

College of Health and Human Services Diversity & Inclusion Plan

The following statements address Diversity & Inclusion planning by the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS), reflecting on the three areas of *Representation*, *Climate*, and *Success*. As defined by the University, Underrepresented Minorities (URM) include Black/African American, Hispanic, and Native American/Alaskan Native only. While this plan reflects that definition by the University, the College would like to see a broadening of the URM definition to be more inclusive of other underrepresented minorities, as we move forward in our efforts. Gender is limited to male and female self-identification. The report is based on data collected over six semesters from Fall 2016 through Spring 2019, with *Climate* including data from the Fall 2019 CHHS Climate Survey. Findings reported in the following plan reflect exact wording from survey items (the surveys are available from University D & I Office upon request). We anticipate that future surveys will expand definitions and gather increasingly meaningful data as we move forward in addressing diversity, inclusion, and equity. A committee of seven faculty and staff volunteer committee members representing the Schools in the CHHS carefully examined the existing data and the most current Climate Fall 2019 survey data, discussed the implications of these data, and developed a Diversity and Inclusion plan for CHHS. Members of the committee attended the two working session Institutes, the first in October 2019 and the second in January 2020, sponsored by the University Diversity & Inclusion committee to analyze the current state of the College, and to develop strategies for enhancing the diversity and inclusion practices. Importantly, as the College is comprised of five Schools, united by their goals of promoting health and well-being in broad and diverse focus areas, we consulted with each of our Schools to ensure that Diversity & Inclusion specific to each was included and addressed in our Diversity and Inclusion Plan.

Representation

The metric of faculty and staff representation of Underrepresented Minorities is important to the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS) on multiple levels. Research indicates that the more that faculty members resemble students, the greater likelihood of higher performance by students (Bollinger, 2007; Umbach, 2006). A diverse faculty are able to bring a breadth of information and experience to the classroom more applicable and relatable to a diverse student body. Having faculty with whom students can identify also motivates our students to pursue and advance their own education as they graduate from our programs. A diverse faculty are well positioned to advocate for Underrepresented Minority students and foster inclusion and equity from a place of lived experience.

A core value of CHHS is a strong commitment to serving the community. Thus, we strive to nurture our strong community partnerships. The diversity of our faculty, staff, and students improve our ability to understand and be present in the community through awareness and greater cultural sensitivity. Notably, the CHHS excels in our impactful community work. We engage diverse, underserved, and underrepresented minority communities in order to improve physical, emotional, and social health and well-being. A diversity of representation in our

faculty and staff allows us to more effectively use community participatory approaches to our research and outreach and best reach our goals of improved health and well-being.

Thus, a first step in moving forward with diversity planning is an assessment of our current state. Using College-level Institutional data from Fall 2016 through Spring 2019, we examined current representation of CHHS tenured and tenure-track faculty compared to CHHS students by Underrepresented Minorities (URM), Ethnicity, and Gender. Using the 80% equity guideline for faculty to student ratio, we calculated the percentages needed for our faculty to reflect our student representation in each area.

URM

It should first be noted that six-semester data for tenured/tenure-track faculty from Fall 2016 through Spring 2019 were compared to five semesters of data available for students (Fall semesters only, 2014 – 2018). We felt the comparison was acceptable as the range of values for each over their respective semesters was small (a 0.80 % change for faculty, and 1.90 % change for students) and standard deviations of mean percentages reflected homogeneity across the semesters.

