

Annual Assessment Report

Reporting Unit: College of Education and Human Development

Report Contact Name: Mary Alfred/Nancy Watson

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

- Students
- Undergraduate
- Masters
- Doctoral

Reporting Date: September 1, 2012

Contact email: malfred@tam.u.edu/n.watson@tam.u.edu

- Faculty, Lecturers, and Instructors
- Administrators (applicable to all organizations)
- Budgeted Staff (applicable to all organizations)
- Professional Other (Define) _____

Introduction by Douglas Palmer, Dean

Central to the mission of the College of Education and Human Development (CEHD) is the development of individuals to learn, to educate, to discover, to serve, and to lead in a culture of diversity. In so doing, the primary mission of the CEHD is to improve the education and health outcomes of the citizens of our state, the nation, and beyond. As noted in the Dean's vision statement found on the CEHD website, "*Just as the U.S. and Texas populations have become increasingly diverse and complex, so to have our faculty and students adapted to better serve the needs of our ever-changing local, state, national and global community.*" The complexities of serving the needs of diverse communities remain a challenge, but our steadfast commitment remains in building a climate that supports a culture of diversity. Therefore, we are guided by three primary diversity goals:

1. Build *organizational capacity* by systematically implementing strategies that enhance our climate of fostering and supporting the development of students and faculty with their many diversity dimensions and backgrounds in their research and instruction.
2. Build *individual capacity* by providing within-college and within-university opportunities for CEHD faculty, students, staff and administrators to actively participate and engage in increasing their knowledge, understanding, commitment, and skill sets to enhance the college climate for diversity and to further integrate into all areas of the college.
3. Systematically *demonstrate and evidence* an environment for all where success and advancement are based on equitable standards and metrics that demonstrate advancement of the mission of the College (from TAMU Campus Diversity Plan).

Mining the Data: The 9-member CEHD State of Diversity assessment team was a richly diverse group of women and men who are doctoral students, staff, faculty, and administrators. The team examined (a) TAMU CEHD longitudinal data, diversity action and implementation plan and interim results; (b) peer data from Michigan State University, University of Minnesota, and The University of Texas at Austin; and (c) departmental peer data from University of Florida (HLKN), University of Illinois (EAHRD), Michigan State University (EPSY) and University of Maryland (TLAC).

1. Engaging the Data

Undergraduate Diversity

A. CEHD longitudinal comparisons (See Table 1):

- a. Slight increase in all racial minority groups except Asians, with greatest increase among Hispanics.
- b. Racially diverse students now comprise 22.3% of undergraduate students, an increase from 18% in 2009. Blacks increased from 99 students in 2010 to 123 in 2011, Asians from 78 to 74. Increasing enrollment diversity is a strategic priority.
- c. Women continue to dominate at 77.23%. Men showed a slight increase at 22.77% or .33% over the previous year.
- d. Diversity among first time in college students saw a slight increase of about 5% (31 students) over the previous year.
- e. Our percent of racially diverse degree completers continues to be substantially less than that of whites; for example in 2011, 73.85% of admits and 83.42% of the degree completers were whites; however, 26.13% of admits and 16.58% of degree completers were racially diverse; in 2009 we had 17% enrollment and 15% graduation. The gap between enrollment and graduation for diverse students appears to have widened. We will continue to monitor trend.

B. CEHD and Peers (See Table 2)

- a. CEHD is increasing in number and percent of racially diverse students (22.3%), but continues to lag behind UT at 42.12%. We fared better than Minnesota (15.86%) and Michigan (13.74%). Similar to our 2010 data, we trail behind UT in Hispanic enrollment, but we surpassed Minnesota who was ahead in 2009; we continue to outperform Michigan. Although we had a slight increase in our number of Black students, from 99 in 2010 to 123 in 2011—an almost 20% increase, we continue to lag behind our peers. Similarly, our peers fared better than us in terms of gender diversity; however, all had a majority women population with Minnesota having the highest percentage of men at 41.89% with TAMU trailing at 22.77%. Our large teacher education program attracts primarily white women and this contributes to the gender and racial disparity in our undergraduate enrollment. We must increase efforts to prepare teacher educators who are representative of diverse school environments; therefore, recruiting racially diverse students is imperative to our mission and we are targeting transfers to fulfill that mission.

