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Purpose of Submittal:

In this session, members of the 2020-21 Structural Equity and Bias Response Team (SEBRT) will discuss the group’s work during its inaugural year and recommendations flowing from that work. Litav Langley, LGBTQ+ Director, who chaired SEBRT, will be joined by SEBRT members Shevell Thibou (Director, Teaching and Learning, Western Libraries), Faye Gallant (Executive Director, Budget and Financial Planning), and Michael Sledge (Associate Dean of Students).

Background:

Creation of SEBRT was recommended by the 2019-20 President’s Council on Equity, Inclusion, and Social Justice. Fully formed in Fall 2021, SEBRT is composed of two teams – a Bias Response Team and a Structural Equity Team. The Bias Response Team provides support to individuals and communities impacted by bias incidents, while the Structural Equity Team uses information about those incidents to inform recommendations aimed at building and sustaining a more equitable and just environment. For the 2020-21 year, the Structural Equity Team was also charged with examining the extent to which Western currently uses a diversity, equity, and justice lens in developing its budget and recommending how to better incorporate those institutional commitments throughout the budget process.

With a focus on the Structural Equity Team’s recommendations regarding budget processes, this session will provide Trustees with an understanding of SEBRT’s work during its inaugural year and institutional actions that can be taken to better infuse the diversity, equity, and justice commitments of Western’s strategic plan throughout our budgeting.
WHAT IS THE BIAS RESPONSE TEAM?

Western is committed to fostering a caring and supportive environment that is equitable and just for all people in our community. The Bias Response Team (BRT) works toward this commitment by (1) supporting students, staff, and faculty who are targeted or impacted by bias incidents and (2) educating the Western community about bias.

www.edu/sebrt

WHAT IS A BIAS INCIDENT?

A bias incident is language or an action that demonstrates bias against an individual or group of people based on actual or perceived race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, gender identity or expression, disability, sexual orientation, age, or veteran status.

HOW CAN I REPORT A BIAS INCIDENT?

Students, staff, and faculty can notify the BRT by submitting an online notification form or directly contacting a member of the BRT. The form can be submitted anonymously.

When the BRT is notified of an incident, a member of the team contacts the person submitting the notification to offer support, discuss next steps, and share resources.

WHY SHOULD I NOTIFY THE BRT OF AN INCIDENT?

The BRT exists to provide our community with care and support. When the BRT is notified of a bias incident, it can coordinate support for people most impacted, work to limit the hurtful impacts of the incident, and advance learning aimed at preventing future similar acts.
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Letter from the Bias Response Team

Dear Western Community,

The Bias Response Team (BRT) was founded in August 2020. Our role is to identify and collaboratively coordinate responses to bias incidents to (1) support Western students, staff, and faculty who are targeted or impacted by these incidents and (2) educate the Western community about impacts and histories of such bias and actions to prevent future similar incidents. We also aim to educate the University community about how to notify the BRT of bias incidents.

The BRT responds caringly and promptly to (1) bias incidents that occur at any Western location, including the Bellingham campus and Western’s locations in Anacortes, Bremerton, Everett, Port Angeles, and Poulsbo, or at a Western-sponsored activity and (2) at our discretion to significant incidents of bias beyond the University that impact people in our Western community. This requires anticipating likely impacts of bias incidents even before full impacts are shared by members of our community.

The following report is a summary of our activities during the BRT’s inaugural academic year. Given the impactful and often deeply personal nature of incidents reported, identifying information has been removed to respect privacy of the reporting parties. While privacy is paramount, so too is transparency. As a group we are committed to honestly representing the hurt experienced by members of our community this year, and the steps we have taken to provide support and resources to those affected.

It is important that we say “thank you” specifically to the students, faculty, and staff who reached out and spoke up when they were concerned that we as a community are not living up to our core principles. Thank you for letting us walk alongside you in these times. It has been an impactful journey for all of us too, working together in building a more accessible, equitable, and just community—and the work continues.

Thank you, too, for reading this report. If you have questions or feedback, please contact us at brt@wwu.edu.