Currently, 9.15% (SD = 0.38%) of tenured/tenure-track faculty represent URM, while 66.4 % (SD = 0.78%) of students represent URM, indicating a discrepancy of 57.25%, and an increase of 43.97% needed in faculty URM representation to meet an 80% guideline. For tenure/tenure-track faculty, data were also available by ethnicity for student representation comparisons (based on six semesters of data for faculty and three fall semesters for students). These data indicate Hispanic representation of tenure/tenure-track faculty at a mean of 7.67% (SD = 0.23%) compared to student Hispanic representation at a mean of 29.67% (SD = 0.55%). While faculty representation was undetectable in provided graphs, we note that mean student representation for Black/African American was 4.1% (SD = 0.17%) and two or more ethnicities was 7.57% (SD = 0.25%). Data indicate overall URM temporary faculty representation ranged from 13.0% to 18% (mean 15.67%, SD = 1.63%). URM staff representation (data provided do not indicate year/semester reflected) is 27.0%.

Clearly, this is a gap that will require multiple long-term strategies to recruit URM faculty and staff, with the largest discrepancy at the tenured/tenure-track level. Moreover, we recognize that strategies must be included in the plan to retain new and existing faculty/staff and nurture successful and rewarding academic experiences.

In order to diversify academia, CHHS also recognizes the gap between URM in receiving doctoral degrees in health-related careers. Data from 2017 indicate that in a sample of 2,637 recipients of doctoral degrees in Health Professions, Family & Consumer Studies, & Parks, Leisure & Fitness, 15% were URM. Thus, a critical step to increase URM representation includes successful preparation of our URM students for doctoral degree programs (Lundy-Wagner, Vultaggio, & Gasman, 2013). The CHHS has been exemplary in its preparation of students for further graduate education leading to doctoral degrees. The School of Public Health offers doctoral degrees through Joint Doctoral Programs (JDP) with University of California, San Diego

(UCSD) in three areas, Health Behavior, Epidemiology, and Global Health and the School of Speech, Language, and Hearing Sciences offers a doctoral degree in Language and Communicative Disorders, also in a JDP with UCSD. The Schools of Exercise and Nutritional Sciences and Speech, Language, and Hearing Science offer clinical doctoral programs in Physical Therapy and Audiology, respectively.

Gender

Data for tenured/tenure-track faculty from Fall 2016 through Spring 2019 were compared to five semesters of data available for students (Fall semesters only, 2014 – 2018). For tenured/tenure-track faculty mean female representation was 59.07% (SD = 1.25%), for temporary faculty 78.67% (SD = 1.21%) and staff (76.0% -only available as conglomerate score) compared to student mean female representation of 72.78% (SD = 0.63%). At each level, representation meets the 80% guideline, with both temporary faculty and staff showing higher percentages of women compared to men. We acknowledge the acceptability of representation with regard to gender, however note the need for continued vigilance to ensure diversity and inclusion with regard to gender and the expansion of gender definition in data gathering, analysis, and strategy development to ensure equity across the spectrum of gender identities.

CHHS Goals and Strategies for Representation

(These Goals and Strategies were mandated by the University and Approved by the Faculty Senate)

Objective: Increase the representation of diverse faculty within the semi-finalist pool by 20% within 5 years of policy implementation. It should be noted that diversity-definitions and criteria may differ based on discipline and should be adapted at specific School levels.

Intervention 1: Require implicit bias training. The College of Health and Human Services will only approve faculty search committee members who have participated in one of the University's Equity-Minded Hiring seminars within the last two years.

Resources needed: This program is funded by the Chief Diversity Officer. Committee members will need to invest a minimum of two-three hours to complete the basic training.

Responsibility: The search committee chair is responsible for confirming that all members have participated in the training prior to beginning review of applications. The College is responsible for store-housing these data for summarization and reporting.

Assessment: The College will submit an annual report to the faculty detailing implementation of this intervention.

Intervention 2: Request Inclusion Representatives¹. The College of Health and Human Services will only advance searches to the Office of Employee Relations and Compliance when the search committees have requested a certified Inclusion Representative.

Resources needed: Not applicable; this program is funded by the Chief Diversity Officer.

Responsibility: The search committee chair will request an approved Inclusion Representative through the Inclusion Representative program as advised by the Associate Chief Diversity Officer.

Assessment: The College will submit an annual report to the faculty detailing the implementation of this intervention.

