Audit Questionnaire Step 3: Building a Compositional and Outcomes-Based Diversity Baseline

Step 3 of the audit questionnaire consists of three main sections: (a) compositional (or structural) diversity metrics, (b) analysis of process-based outcomes, and (c) overall analysis of results and a planning matrix. Sample data tables are provided for the first and second sections that can be adapted or elaborated based on institutional needs and context.

A. Compositional Diversity Metrics

In alignment with the concept of a representative bureaucracy, this segment of the audit establishes baseline metrics for diversity. Sample data tables are drawn from the Integrated Postsecondary Education System (IPEDS) database. These tables can be further refined by institutional type and compared to peer institutions. Additional tables can be developed for executives (vice chancellors, vice presidents, administrative officers), academic leadership (deans, department heads and chairs), staff (full- and part-time), and part-time faculty. Longitudinal comparisons are critical in order to gauge progress over an appropriate time period and to answer questions about increases or decreases in the representation of minoritized groups. In addition, for federal contractors, affirmative action data by job group can be used to compare incumbency versus availability in the appropriate recruitment area and establish goals for women and minorities as aggregate groups rather than by specific minority groups. For institutions that recruit students primarily within a given state, the demographics of the state population can be used as another comparative indicator in the baseline analysis.

In the first example, Table 4.2 addresses the race/ethnicity and gender of full-time instructional faculty at doctorate-granting institutions. An institution-specific table can be developed for statistical comparison to public or private institutions of the same Carnegie classification and type.

Table 4.3 assesses the diversity of the undergraduate student population in terms of race/ethnicity and gender. The results of this analysis will be used in Table 4.6.

Table 4.4 analyzes the race/ethnicity and gender of the graduate student population.

Table 4.5 addresses administrative diversity in terms of education-related administrative positions (student and academic affairs) as reported through the IPEDS database. It provides a point of comparison for certain types of administrative positions.

Table 4.6 compares the demographics of the student population with the demographics of full-time instructional faculty, a key ratio for analysis. Comparisons can be drawn for undergraduates and graduates or a combination of both groups.

B. Outcomes-Based Metrics

This aspect of the audit considers key outcomes such as turnover, merit pay awards, and performance evaluations by employee group. Turnover statistics are a key indicator measured by institutions of higher education that can provide insight into comparative levels of job satisfaction. Table 4.7 can be adapted for use in gauging a range of process-based outcomes. Additional columns may be needed, depending on the institutional process under review and the level of detail desired. Table 4.8 is a sample provided to illustrate the comparison between the turnover of White tenure-track faculty compared to minority faculty.

TABLE 4.2. Full-Time Instructional Faculty Diversity at Doctorate-Granting Institutions: Instruction, Research, and Public Service

Carnegie Classification	GENDER		RACE/ETHNICITY																	
	Total Male %	Total Female %	American Indian or Alaskan Native (Male) %	American Indian or Alaskan Native (Female) %	Asian (Male) %	Asian (Female) %	Black or African American (Male) %	Black or African American (Female) %	Hispanic or Latino (Male) %	Hispanic or Latino (Female) %	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (Male) %	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (Female) %	Non-resident Alien (Male) %	Non-resident Alien (Female) %	Race and Ethnicity Unknown (Male) %	Race and Ethnicity Unknown (Female) %	Two or More Races (Male) %	Two or More Races (Female) %	White (Male) %	White (Female) %
Public Doctoral Universities (highest research activity)	56.0%	44.0%	0.2%	0.3%	6.5%	3.3%	2.2%	2.5%	2.6%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	1.7%	1.9%	1.6%	0.4%	0.4%	39.1%	31.6%
All Public Doctoral Universities (highest, higher, moderate research activity)	58.5%	41.5%	0.2%	0.2%	7.4%	4.1%	1.8%	2.1%	2.4%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	2.7%	1.8%	1.4%	0.4%	0.4%	39.2%	28.4%
Private Doctoral Universities (highest research activity)	61.2%	38.8%	0.1%	0.1%	8.2%	5.6%	1.5%	1.8%	2.1%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	7.3%	3.8%	1.7%	1.2%	0.3%	0.3%	39.9%	24.3%
All Private Doctoral Universities (highest, higher, moderate research activity)	59.8%	40.2%	0.1%	0.1%	7.3%	4.9%	1.9%	2.3%	2.3%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.8%	3.1%	1.8%	1.3%	0.4%	0.3%	40.3%	26.2%

Source: National Center for Education Statistics (2015, 2016), Fall Enrollment Survey, and Institutional Characteristic Survey. Analysis by authors.