In community,

2020-21 Bias Response Team

(members listed at end of report)
Bias Response Team
Background

The Bias Response Team is part of Western’s Structural Equity and Bias Response Team, which was created following a recommendation of the 2019-20 Council on Equity, Inclusion, and Social Justice. The BRT furthers Western’s commitments to access, diversity, equity, and inclusion. Its work particularly advances Western’s third and fourth strategic goals, to foster a caring and supportive environment and to pursue justice and equity in our policies, practices, and impacts. Members of the BRT work as educators and with an ethos of care for our students and colleagues. The BRT recognizes both the right to freedom of speech and the imperative of creating welcoming places to learn for all students.

When it was established in summer 2020, the BRT created a website to share information about its role and how to report bias incidents. The BRT also established a protocol (linked to here) for responding to incidents of bias. Students, staff, and faculty can notify the BRT of an incident via the online notification form or by communicating directly with a member of BRT.

The BRT does not conduct investigations or impose discipline. Investigations of possible civil rights violations are conducted by the Office of Civil Rights & Title IX Compliance (for potential violations of university policy and civil law) and University Police (for potential criminal violations). Discipline is imposed only after a finding of a violation of law or policy and is imposed by the appropriate disciplinary entity (Student Conduct for students, supervisors/vice presidents for employees).
BRT Reports by the Numbers 2020-2021

47

Incidents of Bias Reported

Reports Received: Timeframe

Incidents Reported

Oct 2020 13
Nov 2020 5
Dec 2020 2
Jan 2021 7
Feb 2021 3
Mar 2021 4
Apr 2021 7
May 2021 4
Jun 2021 2
Anonymous Reporting

Yes (5)
10.6%
No (42)
89.4%

Type of Bias Reported

Some notifications referenced more than one type of bias. All types of bias reported in a notification are reflected above.
**Type of Incident Reported**

**TYPE OF INCIDENT**

- **Verbal**
  - Total Number: 23

- **Written**
  - Total Number: 11

- **Graffiti/defacing/flyers**
  - Total Number: 5

- **Failure to provide disability accommodation**
  - Total Number: 4

- **Failure to address verbal behavior**
  - Total Number: 4

### Roles of Reporting Parties and Reportees

**REPORTER AND REPORTEE ROLES**

- **Faculty**: 8 (Reporter), 7 (Reportee)
- **Staff**: 8 (Reporter), 4 (Reportee)
- **Student**: 34 (Reporter), 5 (Reportee)
- **Institutional**: 5 (Reporter), 9 (Reportee)
- **Community**: 4 (Reporter), 9 (Reportee)

**Institutional** - refers to instances of reported bias that were part of an institutional action, such as a school-wide training or broadly published institutional message.

**Community** - refers to an incident of reported bias that occurred on or near the Bellingham campus not targeting a particular individual, such as bias in grafitti.
In total, the BRT received reports of 47 separate incidents of bias throughout the academic year. Most reports were submitted through the online notification form and most reporters self-identified rather than reporting anonymously. Reports were made by students, faculty, and staff. They reported concerns with interpersonal interactions, occurrences in or related to classes, institutional activities, and occurrences in the broader community. Additionally, some reports came through referrals from Western staff and faculty or through issues BRT members learned about in the course of their other professional duties or through local media. The significant volume of reports, the willingness of reporters to self-identify, and the broad cross-section of reporters indicate the BRT was visible and trusted to provide assistance in sensitive and difficult situations.

While it is difficult to summarize the unique and broad ranging concerns and responses, here are some examples that highlight the BRT’s work:

• After online events experienced biased zoom bombings, BRT coordinated with ATUS to provide additional information to the university community about actions to prevent zoom bombing and steps to take if a zoom bombing occurs.

• When students raised concerns about faculty displaying bias or not addressing bias displayed by classmates, BRT members listened with care to student concerns, shared options for addressing the concerns, made appropriate referrals within the university, and engaged in educational conversations with faculty members.

• When an institution-wide training failed to provide effective closed captions and asked a survey question demonstrating a misunderstanding of LGBTQ+ identities, members of the BRT worked with Western colleagues and the vendor that created the training to quickly improve the training.

• When a tweet to Bellingham Police wrongly indicated that a Black Western student might be a suspect in a crime, BRT worked with University Police and University Communications to have the harmful tweet removed, offer support to students, and provide feedback to Bellingham Police.

