During AY 2013-2014, the Joint Minority Affairs Committee (JMAC) consisted of the following members: Joan Bunbury, Sara Docan-Morgan, Darrell King, Mahruq Khan (Chair), Victor Macias-Gonzalez, Susan Niedzwiecki-Pham, Damien Parks, Ingrid Peterson, Jessica Thill, and Jonathan Ying.

The Committee built its work for the year on the research findings from last year’s JMAC Annual Report, the 2013 UW-L Campus Climate Survey, and other issues of interest to committee members. This resulted in raising particular concerns and furthering conversations with the relevant parties across the campus and dividing into three subcommittees to construct specific reports for senior administrators. Below are highlights of the issues that we raised in our meetings. (More in-depth descriptions of these topics can be found in the corresponding minutes posted on the JMAC website.) The reports are also attached.

**Antoiwana Williams** (Director of Office of Multicultural Students Services):

Concerns were raised about how students of color were disproportionately targeted in Eagle Alert system. Some students expressed concern about being targeted by the system just because they are students of color as opposed to their actual performance in the course. Antoiwana quelled many of the members’ concerns, due to her direct experience with the positive impact this system has historically had on the academic performance of students of color. The Committee also pointed out that there could be better and more communication (to both faculty and students) to clarify that the System isn’t solely used to identify “negative” or “problematic” situations but positive performances as well. Furthermore, we raised the issue about the unintended impact of the term “alert” in the name of the System and how students of color may react to this.

**Sharie Brunk** (Director of UW-L 100) and **Jennie Hartzeim** (First Year Experience Coordinator):

JMAC met with Sharie Brunk and Jennie Hartzeim in an effort to expose students, in general, and students of color, in particular, to the importance of diversity on campus encounter when they first come to campus. In particular, the Committee raised the issue of acclimating students to the likely diversity they will encounter among faculty, along lines of race/ethnicity as well as diversity in pedagogical style, and the importance of diversity and inclusion on the campus as a whole. JMAC discussed the possibility of incorporating diversity topics into the UW-L 100 by having members of Campus Climate come in and address some of these topics.
Heidi Macpherson (Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs) and Bob Hoar (Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs):

SEIs: JMAC is interested in ensuring that all promotion and tenure committees are acting in accordance with the Univ. of Wisconsin Board of Regents policies, which state that SEIs should be used in conjunction with other forms of evaluation when it comes to promotion and tenure and that review committees are aware of the research, describing the limitations of SEIs in teaching evaluation. Furthermore, the policy indicates that SEIs should not be used as greater than 30-50% of the overall teaching evaluation of the candidate.

Provost Macpherson invited Nizam Arain, Director of Affirmative Action, to a Joint Promotion Committee meeting to talk about implicit bias, and he will come to an organizational meeting for JPC. The Provost also invited a member of JMAC to address SEI issues at the Dept. Chairs meeting in the next academic year.

At the Fall 2014 Department Chairs/JPC meeting, the Provost will also share version of last year’s JMAC Report (with data/research on the experiences of faculty of color).

The Committee, in response to the recommendations of Chancellor Gow and Provost Macpherson, created reports, including: “Best Practices for Diversifying Faculty;” a review of the Equity Scorecard data on gateway courses (from Institutional Research) and promotion, tenure, and sabbatical data on faculty/staff of color (from HR); and integrated this year’s Campus Climate Survey data into the final 2013-2014 JMAC report, which details research on the experiences of faculty of color at predominantly white institutions.

SOS grants have also been instituted, which could be used for a variety of purposes.

Kris Rosacker & Kerrie Hoar (Senate Executive Committee) and Mike Tollefson (Promotion, Tenure and Salary Committee):

JMAC spoke to representatives of the SEC and PTS Committee re: the potential role that the Senate could play in urging all departments to be compliant with the Board of Regents SEI policies and ensure that the SEI data is being used in context by promotion and tenure committees. The Committee also wanted to raise the issue of the role that Faculty Senate could play in stressing the importance of integrating diversity subjects across the curricula. Members of the SEC responded that the Faculty Senate could make suggestions but can’t mandate anything. They recommended taking the discussion to Dept. Chairs since so much is dictated at the dept. by-law level. They also recommended that JMAC make a presentation to the Faculty Senate re: research on SEIs. They also mentioned that some of this research could be presented in the JPC workshops for Junior Faculty.

Bob Hoar (Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs):

JMAC consulted with Bob Hoar about integrating into the New Faculty Orientation
concerns/experiences that faculty of color will likely encounter on this campus (especially in classrooms with predominantly white study body) and in the La Crosse community. JMAC stressed the importance of having senior administrators come to the new faculty orientation and reiterate to all faculty that diversity in the faculty (both along lines of social identities as well as pedagogical style) is important to senior administrators and that this diversity will be supported in the classroom. JMAC also recognizes findings from research that indicates the importance of senior administrators acknowledging their awareness of the implicit bias in SEIs to new faculty.

Patrick Barlow (University Assessment Coordinator, Chair of Academic Staff Council) and Paula Knudson (Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs)

JMAC met with Patrick Barlow and Paula Knudson to discuss experiences of staff and students of color at UW-L. The primary topic of discussion was career progression and whether or not more processes could be in place for HR or supervisors to approach staff, at the appropriate times, when they are ready to go up for promotion or have progression information be given to supervisors to share with their staff. Paula stated that there are not enough intentional methods for giving opportunities for growth and compensation for staff. Patrick stated that he believes HR is trying to get supervisors to move toward a mentorship model. JMAC pointed out that faculty and staff of color often informally serve as mentors for other faculty or staff of color, yet they are not recognized or compensated for this service and urged a broader institutional recognition of this type of service, especially since it’s critical for retention.

Below are the reports that the JMAC subcommittees compiled.

Respectfully submitted,
Mahruq Khan
Chair, Joint Minority Affairs Committee
1. **Reduce or eliminate reliance on SEIs** as a measure to be considered in promotion/tenure decisions. Research suggests that unconscious bias may play a role in student evaluation of instructors ([How to Diversify the Faculty](#)).

2. **Incorporate into the UW-L New Faculty Orientation a message** from senior administrators that both prepares new faculty for the lack of diversity in our student body and surrounding community and stresses that diversity among faculty members is sought and valued. Most best practice suggestions stress that top leaders of the institution must demonstrate a commitment to diversifying faculty ([How to Diversify the Faculty](#); [Strategies for Achieving Faculty Diversity; Best Practices in Recruiting and Retaining Diverse Faculty](#)).

3. **Make diversifying the faculty a strategic plan priority** ([Best Practices in Recruiting and Retaining Diverse Faculty](#)).

4. **Provide good orientation to the policies, procedures, and expectations for tenure and promotion.** These should reflect the overall mission of the institution ([How to Diversify the Faculty](#)). At a lot of institutions, new faculty members report that these procedures are unclear. Many also report a lack of consistency in promotion policies and procedures across the institution. ([How to Diversify the Faculty: Study of Experiences in the Process of Promotion to Full Professor at the University of Maine](#)). Do not grant exemptions. Design successful and legally defensible diversity initiatives; hires are not just race- and gender-based, but should help to advance institutional diversity, contribute to the robust exchange of ideas, etc. Evaluate faculty and administrators on their “demonstrated commitment to equal educational opportunity” (14). Diverse faculty can be used to recruit and retain other diverse faculty and students ([How to Diversify the Faculty](#)).

5. **Develop an inclusive, consistent across-the-board review process** that takes into consideration different approaches to increase diversity and to identify challenges to diversity ([How to Diversify the Faculty](#)).

