

- 18 RESOLVED: That Cal Poly shall continue raising funds in support of diversity and
19 inclusion as a continued priority; and be it further
20
21 RESOLVED: That Cal Poly shall establish diversity and inclusion as a theme of the
22 upcoming Advancement campaign; and be it further
23
24 RESOLVED: That the Vice President for Student Affairs and the Provost should report
25 annually to the Academic Senate on the uses of all Campus Academic Fees
26 and the Student Success Fee.

Proposed by: Paul Choboter – Math Department, Dianne
DeTurris – Aerospace Engineering, Ashley Eberle –
Career Services, Harvey Greenwald – Emeritus
Academic Senate Chair, Camille O’Bryant –
Associate Dean, CSM

Date: September 13, 2018
Revised: October 12, 2018
Revised: October 24, 2018



OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

MEMORANDUM

To: Dustin Stegner

Date: December 11, 2018

From: Jeffery D. Armstrong

Copies: K. Enz Finken
C. Villa
K. Humphrey
M. Ewing
J. De Leon

Subject: Response to AS-857-18 Resolution on Campus Climate: OUDI Collective Impact Report, Funding and Student Fees

This memo acknowledges receipt of the above-entitled Academic Senate resolution. I appreciate the findings and recommendations of the OUDI Collective Impact Report.

Diversity and inclusion remain a priority for the university. We will continue to move forward as a community to create the campus climate we envision. University Development's commitment to raise funds for diversity and inclusion, in addition to other areas across campus, will remain steadfast. Our ongoing actions and initiatives focused on diversity and inclusion will result in positive, incremental change over time.

Please express my appreciation to the Academic Senate members for their attention to this important matter and for their continued support of diversity and inclusion.

COLLECTIVE IMPACT STRATEGY GROUP REPORT-OUT

Advancing Diversity & Inclusion at Cal Poly

AGENDA

- Opening Remarks, Dr. Jozi De Leon, Vice President for Diversity & Inclusion
- Collective Impact in Review , Kari Mansager, OUDI Program Director
- Campus Climate Recommendations
- Curriculum Recommendations
- Recruit & Retain Recommendations
- Small Table Discussions on Connecting Pieces and Potential Gaps
- Next Steps

COLLECTIVE IMPACT AT CAL POLY



OUR VALUES

- We are a community that is committed to diversity, inclusive community building, equity, cultural humility, and social justice as important aspects of everything we do.
- We believe that trust and mutual respect are gained through transparency and communication and are key in empowering and strengthening our university community
- We incorporate inclusive excellence as central to our relevance, sustainability, and academic rigor as we become a university for the future

OUR ASPIRATIONS

- Eliminate the achievement gap between traditionally underrepresented students and others.
- Curriculum and policies driven by our diversity and inclusion values.
- Work towards becoming an HSI and/or MSI and serving a student population that is representative of CA. Our staff and faculty will also reflect CA's diversity.

COLLECTIVE IMPACT IN REVIEW

- Fall 2017 Focus Groups and Strategy Group Formation
- Winter 2018 Strategy groups begin to meet
- Winter and Spring 2018 Strategy Groups review existing efforts and assess and recommend necessary actions
- Report out of recommendations

CAMPUS CLIMATE STRATEGY GROUP PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED

- *Need for clear communication and messaging* around clear expectations that everyone is responsible for diversity and should be recognized for such work
- *Need for leadership investment*, including venue(s) for hearing campus community voices and to communicate clear expectations of conduct with associated accountability system
- *Need for partnerships and collaborations* particularly in the community
- *Need for enhanced education and learning*, particularly with communicating diversity and inclusion during onboarding/orientation
- *Need for institutional self-assessment* including a new campus climate survey with a clear report and action plan

CAMPUS CLIMATE STRATEGY GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Communicate clear expectation that everyone is responsible for diversity work, campus-wide, and should be recognized for such work
2. Provide a report out (state of diversity) in Fall quarter and a Town Hall in Spring quarter
3. Provide a consistent platform for students, faculty, and staff to express feedback about campus climate to administration and other decision-makers
4. Communicate clear expectations of conduct with associated accountability systems
5. Improve the relationship between San Luis Obispo community and Cal Poly students, faculty, and staff, especially those from underrepresented groups
6. Enhance the onboarding of students, faculty, and staff and embed into new employee orientation learning opportunities related to diversity and inclusion
7. Conduct a campus climate survey with a clear action plan for how report findings will be utilized

CURRICULUM STRATEGY GROUP PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED

- *Need for increased awareness* about the importance of infusing diversity, inclusion and social justice into the curriculum or advancing socially relevant instruction.
- *Need for more professional development opportunities* to learn how to infuse diversity, inclusion and social justice into the curriculum
- *Need for better retention of* faculty and staff who are interested in and/or have the expertise to advance culturally relevant instruction
- *Need for a more defined community* of faculty and staff who are interested in/committed to advancing socially relevant instruction
- Cal Poly does not have a clear or sustainable record of preparing students for the future as evidenced by findings from DLO Assessment project (2008-2011) or observations from WASC re-accreditation report

CURRICULUM STRATEGY GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We recommend that each college/unit increase their explicit commitment to increasing diversity and inclusiveness awareness, knowledge, and skills, specifically in attracting (and successfully hiring) applicants that value diversity and inclusion
2. Creation of a "First Year Experience" for all new faculty that consists of attending a specific number of trainings to increase cultural competence before full teaching loads are in place.
3. We recommend that a group be established on campus for young professionals who are devoted to diversity topics and work.
4. We recommend that the University DLO's become ULO's and are utilized as CLOS' and PLO's in course proposal and course and program reviews/assessments
5. We recommend that the RPT/SPAF process include a review of diversity and inclusion efforts
6. Expand the current University USCP requirement to two courses, a lower and upper division.
7. We recommend that Cal Poly commits to university-wide cluster hires focused on diversity and inclusion

RECRUIT & RETAIN STRATEGY GROUP PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED

- We do successfully recruit students of color, but can't compete with the financial support provided by the UCs and private institutions
- Faculty, staff, and students of color face discrimination in local communities when seeking housing
- Campus visits by prospective students are not always funneled through Admissions
- Onboarding is inconsistent across units and there is a need for mentoring programs for faculty and staff of color
- Admissions & Recruitment is not adequately resourced (not enough FTEs/unable to pay volunteers-Poly Reps, Partners Ambassadors, Hometown Heroes)
- Cross Cultural Centers are not adequately resourced (not enough FTEs and need more programming funds)

RECRUIT & RETAIN STRATEGY GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Provide Admissions & Recruitment additional resources (staffing, programming, and targeted scholarship programs) to recruit URM
2. Use data being collected by University Advising to support implementation of new programs specifically targeting identified gaps and risk factors
3. Require all faculty and staff to provide a statement about the role of diversity and inclusion in Higher Education as a supplemental question in all applications and answer a question about diversity and inclusion during their interview
4. Strategic coordination of efforts to publicize diversity and inclusion resources to all students
5. Provide additional resources (staff and programming funding) from the Cross Cultural Centers
6. Create a university-wide snapshot of student volunteers and paid positions around recruitment and retention of underrepresented students.
7. Implement the Exit Interview Protocol that includes exit interview for all permanent Cal Poly employees
8. Create a Housing Liaison position to assist newly hired faculty and staff transition to the San Luis Obispo County community
9. Develop a mentoring program for new faculty and staff of color and from other underrepresented groups

SMALL TABLE DISCUSSIONS

1. What are connecting pieces amongst the recommendations?
2. What are some potential gaps amongst the recommendations?

NEXT STEPS

- Summer 2018: OUDI will synthesize the recommendations and create a draft strategic plan
- Fall 2018: Inclusive Excellence Committee review recommendations and approve strategic plan
- Fall 2018: OUDI will host a "State of Diversity and Inclusion" to share recommendations and strategic plan
- Fall 2018: Strategy Groups and subgroups will (re)form and begin meeting/implementation
- Winter/Spring 2019: Strategy Groups continue to review existing efforts and assess and recommend necessary actions
- 2018/2019 Academic Year End: Strategy Groups report out recommendations
- Continue the Collective Impact cycle to reach our aspirations to advance diversity and inclusion at Cal Poly!

Curriculum Strategy Group

Co-Leads: Jennifer Teramoto Pedrotti, Camille O'Bryant, Denise Isom

Charge

Infuse diversity, inclusion, and social justice into the curriculum to advance socially relevant instruction and prepare all students for the future.

Problems Identified

The curriculum strategy group tended to focus more on possible solutions/recommendations than actual problems. However, we offer the following four problem areas that are relevant to the recommendations we made.

- **Need for increased awareness** about the importance of infusing diversity, inclusion and social justice into the curriculum or advancing socially relevant instruction.
- **Need for more professional development opportunities** to learn how to infuse diversity, inclusion and social justice into the curriculum
- **Need for better retention of** faculty and staff who are interested in and/or have the expertise to advance culturally relevant instruction
- **Need for a more defined community** of faculty and staff who are interested in/committed to advancing socially relevant instruction
- Cal Poly does not have a clear or sustainable record of preparing students for the future as evidenced by findings from DLO Assessment project (2008-2011) or observations from WASC re-accreditation report (date?)

Short Term (ST) Recommendations (To be explored within the next year)

Recommendation 1:

We recommend that each college/unit increase their explicit commit to increasing diversity and inclusiveness awareness, knowledge, and skills, specifically in attracting (and successfully hiring) applicants that value these areas:

1. Each college will develop a College Diversity Statement
2. Each college will develop a position description for an Associate Dean position (either half time or full) that will incorporate specific and significant responsibility regarding diversity and inclusion
3. Statements of Diversity and Inclusion will be required not only for all hires to faculty positions, but also for all hires to staff positions

Rationale and Relevance:

The College Diversity Statement and requiring of Statements for Diversity and Inclusion serve as outward facing examples of our value for diversity and inclusion. These examples may deepen our hiring pools in both staff and faculty. The addition of Associate Dean positions (or a reallocation of time devoted to these topics within existing positions) allows for dedicated personnel to be responsible for the activities in this section, including assisting with the hiring process and assessment of skills in this area, and in terms of developing systematic efforts at retention of new faculty and staff focused on these areas.

Achievable Timeline

- **Fall, 2018:** Developing a College Diversity Statement could be assigned to a committee within each college. Requiring Statements of Diversity and Inclusion is already mandated for faculty and would just be expanded to staff. OUDI could provide consultation if necessary.

- **2018-2019 Academic Year:** Reorganizing or developing positions descriptions for the Associate Deans is something that could be accomplished rather quickly. If these positions were created as new then funds would need to be identified to determine if the various colleges could support them. If existing positions were reorganized to include diversity and inclusion as a significant portion of duties, additional funds may not be needed.

Measurement Efforts

- Reports of diversity and inclusion efforts in the college could be submitted by Associate Deans with this area of responsibility
- Monitoring of pool of applicants with re: to diversity aspects
- Recording of demographics with re: to successful hires
- Recording developments in curriculum and/or service work related to diversity and inclusion
- If increases occurred in underrepresented faculty or staff, it may also be correlated with increases in underrepresented students; keeping close watch on this to see if this relationship bears out would be important data to collect

Recommendation 2:

Creation of a “First Year Experience” for all new faculty that consists of attending a specific number of the following to increase cultural competence before full teaching loads are in place. Examples of activities might include (a fuller list could be developed if desired):

- CTLT Book Circle on *The Culturally Inclusive Educator*
- Implicit Bias Training (extended version)
- UndocuAlly Training (all three)
- Participate in the summer TIDE program (CTLT)

Rationale and Relevance:

This recommendation would assist the campus in creating organized opportunities for faculty to begin to develop cultural competence and inclusive teaching strategies, while also making explicit our campus value for diversity and inclusion from the beginning of the hiring process. As newer faculty have reduced teaching loads, some time would be available to spend on these endeavors such that they enter their full load of teaching with more expertise in inclusive teaching strategies and/or cultural awareness. Associate Dean positions (following execution of recommendation 1) could assist in the identification of appropriate activities for this section.

Achievable Timeline:

- **2018-2019 Academic Year:** Development of this First Year Experience could occur in anticipation of the faculty cohort beginning on campus in 2019-2020. New faculty hires could work with their college (or OUDI if necessary) to devise a plan for their first year experience, which would be approved by the college. Report of activities related to diversity and inclusion could be submitted to Dean of each college (and the Provost if desired) at the end of each year.

Measurement:

- Faculty could be evaluated on this area as a part of their probationary period (e.g., measurement in awareness, knowledge, and skills) separate from the RPT process.

Recommendation 3:

We recommend that a group be established on campus for young professionals who are devoted to diversity topics and work. This group would be a place where mentoring, professional development, and other topics would be presented in addition to having social events and opportunities for networking and mingling (similar to the Young Professionals Networking Group in the community). Partnering with other community groups (e.g., YPNG, Race Matters, NAACP, etc.) could be explored as well.

Rationale and Relevance:

Some reports of staff and faculty who have left positions at Cal Poly cite among their reasons the lack of diversity and lack of community on the Central Coast and the San Luis Obispo. A group such as this, would help to lead new faculty and staff to a group of individuals that may be similar to them in interests and potentially demographics.

Achievable Timeline:

- **Fall 2018:** Create a “mixer” event inviting individuals with interest and experience working in areas of diversity and inclusion across the campus to come together
- **Winter/Spring 2019:** Offer 2-4 events focused on various professional development topics (e.g., “Doing Diversity Work at a Predominantly White Institution” or “Creating Community on Campus”) given by diversity/inclusion-focused faculty and staff who have been on campus for a longer period of time.

Measurement:

- Create opportunities for involved individuals to give feedback and evaluations on effectiveness and utility

Recommendation 4:

We recommend that the University DLOs become ULOs and are utilized as CLO’s and PLO’s in course proposal and course and program reviews/assessments.

1. Update the existing Diversity Learning Objectives (DLO’s)
2. Integrate the DLOs into the Program Learning Objectives (PLOs) for Academic Affairs and Students Affairs
3. Operationalize the DLO’s in parallel with Course Learning Objectives (CLO’s) for all applicable course proposals and course reviews (i.e. course proposals would require faculty to list which DLO’s are applicable to their course and indicate how the course content and assessments meet those objectives)
4. Provide professional development/training on how to write measurable diversity learning objectives (CTLT).

Rationale and Relevance:

This recommendation would strengthen the University DLO’s, establish them as the common university-wide set of measurable goals and work to better integrate and assess diversity and inclusion in course proposals, GEGB course reviews, as well as AA and SA program evaluations. Future campus assessments of student learning around DLO’s will more accurately reflect and inform our efforts and success in these areas.

Achievable Timeline:

- **2018-2019 Academic Year:** The USCP taskforce has committed to contemporizing the existing DLO’s, OUDI can issue an additional charge to expand that effort
- **2018-2019 Academic Year:** Consultation for and writing of a senate resolution to include the DLO’s in the ULO’s and function alongside CLO’s
- Work with SA to weave DLO’s into their PLO’s and as part of ongoing program evaluations
- CTLT and their Inclusive Excellence specialist will design workshops/trainings around the development, integration and assessment of DLO’s

Recommendation 5:

We recommend that the RPT/WPAF process Include a review of Diversity and Inclusion efforts.

1. Add a section to the WPAF for a Diversity Statement (separate narrative section or in addition to existing narratives on Teaching Philosophy and/or Professional Development)
2. Revise language in the WPAF instructions to include Diversity and inclusion efforts in the Teaching, Research, and Service sections
3. Provide trainings and materials for department and college Promotion and Retention Committees to assist in their assessing of the D&I content and student evaluations
4. Provide training for faculty on inclusive teaching practice and design (CTLT - expansion of TIDE trainings, Inclusive instruction book circles, etc.)

Rationale and Relevance:

As the University works on recruiting and retaining student with marginalized identities, faculty and staff can have an extraordinary impact (positive or negative) on these students’ ability to succeed at Cal Poly. Faculty and staff need relevant tools and resources to become better equipped to create inclusive classrooms, to meet University, College, Department

DLOs, and the University values around Diversity and Inclusion. The additions of Diversity and Inclusion into the RPT/WPAF processes, encourages meaningful integration while also establishing a mechanism for accountability as well as an institutionalized means to recognize and reward exemplary efforts

Achievable Timeline:

- 2018-2019 Academic Year: OUDI, in partnership with departments and colleges already implementing elements of the recommendation, can work to develop best practice models for voluntary implementations in the Fall of 2019
- 2018-2019 Academic Year: Consultation with Academic Personnel to develop strategies for campus wide implementation and any needed senate resolutions and/or contract negotiations
- Development of materials and trainings for both faculty members and department and college PRC's

Recommendation 6:

Expand the current University USCP requirement to two courses, a lower and upper division. Recast/rename USCP to reflect a more critical engagement with issues of Diversity (e.g. "Critical race and intersectional studies", etc.). As is currently the case with USCP, this two-course requirement would be fulfilled through the G.E. program, not as an addition to it. Courses must be reviewed and approved by a committee of scholars with expertise in ethnic studies, queer studies, and/or women's and gender studies.

Rationale and Relevance:

The most recent university assessment of our DLO's, our G.E. program, and University WASC accreditation, all revealed a need to increase the presence of diversity in our curriculum. Current racialized and gendered issues on campus, along with the student demands that have followed, call for a new ethnic studies requirement. This two-course University requirement would meet that need while not adding to impacted curricular programs.

Achievable Timeline:

- 2018-2019 Academic Year: With the G.E. Taskforce report due this Spring, the campus will be posed for this change and can begin work in the Fall to write the needed senate resolution

Long Term Recommendations (To be explored within the next 2-3 years)

[2-4 Long Term Recommendations)

Recommendation 1:

We recommend that Cal Poly commits to university-wide cluster hires focused on diversity and inclusion such that:

- These hires occur every 2-3 years to have a cumulative effect
- Sources of funding for money toward new faculty lines should be identified by the Provost's Office (e.g., earmarking some of the Opportunity Grant funds)
- Cluster hires that focus on staff also be considered (with an emphasis on experience with underrepresented students and relevant topics)
 - Faculty interview process with regard to diversity question(s) should be expanded to staff interview process so as to assess staff candidates' past experience related to diversity and social justice driven initiatives; reviewed by OUDI; etc.

Rationale and Relevance:

This recommendation addresses the need for more underrepresented faculty and staff on campus, and indirectly may bring a better climate for underrepresented students as well. In addition, it asks all colleges to work together to be more explicit about value of diversity and inclusion in their area of campus, and spreads the work across the different disciplines to make sure that multiple voices contribute to the discussion.

Achievable Timeline:

This recommendation requires the development of funds for faculty lines (via Opportunity Grants may be the best sources; part of the 25% devoted to the campus, perhaps), and requires the continued use of a committee to assess and recommend faculty proposals to the provost (staff cluster could be overseen by existing Student Affairs personnel). Once this funding is developed, the cluster hire could occur every 2-3 years.

Measurement:

Measurement would be obtained by noting the increase in diversity within pools and after new staff and faculty are hired. This is a longer term goal as it will come to fruition as more positions are filled.

Recommendations for the Strategy Group Itself

Please provide a brief narrative of your suggestions for the strategy group (i.e. structure, name, charge, constitution, co-lead structure, etc.)

The structure of the strategy group worked well. It was beneficial to have more than one co-lead, as multiple views were brought to the planning and process. The meeting schedule allowed enough time to get work done in between meetings, but was stringent enough to keep the group on task.

Recruit and Retain Strategy Group 6-1-18

Group Charge

This group looks to fulfill our moral imperative to recruit and retain underserved and underrepresented students (URM, 1st generation, low income, women in male-dominated fields, etc.).

Problems Identified

- We do successfully recruit students of color, but can't compete with the financial support provided by the UCs and private institutions
- Faculty, staff, and students of color face discrimination in local communities when seeking housing
- Campus visits by prospective students are not always funneled through Admissions
- Onboarding is inconsistent across units and there is a need for mentoring programs for faculty and staff of color
- Admissions & Recruitment is not adequately resourced (not enough FTEs/unable to pay volunteers-Poly Reps, Partners Ambassadors, Hometown Heroes)
- Cross Cultural Centers are not adequately resourced (not enough FTEs and need more programming funds)

Short Term Recommendations (To be explored within the next year)

{2-4 Short Term Recommendations}

Recommendation

Provide Admissions & Recruitment additional resources (staffing, programming, and targeted scholarship programs) to recruit URM.

SMART

Specific: Provide opportunities for competitive prospects to build and foster relationships with key campus influencers. Expand currently enrolled student volunteer efforts-Hometown Heroes/Ambassador groups. Identify and promote scholarship programs prior to each recruitment cycle. Expand prospect student database across university to help maintain accurate records of recruitment activities throughout campus colleges/departments/clubs/organizations

Measurable: Applicant/Yield data analysis; Post event/activity qualitative surveys

Attainable: Hire admissions staff to implement robust group tour and campus visitor center program. Hire staff to support alumni/current student volunteer programs and universal prospect student database implementation. Provide collateral to promote recruitment activities and scholarship programs.

Relevant: Strengthen relationship between prospects and campus influencers

Use data being collected by University Advising (Beth Merritt Miller) to support implementation of new programs specifically targeting identified gaps & risk factors.

Timely: Generally takes an 18 month cycle to recruit the next class of students-begin hiring additional staff with operating budget over next 3-6 months

Specific: Examine policies related to identification of 1st gen/Pell eligible/etc. to balance student privacy with the need of Food Pantry, University Advising, etc. to do targeted outreach. Explore possibility of mandatory advising at a specific time e.g. end of 1st year or start of 2nd- use staff and faculty advisors- ensure that all students talk to someone at some point. Target at-risk populations (higher representation of students in need of support for retention) & provide information about resources

Measurable: Graduation and persistence rates.