Annual Assessment Report

- b. In 2009, we had the lowest percentage of diversity among first-year undergraduate students (18%); this year, we are at 26.15% and have surpassed Michigan State (18.62%) who was ahead of us. UT (41.78%) and Minnesota (40.52) continue to lead in diversity among first time in college enrollment.
- c. In 2009, both overall diversity and first time in college diversity were consistent at 17% for the CEHD. In 2011, 26.15% of our first time in college students and 22.3% of all students were diverse. These are positive indicators that we are making small strides in increasing racial diversity in the college.
- d. Except for Minnesota, the percentage of degrees awarded to diverse students was lower than enrollment figures. Minnesota had diversity enrollment of 15.86% and degree completers of 17.87%. We were at 22.3% enrollment and 16.58% graduation; UT had 42.12% enrollment and 40% graduation. We fared better than Michigan who had the widest gap with 15.85% enrollment and 8.88% graduation.

While we have made small strides in diversity enrollment, we will continue efforts to recruit and improve retention/completion rates for the racially diverse. Of concern is the absence of men, particularly Black men, in our teacher education program.

Graduate Diversity

A. CEHD longitudinal comparisons: (See Table 3)

- a. A slight decrease in graduate enrollment, from 1323 in 2010 to 1268 in 2011, 4.42% decrease. Racial diversity also decreased, from 35% 2010 to 33% in 2011. There has been a decrease in Blacks, from 183 to 162 (11.5%), Whites, 723 to 666 (7.88%), and American Indian, 5 to 4 (20%). A slight increase by 8 among Hispanics. Women continue to dominate graduate enrollment at 69.61% in 2012 and 69% in 2011, a slight decrease.
- b. Racially diverse masters degree completers went from 49 (23.44%) in 2010 to 70 (25.93%) in 2011. While the percent increase was not very significant, the number was. We had similar increases in doctoral completions among the racially diverse from 19 (22.35%) in 2010 to 45 (41.28%) in 2011, a significant increase both in number and percent.

B. CEHD and Peers: (See table 4)

- a. Graduates follow the national trend of high female enrollments. We are at 69%, followed by UT at 68% with Minnesota at 70.5% and Michigan State at 72%. Little or no shift in gender diversity among the four institutions. We have a slight lead in racial diversity at 33.68%, followed by UT at 32.55%. In 2009, we were at 29% and UT was at 30%, indicating that we have made slightly greater strides than UT. Similar to 2009 data, Minnesota (13.26%) and Michigan (12.9%) continue to trail with a slight improvement. As in 2009, we had the highest number and percent of Black enrollments although there was a slight decrease from 183 (13.83%) in 2010 to 162 (12.78%) in 2011. UT (226, 18.12%) continues to lead in the number of Hispanics, but we follow with 202 (15.93%), with Minnesota (55, 2.55%) and Michigan (50, 2.82%) trailing.
- b. 25.93% of our masters 41.28% of our doctoral completers are diverse; this suggests that, on average, graduation and admissions rates are about the same which is a positive trend for CEHD. We went from 19 diverse doctoral graduates in 2010 to 45 in 2011, trailing UT by 5 and leading Minnesota (n=12) and Michigan (n=3). Overall, we made significant strides in graduate diversity. Retaining and graduating doctoral students may be a challenge given our recent faculty losses.

