## INCLUSIVE EXCELLENCE

Achieving Inclusive Excellence at the University of Delaware
Mid-Term Report Spring 2018

## Making Progress: Inclusive Excellence



CULTURE \& CLIMATE
Engage the campus with activities and programs to foster an inclusive environment

- New Director of Student Diversity and Inclusion, Student Life
- September 2017 public forum on the faculty climate survey (ADVANCE)
- May 2017 Diverse Learning Environment Campus Climate Survey with HERI
- Identifying a location for a multicultural resource center
- University of Delaware Partnership for Public Education
- Community Engagement Initiative
- Near-peer Program serving area high school students


## GRADUATE STUDENTS

Support underrepresented students in their pursuit of graduate degrees

- Bridge to Doctorate program
- NEH Next Generation PhD implementation grant

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS Expand efforts to recruit underrepresented students and assure their success at the University

- Improving pre-college preparation
- Attracting underrepresented minority students to UD
- Improving success and persistence to graduation

GY ACADEMIC PROGRAMMING
Evaluate diversity
content in the curriculum

- First-yearstudent
diversity module now in
place
- Recertification of multicultural course requirement completed
- Title IX training for all members of the campus
- Talks, forums,
workshops and classroom discussions on the principles of diversity and inclusion


## FACULTY

Increase the number of
faculty from underrepresented

## groups

- Inclusive Excellence Cluster Hire
- Inclusive Excellence Postdoctoral Fellow
- Affirmative Action Plan shared at the start of each job search


## STAFF

Provide training on diversity topics

- Required "Valuing Differences" workshop
- Search committee training
required for all staff


# Making Progress on Inclusive Excellence 

Diversity is a core value and guiding principle for the University of Delaware's educational mission, and we continue to strive to make our campus more equitable, inclusive and diverse. As our Advancing Inclusive Excellence-Mid-Term Report demonstrates, our efforts to diversify our campus community are showing promising trends in both student and faculty diversity. Enrollment numbers amongst historically underrepresented and underserved groups from North America has increased 20\% in the past five years for undergraduate students and has increased 33.5\% for graduate students who identify as Black/African American. For Hispanic/Latino(a) graduate students, enrollment numbers have improved 54\% in the past five years, and for those individuals who identify as two or more races, that number is up 81\% since 2013.

To continue these efforts, we have committed more resources to enhance student success. Initiatives like the Blue Hen Success Collaborative and our Transfer Student Services Program support our overall efforts to improve graduation rates for historically underrepresented and underserved students. The Blue Hen Success Collaborative (BHSC) combines the best of technology, best practice research and predictive analytics to help UD leverage data and manage advising and academic support resources to increase retention and graduation rates for students. Fully implemented in the fall of 2017, to date, over 7,000 students have access to BHSC, advisor utilization has increased $75 \%$ in one year, and we have logged more than 21,000 advisor transactions. This means better communication amongst advisors, students, professors, and wellness providers, and a more coordinated network of care for our students. These efforts, along with our transfer student services initiative, ensure that our growing transfer population is engaged and well served. Currently, about nine percent of our total undergraduate population are transfer students. Of these students, seven percent are transferring from international locations, and about four percent of these students are veterans.

Our graduate student population continues to evolve and grow as the Bill Anderson Fund (BAF), a pipeline initiative for historically underrepresented and underserved students in disaster research, finds a home at UD. In August, the BAF board of directors unanimously accepted UD's proposal to house the fund under the University of Delaware's Disaster Research Center. This partnership will allow UD to strengthen its pipeline efforts in STEM fields associated with disaster research globally and will complement the University of Delaware's other efforts in increasing diversity at the graduate level. The African American Public Humanities Initiative, the Next Gen/NEH, and the Bridge to Doctorate programs provide opportunities for colleges to collaborate campus-wide in these efforts. Diversity recruitment programming and inter-institutional networking continue to be priorities as mentoring, professional development, and community-building bolster our efforts to improve time to degree completion rates for historically underrepresented and underserved groups.

The success of our Inclusive Excellence 2021 initiative to increase diversity amongst our faculty, along with our African American Material Culture cluster hires, has cultivated a promising trend that we plan to nurture as we create more meaningful and intentional ways to support mentoring for all faculty. Of our faculty hires in FY18, almost $25 \%$ are from historically underrepresented and underserved groups, an almost $6 \%$ rise since FY17. While we are encouraged by these efforts, we understand that mentoring and professional development opportunities like our institutional membership to the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity improve the climate for faculty success, and aid promotion and tenure outcomes. The Commission Report on Promotion and Tenure, issued in 2017 by the Provost's Office (in collaboration with the Faculty Senate) has made recommendations that align with our institutional efforts to invest in our faculty as we seek to improve faculty equity, diversity, and inclusion in all areas. The implementation of bias training for faculty searches, our revised faculty hiring protocol and our dual career initiative demonstrate UD's commitment to be a change agent in these processes.

In our efforts to build a more welcoming and inclusive campus environment, UD continues to utilize the information from the ADVANCE Faculty Climate Survey and our recent Diverse Learning Environment (DLE) HERI climate survey to guide our efforts. We have revised our Non-Discrimination Policy protocol to more closely align with our Title IX investigatory processes to cultivate a campus climate environment that supports our governing principles of respect, civility, and common decency. In Fall 2017, we embarked on a journey to assess multicultural spaces and programming needs on campus in ways that create capacity to support a wider breadth of underrepresented students and create synergies among all of the work happening on campus that supports underrepresented students. We are also developing co-curricular opportunities that engage ALL students in learning about difference, inclusion, issues of social justice, intercultural awareness and dialogue. In October, a consultant team, led by Dr. Lori Patton Davis of Indiana University-Purdue, held multiple forums with administrators, stakeholders, students and other groups to determine the key needs, opportunities, challenges and concerns related to a UD multicultural space. The consultants' report, and their findings, will help to guide our efforts in the upcoming months to create a more civically engaged campus community where all members feel valued.

Our Community Engagement and Outreach Initiatives have strengthened our efforts to sustain and grow our partnerships with national and regional organizations committed to the values of access and affordability, and the principles of civic engagement and social responsibility. Our recent membership in The American Talent Initiative strengthens our commitment to access and affordability. The initiative is building a collective national framework that aims to enroll and graduate 50,000 additional low-and moderate-income students at the top U.S. colleges and universities by 2025. Our membership in the Campus Compact Mid-Atlantic is an outgrowth of our Carnegie classification as a community engaged institution, and the vision and mission of the Campus Compact Mid-Atlantic aligns with our own institutional educational mission-"to develop globally engaged citizens who actively contribute to creating healthy, sustainable, and socially just communities." As we strengthen our partnerships with community-based organizations dedicated to cultivating the academic pipeline for all students-and we anchor these practices in the principles of access and equity, affordability and student success-we ensure that our democracy will thrive and have impact worldwide in ways that benefit humanity at large.

Even as we continue to strive for excellence, we are already receiving external recognition for our efforts. In September 2017, UD was presented the 2017 Higher Education Excellence in Diversity (HEED) Award from INSIGHT Into Diversity magazine, the oldest and largest diversity-focused publication in higher education. The annual HEED Award is a national honor recognizing U.S. colleges and universities that demonstrate an outstanding commitment to diversity and inclusion. UD was selected for its efforts toward enhancing diversity and inclusion in all aspects of the campus. Specific strengths and areas of progress include:

- New staff positions, rich programming, scholarships and community-based partnerships focused on attracting underrepresented and first-generation undergraduate and graduate students and ensuring their success and persistence to graduation;
- New resources dedicated to the recruitment, retention and advancement of a diverse faculty;
- Trainings, courses and mentoring programs to bolster hiring and retention of underrepresented employees and encourage respect for and appreciation of individual differences; and
- Mechanisms for ensuring continued diversity planning and accountability.

