

REPORT  
OF THE  
PRESIDENT'S UC|21  
DIVERSITY  
TASK FORCE

March 15, 2007

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>I. Roster of Task Force Members</b>                                 | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>II. President's Charge</b>  | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>III. Task Force Vision, Principles, Process and Recommendations</b> | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>IV. Executive Summary</b>   | <b>17</b> |
| <b>V. Subcommittee Reports</b>   | <b>22</b> |
| A. Institutional Structure and Framework                               | <b>23</b> |
| B. Community and Climate: At UC and<br>Throughout Cincinnati           | <b>29</b> |
| C. Student Recruitment and Retention                                   | <b>35</b> |
| D. Faculty Recruitment and Retention                                   | <b>40</b> |
| E. Staff Recruitment and Retention                                     | <b>45</b> |
| <b>VI. Meeting Schedule, Agenda and Notes</b>                          | <b>49</b> |
| <b>VII. Exhibits and Appendices</b>                                    | <b>91</b> |

**SECTION I:**

**ROSTER  
OF  
TASK FORCE  
MEMBERS**

## **I. ROSTER – TASK FORCE**

*(Steering Committee members are noted with “S”)*

Abercrombie, P. Eric  
Acosta, Daniel  
Air, Dorothy  
Banto, Richard (S)  
Bilionis, Lou (S), Chair, Steering Committee  
Brackett, John (S)  
Collins, Charles, M.D.  
Collins, Christina  
Cox, Heather  
Dayes, Hylton  
Dent, Gary  
Driscoll, Jeremy  
Graviss, Linda  
Johnson, William  
Katerburg, Ralph  
Khar, Rishi T.  
Leventhal, Mitch (S)  
Livingston, Mitchel (S)  
Lovette, Bennie  
Meem, Deborah (S)  
Merchant, Debra (S)  
McCrate, Mitchell  
Owens III, Ed  
Parker, Linda Bates  
Prada, Jorge, M.D. (S)  
Rinto, Barbara (S)  
Rousseau, Stephanie  
Schwab, James  
Smith, Edgar  
Spencer, Marian (S), Co-Chair, Task Force  
St. Clair, Kathryn (S)  
Stewart, Gregory  
Straker, Dolores  
Thurnquist, Annemarie  
Trammer, Alecia (S)  
Tsai, Jerry (S)  
Vehr, Gregory J.  
Welsh, Ann (S)  
Wharton, George  
Zimpher, Nancy (S), Co-Chair, Task Force

*Support Staff:* Ben Brooks, Robert Gilson, Marianne Kunnen-Jones, Sandra Smith

## **SECTION II:**

### **PRESIDENT'S CHARGE**

## **II: PRESIDENT'S CHARGE TO TASK FORCE** **(Spring 2006)**

It is time to reassess diversity and climate at the University of Cincinnati, to identify our strengths and weaknesses, and to create an action agenda for institutional change.

A presidential task force, co-chaired by President Nancy L. Zimpher and former president of Quadres at UC, Marian A. Spencer, will engage in an assessment of UC's progress toward diversity and will recommend to the executive committee of the President's Cabinet an overall strategy and action plan for promoting diversity that integrates ongoing efforts and existing institutional structures into goals, plans and benchmarks for moving forward. While recognizing important relationships to the ongoing work of the UC Women's Center and other campus groups, the focus for this effort will be on race and ethnicity among faculty, staff and students at UC.

**Vision:** A campus environment that embraces diversity as one of our core values, infusing every aspect of campus life and purpose, and every measure of success.

**Agenda and Activities:** Members will engage in activities such as the following:

- 1) Discuss what kind of institution we want and how UC fits into the needs of the community. Is UC diverse enough? By what definition? Determine a focus for the work of this task force.
- 2) Review the AASCU/NASULGC publication, *Now is the Time: Meeting the Challenge for a Diverse Academy*. Determine whether this publication is the appropriate tool for a campus-wide conversation about racial/ethnic diversity at UC.
- 3) Study UC's demographics. How do we rate in all areas of diversity and climate? (Affirmative action, number of faculty of color, student data, attitudinal benchmarks, etc.)
- 4) Review the inventory of existing programs and diversity efforts at UC and assess progress toward racial and ethnic diversity. Use a reflective process to identify what we have at UC, our institutional strengths, weaknesses and potential remedial steps to foster personal and institutional change. Where are the gaps? What might we do about the gaps?
- 5) Review recommendations from the *Just Community Task Force*. How is the new student and freshmen experience carried through to other aspects of campus life? How might these recommendations be incorporated into the new action plan?
- 6) Review the draft University Mission Statement and suggest modifications.
- 7) Create awareness, leadership and support for a university-wide conversation about our progress on enhancing diversity through recruitment, retention, partnerships, campus climate, professional development and assessment.

**Work Products to be submitted to Executive Committee of President's Cabinet:**

- 1) Framework and action plan that integrates ongoing efforts and existing institutional structures into goals and plans for promoting diversity at UC.
- 2) A plan for incorporating diversity into the university's performance measures and a set of performance indicators that should be monitored to insure that UC's commitment to diversity is measured; e.g., personnel demographics, enrollment demographics, support programs and activities, attitudinal benchmarks, and academic support services. How will we know if we are making progress?
- 3) Proposed revisions to University Mission Statement

**Task Force Structure:**

- **Co-Chairs:** Marian Spencer and Nancy Zimpher
- **Steering Committee:** This small group, chaired by Lou Bilonis, Dean, College of Law, will lead, organize and guide the work of the task force.

## **SECTION III:**

# **TASK FORCE VISION, PRINCIPLES, PROCESS, RECOMMENDATIONS**

### III. TASK FORCE VISION, PRINCIPLES, PROCESS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### VISION AND PRINCIPLES

From the outset, the President’s UC|21 Diversity Task Force has been motivated by the clear vision laid out in the president’s charge to us: a campus environment that embraces diversity as one of our core values, infusing every aspect of campus life and purpose, and every measure of success.

##### Our Definition of Diversity

This task force recognizes a very broad and inclusive concept of diversity that should include commonly recognized considerations such as race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability status, socioeconomic status, sexual identity, sexual orientation, religion, and regional or national origin. Going forward, we want to emphasize that UC’s concept of diversity should retain the capacity to grow with our understanding.

**Our Compelling Interest in Diversity:** We embrace that vision because diversity at the University of Cincinnati, as in public higher education across America, is essential. As the Supreme Court of the United States acknowledged in *Grutter v. Bollinger*, the 2003 decision that affirmed the University of Michigan Law School’s “compelling state interest” in a diverse student body, “education is the very foundation of good citizenship and for this reason, the diffusion of knowledge and opportunity through public higher education must be accessible to all individuals. . . . It is essential if the dream of one nation is to be realized.”

A 2005 report of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) Task Force on Diversity – *Now Is the Time: Meeting the Challenge for a Diverse Academy* – summarizes the compelling importance of diversity in terms that we affirm. *Now*

*is the Time* eloquently lays out three imperatives that make diversity a vital interest for public universities. First, a diverse campus is essential to fulfilling the **learning imperative** of a public university. It exposes students and faculty to broader perspectives and more ideas, fosters deeper and more critical analysis, and opens new vistas for scholarly inquiry. Second, a diverse campus also is essential to our efforts to produce a vital workforce – to fulfilling the **economic imperative** of a public university. In the words of Justice O’Connor in *Grutter*, “[t]he skills needed in today’s increasingly global marketplace can only be developed through exposure to widely diverse people, cultures, ideas and viewpoints.” And third, a diverse campus is essential to preparing students for effective citizenship in an increasingly diverse America – to fulfilling the public university’s **democracy imperative**. “In order to cultivate a set of leaders with legitimacy in the eyes of the citizenry,” Justice O’Connor wrote in *Grutter*, “it is necessary that the path to leadership be visibly open to talented and qualified individuals of every race and ethnicity.”

At UC, we add to these three our own fourth imperative: our strategic vision, *UC|21: Defining the New Urban Research University*. UC|21 articulates our aspiration to continued betterment and excellence, and it emphasizes the importance of our deep connection to our urban home, Cincinnati, in the pursuit of our aspirations. This task force reaffirms those concepts and acknowledges that a diverse campus, with a culture that fosters diversity, is essential to the effective engagement with our community that makes us strong. Excellence and diversity go hand in hand, and our recommendations are intended to make diversity one of the anchors of UC|21 and to suggest a plan of action to make it so.

UC's proposed new mission statement thus rightly underscores our compelling interest in diversity and diversity's prominence as a core value of the university. UC's proposed mission is to serve "the people of Ohio, the nation and the world as a premier, public, urban research university." We therefore are "committed to excellence and diversity in our students and faculty, undergraduate and graduate education, experience-based learning, and research."

When it comes to diversity, UC unquestionably has experienced significant progress. Over the course of recent decades, UC as a public urban research university has achieved much success and has developed many strengths in providing a more open and inviting climate of opportunity for students, faculty and staff of color. For example, UC ranks fourth among Ohio's 14 public universities in African American enrollment diversity (behind Central State, Cleveland State and University of Akron). The Just Community Initiative, celebrating its 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary this year, has worked to make UC a more caring and just community. While in the 1930s, a pioneering group of African American students formed a student organization called Quadres at a time when racial segregation at UC prevailed, UC now offers numerous programs, activities and organizations geared to various stakeholder groups of color, ranging from its new African American Alumni Association to student groups like ADVANCE, Club Hispano and the Black Arts Collaborative (for listing, see Exhibit One in the online appendix).

Despite the many steps forward, significant challenges remain. For example, an examination of census data by race/ethnicity (see Exhibit Three in online appendix), shows signs of UC's success in many ways, yet reveals a particular challenge that exists in the area of faculty diversity. Our aspiration is to embrace these opportunities for further progress and create a UC where diversity is so intuitive and so seamlessly interwoven into the fabric of our institution that it is a part of our very nature. Diversity is not just about numbers, statistics and demographics; it is much more than compliance with laws and directives; it is about culture, inclusion and creating an environment that supports diversity and affirms each individual's value, potential and contribution to the UC community. In addition, our hope for a climate that truly respects and celebrates differences looks beyond our campus boundaries into the region around us and the myriad ways in which we intersect with the community – educational and corporate partnerships, relationships with suppliers and vendors, civic and service endeavors, and more.

***Our Definition of Diversity:*** This task force recognizes a very broad and inclusive concept of diversity that should include commonly recognized considerations such as race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability status, socioeconomic status, sexual identity, sexual orientation,

religion, and regional or national origin. Going forward, we want to emphasize that UC's concept of diversity should retain the capacity to grow with our understanding. UC must be a place where persons of diverse cultures can thrive academically and professionally.

In recognition of this broad definition, our task force has laid out an ongoing framework to carry UC forward and allow for growth. This framework is set forth in the first of our five recommended initiatives, the Framework and Structures Initiative. Our goal with this first initiative is to anchor the broadest possible definition of diversity into the instructional structure of the university and to lay out a process for clarifying the definition of diversity and creating an integrated institutional plan for diversity. We acknowledge, however, that definitions by their very nature may prove confining, and therefore we caution that diversity is much more than a checklist of characteristics. Our report is intended as a first step toward creating a university culture that can be transformational and evolving.

While we have embraced this broader definition of diversity, our charge from the president asked us to focus specifically upon racial and ethnic diversity at UC. As a result in the other four recommended initiatives - Community and Climate, Student, Faculty and Staff, we focus primarily on race and ethnicity. The focus afforded by our charge proved beneficial in that it kept our task manageable at the outset. A truly comprehensive diversity plan of course will require examination of a broader range of issues and initiatives, but any effort to tackle them all at once likely would suffer from the sheer breadth and weight. We recognize that there are areas that merit further work and expansion, and we feel confident that our recommendations in the Framework Initiative lay out the process for future enhancement.

***Additional Principles That Have Guided Our Work:*** In our effort to produce concrete recommendations that will help UC achieve its vision of a diverse campus, three companion principles have influenced us throughout:

- We cannot get to our destination without knowing where we are and where we have been.
- We cannot get to our destination without building on our strengths, addressing our weaknesses and capitalizing on our opportunities.
- Reaching our destination is easier if we learn from the experiences of others.

## **PROCESS**

Our process followed directly from this vision and these principles.

***Preliminary Overview of History and Current Status of Diversity at UC:*** Meeting monthly beginning in May 2006, the task force devoted its first two meetings (May 17, 2006 and June 26, 2006) to the history of race, ethnicity and diversity initiatives at UC and to an overview of the current state of affairs. We reviewed seminal documents, such as the Report to President Steger from the President's Advisory Council on Race Relations and Human Decency (PACRRHD). We heard firsthand accounts of major moments in the history of race relations on campus, including presentations from former UC vice provost Milton Hinton and Career Development Center Director Linda Bates Parker and reflections from our co-chair, Marian Spencer (a former president of Quadres and former Cincinnati councilwoman), and

Ethnic Programs and Services Director Eric Abercrombie. We paid close attention to data on faculty, student and staff recruitment and retention, hearing a number of reports from George Wharton, director of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Lee Mortimer, academic director of Institutional Research. We reflected on the campus climate and on UC's reputation and relationship with the community. A diverse and inclusive group, the task force stressed thorough inquiry and complete candor.

As with all the task force's meetings, the agendas for these meetings were prepared by the Steering Committee – a smaller group made up of members of the task force and chaired by Louis D. Bilonis, Dean of the College of Law.

***Identification of Five Key Areas:*** The task force's early meetings and discussions revealed five key and recurrent areas that merited closer study and appeared likely areas for major initiatives: (1) Faculty recruitment and retention; (2) Student recruitment and retention; (3) Staff recruitment and retention; (4) Institutional structure and framework; and (5) Campus climate and community relations.

The task force accordingly devoted its July 18, 2006 meeting to brainstorming on the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and possible initiatives associated with each of the five areas. The Steering Committee also formed five subcommittees to devote sustained attention to each of the five identified areas. Drawing on members of the Steering Committee and the broader task force, those subcommittees were:

- Institutional Structure and Framework (chaired by Ann Welsh)
- Community and Climate: At UC and Throughout Cincinnati (chaired by Mitchel Livingston)
- Student Recruitment and Retention (co-chaired by Jerry Tsai and Mitchel Livingston)
- Faculty Recruitment and Retention (chaired by John Brackett)
- Staff Recruitment and Retention (chaired by Alecia Trammer)

***Research on Best Practices:*** During the summer months, the Steering Committee researched major diversity initiatives at other universities and developed a detailed matrix of best practices. This information, together with the ideas developed by the task force during its July 18, 2006 meeting, would influence the work of the task force for the duration. No less significant was the independent research conducted by the various subcommittees, each of which met on a regular basis.

***Further Examination, Research and Discussion:*** The remaining monthly meetings of the task force were devoted to further examination in each of the five areas. In each instance, the meeting was led by members of the respective subcommittee and featured reports, visioning exercises and critical analysis and discussion of strengths, weaknesses and possible initiatives. On August 9, 2006, the meeting concerned faculty recruitment and retention. On September 22, 2006, the focus turned to student recruitment and retention along with issues pertaining to the campus climate. On October 20, 2006, the task force took up staff recruitment and retention and UC's relationship with the greater community. On November 29, 2006, the discussion focused on the institutional structure and framework necessary to

achieve our vision of a diverse UC (and to integrate existing initiatives such as Just Community). On December 19, the task force discussed and reviewed its recommendations as a whole.

From January 19 through March 8, a draft report was vetted with various groups and constituents including Faculty Senate, the Council of Deans, Undergraduate Student Government, Graduate Student Association, African American community leaders and others.

**Communications:** Throughout the process, the task force's work has been documented on the UC Web site at [www.uc.edu/diversitytaskforce](http://www.uc.edu/diversitytaskforce). The Web site also contains a feature to facilitate feedback. During fall 2006, members of the Steering Committee also reached out to the university community, appearing at a number of meetings to discuss the task force and invite comment. These meetings included an event sponsored by the Student Government (promoted widely with the student body) and discussions with the Faculty-Staff Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender/Questioning Task Force, Faculty Senate and other stakeholders ranging from the President's Cabinet to the Human Resources Advisory Committee and union leadership. Feedback on the work of the task force was also sought through articles in the *News Record* and *E-Currents*.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS: FIVE COMPREHENSIVE INITIATIVES**

This report represents the distillation of extensive research and discussion. Corresponding to the lines of inquiry that shaped our work, we recommend *five comprehensive initiatives*.

Each of the five initiatives calls for a number of recommended actions that are calculated to work together to fulfill a goal that is essential to achieving a diverse campus. In an effort to expedite action, the Executive Summary recommends "immediate" steps to be taken, while also listing additional recommendations for longer-range consideration.

To achieve a diverse campus, we recommend a five-pronged approach:

- **Institutional Structure and Framework Initiative:** *Develop an institutional structure and framework at UC that embraces and ensures continued, sustained and effective commitment to diversity.*

This initiative is intended to move the university beyond a demographic approach to diversity toward a more systemic approach and a culture in which diversity is more deeply anchored as a value of the entire institution. To accomplish a cultural change of this depth and breadth, we recommend first and foremost, an integrated institutional plan for diversity, followed by five recommendations that are components of the first.

- **Community and Climate Initiative:** *Enhance our campus climate and relationships with the community in support of our commitment to diversity.*

We aspire to develop a campus climate that supports individual differences and promotes our common humanity. We are encouraged that recent survey data indicate that students of color, in general, perceive the UC campus climate more positively than white students. To help ensure further progress not just for students but also for faculty, staff and others who have relationships with our campus, we suggest that the university underscore its commitment to diversity by adopting a new university mission statement that includes diversity as a core value. We also look beyond our campus and hope that UC can play a role in creating an improved climate for racial and ethnic relations throughout the Cincinnati community.

- **Student Initiative:** *Improve our recruitment and retention of a diverse student body.*

Like the Faculty and Staff Initiatives, this proposal concentrates on enhancements in recruitment and retention. UC's undergraduate enrollment shows a remarkably consistent mix of race and ethnicity over the last five years. We now rank No. 4 among 14 Ohio public universities in African American student enrollment. With our eyes on improving that standing near the top, we envision enrollment that is reflective of our region's and our nation's racial and ethnic mix. Retention among full-time baccalaureate degree-seeking students is improving across the board; however African Americans continue to experience lower retention rates than other groups. By and large, our recommendations in this initiative are targeted to provide more financial and academic-preparation assistance for the neediest students and to reach out to more students of color.

- **Faculty Initiative:** *Recruit and retain more faculty of color, particularly African Americans.*

The level of diversity among our UC faculty is a disappointment, and the situation also appears to be uniformly dismal at higher education institutions elsewhere. It is difficult to retain the underrepresented faculty already on our campus when competition with other campuses nationwide for African American faculty, in particular, is intense. We would like to see UC transform this challenge into an opportunity to become a national model. The recommendations for this initiative center, therefore, mainly on increasing the ranks of our African American and other faculty of color.

- **Staff Initiative:** Improve our recruitment and retention of a diverse staff; create a workplace that supports diversity and affirms each individual's value and potential.