6. **Suggestions for the recruitment of diverse faculty:**
a. Ensure diverse Search and Screen Committees. What does this mean for the new Search Panel procedure now being used for some searches at UW-L? (How to Diversify the Faculty; Strategies for Achieving Faculty Diversity; Search Committee Best and Promising Practices).

b. Train Search Committees, Administrators, and Department Chairs on unconscious bias and assumptions. (Searching for Excellence and Diversity). Work on eliminating myths (How to Diversify the Faculty; Strategies for Achieving Faculty Diversity).

c. Target advertising and networking to diverse populations. Expand beyond the usual circles—include advertising in diverse publications (How to Diversify the Faculty; Search Committee Best and Promising Practices).

d. Consider promoting adjunct and part-time faculty, since women and minorities are more highly represented in these groups (How to Diversify the Faculty).

e. Once the campus visit is arranged, make sure you include diversity in the experience, highlighting diversity programs, outreach, priorities, arranging for meetings with diverse faculty and staff, establish connections with community members and student leaders. Allow them to meet with faculty outside the department who have similar research interests (Best Practices in Recruiting and Retaining Diverse Faculty). Offer to make available a person of similar background, interests, ethnicity, or gender to give their perspectives on the campus and local community climate (Diversifying the Faculty: A guidebook for Search Committees).

f. Avoid giving impression that hires are not merit-based. Establish diversity goals for tenure track and adjunct hires as well. Develop a diverse faculty fellowship program to bring to the campus a small pool of diverse scholars and establish procedures for target-of-opportunity hires (How to Diversify the Faculty).

7. Useful suggestions for making position descriptions more diversity-friendly and inclusive. Suggestions for including signaling language that may attract diverse faculty:

   ▪ “Demonstrated Success In Working With Diverse Populations.”
   ▪ “Experience Interacting With Diverse Populations or Students of Color.”
   ▪ “Academic Experiences With Culturally Diverse Populations.”
   ▪ “Interest In Developing and Implementing Curricula Related to Culturally Diverse Populations”.
   ▪ “Experience with a variety of teaching methods.” (Best Practices in Recruiting and Retaining Diverse Faculty)

8. Suggestions for post-search retention best practices:

   ▪ Offer acceptable, competitive salaries; remember salaries are public information,
avoid setting up a legal challenge.

- Demonstrate Collegiality and provide a comfortable, supportive departmental climate.
- Follow up with hires and make sure departments do not treat them as token hires.
- Deans, chairs, and senior faculty must include diverse hires in informal networks and social events.
- Limit service expectations and do not dump multicultural programming and outreach on minority hires, but establish a procedure where all faculty members contribute to such initiatives and measures.
- Showcase diverse hires’ expertise in the local community; incorporate them into outreach opportunities, establish connections for them.
- Provide mentors and ascertain that new diverse hires understand the tenure process, SEIs, and other important Policies, Rules and Procedures via Orientation and informal mentoring. (Best Practices in Recruiting and Retaining Diverse Faculty)

9. Develop mentoring programs to combat isolation and to offer guidance and support on research, teaching, service, and the tenure and promotion process. Are there faculty in other departments who may be useful mentors or with whom candidates may want to network and develop a community of scholarship? (How to Diversify the Faculty; Study of Experiences in the Process of Promotion to Full Professor at the University of Maine; Strategies for Achieving Faculty Diversity).

10. In the promotion and tenure process make sure that the candidates materials are contextualized so as to not make the candidate seem to be outside of traditional disciplinary boundaries. Minority faculty who carry an excessive service load should be encouraged to request reduced teaching loads and if service loads differ from those of other faculty, the evaluation process should be accordingly adjusted. If a faculty member is expected to play a role in diversity-focused service, this should be reflected in the job description (How to Diversify the Faculty).

11. Consider evaluating faculty on cultural literacy; are they contributing to the needs of a diverse student population, and do those who accomplish this best receive recognition for their enhancement of students’ experience (How to Diversify the Faculty).

10. Legal issues in specific targeted hiring programs and policies:
   a. Establish a procedure for target-of-opportunity hires who may add “particular expertise, experience and diversity to an area of need.” Have a limited number of these and make sure that they enhance disciplinary and interdisciplinary strengths of a program to avoid legal challenge.
b. **Establish diversity incentive funds to enable departments to recruit and hire diverse faculty.** To avoid legal challenge, make sure that the positions are tied to definable educational goals, that they enhance departmental programmatic depth and breadth.

c. **Bonus hire programs:** Reward departments that successful hire and retain diverse candidates with funds to hire additional faculty.

d. **Avoid quotas, set-asides, or special protections for minorities.** (How to Diversify the Faculty)

11. **Guard against complacency**--Continually reaffirm commitment to diversity goals. (Strategies for Achieving Faculty Diversity).
The Inclusive Excellence Effectiveness Team of the 2013/2014 Joint Minority Affairs Committee - consisting of Audrey Elegbede, Jessica Thill, and Damien Parks - reviewed the following databases as part of their charter: Faculty Sabbaticals (2009-2015), Faculty Promotions (effective 2010-2014), Faculty Tenure (effective 2009-2014), Employee Exit Interview Surveys (November 2009 - January 2014), and General Education Equity Score Card (Falls, 2009-2011). Based on our assessment of the data, we argue that the data as yet is incomplete. We are thus hesitant to draw strong conclusions.

The sub-committee has instead chosen to respond to the data provided by highlighting particular points of concern and by asking questions of the data at the individual, classroom/departmental, and institutional levels. It is outlined by database.

**Faculty Tenure (effective 2009-2014):**

- **Observations of data:**
  - There has been an increase in the number of faculty tenured in recent years.
  - There has been an increase in the number of non-white faculty tenured.
  - All non-white faculty tenured in recent years are male.

- **Individual**
  - Do faculty leave for other institutions (academic or non-academic) before they become eligible for tenure?
  - How do faculty of color understand and navigate the tenure process, as compared with their white counterparts?
  - What other factors of the individuals’ identity (gender, religion, sexual orientation, etc.) might be influencing their decision to remain on campus? Or complete the tenure process?

- **Departmental**
  - How many individuals who identify as non-white are members of the academic department?
  - How many individuals who identify as non-white were eligible for tenure?
  - How many individuals who identify as non-white were hired in recent years, particularly under GQ&A, but are not yet eligible for tenure?
  - When will recent hires of individuals who identify as non-white be eligible for tenure? How will that be represented in future tenure rates?
  - How many people who identify as non-white were denied tenure at the departmental level?
  - What is the process for mentoring of junior faculty within departments? Is the experience the same for white and non-white junior faculty?
  - What other factors of the individuals’ identity (gender, religion, sexual orientation, etc.) might be influencing their tenure decision?

- **Institutional**
○ How many people who identify as non-white were denied tenure at the institutional level?
○ How long do white vs. non-white candidates take before going up for tenure?
○ How many white vs. non-white faculty leave campus before they become eligible for tenure?
○ How many white vs. non-white faculty are dismissed from campus before they become eligible for tenure?
○ What is the process for mentoring of junior faculty within the institution? Is the experience the same for white and non-white junior faculty?
○ What other factors of the individuals’ identity (gender, religion, sexual orientation, etc.) might be influencing their tenure decision?
○ How do SEIs impact tenure portfolios, particularly for faculty of color and/or those more likely to teach subjects that challenge students’ world views?

Faculty Promotions (effective 2010-2014):

• Observations of data:
  ○ Comparable data is not available for classified and academic staff.

• Individual
  ○ Who considers promotion?
  ○ When in their careers do individuals consider promotion?
  ○ What considerations do individuals evaluate in applying for promotion?
  ○ Have those promoted in a given year applied in the past? If so, how many times?
  ○ Do faculty leave for other institutions (academic or non-academic) before they become eligible for promotion?
  ○ How do faculty of color understand and navigate the promotion process, as compared with from their white counterparts?
  ○ What other factors of the individuals’ identity (gender, religion, sexual orientation, etc.) might be influencing their decision to apply for promotion? Or complete the promotion process?

• Departmental
  ○ How many individuals who identify as non-white are members of the academic department?
  ○ How many individuals who identify as non-white were eligible for promotion?
  ○ How many individuals who identify as non-white were hired in recent years, particularly under GQ&A, but are not yet eligible for promotion?
  ○ When will recent hires of individuals who identify as non-white be eligible for promotion? How will that be represented in future promotion rates?
  ○ How many people who identify as non-white were denied promotion at the departmental level?
  ○ What is the process for mentoring of junior faculty within departments? Is the experience the same for white and non-white junior faculty?
What other factors of the individuals’ identity (gender, religion, sexual orientation, etc.) might be influencing their promotion decision?

What departments mentor faculty through the promotion process? What is that process?

Who is supported in promotion requests?

What is the history of promotion in the department?

Have those promoted in a given year applied in the past? If so, how many times?

