

University Diversity Committee

2011-2012 Annual Report

Ball State University

Muncie, Indiana

June 2012

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	3
Executive Summary	5
Task 1: Review and Recommend Faculty Employment Policies re: Diversity Issues	5
Task 2: Review Faculty and Administration Personnel Complaints re: Diversity Issues	6
Task 3: Make Recommendations to Promote and Maintain Cultural Diversity Among Faculty Members	6
Task 4: Make Recommendations to Promote Recruitment and Retention of Minority Students	7
Findings and Recommendations	8
Task 1: Review and Recommend Faculty Employment Policies re: Diversity Issues	8
Task 2: Review Faculty and Administration Personnel Complaints re: Diversity Issues	12
Task 3: Make Recommendations to Promote and Maintain Cultural Diversity Among Faculty Members	14
Task 4: Make Recommendations to Promote Recruitment and Retention of Minority Students	16
Appendices	21
Appendix A: Female Associate and Full Professor Survey	22
Appendix B: Enrollment by Race	33
Appendix C: Office of Admissions (Undergraduate Students) Recruitment Strategies	34
Appendix D: Three-Year Retention Rate Comparison by Cohort and Demographic Groups	37
Appendix E: Retention Rates by Demographic Groups	38
Appendix F: Retention Activities	39
Appendix G: Minority Student Withdrawal Report	42
Appendix H: References	43

Introduction

This is the annual report of the Ball State University Diversity Committee based on its examination of data collected during the 2011-2012 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. Michele Chiuini, Architecture—Past Chair
2. John Emert, Honors College
3. Mike Gillilan, Student Affairs
4. Carolyn Kapinus, Graduate School
5. Hyun Sook Kim, Theater and Dance
6. Terry King, Provost (ex officio)—Jacquelyn Buckrop serves as Provost designee
7. Patricia Lovett, Multicultural Center
8. Marcy Meyer, Communication Studies—Assistant Chair
9. Chris Munchel, Office of Admissions
10. Charles Payne, Assistant Provost for Diversity (ex officio)
11. Rhonda Thomas, University Human Resource Services
12. Maria Williams-Hawkins, Telecommunications—Chair
13. 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 Diversity Committee formed four subcommittees to assemble and analyze the data and provide recommendations for each of the committee's assigned tasks.

1. Data Collection
Rhonda Thomas
2. Incorporation of Diversity in P&T Documents
Maria Williams-Hawkins
3. Climate Survey

Marcy Meyer
Charles Payne (chair)

4. Recruitment and Retention of Minority Students

John Emert
Mike Gillilan (chair)
Patricia Lovett
Chris Munchel

For the purpose of the final report, the data analyses were organized in four sections, corresponding to the four tasks assigned to the Committee.

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 2010-2011 to 2011-2012. However, these data are limited because: 1) they aggregate URM and international faculty; 2) they include Burris and Indiana Academy high school teachers in the BSU contract faculty population. According to 2011-2012 Fact Book data (which exclude Burris and Indiana Academy instructors), only 6 of 175 (3.43%) of BSU contract faculty are URM or international faculty. The College of Architecture and Planning (CAP), the College of Communication, Information, and Media (CCIM), and Teachers College (TC) do not currently employ any URM or international contract faculty. CAP and TC do not presently employ any URM or international assistant professors. CCIM does not currently employ any URM or international faculty at the rank of assistant or full professor.

According to 2011-2012 Fact Book data, the percentage of female faculty has continued to increase slightly from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012 in all ranks except for full professors, which have continued to decline. The majority of faculty members in both TC and the College of Applied Sciences and Technology (CAST) continue to be women; however, even in colleges where women constitute the majority group, females are underrepresented at the rank of full professor: 50% in CAST and 41% in TC. The largest discrepancies between the percentage of women who are full professors and the percentage of female faculty overall exist in CCIM (-38.9%), TC (-26.2%), CAP (-21.1%), and CSH (-20.5%). In colleges where women are the non-dominant group, they are practically nonexistent at the full professor level: CCIM (0%), CAP (4.8%), and Miller College of Business (MCOB) (10.7%).

