




MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 1, 2015

TO: Arturo Ocampo, Associate Vice President, Diversity, Educational Equity and Inclusion

FROM:  Matthew Ceppi, Associate Vice President, Institutional Planning & Analysis

SUBJECT: Recommendations 1.6 and 1.9

President Haynes' March 6, 2015 memorandum assigned Diversity Mapping recommendations 1.6 and 1.9 to Institutional Planning & Analysis. This memo is to confirm that I have reviewed the recommendations, convened the individuals needed to work on the recommendations assigned, and identified individuals to whom I am handing off responsibility for any portion of the recommendations.

Recommendation 1.6: Diversity Assessment Effort

Recommendation 1.6 suggests a major diversity assessment effort needs to be undertaken by the University. I concur with this recommendation. The recommended actions include a systematic university-wide assessment protocol be adopted in terms of specific metrics, milestones, indicators, and data collection schedules on key diversity-related goals and objectives, and indicates those come from a future diversity master plan. A number of diversity assessment models have been developed and discussed in the literature. However, the literature is clear that any scorecard or assessment model must be aligned and integrated with the institution's specific diversity strategies, objectives and goals in order to achieve institutional excellence (Williams, 2013). Therefore we assume and recommend that the assessment model for the future diversity master plan be developed in conjunction with the plan, which itself must be aligned with the overall vision and goals of the institution. Williams (2013) discusses two approaches to diversity planning, which are an integrated diversity plan woven into the institutional strategic plan or a centralized diversity plan focused specifically on the diversity agenda of the institution. Given the maturity of the CSUSM strategic plan, the latter is the likely approach.

The existing diversity plan addressed the formative stages and steps for establishing the Office of Educational Equity and Diversity; it did not define broader goals and objectives for diversity and inclusion or tie directly to the University's strategic objectives. Most of the indicators in the plan were focused on the progress of the various tactics and milestones, which are appropriate for a formative assessment. The new diversity master plan should tie directly to the university's five strategic priorities to achieve the goal of an integrated diversity master plan. The five strategic priorities are comprehensive and outlined in a way that strategies, objectives and actions for diversity and inclusion

could be derived from them. The assessment model, or scorecard, would then establish impact and outcomes indicators tied to the diversity and inclusion goals, objectives, and actions.

Several key stakeholders I have met with agree that diversity master plan development must be done with an outside facilitator to avoid any perception of individual bias or agenda, and ensure full buy-in from the campus community. I recommend the same consultant used to facilitate development of the diversity master plan be engaged to facilitate establishment of the assessment model to include:

- Assessment of the current climate using available survey data (employee climate survey and the Diverse Learning Environment survey results available in the Fall), other feedback collected during the mapping process, and institutional data.
- Conduct a SWOT analysis to inform the development of the future diversity master plan.
- Identify university best practices across the country and do a gap analysis comparing CSUSM to those.
- Establish accountability, outcomes and progress indicators with baseline data and targets.
- Develop an implementation plan with timetables and responsibilities.

I have identified a prospective firm with deep experience in planning, evaluation, and diversity and inclusion work that could be engaged to facilitate development of the new diversity master plan, assessment and scorecard.

In a meeting with Dr. Regina Eisenbach, Dean of Academic Programs and chair of the University Assessment Council (UAC), and Cameron Stevenson, Assistant Director of Institutional Planning & Analysis, we agreed that the application of the term “assessment” is to the broader institutional objectives, goals and strategies. Assessment of learning outcomes is the purview of the faculty, and the assessment of learning outcomes relative to diversity and multiculturalism will be embedded in the curricular assessment processes in place or under development. Nevertheless, assuming that the future diversity master plan will include goals and actions around the development of diversity curriculum and the assessment of associated learning outcomes, Institutional Planning & Analysis will consult with UAC on any indicators included in the final institutional assessment or scorecard related to the UAC’s work and assessment of learning outcomes (for example, a qualitative indicator indicating the progress of the UAC’s work to define and assess diversity learning outcomes).

Resource Needs:

A consulting engagement for the development of the diversity master plan, assessment model and scorecard would likely be in the range of \$50,000 in one-time funding plus travel and expenses.

The assessment of institutional objectives for diversity and inclusion should be embedded in the University’s business intelligence (BI) model. The University decision support team, which consists of Institutional Planning & Analysis and IITS, is in the process of building data models, reporting and dashboards that will allow stakeholders to view high level data and drill-down on specific questions and issues. Currently, the team is working with the Office of Undergraduate Studies on predictive analytics models around student success and high impact practices. Resources (approximately \$75,000 base funding) should be set aside to invest in the information management budget for integrating the ongoing diversity assessment and scorecard into the University BI data models and dashboards (using the Tableau tool). This also supports the activities suggested by the Office of Undergraduate Studies in their response to 1.1c.

Recommendation 1.9: Include additional diversity items in the next Campus Climate Survey

President Haynes appointed a Campus Climate Survey task force. I met with Jennifer Williams, Director of Campus Climate, and Bhavisha Talsania, my research analyst who is supporting the campus climate assessment efforts. The task force has not yet completed their work. The chair of the task force, Cathy Baur, and Ms. Williams indicate that the next campus climate survey would likely be in the Fall or Spring of the 2016-17 academic year. The Executive Council concurred. This timeline works well for the inclusion of additional diversity items. The University community will have had the opportunity to review the results of the Diverse Learning Environment survey and will have completed the new diversity master plan, which the additional items should be aligned with. Institutional Planning & Analysis and the director of Campus Climate will work with the Diversity Advisory Council to identify the additional items to be included in the next administration of a campus climate survey. It should also be noted that a systemwide task force has been formed to explore development of a CSU system campus climate survey.

H&A especially recommended the use of the Diverse Learning Environment (DLE) Survey by UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute, which gauges students' experiences with diversity. CSUSM made a decision long before the H&A project to administer the DLE. Administration is currently underway and results should be available by late Fall 2015.

Resource Needs:

Administration of the employee campus climate survey is approximately \$25,000 every two years. Administration of the Diverse Learning Environment survey is \$9,325. We recommend administering the survey every two years.

Please let me know if you have any questions regarding these recommendations and next steps.

Reference:

Williams, D.A. (2013). *A Matter of Excellence: A Guide to Strategic Diversity Leadership and Accountability in Higher Education*. Washington D.C.: American Council on Education.

c: President Karen Haynes
Dr. Regina Eisenbach, Dean of Academic Programs
Ms. Jennifer Williams, Director, Campus Climate
Ms. Cameron Stevenson, Assistant Director, Institutional Planning & Analysis