• **Institutional**
  - How many individuals who identify as non-white are faculty within the institution?
  - How many individuals who identify as non-white were eligible for promotion?
  - How many individuals who identify as non-white were hired in recent years, particularly under GQ&A, but are not yet eligible for promotion?
  - When will recent hires of individuals who identify as non-white be eligible for promotion? How will that be represented in future promotion rates?
  - How many people who identify as non-white were denied promotion at the institutional level?
  - What is the process for mentoring of junior faculty at the institutional level? Is the experience the same for white and non-white faculty?
  - What other factors of the individuals’ identity (gender, religion, sexual orientation, etc.) might be influencing their promotion decision?
  - What is the promotion and mentoring process? How might the process be culturally limiting for some individuals?
  - How might the mentoring process be adjusted to be more culturally inclusive?
  - Who is supported in promotion requests?
  - What is the history of promotion in the institution?
  - Have those promoted in a given year applied in the past? If so, how many times?
  - Have faculty of color had equal access and success in grant and sabbatical applications that would support promotion portfolios?
  - Have faculty of color had equal success in publication and professional presentations that would support promotion portfolios?
  - How do SEIs impact promotion portfolios, particularly for faculty of color and/or those more likely to teach subjects that challenge students’ world views?

**Faculty Sabbaticals (2009-2015):**

• **Observations of data:**
  - During AY 2013/2014 and AY 2010/2011, only white faculty were granted sabbatical.
  - There was no data available on who applied for sabbatical but was denied, nor on previous sabbatical applications lodged by faculty granted sabbaticals between 2009-2015.
• **Individual**
  - Who considers sabbatical?
  - When in their careers do individuals consider sabbatical?
  - What considerations do individuals evaluate in applying for sabbatical?
  - Have those granted sabbatical in a given year applied in the past? If so, how many times? Were their applications successful or not?

• **Departmental**
  - What departments mentor faculty through the sabbatical process?
  - Who is supported in sabbatical requests?
  - What is the history of sabbatical release in the department?
  - Is sabbatical viewed as a reward within the department?
  - Have those denied sabbatical in a given year applied in the past? If so, how many times? Were their applications successful or not?

• **Institutional**
  - What projects are supported in sabbatical requests?
  - Is sabbatical viewed as a reward within the institution?
  - How many individuals applied for sabbatical? What is their demographic/personal identities (gender, race, sexual orientation, ability, etc.)?
  - Who was denied sabbatical?

**Employee Exit Interview Surveys (November 2009 - January 2014):**

• **Observations of data:**

  **SATISFACTION WITH EMPLOYMENT**
  - The mean satisfaction level for employees of color is higher than the mean for all respondents except in the following areas: campus climate (3.91/3.93); collegiality in my department/unit (3.73/3.86), and fringe benefits (4.09/4.14).
  - The mean satisfaction level for employees of color is .4 plus higher than the mean for all respondents in the following areas: salaries; opportunity for advancement/promotion; and workload.
  - The mean dissatisfaction level for employees of color is lower for employees in the following areas: collegiality with the department.
  - The largest distinction in level of mean level of satisfaction between people of color, who were more satisfied than all respondents, is salary (3.64 v. 3.09).

  **INFLUENCE ON DECISION TO LEAVE**
  - The mean level of influence for employees of color leaving UW-L is .4 plus higher than the mean for all respondents in the following areas: lack of local social opportunities, seeking further education and training, pursued by another employer, and alleged racial discrimination.
  - The three top cited reasons for people of color departing UW-L are: family/personal matters; geographical location; and pursued by another employer.
  - There is no breakout within the data between faculty, classified staff, and unclassified staff.
- The exit survey may not capture the true picture of why individuals choose to leave UW-L as it asks individuals to rank a limited number of items in a survey. Survey completion is voluntary.

- **Preliminary conclusions**
  - Lack of social opportunity, collegiality in their departments, and diversity within the local community are highly influential in the decision to leave UW-L. Many acknowledge racial discrimination, which may be a part of this isolation or lack of social networking opportunities.
  - UW-L has hired talented professionals of color that are pursued by other employers. Lack of social inclusion and opportunity on and off campus could contribute to employees of color leaving UW-L, and possibly the La Crosse area.

- **Questions**
  - What key aspects of employees’ satisfaction and/or decision to leave the university are not currently represented on this exit survey?
  - What percentage of employees leaving the institution complete this survey?
  - How might length of employment, gender, and/or other factors influence responses?

**General Education Equity Scorecard (Falls, 2009-2011):**

- **Observations of data:**
  - There is a conflation of International students, Unknown race students, and White students.
  - ‘Mixed race’ students are all conflated. Might there be a difference within student experience based on racial and cultural backgrounds, despite being ‘mixed’?
  - Student statistics are not broken out by gender, which would provide a stronger picture of which students are succeeding and which are not.
    - It might also produce a more clear pathway to devising corrective measures and/or programs.
  - Student data is not broken out by full-time or part-time status, which might produce more clear explanation for why students may not attempt GE requirements within the first two years on campus.
  - No distinctions are made between students who take courses in-person and those who take them online.

- **UW-L G11 (Writing) Requirement**
  - The overall rate of success in meeting this requirement in the first two years of UW-L enrollment was 78.1% for all students.
  - Of those minority students that took UW-L G11 course, American Indian students had the lowest rate of meeting the requirement (62.5%).
  - Minority students have higher rates of not meeting or not attempting to complete G11 requirements within the first two years.
• African American students have the highest rate of unsuccessful attempts to complete this requirement at UW-L (17.6%).
• American Indian students are most noticeably absent from this attempt (31.3%), even though they have a high completion rate if they attempt the course (at 100% successful completion).
  ▪ No African American students attempted course transfers or test transfers of G11 credits; only 16 of the 434 (3.7%) students who met the requirement in this way were students of color.

○ UW-L G21 (Mathematics) Requirement
  ▪ The overall rate of success in meeting this requirement in the first two years of UW-L enrollment was 69.8% for all students, the lowest of any general education category we assessed.
  ▪ Of those minority students that took UW-L G21 course, American Indian students had the lowest successful completion rate within their first two years at UW-L (18.8%)
  ▪ Minority students have higher rates of not meeting or not attempting to complete G21 requirements within the first two years.
    • American Indian students are least successful in successfully attempting to meet this requirement at UW-L (37.5%), followed closely by SE Asian students (36.2%).
    • African American students postpone taking this class within the first two years at the highest rate (33.3%).
    ▪ No African American or SE Asian students earned course transfers or test credits of G21 credits; only 11 of the 273 (4%) students who met the requirement this way were students of color.

○ UW-L G41 (World History) Requirement
  ▪ The overall rate of success in meeting this requirement in the first two years of UW-L enrollment was 75.6% for all students.
  ▪ Of those minority students that took UW-L G41 courses, African American students had the lowest successful completion rate (48.5%)
  ▪ Minority students have higher rates of not meeting or not attempting to complete G41 requirements within the first two years.
    • African American students are unsuccessful in their attempts to meet this requirement in their first two years at UW-L (27.3%).
    • American Indian students are most noticeably absent from this attempt or successful completion within the first two years (31.3%), despite a .90 equity indicator for those took UW-L G41 within the first two years. This indicates that American Indian students are not
attempting UW-LG41 within the first two years, although 81.8% of those who attempted it were successful.

- No African American or American Indian students attempted course transfers or test credits of G41 credits; 8 of the 93 (8.6%) students met the requirement this way were students of color.

○ **UW-L G51 (General Laboratory Science) Requirement**
  - The overall rate of success in meeting this requirement in the first two years of UW-L enrollment was 84.4% for all students.
  - Of those minority students that took UW-L G51 courses, African American students had the lowest successful completion rate (36.4%), followed closely by SE Asian students (56.9%).
  - Minority students have higher rates of not meeting or not attempting to complete G51 requirements within the first two years.
    - African American students are least successful in completing this requirement at UW-L (39.4%). In fact, more students are unsuccessful in completing this requirement (39.4%) than are successful at completing this requirement (36.4%) at UW-L.
    - SE Asian students follow closely behind African American students with unsuccessful completion rates (36.2%).
    - African American students are least likely to have attempted G51 requirements within the first two years at UW-L (24.2%).
    - Only 1 of the 69 (1.4%) students who met this requirement through course transfer or test credit was a student of color.

