

Climate and Diversity Annual Assessment Report

Reporting Unit Division of Academic Affairs Reporting Date: 08/31/12
Report Contact Name Leigh Turner and Suzanne Droleskey Contact email jturner@tamu.edu and sdroleskey@tamu.edu

Please define the groups applicable to your organization for which you collect information and make peer comparisons.

- Administrators (applicable to all organizations)
- Budgeted Staff (applicable to all organizations)
- Other Graduate Student Employees participated in the Climate Survey _____ (Define)

The Division of Academic Affairs, led by the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, is comprised of 8 units: Vice Provost, Public Partnership and Outreach, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies, Associate Provost for Graduate Studies, Dean of Faculties, Vice President and Associate Provost for Diversity, and Academic Services. This report was compiled by the Division of Academic Affairs Climate and Diversity Committee (AACD).

For the applicable groups above, please answer questions 1-6 below. Please provide concrete, specific examples referencing percentage and number changes in as succinct a manner as possible.

Executive Summary

- Division Data – The division surpasses the University in female, Hispanic, and Black or African American employees but lags in Asian employees. Similarly, this comparison holds true for peer averages, but not for individual peer institutional data.
- Benchmarking Survey – This was a success because the Vision 2020 peer institutions were surveyed for the entire division using EEO Job Classifications, data that was already available at each institution. This garnered a high level of responses.
- Climate Survey – This was the first division level survey and garnered responses from 61% of the employees.

1) Engaging the Data

Review and compare current year and previous year data reflecting the state of diversity for the applicable groups and their peers and articulate what the data tell you. Describe your analysis and interpretation of your data.

Division and University Data Comparison -- Offices have been added and realigned within the Division of Academic Affairs in FY2011 and FY2012 which affected the ability to acquire and assess data for some of the units in comparison to previous years. For the most part, 2012 demographics within the Division of Academic Affairs closely mirror those of the university. In examining the staff and faculty totals, both are predominantly white (70.4% for the university, 64.8% division), with Hispanics comprising the second highest percentages (12.4% university, 18.5% division), followed by the Black or African American population (8.4% university, 11.1% division) and those of Asian descent (7.2% university, 3.8% division). All other demographics, at both the university and at the division level, comprise less than 1% of the total employee population.

When examining the total data, the only area where there is a wide discrepancy between university and division demographics is in gender. The university is fairly evenly divided (50.9% male, 49.1% female), but the division is predominantly female, at 73.9% of the employee population within the Division of Academic Affairs.

Women also outnumber men at all levels of EEO Job Code at the university level, with a much higher disparity at the divisional level. This disparity is most pronounced in professional staff, where women total 55.4% of the total university population, and 71.2% within the division.

Race demographics are fairly consistent within all EEO Job Codes, with a White majority, followed in totals by Hispanics, Black or African Americans, and Asians. At the divisional level, percentages of Hispanics and Black or African Americans are consistently greater in comparison to the university. The Asian population is only greater in both Clerical and Administrative staff.

In comparison to the previous year's totals, there is a much higher increase in Black or African American hires at the divisional level (16.4% increase, compared to 6.6% for the university). The university decreased by 2.0% and 2.9% in the Hispanic and Asian employee populations; whereas, Academic Affairs reports an increase of 10.4% and 4.8%, respectively. The number of female employees in the division increased by 2.4% as compared to a 2.9% decrease of female employees in the university.

Climate and Diversity Annual Assessment Report

Overall, the Division of Academic Affairs shows a greater level of diversity in its staff than that of the university in total, though it is still majority White, and the division's Asian population within professional staff lags behind that of the whole campus.

Peer Data Comparison -- Fifteen Vision 2020 Peer Universities were contacted by the AACD committee for data representing all units in the division except CIS (which will provide its own report). Nine returned demographic data (seven in time to be included in this report), and the unit level data will be shared with unit leadership in Fall 2012. This report focuses only on division level data, excluding CIS. See Figure 1 for comparative percentages of totals from the seven reporting institutions. Some key highlights include the following:

TAMU leads in the percentage of female staff (75.3%) compared to both the peer average (70.1%) and all individual universities. TAMU also leads all peers in the number of Hispanic employees at 19.7%.

TAMU has a higher percentage of a Black or African-American staff at 12% as compared to the peer average of 10.4%, but U of NC, U of FL, and UCLA all possess significantly higher percentages at 22.6%, 22.8%, and 19.2%, respectively. Additionally, TAMU lags far behind the peer average for Asian staff, at 3.8% compared to 13%. Both UCLA and UC-San Diego have Asian staff percentages over 20%.

Other segments, with the exception of "Race/Ethnicity Not Specified", were all under 2% values for TAMU, the peer average, and all other institutions, making all numbers comparable and consistent. TAMU had a very low number of unspecified staff at 0.2%, with the peer average at 9.2%.