In order to fulfill our vision of a campus that is welcoming and supportive of all individuals regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability status, socioeconomic status, sexual identity, sexual orientation, religion, and regional or national origin, this initiative recommends enhancing our orientation programs

with an eye toward appreciation of diversity, instituting a centralized exit interview process that provides more information on why employees leave as well as improving workforce planning with more strategic approaches that involve Human Resources and the Office of Equal Opportunity in assisting and monitoring UC units in efforts to recruit and retain staff from historically underrepresented groups.

These initiatives were derived from reports drafted by our subcommittees, and their reports are presented in the Full Subcommittee Reports section, beginning on page 21. Each subcommittee report begins with a statement of vision, followed by a brief discussion of some relevant history and then an assessment of the current state at UC and an identification of the relevant opportunities. Each concludes with recommendations calculated to help achieve the stated vision.

Some observers might contend that our recommendations are “too little, too late”; still others may claim our ideas are too numerous and expensive, especially in a budget environment of cost-cutting and scarce resources. To the former, we recognize that leading organizations in business and industry may be ahead of higher education when it comes to more fully embracing diversity and infusing it into their structures. It is imperative that we do not delay, and we believe this report advances sound recommendations that will produce a foundation upon which UC may build. To the latter, we acknowledge the need for fiscal reserve while stressing that diversity remains one of the great challenges of our nation and an essential ingredient of UC’s success in the generations to come. It requires serious investment over time as well as steady and sustained progress.

Consistent with our charge, these various recommended initiatives reflect an overall strategy. Achieving diversity at UC requires a structural approach and a cultural approach – both are necessary, but neither is sufficient in itself. What is needed is an integrated institutional approach that combines both structural and cultural initiatives and has clear lines of accountability.

Consistent with our charge, these various recommended initiatives also constitute an action plan. They suggest many new actions, but they also integrate ongoing efforts and existing institutional structures – and indeed, underscore the importance (often unsung) of those efforts. Finally, and consistent with our charge, these recommended initiatives state clear goals, identify benchmarks, provide measurable indicators of progress, assign responsibilities and establish timetables for performance.

### **A NOTE ABOUT HISTORY AND TIMELINES**

The history sections drafted by each subcommittee and the African American Experience Timeline available as Exhibit Two represent beginning attempts to record some of UC’s history in diversity, both its celebratory and its controversial moments. Because this history has not previously been available in any comprehensive, written form, these subcommittee reports and the timeline are in many ways a first attempt to record this information in one place. The information presented is therefore acknowledged to be incomplete and contains more details about African American history and less about other underrepresented groups. It

is the task force's hope that the Timeline will be viewed as a starting point for a more comprehensive diversity history as well as a living document that will be added to and altered over time as facts become known.

### **FEEDBACK**

Comments concerning this report may be submitted by e-mail using the Feedback link on the UC|21 Diversity Task Force Web site, at [www.uc.edu/diversitytaskforce](http://www.uc.edu/diversitytaskforce).

## **SECTION IV:**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

## **IV: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY – TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS**

The UC|21 Diversity Task Force formed five subcommittees to address the common themes that emerged from discussions: *Institutional Structure and Framework*; *Community and Climate: At UC and Throughout Cincinnati*; *Student Recruitment and Retention*; *Faculty Recruitment and Retention*; and *Staff Recruitment and Retention*. This executive summary lists the five initiatives and recommendations that evolved from these subcommittees. We have identified immediate steps that are needed to anchor diversity in our culture and listed a second tier of additional concepts that are recommended for longer-term consideration. For fuller details, see the individual subcommittee reports beginning on page 21. The task force proposes that these efforts be launched in the 2007-08 academic year.

### **INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE AND FRAMEWORK INITIATIVE**

Develop an institutional structure and framework at UC that embraces and ensures continued, sustained and effective commitment to diversity.

#### **Immediate**

- **Implement an integrated institutional plan for diversity.**
- **Engage the university in a process to define diversity.**
- **Create a senior-level position of Director of Diversity.**
- **Establish an all-university Committee on Diversity in charge of maintaining this report as a living document, holding responsible parties accountable and reporting on at least an annual basis to the community at large.**
- **Develop, implement and monitor a Communication Plan to ensure continuous and consistent expression of the university's commitment to diversity.**

#### ***Additional:***

- Create a plan to showcase images of diverse cultures.

## COMMUNITY AND CLIMATE INITIATIVE

Enhance our campus climate and relationships with the community in support of our commitment to diversity.

### Immediate

- **Revise the University Mission Statement to include a commitment to diversity.**
- **Reaffirm the university's commitment to the existence of the African American Cultural and Research Center and clarify the separate issue of a multicultural center for broader interests.**
- **Share the findings from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) with relevant student groups and with the mentors and other campus-based influencers of these groups; perform periodic assessment using NSSE and SSI to research and evaluate the concerns that ethnic students face regarding safety throughout our community (focusing off-campus).**

### *Additional:*

- Develop a community dialogue regarding the recommendations of the Just Community Task Force (included in these discussions will be the development of the Core University Values).
- Develop and distribute publications regarding a history of the African American experience at UC and *The Future of Learning* book.
- Develop a marketing initiative focused on increasing education abroad and international co-op opportunities for students of color.
- Reactivate the Racial Incidents Team.
- Incorporate Cincinnati community issues regarding diversity into the university's Center for the City efforts.
- Develop a program that recognizes outstanding alumni of color.
- Elevate the Racial Awareness Program (RAPP) to its original level.
- Encourage greater levels of involvement by students in student organizations, in campus life, and leadership positions; encourage student organizations to become more active and provide them with leadership training; encourage more faculty mentoring to students through faculty involvement as organizational advisors and attendance at student programs.
- Ensure that ethnic students are involved in committees/groups working to enhance safety/security.
- Enhance contracting processes and procedures to maximize their accessibility and understandability, particularly to first-time or inexperienced vendors and further develop relationships with such regional groups as the Cincinnati USA Regional Council, the Cincinnati Minority Business Opportunity Committee, the Cincinnati African American Chamber of Commerce, the Minority Business Accelerator and the South Central Ohio Minority Business Council.

## STUDENT INITIATIVE

Improve our recruitment and retention of a diverse student body.

### Immediate

- **Develop additional scholarship options marketed to students of color that do not include the program requirements of the Darwin T. Turner Program. Turner is a model program and one we support, but it is not an attractive option for some students of color because of the program requirements.**
- **Support the initiatives of STRIVE, Summer Bridge, Gear Up, M2SE, Ohio Core and other programs directed at improving academic preparedness in the admissions pipeline; support the continued development of the dual enrollment programs operated by the College of Applied Science in the Cincinnati public schools.**
- **Enhance partnerships with Cincinnati State, Sinclair and our regional campuses as effective pipelines for need-based students and starting points for students with developmental needs.**

### *Additional:*

- Continue inclusion of non-cognitive factors in admissions application reviews and strengthen the process further, and carefully monitor the impact of increasing standards so as not to incur unintended consequences.
- Increase the number of Darwin Turner Scholars and enhance our sources of support for graduate students of color.
- Enhance efforts to attract and enroll students of color through community involvement and outreach;
- Explore more need-based programs to help students pay tuition and develop strategies to curb significant increases in tuition.
- Improve diversity recruitment results in Cleveland and Columbus by hiring an additional recruitment staff person of color.
- Obtain a higher level of recruitment support from key internal faculty and staff constituencies.
- Expand the concept of cultural competence to include greater focus on race and ethnicity.
- Encourage involvement of alumni of color to assist in the recruitment of students of color.

## FACULTY INITIATIVE

Recruit and retain more faculty of color, particularly African Americans.

### Immediate

- **Create a more viable Department of African and African American Studies, capable of meeting teaching expectations on campus and in Cincinnati's African American communities.**
- **Increase the budget in the Provost's Office to encourage and facilitate diversity in hiring.**

- **Enhance faculty search committees to ensure that each search committee meets with appropriate personnel from the Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO) to discuss venues to advertise for underrepresented faculty and to make sure that no search goes forward without documented best efforts to create a diverse pool.**
- **Enhance recruitment and retention of African American and other underrepresented faculty by making more than one hire at a time, where possible, using mentors/ambassadors from the community to create awareness of what Cincinnati has to offer; creating faculty mentors of all races and ethnicities; creating materials to market Cincinnati to candidates similar to brochures used with students; performing exit interviews with underrepresented faculty who leave; and aiding department heads in assessing and improving the atmosphere within departments.**

***Additional:***

- Establish a Center for the Study of Race, Gender and Social Justice;
- Pursue cluster hires of faculty.
- Grow our own faculty of color.

## **STAFF INITIATIVE**

Improve our recruitment and retention of a diverse staff; create a workplace that supports diversity and affirms each individual's value and potential.

### **Immediate**

- **Enhance employee orientation in general, while also incorporating into it diversity as a core value.**
- **Improve workforce planning.**

***Additional:***

- Have the Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO) and Human Resources (HR) assist and monitor all units of UC in their efforts to recruit and retain staff from historically underrepresented groups.
- Develop and promote throughout the university an inventory of campus and community educational/training opportunities on issues of diversity and develop additional training opportunities as needed, based on periodic climate surveys and feedback from current programs, and promoted in the HR Web site and publications.
- Provide a multidisciplinary center within HR to collect, maintain, analyze and report on diversity data and to provide technical assistance to decision makers for their data needs regarding staff.
- Create a centralized exit interview process.

**SECTION V:**

**FULL  
SUBCOMMITTEE  
REPORTS**

## A. INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE AND FRAMEWORK

### Vision

The first two sentences of UC's proposed new mission statement clearly capture our vision for the future:

“The University of Cincinnati serves the people of Ohio, the nation and the world as a premier, public, urban research university. We are committed to **excellence** and **diversity** in our students and faculty, undergraduate and graduate education, experience-based learning, and research...”

As the mission makes explicit, one of the two core values envisioned as underlying the university is diversity. Our vision is that this mission statement becomes reality.

### History

A substantial portion of our task force sessions have been devoted to a recounting of the lived experience of African Americans at the University of Cincinnati. These discussions indicate that diversity, while a stated goal of the institution over the past 25 years, has not become anchored in the culture of the university. During this period, diversity-oriented initiatives have been overwhelmed by competing demands for visibility, resources and commitment. Further, for many, the university's commitment to diversity is sufficiently tenuous to require continuing vigilance to hold the university to its commitments. This provides clear evidence that diversity is not, as yet, among our core values.

### Current State and Opportunities

The five subcommittees in the task force organized around aspects of the university: recruitment and retention (R&R) of students, faculty and staff; community and climate, and the institutional structure and framework. Each of the R&R subcommittees has presented trend data regarding the university's diversity profile. At the same time, they each acknowledged the need to work more explicitly to create a supportive environment for all. The community and climate subcommittee, in addition to examining internal data on student perceptions of climate, has created a narrative titled, *UC's African American Experience Timeline* (see Exhibit Two in the online Exhibits and Appendices section). Thus each subcommittee reported on issues of structure (i.e., institutional profiles, roles and responsibilities) and culture in both its formal (e.g., Just Community) and informal (i.e., perceptions/interpretations of the meaning of the structural aspects) manifestations.

Similarly, the institutional structure and framework subcommittee used the concepts of structure and culture to organize our thinking on how to achieve our vision of diversity as a core value of the University of Cincinnati. Our first task was to assess the status of diversity efforts at the university. Each of the R&R subcommittees provided useful trend data (not repeated here). In addition to those data, we examined the organizational structure and archival records (e.g., Board rules, Affirmative Action Reports, unit activity reports) for indications of the institutional roles responsible for diversity efforts.

Based on these documents, we have limited evidence that performance on diversity initiatives is contained in the job descriptions of senior administrators; less evidence that performance on such initiatives is evaluated and/or has consequences. Only one academic unit reported using performance toward diversity goals as a basis for evaluation.

Institutionally mandated reporting on diversity efforts is housed in the Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO). Appendix A (in the online Exhibits and Appendices) contains the content requirements for annual reports. In order to understand current efforts to promote and cultivate diversity, we gathered the 2005-06 assessments on diversity efforts provided by each of the colleges/units as well as the statements of purpose and activity for the student service offices. (Samples from these reports are summarized in tabular form in appendices B and C.) These reports guide us toward the models for diversity extant in the university and help us understand the extent to which there are explicit expectations, performance evaluation and consequences tied to initiating, sustaining and enhancing diversity initiatives within the academic units and student services.

These reports suggest that the dominant institutional approach to diversity is demographic, as if achieving critical mass in diversity of students, staff and faculty would be sufficient to our needs. This is partly a function of the report format with its emphasis on reporting recruitment and retention “activities.” (This stands in contrast to a reporting format that also asked for evidence of impact.) The reports indicate wide variation among units in both depth and breadth of diversity initiatives; thus suggesting a relatively idiosyncratic, rather than systematic, approach to diversity. Many units indicate some limited consideration of culture, mentioning the presence of one or two initiatives specifically designed to deepen community understanding of diversity (e.g., awareness programming, developmental activities, curricula and educational programs, scholarship and pedagogy). For the most part, unit responses can generally be categorized as training to enhance individual cultural competence (as distinct from diversity), the creation of recruitment initiatives for faculty and students, and the creation of offices or programs that represent various constituencies based on race, ethnicity, gender or sexual orientation. A very few units (most notably the School of Social Work) utilize a more comprehensive approach matching structural initiatives with cultural ones, as well as providing evidence that performance on diversity initiatives is an integral part of an overall performance management system.

Consideration of institutional history, trends in student, staff and faculty recruitment and retention, student service and unit-based initiatives underscores the testimony of lived experience heard by the task force that a core value of diversity has not been anchored in the culture of this institution. Efforts to create an environment at the University of Cincinnati in which persons from diverse cultures can thrive academically as well as professionally have been sporadic and reactive. Many of these initiatives have been short lived or insulated within specific units. The university’s efforts have stopped short of the creation of a university-wide plan or policies that effectively and comprehensively reflect a commitment to integrate diversity initiatives into our institutional mission and academic plan. Such an integrated institutional approach is fundamental to achieving a core value of diversity.

We then conducted a review of best practices (see Appendix D in the online Exhibits and Appendices) in other public universities known for their visible commitment to diversity, including Indiana, Minnesota, North Carolina, Virginia, Washington and Wisconsin-Madison, as well as regional urban institutions (University of Louisville and IUPUI). This review led to the following observations:

- Responsibility for diversity efforts are most often lodged at the top of the organization, as evidenced by the trend toward the creation of chief diversity officers.
- Such positions occur most often in the aftermath of significant and/or visible evidence of conflict (usually racial insensitivity).
- Significant commitments of financial resources accompany diversity initiatives.
- Three institutional models, distinguished by the authority source, were observed:
  1. Academic/provostal offices, with an emphasis on strategy, supervision of academic programs, scholarship, pedagogy, institutional research, development and communication.
  2. Student affairs offices emphasizing awareness programming.
  3. Human resources offices with an emphasis on training and compliance.
- Four models of program scope were also observed (See Appendix D in the online Exhibits and Appendices): from the narrowly defined self-contained model (UC example, the College of Business' Lindner Honors PLUS), the educational opportunity programs model (UC example, Emerging Ethnic Engineers), the advocacy model (UC example, student services) and a fully integrated model.
- Even the most comprehensive planning is no guarantor of success. In particular, recent five-year progress reports by the University of Wisconsin-Madison and Indiana University provide evidence that effecting true cultural change requires more than comprehensive planning and resource commitments to achieve a culture of diversity.

Establishing a core value of diversity requires consensus regarding what practices, policies and behaviors honor and support diversity. Cultural change entails overcoming a variety of hurdles: definitional ambiguity, uneven and insular past performance, absence of lines of accountability, and a lack of cooperation and collaboration among administration, academic units and student services. Thus, we advocate the adoption of a fully integrated (including academic, student services and administrative units) institutional approach to diversity that combines both structural and cultural initiatives and has clear lines of accountability. Over time, we believe such a model will make our mission of excellence and diversity a reality.

### **Recommendations**

The subcommittee on institutional framework and structure believes that these recommendations, if accepted, would form the basis for an integrated institutional plan for diversity. We offer a caveat, however, that this would only be the beginning and that we can and will expect the plan to grow, evolve and intensify as the beginnings of a culture honoring and supporting diversity takes hold.

### Immediate Recommendations

- **Implement an integrated institutional plan for diversity.**

All of the other recommendations in this section are components of this first, overall recommendation. This plan will have both structural and cultural components, contain clear performance metrics, and provide for annual progress reports to the President and Board of Trustees. Due to UC's history and climate, this plan should focus on racial and ethnic diversity as its starting point, but will be expected to support a broad and inclusive definition of diversity.

*Responsible party:* Plan creation and implementation – Senior VP and Provosts Perzigian and Henney, Senior VP Rimai, Vice President Livingston, and the suggested new Director of Diversity.

- **Engage the university in a process to define diversity.**

Implementation should begin in winter, 2008.

In order to embrace diversity as a core value, we must all understand what is meant by diversity at UC. Diversity must be defined locally within the context of our history, mission and situation and cannot simply be appropriated from another place. The definition should be complete and appropriate for our time and explicitly include references to: "Race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability status, socioeconomic status, sexual identity, sexual orientation, religion and regional/national origin."

*Responsible party:* The BOT and the President's Cabinet as well as every college and division at UC must engage in this process to define diversity.

*Performance metric:* Process completed and BOT adopts definition by June 2008.

*Cost:* None.

- **Create the senior-level position of Director of Diversity.**

This position would report to the President and serve as a member of the President's Cabinet. This title is used as a placeholder in this report.

This position would also serve as a visible statement of our commitment to an institution-wide approach. Its senior status ensures that diversity considerations are included in the strategic planning and operations of the University. The primary responsibilities will include strategic planning for and coordination of diversity initiatives, building a structure for collaboration that crosses academic and administrative lines and establishing a clearinghouse (point of collection and dissemination) to track, coordinate and communicate all current diversity initiatives occurring at UC. It is our expectation that the Director of Diversity will reach out to all units, identifying a diversity "go-to" person in each one and work to expand their influence and number by convening regular meetings of the group.

*Responsible party and performance metrics:*

- A position description will be created by the Steering Team of the President's Diversity Task Force by the end of winter quarter, 2007.

- This position will be vetted and presented to the BOT for their approval by the end of spring quarter, 2007.
- The President will convene a search team, recruitment for this position will begin no later than July 1, with the expectation that the position will be filled no later than autumn, 2007.

*Cost:* Search costs, a salary line commensurate with a senior-level position and an administrative assistant.

- **Establish an all-university Committee on Diversity in charge of maintaining this report as a living document, holding responsible parties accountable and reporting on at least an annual basis to the community at large.**

Additionally the committee would oversee the development of an online communication vehicle that routinely updates our campus community about significant diversity matters.

- This committee will be comprised of students, faculty and representatives of academic, student services and administrative units.
- The committee will be chaired by the Director of Diversity.
- This committee will take the recommendations of the President's Task Force on Diversity and develop policy recommendations and implementation plans.
- The work product emanating from this committee will be forwarded to the Academic Coordinating Committee and the Fiscal Coordinating Committee.

