Equity Data Working Group

Meeting # 1
11.21.17 | CP 105 | 10:30-12:30pm
Agenda

Meeting objectives:
• Create a foundation for collaborative leadership around our work
• Clarify the scope and purpose of the working group
• Identify what we need to know to move forward

> Introductions
> Culture sketch check in
> Group norms
> Working group scope
> Identify expertise/resources available & needed to create:
  • Operational definitions of equity, diversity, inclusion (others?)
  • Definitions for terms in the equity indicators
  • Recommendations for practices related to the collection, reporting, and use of data for the equity goal

> Next steps
  • Resources Available & Needed
  • Scheduling Winter quarter meetings and public forums

> Adjourn
Group Norms

Example: Center for Equity & Inclusion’s *Real Talk Ground Rules:*

Shared with permission from D’Andre Williams, Student worker in CEI, Host of the Real Talk Series

1. We as the participants understand that Real Talk is a safe place for everyone to share. Absolutely no hate speech or personal attacks will be tolerated.

2. Listen actively -- respect others when they are talking.

3. When speaking from your own experience, try not to generalize ("I" instead of "they," "we," and "you").

4. Do not be afraid to challenge one another by respectfully asking questions.

5. Try to participate to the fullest of your ability - community growth depends on the inclusion of every individual voice.

6. Share your own story and experiences. Do not invalidate someone else’s story.

7. The goal is not to agree, it is to gain a deeper understanding of the issue or one another.

8. Be conscious of body language and nonverbal responses.

9. Don’t be afraid to use Google! Look something up or check a fact.

10. Is there anything we should add? We can add more on the whiteboard.
Group Norms

The group looked at the Center for Equity & Inclusion’s Real Talk Ground Rules, which were developed for their Real Talk Series. They were shared and used with permission from Center for Equity & Inclusion’s student staff member and Real Talk Series host, DAndre Williams.

The group wanted to use these ground rules as their group norms with the following additions, adjustments, and expansions:

1. We as the participants understand that the Equity Data Working Group is a safe place for everyone to share. Absolutely no hate speech or personal attacks will be tolerated.

2. Listen actively -- respect others when they are talking.

3. When speaking from your own experience, try not to generalize ("I" instead of "they," "we," and "you").
Group Norms Continued

4 & 5. +
- Do not be afraid to challenge one another by respectfully asking questions
- Try to participate to the fullest of your ability - community growth depends on the inclusion of every individual voice
- Be our authentic selves
- Be aware of not dominating conversations – step-up and step-back
- Assume good intentions and own your impact
- Practice calling each other in
- Utilize, “Oops” when you realize you mis-spoke, “Ouch” when something is hurtful, or snapping in agreement. This can be a way to interrupt something hurtful without the pressure to “be on stage” and explain why it was hurtful. It is then an opportunity for someone else in the group to come alongside and “call in” the one who said something hurtful
Group Norms Continued


7. The goal of our work and discussions are to come to a consensus about our deliverables. This group should have discussion ahead of time about how we come to decisions and what decisions we have the purview to make.

8. Be conscious of body language and nonverbal responses. Aim to learn one another’s patterns and styles instead of assuming a meaning.

9. Don’t be afraid to find scholarly resources. Google-ing can be a good preliminary step to look something up or check a fact, but be willing to dig deeper for a scholarly resource to inform our work.

10. There is flexibility to add to or adjust these group norms. Also, flexibility with one another’s participation due to other commitments and bandwidth.
Working Group Scope

Scope/purpose

1. Provide expertise about campus and national trends related to equity in higher education
2. Provide expertise about data available at UW Tacoma
3. Provide expertise about best practices in reporting data
4. Engage nondominant stakeholders in providing input to how equity data are reported
5. Finalize definitions for equity indicators
6. Make recommendations for equity dashboard indicators
7. Lay the foundation for best practices for collecting and reporting equity data

Timeline/goals

1. End of Autumn (mid-Nov to end of Dec, anticipate 2 meetings)
   i. Membership understands the scope and purpose of their work
   ii. Identifies research that needs to occur, and who will complete that research
   iii. Outline stakeholder engagement/communications strategies
2. Winter (Jan-Mar, anticipate 3 meetings, 2 forums)
   i. Conduct outreach/public forums for input
   ii. Synthesize input from stakeholders and research
   iii. Implement follow-up communications
3. Spring (Mar-May, anticipate 2 meetings)
   i. Finalize definitions for equity indicators
   ii. Make recommendations for equity dashboard indicators
   iii. Implement final follow-up communications
   iv. Make recommendations for equity data practices moving forward
Questions/Comments:

Q: Definition of nondominant stakeholders (d. under Scope and Purpose)?
A: This group will help define that term for our place and time. It traditionally refers to those who have been underrepresented in decisions that affect them.