Recommendations. *The committee recommends that Human Resources 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 3 of the 2012-2017 Strategic Plan. In colleges where no URM or international faculty members are employed at the contract faculty level (i.e., CAP, CCIM, and TC), we recommend that search committees and department chairpersons 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." 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.*

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 11 in 2010-2011 to 13 in 2011-2012. The complaints included all diversity issues except non-sexual harassment and religion. Overall, the data indicate a downward trend in complaints since 2009-2010, when 25 complaints were filed. In this three-year period, the largest increase in complaints was age-related; conversely, the largest decreases were in the areas of disability and race.

***Recommendations.** The committee commends the university and the OUC for making continued progress in this area.*

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

In Fall 2011, the assistant provost for diversity, in collaboration with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE), acquired a diversity climate survey developed by Rankin and Associates. In Spring 2012, the diversity climate subcommittee worked with the OIE to tailor the survey to BSU. The revised survey will be administered in Fall 2012, once it gains IRB approval, is piloted by university diversity committee members, and finalized.

One of the issues identified in the 2010-2011 UDC report and reinforced by 2011-2012 data is the underrepresentation of female full professors at BSU. The OIE, in collaboration with the Assistant Provost for Diversity and the CSH Task Force on the Status of Women, developed and administered a survey for female associate professors and full professors in Spring 2012. The goal of the survey was to assess the potential barriers females face in seeking promotion to full professor. An analysis of the data identified three potential barriers: stress caused by work-life conflict, being overburdened with service, and lack of mentoring.

***Recommendations.** The committee recommends that the university administer the revised Rankin survey in Fall 2012. The results should be used to make informed recommendations to enhance BSU's climate supporting diversity, particularly in colleges where no URM or international faculty are employed at the level of full professor (i.e., CCIM). Regarding the barriers females face in seeking promotion to full professor, the committee recommends the following actions: First, the university should examine the feasibility of adopting more family-friendly policies and programs (Quinn, Lange, & Olswang, 2004). In addition, the university should adapt existing grant programs or create new grant programs that would provide qualified applicants who are female associate professors with additional support to enhance their research productivity. Second, the university should create formalized procedures for departmental chairpersons to follow when faculty members are planning to have children. The procedures should be developed by UHRS in order to bring visibility, transparency, and equity to faculty-chairperson negotiations regarding family leave and flexible teaching schedules. We also recommend that department chairpersons not overburden female associate professors with departmental service. Third, we suggest that departmental chairpersons should assign mentors to female associate professors. These programs, procedures, and practices would help female*

associate professors feel more supported by the university and their department in their quest to earn promotion to full professor. It is especially important to implement these programs, procedures, and practices in colleges where women are underrepresented at the rank of full professor (i.e., CAST, CAP, MCOB, CCIM, CSH, and TC).

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

Ethnic minority students decreased slightly from 12.6% (2,282) in Fall 2010 to 12.2% (2,142) in Fall 2011. Graduate enrollment of ethnic minorities increased from 248 students (6.3%) in Fall 2010 to 304 students (6.7%) in Fall 2011.

Retention of freshmen in the 2010 cohort decreased slightly for American Indian, Bi-Racial, Hispanic, and Caucasian students from the 2009 cohort. Retention of Black students in the 2010 cohort rose to 80.43%, a 3% increase over retention of the 2009 cohort (77.25 %), which represented a second consecutive substantial increase. For students with disabilities, the Fall 2010 cohort was retained at 87%, an increase from the Fall 2009 cohort's retention rate of 78%.

The Recruitment and Retention of Minority Students Sub-Committee 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.*

Findings and Recommendations

Task1: Review and recommend faculty employment policies concerning diversity issues.