Intervention 3: Use Building on Inclusive Excellence (BIE) Criteria. The College of Health and Human Services will employ the University's BIE committee to certify that finalists meet at least three of the BIE criteria. This will occur prior to finalists being approved for a campus visit.

Intervention 3a: All applicants will include a Diversity and Inclusion statement that reflects how they meet Building on Inclusive Excellence criteria as a part of the application materials submitted to Interfolio.

Resources needed: Not applicable; the BIE committee is organized by the Associate Chief Diversity Officer.

Responsibility: The Chair of the search committee will be responsible for including the BIE criteria in the job advertisement. The search chair will also be responsible for submitting candidate materials to the Dean's Office and the Associate Chief Diversity Officer (ACDO) for review by the BIE committee as soon as finalists are selected. After the determination is made by the BIE committee, the Dean and the search committee chair will be notified by the ACDO. The College is responsible for store-housing these data for summarization and reporting.

Assessment: The College will submit an annual report to the faculty detailing implementation of this intervention.

Intervention 4: Improve pool proportionality. In cases where pool proportionality is not reflective of terminal degree holders within the field, the College of Health and Human Services will require the search committee to specify actions that have been taken to ensure a representative pool. Documentation of these actions will be provided to the ACDO. [The Hiring Guide already requires departments to submit a pool proportionality form to the Office of Employee Relations and Compliance (OERC)]

Resources needed: Committee chairs may need training to interpret the data and understand appropriate actions to increase pool proportionality.

Responsibility: The search committee chair is responsible for submitting the pool proportionality form, and any required documentation, to OERC and the ACDO. The College is responsible for store-housing these data for summarization and reporting.

¹ Inclusion Representatives are non-voting members of search committees who provide colleagues with information on equitable hiring practices and support in identifying and reducing the many ways that implicit biases can manifest in the hiring process. More details about this program are coming soon!

Assessment: The College will submit an annual report to the faculty detailing implementation of this intervention.

Climate

The following section reports on CHHS faculty and staff perceptions of the College organizational climate with regard to diversity and inclusion. Data from 2015 and 2016 assessed areas of job satisfaction and work environment with some attention to issues of diversity and inclusion. Most recently, survey data were collected (N=83, Fall 2019) specific to diversity and inclusion and provide greater insight into current perceptions of CHHS faculty and staff (these data are summarized separately below).

Limited data are available from 2016 surveys (N=44) of CHHS faculty (37% female, 2% URM) perceptions of campus and college diversity and climate. Thirty-five percent strongly agreed and 52% percent somewhat agreed that “there is a lot of campus racial conflict here.” When asked, 60% strongly agreed and 33% somewhat agreed that the University “has effective hiring practices and policies that increase faculty diversity.” Sixty-three percent strongly agreed and 25% somewhat agreed that the University “takes responsibility for educating underprepared students.” Thirty six percent strongly agreed and 2% somewhat agreed that “faculty are not prepared to deal with conflict over diversity issues in the classroom.”

Each of these findings suggest the areas for improvement and the development of strategies to enhance the CHHS climate. These data reflect a relatively small number of faculty, and indicate that examination at the School level with regard to climate perceptions may provide needed information in strategy development. The commitment to improved CHHS climate by faculty in this relatively small sample is supported by the following items being rated as “high” or “highest” CHHS priority (a) recruitment of minority students (16% and 48%, respectively), (b) promoting gender diversity in the faculty and administration (13% and 48%, respectively), and (c) promoting racial and ethnic diversity in the faculty and administration (21% and 40%, respectively). This is encouraging as we move forward in diversity and inclusion planning.

More extensive data are available from a 2015 University Climate Survey, disaggregated by College. The committee examined these survey data completed by 110 (52%) of 213 CHHS faculty and staff members. This participation rate is quite similar to the overall University participation rate of 50%. Areas addressed include those identified by the University as key indicators of workplace satisfaction and engagement.

