

Annual Assessment Report

Reporting Unit: Division of Student Affairs (DSA)	Reporting Date: December, 2014
Report Contact Name: Dr. CJ Woods and Dr. Timothy Salazar	Contact email: cjwoods@tamu.edu/timothysalazar@tamu.edu

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

- ✓ Administrators (applicable to all organizations)
- ✓ Budgeted Staff (applicable to all organizations)

1) Engaging the Data

Over the previous two annual reporting cycles women in the Division of Student Affairs at Texas A&M University (DSA) have been a theme. For example, in 2012 it was identified that DSA has a larger percentage of women than our benchmarking peers and in 2013 it was shown that while women over the previous four years make up 57% of DSA workforce, only 40% of executive positions are held by women. In the 2013 annual diversity report it was addressed that the 40% ratio of women in executive positions does not reflect DSA employment patterns or University patterns of women in executive/admin positions. Looking at how this has changed currently in 2014 within the DSA, nine of the 21 directors and vice president level positions are female or 43% of these senior management positions. Executive level positions held by women are: (1) Assistant Vice President, (2) Dean of Student Life, (3) Director of Residence Life, (4) Director of Student Health Services, (5) Director of Student Counseling Services, (6) Director of Student Life Studies, (7) Director of Becky Gates Children Center, (8) Director of Multicultural Services, and (9) Director of Disability Services. This ratio is not out of line with data from peer institutions however, making the comparison of women in similar management positions at benchmarking institutions was difficult due to data reporting issues. In reviewing the data compared with peer institutions, a number of methodological issues arose that made comparisons difficult. Using IPEDS data codes in 2014 was a departure from job categories used in previous years. Two of our benchmark institutions have not fully converted all data sets to the IPEDS codes, therefore challenges were apparent with administrative and staff coding. This makes the comparison of women in “executive” positions outlined in previous reports difficult to directly compare with IPEDS categories. For example, University of Florida provided IPEDS data for their student affairs staff broken down by gender and race/ethnicity however, the data provided does not breakout job categories. Conversely, Ohio State University provided data on gender, race/ethnicity, and job categories however, job category information provided does not use standard IPEDS job classifications. Ohio State University uses categories similar to Texas A&M University job categories used in previous reports. Using these categories, Ohio State reports 48% of “Executive, Administrative” positions staffed by females. University of Texas at Austin uses the IPEDS categories of “Management Occupations” and shows 62% of “Management Occupations” are staffed by females. To put these ratios of females in senior student affairs positions into context, the ratio of females in executive positions at each benchmarking institution was higher than the 31% of females identified in senior student affairs positions in 2008 at large public institutions (Tull and Freeman, 2008).

Table 1: Executive Position Breakdown by Institution

Females in Executive Administrative/Management Occupations	Percent of Positions in that are Executive / Management Occupations
UT Austin – 62% (87)	UT Austin – 10% (87/887)
Ohio State – 48% (77)	Ohio State – 7% (77/1084)
Texas A&M – 43% (21)	Texas A&M – 4% (21/491)
Florida – No Data Available	Florida – No Data Available

Table 1 displays the percentage of female employees in Executive Administrative/Management Occupations along with the percentage of upper strata positions compared to student affairs staff positions. Of the peer institutions who provide comparative data, Texas A&M has the lowest percentage of positions at the Executive level. Along with the fewest opportunities for upper level positions, DSA has the lowest percent of positions staffed by females. UT Austin has the highest number of females in “Management Occupations” but also has the highest ratio of staff members in Management Occupations (10%) and has over four times as many upper strata positions as DSA. Similarly, Ohio State has 48% of their Executive/Administrative positions staffed by females with 7% of staffing in the Executive/Administrative categories but has nearly four times as many upper level positions as DSA.

Table 2 shows that DSA is comparable to peer institutions in most categories. Each institution has unique characteristics that set them apart in one category. For example University of Florida shows 72% of staff are female, 15% higher than the next closest peer. Ohio State shows 27% African American, 14% higher than the next closest peer. UT Austin shows 39% Hispanic, 32% higher than the next closest peer. When looking past these extreme differences in Female, African American, and Hispanic populations, DSA is within range of peer institutions in these and other categories.