Faculty Diversity

A. CEHD longitudinal comparisons: (See Table 5)

- a. CEHD data primarily reflect our regular-status faculty, omitting adjunct instructors who are not regular-status departmental faculty; therefore some numbers will vary.
- b. Overall, we have made progress in promoting women, thus closing the gender gap among T/TT faculty. No significant change in the percent of male and female faculty with women ranging between 53% and 55% over the last six years.
- c. From FY2006 to FY2011, the number of American Indians has remained steady at 2; Asians ranged from 10-14; Blacks went from 14 in 2006 to 25 in FY9 and 2010 and saw a decline to 23 in FY11. In 2007, we had 17 Hispanic faculty, down to 12 in FY11, a trend that is concerning. Asians have remained stable in the last three years, showing an increase from 10-14 from 2009 to 2011. We are closely monitoring the loss of our faculty of color and have launched a study to determine why faculty leave so we can plan strategically to enhance recruitment and retention.

B. CEHD and Peers: (See Table 6)

- a. As our peers, we follow a national trend of near equal or slightly more female faculty. In 2011 TAMU was a close second to UT with 56% and 58% female faculty respectively, followed by Minnesota at 55% and Michigan at 51%. In terms of gender by rank, we trailed in female full professors at 31% of full professors, with UT at 45%, Michigan at 40% and

Annual Assessment Report

- Minnesota at 35%. Moreover, in 2009, 81% of full professors were white compared to 78% in 2011. TAMU lead in percent of racial diversity among full professors (27%, n=12 of 45), followed by UT at 24% (n=13 of 54). TAMU women are closing the gap in the associate professor rank from 43% in 2009 to 52%.
- b. TAMU also lead in the percent of T/TT faculty diversity at 36% (n=37) followed by UT at 29% (n=38). TAMU also lead in the number of Black female faculty, 14, followed by UT with 10. We had a slight decrease in our overall Black faculty from 23 to 19 as well as our Hispanic faculty from 13 to 12.
 - c. Our non-tenure track regular faculty made up 49% of total faculty. Minnesota, 49.75% and UT, 43.72% followed a similar trend. Michigan had the lowest at 35%. For TAMU, the group is primarily white (92%) and female (67%), impacting the overall diversity in terms of race and gender. With the exception of Minnesota, UT and Michigan also had more women than men in the non-tenure track ranks. UT had the highest level of diversity among this group at 22% (n=23 of 101).

Currently, we are beginning to see a loss in faculty, especially those of color. We are collecting data from those who left to determine the reasons for the losses. The College is committed to enhancing the climate; we have completed our climate study and each department has spent time addressing the results and is developing ongoing processes to build a healthier climate. The increased diversity among tenured faculty, both in terms of race and gender, is positively impacting the departments and college. Tenured faculty influence the climate of a program and unit and has greater influence on policy and change.

Staff Diversity (See Tables 8 and 9)

Our support staff are primarily female at 73% (101 of 138), a slight decrease from 77% in 2009. They are also majority white at 78% (108 of 138), a slight decrease from 79% in 2009. Similarly, our administrative staff (directors, deans, and department heads) follow the same trend. Women remained constant at 15 while we saw an increase in men, from 9 in 2010 to 11 in 2011. Of the 10 members of the dean's leadership team (deans and department heads), three are female and seven are male (a decrease of one female from 2009). Additionally, three of the members are from diverse backgrounds. The Black female associate dean was recently promoted to Executive Associate Dean—a positive direction in terms of leadership diversity.

