**NAU Diversity Strategic Plan**

**Prioritization Task Force**

**March 11, 2019**

**Meeting Notes**

* Attendees
  + Priscilla Mills
  + Lauren Copeland-Glenn
  + Megan Trout
  + Grace Ditsworth
  + Calvin Legassie
  + Debra Edgerton
  + German Fermin
  + Gerald Wood
  + Ivy Banks
* Update that we have not heard from EMSA regarding Goal 2.
* Reviewed where the task force got to last meeting: 3.3.
* Discussion of status of goal 3.1 and it’s broad wording.
* Priscilla provided a summary of meeting with VP of Development and Alumni Engagement from the NAU Foundation, Rickey McCurry
  + He is interested in meeting with the task forces to explain how the Foundation is structured.
  + He does not think he would have a single representative for diversity. It would be more about training the representatives to look for opportunities that might exist for particular donations for targeted groups.
  + Did not have a chance to discuss the [Martha Portree Scholarship](https://nau.edu/csw/give-now/) funding status.
  + Working with alumni on affinity groups.
* Discussion of spelling out acronyms throughout the document or having a master key.
* Discussion of status of other task forces.
  + Faculty search committee will meet this Thursday. They have not met since this prioritization task force met last.
  + Metrics task force achieved deciding on benchmark dates every year for working with Institutional Research and Assessment.
    - Census dates
    - IPEDS dates
* Continuation of discussion and prioritization of section 3.3 *General Recruitment and Retention Strategies.*
  + Discussion of revising organization of this goal with “big ideas” to “small idea” sub-bullets underneath the big ideas, versus how it is currently organized with “small ideas” as major bullets. Consensus that this can be addressed as the group moves through the bullets.
  + 2nd bullet: “*At the division, college, or department level, supplement vendor services with targeted efforts to reach diverse applicants through other organizations and publications relevant to the particular discipline or position being recruited (e.g. AABHE - American Association of Blacks in Higher Education; the Society of Hispanic Professional Engineers)”* - Advertising category
    - Discussion that this is currently not happening consistently in every department to get diverse pools.
    - Discussion of current workflow for posting positions.
      * Staff positions only go through HR and are offered services for placing their ads. However, they don’t use groups that will target diverse applicants.
      * Overall lack of organization to get the individual colleges to spend money and research organizations to result in diverse candidates.
      * The Faculty Search task force is addressing how to do this in an efficient and effective way.
      * Discussion of whose responsibility it is - HR or the individual colleges.
    - Placed into years 1-3 priority.
  + Discussion of the first two bullets being under advertisement “big picture”. Discussion of what else can be done, other than providing higher salaries for diverse hires (which is illegal).
    - Discussion of possibility of providing course relief or incentives.
    - Discussion of job postings emphasizing diversity to attract applicants.
    - Discussion of allowability to targeting diverse groups in recruitment.
  + Discussion of big ideas being advertising, training, incentivizing and creating these as main bullets with other sub-bullets underneath. Then, consensus to move the sub-bullets underneath while prioritizing them at the same time.
  + 3rd bullet*“Post NAU diversity-related values and expectations on the Human Resources applicant website and require applicants for all administrator and faculty positions and designated professional and staff positions to provide a statement (similar to a statement of teaching philosophy) about how they will support diversity at NAU.”* - Advertising category
    - Discussion of purpose of this bullet and how this interacts with hiring matrices and decisions. Discussion of how this provides legitimacy and value.
    - Discussion of using the statement to find out about applicants living diversity in their lives or advocating for diversity in their prior positions/community rather than how they will apply the skills at NAU.
    - Discussion of modifying to add “written” statement.
    - Discussion of including a link to the diversity strategic plan on NAU’s website on the applicant website.
    - Discussion of including a statement from the President or the university about why NAU values diversity. Consensus of adding this to the HR requirement.
    - Discussion of comfort and legality of asking applicants to self-identify. If they self-identify voluntarily, that is okay, but it is not okay if it is required to disclose.
    - Discussion of including a link for veterans.
    - Discussion of breaking this into two bullets: one for HR applicant website vs. the written statement requirement.
      * Discussion of putting HR applicant website into 1-3 years priority.
      * Discussion of putting the written statement requirement into 4-7 years vs. 1-3 years.
      * Consensus reached to place in two bullets at 1-3 years priority for both.
    - Discussion of current requirement that applications include a commitment to diversity in the hiring matrix.
      * However, there is not a mechanism to follow-up if there is not compliance with this.
      * However, it is done in a variety of ways between units and not always a written statement and not always given the same weight in the matrix.
    - Discussion of how this requirement will be interpreted by diverse applicants.
      * Discussion of it allowing recognition for strength in this area and demonstrating that it is valued.
    - Discussion of how this might be more difficult for certain staff positions.
  + 4th bullet *“Craft job postings with language that emphasizes the value placed on diversity and inclusion and the support and resources available.”* - Advertising category
    - Discussion and consensus for 1-3 years priority.
  + 5th bullet *“Make search committee trainings for all members more robust and comprehensive, using a variety of learning methods and including topics of diversity best practices, implicit and unconscious bias, effective postings, targeted advertising, support services and community resources for applicants.”* - Training category
    - Discussion of this not being a current requirement for training.
    - Discussion and consensus to place this into 4-7 years priority.
  + 6th bullet *“Provide enhanced opportunities for professional development and training for those who will be representing diversity interests on search committees.”* - Training category
    - Discussion of how you “appear” and assumptions about who represents diversity interests. Discussion of tokenizing.
    - Discussion of how this is being addressed in terms of faculty search.
    - Discussion of something like an “out and proud list” of people who self-identify as representing diversity interests.
      * But who will do that if it means always having to serve on search committees?
        + Discussion of incentives. Does it serve as service committee for annual review purposes?
        + Discussion of being able to rotate off without repercussions.
        + Discussion of being told “that’s why you’re on the committee” being offensive and tokenizing.
    - Discussion of removing institutional bias in terms of the COFS being discriminatory for this requirement with the current language of this goal as written.
    - Discussion of training all people serving on search committees versus training a special group of people (not based on identities/status) to serve as oversight for bias and microaggressions.
    - Discussion of splitting this into two goals: 1. people who opt in to represent diversity interests on search committees; and 2. Providing trainings to those who do opt-in.
    - Discussion of the language in the COFS (Conditions of Faculty Service), Part C Hiring Process for Faculty and Academic Professionals, C.2 Approval to recruit
      * “b. The academic unit head (dean or designee) and/or department chair or director shall appoint the remaining members of the committee with particular attention paid to providing representation that includes ethnic and gender diversity. This requirement may mean that the chair must go outside the department for committee members to ensure the inclusion of underrepresented groups.”
      * “c. If the faculty, the chair or director, and the dean concur, the entire faculty of the academic unit may serve as the screening committee. Gender and minority representation referred to in (b) above is still required.”
* Discussion of Diversity Fellow hiring.
  + Discussion of whether or not to add a Chief Diversity Officer to the current Diversity Strategic Plan document.
    - Discussion of how this may weaken the support for the document from the current administration.
    - Discussion of possible language that could avoid an adversarial perspective.
    - Discussion of using the term “administrator charged with diversity”.
      * Discussion of currently placing responsibility on department heads, VPs, etc. in the plan.
* Next meeting is March 25, 2019 at 2:30PM in the Graduate College.