History of the ACCD

The Emory Advisory Council on Community and Diversity (ACCD) was launched in the fall of 2012 to replace Emory’s three president’s commissions. The President’s Commission on the Status of Women (PCSW), the President’s Commission on Race and Ethnicity (PCORE) and the President’s Commission on Sexuality, Gender Diversity and Queer Equality (PCSGDQE) were established in 1976, 1979, and 1995, respectively. They were created to advise the university president on diversity-related issues. Their contributions and recommendations helped establish the Center for Women, the Office of LGBT Life, and the Office of Community and Diversity, in addition to many other programs and policies.

After the Office of Community and Diversity (C&D) was established in 2007, conversations began to emerge about the need for additional commissions (class, disability, etc.) and the desire to develop a more comprehensive infrastructure to support community and diversity work throughout the Emory enterprise. In the fall of 2011, discussions were initiated to re-imagine community and diversity at Emory. During the spring of 2012, a retreat and a number of critical conversations were facilitated to discuss the work of the President’s Commissions and to devise a new and more action-oriented infrastructure to better focus attention on and accelerate efforts to operationalize Emory’s long-held values of access, equity, and inclusion. After much conversation, active dialogue, and debate, the creation of an Advisory Council on Community and Diversity was proposed to replace the President’s Commissions. The ACCD is composed of the Associate Vice Provost for Community and Diversity (who serves as ACCD Chair), a Steering Committee (SC), and Division Committees on Community and Diversity (DCCDs). The Associate Vice Provost for Community and Diversity chairs the Steering Committee and the ACCD process as a whole. The ACCD is supported by staff in the Office of Community and Diversity.

ACCD Process

The ACCD process is an annual evaluation and reporting process that encourages and supports efforts to improve community and diversity within and across every division of Emory. The process recognizes that most community and diversity efforts occur at the divisional level, and that the divisions themselves are best equipped to implement their own continuous improvement cycles, with guidance and assistance from central administrative offices.

* This report was written and compiled by ACCD Chair Dona Yarbrough, with assistance from Steering Committee members Hal Jones, Paula Gomes, Christine Ristaino, and Alicia Serra. Evaluations and recommendations were derived from Steering Committee feedback.
The major components of the process are as follows:

- C&D gathers data from Human Resources (HR), the Registrar, and the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness (IR) and provides that data to DCCDs for analysis. This data includes information about faculty, staff, and student composition by race and gender.
- DCCDs submit to the SC an annual report on community and diversity that analyzes data, describes and assesses current efforts, and outlines short and long term challenges, goals, and plans. The 2013-2014 report was meant to provide baseline data and information about each division, with subsequent reports focused more specifically on establishing a continuous improvement cycle within each division.
- DCCDs answer questions and receive initial feedback on the reports during brief oral presentations to the SC.
- C&D collects written SC feedback on all DCCD reports. This feedback is presented to the division leader and DCCD leaders during individual meetings. At the meetings, the ACCD chair and an SC representative receive feedback on the ACCD process and present SC recommendations to the division.
- The ACCD chair summarizes DCCD reports and SC feedback in an annual written report to the President and Provost, which is then made publically available. The report highlights the most salient successes and challenges within the divisions and recommends enterprise-wide actions that would support community and diversity.
- The ACCD chair meets annually with the President and Provost to review progress toward divisional goals and SC recommendations.

In addition, the SC has established an ad hoc Subcommittee on Indicators and Recommendations that is examining several questions related to data, such as

- What are recommendations / best practices for the collection of data in surveys? Should Emory encourage units to include the same demographic questions in unit-wide surveys in order to acquire comparative data?
- Should Emory design a standardized organizational survey that can be used by all divisions within the institution?
- What ethical, legal, and logistical challenges does Emory face when collecting data, and how do we work through them?
- Should Emory collect demographic data beyond what is required for federal reporting (e.g. sexual orientation or religion), and if so, how?

