Metrics Task Force Meeting

Wednesday, November 28, 2018

3:30 - 5:00 p.m.

Notes

* Prioritization task force update - Lauren
	+ Met on Monday, November 26
	+ Talked about moving some goals into other goals to make more sense.
	+ Some suggested changes were language changes.
	+ Reference to university values everywhere, not just for orientation and recruitment for students but also faculty and staff.
		- Might move from goal 1
	+ Include commissions in new employee orientation for recruitment.
	+ Identify strategies that have already been implemented such as the Zone trainings.
	+ The task force held a discussion of badging system, and may reword and include language about inventory.
	+ A lot of discussion was held about why the plan was laid out the way it was and how to lay it out to make the most sense.
* Lauren - The idea with this plan is an overall university plan, so some of the strategies may be more appropriate at the unit level.
* Priscilla mentioned that there will be different metrics for different departments. In regards to cultural competence, the only current metric we have is a student survey. This can tell us if students have had negative experiences such as microaggressions. A faculty/staff survey could also serve as a metric. There are other ways to gather metrics such as the number of complaints, for example.
* April asked what data will we get from the climate survey to understand what metrics could be quantified?
* Discussion of the idea of using the MAKSS (The Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey) for faculty and staff.
* Priscilla shared that the EAB survey for students will measure satisfaction for cultural competence, Title IX, and disability. Other models can be added to rotate in, such as food insecurity and more in depth on existing topics. This is the first student survey being performed in a non-homegrown survey environment.
* IDI (intercultural competence) is used in residence life to train, and it is an in depth assessment and personal development tool. It is a program that takes 30-50 hours. Perhaps it could be offered as professional development.
	+ Nick shared that he has examples of the reports that come from the assessment to share with the group.
* We are looking for a faculty/staff survey that is cost effective.
* Karen mentioned reviewing the Coach survey.
* Priscilla also mentioned a HERI survey that was done on campus a few years ago.
* Calvin mentioned that each goal requires a different way of measuring. Many can be measured with a survey. However, some cannot. For example, Goal 2 would be enrollment numbers. Goal 3 would be a faculty/staff survey as well as data. Goal 1 could be measured with a survey and enrollment in things like Diversity Zone. How successful are the programs that are being implemented? Are they being attended? Is it being taken back to the home department and encouraging others to attend? Are the numbers of trainings going up? Goal 4 is what we are already doing. Goal 5 we have to look at how we survey data; compare student vs. faculty/staff.
* April mentioned we are already documenting the communication patterns for accreditation so we can probably use that data.
* Priscilla mentioned the Carnegie measures that could be adopted.
* Calvin mentioned that Goal 3 (“increasing”) is very data driven from enrollment, hiring, etc. data. It could also be surveys.
* Discussion of the need for transparency. U of A has a system for institutional research. We have the Fact Book, but it cannot be manipulated like the U of A system.
	+ Calvin reviewed U of A website (U of A, Diversity by the Numbers) and the only outside organizations mentioned is the survey of earned doctorates. It was determined that the data is for IPEDS.
* Priscilla mentioned the data gathered for Affirmative Action, IPEDS, and other purposes. However, these data are collected with very specific questions in mind and may not be entirely what we need to have a full measurement.
	+ Discussion of who do you want to measure? Temporary staff? Do people only get measured once?
* Discussion of using data not just for external purposes, but gather it to be proactive and invested.
* Discussion of how we do not collect data on LGBTQ or disability for students.
* Discussion of EMSA Tableu interactive dashboard. Capability is now available with Wordpress. Still what is included in these data has been based on particular data requests. However, Lauren mentioned this is not an accessible platform.
* We should decide what we want to measure then bring in IRA to determine how we obtain it.
* Priscilla mentioned if we have all of the data that is great. When it rolls up to the institutional level we have to match and make sure the data is meaningful to ABOR.
	+ Lauren mentioned discrepancies exist for the 21 day census. They drop students who have not paid, for instance. We have to know what we are really looking at.
	+ April mentioned if we pull based on ABOR data then we may be excluding students of color who may have more financial difficulties.
	+ Karen mentioned even if we measure the data differently than ABOR, we can compare the data and see if they both indicate increases.
