



Diversity, Equity & Inclusion Action Planning Workgroup

May 11, 2022
9:00-10:30 am

MEETING SUMMARY

1. Welcome

Co-chairs Keahi McFadden and Tom Fenske welcomed workgroup members to the meeting. They oriented everyone that the group is now in the information-gathering stage. Co-chairs are reevaluating the group's pace of work, especially since the meeting cadence was switched to every-other-week, to make sure the group stays on track with the overall timeline; expect an update at the next meeting. Subcommittees may need to meet more in between the regular meetings.

2. Update on Vision Stakeholder Survey Data

Four workgroup members are analyzing data from the stakeholder vision surveys, where the workgroup asked DFA employees and a few stakeholders from Student Affairs and UHDS asked how the vision resonates with them, and if there are gaps. A total of 169 surveys were submitted; this is a good response rate in English; however no Spanish-language surveys were completed.

The subcommittee expects to share an analysis of the data with the workgroup at the May 24 meeting, and the workgroup will determine if the vision statement needs to be updated to incorporate stakeholder input.

3. Continue investigating categories of inquiry – with real data

- a. What data sources do we have and what do we need?
- b. What information do we need to achieve this piece of the vision?
- c. Are there experts to consult about their approach on this topic?
- d. How else can the workgroup acquire the necessary information for this topic?

The workgroup's advisor from the Office of Institutional Diversity, Teresita Alvarez-Cortez, discussed how the vision statement the workgroup created allows us think in a big-picture way about what the group is trying to achieve. At a previous meeting, the group broke the vision statement down into potential categories of inquiry. For each of those categories, Teresita explained the types of data that already exist that can help answer the workgroup's questions. She discussed existing resources and investigating bodies across the university, such as the President and Provost's Leadership Commission, that are already working on particular topics, like employee retention, for example, and the DFA could collaborate.

Teresita demonstrated the information categories and types of inquiries that can be accessed from university climate survey database. She explained that there are two separate data sets, one that is organized by employee demographics and one by organizational (department) code. By design, the system will not allow inquiries that combine the two because that could make it possible to identify

specific respondents in smaller organizations; the anonymity of the data must be protected. Teresita explained that the data will not likely provide direct answers to the specific questions the workgroup is investigating. Instead, it is useful for identifying trends among different groups of stakeholders, which allows the workgroup to make inferences about how people are feeling, or points to areas for additional stakeholder questions.

As part of this information-gathering stage, the workgroup will create stakeholder engagement plan to coordinate what types of additional information is needed from which groups of stakeholders, and define ways that information will be collected (for example, focus groups, surveys, or individual conversations). All the feedback and information will inform the workgroup's recommended action plan for the division.

Co-chairs Keahi and Tom noted that the vision statement provides a broad range of areas to explore. The workgroup will need to prioritize a big list in order to create an initial action plan that is manageable for the division. It is not possible for the division to address everything with this first action plan—the DEI work is an ongoing, iterative, multi-year effort. Co-chairs reminded everyone that the group is charged with having an action plan ready to launch at the beginning of fall term.

The workgroup split into sub-committees to continue discussing various potential areas for further inquiry, with a focus on identifying gaps in the existing data where research might be needed.

4. Debrief with full workgroup: What kinds of data gaps did your group identify? Ideas for how to collect it?

Co-chairs asked the sub-groups to share what they discussed, and consider where their data collection needs might overlap.

Group 1 – DFA culture and climate. Talked about making sure we take a systematic perspective when considering this topic. Discussed the need to get at the root causes behind the climate survey data. Discussed how small changes at the system-wide level could result in changes to the division's culture (hopefully in a positive direction).

Group 2 – Cultivating a DFA equity lens. Considered other OSU units and departments who have worked to address equity – we could review their approach and processes to inform how we proceed. Talked about how the Fiscal Policy Committee has developed a good review process that promotes stakeholder input; perhaps that could serve as a model for other DFA units/committees that handle policy decisions. Discussed the need for better understanding of pain points in DFA processes, and considering *when* you start to measure something so you know it's a problem, and *how* do we start addressing such things proactively instead of reactively when we develop new procedures.

