

An Analysis of Demographic Data Availability Relating to WHOI and its MC&G Department

Last updated March 3, 2021

This is what is found by the **WHOI MC&G Pod 3** relating to available demographic data, policies used to collect data, and goals for making measurable progress in representation

Overview of available data and how it is collected

- Internal Data
 - MC&G Seminar demographic data
 - Available upon request
 - Historic records lack explicit demographic data collection, so personal knowledge and guessing/stereotyping is used to give a sense of representation
 - Now a survey is sent to all speakers across departments to collect demographic information. This includes, gender, race, career stage and other identifiers (e.g. LGBTQIA, veteran, 1st generation college)
 - So far this survey has had a response rate of 55%
 - An action item from another pod is making this information publicly viewable
 - WHOI Community climate survey by the Rankin & Associates Consulting firm, organized by the WHOI Gender Equity Committee (GEPAC)
 - Available to WHOI community members at <https://web.whoi.edu/yourvoice/executive-summary/>
 - “This information is proprietary and confidential. It is only to be viewed by WHOI employees. It should not be printed, saved, or shared outside this group”
 - 684 surveys were completed (62% response rate across all groups; 20% undergrad, 84% grad, 100% postdoc, 71% scientists, 64% TEIS staff, 50% LREISA, 29% marine crew, 75% admin) by this outside consulting group
 - Data table and analysis of climate survey included
 - Gives a snapshot of demographic data at the time the survey was conducted
 - Ethnic and Gender Diversity at WHOI- A Status Report (2007)
 - Data from Human Resources, and Academic Programs Office
 - Compares demographics with population demographics of the US, MA, Barnstable country, college graduates
 - Looks at board of trustees, WHOI corporation, all WHOI, and various leadership and employment subgroups

- Report distinguishes white men, white women, black, Asia/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, American Indian/Alaskan Native, other
 - HR data collection
 - Collects gender, ethnicity, and citizenship data for all students and postdocs who chose to self identify (during both application stage and onboarding)
 - For NSF, NIH, OSER, and others also report funding source, education data, highest degree/whether degree is US or foreign university
 - HR only can enter one ethnicity otherwise “2 or more” option, though it seems like APO does record both for their own records
 - HR only male/female options
 - We think WHOI should go beyond this minimum and have more granularity than the NSF metrics
- Public Data
 - Only public-facing data is statistics regarding [MIT-WHOI Joint Program applicants and career placements](#). This does not include any demographic information.
 - [MIT Institutional Research](#) may be able to separate out the JP from other data, but this may or may not be able to be released publicly (depends on # of students in the departments)

Overview of goals on demographics or increasing representation

- Institute Goals - N/A
- Department Goals - N/A
- Woods Hole recommended goals (unadopted)
 - Diversity and Inclusion Report and Recommendations on Behalf of the Woods Hole Diversity Initiative ([The Livingston report](#))
 - measurable goals that can be adopted by the scientific institutions in Woods Hole
 - Description of several challenges faced by minoritized groups in the Woods Hole community

Analysis on the status of demographic data and measurable goals compared to other institutions

- How our organization compare to others, or to the field as a whole
 - Our organization lacks a public source of data or measurable goals, so we are currently behind many other peer-institutions with respect to outward-facing commitments
- What we learned about other organizations (or in general) while investigating demographic data?
 - <https://diversity.ucsd.edu/accountability/#Dashboards>
 - <https://diversity.ideo.columbia.edu/seminardiversity>

Proposed policy changes and action items

1. The creation of a public interface for diversity-related goals, data, and progress at the institution level
 - a. A central resource of efforts and initiatives spanning from institute level commitments and programming to student groups
 - i. Associated contact information for the ability to follow-up
 - ii. Appropriate credit to groups that are pushing these initiatives forward
 - b. Vision statement and goals for the institution
 - i. Many examples of these are discussed in the Livingston Report
 - c. A progress report and/or scorecard feature to show what improvements are being made
 - i. Progress report format: periodically update the status of initiatives
 - ii. Scorecard: break initiatives down into action items with point values (usually an initiative will be 1 point, and action items are fractions of that point). Regularly update the score of what is accomplished out of what has been proposed.
 - d. Examples, and their perceived strengths (and weaknesses)
 - i. [The Commitments page for MIT](#)
 1. Strength: We like how the current status of initiatives are listed with the goals as a 'progress report'. It is important that there is a commitment to update something like this with some regularity (twice a year?)
 2. Weakness: no contact information
 - ii. [Academic Affairs and diversity at Lamont](#)
 1. Strengths: availability of a diversity statement, demographic information about science faculty and invited seminar speakers, great resources for a range of applications
 2. Weakness: no demographic information about other large groups in this community including students, post docs and staff
 - iii. [Dartmouth Inclusive Excellence](#)
 1. Strengths: Goals are broken into tasks with progress indicators (clearly defined issue, current status if in progress, and outcome), and who is in charge of accountability for each task; encourages diversity and inclusion plans to be developed and posted on the website of each department, division, and school; many goals, some of which are:
 - a. Double length of URM recruiting fellowship programs
 - b. Add 4 postdoctoral fellowships in areas that support diversity
 - c. Achieve 25% underrepresented faculty
2. A formal collaboration with CDI groups and HR to help track and process demographic data
 - a. We propose an effort be made to collect data more nuanced than the minimum reporting requirements of the NSF

- b. Accountability for retention of underrepresented individuals across career labels
 - i. The Academic Programs Office tracks this for Joint Program students. These are small numbers so the data is kept private, but it is reported that there are no trends that suggest less success within some groups vs others
- 3. Suggested measurable goals and action items at the department level:
 - a. Commitment to improving seminar diversity (MC&G department)
 - i. E.g. [Lamont](#) has a goal to Invite at least 3 URM speakers per year, and encourage all invited speakers to share broader impacts/ outreach/ DEI efforts
 - ii. In order to not rely on stereotyping/assuming, several databases exist in which scientists self identify demographic information. These should be compiled and passed on by seminar organizers
 - 1. [Geoscientists of color](#) - maintained by Jennifer Glass
 - 2. Twitter hashtags such as #blackingeoscience #latinasinSTEM
 - b. Incorporation of demographic data on the department website (ideally department-specific, but at least linking to institution-level data) with acknowledgement of department level diversity efforts
 - i. Goals from other department websites
 - 1. [Dartmouth Earth Science](#): Increase visibility of under-represented minority scientists in courses and seminars, and remove visual cues that reinforce stereotypes that this profession is only for white outdoor enthusiasts
 - 2. [UCDavis Geology](#): [Equitable mentoring strategy](#) includes a mentee information resource (pg 8) with mentee references, mentoring activities, and outcomes; anti-racist mentoring guidelines