

Equity Action Planning Task Force (EAPT)

Tuesday July 16, 2024, at 11:00am
President's Boardroom F303

Agenda

Attendance:

- Charles Anyinam (virtual)
- Kyle Anderson (virtual)
- Sal Renshaw (virtual)
- Kevin Wamsley (virtual)
- Ann-Barbara Graff
- Gail Driedger
- Tyandra Miller
- Chris Greco
- Talena Jackson
- Veronica Afonso
- Natalya Brown
- Emily Couchie
- Sarah Taylor
- Jenny Mackie
- Traci Malkowski

Not in Attendance:

- Quinn Erskine
- Javayah Pettigrew-Hope

Review responses to questions from proponents regarding the addendum

- The committee developed a response to one question received regarding the addendum.
- Question: Regarding Nipissing's ownership of the data collected through the process, how are OCAP data principles for Nipissing's Indigenous population operationalized and how that would bear on the project?
- Answer: We recognize that First Nations communities govern their own data. Best practices around the operationalization of OCAP data principles will be discussed with the successful vendor.

RFP process to date (Adam Middleton)

- Comments, questions and accusations that a past member presented to the group were read by the co-chairs.
- Adam and the co-chairs addressed these questions and reviewed the RFP process to date with the taskforce.
- A committee member asks for an Excel spreadsheet from Procurement for individuals to input their scores. This will be shared with the task force before the closing date.

Past membership discussion

- Linked to a request from a former member about adding “non-supporting” beside their name on the webpage and a follow-up post by the member that their request “was accepted by attendees at today’s meeting.”
- The co-chairs presented a summary of the request that included its presentation during our meeting and the lone follow-up comment, made by one of the co-chairs, that he did not oppose the request at that time.
- Because the request was made near the end of a meeting that was running well passed its scheduled time, members were not given the opportunity to appropriately discuss, reject, or accept the request—a concern that co-chairs reported members expressed following the meeting.
- The difference between unanimity and consensus was discussed.
- While the listing of past members was not seen as an appropriate place to include the above notation, posted minutes were identified as an appropriate forum for capturing the member’s concerns. An outline of those concerns is presented below.

<p>The following concerns were expressed by a former member at Senate, via chat messaging and/or email. This table outlines those concerns and their adjoined responses from co-chairs, procurement and task force members.</p>	
<p>Concern Identified:</p>	<p>Response:</p>
<p>Behaviour that could be perceived as favoring companies that tend to be favourable to University Administration:</p> <p>A co-chair spoke with one such company which specializes in post-secondary administration (e.g. policy analysis) and has added EDI to their portfolio. That company is believed to have provided him with a \$30,000-35,000 estimate.</p>	<p>As president of Nipissing University, co-chair Wamsley receives regular emails from companies who provide consulting or consultation to universities. That said, neither co-chair has communicated with any company/companies for a price or quote regarding this EDI work. Neither co-chair has engaged in discussions related to this project with any firm.</p>
<p>Timeline for posting the RFP, equal opportunity and access to bid on the RFP, “open, fair and transparent” process, fee-based platform concerns:</p> <p>The RFP was released on Bonfire and MERX approximately 11 days before the Task Force’s website was live. This provided companies with subscriptions to the above platforms an early access advantage</p>	<p>Adam Middleton (Procurement Specialist) indicates the Task Force followed all BPSO rules and guidelines in this process. We have the RFP posted for 60 days. The minimum number of days is 15, and best practice is 30 days if the work sought is intricate.</p> <p>The RFP was posted to Bonfire and MERX (high usage, e-procurement platforms with public sector entities).</p> <p>Bonfire is free to use but does offer a paid (premium user) service that, for example, provides reminders and a flowchart to manage procurement processes for a \$499/year fee.</p> <p>Premium subscriber or not, all persons/companies are able to access all RFPs. There is no monetary firewall and no advantage when it comes to bidding.</p>
<p>Intentionally not posting a budget range or budget in the initial RFP</p>	<p>Discussion on whether to post a budget were paused while awaiting additional information from the co-chairs. The Co-Chairs take responsibility for not reporting back to the committee after a discussion between the president and VPFA about the TF’s ability to post a budget range</p> <p>When the inadvertent oversight was flagged an addendum was released identifying the budget range.</p>

The \$100,000 budget	After multiple Executive conversations, university administrators determined a \$50,000 budget was not sufficient and the decision was made to find an additional \$50,000, raising the overall budget to \$100,000.
----------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Topics of discussion following the discussion of the concerns and addressing the concerns:

- A task force member identified we need to meet to talk about the process and how members are feeling. Some tensions would be helpful to sit down and address.
- There is a meeting scheduled in September to address the above concerns