

Third Annual LatCrit Planning Retreat

Cleveland, Ohio May 5-7, 2003

SPONSORED BY:

LATCRIT, INC.
CLEVELAND-MARSHALL UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW
THE CENTER FOR HISPANIC AND CARIBBEAN LEGAL STUDIES,
UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI SCHOOL OF LAW

AGENDA & SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES

(With Appendix of Attachments and Composite Exhibits)

This Agenda and Schedule of Activities for the Third Annual LatCrit Planning Retreat presents a general framework for our time together beginning May 5th, the day after the conclusion of the Eighth Annual LatCrit Conference (LCVIII). As with other LatCrit initiatives, in convoking this Third Annual Retreat we are striving to build on the achievements and initiatives of our past collective efforts, including specifically the work of the First and Second Annual Retreats, in Florida and Oregon, respectively, during the LCVI and the LCVII conferences. Our objectives in this year's Retreat once again are to leverage past learning, to open new avenues of collaboration, and to promote the ethic of solidarity and inclusion that has enabled LatCrit to grow as a community based on genuine friendships and the deep satisfaction of meaningful engagement among critical scholars who share a commitment to social justice and transformative praxis.

The LatCrit Co-Chairs – presently, Angela Harris, Berta Hernandez-Truyol and Frank Valdes – organize this annual Planning Retreat as part of the co-chairs' functions, and for the express purpose of creating an appropriate venue for the kinds of discussions and long-term planning that are crucial to sustaining and guiding the institutional development upon which all LatCrit initiatives ultimately depend: the basic purpose of this gathering is to function as a *planning* Retreat focused both on community-building and institution-building in the short, medium and long term. This Third Annual Planning Retreat, like the Eighth Annual LatCrit Conference, is “open” to all – as in past years, an invitation was included this year in the conference materials, enabling any interested person to participate in the Retreat and thereby in the future development of all LatCrit projects. But given the focus on *planning*, the Annual Planning Retreats depend on the proactive participation of individuals who take responsibility for discrete projects. As in past years, we therefore anticipate and invite participants – both of newcomers and veterans – to forward their own ideas and projects for discussion at each stage of the Retreat schedule.

As in past years, the Retreat opens with a Working Lunch (at 11:30 AM on Monday, May 3, 2003 – the day after the conference concludes) and is organized around five additional plenary sessions over the next two days, which conclude on Wednesday, May 5 at 5:00 PM. The Retreat sessions open with an overview of the status quo during the Working Lunch (also Plenary Session One) on Monday, while the following five plenary sessions will focus concretely on issues concerning future plans for our growing portfolio of projects. *An Appendix of Composite Exhibits for use with each of the Retreat sessions is attached to this Agenda and Schedule of Activities: Retreat participants are requested to review the attachments in advance of the relevant sessions to make sure that your participation in that session's discussion takes this background information into account.* As in the past, throughout these six plenary sessions we will be exploring ways to promote inter-project synergies, cross-disciplinary collaborations, and student-oriented initiatives.

We look forward to your participation in each session of this year's Planning Retreat during the next three days, as follows:

Monday, May 5, 2003

11:30 PM-2:15 PM Plenary Session One and Working Lunch (see Composite Exhibit 1)

OVERVIEW: RECAPPING LATCRIT HISTORY, OUTLINING OUR PORTFOLIO OF PROJECTS, DEVELOPING SYNERGISTIC PRIORITIES, AND ORGANIZING “PROJECT TEAMS”

This first plenary session and working lunch is designed to set the stage for the Retreat discussions by providing an opportunity for Retreat participants to reflect generally on the meaning of the LatCrit project, its history, strengths, weaknesses and future aspirations. The idea is to think big: to imagine what it takes to succeed in creating a long-lasting organization of critical scholars with independent resources and multiple long-term projects aimed at providing mutual assistance and collaborative opportunities for outsiders committed to the project of progressive social transformation both within and beyond the legal academy of the United States; to assess the progress we have made toward these ends; and to reflect on the different ways we envision our future collaborations and institution-building aspirations. We return to these primal questions each year to re-ground ourselves collectively in light of intervening experience: this opening session seeks to ground these general reflections in ways that build on our past experiences and learning. To this end, the session will open with a brief but detailed overview by the Co-Chairs of this year’s Retreat Agenda and Schedule of Activities, focusing specifically on the projects that are currently underway, their status and their future trajectories. *Retreat participants are requested to read, prior to this session, Composite Exhibit 1, attached to this sheet, to become familiar with the background necessary for this discussion: this Exhibit contains the minutes of past Retreats as well as recent reports or memos that provide a summary overview of projects, plans and events that will be covered during this opening plenary session and working lunch.*

2:15-2:30 PM COFFEE & COOKIE BREAK

2:30-5:00 PM Plenary Session Two (see Composite Exhibit 2)

MAKING “THE INTERNATIONAL MOVE”: A REVIEW OF THE STUDENT SCHOLAR PROGRAM (SSP), THE CRITICAL GLOBAL CLASSROOM (CGC), AND THE LATCRIT COLLOQUIUM ON INTERNATIONAL & COMPARATIVE LAW

During the past two years, Retreat participants devoted substantial time to discussing ways of making “the international move” a concrete, programmatic and institutional reality within the LatCrit project. Those discussions focused primarily on the proposal to expand and annualize an international colloquia series modeled on prior LatCrit colloquia held at various sites around the world, as well on the initiation of the Critical Global Classroom study-abroad program in law, policy and social justice activism. As discussed in the first plenary session (see above), we initiated both of those efforts this past year, along with another program that also is international in scope and focus: the Student Scholar Program (SSP). The focus of this second plenary session is on these ongoing efforts, from which our subsequent sessions will flow. The idea here is to discuss the status quo concretely, and to explore ideas to improve and consolidate ongoing programs or projects for the coming year(s). *Retreat participants are requested to review, prior to this session, Composite Exhibit 2 to become familiar with these three new or recent programs – advance familiarity with this background information will make our time together more focused, efficient and productive.*

5:00-7:00 PM HAPPY HOUR: Call Home, Exercise, Nap, Play, Catch-Up with Readings

7:00-9:00 PM GROUP DINNER

9:00-Whenever COMMUNITY BUILDING

Tuesday, May 6, 2003

8:00-9:15 AM **CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST (included, at hotel)**

