

2006-2007 Diversity Plan Review

1. What worked, what didn't work

Goals/ Actions Outlined in your plan	Current status and/or Outcomes
<p>For Faculty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Increase the applicant pool for females & minorities (2) Increase diversity of adjunct faculty (3) Increase connections to emerging scientists (those just finishing their PhD) (4) Increase diversity of faculty research collaborations with minority scientists 	<p>For Faculty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Female applicants for two of our hires were increased (2) Our Adjunct faculty are not part of a hiring process – therefore, this plan was found not to be feasible – will be dropped. (3) We were not able to accomplish this goal due to the lack of coordination with faculty and a designated amount of money not allocated to the goal. We will try and work on this for the coming year. (4) This effort was also not accomplished due to the lack of coordination with faculty and a particular amount of money dedicated to the goal. We will try and work on this for the coming year.
<p>For Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Increase diversity of cultures in seminars (2) Increase student exchanges for students from other countries and from minority schools (3) Increase connections to emerging scientists (4) Participate in University functions (5) Increase visibility of diversity goals and activities (6) Determine potential collaborative universities with Urban Ecology offerings and with high proportions of females & minorities (7) Increase participation in programs for Native Americans (8) Increase connections to Federal agencies with funding for minority recruitment 	<p>For Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) This was not implemented due to the lack of coordination with faculty – we will be reevaluating this goal to see if it is feasible (2) There is a new program in the Ecosystem Science Center to increase student exchanges for students and faculty from other countries (3) This goal was not coordinated very well this year due to the lack of coordination with faculty – we will be reevaluating this goal to see if it is feasible (4) (a) Gave three hands-on activities for the Explorathon in March. Explorathon provides math and science career explorations for women in grades 8-12. Approximately 50% of the students in attendance were non-majority (b) Hosted eleven students from the genetics Summer Youth Program. Victor Busov provided an activity and I gave them a tour of the school. Five students were non-majority. (5) (a) Sent promotional posters to all high schools in Detroit and surrounding counties, Minneapolis and surrounding counties, and Green Bay and surrounding counties (b) Presented hands-on program for the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community After-School Youth group on three occasions. (6) This goal has not yet been achieved. (7) Provided an informational booth for the Career Fair at the American Indians in Science and Engineering Society conference held in Detroit in November. The conference was attended by 423 college students and 109 high school students. (8) This was not implemented due to the lack of coordination with faculty – we will be reevaluating this goal to see if there are faculty interested in this effort and whether the Dean should be developing a proposal to Federal Agencies

	<p>Other efforts not listed on our 2006-07 plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Co-instructed a forest measurement class for ten Detroit Area Pre-College Engineering Program students. All of the students were of African American descent. 2. Gave career presentations for five classes at Ladywood High School, an all-girls school. 3. Out of 73 departmental scholarship awards, 47% of the awards were given to women and 4% of the awards were given to non-majority students. 4. Provided information and hands-on activity for the YES Expo in Detroit. Below are the diversity statistics for the students who attended the YES Expo. <table data-bbox="1117 747 1511 926" style="margin-left: 40px;"> <tr><td>50.7%</td><td>African American</td></tr> <tr><td>42.4%</td><td>Caucasian</td></tr> <tr><td>3.9%</td><td>Hispanic</td></tr> <tr><td>1.7%</td><td>Asian</td></tr> <tr><td>1.1%</td><td>Multicultural</td></tr> <tr><td>0.4%</td><td>Native American</td></tr> </table> 	50.7%	African American	42.4%	Caucasian	3.9%	Hispanic	1.7%	Asian	1.1%	Multicultural	0.4%	Native American
50.7%	African American												
42.4%	Caucasian												
3.9%	Hispanic												
1.7%	Asian												
1.1%	Multicultural												
0.4%	Native American												
<p>For Staff</p> <p>(1) Increase female & minority post docs</p>	<p>For Staff</p> <p>(1) This was not implemented due to the lack of coordination with faculty – we will be reevaluating this goal to see if it is feasible</p>												

2. Please note any Best Practices (successes) that other departments might consider adopting.

- We are seeing some recent success in recruiting from minority high schools such as Cass Tech. This success seems to be due to the involvement of faculty in outreach efforts associated with various research programs/funding such as Biotechnology and Global Climate Change.
- Teachers Institutes are giving us more exposure to the science and math teachers interested in our degree programs.

3. Please note any ideas your department has for improving outcomes

- More plan development is needed with faculty to assist in generating ideas to recruit and retain female and minority students.

Return to Jane Waters (jewaters@mtu.edu).

