

## JEDDI as Labour Imperative

**Nick J. Mulé** York University

### Abstract

The post-secondary education sector is increasingly incorporating equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) frameworks into its institutions. This transition from traditional concepts of affirmative action and employment equity to a decolonization, equity, diversity, and inclusion (DEDI) model was very much in development both at administrative and faculty levels during my stint as Co-Chair of the Joint Committee on Administration of the Agreement (JCoAA), representing a large faculty association. In regular meetings with Labour Relations, representing university administration, conceptual perspectives differed, objectives needed to be agreed upon, and goals compromised. This paper explores the broader model of justice, equity, diversity, decolonization, and inclusion (JEDDI) and the absolute importance of such a perspective for the higher education sector and labour market in general. Implementing and actualizing JEDDI is important as universities continue to diversify. Utilizing such frameworks can assist in assuaging tensions regarding academic freedom, governance, and labour practices.

**Keywords** higher education; justice, equity, decolonization, diversity, inclusion; post-secondary education sector; universities

# Les mesures d'équité, de diversité, de décolonisation et d'inclusion : un impératif syndical

Nick J. Mulé York University

## Résumé

Le secteur de l'éducation postsecondaire intègre de plus en plus des cadres d'équité, de diversité et d'inclusion (EDI) dans ses établissements. Cette transition des concepts traditionnels d'action positive et d'équité en matière d'emploi vers un modèle de décolonisation, d'équité, de diversité et d'inclusion (DEDI) était en plein développement, tant au niveau de l'administration que du personnel académique, lors d'un mandat en tant que coprésident du comité mixte sur l'administration de la convention collective représentant une grande association de personnel académique. Lors de réunions régulières avec le service des relations du travail représentant l'administration de l'université, les perspectives conceptuelles différaient, il fallait se mettre d'accord sur les objectifs et faire des compromis. Le modèle plus large de justice, d'équité, de diversité, de décolonisation et d'inclusion (JEDDI) est exploré, ainsi que l'importance absolue d'une telle perspective dans le secteur de l'enseignement supérieur et sur le marché du travail en général. L'importance de la mise en œuvre et de l'actualisation des mesures de JEDDI est démontrée, car les universités continuent de se diversifier et l'utilisation de ces cadres peut contribuer à apaiser les tensions relatives à la liberté académique, à la gouvernance et aux pratiques de travail.

**Mots-clés** éducation supérieure; justice, équité, décolonisation, diversité, inclusion; secteur de l'éducation postsecondaire; universités

## **Introduction**

Over the past number of years, we have witnessed the growing prominence of the equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) framework in society, including the higher education sector. It has been for good reason that this framework and variations of it are being instituted and administered, given the growing diversification of the faculty complement in the sector (Universities Canada, 2022) and the contributions we bring to higher education in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. In this paper, I share insights from my experience while holding a prominent faculty association position and dealing directly with Labour Relations on a regular basis at a time that coincided with EDI being instituted at York University, one of the larger universities located in southwestern Ontario, Canada. The differing perspectives on EDI between the faculty association and Labour Relations were underscored by differing notions of traditional models of employment equity and affirmative action, temporal contextual issues, and differing understandings of the EDI framework. These differences of perspective produced tensions on multiple levels, from administrative to philosophical, with implications for governance. I argue that the importance of what those of us in the faculty association term the justice, equity, diversity, decolonization, and inclusion (JEDDI) framework is an imperative in higher education labour. Actualizing it in all aspects of our work adds breadth, depth, and value to the principles of academic freedom and academic integrity and it is very much worth continuing to fight for.

The concept of equity has been operationalized and defined in law in terms of fairness needed to mitigate potential draconian laws (Titi, 2021) and recognition of our differences (Blum, 2014), among other definitions. These understandings have influenced social and political thought beyond the legalities of Western philosophical perspectives. Specific to higher education, Amaral (2022) places emphasis on fairness and inclusion when defining equity, with localized focus on student access to and success in higher education, but far less attention has been paid to faculty, administrators, and staff in such settings. By contrast, Indigenous teachings drawn from Ojibwe stories highlight principles of love, truth, bravery, humility, wisdom, honesty, respect, and equity. These principles are very much tied to the land, which preceded books (Johnston, 2010), and call for us to make a concerted effort to recognize the core differences between Indigenous knowledge that emphasizes relationships and deep connections to the land and Western notions of human rights with a focus on individualism (Borrows, 2019). Hence, our challenge is to braid these approaches and others to create a more nuanced understanding and practice of EDI.