The University of Delaware was also named a co-winner of the top Diversity and Inclusion Award for actively promoting inclusive excellence in the workplace during the Delaware Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) Chapter's Diversity and Inclusion Conference held July 11 at the Dover Downs Conference Center. The award noted that UD "contributes to and enhances the environment through a sustained commitment to improve opportunities for the diverse communities" served by the institution.


## Introduction to the Data

As part of his vision for the University of Delaware (UD), President Assanis named inclusive excellence as one of five central priorities, with Inclusive Excellence: An Action Plan for Diversity at UD (May 2016) developed to guide the university's work in diversity, equity, and inclusion. As a joint effort of the Office of the Provost and Institutional Research \& Effectiveness, the Mid-Term Report: Spring 2018 provides a high level, quantitative overview about the university's progress towards achieving inclusive excellence and supplements the qualitative summative Inclusive Excellence Status Report: May 2016-May 2017, which can be found at http://sites.udel.edu/diversity/.

The Mid-Term Report: Spring 2018 is organized thematically into three sections followed by endnotes that describe key data definitions. Though the University takes a broad view about dimensions of diversity, this report focuses on gender, race and ethnicity, citizenship, geographic origin (i.e., Delawareans vs. nonresidents), and indicators of socioeconomic status.

The first section of the report, Student Success, describes diversity trends (from two to five years) and the status of diversity for Associate in Arts, undergraduate, graduate, and Professional \& Continuing Studies students. Not only do we illustrate the compositional diversity of the student body, but we also present diversity in terms of academic outcomes (i.e., STEM degree completions and graduation rates). Part of enhancing inclusive excellence at UD involves understanding diversity and inclusion patterns across higher education institutions in the United States, thus, the most recent, available information from external sources such as the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is included as well.

In the second section of the report, Faculty \& Staff, we chart the university's progress in building an environment of inclusive excellence among employees by highlighting specific employment patterns at UD. For faculty, we present patterns as a function of tenure status, academic rank (e.g., associate vs. full professors), and leadership appointments. For staff, we look at employee category (e.g., exempt vs. hourly) and job category (e.g., professional vs. secretarial/clerical). We envision that future reports will provide a comparative look at diversity trends in employment between UD and other higher education institutions.

We end the report with a section illustrating student and faculty perspectives about UD's Climate \& Culture. Drawn from our most recent institution-wide surveys, we present the responses to diversity and inclusion themed questions that have commonalities between students and faculty. Though this report highlights a small number of questions, more detailed survey results are available on the Institutional Research \& Effectiveness website, http://ire.udel.edu/ir/surveys/.

After reading this report, we believe that the reader will agree that UD has made a great deal of progress towards diversity and inclusion and at the same time there are significant opportunities for improvement. We hope that the Mid-Term Report: Spring 2018 helps inform the UD community about diversity themes in relation to student, faculty, and staff populations, student academic outcomes, and climate and culture in service of nurturing an equitable and inclusive UD campus community.


[^0]
## Student Success

## Goal: Continue to create and retain a diverse student body

The University of Delaware resolves to move from diversity to inclusion and be prepared to cultivate a campus climate that promotes studentsuccess by improving persistence to graduation for undergraduate students, and time to degree for graduate students.

## Enrollment and Majors

What diversity patterns are reflected in student enrollment?

## The diversity of UD students has increased since 2012 with the largest representational gains incurring for Black/African American Associate

 in Arts students and Hispanic/Latino(a) Professional \& Continuing Studies students.- The representation of Hispanic/Latino(a), Black/African American, and Multi-ethnic students increased over a five-year period within the Associate in Arts, undergraduate, graduate, and Professional \& Continuing Studies student populations.
- Since 2012, the representation of Asian students increased within the Associate in Arts, undergraduate, and Professional \& Continuing Studies student populations yet decreased slightly within the graduate student population.

IPEDS Race/Ethnicity ${ }^{i}$ by Student Type (Fall 2012 to Fall 2017)

Associate in Artsii


Undergraduate ${ }^{\text {iii }}$


Average Percentage Point Change

Graduate


Professional \& Continuing Studies

$\square \%$ White $\square$ \% Hispanic/ $\square$ \% Black/African $\square \%$ Asian $\square \%$ Multi-ethnic
Unknown Pacific Islander
Alaska Native

 percentages.
Source: UDSIS Official Extract.

How does UD's student enrollment compare to the State of Delaware's demographic make-up?
Though the racial/ethnic diversity of first-time, first-year Delawareans enrolling at UD has increased since 2013, a large gap exists between UD enrolled Black/African American first-time, first-year students from Delaware and the population of Black/African American high school graduates from Delaware and similar gaps exist for low-income Delawareans.

- The most recent data from 2013 to 2015 shows that the percentage of Hispanic/Latino(a) and Black/African American high school graduates in Delaware is higher than the percentage of Hispanic/Latino(a) and Black/African American Delawareans who enroll at UD as first-time, firstyear students (by 2-3\% and 20-21\% points, respectively).
- From 2013 to 2015, the proportion of low income Delawarean high school graduates was higher than the proportion of low income first-time, first-year Delawareans who enrolled at UD.

IPEDS Race/Ethnicity ${ }^{i}$ and Low Income ${ }^{\text {iv: }}$
UD Delawarean First-Time, First-Year Studentsv and Delawarean High School Graduates (Fall 2013 to Fall 2017)


[^1]Though UD graduate enrollment of Delawarean Hispanic/Latino(a)s is similar to the state population of Hispanic/Latino(a)s enrolled in graduate/professional school, large gaps between UD Delawarean enrollment and the state population of Delawareans exist for Black/African American undergraduate and graduate students.

- When only considering Delaware residents, the most recent data from 2015 show that the enrollment proportion of undergraduate Hispanic/Latino(a) students at UD lagged the state-wide estimated proportion of Hispanic/Latino(a) undergraduates enrolled in college by approximately $2 \%$. On the other hand, the proportion of Hispanic/Latino(a) graduate students enrolled at UD exceeded the statewide estimated proportion of Hispanic/Latino(a) students in graduate or professional school by approximately $1 \%$.
- When only considering Delaware residents, the proportion of undergraduate Black/African Americans enrolled at UD in 2015 lagged the statewide estimated proportion of Black/African American undergraduates enrolled in college in 2015 by approximately $18 \%$. Additionally, enrollment of Black/African American graduate students at UD lagged the statewide estimated proportion of Black/African Americans who enrolled in graduate/professional school by $14 \%$.

IPEDS Race/Ethnicity ${ }^{i}$ of UD Delawareans and Delawareans Enrolled in Postsecondary Institutions by Student Type (Fall 2015 to Fall 2017)

Undergraduate ${ }^{\text {iii }}$


Graduate


Delawareans


Enrolled in college as Enrolled in Graduate undergraduate or Professional school 2015



[^2]How does diversity and inclusion within UD's student body compare to other institutions?
Though lower at UD than at other institutions for undergraduate and graduate students, the representation of underrepresented minority students and students of color increases every year at UD within Associate in Arts, undergraduate, graduate, and Professional \& Continuing Studies student populations.