2. Recent Efforts – Efforts made this past year to (A) retain and (B) recruit diversity in the applicable groups?

A. Retention: Enhance college experience/climate and focus on mentoring initiatives: *Undergraduates* – capstone experiences, long-term domestic/international experiences, freshman and transfer learning communities, research experiences, peer mentoring and relationship building with diverse high schools and community colleges. *Graduates* – Promoting Outstanding Writing for Excellence in Research (P.O.W.E.R.) thesis/dissertation writing course to support doctoral students, graduate student advisory groups in each department, climate survey of graduate students. *Graduates and Faculty* – Workshops with national mentoring experts, input on and implementation of best practices; enhanced faculty/student mentoring relationships. *Faculty* – Faculty Retention Ad Hoc Committee's charge to collect/analyze data from faculty who left the college during the last 5 years, structured mentoring program in 2 departments, college-wide formulation of faculty retention action plan, benchmark peer best practices; T&P workshops by the Associate Dean Faculty Affairs. *Staff* – Staff Advisory Council, shared values regarding continuous improvement of college climate, professional development opportunities, inclusion on college-wide committees. *Administration* – Dean's Council strategic alignment, Dean's Office strategic realignment, findings from department-level climate assessment (see Table 10) used to plan for continuous improvements; diversity and climate committee in each department.

B. Recruitment: Build student pipeline and focus on mentoring initiatives: *Undergraduates* – Visit diverse high school and community college campuses, consult with diversity recruitment expert to improve CEHD recruitment/retention initiatives, provide virtual advising and increased advising staff, Camp ExpLORE to recruit underrepresented students into teaching, workshops for transfer students, building student community through current CEHD students calling admitted students in an effort encourage them to matriculate to TAMU in the fall. *Graduates* – EPSY doctoral training grant emphasizing English Language Learners, systematic engagement with historically black colleges and universities and Hispanic-serving institutions, CEHD research scholarships for doctoral students offered in Fall 2012. *Graduates and Faculty* – Workshops with national mentoring experts, input on and implementation of best practices. *Faculty* – Faculty Retention Ad Hoc Committee's charge to collect/analyze data from faculty who left the college during the last 5 years, structured mentoring program in 2 departments, college-wide formulation of faculty retention action plan, benchmark peer best practices.

Annual Assessment Report

3. Future Efforts - Describe the organization's plans or future efforts to improve the organization's diversity.

Undergraduates – Continue to build relationships with targeted high schools and community colleges, develop strategy for recruiting Black/African American males, conduct undergraduate student climate assessment. **Graduates** – Ongoing mentoring initiatives, analyze graduate student climate data, diversity climate focus groups, and create action plan based upon findings; enhance mentoring for all doctoral students. **Faculty** – Continued efforts of the Faculty Retention Ad Hoc Committee, develop Action Plan in Fall 2012 to drive recruiting/retention efforts. **Administration** – Continued efforts of departmental diversity and climate committees to conduct programming, ongoing self-evaluation of units' diversity and climate (see Table 10), involvement in departmental strategic plan as related to diversity and evaluation of yearly accomplishments. **Dean's Office** – Continued support of departments related to student and faculty issues and diversity climate. In Spring 2013, funds will be given to each department for diversity recognition to enhance the commitment to and visibility of diversity climate efforts throughout the college. **College** – Spring 2013 CEHD Conference on Diversity, and build the website to enhance visibility of our diversity efforts and accomplishments.

4. Advisory Groups - Diversity of the groups who advise your organization, outcomes/plans, efforts to diversify groups

Faculty Retention Ad Hoc Committee – Charged with collecting/analyzing data from faculty who left the college during the last 5 years and identify issues that need to be addressed. College-wide action plan with accountability will be created and implemented in Fall 2012. **Committee on Diversity Initiatives (CoDI)** – 19-member committee established in 2010 to strategically address diversity and climate for all. CoDI is comprised of diverse faculty, undergraduate and graduate students, staff, and administrators. Recent activities: a) created CEHD Diversity definition - *Diversity is the variety and depth of individual personhood and unique experiences that tests, challenges, enriches, expands, and strengthens the collective*, b) five working subcommittees systematically and strategically leading CEHD Diversity efforts: Communication, Leadership, Trust Building, Evaluation/Sustainability, and Education and Awareness. **Dean's Council** – Governing body of the College in an advisory role to the dean. Create 2012 *Intrateam Values* document – how we engage with one another. Committee is made up of faculty, students, staff, and administrators with multiple diversity dimensions and responsibilities. **Departments and Dean's Office** – Active and diverse diversity and climate committees in each unit. Departments reviewed peer and longitudinal data generated through this diversity assessment and generated revised initiatives and strategic plans as deemed necessary. **Dean's Office** – August leadership retreat held to discuss further plans for diversity improvement throughout the CEHD Strategic Plan document. **Deans Advisory Council** – Possibly make the Dean's advisory council a Development Council and create a new diverse advisory council for the college.