Incorporating an EDI framework into systems such as higher education institutions with histories of long-standing Western values that do not include consideration of class (Sullivan & Suissa, 2022), (dis)Ability (Katzman, 2023; Wolbring & Lillywhite, 2021), ethno-racialism (Teo & Febbraro, 2024), gender (MacDonald, 2023), Indigeneity (Lavallee, 2023), sexuality (Myers, Pringle & Giddings, 2013; Rumens, 2018), among others, has been widely discussed. Forms of institutional hegemony in which the privileged group reproduces its access to higher education generationally, reinforcing expectations of who could access this level of education and teach and research within it, have existed for decades. The lack of attention to discrimination and exclusion of others became embedded in these institutions, resulting in pervasive unconscious bias, about which there was a serious lack of data or research (Knopf & Flannigan, 1989). Employment equity and affirmative action models (Bakan & Kobayashi, 2016; Leck & Saunders, 1992) made some headway in addressing such concerns. Nevertheless, systemic barriers have persisted, including outright denial or defensiveness, the fear of change, limited perspectives and thus lack of empathy, power dynamics and gatekeeping, restricted language and framing, time and resource constraints, and competing priorities. Many of these systemic concerns were outlined decades ago by Justice Rosalie Abella (1986) in her report on employment equity. In academic institutions that are tiered and hierarchical, 'peers of the tier' need to vocally counter bias and discrimination. Yet, the stratified nature of universities creates settings of fear of retribution against/amongst employees with less power (i.e., untenured faculty). This produces systemic inequality (Bisson et al., 2022).

We all have a responsibility to address systemic barriers that impede EDI regardless of whether we are faculty or part of administration. Doing so involves developing an understanding of such barriers and the impacts they have on individuals and the system. Without such understanding, systemic barriers are upheld and reinforced. Thus, it is crucial we understand what role(s) we can take in addressing them. The conscious and active education (Das Gupta, 2023) and engagement of participants at all levels of the system is required (Government of Canada, 2024), as is each of us taking the time for self-reflection. Putting EDI principles into practice and keeping one another accountable in a supportive way that benefits each other and the system are also needed. Adopting these approaches counters brand-based window dressing, managerialism, incessant cost-benefit analysis, and the ideology of efficiency (Centre for Human Rights, Equity and Inclusion, 2024). But challenges can arise, which I have experienced, based on positioning within the university and the perspectives each of us bring to our roles (i.e., my role as a faculty member representing JEDDI issues for my faculty

association as opposed to an administrator representing the bureaucratic and economic interests of senior administration).

## **Philosophical and Material Differences**

York University opted for a Decolonization, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (DEDI) framework as its EDI strategy in 2023. Naming decolonization first aligned with the university's concerted efforts to centre Indigeneity on several fronts. Just prior to the finalization and release of the DEDI Strategy, York University Faculty Association's (YUFA) Equity Officers raised concerns that the concept of justice needed to be prioritized both for philosophical and material reasons. Although justice is listed last as one of 12 principles in the plan and lauded as "the conceptual foundation for York University's commitment to DEDI" (p. 12), YUFA's Equity Officers argued that not including it in the name excuses the institution from a genuine and material commitment to social justice.

We argue that social justice concerns can be most effectively addressed by a Justice, Equity, Decolonization, Diversity, and Inclusion (JEDDI) framework (Canadian Centre for Diversity and Inclusion 2014). Although several iterations of this framework (i.e., EDI, DEDI, etc.) (Wolbring & Nguyen, 2023) exist and have increasingly been employed over the past few years, outpacing employment equity and affirmative action models (Day et al., 2022; Eaton, 2022; Hayvon, 2024; Tucker, 2023), absencing justice from them can, in effect, weaken social change initiatives in the work. JEDDI is a fluid concept, ever shifting, intersecting, growing, developing — a constant metamorphosis. By refocusing our JEDDI lens at micro, mezzo, and macro institutional and social organizational levels, we more consciously address social justice issues that have long been overlooked or deliberately marginalized.

