JEDI Committee Meeting Notes

June 10, 2024

- **Attendees:** Jacie Woznicki, Grey Fernández, Jason Orlando, anami.nguyen@protonmail.com, Ryan Torres, Janire Castellano Bueno, Bonnie Flint

- **Resource sharing:**
  - What Needs to Change About DEI — and What Doesn’t

- **Check-in on previous action items**
  - Updates (Read Only):
    - Simon's email regarding the survey: JCB has completed analysis requested. JW to update report and JCB to reply to email.
    - Run 2023 WAI diversity survey: Recommendations identified. Being assigned out to relevant recommenders.
    - Run 2024 WAI Diversity and Belonging Survey: Added in subtasks based on 2023 survey. Should probably start around August 1 to maintain similar timeframe. May need to integrate Survey Group into process.
  - Discussion Needed:
    - (GF) JEDI Committee SOP
      - Maximum number of committee members (8-12).
        - GF: most votes was between 8-12, do we want to discuss the actual max number within this range?
        - JW: Can we stick with this range or do we feel we need to specify 1 number?
        - GF: if we stick with the range, it seems like that means the max is 12. Do we want to stipulate when/why the max might vary?
        - BF: seems that the max should grow as the org grows.
        - JW: Should also depend on whether we have a dedicated JEDI employee. The committee could be smaller when we have someone dedicated to it.
        - AN (in chat): I agree, if we have a dedicated JEDI person, we shouldn't have such a large committee.
        - JCB: I agree in general with BF, but I don't think that the amount of work will necessarily increase with the number of employees, so we might not need to increase committee number as number of employees increases.
− JO: I agree, we should set a max for the current situation and then say we will review as org needs change.
− Conclusion: 10 people max

• Jason’s Comment: I have some concerns about placing too many rules/limits on committee membership by team, department, etc. I would prefer to see the committee made up of people with diverse backgrounds, experiences, and perspectives, and setting minimums and maximums by department could run counter to that philosophy. As an example, if we were to hire a JEDI role that was in the Ops department, the Ops team would have 7 employees. At a 25% cutoff by department, we would be allowed 1.75 employees on the committee. However, I would argue that the JEDI Master, Isaac, and I should be committee members. (+3)
− JO: maybe we get one department that is really diverse, so we don’t want to set up too many limits.
− BF: Yeah, I was also thinking about this in terms of the manager’s perspective, but maybe we address that in another way.
− GF: yes, I think we’ve voted on several things that address the managers’ perspective, so this rule can be based on JEDI preferences.
− RT: Do we want to think about if a manager thinks their report’s work is suffering because of being on JEDI
− GF: We did say that a manager can deny in the case of the PIP, so that helps to put something in, but it might increase the use of PIPs?
− Anam N in Chat: Ooh I don’t like the potential push to more PIPs... Maybe there should be a different way to handle it.
− Ryan Torres in Chat: I would hope that there would be a more transparent discussion leading up to a PIP, and in general I think most (if not all) wouldn’t resort to a PIP first, but I don’t know if we want to have that in writing? I am not overly concerned, but I could see why we would want that
− JO: The draft of the recommendation for the Performance Management Plan, so this will help with this. PIPs are being specifically reserved for tail end of performance issues, so it shouldn’t be a problem here. In terms of a manager removing someone from the JEDI committee, I don’t see that that would be a problem, but it could be possible.
− MG: One of the issues might be that when someone joins the JEDI committee is that they are now adding the JEDI stuff to their
regular task, so that should be considered in the work that is assigned on the other side. There should be a consideration that JEDI is part of your job duties.

○ JW: I agree with MG, when Cat was telling me about the JEDI committee, she said that the work for JEDI is part of your job and can take precedence over other tasks. I think it should be JEDI committee member discretion not manager’s discretion.

○ BF: I think some discussion is required about time commitments and manager input.

○ JO: We can all agree that our workloads will change and we might need to fluctuate our time commitment to JEDI. Now that we are doing this work on the SOP, will that help to clarify the discussion with manager.

○ BF: Yes, the SOP details will help.

○ MG: Some of this can be looked at on a holistic scale, when someone is providing services, the manager, report, and other manager can have a meeting, arrangements can be made to prioritize the workload, but we don’t have a JEDI manager to do this discussion with.

● Asynchronous discussion: Virtual retreat (frequency, timing, structure)
  ○ Topics: Purpose, Format, Frequency/When

● How should limits by the department be determined?

● Would current members be required to step down?

● Discussion topics
  ● Asynchronous discussion: COVID internal policy for staff
    ■ JO: before next meeting, I’d like to have a convo (asynchronous?) about this and how we do this for immunization in general. We should think about comfort level for the staff, etc. Please comment on this when you have time.
    ○ Would like committee feedback on whether we should require vaccinations
    ○ What criteria would be necessary to add a vaccine to the list?

● Action items
  □ All: provide feedback on COVID-19 policy
  □ All: provide feedback on Gender ID question
  □ GF: create list of options for purpose/format/frequency/timing for virtual conference
  □ All: vote on virtual conference options.
  □ JW: Schedule next JEDI meeting in September
  □ BF: meet with IE to assign tasks for trainings, and let VE know the plan for balancing Q3 priorities.