○ **UW-L G6 (Self and Society) Requirement**
  - Overall, 80.5% of students met this requirement during their first two years at UW-L.
  - Of those minority students that attempted UW-L G6 courses, American Indian students had the lowest successful completion rate (56.3%).
  - Minority students have higher rates of not meeting or not attempting to complete G6 requirements within the first two years.
    - American Indian students are least successful in completing this requirement at UW-L (31.3%), followed closely by African American students (27.3%).
    - American Indian students (12.5%) and African American students (12.1%) are least likely to have attempted G6 requirements within the first two years at UW-L.
    - No African American, American Indian, or SE Asian students attempted course transfers or test transfers of G6 credits; only 11 of the 324 (3.4%) students who met the requirement this
way were students of color.

- **Individual Questions**
  - Are students choosing to postpone taking GE courses within the first two years?
  - Are students driven to begin courses in their major right away before completing GE requirements?
  - What role might stereotype threat play in postponement of GE courses?
  - How does student preference for certain instructors and/or class times impact successful completion of GE within the first two years?

- **Classroom Questions**
  - How culturally inclusive are teaching methods and approaches within the classroom? How might dominant cultural approaches to higher education alienate non-white students?
  - How might the race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, ability, etc. of the faculty member influence the reception of course material?
  - How does course availability for first and second year students impact rates of attempt in general education courses?
  - Is there a significant difference in achievement for students in online versus in-person courses?

- **Departmental/Institutional Questions**
  - Why are so few students earning course transfer credit or test credit for UW-L GE courses? To what extent are transfer students’ first attempts to meet these requirements at other institutions unsuccessful? Might more resources need to be put into additional sections of GE courses so that more students are able to successfully complete their GE requirements within the first two years?
  - What types of supplemental instruction and/or individual or group tutoring is available to students in these general education courses?
  - To what extent will the Eagle Alert System impact multicultural student success in their attempts to meet general education courses in their first two years at UW-L?
  - How does the difficulty in completing general education courses (which also serve as prerequisites) in STEM fields impact the number of multicultural students who choose to pursue those majors?

**Subcommittee Recommendations**

In order to begin to answer some of the above questions, as well as provide the institution with meaningful data regarding its progress toward its stated Inclusive Excellence goals, it is the recommendation of the Joint Minority Affairs Committee
that the Equity Scorecard process be replicated using similar methodology on a regular basis. Because the Campus Climate Survey is currently administered on a biannual basis, conducting the Equity Scorecard analysis in alternate years might allow for adequate, timely comparative data.

There is also a need to improve the availability and understanding of this data to faculty, academic staff, and graduate students with a strong interest in educational equity, curricular re/design, program development or improvement, and/or grant development. An easily accessible online repository for data related to inequities in student success and unmet needs of underrepresented students of color has the potential to strengthen applications for competitive UW-System, federal, and non-federal grants.
The AAUP presentation “How to Diversify the Faculty” stressed how developments in Affirmative Action case since the Michigan case have impacted best practices in recruitment and retention of diverse faculty, outlining some policy recommendations.

Section I discusses the benefits of diversifying the faculty. Research suggests that a diverse faculty benefits students presenting them with a variety of view and experiences; Academic freedom contributes to this through a ‘robust exchange of ideas.’ They broaden the learning experience for the majority of the student body and provide a positive role model for diverse students. Absence of a diverse faculty leaves institution vulnerable to discrimination lawsuits: “A diverse faculty, especially one supported by good diversity policies and commitments by the institution, is also less likely to engage in the kind of discrimination that creates legal liability for the institution” (2).

Sections II and III are summaries of affirmative action law generally, and post-Michigan, respectively. Reminds us that public and private institutions need to take steps to eliminate race- and sex-based discrimination, avoiding making a “disparate” impact on minorities by taking “affirmative action” to make the work place free of discrimination, making sure that any policies or practices meant to take race into account in hiring do not run afoot of constitutional protection guaranteeing all equal treatment under the law. This has led to policies that specifically seek to remedy past discrimination, stress the societal benefits of diversity, and are short-lived remedies designed to establish positive change:

- Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 USC ‘2000e makes it illegal for “compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment” based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin;
- Executive Order 11246 requires institutions receiving federal contracts equal to or greater than $50,000 to take affirmative action in the area of race and national origin. Institutions are instructed to set up “specific and result-oriented procedures” that require “effort to make them work” to demonstrate that an Affirmative Action Plan has been created, and considers race, gender, and other factors to remedy past discrimination.
- 14th Amendment to the Constitution establishes equal protection of the laws, unless compelling government interest is demonstrated, as when an Affirmative Action Plan is needed, or when diverse faculty or students need to hired, recruited, and retained to attain the “robust exchange of ideas” that contributes to the educational mission of an institution or when such measures are meant to remedy “manifest racial imbalance.”
It is important to note that significant effort needs to be made to demonstrate that an affirmative action plan must be “narrowly tailored,” which implies due consideration of the following:

1. the efficacy of alternative, "less intrusive" race-neutral approaches;
2. the extent, duration, and flexibility of race-conscious considerations; and
3. the burden on those who do not receive the benefit of any consideration of race (8)

Keep in mind that the University of Michigan decisions deal exclusively with student admissions, not faculty hiring. It, however, produced language and ideas that have implications for faculty hiring, particularly in viewing diversity as a compelling interest and deferring to educators (and policies made by faculty committees such as ours) when our affirmative action hiring decisions are aimed at providing the institution—which has a tradition of free speech—a diversity-enhanced educational mission.

A broad definition of diversity—experience, background, research agenda, pedagogical approach, as well as race, gender, national origin, plus other characteristics—should be at the heart of any faculty initiatives. Individual merit should be at the heart of the decision to hire a person, and race should be considered as a “plus” factor, not a deciding factor. Programs should be periodically reviewed.

Section IV gives best practices to recruit and retain a diverse faculty, from both a legal safety and policy standpoint.

A. **Key factors.** Develop an inclusive, consistent across-the-board review process that takes into consideration different approaches to increase diversity and to identify challenges to diversity. Suggests review of Art Coleman and Scott Palmer, *Federal Law and Recruitment Outreach and Retention: A Framework for Evaluating Diversity Related Programs* (The College Board, 2005). Identify funds, and commit leadership to diversity principles and program goals. Division, College, and Department goals need to be set—and funds need to be provided to implement and assess these goals. Diversity policies and goals need to reflect institutional mission and must be consistent across all actions, statements, and policies. Do not grant exemptions. Design successful and legally defensible diversity initiatives; hires are not just race- and gender-based, but should help to advance institutional diversity, contribute to the robust exchange of ideas, etc. Evaluate faculty and administrators on their “demonstrated commitment to equal educational opportunity” (14). Diverse faculty can be used to recruit and retain other diverse faculty and students. Examine procedures that undermine diversity goals and make changes that advance institutional priorities. Involve EEOP officer and provide training to leadership about diversity goals.

B. **Recruiting & Outreach.** Avoid giving impression that hires are not merit-based. Support diverse hires to retain them. Take steps to increase likelihood of diverse candidate pool, advertise in non-traditional journals and websites that attract interest of diverse faculty, and target doctoral programs in HBCUs, HACUs, and other institutions with diverse populations; identify these
institutions and publications, and direct search committees to use this data in their searches. Establish diversity goals for tenure track and adjunct hires as well. Develop a diverse faculty fellowship program to bring to the campus a small pool of diverse scholars and establish procedures for target-of-opportunity hires.

C. **Search Committees**: Provide resources to increase likelihood of more diverse finalist pool. Train committees about subtle ways in which discrimination can endanger a search. Stress institutional diversity goals and provide materials on diversity recruitment to assist search committee. Make committees diverse and include diverse faculty. Connect with diverse faculty in other disciplines/departments and invite them to candidate job talks. Establish community contacts to whom candidates can be referred to find out about community resources. Are there faculty in other departments who may be useful mentors or with whom candidates may want to network and develop a community of scholarship?