- Since 2012, the representation of underrepresented minority students and students of color at UD has consistently increased among Associate in Arts, undergraduate, graduate, and Professional \& Continuing Studies students.
- Since 2012, the proportion of underrepresented minority students is lower at UD than at AAU public institutions by about 4$5 \%$ for undergraduate students and 1-2\% for graduate students each year. Similarly, students of color make up a lower proportion of the student body at UD than at AAU public institutions.
- The representation of International students and Pell grant recipients at UD is characterized by either consistency or small gains since 2012 yet typically lags AAU public institutions.

Underrepresented Minorities ${ }^{\text {vi }}$, Students of Colorvii, International Students, \& Pell Grant Recipients ${ }^{\text {viii: }}$ UD and AAU Public Institutionsix by Student Type (Fall 2012 to Fall 2017)


Note. URM and SOC include only US citizens/permanent residents.
Source: UDSIS Official Extract and IPEDS, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/.

How has the representation of women and underrepresented minorities changed within Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) majors at UD?

The percentage of women with STEM majors has steadily increased almost yearly at UD since 2012 though disproportionately fewer women than men are STEM majors at UD. The disparity between women and men is most prevalent for UD graduate students.

- Though the proportion of undergraduate students with STEM majors is smaller for women than men (e.g., 29\% STEM women vs. $39 \%$ STEM men in 2017), the representation of undergraduate women in STEM increased approximately $5.6 \%$ from 2012 to 2017.
- The proportion of graduate students with STEM majors is dramatically smaller for women than men (e.g., $35 \%$ STEM women vs. $61 \%$ STEM men in 2017) yet the representation of graduate women in STEM increased by approximately $2.8 \%$ from 2012 to 2017.

STEM $^{\times}$Majors: Gender
(Fall 2012 to Fall 2017)


N Women: \% STEM ■ Women: \% not STEM majors ■\% Women \% Men: \% STEM majors Men: \% not STEM majors ■\% Men

|  |  | Number of UD Enrolled Students by Major Field and Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Associate in Arts |  |  | Undergraduate |  |  | Graduate |  |  | Professional \& Continuing Studies |  |  |
|  |  | Female | Male | Unknown | Female | Male | Unknown | Female | Male | Unknown | Female | Male | Unknown |
| 2017 | STEM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,011 | 2,995 | 1 | 718 | 1,196 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | not STEM | 407 | 397 | 0 | 7,439 | 4,698 | 0 | 1,355 | 751 | 1 | 440 | 361 | 1 |
| 2016 | STEM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,841 | 2,972 | 1 | 683 | 1,153 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | not STEM | 436 | 405 | 0 | 7,349 | 4,506 | 0 | 1,282 | 670 | 4 | 388 | 316 | 1 |
| 2015 | STEM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,687 | 2,930 | 2 | 666 | 1,124 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | not STEM | 413 | 365 | 0 | 7,449 | 4,507 | 0 | 1,261 | 691 | 6 | 402 | 344 | 1 |
| 2014 | STEM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,508 | 2,876 | 0 | 645 | 1,084 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | not STEM | 426 | 384 | 0 | 7,550 | 4,478 | 0 | 1,231 | 761 | 3 | 397 | 328 | 4 |
| 2013 | STEM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,358 | 2,764 | 0 | 612 | 1,054 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | not STEM | 428 | 430 | 0 | 7,349 | 4,400 | 0 | 1,240 | 770 | 3 | 396 | 359 | 3 |
| 2012 | STEM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,230 | 2,610 | 0 | 586 | 1,048 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | not STEM | 378 | 397 | 0 | 7,364 | 4,505 | 0 | 1,256 | 763 | 1 | 385 | 331 | 2 |

[^3]The percentage of underrepresented minority (URM) undergraduate and graduate students with STEM majors have increased since 2012. There is nearly equal representation of URM and non-URM undergraduates with STEM majors, but disproportionately fewer URM STEM majors among graduate students enrolled at UD.

- The proportion of URM undergraduate students enrolling with STEM (vs. non-STEM) majors increased over a 6-year time span by approximately $5 \%$ and is nearly equal to the proportion of non-URM undergraduate students enrolling in STEM (vs. non-STEM) majors.
- The proportion of graduate students enrolling with STEM majors is smaller for URM than non-URM students (e.g., in 2017, $31 \%$ STEM URM graduate students vs. $37 \%$ STEM non-URM graduate students); however, the representation of graduate URM students in STEM increased by approximately 4\% from 2012 to 2017.


## STEM Majors ${ }^{\text {x }}$ : Underrepresented Minorities ${ }^{\text {vi }}$

(Fall 2012 to Fall 2017)


■ URM: \% STEM majors $\square$ URM: \% not STEM majors $\square \%$ URM $\square$ not URM: \% STEM majors $\square$ not URM: \% not STEM majors $\square \%$ not URM

|  |  | Number of Enrolled UD Students by Major Field and Underrepresented Minority Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Associate in Arts |  |  | Undergraduate |  |  | Graduate |  |  | Professional \& Continuing Studies |  |  |
|  |  | URM | not URM | International | URM | not URM | International | URM | not URM | International | URM | not URM | International |
| 2017 | STEM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 790 | 4,857 | 360 | 113 | 866 | 938 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | not STEM | 220 | 575 | 9 | 1,631 | 9,990 | 516 | 257 | 1,458 | 392 | 125 | 651 | 26 |
| 2016 | STEM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 734 | 4,777 | 303 | 96 | 825 | 917 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | not STEM | 222 | 613 | 6 | 1,595 | 9,820 | 440 | 234 | 1,329 | 393 | 108 | 562 | 35 |
| 2015 | STEM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 688 | 4,616 | 315 | 90 | 811 | 893 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | not STEM | 192 | 580 | 6 | 1,567 | 10,033 | 356 | 207 | 1,292 | 459 | 109 | 604 | 34 |
| 2014 | STEM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 648 | 4,430 | 306 | 72 | 825 | 837 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | not STEM | 199 | 601 | 10 | 1,498 | 10,151 | 379 | 207 | 1,340 | 448 | 107 | 593 | 29 |
| 2013 | STEM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 616 | 4,230 | 276 | 72 | 815 | 779 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | not STEM | 195 | 649 | 14 | 1,395 | 9,907 | 447 | 190 | 1,399 | 424 | 102 | 616 | 40 |
| 2012 | STEM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 508 | 4,087 | 245 | 69 | 804 | 761 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | not STEM | 165 | 602 | 8 | 1,307 | 10,091 | 471 | 195 | 1,428 | 397 | 93 | 594 | 31 |

[^4]
## Degree Completion

How have graduation rates changed for students pursuing bachelor's degrees at UD?
Since 2011-2012, UD's 4-year graduation rates rose for all groups pursuing bachelor's degrees, except Race/ethnicity unknown and American Indian/Alaska Native.

- UD's 4-year graduation rate is consistently above the graduation rates of AAU public institutions for Hispanic/Latino(a)s and women pursuing bachelor's degrees.

Bachelor's Degrees:
4-Year Graduation Rates by IPEDS Race/Ethnicity ${ }^{i}$

$$
\leftrightarrow U D \quad-A A U \text { Publics }
$$



All Bachelor's Degree Recepients



Note. In figures: (1) Multi-ethnic not displayed because of missing data, and (2) Change ( $\Delta$ ) calculated on the unrounded difference in percentages between 2011-2012 and 2015-2016. Source: IPEDS, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, https:// nces.ed.gov/ipeds/.