* Data collection cannot be perfect.
* Underrepresented groups have to choose to disclose this information. The only way to find out this information is self-identification. Federally, this self-disclosure cannot be required.
* Discussion of who is not being measured, for example in freshman cohorts. How can we be politically sensitive about what we are not measuring and disclose this?
* Discussion of calling in IRA to ensure we are using the same definitions so we are able to compare outside NAU.
* Priscilla mentioned this data can be used for advocacy, and we have to advocate for continuous betterment of how the data is tracked.
* Karen asked - Is there a governing body for equity and access and best practices for measuring? Priscilla responded the government tells us what to measure for the Affirmative Access plan.
	+ CUPA for HR - Josh is enrolled
	+ There are a lot of affirmative action organizations that give best practices.
	+ American Association for Equity and Diversity
	+ Industry Liaison Group - Lauren is involved and they are focused on Affirmative Action topics.
	+ April asked should we be looking at organizations that are more about education rather than private companies?
	+ There is a data governance committee at NAU that works on these kinds of issues.
* In regards to mixed measures, Nick mentioned that the University Writing program has a rubric and it includes self-assessment and reflection, so perhaps this could be the assessment piece with human stories. Is there is a way to analyze stories? For example, the human stories project, which has been considered as a strategy. Could there be a place for faculty/staff/students to include their stories?
	+ Lauren mentioned it is probably more of a cultural competence strategy rather than a metric. It could be a good research project, and these data sets could lend more research.
	+ Perhaps a goal could be added about seeking more grants/research.
* Priscilla mentioned this will be good for grant reporting.
* Priscilla reviewed the definition of cultural competence. One way is to measure how people feel, but could we put in a few more metrics that could be acceptable to the largest amount of the community?
	+ Measure the institutional commitment based on institutional funds? Yes, we could look at budget put towards diversity.
		- Of course, there are many outside factors that impact budget so it is important to be mindful of the bigger picture. Perhaps it could be measured proportionally, such as a % of state funds and that % should go up, not down.
		- Increased grant projects for diversity means it is probably being valued more. This data could be good to show future funding sources the good work we are doing and growing the funding. Discussion of what types of grants are available for diversity, including disability and women. Perhaps Hispanic serving institution?
* Priscilla provided an overview of the Center for University Access and Inclusion history. It is designed to be a way that, for example, researchers could go across departments/units to get grants towards diversity. It could be a good opportunity but it does not have a lot behind it yet (no staff for example).
* Regarding measuring commitment, is there a way to measure the number of events? The commissions and many groups are doing diversity events. Attendance could also be measured. Discussion of example events that have been held. How could we get a combined list? There is already a lot of money going towards these events.
	+ Discussion of need for centralized calendar, but the new calendar tool is not accessible. So it is currently a manual process on the CUAI website.
	+ We could relate it to who is holding the event and the title of the event.
	+ Discussion of how an accessible calendar could benefit, and need to add it to the priority list.
* What is the schedule for the baseline measurement?
	+ We need to prioritize first so we can determine what we want to measure to determine the timeline.
	+ The only thing planned right now is the student survey which will be finished in April, and will be rolled out early in the spring semester. Raw data by June. Data compared to other institutions and aggregate data by July for benchmarking.
	+ A lot of the data we already have, so it’s more about deciding what we want to pull and then deciding a snapshot date.
* In regards to the definitions in the plan, can we see what is being measured in the new survey or existing data such as IPEDS?
* Discussion of what the survey measures in terms of demographics.
	+ Not religion specifically, but participation in religious student groups.
	+ Veteran is pulled another way.
	+ Not sure about primary language.
* What are thoughts about what to do for the next meeting?
	+ We could invite IRA to discuss definitions. They will be necessary to have support.
	+ Leave what we have done today and think about the different measurements we would like to see related to the plan. Is there anything other than data we would need to measure the goals?
		- Send thoughts to the CUAI email. In the title, use metrics task force.
		- Discussion of a sharepoint where all of the task forces could be working together.

**Meeting End: 5:00 p.m.**