

University at Albany, State University of New York

Scholars Archive

Policy Documents

New York Latino Research and Resources
Network (NYLARNet)

Spring 2012

Unfinished Business: Latino and Other Faculty Diversity in the SUNY System

Edna Acosta-Belén

University at Albany, State University of New York, eacosta-belen@albany.edu

Christine E. Bose

University at Albany, State University of New York, cbose@albany.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/nylarnet_docs



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Latina/o Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Acosta-Belén, Edna and Bose, Christine E., "Unfinished Business: Latino and Other Faculty Diversity in the SUNY System" (2012). *Policy Documents*. 7.

https://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/nylarnet_docs/7

This Policy Document is brought to you for free and open access by the New York Latino Research and Resources Network (NYLARNet) at Scholars Archive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Policy Documents by an authorized administrator of Scholars Archive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@albany.edu.

Unfinished Business: Latino and Other Faculty Diversity in the SUNY System

Edna Acosta-Belén and
Christine E. Bose,
University at Albany,
SUNY

Introduction

Since the 1970s, with the onset of dramatic changes in the demographic composition of the population of New York State and the rest of the nation, and the proliferation of Affirmative Action programs to recruit and increase the number of faculty and students from underrepresented minorities and women, and diversify the curriculum of the various colleges and universities of the SUNY system, there were great expectations for our public institutions to make substantial inroads in changing their predominantly white male profile.

Concomitant with the policy changes that have made diversity an unavoidable part of the contemporary academic discourse are the shifting demographics that are projected to significantly alter the ethnoracial profile of U.S. society throughout the 21st century. According to U.S. Census estimates, by the year 2050 the non-Hispanic white population will consistently decrease to slightly over half (52.8%) of the total U.S. population. This anticipated major demographic shift in the ethnic and racial composition of the nation means that slightly less than half of the total U.S. population will be constituted by minorities.

Hispanics/Latinos(as) will represent 24.5% of the total, African Americans/Blacks 13.6%, Asian/Pacific Islanders 8.2%, and American Indians 0.9%.¹ Currently the largest minority group in the United States, Latinos(as) are expected to constitute approximately one fourth of the total U.S. population, with a projected population of 96.5 million by the middle of the 21st century (see Tables 1-2).

One of the most notable results of the 2010 U.S. Census was the magnitude of the increase in the total Latino population compared to the preceding decade. This particular sector grew from a population of 35.3 million in the year 2000 to 50.4 million in 2010, an increase of 43% from the previous Census. During this same period, the New York Latino population increased by 17% from 2.9 million to 3.4 million, currently representing 18% of the total population of the state. In describing the Census 2010 population changes, demographer William Frey of the Brookings Institution pointed out in a newspaper interview that, “Everything about America now has to do with diversity that we could hardly recognize in 1990” (El Nasser and Overberg 2011, 2A). At the same time, based on the results of a survey conducted by the Applied

Table 1: Population by Race and Hispanic Origin, 1990-2050

[In thousands. As of July 1. Resident population]

Year	Total	Race				Hispanic origin ³	Not of Hispanic origin			
		White	Black	American Indian ¹	Asian ²		White	Black	American Indian ¹	Asian ²
ESTIMATE										
1990	249,402	209,180	30,599	2,073	7,550	22,549	188,601	29,374	1,802	7,076
PROJECTIONS										
Middle Series										
1995	262,820	218,078	33,144	2,241	9,357	26,936	193,566	31,598	1,931	8,788
2000	274,634	225,532	35,454	2,402	11,245	31,366	197,061	33,568	2,054	10,584
2005	285,981	232,463	37,734	2,572	13,212	36,057	199,802	35,485	2,183	12,454
2010	297,716	239,588	40,109	2,754	15,265	41,139	202,390	37,466	2,320	14,402
2020	322,742	254,887	45,075	3,129	19,651	52,652	207,393	41,538	2,601	18,557
2030	346,899	269,046	50,001	3,515	24,337	65,570	209,998	45,448	2,891	22,993
2040	369,980	281,720	55,094	3,932	29,235	80,164	209,621	49,379	3,203	27,614
2050	393,931	294,615	60,592	4,371	34,352	96,508	207,901	53,555	3,534	32,432
Lowest Series										
2050	282,524	213,782	44,477	3,383	20,882	62,230	157,701	40,118	2,793	19,683
Highest Series										
2050	518,903	381,505	81,815	5,384	50,199	133,106	262,140	71,863	4,295	47,498