9:30-12:30 PM **Plenary Session Three (and Composite Exhibit 3)**
CONTINUING “THE INTERNATIONAL MOVE”: NEW AND PENDING PROPOSALS
RELATING TO ONGOING PROJECTS

Our efforts, in particular those discussed above, have attracted positive attention and prompted new proposals designed to help us continue the “international move” of the past several years. In addition, we have business relating to our international efforts left over from prior conversations. Thus, three main areas of Retreat discussion arise here: (1) the proposals from the Inter-American University School of Law; (2) the NGO project, which has remained dormant since approved by the Board two years ago but which Berta Hernandez identified as a priority in her Co-Chair Platform; and (3) the web redesign project, which is increasingly urgent due to our growing international projects: we have discussed this need during the past two years but have been unable to act due to lack of (human) resources. *Retreat participants are requested to review Composite Exhibit 3, attached, prior to this session to become familiar with these areas of discussion: please remember that our “live” time can be more productive substantively if we can focus immediately on exchanging ideas rather than having to convey descriptive information provided in these attachments.*

12:45-1:45 PM **ON-SITE GROUP LUNCH**

2:00-5:00 PM **Plenary Session Four (and Composite Exhibit 4):**
THE ANNUAL CONFERENCES, SYMPOSIA AND RELATED NEW PROJECTS: THE
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP, THE AALS HOSPITALITY SUITE &
EVENTS, THE CHICANA/O STUDIES PROPOSAL AND THE K-12 PROPOSAL

The LatCrit Annual Conferences are the most developed project of LatCrit, Inc. as reflected in the eight years of Annual Conferences we will have just completed. Next year, LatCrit IX will rotate to Philadelphia. As we well know, the process of organizing an Annual Conference requires a delicate balance between numerous and oftentimes competing objectives as well as substantial work dealing with administrative and on-site logistical issues. And because every Annual Conference involves a law review publication, the work involved in hosting an Annual Conference routinely has continued even after the conference is over and everyone has gone home. Because LatCrit is blessed with the continued involvement of an increasing number of persons, we continue to be in an excellent position to approach the Annual Conferences in a more self-consciously programmatic and substantive manner than ever before. However, we also need to step back and consider how the Annual Conferences fit into our overall evolution, and particularly in light of the portfolio of projects which we have discussed during the preceding three plenary sessions of this Retreat. This session therefore turns to the future of the Annual Conferences beyond LCX in 2005, as well as to new proposals that also create occasions for scholarly activity, collective praxis and community gatherings throughout the year. *To be prepared for this session, Retreat participants are requested to review in advance Composite Exhibit 4, attached, which presents important substantive information on these matters to help set the stage for our group discussion.*

5:00-7:00 PM **HAPPY HOUR: Call Home, Exercise, Nap, Play, Catch-Up with Readings**

7:00-9:00 PM **GROUP DINNER**

9:00-Whenever **COMMUNITY BUILDING**

Wednesday, May 7, 2003

8:00-9:15 AM **CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST (included, at hotel)**

9:30-12:30 PM **Plenary Session Five (and Composite Exhibit 5)**
INTERNAL GOVERNANCE: BYLAW REVISIONS, FISCAL PLANNING, AND
ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

The co-chair transition of the past year prompted changes in various areas of internal administration, in the situs of our community treasury, and even in the number of co-chairs (from two to three). As a result, we have been prompted to review the bylaws and our budget figures – both to ascertain how best to accomplish these adjustments in a formally correct and fiscally responsible way as well as to identify revisions to the bylaws and/or budget for structural improvements that might seem advisable in light of the transition and/or other experiences. This session is devoted to a substantive discussion of the bylaws and of our budget calculations, and of their possible revision, in light of recent experience, of our Retreat discussions during the past two days, and of other group aspirations or considerations. *To prepare for this discussion, Retreat participants are requested review Composite Exhibit 5, attached, which present both the bylaws and some areas of potential revision; in addition, Retreat participants are requested to think in advance about potential “primary sponsors” who might provide the minimum “annual seed money” (about \$3-5K) that is necessary to secure each of the programs discussed above from year to year, or alternatively, about ways and means of otherwise securing an ongoing annual financial basis for the programs prioritized in our previous Retreat sessions.*

12:30-1:45 PM **ON-SITE GROUP LUNCH**

2:00-5:00 PM **Plenary Session Six (and Composite Exhibit 6)**
WRAPPING UP AND CONCLUDING THOUGHTS: ALLOCATING TASKS AND
ORGANIZING AN INFRASTRUCTURE TO IMPLEMENT RETREAT IDEAS,
DECISIONS AND PROJECTS DURING THE COMING YEAR(S)

This concluding session is devoted to distilling the Retreat discussions of past two days into a workable plan of action that advances our goals synergistically – recognizing both our strengths and limitations as particular, finite individuals and as a diverse community of geographically diffused scholars and activists to leverage our human and other resources while reducing stress, disharmony or duplication. The basic objective of this final plenary is to ensure that everyone is on the same page on the group decisions of the past couple of days, and has a clear idea of the tasks that each of us will undertake in order to accomplish our collective aspirations as discussed during the plenary sessions; our main objective here is to get organized before we disperse until the following year, and to ensure an adequate level of progress on our various projects during the forthcoming year. *Retreat participants may prepare for this discussion by thinking in advance of how they might best focus their commitments, as well as their limited time and energy, to take advantage of our respective strengths and ameliorate our human or structural limitations, such as: (1) For which specific projects or tasks are you willing to assume responsibility during the next two-three years?; (2) How can we organize our tasks and projects to produce maximum synergies and efficiencies out of individual interests (and limitations)?; and (3) What should be our collective bottom line for the progress that we expect, as a group, to have accomplished by the time we meet for next year’s Planning Retreat in Philadelphia? In thinking about these questions, Retreat participants are requested to review and reflect on Composite Exhibit 6, attached, prior to this session.*

5:00-7:00 PM **HAPPY HOUR: Call Home, Exercise, Nap, Play, Catch-Up with Readings**

7:00-9:00 PM **GROUP DINNER**

9:00-Whenever **COMMUNITY BULDING**

APPENDIX:

ATTACHMENTS AND COMPOSITE EXHIBITS

This Appendix contains six “Composite Exhibits” that correspond to the six Plenary Sessions of the Third Annual LatCrit Planning Retreat as set forth in the Retreat Agenda and Schedule of Activities. The Composite Exhibits are numbered sequentially to match the Plenary Session to which they pertain. Each Composite Exhibit contains documents and other attachments that provide the necessary background information on the projects set for discussion in each of the Retreat’s Plenary Session. Retreat participants are requested to familiarize themselves with each of the Composite Exhibits *prior* to the relevant session so that we are all better able to participate effectively and substantively in each discussion session. To facilitate this kind of advance preparation, the Retreat Agenda includes a two-hour Daily Break between 5:00-7:00 PM that opens time for readings pertaining to the following day’s sessions. The Composite Exhibits focus on the following topics:

Composite Exhibit 1 provides overview information on the LatCrit Portfolio of Projects and similar kinds of documents that enable all Retreat participants to become familiar with the overall status quo of LatCrit group projects; these documents effectively provide a baseline of background information for all of the Retreat’s discussion sessions.