Q: How to plug into larger tri-campus conversation?
A: Yes, we need to discuss this when we think of next steps/moving forward.

Q: What is the scale? Data by campus, schools/colleges?
A: This group will have to decide that together.

Q: Dashboard indicators are generally quantitative, but how to engage nondominant stakeholders around narratives? How would that fit into dashboard? What is the Dashboard? Models from other institutions?
A: It might end up being called “Campus Snap Shot” or another term. It is a way to report on how we’re doing with our goals and will be a mix of quantitative data surrounded by context, using stories like the Tacoma Public School’s dashboard. It will specifically look at the indicators in the Equity Impact Goal, but this group can also look at other indicators because equity both has its own goal in the strategic plan AND is supposed to be woven throughout the plan.
Yes, there are other models, e.g. Cornell University has an “Inclusion dashboard”; we should also look at other members of Coalition of Urban Serving Universities that UW Tacoma is a part of.

Q: Does our scope allow for innovation within which indicators we are looking at?
A: We are building as we go; will consider this and come back with language to the group; also update Dashboard to “Official Campus Reporting.” This is an iterative process that will hopefully lay a foundation for UW Tacoma about how to revisit these conversations as contexts change over time. This group will be surfacing some constraints that exist (e.g. tied to accreditation, etc.) and then other constraints we can ask the University to push against.
Identify expertise/resources available & needed to create, pg1:

- Operational definitions of equity, diversity, inclusion (others?) How do you define equity? How do you define diversity? How do they overlap?
  - Surface: there are a lot of perspectives to consider when making an operational definition
  - See Example Definitions Chart

- Definitions for terms in the equity indicators
- Recommendations for practices related to the collection, reporting, and use of data for the equity goal
- Literature searches – other institutions/cities who are doing a good job of reporting on equitable outcomes
  - Looked at TPS & Cornell
  - This group could do searches for other models

- Find/Understand what data are already being collected
  - Huge topic in itself* so operate into common understanding, a 101 orientations?
  - This group will not be physically pulling the data and putting it into the dashboard, but to guide the implementation
  - Some resources from Data Fellows (opportunity for faculty & staff to become familiar with data resources available and empower them to help their colleagues with initial questions) so that our group can become knowledgeable; not necessary for all to be experts; Alice, Karl, and Bonnie have some knowledge about data collected

- Understand how data are connected to compliance*
- Data connected to Strategic Plan Goals/Indicators and UW Diversity Blueprint
- What is happening with the Tri-campus efforts, e.g. tri-campus climate survey – constraints and opportunities in belonging to a larger institution
- Connecting with stakeholders about equity & inclusion efforts
Identify expertise/resources available & needed to create, pg 2:

> Why is this work really important for our students?

- Focus to bring in/help first generation and underrepresented students; not understanding their perspective and their experiences does not help them
- Resource decisions are made of off data; data may be out-dated, decisions may be habitual; fundamental weakness in data that is collected/reported and then affects our students
- We put people in categories; better understanding the boxes we put people in, opening the boxes up to look into complexities – how do we do this in a way useful to our students and campus
- Change framework to an equity framework – the equity around demographics – leads to the complexity of how we define equity
- We need student voices; faculty & staff voices – how we’re living out the equity mission
Identify expertise/resources available & needed to create, pg 3:

> One of the best sources for qualitative/quantitative data is the scholarly research done by our faculty and students

> Amanda and Ruth will take this list and come back with some ways/proposal to lean in; we will figure out ways for each of us to engage in pieces of this; i.e. how might our working group be effective in synthesizing work so we can figure out how to approach the deliverables?

> “If you want to get something done, give yourself 90 days to do it” –a book focusing on the concept that people tend to be procrastinators
  - Suggestion to shrink timeline to be more intensive about it
  - we’re potentially dealing with unknowns, so the more we get done now, the more time we have to discern what we need to find/create

> Create more internal deadlines for our group?

> Review one another’s work and/or know that expertise is present

> Challenge us and let the group push back on what is reasonable in terms of workload; we want students to give input, but not take on additional work that detracts from their studies/other commitments
Next Steps

> Scheduling Winter quarter meetings and public forums – we will be in touch with a doodle poll and/or utilize outlook calendars

> How we feel about this work right now:
  • Glad I’m here
  • Excited it is being done
  • Curious, nervous, energized
  • Deeply appreciative of community we are creating
  • Grateful
  • Positively overwhelmed x 2 (in a positive way)
  • Glad we’re moving forward
  • Willing to push forward
  • Committed to the chaos (somewhat organized chaos)