Office of the President

**TO MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEES ON LONG RANGE PLANNING AND
EDUCATIONAL POLICY:**

<u>**DISCUSSION ITEM**</u>

For Meeting of September 17, 2009

ANNUAL ACCOUNTABILITY SUB-REPORT ON DIVERSITY

In accordance with the Regents' schedule for accountability sub-reports, the *Annual
Accountability Sub-Report on Diversity* has been prepared for this meeting. This report responds
to two requests made by the Regents:

- The September 2007 recommendation by the Committee on Educational Policy to require
  the UC President to report annually on the status of diversity at the University. This
  recommendation was adopted as Regents' policy.

- The series that the Committee on Long Range Planning has established in order to:
  - review key areas of the accountability framework in more detail;
  - discuss strategic choices that need to be made by UC in those areas;
  - inform the Board's deliberations about important policy and budget questions; and
  - achieve a richer understanding of UC as a system and of campus distinctiveness.

BACKGROUND

Acting on recommendations of a report from a Universitywide task force, the Board of Regents
took three actions at their September 2007 meeting:

1. The Board adopted as policy a Diversity Statement, which reads in part: "Because the
   core mission of the University of California is to serve the interests of the State of
   California, it must seek to achieve diversity among its student bodies and among its
   employees."

2. The Regents endorsed the Report's finding that "change is needed." The study group
   found that, while there are many pockets of success and innovation in seeking and
   supporting diversity, the University as a whole has not made sufficient progress and
   needs to focus greater sustained attention in this area.

3. To monitor progress and ensure accountability, the Regents affirmed that clear, consistent
   and regularly produced data are necessary to "shine a light" on the University's efforts to

increase and support diversity. To help achieve that goal, the Regents adopted a policy that will require the UC President to report annually on the status of diversity at the University.

Campus Narratives

For the 2009 report, the campuses and the Office of the President were asked to provide a narrative description of their goals and metrics for achieving diversity. The complete reports are appended to this item.

The campuses are undertaking a wide variety of diversity initiatives. Each campus has developed, or is in the process of developing, short- and long-term strategic plans. They have designated diversity leaders and diversity committees that are charged with working on initiatives and processes to increase the number of underrepresented minorities among faculty, students, and staff. Initiatives include: fostering relationships with public elementary, middle and high schools; direct communication with potential undergraduates and their families; programs to assist underrepresented freshmen in meeting academic goals and integrating into campus life; diversity training for students and faculty; encouragement of doctoral and post-doctoral research on diversity issues; and staff training programs to improve competence and for career advancement. All of the campuses are actively promoting the Principles of Community that restate the campuses' commitment to diversity, inclusivity, and respect for differences among people.

Figures

The data reported in the accompanying figures are from existing UCOP sources; no new data were requested of the campuses in completing this report. This report benefits from the May 2009 Accountability Framework (now available online at http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/ accountability/), and builds on that report by further disaggregating data – for example, Graduate Academic students are separated from Graduate Professional Degree students; and degrees awarded are displayed by race/ethnicity and gender in one chart.

To provide the committees with advance material prior to the presentation, a number of figures are appended to this item. Given time constraints, only a selected few will be used in the actual presentation. The presentation will instead focus on identified challenges and the actions being taken to address them.

Overall observations about the report:

- Trend lines for diversity indicators are very slow to move, and only give the University the most general idea of progress (or lack thereof).

- Process indicators that can be monitored in the near term and could give the University measurable indicators on improvements that are likely to impact the trend lines over time are lacking. The 2010 diversity report will include new process measures.

- Detailed snapshots serve to refine the University's understanding of race/ethnicity and gender, and can provide direction for areas of further study.

OVERVIEW

The total University community is made up of faculty, students and staff – and there are multiple categories of each. The most racial, ethnic and gender diversity is found among undergraduate students, and the least among faculty (**Figures 1 and 2**).

UC often describes its diversity aspirations in terms of "reflecting the diversity of California." **Figure 3** compares the racial and ethnicity profile of the University of California to the state and the nation. Both the University and the state are much more diverse than the nation as a whole. However, the University demographics have not kept pace with the growing Chicano/Latino population of California.

Diversity Index

U.S. News & World Report calculates a "Diversity Index" for undergraduate students as part of their college rankings. This index does not focus on underrepresented categories but rather on overall diversity. The Index can be best understood as the probability that an undergraduate student will encounter a student from a racial or ethnic group other than their own on their campus.

The *U.S. News and World Report* methodology excludes international students, and includes five categories: American Indians and Native Alaskans, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, African Americans who are non-Hispanic, whites who are non-Hispanic, and Hispanics. Originally published in 1992, this methodology has been widely used by many groups and agencies, including the U.S. Census Bureau.