Composite Exhibit 2 provides background information on the two main programs that we launched last year – the Student Scholar Program and the Critical Global Classroom – as well as the Colloquium on Interanational and Comparative Law that is meeting in Buenos Aires this August 12-14th as part of the Critical Global Classroom curriculum; these three program jointly form a key part of the “international move” that we have discussed during the past several years.

Composite Exhibit 3 provides background information on projects and programs that have received Board approval and are under active development, and that thus point to some of the priorities we face during the coming year(s); in programmatic terms, these projects reinforce the “international move” begun in part through the programs discussed in the preceding session.

Composite Exhibit 4 provides background information on several new projects that are being proposed or have recently been initiated, and which invite discussion as a whole because, as a set, they effectively would establish an annual calendar of “domestic” (in the U.S.) group events; approached as a whole, these projects hopefully can be arranged to provide a regularized flow of meetings and gatherings that minimize scheduling conflicts and maximize programmatic synergies.

Composite Exhibit 5 provides background information on matters pertaining to internal corporate self-governance, including fiscal planning; these documents are designed to enable a group discussion of the internal reforms or adjustments that we may want to implement over the next year to help reinforce our institutional infrastructure in light of our shared experiences, principles and aspirations.

Composite Exhibit 6 provides forward-looking materials that itemize the kinds of tasks and actions that we need to allocate amongst ourselves to ensure that our planning discussions turn into concrete actions; these materials aim to ensure appropriate human resources for all Retreat decisions.

COMPOSITE EXHIBIT 1

Six documents comprise Composite Exhibit 1, which are presented in reverse chronological order as background materials for the first session and Working Lunch on Monday, May 5, 2003. These documents, as a set, are designed to provide all retreat participants with the substantive background to participate actively in this first discussion session.

A: The first document is the “LatCrit Portfolio of Projects” that sets forth the group projects and events that we currently have underway, or under consideration, or in active development. This document provides an overview of LatCrit projects and programs as of this summer and is probably the single most important document to review carefully prior to the Retreat’s commencement.

B: The second document is the “LatCrit Project Action List” that itemizes the various priorities that face us as a group in the development of the various projects described in the Portfolio of Projects. To provide context, this document should be read in conjunction with the Portfolio.

C: The third document is the “Officers Memo” dated March 18, 2003 detailing some of the work that the Co-chairs, the Secretary and the Treasurer have been striving to accomplish leading up to the LCVIII conference in Cleveland. This document provides the most recent snap shot of our collective status quo and plans.

D: The fourth document is a “Co-Chair’s Report” to the LatCrit Board, dated December 30, 2002, which sets out a comprehensive view of the various institutional and programmatic issues and projects that are underway or being planned. This document provides the single most comprehensive report and discussion of recent history and current opportunities, proposals and plans.

E: The fifth document is the Minutes from last year’s Planning Retreat, held in Oregon immediately after the LCVII conference. This document provides a sense of where the Retreat planning process left off last year.

F: The sixth and final document in this Composite Exhibit is the Minutes from the first Planning Retreat, held two years ago in Miami immediately after the LCVI conference. This document provides a good sense of the Retreat’s history and purposes, and outlines the “big-picture” questions or themes with which we began these gatherings.

COMPOSITE EXHIBIT 2

Six documents or attachments comprise Composite Exhibit 2, which are presented in accordance with their relevance to the particular projects that the Retreat Agenda and Schedule of Activities indicates are set for discussion during the Retreat's second session, on Monday, May 5, 2003. Generally, the projects designated for discussion during Plenary Session Two are those that we initiated during this academic year based on last year's Retreat discussions. As a set, these six documents provide background on each project so that Retreat participants are better able to engage in this discussion.

A: The first attachment consists of three documents: the Student Scholar Program Brochure, the Call for Papers and Applications, and the Student Scholar Program Poster, which jointly explain the background and purpose of this new project. This Call, Brochure and Poster, were mailed to the entire LatCrit Master Mailing List (of 1500 recipients) last September to initiate this new program.

B: The second attachment is the Student Scholar Application Packet, which provides the materials that student applicants must complete and return by January of each year to participate in that year's Student Scholar selection process. These materials are posted on the website for students to download, complete and submit.

C: The third document is the Student Scholar Bios for the 2003 Student Scholars, which were selected on the basis of their application materials and are the inaugural class of this new program.

D: The fourth document in Composite Exhibit 2 is the Critical Global Classroom brochure, which explains the background and purpose of this project. This brochure, along with the Critical Global Classroom Poster, was mailed out to the entire LatCrit Master Mailing List this spring to initiate this new program.

E: The fifth document is the Critical Global Classroom Poster, which provides substantially similar information as the brochure. The Poster is included here so that Retreat participants may have a good sense of the outreach materials employed in conjunction with this new program.

F: The sixth document is the Call for Papers and Panels for the LatCrit Colloquium on International and Comparative Law, which explains the history of this Colloquium series as well as the upcoming Colloquium in Buenos Aires on August 12-14, 2003 as part of the Critical Global Classroom curriculum. This document is provided both in English and in Spanish.

COMPOSITE EXHIBIT 3

Four documents comprise Composite Exhibit 3, which again are presented in accordance to their relevance to particular projects set for discussion in Plenary Session 3, on Tuesday, May 6, 2003. This session, as the Retreat Agenda and Schedule of Activities explains, is designed to focus our attention on project under active development designed to continue the “international move” that the projects discussed in the preceding session began. As a set, these five documents are designed to familiarize Retreat participants with the necessary background to discuss the future direction of these planned initiatives.

