Advancing Multifaceted Equity Strategy and Overcoming Resistance

State Higher Education Executive Officers Association
Higher Education Policy Conference

August 9, 2022
Presenters

**Andriel Dees, JD**  
*Vice Chancellor for Equity & Inclusion*  
Office of Equity & Inclusion  
Minnesota State Colleges & Universities

**Priyank Shah, PhD**  
*Associate Vice Chancellor for Equity & Inclusion*  
Office of Equity & Inclusion  
Minnesota State Colleges & Universities

**Tarrence Robertson**  
*Project Director for Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion*  
Office of Equity & Inclusion  
Minnesota State Colleges & Universities
Minnesota State Colleges & Universities

- 26 colleges & 7 universities; 54 campuses
- 340,000 students annually
- Students of Color & Indigenous - 19%
- First-Generation College Students - 12%
- Low-Income Students - 25%
- Veterans and Service Members - 3%
- 15,000+ Faculty & Staff - 13% POCI
- 4,023 academic programs
“By 2030, Minnesota State will eliminate the educational equity gaps at every Minnesota State college and university.”
Strategies for Change

- Equity Lens to Policy Review
- Equity by Design
- Campus Climate
- Equity Scorecard
Advancing Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion

1. Multifaceted & holistic
2. Student success & employee success
3. Integrated & embedded across divisions & branches
4. The institution’s role & eliminating barriers
5. Challenging student deficit mindsets & approaches
6. Mindful of campus & local contexts
7. Maturing institution's ability to engage & realize EDI

Sustaining Efforts & Culture Change
- Equity & Inclusion Council
- EDI Strategic Planning
- Equity Minded Policy Review
- Bias Response Protocol
- Toolkits for EDI
- COVID-19 Disparate Impact
- Representation on Councils
- Equity Scorecard
- Equity by Design
- Campus Climate Assessment
- Academic Program Review
- Anti-Racist Framework
- Informal Resolution Process
- Employee Resource Groups
- Finance & Resource Allocation
- HR – Recruitment & Retention
- Competency Series
- Leadership & CDO Consultation
- CDO Academy
- Divisional Joint Meetings
- Title IX Professional Devlp.
Equity Lens to Policy Review

- An approach for considering the disparate impact of policy design & implementation on stakeholders groups
- Particularly for underserved & marginalized groups
- Assess policy intent & inclusiveness
- Further prioritizes how policies can advance equity
Equity by Design

1. Broadest conceptualization is an approach for revealing and examining differences in the outcomes and experiences for our stakeholders, in effort to determine how disparities can be eliminated.

2. Equity by Design’s methodology & principles are core to informing & shaping EDI efforts → Critical Lens

“How can we do better?”
Equity by Design: Broad Methodology & Strategic Lens

1. **Equity Oriented Methodology & Strategic Lens:**
   - A methodology for revealing & identifying disparate outcomes & experiences of stakeholders
   - Process for driving inquiry into the sources of disparities & mitigation of equity gaps

2. **Critical & Intentional Inquiry:**
   - Process for intentionally analyzing equity gaps & considering how our institutions can impact (shape & mitigate) disparities & improve the success of all stakeholders

3. **Adaptable & Flexible:**
   - A highly adaptable approach which is applicable to a wide range of facets at the institution that can be applied to impact the outcomes of all stakeholders.
Campus Climate

Stakeholders’ experiences & sentiments regarding an institution

**Student Conceptual Domains**
- Sense of belonging/Sense of inclusion
- Safety – Physical
- Safety – Psychological (emotional/mental)
- Discrimination, harassment, & bias experiences
- Accessibility & facilities

**Employee Conceptual Domains**
- Sense of belonging/Sense of inclusion
- Safety – Physical
- Safety – Psychological
- Discrimination, harassment, & bias experiences
- Multicultural competency of employees/leaders/supervisors
- Peer/team/ Supervisor relationships
Equity Scorecard

- Holistic view of equity and disparities
- Institutionalize, normalize, & prioritize EDI
- Create awareness of disparate outcomes
- Prompt consideration & inquiry into inequities
- Convey Equity Story - Readily understandable & straightforward manner
- Provide relevant information to assess the “health” of our institutions
- Foster institutional change to address disparities & close equity gaps
KPI 1: Undergraduate Student Success