Table 2. Overall Historical Trends of Gender and Ethnicity within Division of Student Affairs

<u>Women</u> (1) Florida - 72% (527) (2) UT Austin – 57% (887) (3) Texas A&M – 54% (491) (4) Ohio State – 50% (1084)	<u>African American</u> (1) Ohio State – 27% (1084) (2) UT Austin – 13% (887) (3) Florida - 11% (527) (4) Texas A&M – 10% (491)	<u>Asian</u> (1) Ohio State – 4% (1084) (2) Texas A&M – 3% (491) (3) Florida - 3% (527) (4) UT Austin – 2% (887)
<u>Native American</u> (1) Florida - 1% (527) (2) Texas A&M – 1% (491) (3) Ohio State – 0% (1084) (4) UT Austin – 0% (887)	<u>Hispanic</u> (1) UT Austin – 39% (887) (2) Texas A&M – 7% (491) (3) Florida - 7% (527) (4) Ohio State – 2% (1084)	<u>White</u> (1) Florida - 78% (527) (2) Texas A&M – 76% (491) (3) Ohio State – 60% (1084) (4) UT Austin – 45% (887)
<u>Hawaiian</u> (1) Ohio State – 0% (1084) (2) Florida - 0% (527) (3) UT Austin – 0% (887) (4) Texas A&M – 0% (491)	<u>Undisclosed</u> (1) Ohio State – 6% (1084) (2) Texas A&M – 2% (491) (3) UT Austin – 1% (887) (4) Florida - 0% (527)	<u>2 or More Races</u> (1) Florida - 1% (527) (2) Ohio State – 1% (1084) (3) Texas A&M – 0% (491) (4) UT Austin – 0% (887)

Table 3 shows differences identified in the number of staff at peer benchmark institutions. When comparing staffing ratios to student enrollment, large differences were observed between DSA and other student affairs operations at comparable institutions (Table 3). DSA has the lowest ratio of full time staff per 1000 students enrolled among peer benchmark institutions. University of Florida is the closest peer with 11 full time staff per 1000 students enrolled. However, DSA has 10 less full time staff members per 1000 enrolled students than Ohio State and 8 less fulltime staff members than UT Austin. It is recognized that each institution has a different profile of offices and functions represented by their division of student affairs, however, given the nature of the mission and duties of student affairs, it is a reasonable comparison of the scope of personnel represented in the units. For example, UT Austin student affairs contains their food services and Ohio State student affairs houses facility management and logistics, these are two areas that have been outsourced to private vendors at Texas A&M University. Understanding that there are differences in the profiles of student affairs divisions at peer institutions is important to consider when looking at demographic breakdowns, size, and staffing ratios. A comparison of departments shows that DSA is closest to University of Florida in terms of departments within their division. Regardless, DSA is operating with a lower ratio of fulltime staff than any of the benchmark peers and lowest ratio of staff in executive level positions.

Table 3: Division of Student Affairs Staffing Ratios per 1000 students enrolled

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Employees</u>	<u>Ratio</u>
(1) Ohio State	57466	1084	19:1000
(2) UT Austin	52059	887	17:1000
(3) Florida	49878	527	11:1000
(4) Texas A&M	53576	491	9:1000

DSA efforts to engage unit leaders and communicate the results of knowledge gained through the annual diversity report process included a formal retreat for all department directors. This half-day retreat was facilitated by Kelli McCloud-Schingen of KMS Consulting with division leadership. This retreat engaged each unit director with information about Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI). Each director took the IDI and was scored on the Intercultural Development Continuum (IDC).

The methodology employed for the retreat featured short lectures; small and large group activities, and organizational storytelling. The primary focus of the workshop was to provide VPSA leadership with the results of the IDI framework in order to create a more strategic plan for Diversity and Inclusion. It was also to impress upon leadership the necessity of their active and intentional role in creating a more inclusive environment for all Division employees and students and that begins at the top.

As a result of the half-day retreat, much was covered on the IDI including discussions about the stories of inclusion at A&M, and what story the Division wanted to tell and be remembered for their role in inclusion; as well as what type of people the division wanted to attract and retain.

