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Introduction

The Employer Anti-Racism & Gender Equality Scorecard is designed to empower career centers to influence employers to address inequitable employment outcomes for the historically disadvantaged students they seek to hire, as well as address inequities for those same groups in the communities in which those employers operate and serve. It is a tool that can be scaled to impact more students from those groups than any one campus entity could do alone. Diversity, equity, inclusion (DEI), and social justice strategies/tactics should be focused on minimizing/eliminating inequities in education, entrepreneurship, employment, and economic mobility for Women, Blacks/African Americans, Hispanics/Latinx, and Indigenous Americans. The focus on these defined historically disadvantaged groups is not at the exclusion of other disadvantaged groups. However, career centers have to tackle the “elephant in the room” that many people and organizations are still uncomfortable discussing – yet alone, taking positive action to address. The scorecard is not a panacea for an employer’s DEI work, nor is it a one-off transactional tool. It was designed using the methodologies, principles, and frameworks from Balanced Scorecards, Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs, SWOT Analyses, and GAP Analyses. Using terminology from balanced scorecard frameworks, the four perspectives that were developed for the Employer Anti-Racism & Gender Equality (ARGE) Scorecard serve as a guide to evaluate an employer’s contribution to the equality and equitable outcomes for historically disadvantaged groups beyond transactional recruitment.

Using the scorecard will allow career centers to take a holistic view of an employer’s diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice initiatives. It provides an objective tool to evaluate employer partners and help those organizations develop the capacity to improve practices in their workplaces, communities, and academia that disproportionately impact historically disadvantaged groups. The ARGE Scorecard can also help career counselors and coaches during 1:1 sessions, guided group sessions, or workshops to prepare historically disadvantaged groups to engage in meaningful discussions about DEI and social justice with employers they are interested in. Additionally, for students who do not identify as historically disadvantaged, the scorecard is just as useful (if not more) as an instrument for transformative change around thoughts and sense-making of DEI and social justice in the workplace, community, and academia. The scorecard has many uses, one of which is as a strategic bridge between an employer’s ability to execute goals related to its Learning and Growth Perspective (Balanced Scorecard Framework), and a post-secondary institution’s ability to do likewise with its Excellence Perspective (Equity Scorecard Framework). Typically, the work done at the postsecondary level to produce equitable academic outcomes for historically disadvantaged groups does not always extend to producing equitable professional outcomes at the point of graduation – and beyond.

The Anti-Racism & Gender Equality Scorecard seeks to positively influence an important level of transparency and accountability for employers on their role and responsibility to minimize/eliminate socioeconomic inequities for historically disadvantaged groups. While for some employers, this may run counterintuitive to their desire to solely focus on maximizing shareholder value, there is a growing number of employers that are beginning to focus on maximizing stakeholder value. The development of this scorecard could not have come at a better time given the recent events in the US that have heightened awareness around systemic racism and social injustices. There has been an increase in the number of employers that are moving beyond performative acts to address these problems – and their efforts are not going unnoticed. The ARGE Scorecard aligns strategically with this paradigm shift as companies that have the size, clout, and determination begin to tackle these systemic challenges while simultaneously servicing their shareholders. These are the conscious companies and leaders who truly feel a sense of responsibility to non-shareholding stakeholders (students, employees, communities, customers, suppliers, etc.). This heightened level of consciousness around racial equity and social justice isn’t just for the employers. It is also for the career center professionals – as well as extended campus community partners who work in postsecondary institutions. There is a new calling for career center professionals to take a more proactive approach to track the equitable outcomes in the workplace of historically disadvantaged groups beyond the point of solely helping them to get hired for internships, co-ops, and full-time jobs. This new calling will require career centers to collectively influence and encourage employers to track and report disaggregated data on historically disadvantaged groups so that post-secondary institution stakeholders can partner with them to co-create solutions for identified disparities in the workplace, community, and academia.

The ARGE Scorecard will help employers, postsecondary institutions, students, faculty, and administrators to be aware of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) regarding transparency and accountability for holistically supporting historically disadvantaged groups in the workplace, community, and academia. It provides a framework to guide the development of equality/equity-minded practices, policies, processes, and people. The National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) Career Readiness Competencies are used to prepare, educate, advise, and assess students’ employability. The ARGE Scorecard can serve in a similar fashion with a focus on educating, advising, and assessing employers’ DEI-Maturity Competencies and capacity to holistically support historically disadvantaged groups. Career centers can develop their own rubrics and scoring methodologies to assign points to employers across the pre-defined indicators, criteria, and measurable outputs in the scorecard. These indicators and criteria should align with a career center’s mission, vision, and strategic plan. The points assigned to employers across any of the defined categories will help identify areas of transparency (communications) and accountability (management) when viewing an employer individually, or when ranking multiple employers against their in-group peers and out-group peers on DEI and social justice initiatives designed to produce positive outcomes for historically disadvantaged groups.

A commitment to racial equity and social justice is central to the design and purpose of the ARGE Scorecard. It is based on the philosophy that employers have a duty and stakeholder responsibility to make transformative changes in the lives of people – especially historically disadvantaged groups. Employers are part of society – not apart from it. Furthermore, employees are becoming more vocal about the
expectations they have of their employer’s leaders to take a meaningful stand against systemic racism and social injustices. The core tenets of the ARGE Scorecard philosophy are listed below:

- Disaggregated data is necessary to identify inequities that disproportionately impact historically disadvantaged groups.
- Transparency and accountability of DEI and social justice goals are necessary to measure progress for historically disadvantaged groups.
- Inequities must be holistically addressed for historically disadvantaged groups in the workplace, community, and academia.
- Initiatives that address inequities must be centered in education, entrepreneurship, employment, and economic mobility.

In order to truly achieve the ideals of equality and equity in American society, it is imperative that employers use their political capital, social capital, human capital, and financial capital to strategically minimize/eliminate the persistent harm caused by racism/sexism. The ARGE Scorecard is not another “business case for diversity” scorecard and it is not designed with that case solely in mind. It provides a strategic framework for career centers to make racial equity and social justice central to their mission, vision, and strategic plans. In doing so, career centers will be able to achieve several meaningful goals that will enhance the value they provide to students and professionals from historically disadvantaged groups. The figures below illustrate examples of workplace, community, and academic inequities experienced by these groups.

2020 McKinsey Report – Women in the Workplace

Racial Equity & Anti-Black Racism

The information below is direct from the Multicultural Resource Center at the University of California at San Francisco and captures some key definitions that are useful to explore individually, and collectively as a career center, when discussing the importance of transparency and accountability of data that show employers’ and post-secondary institutions’ status quo and progress on minimizing/eliminating identified inequities for historically disadvantaged groups in their operating environments.

Race is a social construct and a concept which signifies and symbolizes social conflicts and interests by referring to different types of human bodies. (Omi & Winant, 1994, p.54)

Racism is belief that race is the primary determinant of human traits and capacities and that racial differences produce an inherent superiority of a particular race (Omi & Winant, 1994, p.54)

RACISM IS A SYSTEM. It is not an individual character flaw, nor a personal moral failing, nor a psychiatric illness. It is a system (consisting of structures, policies, practices, and norms) that structures opportunity and assigns value based on phenotype, or the way people look. It unfairly disadvantages some individuals and communities. Yet even more profoundly, the system of racism undermines realization of the full potential of our whole society because of the waste of human resources.

(Source: Center for the Study of Racism, Social Justice & Health)

Anti-Racism

“The opposite of racist is not “not racist”, it’s anti-racist”. -Dr. Ibram X. Kendi

- Antiracism: is a powerful collection of antiracist policies that lead to racial equity and are substantiated by antiracists.
- Racist: one who is supporting a racist policy through their actions or inaction or expressing a racist idea.
- Antiracist: one who is supporting an antiracist policy through their actions or expressing an antiracist idea.

Source: How to Be An Antiracist (Kendi, 2019)

Anti-Black Racism

Anti-Blackness as being a two-part formation that both strips Blackness of value (dehumanizes), and systematically marginalizes Black people. This form of anti-Blackness is overt racism. Society also associates politically incorrect comments with the overt nature of anti-Black racism. Beneath this anti-Black racism is the covert structural and systemic racism which predetermines the socioeconomic status of Blacks in this country and is held in place by anti-Black policies, institutions, and ideologies. Anti-Blackness is also the disregard for anti-Black institutions and policies. This disregard is the product of class, race, and/or gender privilege certain individuals experience due to anti-Black institutions and policies.

Source: Council for the Democratizing Education

The information above is essential for career center professionals to educate themselves on what racism really is. Oftentimes, people fall prey to confusing racism with bigotry, prejudices, and stereotypes. Racism has a specific definition and without an understanding of that definition, it will be difficult for one to grasp the concepts of anti-black Racism. Though there are numerous works that one could spend a lifetime reading to capture the historical context and antecedents of the pervasive racial inequities in the US, the excerpt below from the 1965 report called the Moynihan Report (named after former Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan) make a compelling case for the necessity of national action to improve equality and equity for black Americans.

The Negro Family: The Case for National Action (generally referred to as the Moynihan Report)

“The United States is approaching a new crisis in race relations. In the decade that began with the school desegregation decision of the Supreme Court, and ended with the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the demand of Negro Americans for full recognition of their civil rights was finally met. The effort, no matter how savage and brutal, of some State and local governments to thwart the exercise of those rights is doomed. The nation will not put up with it — least of all the Negroes. The present moment will pass. In the meantime, a new period is beginning. In this new period the expectations of the Negro Americans will go beyond civil rights. Being Americans, they will now expect that in the near future equal opportunities for them as a group will produce roughly equal results, as compared with other groups. This is not going to happen. Nor will it happen for generations to come unless a new and special effort is made.

There are two reasons. First, the racist virus in the American blood stream still afflicts us: Negroes will encounter serious personal prejudice for at least another generation. Second, three centuries of sometimes unimaginable mistreatment have taken their toll on the Negro people. The harsh fact is that as a group, at the present time, in terms of ability to win out in the competitions of American life, they are not equal to most of those groups with which they will be competing. Individually, Negro Americans reach the highest peaks of achievement. But collectively, in the spectrum of American ethnic and religious and regional groups, where some get plenty and some get none, where some send eighty percent of their children to college and others pull them out of school at the 8th grade, Negroes are among the weakest. The most difficult fact for white Americans to understand is that in these terms the circumstances of the Negro American community in recent years has probably been getting worse, not better.”
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The Employer Anti-Racism & Gender Equality Scorecard Framework (standard version)

The Employer Anti-Racism & Gender Equality (ARGE) Scorecard is designed to objectively evaluate an employer’s holistic diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice efforts for historically disadvantaged groups through four main perspectives: 1) People & Inclusive Leadership Perspective, 2) Retention & Advancement Perspective, 3) Employer Branding & Recruitment Perspective, and 4) Community & Social Impact Perspective. Each of the four perspectives is broken down into 12 unique key performance indicators (KPI’s) which are further broken down into unique criterion and measurable outputs. Historically disadvantaged groups (HDG’s) are defined by the ARGE Scorecard as Women, Blacks/African Americans, Hispanics/Latinx, and Indigenous Americans. Scores are assigned to employers based on proprietary rubrics that define levels of data transparency and accountability for DEI and social justice initiatives impacting HDG’s. Comparisons and analyses can be made on any combination of employers; and an infinite number of data output combinations can be made using Pivot Tables, Tableau, and other data visualization tools. Note: In the standard scorecard framework in Figure 1; the four perspectives, 12 indicators, 36 criteria, and defined historically disadvantaged groups remain constant and cannot be modified. They guide the rationale, philosophy, and methodology of this standard version. However, career centers may adapt the standard framework to meet their own unique environment by adding other KPI’s (referred to as “indicators” throughout this book); as well as defining additional criteria for those indicators.

