Search Committee Task Force Meeting

Tuesday, November 20, 2018

2:30 - 4:00 p.m., Havasupai C

Notes

* Diversity Strategic Plan
  + One of the goals of the Diversity Strategic Plan is to move away from silos and create university-wide structures
    - This will be a structure that the Diversity Fellow can use if this is a part of their role
  + The structure will provide definitions and common language
  + The DSP is continuing regardless of having a CDO
  + Will ensure that diversity is institutionalized
    - It will be included at all levels
      * Budget
      * Planning
      * Daily work of the university
* The group reviewed the DSP (available from the [CUAI website](https://nau.edu/center-for-university-access-and-inclusion/diversity-strategic-plan/))
* The group reviewed Conditions of Faculty Service Appendix C
  + Discussed that COFS has specific language for requirements for diversity representation on search committees that staff searches currently don’t have
  + Ultimate goal is to align the search committee requirements
    - Needs for diversity representation are similar
* How we got here
  + The idea for the creation of a DSP stemmed from a group who went to a conference at the University of Michigan and saw what they were doing and wanted to bring that to NAU
    - University of Michigan has a multimillion dollar budget for their diversity initiatives
  + Drafting of the DSP was led by the diversity commissions
    - Everything was included (the kitchen sink)
      * Now we need to work on prioritizing
        + What are the big asks in years 1-3 and then going forward
      * We need to build metrics to support initiatives with data
  + Group reviewed the DSP goals
    - These line up with the University Strategic Plan, which lines up to the ABOR strategic plan
    - Reviewed where the University Strategic Plan specifically refers to the DSP – (Goal 1, objective 4; Goal 4, objective 1; Goal 5, objective 4)
      * A flow chart that resembles the USP and ABOR charts will be created
    - Some of the items in the DSP are mandatory and campus-wide and some will be flexible for units to create plans that make sense for them
    - Goals 4 & 5 are important because they create accountability
    - Discussion of the term HUG and that it is a bit controversial
* Reviewed annotations to the DSP to show where work has already been done
* There are good things happening right now with the plan
* Why do we need a task force for search committees?
  + The process of creating a search committee with the current requirements is discriminatory on the face because of overtaxing minority and female faculty
  + When attempts have been made in the past concerns have been brought up because we didn’t have a solution for a change
    - Diverse faculty have said without another solution they would continue in this process while a solution is created
  + One possible solution is to create pools of trainined faculty who can properly represent diversity on search committees
    - How are we going to create that body of talent?
    - How should they be recruited/trained/set up?
      * Unit divisions/college committees who rotate?
        + Will these people be accepted as reasonable members on committees? Can people adequately serve across disciplines?
    - How will this be rewarded and incentivized?
      * Should units be able to decide for themselves how it will be rewarded or should a larger structure exist?
      * How are we able to change loads so that people are willing to participate?
      * Needs to be built-in as a value so that it happens.
  + For staff there is no tenure pressure but their lack of time to participate is similar
  + These are all items that this task force will discuss and hopefully resolve
* Discussion
  + How much ability do we have to change COFS?
    - Starting here because this language already exits
      * Faculty Senate is ready to go to make edits but they want something achievable to replace it.
  + Is the idea of pools the only option?
    - No, it’s open
      * We want to convey that we can’t expect POC to want to do this or pigeon hole them into the idea that they know how to convey diversity
      * We need to replace this process without creating another discriminatory process
  + Can definitions be revisited?
    - If there is feedback, please email it to the CUAI
      * Send sooner than later so we have time to vet proposed changes before the plan is launched
    - Definitions should be the same in both the academic and non-academic spaces
      * Need consistent talking points across the university
      * Some of the difference is with compliance vs university definitions
      * This will need to trickle down to the curriculum committee to adopt
  + How do we incentivize serving on search committees or pools or whatever form this finally takes?
    - It needs to be institutionalized
      * How can we structure this into our performance assessments
      * Can we use pay as incentive (not necessarily bonuses)?
      * Shouldn’t be above and beyond but make it the standard as regular duty expectations
        + Diversity is already built into administrator evaluations
      * Both incentives and performance appraisals should be used and should be mandatory
* Ideas
  + Hiring
    - There seems to be 3 stages of the process
      * Checking qualifications
      * Phone interview
      * On campus interview
    - How do these get weighted? Do the successive stages trump one another as they move forward in the process?
      * The faculty process is prescribed
      * The staff process is not, HR makes suggestions as to how a search should proceed but doesn’t mandate a process
    - There will always be places where bias can enter the decision-making process
      * “Diversity” person who is schooled in diversity is important
  + Suggestion
    - Matrix at phone interview and on-campus interview to show how each stage is weighted
    - When you are able to assess the person’s ability (not just on paper) another set of criteria should be used
    - Out of all the best practices we discuss/decide on, which should be mandated and which should be recommended
  + Will AZ law affect our DSP?
    - AZ has a no preference law
      * Before anti-affirmative action, ABOR had a rule that said that a tie breaker can be used to correct a deficiency (preference) – (this is stated in Executive Order 11246 as needing to be done in recruiting)
      * In 2011 a law was passed that said all money could no longer be used for preferential programs (scholarships went to the Foundation)
        + Preference rule went away

Nothing that indicates personal identity provided to committees

* + - * + Became sophisticated in writing job descriptions to include and require diversity understanding
        + This law will inform how far we can go
* Diversity Fellow Position
  + Comments
    - Not sure how this person is being selected
    - Seems that we aren’t following a process
    - The DSP wasn’t a part of the job description
  + Response
    - DSP is grassroots
      * The idea is to get as much done as possible while we can and get it implemented so it can outlive any barriers that exist right now
* Campus Climate Survey
  + The university is deploying a survey through EAB for students
  + We still need to find a survey for faculty and staff
  + Suggestion
    - IDI
      * Res Life uses this tool, it measures intercultural competence
      * The idea is that diversity is the difference that may make the difference
      * Individuals must be trained in the assessment to give the assessment
        + There is a post assessment as well
        + Provides a plot chart that shows where you think you are vs. where you really are

30-50 hours commitment to work through the areas

* + For the next meeting
    - Think about other options, not just pool idea
    - Comment: How is ethnic diversity defined
      * Language needs to be selected so that diversity is not diluted
    - What qualifies someone to be a part of the pool?
      * Who can be on and do they need specific training?
      * What are we looking for, how are we defining that at a minimum
    - Whose responsibility is it to decide where recruiting happens?
      * People trained in how to do good recruiting but aren’t a part of the search committee?
    - Is there a good model we could look at?
      * There are so many different models, we can look at any of them and pick and choose what will work for us
  + Next meeting, December 11th 2:30-4:00, location TBD.