The JEDDI framework begins with justice as a foundational position of fairness that draws from and is supported by other components of the model (Mulé, forthcoming). Social justice and its pursuit are directly linked to structures and systems with the intent of positively impacting individuals and groups that take part in them (Hurlbert, 2018), including academic settings. Equity surpasses equality in recognizing that differences exist among us all and that such differences require accommodations for fair treatment, access, and opportunity (Hatfield et al., 2011). Decolonization is an ongoing commitment to Indigenous self-determination and requires all of us, regardless of our status, to work towards liberating ourselves from persistent colonial systems, structures, and institutions (Kluttz et al., 2019). Diversity involves not only being recognized but celebrated. It sees our differences

as producing an essential variety of values, perspectives, worldviews, cultures, and lived circumstances that enrich and contribute to social development, particularly in academic settings that value freedom of thought. Inclusion involves a sense of belonging and value to those who have often been excluded by individuals, groups, communities, systems, and structures (Canadian Centre for Diversity and Inclusion, 2014). The integration of each of the five components of the JEDDI model results in a powerful way to address social justice issues and concerns. I return to the implementation of the JEDDI framework later in this article.

## **Structural Positioning**

Between 2020 and 2023 I served as the Co-Chair of the Joint Committee on the Administration of the Agreement (JCoAA), representing my academic staff colleagues for the York University Faculty Association (YUFA). This is a prominent position on a very important committee at which both parties to our collective agreement (CA), faculty and the employer, are held to account to abide by the CA. The JCoAA meets regularly throughout the life of the legally binding CA to ensure its proper administration outside the bargaining process. The other Co-Chair, my counterpart, was from Labour Relations, representing university administration (the employer). They were accompanied by another Labour Relations representative; the Vice President, Faculty Relations; a few deans; and staff responsible for scheduling and minute-taking. I was accompanied by the President of YUFA, the Chief Steward, an Equity Officer, and up to two Members at Large, along with a union staff member who coordinated activities, oversaw follow-up, did scheduling, and took minutes. All aspects of the CA were addressed in the committee involving any issues either party had in carrying out our respective duties. This included York University's adoption of EDI as a framework and the framework's operationalization.

It should be noted that, over the years, JEDDI issues and concerns have become increasingly prominent in the work of YUFA. The association has two Equity Officers on its Executive that oversee the work of four caucuses: the Disability Caucus, the Indigenous Caucus, the Queer Caucus, and the Race and Equity Caucus. Historically, there had been a Women's Caucus with the objective of increasing the number of female faculty, but since the numbers of women has improved significantly over the past few decades, the caucus no longer meets. The Equity Officers hold Joint Equity Caucus meetings with the chairs of all four Equity Caucuses to collaborate, support each other's initiatives, and address intersectional issues. This comprehensively developed structure is indicative of both the large size

and diversity of the faculty association's membership. JEDDI issues are of great importance to many members of YUFA, which I saw firsthand as an Equity Officer in a previous stint on YUFA's Executive.

## Temporal Contexts and Framework Transitioning

During my tenure on JCoAA, two major events took place that had very real consequences for our work and EDI in particular. Six weeks into my role, the COVID-19 pandemic forced York University, along with other Canadian universities, to shut down most of its on-campus operations and to pivot to virtual work. The second incident was the killing of George Floyd in the US, and the increased media attention on police killings of Black and Indigenous people there and in this country. These contextual factors are noteworthy, as the university was under intense pressure to both redesign its operations to conform to public health protocols and respond to the public's increased consciousness of the treatment of Black and Indigenous Peoples in our society. Prior to these events, York University was also in the process of addressing Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Commission Report's (2015) numerous recommendations for higher education institutions. Mass graves of Indigenous children that attended residential schools in Kamloops, BC, were discovered (Anandakugan, 2021) at this time as well. During the pandemic, my role expanded to chairing meetings between YUFA and senior administration (including the President and Provost) to address all COVID-related matters, at first twice a week at the start of the crisis and then weekly, biweekly, and monthly. Also, during this time, the university made a concerted effort to design and implement an EDI strategy.