*Performance metric:* Establish committee and populate it no later than January 1, 2008.

*Cost:* None.

- **Develop, implement and monitor a Communication Plan**

Develop, implement and monitor a communication plan that ensures comprehensive, continuous and consistent expression of the university's commitment to a core value of diversity including, but not limited to Web sites, regular reports on the university's demographics, results of climate surveys and progress toward performance measures, and publications on diversity.

We are more likely to focus on diversity if we make a public statement of what we will do and when.

*Performance metrics:*

- Communication audit conducted by June 2008
- Plan to be in place by August 2008.
- Create template for unit reporting by September 2008
- Update UC Web site by December 2008

*Responsible party:* Steering team is responsible for communication audit, Director of Diversity responsible for other metrics.

*Costs:* To be determined.

### Additional Recommendations

- **Create a plan to showcase images of diverse cultures.**

Each academic and administrative unit will be asked to create a plan to showcase images of diversity. These may include university-wide or unit celebrations, stories about alumni or existing students, materials for the diversity Web site, displays for buildings. Each plan will also include information on how the unit will obtain funding as required. (Some suggestions are contained in Appendix E in the online Exhibits and Appendices.)

*Performance metrics:* Plans submitted to Director of Diversity by September 1, 2008.

*Responsible Party:* Director of Diversity, Academic and Administrative Unit Heads.

*Costs:* To be borne by individual units.

### **Assessment and Accountability**

Progress will be monitored through the metrics outlined above and ultimately through the measures laid out in the plans proposed above.

## **B: COMMUNITY AND CLIMATE: AT UC AND THROUGHOUT CINCINNATI**

### **Vision**

We aspire to develop a campus climate that supports our individual differences and promotes our common humanity. We hope to create a campus whose racial and ethnic diversity is representative of the region and nation served by UC. The campus will be a place where the learning environment fosters an appreciation for, and celebration of excellence, recognizing that diversity is an integral part of an exemplary learning environment.

### **History**

Since Henry Malachi Griffin became the first undergraduate student in 1880 and William Parham graduated from the College of Law in 1874, African American students have always had a presence at the University of Cincinnati. In spite of the racial discrimination experienced by many of these students, they contributed significantly to the successful accomplishments of the university. The historical timeline for African American students at the university can be represented by four distinct periods.

From **1874 to the late 1940s**, systematic oppression for African American students existed at its most profound levels as these students were overtly segregated and denied certain opportunities. Despite these obstacles, many outstanding African American students achieved notable success, such as biologist Charles Henry Turner, one of the notable graduates of the 19<sup>th</sup> century; Jennie Porter, who in 1928 became the first African American woman to earn a doctorate at UC; and Theodore M. Berry, who attended UC as an undergraduate in the 1930s and later became Cincinnati's first African American mayor. However, it was the establishment of the Quadres, an African American university group, founded by Donald Spencer, his sister Valerie, William Lawless Jones, Harold Rhodes and Roberta Henderson, that started the process of breaking down the walls of segregation and allowing African American students as a whole to become more involved and accepted in university life.

The **1950s and 1960s** represent transitional years in the African American experience at UC. As a result of African American athletes becoming more widely recruited by the university, African American students were permitted and encouraged to live on campus. Well-known athletes, such as Oscar Robertson, known by many as the greatest basketball player that has ever lived, opened these doors. In the 1960s, African American students became more involved in establishing organizations including the United Black Association, formed under the leadership of Dwight Tillery, who later became mayor of Cincinnati. Dr. Lawrence Hawkins was named Dean of the College of Community Services, thus becoming UC's first African American administrator. In addition, in the mid-1960s, the Danforth Foundation began to provide funding to recruit graduate students of color in an effort that would evolve into the Minority Fellows Program.

The **1970s through the 1990s** were marked by "Open Access" years. During this period, large numbers of African American students attended UC and in fact in 1975, Tyrone Yates was elected the first African American Student Government president. A major reason for

this influx of African American students was the establishment of University College. Also, these years represented a large increase in the numbers of African American administrators and faculty members. In 1976, an African American, Albert Yates, became Vice President/University Dean for Graduate Education and Research, and two years later the Minority Fellows Program for graduate student recruitment was formalized. It is during this period that UC experienced heights of racial conflict, most notably, the Sigma Alpha Epsilon Fraternity “Martin Luther King Trash Party.” However, because of incidents such as this, the university attempted to deal with its racial problems by establishing committees to monitor campus climate and discipline student violators. The establishment of the Racial Awareness Pilot Project (RAPP) developed by an African American administrator, Linda Bates Parker, had one of the most profound, positive impacts on the issue of race at the university.

The **1990s to the present** can be termed “inclusion” years. In 1991, the undergraduate Minority Scholars Program was named after Dr. Darwin Turner (a renowned African American literature scholar who graduated in 1947 as UC’s youngest graduate ever). Upon the arrival of a new African American Vice President for Student Affairs and Services, Dr. Mitchel Livingston (who is one of several African American vice presidents who have served at UC over the years), the campus climate concerning race relations experienced improvement. As a result of the Just Community Initiative and Livingston’s idea of creating a campus “Main Street,” the university community as a whole seemed to better understand and embrace the concept of diversity and the influence of campus climate. During this period, a donated statue of Oscar Robertson was placed at the Shoemaker Center (now outside the Lindner Athletics Center near Fifth Third Arena), the graduate-level Minority Fellows Program was renamed after Dr. Albert Yates, the Edwards Center was named after Dr. Vera Edwards (a renowned UC African American professor), a residence hall was named after Dr. Darwin T. Turner, the African American Cultural and Research Center was established, and seven African American male student body presidents were elected. In 2006, our presidential task force, co-chaired by President Nancy L. Zimpher and former president of the Quadres at UC, Marian Spencer, was established to recommend an overall strategy and action plan for promoting diversity. (For more information, see *African American Experience Timeline*, Exhibit Two, in the online Exhibits and Appendices section).

Looking beyond the campus borders, our city has experienced a racial and ethnic history uniquely influenced by its location on the Ohio River, a spot that was once considered the “frontier west” and perhaps represents the southern-most large “northern” city. Since August 2004, Cincinnati has served as the home of the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center, reflecting the city’s prominence in efforts to provide safe transport and haven to enslaved African Americans seeking freedom. The museum’s groundbreaking brought citizens of all races together near the banks of the Ohio and spanning the Suspension Bridge in singing *This Little Light of Mine*. While Cincinnati can take pride in its role in the Underground Railroad and many prominent citizens who worked to fight slavery, the city also was home to many citizens who did not embrace the idea of abolitionism, and as a result, the city experienced violence and strife. In more recent decades, this city, like many urban centers across the nation, experienced riots in 1968. Even more recently, civil unrest erupted in April 2001 – in response to the shooting death of an unarmed African American teen, Timothy Thomas, by a white police officer, as well as the deaths of 14 other African

American men at the hands of police from 1995 to 2001. The riots and subsequent boycott of the city focused attention on racial divides that still have not fully been bridged.

### **Current State and Opportunities**

UC has moved forward aggressively to achieve the goal of racial and ethnic diversity. The university leader, President Zimpher, has clearly articulated the direction of the university by the establishment of *UC|21: Defining the New Urban Research University*. The execution of the six goals of UC|21 by the campus community is so important that President Zimpher presents an annual report card on progress to the university's Board of Trustees.

President Zimpher's willingness to engage campus and community stakeholders in a broad-based discussion on how race and ethnicity impacts the university serves as a testament to the commitment of her leadership. Further, the establishment of the Center for Urban Education and the collaborative agreement with Cincinnati State that will provide community college students an integrated, seamless pathway to a baccalaureate degree provide additional opportunities for racial and ethnic diversity on campus.

UC can take great pride in its No. 1 ranking among elite colleges enrolling financially needy students by the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. The university has taken great strides in embracing its history and the diversity embodied in it. Additional survey data clearly indicate that students of color, in general, perceive the campus climate more positively than white students.

There are, however, some unique challenges that will yield opportunities. Two midwestern, urban universities are moving at an accelerated pace. The University of Louisville has named a Vice Provost for Diversity and Equal Opportunity, while Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) has established a Diversity Council headed by university leaders to implement their diversity plan. Moreover, Xavier University has a well-established continuing education and certificate program that adds uniquely to the diversity of their campus. Their program is highly regarded and is led by a dean of Continuing Education.

### **Recommendations**

#### Immediate Recommendations

- **Revise the University Mission Statement to include a commitment to diversity.**  
*Responsible party:* President Zimpher, Cabinet, Board.  
*Costs:* none.
- **Reaffirm the university's commitment to the existence of the African American Cultural and Research Center and clarify the separate issue of a multicultural center for broader interests.**  
*Responsible party:* Mitchel Livingston, VP for Student Affairs; Capital Advisory Committee.  
*Costs:* To be determined.

- **Share the findings from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) with relevant student groups and with the mentors and other campus-based influencers of these groups; perform periodic assessment using NSSE and SSI to research and evaluate the concerns that ethnic students face regarding safety throughout our community (focusing off-campus).** It might be appropriate to share some of this data with African American alumni and with the African American leadership group that meets occasionally with President Zimpher, Vice President Livingston and others.  
*Responsible party:* Mitchel Livingston, VP for Student Affairs and Services; Institutional Research.  
*Cost:* Could be free or involve nominal snacks/pizza – maximum \$500.

Priority Two Recommendations

- **Develop a community dialogue regarding the recommendations of the Just Community Task Force. Included in these discussions will be the development of the Core University Values.**  
*Responsible party:* President Zimpher, Cabinet.  
*Costs:* none.
- **Develop and distribute publications regarding a history of the African American experience at UC and *The Future of Learning* book.**  
*Responsible party:* Mitchel Livingston, VP for Student Affairs and Services.  
*Costs:* \$25,000.
- **Develop a marketing initiative focused on increasing education abroad and international co-op opportunities for students of color.**  
*Responsible party:* Eric Abercrombie, Office of Ethnic Programs & Services. Support provided by Kettil Cedercreutz and the Office of Professional Practice, Mitch Leventhal and the Office of International Affairs; and Linda Bates Parker of Career Development Center.  
*Costs:* \$5,000.
- **Reactivate the Racial Incidents Team.**  
*Responsible party:* Frank Bowen, Associate VP for Student Life.  
*Costs:* none.
- **Incorporate Cincinnati community issues regarding diversity into the university's Center for the City.**  
 This initiative serves other interests such as access to university resources, developing key partnerships, etc.  
*Responsible Party:* Diversity Officer in collaboration with the Center for the City.  
*Costs:* none.

### Additional Recommendations

- **Develop a program that recognizes outstanding alumni of color.**  
*Responsible party:* Chief Diversity Officer; Mitchel Livingston, VP for Student Affairs and Services.  
*Costs:* \$10,000.
- **Elevate the Racial Awareness Program (RAPP) to its original level.**  
The Racial Awareness Program is a 9-month experiential learning program for students to challenge, debate, and educate each other on issues of social justice and social positioning, such as race, culture, gender, class and sexuality. RAPP originally consisted of one program coordinator, two graduate assistants and three facilitators. Currently, there is no professional administrator whose full-time job is to oversee the program. At this time, there is one graduate assistant and one facilitator who is directly responsible. The current program coordinator oversees diversity education, and RAPP is only one-third of her responsibility. Therefore, to bring RAPP back to its original level, additional staffing is needed, including the hiring of a full-time program coordinator.  
*Responsible party:* Frank Bowen, Associate VP for Student Life.  
*Costs:* \$100,000.
- **Encourage greater levels of involvement by students in student organizations, in campus life, and leadership positions; encourage student organizations to become more active and provide them with leadership training; encourage more faculty mentoring to students through faculty involvement as organizational advisors and attendance at student programs.**  
*Responsible party:* Frank Bowen, Associate VP for Student Life; Stacy Downing, Director of Student Activities and Leadership Development; and Eric Abercrombie, Director of Ethnic Programs and Services; Tony Perzigian, Mitchel Livingston.  
*Costs:* none.
- **Ensure that ethnic students are involved in committees/groups working to enhance safety/security.**  
*Responsible party:* Mitchel Livingston; VP for Student Affairs and Services.  
*Cost:* refreshments associated with a catered event – approximately \$1000.
- **Enhance contracting processes and procedures to maximize their accessibility and understandability, particularly to first-time or inexperienced vendors and further develop relationships with such regional groups as the Cincinnati USA Regional Council, the Cincinnati Minority Business Opportunity Committee, the Cincinnati African American Chamber of Commerce, the Minority Business Accelerator and the South Central Ohio Minority Business Council.**  
*Responsible party:* Office of General Counsel.  
*Cost:* To be determined.

### **Assessment and Accountability**

Individuals identified as responsible for the above recommendations will be held accountable through their periodic evaluations. Create a diversity audit to link NSSE, SSI and other related research data to determine progress of the above recommendations and conduct more qualitative assessments of climate.

## C. STUDENT RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

### **Vision**

The vision of the University of Cincinnati enrollment plan is to attract, retain and graduate students who are academically capable and reflect the rich cultural and racial diversity of our region. The university views academic excellence and diversity as threads of a common fabric that are woven together into a rich educational environment. The institution is committed to providing a “living” learning laboratory that strengthens appreciation of our unique differences and common humanity. Grounded in UC’s mission of advancing knowledge and innovation, this vision challenges all students to achieve their fullest potential.

### **History**

After nearly a decade of varying undergraduate enrollment, the university has, over the past three years, experienced some growth in total enrollment as well as for some underrepresented populations. This pattern is seen best in freshman enrollment. Despite the elimination of the College of Evening and Continuing Education and especially University College (about 33% underrepresented students in 2002), African American students have comprised 13-14% of the new freshman population in the most recent two years. Representation of other underrepresented groups has been consistently low over the past five years. Despite growth in the Hispanic population in the area, Hispanic students only comprise about 1.5% of the freshmen student population. UC had an open admissions policy until the 2006-2007 academic school year. Despite the rise in admission standards, enrollment remained even.

The pattern of total undergraduate enrollment shows a remarkably consistent mix of ethnicity over the last five years. African American students have comprised about 13% of the undergraduate student body, even as the total undergraduate enrollment grew from about 26,000 to 27,000. In Ohio, UC ranks third among 14 public universities in terms of student diversity. Retention of students has been a priority for UC in recent years, and the multiple initiatives are beginning to show results.

### **Current State and Opportunities**

***Growth in Numbers.*** From 2002 to 2006, first-time, degree-seeking undergraduate underrepresented students increased 20%, while the overall new student enrollment increased by 14%.

Hispanic enrollment in this category grew by 57% (from a small base) during that same period, while African American enrollment increased 18% – still stronger than overall growth. Asian growth (13%) was slightly slower than that of the overall population.

In Autumn 2006, new first-time, degree-seeking undergraduate African American enrollment stood at 655, up 100 students from five years earlier; new Hispanic enrollment grew by 26 students, to 72 in 2006. The new Asian population increased by just 13 students to 116.

**Percentage of Overall Population.** From 2001 to 2005, total student enrollment grew by 7%, to 35,244. From 2001 to 2005, total underrepresented enrollment grew by 8%, to 5630, or by 413 overall. In 2001, students of color comprised 15.8% of the total student population (undergraduate and graduate); in 2006, they comprised 15.4% of the total student population. During this most recent year, African Americans accounted for 10.9% of the population, while Asians and Hispanics comprised 2.7% and 1.5%, respectively. During the same period, 17% of first-time degree seeking undergraduates identified themselves as students of color. African Americans accounted for 13% of these, while Asians and Hispanics represented 2.3% and 1.4%, respectively.

Despite the closure of University College and strengthening of admission standards, enrollment of minorities remained steady from 2005 to 2006, with only very slight declines in African American enrollment. Our new Center for Access & Transition (CAT) is working to serve as a more effective educational entry-point and pathway for students who may not have enjoyed the same educational opportunities as others. In 2005, UC ranked second statewide only to OSU in total numbers and fourth (14%) in percentage of total enrollment for African American students enrolled among the 13 main university campuses, behind Central State (83%), Cleveland State (20%) and the University of Akron (15%); OSU reported only 8% African American enrollment.

**Retention.** Retention of first-time, full-time baccalaureate-seeking students is improving across the board. From 2001 to 2005, retention of African American students increased by 7% to 71%. Asian retention grew by 4% to 86%, while Hispanic retention grew by only 1%, to 74%. Retention improvements are greatest among African Americans and poorest among Hispanics; however, African Americans continue to lag other groups in retention.

Examination of all first-time, full-time undergraduate degree seeking students (associate and bachelors) shows a more mixed picture of retention. From 2001 to 2005, retention of African Americans stayed flat at 58% and Hispanics stayed flat at 67%, while Asian retention increased by 4% to 85%.

**Undergraduate Scholarships.** Cincinnatus awards to undergraduate students of color have risen from 155 in 2004 to 246 in 2006, with matriculants increasing from 76 to 96 during the same period. Despite this progress, it should be noted that while 71 Cincinnatus scholarships were awarded to African Americans students in 2006, only 31 elected to enroll; this is slightly fewer than the number of African Americans Cincinnatus award winners who enrolled in 2004. In general, during this period the ratio of enrollments resulting from awards has been declining across all three major underrepresented groups, but is most pronounced among Hispanics and African Americans: Hispanics (0.63 to 0.41), African Americans (0.57 to 0.44), and Asians (0.41 to 0.36). The reason for these declines is believed to be due to the relatively higher rate of tuition at UC and the proportionately lower amounts of aid being offered when compared to competing institutions.

**Student Satisfaction, Engagement and Residence Life.** Data from multiple student surveys on student satisfaction and student engagement were evaluated for insights on possible differences in student experiences amongst students of different ethnicities. In the Student

Satisfaction Inventory (SSI, 2006), African American students measured slightly higher overall satisfaction than did white students. African American students are significantly *more satisfied* with their ability to obtain information on campus, academic advising, computing access and services, recruitment, financial aid and overall service excellence. Interestingly, African American students are *less satisfied* with issues relative to racial harmony, diversity, commitment to under-represented populations and parking. Sample sizes for other ethnic groups were too small for meaningful analysis in this survey.

The 2006 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) demonstrates that, while there appear to be slight differences in the way minorities report engagement, the results are rarely statistically significant. In short, minorities report similar engagement patterns to whites. In a similar vein, the recent Residence Hall satisfaction data from the ACUHO-I/EBI Resident Study (2005-2006) indicates that while there is no significant negative difference for minorities when compared to whites on the individual dimensions of satisfaction, there is a very slight, but statistically significant negative difference for minorities when measuring general overall satisfaction with the residence life experience compared to the overall satisfaction of white students.

### **Recommendations**

These recommendations include strategies to foster the likelihood of improvements in academic and social integration. The body of research surrounding college success indicates that both are necessary to move students successfully to degree completion.

