

AACDC Equity Matrix—Revised Matrix (Updated May 19, 2017)

Applicable groups from the Historically Underrepresented Groups: gender, ethnicity, and age

| Dimension | Issue | Question | Possible Measure | Comments | Target Timeframes (subject to change) |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| Advancement and Promotion | Access | Are there gaps in use of existing career ladders/paths that leave employees from historically underrepresented groups with fewer opportunities for advancement? | Review of the existing career ladders/paths applicable to division employees to determine whether there are some groups (gender, age, and ethnicity) not using these to a greater degree than other groups. | Human Resources advised that many career ladders/paths are designed to be used across campus vs. within an office. | Recruitment and Retention Subcommittee examined this and recommendations were approved by the leadership in November 2015. However, the Fall 2016 implementation of the System Pay Plan's ladders and career paths has caused this effort to be put on hold until otherwise directed by the division leadership. |
| Advancement and Promotion | Performance evaluations | Are there historically underrepresented groups who are disproportionately blocked from advancement despite good performance? | Review performance evaluations for a random sample of Academic Affairs employees at all levels over a 5-year period. What is the correlation between advancement/promotion and age, gender, race/ethnicity for employees receiving the various rating categories on performance evaluations (e.g. Exemplary, Exceeds Expectations, Achieves, etc.)? | AACDC was unable to obtain performance evaluation data for the division from Human Resources; therefore a division level review will not be done at this time. Individual units within the division can opt to review their areas since they have access to this information within their work areas. | Not Applicable (see comments) |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| Advancement and Promotion | Performance evaluations | Are members of historically underrepresented groups disproportionately represented in any of the performance evaluation rating categories? | Review performance evaluations for a random sample of Academic Affairs employees at all levels over a 5 year period. Is there a negative correlation between performance and age, gender, or race/ethnicity? | AACDC was unable to obtain performance evaluation data for the division from Human Resources; therefore a division level review will not be done at this time. Individual units within the division can opt to review their areas since they have access to this information within their work areas. | Not Applicable (see comments) |
| Hiring Practices | Attracting applicants from diverse groups | Do NOVs use language that encourages diverse candidates to apply? | Review a representative sample of NOVs for analysis. | Fall 2013 results were reported at the Supervisor's meeting in Summer 2014. A follow-up review was conducted in Fall 2016 to compare results. | 2016 Hiring Process Report submitted to leadership in May 2017 |
| Hiring Practices | Access | How diverse are our applicant pools before interviews begin? | Review EEO data from a representative sample of NOVs from the division. Examine the length of time the NOV is posted. | Fall 2013 results were reported at the Supervisor's meeting in Summer 2014. A follow-up review was conducted in Fall 2016 to compare results. | 2016 Hiring Process Report submitted to leadership in May 2017 |
| Hiring Practices | Awareness, Climate, Attracting applicants from Diverse Groups | Do hiring processes utilize nationally endorsed human resources practices to address diversity experience or issues? | Review a representative sample of division hiring files to determine whether the interview questions, hiring matrices, and reference check questions address diversity issues | Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM), Women in IT, and Texas A&M Human Resources were consulted about these issues. Fall 2013 results were reported at the Supervisor's meeting in | 2016 Hiring Process Report submitted to leadership in May 2017 |

| | | | | | |
|------------------|----------|---|--|--|---|
| | | | | Summer 2014. A follow-up review was conducted in Fall 2016 to compare results. | |
| Hiring Practices | Barriers | What barriers, real or perceived, do supervisors see related to increasing diversity in applicant pools? | The planned AACDC supervisor survey will address this | Supervisor survey was conducted in May 2014 | Results were shared in the Supervisor Meeting in Summer 2014. Recommendations for action were made by supervisors and shared broadly among them. |
| Hiring Practices | Barriers | Are there division practices or processes that may create perceived or real inequities in the hiring process? | Add questions in the next iteration of the division climate survey related to these issues. These may be related to satisfaction levels, in addition to other factors. | Climate Survey with this question was conducted in Fall 2014; results show that there is a perception of barriers. Survey of division supervisors in summer of 2016 found that a majority of supervisors felt processes in their units were not equitable for advancement, promotion, merit, and awarding of administrative leave. They also said they wish they had more training on a number of these issues. Recommendations for new supervisor training are expected in Spring 2017 | Results of the surveys were provided to the Leadership; a pilot with AS was initiated in Fall 2016 to address the issues. Results of that will be available in Fall 2017 Recruitment and Retention Subcommittee made recommendations to track red flags because of these perceptions in their November 2015 report. The first red flag report was provided in to the leadership in February 2017 Summer supervisors meeting shared the data and the Provost asked each unit to have discussions with their staff by September 1, 2016; this was accomplished. |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------|----------|--|--|--|--|
| Advancement and Promotion | Barriers | Are there division practices or processes that may create perceived or real inequities in advancement and promotion? | Add questions in the next iteration of the division climate survey related to these issues. These may be related to satisfaction levels, in addition to other factors. | Climate Survey with this question was conducted in Fall 2014; results show that there is a perception of barriers. | Recruitment and Retention Subcommittee made recommendations to track red flags because of these perceptions in their November 2015 report. The first red flag report was provided to the leadership in February 2017 |
|---------------------------|----------|--|--|--|--|

O:AACDC:Equity:Equity Matrix Revised updated May 2017.