¹American Indian represents American Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut.²Asian represents Asian and Pacific Islander.³Persons of Hispanic origin may be of any race. The information on the total and Hispanic population shown in this report was collected in the 50 States and the District of Columbia and, therefore, does not include residents of Puerto Rico.**Source:** U.S. Census, Current Population Reports, *Population Projections of the United States by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin, 1995-2050*, P25-1130, 1996, 20.**Table 2: Percent of the Population by Race and Hispanic Origin, 1990-2050**

[As of July 1. Resident population]

Year	Total	Race				Hispanic origin ³	Not of Hispanic origin			
		White	Black	American Indian ¹	Asian ²		White	Black	American Indian ¹	Asian ²
ESTIMATE										
1990	100.0	83.9	12.3	0.8	3.0	9.0	75.6	11.8	0.7	2.8
PROJECTIONS										
Middle Series										
1995	100.0	83.0	12.6	0.9	3.6	10.2	73.6	12.0	0.7	3.3
2000	100.0	82.1	12.9	0.9	4.1	11.4	71.8	12.2	0.7	3.9
2005	100.0	81.3	13.2	0.9	4.6	12.6	69.9	12.4	0.8	4.4
2010	100.0	80.5	13.5	0.9	5.1	13.8	68.0	12.6	0.8	4.8
2020	100.0	79.0	14.0	1.0	6.1	16.3	64.3	12.9	0.8	5.7
2030	100.0	77.6	14.4	1.0	7.0	18.9	60.5	13.1	0.8	6.6
2040	100.0	76.1	14.9	1.1	7.9	21.7	56.7	13.3	0.9	7.5
2050	100.0	74.8	15.4	1.1	8.7	24.5	52.8	13.6	0.9	8.2
Lowest Series										
2050	100.0	75.7	15.7	1.2	7.4	22.0	55.8	14.2	1.0	7.0
Highest Series										
2050	100.0	73.5	15.8	1.0	9.7	25.7	50.5	13.8	0.8	9.2

¹American Indian represents American Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut.²Asian represents Asian and Pacific Islander.³Persons of Hispanic origin may be of any race. The information on the total and Hispanic population shown in this report was collected in the 50 States and the District of Columbia and, therefore, does not include residents of Puerto Rico.**Source:** U.S. Census, Current Population Reports, *Population Projections of the United States by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin, 1995-2050*, P25-1130, 1996, 21.

Research Center, an organization that specializes in issues of racial justice, Fulwood (2011) emphasizes the reluctance of the U.S. public to engage in discussions about race or about the multiple implications of the changing demographics: “Our nation’s failure to publicly and candidly grapple with the changing demographics only postpones a necessary conversation about what kind of a country we will choose to become” (1).

Research Objectives

In view of the substantial national and state demographic changes described above, the main objectives of this study, sponsored by the New York Latino Research and Resources Network (NYLARNet) at the University at Albany, SUNY, are to assess the extent to which the institutional recruitment efforts by the colleges and universities of the State University of New York (SUNY) system have translated into concrete accomplishments in hiring and diversifying the full-time tenure-track faculty of selected campuses, and how these colleges and universities monitor their progress in the hiring and retention of Latinos(as) and other underrepresented minority faculty.

As the main public purveyor of higher education, the 64-unit SUNY system includes 4 University Centers (2 of which also incorporate health science campuses), 2 medical schools, 1 optometry school, 1 environmental science and forestry campus, 21 four-year colleges (divided between 13 comprehensive and 8 technology colleges), and 30 community colleges located throughout the state of New York. (The remaining three units include a Ceramics faculty, a state-funded portion of Cornell University, and the System’s Administrative campus in Albany). This study provides an overview of the university centers and 21 four-year college campuses at three points in time (1997, 2003, and 2009), spread across a twelve-year period, and then assesses a small sample of case study SUNY institutions.

The campuses selected for the case study include two University Centers (University at Albany and Binghamton University) and three four-year colleges (SUNY-New Paltz, SUNY-Brockport, and Purchase College). The final selection of the SUNY campuses considered in this report was based both on obtaining regional variation across the state and on

the accessibility of data, which was requested either from Institutional Research or Affirmative Action offices at these campuses. We excluded Stony Brook University and the University at Buffalo, both members of the elite Association of American Universities, because their campus data mixes their professional Health Sciences faculty with their Arts and Sciences faculty, making them less comparable to other campuses.

