Part A:

1. /10 What are the benefits of diversity in the workplace? What impacts diversity? What can you do, as an employee, to promote diversity at work? What can employers do?

Diversity can be an incredibly positive thing when it comes to the workplace. Diversity can come in many forms being, age, ethnicity, gender, race, and capabilities, each having their own unique advantages to bring to your organization and team. Having diversity can open up for innovative ideas because not everyone is the same. People can approach the same task with different angles and try to narrow down on the best result. People with a lot of experience can have major influences on people who may not have as much experience, and this can grow the knowledge of the team. In the bigger picture, its best to have multiple minds working on the same problem as it allows for higher probability of success with all the different approaches.

As an employee, you can promote diversity by being open to accept new team members with a wide range of backgrounds. An employee must be open minded about the people they are working with and trust that they can work together to accomplish any goal. An employee must also be aware of a few things such as avoiding unconscious biases. An employee must be aware that everyone has different strengths and weaknesses and its important to try and make people feel comfortable with their work. This means not pushing someone to do a task they might not be as experienced in and instead letting them get the proper training to do said task or having someone how might be stronger in that area take care of that portion of work.

2. /10 What are your rights at work (Charter rights and health and safety)? What can you do if your rights are violated?

Workers have the right to a healthy workplace, free of harassment and discrimination. Under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, workers are protected for their basic rights and freedom. As for health and safety, your employer is obligated to provide their employees with a workplace that is safe, and free of discrimination and harassment. Every worker has the right to know about any hazards in the workplace and must be given all information, instruction, and training to protect their health and safety. In a working environment as an employee, you must do what your employer tells you. If requests that are asked to seem too dangerous or unsafe, you have the right to refuse work.

If any of your rights are violated, you must tell your employer about anything that is going on. If it is your employer who is violating your rights, you must contact a variety of services such as Human Resources or filing a human rights complaint. Its important to get the situation gets address as quickly as possible so there are no more issues for other people and employees.

Part B:

Case Studies (25 marks each = /50). You must respond to both case studies. In your answer make sure to discuss:

a. Relevant background information

b. Legal issues (for example, negligence; health and safety rights; harassment; Charter rights; etc.)

c. What are the ethical issues? d. What should be done? Why? Justify.

Case 1:

In any situation I would advise anyone to just do the right thing. In this situation the right thing is telling the trust which is telling her boss that the units were from a bad batch. As her co-worker I would back her up from our boss. Our boss doesn’t have any right to influence their employee’s actions by negatively degrading them and making them feel unsure of scared to choose an action they would otherwise feel fine choosing. The boss presented in the case study has many issues going against him. The first thing about him is he’s not accepting of diversity in his staff as he tells Catherine she was only a “diversity hire.” On top of that he is being sexist by calling her just a “stupid female.” These quotes alone violate Catherine’s rights and safety working as his employee. This falls under the Charter Rights because harassment is present. This is something she must not let get to her and she must contact somebody to address the harassment that is accruing. In this process this boss must be taken care of in the sense that he doesn’t harm anymore of his other employees like Catherine. If the situation persists, it must be taken to a higher up to be sorted. With this all being said, her decision should not change from what she thinks is right. The truth is always the best thing to do and if anybody brings up the argument that’s its bad for the company, my counter argument is lying is a bad image for the company. As these people are some of the best customers our company has, it would be a bad picture for any of customers we have as they could see this is how we treat our best customers.

Case 2:

Reading this study through my first thought was this program only solves one question, which is, is the person picking up the child is a legal guardian? For me this raises other issues. What if the guardians of the child are seriously caught up in something and can’t pickup their child but their perfectly trustworthy neighbor was available to pick them up. In this situation the AI creates another problem. Another question raised is, what if the AI malfunctions? Are the daycare employees going to restrict the guardians from picking up their child even if they know who they are, and the child knows they are their guardians? I feel uncomfortable with this kind of AI as it controls basic human interaction and a guardian’s right to take care of their child. This can all be summed up as a negligent perspective on trying to solve just one problem and not addressing any other problems that may be caused by it. With that all said, I do like its intentions. Protecting children from potential strangers should be taken seriously and this AI does that well. As for the comments made by Jonsah’s co-worker, this relates to my previous point, and this raises another problem. The system only accepts legal guardians for retrieving the child but doesn’t mention anything about recognition of the person or the actual relationship between the child and the guardian, just that they are a legal guardian. Reading this portion of the study I read the estranged family member as someone causing harm and they are taking advantage of the system to get hold of a child. I think Jonsah should address this situation to the daycare and his co-worker as something that could be very problematic.