D. **Retention**: Establish mentoring program to combat isolation and to offer guidance and support on research, teaching, service, and the tenure and promotion process. How does diversity in the student body or in the wider community contribute to retention process? In the promotion and tenure process make sure that the candidates materials are contextualized so as to not make the candidate seem to be outside of traditional disciplinary boundaries. Minority faculty who carry an excessive service load should be encouraged to request reduced teaching loads and if service loads differ from those of other faculty, the evaluation process should be accordingly adjusted. If a faculty member is expected to play a role in diversity-focused service, this should be reflected in the job description. Student evaluations of instruction will be negatively skewed for all instructors who teach “difficult subjects” or who challenge students’ commonly held beliefs about race, gender, sexuality, ability, etc. Establish a procedure to take into consideration how students are more likely to challenge and criticize minority and women faculty. Beware that “collegiality” does not become a cudgel that produces homogeneity. Consider evaluating faculty on cultural literacy; are they contributing to the needs of a diverse student population, and do those who accomplish this best receive recognition for their enhancement of students’ experience.

Section V discusses legal issues in specific targeted hiring programs and policies.

1. **Establish a procedure for target-of-opportunity hires who may add “particular expertise, experience and diversity to an area of need.”** Have a limited number of these and make sure that they enhance disciplinary and interdisciplinary strengths of a program to avoid legal challenge.

2. **Establish diversity incentive funds to enable departments to recruit and hire diverse faculty.** To avoid legal challenge, make sure that the positions are tied to definable educational goals, that they enhance departmental programmatic depth and breadth.
3. **Bonus hire programs**: Reward departments that successful hire and retain diverse candidates with funds to hire additional faculty.

4. **Avoid quotas, set-asides, or special protections for minorities.**

Section VI Provides additional resources.


*The Ethics of Recruitment and Faculty Appointments, AAUP Policy Documents & Reports* 141 (9th ed. 2001).


antonio, a.l., Faculty of Color and Scholarship Transformed: New Arguments for Diversifying Faculty, 3 *Diversity Digest* No. 2, at 6-7 (2000).


Diversity Web: www.inform.umd.edu/diversityweb (University of Maryland & Association of American Colleges and Universities).


Moody, JoAnn, *Faculty Diversity: Problems and Solutions* (Routledge 2004)

Smith, Daryl G., How to Diversify the Faculty, 86 *Academe* 48 (Sep.-Oct. 2000).


University of Washington Faculty Recruitment Toolkit, www.washington.edu/admin/eoo/forms/ftk_01.html.

Evidence suggests that although the number of historically under-represented minorities entering higher education are increasing, their representation in the professoriate remains low. Faculty are overwhelmingly white—89% of all faculty—and 11% are Asian (5.7%), African American (5%), Hispanic/Latino (2.7%), and Native American (0.4%). These numbers hide some troubling issues: Most Latinos in the professoriate are at 2-year institutions; African American, Latinos, and Native American faculty is most underrepresented in STEM fields, and Asian Americans are 1.8% of administrators. Limited number of minority faculty, nevertheless, are highly influential and impact their students (Tiles 1-10).

Affirmative Action Plans are important transformative tools that hold administration responsible for positive change. Should guide institutional change, policy initiatives, and need to be assessed regularly.

Diverse faculty enhance the learning experience, and enrich academic excellence. They help recruit and retain diverse student body. Diversity advances institutional goals: It enhances academic quality and fosters excellence by preparing learners to live in a diverse, pluralistic, globalized, multicultural society. It strengthens communities whose citizens will be judged by character and contributions. It fosters teamwork, respect, innovation and collaboration. In Wisconsin, Diversity can be used to advance Closing the Achievement Gap goals and Growth Agenda because it strengthens “economic prosperity by using the skills of individuals from different ethnic backgrounds, cultures and communities” (PPT 19).

Causes frequently seen as contributing to a lack of diversity in faculty hires and retention:
- Lack of Accountability and Commitment From Administrative Leadership
- Assumption that there are no diverse faculty candidates in the pipeline
- Failure to Use Innovative, Creative Methods to Recruit Diverse Candidates Such as Creating Diverse Faculty Lines.
- Disinterest in analyzing factors that discourage diverse candidates from applying to positions at the institution
- Failure to assess or to take into consideration the experiences and perceptions of diverse faculty hires.
- Failure to comprehend link between retention of diverse students and their positive experiences to diverse faculty role models.
- Failure to use creative hiring methods to hire diverse faculty because of status quo legal

Evidence suggests that frequent reasons for which diverse faculty are not recruited, hired or retained includes:
- Campus climate issues and feelings of isolation
• Greater scrutiny of diverse applicant credentials; feeling that only acceptable minorities must be from R-1 and Ivy League institutions.
• A sense of tokenism; they are not hired in key departmental program areas, but instead to teach minority course; they do not form part of departmental critical mass.
• Lack of research validation; their research interests are not taken seriously.
• Unconscious, Race, Ethnicity and Gender Bias - Desire to Hire People “Who Look Like Us” or who can be “collegial”
• The “King of the Hill” and “Queen Bee Syndrome” suggests that existing diverse faculty may perceive diverse hires as competitors and consequently manipulate or sabotage diverse recruits.
• Recruitment Process. White and Male Faculty Diversity Allies Can Sometimes Champion Diversity Efforts More Than Diverse Faculty, Including Faculty of Color and Women.
• No effort is made to connect diverse hires to community on or off campus. Suggests that studies need to be conducted to assess how community can step up to make more diverse hires feel welcome and included.
• Campus does not signal that diversity is valued through funding of diverse initiatives.
• Diverse faculty who hold unconventional views or who challenge the status quo are marginalized or labeled as problem faculty. They frequently may not be included or consulted in governance decisions.

Common complaints from diverse faculty impacting their retention decision.
• Pressured to assimilate and model dominant intellectual paradigms.
• Frequently perceived of Being Incompetent “Affirmative Action Hires”.
• Excluded from informal networks (if there are informal networks, are they inclusive of all diverse faculty, or are they gender- or age- focused? Are informal networks inclusive of all?)
• Academic culture can be difficult to negotiate or challenging, seeming contradictory and paradoxical to Diverse faculty, especially for traditional cultures that may perceive critical questioning as criticism.
• Frequent expectation to serve on minority-focused committees and/or initiatives, or to solve problems of minority students. Minority faculty become experts on minority issues, and do not contribute to campus strategic planning, technology, or budgeting.

Useful suggestions for making position descriptions more diversity-friendly and inclusive. Suggestions for including signaling language that may attract diverse faculty:
• “Demonstrated Success In Working With Diverse Populations.”
• “Experience Interacting With Diverse Populations or Students of Color.”
• “Academic Experiences With Culturally Diverse Populations.”
• “Interest In Developing and Implementing Curricula Related to Culturally Diverse Populations”.
• “Experience with a variety of teaching methods.”
Once the campus visit is arranged, make sure you include diversity in the experience, highlighting diversity programs, outreach, priorities, arranging for meetings with diverse faculty and staff, establish connections with community members and student leaders. Allow them to meet with faculty outside the department who have similar research interests.

Suggestions for post-search retention best practices

- Offer acceptable, competitive salaries; remember salaries are public information, avoid setting up a legal challenge.
- Demonstrate Collegiality and provide a comfortable, supportive departmental climate.
- Follow up with hires and make sure departments do not treat them as token hires.
- Deans, chairs, and senior faculty must include diverse hires in informal networks and social events.
- Limit service expectations and do not dump multicultural programming and outreach on minority hires, but establish a procedure where all faculty members contribute to such initiatives and measures.
- Showcase diverse hires’ expertise in the local community; incorporate them into outreach opportunities, establish connections for them.
- Provide mentors and ascertain that new diverse hires understand the tenure process, SEIs, and other important Policies, Rules and Procedures via Orientation and informal mentoring.
Analysis of 2013 Equity Scorecard Data

In the summer of 2013, the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse (UW-L) Office of Institutional Research (OIR) compiled an Equity Scorecard regarding the comparative success of underrepresented students of color and white students at attempting and successfully completing General Education (GE) requirements during their first two years of attendance at UW-L.

The data provides a snapshot of student success, although the formulas used to calculate the Equity Score for each GE requirement vary slightly from those used in previous Equity Scorecard findings.

Current Campus Initiatives

The gap in achievement between students of color and white students is well-documented and several existing programs and supports are in place to attempt to narrow that gap.