• When swastikas appeared on local businesses, BRT members worked to offer supportive space and counseling resources to students.

Additionally, national events impacted the experiences of Western students, faculty, and staff. After the failure to issue meaningful indictments in the killing of Breonna Taylor, around the Presidential election, after the storming of the Capitol, after the trial of Derek Chauvin for killing George Floyd, and in the face of racist activity directed at AAPI people, the BRT organized virtual support and discussion spaces. Students, faculty, staff, and alumx connected in online spaces to be in community, talk, and share support and resources. The BRT extends great appreciation to colleagues in the Counseling Center and Ethnic Student Center for their partnerships and leadership in holding at least 11 community care and decompression spaces over the academic year.

One misconception the BRT will work to address next year is that many reporters believed the BRT was an investigatory or punitive body, or that the BRT could provide mediation services to resolve interpersonal disputes. The BRT will work to improve messaging that it is an educational and supportive resource hub and that the BRT does not conduct investigations (which is the purview of the Office of Civil Rights and Title IX Compliance) or issue sanctions.

The BRT is also developing educational programming and communications for the upcoming year, including “teach-ins” in collaboration with faculty to provide university-wide opportunities for learning related to issues of bias impacting people in the Western community. The BRT looks forward to building more partnerships as it grows and further focuses its work.
The BRT’s first year of operation coincided with the COVID-19 pandemic. Given the remote nature of much of Western’s operations during the 2020-21 year, reports received and addressed by the BRT this year may not be wholly indicative of the types of bias incidents people at Western might experience and report to the BRT when more students, faculty, and staff are on campus. Nonetheless, themes that emerged in bias incidents this year, including the high proportion of incidents involving bias based on race or ethnicity and of student concerns regarding incidents in classes or interactions with faculty, demonstrate the prudence of building university resources in the near term to better prevent and respond productively to such concerns in the future.

1. **Western should hire and allocate resources to support the success of dedicated full-time professionals, likely housed within the Office of Equity, to engage in (a) productive educational conversations, (b) offer consultations, and (c) provide relevant proactive and reactive trainings for faculty, staff, and students to create more anti-racist, accessible, equitable, and inclusive environments.** It will be important to support these professionals with programmatic resources necessary to meaningfully fulfill their responsibilities. These professionals could have oversight of State Senate Bill 5227 funding for the purposes of developing anti-racism, access, diversity, equity, and inclusion trainings.

Interactions happening in academic courses are important and impactful. The number of concerns from students related to their courses is indicative of the need for greater resources and support to improve communications on ADEI topics and develop a more positive experience in courses and beyond for historically marginalized students.

2. **Western should hire and allocate resources to support the success of at least one full-time dedicated professional, such as an ombud, to provide conflict resolution services including but not limited to mediation.** This professional must have a firm understanding of dynamics of power and oppression and faculty rights and responsibilities, and ample time within their regular job responsibilities to engage in this time intensive work.

This position is needed because the majority of bias incidents were concerns of perceived bias in small group settings such as classrooms, meetings, and informal conversations. What happens in these settings can be extremely impactful to individuals. However, the BRT’s work should be more narrowly focused on responding to incidents of bias that have a broad community impact. Staff serving on the BRT have other full-time responsibilities and cannot dedicate sufficient time to facilitate reconciliation at the scale required.

Furthermore, reports received by the BRT included student concerns regarding how faculty managed conversations regarding accessibility, diversity, equity, or inclusion (ADEI). The grading relationship between faculty and students creates a significant power differential and academic freedom is an added complexity when engaging in creating an inclusive and equitable teaching and learning experience. There is currently no resource at Western tasked with conducting conflict resolution and providing education for faculty and staff regarding dynamics of bias and inclusion separate from potentially investigatory proceedings that could lead to discipline. The BRT encourages building resources that are educational and restorative to serve Western students, faculty, and staff.