To ensure a concerted focus on EDI at the administrative level, York University hired a Vice President, Equity, People and Culture. During their tenure in this role, they expanded EDI to include decolonization. Decolonization, equity, diversity, and inclusion (DEDI) became central to *York University's Academic Plan 2020-2025*. Working in collaboration with the President, the Vice President, Equity, People and Culture formed an EDI Steering Committee and a President's Advisory Council on EDI, consisting of non-academic staff, academic staff, undergraduate and graduate students, and postdocs. Following consultations with all levels of the university, they produced the *York University Decolonizing, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Strategy 2023-2028*. Although generally well received, there remained problems with the university's decision to opt for the DEDI framework, which I will explore below. At the time, York University also appointed faculty members, both people of colour with strong track records on equity issues, into the roles of Senior Advisor on



Equity and Representation in the Office of the Vice President of Equity, People and Culture and an Affirmative Action, Equity, and Inclusion Officer whose major task was to provide anti-racism and equity workshops, particularly to faculty on Hiring Committees. York University also instituted POLARIS (Place for Online Learning for the Adjudication of Researchers Inclusively and Supportively), an online self-paced training tool created by faculty for faculty regarding the review or adjudication of researchers and their applications (Awards Adjudication Committees) and for those serving on Hiring Committees (York University, 2023a).

## **Infrastructural Tensions**

While the York University administration should be commended for these EDI initiatives, credit is equally due to the numerous socially diverse faculty members who advocated for these changes for many years. Our governance infrastructure, like most universities, requires faculty and administration to work collaboratively in meeting the university's goals and objectives, albeit the degree to which this happens is questionable. On the EDI front, it was a combination of faculty advocacy, both within and outside the faculty association, and administrative receptivity that culminated in a shift towards York University's formal DEDI strategy. Nevertheless, tensions persisted.

Although the Vice-President, Equity, People and Culture led the design, development, and consultations of the DEDI Strategy, Labour Relations staff were slow to embrace it. Their level of knowledge and sensitivity to equity issues were minimal at best. This was on display throughout the COVID crisis, when they showed little sensitivity towards the specialized needs of faculty members who were mothers or caregivers of children, seniors, or the (dis)Able. The needs of those who caught the virus or who developed long COVID had to be fought for through extensive grievances involving bureaucratic classifications of short-term vs. long-term disability issues and the ability to work remotely or come to campus when social distancing restrictions were lifted. The long-standing issues that racialized and Indigenous female faculty have faced, from unfair teaching evaluations to fears regarding the tenure process, were exacerbated during the COVID crisis. We argued that teaching evaluations should be suspended during the pandemic, but the employer refused, citing the importance of maintaining faculty members' tenure process, in spite of research that shows the limits of such evaluations (Delgado Shorter, 2023). Repeated attempts at educating Labour Relations, including meeting with the Vice President, Equity, People and Culture, their supervisor, resulted in no change in their sensitivity towards minoritized or disenfranchised



faculty's compounded issues due to the pandemic. This is partly due to the facts that the lead Labour Relations staff were not minoritized and were committed to an adversarial labour relations approach. Any minimal change that did transpire required long, drawn out, intensive advocacy on our part, clearly exposing a serious lack of DEDI education on the part of the Labour Relations representatives. This also revealed a disconnect between the university's professed commitment to principles of DEDI and how it actually treats its faculty.

One example of positive movement toward the furthering of diversity at the university was initiated by members of the faculty association. Black faculty members held a series of consultations with senior administration, asking them to commit to a set of designated hires of Black scholars. York was already in the midst of designated cluster hires for Indigenous faculty. At the time, George Floyd's murder was receiving extensive media coverage and Black Lives Matter was calling upon institutions to reflect on their treatment of Black people. York was being pressed to rise to the challenge by its Black faculty. These consultations were also premised on a report issued in early 2020 by the Joint Sub-Committee on Employment Equity and Inclusion that recommended a minimum of six Black hires within the next 3 years (York University). Two of YUFA's Equity Caucuses, the Race Equity Caucus and the Indigenous Caucus, also collaborated on the report and the consultations, and urged us at JCoAA to support the recommended designated Black and Indigenous hires, which we did. Ultimately, the consultations resulted in 14 designated Black hires and six additional Indigenous designated hires. This combination of faculty and administration working together in the midst of the disturbing George Floyd incident exemplifies what can be accomplished when political will can be harnessed at all levels.

## **Employment Equity and Affirmative Action**

For decades York University had employment equity and affirmative action frameworks in place, and during my stint as JCoAA Co-Chair, EDI efforts were already underway. The Joint Committee on Affirmative Action (JCAA) oversees hiring processes as they relate to employment equity and affirmative action, paying close attention to related articles in our collective agreement. This joint committee, made up of representatives from administration and faculty, met regularly to review and update policies based on feedback and concerns received regarding hires. JCAA issued an annual report that was then submitted to JCoAA. Upon receiving this report in my first year as JCoAA Co-Chair, I examined it and the previous year's annual report to familiarize myself with their processes. Notably,

the reports listed extensive employment equity and affirmative action items raised in the previous year under the categories of 'Observations' and 'For Consideration,' yet there was no 'Recommendations' category. In addition, the lists provided were nearly identical between the two annual reports I reviewed.