SC members attend two-hour bimonthly meetings as well as 10-15 hours of DCCD presentations. The ACCD is supported by the staff of the Office of Community and Diversity, which provides leadership and expertise, data, logistical support, and funding.
**ACCD Purpose**

The purpose of the ACCD process is to create an infrastructure for measuring, assessing, and improving community and diversity at Emory. The process requires the involvement of divisional leadership, as well as other key division members via the Divisional Committees on Community and Diversity (DCCDs), thus emphasizing individual, organizational and community responsibility for facilitating and implementing diversity plans. The process recognizes that each division will have different challenges, goals, and resources. The aim of the process, therefore, is to support each division as it establishes an on-going rhythm of collecting and assessing pertinent data, targeting specific actions and goals, and continuously monitoring progress toward those goals. While the DCCD reports are self-assessments, the process also provides a way for divisions to be evaluated annually by the SC and, ultimately, the President and Provost.

The SC is uniquely qualified to assess and assist divisions in their community and diversity efforts. The SC is comprised of individuals from across the enterprise with professional expertise in various aspects of community and diversity, as well as at-large members who have demonstrated commitment to the institution’s community and diversity goals. Thus the process provides divisions access to expert knowledge and feedback on their efforts.

The ACCD also collects and distributes information in the following ways:

- Divisions are provided with data to assist them in their planning and analyses.
- Best practices are collected via DCCD reports and shared across the institution via feedback meetings, the President’s Town Hall meeting, and public distribution of the report.
- Divisional best practices and challenges inform the SC’s recommendations to the President and Provost. These recommendations are focused on process improvements, program development and evaluation, and strategic initiatives that might best be implemented centrally in order to support divisions in their work.
- Divisional leaders are encouraged to share their reports (or report summaries) with their faculty, staff, students, alumni, and patients.
- DCCD reports educate members of the SC, most of whom have job responsibilities specifically related to community and diversity, about efforts and challenges across the Emory enterprise.

**2013-2014 ACCD Successes and Challenges**

**Overall success of the ACCD process**

As a result of the ACCD process, committees of faculty, staff, students, alumni and/or patients convened in the majority of divisions to examine diversity and
community data, to identify challenges and opportunities, and to develop assessment tools, surveys, plans, and recommendations. For many divisions, this was the first time a comprehensive needs assessment specifically focused on community and diversity had been conducted. In our survey of DCCD members, forty-six percent reported that prior to this process, they had never looked at their division’s data on faculty, staff, students, patients and/or alumni from a community and diversity perspective. In total about 250 people participated in the process, including

- 23 divisional leaders
- 35 steering committee members (18 who participated regularly)
- 208 divisional committee members

Six of 23 divisional leaders attended their division’s presentation, and many DCCDs reported strong leadership investment in the process. To date all but two divisional leaders have met or are scheduled to meet with ACCD representatives to discuss their reports. The remaining two delegated the meeting to a subordinate.

We are confident divisional leaders and DCCD members increased their knowledge and appreciation of the complexity and importance of community and diversity as they engaged this process. Many participants provided feedback to this effect during the oral presentations, divisional leaders meetings, or in C&D’s survey about the process that was sent to all participants. For example,

- DCCD chairs from the School of Business said that the process “amplified concerns in some areas” and allowed them “to give voice to concerns we’ve had all along,” in addition to creating more accountability for diversity so diversity efforts do not rest solely on the shoulders of the school’s chief diversity officer.
- DCCD members from the School of Public Health said the process “revealed that we have a lot of work to do. We think we’re very diverse, but when we look at the statistics, it’s something different.” Additionally, they said, “As a result [of the process], we’re going to be doing a whole new RSPH diversity website.”
- School of Medicine DCCD members said, “the biggest revelation … was how little importance people put” on community and diversity issues. “We don’t sit down and review this information.” “In the end, [departments] came up with future directions and noticed issues, even though they were initially resistant to the process.”
- The Executive Vice President for Business and Administration noted that it was very important to systematically assess community and diversity and be held accountable for it. He reported that a rich discussion resulted from the process in his division, and as a result of the divisional leader meeting, the Associate Vice Provost for C&D and the Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity Programs (EOP) are working with the division’s leadership to
develop specific recruitment strategies to diversify the division’s senior leadership.