5. Organizational Climate - Describe your organization's climate based on data

The CEHD organizational climate is based on the: (A) College's diversity goals and (B) findings of the 2011 climate study.

A. **Diversity Goals:** CEHD has committed to three specific diversity goals (See Introduction).

B. **2011 Climate Study Results:** The college conducted a diversity climate survey in June 2011 with faculty, graduate students, and staff. Findings include: 1) the majority of faculty and staff agreed or strongly agreed that they were comfortable with the climate for diversity in the College (depts. 55%-83%); 2) 27.2% of faculty and staff were undecided or disagreed that they were comfortable with the climate for diversity in their unit; 3) Faculty and staff have heard or observed inappropriate behaviors and statements related to the political beliefs, religion, sexual orientation, as well as age, disability, ethnicity, race, sexism. Furthermore, faculty and staff have heard or observed inappropriate behaviors and statements related to the issues of loss of faculty of color, lack of support for junior faculty, non-tenure track faculty, and staff; also, women having to justify their ideas, both young and older staff feeling devalued by one another.

Based upon the findings, the college and departmental advisory groups and leadership are systematically and strategically implementing changes and providing program opportunities to address the areas above, which will enhance the recruitment and retention of our faculty, students, and staff.

6. Other diversity and climate efforts within your organization

Programming: Difficult Dialogue Program – Fall 2011 and Spring 2012, CEHD Difficult Dialogue Program Training – Fall 2012, Mediation Training (faculty and administrators) – November 2011 and January 2013, Mentoring symposium for Faculty and Students (Dr. Ron Richon, Provost, University of Southern Indiana) – October 2012; CEHD Staff Mediation Training – Spring 2013. **Organization Development and Diversity Initiatives (ODDI) Office:** Increased capacity – added 50% GA and Asst Dean now 75% time, aligned with Office of Faculty Affairs, Research, Diversity and Development under the Executive Associate Dean, Dr. Mary Alfred; 5 monetary awards will be made available to departments and Dean's office to recognize diversity climate activities within their units; creating an OD&DI website in Fall 2012 to make accessible diversity report, CoDI information, strategic initiatives and contact information on people leading diversity and climate programs within CEHD.

Annual Assessment Report

These charts represent: 1) CEHD longitudinal data – our history over two years and 2) peer data – how we compare to our peers in undergraduate and graduate enrollment, faculty, staff, and administration.

Gender	Fall 2010		Fall 2011	
Male	851	22.44%	885	22.77%
Female	2941	77.56%	3001	77.23%
Total	3792		3886	
Race/Ethnicity	Fall 2010		Fall 2011	
American Indian	14	0.37%	9	0.23%
Asian	78	2.06%	74	1.90%
Black	99	2.61%	123	3.17%
Hawaiian/Pac. Isl.	1	0.03%	2	0.05%
Hispanic/Latino	504	13.29%	580	14.93%
2+ Races	41	1.08%	65	1.67%
White	3042	80.22%	3020	77.71%
International	10	0.26%	11	0.28%
Unknown	3	0.08%	2	0.05%
Total	3792		3886	
First Time in College	Fall 2010		Fall 2011	
Racially Diverse	106	20.95%	137	26.15%
White	400	79.05%	387	73.85%
Total	506		524	
Degree Completions	FY 2010		FY 2011	
Racially Diverse	203	16.83%	198	16.58%
White	1003	83.17%	996	83.42%
Total	1206		1194	