A: The first document is the one-page undated proposal that we received from the Dean of the Inter-American University of Puerto Rico School of Law in December 2002. This five-part proposal envisions a close and long-term relationship between that institution and LatCrit that can be synergistic with many of the plans and hopes that we’ve embraced during the past several years.

B: The second attachment consists of two documents. The first is the counter-proposal dated March 10, 2003 that we presented the Dean after the LatCrit Board meeting in January 2003 (in Washington DC) to respond formally to his proposals. This counter-proposal was the basis of a meeting between the Dean and LatCrit Co-Chair Frank Valdes to follow-up on these discussions. At that meeting, the Dean agreed to the counter-proposal. The second document is a conceptual summary of the inter-related projects associated with these proposals and plans.

C: The third document provides information on NGOs and the accreditation process with the United Nations, the first necessary step in making this project operational. This document provides background information on the procedures and tasks involved in activating the LatCrit NGO so that Retreat participants may better discuss how to design the development of this project during the next year or so in ways that are synergistic with other ongoing or planned projects.

D: The fourth document is the undated “LatCrit Website Memorandum” that we prepared last summer after the Planning Retreat to solicit help with the redesign and upgrade of our website. This memo outlines the basic needs we have with respect to our website, needs that grow in urgency and complexity as our projects continue to expand and to become more international. The web redesign is a top priority for this coming year.

COMPOSITE EXHIBIT 4

Four documents or attachments comprise Composite Exhibit 4, which again are organized around the particular projects designated for discussion during Plenary Session 4, on Tuesday, May 6, 2003. These projects turn our attention back to the Annual Conferences and other ongoing or proposed projects in light of the discussions on international programs held in the preceding sessions. As a set, these documents invite Retreat participants to think about our portfolio of projects holistically so that we may arrange our resources as synergistically as possible to accomplish our common aims.

A: The first document is a memo that explains the background of the new Faculty Development Workshop that we initiated this year on the day before the LCVIII conference to consider how this effort might become a joint project of LatCrit and SALT (Society of American Law Teachers), who has been undertaking similar efforts during the past two years. Discussions between SALT and LatCrit officers, as well as other folks, indicates a widely shared interest in partnering on this type of project, making the time ripe for concrete discussions and decisions.

B: The second document is the Calendar of Suite Events at the LatCrit Hospitality Suite during the AALS (Association of American Law Schools) annual meeting in January 2003. This year was our first with the LatCrit-at-AALS Hospitality Suite, and it provided a mid-year venue for multiple activities ranging from Board meetings to community discussions and festivities.

C: The third document is the proposal for the initiation of a LatCrit-Chicana/o studies project, which aims to foster substantive interconnection between Chicana/os studies and LatCrit theory in programmatic, sustainable terms. The proposal envisions a series of gatherings to commence in the upcoming academic year.

D: The fourth attachment in Composite Exhibit 4 is a page from the December 2003 Co-Chair Report to the Board that contemplates the possibility of shifting the Annual Conferences to a biennial calendar. This document is provided to focus attention and spur discussion of basic questions regarding the role of each event or program in our growing Portfolio of Projects in relationship to all our other events and programs – and, in particular, in light of the programs discussed in this and preceding sessions that create new and additional opportunities for community gatherings throughout the academic year.

COMPOSITE EXHIBIT 5

Four documents or attachments comprise Composite Exhibit 5, which are organized around pending issues of internal governance that are set for discussion during Plenary Session 5 on Wednesday, May 7, 2003. These documents as a set are designed to invite wide-ranging feedback on basic issues of group self-governance to ensure a smooth, vibrant and solidaristic future for the projects that we have been discussing in the previous sessions.

A: The first document is the LatCrit Bylaws as they currently read so that Retreat participants may become familiar with them prior to this session.

B: The second attachment is a page from the Officers' Memo dated March 18, 2003 that focuses specifically on areas of Bylaw revision and fiscal planning so that Retreat participants may become familiar with some of the issues that are likely to come up for discussion during this session.

C: The third attachment is a page from the Co-Chair Report to the Board dated December 30, 2002 that focuses in more detail on current and projected budgetary needs to secure a stable fiscal platform for our growing portfolio of projects.

D: The fourth attachment in Composite Exhibit 5 also is a page from the Co-Chair Report to the Board dated December 30, 2002 that focuses on co-chair terms and transition cycles so that Retreat participants may consider questions of bylaw revision, fiscal planning and project development in light of co-chair cycles during the next several years.

COMPOSITE EXHIBIT 6

Two documents comprise Composite Exhibit 6, both of which are designed to ensure that we conclude the sixth and final Plenary Session of this year's Planning Retreat not only with a plan of action for the upcoming year, but also with specific tasks allocated or claimed by individuals interested in working on particular projects or programs. As a pair, these documents are designed to ensure that our Retreat decisions are properly staffed so that decisions become actions. Please review these carefully as we prepare to conclude so that we can distribute our collective human resources – our selves – in the most productive ways possible in light of individual preferences and circumstances.

A: The first document is the “LatCrit Portfolio of Projects” that sets forth the group projects and events that we currently have underway, or under consideration, or in active development. This document, introduced earlier in the Retreat during Plenary Session 1, provides an overview of LatCrit projects and programs as of this summer, and is probably the single most important document to review carefully to obtain an overall sense of where we are as a group.

B: The second document in Composite Exhibit 6 is the “LatCrit Project Action List” that itemizes the various priorities that face us as a group in the development of the various projects described in the Portfolio of Projects. This document also was introduced earlier, during Plenary Session 1. As explained previously, this document should be read in conjunction with the Portfolio.



WWW.LATCRIT.ORG

LATCRIT@LAW.MIAMI.EDU

Minutes for Third Annual LatCrit Planning Retreat

May 5-7, 2003

Cleveland, Ohio

Present: Roberto Corrada (Denver); Belkys Torres (Miami); Martin Saavedra (Argentina); Odeana Neal (Baltimore); Peggy Maisel (Florida International); Hugo Rojas (Chile); Nancy Ehrenreich (Denver); Frank Rudy Cooper (Villanova); Beth Lyon (Villanova); Tayyab Mahmud (Cleveland-Marshall); Thomas Mitchell (Wisconsin); Margaret Montoya (UNM); Angela Harris (UC Berkeley); Robert Westley (Tulane); Gil Carrasco (Willamette); Steve Bender (Oregon); Jairus Grove (Chicago/Texas).