How does UD's doctoral student completion times compare to other institutions?

- Except for UD underrepresented minority doctoral students in the field of Mathematics \& Computer Sciences, median years to degree completion in 2015 and 2016 for UD doctoral students were lower than or near equivalent to doctoral students at academic institutions in the United States that grant master's degrees or doctorates in science, engineering, or selected health fields.


[^5]
## How does UD compare to other institutions in terms of STEM degree completions?

Since 2011-2012, the percentage of STEM degrees awarded to underrepresented minorities, students of color, and women have generally increased. In comparison to other institutions, the most recently available data (2015-2010) shows that UD awards proportionally fewer STEM bachelor's degrees to women, underrepresented minorities, and students of color yet UD awards nearly equal or more STEM master's and doctoral degrees to these groups.

- The percentage of STEM (vs. not STEM) bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees awarded to women, underrepresented minorities, and students of color at UD generally increased from 2011-2012 to 2015-2016.
- The most recently available data from 2015-2016 show that the percentage of STEM bachelor's degrees awarded to women, underrepresented minority, students of color, and international students at UD was below the percentages at AAU public institutions. For example, $11 \%$ of the bachelor's degrees awarded to UD women were in STEM fields, whereas, $15 \%$ of bachelor's degrees awarded to women were in STEM fields at AAU public institutions.
- The percentage of STEM master's degrees awarded to women, underrepresented minorities, and students of color nearly equaled the percentages awarded to the same groups at AAU public institutions in 2015-2016. For example, $13 \%$ of the master's degrees awarded to UD underrepresented minorities were in STEM fields, whereas, $10 \%$ of master's degrees awarded to underrepresented minorities at AAU public institutions were in STEM fields.
- The percentage of STEM doctoral degrees awarded to every group exceeded the percentages awarded to the same groups at AAU public institutions in 2015-2016. For example, $25 \%$ of the doctoral degrees awarded to UD students of color were in STEM fields, whereas, $20 \%$ of the doctoral degrees awarded to underrepresented minorities at AAU public institutions were in STEM fields.


|  |  |  | Women | Men | URM ${ }^{\text {vi }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { not } \\ \text { URM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | SOCvii | $\begin{array}{r} \text { not } \\ \text { SOC } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Inter－ national | U．S．citizens／ permanent residents |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% STEM Doctoral Degrees | 岂 足 | AAU Publics | 22\％ | 38\％ | 22\％ | 25\％ | 25\％ | 25\％ | 41\％ | 25\％ |  |
|  |  |  | 17\％ | 25\％ | 16\％ | 18\％ | 20\％ | 17\％ | 33\％ | 18\％ | AAUPublics ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |
|  | 寺号 | AAU Publics | 18\％ | 31\％ | 9\％ | 19\％ | 16\％ | 19\％ | 36\％ | 18\％ | UD す ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
|  |  |  | 16\％ | 24\％ | 15\％ | 18\％ | 18\％ | 17\％ | 33\％ | 17\％ | AAUPublics ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |
|  | in 둘 | AAU Publics | 20\％ | 31\％ | 18\％ | 18\％ | 18\％ | 18\％ | 39\％ | 18\％ | ¢ ${ }^{\text {g }}$ |
|  |  |  | 16\％ | 24\％ | 16\％ | 17\％ | 18\％ | 17\％ | 34\％ | 17\％ | AAUPublics ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |
|  |  | UD <br> AAU Publics | 16\％ | 31\％ | 5\％ | 18\％ | 12\％ | 17\％ | 38\％ | 17\％ | ่̇ m |
|  |  |  | 17\％ | 24\％ | 15\％ | 17\％ | 18\％ | 17\％ | 32\％ | 17\％ | AAUPublics ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |
|  |  | ud AAU Publics | 19\％ | 31\％ | 21\％ | 16\％ | 18\％ | 16\％ | 42\％ | 16\％ | ก |
|  |  |  | 16\％ | 24\％ |  | 17\％ | 17\％ | 16\％ | 34\％ | 16\％ | AAUPublics ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |
|  |  | \％change | UD，3\％ AAUPublics，1\％ | UD，7\％ <br> AAUPublics， | UD，1\％ <br> AAUPublics， 3 | UD，9\％ AAUPublics， 1 | UD，7\％ <br> AAUPublics， 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UD, 8\% } \\ & \text { AAUPublics,1 } \end{aligned}$ | UD，－1\％ <br> AAUPublics，－1\％ | UD，8\％ <br> AAU Publics，1\％ |  |



Note．In figures：Change（ $\Delta$ ）calculated on the unrounded difference in percentages between 2011－2012 and 2015－2016．
Source：IPEDS，National Center for Education Statistics，U．S．Department of Education，https：／／nces．ed．gov／ipeds／．

# Faculty \& Staff <br> Goal: Recruit, develop, retain and promote a diverse faculty and staff 

The University of Delaware's commitment to Inclusive Excellence requires that our campus reflect the nation and world in which we all live. Inclusive Excellence stems from having exceptional, creative and diverse faculty and staff committed to excellence and poised to lead innovation in their respective fields.

## Hiring and Retention

How have the demographics of UD's faculty changed over time?
Women have increased in representation over the past five years, constituting 44\% of all UD faculty in 2017. Faculty racial/ethnic diversity has also increased since 2012, with the largest gains occurring for Asian tenured/tenure track and Black/African American non-tenure track faculty.

- The representation of Asian and Hispanic/Latino(a) tenured/tenure-track faculty and Black/African American non-tenure track faculty have increased since 2012.
- Women make up the majority of non-tenure track faculty; conversely, women are in the minority within tenured/tenure-track faculty. From 2012 to 2017, the proportion of tenured/tenure track women increased by almost $4 \%$ and the proportion of nontenure track women increased by $2.5 \%$.

Faculty by Tenure Status, IPEDS Race/Ethnicity ${ }^{i}$, and Gender
(Fall 2012 to Fall 2017)



Note. In figures: (1) though shown in the table, International faculty are excluded from the calculation of IPEDS race/ethnicity percentages; (2) bar slice areas are not drawn to scale; and (3) percentages less than $1 \%$ are not displayed.
Source: HR Official Extract.

How have the demographics of UD＇s staff changed over time？
The representation of women within UD staff has remained relatively constant over the past five years，with women constituting about $60 \%$ of all staff in 2017．Since 2012，racial／ethnic diversity among staff has seen modest increases， with the largest gains occurring for Asian and Hispanic／Latino（a）non－exempt staff．
－Asian and Hispanic／Latino（a）non－exempt staff and Hispanic／Latino（a）and Multi－ethnic hourly staff experienced representational gains of more than $1 \%$ since 2012.
－Since 2012，representational increases of less than $1 \%$ have occurred for Hispanic／Latino（a），Black／African American，Multi－ ethnic，and Asian exempt staff．
－Women make up the majority of exempt and non－exempt staff at UD，but are in the minority when considering hourly staff． From 2012 to 2017，the proportion of non－exempt and hourly women has decreased by $2 \%$ and the proportion of exempt women increased by about $1 \%$ ．