I called a meeting with the faculty representatives of JCAA to discuss my observations, learn more about their procedures, and work out on the faculty side how we could make the work of the JCAA more effective. It turned out these categories had long been used and had become part of their annual report template, and that the work of the JCAA had increasingly become box checking with little to no commitment to actual change. Through our discussion, I encouraged the faculty members of the JCAA to assert what they believed needed to be systemically addressed to improve the employment equity and affirmative action components of our hiring processes, and promised that I would take this up with Labour Relations through the JCoAA. I then called a dedicated meeting with JCoAA and JCAA to discuss the JCAA Annual Report. At first cordial, the representatives from Labour Relations eventually took umbrage with our push that recommendations-based language be brought in and we address employment equity and affirmative action issues with the goal of reducing the 'Observations' and 'For Consideration' items year over year and materially implement the required changes. Labour Relations attempted to claim JCAA was responsible for producing an annual report and JCoAA was simply responsible for acknowledging receipt of it. They added that the meeting I had called between JCAA and JCoAA added to their already busy schedules and that monitoring recommendations was outside our scope and increased everyone's workload.

Space does not permit more detail about the discord between administration (Labour Relations) and the faculty association (YUFA), but I felt it important to communicate to the employer that YUFA takes seriously EDI concerns inclusive of employment equity and affirmative action. A high percentage of grievances received by YUFA centre around hirings. As such, we felt it would be in both parties' interests to give employment equity and affirmative action concerns the attention they need and to implement changes we can agree on. Their response is a classic example of systemic procedures overriding actual effective material change. While relations between administrative and faculty representatives on JCAA were quite good, it was the upper level of administration, the Labour Relations representatives in particular, who balked at our requested changes. Eventually, faculty representatives convinced the administrative representatives to be more change-oriented in their joint work on the JCAA. We (faculty representatives) then pushed for the same at the JCoAA level.

## **JEDDI in Practice**

Putting JEDDI into practice involves the varied tasks we undertake as academics within the formal obligations of our work as well as our relationships with people, systems, and structures within academia, communities and society. Practicing JEDDI should be encouraged amongst us all in our roles as academics and beyond. JEDDI work begins with the self, acknowledging one's privileges and oppressions, being cognizant of one's positionality, and consciously considering JEDDI elements regarding how we relate to others. Foundational to JEDDI practice is a commitment to reflexivity, as JEDDI work involves engaging in a learning process at personal, interpersonal, structural, and systemic levels. Therefore, undertaking JEDDI-based social justice work involves a clear personal commitment, a means to extend the practice to others, and knowing how to navigate resistance on the part of others in that process.

Being conscious of our own sense of identity and the varying social locations we occupy, circumstantial contexts we experience, and the essentialism and fluidity of such circumstances, assists us in determining how we position ourselves (The African American Policy Forum & Crenshaw, n.d.). Learning about and applying this thought process to others creates understanding, particularly regarding our differences (Amnesty International, 2024), and varying intersectionalities of our social locations (Crenshaw, 2016; Smith, 2013). This includes the importance of examining our relationship to colonialism and, crucially, how we contribute to decolonization (Kluttz et al., 2019). Accounting for our socialization, the extent of its entrenchment, and how it differs from those of others permits us to check our biases, how such biases influence our behaviours, and determine the means of addressing them (Mason, 2020; Pritlove et al., 2019). Developing allyship through difficult conversations, a commitment to accountability, and meaningful apology furthers the process (Gaffney, 2016; Kluttz et al., 2019). Each of these steps involves self-reflection and may include moments of resistance as well as revelations (Canadian Centre for Diversity and Inclusion, 2014; McIntosh, 2005). JEDDI work is not to be seen as conclusive but rather ongoing, requiring deep thought and a personal commitment to sustain the learnings and continuously practice them.

## **JEDDI Tensions**

The arguments put forth by YUFA's Equity Officers, as evidenced in the literature, speak to a tension between the institution's commitment to DEDI and its commitment to justice. While the employer points to justice as a recognized

principle of its DEDI framework, the faculty association holds justice at such high value it argues it should be part of the framework's name and lead the practice of JEDDI overall. This tension will be monitored by YUFA in the ongoing DEDI work of York University.

