DEIA TF Meeting Minutes 2021 – 09 – 08

Notetaker: Lauren Phegley

Joe supports Jessica’s departure and her prioritization of her self-care. Joe will be the chair until Year Two when their will be another co-chair.

Discussion of Year 1 Survey Report Draft by Assessment Team

Jen: We will look at the new version three report so we can get feedback before presenting to the EC on Monday September 13th. The last TF meeting we got a lot of feedback on version 1 draft, which is still in Microsoft Teams if anyone would like to review it again. We were not able to discuss all feedback since some of the comments were made after the set deadline for comments. Today we are going to review the update draft and ask for feedback. The sub team worked very hard on this document, and we addressed some of your comments in the Word doc and some in the new draft. Current version has table and charts.

People had concerns about the open ended comments, regarding where they are from, how we chose them, and things like that so we provided additional information about how we select those comments and how we come about those things. We added the full survey questions to the end of the report in Appendix A. Plus we have added question text before each section that discusses the results. We tried to make it accessible and readable.

The second section is about the open-ended comments and the first section is about the qualitative data. We added an introduction to the qualitative comments section similar to how it is structured in the quantitative section. At the end of the report, we have recommendations and the conclusion.

Chris expresses support for the hard work that was done with the report.

Jen thanks Chris for his support. The assessment team did include a chart about response rates to address your specific question. We were unable to calculate the response rates for student workers because the DMI doesn’t provide information about student workers. In addition, no graduate hourly and student assistants answered the survey.

Jake will help get information on graduate assistants from HR.

Chris pointed out that one of the issues is that there is tension in the Library as whole, which is reflected in this survey, that we are not actually clear on who is an administrator. People who other employees may think are administration may see themselves as faculty.

Jen states that last TF meeting we had a lot of comments on the open ended comments section, so we added a lot of information and wanted to spend a few minutes discussing it. Open ended comments which were from Question 11 and Question 12 in the baseline survey. Some of the comments from the TF thought that the comments were skewed negatively, but we simply just represented what those who chose to comment where stating. Comments such as ‘na’ or ‘Thank you for doing this survey’ were removed before analysis. The team pulled out themes from the comments, though Jen emphasizes that only some participants answered this fill in the blank portion of the survey.

Following up on the previous TF meeting discussion, where the assessment team was asked to share the raw data from the comments. The team has decided to still not share the comments because this would be betraying the trust of employees who filled out the survey that had only the names of the four assessment people and two co-chairs names on the survey. People entering the survey aren’t really expecting about 15 different people to read their survey responses and some of the people reading it could be the direct supervisor for these respondents. The team used deep reading, interview coding, and topic modeling to do analysis on the comments and to check for preconceived bias.

Joe appreciated how this written explanation in the report helps people understand where the comments were coming from and how they were picked.

Chris asked for the assessment team to indicate that not applicable comments were removed before analysis in the report.

Joe proposes a word cloud to show topics in the report. Lauren states that she can investigate creating a word cloud using the qualitative comments, but that there are no promises.

Chris asked if we could report how many comments were related to bullying out the entire dataset of comments to quantify qualitative comments.

Lauren and Jen discuss the logistics of creating a word cloud in Jupyter notebooks. Jen warns people that the results of having done word clouds in the past with library data, turn out to be a big cloud with the words ‘library’ and ‘university’ most prominent.

Chris suggestions quantify number of comments that mention bullying in the Library to add validity to our discussion.

Jake asks if we could rephrase the phrase “needs assessment” to “in-depth needs assessment”. Also, points out a possible numerical error that will be corrected.

Heather asks if we can quantify the number of comments regarding each theme. Jen explains that the value of comments is that they are comments and not counts. It doesn’t matter how many words are in the comments or how long it is. The assessment teams will discuss amongst ourselves.

Joe suggests changing the word “hierarchy” in the recommendations section. Lauren explains that the reason the section is titled “Address the Power Hierarchy” is that there is a distinct issue in this organization according to the comments and we want to do this justice.

JJ prefers to keep the title that way to validates the existence of the power hierarchy in this library. The differences between AP, faculty, civil service, and graduate students are an incredibly real thing, which can be hard to see as a faculty member because we have so much power.

Heather suggests removing or rewording the phrase “prioritization of DEIA activities by administration” to since she feels that this TF and the DEIA director position are real efforts. Jen thanks Heather for reminding her of this point. Jen points out that the survey was administered before the position of the DEIA director was scheduled to be created, so the administration hadn’t hit full throttle at that point.

JJ points out that Victor wrote in the chat suggested ‘sustained’ which is a good term. JJ wants to stick with ‘real’ because it puts pressure on DEIA efforts by the administration.