The standard ARGE Scorecard Framework does not represent an exhaustive list of indicators. In cases where the standard version is insufficient, career centers are encouraged to modify/add indicators according to what is most important for them to evaluate employers on. This framework is designed to provide career centers with a research-based tool for evaluating the DEI and social justice initiatives made publicly-available by employers. It provides objectivity and consistency in the collection of data to visually capture how employers address equality and equitable outcomes for the historically disadvantaged groups in the workplace, community, and academia through four key areas where severe inequities exist: 1) Education, 2) Entrepreneurship, 3) Employment, and 4) Economic Mobility. These four key areas, at minimum, must be the centerpiece and lens through which an employer’s DEI and social justice initiatives are designed and executed. When using the ARGE Scorecard, it is necessary to be very clear on the racial/ethnic groups that have been defined as historically disadvantaged. Terms like “People of Color”, “Underrepresented Groups/Minorities”, and “Underserved/Marginalized Communities” tend to lump everyone together who is non-white. The problem with those terms is that they obscure the unique and disproportionate challenges faced by specific disadvantaged groups in American society. The fact is that all “people of color” don’t have a centuries-long history and legacy of racism and sexism in America. This is an important fact to acknowledge if one is to use the Employer Anti-Racism & Gender Equality Scorecard for its intended purposes. The focus on the defined historically disadvantaged groups does not diminish the discrimination and hardships faced by other disadvantaged groups in the US. However, it is necessary to uniquely address the structural disadvantages of these defined groups that have been built over centuries in the US – and continue to perpetuate an uneven playing field.

### Table 1: Employer Anti-Racism & Gender Equality Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Workforce Demographics</td>
<td>Rubric #1</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; Leadership Demographics</td>
<td>Rubric #2</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession Management Demographics</td>
<td>Rubric #3</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Pathing Programs</td>
<td>Rubric #4</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement &amp; Well-Being</td>
<td>Rubric #5</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEI Accountability &amp; Training</td>
<td>Rubric #6</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onboarding Strategy</td>
<td>Rubric #7</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Strategy</td>
<td>Rubric #8</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent Engagement Strategy</td>
<td>Rubric #9</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer &amp; Pro-Bono Programs</td>
<td>Rubric #10</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier Diversity Programs</td>
<td>Rubric #11</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy &amp; Pledges</td>
<td>Rubric #12</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Employer Anti-Racism & Gender Equality Scorecard
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ARGE Scorecard: Operationalizing Equity

The scorecard is the first step in the process to capture an employer’s data transparency and accountability in a user-friendly format. The next step is to operationalize that data into a scalable format that will allow career center users to run myriad data visualizations reports. To this end, career centers will be tasked with creating dashboards that allow them to manipulate large amounts of data in the same way that is currently done with data visualization tools such as Tableau, Power BI, and Pivot Tables on First Destination Survey (FDS) data. Dashboard types generally fall into three categories: 1) Operational (real time), 2) Strategic (key performance indicators), and 3) Analytical (trends). While it isn’t feasible (nor realistically possible) for a career center to have an operational dashboard for an employer’s DEI and social justice data, it is certainly possible for career centers to create strategic and/or analytical dashboards. The ARGE Dashboard (see figure 2) provides an example for the design and development of the dashboard and its potential functions. The dashboard should only include data on the top 25/50 DEI-Mature employers that a career center has already defined based on the results from the ARGE Scorecard. DEI-Mature companies are ones that exhibit high levels of data transparency and accountability on their DEI and social justice initiatives as evaluated in the ARGE Scorecard.

Strategic Dashboard

Career centers that are able to dedicate resources to creating a strategic dashboard with the data that is evaluated from the ARGE Scorecard will create immense value for both their employer partners and historically disadvantaged groups. This type of dashboard allows a career center to monitor the scorecard’s 12 key performance indicators and 36 criteria of its top 25/50 DEI-Mature employers year-over-year and to make adjustments on an annual basis to the list of employers as necessary. It can also facilitate an infinite number of data comparisons and benchmarks.

Analytical Dashboard

Career centers that are able to dedicate resources to creating an analytical dashboard with the data that is evaluated from the ARGE Scorecard will create immense value for both their employer partners and historically disadvantaged groups. This type of dashboard allows a career center to analyze data on its top 25/50 DEI-Mature employers in order to discover insights on how the data interrelates (potential cause and effect relationships). This is a value-added service that career centers can use to generate reports and recommendations on best practices for employers to engage with historically disadvantaged groups. Additionally, this dashboard can be useful in predicting trends and targets based on historical data.
ARGE Scorecard: Addressing Corporate Trauma for Vulnerable Groups

Corporate trauma is a real phenomenon for historically disadvantaged groups and career centers have a duty to prepare students and professionals belonging to those groups for that potential (and probable) reality in the workplace. By the same token, career centers also have a duty to engage their employer partners in discussions regarding their policies, practices, and processes to reduce incidences of discrimination, harassment, bullying, stereotyping, and retaliation – to name a few. There are a growing number of companies that are going beyond performative acts to build truly equitable and inclusive workplace cultures. The Employer Anti-Racism & Gender Equality Scorecard facilitates the ability of career centers to ask the right questions and evaluate the right information to determine which employers can present themselves authentically in DEI-themed events and programming for students/professionals who belong to historically disadvantaged groups – as well as those who don’t. A collaboration between career centers and DEI-Mature employers can lead to learning & development initiatives that help students understand those employers’ expectations around fair and inclusive workplace cultures – and the polices/practices that support them.

While some employers might bristle at the thought of having their DEI and social justice activities evaluated by career centers and postsecondary institutions, the reality is that these types of evaluations are already taking place – most of the information is public. It is important that employers not view a career center’s use of the ARG Scorecard as a barrier to their talent acquisition goals. It is quite the opposite. The scorecard is a tool to help employers use their data to tell a unique story on their DEI and social justice initiatives that support historically disadvantaged groups. Before these groups experience corporate trauma, the vast majority of them have experienced some form of trauma in their community and academia due to systemic racism and sexism. Career centers should collect data on the perceptions and experiences that historically disadvantaged groups have with the career center, in addition to any campus climate surveys conducted by the postsecondary institution. Career centers and employers can develop innovative programming that is aligned with the appropriate scorecard perspective(s) to support these groups more effectively. **The data below shows examples of corporate trauma experienced by historically disadvantaged groups in workplaces where they are the minority in leadership and workforce representation.**

| Women experienced and observed far more unfairness than men. |
| Nearly one-quarter of underrepresented men and women of color experienced stereotyping, twice the rate of white and Asian men and women. |
| Nearly one-third of underrepresented women of color were passed over for promotion, more than any other group. |
| Men from underrepresented groups, such as African Americans, Latinos and Native Americans, were most likely to leave due to unfairness (40%). |
| Underrepresented women of color were significantly more likely to cite unfairness as a reason for leaving than white and Asian women (36% versus 28%). |
| Nearly a quarter of underrepresented men and women experienced stereotyping in their previous job and at almost twice the rate of white and Asian men and women. |
| Employees in tech companies were significantly more likely to leave due to unfairness than technical employees in other industries (42% versus 32%). |


| A negative workplace culture can contribute to employee turnover, with three-quarters of workers surveyed saying management is responsible for setting the tone. |
| Even with high numbers of layoffs reported with the global COVID-19 pandemic, employee turnover is still a risk for organizations that do not consider the additional support their employees may need during this time. |
| People of color who experience microaggressions in the workplace are more likely to quit. |
| More than a third (35%) of Black professionals intend to quit within two years compared with 27% of white professionals, with rates being slightly higher for Black women (36%) than Black men (33%). |
| Diverse groups may suffer from turnover when favoritism divides people into in-groups and out-groups. |
| Stereotypes of people of color in the workplace contribute to a higher emotional tax burden for workers of color, in which these employees feel “on guard” at work and may contribute to their intention to leave. |

https://www.catalyst.org/research/turnover-and-retention/

**Impact of Discrimination/Microaggressions**

- 45% of ethnic or race minorities have chosen not to pursue a job because of a perceived lack of inclusion; and
- 59% more ethnic or racial minorities report having experienced a given microaggression than others in the workplace

**How Microaggressions Manifest**

- **Self-doubt**—This can look like a colleague having self-doubt and by asking themselves, “Am I overreacting or being too sensitive?” or saying, “Maybe, I don’t belong here.”
- **Isolation**—If a colleague is the only one or one of the few people of color on their team, they may feel like there isn’t anyone to turn to when injustices occur. Having people who can empathize and affirm their experience is important.
- **Impostor syndrome**—Microaggressions can make it difficult for one to overcome feeling like an impostor or fraud. They may increasingly find it difficult to internalize their talents, skills, and accomplishments, which is necessary to succeed in their careers and advance professionally.

ARGE Scorecard: Data Transparency and Accountability

The importance of transparency and accountability around an employer’s DEI and social justice initiatives cannot be understated. Perhaps the best analogy to use is a *prospectus* for an investment offering. This document provides all of the relevant information needed by prospective investors to make informed decisions about whether or not they’ll put money into an investment. This is not dissimilar to the relevant information a prospective employee could glean from the communication of an employer’s progress with members of historically disadvantaged groups within its workplace – and external to it. Prospective employees belonging to HDG’s have more incentive than non-HDG’s to know what types of policies and practices a prospective employer has in place that ensure/promote fairness, equality, and equity. Another analogy that underscores this point is that of the *annual report*. Public corporations are required to file this document to show their performance across several indicators over the previous year, as well as their plans for the future. New and existing investors would find it difficult to put money into a company that did not provide data on its year-to-year performance – let alone their plans to be competitive and viable. The same can be said for employees belonging to HDG’s. Transparency and accountability of an employer’s DEI and social justice initiatives can have a direct impact on their decision to seriously consider that employer. In the absence of transparency and year-over-year accountability of an employer’s performance on its DEI and social justice key performance indicators, current HDG employees are more likely to leave the workforce (or become disengaged), and prospective ones are more unlikely to want to join it. *Employer data transparency and accountability in the ARGE Scorecard are defined below:*

**Employer Transparency on Historically Disadvantaged Groups (HDG’s):** When using the scorecard to evaluate data transparency, then it is being used as a *Communications tool*. Data transparency is related to an employer’s communications strategy. The standard version of the Employer Anti-Racism & Gender Equality Scorecard is designed to evaluate the presence or absence of data showing the impact of employers’ holistic DEI activities, initiatives, and strategies that are *disaggregated* by race/ethnicity/gender – including historically disadvantaged groups. The presence/absence of data on HDG’s can be interpreted as a proxy for the HDG’s importance to an employer’s senior leadership. When conducting an employer transparency analysis with the scorecard, the actual numerical value of the data IS NOT important. The only measure of concern is the presence/absence of quantitative/qualitative data showing the outcome and impact on the defined historically disadvantaged groups.