With regard to overall satisfaction, 75% agreed or strongly agreed that SDSU was a good place to work. With regard to work culture and environment, 80% agreed or strongly agreed that SDSU does a good job of valuing diversity, and 76% agreed or strongly agreed that their work environment is free from harassment. With regard to communication and teamwork, while 71% agreed or strongly agreed that there was a strong sense of teamwork within their immediate team, only 39% agreed or strongly agreed that there was a strong sense of teamwork within

divisions. Similarly, 38% agreed or strongly agreed that their workgroup received high quality support from other units.

Also examined were areas CHHS faculty and staff perceived as most and least satisfying with regard to work climate. Based on a 5-point Likert-type scale anchored by 1 = “strongly disagree” and 5 = “strongly agree,” and reported here as items were worded in the survey, the most satisfying areas (82 - 96% rated 4/5) were feeling that (1) their work contributed to success of students, (2) success of strategic priorities, (3) awareness of work expectations (4) awareness of how their work contributes to University goals, and (5) plans to remain at SDSU for at least 2 more years. Four of five of these areas reflected overall SDSU perceptions of most satisfying areas. Areas of least satisfaction (defined as only 9 – 36% rating 4/5) were feelings that SDSU (1) did a good job at managing poor performers and helping them improve, (2) recognized efforts and achievements properly, (3) does a good job of retaining highly qualified employees, (4) places a high priority on helping employees reach their potential, and (5) provides transparency of information in a timely manner. These same five areas were the least satisfying for SDSU survey respondents overall.

In evaluating CHHS areas for improvement, the poorest performance area as perceived by CHHS faculty and staff was management of poor performers to help them improve (9% rated 4/5). SDSU overall data also indicate this as the poorest performance area (15% rated 4/5). Thus, the diversity and inclusion plan should include strategies to ensure adequate mentorship of all faculty and staff for success.

An examination of the most recent Climate Survey data (Fall 2019) allowed a further exploration of CHHS members’ perceptions more specifically related to diversity and inclusion, than did earlier data. These findings appear below.

FALL 2019 CLIMATE SURVEY FINDINGS

These findings reflect the perceptions of Tenured faculty, including FERP (36.14%, n=30), tenure-track faculty (14.46%, n=12), lecturer/part time faculty (21.69%, n=18), staff (22.89%, n=19), and administrators (4.82%, n=4). Of these, 21.69% (n=18) reported working at SDSU for more than 20 years, 22.89% (n=19) for 11 – 20 years, 49.4% (n=41) for 1 – 5 years, and 6.02% (n=5) for less than 1 year. Respondents reported being White/Caucasian, non-Hispanic (67.47%, n=56), and URM (25.3%, n=21), including Chicana/o/x, Latina/o/x, Hispanic (12.05%, n=10), Asian/Pacific Islander (10.84%, n=9), Black/African American (2.41%, n=2), and other (8.43%, n=7). Respondents reported as heterosexual/straight (89.16%), lesbian (4.82%), gay (1.20%), bisexual (1.20%), queer (1.20%), prefer not to state (2.41%). Seventy-seven percent described their gender identity as woman, 21.69% as men, and 1.20% as prefer not to state. Respondents reported not having a disability (89.02%), having a disability (3.66%), and preferring not to state (7.32%). With regard to religious affiliation, respondents reported as Agnostic (20.38%), Christian-Catholic (19.28%), Atheist (13.25%), Christian-Protestant (9.64%), None (8.43%), Christian-Other (7.23%), Other religious beliefs (7.23%), prefer not to state (7.23%), Jewish (4.82%), and Buddhist (2.41%). It should be noted that in summarizing responses to the questions posed, smaller categories were combined by the University as some categories were

too small to present meaningful findings. Combining smaller categories gave voice to these groups in the analyses, that might otherwise be lost due to small numbers.

