**EDI Committee Meeting 4 Minutes**

19 August 2020, 10:00-11 PDT

Zoomscape

Chair: Sara Stevens (she, hers)

Members in attendance: AES (she, hers), DL, ZA (she, hers), JB (he, his)

Not in attendance: CM (she, hers), CO (she, hers), IR

Agenda Overview

Request volunteer to take minutes (recent: SS, JB, ZA)

Review and approve minutes from previous meeting

Follow-up on Alumni membership: call for nominations

Follow-up from Intro workshop planning + meeting with SSF

Airtable for EDI Committee - review, discuss, set goals

Consultations with SALA constituencies

Other business?

Minutes

1. DL will take minutes for this meeting
2. Minutes from last meeting approved.
3. Followup on Alumni membership: call for nomination
	1. DL shared his progress on the call for nomination message
	2. JB: commented that both bio and statement of interest should be required to be filled by the nominee

SS: suggested that there should be a word limit of 200 for the statement

* 1. SS: commented that we should set a deadline for the nomination as early as beginning of Sep

JB: commented that the deadline is very tight and thought that end of the month is a more realistic timeline

SS: commented that we should send the nomination form before school starts, conclude the nomination in end of Sep, and have the alumni join us in early Oct

* 1. ZA: commented that we should clarify the requirement and responsibility for the alumni, e.g. the frequency of the meeting (bi-weekly or once per three weeks),
	2. ZA: commented that the format should only be self-nomination and everyone agreed

JB: suggested that we should encourage students, faculty and alumni to urge their alumni peers to self-nominate themselves

* 1. SS: questioned about how the nomination form will be shared to the alumni

JB: questioned about the alumni archive, and what kind of presentation method we are using for the nomination form

SS: suggested that Qualtrics survey is the conventional methods used in UBC, ensuring that alumni are comfortable in sharing their information, it is also a good system for votings to avoid fraud

* 1. SS: survey that goes out would be accessible to the alumni, and they would submit their bio and statement through an attached link
	2. SS: asked if nominees should submit a photo

DL: believed that the votings of the nominees should not be based on appearances but should be based on their values, experiences and what they stand for, and thought that photos is not necessary by the nominees

* 1. JB: asked if the votings are based solely by SALA students and everyone agreed
	2. SS: commented that EDI committee will have its own email in the future, and will use SS email as temporary contact
1. Follow-up from Intro workshop planning + meeting with SSF (Lead: SS)
	1. SS: MF and TT will be hosting an intro workshop which will involve having a EDI session, which is scheduled on the morning of Sep 3 (Thurs) 3rd day of the intro week; mentioned that she has previously attend a meeting with MF and TT and will follow up with the exact time slot and info

SS: said the EDI session will be around 2 hours, mainly about the larger context of EDI, a chance to set the tone for incoming students to be mindful about EDI issues

SS: mentioned that she would take part o the EDI workshop session, and invited NOMAS and FAFA to participate

DL: mentioned that NOMAS and FAFA have reached out to MF and TT for a timeslot to introduce the student groups, however we are still waiting for the response (TT replied that the introduction would take place on the 1st day of Intro week at 3-4pm)

JB: mentioned that the session is also a good opportunity to introduce the EDI committee

SS: agreed and mentioned that incoming students should be able to know there are different channels to voice out their opinions and concerns (e.g. through NOMAS and FAFA)

* 1. SS: talked about her meeting with SSF, Associate Dean, EDI of APSC,

and the suggestions SSF provided to the EDI committee (SS to revise as DL may have missed a few points during the meeting)

* + 1. Staff/faculty EDI training: should figure out what we want to achieve from the training

JB: commented that it is important for the staff/faculty to be “unlearning”, and start from basic terminologies and have no assumption on knowledge

SS: to follow up on the training goals, we need to figure out what we want to achieve and they (SSF?) would figure out “what it would look like”

* + 1. Give concrete examples, what to do and how to react from situations in topics such as anti-racism, questions for race, gender, LTBTQ
		2. Build up competencies within EDI committee

SS: mentioned to SSF about difficulty in collecting data from self-reporting

* + 1. UBC launching UBC workday, a new HR management system that manages how employees in UBC are hired and run, different way of tracking demographics and identity, robust and nuance understanding of the future/ diversity of the school
		2. Diversity audit- send out survey and encourage people to sign up, what the survey look like (perception, where do we stand, capacity of inclusion)
		3. Approach UBC EDI office for help
		4. Forming processes and systems should be main goal of the EDI committee now
		5. Learn from other references, e.g. Mechanical engineering did focus groups on EDI, which could dig deeper to the issues and have real conversations and changes
		6. Work and share ideas with APSC EDI Committee (quick ad-hoc committee formed to work with EDI office)

JB: commented that we should also asked how other schools in UBC are dealing with EDI, reckoned that other schools are in similar level as our group

ZA: commented that it is important to have the survey going and results evaluated so that we understand where the problems are and put the right resources to the problem

SS: agreed, commented that she is more comfortable of having a baseline, which is provided by the info from the survey

ZA: explained how SH process of collecting data and that it is based on student reporting

SS: questioned about the credibility of the collection methods, what would be the best practice moving forward in collecting data and providing a baseline of knowledge?