**Employer Accountability on Historically Disadvantaged Groups (HDG’s):** When using the scorecard to evaluate data accountability, then it is being used as a *Management tool*. Data accountability is related to an employer’s management strategy. The standard version of the Employer Anti-Racism & Gender Equality Scorecard can be used to evaluate two levels of Employer Accountability: 1) Presence/absence of qualitative or quantitative goals/targets referencing HDG’s; 2) Progress (or lack thereof) on select indicators referencing impact/outcomes for HDG’s. These two levels of accountability on HDG’s can be interpreted as proxies for the HDG’s importance to an employer’s senior leadership. When conducting an employer accountability analysis with the scorecard, the actual numerical value of the data IS important. The employer MUST also present a minimum 2-years history of quantitative data in order to allow for comparison. *Note: An evaluation of data accountability can only occur if the employer has made sufficient and relevant disaggregated data available based on its level of transparency.*

While the ARGE Scorecard is designed to evaluate employers of any size and type, there is also a lot that career centers can learn from its usage. In fact, it allows career centers to evaluate their own data transparency and accountability of their initiatives to impact the career development and professional outcomes of historically disadvantaged groups. Similar to the reasons listed for employers, the absence of this data does not build trust or engagement with these groups, nor with the employers who want to recruit them. The benefits of collecting, disaggregating, and reporting that data for internal/external public consumption far outweigh any perceived detriments. It also has the benefit of involving multiple stakeholders – including those belonging to the historically disadvantaged groups – to help co-create processes, practices, and policies that can lead to improved participation rates, learning, and professional outcomes. *Career center data transparency and accountability are defined below:*

**Career Center Transparency on Historically Disadvantaged Groups (HDG’s):** Career centers should evaluate their own data transparency for the historically disadvantaged groups that participate in their programming. This data should be made available to employers and other external stakeholders – as well as internal stakeholders in the campus community. Data transparency is related to a career center’s *communications strategy*. The presence/absence of data on HDG’s can be interpreted as a proxy for the HDG’s importance to a career center’s and/or postsecondary institution’s senior leadership. The employers desiring to engage in career center events and programming could find that data useful to their own DEI efforts if they are targeting historically disadvantaged groups for engagement and recruitment.

**Career Center Accountability on Historically Disadvantaged Groups (HDG’s):** Career centers should evaluate their own data accountability for the historically disadvantaged groups that participate in their programming. This data should be made available to employers and other external stakeholders – as well as internal stakeholders in the campus community. Data accountability is related to a career center’s *management strategy*. Career centers should have two levels of accountability for their own DEI initiatives: 1) Presence/absence of qualitative or quantitative goals/targets referencing HDG’s; 2) Progress (or lack thereof) on select indicators referencing HDG’s. These two levels of accountability on HDG’s can be interpreted as proxies for the HDG’s importance to a career center’s and/or postsecondary institution’s senior leadership. Employers desiring to engage in career center events and programming could find that data useful to their own DEI efforts if they are targeting historically disadvantaged groups for engagement and recruitment.
ARGE Scorecard: The Four Perspectives

Employers are called upon now more than ever to marshal their resources to champion DEI and social justice in ways that produce equality and positive equitable outcomes for historically disadvantaged groups. As stated earlier, in order to effectively combat systemic racism/sexism, targeted and strategic initiatives should be developed to address four key areas where severe inequities exist: 1) Education, 2) Entrepreneurship, 3) Employment, and 4) Economic Mobility. This extends beyond an employer’s office space as employers are expected to positively impact the communities in with they operate and serve. The scorecard allows career centers to use publicly-available (or privately requested) data to objectively evaluate the level of transparency (communications) and accountability (management) of an employer’s holistic DEI and social justice strategies and outcomes. To that end, the scorecard’s four perspectives were created to categorize the core DEI and social justice activities in which an employer typically communicates and manages. This was determined through extensive research of publicly-traded companies from reputable employer rankings publications – in addition to other large private and public companies. The four perspectives were also designed to bridge the gap between the Balanced Scorecard perspectives (Kaplan and Norton) and the Equity Scorecard perspectives (Bensimon and Malcom). The career center holds a unique place in postsecondary institutions as a nexus between the academic experiences/outcomes of historically disadvantaged groups, and their professional experiences/outcomes. The ARGE Scorecard perspectives are defined below:

1. People & Inclusive Leadership Perspective: An analysis of an organization’s key performance indicators of equality and equity through its practices that ensure management and non-management employee representation of its internal Historically Disadvantaged Groups. This perspective views an employer’s strategies and performance on establishing and maintaining a diverse and representative workforce for employees belonging to historically disadvantaged groups. The definition is intentionally broad so that it can be inclusive of myriad indicators that can be used to evaluate this perspective. Indicators in this perspective involve questions such as: (a) What equitable workforce targets is the company trying to achieve? (b) How does the company ensure its succession planning process is inclusive of historically disadvantaged groups? (c) How does the company identify high-potential employees belonging to historically disadvantaged groups? This is not an exhaustive list of questions. There are myriad questions that can be asked based on the indicators a career center wants to evaluate related to its mission, vision, and strategic plan.

2. Retention & Advancement Perspective: An analysis of an organization’s key performance indicators of equality and equity through its practices that foster retention and advancement opportunities for its internal Historically Disadvantaged Groups. This perspective views an employer’s strategies and performance on retaining and advancing employees belonging to historically disadvantaged groups. The definition is intentionally broad so that it can be inclusive of myriad indicators that can be used to evaluate this perspective. Indicators in this perspective involve questions such as: (a) What involvement does the CEO/Board have in creating an inclusive workplace culture? (b) What type of diversity education is made available to employees? (c) How does the company use Climate Surveys to evaluate the perceptions and experiences of its historically disadvantaged groups? There are myriad questions that can be asked based on the indicators a career center wants to evaluate related to its mission, vision, and strategic plan.

3. Employer Branding & Recruitment Perspective: An analysis of an organization’s key performance indicators of equality and equity through its practices that present it as an Employer of Choice for internal/external Historically Disadvantaged Groups. This perspective views an employer’s strategies and performance on attracting and hiring candidates belonging to historically disadvantaged groups. The definition is intentionally broad so that it can be inclusive of myriad indicators that can be used to evaluate this perspective. Indicators in this perspective involve questions such as: (a) How does the company identify and recruit talent from historically disadvantaged groups? (b) What key strategies best position the company to become an Employer of Choice for historically disadvantaged groups? (c) How does the company determine its hiring targets for historically disadvantaged groups? This is not an exhaustive list of questions. There are myriad questions that can be asked based on the indicators a career center wants to evaluate related to its mission, vision, and strategic plan.

4. Community and Social Impact Perspective: An analysis of an organization’s key performance indicators of equality and equity through its practices that improve socioeconomic conditions for external Historically Disadvantaged Groups. This perspective views an employer’s strategies and performance on corporate citizenship through the usage of its political, financial, human, and social capital to positively impact communities and entities serving historically disadvantaged groups. The definition is intentionally broad so that it can be inclusive of myriad indicators that can be used to evaluate this perspective. Indicators in this perspective involve questions such as: (a) How does the company support non-profits and social enterprises that advocate for historically disadvantaged groups? (b) Does the company have a supplier diversity program with a focus on businesses owned by historically disadvantaged groups? (c) Does the company track its employee volunteer-hours spent supporting social causes that primarily impact historically disadvantaged groups? This is not an exhaustive list of questions. There are myriad questions that can be asked based on the indicators a career center wants to evaluate related to its mission, vision, and strategic plan.
ARGE Scorecard: The 12 Indicators and 36 Criteria

There are 12 indicators that are defined for the standard version of the Employer Anti-Racism & Gender Equality Scorecard. These indicators were identified through extensive research and understanding of their strategic fit to one another. They are important to developing strategies that improve the equality and equity of a range of outcomes that impact historically disadvantaged groups. Each indicator is defined by three criteria for a total of 36 criteria. While career centers may not modify the 12 indicators or 36 criteria in the standard version of the scorecard, they can be added to depending on a career center’s unique environment and needs. The standard version of the scorecard offers a flexible framework for the needs of most career centers and takes into consideration the myriad criteria that can be developed to define the 12 indicators. As stated earlier, criteria – in most cases – are broken down into measurable outputs defined by the historically disadvantaged groups that are directly/indirectly impacted. The measurable outputs are what show the level of transparency and accountability an employer makes available on the impact of its holistic DEI and social justice initiatives. For example, the measurable outputs for HDG’s would be represented by the defined rubric ratings for transparency; and be represented by the actual numbers/percentages of the HDG’s in the accountability data. Conversely, some measurable outputs could be displayed as binaries (1 or 0, yes or no, etc.) when they are not referencing quantifiable data. It is also important to note that employers are not required to make all of their disaggregated data publicly available. The goal of the scorecard is to help employers identify the data that can (and should) be disaggregated where it would add mutual value to multiple stakeholders.

People & Inclusive Leadership Perspective

1. Employee Workforce Demographics (indicator)

How diverse is an organization’s non-management workforce in terms of Women, Blacks/African Americans, Hispanics/Latinx, and Indigenous Americans; and how transparent are data and trends made to the public? Three criteria below were identified to define this indicator.

- **Total Workforce:** An analysis of the gender and racial disaggregated data of an organization’s total number of non-managerial employees as defined by the organization. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

- **Professionals:** An analysis of the gender and racial disaggregated data of an organization’s individual contributors as defined by the organization. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

- **New Hires/Entry-Level:** An analysis of the gender and racial disaggregated data of an organization’s new hires/entry-level employees as defined by the organization. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

2. Management & Leadership Demographics (indicator)

How diverse is an organization’s management-level workforce in terms of Women, Blacks/African Americans, Hispanics/Latinx, and Indigenous Americans; and how transparent are data and trends made to the public? Three criteria below were identified to define this indicator.

- **Board of Directors:** An analysis of the gender and racial disaggregated data of an organization’s board of directors (or equivalent). *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

- **Executives/Senior Managers:** An analysis of the gender and racial disaggregated data of an organization’s executives/senior managers as defined by the organization. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

- **First/Mid-level Managers:** An analysis of the gender and racial disaggregated data of an organization’s first/mid-level managers as defined by the organization. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

3. Succession Management Demographics (indicator)

How diverse is an organization’s leadership talent pipeline in terms of Women, Blacks/African Americans, Hispanics/Latinx, and Indigenous Americans; and how transparent are data and trends made to the public? Three criteria below were identified to define this indicator.