Attainable: University Advising currently has a survey, we should continue and provide additional follow-up conversations.

Relevant: This would assist students in reaching their goal and strengthen our work with CSU Graduation Initiative

Timely: Review quarterly

Specific: Require all faculty (including lecturer positions) to include diversity statements in their application. Require all staff (including MPPs) to answer a supplemental question about equity and inclusion in the application. Faculty already required to answer a diversity question during interview. Include this process for staff through HR providing pre-approved sample questions. All staff interviews require asking at least one of these questions. Ask HR to provide a rubric of what constitutes an acceptable answer.

Measurable: The measure will largely be whether or not this is being implemented. The EEF report could also include a checkbox on whether or not the diversity question was asked as a supplemental question in the application and during the interview.

Attainable: Do we need to get union approval for this in staff applications and interviews? We also would like a process for vetting the sample diversity questions such as sending them out to campus along with a

Require all faculty and staff to provide a statement about the role of diversity and inclusion in Higher Education as a supplemental question in all applications and answer a question about diversity and inclusion during their interview

Strategic coordination of efforts to publicize diversity and inclusion resources to all students

survey/feedback process and additional suggestions.

Relevant: This sends an outward facing message of Cal Poly's values of equity and inclusion and ensures that all staff and faculty know about and have answered to those values

Timely: We would like this to take place by 2019/2020.

Specific: Quarterly meetings of representative staff from different offices that represent diversity and inclusion programming. Communicate with faculty about text & links to put on syllabi & course websites (coordinated by CTLT/OU DI/CCC/U. Advising/Campus Health & Wellbeing) to: connect students to campus resources; have consistent inclusion statement; statement encouraging students to ask for help.

Measurable: By using a database we would be able to track engagement and usage of the services. We would also need to get feedback from students.

Attainable: Yes, through clear communication and timelines.

Relevant: Providing a comprehensive resource to assist students by coordinating resources in one place.

Timely: Quarterly meeting to discuss upcoming programming and services

Specific: Hire 2 FTE for CCCs and add another \$150,000 in programming funds. Expand existing programs like PCW and fund new initiatives including monies to send students to conferences and on alternative break trips.

Measurable: Staff hired and funds allocated.

Attainable: Reallocation of existing funds and/or donor-driven.

Relevant: Provide additional support for SOC and other underrepresented groups.

Timely: In place for 2019-2020 academic year.

Specific: A detailed report created through surveying campus entities on their initiatives related to recruitment and retention of URMs. Include: hours of effort by student by

Provide additional resources (staff and programming funding) for the Cross-Cultural Centers.

Create a university-wide snapshot of student volunteers and paid positions around recruitment and retention of underrepresented students. Starting with the

Diversity Action Initiatives summary, research the efforts made in terms of what requests are made for actions, hours committed to the initiative/effort, whether effort is volunteer or paid, whose responsibility or who supervises efforts.

week/quarter/year, staff, faculty; supervisory roles and accountability; assessments/program reviews; unmet demands and goals (recruit, retain whom?).

Measurable: Summarize the raw data by targeted population and by recruitment and retention goals.

Attainable: Who would be the entity or staff/faculty person who could conduct the surveys and compile the detailed report? If relevant entities responded to the survey promptly, the report could reasonably be completed quickly.

Relevant: In order to evaluate whether to provide student course credit or pay for effort, whether staff position is needed/appropriate, or whether the work is seasonal or year-round, the kind of effort put in (or that should be put in) need to be assessed. The research is also necessary to understand what recruitment/retention efforts are well met or not met adequately or at all.

Timely: By October 2018

Long Term Recommendations (To be explored within the next 2-3 years)

{2-4 Short Term Recommendations}

Recommendation

Implement the Exit Interview Protocol that includes exit interviews for all permanent Cal Poly employees.

SMART

Specific: We would first like a report from HR on where campus is at already with this process. Beyond that, we recommend a 3rd party contractor to provide an anonymous survey for all employees leaving Cal Poly along with an optional in-person interview with the 3rd party contractor to collect more information. This survey/collection process would also need to include an informed consent process where we let the participant know that if they disclosed experiences like sexual harassment, the university may need to pursue an investigation. We would also stress the need for an Ombuds position that serves staff and faculty for an option where people can vet their options, including reporting options, BEFORE we lose valuable employees.

Create a Housing Liaison position to assist newly hired faculty and staff transition to the San Luis Obispo County community.

Measurable: The 3rd party contractor would provide an annual report outlining trends and data.

Attainable: Reallocation of existing funds

Relevant: This would help us have data behind the knowledge that many staff and faculty of color are leaving campus after not having positive campus climate experiences

Timely: We would like the report out in Fall 2018 and an Ombuds by 2020

Specific: Hire 1 FTE (split between Academic Personnel and Human Resources) to create partnerships with local cities and governments to assist staff and faculty transition to the community.

Measurable: Someone hired into this role or change of functions to meet this need

Attainable: Reallocation of existing funds

Relevant: To combat housing discrimination

Timely: In place for 2019-20

Develop a mentoring program for new faculty and staff of color and from other underrepresented groups

Specific: Have each Division of the institution create a mentoring program for incoming faculty and staff as part of the onboarding process.

Measurable: Programs are vetted through HR/Academic Personnel and the FSAs.

Attainable: Redirect a portion of staff roles in HR/Academic Personnel to develop mentoring programs.

Relevant: This will help new faculty and staff from underrepresented groups make connections quickly and help to create a sense of belonging.

Timely: In place for the 2019-20 academic year.

Recommendations for the Strategy Group Itself

Please provide a brief narrative of your suggestions for the strategy group (i.e. structure, name, charge, constitution, co-lead structure, etc.)

We recommend dividing this group into two groups. One that focuses on recruitment and retention of students and the other on recruitment and retention of faculty/staff. Within each strategy group, there would be a sub group for recruitment and another for retention.

Campus Climate Strategy Group

For nearly four months (February 2018 to May 2018), a group of Cal Poly faculty, staff, students and administrators met to discuss and develop recommendations as the Campus Climate Strategy Group. Unfortunately, during this period, several bias incidents occurred on and off campus, including a student in blackface, which had a significant negative impact on Cal Poly's community. The incidents sparked student-led demonstrations and calls for immediate changes in the campus climate. Specifically, a group of students, The Drylongso Collective, organized and presented a list of demands to the administration to address the various racist acts that impact historically marginalized and underrepresented groups on campus. In response, the Campus Climate Strategy Group convened and recognized the responsibility to advocate and include, where appropriate, the student demands offered by the Drylongso Collective into the recommendations being offered to OUDI. The student demands provided a salient student voice and further enriched the discussions by the various representatives on the Campus Climate Strategy Group.

Charge

The Campus Climate Strategy Group was charged with developing strategies and actions that will move the campus climate towards one that reflects the values of love, empathy, respect, inclusion, and the valuing of differences in order to increase the well-being of all individuals at Cal Poly.

Problems Identified

The members of the Campus Climate Strategy Group first met to review the previous and current efforts related to diversity and inclusion at Cal Poly. During this time, recommendations collected at the various Collective Impact forums were also reviewed. In the various meetings thereafter, the group focused their discussions on identifying, assessing, and sharing best practices and strategies to ensure a welcoming, inclusive and nurturing environment at Cal Poly. The Campus Climate Strategy Group was asked to look broadly across the various departments and programs to examine ways the campus can enhance their efforts to improve the learning, living, and working environments for students, faculty, and staff at Cal Poly. Several themes emerged highlighting areas where Cal Poly should focus efforts: communication and messaging, leadership investment, partnerships and collaborations, education and learning opportunities, and institutional self-assessment.

Several strategies were discussed that target these identified themes and the following priorities were identified:

- Communication/messaging
 - Communicate clear expectation that everyone is responsible for diversity work, campus wide, and should be recognized for such work
 - Town hall in Spring, and Report Out (State of Diversity) in Fall (highlighting current and historical progress)
- Leadership investment
 - Venue(s) for hearing student/faculty/staff voices
 - Communicate clear expectations of conduct with associated accountability system (policy, code of conduct)
- Partnerships/collaborations
 - Community relations (SLO, region, California)
- Education/learning
 - Onboarding of students/faculty/staff and employee orientation
- Institutional self-assessment
 - Campus climate survey and report/action plan

Recommendations

The following are recommendations developed by the Campus Climate Strategy Group that include both short and long-term strategies that address specific needs for improving the campus climate at Cal Poly:

Recommendation 1: Communicate clear expectation that everyone is responsible for diversity work, campus-wide, and should be recognized for such work

For Cal Poly to build a campus culture that is inclusive and welcoming, every member of the Cal Poly community needs to see themselves as someone who has a responsibility to make all members of the community feel welcome. As our campus community changes, we need to continue to educate ourselves about issues around diversity and inclusion. Along with personal development, initiatives focused on systemic changes including the development and implementation of strategies to track and measure how everyone on campus is working to build an inclusive campus culture must be incorporated.

This recommendation could be measured in a variety of ways dependent on the actual strategies implemented. Specific strategies and measurements that may be utilized include:

- Beginning in Fall 2018, highlight existing mandatory and optional diversity trainings for the campus community
- Beginning in Fall 2018, intentionally embed diversity and inclusion into new faculty orientation, new employee orientation, SLO days presentations, and club advisor training
- Beginning in Fall 2019, annually collect and report out from every college and division how they are promoting and rewarding diversity and inclusion efforts
- Beginning in Fall 2019, include diversity and inclusion activities into employee performance evaluations and faculty RPT (retention, promotion, and tenure) evaluations

In order for many of these strategies to be implemented, financial and personnel resources will be needed. Trainings and presentations require both financial resources for items such as space and materials, and personnel resources for the individuals who will provide consistent offerings and a presence at relevant activities. This may require additional employees who can perform the work, such as an Associate Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion in every college and division, and additional budget for increasing and maintaining opportunities.

Recommendation 2: Provide a Report Out (State of Diversity) in Fall quarter and a Town Hall in Spring quarter

The campus community is interested in ease of access to information surrounding diversity and inclusion at Cal Poly. The Report Out will provide an opportunity to share our progress, including both successes and failures, thus providing individuals with enhanced understanding, increased transparency, and distinguishes diversity and inclusion as a shared priority for Cal Poly. The Report Out would also highlight the intended direction for the campus for the next academic year. The Town Hall will provide an opportunity for students, faculty, and staff to ask questions and hear from administration – an essential piece in building trust. The Town Hall will provide an opportunity for administration to hear what has worked well, where gaps still exist, and provide information or clarity.

This recommendation could be implemented in a variety of ways and we propose the following for consideration:

- The Fall 2018 Report Out would be formatted as interactively as possible while focusing primarily on providing information to attendees.
- The Spring 2019 Town Hall would be formatted as a question and answer session. While some presentation of the purpose and relevancy may be provided, the majority of the time should be utilized to exchange perspectives, ideas, and opinions.
- Topics should address all issues surrounding diversity and inclusion including some of the more difficult topics like campus climate, racism, hostile work environment, sexual harassment, discrimination, and the meaning of diversity
- All Cal Poly internal and external community members would be welcomed in order to provide everyone with an opportunity to share their thoughts and commitments to the university
- Incorporate various means for participation – in-person, live-streamed, recordings, and other uses and technology – so everyone has an equal opportunity to voice their questions without fear or intimidation
- Marketing would focus on the singular event in order to avoid confusion with other similarly-purposed opportunities
- Limit the number of panelists and/or presenters so as to avoid confusion or dilute the topic or issue being discussed

The Campus Climate Strategy Group proposes the Report Out and Town Hall be coordinated by the Office of University Diversity and Inclusion (OUDI). As neither are a current activity provided by OUDI, additional personnel resources may be necessary. These additional personnel resources would primarily be within OUDI yet consideration must be given for those departments and individuals with whom OUDI would need to partner with in order to provide these opportunities.

Recommendation 3: Provide a consistent platform for students, faculty and staff to express feedback about campus climate to administration and other decision-makers

Opportunities for students, faculty and staff to provide feedback about the campus climate are often only available as a response to acute incident scenarios. The infrequent availability for these platforms leaves members of the campus community with pain and frustration as a result of overt racism, exclusion, microaggressions, and overwhelming homogeneity. As a result, the impact of the acute incident scenarios is amplified. Providing regular, reciprocal communication will allow voices to be heard and campus leaders to proactively resolve issues before they escalate. Increasing conversations inside and outside the classroom will ensure diversity and inclusion isn't just a topic in a time of crisis. Additionally, increasing conversations will improve the ability of university leaders to speak authentically on this topic resulting in greater trust with students.

This recommendation could be implemented in a few ways that can be measured using a variety of methods as follows:

- Beginning in Fall 2018, student, faculty, and staff voices will be elevated through the piloting of new formal and casual opportunities to meet with leaders with the purpose of discussing campus climate. These should occur regularly, regardless of campus incidents.
- In order to ensure the campus community feels confident submitting a biased incident report, beginning in Fall 2018, an incident response plan will be created and implemented. The plan will establish a realistic baseline for biased incident reporting. The plan will also standardize open forums for students, faculty, and staff immediately following an incident while publishing transparent updates on a Cal Poly webpage.
- Beginning in Winter 2019, new platforms will be utilized or created that weave in diversity and inclusion. This should include inviting students, faculty, and staff to more public meetings such as Associated Students Incorporated (ASI), Foundation Board, Office of University Diversity and Inclusion, etc), and facilitating more ongoing classroom and meeting discussions through incentivized dialogue training with faculty and staff, to begin in Spring 2019.
- Beginning in Fall 2018 and continuing thereafter, campus will see an increase in attendance at both acute and ongoing listening opportunities
- Campus climate survey results will show improvement on opportunities for student, faculty, and staff voices to be heard
- Beginning in Fall 2019, campus will review results from faculty and staff exit surveys to determine if strategies were successful
- Beginning in Spring 2019, student retention rates and Graduate Status Reports (GSR) will be utilized to determine if strategies were successful
- *Additional details and tactics for consideration are included in the Addendum*

The Campus Climate Strategy Group recognizes that some of these strategies may take time to produce results, but recommends the implementation of the short-term strategies as critical. The campus cannot wait until the next egregious bias incident to occur before taking action. Additionally, personnel resources will be necessary for this recommendation, and it is proposed that the Office of University Diversity and Inclusion take the lead on the coordination of and administrative support for responding to reports of bias incidents. The President's Office should also be responsible for the coordination of and marketing of the regular listening sessions for students, faculty, and staff. We also foresee University Communications assisting with spreading the word about existing public meetings. Each of these activities will require not only the departments leading the effort to be involved, but also those individuals with whom they may partner.

Recommendation 4: Communicate clear expectations of conduct with associated accountability systems

Cal Poly students, faculty, and staff are lacking a consistent message regarding campus expectations related to campus climate. Each area of campus, and individual, has a different perspective of what a positive campus climate looks and feels like resulting in confusion over campus ideals. Cal Poly not only needs to clearly define standards for a positive campus climate, but also to put into place a clear accountability system for those who do not adhere to campus expectations.

This recommendation could be implemented in a variety of ways and we propose the following for consideration:

- Beginning in Fall 2018 and implementing by Winter 2019, develop a zero tolerance policy describing the steps taken when incidents of racism occur. Policy should be made available during the admissions process as well as posted to the Cal Poly website
- Beginning in Fall 2018, evaluate student orientation programs, Week of Welcome (WOW) and SLO Days, Greek Life, student clubs, and other student organizations to ensure student leaders and other group members are current with policies of appropriate conduct
- Beginning in Fall 2019, utilize online platform to create and establish a training focused on empathy for all faculty and staff
- Beginning in Fall 2019, partner with New Student Transition Program (NSTP) to incorporate empathy training for students during WOW and SLO Days

In order for these strategies to be implemented, time, financial, and personnel resources will be needed. It will take significant time and collaboration across campus to reach shared expectations of conduct as well as an accountability system. Personnel resources would also be needed in order to evaluate the various programs on an ongoing basis which may require an additional work assignment for an individual or individuals. Financial and personnel resources will be needed in order to create a training focused on empathy that ties into our expectations of conduct. Development of online training also requires a significant investment of time to make it engaging and information.

Recommendation 5: Improve the relationship between San Luis Obispo community and Cal Poly students, faculty, and staff, especially those from underrepresented groups

The San Luis Obispo community doesn't identify Cal Poly students as their own — as valued members of the overall San Luis Obispo city/county community. Students of color as well as faculty and staff of color don't feel supported or cannot find the resources they need in the larger community, which is less diverse than Cal Poly's student body. The recommendation is to improve the relationship/perceptions of the San Luis Obispo community (and beyond) to Cal Poly students, with a focus on underrepresented students. The recommendation aims to foster allyship between community members and the campus community so that students, faculty and staff feel a sense of welcoming and belonging off-campus, and the SLO community (and even county) will gain increased awareness of the diversity that people of color bring to this area through increased visibility and interaction with students of color.

Specific strategies could be put into place to foster allyship, explore relationship-building between community members and students, encourage and promote community service efforts by students in the community, and provide resources for new students, staff and faculty to help widen their networks and help them feel more connected to the community. This might look like:

- Beginning in Fall 2018, highlight stories of our underrepresented groups, on our website, through direct media pitching; on social media; through videos that are put online, on public access television or used in media pitches; in marketing campaigns throughout town; and other ways to introduce students to the community. A redesigned website could drive the narrative and get our stories to an external audience. A marketing campaign could introduce students of color to the community (see <https://www.northcoastjournal.com/humboldt/a-student-project-seeks-to-bridge-humboldts-campus-community-divide/Content?oid=8697722>.)
- Beginning in Fall 2019, organize a Diversity Celebration in Mission Plaza, for on-campus and community (including nonprofit) groups to participate in, with a focus on a broad range of diversity. Make it an annual event, open and accessible to all.
- Beginning in Winter 2019 and continuing, gather community leaders together to talk about ways to attract and support people of color who live and work in the area. Increase partnerships with the city, the San Luis Obispo Chamber of Commerce and other groups to improve the climate for residents as well as business owners and find more ways to support and retain them. Find more opportunities to invite the community on campus to engage with students (during Week of Welcome, for example).
- Beginning in Fall 2018, enhance communication channels throughout campus to funnel story ideas to communications and marketing teams on stories about students of color. Coordinate with ASI, Student Affairs and other divisions/departments to learn earlier of community service projects, programs and events to promote their events/raise the profile of what our students are doing in the community. Possibly encourage community service (e.g. faculty members could offer credit).
- Beginning in Spring 2019, create a diversity resource guide with a range of resources on campus and in the community, including but not limited to community resources and organizations, faith organizations, cultural clubs, local markets/restaurants/businesses (such as hair salons), media outlets, events and community contacts. It could be organized into various sections — see <http://www2.humboldt.edu/diversity/diversity-resource-guide>. Updated annually, it would serve as a resource for all students but be geared toward underrepresented, marginalized groups to provide increased support and a larger sense of community as soon as they become a member of our campus community.
- Beginning in Summer 2019, explore relationship-building in various other ways, such as: community get-togethers or potlucks between students and SLO residents, listening sessions and other opportunities to bring various groups together.

- Beginning in Fall 2019, establish a partnership with San Luis Obispo and northern Santa Barbara county school districts to educate K-12 students on diversity and inclusion. This could include partnering with teachers to allow students the opportunity to teach supplemental material (and tell their story) to students in grades K-12, complementing the curriculum.

Some of the ideas within this recommendation could be accomplished within a year, but many of the ideas are ongoing, long-term commitments to increase awareness and foster better understanding, empathy and sense of belonging between the campus and external communities. While we have identified beginning dates for the proposed strategies, we recommend that the final product may not be evident until a later time. The overall recommendation could be measured by a handful of metrics such as number of story pitches, news releases, story coverage, community service hours, and/or even a survey of community members to gauge current and future views.

These ideas will take better coordination and communication between many departments, divisions and groups on campus. For this reason, time, financial, and personnel resources will need to be available. Personnel from University Marketing and University Communications would be involved to coordinate and facilitate marketing and communications efforts. Students would be engaged to work on the diversity resource guide (and annual updates. Perhaps one could turn it into an app?). The campaigns, events, resource guide, and other suggestions would require a budget for production.

Recommendation 6: Enhance the onboarding of students, faculty, and staff and embed into new employee orientation learning opportunities related to diversity and inclusion

Vision 2022 states that Cal Poly “will have an enriching, inclusive environment where every student, faculty, and staff member is valued.” That Cal Poly will “create a rich culture of diversity and inclusivity that supports and celebrates the similarities and differences of every individual on campus.” And that “recruitment and retention of faculty and staff will be drive by professional development opportunities...” In order to achieve this vision, a positive campus climate, and a rewarding space in which to learn and work, Cal Poly must focus efforts on the effective onboarding and orientation of students, faculty, and staff. Through effective onboarding and orientation, the university can highlight the priority we place on a diverse and inclusive climate. As a result of providing opportunities to learn of these priorities, including how we define them and what they entail, we will not only benefit from greater retention of our students, faculty, and staff from underrepresented groups, but also move toward a richer and positive campus climate.