TABLE 4.3. Undergraduate Student Diversity at Doctorate-Granting Universities

Carnegie Classifica-tion	GENDER		RACE/ETHNICITY																	
	Total Male %	Total Female %	American Indian or Alaskan Native (Male) %	American Indian or Alaskan Native (Female) %	Asian (Male) %	Asian (Female) %	Black or African American (Male) %	Black or African American (Female) %	Hispanic or Latino (Male) %	Hispanic or Latino (Female) %	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (Male) %	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (Female) %	Non-resident Alien (Male) %	Non-resident Alien (Female) %	Race and Ethnicity Unknown (Male) %	Race and Ethnicity Unknown (Female) %	Two or More Races (Male) %	Two or More Races (Female) %	White (Male) %	White (Female) %
Public Doctoral Universities (highest research activity)	46.8%	53.2%	0.3%	0.4%	2.1%	2.1%	4.6%	7.0%	5.9%	7.6%	0.1%	0.1%	2.3%	1.4%	1.4%	1.5%	1.5%	2.0%	28.6%	31.2%
All Public Doctoral Universities (highest, higher, moderate research activity)	47.8%	52.2%	0.2%	0.3%	4.0%	4.0%	3.8%	5.6%	6.3%	8.0%	0.1%	0.1%	3.2%	2.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.7%	2.0%	27.4%	28.7%
Private Doctoral Universities (highest research activity)	47.8%	52.2%	0.1%	0.1%	7.2%	8.1%	2.5%	3.5%	5.0%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	6.5%	2.2%	2.5%	1.8%	2.4%	22.7%	23.5%
All Private Doctoral Universities (highest, higher, moderate research activity)	42.9%	57.1%	0.1%	0.2%	3.5%	4.3%	3.3%	6.8%	5.2%	7.4%	0.1%	0.1%	3.7%	3.4%	4.2%	6.5%	1.5%	2.4%	21.2%	26.1%

Source. National Center for Education Statistics (2015, 2016), Fall Enrollment Survey, and Institutional Characteristics Survey. Analysis by authors.

TABLE 4.4. Graduate Student Diversity at Doctorate-Granting Institutions

Carnegie Classification	GENDER		RACE/ETHNICITY																	
	Total Male %	Total Female %	American Indian or Alaskan Native (Male) %	American Indian or Alaskan Native (Female) %	Asian (Male) %	Asian (Female) %	Black or African American (Male) %	Black or African American (Female) %	Hispanic or Latino (Male) %	Hispanic or Latino (Female) %	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (Male) %	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (Female) %	Non-resident Alien (Male) %	Non-resident Alien (Female) %	Race and Ethnicity Unknown (Male) %	Race and Ethnicity Unknown (Female) %	Two or More Races (Male) %	Two or More Races (Female) %	White (Male) %	White (Female) %
Public Doctoral Universities (highest research activity)	46.8%	53.2%	0.3%	0.4%	2.1%	2.1%	4.6%	7.0%	5.9%	7.6%	0.1%	0.1%	2.3%	1.4%	1.4%	1.5%	1.5%	2.0%	28.6%	31.2%
All Public Doctoral Universities (highest, higher, moderate research activity)	47.8%	52.2%	0.2%	0.3%	4.0%	4.0%	3.8%	5.6%	6.3%	8.0%	0.1%	0.1%	3.2%	2.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.7%	2.0%	27.4%	28.7%
Private Doctoral Universities (highest research activity)	47.8%	52.2%	0.1%	0.1%	7.2%	8.1%	2.5%	3.5%	5.0%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	6.5%	2.2%	2.5%	1.8%	2.4%	22.7%	23.5%
All Private Doctoral Universities (highest, higher, moderate research activity)	42.9%	57.1%	0.1%	0.2%	3.5%	4.3%	3.3%	6.8%	5.2%	7.4%	0.1%	0.1%	3.7%	3.4%	4.2%	6.5%	1.5%	2.4%	21.2%	26.1%

Source. National Center for Education Statistics (2015, 2016), Fall Enrollment Survey, and Institutional Characteristics Survey. Analysis by authors.