Figure 4 displays the August 2009 *U.S. News & World Report* Diversity Index results for eight undergraduate campuses (excluding Merced), and the University's comparison eight institutions. The Riverside campus ranks fifth in the nation on this index, and above all eight comparison institutions. Riverside is also the only UC campus to receive the federal designation as a Hispanic-Serving Institution. This designation requires an undergraduate population that is at least 25 percent Chicano/Latino.

The same methodology was then applied to the total UC community, and unlike the *U.S. News & World Report* calculations, include "international and other" as a distinct category. The results show greater diversity within the University than the State or the nation. Within UC, for instance, there is a 71 percent chance that the person in front of you in the coffee line is of a different racial or ethnic group, compared to 68 percent for the state, and 53 percent nationally (**Figure 5**).

When the UC diversity index is applied to the University's campus communities as a whole, the greatest diversity can be expected within the undergraduate student category, with a value of

71 percent. The large proportion of international students contributes to the high index for graduate professional students on the general campus and in Health Sciences (71 and 70 percent respectively). Ladder rank faculty have the lowest Diversity Index, at 41 percent.

Diversity indices for each of the campuses overall do not vary as dramatically as the more specific categories presented above, with a range of 65 percent at Santa Barbara to 76 percent at Riverside (**Figures 6 and 7**).

STAFF DIVERSITY

Figures 8 and 9 are taken from the May 2009 Accountability Report, and clearly show the variation in diversity by race/ethnicity and gender across personnel programs, and the slow progress over time. The most diversity is seen among the Professional and Support Staff, and the least among the Senior Management Group. Despite some progress over the years, in 2008 the Senior Management Group was 80 percent white, and 67 percent male.

Among the Professional and Support Staff (**Figure 10**), the reverse is true for gender – roughly two thirds are women across all racial and ethnic groups. **Figures 11 and 12** present staff totals by race/ethnicity and by gender for each campus and the Office of the President. UCLA and Riverside have the highest percentages of underrepresented staff, and women are more than 50 percent of the workforce on every campuses and the Office of the President.

Staff Diversity Council and Study Group Recommendations: Leadership and Accountability

Example of Response: Two themes were woven through all the diversity reports – leadership and accountability. The work teams realized that without a clear message of commitment from top leadership, accompanied by true accountability, the slow pace of change would continue. A summary of the recommendations is appended to this item.

The Board of Regents has made its position clear, that by requiring annual reporting on diversity, and by moving proactively to include diversity as a core competency in the new Performance Management Review Process for senior managers (SMG Policy 505, approved by the Regents July 2008), it is holding UC leaders accountable for progress on this front.

President Yudof has implemented this policy, and reviews have been completed for each Chancellor that included specific discussions of diversity on their campus—the successes, and the problem areas that need to be addressed.

FACULTY DIVERSITY

Figure 13 from the May Accountability Report shows that when taken as a whole, the ladder rank faculty at the University of California is more diverse than the AAU Public and Private institutions. However, white faculty are in the majority at every campus, with Asian Americans being the closest in representation among the remaining groups. Merced has the highest

proportion of Chicano/Latinos of all the campuses, yet Merced also has an absence of African Americans among ladder rank faculty.

In terms of gender, UC again compares favorably to the AAU Public and Private institutions, but as with racial and ethnic diversity, gender also varies among the campuses. The highest proportion of women is found at the Santa Cruz campus, with 36 percent, and the lowest at San Diego, with 20 percent (**Figure 14**).

Figures 15 and 16 tell the University that the largest proportion of underrepresented ladder rank faculty is found in Education, but in real numbers, they are concentrated in arts and humanities and social science disciplines. The pattern is the same for women.

At the Assistant Professor level, UC hiring of underrepresented faculty is well below the estimated national availability in the professional and humanities and social science discipline categories. In life sciences, however, UC hiring exceeds the national availability by two percent. At the Associate and Full Professor levels, UC hiring is well below the estimated national availability in professional disciplines, but exceeds the national availability in humanities and social sciences by two percent (**Figures 17 and 18**).

For women at the Assistant Professor level, UC hiring is also well below the national availability in most discipline categories. The interesting exception is computer science, math and engineering, where women were hired at four percent above the estimated national availability pool. At the Associate and Full Professor level, however, women came close to parity in hiring in the professional category, but were well below in all others (**Figures 19 and 20**).

Campuses are unlikely to make progress in increasing the diversity among the ladder rank faculty in the near term, since faculty recruitment is practically at a stand-still due to the dire budget situation. Additional faculty information will be presented in the *Accountability Sub-report on Faculty Competitiveness* next March.

