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Introduction

This is the annual report of the Ball State University Diversity Committee (UDC) based on its examination of data collected during the 2012-2013 academic year.

The Mandate of the State of Indiana
Legislation in IC 21-27-3-5, Sec. 5 states that the Board of Trustees shall create a diversity committee to complete certain tasks and to issue an annual report stating the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the committee to the Board of Trustees.

Tasks
1. Review and recommend faculty employment policies concerning diversity issues.
2. Review faculty and administration personnel complaints concerning diversity issues.
3. Make recommendations to promote and maintain cultural diversity among faculty members.
4. Make recommendations to promote recruitment and retention of minority students.

Composition of the Committee
1. Michael Burayidi, Urban Planning
2. John Emert, Honors College
3. Mike Gillilan, Student Affairs
4. Courtney Jarrett, Disabled Student Development
5. Carolyn Kapinus, Graduate School
6. Hyun Sook Kim, Theater and Dance
7. Terry King, Provost (ex officio)—Jacquelyn Buckrop serves as Provost designee
8. Bill Knight, Office of Institutional Effectiveness
9. Patricia Lovett, Multicultural Center
10. Marcy Meyer, Communication Studies—Chair
11. Thalia Mulvihill, Educational Studies—Assistant Chair
12. Chris Munchel, Office of Admissions
13. Cailin Murray, Anthropology
14. Charles Payne, Assistant Provost for Diversity (ex officio)
15. Sheila Smith, Information Systems and Operations Management
16. Rhonda Thomas, University Human Resource Services
17. Maria Williams-Hawkins, Telecommunications—Past Chair
18. Renmei Xu, Technology

In order to maintain continuity, there is an Executive Committee formed by the Chair, the Assistant Chair, the Past Chair, and the Assistant Provost for Diversity. The Assistant Chair is elected to succeed the Chair in the following year.

Subcommittees
The UDC formed four subcommittees to assemble and analyze the data and provide recommendations for each of the committee's assigned tasks. A fifth subcommittee was formed to address an ad hoc task assigned by the Provost: to recommend family-friendly policies.
In the following report, the data analyses and recommendations are organized in five sections, corresponding to the five tasks assigned to the committee. The report is preceded by an Executive Summary.
Executive Summary

Task 1: Review and recommend faculty employment policies concerning diversity issues.

According to University Human Resource Services (UHRS) statistics, there was little change in underrepresented minority (URM) and international faculty representation at Ball State University (BSU) from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013. However, these data are limited because: 1) they aggregate URM and international faculty; 2) they include Burris and Indiana Academy instructors in the BSU contract faculty population. According to 2012-2013 Fact Book data (which exclude Burris and Indiana Academy instructors), only 12 of 182 (6.6%) of BSU contract faculty are URM or international faculty. In some colleges, at certain ranks there are no URM or international faculty: Miller College of Business (MCOB), the College of Communication, Information, and Media (CCIM), and Teachers College (TC) do not presently employ any URM or international contract faculty. The College of Fine Arts (CFA) does not currently employ any URM or international assistant professors. The College of Applied Sciences and Technology (CAST) and CCIM do not presently employ any URM or international faculty at the rank of full professor.

According to 2012-2013 Fact Book data, the percentage of instructional faculty who were female was 45.1% in 2011-12, with a very slight increase in 2012-13 to 45.2%. Although the percentage of female associate professors has increased, the percentage of female full professors, assistant professors, and instructors has decreased. The majority of faculty members in both TC and CAST continue to be women; however, even in colleges where women constitute the majority group, females are underrepresented at the rank of full professor: 40% in CAST; 44.4% in TC. The largest discrepancy between the percentage of women who are full professors and the percent of female faculty in the college exists in CCIM (-41.7%). In most colleges where women are the non-dominant group, they are practically nonexistent at the full professor level: The College of Architecture and Planning (CAP) (4.8%), MCOB (10.3%), and CCIM (0%).

Recommendations. Consistent with recommendations made in the 2011-2012 UDC Annual Report, the committee recommends that UHRS gather discrete demographic data about URM and international faculty, so that the university can track its progress in recruiting and retaining members of both groups. We recommend that these data be used as metrics for assessing Goal 1, Objective 7 of the 2012-2017 Strategic Plan. In colleges where no URM or international faculty members are employed at the contract faculty level (i.e., MCOB, CCIM, and TC), we recommend that search committees and unit heads follow the Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action policy for all contract and emergency hires. In addition, we recommend that search committees and department chairpersons follow the practices for recruiting a diverse faculty described in the 2008 College of Sciences and Humanities (CSH) Task Force on Diversity’s “Guide to Recruiting and Retaining a More Diverse Faculty.” Further, we recommend that the university create online training modules to educate search committees and unit heads on appropriate employment policies and recruitment practices. College deans should be responsible for overseeing those searches to ensure that Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action policies and diversity-friendly practices are incorporated in the recruitment and selection processes.
In colleges where there are no URM faculty members at the rank of full professor (i.e., CAST and CCIM) and/or female full professors are nonexistent or dramatically underrepresented (i.e., CAP, CCIM, MCOB), we recommend that the university give priority to qualified special assigned leave applicants who are female or URM associate professors. Alternatively, we recommend that the university establish a competitive grant program that would provide URM and female associate professors in the aforementioned colleges with an opportunity to apply for an additional course reduction/research release.

Finally, we commend the university for joining the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) and CCIM for establishing the “PhD Pathways” program. We recommend that the university continue to recruit potential candidates for the SREB and that the PhD Pathways program be adopted by other colleges, particularly those in which minority faculty members are underrepresented.

**Task 2: Review faculty and administration personnel complaints concerning diversity issues.**

According to reports from the Office of University Compliance (OUC), there was a slight increase in complaints from 14 in 2011-2012 to 15 in 2012-2013. The complaints included all diversity issues except age, national origin, and religion. Overall, the data indicate that the number of complaints has been fairly stable since 2010-2011. In this three-year period, nearly half of all complaints have been related to gender and disability. Over time, the largest decrease has been in the area of disability.

Despite the relatively low number of complaints, the committee recognizes that the number of complaints received and investigated by the OUC may not accurately reflect concerns among university employees. According to the *Workplace Environment Survey (WES)*, 20% of BSU employees had experienced intimidating or hostile behavior within the past three years that affected their work; approximately 43% of the negative behavior reported was related to categories of bias addressed by state or federal statute (e.g., race, age, sex, ethnicity, national origin, etc.). Unfortunately, a number of persons who experienced negative behavior did not report it. Thirty one percent indicated that they did not report because they feared retaliation; 19% did not report for fear that their complaint would not be taken seriously. Twelve percent did not know where to make a report or seek help.