#### Immediate

- **Develop additional scholarship options marketed to students of color that do not include the program requirements of the Darwin T. Turner Program. Turner is a model program and one we support, but it is not an attractive option for some students of color because of the program requirements.**  
*Responsible party:* Caroline Miller, Associate VP for Enrollment Management, with support from Crafting the Class and the Tuition, Discount and Remission Committee – fund-raising support needed.  
*Costs:* \$500,000.
- **Support the initiatives of STRIVE, Summer Bridge, Gear Up, M2SE, Ohio Core and other programs directed at improving academic preparedness in the admissions pipeline; support the continued development of the dual enrollment programs operated by the College of Applied Science in the Cincinnati Public Schools.**  
*Responsible party:* Caroline Miller, Associate VP for Enrollment Management; Tom Hadley, Associate VP for Student Services; funding support from Tony Perzigian, Provost.  
*Costs:* \$500,000 – some may be obtainable through grants.

- **Enhance partnerships with Cincinnati State, Sinclair and our regional campuses as effective pipelines for need-based students and starting points for students with developmental needs.**

*Responsible party:* Tony Perzigian, Provost; Russ Curley, Director of Transfer and Lifelong Learning Center.

*Costs:* \$50,000 for advisor currently on staff but will need some re-deployment.

### Priority Two

- **Continue inclusion of non-cognitive factors in admissions application reviews and strengthen the process further; carefully monitor the impact of increasing standards so as not to incur unintended consequences.**

*Responsible party:* Tom Canepa, Assistant VP for Admissions.

*Costs:* \$20,000.

- **Increase the number of Darwin Turner Scholars and enhance our sources of support for graduate students of color.**

*Responsible party:* Caroline Miller, Associate VP for Enrollment Management; Eric Abercrombie, Director of Ethnic Programs and Services.

*Costs:* \$1,000,000 for students and \$40,000 for one additional staff member.

- **Enhance efforts to attract and enroll students of color through community involvement and outreach.**

*Responsible party:* Tom Canepa, Assistant VP for Admissions.

*Costs:* \$50,000 for a dedicated recruiter.

- **Explore more need-based programs to help students pay tuition and develop strategies to curb significant increases in tuition.**

*Responsible party:* Fiscal Oversight Committee; Monica Rimai, Senior VP for Administration and Finance.

*Costs:* \$1,000,000.

- **Improve diversity recruitment results in Cleveland and Columbus by hiring an additional staff person of color.**

*Responsible party:* Tom Canepa; Assistant VP for Admissions.

*Costs:* \$50,000 for a recruiter on the ground in Columbus.

- **Obtain a higher level of recruitment support from key internal faculty and staff constituencies.**

*Responsible party:* Mitchel Livingston, VP for Student Affairs and Services.

*Costs:* might be free; requires a cultural shift.

Additional recommendations

- **Expand the concept of cultural competence to include greater focus on race and ethnicity.**

*Responsible party:* Diversity Officer.

*Costs:* none.

- **Encourage involvement of alumni of color to assist in the recruitment of students of color.**

*Responsible party:* Diversity Recruiting Officer.

*Costs:* none.

**Assessment and Accountability**

Individuals identified as responsible for the above recommendations will be held accountable through their periodic evaluations. Create a diversity audit to link NSSE, SSI and other related research data to determine progress of the above recommendations and conduct more qualitative assessments of climate.

## D. FACULTY RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

### Vision

Our vision of the future for UC's recruitment and retention of a more diverse faculty is to increase the representation of African Americans and all other underrepresented groups in faculty positions at the three levels of professor, commensurate with their availability percentage in the labor force. We choose carefully to express our vision in terms of goals rather than in the language of fixed quotas. For African Americans, we set a goal of 5.2% in the Full Professors group, 6.5% in the Assistant Professors group; for all underrepresented groups, 17.6% in the Full Professors group, 23.2% in the Associate Professors group. By achieving these goals, UC could expect to move into a position of national leadership, showing the way to other universities in the recruitment and retention of African American faculty and faculty of other underrepresented groups. New cutting-edge, interdisciplinary programs and centers of research and teaching will be a major reason faculty in underrepresented racial and ethnic groups will come to UC and remain. Diversity in faculty is, therefore, one important component in the enhancement of our status as a major urban research university, with strong connections to Cincinnati, a city with a significant population of "minorities." (Note: Associate Professors are not mentioned in the above African American goal and Assistant Professors are not mentioned in the goals for all underrepresented groups because Affirmation Action reports indicate that UC exceeds the external availability in these two categories/groups.)

### History

The history of diversity at UC demonstrates that there has been no continuity of efforts to improve over the long term; instead, diversity has been addressed episodically after negative events spurred protests. The results have been programs of short duration, often followed by the return of the "status quo." In late 1982-83, a fraternity event parodying Martin Luther King, Jr. in a kind of "slave auction" in costume, spurred protest by African American students and staff. The administration responded by constituting a committee to study the issue of race as it related to African Americans on campus. The resulting report, termed the President's Advisory Council on Race Relations and Human Decency (PACRRHD) Report, identified a series of problems and made very specific and detailed recommendations to remedy a bad situation. Those related to faculty recruitment included: creation of a vice president of diversity affairs and the establishment of 10 faculty job lines to facilitate recruitment of African American and other underrepresented faculty groups. In the economic downturn of the early 1990s, these initiatives disappeared. While these PACRRHD recommendations fell by the wayside, individual colleges have made efforts at faculty recruitment in a very difficult fiscal environment (see UC Affirmative Action Report and Plan, July 1, 2006-June 30, 2007, in Appendix J in the online Exhibits and Appendices).

### Current State and Opportunities

The recent UC Affirmative Action Plan and Report states that "good progress" has been made in increasing the representation of all minorities in faculty positions. Minorities increased by two in the Full Professor group, nine in the Associate Professor group, 19 in the Assistant Professor group and four in the Part-time Faculty group. These advances were the result of goals set for all minorities, but the results for African American faculty hiring have

been disappointing, to say the least. In the McMicken College of Arts and Sciences, for example, the number of African American faculty has actually declined by four since 1997. McMicken College serves virtually every undergraduate student on the Uptown campus, yet few of its departments have any African American faculty members at all. Those departments that do often have no more than one or two. While recruitment of African American faculty remains a challenge, there is also a major problem with retention. African American faculty don't stay at UC once hired; the net result has been the decline mentioned above. While UC currently collects no systematic exit-interview data on why they leave, anecdotal evidence suggests two possible reasons: 1. African American faculty are recruited away by universities and colleges looking to expand their own diversity profile (the so-called "revolving door" effect); 2. African American faculty do not always feel at ease in their departments, sometimes encountering isolation and an uninviting environment. (Select academic highlights at UC can be viewed in the UC Affirmative Action Report in the online Appendix J). UC appears to have little strength related to recruitment and retention of African American faculty in particular.

Closely aligned to the recruitment and retention issue concerning underrepresented faculty is the challenge of recruiting and retaining graduate students of color. It will be difficult to make progress on the first without significant strides on the second.

Unfortunately, our examination of faculty diversity plans at approximately 35 universities and colleges, with a focus on Ohio but also with Midwestern and national institutions, found the situation uniformly poor elsewhere as well. From the University of California branch campuses, to Chicago, to Ohio State University, Ohio University, the universities of Iowa, Indiana, Kansas, Virginia and Maryland, the results of their efforts have been disappointing to their own administrations and faculty. By that scale, UC does not appear any worse, but some other universities, like Maryland and Virginia, have operated diversity programs on a much more consistent basis. The opportunity for UC to assume a leading role is there, waiting to be seized.

### **Recommendations**

In light of the challenge outlined above, these recommendations are intended to focus on underrepresented faculty in general, but particularly African American faculty. They aim to create self-sustaining momentum to achieve the goals mentioned in our vision statement. We suggest an action plan that integrates ongoing and existing institutional structures into goals and plans for promoting diversity at UC; we propose concrete steps for the achievement of goals and performance indicators.

#### ***Immediate Recommendations***

- **Create a more viable Department of African and African American Studies, capable of meeting teaching expectations on campus and in Cincinnati's African American communities.**

Currently, the department's faculty is seriously understaffed, with two tenured and one tenure-track positions, and a head from outside of the field. At present, there is no

historian of the African American experience, though a search is expected this year. The department must also be capable of creating programs that connect it to communities in ways that aid in their development as communities and in the development of individuals, particularly children. First, a targeted search for an outside head needs to occur now, to produce the candidate for September 1, 2007.

The current head, Associate Professor John K. Brackett, steps down from the headship August 31, 2007, after two terms as head. For both terms, no other applicants surfaced. When he steps down, there is no replacement for him. Open outside searches have thus far been unsuccessful; a targeted search is in order to give the department the leadership it needs for the future.

Secondly, the department needs a full-time secretary and a full-time grant writer, capable of helping to design and administer budgets related to publicly-funded community programs. We know there is such money available from county, state and federal, as well as private foundation, resources. The department needs more visibility; it needs the staffing to make that happen. The African American Alumni Association, a creation of African American staff and graduates of UC, is connected to the African American Cultural and Research Center, itself operated by the Ethnic Programs and Services. Neither has any direct connection to the academic Department of African and African American Studies.

*Responsible party:* Current Department Head with agreement of dean and provost.

*Costs:* Salary for new head, \$90,000; a grant-writer, @ \$40,000 can be transferred from within current UC employees.

- **Increase the budget in the Provost's Office to encourage and facilitate diversity in hiring.**

As an example, departments may apply for such funds to assist in diversifying the applicant pool through active recruiting and other measures. Such funds might also be requested where necessary to "close the deal" in those situations where a diverse candidate has been selected but the department is unable to put together a package that is competitive with other offers or sufficient to induce the candidate to leave his or her current institution.

*Responsible party:* Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

*Costs:* depends on number of hires, about \$600,000 per year.

- **Enhance faculty search committees to ensure that each search committee meets with appropriate personnel from the Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO) to discuss venues to advertise for faculty of color and to make sure that no search goes forward without documented best efforts to create a diverse pool.**

*Responsible Party:* Director of Office of Equal Opportunity, Department Heads, Deans.

*Costs:* None other than electronic resources associated with UC Office of Equal Opportunity.

- **Enhance recruitment and retention of African American and other underrepresented faculty by making more than one hire at a time, where possible, using mentors/ambassadors from the community to create awareness of what Cincinnati has to offer; creating faculty mentors of all races and ethnicities; creating materials to market Cincinnati to candidates similar to brochures used with students; performing exit interviews with underrepresented faculty who leave; and aiding department heads in assessing and improving the atmosphere within departments.**

Long-Term and Additional Recommendations

- **Establish a Center for the Study of Race, Gender and Social Justice.**  
This would be an interdisciplinary research center joining the efforts of African and African American Studies, Sociology and the Department of Women’s Studies. Strong links to the city would result, with development of an emphasis on forms of social activism and community help.  
*Responsible party:* The three department heads of the departments mentioned above.  
*Costs:* Support from UC|21, then building on grant support.
- **Pursue cluster hires of faculty.**  
Faculty would be located in clusters in new interdisciplinary programs on themes such as: Poverty Studies, African Diaspora Studies, etc. Some UC faculty would be temporarily or permanently assigned based on research and teaching interests; other new faculty would be hired into these programs.  
*Responsible party:* Provosts, Deans, Department Heads, with an initial committee of faculty and administration to develop the proposal and determine initial funding.  
*Costs:* To be determined.
- **Grow our own faculty of color.**  
Establish department level committees to work with colleagues at other universities, possibly, to identify promising students of color who could enter PhD programs and become faculty within the “system.”  
*Responsible party:* Provosts, Deans, Department Heads. They would set up committees to seek out partnerships with like departments at other institutions. The model would be the PhD Project in the College of Business.  
*Costs:* staff support.

**Performance Metrics**

- Class enrollments; community programs, grants won.
- Use of lines to expand underrepresented faculty, especially African American hires.
- Growth of faculty; guest researchers in residence; grants won; conferences held; regional/national notoriety.
- Check on diversity of search pools.
- Academic success of cluster programs.

- Numbers of programs established; increase in PhD candidates among minorities.

### **Assessment and Accountability**

Progress will be gauged by asking these key questions:

- Do we achieve our goals as stated in the vision above?
- Do we achieve transparency?
- Do we consistently review recommendations that become actions?
- Do we enhance our diversity efforts as needed based on yearly review?

## E. STAFF RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

### Vision

UC will be a community welcoming and supportive of all individuals, where all people, regardless of race and ethnicity, age, gender, disability status, sexual orientation, religious and national origin, and socioeconomic status can teach, learn, live and work together. UC will be a workplace that:

- Is committed to improving the quality of education and the culture of the workplace by becoming informed of the perspectives of a diverse community.
- Supports diversity and the affirmation of each individual's value, potential and contribution to the UC community.
- Strives to achieve success by selecting talented individuals who can excel in diverse settings.

### History

UC has lacked a strategic plan to effectively recruit and retain a diverse workforce. Personnel procedures are in place to review hires, but these procedures track hire progress at the end of the recruitment and provide little or no assistance to increase diversity among pools of candidates. There has been no lasting commitment to create real and measurable change. Management is informed regarding UC's objectives in hiring minorities and women, but there is no accountability from management on achieving results regarding increased diversity among staff in many areas of the workforce. Within the past 10 years, compliance reviews by the U.S. Labor Department (OFCCP) have found UC needed improvements in its recruitment and hire tracking procedures to advance the goals of its affirmative action programs.

### Current State and Opportunities

A diverse environment at UC is central to its mission and academic goals. The total workforce at UC includes full-time and part-time faculty and staff. As of March 31, 2006, UC had 7364 full- and part-time employees. The chart below summarizes UC employment.

| <b>Total Workforce</b>   |      |        |
|--------------------------|------|--------|
| White Males              | 2968 | (40%)  |
| White Females            | 2840 | (39%)  |
| African American Males   | 364  | (5%)   |
| African American Females | 578  | (8%)   |
| Asian American Males     | 303  | (4%)   |
| Asian American Females   | 196  | (3%)   |
| Hispanic Males           | 44   | 0.6%)  |
| Hispanic Females         | 38   | (0.5%) |
| Native American Males    | 18   | (0.2%) |
| Native American Females  | 15   | (0.2%) |

Recruitment activities for staff positions are currently processed by each college without central Human Resources (HR) support. As a result, it is extremely difficult to monitor efforts to diversify the workforce. Staff vacancies are advertised in a variety of ways, such as,

in the *Cincinnati Enquirer*, *Cincinnati Herald* and on UC's Web site. Optional recruitment sources used include the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, professional journals, *Black Issues*, recruitment fairs and networking activities.

From 2003 to 2005, there have been continued increases in the number of white employees in Unclassified (managers, directors) positions. Yet, the number of minorities in the same employee group has not increased. There wasn't a significant change to classified employee group numbers.

Current retention and employee development programs (used universally, not targeted toward the recruitment and retention of underrepresented groups) include:

- Management Advancement Program (MAP) – A series of workshops in management development laying the foundations for those new to supervision or management. The workshops cover the skills of management with an emphasis on specific topics that all UC leadership should comprehend.
- Performance Management (Appraisal Process) – Currently managed by individual departments, the annual appraisal process is often not completed.
- Orientation – The current on-line version primarily highlights employee benefits.
- UC Advantage Program – Affinity and value added services to employees; for example, Liberty Mutual homeowners and car insurance or Sibcy Cline real estate services.
- UC Benefits – medical, dental, retirement, etc.
- Broadband Program – This program is for classifications that exercise a substantial degree of independence. Each band is broadly defined to encompass all jobs levels, from entry level to the most senior. Bands better describe the natural progression and skill development of employees than do narrowly defined classifications. Current broadbands include business, fiscal, research assistants, IT and architect.

## **Recommendations**

### Immediate Recommendations

- **Enhance employee orientation in general, while also incorporating into it diversity as a core value.** This would allow new employees to receive a comprehensive orientation to UC that details resources such as support organizations available and provides a campus tour and a welcome pack of information (which may include tickets to UC sports activities, free lunches, locations of mosques, churches, hair salons, grocery stores, etc.) All information could also be made available on the HR Web site.

*Performance metric:* Orientation revamped and materials processed by December, 2007.

*Responsible party:* Human Resources with support from a Committee of UC employees and/or affinity Groups (i.e. Sister Circle, AAPW, etc.)

*Resources:* staff support, \$50,000.

- **Improve workforce planning.**

The components of the Workforce Plan will include:

- Developing a vision or philosophy of how UC's workforce should be managed.
- Surveying local, regional and national market practices and developing competitive human resource programs for the attraction and retention of faculty, staff and students.
- Designing individual development programs for building a motivated and highly performing UC workforce.
- Continuous training for deans, department heads, vice presidents, etc.
- Compensation and benefit planning.
- Refocus Human Resources Department.  
Provide advising and consulting assistance to the departments and colleges, including key contacts to respond to HR-related questions, i.e., staffing, retention, compensation, benefits, training, workman's compensation, succession planning, process management, etc.

*Responsible Party:* Senior Associate VP, HR; Office of Institutional Research, Institute for Policy Research, College of Business.

*Costs:* \$100,000.

*Long-Term and Additional Recommendations*

- **Have the Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO) and Human Resources (HR) assist and monitor all units of UC in their efforts to recruit and retain staff from historically underrepresented groups.**

These areas will closely align their recruitment and retention efforts to ensure that accountability is realized in regard to increasing racial diversity among staff. HR and the OEO will research best practices and benchmark the recruitment and retention activities of leading institutions. HR will provide technical assistance to the office on recruitment, helping them to identify and develop outreach and recruitment processes that will yield candidate.

*Performance metric:* Process developed and communicated within HR and where necessary to hiring entities by September 2007.

*Responsible Party:* HR and the Office of Equal Opportunity (with the agreement of all leaders).

*Costs:* \$15,000.

- **Develop and promote throughout the university an inventory of campus and community educational/training opportunities on issues of diversity. Additional training opportunities should be developed as needed, based on periodic climate surveys and feedback from current programs, and promoted in the HR Web site and publications.**

*Performance Metric:* HR Web page includes inventory of available trainings, cost, dates, and eligibility both on and off campus.

*Responsible Party:* in conjunction with a campus-wide committee of experts such as Linda Bates Parker, Career Development Center, Urban League and others.

*Costs:* \$75,000.

- **Provide a multidisciplinary center within HR to collect, maintain, analyze and report on diversity data and to provide technical assistance to decision makers for their data needs regarding staff.**

It is clear we need more data on a regular basis to assess our current status and determine if and where our efforts are yielding success once a clear plan is in place. HR (including OEO) has access to the data now and could work with Institutional Research to produce better, more timely reports.

*Responsible Party:* Senior Associate VP HR, Office of Institutional Research, Institute for Policy Research, College of Business.

*Costs:* \$60,000.

- **Create a centralized exit interview process.**

This would include creating a form and Web site to collect data from those leaving UC. This data would be used to evaluate trends and to create reports for yearly distribution.

*Responsible party:* HR.

*Costs:* \$75,000.

### **Assessment and Accountability**

Using the metrics indicated and the data generated for each recommendation, HR will monitor the impact of these measures.