Tracking data on underrepresented minority and international faculty.

Based on numbers Human Resources statistics, there was little change in underrepresented minority (URM) and international faculty representation at BSU from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012. (See Table 1.) Compared to last year, we saw a very slight increase (.03%) in tenure track faculty; a very slight decrease (.32%) in contract faculty; and a very slight decrease (.26%) for all other employees. This trend has remained fairly consistent over a 3-year period.

Table 1

Faculty and Staff Diversity 2009-2012

	2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012	
	Total	Min	Total	Min	Total	Min
Tenure Track Faculty	621	89 14.33%	623	92 14.77%	615	91 14.80%
Contract Faculty	613	59 9.62%	618	53 8.58%	593	49 8.26%
All Other Employees	2292	200 8.72%	2285	199 8.71%	2273	192 8.45%
Total Employees	3526	348 9.87%	3526	344 9.76%	3481	332 9.54%

The limitations of analyzing faculty and staff diversity using Human Resources 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 Burriss and Indiana Academy high school teachers in the BSU contract faculty population. This practice is problematic for obvious reasons: Given that we do not include Burriss 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 Burriss and Indiana Academy teachers. (See Table 2.) According to 2011-2012 Fact Book data, only 6 of 175 (3.43%) of BSU contract faculty are URM or international faculty. CAP, CCIM, and TC do not presently employ any URM or international contract faculty. CAP and TC do not currently employ any URM or international assistant professors. CCIM does not presently employ any URM or international faculty at the rank of assistant or full professor.

Table 2

URM and International Faculty by Rank and by College 2011-2012

URM/ International Faculty by Rank	CAST	CAP	MCOB	CCIM	CFA	CSH	TC
Full Professor	1/12 (8.3%)	1/21 (4.8%)	7/28 (25%)	0/14 (0%)	2/20 (10%)	13/100 (13%)	2/27 (7.4%)
Associate Professor	2/21 (9.5%)	3/17 (17.6%)	7/24 (29.2%)	2/12 (16.7%)	1/36 (2.8%)	16/94 (17%)	2/25 (8%)
Assistant Professor	6/42 (14.3%)	0/11 (0%)	1/19 (5.3%)	0/18 (0%)	2/46 (4.3 %)	16/132 (12.1%)	5/40 (12.5%)
Instructor	1/49 (2%)	0/5 (0%)	1/11 (9.1%)	0/28 (0%)	1/5 (20%)	3/40 (7.5%)	0/21 (0%)

Based on Fact Book numbers, the percentage of all instructional faculty members who were female was 43.8% in 2010-2011, with a slight increase in 2011-2012 to 45.1%. The distribution of female faculty by rank for the last three years can be found in Table 3:

Table 3

Female Faculty by Rank 2009-2012

Female Faculty by Rank	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
Full Professor	23.0%	22.5%	22.1%
Associate Professor	43.0%	44.9%	45.9%
Assistant Professor	48.0%	47.8%	48.7%
Instructor	61.0%	62.9%	66.9%

According to 2011-2012 Fact Book data, the percentage of female faculty has increased slightly during the past three years in all ranks except for full professors, which have decreased. (See Table 3.)

Table 4

Female Faculty by College 2009-2012

Female Faculty by College	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
CAST	66%	63.6%	66.1%
CAP	23%	26.9%	25.9%
MCOB	21%	21.3%	20.7%
CCIM	34%	40.7%	38.9%
CFA	38%	39.8%	37.4%
CSH	41%	43.3%	41.5%
TC	64%	63.5%	67.2%

As Table 4 demonstrates, over the past three years, the majority of faculty members in both TC and CAST 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: 50% in CAST; 41% in TC. The largest discrepancies between the percentage of women who are

full professors and the percent of female faculty in the college exist in CCIM (-38.9%), TC (-26.2%), CAP (-21.1%), and CSH (-20.5%). Moderate discrepancies exist in CAST (-16.1%) and MCOB (-10%). 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 colleges where women are the non-dominant group, they are practically nonexistent at the full professor level: CAP (4.8%), MCOB (10.7%), and CCIM (0%).