For this study, we also relied on data provided by the SUNY-Central Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, as well as data collected by the New York State Education Department (NYSED) and National Council of Education Statistics (NCES) Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). All of the gathered data are integrated, analyzed, and presented in aggregate and individual tables and figures by this project’s researchers, who also make some policy recommendations based on the analysis of the available data.

In 2005, NYLARNet published the study “The Decline of Puerto Rican Faculty in the CUNY System from 1981-2002” by Felipe Pimentel. This study documented a steady deterioration in the number of faculty from the largest Latino group in New York City. Pimentel suggested additional research to determine if this particular finding was indicative of a wider declining trend among Latinos(as) in general and other underrepresented faculty of color. Therefore, as a follow-up, this new NYLARNet-sponsored study particularly focuses on Latino faculty representation in the SUNY system.

In our NYLARNet report, the main goal is to document and assess the hiring and retention of Latino faculty, from all the different combined nationalities that fall within this particular U.S. Census rubric, at the selected sample of SUNY institutions. This is done by rank and (where possible) by gender, beginning between 2000 and 2002 and ending either in 2009 or 2010 (depending upon the campus). Much of this data is compared to that for African American, Asian, and non-Latino white faculty categories at the same SUNY institutions.

The main questions considered for this study were as follows:

- Are there patterns of increase or decrease in the number of underrepresented faculty found in the various units of the SUNY system during this study's target period? If so, are any increases proportionate to or reflective of the changing demographic profile of the whole state or this particular region, and of the national doctorate pipeline?
- What kinds of comparisons can be made between the SUNY data and the national trends described in recent NCES-IPEDS reports?
- Taking into account the geographic location and the substantial population concentration differences between the institutions within the CUNY and SUNY systems, what comparisons can be made between the results of this study and Pimentel's study? Is the pattern of declining numbers, found by Pimentel for the CUNY Puerto Rican faculty, an indication of a wider New York State trend for Latinos(as) and other minorities in public higher education?
- Are there patterns of increase or decrease in the number of Latino and other minority faculty to be found in the various units of the SUNY system from 1997 through 2009 that are comparable to the CUNY 1981 through 2002 changes among Latinos(as)? If so, are these increases proportionate to the available Ph.D. pool or to the even greater changes in the demographic profile of the whole state?
- Do the breakdowns between full-time tenure track Assistant Professors and faculty with continuing appointment (Associate or Full Professors), which are analyzed for our five case study SUNY campuses, suggest problems with hiring, promotion, or retention? SUNY does not keep data in a format allowing a cohort analysis which would follow the career trajectories of individual faculty, but we can look for increases in the upper faculty ranks, suggesting promotions, and for increases in the lower faculty ranks that suggested hiring has occurred.
- Are there any gender differences in the representation of Latino, African American, and Asian full time SUNY faculty across the four university research centers, 13 four-year liberal arts comprehensive colleges, and 8 technology colleges?
- Are there any consistent differences between the four university research centers and the 13 four-year liberal arts comprehensive colleges in their current racial ethnic composition or their hiring and promotion patterns for Latino, African American, or Asian full-time faculty?

This study addresses these questions by identifying and compiling data from various sources to evaluate the progress of selected SUNY-system institutions in hiring Latino faculty. Overall, the data that have been collected about the ethnic, racial, and gender composition of the SUNY faculty throughout the system are not available in any fully comprehensive, systematic, historical, or comparative form. Because of this, it is difficult to provide a complete picture of either the accomplishments or shortcomings of SUNY-wide institutional efforts and initiatives to diversify the faculty of its University centers and four-year colleges during the last few decades. Thus, this study is an initial step in providing a comprehensive overview of the current levels of SUNY faculty from federally-protected groups, especially Latinos(as), and showing how the faculty profile of selected university centers or colleges within the system has changed over time.