Specific strategies could be put into place to highlight the value of diversity and inclusion, promote learning about unconscious bias and its impact on our relationships, encourage allyship, and provide resources for new students, faculty, and staff to connect with others in the campus community. This might look like:

- By Fall 2018, student orientation events (SLO Days, WOW, etc) would include an emphasis on the value of diversity and inclusion at Cal Poly
- By Fall 2019, onboarding of students would include dedicated sessions to learning about the definition of diversity and inclusion, strategies for how to avoid bias and discrimination, and approaches for being inclusive
- By Fall 2018, faculty and staff orientation sessions would include an emphasis on the value of diversity and inclusion at Cal Poly
- By Winter 2019, onboarding of faculty and staff would include opportunities to learn about diversity and inclusion, awareness of unconscious bias, and strategies for being inclusive. These learning opportunities would be required for management (MPP) and confidential employees and strongly encouraged for all others
- By Spring 2019, opportunities to learn about being an effective ally would be offered to new and existing students, faculty and staff
- By Fall 2019, Cal Poly will provide a diversity resource guide for all new students, faculty, and staff to connect to campus and community resources, including a special focus on those resources available for individuals from underrepresented groups

While some of these strategies already have dedicated personnel, many are not within the current scope of their roles, thus additional time, financial, and personnel resources would be necessary. Campus-wide working groups would need to form, both for student efforts and separately for faculty and staff efforts, in order to collaborate, partner, and share resources for implementing these strategies. Developing and producing learning opportunities requires expertise, about the subject as well as effective learning strategies, and takes time to produce. Personnel resources would need to be made available in order to take on these additional responsibilities which may require additional staffing. Also, budgetary resources would need to be made available in order to supply space, materials, and the resource guide.

Recommendation 7: Conduct a campus climate survey with a clear action plan for how report findings will be utilized

It is crucial for Cal Poly to cultivate a welcoming and inclusive climate for individuals of all backgrounds. A campus climate survey will provide Cal Poly with a better understanding and assessment of how members of the campus community relate to and interact with one another on a daily basis. The results of the survey will highlight areas of strengths and weaknesses at Cal Poly so the campus can focus efforts appropriately on improving the working and learning environments at Cal Poly.

The following are strategies to make the distribution, analysis, and resulting efforts of the campus climate survey of impact at Cal Poly:

- By Fall 2018, create an outcome report of 2014 Campus Climate Survey. Provide a comprehensive report of the outcomes and deliverables that occurred as result of the 2014 Campus Climate Survey. Report should also include survey results and outcomes that were not implemented and provide a rationale. The 2014 Campus Climate Survey Committee should be consulted for input and development of report. Outcome report should be presented via forums, websites, print, and other venues campus-wide
- By Fall 2018, assess all recent, current, and forthcoming surveys being administered across campus to avoid survey fatigue and duplication of efforts
- Beginning in Fall 2018, create a new Campus Climate Survey Committee. The new committee should include campus-wide representation of students, faculty, and staff, with a focus on formulating research design and survey questions. The committee will consult with scholars who study this type of research/scholarship throughout the research design and survey construction process. The committee will actively reach out to student, faculty, and staff groups to solicit input and feedback, including input from area experts like SAFER, Office of Equal Opportunity, Cross Cultural Centers, Human Resources and Academic Personnel, and Office of University Diversity and Inclusion
- Beginning in Winter 2019, pilot test new Campus Climate Survey and allow time for revisions before campus-wide distribution in Spring 2019
- Maintain a subset of 2014 and subsequent survey questions to ensure longitudinal study, change over time, and analysis for each survey instance

The Campus Climate Strategy Group anticipates this to be an approximately 2 year process – 1 year for development, 2 months to promote, 2 months to administer, 5 months to analyze, and 3 months to operationalize with tangible deliverables. The results should provide Cal Poly with a current temperature of campus climate, and ensure findings and future tangible deliverables are equitably distributed across campus. Given the long-term commitment of this endeavor, we recognize time and personnel resources must be made available. This planning, distribution, analysis, and delivery of the survey will require ample collaboration and significant investment of people and time. While we anticipate the Office of University Diversity and Inclusion may take the lead on this effort, we also know the effort will require thorough input on both the development and the results.

Recommendations for the Strategy Group

The Campus Climate Strategy Groups proposes several ideas for how this strategy group can be utilized moving forward.

- Utilize the group for providing clarity on recommendations, input on proposed strategies prior to implementation, and providing feedback on campus efforts
- Utilize select members to track and measure the implementation of recommendations
- Utilize select members to collaborate across campus on various subsets of recommendations
- Utilize select group members to combine with others across campus who can focus on providing communications and marketing efforts
- Transition the group into a platform for students, faculty, and staff of all backgrounds to share feedback, including projects, progress, and concerns

Addendum

Additional information related to recommendation 3: Provide a consistent platform for students, faculty and staff to express feedback about campus climate to administration and other decision-makers

1. Emphasize the bias incident reporting web page and Campus Police contact info for all campus audiences via email and in all ongoing trainings (faculty/staff orientation, WOW, etc.) so all campus community members feel confident if they need to report an incident.
2. Create a campus incident response plan to be implemented after any future campus incidents of bias or racism, including 1) timely open forums for students, faculty and staff to have their questions answered and speak directly to university leadership; and 2) transparent communication via website and email to inform campus and external audiences like parents/alumni of the steps taken to remedy the situation and preserve a safe, civil environment.
3. Recommend, incentivize (via evaluation/RPT) and provide training to faculty regarding how to discuss issues of diversity and inclusion in a classroom context so students feel they have a regular opportunity to share their perspectives.
4. Evaluate the ongoing calendar of administrative meetings open to the public (ASI, OUDI, President's Office, Foundation Board) and promote them to students so they know of all opportunities to make their voices heard via existing platforms.
5. Elevate the voices of staff and faculty who work directly with students (like professional advisors) to the leadership level through quarterly roundtable discussions with 10 professionals at a time to respond to growing concerns before they become a major issue.
6. Establish "Open Air Lunches" once a month at 805 Kitchen where students can have a free lunch with administrators and discuss what's on their mind regarding campus climate.

Black Students at Public Colleges and Universities

A 50-STATE REPORT CARD

By Shaun R. Harper and Isaiah Simmons
USC Race and Equity Center



A grant from the Ford Foundation funded the production and dissemination of this report. The USC Race and Equity Center gratefully acknowledges Ford's generous support of our research, and all the other ways it demonstrates serious commitment to racial equity.

The authors gratefully acknowledge Sharceff Ross McDonald for inspiring this project.

Opinions expressed herein belong entirely to the authors and do not necessarily represent viewpoints of the Ford Foundation or the Trustees of the University of Southern California.

Recommended citation:

Harper, S. R., & Simmons, I. (2019). *Black students at public colleges and universities: A 50-state report card*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California, Race and Equity Center.

© 2019, University of Southern California. All rights reserved.

USC Race and Equity Center

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....2-3
 Message from Secretary Zakiya Smith Ellis4
 Message from President Elaine P. Maimon5
 Public Higher Education as a Public Good.....6
 Research Methods, Grading, and Limitations7-8
 State-by-State Equity Index Score Map.....9
 Institutions with Highest and Lowest Equity Index Scores.....10

State Data Tables
 Alabama, Alaska12
 Arizona, Arkansas13
 California14
 Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware15
 Florida, Georgia16
 Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois.....17
 Indiana, Iowa, Kansas18
 Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine19
 Maryland, Massachusetts20
 Michigan, Minnesota21
 Mississippi, Missouri, Montana22
 Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire23
 New Jersey, New Mexico24
 New York25
 North Carolina, North Dakota26
 Ohio, Oklahoma.....27
 Oregon.....28
 Pennsylvania29
 Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota.....30
 Tennessee.....31
 Texas.....32
 Utah, Vermont, Virginia.....33
 Washington, West Virginia.....34
 Wisconsin, Wyoming.....35
 Recommendations36-39
 About the Authors.....40

COURTESY OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

More than 900,000 Black undergraduates are enrolled at public colleges and universities across the United States. This report is about the status of these students at every four-year, non-specialized, public postsecondary institution in the nation.

We combine U.S. Census population statistics with quantitative data from the U.S. Department of Education to measure postsecondary access and student success for Black undergraduates. Letter grades (A, B, C, D, F, and I) are awarded to each institution.

Private schools, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Tribal Colleges, military academies, university health and medical institutes, graduate universities, community colleges, and public institutions that primarily confer associate's degrees are not included in our analyses.

This report is arranged by state. Statistics and grades for 506 individual public institutions are provided on each state's list.

EQUITY INDICATORS

Here are the four equity indicators on which we graded public colleges and universities:

Representation Equity

Extent to which Black students' share of enrollment in the undergraduate student population reflects their representation among 18-24 year-old citizens in that state.

Gender Equity

Extent to which the proportionality of Black women's and Black men's respective shares of Black student enrollments in the undergraduate student population reflects the national gender enrollment distribution across all racial/ethnic groups (56.3% women, 43.7% men).

Completion Equity

Extent to which Black students' six-year graduation rates, across four cohorts, matches overall six-year graduation rates during those same time periods at each institution.

Black Student-to-Black Faculty Ratio

Ratio of full-time, degree-seeking Black undergraduates to full-time Black instructional faculty members on each campus.

MAJOR FINDINGS

- Black citizens are 14.6% of 18-24 year-olds across the 50 states, yet only 9.8% of full-time, degree-seeking undergraduates at public colleges and universities are Black. At more than three-fourths of public institutions, traditional-aged Black students are under-enrolled relative to their residency in the states.
- Across all racial/ethnic groups, women comprise 56.3% of full-time, degree-seeking undergraduates at public postsecondary institutions. The enrollment gap between Black women and men is less pronounced. Just over 52% of Black undergraduates at public colleges and universities are women.

RESEARCH BY UNIVERSITY OF PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

• Across four cohorts, 39.4% of Black students completed bachelor's degrees at public institutions within six years, compared to 50.6% of undergraduates overall. Forty-one percent of public colleges and universities graduate one-third or fewer Black students within six years.

• For every full-time Black faculty member at a public college or university, there are 42 full-time, degree-seeking Black undergraduates. Forty institutions employ no full-time Black instructors. On 44% of public campuses, there are 10 or fewer full-time Black faculty members across all ranks and academic fields.

EQUITY INDEX SCORES

In addition to awarding letter grades on the four equity indicators, we calculated an Equity Index Score – the equivalent of a grade point average – for each institution. In the same fashion that colleges and universities customarily compute GPAs, we assigned four points to an A, three to a B, and so on.

The average Equity Index Score across the 506 public institutions is 2.02. No campus earned above 3.50. Two hundred colleges and universities earned scores below 2.00. Lists of institutions with the highest and lowest Equity Index Scores are included on page 10 of this report. We also calculated Equity Index Score averages across all campuses within each state. A map with statewide averages is on page 9.

USING THIS REPORT

We hope this publication will be useful to Black students and their families, postsecondary leaders and faculty members, policymakers, journalists, and a wide range of stakeholders who care about Black students' educational experiences and attainment rates. As such, we present data institution-by-institution within each state. Our aims are to make inequities more transparent and to equip anyone concerned about enrollment, success, and college completion rates for Black students with numbers they can use to demand corrective policies and institutional actions.

This report should not be misused to reinforce deficit narratives about Black undergraduates. Problematic trends presented herein are not fully explained by the failure of K-12 schools to effectively prepare these students for college admission and success or to bad parenting, student disengagement, and low motivation. They also are attributable to institutional practices, policies, mindsets, and cultures that persistently disadvantage Black students and sustain inequities.

Ideally, leaders on college campuses and in state systems of higher education will take seriously the statistics we furnish in this document. We want them to respond by swiftly engaging in rigorous, strategic, and collaborative work to improve the status of Black undergraduates at their institutions. Data presented in this publication ought to inform their efforts and help ensure accountability.

MESSAGE FROM DR. ZAKIYA SMITH ELLIS

SECRETARY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION
State of New Jersey



Prior to joining the New Jersey Governor's cabinet in 2018, Dr. Smith Ellis was Strategy Director for Lumina Foundation. She has also served as Senior Policy Advisor for Education at the White House and a senior policy advisor at the U.S. Department of Education.

To ensure the best possible educational experiences and outcomes for our students, critical self-examination has to be a common practice among postsecondary educators and leaders. Many of us within institutions and state higher education systems routinely assess our progress toward goals, compare ourselves to peers, and develop strategic plans to address our findings. New Jersey is currently in the midst of a long-overdue exploration of this very sort.

Self-assessments must include an honest look at where we stand in addressing equity for students of color. While this should be a component of our planning at all times, it takes on even more significance within our current sociopolitical climate. We are facing a critical juncture in determining the type of nation we want to be – public colleges and universities have an especially urgent and influential role to play in shaping that path. To say this is important work would be an understatement.

Learning in college is not confined to classrooms. Instead, it is woven throughout the educational experience. Higher education leaders often spend a great deal of time thinking about expanding college opportunity and improving learning within and beyond classrooms. We should also carefully consider how the experiences we provide students of color align with stated goals for their success. Colleges and universities convey messages about who is valued in society through signals such as the nature of the faculty, the composition of the student body, and the roles people of color play in key leadership positions.

These signals are sent at a time when students are developing their sense of self and determining how they will interact with others in society. So then, meaningful equity work is imperative to ensuring a better future, not just for our students, but also for our institutions.

When outlining goals and charting progress, it is necessary to be specific. As such, I am thankful to the USC Race and Equity Center for being specific in identifying Black undergraduates in this report. Too often "students of color" are lumped together as if their "other-ness" makes them all the same. If we are to be serious about our endeavors, we must be careful to examine challenges as specifically as possible in order to be clear about the kinds of remedies that are needed. The valuable, carefully curated information furnished in this 50-state report card allows educators and leaders to take seriously our task of critical self-reflection and assessment. Only by focusing our attention in specific ways and acknowledging our specific challenges can we begin to specifically address them. I look forward to this work in the Garden State, and hope that other higher education leaders across the country will take seriously this task as well.



MESSAGE FROM DR. ELAINE P. MAIMON
PRESIDENT
Governors State University

Starting with the Morrill Act of 1862, public universities were built to expand access and success for state residents underserved by private institutions. Low-income students came to land-grant universities to explore the world of ideas, including citizenship in a democracy. It is interesting and somewhat ironic that also in 1862 President Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation. I would surmise that in the midst of the Civil War no one made a connection between the Morrill Act and the Emancipation Proclamation because few Americans then were thinking about higher education for Black students. Yet today it is imperative for public universities to embrace their original conceptual mission of inclusivity and to give special attention to those initially excluded.

In 2018, Black students are now members of higher education's New Majority: first generation, students of color, adult learners, and veterans. Every public university is responsible for educating this majority. The good news is that the public sector has expanded since 1862. Land-grant universities have been joined by numerous regional publics, like my own university, Governors State. Private postsecondary institutions must also contribute to equity goals. Working together, we have the capacity to provide excellent educational opportunities to what used to be considered minority populations. High quality education for the New Majority, as well as for the new minority (traditional students), must be the mission of state universities.

Actualizing this mission requires new ways of thinking and transformations in teaching, learning, and leadership. Outstanding research published by USC Professor Shaun Harper and other scholars in recent years indicates that we must replace deficit frameworks with models that amplify students' assets and institutional responsibility. Identifying strengths is hard work, requiring breaking through barriers and inculcating confidence and trust. The widely used deficit model is the easy way out, emphasizing the correction of surface features rather than in-depth understanding. In essence, universities must commit to research-based transformations, not simply to educate Black students or even to improve service to the New Majority, but to improve college access, students' experiences, and postsecondary educational outcomes in the twenty-first century.

Educational transformations are imperative, if public universities are going to fulfill our mission to Black students and others in the New Majority. But change has a price. Certainly, public universities must be ready to reallocate internal resources, but that responsibility becomes exceedingly difficult as state appropriations decline. It is time for governors and legislators in all 50 states to understand the necessity of investing in human capital. A word of caution: Even with better funding, improvement will rarely be immediate or linear. That is important for policymakers and others to understand as they read report cards. Certainly, this 50-state study on Black student access and success is informative, and every university should strive for better results. But it is necessary to remember that real, long-term change is often recursive, even messy. Transformation requires investment, strategy, patience, accountability, consistent measurement, determination, and courage.

Dr. Maimon served as Chancellor of the University of Alaska Anchorage, Provost of Arizona State University-West, and Vice President of Arizona State University prior to being named the fifth President of Governors State University. Her newest book, "Leading Academic Change: Vision, Strategy, Transformation," was published in 2018.

PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION AS A PUBLIC GOOD

Higher education in the United States is a public good. While it confers enormous personal and material advantages to individuals, it more significantly profits our broader society. Increasing postsecondary degree attainment strengthens our economy and bolsters innovation. Americans who graduate from college are considerably less likely than are those without degrees to be unemployed, dependent on government assistance, and confined to low-wage jobs with inadequate employee benefits and limited opportunities for upward professional advancement. Institutions of higher education help make this possible. While all colleges and universities contribute, those that are public play an especially significant role. Public institutions were originally built to educate the public. Taxpayers in each of the 50 states help support them. These campuses, therefore, belong to the public. A portion of the public is Black. As data in this report make painfully clear, too many public colleges and universities fail to offer Black students equitable access to one of our nation's most valuable public goods.

Inequities in higher education are inextricably linked to larger social forces. For example, citizens who live in poor neighborhoods with high unemployment and excessive crime also typically lack access to quality healthcare, nutritious foods, fair policing, and K-12 schools that are high

performing and equitably resourced. Unfortunately, a disproportionate number of Americans disadvantaged by these factors are Black. Some might argue such challenges are beyond the control of public postsecondary institutions. Actually, higher education helps sustain (and in some instances, exacerbate) these inequities. The overwhelming majority of our nation's elected officials are college graduates – so, too, are CEOs, physicians and nurses, judges and lawyers, school teachers and administrators, and leaders in most sectors of our economy. As colleges and universities routinely fail to teach future professionals how to correct forces that cyclically disadvantage Black Americans, these institutions remain complicit in maintaining engines of racial inequity that severely limit Black students' chances of ever making it to and succeeding in college.

Inequities are not fully explained by forces external to a college campus. There are numerous factors and conditions within it that determine who gets admitted, how they are treated once they matriculate, the inclusiveness of their learning environments, the cultural relevance of what they are taught, the racial diversity of their professors, and their likelihood for personal wellness and academic success. As our data show, faculty members and leaders on too many campuses are bad stewards of the public good, at least as it pertains to Black

students. Instead of asking, "why are Black undergraduates doing so poorly at public institutions," we encourage readers to question why public colleges and universities do so poorly at enrolling and graduating Black students; ensuring gender equity among them; and affording them greater, more reasonable access to same-race faculty members.

Clearly, policymaking activities concerning postsecondary education fail to level the playing field for Black Americans. This is partly attributable to raceless approaches to policymaking. Few state and federal policymakers are Black. Policy actors across all racial/ethnic groups are responsible for guaranteeing that public postsecondary institutions equitably serve the public, including Black residents within states they represent. Moreover, most college presidents, trustees, senior administrators, professors, and admission officers are White. They, too, are responsible for better serving Black students and affording them greater access to the public good that is public higher education.

RESEARCH METHODS, GRADING, AND LIMITATIONS

Examined in this report are four access and equity indicators for Black undergraduates at every four-year, non-specialized, public postsecondary institution in the United States. We analyzed quantitative data from two open-access federal data sources: U.S. Census American Community Survey and the U.S. Department of Education's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

INDICATOR	DATA SOURCE(S)	EQUITY MEASURE
Representation Equity	IPEDS Enrollments (Academic Year 2016-17) and U.S. Census American Community Survey Population Estimates (Year 2016)	Difference between the percent of Black undergraduates at the institution and the percent of Black 18-24-year-old citizens in the state
Gender Equity	IPEDS Enrollments (Academic Year 2016-17)	Enrollment gap between Black undergraduate men and Black undergraduate women relative to the overall enrollment gap between women (56.3%) and men (43.7%) across all racial/ethnic groups
Completion equity	IPEDS Six-Year Graduation Rates for cohorts beginning in 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010 and graduating by 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016	Difference between average six-year graduation rates for four cohorts of Black undergraduate students and four cohorts of undergraduate students overall
Black Students-to-Black Faculty Ratio	IPEDS Enrollments (Academic Year 2016-17) and IPEDS Full-Time Instructional Faculty (Academic Year 2016-17)	Ratio of full-time, degree-seeking Black undergraduates to full-time Black instructional faculty members

On the Representation Equity indicator, A's were awarded to all 120 colleges and universities at which Black enrollments either matched or exceeded Black representation in the states where those schools are located. The remaining letter grades were distributed in fourths across the remaining 386 institutions. On the three other equity indicators, grades were distributed evenly in quintiles, except in cases where ties did not permit exact splits. Put differently, one-fifth of institutions received A's, one-fifth received B's, and so on.

We did not award letter grades to Texas Woman's University and Mississippi University for Women on the Gender Equity indicator. Though both are now co-educational, their single-sex origins explain why Black women's enrollments so drastically outpace Black men's.

IPEDS graduation rates data were missing for 11 colleges and universities. We awarded incompletes (I's) to those schools on the Completion Equity indicator and did not factor it into their Equity Index Scores. These institutions likely have a variety of excusable explanations for non-reporting. For instance, Governors State University did not admit its first freshman class until 2014, and therefore does not yet have a six-year graduation rate. Calculating GSU's rates across four cohorts of six-year graduates will not be possible until 2023. The 10 other non-reporting institutions probably have similarly unique circumstances.

CAUTIONARY NOTE ABOUT A'S AND B'S

Unlike most report cards, high grades (A's and B's) in this publication are not necessarily indicators of exceptional performance. Instead, they are markers of equity between Black undergraduates and comparison groups. We present two illustrative examples in this section.

First, at New Mexico State University, the six-year graduation rate across four cohorts of Black undergraduates was 18.6%, compared to 20.1% for students overall. On average, across all public institutions, 11.2 percentage points separate Black undergraduates and students overall on our Completion Equity indicator. Hence, New Mexico State's relatively low 1.5 percentage point gap places it among the top 20% of public institutions. That four of every five undergraduates who start at New Mexico State do not attain degrees from there within six years renders it a low-performing institution, despite its grade on this particular indicator.