Metric 1: First Year Outcome by Race
(Fall to Fall Persistence and Completion)

System (1111)

1.1 First Year Outcome (Fall to Fall Persistence and Completion) - All Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race / Ethnicity</th>
<th>Equity Gap (Parity=0%)</th>
<th>3-Year Equity Gap Trend</th>
<th>Change in Equity Gap Over 3-Years</th>
<th>Success Rate</th>
<th>Cohort Count</th>
<th>Number to Reach Parity (Eliminate Equity Gap)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic of any race</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 Equity Gaps and Counts - All Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race / Ethnicity</th>
<th>Equity Gap (Parity=0%)</th>
<th>3-Year Equity Gap Trend</th>
<th>Change in Equity Gap Over 3-Years</th>
<th>Success Rate</th>
<th>Cohort Count</th>
<th>Number to Reach Parity (Eliminate Equity Gap)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>-26.7%</td>
<td>Widening</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>-5.3%</td>
<td>Widening</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>2,303</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>-8.1%</td>
<td>Narrowing</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>4,894</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic of any race</td>
<td>-11.8%</td>
<td>Relatively Consistent</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>3,029</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>-9.2%</td>
<td>Widening</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Less than 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>-10.6%</td>
<td>Narrowing</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>1,647</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Comparison Group</td>
<td>Comparison Group</td>
<td>Comparison Group</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>23,297</td>
<td>Comparison Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KPI 2: Compositional Diversity
Metric 1: Student Diversity Relative to Faculty and Staff Diversity
Breakout by Race

System (1111)

2.1c - Student Diversity Relative to Instructional Faculty Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race / Ethnicity</th>
<th>Compositional Gap (Parity = 0%)</th>
<th>5-Year Composition Trend</th>
<th>Change in Compositional Gap over 5-years</th>
<th>Faculty Composition Rate</th>
<th>Faculty Count</th>
<th>Student Composition Rate</th>
<th>Student Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>Parity or Better</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>Narrowing</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>13418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
<td>Relatively Consistent</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>25890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic of any race</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
<td>Relatively Consistent</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>14722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>-0.0%</td>
<td>Relatively Consistent</td>
<td>-0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>Parity or Better</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>6782</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>146554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
<td>Relatively Consistent</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>8844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Challenges, Lessons Learned, & Strategies for Advancing Change
Key Challenges? Resistances? (Mis)understandings?

- Leadership buy-in & support
- Campus autonomy vs. “system-ness”
- Silos & un-concerted or collaborative efforts → “Initiative-itis”
- Student-Deficit mindsets
- Data Disaggregation, use, & literacy
- Discomfort talking about race
- Equity challenges vary from one campus to the next
- Limited resources & bandwidth
- Perception of “lowering standards”
- Getting beyond the “head nod” to activation & action
- Jumping to solutions – student deficit solutions
Lessons Learned & Strategies for Advancing Change

• **Meaningful & structural change requires a holistic view of equity**
  – Collaborative approach & forming coalitions
  – This work is about change → Don’t underestimate fear & discomfort with EDI issues
  – Bring conversation back to institution’s role in shaping, exacerbating, & narrowing equity gaps
  – Focus on “5 P’s”: Policies, Processes, Practices, Pedagogy, and Programming

• **Data**
  – Sound concept, with varying levels of “equity maturity” & infrastructure to support the work
  – Data disaggregation & ability to tell a story; data is rarely “perfect”
  – Data literacy, training, & resources

• **Focusing on institution’s role**
  – What can we do better?

• **This work is a journey; for institutions & people**
  – The work takes time and we’ve continued to learn
  – Equity work is not easy & progress will not always be linear
  – Meet people where they are at, but make it known where you expect them to be
Additional Lessons & Strategies for Advancing Change

• Comprehensive communication plan that permeates beyond one stakeholder group
• Don’t over/underestimate ability of people to lead equity conversations
• Avoid the urge jump to solutions – it can do more harm
• Context Matters – no one size fits all
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