Study Group Recommendation: Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Faculty

Example of Response: Campuses are implementing several revised sections of the Academic Personnel Manual: APM 210 recognizing diversity in appointment and promotion; APM 240 and 245 regarding affirmative action plans at the school, division and department levels, respectively; and APM 760, on privileges and benefits related to work and family issues.

GRADUATE ACADEMIC STUDENT DIVERSITY

Enrollment in UC's graduate academic programs is overwhelmingly white. However, within each racial and ethnic category, women are well represented. More African American women were enrolled than men, 59 to 41 percent; but the reverse was true for white women, who were only 45 percent of enrolled students, compared to 55 percent for white men (**Figure 21**).

Figure 22 displays Ph.D.s awarded by race/ethnicity and gender. This is a critical view because new Ph.D.s are the pool for new faculty. Women in all racial and ethnic groups are receiving Ph.D.s in life science STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) fields at higher rates than men, however at much lower rates in the physical science STEM fields.

GRADUATE PROFESSIONAL DEGREE STUDENT DIVERSITY

Underrepresented students are a very small percentage (14 percent) of total professional degree students (**Figure 23**). African American enrollment in first-year business school classes is in the single digits in every school; for Chicano/Latino students, the numbers are also in the single digits everywhere except UCLA. Law schools had 12 percent total underrepresented student enrollment in their fall 2008 classes, compared to five percent for Business. Medical schools were significantly higher, with 21 percent. More information on medical schools will be presented in the *Accountability Sub-Report on Health Science* in November. The numbers for business and law schools are simply unacceptable, and have been brought to the attention of the chancellors. At the November Regents' meeting, there will be diversity data presented with the Professional Fee Degree action item.

Across all racial and ethnic groups, men received the greatest percentage of professional degrees in business. For women, the greatest percentage of professional degrees awarded was in "Other Health" fields (dentistry, nursing, optometry, pharmacy, public health and veterinary medicine); with the exception of Chicana/Latina women, who received the highest percentage of their degrees in Education (**Figure 24**).

Study Group Recommendation: Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Graduate Students

Example of Response: UC campuses received funding from the National Science Foundation (NSF) through the Alliance for Graduate Education and the Professoriate (AGEP) grant with the goal of increasing the number of underrepresented minority students who acquire doctoral degrees, and ultimately enter the professoriate, in the fields of science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM).

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT DIVERSITY

UC has more diversity among undergraduate students than graduate students, but African Americans are still significantly underrepresented at every campus compared to the other racial and ethnic groups, and compared to the University's eight comparison institutions. In contrast to the disparity in the faculty ranks, among the undergraduate population, women made up over 50 percent of undergraduate enrollment at every campus except Merced (**Figures 25 and 26**).

There are some differences in the profile of entering freshmen compared to students who transfer from a California Community College. A higher proportion of Asian American students (42 percent compared to 34 percent) enroll as freshmen, while the opposite is true for white students (43 percent for transfer students compared to 34 percent for freshmen). African American and Chicano/Latino students enroll in approximately the same proportions at both

levels (African Americans at 3-4 percent and Chicano/Latinos students at 19-20 percent (**Figures 27 and 28**).

Figure 29 is the familiar "gap chart" that depicts the difference between the percentage of underrepresented minorities graduating from California high schools, and the percentage enrolling as freshmen at the University. **Figures 30 and 31** separate the trend lines for African American and Chicano/Latino students. For African American students, the percentage of total high school graduates has been stable, between 7.1 and 7.7 percent over the past 20 years, and the gap between high school graduates and UC freshmen has narrowed somewhat in recent years.

For Chicano/Latino students, however, it is a very different picture. In 1989 they made up only 21 percent of high school graduates in California, compared to over 40 percent today. UC has consistently enrolled more Chicano/Latino students each year, but isn't keeping pace with the rapidly growing population.

At the last Regents meeting in July, the *Accountability Sub-Report on Student Success* was presented. As described in that presentation, and included here as **Figure 32**, only 67 percent of African American male freshmen graduate within six years, compared to 87 percent of Asian American females. The same pattern is seen with transfer students, although African American males graduate at a higher rate than their freshmen peers, 77 percent compared to 68 percent (**Figure 33**).

As with graduate academic degrees, undergraduate women are also underrepresented in physical science STEM fields across all racial and ethnic groups. Unlike graduate academic students who are predominantly male, the reverse is true for undergraduate students. Across all racial and ethnic groups, women receive the majority of the degrees awarded. African American and Chicana/Latina women received the largest percentage of their degrees in the social sciences; while white women have the largest percentage of the arts and humanities; and Asian American women receive the highest percentage of life science degrees (**Figure 34**).

Overall, underrepresented students receive twice as many degrees in the social sciences, arts and humanities than in STEM disciplines. Women earn 25 percent of the degrees in the physical STEM fields, as compared to approximately 60 percent in the other disciplines.