First Year Research Exposure

The First Year Research Exposure (FYRE) program began in 2012 as a small-scale attempt to improve outcomes for underrepresented students of color attempting to fulfill their Laboratory Science GE requirement. The program, funded by the College of Science and Health and the Wisconsin Alliance for Minority Participation, recruits 12 incoming first year students of color annually and assists them in successful completion of gateway STEM courses. All FYRE participants enroll in BIO 105 together. Those that are eligible enroll in CHM 103 together the following Spring. All FYRE students are encouraged and supported in their efforts to meet mathematics requirements for their major. Of the program’s 22 participants, 100% have earned a grade of “C” or higher in BIO 105. In its first year, 100% of those attempting CHM 103 also earned a passing grade on their first attempt.
Academic Success Institute

FYRE partners with the Academic Success Institute (ASI), housed in the Office of Multicultural Student Services (OMSS), to provide participants in both programs with the opportunity to enroll in BIO 105 lab together, and to participate in a weekly review session taught by a Biology instructor. ASI participants are first-year students who face one or more barriers to college success; they are first-generation students, have financial need, and/or identify as part of a historically underserved racial and ethnic college population. As part of their commitment to the program, they earn 6-8 summer credits, 3 of which typically meet the Self and Society GE requirement. In 2013, 24 ASI participants enrolled in POL 101 and all passed the class with a grade of C or better. Additionally, ASI students enroll in math and reading/study skills development courses over the summer, which increase their likelihood of earning

FastTrack

FastTrack is a mathematics enhancement program for incoming freshman that initially placed into MTH 050 or 051. The goal of the FastTrack is to provide online and campus based instruction with the intent to develop and increase the math skills of participating students so that they may retake the math placement exam and place into higher level mathematics classes for the fall. The program also serves to orient them to campus. Data from participants of the 2012 and 2013 Fast Track programs indicate that students enrolled in the developmental online component of Fast Track fare far better than the general population in their Mathematics General Education courses.

Other Campus Resources
The Office of Multicultural Student Services offers individual tutoring to students in general education courses. This supplements the tutoring provided to all students through the Murphy Learning Center and other departmental tutoring services. Student Support Services also provides math, English, and science tutoring for its students enrolled in general education coursework.

General Education Course Attempts and Success

G6. Self and Society General Education Requirement

Overall, 80.5% of students successful met this requirement in their first two years at UW-L, with white students success rate at 81.2%. The widest disparity existed for Native American students, 31.3% of whom were unsuccessful in their attempt to meet this requirement, and 12.5% of whom did not attempt it. These numbers are only slightly improved for African American students, of whom 60.6% meet the requirement in their first two years, with 27.3% making an unsuccessful attempt and 12.1% not attempting the course. 22.4% of Southeast Asian students are unsuccessful in their first attempts to pass this course, as compared with 4.4% or white students are 5.2% of students overall.

G11. Writing General Education Requirement

Students meet this requirement in their first two years at a rate of 78.1% overall, with white students succeeding at a similar rate of 78.3%. Most notably in this category, Native American students outperformed all other racial and ethnic student groups; 100% of students who attempted the course passed with a grade of A, B, or C; however, 31.3% of Native American students elected not to attempt this class in their first two years at UW-L. Almost 17% of Hispanic and Latino students postpone their attempts to take this class to their third year or beyond. African
American students are unsuccessful in their attempts to meet this requirement at a rate of 17.6%, with an additional 11.8% not attempting the class in their first two years. Southeast Asian students, many of whom are Hmong Americans, meet this requirement at a rate of 72.9%, with 10.2% attempting unsuccessfully to pass the class, and an additional 15.3% electing not to attempt it in their first two years. The campus-wide percentage of students postponing this course was 11.8%.

**G21. Mathematics General Education Requirement**

**Unanswered Questions & Areas of Concern**

There are several unanswered questions about the variation in student success, especially in the areas where there exists wide gaps in achievement between underrepresented students and their white peers:

- What drives the decisions of students who do not attempt to meet certain general education requirements in their first two years on campus? To what degree do factors such as course availability, stereotype threat, placement test scores influence their decisions?
- To what extent will the Eagle Alert System impact multicultural student success in their attempts to meet general education courses in their first two years at UW-L?
- What, if any, difference exists between students attempting general education courses in online versus in-person environments?

**Committee Recommendations**

It is the recommendation of the Joint Minority Affairs Committee that the Equity Scorecard process be replicated using similar methodology on a regular basis. Because the Campus Climate Survey is currently administered on a biannual...
basis, conducting the Equity Scorecard analysis in alternate years might allow for adequate, timely comparative data.

There is also a need to improve the availability and understanding of this data to faculty, academic staff, and graduate students with a strong interest in educational equity, curricular re/design, program development or improvement, and/or grant development. An easily accessible online repository for data related to inequities in student success and unmet needs of underrepresented students of color has the potential to strengthen applications for competitive UW-System, federal, and non-federal grants.
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According to its university website, UW-L defines inclusive excellence as “our active, intentional, and ongoing commitment to bridge differences with understanding and respect so all can thrive.” In the spirit of this definition, the Joint Minority Affairs Committee has compiled this report to describe the experiences of faculty of color in academia across the U.S. In addition, now that we have the 2013 Campus Climate Survey data available, we have integrated relevant segments into this report to highlight local experiences.

Although the studies cited in our report focus primarily on faculty of color - members of historically-underrepresented population and immigrants who resemble them - we recognize that faculty and staff from all minority groups experience unique challenges, both in and out of the classroom. Thus, we include in our definition of "faculty of color" all those who differ from the majority population, whether in terms of race, ethnicity, ability, age, gender, sexuality, or class. Having diverse faculty results in many positive outcomes for universities. For example, Hurtado (2000) found that faculty and student body diversity contributed to outcomes such as acceptance of people of different races, leadership ability, critical thinking, and problem-solving among students. Speaking more broadly about the university, University of Pittsburgh Provost James Maher said, “A diverse faculty is essential for the university’s full engagement in the community of scholars. Cutting-edge scholarship and the growth of knowledge depend on discussion and debate incorporating multiple perspectives, theories, and approaches” (Moody, 2004, p. 174).

Given the benefits of a diverse faculty, UW-L should place a high priority on retaining, recruiting, and promoting faculty of color. Results from UW-L's 2013 Campus Climate survey suggest that the students and employees who feel most comfortable with our campus climate are White and able-bodied. The implication is that employees and students of color, and those with physical disabilities feel less comfortable. This finding suggests that UW-L has room for improvement, in terms of creating a comfortable campus climate for all people. Because faculty provide support, role modeling, and guidance to students, it is important that students see and interact with faculty who have found a sense of comfort on our campus, and it is important to create and implement ways to create this climate.

This report outlines: reasons for under-representation of faculty of color in academia, experiences inside the classroom (e.g. teaching evaluations) and outside of the classroom (e.g. interactions with colleagues), additional service expectations, consequences of differential treatment of faculty of color in academia, and finally, recommendations to support faculty of color at UW-L.

Reasons for Under-representation of Faculty of Color in Academia

Ethnic and racial-minority faculty continue to be underrepresented in the U.S. professoriate, representing only about 17% of all full-time professors in the academy (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2009). When analyzed by rank, the same data set reveals that faculty of color comprise 13% of full professors, 17% of associate professors, and 21% of assistant professors. This composition suggests that although there is a growing trend toward diversity of faculty in higher education, faculty of color remain underrepresented, particularly at higher ranks in the academy. In addition, these statistics reveal that those who are making tenure and promotion decisions are likely senior White faculty members who may not understand the perspectives and experiences of junior faculty of color.
There are several reasons for this drastic underrepresentation, including institutional racism, socioeconomic barriers, and, for Latinas, traditional gender role expectations (Martinez Aleman, 1995; Gandara, 1995; Niemann, Romero, & Arbona 2000). The barriers Hispanics face in attaining a postgraduate education include low high school and college graduation rates and lack of finances, among others (Quaid, 2009; Monforti, 2012). More than ¼ of Latino/a faculty said financial burdens have slowed down their progress. Another common issue involves forced duality (i.e. being perceived by colleagues as either Mexican American or as a scholar, but not both), which reinforces feelings of tokenism, stigmatization and stereotype threat and can lead to extreme visibility (Kanter 1977; Niemann & Dovidio, 1998a; Pollack & Niemann, 1998), and convenient invisibility (Tierney & Rhoades, 1993). In addition, many Latino/a faculty members deal with forms of role strain, such as the pressure to always put family first during graduate school, which affects Latina women primarily (Niemann, 2012).