The rise of EDI frameworks in academic settings inevitably brushes up against one of the most sacred values of academia, academic freedom. Increasingly in academia, EDI statements are being requested of new faculty candidates, who are asked about their ability to teach diverse student bodies and create inclusive learning spaces. Similarly, some research funders are calling upon researchers to include EDI plans in their grant proposals. These are important elements in lowering or eliminating barriers. Nevertheless, as I illustrate in this paper, EDI can be complicated, and candidates/researchers may carry varying views about it that may not entirely align with that of the institution. An explicit example of this are individuals who see EDI as a threat to their academic freedom. Institutions need to be open to varying perspectives on EDI and to the fact that academics have the right to express differing views even if they are critical. In the case of academic appointments, it is important that institutional EDI statements are not imposed, but rather co-created by faculty, who, in turn, provide careful peer decisions in reviewing such applications. Also, academics engaged in peer reviewing research applications need to carefully assess applicant EDI statements for their relevance to the work of the proposed research project (Robinson, 2023).

## **JEDDI and Multi-Structural Governance**

Just as JEDDI issues are ongoing and open-ended, in that they involve developing sensitivity towards individuated and group needs, so too is the framework they are placed in. The true value of undertaking JEDDI concepts in post-secondary education requires a commitment to it on all levels. This in turn requires us to keep each other in check regarding these principles for accountability purposes. A glaring contradiction apparent at York University is that senior administration (including the President) has embraced DEDI as a framework, extending considerable resources for institutional implementation, yet such DEDI principles are not upheld in the administration itself, at least not in YUFA's experiences dealing with Labour Relations. This disconnect represents a broken link in the system that YUFA has repeatedly called out and that senior administration has yet to adequately address. JEDDI work is not easy work, and a commitment to it via statements, strategies, and reports is only the beginning. The real work is in consciously committing

ourselves to its principles as faculty members and as administrators. Only then will there be any chance for JEDDI to become institutionally meaningful.

## **Future of JEDDI in Higher Education**

The JEDDI framework is not perfect and can rightfully be accused as being the latest buzzword model in the field of human rights and equity work (El Muggamar, 2023). And yet, as the higher education sector steeped in white Anglo-Saxon tradition (Ellard, 2019) continues to diversify, a framework such as JEDDI helps us focus on what the academy has tended to ignore for too long. The varying social locations occupied by those who work in and study at universities clearly needs to be recognized. Translating these diversities through JEDDI policies and practices to effectively address long-standing oppressions is key. Once again, the commitment to JEDDI needs to be an ongoing one.

## **Conclusion**

As EDI has become a prominent framework driven by increased consciousness of the diversity of our society and the need for equitable responses and more inclusive approaches, traditional employment equity and affirmative action models are being transformed. All major sectors are being impacted, and post-secondary education is no exception, with EDI needed at all structural levels within universities. This paper has highlighted the more expansive JEDDI model based on my experiences in my past role as Co-Chair of the Joint Committee on Administration of the Agreement (JCoAA) at York. Having been in this position during a crucial time of DEDI development, external pressures regarding attention to and accommodation of Black issues, compounded by the COVID pandemic crisis, revealed structural tensions with material implications based on philosophical differences. Our understanding and interpretation of EDI, DEDI, or JEDDI are dependent on our social positionings. These positionings, particularly for those of us in minoritized or disenfranchised populations, must inform the ongoing work required in these initiatives. Just as universities have become and continue to be diversified, and despite the imperfections of JEDDI frameworks, it is imperative that this work continues, with strong commitment to operationalizing decolonization, equity, diversity, and inclusion, towards justice-based material changes. Sidestepping the latter, which the employer did in our case, falls short of the very implementation principles of JEDDI and inevitably will require further advocacy on the part of faculty members.