Present for the CGC session only: Jack Guttenberg (Cleveland-Marshall)

The meeting began at 11:45 a.m. After introductions, Angela began by saying that LatCrit is at a crossroads. Until this point LatCrit has really been Lisa and Frank. Now Lisa has left the board, and Frank would like to cut back on his participation. The big question for us is how we can sustain our energy and spread out the work, particularly as we take on more and more projects.

The group briefly reviewed Tab 1, Composite Exhibit 1 and the projects described in it. A discussion of the annual conference followed. Frank Rudy and several others expressed the view that keeping the annual conference annual was important because it is an important way of attracting and integrating new people. Belkys pointed out that the North-South exchange will be annual and could be the attraction in the off years. Angela asked whether the Junior Faculty Development Workshop, particularly if attached to the SALT teaching conference and the AALS teaching conference and annual meeting, could also be a substitute. Frank Rudy felt that these workshops would get junior faculty excited about LatCrit but then in the "off" years they would have nowhere to go with this excitement. He suggested that perhaps the conference should be smaller in the "off" years and aimed specifically at junior folks.

Thomas expressed a desire, as an outsider, for some explanation of LatCrit principles, noting that when he first heard the term "LatCrit" he assumed we were simply a Latino/a identity group. The discussion then turned to the principles in the materials under "Day 1: Taking Stock." Angela gave a brief explanation of each of the principles. Margaret then added other principles. In her view LatCrit is also:

- hybridity based
- committed to “multilinguality”
- border conscious
- transparent
- accountable
- counter-colonial.

Other principles offered were: under anti-essentialism, attention to gender and sexuality issues, and a commitment to balancing representation on panels and committees in terms of various identity groups; under multi-dimensionality, gender equity, the need for native voices, and multi-ethnicity; and under community building, helping new scholars, and a commitment to peer review (providing readers for articles in progress, mentorship, hiring). Margaret expressed her continuing concern that LatCrit does not successfully provide a space for indigenous voices.

Hugo wondered whether this long list of principles were really “principles” at all, and suggested that the group should define a short list of core principles from which other derivative values might flow.

Jairus suggested that attention to class issues would be valuable for LatCrit. He noted that it is difficult for people from nonprofits and NGOs to attend the conference, since they cannot get reimbursement from their institutions. Class is important in terms of substance too, as panels concerning local issues can reach out to the local working class.

Belkys noted that as a scholar in English she felt completely alienated at the most recent conference and concluded that she would not invite her colleagues to attend. She challenged the group to decide whether it is truly committed to inter-disciplinarity, which would require big changes in the conference’s substance. Others noted that it is difficult to keep scholars from other disciplines attending from year to year. The group expressed interest in returning to this discussion at a later point.

Returning to Hugo’s point, Nancy suggested that the values the group had articulated could be put into a matrix form. She suggested the following arrangement:

antissubordination

class, hybridity, gender, sexuality, race, anti-colonial

multidimensionality

theory-praxis, local-global, interdisciplinarity

community building

nurturing new scholars, multilinguality, transparency, accountability, inclusiveness, institutional support

antiessentialism

border consciousness, multilinguality

critical/self-critical
ethical

Hugo approved of the matrix and noted that it is important for jurisprudence scholars from the South to have a concise list of principles that define LatCrit. It is not adequate to tell a story of origins ('there's a history to that . . .').

After lunch, Margaret gave a presentation on "**Localization of LatCrit Theory and Practice**" (see handout). After reviewing the material presented in the handout, she noted that ARTI is working with Pizarro and Montoya to bring antiracism pedagogy into Albuquerque. She suggested that localization of LatCrit has some fundraising potential. There are people looking for the kinds of tools and takes LatCrit offers on racism and power. Margaret sees this, primarily, however, as a K-12 project. Racism needs to be engaged at the K-12 level. She and Jairus agreed that student involvement is critical; excellent curriculum materials are not enough if students do not feel empowered by the learning process (the "banking" model in which students are treated as empty vessels to be filled with knowledge). It is also important to train teachers to use the materials.

What can LatCrit do to support these projects? Margaret expressed the need for help in pulling together materials and, importantly, translating LatCrit articles and essays into versions accessible to high school audiences. It was suggested that LatCrit scholars should make the commitment to create two versions of everything they want to make accessible – one for academic audiences and one for popular audiences.

Nancy and Robert noted that hours of videotape have been shot of various conferences and that this material could be edited for use in high school classrooms. Jairus suggested that CD-ROM is a good format for high school use. Nancy will bring a digital camera next year and will videotape the opening introduction session as each person explains why LatCrit is important to him/her.

Odeana gave a presentation on **the Critical Global Classroom**. She noted that the project is undersubscribed this year, but that the group had made a commitment to go forward anyway. Next year should be better because materials now exist and can be used as a recruitment tool.

Several people expressed the view that given the crucial relationship of the CGC to LatCrit's ability to generate its own financial resources, every board member should treat CGC recruitment as a fiduciary responsibility.

Odeana asked for discussion on the point that there is a tension between the program's profitability and its accessibility to people who LatCrit genuinely wants to reach. The program is very expensive and out of reach for many students. Several suggestions were made in regard to this:

- Student funding through public interest summer fellowship programs

- Publicize the program in departments other than the law school
- Seek foundation funding for the program (for instance the Open Space Institute)
- This is a dynamic process; in the early years the students will mainly be privileged, but as the program continues and resources are banked there will be the opportunity for scholarships

Margaret expressed the concern that those interested in the program will want to know whether the people participating from the host country are people with the right values. It was suggested that a short history of the program's development be compiled. The history should make reference to specific collaborations (i.e. mention key names) and mention the anti-colonialist roots of the enterprise.

Robert suggested that the pricing for the CGC should reflect the price for other similar programs available in each school. Odeana asked what the median price of summer abroad programs was, in total and per credit. What do students usually pay for summer school? Jack suggested that the ABA collects this information and that deans should have it in a looseleaf binder.

Regarding recruitment techniques, Jack expressed the view that posters are expensive yet useless. He suggested that in his experience with Cleveland-Marshall's summer program in Russia, the best way to recruit is through individual faculty members, and the second best way is through other students. He suggested requiring participating students to take pictures of the program and later give presentations on the program at their home schools. These presentations could be standardized by creating a PowerPoint presentation. Jairus will compile a list of all university programs having to do with race and ethnicity.