Table 1: TAMU Undergraduate Student Information

Gender	TAMU		UT		MINN		MSU	
Male	885	22.77%	628	30.77%	470	41.89%	536	25.57%
Female	3001	77.23%	1413	69.23%	652	58.11%	1560	74.43%
Total	3886		2041		1122		2096	
Race/Ethnicity	TAMU		UT		MINN		MSU	
American Indian	9	0.23%	6	0.29%	5	0.45%	9	0.43%
Asian	74	1.90%	175	8.57%	85	7.58%	41	1.96%
Black	123	3.17%	159	7.79%	54	4.81%	126	6.01%
Hawaiian/Pac. Isl.	2	0.05%	2	0.10%	2	0.18%	0	0.00%
Hispanic/Latino	580	14.93%	496	24.30%	32	2.85%	75	3.58%
2+ Races	65	1.67%	19	0.93%	0	0.00%	37	1.77%
White	3020	77.71%	1120	54.88%	903	80.48%	1761	84.02%
International	11	0.28%	55	2.69%	21	1.87%	21	1.00%
Unknown	2	0.05%	9	0.44%	20	1.78%	26	1.24%
Total	3886		2041		1122		2096	
First Time in College	TAMU		UT		MINN		MSU	
Racially Diverse	137	26.15%	89	41.78%	171	40.52%	81	18.62%
White	387	73.85%	124	58.22%	251	59.48%	354	81.38%
Total	524		213		422		435	
Degree Completions	TAMU		UT		MINN		MSU	
Racially Diverse	198	16.58%	202	40.08%	99	17.87%	30	8.88%
White	996	83.42%	302	59.92%	455	82.13%	308	91.12%
Total	1194		504		554		338	

Table 2: Peer Institution Undergraduate Student Information – FY 2011

Gender	Fall 2010		Fall 2011	
Male	402	30.39%	393	30.99%
Female	921	69.61%	875	69.01%
Total	1323		1268	
Race/Ethnicity	Fall 2010		Fall 2011	
American Indian	5	0.38%	4	0.32%
Asian	39	2.95%	40	3.15%
Black	183	13.83%	162	12.78%
Hawaiian/Pac. Isl.	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Hispanic/Latino	194	14.66%	202	15.93%
2+ Races	15	1.13%	19	1.50%
White	723	54.65%	666	52.52%
International	156	11.79%	170	13.41%
Unknown	8	0.60%	5	0.39%
Total	1323		1268	
Masters Completions	FY 2010		FY 2011	
Racially Diverse	49	23.44%	70	25.93%
White	160	76.56%	200	74.07%
Total	209		270	
Doctoral Completions	FY 2010		FY 2011	
Racially Diverse	19	22.35%	45	41.28%
White	66	77.65%	64	58.72%
Total	85		109	

Table 3: TAMU Graduate Student Information

Gender	TAMU		UT		MINN		MSU	
Male	393	30.99%	396	31.76%	636	29.50%	498	28.07%
Female	875	69.01%	851	68.24%	1520	70.50%	1276	71.93%
Total	1268		1247		2156		1774	
Race/Ethnicity	TAMU		UT		MINN		MSU	
American Indian	4	0.32%	5	0.40%	20	0.93%	7	0.39%
Asian	40	3.15%	58	4.65%	93	4.31%	45	2.54%
Black	162	12.78%	99	7.94%	116	5.38%	104	5.86%
Hawaiian/Pac. Isl.	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	0.09%	2	0.11%
Hispanic/Latino	202	15.93%	226	18.12%	55	2.55%	50	2.82%
2+ Races	19	1.50%	18	1.44%	0	0.00%	21	1.18%
White	666	52.52%	661	53.01%	1586	73.56%	1308	73.73%
International	170	13.41%	164	13.15%	203	9.42%	192	10.82%
Unknown	5	0.39%	16	1.28%	81	3.76%	45	2.54%
Total	1268		1247		2156		1774	
Masters Completions	TAMU		UT		MINN		MSU	
Racially Diverse	70	25.93%	75	37.88%	46	10.62%	37	20.90%
White	200	74.07%	123	62.12%	387	89.38%	140	79.10%
Total	270		198		433		177	
Doctoral Completions	TAMU		UT		MINN		MSU	
Racially Diverse	45	41.28%	49	41.88%	12	17.39%	3	10.34%
White	64	58.72%	68	58.12%	57	82.61%	26	89.66%
Total	109		117		69		29	