## **SECTION VI:**

### **MEETING SCHEDULE, AGENDA AND NOTES**

## MEETING SCHEDULE

Meetings took place at the African American Cultural and Research Center from 4 to 5:30 p.m. on the following dates:

May 17, 2006 (Wednesday)  
June 26, 2006 (Monday)  
July 18, 2006 (Tuesday)  
August 9, 2006 (Wednesday)  
September 22, 2006 (Friday)  
October 20, 2006 (Friday)  
November 29, 2006 (Wednesday)  
December 19, 2006 (Tuesday)

**President's UC | 21 Diversity Task Force**  
**Wednesday, May 17, 2006**  
**4:00 – 5:30 p.m.**  
**African American Cultural and Research Center**

**- AGENDA-**

|      |   |   |
|------|---|---|
| 4:00 | Welcome & Introductions   | Lou Bilonis, Dean, College of Law<br>Chair, Steering Committee  |
| 4:10 | The Imperative  | Nancy L. Zimpher, Task Force Co-Chair<br>Marian Spencer, Task Force Co-Chair                                    |
| 4:20 | Overview of the Work<br>Timeline<br>Work Products<br>Next Steps | L. Bilonis  |
| 4:30 | Historical Framework  | Linda Bates Parker, Director<br>Career Development Center   |
| 4:45 | Where are we now?   | George Wharton, Director<br>Office of Equal Opportunity<br><br>Lee Mortimer, Director<br>Institutional Research |
| 5:00 | Conversation  | L. Bilonis  |
| 5:25 | Concluding Remarks  | N. Zimpher and M. Spencer   |

---

*Next Meeting: Monday, June 26, 2006 from 4:00 – 5:30 p.m.*

**President's UC | 21 Diversity Task Force Meeting**  
**Monday, June 26, 2006**  
**4:00 – 5:30 p.m.**  
**African American Cultural and Research Center**

**AGENDA**

|      |  |  |
|------|--|--|
| 4:00 | Welcome  | Lou Bilonis, Dean, College of Law<br>Chair, Steering Committee   |
| 4:05 | Introduction of Guest Speaker  | Marian Spencer, Task Force Co-chair  |
| 4:06 | Retrospective  | Dr. Milton W. Hinton, Retired President<br>NAACP Cincinnati Chapter<br>Professor & Vice Provost at UC 1970-92  |
|      | Presentations:   |  |
| 4:20 | ▪ UC Staff Demographics  | George Wharton, Director<br>Office of Equal Opportunity  |
| 4:30 | ▪ National Survey of Student<br>Engagement Data by Race<br>and Gender    | Lee Mortimer, Director<br>Institutional Research   |
| 4:40 | ▪ Report from Faculty Senate<br>Subcommittee on<br>Multicultural Affairs | Jorge Prada, Assistant Professor, Psychiatry<br>Chair, Faculty Senate Subcommittee<br>on Multicultural Affairs |
| 4:50 | Questions and Discussion   | Lou Bilonis, Dean, College of Law<br>Chair, Steering Committee   |
| 5:00 | Sharpening the Issues  | Lou Bilonis, Dean, College of Law<br>Chair, Steering Committee   |
| 5:25 | Concluding Remarks   | Nancy Zimpher and Marian Spencer<br>Task Force Co-chairs   |

*Next Meeting: Tuesday, July 18, 2006 from 4:00 – 5:30 p.m.*

**President's UC | 21 Diversity Task Force**  
**Tuesday, July 18, 2006**  
**4:00 – 5:30 p.m.**  
**African American Cultural and Research Center**

**AGENDA**

- |             |  |   |
|-------------|--|---|
| <b>4:00</b> | Welcome/Opening Comments   | Lou Bilonis, Dean<br>College of Law,<br>Chair, Steering Committee   |
| <b>4:05</b> | Update on Process for Identifying<br>UC's Values and Updating Institutional<br>Mission Statement   | Mitchel Livingston, Vice President<br>Student Affairs and Services<br>Founder & Co-chair, Just<br>Community |
| <b>4:15</b> | Introduction of Small Group Discussions  | Lou Bilonis   |
| <b>4:20</b> | Small Group Discussions: Identify key<br>objectives and indicators of success for each<br>of these areas:  | Leaders/Recorders:  |
|             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Faculty/Staff Recruitment<br/>and Retention</li><li>• Student Life, Climate and Recruitment</li><li>• Institutional Structures to Ensure<br/>Momentum Over Time</li><li>• Business/Community Relations</li></ul> | John Brackett<br><br>Jerry Tsai & M. Livingston<br><br>Deb Meem<br><br>Debra Merchant                       |
| <b>5:25</b> | Closing Remarks  | Lou Bilonis   |

**President's UC | 21 Diversity Task Force**  
**Wednesday, August 9, 2006**  
**4:00 – 5:30 p.m.**  
**African American Cultural and Research Center**

**AGENDA**

- |             |  |  |
|-------------|--|--|
| <b>4:00</b> | Welcome/Opening Comments   | Lou Bilonis, Dean<br>College of Law,<br>Chair, Steering Committee  |
| <b>4:05</b> | Introduce Theme:<br>"Recruitment and Retention of Minority Faculty"  | John Brackett,<br>Deb Meem, and<br>Jorge Prada (Subcommittee on<br>Faculty Recruitment and<br>Retention) |
| <b>4:15</b> | Explanation of Discussion Format   | John Brackett and<br>Deb Meem  |
| <b>4:20</b> | Full group discussion focused on 3 areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Recruitment (commitment to adding new minority faculty): points 3,2,5,6,7</li><li>• Retention (commitment to keeping/ supporting minority faculty who are already here): points 7,9, RPT procedures</li><li>• Foregrounding minority issues (commitment to changing UC culture): points 2,4,7</li></ul> (Points 1-10 located on pp 2-3 of this agenda) | Facilitated by John Brackett and<br>Deb Meem   |
| <b>5:25</b> | Closing Remarks  | Lou Bilonis  |

**President's UC | 21 Diversity Task Force**  
**Friday, September 22, 2006**  
**4:00 – 5:30 p.m.**  
**African American Cultural and Research Center**

**AGENDA**

- |             |  |   |
|-------------|--|---|
| <b>4:00</b> | Welcome/Opening Comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Tasks &amp; Timetable</li><li>▪ Subcommittees</li><li>▪ Report Outline</li><li>▪ Matrix of Best Practices</li></ul> | Lou Bilonis, Dean<br>College of Law,<br>Chair, Steering Committee   |
| <b>4:15</b> | Student Recruitment and Retention <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Committee Update</li></ul>   | Richard Banto<br>Ralph Katerburg<br>Mitch Leventhal<br>Mitchel Livingston, Co-chair<br>Jerry Tsai, Co-chair |
| <b>4:45</b> | Community and Climate: A Look Inside UC <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Assessment of July, 2006 <i>Just Community Task Force Report and Core Values</i>)</li></ul>          | Mitchel Livingston  |
| <b>5:15</b> | Closing Remarks  | Lou Bilonis, Chair, Steering Committee, and Co-chairs, Marian Spencer and Nancy Zimpher.                    |

**Next meeting of the full task force is scheduled for October 20, 2006 from 4:00 – 5:30 p.m. at the African American Cultural and Research Center.**

**President's UC | 21 Diversity Task Force**  
**Friday, October 20, 2006**  
**4:00 – 5:30 p.m.**  
**African American Cultural and Research Center**

**AGENDA**

- |             |  |   |
|-------------|--|---|
| <b>4:00</b> | Welcome/Opening Comments   | Lou Billionis, Dean, College of Law<br>Chair, Steering Committee  |
| <b>4:15</b> | Staff Recruitment and Retention <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Committee Report</li><li>▪ Visioning Exercise</li><li>▪</li></ul>  | Charles Collins<br>Gary Dent<br>Bill Johnson<br>Barb Rinto<br>Alecia Trammer, Chair<br>George Wharton   |
| <b>4:45</b> | Community and Climate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Update on Assessment of <i>Just Community Task Force Report (7/06) and Core Values</i></li><li>▪ A Look Throughout Cincinnati</li><li>▪ Facilitated small group conversations:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Student Admission &amp; Retention</li><li>○ Employment Opportunities</li><li>○ Vendor &amp; Contractual Relations</li><li>○ Community Engagement/Key Partnerships</li></ul></li><li>▪ Diversity Time Line</li></ul> | Mitchel Livingston, Chair; Eric Abercrombie,<br>Jeremy Driscoll, Ed Owens, Jim Schwab,<br>Marian Spencer, Ann Welsh<br><br>○ Linda Bates Parker<br>○ Gary Dent<br>○ George Wharton<br>○ Greg Vehr<br><br>Mitchel Livingston |
| <b>5:15</b> | Closing Remarks  | Lou Billionis, Chair, Steering Committee<br>Marian Spencer, Co-chair, Task Force  |

*Next meeting of the full task force is scheduled for November 29, 2006 from 4:00 – 5:30 p.m. at the African American Cultural and Research Center.*

## President's UC | 21 Diversity Task Force

Wednesday, November 29, 2006

4:00 – 5:30 p.m.

African American Cultural and Research Center

### AGENDA

- |      |   |  |
|------|---|--|
| 4:00 | Welcome/Opening Comments  | Lou Billionis, Dean, College of Law<br>Chair, Steering Committee   |
| 4:05 | Alignment of Just Community<br>Recommendations and UC 21 Core Values<br>Statement | Mitchel Livingston   |
| 4:15 | Institutional Structure and Framework   | A. Welsh, D. Acosta, D. Merchant, B. Rinto   |
| 5:15 | Final Sweep of Ideas to Date<br>Have we missed something?                         | L. Billionis   |
| 5:25 | Closing Remarks   | Lou Billionis, Chair, Steering Committee<br>Marian Spencer, Co-chair, Task Force<br>N. Zimpher, Co-chair, Task Force |

*Next meeting of the full task force is scheduled for December 19, 2006 from 4:00 – 5:30 p.m. at the African American Cultural and Research Center.*

**President's UC | 21 Diversity Task Force  
Final Meeting  
Tuesday, December 19, 2006  
4:00 – 5:30 p.m.  
African American Cultural and Research Center**

**AGENDA**

1. Welcome/Opening Comments (L. Billionis)
  
2. Discussion of Draft Report and Recommendations (L. Billionis)
  - Did we accomplish what we were asked to do?
  - Do we agree on the recommendations?
  - Are the recommendations in priority order?
  - Are there any recommendations that might be considered problematic?
  - Do we anticipate negative reactions to any of the recommendations? Any points of criticism? If so, does the document respond to these?
  - Are there any messages in the text not conveyed that need to be conveyed?
  - Other
  
3. Next Steps (L. Billionis)
  
4. Closing Remarks (M. Spencer)

## NOTES FROM TASK FORCE MEETINGS

MAY 17, 2006

Steering Committee Chair Lou Billionis, Dean of the College of Law, welcomed everyone to this first meeting of the task force and called on members to introduce themselves.

President Zimpher remarked that the university is a place of opportunity and of her personal commitment to reassess UC's efforts toward diversity and inclusion in order to help UC realize its aspirations to become a premier urban research university. Some have told her that our strategic academic plan, UC|21, doesn't shout "diversity." In organizations, you can either create a subset called diversity and assign responsibility, or you can weave diversity throughout the organization like threads through a cloth. Some of UC's alumni whom the President met in New York and Cleveland had shared pointed memories with her. We have ongoing efforts for women and LGBT students and staff, but it is clear that UC needs to do more. Along came a report from NASULGC, a national umbrella organization for higher education institutions that she will chair next year. "Now is the Time" seemed quite timely and this is why she called Marian Spencer and said, "Let's figure this out together."

Marian Spencer admitted that she was one of those alumni who spoke derogatorily about UC during the time she was a student. In 66 years, to come back and be able to be a part of something that is moving toward a new philosophy of living within our educative areas is wonderful, and she promises to do everything she can to make it work.

Chair Billionis reported that the steering committee has met twice in the past month to forecast the path that we would like to take in the months to come. Our task is to identify three-five proposals for promoting and enhancing diversity on campus.

Given that we do not work on a blank slate and must integrate ongoing efforts and institutional structures as well, we will need to assess on-going efforts and recommend opportunities for strengthening and improving them, all the while realizing that we are working in a very complex environment. We want to ensure that progress will be made, have clear goals and clear action plans that identify "measurables" and benchmarks. At the same time we must also be mindful of the products and the process that we follow in articulating the goals. Success will require trust and mutual commitment, a willingness to express differences of opinion with candor. A by-product is that we can model an inclusive approach that will ensure success at the university level. Our timeline calls for the work to be done by the end of this calendar year. The method we will follow is:

1. Define our focus...the what, the definitions, flesh out questions of mission and value.
2. Assess where we are with respect to diversity, hiring, retention, enrollment, mission statement and existing institutional structures to deliver diversity and ensure progress. Assess what is the cultural state of affairs at UC and in relation to our public. This leads to inquiry about our strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges.
3. We must target meaningful and concrete actions to move us forward through a strong and inclusive process.

4. Next steps are clear. We need to start as a group; build a team; take up initial items that we've identified.

In preparation for today's meeting, we turned to Linda Bates Parker to provide historical context and to frame our work and to Lee Mortimer and George Wharton to provide the data.

L. Bates Parker began by quoting the phrase, "If we do not know our history we are doomed to repeat it." She wants UC to be a university of choice for her grandchildren, as it was not for her. As a result of the Michigan case, we must focus on racial issues and other things that are part of the package of diversity. She then referred to a set of slides that provide an overview of significant events and diversity efforts over the past 35 years. See slides for details. Highlights include:

- 1968, Dwight Tillery organized African American students for action.
- 1970, the Department of Afro-American Studies was formed, now the Dept of African and African-American Studies. Underrepresented groups must still be the foundation of our work.
- 1973, establishment of the Office of Minority Affairs, now the Office of Ethnic Programs and Services.
- 1982, Sigma Alpha Epsilon Fraternity holds a "Martin Luther King Trash Party." It was full of hostile and insulting stereotypical comments and beliefs about African American student life and culture. It resulted in one of the most volatile times on this campus. L. Bates Parker worked as a student affairs rep at the time. "We were told 'boys will be boys.' It was a difficult time," she said. It resulted in large protests on campus.
- Too often we have been put into reactive mode rather than proactive.
- 1985 Racial Awareness Pilot Program (RAPP) resulted from another vehemently hostile climate on campus brought about by a Student Government leader's suggestion that African American groups be eliminated. Student Affairs and Services was again asked to do something, meet with students and make something happen. Why were there not courses, classes to help? A petition requested courses to address justice issues. In 1985, a full year was committed to RAPP sessions.
- 1988 Faculty Senate supported a contemporary issues interdisciplinary course. President Steger established a university-wide advisory council PACRRHD (President's Advisory Council on Race Relations and Human Decency) and a quality of life survey was conducted.
- 1989, BoT approved a resolution and a new VP for Minority Affairs and Human Relations was established. But, he was out within a year. Later, Vice Provost Tom Wagner circulated a position paper on racism at UC.
- 1989, Vice Provost Milt Hinton created an action plan for diversity to increase faculty representation. Provost Norm Baker created the Margaret Core Tangeman award.
- 1990, Vice Provost Mary Ellen Ashley published "Combating Racism on College Campuses." Linda asks where the institutional history is archived

and asked why it is so difficult to reconstruct our university's history? She hopes the information she has put together will be preserved.

- 1991, African American Cultural and Research Center opens.
- 1995, VP Livingston began discussions of the Just Community. The principles were approved by the BoT in 2000.
- 2004, Linda Bates Parker was asked to convene a task force to make recommendation on incorporating diversity in UC|21.
- 2005 Diversity Collaborative Proposal was submitted to the President
- We have work to do to get ready for the future because by 2015 it is estimated that 80% of students will be students of color.

George Wharton provided more historical perspective. He arrived in 1994 as Director of Equal Opportunity and assists university management with diversity and inclusion. He is particularly interested in where persons of color work within the university. We have an affirmative action program and are an equal opportunity employer. In the charts presented we can see all the data on racial, gender and ethnic numbers.

Highlights include:

- African American full time faculty by college, 1989 and 2005. There has been some progress.
- Two slides look at gender and race within senior level executive positions 1997 and 2005.
- Another tracks female full, associate and assistant professors by ethnic background, numbers which seem to be increasing
- Ethnic men in senior executive positions are increasing, as are ethnic men in senior administrative positions
- Faculty full professors are increasing in most areas, but we seem to have lost African American faculty at assistant and associate levels
- Overall, regarding faculty, 21% of our full professors are women; 45% of the assistant professors are female; 35% of full time faculty is females; 1.2% of full professors are African American; 3% are at assistant level; 10% of assistant professors are Asian; 1.2% of full professors are Hispanic. 12.1% of full professors are minority; 20% of associates; 15% of assistants.

George also pointed out that in the PACCRHD report issued some years ago, UC had a goal of reaching 10 percent African American among faculty. We are not reaching that goal.

Lee Mortimer presented data on student diversity and enrollment. He talked about how the data was collected, progress since 2001 and how we compare to other Ohio institutions for both minority and international student enrollment. Lee explained that IPEDS (Integrated Post-Secondary Education System) from the US Department of Education drives our reporting process and systems. Nonresident alien and race/ethnicity (multi-ethnic) categories are most interesting and currently 6 of every 10 students selects this latter descriptor.

- Over the last five years, overall we have had 6.5% enrollment increase for all campuses. Men increased 3.6%; women 9.1%; American Indian we lost 17.1%; African American non-Hispanic increased 5.4%; Asian increased 9.7%; Hispanic 39.1%; white students have grown at 3.3%; but unknowns have grown by 53%. Acknowledging the small samples, the trends are clear. The US DOE is taking this seriously and so must we. Things are changing.
- How do we compare in Ohio? Autumn 2004 data indicate that we are now 46.4% men and the state average is 44.6%. Women at UC are 53.6% and Ohio is 55.6%. For African Americans, we rank 4<sup>th</sup> in the state in percentage at 11.4% vs. 8.8%. For American Indians we rank 4<sup>th</sup>. Asian we rank 3<sup>rd</sup>; Hispanic we rank 7<sup>th</sup>. If you were to add these together, we rank 4<sup>th</sup> in Ohio. OSU, Cleveland, Akron, UC are the most diverse campuses. We rank 11<sup>th</sup> in % of white students. Only two are lower. In the non-resident alien category, we rank 3<sup>rd</sup> and in the unknown multiracial category we rank 5<sup>th</sup>.
- Non-resident aliens: One of every 20 students at UC is from another country. 727 from Asian countries, but these students are not considered Asian for current reporting purposes. Also, we have 603 students from India, but these are not considered Indian, but rather non-resident aliens. Some took offense to this designation and clearly consider this diversity for our campus.
- Census data indicates that multi-ethnicity is in our future. In the state of Ohio the institutions with the highest number of unknowns have the highest numbers in special ethnic groups as well.
- Summary. Total student enrollment increases have been at 6.5% while ethnic enrollment increases are 8%. We are one of the most diverse campuses in the state. Complete data sets are at [www.uc.edu/institutionalresearch](http://www.uc.edu/institutionalresearch)

Lou Billionis thanked the presenters and led the entire group in conversation. The group had lots of questions and all were invited to put their points on the table as we move forward. The steering committee does not have the answers or a specific agenda, so people shared information, caveats and cautions. Eric Abercrombie added more historical data about UC that he felt was important, including information about a United Black Faculty and Staff Association that served as a mouthpiece in the 1970s. We must also talk about the Darwin T. Turner Scholars Program, which resulted from an approach to President Bennis. Also, Mr. Ralph Corbett gave \$50,000 to bring 30 students to UC and Lawrence Hawkins was instrumental in this effort. In the 1980s there was a task force to study African American issues and that's when Bob Meacham was hired to oversee programs. At one time there were race-specific offices within each of the colleges, but Emerging Ethnic Engineers might be the only representative office now in an academic area. It was also pointed out to the current student leaders in the room that at UC it is typical for African American students to run on the slate for student body president.