Turner, Meyers, and Cresswell (1999) identified six barriers to the recruitment and retention of faculty of color. These include:

- isolation or lack of mentoring
- occupational stress
- devaluation of “minority” research
- the “token hire” misconception
- racial and ethnic bias in recruiting and hiring
- racial and ethnic bias in tenure and promotion practices and policies. (pp. 29-31)

In their study of the experiences of faculty of color at Midwestern universities, Turner et al. (1999) found that “while 77% of institutional respondents [administrators] rated recruiting and retaining faculty of color as ‘high’ or ‘very high’ priorities, most offered little structured support for attaining these institutional goals” (p. 45). Thus, although UW-L’s goal of inclusive excellence aims to “bridge differences with understanding and respect so all can thrive,” it is important to strengthen efforts to enable faculty of color, specifically, to thrive. Currently, there is a gap between the goals institutions like UW-L say they want to achieve, and the actions taken in furtherance of these goals. Evidence of this gap can be seen in how faculty rank the comfort level of the campus climate. Over one in ten faculty say they are uncomfortable or very uncomfortable with the campus climate. In particular, the odds of being comfortable with the campus climate are 78.3% lower for non-white employees, and non-white employees are 674% more likely to express there is not enough emphasis on diversity at UW-L. Not surprisingly employees most likely to be comfortable with the climate are white employees.

**In the Classroom: Teaching Evaluations**

Synthesizing a review of over 250 studies related to faculty of color in academe, Turner, Gonzalez, and Wood (2008) provide the following quote, which captures the challenges that faculty of color face with regard to teaching.

Within the departmental context, faculty of color “love of teaching” was noted as a primary reason for their persistence in academe. However, undervaluation of their research interests, approaches, and theoretical frameworks and challenges to their credentials and intellect in the classroom contribute to their dissatisfaction with their professorial roles. (p. 143) Corroborating the above point, Anderson and Smith (2005) found that Latino/a professors are rated [by students] more positively than White professors when they are lenient, and more negatively when they are strict. In addition, African American faculty have reported being perceived [by students] as “biased and self-interested” when teaching about race (Easton, 2013, p. 157).
Furthermore, there appears to be very strong evidence to question the heavy reliance on the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) in making promotion and tenure decisions. There is evidence of strong, positive correlations between instructors’ culturally relevant personality traits and students’ ratings of instruction. In one study (Kneipp et al., 2010), university faculty members were asked to complete the Big Five Personality Test and to provide archives of data from student evaluations from the previous two years. Extroversion and agreeableness (both having been demonstrated in prior research as culturally mediated personality variables) accounted for a more substantial portion of the variance among student evaluation of instruction than did teaching style or practices. This suggests that SEIs are measuring situational and cultural states in which personality traits exist, rather than the actual behaviors related to the demonstration of good teaching.

Student bias toward instructor personality traits and states may be impacted by the types of items that appear on the typical measurements used to evaluate instructional experiences. For instance, Nargundkar and Shrikhande (2012) found that SEI items traditionally measure a cluster of instructor characteristics that students may be uncertain about, as they frequently are believed to measure teaching outcomes for which students are untrained/unqualified to make high stakes judgments. Further student bias on those items may be related to the comparative judgment. For instance, results of student feedback about their SEI participation revealed that their ratings of instructors are based more frequently upon normative comparisons and not on criterion-referenced frameworks applied to only one course or instructor at a time. Given the Kneipp et al. (2010) findings cited above, this normative derivation of instructor effectiveness may be linked to cultural and social expectations set by the majority of student experiences with faculty members who may unknowingly establish baseline and benchmark performance expectations among student groups.

Other research has documented that the (actual or perceived) class, ethnic, racial, gendered, and ideological identities of students and instructors affect students’ evaluations of minority faculty. Studies show that “instructors who share students’ attitudes or appear to do so, have an advantage in procuring higher ratings” (Wachtel, 1998). Young, attractive, and White faculty earn higher evaluations than faculty perceived to be less youthful, outgoing, or physically attractive. Recent studies have observed that a faculty member’s “hotness” (i.e., perceived physical attractiveness) directly correlates to a more positive evaluation score, echoing findings of studies from four decades ago (Freng & Webber, 2009).

Similarly, in a classic study measuring student receptivity of socially attractive professors conducted in 1973—named the “Dr. Fox study”—it was discovered that students rated a faculty member who was more expressive and charismatic higher than others even though that instructor’s presentation of content knowledge was actually less stellar than that of the less attractive instructor (Naftulin, Ware, & Donnelly, 1973). The research on this issue over many decades demonstrates that SEIs are little more than well-orchestrated, institutionalized popularity contests that advantage instructors who fit students’ expectations for normative behavior and appearance. White students are likely to be particularly critical of faculty of color who differ from them in terms of manner, life experiences, and physical characteristics.

At the UW-L Conference on Teaching and Learning in September 2012, several junior faculty (three women of color, one Caucasian woman) spoke about their experiences teaching at UW-L. Three of the women spoke explicitly about the challenges inherent in teaching about issues related to race, ethnicity, gender, and identity, and all agreed that their own identities influenced students’ perceptions of, and receptivity to, course material. Given the pervasiveness of color-
blind ideology, which assumes current racial dynamics (e.g., housing segregation, income gap) are a result of individual choice and inherent cultural differences, those who teach topics related to diversity, including women’s studies and women of color studies, are likely to encounter students who react with hostility for what they perceived as attacks on Whites and themselves, specifically (Chang, 2012). The panel and its subsequent feedback suggest that the racial identity of instructors adds an additional layer of difficulty when addressing diversity-related issues, as students question the objectivity and bias of faculty of color who teach about race.

Lang (2011) argues that, given the strong potential for bias, student evaluations of teaching should not be used to infer student learning, to demonstrate incremental improvements in teaching, or to compare faculty members and courses. Rather, student evaluations should be viewed in the context of other sources of evidence of effective teaching (e.g., teaching portfolios, teaching observations, unsolicited student feedback). Although UW-L’s heavy reliance on the SEI as an assessment of teaching effectiveness reduces all instructors to a single composite score, faculty of color may be particularly disadvantaged, and steps should be taken to view all teachers more holistically.

**Out of the Classroom: Colleague Interactions**

Faculty of color may also experience challenges outside the classroom, due to differences in culture and background from the White, male majority. As Alger (2000) points out: "Collegiality" is another criterion that is creeping into more and more faculty evaluation processes. Collegiality can be a code word for favoring candidates with backgrounds, interests, and political and social perspectives similar to one's own. This vague and subjective criterion can be used against faculty members whose work and ideas challenge traditional orthodoxy in their departments or institutions. (n.p.)

In addition, Owuachi-Willig (2012) cites research that suggests that female faculty of color must make extra attempts to counter negative stereotypes. Junior faculty of color, in particular, must also make decisions about when to give voice to their experiences and when to keep them to themselves when interacting both with other faculty and with students. In addition, campus-wide efforts to address issues of diversity do not always attend to the intellectual and emotional interests of faculty of color (Diggs, Garrison-Wade, Estrada & Galindo, 2009). For example, informal mentorships are particularly meaningful to junior faculty, but not all campuses offer multiple opportunities for junior faculty of color to meet and interact with senior faculty of color, in order to cultivate these relationships.

Experiences of pain, isolation, and discrimination are still relevant to the experiences of black women in the academy (Wing, 2012). Faculty of color report experiencing offensive comments from department chairs and/or deans regarding their race. One person noted that other faculty members in department were oblivious to their experiences as the only person of color in the entire department. They [white faculty] said, “Now that we have you, we don’t need to worry about hiring another minority member” (Niemann, 2012, p. 342). Another African American woman was told, “You only got the position because you are a black female, and the department gets to count you twice” (Wallace, Moore, Wilson, & Hart, 2012, p. 431). Another noted, “The problem with being a female faculty of color is that you get it from all sides—from your colleagues AND from your students” (Monforti, 2012, p. 403). African Americans can face unique obstacles in the classroom. They are more likely to face challenges to their expertise and authority in the classroom. In addition, several studies have shown that their tone of voice, facial expressions, body language, and dress in the classroom can have direct consequences on their
perceived level of competence, which can also impact student evaluations (Monforti, 2012). Fifty-nine percent of Latinas in Monforti’s (2012) survey said that they were expected to be experts in Latin American and ethnic and/or gender politics, regardless of their academic discipline, just because they are Latinas. Other Latina academics reported problems like sexual harassment, questions about immigration status, and inappropriate comments that undermined them in public, professional spaces. Latinas, more than Latinos, cited family concerns, not receiving good mentoring, sexism and racism as challenges they face in the profession (Monforti, 2012). They said it would have been helpful to have been invited to do research and publish with senior faculty. In general, gender appears to have a more negative impact than ethnicity across all groups with respect to mentoring (Monforti, 2012).

