Equity Data Working Group

Winter Meeting #1
1.5.18 | GWP 320 | 9:00-11:00am
Agenda

Meeting objectives:

> Updates on leads/co-leads and subcommittee members for Winter subcommittees
> Hear recommendations, learn from research by subcommittees
> Lay the foundation for ‘strawmen’ definitions & indicators for stakeholder engagement

> Introductions & re-introductions
> Review meeting objectives
> Group norms check-in
> Tri-campus updates
> Winter subcommittees updates & report-outs
  • Update on leads/co-leads
  • Operational definitions (Ruth)
  • Models for reporting equity (Shaquita)
  • Data collected at UW Tacoma (Alice)
  • Stakeholder Survey (Bonnie)

> Break
> Sharing documents
> Making decisions
> Scheduling stakeholder engagement activities
> Scheduling Winter meetings
> Objectives for the next meeting
> Adjourn
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").

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. We will have flexibility with one another’s participation due to other commitments/bandwidth and expect that if you miss a meeting, you will be proactive about catching yourself up. As we will be using our dispersed expertise, we all need to make the effort to be engaged and present.

11. There is flexibility to add to or adjust these group norms.
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
   iv. Make recommendations for equity data practices moving forward
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
**Tri-Campus updates**

- EDWG leaders have reached out to Deirdre Raynor, Mentha Hynes-Wilson, and Marian Harris as they are all active in tri-campus work (and climate survey). We will periodically check in with them via email for updates.

- Still in process for finding vendor for climate survey

- Probably administered 18-19 academic year; then work to analyze data

- We'll have to be aware of this timeline and how we can best move forward, as the survey impacts our work
  - It may be analyzed in such a way that favors perception of whoever does the analysis; recommend a parallel data analysis on each campus;
  - recommend that data doesn't stay with the vendor
  - Forward these points to aforementioned leaders (Marian et al.)

- Our data reports out as Asian/Pacific Islander - this doesn't serve our diverse communities that fall within that category very well

- Coalition Application - overlap with about 40% of applicants who apply – not sure if application coalition uses one form that retrieves race/ethnicity/gender data
  - Be aware of these in terms of what information we collect now and what info may be collected moving forward with new application. Loose data on grad. applicants because we don't own the form.

- There are three communications shops among tri-campus institution; different views on how to communicate enrollment numbers as they relate to under-represented minorities
  - Discussion around fundamental principles that guide how UW speaks about enrollment numbers, the diversity within those numbers, and what stories are told in relation to that
  - Some disagreement around certain issues driven by different perspectives of the different campuses; campuses who are “more diverse” search for more ways to talk about it than the campuses who are “less diverse”
  - Some campuses feel like their mission isn't being served
  - Making sure stories keep each campus in positive light may = sharing data in different ways
  - Media for UW – need to look into this conversation (how to report enrollment in light of underrepresented minority groups) more deeply and agree on an approach moving forward

- Surfaces opportunity to come up with practice recommendations here that may or may not be adopted by other groups
  - If we come up with an approach that doesn't harmonize...then what? – let's what be aware of this as we make recommendations to leadership - they'll determine how to implement and what can be implemented
Winter Subcommittee Updates & report-outs

• Update on leads/co-leads
  > See EDWG_Winter_Goals_and_Subcommittees-1.5.18
    • All will lean in on Student Stakeholder engagement with ideas generated by Amanda and Ruth

• Operational definitions (Ruth)
  > See EDWG Example Definitions-1.5.18 and 20171227-equity-data-research

• Models for reporting equity (Shaquita)
  > Next Slide and see GARE_GettingtoEquity_July2017_PUBLISH and CommittingtoEquityInclusiveExcellence

• Data collected at UW Tacoma (Alice)
  > See Draft - Identify Data Collected

• Stakeholder Survey (Bonnie)
  > Moved to next meeting due to time constraints
Models for reporting equity (Shaquita)

- Government example – racial equity centered model; results-based accountability model - Shaquita read definitions aloud
  - See materials

- Climate survey should have proceeded equity data working group, technically

- How institutions collect/report data
  - Demographic info; racial data; many institutions are beginning to disaggregate for Asian, Latinx
  - Attrition data; grad. rates; climate survey responses (attitudes, perceptions, behaviors)
  - How reported: in reports, dashboards (i.e. Cornell)
  - How used in decisions: recruitment; orientation (racially specific orientations); retention efforts (students experiences, better sense of belong); retention efforts for faculty & staff, trainings; mentoring between faculty and students; strategic plans

- UW has an affirmative action plan – find on website (even though WA isn’t an affirmative action state, e.g. faculty demographic data is a year behind)

- Climate survey results important as baseline and ongoing assessment

- Does UW plan on having a reg. scheduled climate survey? Every 3 years?
  - Fresh start because previous surveys didn’t meet the needs of UW
  - Will this climate survey be sufficient for our needs? Data ready in 2021 doesn’t help the Strategic Plan timeline
  - Does tri-campus climate survey include community stakeholders in the way out strategic plan does?
  - Is UW trying to also build a dashboard that reports on Diversity Blueprint and Umbrella UW-wide Strategic Plan?

- Generally accepted and frequently reported diversity metrics: enrollment, retention, persistence, graduation should/could we report with disaggregation?
  - Since we only have 5K students, don’t want data to show individuals
Models for reporting equity (Shaquita)

Racial Equity Centered Results Based Accountability Model

“Results-Based Accountability™ (RBA) is a tool that starts with the desired results and works backwards towards the means, to ensure that your plans work toward community results with stakeholder-driven implementation. This disrupts historic patterns of “doing what we’ve always done, because we’ve always done it that way.” That way of work, done with the best intentions, does not produce the racial equity we demand in our communities. RBA also helps distinguish between population level (whole groups) indicators, that are the responsibility of multiple systems and take a long time to shift, and performance measures (activity-specific) that organizations can use to determine whether what they do is having an impact. Tools are not the work, but they are a part of the work. The following guide will help you begin the process of using a powerful tool, Results-Based Accountability™ that incorporates a racial equity lens. The overarching RBA framework shows a relationship between Results, Indicators, and Activities. The orange bar in the diagram separates the population level results and indicators that are the responsibility of many systems over time; below the orange bar are the activities for which jurisdictions can develop performance measures and hold themselves accountable. The activities below the line should contribute to the change toward which the jurisdiction aims. The illustration on the next page visualizes what that looks like. To start, Results-Based Accountability™ uses seven primary steps, also called questions of population accountability.”
Sharing Documents

- Documents will be shared:
  - Via email - EDWG now has a group listserv for members and those who want to stay informed. Feel free to use: uwt-equity-data-work-group@uw.edu

- In the S-drive: S:\Chancellors_Office\Strategic_Plan\Impact Goal Folders\Equity\2017 Equity Data Working Group

- And eventually posted on the EDWG webpage once notes/materials are reviewed by group: http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/strategic-planning/equity-data-working-group-edwg
Making Decisions

“Fist to five” – a way to develop consensus - scale
4-5 = good to go
3 = not the best, but won’t stop process; **a decision you can live with after full participation**
2-1 = not comfortable, more discussion, stops process;

If we can’t come to consensus, use majority?
Use super-majority concept? Agreed: **70% of present members must consent to move forward**

Our next meeting is our only meeting scheduled for that work
There will be prep/home work for the next meeting that will help; we’ll break into groups for intense work-present-go back to small group-report-vote
Scheduling – stakeholder engagement activities & additional meetings

Moved to Next Meeting
Objective for next meeting

Make strawmen definitions to share with stakeholders