1. Approve minutes from last meeting  
   a. Minutes approved.
2. Finalizing LAI-wide DEI goal  
   a. Previous draft language (taken from July 7 meeting):  
      i. With a reference to the draft statement: “Choose one of the commitments in the LAI DEI statement to focus on in your work, and reflect on how the actions you have taken in focusing on this commitment have changed your perspective and enable you to grow as an LAI employee.”  
         1. Instead of demanding a somewhat restrictive 1:1 approach, we might ask people to develop a SMART goal that emphasizes how they intend to embrace the statement as a whole and what that will look like for their position this year.
      ii. Without a reference to the draft statement: “Identify a way to make LAI a more diverse, equitable, and inclusive organization and how you can contribute to that in your work.”  
         1. How can we balance acknowledging the fluidity of DEI work against assigning the appropriate priority to the work (when DEI work does not lend itself to SMART goals)?
         2. If we agree that performance management is the appropriate (or least inappropriate) space to ensure DEI work is prioritized, and if we agree that DEI work is incompatible with the SMART goal approach, propose the following: “Identify a way to help transform LAI into a more diverse, equitable, and inclusive organization and actively prioritize that in your work.”
            a. This could have a more active/explicit verb or action item, which might be left to the manager-employee discussion. Additionally, there is the issue of how employees measure/report out about their progress.
            b. Managers will need guidance on how to evaluate employee progress regardless of text if we fold DEI into the performance management process.
      iii. Folding DEI into a SMART LAI-wide goal: “Craft a goal to improve the student experience, being mindful of our commitment to DEI.”
         1. Finding out the ‘what’ of DEI work is going to be different for each person in LAI. Because we cannot find a suitable substitute for prioritizing this work, the performance management process remains the right place to put this.
   b. Discussion
i. What should be our targets for goals, since tomorrow is the official deadline?
   1. On the tension between tomorrow’s deadline and our intention to prioritize DEI in LAI via the performance management process: DEI work does not lend itself to a good SMART goal. We might message that this goal should be approached aspirationally, as opposed to with any sort of specificity, in order to ensure that the organization understands that DEI is a priority.
   2. SMART goals might not transform individual values or the entire organization in one cycle, but we can certainly move in the right direction with SMART goals (as we have with tutoring outreach to first-generation students, accessibility remediation, etc.). We’ll never be able to do everything, but we can do something.
   3. The September 16 deadline is aspirational, and we could decide to message an extension to enable employees to craft more considered and meaningful goals.

ii. Given employee feedback about technical issues in Talent@GW around previous LAI-wide cascaded goals, should we consider not pushing the LAI-wide goal down in the system?
   1. If we could decide on an LAI-wide goal and just make the text centrally available, there may not be a need to cascade in the system.
   2. Managers need to work closely with their employees on crafting individual goals in this space anyway.

iii. Creating a DEI goal might be an attempt to fit a circle into a square. Some feel that we have prioritized and can continue to prioritize DEI without it being part of the performance management process.
   1. It is worth balancing the following two viewpoints: one that believes we have sufficiently prioritized DEI, and one that believes LAI has not done enough to represent and include them. We would need something to hold onto and point to in concluding that we have sufficiently prioritized DEI. What is the problem we are trying to solve, what are we doing to solve it, and can we reiterate that we--and the university--are committed to DEI as a core value?
   2. DEI has risen to the top of mind in recent months, and while it is certainly valid for individuals to feel as though DEI is not sufficiently prioritized, that does not necessarily mean that we have not done what we should do as an organization. We have prioritized it simply by virtue of creating the spaces for conversation--lunch sessions, book club, the DEI Committee.
   3. If all we are doing is talking about it, there is the concern that that does not constitute sufficient prioritization. The performance management space may not be ideally suited, but we have
previously discussed certain methods of evaluation and assessment (e.g. superimposing the previously-suggested depth of engagement framework) that would help us lead the organization to a sense that DEI prioritization does not exist only in the form of words.

4. We need employees to look at how they show up to work through the lens of DEI, regardless of the nature of their work: Is how I am going about my work helping, hindering, or not affecting LAI’s transformation into a more diverse, equitable, and inclusive organization (and to what degree)?

5. The question remains--how do we make this into a goal?

6. Some concern that not pushing this down as a goal falls short of effectively messaging that we are prioritizing DEI work.

iv. What about trying to shoehorn DEI elements into jobs that are entirely transactional?

1. Every job, taskflow, team, etc. can be examined through the DEI lens and improved in order to pursue the type of organization that LAI aspires to be.

3. Approve new organizational charts

   a. Given the need for clarification about certain positions and the prospect of imminent hires, approval and publishing will occur later in October.