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|c|}{IPEDS Race／Ethnicityi and Gender by Employee Categoryxii （Fall 2012 to Fall 2017）} <br>
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Race／Ethnicty} \& \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Gender} <br>
\hline $$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 缟 } \\
& \text { 㗜 }
\end{aligned}
$$ \&  \&  \&  \& 59．8\％
40
$402 \%$
2013 \& 60．2\％
208\％
328\％
2014 \& 60．5\％
385
305
2015 \& 60．0\％
40．\％
2016 \& $59.2 \%$
48
408
2017 <br>
\hline \&  \&  \& $75.8 \%$

34．2\％
2012 \& 76．0\％
340\％
2013 \& 74．9\％ \& 74．7\％ \& 75．1\％ \& 73．7\％
26．3\％
2017 <br>

\hline 部 \&  \&  \&  \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 33.3 \% \\
& 601119 \\
& 66.7 \%
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
2013
$$ \& －${ }_{\text {33．3\％}}^{\text {¢ }}$ \& －${ }_{\text {¢ }}^{\text {32 }}$ \& 2016 \& －${ }_{\text {31．6\％}}^{\text {¢ }}$ <br>

\hline \& $\begin{array}{lll}■ \% \text { White } & \text { ■ \％Asian } & ■ \% \text { Multi－ethnic } \\ \text { ■ \％Black／African } & ■ \% \text { Race／Ethnicity } & ■ \% \text { American Indi }\end{array}$ \& ispanic／Latino（a） \& \& \％ \& en \& \& \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

|  |  |  | Number of UD Staff by Gender and IPEDS Race/Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | White | Hispanic/ <br> Latino(a) | Black/African American | Asian | Multi-ethnic | American Indian/ Alaska Native | Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander | Race/ethnicity unknown | International |
| Exempt |  | Women | 797 | 16 | 77 | 45 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
|  | 2012 | Men | 545 | 12 | 51 | 47 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 13 |
|  | 2013 | Women | 844 | 19 | 84 | 49 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 5 |
|  |  | Men | 550 | 16 | 54 | 40 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 12 |
|  | 2014 | Women | 893 | 22 | 83 | 49 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 5 |
|  |  | Men | 566 | 18 | 56 | 44 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 11 |
|  | 2015 | Women | 931 | 22 | 90 | 52 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
|  |  | Men | 587 | 16 | 58 | 48 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 12 |
|  | 2016 | Women | 946 | 24 | 81 | 51 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 11 |
|  |  | Men | 602 | 14 | 55 | 56 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 13 |
|  | 2017 | Women | 915 | 29 | 99 | 54 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 11 |
|  |  | Men | 617 | 15 | 62 | 52 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 17 |
| Hourly | 2012 | Women | 64 | 14 | 43 | 14 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Men | 178 | 13 | 67 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2013 | Women | 63 | 16 | 43 | 15 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Men | 187 | 14 | 69 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | Women | 66 | 17 | 35 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Men | 175 | 14 | 68 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 2015 | Women | 63 | 18 | 32 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Men | 177 | 14 | 71 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 2016 | Women | 55 | 19 | 27 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Men | 166 | 14 | 68 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 2017 | Women | 53 | 21 | 32 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Men | 169 | 16 | 70 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non-Exempt | 2012 | Women | 561 | 8 | 70 | 10 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 1 |
|  |  | Men | 175 | 1 | 24 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 2013 | Women | 542 | 9 | 68 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 2 |
|  |  | Men | 169 | 1 | 21 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | Women | 535 | 12 | 61 | 10 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 2 |
|  |  | Men | 176 | 2 | 23 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2015 | Women | 521 | 15 | 64 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 1 |
|  |  | Men | 172 | 2 | 24 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2016 | Women | 511 | 15 | 69 | 10 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
|  |  | Men | 167 | 3 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2017 | Women | 547 | 16 | 72 | 13 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
|  |  | Men | 185 | 6 | 26 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Note. In figures: (1) though shown in the table, International staff are excluded from the calculation of IPEDS race/ethnicity percentages; (2) bar slice areas are not drawn to scale; and (3) percentages less than $1 \%$ not displayed.
Source: HR Official Extract.

## Positions and Promotion

How have the patterns of diversity changed within faculty ranks?
Regardless of tenure status, women are underrepresented at the highest ranks, and only modest improvements have occurred since 2012. Tenured/tenure-track women generally start off in the assistant rank on equal footing with men, and their representation at the associate rank is steadily moving towards parity. Non-tenure track women are overrepresented at the instructor and assistant ranks, yet they are underrepresented at the associate and full ranks.

- With respect to tenured/tenure track women, the proportion of women assistant professors is at or above $50 \%$ and has been so for the last five years. The proportion of women associate professors is moving towards parity as evinced by the $5 \%$ increase in the representation of women since 2012, resulting in women making up $44 \%$ of associate professors in 2017 . Since 2012, only modest increases have occurred in the representation of women who are full professors.
- Women make up the majority of instructors and assistant professors within non-tenure track faculty and have done so for the past five years. Since 2012, the proportion of women associate professors decreased away from parity for non-tenure track faculty (e.g., of associate professors, $44 \%$ were women in 2012 and $39 \%$ were women in 2017). As of 2016, the proportion of women full professors moved towards parity with a $16 \%$ increase in representation for non-tenure track women faculty.


## Women Faculty by Tenure Status

(Fall 2012 to Fall 2017)


Note. In figures: (1) Instructor rank for tenured/tenure track faculty not displayed and dashed lines are the linear regression best-fit trend lines.
Source: HR Official Extract.

Within tenured/tenure track faculty, underrepresented minorities and faculty of color are underrepresented at the highest ranks, and only modest improvements have occurred since 2012. The majority of tenured/tenure-track faculty who are not underrepresented minorities or faculty of color are full professors, whereas, associate and assistant professors together constitute a majority for tenured/tenure-track underrepresented minority faculty and faculty of color.

- Among tenured/tenure-track faculty, the proportion of full professors (to lower ranks) has increased for underrepresented minority faculty and faculty of color since 2012; even so, there are proportionally fewer full professors and proportionally more assistant and associate professors among underrepresented minority faculty and faculty of color. For example, in 2017 the assistant: associate: full professor distribution of ranks within tenured/tenure track faculty was $17 \%: 34 \%$ : $49 \%$ for faculty who are not underrepresented minorities and $22 \%$ : $39 \%$ : $39 \%$ for underrepresented minority faculty.
- Among non-tenure track faculty, the proportion of instructors (to higher ranks) has decreased for underrepresented minority faculty since 2012; even so, there are proportionally more instructors among underrepresented minority faculty.