GRADE	DISTRIBUTION	EQUITY INDEX POINTS
A	Top 20%	4
B	Second Quintile	3
C	Third Quintile	2
D	Fourth Quintile	1
F	Bottom 20%	0
I	Incomplete	

RESEARCH METHODS, GRADING, AND LIMITATIONS (CONTINUED)

Second, an A was awarded to Michigan Technological University because its 12:1 Black students-to-Black faculty ratio is one of the lowest among public institutions in the nation, thereby placing it in the top quintile. However, it is worth noting that Michigan Tech had only 48 full-time, degree-seeking Black undergraduates and a total of four full-time Black instructional faculty members across all ranks and academic fields during the 2016-17 academic school year. Black representation at Michigan Tech is alarmingly low, especially given its size and the relatively high number of Black residents across the state in which it is located.

In light of these two examples, we strongly encourage readers to look at all data we provide for each institution, not just its letter grades and Equity Index Score.

LIMITATIONS

Each equity indicator in this report has at least one noteworthy limitation.

Representation Equity includes only 18-24 year-old Black citizens in each state, those who are the same age as traditional college enrollees. Some Black undergraduates attending public four-year institutions are returning adult learners. Black student enrollment percentages include them, but the state residency percentages do not. It is important to acknowledge that at many public four-year institutions (especially research universities) the overwhelming majority of full-time, degree-seeking Black undergraduates are traditional age.

Our **Gender Equity** measure treats gender as a binary (women and men), which is a limitation. We analyzed and report the data this way because IPEDS has no other gender identity options.

Federal graduation rates do not account for undergraduates who transferred from one institution to another, which is a limitation of our **Completion Equity** measure. Transfer students are counted as dropouts in IPEDS. No published evidence or anecdotal reports suggest that Black undergraduates are any more or less likely than are members of other racial groups to transfer from public colleges and universities to other postsecondary institutions.

Lastly, as previously noted in our Michigan Tech example, we awarded A's to some institutions that employ a pathetically low number of full-time Black instructional faculty members and enroll very few full-time, degree-seeking Black undergraduates. This is a limitation of our **Black Students-to-Black Faculty Ratio** measure. It extends across the other three indicators as well. Distributing grades by quintiles demanded that we inevitably award A's and B's to some institutions that perform poorly, but relatively not as bad as three-fifths of other public colleges and universities.

DATA ACCURACY

Institutional data we present in this report are from the U.S. Department of Education's publicly available Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). Every college and university in the nation receiving federal funds is required to annually submit these and other data to IPEDS. Statistical inaccuracies in this report are most likely attributable to erroneous institutional reporting to the federal government or to technical processing errors in IPEDS. Questions or concerns about data accuracy should be directed to the IPEDS Data Use Help Desk at 1-866-558-0658.

STATEWIDE EQUITY INDEX SCORES



INSTITUTIONS WITH HIGHEST AND LOWEST EQUITY INDEX SCORES

HIGHEST SCORES

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	EQUITY INDEX SCORE
Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts	3.50
University of California-San Diego	3.50
University of Louisville	3.50
University of Minnesota-Morris	3.33
Pennsylvania State University-Casler Allegheny	3.25
University of Vermont	3.25
University of Utah	3.25
University of Washington-Bothell Campus	3.25
Fitchburg State University	3.25
Framingham State University	3.25
Portland State University	3.25
University of West Alabama	3.25
University of Washington-Seattle Campus	3.25
Chicago State University	3.25
Rutgers University-Newark	3.25
University of Massachusetts-Boston	3.25
CUNY City College	3.25
Pennsylvania State University-Schuylkill	3.00
Texas A&M University-Central Texas	3.00
Arizona State University-West	3.00
Texas A&M University-San Antonio	3.00
University of Alaska-Anchorage	3.00
University of Washington-Tacoma Campus	3.00
California State University-Monterey Bay	3.00
Pennsylvania State University-Harrisburg	3.00
University of New Mexico	3.00
University of Texas at Tyler	3.00
University of California-Santa Barbara	3.00
Arizona State University-Dowdtown Phoenix	3.00
Salem State University	3.00
Marshall University	3.00
California State University-Fresno	3.00
Northern Arizona University	3.00
University of Iowa	3.00
Bridgewater State University	3.00
University of California-Riverside	3.00

LOWEST SCORES

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	EQUITY INDEX SCORE
Florida Polytechnic University	0.33
University of Alaska-Southeast	0.50
Fort Lewis College	0.50
Wayne State College	0.50
Northern Michigan University	0.50
West Texas A&M University	0.50
Arkansas Tech University	0.50
Northern State University	0.75
New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology	0.75
Wright State University-Lake Campus	0.75
West Liberty University	0.75
University of Wisconsin-Stout	0.75
University of Virginia College at Wise	0.75
Southwestern Oklahoma State University	0.75
Louisiana State University-Monroe	0.75
Northeast Missouri State University	0.75
Oakland University	0.75
University of Southern Mississippi	0.75
University of Maine at Machias	1.00
University of Maine at Presque Isle	1.00
Pennsylvania State University-Schuylkill	1.00
Lake Superior State University	1.00
University of Connecticut-Avery Point	1.00
Montana State University-Billings	1.00
Pennsylvania State University-Lehigh Valley	1.00
Dakota State University	1.00
Michigan Technological University	1.00
Western State Colorado University	1.00
Cladron State College	1.00
Bernigi State University	1.00
Mayville State University	1.00
Southwest Minnesota State University	1.00
Perry State College	1.00
Concord University	1.00
Glenville State College	1.00

Highlighted on this page are public colleges and universities with exceptionally high and low equity index scores. On the one hand, we think it is important to call attention to institutions that outperform others on the four equity measures chosen for this study. But on the other hand, we deem it problematic to offer kudos to any campus that sustains inequity on any equity indicator or that otherwise disadvantages Black undergraduates. Put differently, a campus that performs well in comparison to others is not necessarily a national model of excellence that is exempt from recommendations offered at the end of this report.

50 State Data Tables

WITH STATISTICS, GRADES,
AND EQUITY INDEX SCORES
FOR INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTIONS

ALABAMA

Statewide Equity
Index Score



1.95

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY			BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO					
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK 18-24 YOUNGS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	DIFFERENTIAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2000	BLACK FACULTY 2000	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Ahrens State University	9.7	32.3	-22.7	F	70.1	23.9	46.2	D	---	---	---	F	117	8	1311	A	1.67
Auburn University	6.7	32.3	-25.6	F	51.8	48.2	4.5	B	57.3	71.7	-14.4	D	1356	47	29:1	B	1.75
Auburn University at Montgomery	37.3	32.3	5.0	A	74.5	25.5	49.0	F	15.6	23.8	-8.2	B	1153	17	68:1	D	3.00
Jacksonville State University	18.8	32.3	-13.7	F	57.2	42.8	14.4	A	23.2	31.9	-8.7	B	1003	23	44:1	C	2.25
Troy University	27.2	32.3	-5.1	C	64.1	35.9	28.2	C	24.4	35.7	-11.3	C	2540	45	60:1	D	1.75
University of Alabama	10.0	32.3	-22.3	F	63.5	36.5	27.0	C	56.7	67.1	-10.4	C	2004	30	36:1	C	1.50
University of Alabama at Birmingham	34.3	32.3	2.0	D	67.2	32.8	34.4	D	49.9	54.1	-4.2	A	2323	131	18:1	A	2.50
University of Alabama in Huntsville	11.0	32.3	-21.4	F	57.0	43.0	14.0	A	37.0	48.1	-11.1	C	574	12	48:1	D	1.75
University of Montevallo	15.0	32.3	-17.3	F	70.3	29.7	40.6	D	46.1	45.9	0.2	A	317	22	27:1	B	3.00
University of North Alabama	14.1	32.3	-18.2	F	53.4	46.6	6.8	B	23.5	38.0	-14.5	D	727	13	56:1	D	1.25
University of South Alabama	22.1	32.3	-10.3	D	61.8	38.4	23.4	B	25.9	35.9	-10.0	C	2116	38	56:1	D	1.75
University of West Alabama	39.7	32.3	7.3	A	58.9	41.1	17.8	A	25.3	30.6	-5.3	B	683	16	43:1	C	3.25

ALASKA

Statewide Equity
Index Score



1.83

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY			BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO					
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK 18-24 YOUNGS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	DIFFERENTIAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2000	BLACK FACULTY 2000	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
University of Alaska Anchorage	3.0	4.5	-1.4	B	54.0	46.0	8.0	A	16.9	26.7	-9.7	C	200	8	25:1	B	3.00
University of Alaska Fairbanks	1.8	4.5	-2.7	C	45.5	54.5	-9.0	D	23.5	28.7	-5.2	D	55	6	9:1	A	2.00
University of Alaska Southeast	1.0	4.5	-3.4	C	63.3	16.7	46.6	F	0.0	18.0	-18.0	F	6	0	0	F	0.50

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY			GENDER EQUITY			COMPLETION EQUITY			BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO							
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK TO 90 % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS PER 1000	BLACK FACULTY PER 1000	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX	
Arizona State University-Downtown Phoenix	3.8	5.4	0.4	A	69.7	30.3	13.4	D	90.1	81.5	-1.4	A	47.8	20	24.1	B	2.00
Arizona State University-Polytechnic	4.2	5.4	-1.2	B	31.9	68.1	24.4	F	34.9	58.5	-23.5	F	141	7	20.1	A	1.75
Arizona State University-Tempe	3.7	5.4	-1.7	B	49.0	31.0	7.3	C	49.3	63.8	-14.5	D	1441	49	31.1	B	2.25
Arizona State University-West	5.6	5.4	0.2	A	59.6	40.4	3.3	B	43.8	60.5	-16.6	D	151	8	19.1	A	3.00
Northern Arizona University	2.9	5.4	-2.5	B	17.8	42.4	1.3	A	43.2	51.7	-8.3	B	627	18	35.1	C	2.00
University of Arizona	3.6	5.4	-1.8	B	50.7	49.3	5.6	B	43.9	60.6	-16.7	D	1059	37	28.1	B	2.50
University of Arizona-South	4.3	5.4	-1.2	B	50.0	50.0	5.3	C	---	---	---	I	8	0	0	F	1.50

ARIZONA
Statewide Equity Index Score
2.45

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY			GENDER EQUITY			COMPLETION EQUITY			BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO							
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK TO 90 % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS PER 1000	BLACK FACULTY PER 1000	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX	
Arkansas State University	11.0	19.4	-7.4	D	57.1	42.9	0.8	A	26.0	38.9	-12.8	D	867	23	28.1	B	2.25
Arkansas Tech University	6.7	19.4	-10.7	D	44.2	55.8	12.1	D	20.8	42.1	-21.3	F	588	8	74.1	F	0.50
Henderson State University	23.3	19.4	3.9	A	54.3	45.7	5.0	A	53.2	32.9	-9.7	C	430	8	81.1	F	2.50
Southern Arkansas University	27.2	19.4	7.9	A	56.1	43.9	0.2	A	23.7	33.0	-9.4	C	787	8	198.1	F	2.50
University of Arkansas	4.6	19.4	-14.7	F	51.2	48.8	5.1	B	48.6	62.5	-13.9	D	916	16	25.1	B	1.75
University of Arkansas at Little Rock	25.1	19.4	5.7	A	66.0	34.0	8.7	D	13.6	24.9	-11.3	C	1110	30	37.1	C	2.25
University of Arkansas-Fort Smith	2.7	19.4	-15.6	F	60.8	39.2	4.5	B	20.3	25.5	-5.1	B	158	10	16.1	A	2.50
University of Central Arkansas	16.7	19.4	-2.6	B	63.2	36.8	6.3	C	26.5	42.3	-15.8	D	1330	25	53.1	D	1.75

ARKANSAS
Statewide Equity Index Score
2.00

CALIFORNIA
Statewide Equity Index Score
2.46

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY			GENDER EQUITY			COMPLETION EQUITY			BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO							
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK TO 90 % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS PER 1000	BLACK FACULTY PER 1000	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX	
California Polytechnic State University-San Luis Obispo	0.7	6.8	-5.9	D	40.3	59.7	18.0	D	59.4	74.7	-15.3	D	144	13	12.1	A	1.75
California State Polytechnic University-Pomona	3.4	6.8	-3.2	C	51.7	48.3	4.8	B	48.9	59.0	-10.0	C	710	18	44.1	C	2.25
California State University-Bakersfield	6.2	6.8	-0.4	B	64.6	35.4	8.3	C	28.7	40.6	-11.8	C	413	11	40.1	C	2.25
California State University-Chanel Islands	2.5	6.8	-4.0	C	70.6	29.4	14.3	D	48.5	56.9	-8.4	B	136	4	34.1	C	2.00
California State University-Chico	7.6	6.8	-4.0	C	52.5	47.5	3.8	B	48.9	61.3	-12.3	F	387	7	55.1	D	1.50
California State University-Dominguez Hills	11.8	6.8	5.2	A	67.8	32.1	11.6	D	26.8	34.8	-8.2	B	1101	27	41.1	C	2.50
California State University-East Bay	10.4	6.8	3.8	A	70.6	29.4	14.3	D	26.8	42.5	-15.7	D	1302	23	53.1	D	1.75
California State University-Fresno	3.0	6.8	-3.6	C	57.1	42.9	0.8	A	41.6	54.0	-12.4	C	569	28	20.1	A	3.00
California State University-Fullerton	2.0	6.8	-4.5	C	63.0	37.0	8.7	C	46.6	58.1	-11.5	C	568	31	18.1	A	3.00
California State University-Long Beach	4.0	6.8	-2.6	B	63.3	36.7	7.0	C	55.4	63.2	-9.8	C	1107	36	31.1	B	2.50
California State University-Los Angeles	3.8	6.8	-2.7	C	63.0	37.0	8.7	C	30.2	42.1	-11.9	C	770	38	20.1	A	3.00
California State University-Monterey Bay	5.4	6.8	-1.2	B	65.2	34.8	8.9	C	48.5	49.3	0.2	A	328	11	30.1	B	3.00
California State University-Northridge	5.0	6.8	-1.8	B	60.1	39.9	3.4	B	36.7	48.3	-11.6	C	1453	45	32.1	B	2.75
California State University-Sacramento	5.8	6.8	-0.8	B	60.8	39.2	4.5	B	31.9	45.5	-13.6	D	1337	32	42.1	C	2.25
California State University-San Bernardino	5.5	6.8	-1.1	B	62.7	37.3	6.4	C	38.6	49.1	-10.4	C	903	21	43.1	C	2.25
California State University-San Marcos	3.3	6.8	-3.3	C	60.7	39.3	4.4	B	43.7	50.1	-6.4	B	341	9	38.1	C	2.50
California State University-Stanislaus	2.2	6.8	-4.4	C	63.3	36.7	7.2	C	48.9	54.4	-7.5	B	139	10	16.1	A	2.75
Humboldt State University	3.4	6.8	-3.1	C	48.4	50.6	6.9	C	33.3	44.0	-10.6	C	257	5	51.1	D	1.75
San Diego State University	4.1	6.8	-2.3	B	59.5	40.5	3.2	B	59.4	68.2	-8.6	B	1078	22	49.1	D	2.50
San Francisco State University	4.9	6.8	-1.7	B	84.0	16.0	7.7	C	39.4	50.0	-10.6	C	1035	37	28.1	B	2.50
San Jose State University	2.5	6.8	-3.1	C	48.9	51.1	7.4	C	40.6	54.2	-13.6	D	732	18	41.1	D	1.50
Sonoma State University	2.2	6.8	-4.4	C	57.2	42.8	0.9	A	41.2	57.2	-16.0	D	173	4	43.1	C	2.25
University of California-Berkeley	1.9	6.8	-4.7	C	59.0	41.0	2.7	B	75.4	91.3	-15.9	D	225	34	10.1	A	3.00
University of California-Davis	2.2	6.8	-4.3	C	60.8	39.2	4.5	B	71.0	83.6	-12.6	C	637	43	15.1	A	2.75
University of California-Irvine	1.9	6.8	-4.7	C	62.3	37.3	6.2	C	81.0	88.9	-9.9	B	112	11	10.1	A	2.75
University of California-Los Angeles	2.2	6.8	-4.4	C	63.9	36.1	7.6	C	82.3	90.9	-8.6	B	965	106	9.1	A	2.75
University of California-Merced	4.7	6.8	-1.9	B	60.2	39.8	3.9	B	60.6	84.1	-23.5	A	114	6	53.1	D	2.75
University of California-Riverside	4.2	6.8	-2.4	B	64.1	35.9	7.6	C	70.5	70.5	0.1	A	814	34	24.1	B	3.00
University of California-San Diego	1.4	6.8	-5.1	C	58.9	41.1	0.8	A	84.4	88.8	-4.2	A	397	40	10.1	A	3.00
University of California-Santa Barbara	2.1	6.8	-4.5	C	61.2	38.8	4.9	B	74.1	81.3	-7.2	B	443	22	20.1	A	3.00
University of California-Santa Cruz	2.0	6.8	-4.8	C	59.5	40.4	1.1	B	68.4	76.3	-7.9	B	329	13	22.1	B	2.75

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK B.S. %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2018	BLACK FACULTY 2018	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Adams State University	7.9	5.0	-2.9	A	26.6	73.4	29.7	F	18.4	26.8	-7.4	B	138	0	0	F	1.75
Colorado Mesa University	2.6	5.0	-2.3	B	32.1	67.9	24.2	F	31.5	34.8	-3.3	A	180	0	0	F	1.75
Colorado School of Mines	0.3	3.0	-2.7	C	14.6	85.4	41.7	F	55.8	75.0	-19.1	F	41	3	14:1	A	1.30
Colorado State University-Fort Collins	2.4	5.0	-2.5	B	49.7	50.3	6.6	C	39.0	65.6	-26.6	B	513	14	37:1	C	2.50
Colorado State University-Pueblo	7.9	8.0	-0.1	A	38.2	61.8	18.1	F	23.9	38.6	-14.7	C	258	8	50:1	D	1.75
Fort Lewis College	1.1	5.0	-3.9	C	28.4	70.6	26.9	F	16.7	40.1	-23.4	F	24	0	0	F	0.50
Metropolitan State University of Denver	5.7	3.0	2.7	A	49.7	50.3	6.6	C	13.1	23.5	-10.4	C	794	22	22:1	B	2.75
University of Colorado Boulder	1.6	5.0	-3.4	C	42.6	57.4	13.7	D	56.4	70.2	-13.8	D	411	29	14:1	A	2.00
University of Colorado Colorado Springs	3.9	5.0	-1.1	B	34.7	65.3	10.6	F	39.3	46.0	-6.7	B	307	3	64:1	D	2.75
University of Northern Colorado	4.0	5.0	-0.9	B	54.1	45.9	2.2	A	36.6	47.2	-10.6	C	331	9	37:1	C	2.75
Western State Colorado University	7.1	5.0	2.1	A	23.7	76.3	32.6	F	23.6	41.3	-17.7	D	58	0	0	F	1.00

COLORADO

Statewide Equity Index Score

1.91

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK B.S. %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2018	BLACK FACULTY 2018	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Central Connecticut State University	11.5	13.2	-1.7	B	49.9	50.1	6.4	C	42.7	53.7	-11.0	C	882	23	38:1	C	2.25
Eastern Connecticut State University	8.0	13.2	-5.2	C	53.5	46.5	2.8	B	45.7	54.5	-8.8	B	348	14	24:1	B	2.75
Southern Connecticut State University	16.6	13.2	3.4	A	62.5	37.5	8.2	C	44.7	51.4	-6.7	B	1123	29	39:1	C	2.75
University of Connecticut	5.8	13.2	-7.4	D	53.3	46.7	3.0	B	70.8	82.3	-11.5	C	1075	58	19:1	A	2.50
University of Connecticut-Avery Point	4.2	13.2	-8.9	D	48.2	51.8	10.1	D	40.7	32.1	-8.4	C	88	0	0	F	1.00
University of Connecticut-Stamford	10.4	13.2	-2.8	C	63.4	36.6	7.1	C	54.0	56.3	-2.3	A	123	0	0	F	2.00
University of Connecticut-Waterbury Campus	11.9	13.2	-1.3	B	40.7	59.3	4.4	B	48.0	54.4	-6.4	B	214	0	0	F	2.25
Western Connecticut State University	11.4	13.2	-1.8	B	49.5	50.5	6.8	C	35.3	45.5	-9.3	C	469	9	52:1	D	2.00

CONNECTICUT

Statewide Equity Index Score

2.19

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK B.S. %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2018	BLACK FACULTY 2018	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
University of Delaware	8.6	8.1	0.5	F	56.0	44.0	0.3	A	66.9	61.7	-5.2	D	993	45	22:1	B	2.00

DELAWARE

Statewide Equity Index Score

2.00

FLORIDA

Statewide Equity Index Score

1.89

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK B.S. %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2018	BLACK FACULTY 2018	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Florida Atlantic University	18.6	21.5	-2.9	C	62.3	37.7	6.0	C	45.5	46.5	-0.9	A	2364	54	54:1	D	2.25
Florida Gulf Coast University	7.0	21.5	-14.5	F	61.5	38.5	5.2	B	43.4	45.5	-2.1	A	753	16	47:1	D	2.00
Florida International University	11.9	21.5	-9.7	D	61.7	38.3	5.4	B	44.8	54.9	-10.1	C	3072	77	40:1	C	2.00
Florida Polytechnic University	4.4	21.5	-17.2	F	9.1	90.9	47.2	F	---	---	---	I	55	1	55:1	D	0.33
Florida State University	8.1	21.5	-13.4	F	64.8	35.2	8.3	C	76.9	78.9	-1.9	A	2252	50	47:1	D	1.75
New College of Florida	2.8	21.5	-18.8	F	70.8	29.2	14.5	D	60.0	67.5	-7.5	B	24	3	8:1	A	2.00
University of Central Florida	11.1	21.5	-10.4	D	61.9	38.1	5.6	B	65.1	69.0	-3.9	A	4232	33	77:1	F	2.00
University of Florida	6.1	21.5	-15.5	F	64.4	35.6	8.1	C	79.0	86.9	-7.9	B	1657	88	22:1	B	2.00
University of North Florida	8.7	21.5	-12.9	F	64.9	35.1	6.8	C	49.4	53.3	-3.9	A	814	23	36:1	C	2.00
University of South Florida	10.0	21.5	-11.5	F	62.0	38.0	5.7	B	66.6	66.6	0.0	A	2362	81	29:1	B	2.50
University of South Florida-Sarasota-Manatee	4.6	21.5	-16.9	F	65.2	34.8	6.9	C	---	---	---	I	46	5	9:1	A	2.00
University of South Florida-St. Petersburg	7.6	21.5	-13.9	F	65.9	34.1	8.6	D	21.3	36.8	-15.5	B	208	6	35:1	C	1.50
University of West Florida	12.9	21.5	-8.7	D	54.9	45.1	1.4	A	39.9	47.7	-7.8	B	902	18	47:1	D	2.25