Beth Lyon gave a short pitch for the **need to recruit more clinicians to the LatCrit conference**, particularly the Villanova conference. She asked for some history on whether clinicians have previously been involved with LatCrit and if so, to what extent.

Margaret noted that she began as a clinician and has written several articles that would be interesting to clinicians. She then named other clinicians who have participated in LatCrit, including Peggy Maisel, Alicia Alvarez, Sue Bryant, Jean Koh-Peters. She suggested that the Clinicians of Color would be a key subgroup to sponsor participation or to be invited. There was some discussion of whether Clinicians of Color is an active organization.

Some hurdles to clinician participation were identified. The annual clinical conference is the second weekend in May. Clinicians often do not have the financial resources to attend more than one conference, and their annual conference provides the same community-building function as LatCrit does for its constituency. It was suggested in response that perhaps clinicians can be persuaded to come in for one day. However, it is a LatCrit principle that participants should stay for the whole conference in order to become part of the community. Perhaps a few key senior clinicians can be persuaded to come.

It was noted that clinician-LatCrit engagement should be a two-way street. There should be some LatCrit participation at the clinical conference. Margaret noted that this has happened in

the past.

Thomas gave a short presentation on his **externship program involving native American and African American land tenure**. The program has sites on Indian reservations, colonias, and in North Carolina and Appalachia. Currently, many schools in addition to Wisconsin have students that participate in the clinic, including students from UNM, UNLV, and Howard. Participating students travel to these areas for ten days, write papers, and send the papers back to the communities. The program has been praised as cutting-edge, and yet Wisconsin will not provide adequate support. Other schools Thomas has approached have wanted to limit the clinic to their own students only.

It was suggested that some schools might be amenable to opening up the program without trying to capture it. Nell Newton and Rennard Strickland were mentioned as deans that might be willing to work with the program. The issue was marked by the group as worthy of further exploration regarding LatCrit involvement.

The meeting ended at 5:00 p.m.

Minutes for LatCrit Retreat, 5/6/03
Angela Harris, secretary

Present: Belkys Torres (Miami); Martin Saavedra (Argentina); Odeana Neal (Baltimore); Hugo Rojas (Chile); Nancy Ehrenreich (Denver); Frank Rudy Cooper (Villanova); Beth Lyon (Villanova); Tayyab Mahmud (Cleveland-Marshall); Thomas Mitchell (Wisconsin); Frank Valdes (Miami); Angela Harris (UC Berkeley); Robert Westley (Tulane); Gil Carrasco (Willamette); Steve Bender (Oregon); Jairus Grove (Chicago/Texas).

The morning session began at 10:00 with Angela's report on and a discussion of **the Student Scholar Program (SSP)**. The program was very successful this year. Problems in the future will probably stem from its very success. There are at least two: (1) in terms of program administration, if the number of submissions increases dramatically it will be increasingly difficult to constitute a committee and to get it to reach consensus; and (2) the program needs a stable funding base.

Frank suggested that as to funding, Jerome had indicated that Duke might be willing to provide \$5000 per year and Boalt \$2500 per year, plus covering the costs of mailing, the brochure and posters, and so on. It was noted that for next year, the deadline could be Martin Luther King, Jr. Day (or the day after) and the program could be designated the Martin Luther King, Jr. Fellowship. This would create a funding opportunity for the Martin Luther King Jr. Foundation in Atlanta. The AALS annual meeting is in Atlanta next year and this would be a good time to talk to people at the foundation. Jairus cautioned that the foundation people are very touchy about the use of the name. It would be better to approach them before renaming the fellowship.

There was some discussion of where the Student Scholar papers will be published. It could be either in the symposium issue or wherever the Colloquium papers are published (the

LatCrit law review). It might be more helpful for the students in terms of their careers to be published in established law reviews. However, perhaps the students should make the choice. Steve noted that the number of pages allotted to the symposium by the law review is an issue. We typically go to 1000-1100 pages, which is well above the 500 page limit, so for next year the Villanova Law Review will need a partner. Seton Hall was mentioned as a possibility.

Frank noted that there had been some brief discussion at the conference about enabling Student Scholars to make a choice between attending the CGC and participating in Thomas's externship program. However, it was agreed that this possibility is for future development and not for the coming year.

There was some discussion about revising the SSP brochure. Hugo suggested that it would be good to have the revisions and the poster finished before July so they could be distributed at the CGC. Nancy suggested that next year's brochure include something about this year's winners. Frank suggested that a Spanish-language version of the brochure would be a good idea. There are companies that can do translations of this sort for about \$7.00 per hour. However, Steve has a research assistant who could do it this summer; the updates should be sent to him.

Regarding paper submissions: Belkys suggested that it is necessary to specify that the papers should be law-related, since this is in fact what we expect. Martin noted that if the publicity is translated into Spanish, we should be prepared to receive a lot more papers in Spanish and on Latin-American themes. Martin, Hugo, and Pedro Malavet are all willing to be committee members to read the papers in Spanish. Frank Rudy noted a mistake in the word limit. Seminar papers are usually no more than 7500 words, which is thirty pages. However, Martin pointed out that you need more words to say the same thing in Spanish, so the better word limit would be 10,000 words.

Frank expressed the desire for this year's Student Scholars to come back next year. Perhaps there should be a panel for past scholars, and past scholars could receive a discounted rate the second year. Then they would be on their own. Past scholars could also participate in mentoring the new scholars. Perhaps a panel should be organized for Student Scholars on getting into academia. This could be part of the Junior Faculty Development Workshop.

The next topic of discussion was a **return to Thomas Mitchell's externship program**. Frank suggested that we could make the student stipends \$5000 each in order to permit participating students to attend the LatCrit conference. For five externships, we just need eight schools to give \$3000 each. Possible contributing schools included Villanova, University of Florida, University of Connecticut, American University, Denver, Wisconsin, University of New Mexico, Seattle, St. Mary's, and NYU. Gerald Lopez could possibly help out the program, as could Gerald Torres at Texas. The National Lawyers Guild, the HNBA, and the National Bar Association are also possible sponsors. The group can be developing sponsorships this year and next year. Nancy mentioned a consortium of schools in the Northeast developed by AALS, which is intended to encourage students to think about doing pro bono work "on the side" even if they are not going to work as public interest lawyers.