| Underrepresented Minority Facultyiv \& Faculty of Color ${ }^{\text {vii }}$ by Tenure Status (Fall 2012 to Fall 2017) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Tenured/Tenure Track | Non-Tenure Track |
| URM |  |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{llllllll}2012 & 2013 & 2014 & 2015 & 2016 & 2017\end{array}$ | $2012{ }^{2012}{ }^{2013}$ |
| not |  | 37,\%\% (i) |
| URM |  |  |
|  | $\square \%$ Instructor $■$ \% Assistant Professor $■$ \% Associate Professor $\quad$ \% Full Professor |  |
| FOC |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { no } \\ & \text { FOC } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |


|  | Tenured/Tenure Track |  |  |  |  |  |  | Non-Tenure Track |  |  |  |  |  |  | All Tracks w/ Admin position | w/o Admin position | $\begin{gathered} \text { All } \\ \text { Faculty } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | URM | FOC | International | All Faculty |  |  | Women | URM | FOC | International | All Faculty |  |  |  |  |  |
| Instructor | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2012 | Instructor | 89 | 14 | 20 | 0 | 122 | 2012 | Instructor | 2 | 120 | 122 |
| Assistant | 86 | 16 | 51 | 8 | 172 |  | Assistant | 72 | 11 | 24 | 2 | 142 |  | Assistant | 3 | 139 | 142 |
| Associate | 123 | 30 | 68 | 3 | 314 |  | Associate | 22 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 50 |  | Associate | 3 | 47 | 50 |
| Full Professor | 112 | 24 | 68 | 0 | 445 |  | Full Professor | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 |  | Full Professor | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| Instructor | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2013 | Instructor | 85 | 12 | 17 | 2 | 122 | 2013 | Instructor | 2 | 120 | 122 |
| Assistant | 81 | 13 | 47 | 7 | 161 |  | Assistant | 77 | 14 | 26 | 4 | 146 |  | Assistant | 3 | 143 | 146 |
| Associate | 122 | 29 | 68 | 2 | 306 |  | Associate | 21 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 53 |  | Associate | 4 | 49 | 53 |
| Full Professor | 124 | 27 | 72 | 0 | 457 |  | Full Professor | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 |  | Full Professor | 0 | 9 | 9 |
| Instructor | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2014 | Instructor | 80 | 12 | 16 | 1 | 117 | 2014 | Instructor | 2 | 115 | 117 |
| Assistant | 81 | 12 | 39 | 17 | 163 |  | Assistant | 81 | 17 | 26 | 6 | 148 |  | Assistant | 2 | 146 | 148 |
| Associate | 128 | 29 | 73 | 2 | 301 |  | Associate | 20 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 56 |  | Associate | 3 | 53 | 56 |
| Full Professor | 122 | 28 | 74 | 0 | 453 |  | Full Professor | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 14 |  | Full Professor | 0 | 14 | 14 |
| Instructor | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2015 | Instructor | 78 | 10 | 12 | 2 | 112 | 2015 | Instructor | 2 | 110 | 112 |
| Assistant | 83 | 11 | 38 | 26 | 163 |  | Assistant | 85 | 13 | 21 | 4 | 148 |  | Assistant | 5 | 143 | 148 |
| Associate | 135 | 31 | 75 | 2 | 309 |  | Associate | 21 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 57 |  | Associate | 3 | 54 | 57 |
| Full Professor | 120 | 26 | 75 | 0 | 448 |  | Full Professor | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 13 |  | Full Professor | 0 | 13 | 13 |
| Instructor | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2016 | Instructor | 74 | 9 | 11 | 1 | 102 | 2016 | Instructor | 2 | 100 | 102 |
| Assistant | 86 | 13 | 44 | 19 | 169 |  | Assistant | 88 | 15 | 25 | 5 | 157 |  | Assistant | 4 | 153 | 157 |
| Associate | 141 | 29 | 75 | 1 | 307 |  | Associate | 23 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 60 |  | Associate | 3 | 57 | 60 |
| Full Professor | 119 | 30 | 83 | , | 447 |  | Full Professor | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 14 |  | Full Professor | 0 | 14 | 14 |
| Instructor | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2017 | Instructor | 82 | 13 | 15 | 1 | 109 | 2017 | Instructor | 1 | 108 | 109 |
| Assistant | 96 | 17 | 48 | 19 | 182 |  | Assistant | 103 | 16 | 26 |  | 171 |  | Assistant | 6 | 165 | 171 |
| Associate | 140 | 31 | 85 | 2 | 316 |  | Associate | 24 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 61 |  | Associate | 3 | 58 | 61 |
| Full Professor | 124 | 31 | 87 | 0 | 448 |  | Full Professor | 7 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 19 |  | Full Professor | 0 | 19 | 19 |

Note. In figures: (1) Instructor rank for tenured/tenure track faculty not displayed and zero percentages are not displayed in text labels.
Source: HR Official Extract.

How has diversity changed for faculty leadership positions?

- The proportion of underrepresented minorities in faculty leadership positions in 2017 exceeds the representation of underrepresented minorities within the faculty. The proportion of women faculty and faculty of color in leadership positions in 2017 is below their representation within the faculty.


## Faculty with Administrative Appointments

(Fall 2012 to Fall 2017)

| Gender |  |  |  |  | Underrepresented Minorities ${ }^{\text {vi }}$ |  |  |  |  | Faculty of Colorvii |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100\% 50\% |  | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% | 100\% 50\% | 0\% | 50\% |  | 100\% | 100\% 50\% |  | 0\% | 50\% |  | 100\% |
| Total: \% Women, 40.6\% | 34\% | 2012 | 66\% |  | Total: \% URM, 7.8\% | 7\% 2012 |  | 93\% |  | Total: \% FOC, 19.1\% | 11\% | 2012 |  | 89\% |  |
| Total: \% Women, 41.0\% | 33\% | 2013 | 67\% |  | Total: \% URM, 7.8\% | 7\% 2013 |  | 93\% |  | Total: \% FOC, 19.1\% | 11\% | 2013 |  | 89\% |  |
| Total: \% Women, 41.3\% | 36\% | 2014 | 64\% |  | Total:\% URM, 8.3\% | 10\% 2014 |  | 90\% |  | Total: \% FOC, 19.4\% | 13\% | 2014 |  | 87\% |  |
| Total:\% Women, 42.0\% | 34\% | 2015 | 66\% |  | Total: \% URM, 7.8\% | 8\% 2015 |  | 92\% |  | Total: \% FOC, 18.9\% | 13\% | 2015 |  | 88\% |  |
| Total: \% Women, 42.7\% | 37\% | 2016 | 63\% |  | Total:\% URM, 8.1\% | 10\% 2016 |  | 90\% |  | Total: \% FOC, 20.1\% | 14\% | 2016 |  | 86\% |  |
| Total: \% Women, 44.1\% | 35\% | 2017 | 65\% |  | Total: \% URM, 8.9\% | 11\% 2017 |  | 89\% |  | Total: \% FOC, 21.4\% | 16\% | 2017 |  | 84\% |  |
| - Leadership: \% Women |  |  |  |  | Leadership: \% URM |  |  |  |  | Leadership: \% FOC |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\square$ Leadership: \% Men |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Leadership: \% not URM |  |  |  |  | Leadership: \% not FOC |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\square$ Total: \% Women |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Total: \% URM |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Total: \% FOC |  |  |  |  |  |

Note. Leadership categories include every job title level (e.g., Interim/Acting, Vice, Deputy, Associate, etc.) of Presidents, Provosts, Deans, Chairs, Academic Center Directors, and other administrative faculty positions (e.g., program/agency Director, Special Assistant).
Source: HR Offiical Extract.

How has staff diversity changed over time?