**Recommendations.** The committee recommends that the university inform new employees at orientation where complaints of various types can be filed. In addition, we recommend that new employees be informed that retaliation for making complaints will not be tolerated by the University. Employees should receive annual reminders about where to file complaints regarding intimidating, hostile, or retaliatory behavior. All supervisors should be regularly informed of their responsibilities and consequences regarding retaliation for complaints.

In addition, we recommend that the university utilize the WES results as a benchmark and establish measurable, attainable goals for fewer concerns about retaliation, fewer concerns
about complaints not being taken seriously, and fewer reports of not knowing where to file a complaint or seek help.

Task 3: Make recommendations to promote and maintain cultural diversity among faculty members.

As previously stated, the WES revealed that 20% of employees had experienced intimidating or hostile behavior that affected their work within the past three years. Among the respondents who indicated they experienced intimidating or hostile conduct, the largest portion said such conduct was based upon “other reasons” (which most frequently included a difficult situation with a supervisor or another employee or unspecified bullying), their job role (i.e., being a faculty member, staff member, or administrator), biological sex, and age. The percentage of respondents who identified themselves as administrators were more likely (92%) to indicate such conduct was based upon their job role was much higher than for other groups. Women were more likely than men to indicate that such conduct was based upon their biological sex (31% women vs. 12% men). Respondents who identified their sexual orientation as other than heterosexual were more likely (22%) to indicate that they believed such conduct was based upon sexual orientation than were respondents who identified their sexual orientation as heterosexual (1%). Respondents who indicated that their race was other than White were more likely (55%) to indicate that such conduct was based upon race than were respondents who identified their race as White (2%). Respondents who reported their age as 25-32 were more likely (43%) than older respondents to indicate such conduct was based upon age (25% for age 33-42, 9% for age 43-51, 20% for age 52-60, 29% for older than 60). Respondents who indicated that they were in an active military status or who were veterans were more likely (22%) than those with no military status (0%) to indicate that such conduct was based upon their military/veteran status. Respondents who indicated that they have an apparent medical condition were more likely (40%) to indicate that such conduct was based upon their medical condition than were respondents who indicated that they have a non-apparent medical condition (16%) or that they had no such condition (2%). Respondents who indicated that they were not U.S. citizens were more likely (17%) to indicate that such conduct was based upon their immigrant status than were those who indicated that they are U.S. citizens (0%). The percentage of faculty members in CAP who indicated they had personally experienced work-related intimidating or hostile conduct (45%) was substantially higher than overall across colleges (26%).

In addition, the WES assessed the institutional climate for diversity, at both the departmental and university levels. In both cases, the majority of faculty and staff members felt the climate was positive in all categories. However, there were several departmental and university climate items for which faculty respondents from CAP gave substantially more negative responses than the university average. In contrast, CCIM faculty tended to have the most positive perceptions of departmental and university climate.

Although the WES results revealed numerous between-groups differences, we do not know why these differences exist. Therefore, we recommend conducting additional research (as described below) to better understand employees’ perceptions.
Recommendations. The committee recommends that the university create and disseminate a statement, endorsed by the Trustees and President’s Cabinet, about the importance and educational value of a diverse and inclusive campus climate. In addition, we recommend a review of all communications, including the University web site, for use of inclusive language. Further, we recommend that the university establish specific expectations for middle managers, directors, and department chairpersons related to supervision, mentoring, communication, harassment and discrimination, and other human development responsibilities for position performance reviews. Additionally, we recommend providing professional development opportunities concerning diversity and inclusion for new faculty and staff members at orientation events.

Finally, we recommend that the university carry out interviews and/or focus groups to more fully understand the experiences of faculty and staff members who are members of the following groups: those who identify their race as other than White; those in the 25-32 age group; those who are not U.S. citizens; those with apparent or non-apparent medical conditions; those of non-heterosexual sexual orientations; veterans or those in an active military status; associate professors; academic administrators; and faculty members in CAP.

Task 4: Make recommendations to promote recruitment and retention of minority students.

According to Fact Book data, the percentage of ethnic minority students (undergraduate and graduate) has remained relatively stable over the past couple of years. Over the past two years, the percent of undergraduate minority enrollment has decreased from 2010-2011 (12.6%) to 2011-2012 (12.2%) to 2012-2013 (11.9%), with the number of students decreasing respectively from 2,282 to 2,142 to 1,987. In the past year, the number of Native American students has decreased substantially (45%), followed by a 32% decrease in Biracial students. In the same two-year period, graduate enrollment of ethnic minorities increased from 248 students in 2010-2011 to 304 students in 2011-2012 to 358 students in 2012-2013, which is a substantial increase in percentage of graduate enrollment (6.3 to 6.7% to 8.1%).

Retention of freshmen in the 2011 cohort increased for Native American, Asian, Bi-Racial, Black, Hispanic, and Caucasian students from the 2010 cohort. Retention of Asian students rose by 2.5% to 84.38%. The Hispanic student retention numbers decreased from 76.52% to 70.34%. Since the fall of 2010, the retention rate for students with disabilities has remained at 80%.

The Task 4 subcommittee reviewed existing initiatives by the Office of Admissions, the Multicultural Center, Disabled Student Development, and the Graduate School and generated the following recommendations:

Recommendations. The committee commends the university on efforts that were successful last year and recommends their continuance. In addition, the committee recommends that the Graduate School hold virtual information sessions targeted to prospective under-represented minority graduate students and collaborate with Ball State colleges and departments to determine strategies to reach prospective URM graduate students.
Provost’s Task: Recommend Family Friendly Policies.

The Provost’s Task subcommittee examined family-friendly policies, programs, and practices at Ball State University and other universities, conducting archival research, as well as informal interviews with staff members in various units. The subcommittee’s preliminary research resulted in the following recommendations:

**Recommendations.** The committee recommends updating the UHRS website, recognizing fathers/partners on the Child Care web pages, adding a list of recommended local childcare facilities, and information about the Child Study Center (CSC). In addition, the committee recommends that the CSC hold trainings for new staff before the beginning of each semester so that the center can be open when classes begin. The committee also recommends that the university investigate the feasibility of a child care voucher program.

The committee recommends that UHRS provide a FAQ section specifically for FMLA related to paternity/maternity & child care. The committee further recommends having a temp pool for employees on FMLA time, so that coworkers are not assigned additional duties without extra pay. Faculty should be given a stipend if they agree to cover a significant number of classes for colleagues on family or medical leave. Finally, the committee recommends analyzing the Campus Wide Benefits Survey results to see how many employees are utilizing FMLA for family needs (specifically maternity/paternity, childcare, or eldercare) and making additional recommendations based on the survey results.
Findings and Recommendations

Task 1: Review and recommend faculty employment policies concerning diversity issues.

Tracking data on underrepresented minority and international faculty.