- **Leadership Program Employees:** An analysis of the gender and racial disaggregated data of an organization’s leadership development program (or equivalent) participants. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

- **High-Potential Employees:** An analysis of the gender and racial disaggregated data of an organization’s designated high-potential employees (or equivalent). *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

- **Promoted Employees:** An analysis of the gender and racial disaggregated data of an organization’s promoted employees. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

Retention & Advancement Perspective

4. Career Pathing Programs (indicator)

How fair and available are opportunities for employees to develop and progress in an organization in terms of Women, Blacks/African Americans, Hispanics/Latinx, and Indigenous Americans; and how transparent are data and trends made to the public? Three criteria below were identified to define this indicator.

- **Promotion Bias:** An analysis of the gender and racial disaggregated data of an organization’s formal promotion policies/practices to identify and minimize biases. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

- **Pay Equity Bias:** An analysis of the gender and racial disaggregated data of an organization’s formal pay parity policies/practices to identify and minimize biases. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.
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5. Employee Engagement & Well-Being (indicator)
How does an organization continuously improve its workplace culture to nurture high performance and engagement of its Women, Blacks/African Americans, Hispanics/Latinx, and Indigenous Americans; and how transparent are data and trends made to the public? Three criteria below were identified to define this indicator.

- **Turnover Rate:** An analysis of the gender and racial disaggregated data of an organization’s voluntary and involuntary turnover to identify and minimize inequities. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

- **Culture & Climate Surveys:** An analysis of the gender and racial disaggregated data of an organization’s climate (or equivalent) surveys to identify and minimize inequities. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

- **Stay & Departure Interviews:** An analysis of an organization’s policies/practices to minimize/eliminate hostile behaviors that disproportionately harm the psychological safety and well-being of historically disadvantaged groups. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

6. DEI Accountability & Training (indicator)
How does an organization define and implement its vision of an inclusive workplace culture that is supportive and welcoming of Women, Blacks/African Americans, Hispanics/Latinx, and Indigenous Americans; and how transparent are data and trends made to the public? Three criteria below were identified to define this indicator.

- **Anti-Harassment/Bullying Policies:** An analysis of an organization’s HR Policies and Employee Handbooks for details of steps it takes to identify and minimize any (or all) of the following at minimum: 1) Discrimination/Harassment, 2) Bullying, 3) Micro-Aggressions, 4) Uncivil Behaviors, 5) Stereotyping, and 6) Retaliation. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

- **Diversity Education:** An analysis of an organization’s efforts to implement/expand Unconscious Bias Education and other diversity training for its employees and stakeholders to develop a DEI-Mature workplace supportive of historically disadvantaged groups. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

- **CEO & Board Commitment:** An analysis of an organization’s Senior Leadership commitment to DEI and social justice through its company-wide actions that advance equality and equity for historically disadvantaged groups internal/external to the organization. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

**Employer Branding & Recruitment Perspective**

7. Onboarding Strategy (indicator)
How does an organization create a sense of belonging and lay the foundation for workplace success for Women, Blacks/African Americans, Hispanics/Latinx, and Indigenous Americans; and how transparent are data and trends made to the public? Three criteria below were identified to define this indicator.

- **Culture & Work Environment Training:** An analysis of an organization’s formal training on job roles, business operations, and workplace culture for incoming hires from historically disadvantaged groups. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

- **Mentoring Program:** An analysis of an organization’s formal programs to pair experienced non-management and management-level Mentors with incoming hires from historically disadvantaged groups. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

- **Peer/Buddy Program:** An analysis of an organization’s formal programs to pair early career professionals with incoming hires from historically disadvantaged groups. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

8. Recruitment Strategy (indicator)
How does an organization improve its capabilities to increase its hiring outcomes for diverse employees that are Women, Blacks/African Americans, Hispanics/Latinx, and Indigenous Americans; and how transparent are data and trends made to the public? Three criteria below were identified to define this indicator.

- **Selection Process:** An analysis of an organization’s formal training provided to its Recruiters and Hiring Managers to identify and minimize biases in application reviews, assessments, interviewing, and hiring candidates belonging to historically disadvantaged groups. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

- **Sourcing Channels:** An analysis of an organization’s formal training provided to its Recruiters and Hiring Managers to identify and expand its sourcing channels to find potential applicants belonging to historically disadvantaged groups. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

- **Job Descriptions:** An analysis of an organization’s formal training provided to its Recruiters and Hiring Managers to identify and minimize biases in its job descriptions advertised to potential applicants belonging to historically disadvantaged groups. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

9. Talent Engagement Strategy (indicator)
How does an organization position itself as an Employer of Choice (where employees choose to join, remain, and refer) for Women, Blacks/African Americans, Hispanics/Latinx, and Indigenous Americans; and how transparent are data and trends made to the public? Three criteria below were identified to define this indicator.
Employee Resource Groups: An analysis of an organization’s business integration of its HDG-affiliated employee resource groups that are strategically involved in any (or all) of the following at minimum: 1) Diversity Recruitment Initiatives, 2) Product & Services Development/Marketing, and 3) Workplace Culture Improvement. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

Inclusive Workplace Recognition: An analysis of an organization’s recognition in reputable publications and/or external accreditations that evaluate the best workplaces for diverse employees from historically disadvantaged groups in any (or all) of the following at minimum: 1) National Recognition, 2) Regional Recognition, and 3) Local Recognition. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

Marketing & Communications: An analysis of an organization’s DEI (or equivalent) Reports and information that present data transparency and accountability on its initiatives to improve outcomes for historically disadvantaged groups in any (or all) of the following at minimum: 1) Education, 2) Entrepreneurship, 3) Employment, and 4) Economic Mobility. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

Community & Social Impact Perspective
10. Volunteer & Pro-Bono Programs (indicator)
How does an organization incentivize and deploy its human capital to support initiatives outside the workplace that enhance the knowledge, skills, and abilities of Women, Blacks/African Americans, Hispanics/Latinx, and Indigenous Americans; and how transparent are data and trends made to the public? Three criteria below were identified to define this indicator.

Educational Institutions: An analysis of an organization’s employee volunteer-hours and projects dedicated to upskilling students, staff, and faculty at minority-serving institutions and predominately white institutions (K-12 to postsecondary) that serve historically disadvantaged groups. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

Non-Profits & Empowerment Programs: An analysis of an organization’s employee volunteer-hours and projects dedicated to upskilling owners and managers at minority-serving entities whose mission is to minimize/eliminate inequities for historically disadvantaged groups in any (or all) of the following at minimum: 1) Healthcare, 2) Housing, 3) Education, 4) Entrepreneurship 5) Employment, 6) Law Enforcement, and any other area where these groups have been historically disadvantaged. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

Small Businesses: An analysis of an organization’s employee volunteer-hours and projects dedicated to upskilling owners and managers of small businesses belonging to historically disadvantaged groups. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

11. Supplier Diversity Programs (indicator)
How does an organization utilize and support diverse suppliers that are owned by Women, Blacks/African Americans, Hispanics/Latinx, and Indigenous Americans; and how transparent is data made to the public? Three criteria below were identified to define this indicator.

Procurement: An analysis of an organization’s spend with suppliers belonging to historically disadvantaged groups broken down by any (or all) of the following at minimum: 1) Total spent on HDG suppliers, 2) Total number/percentage of overall supplier budget spent on HDG suppliers, and 3) Total number/percentage of suppliers disaggregated by HDG identification. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

Distribution: An analysis of an organization’s franchise-owners (specific to companies that offer franchise opportunities) belonging to historically disadvantaged groups broken down by the following at minimum: 1) Total number/percentage of franchisees disaggregated by HDG identification, 2) Total number/percentage of revenues generated by HDG identification. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

Shelf-Space: An analysis of an organization’s shelf-space (specific to retail) dedicated to products created/owned by suppliers belonging to historically disadvantaged groups broken down by the following at minimum: 1) Total number/percentage of shelf-space disaggregated by HDG identification, 2) Total number/percentage of revenues generated by HDG identification. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

12. Philanthropy & Pledges (indicator)
How does an organization use its stature and resources to advance the empowerment and socioeconomic well-being of Women, Blacks/African Americans, Hispanics/Latinx, and Indigenous Americans; and how transparent is data made to the public? Three criteria below were identified to define this indicator.

Anti-Racism/Sexism & Social Causes: An analysis of an organization’s advocacy for causes and campaigns to support historically disadvantaged groups in any (or all) of the following at minimum: 1) Black Lives Matter, 2) Racial Equality, 3) Gender Equality, and any other area where these groups have been historically disadvantaged. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

Government Agencies: An analysis of an organization’s support for policies and minority-serving agencies whose mission is to minimize/eliminate inequities for historically disadvantaged groups in any of the following: 1) Healthcare, 2) Housing, 3) Education, 4) Entrepreneurship 5) Employment, 6) Law Enforcement, and any other area where these groups have been historically disadvantaged. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.

Non-Profits & Empowerment Programs: An analysis of an organization’s financial contributions to, and partnerships with, minority-serving entities whose mission is to minimize/eliminate inequities for historically disadvantaged groups in any of the following at minimum: 1) Healthcare, 2) Housing, 3) Education, 4) Entrepreneurship 5) Employment, 6) Law Enforcement, and any other area where these groups have been historically disadvantaged. *Based on publicly available (or privately requested) information.
ARGE Scorecard: Strategy Mapping DEI Cause-and-Effect

The Employer Anti-Racism & Gender Equality (ARGE) Scorecard perspectives in the standard version are placed in a specific and strategic order. The ladder logic behind the hierarchical placement can best be understood by examining the motivational theory used in Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. In that framework, a bottom-up approach is used where the satisfaction of needs are categorized in the following order from the base to the top: 1) Basic Needs, 2) Psychological Needs, and 3) Self-fulfilment Needs. This theory is useful in understanding the ladder logic of the ARGE Scorecard perspectives as they pertain to historically disadvantaged groups (HDG’s) and the flow of the scorecard from the bottom-up. For example, the “Community & Social Impact” perspective is related to the “Basic Needs” foundational-level of Maslow’s Hierarchy. In other words, the systemic harms that impact HDG’s disproportionately are imbedded within the foundations of their communities. Therefore, any strategies to minimize/eliminate those harms must also begin within their communities. When the needs of the community are sufficiently met, then it is better able to sustain its members, reinforce and replicate equality, and foster positive equitable outcomes. The hierarchical nature of the scorecard does not mean that multiple perspectives shouldn’t be addressed simultaneously by employers – in fact, it is encouraged and necessary. It is only meant to draw attention to the design of the scorecard’s intentional bottom-up order so that career centers and employers understand their connection to one another. Failure to understand this concept can result in a “Jenga-style” collapse of the most well-intentioned DEI and social justice strategies.