- The representation of women, underrepresented minorities, and staff of color within executive/administrative/managerial staff is marked by wide fluctuations across the years.
- Women are in the majority within professional and secretarial/clerical staff and their representation within these job categories has remained stable since 2012.
- Modest gains and stability characterize the representation of underrepresented minorities and staff of color from 2012 to 2017 in all of the job categories except for the executive/administrative/managerial category.



|  |  | Executive/Admin /Managerial | Professional | Clerical/ <br> Secretarial | Technical/ Paraprofessiona | Service/ Maintenance | Skilled Crafts | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Women | 2012 | 9 | 940 | 560 | 100 | 132 | 5 | 0 |
|  | 2013 | 9 | 1,002 | 545 | 94 | 135 | 5 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 7 | 1,046 | 536 | 97 | 131 | 4 | 10 |
|  | 2015 | 7 | 1,113 | 529 | 96 | 127 | 3 | 0 |
|  | 2016 | 5 | 1,123 | 518 | 98 | 117 | 3 | 0 |
|  | 2017 | 4 | 1,202 | 483 | 94 | 122 | 3 | 0 |
| URM | 2012 | 3 | 67 | 121 | 20 | 43 | 159 | 0 |
|  | 2013 | 5 | 66 | 126 | 21 | 39 | 174 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 6 | 63 | 118 | 21 | 40 | 179 | 0 |
|  | 2015 | 5 | 70 | 118 | 21 | 40 | 188 | 0 |
|  | 2016 | 1 | 74 | 111 | 19 | 40 | 180 | 1 |
|  | 2017 | 2 | 71 | 123 | 19 | 44 | 221 | 0 |
| Staff of Color | 2012 | 3 | 77 | 141 | 20 | 49 | 251 | 0 |
|  | 2013 | 5 | 73 | 146 | 21 | 47 | 263 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 6 | 73 | 139 | 21 | 47 | 267 | 5 |
|  | 2015 | 5 | 80 | 140 | 21 | 46 | 288 | 0 |
|  | 2016 | 1 | 83 | 137 | 19 | 47 | 287 | 1 |
|  | 2017 | 2 | 78 | 149 | 19 | 52 | 332 | 0 |
| All Staff | 2012 | 27 | 611 | 271 | 133 | 260 | 1,599 | 0 |
|  | 2013 | 25 | 591 | 280 | 141 | 250 | 1,665 | 1 |
|  | 2014 | 27 | 589 | 270 | 136 | 255 | 1,717 | 22 |
|  | 2015 | 26 | 582 | 270 | 136 | 254 | 1,825 | 0 |
|  | 2016 | 13 | 570 | 257 | 127 | 249 | 1,866 | 1 |
|  | 2017 | 14 | 536 | 266 | 130 | 252 | 1,989 | 0 |

Source: HR Official Extract.

## Climate \& Culture

## Goal: Building community and improving campus climate

The University of Delaware's collective mission of valuing and respecting diverse people and cultures means we must be intentional in our work to make our campus more equitable, diverse, and inclusive at every level of the institution. Most importantly, we want to continue to cultivate a more welcoming campus community where faculty, staff, and students can thrive and all are valued and appreciated.

## Students

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Administered to first-year and senior undergraduate students at UD in Spring 2017, NSSE collects information about the ways in which first-year and senior students study, learn, and interact with faculty and each other. Full survey reports are available at the Institutional Research \& Effectiveness website, http://ire.udel.edu/ir/nsse/.

- Though $57 \%$ of international first-year and senior students believed that UD encourages contact among students from different backgrounds some or very little, $60 \%$ of them believe that their experience at UD contributes quite a bit or very much to understanding people of other backgrounds.
- Upwards of $59 \%$ of first-year and senior women, underrepresented minorities, students of color, and international undergraduates believed that their experience at UD contributes quite a bit or very much to understanding people of other backgrounds.
- Proportionally more first-year women and international students considered leaving UD because of campus climate, location, and culture than any other group yet this proportion was consonant with the average proportion of first-year students who considered leaving UD because of campus climate, location, and culture (33\%).


Higher Education Research Institute (HERI), Diverse Learning Environments (DLE) Survey Developed to capture student perceptions about institutional climate and experiences with faculty, staff, and peers, the DLE was administered to undergraduates at the Newark campus in Spring 2016. Survey reports are available at the Center for the Study of Diversity website, https://www.csd.udel.edu/publications-communication/campus-climate.

- Between 19-21\% of students of color, underrepresented minority, and international students felt excluded very often or often because of their identity since coming to UD compared to $12 \%$ of all undergraduates who felt excluded very often or often because of their identity.
- Proportionally more international students very often or often felt unwelcome on campus because of their identity ( $28 \%$ ) than any other group, which was followed in proportion by underrepresented minority students ( $22 \%$ ) and students of color ( $20 \%$ ).
- Upwards of $78 \%$ of students of color, women, underrepresented minority, and international students strongly agree or agree that they see themselves as part of the campus community, which is on par with the proportion of all undergraduates (79\%) who see themselves as part of the campus community.
- Proportionally more underrepresented minorities and students of color strongly disagree or disagree that UD promotes the appreciation of cultural differences ( $34 \%$ and $29 \%$, respectively) than women and international students ( $16 \%$ and $15 \%$, respectively).

| DLE Ratings Related to UD's Diversity and Inclusion Climate |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Felt excluded because of their identity since coming to UD | Felt unwelcome in residence halls, classrooms, student centers, dining halls, libraries, etc. because of their identity since coming to UD | Saw themselves as a part of the campus community. | Believed that UD promotes the appreciation of cultural differences |
| $\begin{aligned} & \Xi \\ & \ddot{U} \\ & 0 \\ & B \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\sum_{\substack{5 \\ 0}}$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { B } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | - Very Often or Often: \% Undergraduates <br> ■ Never, Seldom, or Sometimes: \% Undergraduates |  | Strongly Disagree or Disagree: \% Undergraduates <br> Strongly Agree or Agree: \% Undergraduates |  |
| Note. The examples presented in the survey to define identity were gender, citizenship, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic class, political affiliation, ability/disability status, religious/spiritual affiliation, and sexual orientation. Original 5-point scales collapsed into 2-point scales. URM and SOC include only U.S. citizens/permanent residents. |  |  |  |  |

Graduate Student Experience in the Research University (gradSERU) Administered to graduate students at UD in Spring 2017, the gradSERU is a comprehensive, longitudinal study initiated by the Center for the Study of Higher Education (CSHE) and the University of Minnesota's Office of Institutional Research to help answer questions about the potential relationship between graduate education experiences, program characteristics, and development outcomes of masters and doctoral students at the leading research universities across the globe. Survey reports are available at the Institutional Research \& Effectiveness website, http://ire.udel.edu/ir/surveys/.

- The highest proportion of graduate students who agree or strongly agree that overall climate is positive and welcoming are international students followed in proportion by women, students of color, and underrepresented minorities.
- Only $11 \%$ of women graduate students disagree or strongly disagree that the climate for female students is equivalent to the climate for male students.
- More than a quarter of underrepresented minority graduate students disagree or strongly disagree that the climate for racial/ethnic minorities is about equal to the climate for non-minority students.
- Only $12 \%$ of international graduate students disagree or strongly disagree that the climate for international students is equivalent to the climate for domestic students.

| gradSERU Ratings Related to UD's Diversity and Inclusion Climate |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Climate for female students is at least as good as it is for male students | Climate for racial/ethnic minority students is at least as good as it is for non-minority students | Climate for int'l students is at least as good as it is for domestic students | Overall environment/climate is positive \& welcoming |
| E E O $\stackrel{3}{3}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \% \\ & 89 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12 \% \\ 88 \% \end{array}$ | 13\% 87\% | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \% \\ & 89 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| 号 | 17\% 83\% |  | 15\% 85\% | 17\% 83\% |
| : |  |  | $17 \%$ 83\% |  |
|  | 5\% 95\% |  | $12 \%$ 88\% |  |
|  | 8\% 92\% | $10 \%$ 90\% | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \% \\ & 88 \% \end{aligned}$ | 9\% 91\% |
| - Strongly Disagree or Disagree: \% Graduates - Strongly Agree or Agree: \% Graduates |  |  |  |  |
| Note. Original 4-point scale collapsed into a 2-point scale. Excludes graduate students who did not respond to gender, citizenship, or race/ethnicity questions. URM and SOC include only U.S citizens/permanent residents. |  |  |  |  |

## Faculty

Faculty Climate Survey The faculty climate survey, developed by the NSF ADVANCE IT leadership team in partnership with Institutional Research and Effectiveness, assessed the climate for full-time tenured/tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty in Spring 2016. A full report on the survey results, as well as an executive summary, are available online at the UD ADVANCE website http://sites.udel.edu/advance/research-new/institutional-research-and-data/.

