Diversity Criterion: Successful Strategies for Responding & Incorporation in Criteria Revision

Presented by CEPH Accreditation Specialists
• Brittney Lilly, MPH
• Kristen Varol, MPH, CHES
How Did We Get Here?

• Used to have strong focus on structural diversity, counting of individuals

• Now greater emphasis on institutional/programmatic systems and culture

• Expanded focus from race/ethnicity/gender to also consider other categories that fit with SPH/PHP’s mission
## Data Template

### Template 1.8.1. Summary Data for Faculty, Students and/or Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Definition</th>
<th>Method of Collection</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must report at least four lines of data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One must relate to students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One must relate to faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 2 categories must relate to race/ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General concepts

• Define categories of interest that align with mission, setting, etc.
• Consistently and systematically follow through on commitment to the categories of interest
  • All aspects of activity: student recruitment, faculty recruitment, retention of both, curriculum, research & service focus, etc.
• Demonstrate quantitative evidence for success
• Demonstrate other evidence for success
• Demonstrate commitment to ongoing review & reevaluation as needed
Documentation Requests

• Present a coherent, coordinated approach
  • Don’t answer doc requests as if they are independent of one another—requests are intended to be related and complementary

• Answer these questions for site visitors
  • How do/will you know you’re successful?
  • Are you doing enough?
  • If not, what are you doing/what do you plan to do to improve?

• Make sure that answers are program/school-specific
  • Fine to use successful university or college-level systems or definitions, but need to evaluate the fit & “make it your own.”
Common Issues
(aka: Things that annoy site visitors)

• Weak or poorly-explained rationale for chosen populations
  • You know your setting best!

• Use of gender as a category without clear rationale
  • Gender imbalance in PH students typically tilts female, but leadership & senior faculty roles may not
  • May be a meaningful category for you, but need to explain WHY

• Reliance on university- or college-based plans without tailoring or evidence of examination

• Disconnect between data in template and discussion in other documentation requests
  • Happens more frequently than one would expect!
More common issues...

• Broad statements without relationship to chosen populations of interest
  • “Most courses in our curriculum address disparate effects of public health issues and policies on different populations.”

• Long list of links to standard non-discrimination policies
  • This criterion should tell visitors about YOUR school/program, not about verifying existence of formal language that is standard across most universities

• Resting on laurels/perception of complacency

• Lack of evidence that PHP/SPH is responding to data & adapting
Some technicalities

• Some programs have identified legal issues with defining “targets”
• International settings have different diversity frameworks

• Focus on the criterion’s intent & spirit
  • What CAN you do?
  • What is meaningful in your setting, given context & constraints?
  • How can you express accountability & measure success?
  • Criterion is intended to be useful component of self-reflection/self-study
Planned criteria revisions

• Will combine some redundant requests
• More focus on examples rather than the existence of policies and procedures
• Will more explicitly seek rationale for populations of interest – and clear links between these populations and the data presented
Enough abstraction...

What has actually worked? What hasn’t?