3. **Formal, regular avenues of communication should be established between leaders of the Structural Equity and Bias Response Team and the Office of Equity.** Among other things, these avenues of communication will allow the Office of Equity’s development and delivery of training and education to be informed by the specificities of what is being reported to the Bias Response Team. In the development of trainings and educational programming, it will be important for the Office of Equity to collaborate with faculty and staff with expertise in the topics being addressed.
Bias Response Team Roster
2020-2021

Brandon Joseph
Men’s Resiliency Specialist (through April 2021)

Christian Urcia
Assistant Director, Residence Life

Jon McGough
Director, Disability Access Center

Keith Williams
Assistant Director of Public Safety

Litav Langley
Director, LGBTQ+ Western, SEBRT Chair (2020-21)

Mary Heller
Office of Civil Rights & Title IX Compliance (through April 2021)

Samantha Bragg
Office of Civil Rights & Title IX Compliance (beginning May 2021)

Michael Sledge
Associate Dean of Students/Executive Director – Student Life

Moya Lojewski
Ethnic Student Center Club Advising Manager (through April 2021)

Sarah Godoy
Director, Counseling Center

Shevell Thibou
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Report of the Structural Equity Team Regarding Access, Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Justice in the University’s Budget Processes

Western Washington University

June 15, 2021

In Fall 2020, President Randhawa charged the inaugural Structural Equity Team with developing recommendations regarding diversity, equity, and justice in Western Washington University’s budget process. This Report responds to the questions in the charge and offers recommendations as requested.

INTRODUCTION

Background

During the 2019-20 academic year, President Randhawa charged the Council on Equity, Inclusion, and Social Justice (the Council) with generating recommendations regarding creation of a bias education and response team for Western. The Council submitted its recommendations on March 16, 2020, proposing creation of a Structural Equity and Bias Response Team (SEBRT).

President Randhawa in turn created SEBRT, with formation of the Structural Equity Team concluding in November 2020. The Structural Equity Team is responsible for creating a public report regarding bias incidents reported to the Bias Response Team (BRT) and recommendations to foster an equitable and just environment based on information learned by the BRT. For the 2020-21 academic year, the Structural Equity Team was also charged with examining the university’s budget process through a diversity, equity, and justice lens (charge and Structural Equity Team composition are here). This examination, and recommendations flowing from it, are the focus of this report.

The Structural Equity Team’s charge regarding budget process specifically poses these questions:

- To what extent does Western use a diversity, equity, and justice lens in developing its budget and arriving at budget priorities? How could this be improved at various stages of the process?

- What are the core principles and values that need to be applied in using a diversity, equity, and justice lens to develop and make budget decisions at various levels of the institution?

- How do we structurally and practically increase opportunities for diverse members of the Western community to provide input into the budget processes?
Overview

In this report, we first set out the core principles and values to be applied when using an access, diversity, equity, and justice lens to develop and make budget decisions.

We next describe the extent to which Western currently uses a diversity, equity, and justice lens in developing its budget and arriving at budget priorities. In this section, we describe the method by which we sought to ascertain how diversity, equity, and justice commitments are currently manifested within divisional, college, and institution-level budget processes.

Finally, we offer recommendations for how Western’s budget processes could be improved to better use an access, diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice lens when developing budgets and setting budget priorities. Among other recommendations, we offer suggestions about how Western could structurally and practically increase opportunities for diverse members of the university community to provide input into our budget processes.
CORE PRINCIPLES AND VALUES

The following principles and values are rooted in the commitments of Western’s 2018-2025 Strategic Plan. They are intended to be broadly applicable across the university’s diverse divisions, colleges, and departments.

In developing the principles, values, and recommendations offered in this Report, the SET found it beneficial to create working definitions of the terms “diversity,” “equity,” “justice,” “inclusion,” and “access” that can be used when engaging these concepts in budget processes. These definitions are provided in Appendix A to this Report. The definitions are offered not to be prescriptive, but to offer some common sense of understanding and meaning amongst the many people in our university community who interact with and are decision-makers in Western’s budget processes.

Principle 1: Budgets reflect departmental, divisional, and institutional values. Budgets, and the processes underlying their development, should reflect Western’s values articulated in our 2018-2025 Strategic Plan and advance the Strategic Plan’s goals.

Principle 2: Recognizing Goal 4 of the Strategic Plan, financial commitments to access, equity, diversity, and justice should be diffused throughout budgets on an ongoing basis. Additionally, budgets should include specific resourcing to advance access, equity, diversity, and justice.