Results from the UW-L 2013 Campus Climate survey suggest that the problems and challenges discussed above are highly relevant to faculty on our campus. For example, stereotyping, bullying, intimidation, verbal abuse, discrimination, and microaggressions were all reported as problems for faculty and staff on our campus. Other challenges included racism, sexism, heterosexism, and sizeism, all of which target faculty members of marginalized groups.

More specifically, UW-L 2013 Campus Climate Survey results indicate that 35% of employees and 17% of students reported being bullied at least once in the past five years. It is also important to note that the odds of being bullied are 250% higher for non-white employees. Students and employees of color, students and employees with a disability, students who work 20 or more hours per week, students who live on campus, LQBTQ employees and full professors at UW-L have the highest rates of being bullied or intimidated.

Service Expectations
As Smith and Anderson (2005) point out, “The hiring, renewal, and tenuring of faculty in academia, from large research institutions to small liberal arts and community colleges, depend on the interaction of a range of factors, many of which extend beyond the immediate control of the faculty member or the quality of job performance” (Bowen, 2012, p. 130). Although this assertion is true for all faculty, members of underrepresented groups may experience disadvantages that render their road to tenure more challenging. For example, Baez (2000) writes that “faculty of color’s opportunity for advancement likely is reduced significantly by excessive service demands” (p. 363).

Faculty of color are often specifically sought out by students of color who are facing various kinds of challenges on campus and are looking for assistance from someone with whom they can identify (Niemann, 2012, p. 345). Women of color feel duty-bound to respond to students who feel marginalized, especially ethnic/racial minorities. It is critical for administrators and colleagues to understand this not as a voluntary “extra” but as an inherent part of the role that faculty of color perform as a service to the institution, not just to these student populations. In addition, faculty of color are tokenized in many ways: they are expected to teach on issues of race and serve on diversity committees more than their White counterparts (Baez, 2000). Expectations of diversity on committees can lead to Latinas doing extra work that may or may not be rewarded. One person was assigned complex and time-consuming administrative tasks necessary for the program, which left little time for research. (Niemann, 2012). Furthermore, Black women feel service obligations to write letters of support for other black students and women in academy (Wing, 2012). The more overwhelmed they [faculty of color] became with non-research responsibilities, the more incompetent they felt (Monforti, 2012). The climate of departments can also affect an individual’s teaching, administrative and research work (Niemann, 2012).
The consequence is that faculty of color may be viewed as tokens and/or with suspicion for bringing “diversity” to departments when race is not supposed to matter. Moreover, faculty of color often pay a cultural or race tax when they are asked to serve on committees largely because of their race, ethnicity, and/or gender. One way to recognize these additional responsibilities is to measure them and to ease the assigned teaching load, accordingly.

**Consequences of Differential Treatment of Faculty of Color in Higher Education**

For graduate students of color entering academe as faculty members, the experiences of isolation and disconnection continue, given the unconscious biases and overt racism they encounter. Beginning with recruitment and hiring, academics of color may be vulnerable to stereotype threat and begin consciously or unconsciously to internalize stigmatizing myths and stereotypes relative to academia (Pratkanis & Turner 1996; Niemann, 2012, p. 338). Members of minority groups are frequently judged not as individuals but as representatives of their groups, which creates undue pressure (Wing, 2012). Black women, in particular, feel pressure to keep innovating courses because of the perceptions that they are not “acceptable” professors (Wing, 2012). More specifically, Campus Climate Survey results indicate that 44% of employees and 41% of students at UW-L reported being stereotyped at least once in the past five years. Students of color, female students, students between the ages of 20 and 25 and LGBTQ students were most likely to be stereotyped at UW-L.

African American women work in isolation, which can have detrimental effects on morale and may cause them to leave the academy altogether. In addition, they are subjected to both racial and gender devaluation. This is a process where the status and power of an authoritative position are downplayed when a woman holds it and penalized for those agitating for change (Monroe et al., 2008). Furthermore, when faculty of color do not see themselves represented in the institution’s leadership history, it can have an effect on how central they view themselves to the institution. For instance, one faculty member mentioned that it is alienating to not see racial/gender diversity in images/portraits posted on the walls of the university (Wing, 2012).

Bowman and Deal (2008) note that it may be difficult for people to reach their full potential if their work environment is not conducive to harnessing their special talents and skills. All UW-L employees want to contribute to the betterment of the university, no matter their race, gender, cultural or religious background, or sexual orientation. This is important when discussing retention of faculty and staff members. Employees who do not feel valued are more likely to seek employment elsewhere, especially if they do not have institutional support to cope with their devaluation.

Particular students and employees at UW-L report experiences of discrimination, as well. 22% of employees and 8% of students reported being discriminated against at least once in the past five years at UW-L. Non-white employees are 328% more likely to experience discrimination. Students and employees most likely to experience discrimination, include: students and employees of color, employees between the ages of 43 and 51, employees with a disability, students between the ages of 22 and 25, and students with a disability.

**Committee Recommendations**

Based on the above research, as well as our own appraisals, the Joint Minority Affairs Committee of 2012-2013 makes the following recommendations:

1) **SEIs**
   - Senior academic officers and members of promotion and tenure committees drastically reduce the relative importance of SEIs in consideration for promotion and tenure –
for ALL faculty (due to the inherent invalidity, unreliability, and flawed nature of the instrument) — and especially for faculty of color, in particular recognition of the discriminatory effects for faculty perceived as having a cultural difference from the predominant student population.

- A redesign of the SEI process and procedure that uses instructor evaluation from peers who have knowledge about effective pedagogical practices rather than by students
- Institutional emphasis on integrating issues of instructor diversity into the UW-L 100 curriculum, or in orientation for undergraduate and graduate students

2) Necessary Institutional Support for Faculty of Color

- Anonymous, secure spaces for faculty of color to articulate experiences on campus and in the community (e.g. creation of an online site to articulate concerns)
- Opportunities for professional development for classified and unclassified employees of color (e.g., additional funding for attending conferences, hosting diversity-related conferences on campus)
- Institutional funds for the creation of research on the experiences of faculty and staff of color (e.g., earmarking small grant money for research in this area)
- Discussion of UW-L’s student culture during the new faculty orientations

3) Systemic institutional recognition of extra labor (from which the institution also benefits) provided by faculty of color

- Formal consideration and inclusion of extra service work and expectations for faculty of color in promotion and tenure process (i.e., formal recognition)
- Support through funding and/or release time for mentorship of students of color

4) Comprehensive institutional initiatives to encourage all faculty/administrators to bring about a more inclusive campus

- Professional incentives and rewards for faculty/staff involvement in inclusive excellence programs related cultural sensitivity, tokenism, and stereotype threat
- Incentives, training, and recommended practices for senior mentors of new and mid-level faculty mentors, particularly with respect to understanding and providing support for faculty of color
- Funding and institutional support for faculty of color to pay for membership dues for professional organizations related to diversity and professional identity
- Significant, ongoing incentives and recognition (i.e., during promotion and tenure process, and annual reviews) for integrating diversity into the curriculum
- Annual performance evaluation of Chairs, Deans, and Administrators should include an assessment of administrators’ efforts - at each level- toward increased inclusivity in their respective departments/colleges/etc.

As a final note, it is worth underscoring that students of color are not responsible for generating the ideas for, nor bringing about, the changes that are needed in academia. This is not meant to disclude themes that arise among students of color in the campus climate, a topic that requires discussion that goes beyond the scope of this report. The responsibility for changes in academia lie directly on the shoulders of institutions, administrators, governance groups, department chairs, and senior faculty. It is our hope to move forward with these recommendations in the fall of 2013 by presenting these recommendations to Faculty Senate.
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