Based on University Human Resource Services (UHRS) statistics, there was little change in underrepresented minority (URM) and international faculty representation at Ball State University (BSU) from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013. (See Table 1.) Compared to the previous year, we saw a very slight increase (.16%) in tenure track faculty; a very slight increase (.71%) in contract faculty; and a very slight increase (.35%) for all other employees.

Table 1
Faculty and Staff Diversity Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>623</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.77%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>618</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.58%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2285</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>2273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.71%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3526</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>3481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.76%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As stated in the 2011-2012 UDC Annual Report, the limitations of analyzing faculty and staff diversity using UHRS data are twofold: First, the data aggregate URM and international faculty. This practice is problematic because URM and international faculty have significantly different experiences from one another (Howe, 2008; Thompson, 2008). BSU gathers discrete data about URM and international students; therefore, we should gather parallel data about faculty. Because demographic data about URM faculty are not currently available to the public, we cannot evaluate the extent to which URM faculty are actually underrepresented at BSU. Second, the data include Burris and Indiana Academy instructors in the BSU contract faculty population. This practice is problematic for obvious reasons: Given that we do not include Burris and Indiana Academy students in the BSU student population, we should not include their teachers in
our contract faculty population. To do so is to overestimate the extent of diversity in BSU’s contract faculty population.

We can gain a more accurate estimate of diversity in the BSU contract faculty population by examining Fact Book data. Although Fact Book data do not include faculty who serve in administrative/professional positions, they provide a more realistic assessment of diversity in BSU’s faculty because they exclude Burris and Indiana Academy teachers. (See Table 2.) According to 2012-2013 Fact Book data, only 12 of 182 (6.6%) of BSU contract faculty are URM or international faculty. In some colleges, at certain ranks there are no URM or international faculty: Miller College of Business (MCOB), the College of Communication, Information, and Media (CCIM), and Teachers College (TC) do not presently employ any URM or international contract faculty. The College of Fine Arts (CFA) does not currently employ any URM or international assistant professors. The College of Applied Sciences and Technology (CAST) and CCIM do not presently employ any URM or international faculty at the rank of full professor.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>URM/International Faculty by Rank</th>
<th>CAST</th>
<th>CAP</th>
<th>MCOB</th>
<th>CCIM</th>
<th>CFA</th>
<th>CSH</th>
<th>TC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>0/10 (0%)</td>
<td>3/21 (14.3%)</td>
<td>9/29 (31%)</td>
<td>0/13 (0%)</td>
<td>2/21 (9.5%)</td>
<td>13/97 (13.4%)</td>
<td>3/27 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>1/23 (4.3%)</td>
<td>3/17 (17.6%)</td>
<td>6/23 (26.1%)</td>
<td>2/13 (15.4%)</td>
<td>3/42 (7.1%)</td>
<td>16/94 (17%)</td>
<td>4/28 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>9/38 (23.7%)</td>
<td>1/11 (9.1%)</td>
<td>5/22 (22.7%)</td>
<td>3/17 (17.6%)</td>
<td>0/41 (0%)</td>
<td>28/134 (20.9%)</td>
<td>4/40 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>2/51 (3.9%)</td>
<td>2/7 (28.6%)</td>
<td>0/10 (0%)</td>
<td>0/29 (0%)</td>
<td>1/6 (16.7%)</td>
<td>5/46 (10.9%)</td>
<td>0/17 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tracking data on female faculty.

Based on Fact Book data, the percentage of instructional faculty who were female was 45.1% in 2011-12 with a very slight increase in 2012-13 to 45.2%. (See Table 3.) Over the past five years, we have seen an increase in females in associate professor and instructor ranks; however, we have seen decreases in the number of female full professors and assistant professors. The distribution of female faculty by rank for the last five years follows:
Table 3
Female Faculty by Rank 2008-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female Faculty by Rank</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 4 demonstrates, over the past five years, the majority of faculty members in both CAST and TC have been women. It is interesting to note, however, that even in colleges where women constitute the majority group, females are underrepresented at the rank of full professor: 40% in CAST; 44.4% in TC. (See Table 5.) The largest discrepancy between the percentage of women who are full professors and the percent of female faculty in the college exists in CCIM (−41.7%). Moderate discrepancies exist in CAST (−27.2%), TC (−24.4%), CAP (−23.8%), and the College of Sciences and Humanities (CSH) (−19.8%). The discrepancy is less pronounced in MCOB (−8.7%); however, there is only one college (CFA) in which the percentage of women who are full professors approximates the percentage of female faculty overall. As Table 5 illustrates, in most colleges where women are the non-dominant group, they are practically nonexistent at the full professor level: The College of Architecture and Planning (CAP) (4.8%), MCOB (10.3%), and CCIM (0%).
### Table 4
Female Faculty by College 2008-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female Faculty by College</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAST</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCOB</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCIM</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSH</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5
Female Faculty by Rank and by College 2012-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female Faculty by Rank</th>
<th>CAST</th>
<th>CAP</th>
<th>MCOB</th>
<th>CCIM</th>
<th>CFA</th>
<th>CSH</th>
<th>TC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>4/10 (40.0%)</td>
<td>1/21 (4.8%)</td>
<td>3/29 (10.3%)</td>
<td>0/13 (0%)</td>
<td>8/21 (38.1%)</td>
<td>20/97 (20.6%)</td>
<td>12/27 (44.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>11/23 (47.8%)</td>
<td>7/17 (41.2%)</td>
<td>7/23 (30.4%)</td>
<td>8/13 (61.5%)</td>
<td>15/42 (35.7%)</td>
<td>43/94 (45.7%)</td>
<td>22/28 (78.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>24/38 (63.2%)</td>
<td>2/11 (18.2%)</td>
<td>5/22 (22.7%)</td>
<td>11/17 (64.7%)</td>
<td>15/41 (36.6%)</td>
<td>59/134 (44.0%)</td>
<td>28/40 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>43/51 (84.3%)</td>
<td>6/7 (85.7%)</td>
<td>1/10 (10.0%)</td>
<td>11/29 (37.9%)</td>
<td>2/6 (33.3%)</td>
<td>28/46 (60.9%)</td>
<td>15/17 (88.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The committee recognizes that, over the past year, the university has developed a number of initiatives to address the underrepresentation of minority faculty members and the lack of female full professors. For example, CCIM’s “PhD Pathways” program was established in 2012-2013 by the Dean of CCIM. PhD Pathways is a mentoring program that matches undergraduate and graduate students from underrepresented backgrounds with faculty, professional staff, community professionals, and distinguished alumni associated with BSU. By meeting with a mentor on a consistent basis, interacting with other protégés, and participating in a set of university-sponsored events, PhD Pathways helps protégés gain knowledge and establish networks beyond the scope of BSU in order to build crucial relationships for establishing a successful career. The ultimate goal of the program is to encourage former URM students to apply to BSU as job candidates after they have earned their professional degrees.

