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.