Another funding model is to have organizations each fund a student or students. Local

organizations like the HNBA could fund a student. National BALSA could also fund a student, which would help give them a sense of ownership. Law firms are another possible target, although Thomas has tried this route already with only modest success. Jairus could contact the Texas Bar.

John Powell's institute was mentioned as yet another source of funding. We could ask John for \$20,000 per year to fund the program. To accommodate John's interest in the Americas, students from other countries could be participants. Odeana suggested that we speak to Paula Johnson regarding her program in Zimbabwe.

In terms of an action plan, this summer we will conceptualize the revamped program, update the materials, and identify funding targets. In the fall we will do active fundraising. By February we can move to outreach. The program can also be showcased at the clinicians' conference. Beth suggested that Dan Fuller at the University of Alabama does work with rural clinics and would be a good partner for Thomas. She will talk with him. She will also talk about the program at this year's conference and will mention LatCrit IX.

The next topic was the **Colloquium**. This group has met periodically already; this year it will be meeting in conjunction with the CGC. The purpose is to cultivate interest in what's happening at the host site and connect local people with LatCrit. The long-term purpose is developing "cells of subversion."

Thus far the colloquium has been supported by the University of Miami; it needs \$5000 minimum to operate. It is free to participants; the program provides box lunches, and rooms for some key people, but no travel. This year the call for papers is in Spanish as well as English. The deadline is May 15-May 30. In the past, papers have been published in the University of Miami's comparative law journal, in the La Raza Law Journal, and in a book. This year, they will probably appear in the LatCrit law journal. There are five standing themes, which are the themes of the CGC.

We need to decide how to fund the Colloquium. Perhaps John Powell could fund it as a "critical partnership." It has definitely sparked interest beyond LatCrit people: John Calmore and Bob Cottrell, for example, are interested and about 100 people attended in Chile.

This year the Colloquium is housing the South Africa CGC people. The group should encourage everyone they know who has ties to South Africa to come to the Colloquium this year. Thomas mentioned that Heinz Klug would be a great connection. Beth noted that Danny Bradlow at American University is in with the IMF/World Bank and can help secure funding. Penny Andrews and Adrien Wing are also key people. It was noted, however, that if the Colloquium grows we will not be able to feed everybody.

Presentations must be in English in order to secure CGC credit, because ABA regulations require 220 minutes of instruction in English for accreditation. Martin noted that some people will be repelled by this English-language requirement. The best solution would be simultaneous translation. The Open Space Institute might be approached to provide this. Jairus will give Odeana the name of a contact person at the OSI. OSI has provided translation in the past for his

debate teams.

The group then discussed the **Puerto Rico projects**. Discussion of the **Policy and Theory Institute** was deferred until the Board retreat.

The purposes of the **South-North Exchange** are to bring an annual event to Interamerican University; to disseminate outsider jurisprudence; and to cultivate South-North networks. These elements are non-negotiable for the dean, who pays for the event. However, the topic of the exchange is up for grabs. It might be “interdisciplinary studies.”

The dean would like there to be a course that students can enroll in, partly so that a LatCrit Student Association can be formed to prepare students for doing work on the journal. If such a course is embedded in the South-North Exchange, it could also be spun off as a **LatCrit seminar** (a traveling road show).

Celina’s REG project has been an interdisciplinary conversation on developing new theories of democracy that will better address racial injustice. This group will be meeting in December at the same time as the South-North Exchange. If these events are folded into one another, the format might consist of a morning program that would be a class on outsider jurisprudence for the students (covering LatCrit principles, and so on). The afternoon would be a session based on the call for papers.

Jorge Esquirol, Hugo, Martin, and Celina will give lists of names to Frank. In September an email will go out announcing the exchange. The event itself might be either a planning event or an actual substantive exchange.

The **LatCrit law journal** will be published twice a year, and its contents will be a combination of symposia and individual articles (perhaps one or two individual articles). We need to constitute a board of directors that is expansive and interdisciplinary. The journal will be published in both Spanish and English, and everyone needs to get their school to subscribe to it. The first issue should appear in the spring of 2004.

Angela said she is uncomfortable with “LatCrit Law Journal” as the title. What about an interdisciplinary journal titled something like “Law and Subordination” or “Law/Culture/Politics”? Nancy suggested “Critical Networks.” Robert suggested the “Race, Ethnicity and Gender Justice Journal.” Frank believed that the dean will be willing to discuss a new title. We should solicit title ideas from our membership.

Angela suggested that each issue could revolve around a substantive theme. Frank suggested that the themes could be tied to the South-North Exchange themes. Each year we could solicit people to develop a theme. Martin suggested that the Cardozo Law Journal is a good model of a truly interdisciplinary law journal.

Over the summer we will develop an editorial board. In the meantime we will send out an email with a call for papers, call for subscriptions, a solicitation for titles, and feedback on the mission statement. The call for papers can also be taken to Law and Society. Roberto, Nancy,

and Angela can draft the mission statement and send it to Frank. In the fall we will constitute the editorial board, and prepare for the colloquium papers, which are due in September. Editing will be done in October, November, and December.

The LatCrit website. Frank noted that we have been trying to get all the symposia online. LatCrit I is online. We have tried to make it a practice to ask law reviews for 100 hard copies for distribution, and then to ask to put the symposium online one year after it comes out in hard copy. Now, however, we need someone to go back and actually do it. (Some journals only have tables of contents online.) Steve noted that journals are reluctant to give up the materials, but will allow links from their own sites.

Other website tasks are also necessary: (1) to redesign our site to make it more dynamic; (2) to make the site more interactive, so that, for example, conferees can register online; (3) to find a permanent home for the website other than the University of Miami. Robert will follow up with someone he knows who can be paid to undertake the redesign. Jairus noted that Yahoo! can host a listserv for free, and noted that Web design is getting cheaper and cheaper. We can expect to spend about \$500 on the redesign project. With respect to the permanent home, it is more cost-effective to rent space on someone else's server than to buy our own.

Next year's conference at Villanova. Frank Rudy and Beth passed out a handout with talking points. There was some discussion about location – whether the conference should be in downtown Philadelphia or at Villanova, or whether the retreat could be at Villanova and the conference downtown. Tayyab suggested that the Philadelphia Visitors Convention Bureau might be a font of information. The proposed dates are April 29 - May 5, with the Junior Faculty Development Workshop scheduled for April 28.