Second, the university has recently formed a partnership with the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB). In 1993, the SREB established the SREB-State Doctoral Scholars Program to address the lack of minority students seeking PhDs and the lack of effective hiring policies and practices on predominantly White campuses. The SREB program has, until recently, been limited to a few southern states, but is currently expanding nationally. Up to this point, IUPUI has been the only school involved in the state of Indiana. Provost King and Associate Provost and Dean of the Graduate School, Dr. Robert Morris, have agreed for Ball State to become a participating member of SREB, starting in the fall of 2013: Currently, the university has identified four minority doctoral students to be our initial participants.

**Recommendations.** Our recommendations related to faculty employment policies and programs pertaining to diversity follow. Please note that recommendations 1-3 are consistent with recommendations made in the 2011-2012 UDC Annual Report.

First, the committee recommends that UHRS gather discrete demographic data about URM and international faculty, so that the university can track its progress in recruiting and retaining members of both groups. We recommend that these data be used as metrics for assessing Goal 1, Objective 7 of the 2012-2017 Strategic Plan.

Second, in colleges where no URM or international faculty members are employed at the contract faculty level (i.e., MCOB, CCIM, and TC), we recommend that search committees and unit heads follow the Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action policy for all contract and emergency hires. In addition, we recommend that search committees and unit heads follow the practices for recruiting a diverse faculty described in the 2008 CSH Task Force on Diversity’s “Guide to Recruiting and Retaining a More Diverse Faculty.” We recommend that the university create online training modules to educate search committees and unit heads on appropriate employment policies and recruitment practices. College deans should be responsible for overseeing those searches to ensure that Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action policies and diversity-friendly practices are incorporated in the recruitment and selection processes. Non-diverse candidate pools should not be permitted to proceed unless the unit head or search committee can demonstrate that it has made significant efforts to attract a broad pool of candidates.
Third, in colleges where there are no URM faculty members at the rank of full professor (i.e., CAST and CCIM) and/or female full professors are nonexistent or dramatically underrepresented (i.e., CAP, CCIM, MCOB), we recommend that the university give priority to qualified special assigned leave applicants who are female or URM associate professors. Alternatively, the university could establish a competitive grant program that would provide URM and female associate professors in the aforementioned colleges with an opportunity to apply for an additional course reduction/research release. These types of programs would be relatively inexpensive and would provide qualified applicants with additional support to enhance their research productivity as they seek promotion to full professor.

Fourth, we recommend that the university adopt a “Grow Our Own URM Faculty and Staff” program through initiatives such as CCIM’s “PhD Pathways” program. We commend CCIM on establishing this program and recommend that it be adopted by other colleges, particularly those in which minority faculty members are underrepresented.

Finally, we commend the university on joining the SREB. We recommend that the university continue to recruit potential candidates, hopefully increasing the number of participants in 2013-2014.

Task 2: Review faculty and administration personnel complaints concerning diversity issues.

The UDC is charged with reviewing faculty and administration personnel complaints concerning diversity issues and making appropriate recommendations. Past UDCs have requested, obtained, and compared annual reports from the Office of University Compliance (OUC), as complaints regarding discrimination and harassment based on categories addressed by state and federal statute are directed to the OUC. This year’s report also reviews relevant portions of a university-wide employee survey administered in the fall of 2012.

According to an academic-year-end report from the OUC, fifteen complaints were made by eight persons (complainants) in 2012-2013. Eleven complaints were filed by five internal persons; three persons external to the institution filed four complaints.

Three of the eight total complainants cited multiple bases (bias categories) in their complaints. Race was cited four times as the basis for the complaint. Gender (not in the form of sexual harassment) and disability were each cited three times. “Harassment or a hostile work environment, or other basis not defined by state or federal law” and retaliation were each cited twice. Sexual harassment was cited once (see Table 6).

The 15 complaints filed in 2012-2013 is a small increase from the 14 filed in 2011-2012. The number of complaints filed each year in the OUC has been fairly stable (between 11-15) during the past five academic years, with the exception of the 2009-2010 academic year (see Figure 1). In that year, 11 persons filed 35 complaints.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bias Category</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (not in the form of sexual harassment)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment or Hostile Work Environment (or other basis not defined by state or federal law)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Origin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A single complaint may cite multiple bias categories. In 2012-2013, for example, three complaints cited two categories.*
A single person may file multiple complaints. For example, in 2009-2010, 11 persons filed a total of 35 complaints.
In the past five academic years, disability (22 times) and gender (22 times) have been the most frequently cited bases for complaints. During the same period, the least frequently occurring complaint bases have been sexual harassment (three times), national origin (three times), and religion (once).

The 2011-2012 diversity report commended the university and the OUC for the reduced number of complaints concerning diversity. The continued low number of complaints since 2009-2010 remains encouraging. However, the number of complaints received and investigated by the OUC may not accurately reflect concerns among university employees about discrimination or harassment.

The committee reviewed the Workplace Environment Survey (WES) administered in the fall of 2012 (reviewed in more detail under Task 3) in light of the Task 2 charge. During the past recent three years, most employees (80%) had not experienced conduct by others that interfered with their work. Ninety percent (90%) of employees had not considered leaving Ball State due to the institutional climate for diversity. Of the twenty percent (20%) of employees who had experienced negative behavior that affected their work, it appears that less than half of those experienced negative behavior related to diversity or categories of bias addressed by state or federal statute (e.g., race, age, sex, ethnicity, national origin, etc.).

Unfortunately, a number of persons who experienced negative behavior did not report it. Thirty-one percent indicated that they did not report as they feared retaliation while 19% did not report for fear that their complaint would not be taken seriously. Twelve percent did not know where to make a report or seek help. The WES results do not allow us to determine how many of those not reporting experienced negative behavior related to diversity versus other issues. However, as some of the negative behavior reported by a fifth of the respondents to the survey was related to diversity, the committee considers it prudent to assume that some of the reported concerns about retaliation or not being taken seriously are attached to diversity-related complaints and makes recommendations accordingly.

**Recommendations.**

1. Ensure that employees are made aware at new employee orientation and annually via an effective communication channel (e.g., performance evaluation process) where complaints of various types can be filed. While the OUC handles many diversity-related complaints (see Table 6 and Figure 1 for categories), most of the concerns expressed in the WES had some other basis and should be reported elsewhere.

2. Ensure that employees are made aware at new employee orientation and annually via an effective communication channel that retaliation for making complaints will not be tolerated by the university.

3. Ensure that all supervisors are regularly informed (e.g., as part of their annual performance review) of their responsibilities and consequences regarding retaliation for complaints.