Group 3 – Designing DEI education for DFA. Discussed existing resources—there are a lot, even just at OSU. Discussed need to understand areas of interest for learning within the division and areas of biggest need. Some groups at OSU, like EOA for example, might have interesting perspectives on what kinds of education would best benefit DFA employees. Discussed the possibility of having some DEI training be required. Need to identify what makes people feel excluded or treated unfairly – is it things like pay equity and opportunities for advancement?

Group 4 – Recruitment and Retention. Discussed inconsistency in current recruiting practices across the university – some people always serve on search committees; some never have. Some leaders require search advocates on all searches, others don't. Discussed need for all search committee members to have a base level of DEI-related training before they serve, so the burden is not only on the search advocate. Establish some consistent recruitment practices and (and provide clear guidelines) for all university departments to follow.

Group 5 – Vision Survey Analysis Group. Discussed how they plan to identify themes and trends. Discussed reasons the Spanish-language surveys had no responses (the DFA never sends things in Spanish language, may need to do outreach with supervisors, find out if there are barriers to participation). Discussed whether and when official division communications should be shared in Spanish and/or other languages.

Group 6 – Pre-boarding and onboarding new employees. Group is reaching out to UHR to better understand what is included in the current onboarding process. HR team is currently updating its onboarding process, so need to collect more information here. The subgroup will meet again next week.

Group 7 – Equitable procurement and contracts. Evaluating current MWESB data (an industry-specific term for minority-owned, women-owned and emerging small businesses). Discussed need to understand percentage of MWESB vendors, how much OSU spends with them in proportion to other vendors. Discussed benchmarking against other public institutions around insurance requirements and construction contracts. Discussed conducting outreach to companies about why they don't respond to OSU's requests for proposals, or why they don't get hired by general contractors who work for OSU.

5. Next steps for the workgroup

Co-chairs thanked everyone for the great work in the small groups. They asked small groups to continue meeting over the next two weeks as they can – think about the questions that need answered and what kind of data is required. At the next meeting, the workgroup will continue discussing data collection, analysis and assessment and begin to design a stakeholder outreach plan.

DFA DEI Action Planning Workgroup Members

Teresita Alvarez-Cortez, Acting Assistant Vice President, Strategic Diversity Initiatives, Office of Institutional Diversity (*workgroup advisor*)

Christine Atwood, Administrative & Diversity Manager; Procurement, Contracts & Materials Management

Machelle Bamberger, Hazardous Waste Safety Officer, Environmental Health & Safety

Kirsten Bradley, Project Manager, Enterprise Project Portfolio Management Office

Jonathan Champney, Buyer 2, Facilities Services

Kim Cholewinski, Academic Human Resources Officer, University Human Resources

Todd Cross, Trades Maintenance Coordinator, Facilities Services

Tracy Elmshaeuser, Executive Assistant to the Senior Associate Vice President for Administration

Tom Fenske, Business Center Manager (HSBC, BEBC), Controller's Unit (*workgroup co-chair*)

Keith Foster, Insurance Contract Specialist, Insurance & Risk Management

Anne Gillies, Search Advocate Program Director, University Human Resources

Jessica King, Travel & Expense Support Specialist, Controller's Unit

Mary Macy, Fiscal Coordinator 1 (HSBC), Controller's Unit

Daniel Mahoney, Academic Liaison, University Human Resources

Melissa Medina, Retirement Officer, University Human Resources

Keahi McFadden, Executive Assistant to AVP of University Facilities, Infrastructure & Operations (***workgroup co-chair***)

Christina McKnight, Director, Insurance & Risk Management

Stephen Nelson, Chief Procurement Officer; Procurement, Contracts & Materials Management

Bob Richardson, University Land Use Planning Manager, Capital Planning & Development

Aviva Rivera, Business Center Manager (FOBC, CEOAS), Controller's Unit

Melanie Rose, Manager of DFA Strategic Initiatives (***workgroup administrator***)

Justin Schaffer, Accountant 2 (FOBC), Controller's Unit

Stephanie Smith, Fiscal Coordinator 2 / Travel Administrator, Controller's Unit

Sudie Swader, Fiscal Coordinator 1 (AMBC), Controller's Unit

Jane Waite, Social Justice Education Initiative Director, University Human Resources

Ben Wessel, Director, DFA Information Technology