Table 4: Peer Institution Graduate Student Information – FY 2011

Annual Assessment Report

Gender	Fall 2010		Fall 2011	
Male	98	44.95%	89	43.84%
Female	120	55.05%	114	56.16%
Total	218		203	
Race/Ethnicity	Fall 2010		Fall 2011	
American Indian	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Asian	14	6.42%	14	6.90%
Black	23	10.55%	19	9.36%
Hawaiian/Pac. Isl.	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Hispanic/Latino	13	5.96%	12	5.91%
2+ Races	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
White	168	77.06%	158	77.83%
Unknown	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	218		203	
Rank	Fall 2010		Fall 2011	
Professor	46	21.10%	45	20.64%
Associate Professor	39	17.89%	33	15.14%
Assistant Professor	36	16.51%	25	11.47%
Non-Tenure Track*	97	44.50%	100	45.87%
Total	218		203	

Table 5: TAMU Faculty Information
(*Includes Lecturers & Instructors)

Gender	TAMU		UT		MINN		MSU	
Male	89	43.84%	98	42.42%	92	45.32%	90	49.18%
Female	114	56.16%	133	57.58%	111	54.68%	93	50.82%
Total	203		231		203		183	
Race/Ethnicity	TAMU		UT		MINN		MSU	
American Indian	0	0.00%	2	0.87%	1	0.49%	0	0.00%
Asian	14	6.90%	7	3.03%	9	4.43%	8	4.37%
Black	19	9.36%	20	8.66%	15	7.39%	14	7.65%
Hawaiian/Pac. Isl.	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Hispanic/Latino	12	5.91%	32	13.85%	4	1.97%	6	3.28%
2+ Races	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
White	158	77.83%	170	73.59%	172	84.73%	155	84.70%
Unknown	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	0.99%	0	0.00%
Total	203		231		203		183	
Rank	TAMU		UT		MINN		MSU	
Professor	45	22.17%	56	24.24%	54	26.60%	50	27.32%
Associate Professor	33	16.26%	36	15.58%	37	18.23%	40	21.86%
Assistant Professor	25	12.32%	38	16.45%	11	5.42%	28	15.30%
Non-Tenure Track*	100	49.26%	101	43.72%	101	49.75%	65	35.52%
Total	203		231		203		183	

Table 6: Peer Institution Faculty Information – FY 2011
(*Includes Lecturers & Instructors)

Total	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011	
Total	246		255		249		242		248		240	
Gender	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011	
Male	114	46.34%	116	45.49%	115	46.18%	113	46.69%	112	45.16%	107	44.58%
Female	132	53.66%	139	54.51%	134	53.82%	129	53.31%	136	54.84%	133	55.42%
Race/Ethnicity	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011	
American Indian	2	0.81%	2	0.78%	2	0.80%	2	0.83%	2	0.81%	2	0.83%
Asian	10	4.07%	11	4.31%	12	4.82%	10	4.13%	12	4.84%	14	5.83%
Black	14	5.69%	20	7.84%	23	9.24%	25	10.33%	25	10.08%	23	9.58%
Hispanic/Latino	16	6.50%	17	6.67%	15	6.02%	13	5.37%	15	6.05%	13	5.42%
White	204	82.93%	205	80.39%	197	79.12%	191	78.93%	193	77.82%	186	77.50%