---

1 This could range between 20-45% as respondents could and did list multiple categories. The category chosen most frequently was “other.”
4. Utilize the WES results as a benchmark and establish measurable, attainable goals for the following at its next administration:

a. fewer concerns about retaliation;

b. fewer concerns about complaints not being taken seriously;

c. fewer reports of not knowing where to file a complaint or seek help.

Task 3: Make recommendations to promote and maintain cultural diversity among faculty members.

The Workplace Environment Survey (WES) was developed and administered by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) in Fall 2012. Seventy-three percent of full-time faculty and staff members (66.5% of faculty members and academic administrators and 75.8% of staff members) responded. Females, racial/ethnic minorities, staff members, and employees in the less-than-age-52 group were slightly overrepresented among the respondents. In addition to job satisfaction items, the survey asked respondents about the extent to which they had personally experienced work-related intimidating or hostile conduct that interfered with their ability to do their jobs and also about their perceptions of the workplace climate, both for the university overall and in their departments.

The UDC subcommittee that was charged with reviewing the survey results and making recommendations in response reviewed the quantitative survey results made available to the entire university community and also asked the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to do some additional analyses with the non-public open-ended diversity-related responses, while maintaining anonymity of the respondents.

Summary of Key Quantitative Findings.

• Twenty-six percent of faculty members and eighteen percent of staff members indicated that within the past three years they had personally experienced work-related intimidating or hostile conduct that interfered with their ability to do their jobs.
  o The percentage of faculty members in the College of Architecture and Planning who indicated they had personally experienced work-related intimidating or hostile conduct (45%) was substantially higher than overall across colleges (26%). The three most frequently cited reasons for hostile conduct in CAP were job role (58%), biological sex (42%), and race (25%). CAP also has a lower percentage of female faculty members (29%) than the university average (45%).

---

This difference was not statistically significant, although it may still be considered an important finding. In some cases, significance may have been suppressed by very small group sizes.
• Twelve percent of faculty members and nine percent of staff members indicated that they had seriously considered leaving Ball State because of the institutional climate for diversity; the largest portions of faculty (38% of those who said they had considered leaving) and staff (43% of those who considered leaving) members indicated that they considered leaving in 2011-12 (the most recent year indicated).
  o The percentage of associate professors who indicated they have considered leaving (17%) was higher than for any other employee category.  
  o The percentage of respondents who identified their sexual orientation as other than heterosexual who indicated they have considered leaving (24%) was substantially higher than for respondents who indicated their sexual orientation was heterosexual (8%).
  o The percentage of respondents who identified their race/ethnicity as other than White who indicated they have considered leaving (23%) was substantially higher than for respondents who indicated their race/ethnicity was White (8%).
  o The percentage of respondents who indicated that they have an apparent medical condition that impacts their work activities who indicated they have considered leaving (22%) was substantially higher than for respondents who indicated that have a non-apparent medical condition (11%) and for respondents who indicated they have no such condition (9%).

• Among the respondents who indicated they experienced intimidating or hostile conduct, the largest portion said such conduct was based upon “other reasons” (which most frequently included a difficult situation with a supervisor or another employee or unspecified bullying), their job role (i.e., being a faculty member, staff member, or administrator), biological sex, and age. It is important to note that the most frequent “other reasons” did not necessarily relate to issues of diversity and inclusion.
  o The percentage of respondents who identified themselves as administrators were more were more likely (92%) to indicate such conduct was based upon their job role was much higher than for other groups.
  o Women were more likely than men to indicate that such conduct was based upon their biological sex (31% women vs. 12% men), while men were more likely to indicate that such conduct was based upon the respondent’s political views (12% men vs. 4% women).
  o Respondents who identified their sexual orientation as other than heterosexual were more likely (22%) to indicate that they believed such conduct was based upon sexual orientation than were respondents who identified their sexual orientation as heterosexual (1%). Those who identified their sexual orientation as other than heterosexual were also more likely than those who identified their sexual orientation as heterosexual to believe the conduct was based upon their medical condition (22% vs. 6%) and their biological sex (39% vs. 23%).
  o Respondents who indicated that their race was other than White were more likely (55%) to indicate that such conduct was based upon race than were respondents who identified their race as White (2%). Those who identified their race as other than White were also more likely than those who identified their race as White to indicate that such conduct was based upon their ethnicity (31% vs. 3%).
Respondents who reported their age as 25-32 were more likely (43%) than older respondents to indicate such conduct was based upon age (25% for age 33-42, 9% for age 43-51, 20% for age 52-60, 29% for older than 60). Younger respondents were also more likely to attribute such conduct to their educational level (24% vs. 12% overall). Respondents of age 61 or older were also more likely than those of other age groups to feel that such conduct was based upon their political views (14% vs. 7% overall).

Younger respondents were also more likely to attribute such conduct to their educational level (24% vs. 12% overall). Respondents of age 61 or older were also more likely than those of other age groups to feel that such conduct was based upon their political views (11% vs. 6%).

Respondents who indicated that they were in an active military status or who were veterans were more likely (22%) than those with no military status (0%) to indicate that such conduct was based upon their military/veteran status. Those in an active military status or who were veterans were more likely than those with no military status to indicate that they believed such conduct was based upon their educational level (22% vs. 12%), political views (11% vs. 6%), religious/spiritual views (11% vs. 4%), and their socioeconomic status (11% vs. 5%).

Respondents who indicated that they have an apparent medical condition were more likely (40%) to indicate that such conduct was based upon their medical condition than were respondents who indicated that they have a non-apparent medical condition (16%) or that they had no such condition (2%). They were also more likely to indicate that such conduct was based upon their physical characteristics (20% vs. 9% for those with a non-apparent medical condition and 6% with no such condition) and upon their political views (20% vs. 8% for those with a non-apparent medical condition and 4% with no such condition).

Respondents who indicated that they were not U.S. citizens were more likely (17%) to indicate that such conduct was based upon their immigrant status than were those who indicated that they are U.S. citizens (0%). They were also more likely to indicate that such conduct was based upon their country of origin (33% vs. 1%), their English language proficiency/accent (50% vs. 1%), their ethnicity (50% vs. 5%), their race (33% vs. 7%), and their religious/spiritual views (17% vs. 4%).