To facilitate a thorough understanding of this design in practice, a strategy map (see figure 3) can be developed in order to visualize and communicate how value is created at each perspective when evaluating an employer’s DEI and social justice strategies and outcomes. The perspectives serve as a guide to ensure that the DEI and social justice work is carried out and clearly communicated to internal and external stakeholders. Strategy mapping can be used as a learning and development tool for career centers to enhance their knowledge about the value chain of an employer’s holistic DEI and social justice strategies that should have measurable impacts on education, entrepreneurship, employment, and economic mobility for HDG’s. Career centers have a duty to evaluate these strategies for employers that want to participate in engagement and recruitment events targeted specifically for historically disadvantaged groups. A strategy map can create opportunities for career centers to design new engagement and partnership initiatives to level the playing field for HDG’s. An example of a strategy map was created below to make clear the cause-and-effect connection between strategic objectives developed within the four perspectives.
ARGEX Scorecard: SWOT and GAP Analysis

Most organizations use some iteration of SWOT and GAP Analyses to achieve their business objectives and goals. Career centers are well-versed in the use of those techniques and tools because of their role in executing their own mission and vision. The ARGEX Scorecard perspectives were designed with the SWOT Framework in mind. The perspectives of “People & Inclusive Leadership” and “Retention & Advancement” represent the activities that primarily impact an employer’s internal historically disadvantaged groups. The perspectives of “Employer Branding & Recruitment” and “Community & Social Impact” represent the activities that primarily impact external historically disadvantaged groups. It is all too easy for career centers to make the assumption that every person that represents an employer partner is well-versed in these strategic frameworks. That is not the reality. The career centers that prioritize asking deeper questions about employers’ SWOT’s and GAP’s pertaining to the four scorecard perspectives, can position themselves as trusted partners capable of helping those employers successfully execute their DEI and social justice strategies.

SWOT Analysis

How can career centers know how employers have defined their SWOT’s against the four perspectives? This information will rarely be stated in an employers’ publicly-available reports specific to the perspectives themselves. Therefore, career centers will be tasked with trying to gather this information directly from their employer liaisons. This is an example of how career centers can use the scorecard to help employers improve the effectiveness of their communications to historically disadvantaged groups. In this collaboration, career centers are able to include the “voice of the HDG” to help employers formulate better DEI and social justice strategies that will maximize their impact across the four scorecard perspectives. In the SWOT Framework, Strengths and Weaknesses are internal to an organization; and Opportunities and Threats are external to it. This framework overlays with the scorecard (see Figure 4) through an employer’s strengths/weaknesses with equitable representation and retention of its internal HDG employees; and its opportunity/threats with recruiting and impacting external HDG non-employees.

GAP Analysis

While the SWOT Analysis is extremely useful for assessing where an employer is currently positioned across the four perspectives, it is the GAP Analysis that will be used by employers to formulate and manage the strategies that will be developed to achieve desired goals. Unlike the SWOT Analysis, this information is sometimes stated in an employers’ publicly-available reports specific to the scorecard perspectives. In the cases where employers don’t state targeted goals they are trying to achieve, then career centers will be tasked with trying to gather this information directly from their employer liaisons. Sometimes employers will state their DEI and social justice achievements using quantifiable and/or qualitative data. This type of data accountability is typically more prevalent in the scorecard indicators associated with the “People & Inclusive Leadership”, “Retention & Advancement”, and “Community & Social Impact” perspectives. When career centers gain deeper insights into employers’ identified gaps and underlying reasons for those gaps within the associated perspectives, then they will be better positioned to provide value-added support to employers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Workforce Demographics</td>
<td>Rubric #1</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; Leadership Demographics</td>
<td>Rubric #2</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession Management &amp; Development</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Pathing Programs</td>
<td>Rubric #4</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement &amp; Well-Being</td>
<td>Rubric #5</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEI Accountability &amp; Training</td>
<td>Rubric #6</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onboarding Strategy</td>
<td>Rubric #7</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Strategy</td>
<td>Rubric #8</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent Engagement Strategy</td>
<td>Rubric #9</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer &amp; Pro-Bono Programs</td>
<td>Rubric #10</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier Diversity Programs</td>
<td>Rubric #11</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy &amp; Pledges</td>
<td>Rubric #12</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Measure * Weight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GAP Analysis question to ask in each ARGEX Perspective

“How can we improve equitable outcomes for historically disadvantaged groups in…?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARGE Scorecard: Usage in Career Centers

There are myriad ways to use the scorecard and career centers are encouraged to be innovative in how they adapt and use the scorecard to achieve their mission for supporting historically disadvantaged groups. Ultimately, the scorecard is an objective tool that can be used to guide decision-making on which employers to include in key programming and signature events designed specifically for historically disadvantaged groups. The information listed below should serve as a guide, but is not an exhaustive list of ways to use the scorecard.

Checklist before using Scorecard

- Commit to learning about the history of racism and sexism in the US and challenge any unfounded beliefs or assumptions.
- Agree upon what anti-racism and gender equality mean to the career center through the lens of the historically disadvantaged groups defined by the ARGE Scorecard.
- Make a bold statement on how the career center will position anti-racism and gender equality in its operating environment and practices.
- Determine which perspectives and indicators are most important to the historically disadvantaged groups served by the career center and postsecondary institution.

Evaluating Inactive, Active, and Prospective Employer Partners

- Identify the resources (staff, interns, grad assistants, etc.) available to conduct employer research and analysis using the scorecard.
- Review employer reports to find disaggregated data specific to historically disadvantaged groups to be evaluated from the following primary sources: a) Publicly-available resources; b) Data requested directly from employer liaisons.
- Use rubrics to evaluate employers across any (or all) of the scorecard perspectives in order to determine the top 25/50 DEI Employers based on any (or both) of the following two factors: a) Transparency (Communications) of DEI and social justice data on historically disadvantaged groups; b) Accountability (Management) of DEI and social justice data on historically disadvantaged groups.
- Develop a communications plan to inform Employer Partners that the career center will be implementing the use of a scorecard to guide decision-making on the employers invited to participate in designated initiatives/events. Be prepared to explain the career center’s purpose for implementing the scorecard.

Ways to use the Scorecard (through the lens of historically disadvantaged groups)

- Which employers to provide DEI-Maturity Competencies training for?
- Which employers to promote directly to HDG Students for internship and full-time job opportunities?
- Which employers to participate in Corporate Partners, Sponsors Programs, and Advisory Boards?
- Which employers to participate in Experiential Learning Programs designed for HDG Students?
- Which employers to participate in DEI-themed Networking Events and Career Fairs?
- Which employers to participate in DEI-themed Career Education Workshops?
- Which employers to participate in strategic alliances to support Student Enrollment & Retention for HDG’s?

ARGE Scorecard Goals

There are myriad goals that a career center can achieve using the scorecard. The key will be identifying the ones that can provide the most sustainable and positive impact to historically disadvantaged groups. What follows is not an exhaustive list: 1) Promote anti-racism/sexism in the workplace, community, and academia, 2) Be more equity-minded when considering historically disadvantaged groups in the workplace, community, and academia, 3) Influence employers to be transparent and accountable for the equitable outcomes in recruitment, retention, and advancement of historically disadvantaged groups, 4) Influence employers to play meaningful roles in education, entrepreneurship, employment, and economic mobility for historically disadvantaged groups, and 5) Influence campus community partners to work with career centers to bridge equitable academic outcomes with equitable professional outcomes for historically disadvantaged groups.

ARGE Scorecard Effectiveness

Career centers should identify ways to measure how effective the scorecard is in helping them to advance their strategic DEI and social justice goals that positively impact historically disadvantaged groups. Effectiveness can be measured in many ways and will depend upon the goals that are created and the tools used to assess their outcomes. What follows is not an exhaustive list: 1) Increase in quality career education programming addressing specific needs of historically disadvantaged groups, 2) Increase in employer transparency and accountability on its initiatives that impact historically disadvantaged groups, 3) Increase in career center transparency and accountability on its initiatives that impact historically disadvantaged groups, 4) Increase in campus community awareness of employer DEI and social justice initiatives, and 5) Survey ratings from historically disadvantaged groups.

Benefits of using the Scorecard (not an exhaustive list)

- Provide uniformity and consistency for evaluating employers’ DEI and social justice initiatives that impact historically disadvantaged groups.
- Enhance Career Center DEI knowledge, programming, practices, and activities to strategically support its internal and external stakeholders.
- Identify the Top 25/50 DEI-Mature Employers that are positioned to provide Career Pathways for historically disadvantaged groups through recruitment, mentoring, and experiential learning opportunities.
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* Guide decision-making for which Employers participate in Sponsorships, Partnerships, Boards, and other high-profile opportunities.

**ARGE Scorecard: Case Study 1 – Reviewing Employer DEI & Social Justice Data**

When using the scorecard to evaluate employers’ DEI and social justice data transparency and accountability related to historically disadvantaged groups, it is necessary to understand what constitutes the level of transparency that would provide useful information upon which both career centers and stakeholders belonging to the HDG’s can make informed decisions. The ARGE Scorecard is designed to evaluate the presence/absence of disaggregated data specific to HDG’s. To restate, the emphasis on HDG’s is not at the exclusion of other disadvantaged groups. The emphasis is meant to address the needs of these groups that continue to disproportionately experience negative outcomes resulting from systemic racism/sexism. The information presented in the graphics below provide examples of employers’ DEI and social justice initiatives and outcomes data. On the surface, it can appear that an employer may be providing sufficient transparency and accountability around disaggregated data. However, it is often necessary for career centers to go into more depth in order to understand an employer’s performance that is specific to historically disadvantaged groups.

### People & Inclusive Culture Perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Categories</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black or African American</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other¹</th>
<th>Total U.S. Colleagues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec-Sr Level Officers &amp; Mgrs</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Mid Level Officers &amp; Mgrs</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total U.S. Colleagues</strong></td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Retention & Advancement Perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Turnover number</th>
<th>Turnover percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-31</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-44</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-63</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 and up</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas for Improvement for Employers

- Include prior 2-3 years of data for comparison.
- State the desired goals/targets for HDG representation in these job categories.

**Benefit**

- Reinforce commitment to equality and equity through Senior Leadership representation.
- Increase profile as Diverse & Inclusive Workplace.

### Employer Branding & Recruitment Perspective

- Include prior 2-3 years of data for comparison.
- Show disaggregated turnover data by historically disadvantaged groups.

**Benefit**

- Reinforce commitment to reducing behaviors that lead to disproportionate turnover.
- Increase profile as Diverse & Inclusive Workplace.

### Community & Social Impact Perspective

- Include prior 2-3 years of data for comparison.
- Break down supplier diversity into disaggregated data by historically disadvantaged groups.

**Benefit**

- Reinforce commitment to equality and equity through supporting WMBE firms.
- Increase profile as Diverse & Inclusive Workplace.

---
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ARGE Scorecard: Case Study 2 – Assigning Points to Employers

To determine employers’ scores using the standard version of the scorecard, the 12 defined key performance indicators must be measured using proprietary rubrics that facilitate the objective evaluation of the information found in employers’ public and non-public resources. To be considered for an in-depth scorecard review, at minimum, employers should be approved to recruit at the career center and meet any of the following criteria: 1) be a publicly-traded organization, 2) be a large private or non-profit organization, 3) be a higher education institution. The scorecard can also be used on small and mid-sized employers, however, in those cases, it should be used more as an advising tool rather than a comparative analysis tool due to the typical lack of disaggregated data from those employer types. This should not deter the use of the scorecard with small and mid-sized employers. It is imperative to help them integrate DEI and social justice strategies within their business operations as they grow and have larger impacts on the communities in which they serve.