GEORGIA

Statewide Equity Index Score

2.16

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK B.S. %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2018	BLACK FACULTY 2018	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Armstrong State University	24.9	36.2	-11.3	F	72.6	27.4	17.2	F	33.9	31.5	2.4	A	1171	28	42:1	C	1.50
Augusta University	24.0	36.2	-12.2	F	70.4	29.6	14.1	D	21.9	29.2	-7.3	B	978	52	18:1	A	2.00
Clayton State University	16.5	36.2	-19.7	A	73.2	26.8	16.8	F	31.4	31.7	-0.3	A	2265	45	50:1	D	2.25
Columbus State University	16.5	36.2	-19.7	A	67.2	32.8	10.9	D	25.5	30.8	-5.3	B	1831	34	54:1	D	2.25
Dalton State College	5.6	36.2	-30.6	F	53.9	46.1	2.7	B	14.3	20.7	-6.4	B	181	4	45:1	C	2.00
Georgia College and State University	5.1	36.2	-31.1	F	64.1	35.9	7.8	C	57.6	60.5	-2.9	A	281	25	11:1	A	2.50
Georgia Gwinnett College	31.1	36.2	-5.1	C	60.3	39.7	4.0	B	11.5	20.3	-8.8	B	1635	45	36:1	D	2.25
Georgia Institute of Technology	6.7	36.2	-29.5	F	40.0	60.0	16.3	F	76.3	83.7	-7.4	B	924	24	39:1	C	1.25
Georgia Southern University	25.6	36.2	-10.6	D	54.4	45.6	1.9	A	51.2	50.9	0.3	A	4077	45	91:1	F	2.25
Georgia Southwestern State University	27.0	36.2	-9.2	D	85.5	14.5	9.2	D	29.0	33.3	-4.2	A	475	7	68:1	D	1.75
Georgia State University	45.8	36.2	9.6	A	61.7	38.3	9.4	D	56.9	53.4	3.5	A	7774	118	66:1	D	2.50
Kennesaw State University	20.8	36.2	-15.4	F	64.1	35.9	2.2	A	38.4	42.3	-3.9	A	5023	96	52:1	D	2.25
Middle Georgia State University	18.3	36.2	-17.9	A	58.5	41.5	5.2	B	12.6	25.2	-12.6	C	1793	28	61:1	D	2.10
University of Georgia	7.7	36.2	-28.5	F	64.7	35.3	8.4	C	81.0	83.5	-2.5	A	2018	102	20:1	A	2.50
University of North Georgia	3.0	36.2	-33.2	F	54.1	45.9	2.2	A	28.8	33.2	-4.4	F	477	25	19:1	A	2.00
University of West Georgia	40.9	36.2	4.7	A	68.4	31.6	10.1	D	42.8	40.9	1.9	A	3665	30	122:1	F	2.25
Valdosta State University	37.8	36.2	1.6	A	60.1	39.9	9.8	B	33.4	37.8	-4.4	A	2703	27	100:1	F	2.75

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK 18-24 YR OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2016	BLACK FACULTY 2016	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
University of Hawaii at Hilo	1.1	3.4	-2.3	B	42.3	57.7	14.0	D	15.8	37.3	-21.5	F	38	1	28:1	B	1.75
University of Hawaii at Manoa	1.5	3.4	-1.9	B	44.0	56.0	12.3	D	33.0	57.0	-24.0	F	159	15	11:1	A	2.00
University of Hawaii-West Oahu	0.3	3.4	-3.1	B	53.0	46.2	6.5	A	0.0	27.0	-27.0	F	38	6	7:1	A	2.75

HAWAII
Statewide Equity Index Score
2.17

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK 18-24 YR OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2016	BLACK FACULTY 2016	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Boise State University	1.8	1.2	0.5	A	36.7	63.3	19.0	F	34.5	38.1	-3.6	A	199	2	86:1	D	2.25
Idaho State University	1.1	1.2	-0.1	B	38.0	62.0	18.3	F	39.6	28.3	10.4	A	71	3	24:1	B	1.60
Lewis-Clark State College	1.3	1.2	0.1	A	37.9	62.1	18.4	F	9.1	23.6	-14.5	D	89	2	19:1	A	2.33
University of Idaho	1.5	1.2	0.3	A	24.1	75.9	32.2	F	27.7	56.3	-28.6	F	108	8	14:1	A	2.00

IDAHO
Statewide Equity Index Score
2.25

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK 18-24 YR OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2016	BLACK FACULTY 2016	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Chicago State University	71.2	17.6	53.6	A	72.2	27.8	15.9	D	14.3	15.4	-1.1	A	1042	88	12:1	A	2.21
Eastern Illinois University	19.8	17.6	2.3	A	58.7	41.3	2.4	A	44.7	58.8	-14.1	D	1090	18	57:1	D	2.50
Governors State University	40.2	17.6	22.6	A	69.6	20.4	13.3	D	---	---	---	I	773	31	25:1	B	2.67
Illinois State University	8.4	17.6	-9.2	D	60.9	39.1	4.6	B	53.8	72.2	-18.4	F	1462	33	44:1	C	1.50
Northeastern Illinois University	11.1	17.6	-6.5	D	63.7	37.3	6.4	C	7.9	22.1	-14.2	D	474	22	22:1	B	1.75
Northern Illinois University	16.4	17.6	-1.2	B	57.2	42.8	0.9	A	28.9	49.4	-20.5	F	2027	27	75:1	F	1.75
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale	17.7	17.6	0.0	A	56.1	43.8	0.0	A	30.0	44.1	-14.1	D	1556	59	26:1	C	2.75
Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville	14.9	17.6	-2.7	C	63.6	36.4	7.3	C	29.9	49.3	-19.4	F	1474	38	39:1	C	1.50
University of Illinois at Chicago	6.2	17.6	-11.4	D	82.9	17.1	6.0	C	43.2	36.4	-6.8	D	1311	107	13:1	A	2.00
University of Illinois at Springfield	17.3	17.6	-0.3	B	65.9	34.1	9.6	D	38.5	47.5	-9.1	B	328	9	36:1	C	2.25
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	5.9	17.6	-11.7	F	59.1	40.8	8.9	B	74.4	84.6	-10.3	C	1909	97	20:1	A	2.33
Western Illinois University	22.1	17.6	4.5	A	60.3	39.7	4.0	B	40.5	54.1	-13.6	D	1653	30	55:1	D	2.25

ILLINOIS
Statewide Equity Index Score
2.20

INDIANA
Statewide Equity Index Score
2.02

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK 18-24 YR OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2016	BLACK FACULTY 2016	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Ball State University	7.9	10.7	-2.8	C	61.0	39.0	4.7	B	47.0	60.8	-13.8	D	1186	25	46:1	C	1.00
Indiana State University	19.6	10.7	8.9	A	56.9	43.1	0.6	A	23.8	40.0	-16.2	D	1934	17	108:1	F	2.25
Indiana University-Bloomington	4.4	10.7	-6.4	D	55.9	44.1	0.3	A	61.1	77.0	-16.0	D	1387	80	16:1	A	2.50
Indiana University-East	3.7	10.7	-7.0	D	60.9	39.1	4.8	B	15.0	28.3	-13.3	D	69	3	23:1	B	2.00
Indiana University-Kokomo	4.5	10.7	-6.2	D	61.1	38.9	8.8	C	80.0	80.8	-0.6	C	83	7	12:1	A	2.55
Indiana University-Northwest	14.9	10.7	4.2	A	70.3	29.7	14.0	D	9.0	25.1	-16.1	D	407	12	34:1	C	2.00
Indiana University-Purdue University-Fort Wayne	4.8	10.7	-5.9	D	54.0	46.0	7.7	C	7.9	24.8	-16.6	D	292	11	27:1	B	1.75
Indiana University-Purdue University-Indianapolis	9.4	10.7	-1.3	B	66.8	33.2	10.5	D	30.9	49.2	-18.3	D	1632	102	16:1	A	2.25
Indiana University-South Bend	6.7	10.7	-4.0	C	69.3	30.7	13.0	D	14.8	26.1	-11.7	C	334	7	38:1	C	1.75
Indiana University-Southeast	6.7	10.7	-4.0	C	62.6	37.4	8.3	C	11.9	30.3	-18.4	F	222	10	22:1	B	1.75
Purdue University	3.0	10.7	-7.7	D	48.4	50.6	6.9	C	60.5	73.8	-13.3	D	874	56	16:1	A	2.00
University of Southern Indiana	4.2	10.7	-6.5	D	61.1	38.9	4.8	B	17.9	36.6	-20.7	F	280	9	31:1	B	1.75

IOWA
Statewide Equity Index Score
2.33

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK 18-24 YR OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2016	BLACK FACULTY 2016	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Iowa State University	12.9	4.7	8.2	B	41.3	58.7	15.0	D	47.9	70.7	-22.8	F	729	41	18:1	A	2.00
University of Iowa	3.4	4.7	-1.3	B	54.2	45.8	2.1	A	55.9	70.8	-15.0	D	706	49	14:1	A	3.00
University of Northern Iowa	3.6	4.7	-1.1	B	46.0	54.0	10.3	D	36.3	65.8	-29.5	F	337	14	17:1	A	2.00

KANSAS
Statewide Equity Index Score
1.61

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK 18-24 YR OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2016	BLACK FACULTY 2016	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Emporia State University	5.3	7.3	-2.0	B	43.9	56.1	12.4	D	30.4	41.1	-10.7	C	180	3	60:1	D	1.75
Fort Hays State University	4.4	7.3	-2.9	C	44.4	55.6	11.9	D	16.5	40.4	-23.9	F	248	7	35:1	C	1.25
Kansas State University	3.4	7.3	-3.9	C	48.5	51.5	7.8	C	58.8	60.8	-2.0	F	896	13	69:1	B	1.75
Pittsburg State University	3.9	7.3	-3.4	C	39.9	60.1	18.4	F	32.1	47.8	-15.7	D	203	5	40:1	C	1.25
University of Kansas	4.2	7.3	-3.1	C	48.3	51.7	7.6	C	44.3	61.8	-17.2	D	715	8	89:1	A	2.25
Washburn University	5.3	7.3	-2.0	B	44.3	55.7	12.0	D	14.2	34.9	-20.7	F	201	4	50:1	D	1.25
Wichita State University	3.4	7.3	-3.9	C	49.5	50.5	7.0	C	28.0	44.8	-16.8	D	463	7	66:1	D	1.75

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK 18-24 YR OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS PER FACULTY	BLACK FACULTY PER 1000	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Eastern Kentucky University	8.1	10.6	-4.5	C	53.0	47.0	3.3	B	22.8	43.6	-23.0	D	889	28	3011	B	1.33
Morehead State University	4.1	10.4	-6.5	D	48.4	53.6	9.9	D	27.1	44.1	-17.0	D	239	14	1711	A	1.75
Murray State University	8.7	10.6	-1.9	C	56.4	43.8	0.1	A	39.1	30.5	-11.5	C	468	18	2911	B	2.75
Northern Kentucky University	7.4	10.6	-3.2	C	65.0	35.0	8.7	C	23.9	37.9	-14.0	D	672	27	2511	B	2.00
University of Kentucky	7.8	10.6	-2.8	C	55.8	44.4	0.7	A	44.1	61.4	-17.3	F	1829	35	3011	B	2.25
University of Louisville	11.1	10.8	0.3	A	59.1	40.9	2.8	B	46.5	53.2	-6.7	B	1366	112	1211	A	3.50
Western Kentucky University	9.7	10.4	-0.8	B	52.4	48.6	2.9	B	32.3	50.6	-28.3	F	1204	36	3511	C	1.00

KENTUCKY

Statewide Equity Index Score

2.36



COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK 18-24 YR OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS PER FACULTY	BLACK FACULTY PER 1000	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Louisiana State University	12.8	38.4	-26.4	F	62.3	37.7	6.0	C	56.1	65.5	-9.4	C	2811	24	5211	D	1.35
Louisiana State University-Alexandria	16.8	38.6	-21.8	F	64.4	35.6	6.1	C	7.4	23.1	-15.7	D	298	4	7511	F	0.75
Louisiana State University-Shreveport	21.3	38.6	-17.3	F	68.5	31.5	12.2	D	22.7	35.8	-11.1	C	352	12	2911	B	1.50
Louisiana Tech University	13.6	38.6	-25.0	F	47.8	58.4	8.7	C	40.4	59.4	-19.0	C	1010	11	9211	F	1.00
McNeese State University	17.7	38.6	-20.9	F	64.0	35.4	8.3	C	59.1	40.1	-11.0	C	992	18	5011	F	1.00
Nicholls State University	23.0	38.6	-17.6	F	64.6	35.4	8.3	C	31.2	43.3	-12.1	C	964	8	12111	F	1.00
Northwestern State University of Louisiana	21.1	38.6	-7.5	D	68.0	32.0	11.7	D	33.0	37.0	-4.0	A	1610	16	10111	F	1.50
Southeastern Louisiana University	18.8	38.6	-20.0	F	67.4	32.6	11.1	D	27.9	37.3	-9.3	C	1675	25	6711	D	1.00
University of Louisiana at Lafayette	20.6	38.6	-18.0	F	61.7	38.3	5.4	B	35.9	46.0	-10.1	C	2531	33	8011	F	1.25
University of Louisiana at Monroe	24.5	38.6	-14.1	F	69.3	30.7	13.0	D	34.4	40.1	-5.7	B	1264	16	7911	F	1.00
University of New Orleans	16.5	38.6	-22.2	F	59.0	41.0	2.7	B	24.0	34.3	-10.3	C	794	20	3811	C	1.75

LOUISIANA

Statewide Equity Index Score

1.18



COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK 18-24 YR OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS PER FACULTY	BLACK FACULTY PER 1000	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
University of Maine	3.2	2.4	-0.3	B	31.6	68.4	24.7	F	27.7	57.4	-29.8	F	174	4	4411	C	1.25
University of Maine at Augusta	1.3	2.4	-1.1	B	50.0	50.0	6.3	C	0.0	12.5	-12.5	C	18	0	0	F	1.75
University of Maine at Farmington	2.3	2.4	-0.2	B	44.4	55.6	11.9	D	50.0	55.8	-5.8	B	18	1	3811	C	2.11
University of Maine at Fort Kent	3.9	2.4	1.5	A	73.1	26.9	16.8	F	33.3	36.5	-3.1	A	26	1	2611	B	2.75
University of Maine at Machias	4.3	2.4	1.8	A	37.8	62.2	24.7	F	8.3	29.7	-21.5	F	17	0	0	F	1.00
University of Maine at Presque Isle	2.9	2.4	0.5	A	38.8	63.2	19.5	F	20.0	38.3	-18.3	F	19	0	0	F	1.00
University of Southern Maine	5.0	2.4	2.6	A	49.5	50.5	6.8	C	18.4	31.1	-13.9	D	184	2	3111	F	1.75

MAINE

Statewide Equity Index Score

1.68



MARYLAND

Statewide Equity Index Score

2.21



COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK 18-24 YR OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS PER FACULTY	BLACK FACULTY PER 1000	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Frostburg State University	34.7	33.2	1.5	A	47.3	52.7	8.0	C	44.8	48.4	-3.5	A	1419	10	14211	F	2.50
Salisbury University	13.4	33.2	-19.9	F	38.2	41.8	1.9	A	58.3	67.2	-8.9	B	867	24	4011	C	2.25
St. Mary's College of Maryland	8.8	33.2	-24.5	F	48.9	51.1	7.4	C	71.1	78.1	-8.9	B	131	9	1711	A	2.11
Towson University	19.1	33.2	-14.1	F	64.8	35.2	8.5	C	64.8	68.6	-3.7	A	3214	50	6411	D	1.75
University of Baltimore	48.1	33.2	14.9	A	63.9	36.1	7.6	C	88.6	37.1	-7.5	B	960	17	5611	D	2.50
University of Maryland-Baltimore County	17.5	33.2	-15.7	F	52.3	47.7	4.0	B	68.8	63.3	-5.5	A	1862	34	4911	D	2.00
University of Maryland-College Park	13.0	33.2	-20.3	F	55.6	44.4	0.7	A	79.3	85.4	-6.1	B	3391	69	3811	C	2.11

MASSACHUSETTS

Statewide Equity Index Score

2.81



COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK 18-24 YR OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS PER FACULTY	BLACK FACULTY PER 1000	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Bridgewater State University	10.1	9.0	1.1	A	34.9	45.1	1.4	A	52.9	58.3	-5.3	B	787	12	6811	D	2.50
Fitchburg State University	9.7	9.0	0.7	A	52.2	46.8	3.1	B	55.6	53.6	2.0	A	333	10	3311	C	2.25
Framingham State University	10.7	9.0	1.7	A	53.0	47.0	2.3	B	50.0	53.3	-3.3	A	704	9	4411	C	3.11
Massachusetts College of Art and Design	4.2	9.0	-4.9	C	52.8	46.2	2.5	A	55.3	78.0	-18.7	F	65	4	1611	A	2.50
Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts	10.0	9.0	0.9	A	60.0	40.0	3.7	B	55.8	53.4	2.1	A	125	4	3111	B	3.50
Salem State University	9.6	9.0	-0.4	B	61.2	38.8	4.9	B	49.8	48.2	-1.6	B	300	20	8511	B	3.00
University of Massachusetts-Amherst	3.7	9.0	-5.3	C	50.3	49.7	0.0	C	67.4	75.8	-8.4	B	790	37	1411	A	2.75
University of Massachusetts-Boston	14.8	9.0	5.8	A	62.1	37.9	5.8	B	43.7	43.4	0.3	A	1355	36	3811	C	3.25
University of Massachusetts-Bartmouth	16.1	9.0	7.1	A	38.9	43.1	0.6	A	48.0	47.6	-4.7	B	950	13	7411	F	2.75
University of Massachusetts-Lowell	5.7	9.0	-3.3	C	37.5	62.5	18.8	F	48.0	55.1	-7.2	B	568	12	4711	D	1.50
Westfield State University	4.5	9.0	-4.5	C	51.3	48.7	3.0	B	49.0	62.7	-13.7	D	323	14	2511	A	3.30
Worcester State University	7.3	9.0	-1.7	B	49.7	50.3	6.6	C	43.2	58.3	-9.1	B	284	7	4211	C	2.50

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK RB 24 YR OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2016	BLACK FACULTY 2016	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Central Michigan University	7.5	17.0	-9.4	D	87.7	48.3	1.4	A	46.4	57.8	-11.4	C	1297	85	15.1	D	3.00
Eastern Michigan University	20.0	17.0	3.0	A	65.9	37.1	8.6	C	23.1	38.9	-15.8	D	2543	46	55.1	D	2.00
Ferris State University	7.2	17.0	-9.8	D	51.8	48.4	4.7	B	38.0	47.4	-11.4	C	630	13	53.1	D	1.73
Grand Valley State University	5.2	17.0	-11.7	F	81.5	36.5	5.2	B	56.2	66.8	-10.6	C	1028	35	29.1	B	2.00
Lake Superior State University	1.3	17.0	-15.7	F	43.5	56.5	12.8	D	35.0	41.8	-8.8	B	33	0	0	F	1.00
Michigan State University	7.2	17.0	-9.8	D	62.6	37.4	6.3	C	58.2	78.1	-19.9	F	2546	128	20.1	A	1.75
Michigan Technological University	6.9	17.0	-10.1	F	25.0	75.0	11.3	F	47.1	65.3	-18.3	F	48	4	12.1	A	1.00
Northern Michigan University	2.4	17.0	-14.6	F	40.0	60.0	16.3	F	25.0	48.6	-23.6	F	150	4	38.1	C	0.50
Oakland University	7.7	17.0	-9.3	D	66.9	33.1	10.6	D	21.7	44.8	-23.1	F	991	20	50.1	D	0.75
Saginaw Valley State University	8.9	17.0	-8.1	D	59.0	41.0	2.7	B	17.5	39.3	-21.8	F	600	12	50.1	D	1.25
University of Michigan-Ann Arbor	4.4	17.0	-12.6	F	58.8	41.8	2.5	A	78.4	90.5	-12.1	C	1213	184	7.1	A	2.50
University of Michigan-Dearborn	7.8	17.0	-9.2	D	57.7	42.3	1.4	A	38.1	52.2	-14.1	D	361	9	40.1	C	2.00
University of Michigan-Flint	11.7	17.0	-5.3	C	68.0	32.0	11.7	D	23.3	36.7	-13.4	D	1539	28	18.1	A	1.00
Wayne State University	14.6	17.0	-2.3	B	63.8	36.2	7.3	C	15.1	35.0	-21.9	F	1750	119	15.1	A	2.25
Western Michigan University	11.9	17.0	-5.0	C	67.3	42.7	1.0	A	39.9	54.0	-14.1	D	1942	87	12.1	D	2.00