Within each EEO Job Category, TAMU leads in the percentage of Hispanic staff. TAMU has only a slightly higher percentage of Black or African-American staff when compared to the peer average for Professional Non-Faculty and Clerical staff, and lags behind the peer average for Administrators. UNC and U of FL both have commanding leads in African-American staff as compared to all other institutions in this study. Though TAMU leads in Asian administrators, in all other job categories TAMU lags behind the peer average and many other institutions for Asian staff.

In general, TAMU does very well in the hiring of Hispanic and female staff, but lags behind the averages of peer institutions in the number of Black or African-American and Asian staff in almost every EEO Job Category. In all other categories, TAMU seems to hold numbers comparable to other institutions.

2) Recent Efforts

What efforts have been made this past year to retain diversity in the applicable groups?

The most common activities were related to educating existing staff on issues of diversity to enhance the climate for diversity in the workplace. Staff members attended a variety of events, conferences, retreats, facilitated discussions, and training (both on and off campus including state and national professional associations).

Three units utilized human resource programs such as extended leave programs, equity increases, and reclassifications to retain a diverse workforce. At the office level, common practices of cultural sensitivity were put in place regarding religious and cultural events and food options. Two units facilitated initiatives that support employees through mentoring and networking. One office promoted internal hiring of diverse candidates into vacant positions.

What efforts have been made this past year to recruit for diversity in the applicable groups?

Fewer positions have been open than in the past several years since all units have intentionally decreased the number of vacant positions after re-evaluating business needs. Units with vacant positions utilized the services of Human Resources to identify a diverse applicant pool and placed announcements in statewide publications and list serves. In addition, some contacted diversity networking groups and professional associations. Some units conducted national searches or reached out to colleagues from underrepresented groups to inform them of vacancies. One unit used interview processes to ascertain candidates' views and approaches to diversity. Two units facilitated or initiated training and/or dialogue related to the importance of diversifying faculty, staff, and student groups.

Climate and Diversity Annual Assessment Report

3) Future Efforts

Describe the organization's plans or future efforts to improve the organization's diversity?

All current initiatives as noted above to retain and recruit diversity will be continued. While some offices have small staff sizes and infrequent turnover, the AACD Committee recommends the following:

- Review hiring and retention strategies to identify best practices.
- Complete analysis of the division climate survey and engage division leadership and employees in dialogue about the results and potential interventions.
- Broadly distribute peer workforce presence data and engage division leadership and employees in dialogue about the results and implications for recruitment and retention.

4) Advisory Groups

Describe the diversity of the various groups who advise your organization regarding diversity and climate. What efforts or plans have come out of this group that may not have been articulated above? What efforts are made to diversify the group when there is a membership vacancy?

Three advisory groups have members from outside TAMU. Having a diverse membership is important to the groups, valued by the units, and an important component of member selection. Members of the groups are not asked to disclose their gender or ethnicity; a summary of the composition of these groups is based on observation and not necessarily accurate. When vacancies occur, efforts will be made to identify prospective members from underrepresented groups.

Career Center Advisory Council is comprised of external employers and internal faculty, staff and administrators (59 members). Of external members, 24% (5/21) are members of underrepresented ethnicities and 43% (9/21) are women. Council's purpose is to facilitate the Career Center mission by engaging the participation of corporate and academic representatives who share their insights and advice on critical issues.

Office of Admissions VIP Advisory Group is made up of seven high school counselors from throughout the State and provides guidance regarding efforts to recruit a diverse student population. Members are selected by the Admissions staff and include counselors from their targeted high schools, which include a majority of underrepresented students. 57% (4/7) are members of underrepresented ethnicities and 43% (3/7) are women.

Texas A&M International Advisory Board, composed of 40 men and women from business, government, education, and other areas, advises TAMU on international program development and emphasis areas. 38% are members of underrepresented ethnicities and 17% are women. Its members participate in international activities and assist in building an international network for the University, as well as promoting awareness of international programs and issues.

5) Organizational Climate

Describe your organization's climate based on data. Indicate if your organization has distributed a climate survey (and when) or other source of data and what actions have been taken as a result of the responses.

The AACD Committee, with support from Data and Research Services, conducted a climate survey in May and June of 2012, which garnered a 61% response rate. A full analysis of all survey data will be completed in Fall 2012. A preliminary quantitative analysis examined significant differences in responses based on membership in gender and underrepresented groups. This preliminary quantitative analysis indicated that there were no significant differences based on sex/gender; however, there were multiple significant differences (Chi Square Analysis) based on membership in an underrepresented group.