Resource allocations must advance the university’s mission of inclusive achievement and the moral imperative of equitable degree attainment.

What work divisions do to advance access, diversity, equity, and justice and how they do it may vary depending on the role of the division.

Principle 3: Departmental, college, divisional, and institutional actions furthering commitments to access, diversity, equity, and justice are fundamental responsibilities of Western and are necessary to the health of the university and the people who compose our Western community now and in the future. These actions must be appropriately financially resourced; they cannot be un-resourced add-ons.

For example, actions to ensure participation by diverse people in processes and to recruit, retain, and support the thriving of diverse students, staff, and faculty require thoughtful allocation of financial resources.

Principle 4: Members of the organization with diverse identities and perspectives should be included at all stages of institutional, divisional, college-level, and departmental budget creation and prioritization.
Inclusion requires allocation of time and resources for a diversity of people and positions to meaningfully participate in the process. It requires more than a seat at the table.

**Principle 5:** All stages and levels of the budget process, and information about actual spending, should be accessible, transparent, and understandable to students, faculty, and staff.

**Principle 6:** The budget process should foster collaboration across departments, colleges, and divisions in making progress towards access, diversity, equity, and justice goals.

*Increased collaboration reduces silos, allowing greater impacts and reducing redundancies.*

*Increased collaboration requires resource commitments at the divisional and departmental levels and cannot be an un-resourced “add on” to existing service or extracurricular commitments.*

**Principle 7:** Continued allocation of funding should be tied to demonstrated progress in advancing strategic goals and objectives related to diversity, equity, and justice.

*Metrics for measuring progress should be constructed through deliberative and inclusive processes.*

*Collecting and assessing metrics should not be an administrative burden and should be acknowledged as valuable work and incorporated accordingly.*
DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND JUSTICE CONSIDERATIONS IN WESTERN’S CURRENT BUDGET PROCESSES

Introduction

In evaluating Western’s existing budget processes, we aimed to first identify common themes and opportunities, and next to root the principles above practically and tactically into the existing landscape of budgeting across Western. The recommendations that follow arise from the principles and are intended to provide actionable ways to improve the application of an access, diversity, equity, and justice lens and increase opportunities for diverse members of Western’s community to engage with the budget process, recognizing current opportunities and challenges.

Methodology

To assess to what extent Western currently uses a diversity, equity, and justice lens in budget processes, we began with an orientation to the institutional processes and structures from Budget and Financial Planning, followed by a more in-depth presentation and question and answer session with Structural Equity Team members. We then collectively developed a questionnaire (Appendix B) to collect more detailed information about local budget processes across the university, focused on understanding our current state and context. Budget authorities (such as vice presidents, budget officers, and deans) at the divisional and college levels completed the questionnaire. We then tabulated the responses, highlighting additional information and context that helped to more fully describe existing processes, and reviewed the collection for common themes, needs, and opportunities.

Findings

Our findings include opportunities and common challenges. Beginning with opportunities, respondents described existing committees at the division and college level who have been actively working on development of ADEIJ definitions, processes, and policies, but as of yet are typically not engaged in budget processes or development. Where definitions and criteria/considerations formally exist, they have been developed collaboratively and are grounded in the specific context of the unit. The range of responses on each question also highlighted the opportunity to learn from each other and adapt approaches – within the common challenges discussed below, there was often an answer that described a solution or evolving process.

Common challenges identified in reviewing questionnaire responses include: ability to track and report on decisions and expenditures, identifying resources to support broader engagement (both in ADEIJ work more broadly, and in committee work related to decision making), few roles explicitly charged with highlighting ADEIJ implications of budget decisions, and a common compartmentalization of resources specific to ADEIJ efforts or siloed approach. Of
particular note was a frequent association of lens with targeted funding, which we seek to address via recommendations below.