The following analyses group responses in the following manner: somewhat agree, agree and strongly agree as “agreed.” Similarly, somewhat disagree, disagree, and strongly disagree are combined and reflected as “disagreed.”

Focusing on questions related to diversity and inclusion, the most current survey revealed the following. Overall, 88% of respondents agreed that their work environment was welcoming of employees of diverse backgrounds, and 87% agreed that their work environment was collaborative for employees of diverse backgrounds. Similarly, 87% agreed that their work environment was supportive of employees of diverse backgrounds and 87% agreed that their work environment was respectful of employees of diverse backgrounds. When asked whether they felt that (a) their presence was valued, overall 82% agreed with the statement, (b) their expertise was valued, overall 84% agreed. When asked if the College has demonstrated a commitment to hiring employees of diverse backgrounds, overall 89% agreed; a commitment to retaining employees of a diverse background, overall 79% agreed, and a commitment to the career advancement of employees of diverse backgrounds, overall 77% agreed. When asked if given the choice would one still come to SDSU, overall 90% agreed.

Thus, when viewed overall there was general agreement with questions regarding climate perceptions of contributions valued within the College, the welcoming, support, and respect for diverse employees within the College, the hiring and retention of diverse employees, and satisfaction with choosing SDSU as a place of employment. These CHHS climate survey findings support the efforts by the College to provide a work environment that embraces the contributions of a diverse faculty and staff.

When data were examined by URM status, gender, years of employment, position level, religious affiliation, and sexual orientation some differences were seen in agreement. We highlight here the biggest discrepancies found. Please see attached/included CHHS academic documents: Climate Category Breakdowns for all category breakdowns. Using a diversity and inclusion lens, discrepancies were most noted based on identification as a sexual majority or minority, URM status, and gender. For example, 90% of those identifying as a sexual majority agreed that the work environment was welcoming to employees of diverse backgrounds compared to 57% of those identifying as a sexual minority. Similarly, 100% of men agreed with the statement compared to 84% of women, and 90% of non-URM agreed compared to 75% of URM. A similar pattern is seen with perceptions that the work environment was supportive of employees from diverse backgrounds, with the greatest discrepancies in 89% of those identifying as a sexual majority agreeing with the statement compared to 57% of those identifying as a sexual minority. While not as great a discrepancy, 88% of non-URM agreed with the statement compared to 75% of URM. These results were quite similar with perceptions of a collaborative environment for employees of a diverse background with 89% of those identifying as a sexual majority agreeing compared to 57% of those identifying as a sexual minority, 100%

of men agreeing compared to 83% of women, and 88% of non-URM agreeing with the statement compared to 75% of URM.

When asked whether one felt their presence was valued, the greatest discrepancy was found in 88% of those identifying as a sexual majority agreeing with the statement compared to 57% identifying as a sexual minority. Similarly, when asked whether they felt their expertise was valued, 89% of those identifying as a sexual majority agreed with the statement compared to 57% identifying as a sexual minority. Discrepancy was also seen based by URM status with 90% of non-URM agreeing with the statement compared to 67% of URM. In regard to feeling contributions were valued the greatest discrepancies were seen with 86% of non-URM agreeing with the statement compared to 67% of non-URM, and 94% of men agreed compared to 79% of women.

When examining agreement with the statement that the College has demonstrated commitment to hiring employees of diverse backgrounds, the greatest discrepancies were noted based on sexual identification and URM status. For those identifying as a sexual majority, 93% agreed with the statement compared to 71% identifying as a sexual minority. Similarly, 94% of non-URM agreed with the statement compared to 75% of URM. With regard to the College's commitment to retaining employees of a diverse background, 86% of non-URM agreed compared to 59% URM, and 94% of men agreed compared to 79% of women. When asked about the College commitment to the career advancement of employees of diverse backgrounds, 85% of non-URM agreed compared to 58% of URM, and 94% of men agreed with the statement compared to 77% of women.