One survey item asked respondents how often they have experienced or observed inappropriate behaviors and/or comments regarding seven areas. Of those areas, there was a significant difference in response rates between members of underrepresented groups and those not identifying with an underrepresented group in five areas: political beliefs, race, sex/gender, sexual orientation and disability. Two areas without significance were age and religion. (Details shown in Figure 2)

Climate and Diversity Annual Assessment Report

Another survey item asked respondents about their perception of the diversity climate in their workplace. Among members of underrepresented groups, 18.18% indicated the climate had become “significantly worse” in the past three years (or less if they had been at TAMU fewer than that). Responses from participants not identifying as members of an underrepresented group indicated “Significantly Worse” at a rate of 4.42%. This shows a 13.66 percentage point difference between the two groups.

Furthermore, members of underrepresented groups agreed that they needed to minimize various characteristics of their identity (language, dress, beliefs, etc.) to fit in at a much higher rate than respondents who are not members. This trend is consistent at all organizational levels – the department, the Division of Academic Affairs, and at the university -- with members of underrepresented groups reporting from 16 and 24 percentage points higher their need to minimize characteristics.

Additionally, members of underrepresented groups reported a variety of negative personal experiences at a much higher rate than those not identifying as underrepresented, a difference of 27.5%. These experiences have not yet been fully analyzed.

A preliminary qualitative analysis of major themes in comments provided by 194 (51%) of the 378 FTE respondents reveals the following (*note: numbers are indicative of comment “frequency” only, as individuals may have provided multiple comments*):

- 36% feel as though they work in “an environment of tremendous uncertainty.” Recent fiscal constraints, Reductions in Force (RIFs), outsourcing, departmental mergers, and reorganizations have created considerable feelings of insecurity. The majority expressing this sentiment were women.
- 21% commented that they don’t feel valued. They indicated that their opinions are rarely sought and that they receive few financial rewards for their loyalty and hard work. They also shared feelings of being devalued by very high level administrators through their words and deeds. The majority expressing this sentiment were women.
- 14% described the university as “unwelcoming.” At the same time, 4% recognized that we are making positive strides as evidenced by more frequent diversity-related events and conversations. Administrators and supervisors are credited for facilitating this positive change.
- 8.76% urged us to “stop making such a big deal of diversity.” Individuals expressing this sentiment were those who did not identify as “underrepresented.” 5.67% of those who did not identify as “underrepresented” also stated that they have never seen prejudice, oppression, or discrimination at the unit or institutional level, and that “reverse discrimination” negatively impacts their experience.
- 2.57% felt that the climate at Texas A&M University Galveston is “chilly,” especially so for women and ethnic minorities.
- 1.5% who identify as Christian feel as though their right to free expression is being abridged. Simultaneously, 3.6% noted that they felt marginalized by the “overly Christian” environment and frequent failure to “separate church and state.”
- 14.9% are very satisfied with their jobs and quality of work life.

Overall, approximately 88.5% of the comments conveyed concerns; 10% were very positive about the climate; and 1% was neutral.

6) Other Efforts

Describe any other diversity and climate efforts within your organization that are not articulated above.

Many units within the Division of Academic Affairs are involved with various programming and staffing initiatives which facilitate and promote diversity. Notable program examples include Brazos Valley Worldfest, the Faculty Mentoring Program, Enhancing Diversity Seminar Series, Difficult Dialogues Training, the One Community Initiative, Aggie ALLIES, training on language and learning differences, and high impact learning experiences, domestic and abroad. Division units also provide a variety of outreach and services for diverse populations. Notable among these are Regent Scholar support programs, and faculty networks. In addition several division staff members have been invited speakers or made presentations about diversity awareness/initiatives at state and national venues. Such efforts foster broader awareness about TAMU in unique forums.

Several offices facilitated diversity in their offices by hiring graduate assistants and student workers from diverse backgrounds, which adds to the diversity of the office and allows staff members to develop skills to work with diverse colleagues. One office is conducting a research project on why students from certain majors or ethnicities are underrepresented in its programs.

Addendum to Climate and Diversity Annual Assessment Report -- Division of Academic Affairs 9/3/2012

Figure 1: Peer Comparison Data

University Name:	TAMU	Peer Average	U of MN	U of NC	Penn State	U of Florida	U of WI**	UCLA*	UC-San Diego*
------------------	------	--------------	---------	---------	------------	--------------	-----------	-------	---------------