MICHIGAN
Statewide Equity Index Score
1.65



COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK RB 24 YR OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2016	BLACK FACULTY 2016	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Bemidji State University	2.0	7.4	-5.4	C	14.3	65.7	22.0	F	88.6	44.7	-21.1	D	87	1	87.1	D	1.00
Metropolitan State University	18.3	7.4	10.9	A	55.8	44.2	0.5	A	24.3	33.9	-9.6	C	516	8	65.1	D	2.75
Minnesota State University Moorhead	9.8	7.4	2.4	C	28.1	70.9	87.2	F	17.0	42.9	-25.9	F	117	4	29.1	B	1.85
Minnesota State University-Mankato	5.1	7.4	-2.3	B	46.6	53.4	9.7	D	29.3	49.3	-19.9	F	551	15	37.1	C	1.50
St. Cloud State University	6.1	7.4	-1.3	B	48.0	34.0	10.3	D	31.5	44.3	-12.8	D	510	11	47.1	B	2.00
Southwest Minnesota State University	5.6	7.4	-1.8	B	33.0	67.0	23.3	F	16.4	43.8	-27.4	F	103	2	52.1	D	1.00
University of Minnesota-Crookston	6.6	7.4	-0.8	B	22.7	77.3	33.8	F	30.0	47.9	-17.9	F	73	2	36.1	C	1.25
University of Minnesota-Duluth	5.4	7.4	-2.0	C	45.1	54.9	13.2	D	47.2	59.3	-12.2	C	209	12	17.1	A	2.25
University of Minnesota-Morris	2.0	7.4	-5.4	C	56.8	43.8	0.0	A	55.9	64.8	-9.0	B	27	2	14.1	A	3.25
University of Minnesota-Rochester	7.4	7.4	0.0	A	63.3	36.7	7.0	C	50.0	54.9	-4.9	B	20	0	0	F	2.25
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities	4.2	7.4	-3.2	C	57.3	42.3	1.2	A	58.1	77.3	-19.2	F	1195	72	17.1	A	2.50
Winona State University	2.3	7.4	-5.1	C	43.7	56.3	12.8	D	52.2	57.3	-5.1	B	151	7	22.1	B	2.25

MINNESOTA
Statewide Equity Index Score
1.94



MISSISSIPPI
Statewide Equity Index Score
1.42



COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK RB 24 YR OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2016	BLACK FACULTY 2016	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Delta State University	34.7	43.7	-9.0	D	62.8	37.2	6.3	C	21.9	34.2	-12.3	C	790	18	43.1	C	1.75
Mississippi State University	20.5	43.7	-23.2	F	58.1	41.9	1.8	A	44.7	60.3	-15.7	D	3302	54	61.1	D	1.50
Mississippi University for Women	37.1	43.7	-6.6	D	87.8	12.4	31.3	---	36.7	43.9	-7.2	B	784	5	157.1	F	1.33
University of Mississippi	18.9	43.7	-24.8	F	64.7	35.3	8.4	C	45.2	60.0	-14.9	D	2258	127	18.1	A	1.75
University of Southern Mississippi	28.2	43.7	-14.5	F	67.6	32.4	11.3	D	37.2	47.1	-9.8	C	2292	28	107.1	F	0.75

MISSOURI
Statewide Equity Index Score
1.68



COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK RB 24 YR OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2016	BLACK FACULTY 2016	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Missouri Southern State University	7.1	14.6	-7.5	D	45.3	54.5	10.8	D	20.8	33.1	-12.4	C	910	8	113.1	D	1.33
Missouri State University-Springfield	4.8	14.6	-9.8	D	35.1	44.9	1.2	A	35.9	53.8	-18.0	F	722	24	30.1	B	2.00
Missouri University of Science and Technology	3.2	14.6	-11.4	F	55.5	74.5	30.8	F	47.0	63.9	-16.9	D	300	9	33.1	B	1.00
Missouri Western State University	10.5	14.6	-4.1	C	51.5	48.5	4.8	B	14.3	31.5	-17.2	D	357	1	357.1	F	1.50
Northwest Missouri State University	6.3	14.6	-8.3	D	47.8	52.2	9.1	D	29.2	46.4	-17.2	F	307	5	61.1	D	0.75
Southeast Missouri State University	10.3	14.6	-4.3	C	37.0	43.0	0.7	A	33.6	49.2	-15.6	D	795	17	47.1	D	2.00
Truman State University	8.7	14.6	-5.9	F	57.3	42.7	1.0	A	80.3	71.7	-11.4	C	252	3	84.1	D	1.75
University of Central Missouri	11.0	14.6	-3.6	C	55.9	44.1	0.4	A	39.1	52.9	-13.8	D	852	14	61.1	D	2.00
University of Missouri-Columbia	7.8	14.6	-6.8	D	61.0	39.0	4.7	B	55.8	69.1	-13.3	D	1872	57	33.1	C	1.75
University of Missouri-Kansas City	14.6	14.6	0.0	A	62.9	37.1	6.6	C	29.7	49.6	-19.9	F	951	34	28.1	B	2.25
University of Missouri-St. Louis	15.1	14.6	0.5	A	66.7	33.3	10.4	D	22.5	45.5	-23.0	F	780	27	29.1	B	2.25

MONTANA
Statewide Equity Index Score
1.71



COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK RB 24 YR OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2016	BLACK FACULTY 2016	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Montana State University	0.6	0.8	-0.2	B	31.0	68.0	25.2	F	47.3	51.1	-3.8	B	71	1	71.1	D	1.75
Montana State University-Billings	1.4	0.8	0.6	A	31.4	68.6	24.9	F	0.0	24.4	-24.4	F	35	0	0	F	1.00
Montana State University-Northern	3.1	0.8	2.3	A	7.1	92.9	49.2	F	0.0	24.2	-24.2	F	28	1	28.1	B	1.75
Montana Tech of the University of Montana	1.1	0.8	0.3	A	22.2	77.8	34.1	F	33.3	42.9	-9.5	C	18	0	0	F	1.50
University of Montana	1.1	0.8	0.3	A	28.0	72.0	28.3	F	39.2	48.2	-9.0	B	83	2	41.1	C	2.25
University of Montana-Western	1.5	0.8	0.7	A	22.2	77.8	34.1	F	60.0	47.4	12.6	A	18	0	0	F	2.00

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK 18-24 YR OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS PER	BLACK FACULTY PER	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Chadron State College	3.8	6.1	-2.3	B	26.2	73.8	30.1	F	15.4	36.7	-21.3	F	83	1	83:1	D	1.00
Peru State College	10.1	6.1	3.9	A	27.5	72.5	28.8	F	16.3	37.1	-20.7	F	120	1	120:1	F	1.00
University of Nebraska at Kearney	2.0	6.1	-4.1	C	25.0	73.0	31.3	F	19.1	55.7	-36.6	F	84	9	14:1	A	1.50
University of Nebraska at Omaha	5.8	6.1	-0.3	B	59.1	40.9	2.8	B	23.2	44.6	-21.5	F	570	26	22:1	B	2.25
University of Nebraska-Lincoln	2.7	6.1	-3.3	C	48.3	51.7	8.0	C	49.1	66.8	-17.7	F	518	29	18:1	A	2.00
Wayne State College	3.1	6.1	-3.1	C	16.0	84.0	40.3	F	20.8	47.8	-27.0	F	75	1	75:1	F	0.50

NEBRASKA

Statewide Equity Index Score
1.38



COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK 18-24 YR OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS PER	BLACK FACULTY PER	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Nevada State College	11.7	10.6	-1.9	C	73.5	24.5	19.2	F	19.0	14.1	-5.3	B	109	3	34:1	C	1.75
University of Nevada-Las Vegas	7.6	10.6	-3.1	C	62.5	37.5	6.2	C	31.4	40.8	-9.4	C	1378	37	37:1	C	2.00
University of Nevada-Reno	3.5	10.6	-7.1	D	52.7	47.3	3.8	B	42.6	54.7	-12.2	C	548	20	27:1	B	2.25

NEVADA

Statewide Equity Index Score
2.00



COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK 18-24 YR OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS PER	BLACK FACULTY PER	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Granite State College	3.1	2.1	1.1	A	64.3	34.3	3.2	D	---	---	---	F	29	0	0	F	1.67
Keene State College	1.3	2.1	-0.8	B	44.0	56.0	12.3	D	35.7	62.8	-27.1	F	50	3	17:1	A	2.00
Plymouth State University	2.3	2.1	0.3	A	35.9	64.1	20.4	F	35.5	56.5	-21.0	F	92	2	46:1	C	1.50
University of New Hampshire	1.3	2.1	-0.8	B	39.4	60.6	16.9	F	69.1	78.6	-9.5	C	100	9	18:1	A	2.25
University of New Hampshire at Manchester	1.2	2.1	-0.9	B	57.1	42.9	0.8	A	0.0	57.8	-57.8	F	7	0	0	F	1.75

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Statewide Equity Index Score
1.83



NEW JERSEY

Statewide Equity Index Score
2.25



COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK 18-24 YR OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS PER	BLACK FACULTY PER	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Kean University	19.5	18.9	-0.6	A	59.8	40.2	2.5	B	39.7	48.7	-9.0	B	1793	31	58:1	D	2.75
Monclair State University	12.0	10.9	-1.9	C	64.1	35.9	7.8	C	60.6	64.5	-3.9	A	1789	39	46:1	C	2.50
New Jersey City University	22.9	16.9	5.7	A	32.1	37.9	3.9	B	22.3	21.0	-8.7	B	1154	32	36:1	C	3.00
New Jersey Institute of Technology	7.7	16.9	-9.2	D	23.9	76.1	32.4	F	42.3	59.4	-17.0	D	473	15	32:1	B	1.25
Ramapo College of New Jersey	3.3	16.9	-13.8	F	60.3	39.8	3.9	B	57.9	73.0	-15.1	D	264	12	22:1	B	1.75
Rowan University	10.2	16.9	-6.7	D	51.8	48.2	4.5	B	49.0	68.5	-19.5	F	1302	32	41:1	C	1.50
Rutgers University-Camden	18.8	16.9	-1.1	B	71.8	28.2	13.5	D	49.2	56.0	-6.8	B	600	12	57:1	D	2.00
Rutgers University-New Brunswick	7.3	16.9	-9.6	D	58.6	41.4	3.3	B	73.1	90.0	-6.9	B	2490	119	21:1	B	2.50
Rutgers University-Newark	17.8	16.9	0.8	A	63.8	37.4	6.3	C	67.3	66.7	-4.4	A	1184	38	31:1	B	2.25
Stockton University	6.9	16.9	-10.0	D	64.2	35.8	7.9	C	46.4	69.0	-22.6	F	514	24	21:1	B	1.50
The College of New Jersey	5.6	16.9	-11.3	F	52.9	47.1	3.4	B	68.6	85.8	-17.0	D	359	20	18:1	A	2.00
William Paterson University of New Jersey	17.0	18.9	-0.1	A	57.9	42.1	1.6	A	38.6	50.1	-11.6	C	1275	36	35:1	C	3.00

NEW MEXICO

Statewide Equity Index Score
1.88



COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK 18-24 YR OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS PER	BLACK FACULTY PER	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Eastern New Mexico University	7.0	3.2	3.8	A	34.4	65.6	21.9	F	17.2	30.3	-12.9	D	149	1	149:1	F	1.25
New Mexico Highlands University	6.2	3.2	3.0	A	35.6	64.4	20.7	F	11.2	16.8	-7.6	B	60	2	45:1	C	2.50
New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology	1.8	3.1	-1.4	B	11.5	88.5	44.8	F	33.0	47.0	-12.0	F	28	0	0	F	0.75
New Mexico State University	3.0	3.2	-0.2	B	44.4	55.6	11.9	D	31.1	44.0	-12.9	D	295	11	27:1	B	2.00
University of New Mexico	0.5	3.1	-0.6	B	49.2	50.8	7.1	C	38.4	48.4	-8.0	B	386	20	19:1	A	3.00
Western New Mexico University	7.7	3.2	4.4	A	31.3	68.7	25.0	F	18.6	20.1	-1.5	A	99	1	99:1	F	2.00

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK TO BI WHOLE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2006	BLACK FACULTY 2006	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Binghamton University	5.3	17.8	-12.5	F	55.7	44.8	0.8	A	77.1	81.4	-4.3	A	700	93	28.1	B	2.75
College of Staten Island CUNY	14.8	17.8	-3.0	C	80.1	39.9	3.8	B	24.4	46.4	-22.0	F	1416	15	94.1	F	1.25
CUNY Bernard M Baruch College	7.9	17.8	-9.9	D	53.4	48.6	1.9	B	58.4	67.2	-8.8	B	893	30	30.1	B	2.50
CUNY Brooklyn College	19.4	17.8	1.6	A	63.6	38.4	7.3	C	46.0	51.5	-4.6	A	1964	38	52.1	D	2.75
CUNY City College	11.1	17.8	-6.7	C	53.8	44.2	0.5	A	45.0	44.2	0.8	A	1306	51	30.1	B	1.25
CUNY Hunter College	8.6	17.8	-9.2	D	70.9	29.1	14.8	D	53.6	52.2	1.3	A	1189	58	21.1	B	2.25
CUNY John Jay College of Criminal Justice	16.1	17.8	-1.7	B	65.0	35.0	8.7	C	49.7	43.0	-6.7	C	1181	43	37.1	C	2.75
CUNY Lehman College	24.2	17.8	6.4	A	65.9	34.1	9.6	D	35.6	38.5	-2.9	A	1588	40	40.1	C	2.75
CUNY Queens College	8.3	17.8	-9.5	D	33.3	41.7	1.0	A	51.4	57.8	-6.2	B	889	33	39.1	A	2.75
CUNY York College	25.5	17.8	7.8	A	68.9	31.1	12.6	D	30.6	28.1	2.5	A	1776	39	46.1	C	2.75
Farmingdale State College	9.1	17.8	-8.7	D	47.3	33.7	9.0	C	44.7	47.4	-2.7	A	820	13	48.1	D	2.00
Stony Brook University	6.5	17.8	-11.3	F	54.7	45.3	1.8	A	70.8	68.8	2.0	A	1015	61	17.1	A	3.00
SUNY at Albany	17.3	17.8	-0.5	B	58.0	42.0	1.7	A	70.6	68.6	2.0	A	2141	59	74.1	F	2.75
SUNY at Fredonia	7.0	17.8	-10.8	F	57.9	42.1	1.6	A	50.6	64.6	-14.1	D	297	3	89.1	F	1.25
SUNY at New Paltz	5.8	17.8	-12.0	F	65.2	24.8	8.9	C	67.3	72.5	-5.2	B	158	14	16.1	B	3.00
SUNY at Purchase College	11.4	17.8	-6.3	D	53.2	36.8	3.1	B	51.2	61.7	-10.4	A	417	9	46.1	C	2.50
SUNY Buffalo State	22.4	17.8	4.7	A	59.3	40.8	1.9	B	48.7	48.1	0.6	A	2483	18	137.1	F	2.75
SUNY College at Brockport	11.2	17.8	-6.6	D	59.9	40.1	3.6	B	54.3	68.0	-13.7	D	716	12	60.1	D	1.50
SUNY College at Geneseo	2.9	17.8	-14.8	F	63.9	36.1	7.8	C	59.8	73.6	-13.8	F	118	8	20.1	A	1.50
SUNY College at Old Westbury	29.1	17.8	10.4	A	65.6	34.4	9.3	D	42.1	39.3	2.8	A	1010	21	48.1	D	2.50
SUNY College at Oswego	8.5	17.8	-9.3	D	57.2	45.8	0.8	A	50.7	63.3	-12.6	C	584	18	39.1	B	2.50
SUNY College at Plattsburgh	7.7	17.8	-10.1	D	58.3	41.7	2.0	A	57.8	62.5	-4.6	A	378	6	68.1	D	2.50
SUNY College at Potsdam	11.8	17.8	-6.0	D	56.3	43.7	0.5	A	42.2	53.0	-10.8	C	373	8	47.1	D	2.00
SUNY College of Agriculture and Technology at Cobleskill	12.1	17.8	-5.7	D	50.4	49.6	5.8	B	50.0	45.9	4.1	A	268	1	269.1	F	2.00
SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry	1.5	17.8	-16.3	F	50.0	50.0	5.3	C	64.2	71.7	-7.5	B	26	3	9.1	A	2.25
SUNY Cortland	6.1	17.8	-11.7	F	51.5	48.5	4.8	B	53.8	70.8	-17.1	D	375	6	63.1	D	1.25
SUNY Empire State College	20.9	17.8	3.1	A	75.1	24.9	18.8	F	10.1	15.8	-5.7	B	778	17	46.1	C	2.25
SUNY Genesota	3.8	17.8	-14.0	F	59.6	40.4	3.3	B	69.9	71.8	-1.9	A	213	13	16.1	A	2.75
SUNY Polytechnic Institute	5.3	17.8	-12.5	F	21.5	68.5	24.8	F	44.4	46.0	-1.6	A	89	4	23.1	B	1.75
University at Buffalo	7.5	17.8	-10.3	D	50.0	50.0	6.3	C	63.0	73.0	-10.0	C	1409	35	40.1	C	1.75

NEW YORK
Statewide Equity
Index Score
2.28



NORTH CAROLINA
Statewide Equity
Index Score
2.23



COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK TO BI WHOLE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2006	BLACK FACULTY 2006	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Appalachian State University	3.8	25.8	-21.7	F	47.1	52.9	9.2	D	57.5	70.3	-12.8	D	588	17	35.1	C	1.00
East Carolina University	16.0	25.6	-9.4	D	59.7	40.3	3.4	B	59.0	59.4	-0.4	A	2161	80	53.1	D	2.15
North Carolina State University at Raleigh	6.0	25.5	-19.5	F	55.2	44.8	1.1	A	69.1	75.9	-6.8	B	1243	67	19.1	A	2.75
University of North Carolina at Asheville	4.4	25.5	-21.0	F	55.4	44.6	0.9	A	55.7	61.5	-5.8	B	139	14	10.1	A	2.75
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	7.6	25.5	-17.7	F	65.7	34.3	9.4	D	85.0	90.4	-5.4	B	1389	104	13.1	A	2.00
University of North Carolina at Charlotte	18.0	25.5	-6.5	D	56.8	43.2	0.5	A	54.4	54.7	-0.3	A	3242	62	52.1	D	2.50
University of North Carolina at Greensboro	19.9	25.5	-5.4	A	71.5	28.5	15.2	D	56.9	55.2	1.7	A	4013	31	79.1	F	2.25
University of North Carolina at Pembroke	37.1	25.5	11.7	A	56.4	43.6	0.1	A	35.5	35.4	0.1	A	1663	13	126.1	F	3.00
University of North Carolina School of the Arts	9.3	25.5	-16.2	F	46.3	53.7	10.0	D	60.8	63.3	-2.5	A	81	3	16.1	A	2.25
University of North Carolina Wilmington	4.3	25.5	-21.2	F	52.9	47.1	3.4	B	69.7	71.2	-1.5	A	510	21	24.1	B	2.50
Western Carolina University	6.5	25.5	-18.9	F	46.8	53.2	9.5	D	51.8	55.9	-4.1	A	511	6	85.1	F	1.25

NORTH DAKOTA
Statewide Equity
Index Score
1.38



COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK TO BI WHOLE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2006	BLACK FACULTY 2006	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Dickinson State University	4.4	3.4	1.1	A	50.0	50.0	36.3	F	31.6	28.1	-3.5	C	40	0	0	F	1.50
Mayville State University	12.5	3.4	9.1	A	6.6	93.4	49.7	F	12.5	32.4	-19.8	F	76	0	0	F	1.00
Minot State University	3.3	3.4	-0.1	A	25.8	74.1	30.4	F	26.3	41.0	-14.7	D	109	1	108.1	F	1.25
North Dakota State University	2.9	3.4	-0.5	B	36.7	63.3	19.8	F	22.8	54.7	-31.9	F	305	9	34.1	C	1.25
University of North Dakota	9.1	3.4	-5.7	B	32.8	67.2	33.7	F	48.7	53.9	-5.2	C	181	8	23.1	B	2.00
Valley City State University	3.7	3.4	0.3	A	14.8	85.2	41.5	F	29.0	42.0	-13.0	D	57	0	0	F	1.25

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK BS/BA VS OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % UNDERREPRESENTED	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS PER	BLACK FACULTY PER	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Bowling Green State University	9.6	15.1	-5.5	C	38.3	41.7	2.0	A	41.3	54.3	-13.0	D	2230	29	43:1	C	2.25
Cleveland State University	15.0	15.1	0.0	A	65.5	34.5	9.2	D	16.5	37.7	-21.2	F	1375	31	44:1	C	1.75
Kent State University at Kent	9.0	15.1	-6.1	D	68.4	31.6	12.1	D	39.5	54.4	-14.9	D	1713	47	36:1	C	1.85
Miami University-Hamilton	9.0	15.1	-6.0	D	50.6	49.4	5.7	B	7.5	25.9	-18.3	F	172	1	172:1	F	1.00
Miami University-Middletown	4.1	15.1	-11.0	F	59.1	40.9	3.8	B	2.7	18.9	-16.1	D	44	1	44:1	C	1.10
Miami University-Oxford	3.2	15.1	-11.9	F	51.8	48.2	4.5	B	71.2	79.5	-8.3	B	508	44	12:1	A	2.50
Ohio State University	5.2	15.1	-9.9	D	53.3	44.3	0.8	A	72.9	83.4	-10.4	C	2154	139	16:1	A	2.75
Ohio University	5.4	15.1	-9.7	D	58.0	42.0	1.7	A	58.2	65.9	-7.6	B	955	38	25:1	B	2.75
Shawnee State University	6.1	15.1	-9.0	D	39.2	60.8	17.1	F	14.9	26.8	-11.9	C	181	5	36:1	C	1.15
University of Akron	11.2	15.1	-3.8	C	51.1	48.9	5.2	B	15.7	40.9	-25.1	F	1501	34	44:1	C	1.75
University of Cincinnati	6.8	15.1	-8.5	D	35.8	44.2	0.5	A	49.8	65.0	-15.2	D	1419	90	16:1	A	2.50
University of Toledo	11.5	15.1	-3.5	C	55.2	44.8	1.1	A	19.4	43.9	-24.4	F	1477	22	67:1	D	1.75
Wright State University	11.6	15.1	-3.5	C	64.4	35.6	8.1	C	20.3	38.7	-18.5	F	1107	33	34:1	C	1.50
Wright State University-Lake Campus	3.3	15.1	-11.8	F	41.4	58.6	14.9	D	20.0	29.4	-9.4	C	29	0	0	F	0.75
Youngstown State University	9.8	15.1	-5.2	D	54.9	45.1	1.4	A	8.6	33.1	-23.5	F	793	24	32:1	B	2.00