Specific action items developed through this retreat process with Kelli McCloud-Schingen were to:

- Articulate the Division’s Story (How do you want the community to experience encounters with the Division)
- Define and Communicate D&I at the Division level
- Identify, Define, and Market the Brand

The Division is in the process of implementing these recommended action items. Specific efforts include the incorporation of a division wide diversity statement as part of the DSA strategic plan to be finalized in May 2015. Specifically, the Diversity and Inclusion statement under consideration for May 2015 is “We are committed to cultivating a campus environment where people

from all backgrounds and experiences can thrive. We build and model a welcoming environment that promotes a deeper understanding of identities that are different from our own.” As the DSA strategic plan is finalized this Diversity and Inclusion statement will be a part of the marketing and branding of the DSA commitment to diversity.

The DSA has identified key areas for enhanced efforts in previous annual reports. They are related to access to diversity training, professional development, and division staff development. Funding provided by the Vice President and Associate Provost for Diversity over the past few years has been used to accomplish these DSA goals. Over the past three years DSA has been awarded funds for continuous progress on diversity and inclusion efforts. This money has been reinvested in the division to accomplish DSA goals of division staff development, professional development, and access to diversity training. Nearly \$50,000 has been awarded from this funding by the VPSA to support diversity initiatives throughout the Division. One example of a DSA initiative that has utilized these diversity funds is the DSA Staff Development Committee. This committee puts on six division wide trainings during the academic year. Of these six trainings, 50% have addressed issues of diversity and inclusion training related to staff climate and working with students. The staff development committee also added the Enhancing Diversity Seminar Series sponsored by the Vice President and Associate Provost for Diversity to the list of recommended staff development opportunities. This emphasis on diversity in staff development for the division is in line with Goal 4 outlined in Action 2015 and Imperative 6 in Vision 2020. In addition, smaller targeted opportunities have been provided for staff development. An example of a target staff development opportunity was Dr. Vivian Santiago’s presentation, *Not Latino Enough: Narratives of Latino Students Grappling with Latino Identity Issues in College*. This presentation was a partnership between Multicultural Services and the Staff Development Committee that utilized diversity funding provided by the DSA. Ten-percent of division staff attended this presentation and over 80% of responses in the preceding assessment indicated this was important information for student affairs professionals and it was relevant for their current position. Additionally, over 90% indicated this information was valuable for their future in student affairs.

2) Recruitment and Retention

DSA provided support and resources for the Division’s Staff Development Committee to focus on staff development initiatives consistent with Goal 4 outlined in Action 2015 and Imperative 6 in Vision 2020. The Staff Development Committee’s goal is to train and develop employees within the division of student affairs. In November of 2013 this committee hosted Dr. Stan Carpenter to present on *Taking Charge of your Professional Development*. This program focused on how employees can be purposeful in career development opportunities and strategies. Eighty percent of employees who attended this presentation thought this presentation was relevant for their current position. Another initiative undertaken by this group is to study a mentoring program for new employees within the division to facilitate connecting new employees with more experienced employees.

Staff **retention** efforts are prevalent throughout DSA with multiple departments such as Student Life Studies, University Center and Special Events, and the Veterans Resource Center experiencing low turnover of staff. Departments engage in various professional development approaches to train and retain employees. Examples of retention strategies employed by DSA departments include aligning jobs with career ladders, sponsoring of professional development opportunities, mentorship programs, staff recognition awards, networking opportunities, and flexibility in scheduling to allow for class, trainings, and committee work external to the DSA. Additionally, many departments report identifying ways to increase responsibility for professional staff in meaningful ways such as supervision opportunities, budget management, and student advising. Some of these efforts have been impacted by the recent PWC report. Specifically, the DSA will ascertain whether there is a disparate impact on division efforts to recruit and retain diverse staff by monitoring the impact of the PWC recommendations with emphasis on staff morale and satisfaction.