## References

- Abella, R. S. (1986). Employment Equity. *Man. LJ*, 16, 185.
- Amaral, A. (2022). Equity in higher education: Evidences, policies and practices. Setting the scene. In *Equity policies in global higher education: Reducing Inequality and increasing participation and attainment* (pp. 23-46). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Amnesty International. (2024). *Discrimination*. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/what-we-do/discrimination/>
- Anandakugan, N. (2021). The Death at Kamloops School: The deadliness of Indigenous Boarding Schools in Canada and Beyond. *Harvard International Review*, 42(3), 12–16. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27275709>
- Bakan, A. B., & Audrey, K. (2007). Affirmative action and employment equity: Policy, ideology, and backlash in Canadian context. *Studies in Political Economy*, 79(1), 145-166.
- Bisson, L.F., Grindstaff, L., Brazil-Cruz, L., & Barbu, S.J. (Eds.) (2022). *Uprooting bias in the academy: Lessons from the field*. Springer Cham.
- Blum, L. (2014). Three educational values for a multicultural society: Difference recognition, national cohesion and equality. *Journal of moral education*, 43(3), 332-344.
- Borrows, J. (2019). *Law's Indigenous Ethics*. University of Toronto Press.
- Canadian Centre for Diversity and Inclusion (CCDI). (2014). *Addressing fear and resistance: Toolkit for diversity and inclusion practitioners*. <https://ccdi.ca/media/1074/20150217-ccdi-report-addressing-fear-and-resistance-in-di-eng.pdf>
- Centre for Human Rights, Equity and Inclusion. (2024). Justice, equity, decolonization, diversity & inclusion: JEDDI champions session with CHREI. York University.
- Das Gupta, T. (2023). Unconscious bias training: Performativity or pushing the margins? OCUFA: *Academic Matters*, 15-19.
- Crenshaw, K. (2016). *The urgency of intersectionality*. TEDwomen. [https://www.ted.com/talks/kimberle\\_crenshaw\\_the\\_urgency\\_of\\_intersectionality?language=en](https://www.ted.com/talks/kimberle_crenshaw_the_urgency_of_intersectionality?language=en)
- Day, A., Lee, L., Thomas, D.S.P. & Spickard, J. (Eds.) (2022). *Diversity, inclusion, and decolonization: Practical tools for improving teaching, research, and scholarship*. Bristol: Bristol University Press.
- David Delgado Shorter. (2023). Student Teaching Evaluations Are Racist, Sexist, and Often Useless: It's time to put these flawed measures in their place. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Eaton, S.E. (2022). New priorities for academic integrity: equity, diversity, inclusion, decolonization and Indigenization. *International Journal for Educational Integrity* 18, (10). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-022-00105-0>

El Muggamar, R. (2023, March 7). What does social justice have to do with it? York University: Inclusion Week Webinar. <https://youtu.be/UowmLZFxfqo>

Ellard, D-B. (2019). *Anglo-Saxon(ist) pasts, postSaxon futures*. Punctum Books.

Gaffney, C. (2016). Anatomy of an ally: Be there – for kids and colleagues – when caring just isn't enough. *Learning for Justice*, 53. <https://www.learningforjustice.org/magazine/summer-2016/anatomy-of-an-ally>

Government of Canada. (2024). Best practices in equity, diversity and inclusion in research practice and design. New Frontiers in Research Fund. <https://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/nfrf-fnfr/edi-eng.aspx>

Hatfield, E., Salmon, M., & Rapson, R.L. (2011). Equity theory and social justice. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 8(2), 101-121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14766086.2011.581818>

Hayvon, J.C. (2024). Action against inequalities: A synthesis of social justice & equity, diversity, inclusion frameworks. *International Journal for Equity in Health* 23, (106) <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-024-02141-3>

Hurlbert, M.A. (2018). Theorizing justice. In M.A. Hurlbert (Ed.) *Pursuing Justice: An Introduction to Justice Studies* (Second Edition), 27-61. Halifax, Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.

Johnston, B. (2010). *The Gift of the Stars*. Kegedonce Press.

Katzman, E. (2023, Fall). Universal design for universal access. OCUFA: *Academic Matters*, 20-24.

Kluttz, J., Walker, J., & Walter, P. (2019). Unsettling allyship, unlearning and learning towards decolonizing solidarity. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 52,(1), 49-66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02660830.2019.1654591>

Knopf R. & Flannigan, T. (1989). *Human Rights & Social Technology: The War on Discrimination*. Carleton University Press.

Lavallee, L. (2023). Why Indigenous resurgence is needed at universities: An interview with Lynn Lavallee. OCUFA: *Academic Matters*, 3-5.



Leck, J.D., & Saunders, D.M. (1992). Canada's Employment Equity Act: Effects on employee selection. *Population Research and Policy Review* 11, 21–49.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00136393>

MacDonald, S.Z. (2023). Admitting women into English-Canadian universities: A short history. OCUFA: *Academic Matters*, 10-14.