RECOMMENDATIONS: TOWARDS AN ACCESS, DIVERSITY, EQUITY, INCLUSION, AND JUSTICE LENS THROUGHOUT WESTERN’S BUDGET PROCESSES

1. Common definitions are critical in both improving our application of an access, diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice lens to our budget development and in increasing engagement in budget processes. Definitions have been developed at a local level through college and divisional ADEI committees (see College of Business and Economics and Woodring College of Education) or are in development (Enrollment and Student Services, Business and Financial Affairs). Local development of definitions is important to tie concepts to the specific nature of an area’s work, and this recommendation is not meant to discourage or make redundant those efforts. We recommend that a common set of generally applicable definitions be adopted at the university level (see Appendix A), with divisions and departments building upon these definitions in ways that are relevant to their particular work.

2. The budget process at all levels must begin with setting priorities that align with Western’s mission and strategic goals. Where possible, budget requests should make explicit the connection between requested resources and these priorities, and recommendations and decisions should tie back directly to the strategic plan (e.g. for each new line item, note which strategic goal(s) it supports).

3. Every department should be engaged in ADEIJ work in ways that are relevant for that department and that are resourced. All divisions and departments must allocate meaningful, reliable, permanent, flexible resources specifically to advance strategic goals and objectives related to access, diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice. Resources may include specific funds and/or clearly allocated employee time and effort, and should be clearly defined.

4. Rubrics or other tools should be used to help budget developers and decisionmakers (including the University Planning and Resources Council, Vice Presidents, and Deans, and local/divisional decisionmakers) apply an access, diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice lens throughout budget processes. For the institutional budget processes (decision package proposals, internal budget requests, and emergent budget requests) we
recommend including these tools in the templates. **These tools can and should be applied to all budget proposals, not only those explicitly categorized as ADEIJ initiatives.** The Budget Strategy Analysis Group provides one example of applying an ADEI lens to varied budget ideas. These tools could include questions informed by Goals 3 and 4 of Western’s Strategic Plan such as:

*How does this allocation or withdrawal of funding advance or hinder access to Western, academic excellence, and inclusive achievement?*

*Beyond specific projects, how does this budget holistically and actively redress inequities based on race, ethnicity, creed, disability, gender, socioeconomic class, and sexual orientation?*

*For proposals that include personnel resources, how does the proposal improve recruitment, retention, and satisfaction of diverse faculty, staff, and administrators?*

*For proposals that include capital development or IT infrastructure, how are physical accessibility and cultural inclusion (beyond statutory requirements) resourced as foundational elements of project development?*

*How was this proposal or request developed? Who was involved, and in what role/capacity? Which groups were engaged and at what stages?*

5. **Engagement with the budget process requires accessible information regardless of a person’s role in the institution or access to informal knowledge sharing networks.** Information about the budget process should be easy to find. This includes information about opportunities for participation in the budget process. Descriptions of process should follow plain language standards. Onboarding and/or other trainings should include information on how to effectively pursue funding, how to be involved in the budget, and how to find information about budget initiatives.

6. **The budget process should include tracking and reporting on access, diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice related budget initiatives at both the institutional and local levels, with a consistent approach that is replicable.** This would include:

   *Establishing criteria for what constitutes an ADEIJ activity for budget reporting purposes (perhaps led by the Office of Equity or Chief Diversity Officer).*

   *Identifying and implementing a system for tracking budget decisions and actual spending associated with ADEIJ activities across the university that is easily reportable (led by Budget and Financial Planning).*
Including updates on ADEIJ budget initiatives and processes in divisional and college reports. **ESS** already aims to do this and the template ESS uses may be replicable.

7. Western’s current approach of having each member of a budget decision-making body charged with considering impacts to access, diversity, equity, and inclusion in their deliberations is important. This work should not be siloed, but it can and should be strengthened by including positions that are specifically and primarily responsible for applying an ADEIJ lens. In the substantive processes of developing their budgets and making budget allocation decisions, all divisions and colleges should include at least one position from within the unit that is specifically responsible for applying an ADEIJ lens. In units where these positions do not already exist, new positions should be created or current positions should be revised so that formal job descriptions and shared understanding of position responsibilities includes applying an informed ADEIJ lens to the unit’s budget work.

At the institutional level, this role could be filled by the incoming Chief Diversity Officer supported by a system of deputies who are representative, both in terms of positionality and identity, and who can provide feedback to the CDO on community priorities.