- The CEO of Emory University Hospital (EUH) stressed the importance of the ACCD process and the value in assessing EUH’s successes and opportunities related to community and diversity.

The Emory Healthcare (EHC) process appeared to run particularly smoothly and efficiently, in great part because Hal Jones, Director of Care Transformation, worked closely with C&D to incorporate the ACCD process into EHC’s already existing Entity Care Transformation Advisory Groups. These advisory groups functioned as DCCDs. The ACCD report templates were modified for EHC to reflect current initiatives and reports that provided a framework through which to assess community and diversity needs and goals. EHC regularly collects survey data on patient satisfaction (Press-Ganey scores) and employee engagement. As part of the Care Transformation training and implementation, “the Pledge” (which promotes employees’ commitment to and respect for one another) has been implemented to facilitate a fair and just culture. The focus of the Pledge is to encourage individual and community responsibility to engage in the process of culture change throughout the EHC system. As a result, Healthcare produced some of the best reports this year, and these divisions’ focus on the patient experience with regard to community and diversity issues could serve as a model for divisions focused on serving students or alumni. Some of the divisions concentrated heavily on the patient experience and plan to assess employee perspectives more actively in future reporting. Overall, the EHC template facilitated more consistency in reporting among the hospitals and clinics.

As a result of the process, C&D and the SC learned about different methods of data collection and numerous initiatives across the enterprise. By housing this information in a central location, C&D can assist units in need of information when applying for grants and awards and when requesting examples of model survey questions and best practices outlined by other divisions. The process develops “institutional memory” and baseline documentation about annual community and diversity efforts at Emory. The process also allows for the discovery of issues as well as solutions that span multiple units. It enables Emory to share strategies employed to solve similar problems, with the goal of lessening the need to “reinvent the wheel” when a problem arises within a division. Furthermore, it assists with the development of a community and diversity organizational toolkit that can promote active leadership and employee engagement.

Finally, each DCCD was asked to list at least three goals, aspirations, or plans for enhancing community and diversity among their constituencies. As a result, many units developed concrete diversity recommendations and implementation plans that will be revisited by the SC next year in order to assess progress and to define specific accountability measures.

**ACCD Process Improvements**
While we believe that the ACCD process was tremendously successful overall, we also asked for and received significant feedback -- via oral presentations, meetings with divisional leaders and DCCD chairs, and an online survey to all DCCD members -- on ways to improve the ACCD process. Below is a list of the primary issues, along with a plan of action for addressing them:

- **PROBLEM:** Some divisions reported that ACCD guidelines shifted over the course of the year, and they received multiple versions of the report templates. This made it difficult for DCCDs to understand exactly what was required in the reports. **SOLUTION:** Revised guidelines and a timeline for the annual process will be distributed in early March and will not be revised after that point. In addition, Dona Yarbrough and Hal Jones have significantly streamlined the report templates to encourage a continuous improvement cycle with regard to community and diversity efforts within each division. This is consistent with the original vision of the ACCD process, in which the first year would focus on baseline data collection and analysis, and subsequent years would focus on specific measures, actions, goals, and assessments of progress.

- **PROBLEM:** Some divisions reported they had difficulty recreating the data charts required for the report and that this activity took up an inordinate amount of time. **SOLUTION:** Given C&D provides this data to the divisions, there is no reason for divisions to recreate the data in their reports. Instead, the SC will receive access to the same data, and DCCDs will be asked only to analyze it.

- **PROBLEM:** One divisional leader suggested “that a more collaborative clarification of research questions might have allowed us to identify and standardize the data appropriate for each well-defined question in a way that is consistent with good social science research.” **SOLUTION:** Feedback on the report guidelines is being solicited from other divisional leaders and social science research experts, as well as data and process consultants.