Study Group Recommendation: Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Undergraduate Students

Example of Response: To give more students an opportunity to present their qualifications to UC campuses while continuing to provide a guarantee of admission to the highest-performing students, the University of California Board of Regents approved changes to the University's requirements for freshman admission. The changes will take effect for the fall 2012 entering class.

CAMPUS CLIMATE

At the present time, there is no Universitywide climate survey. Individual campuses have administered their own surveys, but it has not been done across the system. The only system wide data available is the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES), which was not designed to measure climate. Two UCUES questions, on respect and tolerance are included here, with Universitywide totals and campus level data (**Figures 35 and 36**). As a group, African American students feel less respected that other racial and ethnic groups and experience less tolerance of diversity, but there are differences by gender and by campus that are worth exploring further.

Staff Diversity Council and Study Group Recommendation: Regularly Assess Campus Climate

As soon as resources permit, a Universitywide climate survey should be undertaken to address the University's lack of data in this critical area.

SUMMARY

Staff Diversity Council and Study Group Recommendations: Include Diversity in Academic Planning, and Apply Funding & Support

To be successful, "diversity" cannot be seen as an optional initiative; it must be part of the way the University goes about its work—the way it teaches, does research, and engages with California's communities. This has always been a challenge that the University has met with varying degrees of success. However, in the current economic crisis, UC must develop new and innovative ways to foster diversity on the University's campuses and at the Office of the President. Impacts on diversity must be part of all the University's planning efforts, and thoroughly integrated to leverage scarce resources.

The excellence of UC depends on the University's ability to recruit and retain a highly qualified and diverse faculty, staff and student body.

ATTACHMENTS

1.   Summary of the Recommendations of the Staff Diversity Council and the Study Group on University Diversity - see next page
2.   Figures
3.   Narrative

	THE REPORTS OF THE STAFF DIVERSITY COUNCIL AND THE STUDY GROUP ON UNIVERSITY DIVERSITY
	Summary of Recommendations
1	**Leadership**
	Strong leadership is critical to creating a campus climate that fosters equal opportunity and diversity
	Recognize leaders who establish effective programs that model UC's ethical values and support the growth and placement of a diverse leadership pipeline
	Develop a comprehensive, systemwide talent management and leadership development plan aligned with affirmative action and diversity program goals
UCR	UC's campuses that qualify are encouraged to seek federal status as Hispanic-Serving Institutions
2	**Accountability**
	Increased accountability at the campus, division and departmental levels
Done	Require the President of the University to report annually to The Regents on the status of diversity at the University
Done	Ensure system wide management accountability for diversity goals, and for employee development
3	**Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Staff**
	Clarify the UC job structure, including career paths and related skills/competencies so that employees can more easily navigate the system and institutional progress can be measured
	Standardize systemwide data and reporting requirements to support locations' ability to track talent across organizational boundaries
4	**Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Faculty**
	Campuses can do more to promote faculty diversity through recruitment, hiring and retention practices
5	**Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Graduate Students**
	Campuses and departments can do more to promote a competitive, diverse pool of graduate applicants and to retain matriculated students
6	**Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Undergraduate Students**
	UC needs a comprehensive education pipeline repair plan
	Transfer admissions is a necessary part of UC's comprehensive education repair plan
	A strong, stable, and steadfast commitment to academic preparation programs must be part of UC's plan
	UC should better compete for the best and brightest from California's diverse communities
	UC's financial aid/scholarship packages should be more competitive for underrepresented students
Done	UC should rethink how it determines UC eligibility
	California greatly needs more qualified school and college counselors

Summary of Recommendations, Continued	
7	**UC Campus Admissions Should Align to Best Practices**
	Further streamlining of UC admissions would support best practices in admissions
	Optimizing UC's capacity to achieve its diversity goals requires careful analysis of legal obligations
	Disparate impact should be eliminated by all appropriate means
8	**Regularly Assess Campus Climate**
	Address unhealthy climate factors
	Address risks raised by claims of discrimination and lack of attention to diversity issues
	To create and sustain an inviting, supportive and nondiscriminatory work environment at each location, publicize the Principles of Community and administer a climate survey at least every four years
	Greater diversity at UC will require institutionalizing a supportive climate, with accountability
9	**Academic Planning**
	Diversity will not thrive unless it is incorporated into academic planning at every level
10	**Apply Funding & Support**
	Resource Allocation and Faculty Rewards - Resources and rewards are essential to influence faculty and departmental behavior and demonstrate the University's commitment to diversity and equal opportunity
	Resource Allocation and Assessment of Departments and Schools - Resource allocation is essential to influence departmental behavior and demonstrate the University's commitment to the diversity of graduate and professional school students
	Enhance and create programs to support success