For divisions, colleges, and other units with similar budgetary discretion and responsibility, this role should be filled by someone who is both actively engaged in and accountable to ADEIJ initiatives within the unit and empowered to participate as a co-equal member of the body. This should be a formal appointment included in workload or job duty determinations.

8. To support broader community engagement in the budget process, leverage/apply local shared governance structures to budget development, similar to curriculum development. Use this to create formal structures of participation that do not require additional vulnerability (e.g. undervalued service work by faculty, additional job responsibilities with no offset of previous responsibilities for staff) for participants. Units must develop and internally share formal mechanisms for inclusion in their budget processes, including providing defined opportunities for stakeholders within the unit to participate (e.g. open calls for applications to serve on budget committees). These members should be granted the same resources, responsibility, and input of those already present in the budgeting process.
9. To foster collaboration in support of advancing ADEIJ goals, include structured opportunities and resources such as applications for support (course buyouts, labor distribution codes (funding for staff to charge time towards), student stipends, etc.) to develop full-fledged collaborative proposals for funding. Opportunities could also include funded workshops or events where participants could initiate collaborations. Fostering collaboration should include fostering inter-college and inter-divisional collaborations.

10. Continued allocation of funding should be tied to demonstrated progress advancing strategic goals and objectives related to access, diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice. Metrics for measuring progress should be constructed through deliberative and inclusive processes. Collecting and assessing metrics should not be an administrative burden and should be acknowledged as valuable work and incorporated accordingly. When considering allocation of funds based on progress in advancing ADEIJ objectives, in addition to progress made by departments fitting clearly within the university organization chart, attention should be paid to progress made by less formal entities engaged in access, diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice, such as employee resource groups.

11. Continued review of the budget process for opportunities to improve alignment with Western’s strategic plan and particularly advancing access, diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice is essential to carry this work forward. We recommend this topic be revisited following implementation of recommendations to assess new or remaining gaps and opportunities, and that an existing body (such as the University Planning and Resources Council) be named as the home for this ongoing review to ensure its success.
APPENDIX A: DEFINITIONS

The terms diversity, equity, inclusion, access, and justice are often defined differently depending on the audience and one’s perspective. These terms have also evolved through time. The following definitions were developed by the Structural Equity Team (SET) to provide a common understanding as SET discussed potential recommendations. These definitions may be further improved for adoption at the institutional level and are not intended to limit divisional, college, or departmental additions to institutional definitions. Indeed, collaboration within divisions and departments to build in context-specific ways upon institutional definitions is encouraged.

**Diversity** refers to socially relevant differences among people resulting from history, culture, and circumstances. Our differences can be along dimensions including race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, nationality and citizenship, language, age, physical abilities, neurodiversity, religious beliefs, and other aspects of our identities and experiences. Valuing diversity includes being receptive to and respectful of the many attributes and experiences everyone brings to the institution. Valuing diversity means identifying and acknowledging the many dimensions of an individual’s identity, being considerate and respectful of the fact that everyone is unique, and aiming to create fairness across differences in every aspect of our work.

Diversity is understanding each other beyond simple tolerance and emphasizing acceptance and inclusion of difference. It is the practice of knowing how to respect, relate to, and consider the many things that make us different and unique from one another, while embracing and celebrating our differences. Remember, the ways in which we are a diverse are not necessarily visible or readily evident.

**Examples:**

- Increase BIPOC hires across the institution; this includes providing equitable salaries.
- Develop one’s knowledge and awareness related to particular cultural behaviors and norms.

**Equity** demands remedies to redress historic injustices that have prevented or diminished access. To maximize opportunities for access experienced by certain groups, an equitable institution commits resources to level the playing field. Equality, by contrast, sets up the expectation that every individual deserves the same opportunity to influence the course of democracy; it treats each person the same when distributing resources and opportunities. Equality fails to recognize and celebrate our unique differences and needs. Individuals should be informed and represented within all aspects of the institution, empowered to be independent, and celebrated for their uniqueness.
Examples:

- Create scholarship opportunities within each college for underrepresented students.
- Provide accommodation for students with disabilities to create equitable opportunities for success.
- Provide the same exposure and support to BIPOC related events that is provided to non-BIPOC specific alumnx engagements and fundraising opportunities.