Table 7: TAMU Faculty Diversity – FY 2006-2011

Gender	TAMU		BV	
Male	37	26.81%	96,221	49.38%
Female	101	73.19%	98,630	50.62%
Total	138	100.00%	194,851	100.00%
Race/Ethnicity	TAMU		BV	
American Indian	0	0.00%	484	0.25%
Asian	3	2.17%	9,982	5.20%
Black	10	7.25%	20,827	10.85%
Hawaiian/Pac. Isl.	0	0.00%	82	0.04%
Hispanic/Latino	17	12.32%	45,405	23.64%
White	108	78.26%	115,252	60.02%
Total	138	100.00%	192,032	100.00%

Table 8: TAMU and Brazos Valley Staff Diversity

	FY 2010		FY 2011	
Administrators*	24		26	
Female	15	62.50%	15	57.70%
Racially Diverse	4	16.60%	5	19.20%

Table 9: TAMU Administrator Diversity
(*Dean, Director and Department Head titles)

Supportive Environment for:	Undergraduate Student		Graduate Student		Staff		Faculty	
	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
Work of Department/Unit	DEAN: N/A EAHRD: A EPSY: A HLKN: B TLAC: C	DEAN: B EAHRD: A EPSY: A HLKN: B TLAC: B	DEAN: N/A EAHRD: A EPSY: B HLKN: B TLAC: D	DEAN: B EAHRD: A EPSY: B HLKN: B TLAC: B	DEAN: B EAHRD: A EPSY: A HLKN: B TLAC: C	DEAN: B EAHRD: A EPSY: B HLKN: B TLAC: B	DEAN: N/A EAHRD: B EPSY: B HLKN: B TLAC: D	DEAN: B EAHRD: B EPSY: A HLKN: B TLAC: B
Diverse Ideas	DEAN: N/A EAHRD: B EPSY: C HLKN: B TLAC: C	DEAN: C EAHRD: B EPSY: C HLKN: B TLAC: B	DEAN: N/A EAHRD: A EPSY: B HLKN: B TLAC: D	DEAN: B EAHRD: A EPSY: B HLKN: B TLAC: B	DEAN: C EAHRD: A EPSY: B HLKN: B TLAC: C	DEAN: C EAHRD: A EPSY: A HLKN: B TLAC: B	DEAN: N/A EAHRD: B EPSY: B HLKN: B TLAC: D	DEAN: B EAHRD: A EPSY: A HLKN: B TLAC: C
Diverse Individual Identity	DEAN: N/A EAHRD: B EPSY: C HLKN: B TLAC: D	DEAN: C EAHRD: B EPSY: B HLKN: B TLAC: C	DEAN: N/A EAHRD: B EPSY: B HLKN: B TLAC: C	DEAN: B EAHRD: B EPSY: A HLKN: B TLAC: B	DEAN: B EAHRD: B EPSY: B HLKN: C TLAC: D	DEAN: B EAHRD: B EPSY: B HLKN: B TLAC: B	DEAN: N/A EAHRD: C EPSY: B HLKN: C TLAC: E	DEAN: B EAHRD: B EPSY: B HLKN: C TLAC: C
Learning Organization	DEAN: N/A EAHRD: A EPSY: A HLKN: B TLAC: B	DEAN: B EAHRD: A EPSY: A HLKN: B TLAC: B	DEAN: N/A EAHRD: A EPSY: B HLKN: B TLAC: C	DEAN: B EAHRD: A EPSY: A HLKN: B TLAC: B	DEAN: B EAHRD: A EPSY: A HLKN: B TLAC: C	DEAN: B EAHRD: A EPSY: B HLKN: B TLAC: B	DEAN: N/A EAHRD: A EPSY: A HLKN: B TLAC: D	DEAN: B EAHRD: A EPSY: A HLKN: B TLAC: C

Table 10: 2011-2012 Dean/Department Heads Report Card Summary. Each unit leader was asked to reflect on the strength of valuing diversity related to faculty, students, and staff on each of the areas on the left and provide a self-evaluation.