In the standard scorecard version, each of the four perspectives are broken down into three unique indicators, each indicator is broken down into three unique criteria, and each criterion can be further broken down into measurable outputs that reflect their direct/indirect impact on the demographic groups of Women, Blacks/African Americans, Hispanics/Latinx, and Indigenous Americans. Each measurable output is assigned points based on customized rubrics that must be developed for each indicator in order to provide scoring consistency, validity, and reliability. Comparisons and analyses can be made on any combination of employers and an infinite number of data output combinations can be made using Pivot Tables and Tableau data visualization tools. This will allow database users the ability to select employers on various inputs that can be evaluated against industry peers, non-industry peers, geographic peers, non-geographic peers, and more.

The points scale assigned to the components of the scorecard are up to individual career centers to decide. Comparisons between organizations can be done individually, or by using average scores for the various scorecard components to compare against deviations. That would allow users to gauge how well employers perform among the varying levels of data transparency and data accountability. Based on what users’ deem most relevant to their decision making process, they can compare employers across any (or all) of the scorecard components: 1) Perspectives, 2) Indicators, 3) Criteria, and 4) Measurable Outputs. For example, a career center user may be interested in comparing specific indicators and criteria of employers’ “People & Inclusive Leadership Perspective” for the purpose of deciding which employer(s) would be best suited to include on a Career Panel focused on employers with leadership programs designed specifically for members of historically disadvantaged groups. Alternatively, a career center user can compare specific indicators and criteria of employers’ “Retention & Advancement Perspective” for the purposes of deciding which employer(s) have active strategies to reduce promotion disparities for historically disadvantaged groups.

Below is a snapshot of what the visual data can look like when using the scorecard to evaluate and benchmark the data transparency and accountability of employers’ DEI and social justice outcomes for selected criteria. It is important to note that there are no good/bad averages for the various scorecard components that can be measured. Employers that fall below the benchmark average in any specific scorecard component can be followed up with by career centers to discuss how to improve their data transparency using the examples of their peers that have higher scores. Career centers can use any scoring method they choose as the numbers won’t change the outcomes of the ARGE Spectrum for Data Transparency (see figure 5). The data below is based on calendar year 2019 information and is for illustration purposes only.
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ARGE Scorecard: Do’s and Don’ts for Career Center Usage

While the scorecard presents a framework to guide career center professionals’ employer intake and outreach discussions around DEI and social justice initiatives that impact historically disadvantaged groups, care must be taken to use the scorecard correctly and for its intended purposes. Used in the right ways, the scorecard can unlock a deeper level of conversation with an employer regarding its holistic DEI and social justice strategies and outcomes. This can lead to innovative collaborations and programs between a career center, employer, postsecondary institution, community partners – and most important of all – the members belonging to historically disadvantaged groups. It is useful for career centers to take the following guidelines into consideration when using the scorecard:

Do (what follows is not an exhaustive list)
- Use the scorecard’s four perspectives as the foundation for selecting any (or all) of the 12 indicators that the career center wants to evaluate employers on.
- Be realistic with any key performance indicators that are developed outside of the original 12 in the standard framework. Additional indicators should be ones that provide a value-added benefit to employers and members of historically disadvantaged groups.
- Create rubrics that allow for an objective, validated, and repeatable method to evaluate the scorecard components.
- Use the scorecard as a collaborative tool to generate dialogue around an employer’s DEI and social justice initiatives – or lack thereof.
- Use the scorecard to educate employers on how to improve their DEI and social justice data transparency and accountability as it pertains to impacts and outcomes for historically disadvantaged groups.
- Update employers’ scorecard points on an annual basis aligned with the release of their annual reports (or equivalent) that contain the data that is evaluated.
- Compare employers using their data from the equivalent calendar years. For example, Employer A’s 2020 data must not be compared to Employer B’s 2021 data.
- Develop a clear communications plan to explain to employer partners how the scorecard is designed to improve the way career centers and employers partner to increase the engagement, recruitment, and workplace satisfaction for historically disadvantaged groups.

Don’t (what follows is not an exhaustive list)
- Use the scorecard in a “name and shame” manner for employers that lack any data transparency or accountability on DEI and social justice initiatives; or that lack any initiatives at all.
- Use the scorecard to compare employers with vastly different workforce sizes against each other – unless it’s for analytical purposes only.
- Assume that the employer liaison to the career center knows about their company’s holistic DEI and social justice initiatives – or is even aware that their employer makes that data publicly available.
- Use the scorecard as a “Holy Grail” of how every employer should communicate their holistic DEI and social justice initiatives.
- Use the scorecard as a prescriptive tool when evaluating Employer DEI-Maturity Competencies defined by the career center.
- Share an employer’s points tally from the scorecard evaluation with students without a thorough explanation of how the points were calculated and what they mean.
- Confuse data transparency with data accountability: transparency is the form and substance of data that is made publicly available, and accountability is the quantifiable metrics of data that is made transparent that show trends and performance on specified goals/targets.
- Violate an employer’s trust if they provide the career center with data that they request to not be made public.
Appendix A
This appendix provides examples of employer data transparency and accountability on DEI and social justice initiatives for historically disadvantage groups; as well as resources that aided the collection of data and information. This is not an exhaustive list of employers or resources.
ARGE Scorecard Questions for Employers (examples)

Career center professionals can find data on an employer’s DEI and social justice initiatives through researching its publicly-available information or through requesting it directly from the company. The main purpose of the scorecard is to evaluate disaggregated data on Women, Blacks/African Americans, Hispanics/Latinx, and Indigenous Americans that show an employer’s level of transparency and accountability of its DEI and social justice strategies and outcomes. In cases where the desired data is not publicly available, then the sample list of questions below can serve as a guide when formulating information requests from an employer liaison (campus recruiter, diversity manager, alumni, etc.). What follows is not an exhaustive list:

a. **People & Inclusive Leadership Perspective:** *An analysis of an organization’s key performance indicators of equality and equity through its practices that ensure management and non-management employee representation of its internal Historically Disadvantaged Groups.*
   
i. Does a company track employee demographics on its Senior Leadership Team (Board of Directors, Executives, and Directors) broken down by demographics that include data on HDG’s for the past 2-3 years?
   
ii. Does a company track employee demographics on its New Hires/Entry-Level Employees broken down by demographics that include data on HDG’s for the past 2-3 years?
   
iii. Does a company track employee demographics by Leadership Development Programs broken down by demographics that include data on HDG’s for the past 2-3 years?

b. **Retention & Advancement Perspective:** *An analysis of an organization’s key performance indicators of equality and equity through its practices that foster retention and advancement opportunities for its internal Historically Disadvantaged Groups.*
   
i. Does a company track perceptions of fairness, trust, and respect through Climate Surveys broken down by demographics that include data on HDG’s for the past 2-3 years?
   
ii. Does a company track Discrimination/Harassment, Bullying, Micro-aggressions, Workplace Violence, and Grievances/Complaints broken down by demographics that include data on HDG’s for the past 2-3 years?
   
iii. Does a company offer annual training for the past 2-3 years on any of the following: 1) Unconscious Bias Workshops, 2) Communication & leadership styles for Women, 3) Communication & leadership styles for Racial & Ethnic Groups Minority Communication Styles?

c. **Employer Branding & Recruitment Perspective:** *An analysis of an organization’s key performance indicators of equality and equity through its practices that position it as an Employer of Choice for internal/external Historically Disadvantaged Groups.*
   
i. Does a company have a goal to fill more positions at all levels with diverse candidates belonging to HDG’s for the past 2-3 years?
   
ii. Does a company currently (or plan to) offer a dedicated DEI annual report to track and communicate its DEI and social justice initiatives and outcomes to prospective candidates belonging to HDG’s for the past 2-3 years?
   
iii. Does a company have a goal to be listed in Rankings Publications that recognize employers considered to have desirable workplace environments for HDG’s for the past 2-3 years?

d. **Community and Social Impact Perspective:** *An analysis of an organization’s key performance indicators of equality and equity through its practices that improve socioeconomic conditions for external Historically Disadvantaged Groups.*
   
i. Does a company track its progress with supplier diversity programs broken down by demographics that include data on HDG-owned businesses for the past 2-3 years?
   
ii. Does a company track its support and engagement with K-12 schools for students broken down by demographics that include data on HDG’s for the past 2-3 years?
   
iii. Does a company track its Financial Contributions and/or Pro Bono Work with For/Non-Profits and Government Agencies whose mission is to advance equality and equitable outcomes for demographics that include HDG’s?
### Rubric_Management & Leadership Demographics (examples)

**Note:** This rubric is designed to evaluate for Data Transparency only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Points (1)</th>
<th>Points (2)</th>
<th>Points (3)</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Board of Directors/Trustees** | - Evidence of *non-US specific* representation for Women with non-disaggregated quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s)  
- Evidence of terms, including variants, such as “Underrepresented Minorities” with non-disaggregated quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s)  
- Evidence of terms, including variants, such as “People of Color” with non-disaggregated quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s) | - Evidence of US-specific representation for Women with minimum 1-year history of quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s)  
- Evidence of representation for Blacks/African Americans with minimum 1-year history of quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s)  
- Evidence of representation for Hispanics/Latinx with minimum 1-year history of quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s) | - Evidence of US-specific representation for Women with minimum 2-years history of quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s)  
- Evidence of representation for Blacks/African Americans with minimum 2-years history of quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s)  
- Evidence of representation for Hispanics/Latinx with minimum 2-years history of quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s) |       |
| **Executives/Senior Managers** (examples: CEO and Executive Leadership Team) | - Evidence of *non-US specific* representation for Women with non-disaggregated quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s)  
- Evidence of terms, including variants, such as “Underrepresented Minorities” with non-disaggregated quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s)  
- Evidence of terms, including variants, such as “People of Color” with non-disaggregated quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s) | - Evidence of US-specific representation for Women with minimum 1-year history of quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s)  
- Evidence of representation for Blacks/African Americans with minimum 1-year history of quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s)  
- Evidence of representation for Hispanics/Latinx with minimum 1-year history of quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s) | - Evidence of US-specific representation for Women with minimum 2-years history of quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s)  
- Evidence of representation for Blacks/African Americans with minimum 2-years history of quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s)  
- Evidence of representation for Hispanics/Latinx with minimum 2-years history of quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s) |       |
| **First/Mid-level Managers** (non-executive leaders as defined by the company) | - Evidence of *non-US specific* representation for Women with non-disaggregated quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s)  
- Evidence of terms, including variants, such as “Underrepresented Minorities” with non-disaggregated quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s)  
- Evidence of terms, including variants, such as “People of Color” with non-disaggregated quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s) | - Evidence of US-specific representation for Women with minimum 1-year history of quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s)  
- Evidence of representation for Blacks/African Americans with minimum 1-year history of quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s)  
- Evidence of representation for Hispanics/Latinx with minimum 1-year history of quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s) | - Evidence of US-specific representation for Women with minimum 2-years history of quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s)  
- Evidence of representation for Blacks/African Americans with minimum 2-years history of quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s)  
- Evidence of representation for Hispanics/Latinx with minimum 2-years history of quantitative data (numbers and percentages describing increase, decrease, or impact in KPI’s) |       |

**Max score for a Criterion:** 9 points

*Non-US Specific:* defined as data that is global or not disaggregated by regions that included the US.
ARGE Scorecard: Research Resources (examples)

There is an extensive amount of research that has to be performed in order to provide accurate data for the scorecard analysis. This will ensure that it produces transparent, consistent, and valid input. In many cases, a career center won’t have the time or resources to perform a deep level of research and analysis on a large number of companies. In those cases, it is recommended to limit the initial use of the scorecard on companies that have consistently participated in past DEI-themed events that were facilitated by the career center or a campus community partner. The list below is not exhaustive but provides examples for where indicator and criteria data for the scorecard can be identified.