- **PROBLEM:** One divisional leader expressed a concern that data “in the report are of a sensitive institutional nature and in some cases may represent individual students or small groups of students whose identities may be discerned.” **SOLUTION:** Nancy Bliwise, Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Planning and leader of IR, was consulted regarding institutional concerns about confidentiality. She did not feel sharing data with the SC was a concern given that the confidentiality of the data is stressed to all SC members, who are Emory employees bound to adhere to institutional mandates regarding confidentiality. In addition, she and the Associate Vice Provost for Community and Diversity agreed that the usefulness of the data would be severely hampered if small numbers were not reported. To further stress the importance of confidentiality, in future years SC members will be required to sign a confidentiality pledge.
• **PROBLEM:** Some divisions noted that the time frames listed on the data received from C&D differed from what the ACCD requested in the final report. One division reported it did not receive the data. **SOLUTION:** Clarify what data divisions are being asked to analyze and keep track of whether data was sent and received.

• **PROBLEM:** A couple of DCCDs suggested that the time between the submission of reports and receiving significant feedback on the reports was too long. **SOLUTION:** The report due date will be moved up a month to August 1, thus allowing the SC time to read reports before the beginning of the academic and fiscal year. We believe this will allow the ACCD to complete oral presentations and follow up meetings with divisional leaders by December 25.

### DCCD Reports

#### Quality of Reports: Challenges and Successes

Overall, we were extremely pleased with the quality of DCCD reports. One division submitted a report with surprisingly little analysis or specificity with regard to specific efforts in support of community and diversity. A number of SC members familiar with this division felt the report did not adequately reflect current initiatives. Another division submitted its report long after the due date (three months late). Two divisions did not create a DCCD but rather assigned one person to write the report, resulting in reports with incomplete information and a lack of divisional support for goals and recommendations. These issues are being addressed during divisional leaders meetings, and we expect greater adherence to the process guidelines next year.

EHC reports tended to be of especially high quality, perhaps because EHC has already been engaged in “care transformation” plans that overlap with community and diversity efforts to some extent. EHC reports tended to focus on concrete outcomes based on evidence: for example, it was noted that research suggests patients respond better to a staff that reflects their own diversity, thus efforts to increase staff diversity were tied directly to patient outcomes. Similarly, several EHC divisions noted patients reported issues with English-only signage, and as a result, signage is being altered based on patient populations and with specific input from patients whose first language is not English.

The Steering Committee felt that the best reports came from Marketing and Communications, the Goizueta Business School, Development and Alumni Relations, Yerkes National Primate Center, Emory University Hospital, and Emory Saint Joseph’s Hospital. Each of these reports reflected a deep engagement with the data, a thoughtful discussion of issues, and recommendations or a plan for addressing the issues.
Quality of Efforts: Challenges and Successes

Taken together, the reports provide insight into the numerous challenges Emory faces in achieving optimal community and diversity, as well as our successes and the many programs, initiatives, and plans in support of community and diversity that are currently under way.

We want to take special note of three significant challenges that span multiple divisions. We have also noted, where applicable, current efforts to address these issues in one or more divisions.

1. **Challenges with communication and transparency, especially between leadership and staff.** Several divisions noted that it is difficult to communicate goals and values across the division, as well as to ensure that members of the division understand how their work contributes to a greater good. The Law School should be commended for conducting an organizational study designed by Goizueta Business School Professors Michael Sacks and Peter Topping. The report noted that of particular concern in the study was a significant gap in the perceptions of community relations between faculty and staff. The study also indicated that improvements were needed in conflict management, decision-making, communications, and community building. The Law School has already begun efforts to improve communication in the school, and the DCCD has been charged with implementing some of the report’s other recommendations. The Laney Graduate School and Yerkes Primate Center have noted a similar disconnect between faculty / executive administration and staff, and both have implemented regular talks and meetings to improve communication and comprehension of the division’s work. EHC’s “Pledge” initiative, which promotes respect and productive working relationships, may prove to be a useful model for addressing these issues.