Table 5

Female Faculty by Rank and by College 2011-2012

Female Faculty by Rank	CAST	CAP	MCOB	CCIM	CFA	CSH	TC
Full Professor	6/12 (50%)	1/21 (4.8%)	3/28 (10.7%)	0/14 (0%)	7/20 (35%)	21/100 (21%)	11/27 (41%)
Associate Professor	9/21 (42.9%)	7/17 (41.2%)	7/24 (29.2%)	7/12 (58.3%)	13/36 (36.1%)	43/94 (45.7%)	19/25 (76%)
Assistant Professor	26/42 (61.9%)	2/11 (18.2%)	5/19 (26.3%)	10/18 (55.6%)	18/46 (39.1%)	60/132 (45.5%)	28/40 (70%)
Instructor	41/49 (83.7%)	4/5 (80%)	2/11 (18.2%)	11/28 (39.3%)	2/5 (40%)	28/40 (70%)	18/21 (85.7%)

Although the committee acknowledges that there may be alternative interpretations of these data, we believe that they evidence institutionalized power differences related to race and sex. As Allen (2011) explained,

Racial dynamics often unfold during personnel procedures such as recruiting, hiring, evaluating, and promoting employees. To recruit employees, organizations often rely on informal hiring practices, and applicants often learn about jobs through friends or relatives. As a result, organizations that use employee referrals to fill job vacancies tend to hire workers of the same race as current employees, which helps to maintain racial segregation patterns of employment across all levels of organizations. (p. 87)

Human Resources statistics suggest that BSU's informal hiring practices may perpetuate the underrepresentation of URM faculty members: Between July and December 2011, 52 % of 183 new hires answered "friend/ relative/other" when asked how they learned of the position. Between January and June 2012, 58% of 52 new hires gave similar responses. Although we do not know for certain that these friends/relatives/others were BSU employees, it is a logical inference, given that BSU employees would likely be more knowledgeable about BSU job openings than would members of the general public.

Recommendations. *Our recommendations related to faculty employment policies related to diversity are twofold:*

First, the Committee recommends that Human Resources 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 3 of the 2012-2017 Strategic Plan. In addition, given that 2011-2012 Fact Book data characterize 20% of faculty as “other/unknown,” we recommend that Human Resources gather additional data to determine how many employees are biracial, multiracial, etc.

Second, in colleges where no URM or international faculty members are employed at the contract faculty level (i.e., CAP, CCIM, and TC), we recommend that search committees and department chairpersons 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 CSH Task Force on Diversity’s “Guide to Recruiting and Retaining a More Diverse Faculty.” 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.

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

The Diversity Committee is charged with reporting on complaints filed in the past year. According to reports from the OUC, in 2011-2012, 13 complaints were made by a total of 13 persons. Six persons filed 6 internal complaints, and 7 persons filed 7 external complaints (with one person citing two areas in one complaint). One complaint based on age was filed internally; two were filed externally. One complaint based on biological sex was filed internally; three were filed externally. One complaint based on national origin and one complaint based on race were filed internally. One retaliation and two disability complaints were filed externally. (See Table 6.)

These numbers show a slight increase in complaints from 11 in 2010-2011 to 13 in 2011-2012, but overall, there has been a downward trend since 2009-2010, when 25 complaints were filed (See Table 7.) In this three-year period, the largest increase in complaints was age-related; conversely, the largest decreases were in the areas of disability and race.