- **Employer Website Resources**
  - Selected Pages: 1) About Us (Our Company), 2) Diversity & Inclusion, 3) Careers & Job Postings
  - Annual Report
  - Social Responsibility Report
  - Sustainability Report
  - Citizenship Report
  - HR Capital Management Report
  - Environment, Social, Governance (ESG) Report
  - Global Impact Report
  - Diversity & Inclusion Report
  - D&I Visual Analytics Database
  - Affinity Groups/Employee Resource Groups
  - Supplier Diversity Report
  - HR Policy Manual or Employee Handbook

- **Post-Secondary Institution Resources**
  - Career Services Manager Database
  - Non-OCR Activities & Events
  - Department-based Career Offices
  - Non-Career Center Activities & Events
  - Advancement and Fundraising

- **Employer Rankings Publications**
  - Best Places to Work for Diversity
  - Best Places to Work for Minorities
  - Best Places to Work for Women
  - Best Places to Work for Blacks/African Americans
  - Best Places to Work for Hispanics/Latinx
Altria Data Transparency and Accountability for HDG’s

Altria provides examples of data transparency and accountability that are categorized under the following ARGE Scorecard Perspectives: 1) People & Inclusive Leadership Perspective, 2) Employer Branding & Recruitment Perspective.

Our Inclusion & Diversity (IGD) Aimimg Points recognize that if we are going to achieve our 10-year Vision, we must be a more diverse company with more diverse leadership and be a more inclusive place to work. We’re dedicated to achieving our five aspirational IGD Aimimg Points as soon as possible.

Our overall approach continues to include promoting a vibrant, inclusive workplace, attracting and retaining talent and diverse people, rewarding and recognizing our employees, and creating a safe workplace. Throughout this chapter, we’ll share examples of how our Path Forward is coming to life across all aspects of our approach, as well as areas where we still have work to do.

Promoting a Vibrant, Inclusive Workplace

We recognize the power of diverse teams — unique individuals who don’t think or look alike — working together to shape our future. We believe our personal success and progress should be determined by working in a way consistent with our Cultural Aspiration and not the boxes we walk in. And we’re all inspired to bring our best because our unique strengths are valued. While we’ve talked a lot about being this company, we haven’t made the progress at the pace that most of us would like. Learning from our past, we’re committed to becoming the company we need to be to achieve our 10-year Vision. To that end, we’re dedicated to reaching the following aspirational Inclusion and Diversity Aimimg Points as soon as possible:

- Be an inclusive place to work for all employees, regardless of level, demographic group or work function.
- Have equal numbers of men and women among our VPs and our Directors.
- Increase our VPs and our Directors who are Asian, Black, Hispanic or two or more races to at least 30%.
- Increase our VPs and our Directors who are LGBTQ+, a person with a disability or veteran.
- Have diverse leadership teams that reflect the organizations they lead.

We believe that achieving all of our IGD Aimimg Points will likely take between five and ten years. It will require commitment, transparency and accountability. To be successful, beginning in 2020 we will:

1. Measure and Share
   - We will measure our progress and broadly share at least twice a year how we’re doing in areas critical to driving our success as well as our progress in reaching our Aimimg points.

2. Build the Best, Most Diverse Teams
   - We will name gaps in underrepresented groups by developing talent acquisition and onboarding strategies and goals at both the enterprise and functional levels.

3. Develop the Pipeline
   - We will invest in leader and employee development to build a diverse talent pipeline prepared and willing to lead at every level.

4. Hold Ourselves Accountable
   - We will leverage organizational plans, the Altria Diversity Council, Employee Resource Groups, external partnerships and people systems to help us deliver these results.

Building Trust Through Transparency

One of the drivers of Altria’s organizational strength is an atmosphere of trust; employees that have trusting relationships can share information more freely and drive innovation forward. In 2019, I co-led a cross-functional team aimed at increasing transparency to accelerate trust within our organization. Our team identified two areas where employees wanted access to more information: our diversity data and our compensation structures.

For many years, Altria has focused on inclusion and diversity efforts, but employees did not have access to data to see the progress themselves. We partnered with our Information Services and People Analytics teams to create an easily accessible data platform, including breakdowns of our employee data by race and gender, with filters such as function or tenure. Hopefully this interactive tool allows employees to feel more connected to our diversity aspiration journey.

Employees also expressed interest in transparency around pay equity across different demographic groups. Our team worked with HR to examine our equitable compensation processes for salaried employees, such as external benchmarks and annual statistical analysis to ensure that women and men are paid par with each other. We also wanted employees to have more confidence in Altria’s approach to pay equity through access to this information. In partnership with the HR Compensation Team, we released a new annual compensation report, which includes detailed compensation structures and comparison data by gender and race. Sharing pay equity information empowers employees with knowledge and ultimately builds trust throughout the organization.

This work would not have been possible without the GREAT talents of my teammates and the commitment of our executive champions.

Attracting, Developing & Retaining Talented People

Employees want challenging, meaningful work. They want to make decisions that matter, while developing their careers. We provide these opportunities, including paid internships and diverse assignments designed to stretch capability.

Recruiting

We recruit people with strong leadership potential. Our companies have longstanding recruiting relationships with 11 universities nationwide. Each year, we offer students paid co-ops or internships and many of these interns begin their careers with Altria after they graduate. In 2019, we examined University partnerships and made some changes in order to increase diversity. We established a new partnership with Florida International University, which has a large Hispanic student population. In addition, we looked at some of our existing universities to identify areas where we could expand the functions that recruit there. North Carolina A&T, a Historically Black College and University we were able to add sales recruiting to complement our already strong partnership for engineering and manufacturing.

Our UNIFI and Spring ERGs, along with Talent Acquisition and the Diversity and Inclusion team, partnered 170 interns with employee mentors outside their assigned function in 2019. Our Senior Vice President, Chief Human Resources Officer and Chief Compliance Officer, Charlie Whitaker, and other executives served as intern mentors as part of this program. Seventy-nine percent of interns surveyed said that this enhanced their overall experience.

Source: Altria 2019 Corporate Social Responsibility Report
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PwC Data Accountability for HDG's

PwC provides examples of data transparency and accountability that are categorized under the following ARGE Scorecard Perspectives: 1) People & Inclusive Leadership Perspective, 2) Employer Branding & Recruitment Perspective.

Source: PwC 2020 Diversity & Inclusion Transparency Report
Microsoft provides examples of data transparency and accountability that are categorized under the following ARGE Scorecard Perspectives:

1) People & Inclusive Leadership Perspective, 2) Community & Social Impact Perspective.

Microsoft Data Transparency and Accountability for HDG’s

The information on the following pages reflects data from Microsoft with our minimally integrated companies from the previous page.

Population numbers continue to rise

Our 2019 workforce snapshot shows positive trends in the number of people of diverse backgrounds along all the categories we measure. From June 2018 to June 2019 our global workforce grew 7.2% overall and in the U.S. alone, the number of minority employees grew 6.9%. The population growth of women globally and of U.S. based employees in the U.S. have each grown at faster rates than our overall population growth, some highlights within that one year growth include:

- In the U.S., the number of African American/Black employees has increased 13.5% overall, including a 28.0% increase in technical roles.
- The number of Hispanic/Latino employees in the U.S. grew 12.0% overall, including a 28.0% increase in the number of Hispanic/Latino executives.
- In the U.S., the number of Asian employees (in groups that comprise more than a dozen ethnic groups) has grown 18.6% overall, including a 37.9% increase in the number of Asian directors.
- We saw a 22.9% increase in the number of employees in the U.S. who identify as multi-ethnic, including a 31.1% increase among languages—almost double the number of multi-lingual managers since 2016.
- The number of women in our worldwide workforce has risen 11.1% overall, including a 17.8% increase in technical roles, and a 14.7% increase in the number of women executives.

Since 2016, we’ve seen a 56.6% increase in women executives, and the number of women executives in technical roles has almost doubled in three years. A 59.3% increase. All the board level, the data of directors nominated for election at the 2019 annual shareholders meeting included five women, accounting for 38% of our directors and two of our four board committees will be chaired by women.

Improving representation at all levels of the company

The size of our workforce can be scaled for the impact in our population the size of 100,000 and its size of you build the groups we track not always translate to the percentage point gains in our representation among the full workforce. Increase and a two percentage point. In representation levels are meaningful and encouraging. These data points are helping us assess the effect of our efforts and providing insights on where we need to turn more or do better. For example, we can be better track, examine, and work on closing the gaps in representation among individual contributors versus managers.

In terms of race and ethnicity, we saw modest year-over-year growth in total representation in all categories, including in tech and leadership roles at both the director and executive level.

Source: Microsoft 2019 Diversity & Inclusion Report
JP Morgan Chase Data Transparency and Accountability for HDG’s

JP Morgan Chase provides examples of data transparency and accountability that are categorized under the following ARGE Scorecard Perspectives: 1) People & Inclusive Leadership Perspective, 2) Retention & Advancement Perspective, 3) Employer Branding & Recruitment Perspective, and 4) Community & Social Impact Perspective.

### U.S. EEOC Deep-Dive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EEO</th>
<th>Total Workforce</th>
<th>Exec./Sr. Lvl</th>
<th>Mid-Lvl Managers</th>
<th>Professionals</th>
<th>All Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. White</td>
<td>161,810</td>
<td>165,266</td>
<td>2,982</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>44,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Ethnic</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Asian</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Black</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Hispanic</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Women</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Men</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. LGBT+</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Disabled</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Military</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Ethnicity data is as of December 31, 2019 – for the U.S. only – because tracking ethnicity outside of the U.S. is limited. However, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) data is as of October 15, 2019 – and since 2010, has been shared publicly.

