JEDI Committee Meeting Notes

September 7, 2022
Attendees:

Cat Kerr, staff, Communications Manager
Luke Hecht, staff, Grants Manager
Nik Vetr, board, Director
Stien van der Ploeg, board, Treasurer — meeting facilitator

Topic 1: Board compensation

NV:
- Compensation can make board membership more accessible for people who can’t financially afford to donate their time to managing the org.
- 2 questions: Whether to compensate at all, and then how much?
- The board would have to vote on whether to enact this, but that would be a conflict of interest because they’re voting on whether to compensate themselves.
  - To remedy the conflict of interest we can have staff approve it too and make compensation available for future board members, not current board members.
- If we compensate board members financially, then should we be stricter about certain expectations?

1. The question
   a. Should we compensate some or all board members to not prohibit people with limited time and resources join the board. That could increase equity and diversity.
   b. Common practice ~20% compensate
   c. Nik did a bunch of research
   d. The logistics can be figured out later, now we just ask if compensation is ideal.

2. Round robin: additional thoughts & leanings
   a. NV: offering pay will likely increase interest
   b. CK: open to it, but we should have some way to assess if it works and what we want to measure. How do we assess who or if all receive compensation? What kind of diversity are we aiming for, and is offering compensation likely to achieve it? (And how do we know?)
   c. LH: no strong opinion but open but knowing the effect would be good to research
   d. SV: let’s explore further what options would fit our situation

3. Recommendation:
   a. Explore this idea further.
b. **Actionable steps: (SvdP):** NV can talk to Jason because the pay is Ops related + JO has experience working with boards. NV will see if people can have access to helpful/relevant website he found.

c. **Explore how previous decisions to compensate work were determined, e.g. do paid work tests promote DEI goals?**

---

**Topic 2: Hiring**

1. **Summary of efforts so far**
   a. **SvdP:**
      i. Post jobs in strategically chosen places.
      ii. Be present in more diverse spaces in general.
      iii. Include a diversity statement in job posts.
      iv. Job descriptions include only qualifications that are completely necessary.
      v. Work test and interview questions use a rubric tied to job necessities.
      vi. Offer paid work tests.

2. [Inclusion Targets: What’s Legal? | ACLU of Southern California (aclusocal.org)]

3. **Summary of Mark’s findings**
   
   It appears we ran a successful hiring round that attracted a racially diverse candidate pool, provided equity in our assessment process, and resulted in equitable offer decisions. There is always room for improvement (and we should strive to do better), but these results are an encouraging sign that our hiring efforts have been effective in advancing our DEI goals on race. I think we should be very proud of this achievement.

   All told, we attracted 580 applicants for 4 different roles (3 Science, 1 Development), ultimately inviting 14 to the final interview stage (2.4% of total) and hiring 6 new employees (1% of total). 23.6% of applicants reported being solely non-white, which roughly reflects the racial diversity of the US in 2021 according to the US Census (24.2%).

   A key takeaway for future hiring rounds:
   We attracted too few Black applicants (22 out of 580, 3.8%). We should focus on conducting more outreach to Black applicants in future hiring rounds.

4. **Question posed by Mal**
   a. We must try to eliminate all bias from our processes that encourages homogeneity, but what can/should/shouldn’t we do beyond that?
   b. Consequences of having a completely blind hiring process vs a partial blind process vs the hiring team having access to all diversity data

5. **Round robin: additional thoughts & leanings**

6. **Recommendation: The hiring team should focus its research particularly on**
a. The earlier application review stages are likely more important to review diversity and particularly race
b. Consider hiring entry level roles in science where there is more diversity to develop a pipeline