Table 6

Office of University Compliance Internal and External Complaints 2009-2012

	2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012	
	Complaints		Complaints		Complaints	
	Internal	External	Internal	External	Internal	External
Age	4	0	4	0	1	2
Biological sex (not in the form of sexual harassment)	6	1	3	0	1	3
Sexual Harassment	0	0	0	0	2	0
Harassment or Hostile Work Environment	1	0	2	0	0	0
National Origin	2	0	0	0	1	0
Race	4	1	0	0	1	0
Religion	1	0	0	0	0	0
Retaliation	3	1	0	3	0	1
Disability	10	1	0	3	0	2

Table 7

Office of University Compliance Total Complaints 2009-2012

Age	2009-10	0
	2010-11	4
	2011-12	3
Biological sex (not in the form of sexual harassment)	2009-10	7
	2010-11	3
	2011-12	4
Sexual Harassment	2009-10	0
	2010-11	0
	2011-12	2
Harassment or Hostile Work Environment	2009-10	1
	2010-11	2
	2011-12	0
National Origin	2009-10	2
	2010-11	0
	2011-12	1
Race	2009-10	5
	2010-11	0
	2011-12	1
Religion	2009-10	1
	2010-11	0
	2011-12	0
Retaliation	2009-10	4
	2010-11	3
	2011-12	1
Disability	2009-10	10
	2010-11	3
	2011-12	2

Recommendations. The committee commends the university and the OUC for making continued progress in this area. We have no recommendations at this time.

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

Diversity climate survey. In 2010-2011, the committee recommended that the university develop and administer a climate survey. The goal of the survey was to gather data that could be analyzed in order to enable the University Diversity Committee (UDC) to make recommendations to the Provost, President, and Board of Trustees to enhance BSU's climate supporting diversity.

In Fall 2011, the assistant provost for diversity, in collaboration with OIE, acquired a diversity climate survey developed by Rankin and Associates. In Spring 2012, the diversity climate subcommittee worked with the OIE to tailor the survey to BSU. The revised survey will be administered in Fall 2012, once it gains Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, is piloted by the UDC, and finalized.

Female associate and full professor survey. One of the issues identified in the 2010-2011 report and reinforced by 2011-2012 data is the underrepresentation of female professors at BSU. The OIE, at the request of the CSH Task Force on the Status of Women and the UDC, distributed a survey assessing the potential barriers females face in seeking promotion to full professor. The survey was distributed to all female full and associate faculty on April 20th and was available until April 30th. Nearly 63% of all female full and associate faculty completed the survey (101 out of 161). The results of the survey are reported in Appendix A.

The first issue identified by the survey concerned the area of work-life balance. At least 3 out of 4 respondents reported experiencing stress related to work-life balance. These percentages were even higher in CCIM and College of Fine Arts (CFA). (See Table 3 in Appendix A.) Related to the previous point, nearly half of the CFA respondents with children have children under the age of 5, and 80% of CCIM faculty members have responsibility for children or elders. (See Table 4 in Appendix A.) In general, about 7 out of 10 respondents with children reported experiencing difficulty in needing time for research, travel, conventions, and fieldwork because of their children. This percentage was higher for CSH faculty. (See Table 4 in Appendix A.)

An analysis was conducted to explore significant differences in responses between associate and full professors. (See Table 12 in Appendix A.) Two of these differences related to work-life issues. First, a significantly higher percentage of associates reported having experienced high levels of stress and/or health conditions as a result of work-life balance and currently providing or having provided child or elder care since becoming an associate professor. (See Table 12.) Additionally, a significantly lower percentage of associates reported feeling supported by their department in work-life balance. (See Table 12.)

The second area identified by the survey was related to the issue of being overburdened with service. Nearly half of all associate faculty respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they feel forced into service work and time consuming activities because assistant professors are protected from too much service and full professors have more choice in their departmental involvement. (See Table 8 in Appendix A.) This sentiment was particularly prevalent in MCOB, where over 80% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. (See Table 8.) Across all colleges, respondents reported devoting more time to their departmental service than to other kinds of service. (See Table 5 in Appendix A.) In general, if respondents had to take away one of their responsibilities, the largest percentage would take away service responsibilities, followed by research responsibilities. A higher percentage of CFA faculty would take away service, and a higher percentage of CSH faculty would take away research. (See Table 6 in Appendix A.)