TABLE 4.5. Full-Time Administrators in Student and Academic Affairs and Other Education Administrative Services in Doctorate-Granting Institutions

Carnegie Classification	GENDER		RACE/ETHNICITY																	
	Total Male %	Total Female %	American Indian or Alaskan Native (Male) %	American Indian or Alaskan Native (Female) %	Asian (Male) %	Asian (Female) %	Black or African American (Male) %	Black or African American (Female) %	Hispanic or Latino (Male) %	Hispanic or Latino (Female) %	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (Male) %	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (Female) %	Non-resident Alien (Male) %	Non-resident Alien (Female) %	Race and Ethnicity Unknown (Male) %	Race and Ethnicity Unknown (Female) %	Two or More Races (Male) %	Two or More Races (Female) %	White (Male) %	White (Female) %
Public Doctoral Universities (highest research activity)	28.7%	71.3%	0.2%	0.3%	1.0%	1.7%	3.0%	10.0%	2.1%	4.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%	0.6%	1.0%	1.8%	0.3%	0.9%	20.6%	51.5%
All Public Doctoral Universities (highest, higher, moderate research activity)	29.7%	70.3%	0.2%	0.4%	1.2%	2.7%	3.0%	8.2%	2.0%	5.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.6%	0.8%	1.0%	2.2%	0.4%	1.1%	21.2%	49.7%
Private Doctoral Universities (highest research activity)	28.3%	71.7%	0.1%	0.1%	1.0%	4.5%	3.2%	11.3%	1.8%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	1.3%	1.0%	1.8%	0.4%	1.0%	20.1%	46.1%
All Private Doctoral Universities (highest, higher, moderate research activity)	30.2%	69.8%	0.1%	0.3%	1.0%	3.3%	3.0%	9.0%	2.3%	6.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.6%	1.0%	1.2%	2.3%	0.4%	1.0%	21.6%	46.8%

Source. National Center for Education Statistics (2015, 2016), Fall Enrollment Survey, and Institutional Characteristics Survey. Analysis by authors.

TABLE 4.6. Comparison of Full-Time Faculty Demographics With Undergraduate Student Population

Race/Ethnicity	Male	Female	Total	Percentage	Comparison With Student Population (%)
American Indian or Alaska Native					
Asian					
Black or African American					
Hispanic or Latino					
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander					
Nonresident Alien					
Race and Ethnicity Unknown					
Two or More Races					
White					
Total					

TABLE 4.7. Determining Process-Based Outcomes

Academic Year _____   Job Group _____   Process _____

Race/Ethnicity	Total in Job Category	Male	Female	Total	Racial/Ethnic Group in Job Category (%)
American Indian or Alaska Native					
Asian					
Black or African American					
Hispanic or Latino					
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander					
Nonresident Alien					
Race and Ethnicity Unknown					
Two or More Races					
White					
Total					

TABLE 4.8. Sample Turnover Statistics for Tenure-Track Faculty

Academic Year _____   Job Group <u>Tenure-Track Faculty (Pretenure)</u>   Process <u>Turnover</u>

Race/Ethnicity	Total in Job Category	Male	Female	Total	Turnover by Race/Ethnicity (%)
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	0	1	1	100
Asian	12	2	1	3	25
Black or African American	8	1	2	3	37.5
Hispanic or Latino	7	1	0	1	14.2
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0
Nonresident Alien	9	0	1	3	33
Race and Ethnicity Unknown	5	0	1	1	20
Two or More Races	8	1	0	1	12.5
White	57	3	1	4	7
Total (includes overall turnover percentage)	107	8	7	17	15.9

Note. Assumption: 107 Tenure-Track Faculty (Pretenure).

C. *Overall Analysis of Results and a Planning Matrix*

This section of the audit examines the results of the analysis to use as a basis for future planning.

1. What boundary-spanning thematic inferences about the institution can be drawn from the data analysis?

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

2. What are the areas of strength/IE in the analysis?

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

3. What areas require further study?

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

4. What opportunities exist for improvement?

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

5. What additional qualitative data need to be considered to cross-check results?

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

6. What resources (both financial and nonfinancial) will catalyze progress in areas that require improvement?

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

7. In what areas has progress been made over a discrete time period?

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

What factors may have produced these results?

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. In what areas has there been little or no progress or even backward movement?

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

   What factors may have produced these results?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

9. Going forward, what specific strategies will address needed areas of improvement?

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

   e. _____

Summative Evaluation: Please provide a summative evaluation of the results of this questionnaire and concrete steps for enhancement:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Goals for enhancement:

   1. _____

   2. _____

   3. _____