Being one of the largest public higher education systems in the country in a politically liberal state with a long history of receiving large numbers of (im)migrants from the Americas and other parts of the world, SUNY campuses have been consistent in their support of diversity goals in their respective institutional mission, strategic planning, or affirmative action statements. For instance, the mission statement of the University at Albany indicates that the institution is "striving to create a just community and maintains that diversity is essential to achieving excellence"; Binghamton University affirms "its responsibility to build a multicultural campus community that offers opportunity for access and participation to all

members of society”; SUNY College at New Paltz asserts that, “...we are fiercely committed to maintaining our diversity”; Purchase College stresses that “we celebrate our diversity by cultivating a community that appreciates and advocates for diversity at all levels of the institution”; and SUNY College at Brockport states that the institution “is committed to serving New York residents, including a large diverse student population whose varying interests and needs reflect the complex concerns of contemporary society.” However, as far as we can determine, there are no systematic annual or periodic institutional trend assessments or integrated comparative data generated by the SUNY Central Office or individual campuses that show a consistent monitoring of the progress made in increasing the number of minority faculty throughout the numerous campuses that comprise the system. Having this data would make it easier to determine the changes in policies or actions needed to respond to any stagnation or decline in underrepresented faculty at specific campuses or throughout the system.

As a result of a legislative mandate, SUNY-Central established the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ODEI; originally the Office of Diversity and Educational Equity) in 2007. This unit’s Vision and Mission Statement maintains that, “ODEI aspires to situate diversity as an integral component of academic excellence at the State University of New York (SUNY), and in the process, establish the University as a national leader in preparing its students for success in a culturally and racially diverse society.” One of ODEI’s most accomplished programs is its Faculty Diversity Program which allows individual campuses to compete for up to three years of partial salary support and start up packages for recruitment of faculty from underrepresented populations. Since its inception, 21 faculty members (12 women and 9 men) have been hired through this program, including 8 Latinos(as) and 8 African Americans. Nonetheless, there is no SUNY system-wide Affirmative Action Officer to monitor individual campus progress in increasing the number of underrepresented minority faculty. None of the individual campuses that are the focus of this study have any designated diversity-focused faculty recruitment program of their own in place, although they have existed in the past. For instance, the University at Albany used to have a “Target of Opportunity” (TOP) minority faculty

recruitment program that was suspended in 2005 and never replaced. On most campuses, upper level administrative leadership usually determines the centrality of diversity hiring and sets the tone for the extent to which departments or colleges will seriously engage in the recruitment of minority faculty.

Barriers to Diversity: A Literature Review

A review of the most recent literature on promoting diversity in higher education shows that there is a consensus among researchers that U.S. colleges and universities must do significantly better to achieve more inclusive institutional environments. There is also a consensus recognition that diversity goes beyond correcting past and present inequalities and exclusions, but has become essential to the professional training of a workforce that is well prepared to deal more effectively with the realities of a multicultural nation and a more interconnected global society (Brown-Glaude 2009; Smith 2009; Hale 2004).

During the early stages of institutional efforts to diversify their faculties, administrators pointed to “a pipeline problem” to explain the lack of representation of women, Latinos(as), and other minorities by attributing it to a paucity of these groups in the pool of qualified candidates with doctoral degrees. A U.S. Department of Education (DOE) report shows that back in 1977, Latinos(as) represented only 1.6% and African Americans 3.8% of all doctoral degree recipients. By 2008, these figures had increased to 3.6 % for Latinos(as) and 6.1% for African Americans (DOE 2009); and in 2010, among U.S. citizens and permanent residents receiving doctorates, 5.9% were Latinos, 6.3% were African American, and 9.0% were Asian (NSF 2011). But despite these modest increases in the doctoral degree pipeline, more recent reports show that whites still constitute a significant majority (about 80%) of all faculty at U.S. colleges and universities (DOE 2009). The most impressive outcome in increasing the pipeline has been for women, who in 2009 represented approximately 47% of all doctoral degree recipients (NSF 2009). Nonetheless, the large majority of these women are white. Only 4% of doctoral degrees awarded in 2008 were for Latinas,

slightly higher than the 3.1% for Latinos. Two other features of the pipeline are worth mentioning. A significant proportion (about 30% in 2006-2007) of Latino doctorates are awarded in Puerto Rico. Also, SUNY produces more Latino doctorates in the social sciences and the humanities than all the private universities in the state (Cruz 2010, 235).