These findings echo Allen's (2011) observations about the gendered nature of work and status in the academy:

Female professors tend to spend more time teaching, advising, and being involved in service activities, while male professors often spend more time in research activities. [These gendered patterns of behavior] correspond with the hierarchical system in many research universities that values research more than teaching, while supposedly attributing equal weight to both. (p. 60)

Finally, a third area identified by the survey concerned mentoring. Fewer than 3 out of 10 respondents reported having a mentor, yet at least 9 out of 10 reported that they believe that having a mentor is important. (See Table 12 in Appendix A.)

Recommendations. *The committee recommends that the university administer the revised Rankin survey in Fall 2012. The results should be used to make informed recommendations to enhance BSU's climate supporting diversity, particularly in colleges in which no URM or international faculty are employed at the level of full professor (i.e., CCIM). Given that work-life conflict, disproportionate service burden, and lack of mentoring have been identified as barriers females face in seeking promotion to full professor, the committee recommends that the university take the following steps to ameliorate these problems:*

First, we recommend that the university examine the feasibility of adopting more family-friendly policies and programs (e.g., elder-care support, dependent-care assistance, on-site child care, part-time tenure-track options, etc.) (Quinn, Lange, & Olswang, 2004). In addition, the university could change the evaluation criteria for the special assigned leave with pay program in order to give priority to qualified applicants who are female associate professors. Alternatively, a grant program could be established that would provide female associate professors with an opportunity to apply for an additional course reduction/research release. This type of program would be relatively inexpensive and would provide qualified applicants with additional support to enhance their research productivity.

Second, we recommend that the university create formalized procedures for departmental chairpersons to follow when faculty members are planning to have children. The procedures should be developed by UHRS in order to bring visibility, transparency, and equity to faculty-chairperson negotiations regarding family leave, tenure-clock extension, and flexible teaching schedules. We also recommend that department chairpersons be careful not to overburden female associate professors with departmental service. These programs, procedures, and practices would help female associate professors feel more supported by the university and their department in their quest to earn promotion to full professor.

Third, we suggest that departmental chairpersons should assign mentors to female associate professors. If a full professor is not available within the department, the chairperson should help the associate professor network with potential mentors in the college or university. Given that female full professors are underrepresented in the university, departmental chairpersons must assign mentoring duties with discretion, in an effort not to further overburden female full professors or senior associate professors with service.

It is particularly important to implement these programs, procedures, and practices in colleges where women are underrepresented at the rank of full professor (i.e., CAST, CAP, MCOB,

CCIM, CSH, and TC). Therefore, in these colleges, deans should hold department chairs accountable for enacting family supportive supervisory behaviors toward female faculty.

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

Enrollment by race. Ethnic minority students as a percent of undergraduate enrollment have increased fairly steadily over the last five years, rising from 11.0% (representing 1,834 students) in Fall 2007 to 12.2% (2,142 students) in Fall 2011. In the most recent period, the percent of undergraduate minority enrollment decreased slightly from the five-year high of 12.6% (2,282) in Fall 2010 to 12.2% (2,142) in Fall 2011.

Graduate enrollment of ethnic minorities increased from 248 students in Fall 2010 to 304 students in Fall 2011, with an increase for a second year in a row of the percentage of graduate enrollment (6.3% to 6.7%), although the percentage has remained fairly steady over the last five years.

Overall, the percentage of ethnic minority students (undergraduate and graduate) has increased over the past five years from 10.3% in Fall 2007 to 11.0% in Fall 2011; however, that percentage dipped slightly from the five-year high of 11.5% in 2010 to 11.0% in 2011.

More information about enrollment by race may be found in Appendix B.