When asked if given the choice would one still come to SDSU, overall 90% agreed; 94% of non-URM agreed with the statement compared to 75% of URM; 100% of men agreed compared to 89% of women.

Qualitative comments were also examined with regard to perceptions of the climate. These open-ended responses generally supported the quantitative responses. Notably, a repeated comment related to the lack of recognition for calendar holidays specific to different cultural and religious groups, particularly as some of these days affect work schedules.

Together, quantitative and qualitative data were used to develop CHHS goals and strategies for enhancing the climate perceptions of those in CHHS. These appear below.

CHHS Goals and Strategies for Climate

Objective: Improve the climate perceptions of members across the College of Health and Human Services, particularly with regard to perceptions and celebration of diversity, inclusion, and equity to foster reappointment, tenure, promotion, and retention of CHHS members.

Intervention 1: Encourage implicit bias training for all CHHS members. The CHHS will ensure that information on available implicit bias training is distributed to all staff, lecturers, tenure-track and tenured faculty and encourage participation in one of the University's Equity-Minded Implicit Bias seminars once a year.

Resources needed: This program is funded by the Chief Diversity Officer. CHHS members will need to invest two-three hours to complete the training.

Responsibility: The Director of each School is responsible for confirming that all members of the School have participated in the training. The CHHS Office of the Dean will be responsible for confirming that all members of the CHHS administrative personnel have participated in the training, and for store-housing data for summarization and reporting purposes.

Assessment: The College will submit an annual report to the faculty detailing implementation of this intervention.

Intervention 2: Initiate a Diversity and Inclusion focused Speaker Series. The CHHS will initiate a Speaker Series and provide two invited speaker presentations per academic year. Specifically, the series will highlight the work and issues/challenges of URM, those identifying as a sexual minority, and women in the areas of Health and Human Services. Speakers will be URM, sexual minority and women and may be members of the CHHS community or the broader community.

Resources: The Speaker series will be funded by the CHHS Office of the Dean.

Responsibility: The CHHS Office of the Dean will be responsible for arranging the series and presentations, with a rotating system of nominations based on the 5 Schools of the CHHS.

Assessment: The College will submit an annual report to the faculty detailing implementation of this intervention.

Intervention 3: Increase Respect, Inclusion, and Identification of Cultural and Religious Observances. Calendars that include the dates of cultural and religious observances will appear on the CHHS and School websites, including those with related restrictions on working during their observance. Adopt a policy to exclude major meetings (e.g., faculty meetings) being held on these dates.

Resources: Personnel in the Office of the Dean and Schools to update website information and manage meeting scheduling.

Responsibilities: The Office of the Dean will update the CHHS website and oversee meetings that may be affected. The School Directors will oversee management of the process at the School levels.

Assessment: The College will submit an annual report to the faculty detailing implementation of this intervention.

Intervention 4: Establish an identity-based mentorship in CHHS. All CHHS members are eligible to participate in an identity-based mentorship opportunity. School Directors will identify the Office of the University Chief Diversity Officer as a resource for a matched mentorship program.

Resource: The Office of the University Chief Diversity Officer will provide input and match CHHS members to appropriate mentors (not necessarily in CHHS). A small stipend will be awarded to the mentor by the Office of the Chief Diversity Officer.

Responsibility: The School Directors will make all School members aware of the availability of the mentoring option. Interested individuals may contact the Office of University Chief Diversity Officer to enroll in the program. When necessary, appropriate union notification will occur.

Assessment: The Office of the University Chief Diversity Officer will submit an annual report of CHHS use of the program to the CHHS, detailing implementation of this intervention.

Objective 2: Gain a more accurate perspective of overall climate perceptions held by CHHS members.

Intervention Strategy 1: Collect survey data from CHHS members as to their perceptions of the indicators of climate in the workplace to better and more accurately track these perceptions.

Resources: Survey software available through Campus ITT. Personnel to administer the survey.