---

Our Business Resource Groups (BRGs) are an essential part of how we cultivate an inclusive work environment. These are groups of employees who volunteer to advance the firm’s position in the global marketplace and diversity and inclusion strategies by leveraging the unique perspectives of their members. Our firm has ten BRGs globally focused on ethnic communities and other groups, including Hispanic and Latino, black, Asian and Pacific Islander, military and veterans, LGBT+ employees, women, people with disabilities, early career employees, administrative professionals and working families. Approximately 43% of our employees were members of at least one BRG in 2019.

We also have a variety of executive forums designed to support and advance diversity and inclusion within our firm. For example, the Hispanic Executive Forum serves as a senior collective voice for the Hispanic and Latino community and supports the Adelante BRG and other Hispanic leadership forums across the firm’s lines of business; engages with external organizations; and supports the firm’s campus hiring, new employee on-boarding and retention and development efforts among the Hispanic and Latino community. The Asian Executive Forum similarly partners with the AsPIRE BRG and supports the firm’s commitment to the Asian American and Pacific Islander community through recruitment, development, advancement and external engagement.

**Investing in the Black Community**

In 2019, we marked the third anniversary of our firm’s Advancing Black Leaders (ABL) strategy to increase representation of black talent across all of our businesses. While we have much more to do, this strategy is delivering tangible results, especially at senior levels of the firm. We expanded the ABL strategy to our Europe, Middle East and Africa region, which resulted in our doubling the number of black Managing Directors in those regions between 2018 and 2019.

We also launched ABP in 2019, which builds on the success of our internal ABL strategy and extends our commitment to helping black Americans achieve economic success in our communities. This initiative combines the firm’s business and philanthropic resources to accelerate economic opportunity for black Americans by strengthening education and job training, growing careers and building wealth. As part of this program, we committed to hiring more than 4,000 black students over the next five years into apprenticeships, internships and post-graduation roles. In 2019—our first year working toward this commitment—we achieved 29% of the target.

Source: JP Morgan 2019 Environmental, Social, and Governance Report

© 2020, Roderick E. Lewis. All rights reserved.
Bank of America Data Transparency and Accountability for HDG's

Bank of America provides examples of data transparency and accountability that are categorized under the following ARGE Scorecard Perspectives: 1) People & Inclusive Leadership Perspective, 2) Retention & Advancement Perspective.

Since 2015, we have maintained or increased workforce diversity while reducing our total headcount by 4%.

Management levels and managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global and U.S. diversity</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management levels 1-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of Color</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of Color</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Data for women is global; people of color is U.S. only.
2 Above, we disclose ‘Global and U.S. Diversity’ beginning in 2015, as we made a renewed commitment to our organizational health in October 2015.

Campus hires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global and U.S. diversity</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of Color</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>133%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Data for women is global; people of color is U.S. only.
2 For ‘Campus Diversity’ we disclosed our workforce data beginning in 2009, since we measure against a 10-year cycle.

External partnerships

In addition to our leadership councils and Employee Networks, we reinforce our commitment to diversity and expand our impact by partnering with other organizations focused on advancing and driving inclusion in the workplace, including:

- Black Enterprise: Premiere business, investing and wealth building resource for African-Americans committed to programs and initiatives to develop Black women
- Business in the Community: The largest U.K.-based business-led membership organization dedicated to responsible business, including supporting the creation of a skilled, inclusive workforce today and for the future
- CEO Action for Diversity & Inclusion: The largest CEO-driven business commitment to advance diversity and inclusion in the workplace, representing more than 85 industries, all 50 U.S. states and millions of teammates globally
- Catalyst CEO Champions for Change: A group of over 60 CEOs pledging to advance more women into all levels of leadership
- Executive Leadership Council: Committed to advancing the role and contributions of Black executives and preparing the next generation of corporate leaders
- Hispanic Association on Corporate Responsibility: An advocacy and leadership development organization designed to advance the inclusion of Hispanics in corporate America
- Institute for Veterans and Military Families: Higher education’s first interdisciplinary academic institute focused on advancing the lives of the nation’s military veterans and their families
- Latino Corporate Director Association: Dedicated to developing, supporting and increasing the number of U.S. Latinos on corporate boards
- National Association of Black Accountants: Dedicated to bridging the opportunity gap for Black professionals in the accounting, finance and related business professions
- Out & Equal: National organization focused on creating a culture of belonging for all through LGBTQ workplace equality
- The Hispanic Promise: Launched in 2019 by the We Are All Human Foundation with the goal of creating a more inclusive work environment for Hispanics
- U.S. 30% Club: Launched in 2014, the U.S. 30% Club is comprised of CEOs and Chairs committed to developing and promoting female talent within their organizations, with a goal of achieving 30% female directors on S&P 100 boards by 2020.

Source: Bank of America 2019 Human Capital Report
Merck Data Transparency and Accountability for HDG’s

Merck provides examples of data transparency and accountability that are categorized under the following ARGE Scorecard Perspectives: 1) People & Inclusive Leadership Perspective, 2) Retention & Advancement Perspective.

Source: Merck 2020 Environmental, Social, and Governance Report
## DEI Employer Rankings Publications (examples)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication Titles</th>
<th>Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada's Best Diversity Employers</td>
<td><a href="https://www.canadastop100.com/diversity/">https://www.canadastop100.com/diversity/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Social America's Best Diversity Companies</td>
<td><a href="https://diversity.social/top-diversity-employers/Country/united-states/">https://diversity.social/top-diversity-employers/Country/united-states/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Inclusive Top 50 UK Employers</td>
<td><a href="https://www.inclusivecompanies.co.uk/inclusive-top50/">https://www.inclusivecompanies.co.uk/inclusive-top50/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortune's 100 Best Workplaces for Diversity</td>
<td><a href="https://fortune.com/best-workplaces-for-diversity/">https://fortune.com/best-workplaces-for-diversity/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PwC Diversity &amp; Inclusion Transparency Report</td>
<td><a href="https://static1.squarespace.com/static/57d4e9f1bbee0c6edc452320/f5b1f82c2b6a288817272d4f/1528821812319/0/EmployeroftheChoice-May2018.pdf">https://static1.squarespace.com/static/57d4e9f1bbee0c6edc452320/f5b1f82c2b6a288817272d4f/1528821812319/0/EmployeroftheChoice-May2018.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortune 10 Best Workplaces for Hispanics and Latinos</td>
<td><a href="https://fortune.com/best-workplaces-for-hispanics-and-latinoos/">https://fortune.com/best-workplaces-for-hispanics-and-latinoos/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortune 75 Best Workplaces for Women</td>
<td><a href="https://fortune.com/best-workplaces-for-women/">https://fortune.com/best-workplaces-for-women/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Place to Work Best Workplaces for Women 2019</td>
<td><a href="https://www.greatplacetowork.com/best-workplaces/women">https://www.greatplacetowork.com/best-workplaces/women</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INHERSIGHT 50 Best Places to Work</td>
<td><a href="https://www.inheritight.com/companies/best-p_n=142661918">https://www.inheritight.com/companies/best-p_n=142661918</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebony Jet 10 Best Workplaces for African Americans</td>
<td><a href="https://www.ebonyjet.com/10-best-workplaces-for-african-americans/">https://www.ebonyjet.com/10-best-workplaces-for-african-americans/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statista Best Employers for Women</td>
<td><a href="https://www.statista.com/chart/18615/the-best-employers-for-women/">https://www.statista.com/chart/18615/the-best-employers-for-women/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbes America’s Best Employers for Women 2020</td>
<td><a href="https://www.forbes.com/best-employers-women/#244e29f77def9">https://www.forbes.com/best-employers-women/#244e29f77def9</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

The importance of the career services office at postsecondary institutions often goes understated. However, during these challenging times its purpose and mission have never been clearer. The creation of the Employer Anti-Racism & Gender Equality Scorecard adds an additional tool for career centers to continue advancing the profession beyond its perceived transactional nature. While helping students to prepare for life beyond postsecondary institutions will always be core to a career center’s mission, it will also need to adapt and evolve that mission to take on challenges associated with systemic racism and social injustices. A cursory review of most career center job descriptions show that diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) continue to be listed among the many skills desired in prospective employees and leaders in the field. In the past year, terms such as “social justice” are now more prevalent alongside discussions and presentations pertaining to DEI in the workplace, community, and academia. This is not a coincidence. The events of 2020 that highlighted racial inequities and systemic racism were preceded by centuries of similar and worse acts of violence and disregard for the lives and socioeconomic conditions of Black Americans. The disproportionate inequities produced by systemic racism and social injustices disproportionately impact almost every facet of life for Women, Blacks/African-Americans, Hispanics/Latinx, and Indigenous Americans.

The call has never been greater for public and private organizations to take on greater roles in ending these harmful systems and behaviors. The most successful companies adapt with the times in order to thrive and prosper economically. Change is an enduring constant. Consumer tastes, technologies, jobs, government policies, social unrest, climate change, environmental destruction, and demographics are constantly shifting—often in unpredictable and unexpected ways. This is also why many companies have integrated the acronym VUCA into their strategic planning processes. VUCA stands for volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity. It goes without saying that well-managed organizations invest a lot of time and resources into mitigating the impact of VUCA in order to successfully execute their various objectives. In the not-so-distant past, systemic racism and social injustices were not elevated to the level of being mission-critical for an employer’s ability to be successful in its operating environment. The events of 2020 changed that. There has never been a time in recent memory where more CEO’s and Board-level leaders made bold statements denouncing systemic racism, anti-blackness, and social injustices. These leaders often went beyond the standard performative acts that did little (if anything) to move the needle of change for members of the aforementioned historically disadvantaged groups. It is a clear sign that a higher level of consciousness is taking hold in employers allowing them to look beyond pure business results. This is also in line with a growing number of major corporations that signed the 2019 Business Roundtable’s “Statement on the Purpose of a Corporation” which called for a shift from pure shareholder capitalism, to the more inclusive stakeholder capitalism.

Career centers must also redefine their own “statement of purpose” that will make a profound shift from its value being seen primarily in terms of “employment outcomes” – or “job placement” (which is what career centers are normally associated with). With the internet boom in the 1990’s, telecommunications and cable companies were constantly challenged with laying and connecting the “last mile” of cable to potential customers outside of urban, or densely-populated, areas. The term “last mile” quickly became a metaphor to represent myriad business challenges outside of those industries. Put simply, it means the efforts that an organization has to undertake to deliver its products and services to its increasingly dispersed end-users – also known as customers, shoppers, choosers, and users. In the world of career centers at postsecondary institutions (especially those defined as predominantly white institutions), one of the major “last miles” within their ecosystem is to effectively and efficiently support students from marginalized communities – especially those belonging to historically disadvantaged groups. However, this last mile no longer ends at the “point of hire”. Career centers must go beyond the last mile of merely facilitating the connections between employers and historically disadvantaged groups. They are now called upon to make DEI and social justice part and parcel of their purpose and mission. The Employer Anti-Racism & Gender Equality Scorecard can create a new type of collaborative and strategic relationship between career centers and employers to make gains on minimizing/eliminating the disproportionate inequities that exist for historically disadvantaged groups in education, entrepreneurship, employment, and economic mobility.