OHIO
Statewide Equity
Index Score
1.82



COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK BS/BA VS OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % UNDERREPRESENTED	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS PER	BLACK FACULTY PER	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Carleton University	11.0	9.3	3.8	A	59.0	41.0	2.7	B	13.3	22.2	-8.9	B	383	7	55:1	D	2.75
East Central University	3.9	9.3	-5.5	C	34.9	65.1	21.4	F	29.8	34.3	-4.5	A	109	3	36:1	C	2.00
Northeastern State University	3.8	9.3	-5.5	C	46.2	53.8	10.1	D	23.7	28.3	-4.6	A	184	8	23:1	B	2.50
Northern Oklahoma State University	7.4	9.3	-1.9	B	55.6	77.4	33.7	F	7.3	27.4	-20.1	F	106	3	35:1	C	1.25
Oklahoma Panhandle State University	11.3	9.3	1.8	A	15.2	64.8	41.1	F	30.8	31.1	-0.4	A	99	0	0	F	3.00
Oklahoma State University	4.5	9.3	-4.9	C	48.6	51.4	7.7	C	42.1	61.2	-19.1	F	821	20	41:1	C	1.50
Rogers State University	4.2	9.3	-5.1	C	57.8	48.4	1.3	A	5.9	23.1	-17.2	D	89	3	33:1	C	2.15
Southeastern Oklahoma State University	5.5	9.3	-3.8	C	27.6	72.2	28.5	F	22.4	28.4	-6.0	B	133	1	133:1	F	1.25
Southern Oklahoma State University	4.8	9.3	-4.5	C	38.1	61.9	18.2	F	19.3	32.7	-13.4	D	188	2	84:1	F	0.75
University of Central Oklahoma	8.8	9.3	-0.5	B	60.0	40.0	3.7	B	27.2	37.4	-10.2	C	926	15	62:1	D	2.25
University of Oklahoma-Norman Campus	4.6	9.3	-4.7	C	49.6	50.4	8.7	C	18.0	68.7	-50.7	C	838	25	34:1	C	2.00
University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma	3.5	9.3	-5.8	D	72.0	28.0	15.7	D	25.0	41.4	-16.4	D	25	1	25:1	B	1.50

OKLAHOMA
Statewide Equity
Index Score
1.83



OREGON
Statewide Equity
Index Score
2.07

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK BS/BA VS OLDS %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % UNDERREPRESENTED	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS PER	BLACK FACULTY PER	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Eastern Oregon University	2.7	2.5	0.3	A	21.8	76.1	32.9	F	16.1	28.8	-12.5	C	48	1	48:1	C	2.00
Oregon Institute of Technology	1.3	2.5	-1.2	B	20.0	70.0	26.3	F	40.0	45.9	-5.9	B	30	0	0	F	1.50
Oregon State University	1.3	2.5	-1.1	B	38.9	61.1	17.4	F	43.4	63.1	-19.7	F	344	13	19:1	A	1.75
Portland State University	3.6	2.5	1.1	A	52.2	47.8	4.1	B	33.2	43.4	-10.2	C	494	25	20:1	A	3.25
Southern Oregon University	2.8	2.5	0.3	A	33.9	61.1	17.8	F	27.1	38.0	-10.9	C	90	0	0	F	1.50
University of Oregon	2.1	2.5	-0.4	B	46.5	53.5	9.8	D	60.8	69.7	-9.0	B	381	17	22:1	B	2.50
Western Oregon University	4.0	2.5	1.5	A	43.8	56.2	12.5	D	33.1	43.3	-10.3	C	152	3	54:1	D	3.00

PENNSYLVANIA

Statewide Equity Index Score
1.89

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK WOMEN %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS PER 100	BLACK FACULTY PER 100	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Boycarsburg University of Pennsylvania	8.7	14.2	-5.5	C	53.4	46.8	2.9	B	40.5	68.8	-22.0	F	714	11	65:1	D	1.50
California University of Pennsylvania	13.7	14.2	-0.5	B	50.0	50.0	6.3	C	42.1	53.8	-11.7	C	632	22	29:1	B	2.50
Clarion University of Pennsylvania	7.7	14.2	-6.6	D	49.5	50.5	8.8	C	24.8	50.7	-26.0	F	273	7	39:1	C	1.15
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania	15.4	14.2	1.2	A	53.9	46.1	2.4	A	41.0	55.8	-14.9	D	866	11	79:1	F	2.25
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania	7.4	14.2	-6.8	D	48.1	51.8	8.2	C	33.4	48.3	-14.9	D	392	8	49:1	C	1.50
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	12.2	14.2	-2.0	B	54.8	45.2	1.5	A	32.6	53.4	-20.9	F	1212	20	61:1	D	2.00
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	7.7	14.2	-6.6	D	42.5	57.5	13.8	D	33.6	54.7	-21.2	F	354	15	23:1	C	1.00
Lock Haven University	9.7	14.2	-4.6	C	45.0	55.0	11.3	D	32.9	48.3	-15.3	D	240	7	49:1	D	1.25
Mansfield University of Pennsylvania	10.4	14.2	-3.9	C	55.8	44.2	0.5	A	40.2	52.0	-11.9	C	299	1	299:1	F	2.00
Millersville University of Pennsylvania	8.4	14.2	-5.8	D	52.9	47.1	3.4	B	40.1	61.9	-21.8	F	495	17	29:1	B	1.75
Pennsylvania State University-Abington	13.4	14.2	-0.8	B	60.0	40.0	3.7	B	32.0	47.6	-15.6	D	408	7	58:1	D	2.00
Pennsylvania State University-Altoona	7.4	14.2	-6.8	D	57.3	42.7	1.0	A	56.9	88.8	-11.8	C	246	3	82:1	F	1.75
Pennsylvania State University-Beaver	9.9	14.2	-4.3	C	53.2	46.8	3.1	B	35.2	44.5	-9.3	C	62	1	31:1	B	2.50
Pennsylvania State University-Berks	10.5	14.2	-3.7	C	43.1	50.9	7.2	C	44.4	58.7	-14.3	D	265	1	265:1	F	1.25
Pennsylvania State University-Bradysville	11.3	14.2	-2.9	C	51.1	48.9	5.2	B	24.2	43.1	-18.9	F	178	4	44:1	C	2.15
Pennsylvania State University-Erie-Bellevue	3.1	14.2	-11.1	F	58.9	41.1	2.6	A	38.7	67.7	-31.0	F	129	3	43:1	C	1.50
Pennsylvania State University-Fayette-Eberly	4.7	14.2	-9.5	D	37.7	43.3	1.4	A	21.7	44.9	-23.2	F	28	0	0	F	1.15
Pennsylvania State University-Greater Allegheny	20.6	14.2	6.4	A	54.0	46.0	2.3	A	27.3	41.2	-13.9	D	100	8	13:1	A	2.25
Pennsylvania State University-Harrisburg	9.9	14.2	-4.3	C	54.4	43.8	1.9	A	84.8	83.7	1.1	A	375	10	38:1	C	3.00
Pennsylvania State University-Juniata Valley	6.6	14.2	-7.7	D	48.9	51.1	7.4	C	41.2	54.5	-13.3	D	45	0	0	F	1.00
Pennsylvania State University-New Kensington	5.2	14.2	-9.0	D	33.3	66.7	23.0	F	38.0	51.1	-13.1	D	27	1	27:1	B	1.15
Pennsylvania State University-Schuylkill	18.8	14.2	4.6	A	54.7	45.3	1.6	A	43.0	43.1	-0.1	A	117	0	0	F	3.00
Pennsylvania State University-Shenandoah	3.8	14.2	-10.4	F	61.6	38.4	7.3	C	3.1	30.4	-27.3	F	22	0	0	F	1.00
Pennsylvania State University-University Park	4.1	14.2	-10.1	D	56.0	44.0	0.3	A	69.8	83.5	-13.8	D	1645	105	16:1	A	2.50
Pennsylvania State University-Wilkes-Barre	4.3	14.2	-9.9	D	37.8	72.2	28:1	F	51.9	49.5	2.4	A	18	4	5:1	A	2.15
Pennsylvania State University-Worthington Scranton	3.0	14.2	-11.3	F	52.0	48.0	4.3	B	20.0	42.4	-22.4	F	25	1	25:1	B	1.50
Pennsylvania State University-York	6.6	14.2	-7.6	D	32.7	47.3	3.6	B	39.0	48.7	-10.8	C	55	1	55:1	D	1.75
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania	11.3	14.2	-2.9	C	48.8	50.2	8.5	C	37.7	55.6	-18.0	F	626	15	42:1	C	1.50
Temple University	11.8	14.2	-2.4	B	64.5	35.5	8.2	C	64.2	68.2	-4.1	B	3090	117	26:1	B	2.15
University of Pittsburgh-Bradford	13.4	14.2	-0.8	B	44.2	55.8	19.1	D	46.7	49.9	-3.2	A	181	3	60:1	D	1.15
University of Pittsburgh-Greensburg	6.0	14.2	-8.2	D	62.8	37.2	6.5	C	47.9	55.0	-7.9	B	88	3	29:1	B	2.25
University of Pittsburgh-Johnstown	4.0	14.2	-10.2	D	56.0	44.0	0.3	A	30.3	53.4	-23.1	F	109	2	55:1	D	1.50
University of Pittsburgh-Pittsburgh Campus	5.1	14.2	-9.1	D	57.2	42.8	0.8	A	70.7	81.3	-10.6	C	925	108	9:1	A	8.75
West Chester University of Pennsylvania	10.6	14.2	-3.6	C	62.5	37.5	8:2	C	51.8	69.2	-17.4	F	1333	24	40:1	C	1.50

RHODE ISLAND

Statewide Equity Index Score
2.00

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK WOMEN %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS PER 100	BLACK FACULTY PER 100	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Rhode Island College	8.5	7.8	0.7	A	64.6	35.4	6:3	C	38.3	44.2	-11.9	C	474	6	79:1	F	2.00
University of Rhode Island	5.1	7.8	-2.8	C	48.4	51.6	7.9	C	48.9	62.1	-13.1	D	628	20	31:1	B	2.00

SOUTH CAROLINA

Statewide Equity Index Score
1.78

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK WOMEN %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS PER 100	BLACK FACULTY PER 100	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Clemson University	8.7	32.1	-25.4	F	48.3	51.7	8.0	C	86.3	81.7	-15.5	D	1203	48	25:1	B	1.60
Coastal Carolina University	20.4	32.1	-11.8	F	46.5	53.5	9.8	D	46.0	43.7	2.3	A	1798	91	86:1	F	1.25
College of Charleston	7.3	32.1	-24.7	F	68.9	31.1	12.8	D	81.6	67.1	-14.4	B	707	35	20:1	B	1.75
Francis Marion University	14.0	32.1	-11.9	A	77.9	22.1	21.6	F	40.1	40.9	-0.8	A	1355	8	169:1	F	2.00
Lander University	29.2	32.1	-3.0	C	74.3	25.7	18.0	F	38.4	45.8	-7.4	B	738	10	73:1	F	1.25
University of South Carolina-Aiken	26.8	32.1	-5.6	C	71.7	28.3	15.4	D	40.6	41.8	-1.1	A	750	7	107:1	F	1.75
University of South Carolina-Beaufort	28.3	32.1	-3.9	D	72.3	27.8	15.9	D	24.2	24.0	-0.2	A	389	8	48:1	F	1.50
University of South Carolina-Columbia	8.3	32.1	-23.3	F	59.4	40.6	3.1	B	71.0	72.9	-1.8	A	8106	83	97:1	B	2.50
University of South Carolina-Upstate	30.6	32.1	-1.6	B	73.8	26.2	17.5	F	41.3	40.3	0.9	A	1348	24	56:1	D	2.00
Winthrop University	30.5	32.1	-1.6	B	71.0	29.0	14.7	D	56.7	55.1	1.6	A	1386	23	60:1	D	2.55

SOUTH DAKOTA

Statewide Equity Index Score
1.63

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK WOMEN %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS PER 100	BLACK FACULTY PER 100	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Black Hills State University	1.5	2.4	-0.9	B	18.8	81.2	37.6	F	30.8	33.7	-2.9	A	22	1	22:1	B	1.50
Dakota State University	2.5	2.4	0.1	A	8.9	91.1	47.4	F	10.0	41.0	-31.0	F	45	0	0	F	1.00
Northern State University	1.9	2.4	-0.5	B	10.0	84.0	40.3	F	15.0	49.1	-34.1	F	13	0	0	F	0.75
South Dakota School of Mines and Technology	1.7	2.4	-0.7	B	2.9	97.1	53.4	F	33.3	49.1	-15.8	D	24	1	24:1	C	1.50
South Dakota State University	1.5	2.4	-0.9	B	16.1	83.9	20.2	F	38.3	55.7	-23.4	F	133	8	17:1	A	1.75
University of South Dakota	2.8	2.4	0.4	A	29.0	71.0	27.3	F	40.3	54.0	-13.7	D	138	8	17:1	A	2.25

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK TO 2016 WHITES %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2016	BLACK FACULTY 2016	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Austin Peay State University	31.0	21.5	-9.5	B	66.8	39.2	4.5	B	30.5	36.5	-6.0	B	1473	25	59:1	D	2.30
East Tennessee State University	6.5	21.5	15.0	F	54.9	45.1	1.4	A	24.8	41.9	-17.1	F	603	20	30:1	B	1.75
Middle Tennessee State University	22.2	21.5	0.7	A	62.5	37.5	6.2	C	42.8	44.8	-2.0	A	3553	81	38:1	D	0.75
Tennessee Technological University	4.0	21.5	17.5	F	33.8	66.2	25.5	F	43.8	51.0	-7.2	B	337	13	26:1	B	1.50
University of Memphis	34.8	21.5	13.3	A	63.2	24.8	8.9	C	33.3	43.5	-10.2	C	4302	78	55:1	D	0.25
University of Tennessee-Chattanooga	10.4	21.5	11.1	F	60.1	39.9	3.8	B	31.1	41.3	-10.1	C	923	32	29:1	B	2.00
University of Tennessee-Knoxville	6.7	21.5	14.8	F	54.5	45.5	1.8	A	58.9	68.9	-10.1	C	1396	56	25:1	B	0.25
University of Tennessee-Martin	14.0	21.5	7.5	D	60.4	39.6	4.1	B	40.0	47.3	-7.3	B	692	16	43:1	C	2.25

TENNESSEE

Statewide Equity Index Score
2.16



STATEWIDE EQUITY INDEX SCORE BY COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY

TEXAS

Statewide Equity Index Score
2.19



COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK TO 2016 WHITES %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2016	BLACK FACULTY 2016	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Angelo State University	9.3	13.3	4.0	C	43.0	57.0	13.3	D	22.6	32.0	-9.4	C	451	5	90:1	F	1.15
Lamar University	28.1	13.6	14.6	A	62.3	37.7	6.0	C	22.7	23.0	-0.3	C	1730	25	69:1	D	2.25
Midwestern State University	14.7	13.5	1.2	A	54.5	43.5	1.8	A	31.3	43.4	-12.1	C	606	4	152:1	F	0.10
Sam Houston State University	19.3	13.5	5.8	A	65.6	34.4	9.3	D	47.0	50.9	-3.9	A	2802	32	88:1	F	2.25
Stephen F. Austin State University	19.3	13.5	5.8	A	65.3	34.7	8.0	C	35.5	43.0	-7.5	B	1850	13	134:1	F	0.11
Sul Ross State University	10.5	13.5	3.0	C	17.4	82.6	38.9	F	9.6	21.6	-12.0	C	144	3	48:1	D	1.25
Tarleton State University	7.8	13.5	5.7	D	57.1	48.9	0.8	A	29.6	43.7	-14.1	D	632	11	57:1	D	1.75
Texas A&M International University	0.4	18.5	-18.1	F	18.7	81.3	39.6	F	36.8	42.4	-5.6	B	18	6	3:1	A	1.75
Texas A&M University-Central Texas	19.6	13.5	6.0	A	68.0	32.0	11.7	D	---	---	---	I	122	4	30:1	A	2.00
Texas A&M University-College Station	3.2	13.5	10.3	D	54.5	45.5	1.8	A	67.6	79.4	-11.8	C	1454	102	14:1	A	2.75
Texas A&M University-Commerce	22.8	13.5	9.0	A	56.5	43.5	0.2	A	37.1	45.5	-8.4	B	1410	18	50:1	D	1.00
Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi	7.2	13.5	6.3	D	57.4	42.6	1.1	A	38.2	37.4	0.7	A	592	12	49:1	D	2.50
Texas A&M University-Kingsville	6.8	13.5	6.7	D	38.0	62.0	18.3	F	18.8	28.3	-9.5	D	347	11	31:1	B	1.25
Texas A&M University-San Antonio	8.0	13.5	5.5	C	54.7	45.3	1.6	A	---	---	---	I	190	8	24:1	B	3.00
Texas A&M University-Texarkana	14.9	13.5	1.4	A	67.1	32.9	10.8	D	8.1	26.3	-17.2	D	164	3	55:1	D	1.75
Texas State University	10.0	15.5	-5.5	C	57.7	42.3	1.4	A	54.1	54.8	-0.7	A	2811	35	80:1	F	2.50
Texas Tech University	6.3	13.5	7.2	D	49.1	50.9	14.2	D	53.8	59.3	-5.5	B	1682	16	105:1	C	1.75
Texas Woman's University	21.2	13.5	7.6	A	93.8	6.2	37.5	---	33.3	41.1	-7.8	B	1476	23	64:1	D	2.67
University of Houston	10.6	13.5	2.9	C	53.1	44.9	1.2	A	37.1	49.3	-12.2	C	3691	38	71:1	D	1.25
University of Houston-Clear Lake	7.7	13.5	5.8	D	69.8	30.4	13.3	D	---	---	---	I	207	19	11:1	A	2.00
University of Houston-Downtown	18.7	13.5	5.2	A	62.8	37.2	6.5	C	11.8	15.5	-3.7	A	1184	34	35:1	C	2.00
University of Houston-Victoria	17.3	13.5	3.8	A	57.5	42.5	1.2	A	8.7	17.8	-8.1	B	275	1	275:1	F	2.75
University of North Texas	13.0	13.5	-0.5	B	57.3	42.7	1.0	A	47.3	50.8	-3.7	A	2317	54	43:1	D	3.00
University of North Texas at Dallas	28.5	13.5	15.0	A	68.5	31.5	12.2	D	27.3	32.6	-5.3	B	391	11	36:1	C	2.50
University of Texas at Arlington	19.9	13.5	6.4	B	62.3	37.8	5.9	B	37.2	44.4	-7.2	B	1139	21	102:1	F	2.25
University of Texas at Austin	4.2	13.5	9.3	D	63.0	37.0	6.7	C	68.3	80.2	-11.9	C	1558	88	18:1	A	2.25
University of Texas at Dallas	5.9	13.5	7.6	D	47.8	52.4	8.7	C	52.4	66.9	-14.5	D	786	19	41:1	C	1.50
University of Texas at El Paso	2.6	13.5	10.9	F	42.0	58.0	14.3	D	23.9	39.0	-15.1	D	345	18	19:1	A	1.50
University of Texas at San Antonio	9.9	13.5	3.6	C	58.6	41.4	2.3	A	38.4	31.8	6.6	A	1370	26	53:1	D	2.75
University of Texas at Tyler	0.2	13.5	13.3	F	62.2	37.8	5.9	B	38.4	42.2	-3.8	A	442	16	28:1	B	3.00
University of Texas of the Permian Basin	5.5	13.5	8.0	D	37.0	63.0	19.3	F	23.9	33.4	-9.5	B	119	3	40:1	C	1.50
University of Texas Rio Grande Valley	0.5	13.5	13.0	F	45.9	54.1	10.4	D	34.3	40.5	-6.2	B	98	27	4:1	A	2.00
West Texas A&M University	5.3	13.5	8.2	D	40.5	59.5	13.8	D	23.4	41.2	-17.8	F	289	3	100:1	F	0.10

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK TO BI WHITES %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2006	BLACK FACULTY 2006	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Southern Utah University	2.2	1.3	1.0	A	36.1	61.9	16.2	F	32.3	38.2	-5.8	B	1.88	0	0	F	1.75
University of Utah	1.3	1.2	0.1	A	46.6	52.4	9.7	D	58.3	63.0	-4.7	A	223	18	12:1	A	3.25
Utah State University	0.9	1.2	-0.3	B	40.8	59.3	18.5	D	39.6	48.5	-8.9	B	1.87	8	23:1	B	2.50
Utah Valley University	0.9	1.2	-0.4	B	40.4	59.6	19.9	D	16.3	25.7	-9.3	C	148	5	24:1	B	2.25
Weber State University	2.0	1.3	0.7	A	28.1	61.9	18.2	F	19.8	37.2	-17.4	F	208	6	34:1	C	1.50