Responsibilities: Office of the Dean of CHHS will administer the survey. The Office of the Chief Diversity Officer will aggregate the data and provide them to CHHS for interpretation.

Assessment: The College will submit an annual report to the faculty detailing implementation of this intervention.

Success

Limited data are available to address faculty success with regard to tenure and promotion, and are reported here based on weighted average years to full promotion for CHHS faculty. No data were reported separately for URM faculty (n=3). For non-URM faculty (n=16), the weighted average number of years to full promotion (Associate to Professor) was 6.25, for male faculty (n=7), 6.7 years, for female faculty (n=12), 5.56 years, for non-URM male faculty (n=6), 6.82 years, for non-URM female faculty (n=10), 5.91 years. Extrapolating from these data, the inclusion of the 2 female URM faculty in weighted averages reduced the average years to full promotion by 0.35 years. Inclusion of the 1 male URM in the weighted averages reduced the average years to full promotion by 0.12 years. Based on this small sample, it is encouraging to note that there appears to be no difference based on URM in years to full promotion.

CHHS Goals and Strategies for Success

Objective 1: Gain a more accurate perspective of overall perceptions of success held by CHHS members.

Intervention Strategy 1: Collect survey data from CHHS members as to their perceptions of the indicators of success in the workplace to better and more accurately track success metrics.

Resources: Survey software available through Campus ITT. Personnel to administer the survey.

Responsibilities: Office of the Dean of CHHS will administer the survey. The Office of the Chief Diversity Officer will aggregate the data and provide them to CHHS for interpretation.

Assessment: The College will submit an annual report to the faculty detailing implementation of this intervention.

Objective 2: Collect and track data to gain a more accurate perspective of success metrics from time of hire to tenure to ensure equitable distribution of service obligations and retain faculty.

Intervention Strategy 2 : Collect additional data to more accurately reflect success using metrics of career advancement focused on time from hire to achieving tenure to better and more accurately track success metrics.

Resources: Survey software available through Campus ITT. Personnel to administer the survey.

Responsibilities: Office of the Dean of CHHS will administer the survey. The Office of the Chief Diversity Officer will aggregate the data and provide them to CHHS for interpretation.

Assessment: The College will submit an annual report to the faculty detailing implementation of this intervention.

Intervention Strategy 3: Tracking service obligations with CHHS to ensure these are not overly weighted based on URM, gender, and/or sexual identity. Underrepresented groups (e.g., URM, women, those identifying as sexual minority) often carry a disproportionate load of service (Whittaker et al., 2015). The CHHS will begin tracking service at the University, College, and School levels to ensure that under-represented faculty and staff are not disproportionately burdened. While quantitative information (e.g., number of committees) is limited in the depth of information (e.g. amount of service burden), this step is an initial one to better understand and monitor service obligations unfairly distributed.

Resources: Personnel to monitor service obligations (usually done at School level). Use of appropriate software.

Responsibilities: Schools will collect service obligation data for summarization. The Office of the Chief Diversity Officer will summarize and disaggregate these data as a part of the Diversity and Inclusion projects.

Assessment: The College will submit an annual report to the faculty detailing implementation of this intervention.

References

Bollinger, L. C. (2007). Why diversity matters. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 35 (39): B20.

Lundy-Wagner, V. Vultaggio, J., Gasman, M. (2013). Preparing underrepresented students of color for doctoral success: The role of undergraduate institutions. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 8, 151-172.

Umbach, P.D. (2006).The contribution of faculty of color to undergraduate education. *Research in Higher Education*, 47, 317–345. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-005-9391-3>

Whittaker, J. A., Montgomery, B. L., & Martinez Acosta, V. G. (2015). Retention of Underrepresented Minority Faculty: Strategic initiatives for institutional value proposition based on perspectives from a range of academic institutions. *Journal of Undergraduate Neuroscience Education*, 13(3), A136–A145.