The units reporting to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs include: The Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation, The Aggie Honor System Office, and Academic Program Review. All told, there are 14 full-time employees across the three units and/or reporting directly to the associate provost, and 1 part-time employee (coordinator for Academic Program Review). Individual units are small, and directors work hard to ensure employees feel welcome and comfortable discussing issues of climate, equity and retention with unit leadership.

I. **ACCOUNTABILITY** – Review and compare current year and previous years’ data for applicable groups within your unit(s) across your peers and articulate what the data tell you related to unit, peer, local, and national contexts. Describe accountability procedures in place for unit leaders (e.g., leadership team, department heads, supervisors, managers, student leaders, etc.) and any specific action/intervention plans instituted as a result of the analysis, interpretation, and discussion of your data.

A. **Recruitment.** Examine how peer institutions’ strategies and unit strategies are contributing to the recruitment of a strong, demonstrable presence of diversity for students, faculty, and staff.

The Aggie Honor System Office had one job vacancy during the past year. An initial review of applications by the Director and selection committee showed a lack of diversity in the applicant pool. The Director worked with Human Resources and AABS to expand the areas where the job was advertised. This resulted in a much more diverse applicant pool, which ultimately led to the selection of a highly qualified candidate. This mirrors strategies used at peer institutions, including University of Wisconsin – Madison and UNC-Chapel Hill, and highlights the importance of utilizing campus resources to ensure a diverse applicant pool.

Institutional Effectiveness and Evaluation, since its inception in Fall 2015, and Academic Program Review have had no vacancies, nor have any full-time positions been filled.

B. **Retention.** Examine how peer institutions’ strategies and unit strategies retain diversity in undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty, and staff.

Professional development is important in all of the units, and staff members have had the opportunity to travel to professional conferences and participate in other forms of professional development such as Employee and Organizational Development (EOD) trainings including computer workshops, Group Leadership Forum, and Leadership Institute. In Fall 2015 one position was reclassified, promoting a woman to an assistant director position.

In light of the creation of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation, EOD facilitated a two-part teambuilding retreat during Fall 2015 to create a new mission statement for the organization and develop comradery. This workshop served as a jumping off point for the new unit, as well as an opportunity to develop internal processes to continue bringing the unit together. For example, now IE&E hosts monthly “Birthday Breaks” in order to bring staff together, recognizing full-time staff, graduate assistants, and student assistants. These social activities give staff the opportunity to socialize and develop comradery with one another, which the Assistant Provost believes is necessary to maintain connections and unity across a unit engaged in very different work supporting the university. The director of the unit (the Assistant Provost) also worked closely with each member of the OE&E staff to identify professional development opportunities each wanted to pursue (either
offered on campus or at state/regional/national professional meetings). Supporting these opportunities was a means through which to support individuals’ desires for professional development, communicate the leadership’s commitment to professional development and retention, and to invest in the success and of the office.

Peer institutions engage in this work in a variety of ways, from professional development opportunities to conversations within the units with colleagues. Retention across the units remains high.

II. **CLIMATE** – Examine how your peer institutions are working to create and maintain an inclusive and healthy working and learning environment for students, faculty, and staff.

During the Fall 2015 semester, the Associate Provost Leadership Team began planning quarterly meetings focused on a particular climate issue of relevance to the work the units engage in and/or a climate issue on campus. Suggested topics at the time ranged from microaggressions (a topic of concern from the division climate survey) to the experience of historically underrepresented faculty, staff, and students on campus. The quarterly workshops are intended to be mandatory for all full-time employees and open to graduate student assistants if they are scheduled during their normal working hours. This practice is similar to programs at the University of Florida, who engage in diversity workshops for all members. These meetings continue to occur on a quarterly basis and promote staff engagement in conversations promoting an inclusive and healthy working environment. The Associate Provost Leadership Team continues to determine topics based on local needs in the units and campus climate as a whole.

III. **EQUITY** – Examine unit level strategies to address equity issues and perceptions of inequity for students, faculty, and staff (e.g., advancement, promotion, access to information and opportunities, professional development, salary studies, student leadership development, start-up packages, leadership succession planning, etc.).

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation took steps during the Fall of 2015 to begin addressing equity issues which came to light as a result of the merger between the Office of Institutional Assessment and Measurement and Research Services and the subsequent review of all existing position descriptions, pay, and classifications. Like what is seen in practices at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, job title and compensation analyses were undertaken (though at a more local level), lasting through the Fall 2015 to completely address. Through this close examination, issues of inequity were identified with adjustments taking effect at the beginning of calendar year 2016.