UTAH

Statewide Equity Index Score
2.25



COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK TO BI WHITES %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2006	BLACK FACULTY 2006	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Castleton University	1.8	2.3	-0.6	B	16.1	63.9	40.2	F	69.2	48.9	20.4	A	31	1	31:1	B	2.50
Johnson State College	4.3	2.3	2.0	A	34.2	65.8	32.1	F	33.3	35.2	-1.8	A	38	0	0	F	2.00
Lyndon State College	3.2	2.3	0.9	A	19.4	60.6	36.9	F	23.7	35.9	-12.2	C	31	0	0	F	1.50
University of Vermont	1.2	2.3	-1.2	B	52.5	47.5	3.8	B	70.5	75.8	-5.1	B	118	24	5:1	A	3.25

VERMONT

Statewide Equity Index Score
2.31



COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK TO BI WHITES %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2006	BLACK FACULTY 2006	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Christoper Newport University	7.6	22.3	-14.6	F	50.1	48.9	0.2	C	62.8	69.4	-6.6	B	373	12	31:1	B	2.00
College of William and Mary	7.1	22.3	-15.2	F	63.3	38.7	7.0	C	87.1	90.5	-3.4	A	439	23	19:1	A	2.50
George Mason University	10.9	22.3	-11.4	F	60.3	38.7	4.0	B	69.8	68.5	1.3	A	2048	58	35:1	C	2.25
James Madison University	4.6	22.3	-17.7	F	59.9	40.1	2.6	B	74.1	62.1	12.0	B	856	28	31:1	B	2.25
Longwood University	8.9	22.3	-13.4	F	64.9	35.1	8.8	C	56.1	65.2	-9.1	B	333	3	71:1	D	1.50
Old Dominion University	21.1	22.3	0.8	A	60.1	39.9	3.8	B	60.9	51.6	9.3	B	4723	51	93:1	F	0.75
Randolph University	15.3	22.3	-7.0	D	57.9	42.1	1.8	A	52.8	56.7	-3.9	B	1933	15	13:1	F	1.00
University of Mary Washington	6.9	22.3	-15.4	F	55.8	44.4	0.7	A	62.7	72.1	-9.4	C	288	9	30:1	B	2.25
University of Virginia	6.5	22.3	-15.8	F	39.8	40.2	1.3	B	87.1	91.7	-4.6	B	938	81	12:1	A	2.50
University of Virginia College at Wise	11.3	22.3	-10.9	F	24.1	75.9	32.2	F	29.9	41.6	-11.7	C	145	3	48:1	D	0.75
Virginia Commonwealth University	19.1	22.3	-3.2	C	67.0	33.0	10.7	D	59.3	59.9	-0.6	A	3623	109	33:1	C	2.25
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	4.0	22.3	-18.3	F	41.4	56.6	14.9	D	72.7	83.1	-10.4	C	996	47	21:1	B	1.50

VIRGINIA

Statewide Equity Index Score
2.04



WASHINGTON

Statewide Equity Index Score
2.59



COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK TO BI WHITES %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2006	BLACK FACULTY 2006	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Central Washington University	3.3	4.5	-1.0	B	43.2	56.8	13.1	D	37.4	52.2	-14.6	D	319	10	33:1	C	1.75
Eastern Washington University	8.8	4.5	4.0	A	47.1	52.9	9.2	D	30.6	45.9	-15.3	D	340	12	28:1	B	2.00
The Evergreen State College	5.1	4.5	0.6	A	54.0	46.0	2.3	A	48.6	55.8	-7.2	B	178	0	0	F	2.25
University of Washington-Bothell Campus	6.4	4.5	1.9	A	55.0	45.0	1.3	A	65.9	67.9	-2.0	A	282	4	71:1	D	3.25
University of Washington-Seattle Campus	2.6	4.5	-1.9	B	55.0	45.0	1.8	A	74.2	83.4	-9.2	C	737	38	13:1	A	2.25
University of Washington-Tacoma Campus	7.3	4.5	2.8	A	55.8	44.2	0.5	A	47.5	57.1	-9.5	C	274	6	46:1	C	2.00
Washington State University	1.4	4.5	-3.1	B	50.8	49.2	5.5	B	55.2	66.8	-10.6	C	719	11	66:1	D	2.25
Western Washington University	1.7	4.5	-2.8	C	56.8	43.2	0.5	A	54.6	70.4	-15.7	D	229	10	23:1	B	2.50

WEST VIRGINIA

Statewide Equity Index Score
1.79



COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK TO BI WHITES %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2006	BLACK FACULTY 2006	RATIO	GRADE	EQUITY INDEX
Concord University	6.6	5.2	1.4	A	35.0	63.0	11.3	F	17.8	25.5	-7.7	F	109	1	109:1	F	1.00
Fairmont State University	5.9	5.2	0.6	A	29.8	70.2	26.5	F	25.5	31.0	-5.6	B	191	3	64:1	D	2.00
Glenville State College	13.6	5.2	8.3	A	20.7	79.3	35.6	F	13.8	21.7	-7.9	F	145	0	0	F	1.50
Marshall University	6.9	5.2	1.7	A	47.5	52.5	8.8	C	37.5	44.8	-7.3	B	547	21	26:1	B	3.00
Shepherd University	10.3	5.2	2.9	A	42.8	57.1	13.4	D	31.9	43.2	-11.2	C	219	4	55:1	C	2.00
West Liberty University	2.7	5.2	-2.5	B	26.5	73.5	29.8	F	20.5	43.0	-22.5	F	49	0	0	F	0.75
West Virginia University	4.8	5.2	-0.4	B	26.5	63.5	19.8	F	41.6	36.8	4.8	D	981	38	25:1	A	2.00
West Virginia University Institute of Technology	6.1	5.2	2.9	A	44.3	55.7	12.0	D	3.9	20.0	-16.1	D	79	2	40:1	C	2.00

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				EQUITY INDEX
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK F-PT %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2000	BLACK FACULTY 2000	RATIO	GRADE	
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire	0.9	8.2	-7.3	D	34.5	65.5	21.8	F	65.2	66.9	-1.6	A	84	19	8.1	A	2.55
University of Wisconsin-Green Bay	1.6	8.2	-6.7	D	34.4	65.6	21.9	F	40.5	47.9	-7.3	B	64	3	21:1	B	1.75
University of Wisconsin-La Crosse	0.8	8.3	-7.4	D	32.7	60.3	16.5	F	47.1	67.9	-20.8	F	73	8	9:1	A	1.55
University of Wisconsin-Madison	2.1	8.2	-6.1	D	53.8	46.2	2.5	A	71.4	84.1	-12.7	C	599	87	9:1	A	2.75
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	7.4	8.2	-0.8	B	62.5	37.3	6.2	C	20.5	41.5	-21.0	F	1134	47	24:1	B	2.00
University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh	2.6	8.2	-5.6	C	50.7	49.3	5.6	B	24.3	52.8	-28.5	F	215	7	31:1	B	2.00
University of Wisconsin-Parkside	8.6	8.3	0.4	A	56.3	43.7	9.0	A	15.9	29.9	-14.0	D	279	7	40:1	C	2.75
University of Wisconsin-Platteville	1.2	8.2	-7.1	D	36.7	63.3	15.6	F	14.2	53.5	-39.3	F	70	15	5:1	A	1.25
University of Wisconsin-River Falls	1.8	8.1	-6.3	D	43.1	57.9	14.3	D	28.4	54.3	-25.8	F	74	3	21:1	B	1.55
University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point	2.6	8.2	-5.6	C	43.0	57.0	13.3	D	32.6	61.3	-28.8	F	300	3	67:1	D	1.00
University of Wisconsin-Stout	1.9	8.3	-6.3	D	35.3	60.7	26.0	F	32.0	54.7	-22.7	F	133	3	44:1	C	0.75
University of Wisconsin-Superior	1.7	8.2	-6.6	D	30.0	70.0	26.3	F	26.7	41.8	-15.1	D	30	2	15:1	A	1.50
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater	4.1	8.2	-4.2	C	46.1	53.9	10.2	D	29.6	57.4	-27.8	F	410	17	24:1	B	1.50

WISCONSIN

Statewide Equity Index Score
1.69



COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	REPRESENTATION EQUITY				GENDER EQUITY				COMPLETION EQUITY				BLACK STUDENT-TO-BLACK FACULTY RATIO				EQUITY INDEX
	BLACK STUDENTS %	BLACK F-PT %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK WOMEN %	BLACK MEN %	NATIONAL % DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK GRAD RATE %	OVERALL GRAD RATE %	% DIFFERENCE	GRADE	BLACK STUDENTS 2000	BLACK FACULTY 2000	RATIO	GRADE	
University of Wyoming	1.2	8.1	-6.9	B	28.1	71.9	28.2	F	33.3	54.7	-21.4	F	99	8	12:1	A	1.75

WYOMING

Statewide Equity Index Score
1.75



RECOMMENDATIONS

We do not believe Black students are largely responsible for their underrepresentation and lack of success at public colleges and universities. Factors such as low motivation, insufficient academic effort, fixed mindsets, low classroom and out-of-class engagement, and parental influences are indeed partly responsible for some trends noted in this publication. Notwithstanding, researchers and postsecondary leaders rely too heavily on these factors as they attempt to explain the educational status of Black undergraduates. The onus for success is too often placed entirely on students, their families, and K-12 schools they attended. In this section, we shift more of the responsibility to higher education leaders and policymakers.

Recommendations offered below are for professionals who work at and on behalf of public colleges and universities. We do not maintain that simply doing the few things we suggest will be enough to fix *all* problems that undermine access and success for Black undergraduates. We are confident, however, that our recommendations will help remedy *some* inequities documented in this report.

ACHIEVING EQUITY ACROSS THE FOUR INDICATORS

Many institutions performed exceptionally on one or more of our equity indicators. Leaders at system and campus levels should reach out to colleagues at these institutions to understand how they achieved such extraordinary results. Creating opportunities for organizational learning across campuses is one recommendation we have for public postsecondary system executives. At statewide convenings, professionals from institutions that earned A's on one indicator could share helpful strategies with colleagues from lower-performing institutions.

Faculty members and leaders at campus and system levels must spend time learning how to actually achieve racial equity. Our research at the USC Race and Equity Center makes painfully clear that most people who work in higher education never learned much, if anything at all, about how to address racism or strategically achieve racial equity. Since those who are supposed to fix racial inequities on campuses were not taught how to do so, it is no surprise that widespread inequity continually persists. The USC Equity Institutes, our eight-week professional learning series, is one response to this problem. In addition to facilitating

eight 90-minute modules for 20 leaders at an institution, we also coach teams as they create strategic plans for the design, implementation, resourcing, assessment, accountability, communication, and sustainability of four racial equity projects. We believe it hard to achieve equity for Black undergraduates at public colleges and universities without this level of commitment to professional learning and strategic organizational change.

The work of Black student success cannot rest mostly on a chief diversity officer, black culture center staff, or a few Black faculty members. Instead, we recommend establishing cross-campus, cross-sector teams comprised of faculty and staff members, senior administrators, alumni, and Black undergraduates; these teams should include some White professors and administrators.

INCREASING BLACK UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT ENROLLMENTS

At many public institutions, a disproportionately high share of Black undergraduates come from only 4-5 cities and just a small number of supplier high schools within those cities. This signifies that recruiters return to the same places year after year to find Black applicants. While strong partnerships between high schools and postsecondary institutions are praiseworthy, heavy or exclusive reliance on a small number of them is unlikely to produce different results from one year to the next. Admission officers must substantively engage a wider array of high schools to find talented prospective Black students.

State legislators and public postsecondary system executives must invest more resources into programs that specifically prepare Black students for college admission and success. Prep programs for low-income, first generation, and underrepresented students are oftentimes not specific enough. Consequently, too few Black students directly benefit from them. Legislators and public system executives who wish to align Black student enrollments with Black representation in the state's population should make money available to create

new partnerships, to establish college access programs specifically for Black students, and to increase admission officers' travel budgets to more high schools across the state with the explicit goal of enrolling more Black state residents. Haphazardly awarding such funds would be irresponsible. Instead, public institutions must be required to submit Black student recruitment plans that include goals, strategies, and metrics. In addition, state system offices should launch systemwide campaigns to specifically increase Black undergraduate enrollments.

Any college recruiter from any racial/ethnic group who wishes to enroll more Black state residents could do so by employing the right strategies. However, it is worth noting that, nationally, 85% of college admission directors and 80% of admission officers are White. Undoubtedly, increasing the number of Black recruiters a campus sends to high schools across the state (especially those enrolling high numbers of Black students), to places of religious worship that Black families attend, and to predominantly Black neighborhoods and community centers would help increase a public postsecondary institution's chances of recruiting more Black undergraduates. Diversifying the college admission profession requires intentionality and casting a wider net. We write about a

resource below in the Black faculty recruitment and retention section that would also help diversify admission offices.

Last spring, our center published its biennial report on Black male student-athletes and racial inequities in NCAA Division I sports. Eighty-two percent of institutions in the dataset were public. In the study, Professor Shaun Harper suggested admission officers should behave more like coaches who seek to recruit talented Black male high school students to play on revenue-generating sports teams. "A coach does not wait for high school students to express interest in playing for the university – he and his staff scout talent, establish collaborative partnerships with high school coaches, spend time cultivating one-on-one relationships with recruits, visit homes to talk with parents and families, host special visit days for student-athletes whom they wish to recruit, and search far and wide for the most talented prospects," Harper noted. Targeted activities such as these are necessary to recruit more Black students who are not athletes. We reject the excuse that admissible Black undergraduates cannot be found, as public postsecondary institutions confirm year after year that they are able to miraculously locate Black men when millions of dollars are to be made from their labor on football fields and basketball courts.

RECOMMENDATIONS
(CONTINUED)

ENSURING GENDER EQUITY IN AND BEYOND ENROLLMENT

For nearly two decades, higher education scholars and practitioners have invested tremendous effort into narrowing the gender gap in Black student enrollments. That women are now 52% and men are 48% of full-time, degree-seeking Black undergraduates is evidence that these efforts have been successful at public institutions. It is noteworthy that Black women's enrollments did not decline as Black men's increased. What did happen, though, is that Black women's gender-specific needs, experiences, and issues were largely ignored as institutions worked to address Black men's challenges. This was wrong.

On campuses where Black undergraduate women considerably outnumber Black undergraduate men, or vice versa, we recommend creating gender-specific outreach and enrollment strategies. Together, specificity and strategy can help achieve gender balance. Systemwide Black male initiatives, recruitment plans aimed at enrolling more Black men who are not student-athletes, and campus resource centers and student organizations aimed at improving academic success for Black undergraduate men are all fine with us – so long as institutions also commit energy and resources to understanding and meeting Black women's

gender-specific needs. Just because Black women perform better on equity indicators such as the four used in this study does not mean there are not other inequities that specifically disadvantage them. We suggest conducting qualitative studies on Black women's and men's uniquely gendered experiences, as well as disaggregating quantitative data by race and gender. Analyzing Black women's educational outcomes in comparison to women from other racial/ethnic groups, as opposed to always using Black men as their comparison, would also reveal particular racial inequities.

GRADUATING BLACK STUDENTS AT HIGHER RATES

Decades of research makes clear that high school preparation, affordability and financial aid, the investment of academic effort, and high levels of engagement inside and outside of classrooms are serious determinants of college completion (Mayhew et al., 2016). Leaders at campus and system levels, as well as state and federal policymakers, need to take this research seriously and invest resources into initiatives that specifically prepare Black students for college and ensure they have the financial support necessary to persist once they enroll. Funding Pell Grants at levels that actually cover the cost of attendance for low-income Black students is a serious recommendation

for federal policymakers. Giving institutions the resources they need to strategically address longstanding racial inequities must be among state and federal policymakers' highest priorities.

In their 2018 study, USC Race and Equity Center researchers Shaun Harper and Charles Davis, along with their collaborator Edward Smith, discovered that college completion is not just about financial aid and the other aforementioned factors. Their research makes clear that Black students also drop out of college because of the racism they frequently encounter on campus. Educators and administrators must understand the relationship between environmental racism and Black student attrition. Data from our center's National Assessment of Collegiate Campus Climates, an annual quantitative survey, would be helpful. Once institutions have data about how Black undergraduates differently and specifically experience the racial climate, various stakeholders across campus must begin to strategically address students' encounters with racial microaggressions, racist stereotypes, erasure in the curriculum, and overt forms of racism. Those experiences, not just academic readiness and financial aid, help distinguish Black undergraduates who drop out of college from those who ultimately persist through baccalaureate degree attainment.

RECRUITING AND RETAINING FULL-TIME BLACK FACULTY MEMBERS

Since its publication in the *Journal of Higher Education* in 2004, "Interrupting the Usual: Successful Strategies for Diversifying the Faculty" has become one of the most cited peer-reviewed articles on the topic of faculty diversity. It also has been used to guide practice on a countless number of campuses across the nation. We highly recommend that public institution leaders read it and employ strategies offered therein. *Diversifying the Faculty: A Guidebook for Search Committees* is another incredibly useful publication for campus leaders, faculty members, and search committees.

Institutions must go beyond simply posting job announcements on their HR websites and in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Search committees have to be trained on bias, held accountable for producing racially diverse finalist pools, and expected to write position descriptions that amplify the institution's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Aggressively disseminating ads through academic networks that include several Black academicians also is required for success.

The USC Race and Equity Center will soon launch PRISM, a professional networking and racial equity recruitment resource for colleges and univer-

sities. Eventually, PRISM will include thousands of employable people of color with standardized profiles, as well as downloadable CVs/resumes and work samples. Institutions will be able to search for and direct message professionals of color whom they deem qualified and potentially attractive for opportunities on their campuses. This will be one way to ensure that more current and prospective Black faculty members know about positions at public institutions. In addition to faculty members across academic ranks and fields, PRISM will include administrators of color across sectors (admissions, student affairs, academic affairs, and business services, to name a few).

Recruiting more Black full-time faculty members without addressing racial climate and workload imbalance issues and ensuring that White faculty colleagues respect their scholarship would be a waste of institutional resources. Turner, González, and Wood (2008) published a comprehensive synthesis of research about faculty of color. White professors and leaders should read this article, discuss it, and begin working in collaboration with Black colleagues and other faculty members of color on their campuses to strategically correct troublesome experiential realities. Anything short of this will guarantee perpetual imbalances in Black student-to-Black faculty ratios and high turnover rates among Black professors.

REFERENCES

- Harper, S. R. (2018). *Black male student-athletes and racial inequities in NCAA Division I college sports: 2018 edition*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California, Race and Equity Center.
- Harper, S. R., Smith, E. J., & Davis III, C. H. F. (2018). A critical race case analysis of Black undergraduate student success at an urban university. *Urban Education, 53*(1), 3-25.
- Mayhew, M. J., Rockenbach, A. N., Bowman, N. A., Seifert, T. A., Wolniak, G. C., Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2016). *How college affects students* (Vol. 3): *21st century evidence that higher education works*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Smith, D. G., Turner, C. S. V., Osei-Kofi, N., Richards, S. (2004). Interrupting the usual: Successful strategies for diversifying the faculty. *Journal of Higher Education, 75*(2), 131-160.
- Turner, C. S. V. (2002). *Diversifying the faculty: A guidebook for search committees*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Turner, C. S.V., González, J. C., & Wood, J. L. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1*(3), 139-168.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS



Shaun R. Harper attended public educational institutions from kindergarten through graduate school. His bachelor's degree is from Albany State, a public Historically Black University in Georgia. His master's and Ph.D. are from Indiana University. Governors State University awarded him an honorary doctorate in 2017. Dr. Harper is a Provost Professor in the Rossier School of Education and the Marshall School of Business at the University of Southern California. He also is the Clifford and Betty Allen Chair in Urban Leadership, founder and executive director of the USC Race and Equity Center, and immediate past president of the Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Email: sharper@usc.edu
Twitter: [@DrShaunHarper](https://twitter.com/DrShaunHarper)



Isaiah Simmons earned his bachelor's degree in psychology from The College of William & Mary, a public postsecondary institution in the Commonwealth of Virginia. He is currently a graduate student in the Sol Price School of Public Policy at the University of Southern California. Isaiah is also a research associate in the USC Race and Equity Center, where he primarily works on education policy studies.

Email: isaiahhsi@usc.edu

ABOUT THE CENTER

The University of Southern California is home to a dynamic research and organizational improvement center that helps professionals in educational institutions, corporations, and other contexts strategically develop and achieve equity goals, better understand and correct climate problems, avoid and recover from racial crises, and engineer sustainable cultures of inclusion and respect. Evidence, as well as scalable and adaptable models of success, inform our rigorous approach.

The USC Race and Equity Center's strength largely resides in its interdisciplinary network of faculty affiliates. We unite more than 100 professors across academic schools at USC who are experts on race and racism, people of color, immigration, and other important dimensions of equity. These scholars work together on research, as well as on the development of useful tools and resources. When journalists, policymakers, and organizational leaders call us for expertise and assistance, we leverage our brilliant cast of faculty affiliates.

Rigorous, evidence-based work that educates our nation, transforms institutions and organizations, boldly confronts racism, and strategically achieves equity is what we do at the USC Race and Equity Center. The Center is home to the National Assessment of Collegiate Campus Climates, the USC Equity Institutes, PRISM (a professional networking and racial equity recruiting resource), and the Alliance for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion in Business.

Website: race.usc.edu
Phone: (213) 740-0385
Twitter: @uscRaceEquity

USC Race and Equity Center

University of Southern California
635 Downey Way
Verna and Peter Dauterive Hall, Suite 214
Los Angeles, CA 90089-3331