Although the pipeline issue is still frequently used to justify the slow progress in hiring faculty from underrepresented groups at postsecondary institutions, it is not the only obstacle and, indeed, an increasing doctoral pipeline of minority faculty does not guarantee increased faculty diversity. Among the main findings from a study on minority faculty representation, sponsored by the James Irvine Foundation and the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), based on data collected between 2000-2004 at twenty-eight independent colleges and universities in California, is the sobering fact that “there has been very little change in the proportion of underrepresented minority (URM) faculty, in particular, at college campuses” (Moreno et al. 2006, 2). In this study, researchers also document a “revolving door” effect or faculty retention problem that tends to undercut the fairly small institutional gains in hiring minorities, and suggests that efforts to retain minority faculty require as much attention as does their initial recruitment (12).

Unsupportive campus environments have been found to be a factor in hindering the retention of minority faculty, as well as graduate students. Felder and Castillo (2011) agree with several other researchers when they state that “attention must also be given to the pervasive issues associated with racialized structures and practices that marginalize students and faculty of color” (1). Smith (2009) underscores the importance of “public and constituency perception of institutional diversity, and equity” (247) as a key factor in improving a campus climate. She also notes that diversity efforts should not be relegated primarily to the engagement of the few faculty of color and staff that are already there, instead of fostering a climate of participation and commitment towards the goal of increasing underrepresented faculty, students, and staff that involves all sectors of the institution.

There are a number of visible and invisible institutional barriers that hinder progress in diversity efforts. Bronstein, Rothblum, and Salomon (1993)

suggest that in order to help faculty of color and women “break the glass walls” that block their access to academic careers, higher education institutions “must educate their faculty about the subtle ways that sexism and racism can limit academic advancement” (29). This process also entails reexamining existing institutional policies and practices in pursuing diversity goals.

Institutionalized racism commonly manifests itself in subtle ways. For instance, frequently departments and university promotion and tenure review committees place higher expectations on the scholarly productivity and overall performance of faculty of color while, at the same time, more departmental, college, and university service demands are placed upon their time in attempts to “diversify” the composition of most campus committees. Faculty of color also are expected to mentor and serve as role models for students of color. While it is important to recognize the empowering effect that the presence of minority faculty has for students of color (Smith 2009), these expectations often place minority faculty in a “catch 22” situation in dealing with conflicting demands on their time. Moreover, if faculty of color are doing research on minority-related issues that challenge traditional Eurocentric and patriarchal epistemologies, their work is often considered outside the academic “mainstream” and either devalued, more scrutinized, or regarded as narrow or mostly “identity politics,” rather than legitimate research (Brown-Glaude 2009; Hale 2004). Delgado Bernal and Villalpando (2010) have documented these widespread attitudes among non-minority faculty, along with the segregation of faculty of color across lower-tier institutions and across academic departments, where they are largely represented in fields such as ethnic and area studies, women’s studies, foreign languages, and education, and largely absent from many other disciplines. These authors argue that “higher education continues to reflect a state of *de facto* racial and gender segregation” (170).

Although in this day and age, very few people see themselves as racist and some believe that we are in a “post-racial” era, in reality new and less overt forms of racism still persist in U.S. society and contribute to perpetuating existing inequalities. In

Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States (2003), Bonilla-Silva has shown that “contemporary racial inequality is reproduced through “New Racism” practices that are subtle, institutional, and apparently non-racial” (3).

Other studies show that despite the “promoting diversity” rhetoric commonly used by most institutions in their mission statements, strategic plans, or Affirmative Action statements, there are few campus initiatives targeted at increasing awareness of racist attitudes and practices, or for dealing with “white privilege” or the selective indifference, negative attitudes, or resistance towards diversity prevailing within the wider non-minority campus population. Institutional support systems for minority faculty and students are notably weak or non-existent and, in many instances, the practice of diversity is still at the margins of academic life (Moreno et al. 2006). Diversity efforts frequently are reduced to a mere act of “tokenism” or viewed as self-serving advocacy on the part of underrepresented minorities. When conducting recruitment searches, departments are encouraged to diversify their pool of candidates, but rarely does this effort translate into the actual hiring of minority applicants, except in departments where they are already well-represented. Thus, despite the increasingly multicultural and multiracial profile of the U.S. population and today’s global society, diversity efforts are still unfinished business and awaiting a more central place in higher education.