- The largest proportion of faculty who rated the overall climate for diversity higher than very poor or poor (i.e., fair, average, good, very good, or excellent) were women, who were followed in proportion by international faculty, faculty of color, and underrepresented minority faculty.
- Only $15 \%$ of UD women faculty believe that the climate for women faculty is poor or very poor.
- Nearly two-fifths of UD's faculty of color and nearly one-half of UD's underrepresented faculty believe that the climate for faculty of color is poor or very poor.

| Faculty Climate Survey Ratings Related to UD Climate |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | The climate for women faculty | The climate for faculty of color | The overall climate for diversity |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{E}{\tilde{0}} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| 号 |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 㤫 } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| - Very Poor or Poor: \% Faculty - Fair, Average, Good, Very Good, or Excellent: \% Faculty |  |  |  |

[^6] FOC include only U.S citizens/permanent residents.

## Endnotes

${ }^{\mathrm{i}}$ IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System) Race/Ethnicity definitions of the National Center for Education Statistics (U.S. Department of Education): In federal race/ethnicity reporting, all individuals who are not U.S. citizens or permanent residents are foreigners classified as Non-resident aliens (UD calls this group International). Non-foreign individuals who identify as Hispanic/Latino(a) are classified as Hispanic/Latino(a) regardless of whether they also identify with any other race/ethnicity category. American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Black/African American, and White are individuals who are not foreign, are not Hispanic/Latino(a), and identify as one and only one race/ethnicity category. Finally, all non-foreign and nonHispanic/Latino(a) individuals who identify as more than one race/ethnicity category are classified as Two or more Races (UD calls this group Multi-ethnic).
${ }^{i i}$ UD Associate in Arts (AA) includes full- and part-time students enrolled in associate's degree programs at the Dover, Georgetown, and Wilmington campuses.
iii UD Undergraduates include full- and part-time students enrolled in bachelor's degree programs.
${ }^{\text {iv }}$ Low Income UD students are individuals whose taxable family income for the preceding year did not exceed 150 percent of the federal poverty guidelines published by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
${ }^{v}$ First-Time, First-Year Student cohorts follow IPEDS definitions for reporting degree-seeking, undergraduate student fall enrollment and includes full- and part-time students enrolled in associate's and bachelor's degree programs at all campuses.
${ }^{\text {vi }}$ Underrepresented Minorities (URM) include persons who identify as American Indian/Alaska Native, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino(a), or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander according to the IPEDS race/ethnicity classification system.
vii Students of Color (SOC), Faculty of Color (FOC), and Staff of Color (SfOC) include persons who identify as Asian, American Indian/Alaska Native, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino(a), or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander according to the IPEDS race/ethnicity classification system.
viii Pell Grant Recipients are low income associate's and bachelor's degree students who receive need-based federal grants based on expected family contribution (EFC), the cost of attendance, part- or full-time enrollment status, and academic year length of attendance.
${ }^{\text {ix }}$ Association of American Universities (AAU) publics are 34 public research universities that are members of the Association of American Universities.
${ }^{x}$ STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) major and degree designations at UD are based on the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's 2016 list of designated degree programs,
https://www.ice.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Document/2016/stem-list.pdf, which is based on the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) definition of STEM fields. STEM majors and degrees are designated by their 6-digit CIP codes (NCES, U.S. Department of Education).
${ }^{\text {xi }}$ The Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP), developed by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics, provides a taxonomic scheme that supports the accurate tracking and reporting of fields of study and program completions activity.
xii Employees entitled to minimum wage and overtime pay provisions under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) are called Non-Exempt. Employees classified as Exempt are paid on a salary basis and are exempt from the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the FLSA. The most common exemptions are for executive, administrative, professional, outside sales employees, and computer professionals.
xiii Job category is based on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's (EEOC) reporting form for Institutions of Higher Education (i.e., EEO-6 categories and definitions).

The University of Delaware does not discriminate against any person on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, genetic information, marital status, disability, religion, age, veteran status or any other characteristic protected by applicable law in its employment, educational programs and activities, admissions policies, and scholarship and loan programs as required by Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and other applicable statutes and University policies. The University of Delaware also prohibits unlawful harassment including sexual harassment and sexual violence.

For inquiries or complaints related to non-discrimination policies, please contact:

Fatimah Stone
Interim Director, Institutional Equity \& Title IX Coordinator
305 Hullihen Hall, Newark, DE 19716
302-831-8063
fstone@udel.edu

For complaints related to Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and/or the Americans with Disabilities Act, please contact:

Anne L. Jannarone, M.Ed., Ed.S.
Director, Office of Disability Support Services
Alison Hall, Suite 130
Newark, DE 19716
302-831-4643
ajannaro@udel.edu

OR contact the U.S. Department of Education - Office for Civil Rights.


[^0]:    Note. Students include Associate in Arts (AA), Newark campus undergraduates (UGRAD), graduate (GRAD), and Professoinal \& Continuing Studies (PCS). Faculty include tenured/tenure-track (T/TT) and non-tenure track (NT). \% of Color includes persons who identify as Asian, American Indian/Alaska Native, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino(a), or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander according to the IPEDS race/ethnicity classification system.
    Source: UDSIS Official Extract and HR Official Extract.

[^1]:    Note. In figures: (1) to match data source definitions, calculated percentages exclude race/ethncity unknown and Asian is grouped together with Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; (2) calculated percentages exclude International; (3) positive percentage point change indicates that the $\%$ of UD's Delawarean enrollment exceeded the $\%$ of Delawarean high school graduates; and (4) scales differ among the demographic categories.
    Source: UDSIS Official Extract and U.S. Department of Education, ED Data Express, https://eddataexpress.ed.gov, and EDFacts/Consolidated State Performance Report, http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/consolidated/index.html.

[^2]:    Note. In figures: (1) Percentages less than $1 \%$ are not displayed.
    Source: UDSIS Official Extract and 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, U.S. Census Bureau, https://factfinder.census.gov/.

[^3]:    Note. Figure percentages comparing women and men exclude students of unknown gender.
    Source: UDSIS Official Extract.

[^4]:    Note. Though shown in the table, International students are excluded from the calculation of URM percentages in the figure. URM includes only US citizens/permanent residents.
    Source: UDSIS Official Extract.

[^5]:    Note. Academic disciplines generated using CIP codesxi (National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education).
    Source: UD Degree Data Mart and 2015 and 2016 Survey of Earned Doctorates, National Science Foundation, National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics,
    https://www.nsf.gov/statistics/srvydoctorates/.

[^6]:    Note. Original 7-point scale collapsed into a 2-point scale. Excludes faculty who did not respond to tenure status and gender, citizenship, or race/ethnicity questions. URM and