- Among those who experienced such conduct, the largest portions said they were the target of derogatory remarks or that they experienced the conduct in some other ways (which most often included verbal or written abuse, inappropriate behavior, or bullying).
- Among those who experienced such conduct, the largest portions said the conduct took place in a campus office, in a meeting, or in other locations (which most often included other workplaces).
- Among those who experienced such conduct, the largest portions said the conduct was carried out by a coworker or supervisor.
- Among those who experienced such conduct, the largest portions said their responses were avoiding the person who engaged in the conduct, not reporting the conduct for fear of retaliation, telling a friend, confronting the person at the time, seeking support from a faculty or staff member, not reporting the conduct for fear that the complaint would not be taken seriously, and other reasons (which most often included a discussion with one’s supervisor).
• Seventy-eight percent of faculty respondents said they had incorporated diversity-related material in their classes; 32% said they conducted diversity-related research; and 49% indicated engaging in diversity-related service.
  o Seventy percent of respondents who identified their race/ethnicity as other than White indicated that they engaged in diversity-related service, but only 46% of respondents who identified themselves as White did so.
• Respondents were asked to rate the institutional climate for diversity, once for their department or work unit and once for the overall university. In both cases, the majority of faculty and staff members felt the climate was positive in all categories.
  o The percentage of respondents who identified themselves as other than White who felt that the departmental climate for people of color was negative or very negative was 15%; this compares to 2% for respondents who identified themselves as White. Responses concerning the university climate for people of color were much more similar between the groups.
  o The percentage of respondents who identified themselves as women who felt that the departmental climate for women was negative or very negative was 9%; this compares to 4% for respondents who identified themselves as men. The percentage of respondents who identified themselves as women who felt that the university climate for women was negative or very negative was 7%; this compares to 3% for respondents who identified themselves as men.
  o There were several departmental climate items for which faculty respondents from the College of Architecture and Planning (CAP) gave substantially more negative responses than the university average.
    o 30% of CAP faculty respondents gave a response of negative or very negative to the “friendly vs. hostile” item, as compared with 9% of all faculty members across colleges
    o 47% of CAP faculty respondents gave a response of negative or very negative to the “improving vs. regressing” item, as compared with 13% of all faculty members across colleges
    o 10% of CAP faculty respondents gave a response of negative or very negative to the item about the climate being positive vs. negative for people of color, as compared with 4% of all faculty members across colleges
    o 37% of CAP faculty respondents gave a response of negative or very negative to the item about the climate being positive vs. negative for women, as compared with 9% of all faculty members across colleges
    o 20% of CAP faculty respondents gave a response of negative or very negative to the item about the climate being positive vs. negative for non-native English speakers, as compared with 6% of all faculty members across colleges
    o 17% of CAP faculty respondents gave a response of negative or very negative to the item about the climate being positive vs. negative for people who are not U.S. citizens, as compared with 6% of all faculty members across colleges
30% of CAP faculty respondents gave a response of negative or very negative to the “respectful vs. disrespectful” item, as compared with 7% of all faculty members across colleges.

The college that tended to have the most positive findings concerning the departmental climate was the College of Communication, Information, and Media (CCIM).

3% of CCIM faculty respondents gave a response of negative or very negative to the “friendly vs. hostile” item, as compared with 9% of all faculty members across colleges.

6% of CCIM faculty respondents gave a response of negative or very negative to the “improving vs. regressing” item, as compared with 13% of all faculty members across colleges.

0% of CCIM faculty respondents gave a response of negative or very negative to the item about the climate being positive vs. negative for people of color, as compared with 4% of all faculty members across colleges.

0% of CCIM faculty respondents gave a response of negative or very negative to the item about the climate being positive vs. negative for women, as compared with 9% of all faculty members across colleges.

3% of CCIM faculty respondents gave a response of negative or very negative to the item about the climate being positive vs. negative for non-native English speakers, as compared with 6% of all faculty members across colleges.

0% of CCIM faculty respondents gave a response of negative or very negative to the item about the climate being positive vs. negative for people who are not U.S. citizens, as compared with 6% of all faculty members across colleges.

3% of CCIM faculty respondents gave a response of negative or very negative to the “respectful vs. disrespectful” item, as compared with 7% of all faculty members across colleges.

There were several university climate items for which faculty respondents from the College of Architecture and Planning (CAP) gave substantially more negative responses than the university average.

14% of CAP faculty respondents gave a response of negative or very negative to the item about the climate being positive vs. negative for people of color, as compared with 7% of all faculty members across colleges.

31% of CAP faculty respondents gave a response of negative or very negative to the item about the climate being positive vs. negative for women, as compared with 9% of all faculty members across colleges.

22% of CAP faculty respondents gave a response of negative or very negative to the item about the climate being positive vs. negative for non-native English speakers, as compared with 8% of all faculty members across colleges.
19% of CAP faculty respondents gave a response of negative or very negative to the item about the climate being positive vs. negative for people who are not U.S. citizens, as compared with 7% of all faculty members across colleges.

The college that tended to have the most positive findings concerning the University climate was the College of Communication, Information, and Media (CCIM). 0% of CCIM faculty respondents gave a response of negative or very negative to the "friendly vs. hostile" item, as compared with 4% of all faculty members across colleges.

6% of CCIM faculty respondents gave a response of negative or very negative to the "improving vs. regressing" item, as compared with 10% of all faculty members across colleges.

0% of CCIM faculty respondents gave a response of negative or very negative to the item about the climate being positive vs. negative for women, as compared with 9% of all faculty members across colleges.

Although the WES results revealed numerous between-groups differences, we do not know why these differences exist. Therefore, we recommend conducting additional research (as described in the recommendations below) to better understand employees’ perceptions.

Summary of Open-ended Responses.

Nine respondents gave responses to the survey prompt stating “If you would like to elaborate on your personal experiences, please do so here” that were categorized as concerning discrimination. Among these nine respondents:

Three indicated that they believed the behavior they experienced was based upon their age, one indicated it was based upon his or her educational level, one indicated it was based upon his or her ethnicity, four indicated it was based upon their biological sex, one indicated it was based upon his or her medical condition, two indicated it was based upon their job roles, one indicated it was based upon his or her socioeconomic status, and two indicated it was based upon other reasons that they supplied (these included “my ethical stance” and being a Ball State University alumnus); respondents had the option to indicate multiple reasons for the conduct.

One indicated that he or she experienced this conduct by observing others staring at him or her, one indicated that he or she received derogatory written comments, two indicated that they were singled out as the token resident authorities due to their identity, one indicated that he or she was the target of derogatory remarks, and eight indicated another reason that they supplied (these included issues being handled differently do to the respondent’s race; bullying and treatment from supervisor; being ignored; being described as being the wrong gender in a job search; being threatened with a demotion; multiple derogatory comments based upon employee group, gender, and age; being the target of gossip, relational aggression, and being denied promotion; and the situation being student-related); respondents had the option to indicate multiple ways in which they experienced the conduct.
Ten indicated that the source of the conduct was an administrator, department head, or supervisor, one indicated that it was a co-worker, two indicated that it was a faculty member (the respondents were staff members), two indicated that it was a staff member (one respondent was a faculty member and one was a staff member), and one indicated that it was a student, and one gave a response of “other,” which he or she identified as an administrator who serves as the respondent’s supervisor. Respondents had the option to indicate multiple ways in which they experienced the conduct.

