How Assessment is Changing DEI Work – A Longitudinal Cohort Study

Alex Najduch, Director of Evaluation and Assessment



Understanding the Dartmouth Context

- Rural campus in Hanover, New Hampshire
- 4,400 undergraduate students
- 2,300 graduate students
- Private, not-for-profit
- Highly selective, Ivy league institution



Current efforts to examine diversity, equity, inclusion and belonging have gaps.

- Reporting demographics across race, gender and other salient identities
 - Challenge: sexual orientation, religious affiliation, and political affiliation are not routinely collected
- Conducting surveys and cross tabulating results
 - Challenge: Not using a reference group

Our Approach: Move from General Assumptions to Understanding Specific Experiences







Create a randomized, representative sample of faculty, students and staff for a new pulse survey Apply rigorous statistical testing for reliability and validity

Leverage relative risk ratios, commonly used in clinical trials to examine the experiences of each group

Survey Instrument: Take the T.E.M.P. Toward Equity, Measuring Progress

- 1. I feel like I belong at Dartmouth
- 2. I feel connected to the Dartmouth community
- 3. I trust the senior leadership of the institution to further goals of diversity, equity and inclusion
- 4. I feel like Dartmouth is a place where people with diverse opinions and backgrounds can be heard
- 5. I feel like Dartmouth demonstrates a strong institutional commitment to inclusion
- 6. I believe Dartmouth has a process to take appropriate action in response to incidents of bias

Social Indicators

Gender

Race/ Ethnicity

Sexual Orientation Political Affiliation

Building Parallel Survey Cohorts

There are two distinct groups:

- General Public anyone who wants to participate
- Randomized, stratified cohort



Aggregated Groups of Social Indicators

Gender

- Female
- Male
- I prefer not to say
- Gender expansive

Race Ethnicity

- Asian
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino
- I prefer not to say
- Two or more races
- White

Political Affiliations

- Conservative
- Moderate
- Liberal
- I prefer not to say

Sexual Orientation

- Heterosexual
- I prefer not to say
- Queer

Relative Risk Analysis

Factors	Incidence		Total
	Yes	No	Iotai
Exposed group	Α	В	A+B
Non-exposed group	С	D	C+D

How many times factor exposure would increase the incidence of an individual:

Relative risk larger than 1 represents that risks have increased due to factor exposure.

The value obtained by subtracting 1 from the relative risk is an excess relative risk, showing an increased amount of risks.

Results of Relative Risk Analysis

I feel connected to the Dartmouth community.

	N	Relative Risk (95% Confidence Interval)	P Value	Total sample size
Social Indicator				
A				
Group 1	246	1.26 (0.96 - 1.65)		424
Group 2	130	1.24 (0.79 - 1.95)		424
Group 3	23	0.5 (0.2 - 1.21)		424
Group 4	13	0.11 (0.037 - 0.32)	p < 0.05	424
В				
Group 1	34	0.81 (0.35 - 1.89)		424
Group 2	16	2.62 (0.35 - 19. 4)		424
Group 3	12	0.87 (0.2 - 3.9)		424
Group 4	25	0.45 (0.2 - 1.03)		424
Group 5	21	1.05 (0.32 - 3.45)		424
Group 6	299	1.16 (0.95 - 1.43)		424
С				
Group 1	35	0.7 (0.32 - 1.53)		424
Group 2	67	1.29 (0.65 - 2.56)		424
Group 3	263	1.0 (0.81 - 1.24)		424
Group 4	36	1.4 (0.51 - 3.81)		424
D				
Group 1	314	1.23 (1.01 - 1.51)	p < 0.05	424
Group 2	39	0.51 (0.26 - 0.99)	p < 0.05	424
Group 3	61	0.71 (0.4 - 1.26)		424

Limitations



You will lose people to attrition, and that's ok! (Ideally, this is < 5%)

Conclusion: Relative risk analysis coupled with a representative cohort provides more specific and actionable data for inclusion and belonging

- Clarifies experiences of each group
- Decenters majority groups for more objective conclusions
- Quantifies trends beyond response percentages



Thank You

Any questions?