Recruitment activities for minority students. The Office of Undergraduate Admissions hosted its third Minority Recruitment Program at the Madame CJ Walker Theater in Indianapolis and hosted a second diversity yield program at a new venue in Indianapolis – Indiana Historical Society. The office continues building a deeper relationship with the Center for Leadership Development (CLD) and continues to target diversity recruitment events in Indianapolis, Chicago, St. Louis, and Detroit.

The Multicultural Center Director, along with the Office of Admissions staff, attended the Minority Student Reception in Indianapolis. The purpose of the event was to speak with underrepresented minority (URM) prospective students and their families about BSU.

The Graduate School continued to provide virtual information sessions targeted at URM students, attended graduate school fairs at historically Black universities (yielding 30 inquiries), and provided funding for all McNair Scholars¹ attending BSU.

Staff members from the Office of Disabled Student Development (DSD) developed a website containing presentations of services for college students with disabilities. A letter marketing the website has been sent to all high schools in Indiana; an enclosed brochure describes the transition to college. Staff members regularly make presentations on the transition process to college at state and regional meetings and highlight Ball State's services when doing so. DSD also sponsors the power soccer team, which is attractive to prospective students who use wheelchairs.

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

Freshman to sophomore retention data by race. Retention of freshmen in the 2010 cohort decreased slightly for American Indian, Bi-Racial, Hispanic, and Caucasian students from the

¹ The McNair Scholars Program is designed to help prepare undergraduate students who are disadvantaged or from underrepresented minority groups for graduate school through involvement in research activities.

2009 cohort. Retention of Black students in the 2010 cohort rose to 80.43%, a 3% increase over retention of the 2009 cohort (77.25 %) which represented a second consecutive substantial increase. These numbers do not reflect international students at Ball State. For complete information, please see Appendix D.

Among URM students (excluding students with disabilities), women were retained from the first to second year of college at a higher level than men in the two cohort groups arriving in Fall 2009 and 2010. Black males were the exception as they returned at a higher level (82.5%) than Black women (77.59%). See Appendix E for more information.

For students with disabilities, the Fall 2010 cohort was retained at 87%, an increase from the Fall 2009 cohort's retention rate of 78%. See Appendix F for more information.

Retention activities for minority students

The Office of Disabled Student Development (DSD), the Multicultural Center and Multicultural Student Organizations conducted numerous events and programs. These events support the academic and other developmental needs of URM students and promote a positive, multicultural environment for all students and other Ball State community members.

The Multicultural Center's eight Excel Mentors supported 25 new students through the 2010-2011 year beginning with a new three day summer program in August 2010. Ninety-six % of the participants returned for Spring 2011. DSD's Faculty Mentoring Program (FMP) began its sixth year in Fall 2011 with 50 faculty mentors; the FMP has hosted over 250 students in five years and attracted a three-year Department of Education grant in 2008.

A total of 5,570 individuals attended programs sponsored by the Multicultural Center during the 2010-2011 academic year; 601 students used the services of Disabled Student Development during the same period.

Ball State University has many diverse student organizations, including the Latino Student Union, Black Student Association, Asian American Student Association, and Spectrum (GLBTQA organization). Support for these organizations come from the Office of Student Life, the Multicultural Center, and faculty advisors. The connections made in and among these groups support the University's retention goals; the activities implemented by these groups are important components of the University's recruitment and retention activities. These organizations hosted numerous programs (60) involving 3,916 students in 2010-2011.

For more information on retention activities, see Appendix F.

Research related to retention of minority students. The sub-committee conducted a preliminary review of two data sets to acquire information regarding the retention of minority students.

The first set of data is provided by the Office of the Vice President of Student Affairs. The Assistant to the Vice President or her designee meets with students who withdraw during the academic year. The meeting is conducted to ensure that the student is aware of the implications of withdrawal at different times of the year (amount of refund, financial aid, etc.), to assist the student with making arrangements for withdrawal, and to interview the student on the reasons for withdrawal. The report (Appendix G) provided to the sub-committee includes four years of data, beginning with Fall 2008 and ending with Fall 2011 and includes the number of minority

students withdrawing during each semester categorized by ethnicity, classification (undergraduate part-time, undergraduate full-time, etc.), and reason for withdrawing.