JB: questioned about what we want to get out of the survey? What kind of knowledge are we trying to share?

SS: believe that waiting for the survey data is too slow, as it takes time to execute and we want to provide mandatory training in early fall, clarified that baseline of knowledge as in basic terminology in EDI, basic understanding of what we are working on, e.g. what does EDI look like in studio culture, how to encourage faculty to have an inclusive classroom

JB: commented that staff and faculty should start with a foundational tutorials together, learning how to behave in classrooms

SS: mentioned that the mandatory staff/faculty training will be in duration of half-day

JB: questioned on training day

* What do we have to commit?
* strongly advised or mandatory?
* are these moderated?

JB: Suggested to find a time windows so that significant amount of people can participate, expect full attendants;

SS: agreed, replied that it depend on content covered, inclusive classroom, equity office (professional, office culture)

ZA: commented that students and faculty EDI training should be tailored differently, should set 2 different set of goals for the trainings

SS: added that staff and faculty should have different training as well

ZA: suggested that there could be a baseline training for all, and that it could then be divided into different modules

SS: asked for student perspective on how to provide training for students

ZA: suggested that student training should comprise defining basic terminologies, inform them about students with different backgrounds, not only focus on racism, but gender, etc., all topics should be included; e.g. how to interact with people with differences? What are the responsibilities of prof and students?

SS: added that students should learn how to deal with situations when things go wrong? How to handle it?

DL: suggested that students should learn about different channels of reporting/ educating/ resources regarding EDI

SS: agreed that students should learn about their options, know that there are ways to stay anonymous, seek apology/ change, readdress issues

SS: brought up about the recent townhall Q&A, students should be able to use social media to address their issues, faculty should take them into considerations as well, and learn how to respond better and make change

JB: We should share the EDI issues that come up with EDI office of UBC as those would be useful info for them

SS: Further content of EDI training be shared with committee first, then we will share with council before conduct training

JB: suggested that we should fix two time slots options in the staff/faculty training (four hour block to conduct training)

JB: questioned that If CTLT is mandatory, what do we need in terms of time, how much time the audience needs?

1. Airtable for EDI Committee - review, discuss, set goals:
2. SS: went over the airtable format and how it operates, commented about it’s user-friendliness and transparency

SS: commented that the initiative is for the larger umbrella of committee goals, and tasks to be more specific

1. SS: questioned if we should share the airtable and how it should be done

SS: commented that we could get the students affair committee involved in communications/ sharing our progress

1. JB: commented that we should do a “competition scan” and try to understand how other schools (particularly design schools) are doing in terms of EDI, talking to other schools is a high priority as it helps evaluate our capacities and priorities

ZA: agreed and mentioned that this is an important task before executing any initiatives

1. SS: gave example on categorising initiatives and tasks, mentioned that she is still trying to find a balance between the two

Initiative: reconciling with DC

Tasks: renaming building, invite him as aperitif guest lecturer

ZA: commented that the initiatives do not need to be vague, should be clearly understood

SS: agreed and that the Airtable should be clearly communicated and published to be seen by everyone, allowing transparency

JB: commented that initiatives ties to values, and task are subsets that are more actionable and specific

1. SS: welcome the group to add and edit the airtable, need to figure out
	1. what we can accomplish now
	2. what are small, medium and long term goals
	3. what we should share to the public e.g. accomplishment etc.
2. Consultations with SALA constituencies and communicating our efforts

Due to time constraint, agenda 6 has not been discussed yet

1. Other business?
	1. Next meeting scheduled in 2 weeks (Sep 2, 2020)
	2. DL: gave update on the Mtg3 Agenda 9d about the Waterloo students who reached out to the committee to invite 1-2 student leaders to be one of the panelists for a cross-institutional dialogue about decolonizing design education and removing inequitable barriers.

ZA: provided more detail about the email from the Waterloo students

SS: commented that this seems to be a student initiative, and that the faculty will only be in a role of facilitator

JB: agreed and mentioned that DL and ZA should seek clarification from the Waterloo students about the topic, curriculum, timeline as well as its intersectionality with UBC

ZA: agreed and that she would reply to the email for clarification