ATTACHMENT 3, PART 1

**Enrollment Mix
TARGET PERCENTAGES**

Undergraduate Enrollment Targets by Enrollment Mix 2004 – 2010						
Type of Student	2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Target	2010 Target	2006 – 2010 Difference
Domestic Resident	72%	72%	71%	68%	60%	- 11%
Domestic Non-Resident	24%	24%	25%	26%	30%	5%
International	4%	4%	4%	5%	10%	6%

Undergraduate Enrollment Goals by Gender 2004 – 2010						
Gender	2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Target	2010 Target	2006 – 2010 Difference
Female	23%	22%	23%	25%	30%	7%
Male	77%	78%	77%	75%	70%	-7%

Undergraduate Diversity Goals 2004 – 2010 *						
Ethnic Group	2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Target	2010 Target	2006 – 2010 Difference
African American	1.8%	1.7%	1.9%	2.75%	3.5%	1.6%
Asian American	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	2.55%	3.8%	2.7%
Hispanic American	1.2%	1.5%	1.2%	2.05%	3.0%	1.8%
Native American	0.9%	0.8%	1.0%	1.25%	1.5%	0.5%
Multiracial	0.5%	0.7%	0.7%	1.00%		
White	81.5%	81.4%	86.4%	82.30%	77.2%	- 9.2%
International	4.3%	3.8%	3.9%	7.7%	11.0%	7.1%
Undeclared	3.4%	3.4%	3.8%	0.45%		

* Enrollment diversity goals were established by the University Diversity Committee and approved by the Deans in 2005. These goals, however, were established for 2015. Therefore, the 2010 percentages denote the median between 2006 and 2015. These percentages do not include distance education students.

Enrollment Mix TARGET PERCENTAGES

Graduate Enrollment Targets by Enrollment Mix 2004 – 2010						
Type of Student	2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Target	2010 Target	2006 – 2010 Difference
Domestic Resident	34%	33%	35%	31%	26%	-9%
Domestic Non-Resident	21%	23%	25%	25%	29%	4%
International	45%	44%	40%	45%	45%	5%

Graduate Enrollment Goals by Gender 2004 – 2010						
Gender	2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Target	2010 Target	2006 – 2010 Difference
Female	34%	34%	34%	35%	38%	15%
Male	66%	66%	66%	65%	62%	-15%

Graduate Diversity Goals 2004 – 2010 *						
Ethnic Group	2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Target	2010 Target	2006 – 2010 Difference
African American	1.0%	1.7%	1.7%	2.0%	4.0%	2.3%
Asian American	1.0%	1.0%	1.6%	2.0%	2.0%	0.6%
Hispanic American	1.9%	1.8%	2.0%	2.5%	5.0%	3.0%
Native American	0.5%	0.2%	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%	0.1%
Multiracial	0.4%	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%	1.0%	0.4%
White	47.7%	46.8%	49.5%	43.3%	38.5%	-11%
International	44.5%	44.1%	40.3%	45.0%	45.0%	4.7%
Undeclared	3.0%	3.8%	3.8%	4.0%	4.0%	0.2%

* Enrollment diversity goals were established by the University Diversity Committee and approved by the Deans in 2005. These goals, however, were established for 2015. Therefore, the 2010 percentages denote the median between 2006 and 2015. These percentages do not include distance education students.

**2006-2007 Diversity Plan Review
Department/School/College Demographics***

Undergraduate Students (Total=42/152)

	2005-06 Number	% of Dept. Total	2006-07 Number	% of Dept. Total
Male	93	65.5	101	66.4
Female	49	34.5	51	33.6
Transgender	-	-	1	0.7
African American	-	-	1	0.7
Hispanic/Latino	1	0.7	1	0.7
Native American	5	3.5	3	2
Asian American	-	-	-	-
Multi Racial	-	-	-	-
International	1	0.7	-	-

Graduate Students (Total=85/76)

	2005-06 Number	% of Dept. Total	2006-07 Number	% of Dept. Total
Male	39	45.9	36	47.4
Female	46	54.1	40	52.6
Transgender	-	-	-	-
African American	1	1.2	-	-
Hispanic/Latino	3	3.5	3	3.9
Native American	-	-	-	-
Asian American	-	-	-	-
Multi Racial	1	1.2	-	-
International	23	27.1	17	22.4

Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty (Total=16/17)

	2005-06 Number	% of Dept. Total	2006-07 Number	% of Dept. Total
Male	13	81.3	13	76.5
Female	3	18.8	4	23.5
Transgender	-	-	-	-
African American	-	-	-	-
Hispanic/Latino	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-
Asian American	1	6.3	1	5.9
Multi Racial	-	-	-	-
International	2	12.5	2	11.8

College/School-Wide Staff (Total=53/67)

	2005-06 Number	% of Dept. Total	2006-07 Number	% of Dept. Total
Male	22	41.5	31	46.3
Female	31	58.5	36	53.7
Transgender	-	-	-	-
African American	-	-	-	-
Hispanic/Latino	-	-	-	-
Native American	-	-	-	-
Asian American	1	1.9	1	1.5
Multi Racial	-	-	-	-
International	9	17.0	14	20.9

*Source: MTU Institutional Analysis

These numbers and percentages do not include distance education students.