All agreed it would be nice to see a fleshed out history, but there seems to be no central place housing all this factual information. Is it archived somewhere? It is possible that since we have not claimed this history, this might explain the frustrating lack of traction.

Another significant memory from the 1980s was the Yates program for graduate fellowships. It has had a significant impact on a lot of programs, but no one really knows the history. Yates was one of our first African American deans and it was named after him. McNair is another program that has had a positive impact. Faculty numbers seem to be low, so this will be important data to look into. Students need to see faculty of color in their programs. B. Rinto referred to a report she's working on for the status of women. The data on student enrollment should also tell us how we're doing not only in Ohio but nationally. Lee has national data and could present more. UC now has two different peer groups, the Urban 13 and one considered more "aspirational" that includes the larger institutions and public research universities with medical schools and located in urban areas whom we aspire to be more like. Looking at the national statistics, about 12% of students enrolled are African American. Here at UC, and contrary to perceptions about our Collegiate Structure Initiative, our African American student numbers are increasing *and the students will graduate!* We are achieving diversity with quality.

Some suggested that looking at all these numbers keeps people away from the heart of the work. Do we want to be better? Do we want to have representation that reflects the community? We should look back at the PACCRHD report where we called for 10% of our UC faculty to be African American. Why have we not achieved the goals? We should find something to embrace and run with it. It is troubling that some students enrolled in diversity courses say diversity is not important. It is an educational mandate that they use their time on campus to learn to interact. Shame on us for using a corporate model, but that's where we are. If we get stuck on things like the charts, we will miss opportunities to talk about how we can be better.

Marian Spencer shared that Scripps Howard made a significant contribution to another Ohio university last week and that diversity has to be seen as valuable for society. Ohio University has a long way to go, but they have a plan and funding in place to improve.

Conversation turned to the need to have a commitment to hiring professors of color. The numbers are pathetic and still they are declining. In terms of students, this is a difficult issue to handle, and we want to see all numbers go up together. Another category for consideration is how the new processes and commitments continue with structures in place so we don't have to start over again one day in the future.

Ed Owens of the community said he was proud and thankful to be part of this process. Hopefully part of our work will be to look at UC's base of vendors and make a judgment about the diversity of our vendor base.

George Wharton added that part of the work has to be where we are going with this. Is it helpful to measure us against other institutions and against ourselves internally? Our floor

should be at least where we were in 1989. But, more than that, UC should be a leader, not just on par.

This is the beginning of a longer and larger conversation which will continue at the June 26 meeting. The members of the Steering Committee will reflect on this conversation and be back in touch. President Zimpher added that we are still going to add a trustee to the task force, and others are welcome to recommend other names if specific constituencies are not represented.

The President shared that she is often asked, “What is UC doing about race in Cincinnati?” We have a huge challenge here ourselves, but we must model for the city as well. Marian Spencer added that UC should be able to attract almost anyone from anywhere. We should have a plan for going after faculty and students, monitor and mentor those who choose to come, and do all that is needed to retain them.

### **JUNE 26, 2006**

Steering Committee Chair, Lou Bilonis, Dean of the College of Law, welcomed everyone to this second meeting of the task force, provided an overview of the work at hand as well as comments and thoughts about the direction of the work. He explained that we’re still viewing the work from 50,000 feet, but will drill down to specific issues over time. Meeting notes are to be considered open to all. We plan to post notes on the task force Web site, so everyone is asked to review the notes from the previous meetings and contact Marianne Kunnen-Jones with any suggested revisions or corrections. Supplements to group work, handouts and other materials are always welcome. Electronic format is preferred so that such materials can be posted on the Web site.

Denise Andrews of Legacy Unlimited attended this meeting as an observer and guest. Denise and her colleagues are bringing the *People Supporting People* diversity and inclusion program to Cincinnati in July and have invited one UC leader to attend.

Marian Spencer introduced Dr. Milton Hinton, retired president of the Cincinnati Chapter of the NAACP and former professor and vice provost at UC (1970-92). Dr. Hinton provided a retrospective for our work and provided insights into the rift between UC and the African American community. During Dr. Hinton’s time at UC, he handled many complaints, racial concerns and deep hurts. It seems that UC offered no messages to counter the negativity in the press and the demonstrations. More recently, the dissolution of University College was perceived as negative by the African American community. As Vice Provost for Minority Affairs, his strategies included:

- A Community Advisory Committee
- A four-pronged program for increasing the number of African American faculty in Law, CCM, Business, Engineering, History, DAAP, & Clermont. Programs included both recruiting and retaining faculty of color and included the following aspects: a) the administration would pay for any position filled by African American candidates; b) the administration would add funds to enhance start-up packages; c) the administration would provide funding for positions for spouses;

- d) the administration provided funds for faculty to travel to conferences to talk with talented prospects about UC.
- Graduate Minority Fellows and Scholars Program was highly successful because of its monitoring and mentoring aspects.

Dr. Hinton examined a copy of NASULGC's "Now is the Time" but did not "get hooked" on most of the report. However, increasing access to diverse groups is an important first step and this was *the* hook for him. During the Q&A time, Dr. Hinton explained that as vice provost, he had Provost Norm Baker's complete backing, great support and funding. There was no strong leadership on diversity from the top until then. Diversity cannot be an addendum; some one person must be responsible for diversity as their primary job; the duties should not be dispersed. Also, programs that are worthy must be institutionalized so that funding is secure.

Three presentations of data were made at this meeting:

1. George Wharton, Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity, presented spread sheets of staff demographics from 1997-2006. Data included hiring, promotion and separation of employees and was divided into categories including executive, senior administrative and chairs, senior managers, faculty and both professional and non-professional staff. Results indicate a net loss of persons of color. Details of Mr. Wharton's presentation will be posted on the task force Web site. Some suggested that it would be interesting to compare the numbers for white women versus persons of color because it seems UC has made excellent progress in recruiting and retaining women.
2. Lee Mortimer, Director of Institutional Research, shared data on student engagement collected from a 100-question survey of 1<sup>st</sup> year and senior students. He chose to share highlights from five different areas of questioning and urges members of the task force to visit the complete data set provided on his Web site.
3. Jorge Prada, Assistant Professor, Psychiatry and Chair of the Faculty Senate's Human Relations Committee, presented a report from the Human Relations Committee and the Sub-committee for Multicultural Relations, chaired by Mr. Derek Mize. Dr. Prada's presentation included a list of distinct recommendations. The complete report can be found at: [www.uc.edu/facultysenate](http://www.uc.edu/facultysenate) .

The Steering Committee will meet on July 10 to plan the July 18 meeting of the task force. It is clear that, in addition to faculty hiring, issues related to staff and students must also be addressed. For example, we need to know what students of color right here and now are saying about UC. One more presentation we might need is the CAT and how it's going. Every manager at UC should be provided with an orientation that includes best practices for recruiting and retaining staff. To the best of our knowledge, nothing is currently offered. In addition, we must ensure that hiring and retention on both the East and West campuses are addressed. Exit interviews are needed for all persons who leave. We need to know why we are losing people. Is UC perceived as a training ground for persons of color? Do other institutions have more resources to recruit people away than UC has to retain? Are we dealing with work/life issues or with money challenges? A model needs to be built on data to help us answer these questions. Ed Owens suggested that, as the area's largest employer,

UC must look at its supplier base too and ensure that we do business with a diverse group of suppliers.

There seems to be no clear model for us among our list of aspirational universities. Barb Rinto provided some data from case studies and Eric Abercrombie provided documents from other universities to give us some examples of what efforts are going on elsewhere. It is clear that we must be intentional and well funded.

Marian Spencer provided closing reports and suggested that UC can be a model for others if we have a mind to be. We have got to be better, because we are expected to be!

The next meeting of the task force is scheduled for Tuesday, July 18, 2006 from 4:00 – 5:30 p.m.

### **JULY 18, 2006**

L. Bilionis opening the meeting, indicated that Marian Spencer regretted that she could not attend the meeting.

President Zimpher extended her appreciation to the task force and the steering committee for all the great information they have been sharing and for keeping the group on task. She has talked about the task force in a variety of venues and the response she receives reinforces to her the great need and importance of this work. She expressed her hope that the task force would find ways that would make UC a role model for others.

M. Livingston gave an update on the university mission statement, Just Community Initiative and an attempt to reconcile the values of UC|21 with Just Community principles. Mitchel passed out a draft mission statement for UC that will be forwarded to the President's Cabinet and then to the Board of Trustees for approval. He suggested that members funnel suggested changes to M. Kunnen-Jones by noon on Thursday.

Mitchel said that Ann Welsh, Wayne Hall and Andrea Lindell headed up an effort to examine values of UC|21 and Just Community, as well as the mission statement and provided some recommendations about incorporating them into one set of university values – recommendations that Mitchel distributed.

Mitchel also talked about a task force that examined Just Community and has made recommendations pertaining to its next steps. He stressed that Just Community is not a destination but a journey that we are on as a university.

L Bilionis said that the remainder of the meeting would be devoted to discussion. He split the crowd into four tables and assigned recorders to lead and record the conversations at each table to focus on the four themes on the agenda. He also indicated that the next task force meeting would probably focus on one of the four issues in more detail (faculty and staff retention and recruitment – what can we accomplish now and what we wish would could accomplish in the future).

After the small group discussion, the recorders reported back to the entire gathering some highlights of the discussion. The following notes were provided in writing by the recorders for each issue:

*Faculty/Staff Recruitment-Retention*  
(John Brackett)

Faculty:

Discussion produced a range of suggestions from training UC faculty and other employees, on the meaning of diversity, to conducting exit interviews with minority Faculty and Staff as they leave for positions with other institutions. To be more specific:

- 1) Training should be continual, in series of workshops; it should be “personalized, that is, to begin by finding personal experiences of the majority participants in which they were *the minority* in a larger group. Touching that chord of the personal experience of being the alien could help members of the majority to understand the experience of those who are aliens in our society everyday.
- 2) Seek to create cross-departmental, cross-college/school professional relationships for newly hired minorities as a way of building UC community.
- 3) Bring in community (and campus) ambassadors to help acclimate new minority hires to the University and city communities. Use or hire senior Faculty to serve, in part, as mentors to junior hires.
- 4) Build a pool of potential recruits by: creating on-line resources which identify qualified minority PhDs and make these available to search committees, especially department heads; as part of searches, help search committees find the appropriate places to advertise jobs to attract minority applicants; “create our own” by developing minority PhD candidates in our own programs.
- 5) Conduct exit interviews with departing minority faculty.

Staff:

Many of the same suggestions apply to staff as to faculty.

- 1) Diversity training sessions, as outlined above.
- 2) Explore creation of “career ladders” for staff, to build commitment to staying at UC and prospering while advancing personal career goals.
- 3) Professional development funds and programs.
- 4) Mentoring and use of ambassadors to ease new hires into the UC and Cincinnati communities.

Finally, for both categories, there must be a system of accountability that rewards as well as creates disincentives for failure.

*Student Life, Climate and Recruitment Group*  
(Jerry Tsai)

*Over-arching Points of Discussion*

- Climate of UC student life with regards to diversity
- Is UC welcoming to students of color?
- Retention of students of color?

- Integration of different and diverse populations
- We have polarized/clustered diversity
- Curriculum that touches on diversity
- Faculty relating to students and diversity

*Identified Key Objectives*

- Faculty training/awareness for diversity
- Faculty setting the example of diversity in action
- We need to welcome diverse students (welcoming atmosphere)
- Integration of diverse students in housing and/or the FYE learning communities
- Develop a curriculum around diversity for credit, required to graduate, encompasses inside and outside the classroom experiences
- Create a map of diverse locations at UC and have a scavenger hunt during welcome week
- Administer a survey of students with regards to diversity (ask them formally)
- Compare ourselves against the other institutions that are taking students of color away from us
- Hold higher GPA standards for diverse students to help with retention, graduation rates and success
- Be a leader in the state in regards to diversity of students
- Have a center (home) for diverse students (multi-cultural center?)
- Have a Dean of Ethnic Affairs (or Vice Provost)
- Have a central office that addresses diversity and all its areas

*Recap of Discussions*

Comment:

Should we as an institution have diversity based off of societal percentages on diversity? Is the pool of college students (or perspective college students) even big enough to do this?

Comment:

We need to make sure we address the student climate of UC too. There is the AACRC, special programs (Upward Bound, etc) and diverse student leadership at UC. The saddest areas are recruitment and retention.

Comment:

Students seem polarized (especially regarding diversity). Can we integrate them?

Comment:

First we need to give diverse students a place, a home. This needs to be a holistic approach that is university-wide. We need places like the AACRC at the university. We lack with regards to the academic piece of diversity.

Comment:

We also lack in training of faculty in regards to diversity in the classroom. A diverse classroom presents new challenges. Here's an idea: have training and equip the faculty with tools to allow for the fostering of diversity. Possibly a "Center for Training and Learning" that addresses diversity in the classroom.

Comment:

We should also look at diversity as a trend too.

Comment:

Are we struggling with diversity because of the college climate?

Comment:

Or is it the city climate?

Comment:

We should give academic credit to students for living out their commitment to diversity. We would spell out a curriculum that encompasses multiple entities of diversity, inside the classroom (academic), outside the classroom (experiential), etc. This could be on their transcript. Then our students will not only be able to tell their future employers about their leadership experience and academic experience, but also their diversity experience as well.

Comment:

Diversity does need to be a part of our curriculum. We need a campus that integrates diversity (people and education). Let's make it a part of the educational process. At Stanford they purposely mix students in housing with regards to creating a diversity roommate situation. We should also have events on campus that celebrate diversity; maybe a one-day event.

Comment:

We need something more than curriculum, but what is it? The one shot at a time approach is an ineffective way of doing it.

Comment:

What is the climate really like here at UC? Let's look at graduation rates among different sects of campus. Do race specific programs help or hurt our diversity efforts?

Comment:

The receptivity of faculty to diversity (with the students) is lacking. We could create a program that addresses this.

Comment:

These problems (more specifically with African American students' graduation/GPA) are national problems.

Comment:

Remember that diversity is more than just black and white.

Comment:

We should have a home (sense of place, welcoming atmosphere) for all diverse students.

Comment:

Do we need more information from students regarding GPA, retention, etc?

Comment:

We need to gain and give more perspectives; we need more of these type of conversations.

Comment:

We need a good student life and climate in order to recruit and retain.

Comment:

For African American and Hispanic students, UC is not their first choice. Why not? There is a historical legacy. We need to address this issue. Does UC welcome African American, Hispanic, homosexual, etc. students?

Comment:

We need a welcoming atmosphere at UC. In the past we've had inconsistent messages that affect diversity and whether or not it is welcoming to students of color. Examples are the students of color graduation event and the moving or not of the AACRC. It feels that things

keep getting taken away from the students. Why aren't certain things getting funded? Why are the numbers going down?

Comment:

This happened because of insensitivity. The issue of not feeling welcome is big. We need money to "court" students of color.

Comment:

We should look at the other schools that are taking diverse students away from us, schools like OSU and Central College. What are they doing that we are not?

Comment:

OSU has a Dean of Ethnic Affairs (or a Vice Provost)

Comment:

They have a central area/office to go to about diversity.

Comment:

We have a council on diversity to get African American students into pharmacy school. We are taking the extra step to welcome them.

Comment:

We need to know our own story about diversity.

Comment:

We need a survey on why students of color are here, if UC was their first choice, why they stay, etc.

Comment:

We have the Darwin T. Turner Scholarship but the funding is less than sufficient. Other schools are "out-bidding" UC for talented students of color.

Comment:

We should make sure to look at student life and climate overall since what goes on here impacts the entire climate.

Comment:

Likes attract likes and we have clustered diversity. People of similar interests/qualities find each other and stick with each other. Examples of this can be seen in the food court at lunch. The band sits with the band, etc. We need to find a crossroads of life. We need to find a way to shake up the clustering. Maybe residential life, maybe a nation's dinner to change the climate of the lunch table? How do we mix up the equation of students?

Comment:

We need to make the comfort zones of students more diverse.

Comment:

We could do residence hall placement with a more intentional eye on diversity. Let's make it so the international dorm has more than just international students.

Comment:

We have a 30% graduation rate with regards to African American students. Are we welcoming?

Comment:

Does the FYE reflect diversity? How do we break up the groups/learning communities? Should we be more intentional with the placement of students here too?

Comment:

Diversity in the classroom is dependent on the major and college.

Comment:

Can we change how we break up the FYE groups?

Comment:

How about the examples that faculty set for the students regarding diversity? Is there a way to use the faculty to communicate this idea of diversity? Is there a way to use the community?

Comment:

The faculty is untapped at times. We should make these things that promote diversity fun too.

Comment:

Some students want their own autonomy.

Comment:

We won't be taking anything away from the university regarding diversity. We are looking to add things. The AACRC is representative of a culturally significant thing at UC.

Comment:

Maybe there is some way to have a diversity push among student groups and encourage them to reach out to a more diverse pool of students.

Comment:

What about creating a diversity map that highlights all the different entities of diversity at UC? Things like the AACRC, Hillel Center, Valentine House, Women's Center, etc. would be on the map.

Comment:

We could make it a scavenger hunt or something, maybe during welcome week.

### *Institutional Structures Discussion Group Notes*

(Deb Meem)

#### Cluster 1. Ideas that have been tried already at UC and should be brought back.

a. Administrative position at the VP or Provost level whose responsibility it is to keep diversity issues on the table in the cabinet and all areas of the university. Person must be autonomous and must report directly to the President. Also a "designated hitter" in every unit, to ensure coherence in message.

Advantages:

- Accountability: It's their job to produce results.
- Sends message that UC values diversity as an institution.
- Potential to tie various initiatives together, function on East and West campuses.

Disadvantages:

- Too much burden on one individual.
- When one person or office is responsible, the rest of us don't have to do the work.
- Therefore, possibly little impact on UC culture over time.

b. Incentives for minority recruitment and hiring: Non-diverse searches cannot go forward, rules for short lists of candidates, "grow your own" PhDs (change current custom of not hiring our own PhDs), automatic approval of position when minority candidate is available.

Advantages:

- Produces quick results because departments compete for positions
- Makes minority hiring seem terrific, therefore culture shift.