Employee **recruitment** within DSA show various signs of exceeding minimum requirements for hiring new staff. Reported frequently across the division is advertising of open position on list serves that reach a diverse population. This recruitment approach is used in connection with purposeful recruitment of qualified and diverse applicant pools through accessing professional networks specific to department and position needs. The recruitment of diversity is identified as a purposeful endeavor by departments and is incorporated into hiring committee composition. It is identified that diversity necessary for a successful DSA is more than race and gender. Examples of diversity hiring include individuals with disabilities, marital status, sexual orientation, and religious beliefs. In order to best meet the needs of a diverse student body on Texas A&M University’s campus, DSA needs to reflect identities students can identify with. The DSA is in the process of finalizing plans to include a standard diversity statement incorporated through its strategic planning process into all staff searches in an effort to reflect the division’s commitment to diversity among staff. Additionally, discussions are taking place around recruitment practices related to on campus interviews and hiring package practices. This effort is needed to assure that candidates are being treated equitably in terms of relocation expenses and other factors related to relocating to College Station and recruitment to Texas A&M University.

3) Internal/External Advisory and/or Developmental Council Groups

Every DSA Department participates in various developmental councils internal to the division. While the DSA 2.0 committee is the DSA committee specifically tasked with examining division diversity issues, directors recognize that diversity issues are not isolated to this group. “All of these experiences [staff committee service] can have an equity and diversity component” (DSA Department Director). Another DSA Director indicated that “[they] try to have representation on every committee possible as we

believe our staff serving on these committees can help bring a diverse student and staff perspective to the table.” Examples of diversity brought to these internal groups by staff were age related diversity and diversity in professional backgrounds. Evidence for how the various division wide committees engage in conversations around diversity is present. For example, the Staff Development Committee has provided programming related to diversity on several occasions throughout the previous academic year. This includes bringing to campus external speakers such as Jessica Pettitt and Dr. Vivian Santiago to address issues of inclusion. Multicultural Services hosts the annual Diversity Training Institute (DTI) each year which draws national participation from colleges and universities. Alternatively, the division uses its internal professional capacity to address issues of inclusion. Dr. Martha Dannenbaum and Dr. Maggie Gartner provided training around mental and physical health issues students and staff are facing. Lt. Col. Jerry Smith provided research on how military veterans experience the higher education environment.

DSA departments and staff identify a large number of committee and advisory group work they participate in external to DSA. National professional organizations, local community organizations, campus committee advisory groups, and faculty/academic advisory developmental groups were identified as four areas where DSA staff contribute to committees and advisory groups external to the DSA. Most departments identified at least two of these types of external groups they participate with. Of note are the departments of Multicultural Services, Disability Services, and Residence Life reporting advising roles to academic/faculty areas. Multicultural Services reported being invited to attend monthly meetings for the College of Science, College of Architecture, and College of Liberal Arts to serve as a resource for these academic colleges. Disability Services has a faculty advisory board and Residence Life participates on the College of Agriculture and Life Science development council. It is recognized that not all of these committees and advisory roles are specific to diversity but again it is recognized that “these committees are not necessarily focused on diversity but are component conversations” (DSA Department Director).

Table 4: Variety of Advisory Councils and Groups

Department	Internal Division/External Department Group	Internal University Group/External Division Group (Faculty, Students)	Community/Local Organizations	National Professional Organizations
Becky Gates Children Center	X		X	
Disability Services	X	X		
Information Technology	X	X		
Memorial Student Center	X	X		X
Multicultural Student Services	X	X	X	X
Music Activities	X			
Recreational Sports	X			
Residence Life	X	X		
Student Activities	X			
Student Counseling	X	X		
Student Health	X	X	X	
Student Life Studies	X	X		
University Center and Special Events	X			X
Veterans' Resource Center	X	X		

4) Unit Climate

As part of the monthly staff development assessment, staff members who attend are asked, “How Welcome and a part of the DSA Community did you feel at the program.” This question has been asked longitudinally over time. This past academic year, 74% of staff indicated that they felt “Very Welcome”, 26% of staff report feeling “Somewhat Welcome”, and less than 1% of staff reporting “Not at all Welcome” when they attend the monthly staff development meetings.

