



GSC Equity Lens

Equity | Justice | Inclusion | Diversity | Access

Objective—By utilizing an equity lens, GSC can be more effective, conscientious, and intentional in decision-making. Policies, programs, practices, and decisions can be made with more time and thought to be critical and strategically move towards equitable outcomes. By engaging multiple perspectives, harm can be reduced and we can hold ourselves accountable to impacted parties.

1. Outcomes and Assumptions

Outcomes

How can this decision meaningfully move toward our equity goals?

In the best-case scenario, what does success look like if this decision is implemented?

What may be some negative or unintended consequences? Who is affected?

Assumptions

Is there anything that is being taken for granted in this decision?

How does our positionality inform and influence this decision? What biases may be at play?

What is being prioritized over equity?
What is non-negotiable in this decision?

2. Engage Diverse Perspectives

How are our processes supporting the empowerment of communities historically most affected by inequities?

How do we make diverse communities feel included, engaged, successful, valued, productive, safe, and heard?

Are we considering the access needs of communities based on time, day, physical and technical accommodations?

Have we received any input from potentially impacted communities before moving forward?

3. Attend to barriers

What barriers are keeping people from participating or engaging with this decision?

What does the barrier look like? Is it a policy, practice, or process? Is it managerial, financial, programmatic, or institutionally mandated?

What can be done to mitigate or remove these barriers in the future?

Are there new barriers being created in this decision?

4. Communication

How will we communicate the decision in an inclusive, culturally sensitive, accessible, and responsible manner to affected parties?

Which channels will execute and assist in our communications?

5. Feedback and Evaluation

How are we holding ourselves accountable for whatever impact this decision had (invitation, process, closure)?

Who was affected—positively, negatively, or not at all—by this decision, process, and action? List positives and negatives.

Which stakeholder groups would we like to have included but were unable to facilitate? What blindspots were unaccounted for?

What have we learned about effective practices that we can recommend being continued by other offices and departments?