Making significant progress in diversifying the faculty, staff, student bodies, and the curriculum of postsecondary institutions requires consistent attention and a steady allocation of resources that, in practice, few institutions are currently willing to make a priority. Moreover, the economic recession that has afflicted U.S. society in recent years has contributed to severe reductions in the budgets of public universities, including the SUNY system. For several years, the government of the state of New York has followed a path of severe budget reductions in education and other areas of public spending in response to years of unrestrained deficits. Reduced budgets mean that less hiring is being done and hardly any efforts are made to

retain or replace turnover faculty at many institutions. Seldom is the notion of maintaining a diversified faculty a major item of consideration in any downsizing or retrenchment of academic programs.

On the other hand, it is important to note that the scholarship that focuses on the intersectionalities of race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, class, and other sources of difference has contributed to significant paradigm shifts and knowledge transformations in most academic disciplines, and introduced innovative theoretical and methodological approaches to research and teaching. Berger and Gridroz (2009) and Chow, Texler, and Lin (2011) show that the intersectional approach, initially promoted in interdisciplinary fields such as women’s, gender, ethnic, and area studies, is one of the most important theoretical advances and tools of analysis in most academic fields, and it is now widely applied to the study of global, transnational, and domestic contexts and conditions. Thus, there is a plethora of significant research on issues of ethnicity, race, gender, sexuality, and class that has flourished in the academy during the last four decades.

Cruz (2010) suggests that in order for CUNY and SUNY to face the diversity challenge they “must not just acknowledge the inevitable diversity created by demographic changes in New York, but respond to this new diverse environment by reflecting it among its students, administrators, staff, and faculty” (229).

Analysis of Data and Major Findings

Overall, this study’s analysis of the faculty composition data for selected SUNY campuses suggests that similar patterns of stagnation or decline in the hiring and retention of faculty of color exist and reflect a nationwide trend. The tables below clearly support this statement.

A Contemporary Overview

Table 3 shows the average percentage of full time SUNY faculty, as of Fall 2009, according to their sex and minority status, including data on the largest subgroups (African Americans, Latinos(as), and Asians). On average, 43% of these SUNY faculty members are women, suggesting great strides over the last few decades for this particular group. Indeed, some of the figures are even higher than this average,

Table 3. Percent of Selected Protected Classes among SUNY Full Time Faculty, by Institution Type, Fall 2009 (SUNY Data)

Institution	Women	Men	Minorities	Black	Latino	Asian
4 Research University Centers	34.9	65.1	19.3	3.9	2.4	12.7
13 Liberal Arts Colleges	46.2	53.8	14.3	4.5	3.2	5.7
8 Technology Colleges	37.9	62.1	10.5	3.3	2.2	4.8
30 Community Colleges	53.4	46.6	8.4	3.4	2.1	2.4
All SUNY	43.0	57.0	14.2	3.9	2.6	7.3

especially at the community colleges (53.4%) and on four-year liberal arts campuses (46.2%), but they are lower than the SUNY average at the four-year technology colleges (37.9%) and the prestigious research university centers (34.9%). This variation suggests there is stratification in the types of institutions where women faculty are most welcome.

Is this cross-institutional pattern the same for minority faculty? The answer is more complicated. On average, 14.2% of all SUNY full-time faculty members are considered minorities but, in this case, it is the research university centers that have higher than SUNY average rates, at fully 19.3% minority faculty representation. However, this is due to their 12.7% Asian faculty, a group that represents only 7.3% of the New York State population, and not a result of aggressive hiring of qualified African American and Latino faculty, who are the most underrepresented faculty. On average, SUNY's four-year comprehensive colleges (and not the university research centers) employ slightly more than the SUNY average of 3.9% African American and 2.6% Latino full-time faculty, but the four year campuses' higher rates of 4.5% African American and 3.2% Latino full-time faculty still do not come close to representing the New York State population, which is 15.9% African American and 17.6% Latino. Furthermore, while Latinos(as) may be 3.6% of the national doctoral degree holders, they are 5% of all people with graduate or professional degrees in New York State (De Jesús and Vásquez 2005, 3).

Table 4 on SUNY's full-time faculty in 2009, separated by institution, reveals the variation found among the specific campuses on each of these measures of diversity. We focus our discussion of this table on the four research university centers and

the thirteen comprehensive liberal arts colleges.

Table 4 reveals very little variation among the research university centers, but it is worth noting those campuses that report increases in their minority faculty: Binghamton University has the highest percentages of female (38.2%) and Asian faculty (13.4%), as well as the highest overall rate of minority faculty (19.9%); the University at Albany has the highest percentage of Latino faculty (3.3%), and the University at Buffalo has the highest percentage of African American faculty (4.3%). But, overall, these figures do not reflect any significant progress for a twelve year period.