Disadvantages:

- Top-down feel.
- Artificial manipulation of candidate pools (i.e. encourages the same kind of “let’s see what we can get away with” tactics that have plagued Affirmative Action).
- There will be some feeling that we are not hiring the best person for the job.
- Unless tied to programs targeting retention, may result in revolving-door hires.

c. Diversity segment in new faculty orientation, aimed at all, not just minority faculty

### Cluster 2. New ideas.

a. Consider why ideas such as those in Cluster 1 were eliminated and analyze those reasons. Were they ineffective? Victims of budget cuts? Why not restored after budget emergency ended? After positions/policies/practices ended, did responsibilities go by the wayside also?

b. “Diversity ambassadors” at all levels in the university.

c. Check *Fortune* ranking of businesses that have successfully diversified and learn from them.

d. Joint appointment between UC and City of Cincinnati (Human Resources dept or other) or some successful company (P&G, GE, Toyota concerning supplier diversity).

e. Re student target, set goal to mimic diversity of greater Cincinnati area ( $\pm$  30% diverse).

f. Ongoing body (like this task force) that collects annual data, holds diversity issue to the light of day constantly, can function whether or not there is a VP or Provost or whatever, may require that any change in (departmental, unit, etc.) practice that affects diversity be reported.

g. How to get tenured faculty (immune to “required” initiatives that might lead to culture shift) on board? Carrot = incentives, monetary or otherwise. Stick = negotiate changes in RPT requirements in order to goose senior faculty into getting on board.

### Business/Community Relations

(Debra Merchant)

#### Table 1 General comments:

This is a timely discussion because of the interest on the part of businesses who recruit for diversity at UC. Colleges are struggling with how to get around FERPA restrictions in order to create a diverse student pool to present to potential employers?

Are our marketing tools/pieces adequately reflective of our commitment to diversity?

Communication is the critical piece; how we communicate to the larger community about the UC community and who we are.

We're not leveraging our alumni to increase diversity among our vendors, in our relationships with businesses or in our recruitment for diversity on campus.

Key objectives:

Clarify how and to what extent we (UC) want to be a purveyor of information regarding diversity to companies/employers who are vendors or potential employers.

Develop a plan for increasing diversity within business/community relations (i.e. in the pool of UC vendors)

Send a consistent and clear message that UC is committed to diversity initiatives. (Let our actions in the community be consistent with our message that diversity is important at UC.)

Success indicators:

- More diversity in the pool of students hired by employers.
- More diversity in colleges where students of color are underrepresented (i.e. College of Pharmacy).
- Employers who chose not to prioritize diversity will have their awareness raised regarding the value in hiring for diversity.
- UC will be recognized as a University where work in the area of diversity is valued and can be accomplished
- Increased commitment of faculty/staff to push this goal forward.
- Change (improvement) in the negative perception of UC in the community. (There is a perception that UC pushes its agenda in the community without considering community preferences or needs.)
- Creation of a sustainable, credible diversity initiative and wide publication of the initiative to the community.
- A plan of communication and public presentation(s) of our goals/accomplishments in promoting diversity at UC as well as our failures.
- Defined University commitments to communicate broad strategies and identify collaborative partners to achieve increased diversity.

*Table 2 General comments:*

It's important for businesses/community partners to have information about the University and what we're doing in a variety of areas. Communicate a commitment to increase diversity in our colleges with sanctions when we run into different mind sets.

Adhere to principles UC values such as increased diversity at all levels of the University.

We (UC) have clout. Our actions should reflect our values. Actively seek out partners in the community who reflect our values.

Communicate to others in the UC family when the behavior or values of community partners isn't consistent with our values. (i.e. the College of Business should know if another college

is not placing interns with a particular company because they do not value diversity in the workplace).

People don't think UC needs anything. There are other ways to work with people in the community other than by giving money. Share our resources; allow members/groups in the community the opportunity to access our new facilities.

*Key objectives:*

Cultivate new relationships with people/networks representing diverse populations in the community.

Raise awareness within the general and business community regarding UC's commitment to increase diversity at the university.

*Success indicators:*

- Clearly defined set of UC principles/values related to diversity.
- New groups/partners representing diverse populations among our list of community partners.
- A recruitment plan that establishes ongoing relationships and a pipeline for culturally diverse applicants to the university.
- Our community and business partners articulate UC's commitment to hiring, admitting and retaining a diverse study body, faculty and staff.

*Table 3 General comments:*

We have lots of volunteers (students) who are involved in projects in the community, but there's not a lot of diversity across the students who volunteer.

It would send a positive message to the community if UC supported the community's symbols of diversity (i.e. shared positions at the university and Hebrew Union or the Freedom Center).

We should find out what businesses in our community are doing to recruit, retain and market for diversity.

How do we define diversity (looking outward) to communicate to the community OUR definition of diversity?

*Key objectives:*

- ✓ Fold diversity initiatives into current successful, high profile community projects.
- ✓ Include persons with disabilities in diversity initiatives/plans.
- ✓ Identify the icons or pillars of diversity in our community (i.e. NCCJ, Freedom Center).
- ✓ Send a clear message that persons with disabilities are valued by UC.
- ✓ Purposefully, diversify groups that are working on community projects.
- ✓ Help community/business partners understand the value in diversity in the community and in business.

- ✓ Attach ourselves (UC) to the most prominent symbols of diversity in the area.
- ✓ Maximize relationships with community partners, businesses and schools to increase diversity at all levels of the University and to communicate our commitment to improving our “track record” with diversity initiatives.

*Success indicators:*

- Partner with appropriate organizations to build a Habitat house that’s “visitable” by persons with disabilities.
- Definition of diversity at UC extends beyond race.
- Shared positions in community and/or business organization.
- Partnerships with secondary and other post-secondary institutions (i.e. Cincinnati State) that results in more students moving successfully from high school and two year institutions to UC.

*Table 4 General discussion:*

Our institution should model the behaviors (as it relates to valuing diversity) that are consistent with our values and that we want others to engage in.

Take a stand on diversity issues in the community; don’t be silent.

Re-examine the ways we communicate UC’s principles, values and initiatives. Perhaps UC should use different mediums. Our message isn’t getting across to the community.

What is UC doing to support/raise standards in the Cincinnati Public Schools and surrounding districts to increase the likelihood that students in diverse, low-socioeconomic communities will succeed in college?

*Key objectives:*

- ✓ Increase partnerships with minority vendors

*Success indicators:*

- When UC makes decisions, it becomes routine that we consider diversity issues.
- Data on successful partnerships with minority vendors.
- Data on the implementation of successful diversity initiatives.

**SEPTEMBER 22, 2006**

1. L. Bilionis welcomed all to the meeting and provided an update of where we are:
  - a. Steering Committee has been at work in subcommittees. We’ve spent time listening and trying not to dictate the agenda. We have been working in five subgroups organized around the areas of impact we want to make.
  - b. We’ve accomplished much through the matrix or inventory of best practices. Now groups are strategizing with consultants and following tasks outlined on the timetable distributed today.

- c. We are trying to keep a communications link with the outside world. A new subcommittee on communications is being formed and a set of talking points about the task force and its work is in draft form.
  - d. An outline for our report has been agreed to by the subcommittee chairs. (See template.)
  - e. Today we are trying to identify key pieces of information and provide counsel to the subcommittee on student recruitment and retention.
2. Co-chairs of the Student Recruitment and Retention subcommittee, Jerry Tsai and Mitchel Livingston, led discussion. On the screen they provided an overview of committee members, an outline of their section of the report, sources of data and division of labor. Sources for data include: Residence Hall Satisfaction Data; Student Satisfaction Inventory; NSSE Benchmarks; Enrollment Profiles; Retention Profile; and Student Profile. Mitchel acknowledged the enormous contribution of Eric Abercrombie, who has supplied the task force with a wealth of information from other universities and Web sites. Survey research will be conducted and meetings with institutional experts will be held in order to get a better sense of recruitment and retention. By the close of October, this subcommittee will have a good sense of the contents of their report and recommendations.
  3. M. Livingston walked the task force through the data showing changes in enrollment over time, retention rates (which now approach 80% overall), NSSE benchmark data about supportive campus environments, active and collaborative learning, student/faculty interaction, academic challenges and enriching educational experiences. There was some concern expressed about the data not being presented in a disaggregated way that allows possible trends to emerge concerning both race and gender combined, so the subcommittee will consider getting the data broken down in more detail.
  4. Small group discussion. Three tables were formed to identify what we should be doing to insure success. What should UC look like five years from now in the categories of recruitment and retention? These views will be shared with expects next week. The records of table discussions were submitted to the subcommittee members.
    - a. J. Tsai's table mentioned more scholarships, lower tuition for all students, certain programs that appeal to diverse students, better market research about what students want, reaching for similar demographics in city and university; more diverse admissions officers, attention to materials and the Web site show that it shows the university's commitment to diversity. Retention efforts should include learning communities, exit surveys to find out why students leave UC; e.g., do diverse students leave because of financial constraints or displeasure with their experiences? More nontraditional courses on-line.
    - b. M. Leventhal's table got stuck on how success was measured. The "disaggregation" question should be extended so that we look at colleges and disciplines where we have low numbers compared to others. We need to work harder to work on getting to the best students early, perhaps by 8<sup>th</sup> grade; Strive, Gear-Up, etc. We need to understand these and other early intervention programs better. Economics was raised as very important, e.g., co-op experiences could easily be created in more disciplines. Exit interviews should

be given to those who leave, and information should be collected from students who apply but don't actually enroll. Better faculty support and affinity groups were other ideas.

Notes provided by M. Leventhal are inserted here:

### **Student Recruitment and Retention – What Should Success Look Like?**

- i. How is success measured? Relative to community? Against peers? Against ourselves?
- ii. Need to disaggregate by gender AND school or discipline. Some colleges have significantly poorer profiles than the aggregates would suggest.

#### **RECRUITMENT**

- iii. Need an ongoing effort to reach the best students in 8<sup>th</sup>/9<sup>th</sup> grades. UC utilize PSOE program. Need more info about STRIVE and GearUP (nobody knew details). Also corporate partnerships with schools, like GE and Aiken HS.

#### **RETENTION**

- iv. Economics are very important for success. How can this be addressed? Jobs? Scholarships? What about a concerted effort to broadly extend co-op to fields not presently offering it?
- v. Survey non-comers and exit interview departing students (non-completers).
- vi. Provide better starts to improve retention
- vii. Better support/involvement by faculty
- viii. Affinity groups early on

Notes from Jerry Tsai's group are inserted here:

### **Students Recruitment and Retention What Should Success Look Like**

#### Recruitment (Enrollment)

- Scholarships available to diversity/lower tuition
- Programs and Academic Reputation – towards diversity
- Better market research – see what different ethnicity want in colleges
  - Explore size of pool(are we limiting by recruiting)
- Admission officers are diverse as well and/or ethnically sensitive.
- Materials show diversity and commitment too (Web site, etc.)
  - Diverse face

#### *Retention*

- Higher for all groups

- University wide mentor program (community service, \$200 off tuition)
- Expanding learning community concept to diversity
- Exit survey data to help resolve issue
- Prevention method of keeping students
- Flexible degree programs
- Non-tradition courses online

### **Students Recruitment and Retention Element of a Vision Statement**

#### Recruitment (Enrollment)

- Representative
- Aggressive (intensity/vigor)
- Under-represented
- Inclusivity
- Fundamental (part of mission)
- Explicit
- Committed/dedicated (to success)
- Culture
- Dynamic/synergistic
- Integrated/welcoming
- Integral

#### *Retention*

- 100% - deliver what promised
- No leaving for lack of resources
- Lack of academic challenge – engagement
- Excellent support system
- Flexible (different learning styles and paces)
- Can realistically graduate in 4 years
- Quarter system works against retention
- Envision outcome
  - See light at the end of the tunnel
- More individualized curriculum

- c. R. Katerburg's group focused on measurable goals and a discussion of programs at UC. Some programs are showing great numbers while others are not. Financial support was another big issue, especially early support. The second major theme discussed in this group was partnerships with employers in a variety of ways. Early experiences in the work place seem to motivate students to persist in their field. Co-op is just one model; paid internships is another. Finally, professionals might be able to assist with ethnic recruiting in particular fields, e.g., Pharmacy.

- d. M. Livingston thanked all for their contributions and suggested that all of these are viable areas for discussion and that they will be tested with the experts next week.
- e. The members of the task force then spent a few moments on aspirations we have for our institution as relates to recruitment and retention. Some key words or ideas that must be included in our “aspirational” statements include: representative; aggressive; pursue with intensity, representative of society as a whole; inclusiveness; underrepresented; committed; culture of inclusion; dynamic; integrated; welcoming; integral to; committed to success; we must communicate to prospective students that this university explicitly considers the concept of diversity as part of their education and our mission; branding initiatives should be closely associated with diversity.
- f. Retention keywords include: 100% retention; no student leaves because of lack of resources; engage students academically; make sure there is sufficient academic challenge; excellent support systems; flexibility for different styles of learning for everybody; different styles and paces of learning; more evening opportunities; realistic graduation timelines; quarter system might work against retention; ability to envision an outcome; flexible time lines for completing programs in three years.
- g. M. Livingston then turned to the topic of Campus and Community Climate. The Student Satisfaction Inventory includes an item on this and aggregate data indicates that white, African American and other student data is quite similar. Underneath the data, particular questions differentiate responses worthy of our attention although perhaps not statistically significant. What would the ideal campus climate look like? Small groups discussed this and then reported out.
  - a. M. Leventhal’s group wants there to be a positive reaction about UC around the community; welcoming; attractive signage; positive urban streetscape, even after 5 p.m.; improved safety perceptions; bridge the faculty/staff divide with students at the center; events that bring the entire community together; resourceful; use and share knowledge so that information is not a threat but celebrates our diversity; breakdown collegiate nationalisms.

Notes provided by Mitch Leventhal are inserted here:

**Campus Community and Climate – What Should We Look Like?**

- Woven into the community – the surrounding community, within 2 miles, should have a concrete impression of our role, contribution, etc.
- Welcoming, with attractive, clear signage
- Positive urban streetscape, even after 5 pm - Short Vine, Jefferson, Calhoun – sidewalk cafes, activity
- Transportation access – students need convenient/easy access to entire city. This also relates to perceptions of safety.
- Bridge Faculty-Staff divide, with students at the center. More events that bring together all of the university community: faculty, staff, students

- Be “resourceful” – use/share knowledge. Knowledge should not be perceived as a threat. Become an informed community that celebrates diversity.
  - Break down collegiate nationalisms.
- b. E. Owens group suggested there is great synergy between the topics today. We should look at those organizations already in place and see if they are being leveraged to the max. Would there be utility in participating with the Black Student Union on a rotating basis some talks from African American bankers, or other professionals different from those they encounter at the university. The community could help UC in this quest. This dynamic would help recruitment and retention.
  - c. J. Driscoll’s group hit on a few different subjects. Handling complaints at UC is sometimes not good. We need more integrated student organizations and must ask hard questions like, Is Rally Cats as diverse as it could be? Student Government? We must strive to encourage students to extend their college identity to that of the larger UC; all students should express pride in UC; need more interactions between ethnicities; expanding exposure to other cultures breaks down barriers. UC gear should be the norm to build pride.
  - d. Key elements of an ideal environment include: exciting; visible; comfort; high energy; urban; what students will be at the end; connecting of the dots; inspired;
  - e. Next time we will do an exercise with three different sources of information for defining core values of the university: 1) UC|21 planning process; 2) task force recommendations; and 3) Just Community-related language. All need to be integrated to come up with a core set of values that are the essence of the UC experience. Between now and next time, think deeply about that so that we can condense this to 4-5 core ideals that capture the essence. (Diversity is one! Is Just Community another?)
  - f. Another exercise is assessment of Just Community. The new brochure was distributed and Mitchel said to note the history line. Just Community is marking its 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary. He said we hope these activities have enhanced climate and culture at UC.
  - g. Final thoughts from co-chair, Marian Spencer: Mrs. Spencer thinks it’s important that we’re having this discussion on this campus. We’re moving in the right direction and our experiences could be important to other universities as we develop a roadmap that they have yet to be involved with. She sees in our future maybe a nucleus of understanding that has heretofore not been a part of our educational experience. People are not well educated unless they appreciate the potential of a diverse community. In welcoming all to our country, this made our country great.
  - h. The next meeting is October 20, 2006, when we will focus on staff recruitment and retention.

**OCTOBER 20, 2006**

L. Bilionis provided an update from the Steering Committee. In short order we are expecting a draft report from each subcommittee that reflects conversations to date and offers solutions we can believe in. A notice and comment period will follow and the report will be presented to the president by the end of the year. A subcommittee on communications has convened to organize further conversations with other campus constituencies to encourage feedback and suggestions. If you know of particular groups on campus that might benefit from a visit, please let Lou know. To date, the meetings have been reassuring. People are rooting for us and are interested in our work.

### **Staff Recruitment and Retention**

A. Trammer shared information collected by her subcommittee and summarized the focus of the group's meetings to date. The subcommittee has consulted with resource experts Theresa Murphy of HR and Diane Lewis from Organizational Performance in the course of their work. See the subcommittee's Power Point presentation handout for data on UC's:

1. Workforce
2. Employee-staff groups
3. Ethnicity breakdown by groups
4. Recruitment activities
5. Retention and employee development activities
6. Total compensation processes.

The subcommittee wanted the record to note that they had to struggle to find all the data they needed and had to seek information from various campus locations.

Results from the survey on *Best Places to Work 2005* were quite interesting and showed vast differences in perceptions among hourly and professional employees at UC. The winners of this local competition, NKU, Children's Hospital and TriHealth, scored considerably higher than UC on a number of measures.

Recruitment activities include e-posting advertising (required) and optional activities such as the Chronicle, recruitment fairs, networking, but each college does its own process without central HR support.

Retention and Employee Development activities include: UC is Listening, Management Advancement Program (MAP), performance appraisal process and UC events such as employee orientation, holiday events, ethnic faculty, staff, student welcome receptions, benefits fairs, total compensation benefits, UC Advantage Program and value-added services such as homeowners and car insurance, as well as the rather new Sibcy Cline real estate services.

Small groups discussed and identified things UC seems to be doing well:

- Advertise in appropriate publications;
- Offer competitive benefits (not salary);

- Post positions systematically (including internal postings first which give opportunities to move up);
- We do well at the bottom but not so well at the top;
- Benefits packages;
- Tuition remission program;
- Professional development opportunities (but this varies across campus);
- Physical facilities have been modernized and are good;
- Environmental things like office staff support.