Three indicated that their reaction to experiencing this conduct were was to confront the person at the time, one indicated that he or she confronted the person later, three indicated that they avoided the person, five indicated that they told a friend, two indicated that they sought support from a counselor, three indicated that they sought support from a faculty member, one indicated that he or she sought support from a staff member, two indicated that they did not know who to contact for help, three indicated that they did not report the conduct for fear of retaliation, three indicated that they did not report the conduct for fear that their complaint would not be taken seriously, three indicated that they did report the conduct but feared that their complaints would not be taken seriously, and three reported other reasons that they supplied, which included contacting an attorney and trying to report the conduct but being told that they were ineligible to do so.

**Recommendations.**

1. Create and disseminate a statement, endorsed by the Trustees and President’s Cabinet, about the importance and educational value of a diverse and inclusive campus climate.
2. Review all communications, including the university web site, for use of inclusive language.
3. Establish specific expectations for middle managers, directors, and department chairs related to supervision, mentoring, communication, harassment and discrimination, and other human development responsibilities for position performance reviews.
4. Provide professional development opportunities concerning diversity and inclusion for new faculty and staff members at orientation events.
5. Carry out interviews and/or focus groups to more fully understand the experiences of faculty and staff members who are members of the following groups: those who identify their race as other than White; those in the 25-32 age group; those who are not U.S. citizens; those with apparent or non-apparent medical conditions; those of non-heterosexual sexual orientations; veterans or those in an active military status; associate professors; academic administrators; and faculty members in CAP.

**Task 4: Make recommendations to promote recruitment and retention of minority students.**

**Enrollment by Race.**
According to Fact Book data, the percentage of ethnic minority students (undergraduate and graduate) has remained relatively stable over the past couple of years. We have seen a slight decline from 11.5% in 2010-2011 to 11.0% in 2011-2012 and 11.1% in 2012-13. More detailed information about student enrollment by race may be found in Appendix A.

Over the past two years, the percent of undergraduate minority enrollment has decreased from 2010-2011 (12.6%) to 2011-2012 (12.2%) to 2012-2013 (11.9%), with the number of students decreasing respectively from 2,282 to 2,142 to 1,987. In the past year, in particular, the number of Native American students has decreased substantially (45%), followed by a 32% decrease in Biracial students.

In the same two-year period, graduate enrollment of ethnic minorities increased from 248 students in 2010-2011 to 304 students in 2011-2012 to 358 students in 2012-2013, which is a substantial increase in percentage of graduate enrollment (6.3 to 6.7% to 8.1%).

**Recruitment Efforts for Minority Students.**

The Office of Admissions has an aggressive plan to recruit students from diverse backgrounds. Each Admissions staff member is equipped with publications specifically marketed for high school prospects. Each staff member is assigned a territory with a focus on selected high schools and college fairs scheduled throughout the year. In order to continue to strengthen diversity recruitment and yield programs, the Office of Admissions has placed an emphasis on visiting more schools with 50% or greater minority student enrollment and participating in more college fairs or venues that promote the attendance of underrepresented students. The Office of Admissions will also continue to build a deeper level of commitment with the Center for Leadership Development in Indianapolis and Project Leadership.

The Graduate School continued to attend graduate school fairs and provide sessions targeted at URM students. The recruiting efforts for 2011-12 follow:

- The Graduate School Recruiter worked with IUPUI to promote graduate education state-wide to include underrepresented minority populations (i.e., shared marketing for our upcoming graduate school fairs and informational events).
- Graduate Dean Dr. Robert Morris has agreed to fund as many McNair Scholars who enroll at BSU as the budget permits. The Graduate School has provided the McNair Scholar Database to all graduate program advisors to use in recruiting. The Graduate School has utilized McNair Scholar Database in promotion of graduate recruiting events such as “What Can Graduate School Do For You?”
- The Graduate School Recruiter presented “Benefits of Graduate Study” at Western Michigan University (Approximately 20 TRIO students).
- The Graduate School Recruiter attended graduate school fairs at Knox College and Monmouth (student population of approximately 25% underrepresented minority populations).
- The Graduate School worked with the College of Communication and Media (CCIM) to create a strategic recruiting plan for the CCIM Diversity Initiative.
The Multicultural Center staff, along with the Office of Admissions staff attended the Minority Student Reception in Indianapolis during fall and spring semesters. The purpose of the event was to speak with prospective URM students and their families about Ball State University. The staff also participated in Explore Ball State, Preview Days, and Admitted Student Days hosted by the Office of Admissions.

The Office of Disabled Student Development (DSD) staff members spoke at several workshops, conferences, and transition fairs in Indiana describing the transition to college for students with disabilities and highlighting Ball State’s services and programs for students with disabilities. DSD provides sponsorship for the Power Soccer team, the first university-sponsored Power Soccer team (soccer for power wheelchair users). Now in its sixth year, this team has continued to be an attraction for prospective students who are wheelchair users.

A complete list of 2011-12 minority student recruiting activities may be found in Appendix B.

**Freshman to Sophomore Retention Data by Race.**

Retention of freshmen in the 2011 cohort increased for Native American, Asian, Bi-Racial, Black, Hispanic, and Caucasian students from the 2010 cohort. Retention of Asian students rose by 2.5% to 84.38%. The Hispanic student retention numbers decreased from 76.52% to 70.34%. Please note that the Native American cohort increased by 4 more students; however, because the enrollment numbers are extremely low, the retention rate decreases considerably when a student does not return for year 2. For more detailed information about minority student retention, please see Appendix C.

Since the fall of 2010, the retention rate for students with disabilities has remained at 80%. Seventy-two percent of the 74 matriculating freshmen who disclosed a disability to DSD by the official statistics day for the fall 2011 semester were retained for the fall 2012 semester.

**Retention Activities for Minority Students.**

The DSD, the Multicultural Center, and several Multicultural Student Organizations sponsored numerous events, programs, and services for minority students during the 2011-2012 academic year. A total of 6,740 students, faculty, and staff attended programs sponsored by the Multicultural Center, while 637 students with disabilities used DSD services.

Ball State University has many diverse student organizations, some of which are advised by the Office of Student Life. These organizations are the Latino Student Union (LSU), Black Student Association (BSA), Asian American Student Association (AASA), and Spectrum. These organizations sponsor and develop cultural, educational, and social programming for their members and Ball State students. Multicultural organizations celebrate diversity along with promoting cultural awareness for the entire university. Any Ball State student can join a multicultural organization, regardless of race or ethnicity. These organizations hosted 74 programs with 4,155 students in attendance during 2011-12. Overall, the program attendance for these programs has not been consistent: the 2008-09 shows the largest overall attendance of 6,909. The reason for the decrease in attendance for 2009-2011 is the low attendance at LSU, BSA, AASA, and Spectrum’s signature programs. For complete details, see Appendix D.
Withdrawal Data by Race.