*Inclusion* means all individuals are fully engaged and empowered to participate in the life and work of the university. Inclusion requires understanding our history, removing barriers, and revising processes and ways of operating to include people and perspectives that have historically been excluded or undervalued. Inclusion creates an empowering space where individuals can engage authentically and safely.

Examples:

- Provide participants involved in budget conversations with equal and safe access to historical and relevant information.
- Update university stakeholders regularly on budget related matters; this includes providing contextual information, Q&A opportunities, and relevant documentation.
- Include and compensate students to participate on faculty committees and task forces; this includes providing them with similar voting authority as faculty participants.
- Increase opportunities for current BIPOC staff/faculty to be involved in highly visible decisions related to budget and hiring.

*Access* moves beyond compliance and accommodation, taking a proactive approach that ensures university constituents’ wide range of needs (e.g., ability, socioeconomic status, gender) are met. It ensures meaningful equal opportunity to instruction, physical and virtual spaces, professional resources, and other services.

*Accessible* means that a person with a disability is afforded the opportunity to acquire the same information, engage in the same interactions, and enjoy the same services as a person without a disability in an equally effective and equally integrated manner, with substantially equivalent ease of use. A person with a disability must be able to obtain information provided as fully, equally, and independently as a person without a disability.

Examples:

- Ensure students basic needs are met (e.g., housing, food, technology).
- Ensure equitable access to not only curricular and co-curricular opportunities, but also extracurricular offerings (e.g. sports clubs, speaking events, outdoor programs).
• Engage with several types of disabled students before and throughout the planning and building processes for new and retrofitted buildings and other on-campus infrastructure; this includes considering who is not here and how we can make spaces inviting for them to be here.

Justice consists of a combination of diversity, accessibility, equity, and inclusion. Each of these elements intersect to achieve an empowering, liberating, transparent, and just organization. The institution should work towards creating and sustaining just outcomes by holding individuals accountable for their contributions to fostering a diverse, accessible, equitable, and inclusive teaching and learning community.

Examples:

• Work towards reparations when a member of the university community reports a bias incident.
• Empower supervisors and employees to pursue ADEI trainings, workshops, and other opportunities with the same level of encouragement and support provided for professional development offerings related to one’s field and/or position responsibilities.
APPENDIX B: Structural Equity Team Questionnaire on Budget Processes, Winter 2021

Name of Unit (e.g. College/Division)

Point of Contact for Submission

1. Does your unit have standing definitions of: diversity, equity, inclusion, accessibility, and justice?
   a. If yes, when and how were these definitions created and/or adopted?
   b. How does your unit implement this definition?
   c. Has the strategic plan evolved these definitions?

2. How does your area ensure accountability and focus of resources in achievement of Goal 4 (LINK) of the strategic plan?

3. Do you currently have criteria in place to assess the Diversity, Equity, and Justice (DEJ) impact of changes in budget (proposals, cuts, etc.) within your unit? If so, what are they?

4. How, if at all, are your formal budget processes and structures deliberately inclusive of people with diverse social identities and/or positions within the unit or university?
   a. In your budget process, are there roles charged with ensuring equitable and just impacts or outcomes of that process?
   b. Are those most responsible and accountable for DEJ work in your unit represented in your budgeting process? What mechanisms does your unit deploy to ensure that their input is invited and acted upon?

5. How has the lens of diversity, equity, and justice guided your development of budgetary priorities? Please specify which dimensions of that lens (diversity, equity, justice) have played a role, as well as the specific social groups (e.g., Black, Indigenous, LGBTQ+, first generation, etc.; students, faculty, staff, alumni, community) highlighted.
6. Are you tracking DEJ expenditures? How are these being tracked? Where is the data kept and who has access to it?

While our charge is focused on process, if you are able to share we would also love to know:

- In addition to your general approach, we welcome examples of specific initiatives you are investing in to deepen the role of diversity, equity, and justice in your activities?
- How are successful DEJ programs scaled, expanded, and/or made permanent?
- Do you have a mechanism for measuring the DEJ successes and impact of investments and considering the continuation or repurposing of funding?