% of Grand Total

EEO Job Group Totals (With Categorical Breakdown)									
Executive/Administrative	25.1%	15.6%	8.6%	39.1%	23.6%	10.5%	23.1%		
% Race/Ethnicity of Executive/Administrative									
White	71.4%	76.2%	81.3%	78.9%	77.2%	74.2%	71.3%		
Black or African-American	10.3%	13.8%	9.4%	18.9%	9.4%	21.0%	11.3%		
Hispanic	12.7%	5.1%	6.3%	1.1%	4.7%	3.2%	11.3%		
Asian	4.0%	1.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.8%	1.6%	1.3%		
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.0%	0.3%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Two or More Races	1.6%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	2.5%		
Race/Ethnicity Not Specified	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	2.5%		
% Sex/Gender of Executive/Administrative									
Male	30.2%	37.9%	37.5%	30.0%	37.8%	35.5%	48.8%		
Female	69.8%	62.1%	62.5%	70.0%	62.2%	64.5%	51.3%		
Professional Non-Faculty	52.4%	37.4%	67.6%	33.0%	44.3%	30.6%	54.9%		
% Race/Ethnicity of Professional Non-Faculty									
White	62.4%	76.4%	84.1%	65.8%	77.0%	66.9%	78.9%		
Black or African-American	10.6%	9.4%	3.6%	19.7%	7.9%	19.9%	4.7%		
Hispanic	22.1%	5.3%	3.2%	3.9%	7.9%	6.6%	4.2%		
Asian	3.8%	5.2%	6.7%	10.5%	2.1%	4.4%	5.8%		
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.8%	0.3%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%		
Two or More Races	0.4%	1.5%	1.6%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	1.6%		
Race/Ethnicity Not Specified	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	0.6%	4.2%		
% Sex/Gender of Professional Non-Faculty									
Male	31.2%	34.1%	35.3%	34.2%	36.0%	32.6%	31.6%		
Female	68.8%	65.9%	64.7%	65.8%	64.0%	67.4%	68.4%		
Clerical/Secretarial	22.5%	29.9%	23.9%	27.8%	32.1%	58.9%	22.0%		
% Race/Ethnicity of Clerical/Secretarial									
White	54.9%	57.5%	74.2%	65.6%	92.5%	27.9%	86.8%		
Black or African-American	16.8%	16.0%	7.9%	31.3%	2.9%	24.7%	2.6%		
Hispanic	22.1%	7.6%	2.2%	0.0%	1.2%	14.7%	2.6%		
Asian	3.5%	4.5%	12.4%	1.6%	0.6%	5.2%	3.9%		
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.0%	0.4%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%		
Two or More Races	1.8%	1.1%	1.1%	1.6%	1.2%	1.1%	0.0%		
Race/Ethnicity Not Specified	0.9%	12.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	26.1%	3.9%		
% Sex/Gender of Clerical/Secretarial									
Male	3.5%	19.3%	15.7%	12.5%	1.7%	29.9%	21.1%		
Female	96.5%	80.7%	84.3%	87.5%	98.3%	70.1%	78.9%		
Sex Totals									
Men	24.7%	29.9%	30.8%	26.5%	25.4%	31.3%	33.2%	35.0%	29.6%
Women	75.3%	70.1%	69.2%	73.5%	74.6%	68.7%	66.8%	65.0%	70.4%
Race/Ethnicity Totals									
White	62.9%	55.9%	81.5%	70.9%	82.0%	44.7%	78.9%	37.9%	35.7%
Black or African-American	12.0%	10.4%	5.1%	22.6%	6.7%	22.8%	5.8%	19.2%	4.9%
Hispanic	19.7%	10.4%	3.2%	1.7%	5.0%	11.0%	5.5%	17.9%	16.3%
Asian	3.8%	13.0%	7.5%	4.3%	1.3%	4.6%	4.3%	23.8%	26.2%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.4%	0.4%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.3%	1.3%	0.3%
Two or More Races	1.0%	0.7%	1.3%	0.4%	1.3%	1.2%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Race/Ethnicity Not Specified	0.2%	9.2%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	15.6%	3.8%	0.0%	16.7%

Note: All race and ethnicity classifications are consistent with EEO classifications and data provided by Texas A&M University Human Resources.

*California universities use unique job groupings that cannot be directly compared to those of the other peers. California institutions sent numbers that included breakdowns of job type in the following categories: "Senior Management Group," "Managers & Senior Professionals," and "Professionals and Support Staff." The totals, however, were found to be valid for comparison in the fields of sex/gender and race/ethnicity.

**University of Wisconsin only submitted totals for all areas requested. There is no breakdown by unit or department to consider in analysis.

Figure 2: Organizational Climate

The following table summarizes the percentage of climate survey respondents who “experienced or observed inappropriate behaviors and/or comments”. These respondents chose “often” or “very often” for political beliefs, race, sex/gender and sexual orientation and “rarely” or “not at all” for disability.

	Political beliefs	Race	Sex/Gender	Sexual Orientation	Disability
Member of underrepresented group	29.41	16.24	10.92	12.61	88.24
Not a member of underrepresented group	10.31	3.15	2.69	5.38	96.41
% Difference	19.1	13.09	8.23	7.23	8.17