Mason, B. (2020, June 04). Curbing implicit bias: What works and what doesn't. *knowable Magazine*. <https://knowablemagazine.org/content/article/mind/2020/how-to-curb-implicit-bias>

McIntosh, P. (2005). *White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack*.

<https://admin.artsci.washington.edu/sites/adming/files/unpacking-invisible-knapsack.pdf>

Mulé, N.J. (Forthcoming). Grounding Social Justice Principles for Global Social Issues. In R. Baikady (Ed.) *Reimagining Social Work Education in Our Turbulent World*. Springer Nature/Routledge.

Myers, B., Pringle, J. K., & Giddings, L. S. (2013). Reflections from EDI conferences: consistency and change. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 32(4), 455-463.

Pritlove, C., Juando-Prats, C., Ala-leppilampi, & Parsons, J.A. (2019). The good, the bad, and ugly of implicit bias. *The Lancet*, 393(10171). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)32267-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32267-0)

Robinson, D. (2023). EDI statements: A thread to academic freedom? *CAUT Bulletin*, September-October, p.7.

Rumens, N. (2018). Queered methodologies for equality, diversity and inclusion researchers. In *Handbook of research methods in diversity management, equality and inclusion at work* (pp. 103-121). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Smith, A. (2013). *The Problem with "Privilege."* Andrea Smith's Blog.

<https://andrea366.wordpress.com/2013/08/14/the-problem-with-privilege-by-andrea-smith/>

Sullivan, A., & Suissa, J. (2022). The EDI opponents of equality, diversity and inclusion. *Culture Wars Papers*, (2), 1-6.

Teo, T., & Febbraro, A. R. (2024). Modeling and theorizing in psychology: Autoepistemology and epistemic EDI (equity, diversity, and inclusion) as tools for challenging racism. *Review of General Psychology*, 10892680241261053.

The African American Policy Forum & Crenshaw, K. (N.D.) *Intersectionality matters! The podcast that brings intersectionality to life*. <https://www.aapf.org/intersectionality-matters>

Titli, C. (2021). *The Function of Equity in International Law*. Oxford Academic.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198868002.003.0002>

Truth, & Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015). *Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, Volume One: Summary: Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future*. James Lorimer & Company.

Tucker, A. (2023). Decolonizing Learning by the Promoting Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Framework in Higher Education Curriculum: Concept Paper. In T. Bastiaens (Ed.), *Proceedings of EdMedia + Innovate Learning* (pp. 1170-1174). Vienna, Austria: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).  
<https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/222631/>

Universities Canada. (2022). Stats on equity, diversity, and inclusion at Canadian universities. <https://univcan.ca/priorities/equity-diversity-inclusion/stats-on-equity-diversity-and-inclusion-at-canadian-universities/#:~:text=Among%20university%20leadership%2C%2053%25%20identify,EDI%2C%20Universities%20Canada%2C%202022>

Wolbring, G., & Lillywhite, A. (2021). Equity/equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) in universities: the case of disabled people. *Societies*, 11(2), 49.

Wolbring, G. & Nguyen, A. (2023). Equity/Equality, Diversity and Inclusion, and Other EDI Phrases and EDI Policy Frameworks: A Scoping Review. *Trends in Higher Education* 2(1):168-237. <https://doi.org/10.3390/higheredu2010011>

York University. (2019). *York University's Academic Plan 2020-2025*.  
<https://www.yorku.ca/uap2020-25/>

York University. (2020). *Increasing the Representation of Black Faculty Members at York: Report and Recommendations by the Joint Subcommittee of Employment Equity and Inclusivity*. <https://yorkspace.library.yorku.ca/server/api/core/bitstreams/38b80fca-0c48-4b99-93e9-38807360d756/content>

York University. (2023a). *POLARIS: About Us*.  
<https://www.yorku.ca/research/project/polaris/about-us/>

York University. (2023b). *York University Decolonizing, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Strategy 2023-2028*. [https://www.yorku.ca/dedi-strategy/wp-content/uploads/sites/854/2023/05/22-201\\_DEDI-Strategy-2023-28\\_EN\\_r5.pdf](https://www.yorku.ca/dedi-strategy/wp-content/uploads/sites/854/2023/05/22-201_DEDI-Strategy-2023-28_EN_r5.pdf)