An analysis of seven semesters of student withdrawal data (F-09-S10, F10-S11, F11-S12, and F12) suggests that minority student withdrawals remain relatively consistent, with Fall 2012 having the lowest withdrawal count since Spring 2010, comprising 17% of all withdrawals over the period (low of 14.5% in Fall 2009, high of 22% in Spring 2012). The analysis of the reasons for minority student withdrawals indicates that they withdraw from classes for similar reasons as all other students, with medical and financial being the two most common reasons.

Over the same period of time, the percentage of minority students who withdrew from Ball State for the reason “dissatisfied” was low (averaging 8% for Fall 2012). This percentage is slightly higher than the overall percentage of 5% for all withdrawing students. Minority student withdrawals for the reason “dissatisfied” ranged from 2%-9% from Fall 2009 through Fall 2012, while the percentage of all withdrawing students reported “dissatisfied” as the reason for withdrawal ranged from 3-9%. For more detailed information about minority student withdrawal, please see Appendix E.

Recommendations.

Office of Admissions (Undergraduate Admissions)

2. Continue to offer programs for students from diverse backgrounds in key areas.
3. Continue to strengthen the Summer Scholars Program and increase the awareness/visibility in key in- and out-of-state markets.
4. Continue to build relationships in targeted high schools with strong diverse and academically prepared populations.

Graduate School

1. The Graduate School and departments with graduate programs can hold virtual information sessions targeted to under-represented minority students.
2. The Graduate School Recruiter should continue to work with Colleges and Departments to determine strategies to reach under-represented minority (URM) students.
3. The Graduate School should continue to award assistantships to all qualified McNair Scholars.

Multicultural Center

1. Continue to assist the Office of Admissions with campus visits and attend selected off-campus events for recruiting URM students.
2. Continue to increase the participation of URM students in the Excel Mentor Program.
3. Continue to provide support in advising and assisting multicultural student organizations.
4. Continue to look for ways to enhance multicultural programming university wide.

**Disabled Student Development**

1. Continue successful current practices, such as the Faculty Mentorship Program, that foster a high retention rate of students with disabilities.
2. Continue to participate in Admissions programs to raise awareness for prospective students about services for students with disabilities on campus. Also continue to reach out to the K-12 community to discuss the transition to college for students with disabilities.

**Provost’s Task: Recommend Family Friendly Policies.**

The Provost’s Task subcommittee examined family-friendly policies, programs, and practices at Ball State University and other universities. The subcommittee conducted six informal interviews with staff members in UHRS, Housing/Resident Life, Student Affairs, and Academic Affairs. In addition, we interviewed faculty and staff at other universities and gathered archival data about family-friendly policies at those institutions. Links to those other universities are provided in Appendix F. We also obtained a copy of a report from the CSH Task Force on the Status of Women, which has created recommendations for a new Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) policy, currently under review by Business Affairs. This report is included in Appendix G. Our preliminary research resulted in the following recommendations:

**Recommendations.**

1. In the information provided on the Ball State FMLA page, there is no mention of fathers or paternity (although it could be inferred on the first FMLA page). It would be helpful for fathers/partners to be recognized explicitly, at least on the Child Care web pages.
2. UHRS keeps statistics on who uses FMLA time, but doesn’t categorize them (such as maternity/paternity, illness, adoption, elder care, etc.). It would be helpful if the committee knew how many employees were utilizing FMLA for family needs (specifically maternity/paternity, child care, or elder care). The committee could then see how many employees are utilizing these policies. This would be especially helpful in regards to elder care, as none of the employees whom we interviewed had FMLA experience related to that topic.
3. UHRS asks for feedback during the FMLA process and also solicited feedback from the Campus Wide Benefits Survey. The results have not been released yet. The committee suggests analyzing the feedback to see what other recommendations should be made.
4. According to UHRS, information regarding FMLA is also provided through their website, employee handbooks, posters, annual training for supervisors and employees, and an online training module that was updated two months ago. Supervisors do indeed hear about these trainings, but other employees may not. The consensus from our interviewees was that the website was where they went for information about FMLA. That being said, an update to the website is needed. Recommendations for local childcare facilities could easily be added. The website currently links to the in.gov childcare search, but a list would be more helpful.
5. According to our interviewees who have utilized FMLA time, the process is difficult to navigate. Some felt that UHRS staff were not helpful or clear enough when answering their questions. Others had difficulty with filing paperwork before and after the birth of the child (colic, sleeplessness, not able to travel to campus, etc.). One person said, “It should have been simple: Visit UHRS, get a packet, get counseling on the financials/file your days in advance, have it signed/returned by the doctor, then you’re done.” The committee recommends providing a FAQ section specifically for FMLA related to paternity/maternity & child care. The FAQ could be informed by feedback that UHRS receives, as well as our recommendations.

6. The university does not have a policy for providing temp staff or contract faculty while an employee is on family or medical leave. In many cases, coworkers are expected to cover the person’s job or courses while he or she is on leave. This informal process sometimes causes unpleasant work environments and stress for co-workers, as well as employees who need FMLA time. If a temp is allocated to a department/office, the employee needing that temp is often asked to find and train that person. That again can add undue stress to the employee who needs FMLA time. It should be the university who has the plan, not the employee. The committee recommends having a temp pool for employees on leave and budgeting it in as the cost of doing business so coworkers are not assigned additional duties without extra pay. Faculty who take on additional teaching to cover for a colleague should be given a stipend if they agree to cover a significant number of classes for peers on family or medical leave.

7. Childcare can be especially hard to arrange. As mentioned above, UHRS does provide some helpful resources. Some employees use the Child Study Center (CSC) on campus, and others utilize off-campus facilities. Information for the CSC could be added to the Child Care Parent Information webpage. It should be noted that the CSC does not provide childcare during the first and last weeks of each semester, which creates a burden for those employees who utilize the center. The committee recommends that the CSC hold trainings for new staff before the beginning of each semester so that the center can be open when classes begin. It is unfair to expect parents of very young children or children with special needs to arrange temporary and additional childcare for those two weeks each semester. Private daycares may not be willing to take children in the short term and that kind of disruption to a child’s schedule can place additional stress and burdens on families.

8. Some employees mentioned that they would like to see a voucher program to the CSC or other sites to offset childcare costs. The committee recommends investigating the feasibility of a voucher program, similar to what other universities are doing (see Appendix F). The State of Indiana has a voucher program for impoverished families, but the information is difficult to navigate.

9. Spousal employment opportunities could be provided for new employees’ spouses. In cases where outstanding new faculty members are acquired, help in employing their spouses has been made available. This type of program would be beneficial to all incoming employees with unemployed spouses.