2. **Challenges in obtaining useful data.**
   a. Several divisions noted discrepancies between the HR/IR data they received from Community and Diversity and divisional records or understandings of job positions within the division. Similar issues have been noted by EOP, IR, and the ACCD’s Subcommittee on Indicators and Recommendations. There is a need to train HR personnel to enter employee data correctly and in a timely manner in order to ensure useful data is generated for the ACCD and EOP, federal and accreditation reporting requirements, and strategic planning processes within the divisions.
   b. Both the Office of the Provost and the Office of the President noted difficulty obtaining adequate survey results, and a number of divisions noted that having faculty, staff, and student data limited to information on race and gender hampered their ability to address a broad range of diversity issues. Goizueta Business School could serve as a model for other units in that it routinely surveys both staff and
students and asks about sexual identity as well as race and gender. Additional recommendations regarding surveys are found on pages 10 and 11.

3. **Recruiting diverse students, faculty, and senior administrators.** A number of divisions reported issues with recruitment in one or more of the above populations. All schools reported efforts to increase student diversity. Many schools noted a lack of diversity among faculty, but most reports did not present a clear strategy for recruiting a more diverse faculty, and this issue became a primary area of discussion in most meetings between the ACCD chair and the Deans. Some units reported a lack of diversity among senior administrators.

Perhaps the most positive outcome of the ACCD process is that we learned about model programs and initiatives in various units. Where applicable, these programs and initiatives are being shared with other divisions that report experiencing similar issues or that have similar populations. Examples of model programs and initiatives include

- Laney Graduate School’s Back-Up Emergency Child Care.
- Yerkes’ English as a second language classes on-site, as well as their community partnership with Goodwill Industries for custodial services.
- Campus Life’s “Campus Life Compact for Building an Inclusive Community,” through which goals were developed as a result of town halls, comment boxes, etc. The Campus Life Compact document is public and updated regularly to indicate what has been completed.
- School of Medicine’s survey which revealed that 40% of staff self-report that they did not receive a formal evaluation within the last year. The school has developed concrete goals to increase that percentage.
- School of Medicine’s plans to increase student education and awareness around unconscious bias.
- The Emory Clinic’s Interior Design Standards and Art Committee, which was established to “develop and implement a systematic program to ensure a consistent level of interior quality” through “furniture, fixtures, finishes, and art work in common areas.” This committee evaluates universal design and adaptive technologies, appropriate signage and directions, and diversity representation in photographs and artwork.
- “The Pledge,” EHC’s initiative to promote positive interpersonal relationships among employees.
- Goizueta Business School’s faculty workshop on unconscious bias in the faculty search process.
- Marketing and Communication’s review of diversity in their major publications.
- Woodruff Health Science Center’s Woodruff Leadership Academy.
- Woodruff School of Nursing’s “Changing the Face of Nursing” campaign for male student recruitment.
Recommendations

The SC provided specific recommendations to each division via individual meetings with divisional leaders and DCCD chairs. Examples of recommendations include the following:

- We recommended to three schools that they develop a strategic plan to increase faculty diversity, including establishing a clear, fair and equitable search process; institutionalizing diversity recruitment strategies; training search/appointments committees in diversity best practices; and ensuring efforts are documented and assessed.
- We recommended to one school that they explore the need for curricular transformation related to cultural competency.
- We recommended to one school that they revise the school's definition of community to more accurately reflect the diversity of the community.
- We recommended to three divisions that they develop a plan to analyze staff diversity and implement specific, proactive recruitment and hiring strategies where needed.
- We recommended to three EHC divisions that they focus on solving patient language barrier issues over the next year.
- We recommended to one EHC division that they develop a systematic approach to training doctors, nurses, and staff in sensitivity to patient diversity.

The SC also recommends that the following areas would best be improved through some level of central intervention or implementation. We ask that the executive leadership of Emory consider these recommendations and develop a plan of action.