A common approach identified across units to address departmental climate is allowing staff autonomy and flexibility. Flexible schedules are used by some departments to provide staff with autonomy to manage their time appropriately based on work, family, or personal demands that are outside of standard 8 am to 5 pm working hours. This is important for staff to maintain a work life balance that manages family needs, educational goals, or other interests. This approach is common in the MSC, Student Activities and Multicultural Services where staff routinely work late evenings to accommodate student groups’ meeting schedules. Consistent with the approach of professional autonomy is departments allowing staff to manage their own professional development budget. This allows staff to take accountability and ownership of their professional development identity. Finally, departments report seeking staff input on department initiatives to obtain diverse perspectives.

5) Equity

Division wide discussions around recruitment and professional development are taking place. Through ongoing discussion around equity in recruitment and hiring, it has been identified that a clear diversity statement on the division's website is important. Through these discussions there has been a recognition that a more uniformed approach to human resource processes may benefit the division. Issues such as paying for applicants' on campus interviews during recruitment, extension of relocation costs for new hires, and use of skill advancement pay increases for current employees attaining advanced degrees will be examined further by the DSA to ensure equitable and market trending processes are in place for recruitment, hiring, and retention of staff.

Department directors discussed salary and compensation as issues related to equity within their departments. Salary compression issues experienced by the University and surrounding community were discussed. These discussions indicated that salary demands of newly hired candidates is a concern. Additionally, gender inequities in compensation were identified for similar positions of responsibility and addressed over this past year as well as salary adjustments during the hiring process.

Beyond salary issues, departments have approached campus equity issues from a variety of ways. Employees are encouraged to participate in DSA activities such as the monthly staff development meetings. In addition staff is encouraged to attend other personal and professional educational opportunities that exist on the Texas A&M University campus. Cultural education is one component of this campus equity effort; however, cultural education is also an important component of departmental training. For example the Becky Gates Children Center has identified children served from 24 different countries. To meet the needs of these children and their families programming related to global issues of poverty, hunger and other human rights issues in countries represented by its clients is used to educate staff on cultural competency.

Unit equity efforts have been made to address issues of systemic inequality around compensation through career ladders and salary adjustments over the previous few years as outlined in previous annual reports. These efforts, along with others, are ongoing however the PWC report's span of control has created challenges for following through with career ladder plans. Prior to adjustments around span of control mid-level employees were supervising entry-level employees as part of their job responsibilities. The removal of supervisory responsibilities and placement of these responsibilities in higher-level positions with infrequent turnover has reduced opportunities for professional advancement. This has required departments within the division to re-evaluate existing succession plans as leadership opportunities, as measured by supervisory experience, have to be removed from employees who otherwise would be in a succession or advancement situations.

6) Future Efforts

The DSA is in the process of reaffirming its division wide strategic plan. Through this process a division wide diversity statement is being developed to address the recommendations of Kelli McLoud-Schingen of KMS Consulting around building a division diversity brand. It is anticipated that the division's diversity statement will be incorporated into department recruitment efforts as part of this ongoing process to develop the division's diversity brand.

Another aspect of strategic planning that is ongoing deals with meeting ADA needs in facilities and programs operated by DSA departments and staff utilization. There is a focus on strategic positions, cross training, and position analysis moving forward so staff can best meet the needs of students. Additionally, diversity funding grants administered by the VPSA will be better promoted and awarded within the division to allow for greater use and impact. The addition of a Communication Manager will also assist the DSA in meeting branding recommendations around diversity and inclusion.

An over-arching theme discussed by departments as they talked about moving forward is creating an environment for students that is safe, clean, inclusive, respectful, and welcoming. This goal ties in with ongoing efforts reported in the previous cycle related to the evaluation of Texas A&M University traditions and how they are or are not inclusive to student groups. Ongoing efforts toward these goals this past year included the induction of Clarence Sasser into the Aggies Medal of Honor MSC exhibit and the Hall of Distinguished Alumni. The DSA was instrumental in acknowledging and recognizing the accomplishments of Clarence Sasser. Finally, DSA units continuously encourage and provide opportunities for diverse representation of students in key leadership and committee positions within the DSA.