The chart also provides a comparison to reasons for withdrawal provided by all students who withdrew during the same semester.

An analysis of the seven semesters of student withdrawal data (F08-S09, F09-S10, F10-S11, and F11) suggests that minority student withdrawals have remained constant, comprising on average 16% of all withdrawals over that period (low of 14.5% in Spring 2009, high of 19.8% in Spring 2011). An analysis of the reasons for minority student withdrawals over the same period indicates they withdraw from classes for similar reasons as all other students. The most common reasons for student withdrawal are medical problems, family situations, financial and "other."

Over the same period of time, the percentage of minority students who withdrew from BSU for the reason "dissatisfied" was low (averaging about 5% over the period examined). This percentage is about the same as that reported for all withdrawing students. Minority student withdrawal for the reason "dissatisfied" ranged from 2%-10% from Fall 2008 through Fall 2011, while the percentage of all withdrawing students reporting "dissatisfied" as the reason for withdrawal ranged from 4%-9%.

The second set of data under review comes from Ball State's MAP-Works (Making Achievement Possible) assessment system. The system includes a survey given to first-year and transfer students early in their first semester as a Ball State student. Survey questions focus on skills, behaviors, attitudes, and experiences that have been demonstrated to have an impact on retention. These include but are not limited to: (a) preparation for college, (b) personal skills, (c) college-going behaviors and expectations, (d) initial academic experiences, (e) living experiences, and (f) integration with the university.

The OIE administered the survey and provided the sub-committee with various preliminary analyses of data from first-year students (excluding transfer students) arriving Fall 2010 and Fall 2011. Student responses were analyzed with respect to differences in biological sex and race.

There are two phases of the MAP-Works data analysis. Beginning Fall 2012, sub-committee members will begin a review of OIE's reports in order to determine future recommendations for action.

In the second phase of the analysis, as data sets continue to accumulate, several years of pooled data should allow for a regression analysis comparing students who returned each spring to those who did not, and then on those students who returned the next fall semester with those who did not. When sufficient data are available, this analysis may allow us to identify factors that are significant in distinguishing between returners and non-returners, including any impact related to race and ethnicity.

Recommendations. *Given that the efforts directed toward recruitment and retention of minority students have been largely successful, recommendations from the various offices focus on continuing and expanding proven methods of attracting minority students to BSU and assisting them in being successful. Specific programs include:*

Office of Admissions

- *Continue to enhance the partnership with 21st Century Scholars programs. The office has also established a relationship with Project Leadership. Project Leadership's*

goal is to increase participation in 21st Century for students in Grant and Delaware County.

- *Continue to build relationships with high schools with a high percentage of minority students.*
- *Continue to train Multicultural Ambassador Corp (MAC) students to visit targeted high schools to share their experiences and to showcase how Ball State has impacted their lives.*
- *Translate key marketing materials into Spanish as needed. The office has a travel brochure and financial aid brochure that is being translated into Spanish. There are also advertisements that have been translated into Spanish that are used in various Spanish publications around the state.*
- *Continue to build/foster relationship with the CLD. Ball State had its second CLD student graduate in May 2012. The first CLD cohort are now alumni.*

Multicultural Center

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

Disabled Student Development

- *Continue successful current practices, such as the Faculty Mentorship Program, that foster a high retention rate of students with disabilities.*
- *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.*

Graduate School

- *Hold virtual information sessions targeted to under-represented minority students.*
- *Continue to award assistantships to all qualified McNair Scholars.*
- *Work with Ball State colleges and departments to determine strategies to reach URM students.*

Other

- *Continue review of the MAP-Works data with assistance of OIE.*