- Improving data collection related to community and diversity.
  - HR, IR, and EOP should work together to identify problems and develop solutions to data collection issues related to PeopleSoft.
  - The ACCD Subcommittee on Indicators and Recommendations should provide suggested standard demographic questions to be used in division-level surveys.
  - HR, the Office of Community and Diversity, and others should collaborate to revisit the possibility of implementing a regular campus-wide survey that would measure employee (faculty and staff) climate and engagement and collect demographic data (on religion, sexual orientation, etc.) not currently available.
  - Campus Life, the Office of the Provost, and the schools should collaborate to include standard demographic and climate questions on regularly administered student surveys. Questions about identity
not captured in Registrar data (sexual orientation, disability, etc.) should be included.

- EHC should collect survey data on LGBT patients to assess climate issues and the hospital’s ability to reflect LGBT identities in electronic systems and forms (e.g. preferred greeting fields and a “partner” option on intake forms).

  - *Increasing employee diversity, especially at the tenure and tenure-track faculty, executive, and senior management levels.*
    - The Office of Equal Opportunity should have clear and significant monitoring and approvals authority in both faculty and staff search processes. The President and Provost should communicate to executive leaders that new oversight will be implemented and more robust EOP processes put in place.
    - Create a strategic plan for faculty and staff diversity and ensure consistent communication and collaboration among executive leadership, school leadership, and diversity officers responsible for monitoring and training.
    - Increase diversity recruitment and hiring training at the central level and increase central resources to accomplish this training.
      - Establish regular faculty appointments/search chair and committee training in every school through the Office of Community and Diversity. The President and Provost should communicate the expectation that such training will occur. (Currently this training occurs in a minority of Emory schools.)
      - Charge an existing unit with responsibility, or establish a new unit responsible for, diversity training in staff hiring and recruitment. Target areas of concern.
    - Evaluate current efforts related to diverse hiring and recruitment (Emory Dual Career Network, Diversity and Excellence Funds) and consider new efforts (recruitment travel funds, online tools and training).
    - Assess climate and retention for women and minority employees.

  - *Centralizing diversity training.* There is currently no unit charged with providing, and adequately resourced to provide, diversity training beyond basic compliance (EOP) and faculty recruitment and hiring (C&D). This gap in training came up in a number of DCCD presentations as well as in individual meetings with leaders. C&D should be adequately resourced to provide leadership in a collaboration between HR and diversity officers across the enterprise to provide training in the area of “managing diversity” in the workplace.

  - *Increasing the role of the President and Provost in establishing community and diversity goals and expectations.* Leadership by the President and Provost has been responsible for significant improvements to community and diversity at Emory over the last few years, including the establishment of the ACCD
process itself. As noted above, this leadership must continue in order to implement ACCD recommendations. Thus,
  o The President and Provost should charge executive leadership in the appropriate units with accomplishing the recommendations set forth by the SC.
  o The President and Provost should articulate clear expectations and hold executive leadership in all divisions directly accountable for being actively engaged in establishing and sustaining a process and structure for the measurement, assessment and continuous improvement of community and diversity in their respective divisions.

Conclusion

As was noted in an *Insight Into Diversity* (September / October 2013) article about Emory's emerging ACCD process, "Most universities seek to build community and empower diversity, but it's difficult to ensure that goals set by mission statements are driven into the numerous divisions and learning sectors ultimately responsible for carrying out the work" (17). In its first year, the ACCD has been recognized nationally as an innovative (and even unique) way to drive improvements in community and diversity, and it has spurred assessment of community and diversity efforts in 23 Emory divisions. More importantly, the process has resulted in numerous concrete actions and plans aimed at improving community and diversity within divisions. The process established by the SC has initiated a rhythm of continuous improvement within divisions, which will solidify into a habit of measurement, assessment, and improvement within the coming years. This is a proven method for creating change that has never before been systematically applied to community and diversity at Emory. The SC is extremely optimistic that the process, given continued support by executive leadership, will result in nothing short of positive change for the Emory enterprise and all its constituencies.