Small groups discussed and identified things UC seems not to be doing well:

- Requests for “exceptions” re salary offers during the hiring process seem to have become the rule;
- Employees have lots of questions around pay;
- Issue of digital divide where some employees do not have access to computers;
- A career development plan for lower level employees;
- Lack of inconsistency regarding special designated funds for positions that require higher salaries;
- Search processes that don’t always result in diversified pools. We often move forward without diverse pools instead of expanding the search.
- When asked if we ever trump offers made by other universities, the answer was that it depends on the college. Some colleges tend to find funding to supplement and match funds being offered to candidates, but other colleges don’t have that option. It was thought that we used to have a central fund to help recruiting for diversity. Some departments have endowments to use; but there is a divide between recruitment of faculty and staff. Many times the partner of a faculty member might be a good fit for a staff position, but this is done inconsistently across the university. The group spoke well about certain recent hires, but asserted that we don’t seem to have enough of these.
- Perhaps we shouldn’t just brag in our own publications that reach limited constituencies, but use the popular media more to spread our good news.
- A corollary about searches is that we need stronger accountability pressures to insist that pools include diverse candidates. This has to be internalized in our culture. While the lawyers caution us, there is language we could insert in the search process to insure diverse pools of candidates. Have we tried to gather information from people recently hired about why they chose UC so that we can use it in future recruitment efforts? Harvard is working to create a culture of minority scholarship to create a magnet for other scholars. A culture of acceptance is an important factor.
- The Cincinnati community can be a hostile place for newcomers, so having designated people to make introductions to the community is critical. It would be good if every new person had a senior level mentor and support to take new employees from Day 1 to ensure success. We don’t seem to be clear as an institution about what we want mentors to do. Perhaps we need another conversation about this specifically. What really helps a new person to acclimate to the environment? There should be a prescribed way to bring people of color

into the campus. It's more than acculturation. Could we be doing more minority/majority mentoring?

- Given that tuition remission is listed as a valuable thing, might we use that program to bring people up from the bottom tier of employees. Talented persons could be identified for special opportunities.
- We must think through diversity consequences at budget time.

### **Community and Climate: The Larger Cincinnati Community**

This subcommittee focused on the question of how the larger Cincinnati community perceives UC. In small groups, we discussed our strengths and weaknesses (as we believe they are perceived by the larger community) as well as suggestions for doing something about these perceptions. Three areas where we are particularly vulnerable include: Admission (who gets in and who is kept out); Employment opportunities; and Vendor and contractual relations.

**Admission and Retention.** This group decided to focus on our perceived weaknesses only:

- The change in academic standards is perceived as designed to exclude from UC both low income African Americans and urban students from CPS.
- Closing University College and establishing the CAT was seen as a slap in the face to African Americans. Yet, when U-College existed, it was considered a Mickey Mouse place where easy courses were offered to African American students.
- Under-funding organizations on campus with the mission to work with African American students.
- No general knowledge or understanding of SPARK.
- Diversity organizations within colleges tend to be driven by soft money.
- Better advertising needed.
- Better communications with CPS needed.

**Employment Opportunities.** Strengths include:

- Many people *want* to come to work at UC.
- UC is perceived as a great place to work...a place of opportunity.
- Salaries are perceived as "big."
- UC is perceived as a diverse institution and people can see themselves here.
- Weaknesses include access to information about how to apply.
- Electronic posting of employment opportunities is not enough.
- UC employment is often seen as a maze.
- Once people are employed, how are they treated? Again, more tools for navigating the system and moving up in the organization are needed. Some believe that a "softer touch" to connect people to jobs would be helpful.

**Vendor Relations.** Perceived weaknesses include:

- It seems that our minority vendor program in the Purchasing Department is not that well known.
- The perceptions about what we're doing with minorities and women are not good.
- We need to engage in activities to strengthen the office of minority contracting.

- We could be doing better in the amount of contracting with minority vendors and with training and fairs and advertisements so people are aware that we have these programs. It's a process of getting information out.
- On-line is one thing, but there must be other ways of encouraging minority business.
- We must be more aggressive.
- The state mandated contracting minority vendor certification process is cumbersome and doesn't lend itself to increasing the numbers.
- Specifications can be crafted so that certain groups are "written out."
- Institutional support for this activity is perceived to be weak and in need of strengthening. Currently, we have two staff members designated there now, but one is due to retire.
- The facts don't seem to overcome the negative perceptions about UC as a place of great opportunity for minority vendors. We do have goals that we should be attaining in this area, but are they being measured and assessed?
- Recommendations:
  - Strengthen the office that handles minority vendors with more institutional support.
  - Demystify the process by offering regular training programs on how to do business with the university. In the real nuts and bolts of how to submit a competitive bid.

**Closing Remarks.** L. Bilonis said the range of issues that the task force is taking up is staggering and it is to our credit that we have dared to venture into these issues. He encourages all to be optimistic about the outcomes. Marian Spencer added that we are a 300 million person country now and there is a question of how to deal with all of the diversity. Universities are one place to prepare and meet the challenge and she is pleased to be a part of this effort.

**REMINDER:** At the next meeting M. Livingston would appreciate feedback on the Just Community principles and core values. He asks that all members of the task force review the core value statements and the Just Community recommendations in advance.

### **NOVEMBER 29, 2006**

1. Opening Comments: L. Bilonis welcomed all and was encouraged by the progress all are making. We are "batting clean-up with the bases loaded." Issues are surfacing for final clean-up, and we can all take pride in what has been accomplished since May. The schedule is full for today so the platform was handed over to M. Livingston.
2. M. Livingston asked to briefly allow N. Zimpher to speak about the book printed about student-nominated professors at UC that fulfill or exceed expectations of diversity. It was agreed that this resource is a good one and that its publishing comes at a wonderful time for the task force to deliver its recommendations.

3. M. Livingston then briefly addressed the recent racial incident on campus, distributing a copy of the *News Record* statement he submitted on behalf of the university.
4. Just Community has celebrated 10 years at UC and is ready to go to “the next level.” As an organization it sensitively and clearly handles issues on campus so that people feel empowered to stand for what they believe. To help move it into more significance M. Livingston asked for the approval of several initiatives:
  - a. Expanded core values that are integrated into goal setting and aligned with UC|21
  - b. Town hall meetings should occur so that all constituencies are represented
  - c. The Just Community Awards should be integrated into the task force report: Teaching, Living, Learning, Working and Community Engagement.
  - d. UC should regularly conduct an audit. Are we having our desired impact?
5. G. Vehr raised the issue of measurement of success. Conversation ensued about measurement. How will success be measured? Does a metric yet exist? Is an “award” system really the way to go when striving for diversity? Will the metric be incrementally fashioned to allow for gradual and realistic growth? N. Zimpher indicated that she is expecting in the report the metrics by which to measure success.
6. A. Welsh offered that her group’s presentation on Institutional Structure and Framework addresses this very issue and asked to present. Livingston agreed.
7. Subsequent breakout groups discussed opportunities to enhance diversity institutionally: “Grow our own” strategies, diversity audit cards, Chief Diversity Officer, etc.
8. L. Bilionis brought the discussion to a close asking of the task force, “What have we missed?” Some issues raised for last minute reiteration/consideration:
  - a. How are we defining diversity?
  - b. Are we anticipating the challenges that will arise in response to whatever it is we release?
  - c. How rich will the Web site be?
  - d. Are our metrics attainable for some clear, short-term victories?

### DECEMBER 19, 2006

1. **Welcome/Opening Remarks.** L. Bilionis welcomed all to this final meeting of the task force and shared the vision for today’s work. He congratulated Marian Spencer on her recently awarded Honorary Degree and members of the task force rose to provide a standing ovation.

L. Bilionis suggested that the work for today is to make sure we have positioned the steering committee to take the final steps. We will use the questions listed in our agenda to guide today’s discussion:

- ✓ Did we accomplish what we were asked to do?
- ✓ Do we agree on the recommendations?
- ✓ Are the recommendations in priority order?
- ✓ Are there any recommendations that might be considered problematic?

- ✓ Do we anticipate negative reactions to any of the recommendations? Any points of criticism? If so, does the document respond to these?
- ✓ Are there any messages in the text not conveyed that need to be conveyed?

**2. Did we accomplish what we were asked to do?**

- a. Some think we still need to flesh out some of the action plan costs and responsibilities.
- b. But, we don't want to hamstring the President, so this task force could authorize the chair to say to the President that she has liberty to take this as a working document and have license to modify it as needed. We perceive this as a starting point for a lot of work yet to come.
- c. Others said we have met the charge, and this is a good set of recommendations.
- d. We haven't yet provided a working definition of diversity.
- e. We should give the President this report without any further comment and the Cabinet can help decide what to do next.
- f. All agreed it was a good process and they were honored to serve.
- g. The question of the choice of the title "director" for the diversity position was raised. This is intended to be a "place holder title", but the intent is a high level, university-wide portfolio of responsibilities.
- h. A comprehensive list of all programs and offices that serve students of color across the entire university should be included in the appendix. M. Livingston reported that his subcommittee is working on that.

**3. Do we agree on the recommendations? Do we have too many?**

- a. Some members of the task force were amazed that so much was captured during the process and were looking for something more cohesive coming out of the report. To some, the report seems fractured. Some felt there were too many recommendations.
- b. For some of our community members, they were impressed with the work and the products generated here. We met the charge in a profound way and there are not too many recommendations. If we reduced the list, over time, some details may be forgotten over the 3-5 years it will take for implementation. While it is true the recommendations might not be cohesive and flow synergistically, all realize that we have to start broadly and narrow down in order to be successful. Through UC|21 there is a framework and consciousness raised across the campus. An action plan is yet to be created. That can be cohesive. But we did talk about packaging and the clearer we can make this, the better.
- c. Some think that 50 recommendations are too many to get arms around. What might help is a major goal for each section with a list of sub-goals underneath. Editors can do this for us.
- d. We have been comprehensive and detailed. All these recommendations are not a bad thing: each resulted from great thought and should not be reduced. In the future when we go back, we might lose details. We don't imagine for a

minute that all recommendations will be enacted; some will be tabled for later on. We need to be reminded of what we did not do.

- e. If this document is going to lead the campus, what five points do we really want to get out as a key message? Some think that would be an unwise strategy. Every one of these has the possibility to move UC forward, and we should claim all.
- f. Perhaps we should make more explicit the statements describing the reasons for the five subcommittees. Are the five subcommittees the frame of the recommendations? Are they the big picture?
- g. It was pointed out that some “recommendations” are really “strategies.” They should be sorted and named as such. What are the big picture goals that might frame the strategies? (E.g. the recommendation isn’t to define diversity. The recommendation as envisioned by the subcommittee might be better stated like, “Establish a process for a university-wide conversation to define diversity.”

#### **4. Are the recommendations in priority order?**

- a. All the subcommittees ranked their recommendations before submitting, so, yes, this has been done.
- b. Some expressed concerns that the writers of the document used this opportunity to list all of the things that haven’t been accomplished over time at UC rather than to say what has been accomplished. Others replied that the historical timeline yet to be finished identifies all of the successes. Yet, it is possible that some will want to use the document “against” us. Debate centered on the right number of recommendations. Is it better to have fewer recommendations against which to be measured, or many?
- c. Rather than wait for a definition of diversity to evolve from campus-wide conversations, some think that it is important to include our working definition of diversity. It was agreed to include our definition at the outset. Some people may debate it, though. We were committed to defining diversity as broadly as the human condition and the task force chose to place the issue of race and ethnicity within the larger context. Hopefully we will broaden people’s definition over time. Maybe a way to help the concern about not defining diversity explicitly is to say something in the preface. On page 25, section 5, the language is there. But we want to recommend a process too because at UC there are elements of diversity that people just don’t get. So it is important that a recommendation includes, “Engage the university in a process to define diversity” instead of the way it is stated in A2.

#### **5. Is there something missing in our report?**

- a. Where in the report do we make the case for diversity? This should be stated at the outset so that as an institution we make the case that diversity is a compelling interest. We talk about it in one of the subcommittees as foundational to our mission, but we didn’t exactly bring this out as a compelling interest. Without such language, we could be up for challenges.

- b. Regarding the legality of the recommendations, all must build off the mission statement. New language about diversity indicates that achieving diversity is vital to achieving our mission. The two lawyers in the room counseled that maybe we ought to, up front, state clearly that this builds on a fundamental premise because diversity is a compelling interest of the university. Perhaps we should include some research references to support this statement. The inherent educational value makes diversity compelling. We should include a strong statement to assert that the task force discussed this explicitly.
- c. Performance indicators propose revisions to the university mission statement. Did we take a position? Yes. The report recommends explicitly inclusive language in the mission statement.
- d. The report should include a framework and an action plan. At the very least, we need a reframing that captures our choice to go down a 5-point plan. The action plan can have goals and objectives; then we have met our charge. It could be the job of the steering committee to create a specific plan with categories.
- e. The cultural component of the definition needs tuning up and needs to move up to the top of the document. Restate A2 to focus on process and cultural component to align with our broader concept.
- f. Must clean up the jargon used in various places in the document. B13, for example, needs work. The word “minority” throughout needs to go. Is “persons of color” better? Underrepresented groups? What terms should be utilized? See B13, C13, C9, D6 and D4. We must also make appropriate references to Asian Americans, Native Peoples, Hispanic/Latinos and others. The steering committee was charged with combing the document to look for inappropriate language and settle on consistent language throughout.

**6. Are there any recommendations that might be considered problematic? Do we anticipate negative reactions to any of the recommendations? Any points of criticism? If so, does the document respond to these?**

- a. There may be some confusion about the recommendation concerning the director of diversity’s relationship to the Center for the City. The Center for the City already has an executive director and the two directors should work together collaboratively.
- b. Is this office the one responsible for diversifying UC’s supplier base? Once this document leaves the campus, if our “spend” with vendors is X dollars and we’ve expressed this commitment for diversity, the question will definitely come regarding exactly how we’re being inclusive with vendors. It was recommended that the office of diversity have a person responsible for being the lead person on supplier diversity. This recommendation needs to go back to the committee for a clearer recommendation for procurement monitoring. M. McCrate would like to be part of the discussion on this.
- c. The D4 recommendation on search pools may be too harsh and should land somewhere between “it must be” and “make every effort to achieve.” Creating an acceptable pool includes the notion that a pool may be acceptable if an effort was made to have a diverse pool. On the one hand, if you add “best

efforts” that might be an invitation to dilute the pool. On the other hand, there might be tension if we leave it as written. Or we could try to rewrite in order to get the language just right. If you don’t have a diverse pool, what do you do? Can you say that the Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO) must be called in to help achieve the goal of a diverse pool? A rewrite could say that in the absence of a diverse pool, the committee must go to OEO. Or, another way is that the hiring person must document attempts or acceptable efforts to make the pool diverse. Then proceeding with a homogeneous pool could proceed. It is clear that we must do more to train our managers to conduct searches. Should we replace the language, “no search will go forward” with “No search will go forward without documented best efforts to create a diverse pool?” Some asked that, since we will have to interpret this anyway, why wouldn’t we use the strongest language possible? In the end, language about documented best efforts approach seems best. This language might be a recommendation for staff as well as faculty. E1 embraces this same intent. Ed Owens argues for keeping the language as it exists as the benchmark. John B wanted to leave it as is too. Does this put too much burden on the search committees? There should be some uniform standard that office of affirmative action monitors.

- d. D2 – what does this recommendation mean? It repeats the PACCARD report language. But, hires cannot be “because” of a specific factor, such as ethnicity. We liked the idea of allocating resources to make these hires, but further conversation is needed to tune this up.
- e. Last recommendation in staff section about enhancing orientations should say something about diversity specifically and our values in general. This will set the tone for other orientation activities. It does say this in the narrative, but not in the recommendations spreadsheet. Let’s add it there.
- f. Did we decide to change A3 language? Yes. Make intent more explicit.
- g. A6 is not clear. Where will funding come from? For example, Showcase was an unfunded mandate last year. Who was this intended for? All administrative and academic units.
- h. C5 price tag should be removed and replaced with an amount unspecified.

**7. Are there any messages in the text not conveyed that need to be conveyed?**

- a. We aspire to have a culture that intuitively includes and embraces diversity. Maybe this expectation should go into the preamble. If our culture really was inclusive and valued diversity, we wouldn’t need directives such as those in our report. This is another theme that is fundamental and the premises need to be brought topside in the document.
- b. It is also important that we talk about study abroad and being global. Black students, for example, need to be made aware of study abroad opportunities. We might add this somewhere as a goal.

8. **Next Steps.** This has been a very productive conversation and the result of terrific work. The chairs are very proud of the work we’ve done to position UC strongly, to learn from lessons of the past and build a structure for the years to come. Next steps

are to follow through on today's work and prepare a final document to submit to the President and Executive Committee.

9. **Closing Remarks.** Dr. Marian Spencer shared that President Zimpher was unable to be with the task force today because she was called to Columbus to meet with Regents.

*Dr. Spencer remarked, "It is my distinct honor and privilege to thank each of you who has participated in our 8-month journey...exploring, researching, digesting and suggesting many plans of action and developing a set of recommendations to submit to the Executive Committee of the President's Cabinet.*

*You've been a wonderful group with whom to work – individually and collectively. You sensed the importance of the task from the very beginning: the need for our University to make a priority of developing what we mean by "diversity," putting it in our mission statement and including it in everything we do from administration heads to students in the classroom – our programming, our staffing, our underlying philosophy for being. We want the world to know that we know the importance of diversity in the entire educational process, from birth to death. We want our students to be well-versed in the need for inclusion in our global, as well as our provincial communities.*

*Our graduates will be leaders. History attests to this. We want them to be able to be well-educated in the understanding of what "inclusion" means; the Just Community has the viability, visibility and value that comes with the practices of diversity – intact.*

*Thank you for bringing our University into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century by helping us all to understand and practice diversity together."*

## **SECTION VII:**

# **EXHIBITS AND APPENDICES**

**EXHIBITS AND APPENDICES: LISTING**  
(To access all items, see <<http://www.uc.edu/sas/diversity/>>)

**Subcommittee On Institutional Structure And Framework**

[Exhibit One: UC Diversity-Related Organizations, Programs, Services Initiatives](#)

[Exhibit Two: African American Experience Timeline](#)

[Appendix A: Strategies to Enhance Diversity](#)

[Appendix B: Sample Unit Diversity Initiatives, 2005-2006](#)

[Appendix C: Student Affairs and Services Offices and Student Organizations  
Assessment of Structural and Cultural Position within the University](#)

[Appendix D: Best Practices and Critical Components for Success](#)

[Appendix E: Examples of Culture of Diversity](#)

**Community and Campus Climate: At UC and Throughout Cincinnati**

[Appendix F: University Core Values](#)

[Appendix G: Overview of the National Study of Student Engagement \(NSSE\) and the Student Satisfaction Inventory \(SSI\)](#)

[Appendix H: ACUHO-I/EBI Data Summary by Ethnic Group or Nationality](#)

**Student Recruitment and Retention**

[Appendix H: ACUHO-I/EBI Data Summary by Ethnic Group or Nationality](#)

[Appendix I: Overview of Recruitment and Retention](#)

**Faculty Recruitment and Retention**

[Appendix J: University of Cincinnati Affirmative Action Report and Plan](#)

**Task Force as a Whole**

Exhibit Three: [http://www.uc.edu/sas/documents/diversity/Exhibit\\_3\\_Population\\_data1.pdf](http://www.uc.edu/sas/documents/diversity/Exhibit_3_Population_data1.pdf)