandum, the resolution should be inclusive not divisive.

In closing, as I've stated before: *“It can be a difficult step to move forward from a community formed by the fight for equal rights to a larger community for the benefit of ALL”*. We should embrace the progress made and build on it in a positive way.

Thank you,

Tod Williams

Dear Council Members:

RE: Agenda Item Jan 25 agenda: Racial Equity Definition; Item 3.5

After reading the referenced memo (Definition of Racial Equity Date: January 13, 2022, authored by Zulma V. Macie), I have some concerns and items for your consideration.

Summary of Concerns

1. Issues with the definition

In summary, there are numerous concerns with the definition of “racial equity” in the memo.

The memo definition of “racial equity” is

- unclear and in concise
- unmeasurable or subjective outcomes are listed
- it prioritizes one set of residents over other residents
- is not inclusive as specific races/ethnicities/groups are not mentioned (i.e., Jews, Arabs, recent immigrants/refugees, women, young men, etc.)
- focused on outcomes without clearing providing objective metrics (See discussion of equality versus equity below)
- implies that the City of San Jose policies/practices are at fault for inequalities (which could have financial and legal ramifications for the city and the taxpayers)
- focused on unmeasurable items such as “psychologically safe spaces”

2. Issues with obtaining public input

- Only 2 public meetings were held in December to obtain input. This is a month where public input is limited due to holidays.
- Appears to have focused on getting inputs from non-profits and specific groups of residents instead of from the community at large
- Appears to have avoided obtaining opposing or alternate viewpoints
- Uses terms in this memo (and probably during meetings) that would limit alternative or opposing viewpoints from being expressed. Thus, not providing a “psychologically safe” place for all community members

For the above reasons, I believe additional work is necessary to develop a definition. The current definition and the work to obtain it is incomplete and/or flawed.

Additional Thoughts

1. Differences Between Equality and Equity

As Vice President Kamala Harris tweeted before the election “There’s a big difference between equality and equity.”

As noted in the [‘Equity’ Is a Mandate to Discriminate](#) “There is a big difference [between equality and equity]. It’s the difference between equal treatment and equal outcomes.

Equality means equal treatment, unbiased competition and impartially judged outcomes. Equity means equal outcomes, achieved if necessary by unequal treatment, biased competition and preferential judging.”

“Outcome” or “outcomes” is used extensively in the memo – 11 times. It appears to be a main feature of the memo. Is this the main feature, intent, and objective of the Office of Racial Equity to focus on outcomes and justify unequal treatment of residents? Should this be the goal and objective? Is this what the majority of the voters in San Jose would support?

As noted in [Reminder: local voters reject expanded affirmative action policies](#) “County voters rejected Proposition 16, an effort to reinstate affirmative action policies on a broad scale. Even though the San Jose City Council unanimously came out in favor of Prop 16, the voters in ... Santa Clara County rejected their advice 52% to 48%.”

Any system or policy that demands equity versus equality and equal opportunity, needs to be fully vetted and the implications understood. Furthermore, some of the expressed and implied outcomes are not within the control of the City of San Jose. Thus, there may be limited actions that can be taken by the City that will affect the outcomes

3. Changing Conditions – White Males in Trouble?

Changes are occurring in our society. And groups that historical were considered “privileged” may be slipping as demonstrated in these articles [Do Pro-Women Groups on Campus Discriminate Against Men?](#) and [A Generation of Men Give-up On College.](#)

As noted in the second article, “The college gender gap cuts across race, geography and economic background. For the most part, white men—once the predominant group on American campuses—no longer hold a statistical edge in enrollment rates, said Mr. Mortenson, of the Pell Institute. ***Enrollment rates for poor and working-class white men are lower than those of young Black, Latino and Asian men from the same economic backgrounds,*** according to an analysis of census data by the Pell Institute for the Journal.” (Bold and italics added for emphasis.)

So, services and support for members of this community (young white males) may be necessary.

4. Jews & Arabs Excluded?

We have recently seen anti-Semitism in our country. We have also seen evidence of contempt for the Islamic community. But while “faith-based communities” are mentioned in the Analysis section of the memo, there is no specific reference to these specific groups in the definition. These are groups which some also consider to be racial as well as religious. (see: [DNA links prove Jews are a ‘race,’ says genetics expert](#) and [Are Jews a Race or a Religion?](#))

Summary

Conditions are changing in our communities. We need to be supportive of all community members. And more support may be necessary in some communities than others. And the

communities that need support may change over time. Developing a plan that does not recognize these facts is flawed. A definition that does not recognize these facts is flawed.

Please consider rejecting this definition and memo. Please send this memo back to staff for more community input and to assure that the all communities are considered.

Respectfully submitted,
Sandra A. Delvin, PE