There was some discussion about the symposium project which follows the conference. Frank noted that law review editors often treat pieces as stand-alone when they are really not; they come in clusters. If we organize them into clusters first, then the editors won't have a chance to reject pieces individually. Steve noted that there will be two law reviews participating so we need two sets of clusters. He suggested that Frank Rudy and Beth give themselves a couple of weeks before the students come back to work on creating the clusters, and urged them to think early about cluster introductions which took a lot of time last year.

Tayyab raised the issue of whether the faculty editors should engage in substantive screening. In the past we have been exploited by certain authors whose work is not really LatCrit. There are also authors who have engaged in "gut and stuff," submitting essays that ballooned into tenure-piece length. Essays need to be made leaner. Steve suggested that the cluster introducers can be the last line of defense, but there is not a lot of time for revision at this point.

The idea of a committee to assist Frank Rudy, Beth, and Tayyab was floated. The committee could be a sounding board for problematic pieces and cluster suggestions. Names for the committee included Keith Aoki, Steve Bender, Nancy Ehrenreich, Berta, Roberto, and Belkys.

The group then discussed convergences with clinicians. Thomas noted that a lot of clinicians need venues in which to publish. The LatCrit symposia might be attractive precisely because these consist of essay-size pieces. However, Nancy noted that the LatCrit symposium might be a low-prestige venue from the schools' perspectives. With respect to getting clinicians to come to the conference, Beth asked about a reduced fee. Odeana suggested there should be a price differential between tenure/tenure track faculty and "others," which could encompass clinicians who are not treated as tenure track faculty, students, and activists. Steve noted that in the past meals have cost about \$200-\$225 and the conference fee has been about \$75-\$100. Attendees who are not being supported by an institution might also consider sharing a hotel room.

Frank pointed out that there is now a conference planning template to make planning easier, outlined in the "overview of program activities" in this year's program. The conference always includes five plenaries, three keynotes, concurrent panels, and an opening roundtable on current events. With respect to keynote speakers, suggestions included Cynthia McKinney, Michael Moore, Amativa Kumar (sp?), author of "Passport Photos," Paul Bove, Vasouki Nesai, and Henry Giroux. Jairus can talk to Giroux. Next year's substantive themes are (1) education and (2) beyond backlash politics. Hugo and Martin noted that "backlash" is a North American term not recognized elsewhere in the Americas. "Kulturkampf" would be a more widely recognized term. Frank and Beth will think about titles that combine these two ideas.

Frank Rudy gave a short report on the **Junior Faculty Development Workshop**. He has received a favorable response to the idea of having four events spread over the year. Nancy expressed concern over the human resources necessary to cover this. Frank Rudy noted that SALT will take the lead on the teaching conference session. Suggestions for future improvement included breaking out into small groups by stage in teaching; more questions in advance; more hands-on events; getting participants to commit to feedback time; and providing more handouts. Thomas suggested that the niche LatCrit fills is critical theory; pedagogy is covered in other sorts of junior faculty development programs.

The meeting adjourned around 4:30 p.m.

Minutes for LatCrit Retreat, 5/7/03
Angela Harris, secretary

Present: Martin Saavedra (Argentina); Odeana Neal (Baltimore); Hugo Rojas (Chile); Frank Rudy Cooper (Villanova); Beth Lyon (Villanova); Tayyab Mahmud (Cleveland-Marshall); Frank Valdes (Miami); Angela Harris (UC Berkeley); Robert Westley (Tulane); Jairus Grove (Chicago/Texas).

This session was devoted to creating project teams and plans for action.

1. **Annual conference.** Frank Rudy and Beth will send title/them ideas to the listserv (which Odeana will create, composed of the Board plus the retreat participants); create a save-the-date postcard; and send hotel contracts to Steve, Pedro, and Roberto for advice and comment. Jairus suggested that there should be a bibliography of readings related to the conference themes.

Pedro and Roberto were suggested as people who would work on this.

Frank will update the brochure and flyer and fed-ex to Beth.

2. **Website.** Robert will follow up with his friend; Frank will follow up with Beatriz's cousin. Regarding the Spanish version of the website, Martin noted that he can do the translation. Jairus can find out pricing information and will talk to Beatriz regarding finding a new home for the site. Hugo will talk to Roberto about becoming the webmaster. The timeline is 2-3 weeks for these tasks.

3. **NGO:** Angela and Frank will talk to Berta.

4. **CGC and SSP.** There was some discussion over whether the colloquium will always be part of the CGC. Angela will revise the SSP materials before July in order to send them to Hugo for the CGC, and will keep in contact with Beth regarding the conference materials (target for completion: September 10) and with Odeana regarding the CGC materials (target for completion: October 1).

In the summer, we will approach Boalt and Duke about being co-sponsors. In the fall we will approach the Martin Luther King, Jr. foundation people.

5. **Junior Faculty Development Workshop.** Hugo and Martin can give talks in Spanish. Frank Rudy will constitute a planning committee with Alfreda, Adele, Devon, and Holly.

6. **Policy-Theory Institute:** we will contact Celina next year.

7. **South-North Exchange:** Frank will work on creating contacts. Martin and Hugo will be on the project team along with Frank, Angel Oquendo, Angela, Robert. The conversations can begin during the summer so a call for papers can go out September 1. The dates and formats need to be finalized.

8. **LatCrit Seminar.** This will take place in Puerto Rico this December.

9. **LatCrit journal.** Action items include determining the name; creating a subscription base; constituting an editorial board; writing a mission statement; and working with the dean at Interamerican to develop the support network of staff and students. The project team will include Angela, Nancy, Frank, Roberto, Robert, Belkys, Martin, and Hugo. Frank will send a letter to the dean of Interamerican. There will be a meeting with the dean on May 30.

10. **Chicano/a Studies Project.** Frank will send an email to Kevin Johnson encouraging him to follow up along with Guadalupe Luna, Mary Romero, and Steve Bender.

11. **K-12 Education Project.** Margaret will follow up with the people who signed the sheet volunteering to help.

12. **Land Tenure Externship Project.** Thomas and Robert will work on redrafting the

materials. Angela and Thomas will speak regarding approaching John Powell. Our suggestions to John will include (1) making the program hemispheric (adding students from the South) and (2) adding a trip to the LatCrit conference to the program (requiring an extra \$1000 per person).

Finally, everyone should send an email to Tayyab's dean thanking him for hosting this year's conference.