In comparison to the four university centers, the thirteen comprehensive liberal arts campuses have much more variation in their diversity statistics. This seems due to their specific college structure and history, geographic location, and the commitment of each campus to focus on diversity. Two of the liberal arts colleges, Empire State and Old Westbury, stand out for their unique mission or history, which has led them to employ relatively high percentages of two or more protected classes of faculty.

As a decentralized multi-location college, Empire State's website highlights their use of "innovative, alternative, and flexible approaches to higher education." They offer individualized courses, curriculum, and evaluations, based on one-to-one independent study, operating 12 months per year, with minimal physical plants, and they are interdisciplinary without any departments organized by discipline. Their flexible course structure and faculty work hours undoubtedly account for the fact that 63.7% of Empire State College's full-time faculty are women. In addition, its mission statement

**TABLE 4. FULL-TIME FACULTY EMPLOYEES UNDER THE PROGRAM OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
BY GENDER AND RACE/ETHNICITY,¹
PERCENT DISTRIBUTIONS ARE WITHIN FACULTY CATEGORY AND ACROSS RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUPS, FALL 2009**

FULL-TIME FACULTY AND SUNY CAMPUS	TOTAL		GENDER		RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUPS										NON-RESIDENT ALIEN							
	Number	Percent	FEMALE	MALE	White ²	TOTAL MINORITIES		Black or African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Two or More RACES		No.	%							
						Number	Percent					No.	%			No.	%	No.	%			
SUNY FACULTY TOTAL³	15,749	100.0%	6,771	43.0%	8,978	57.0%	12,834	81.5%	2,238	14.2%	618	3.9%	403	2.6%	1,147	7.3%	55	0.3%	15	0.1%	677	4.3%
RESEARCH UNIVERSITY CENTERS FACULTY⁴	4,279	100.0%	1,492	34.9%	2,787	65.1%	3,207	74.9%	826	19.3%	165	3.9%	103	2.4%	545	12.7%	12	0.3%	1	0.0%	246	5.7%
ALBANY	639	100.0%	228	35.7%	411	64.3%	482	75.4%	118	18.5%	26	4.1%	21	3.3%	70	11.0%	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	39	6.1%
BINGHAMTON	574	100.0%	219	38.2%	355	61.8%	417	72.6%	112	19.5%	18	3.1%	15	2.6%	77	13.4%	2	0.3%	0	0.0%	45	7.8%
BUFFALO Includes HSC	1,554	100.0%	522	33.6%	1,032	66.4%	1,137	73.2%	309	19.9%	67	4.3%	29	1.9%	205	13.2%	7	0.5%	1	0.1%	102	6.6%
STONY BROOK Includes HSC	1,512	100.0%	523	34.6%	989	65.4%	1,165	77.1%	287	19.0%	54	3.6%	38	2.5%	193	12.8%	2	0.1%	0	0.0%	60	4.0%
COMPREHENSIVE COLLEGES FACULTY	3,484	100.0%	1,610	46.2%	1,874	53.8%	2,851	81.8%	497	14.3%	158	4.5%	112	3.2%	199	5.7%	16	0.5%	12	0.3%	136	3.9%
BROCKPORT	360	100.0%	174	48.3%	186	51.7%	281	78.1%	59	16.4%	23	6.4%	12	3.3%	22	6.1%	1	0.3%	1	0.3%	20	5.6%
BUFFALO	428	100.0%	195	45.6%	233	54.4%	341	79.7%	69	16.1%	25	5.8%	14	3.3%	23	5.4%	4	0.9%	3	0.7%	18	4.2%
CORTLAND	289	100.0%	142	49.1%	147	50.9%	247	85.5%	33	11.4%	10	3.5%	10	3.5%	12	4.2%	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	9	3.1%
EMPIRE STATE	190	100.0%	121	63.7%	69	36.3%	155	81.6%	27	14.2%	19	10.0%	3	1.6%	4	2.1%	1	0.5%	0	0.0%	8	4.2%
FREDONIA	259	100.0%	114	44.0%	145	56.0%	218	84.2%	23	8.9%	3	1.2%	5	1.9%	14	5.4%	1	0.4%	0	0.0%	18	6.9%
GENESEO	248	100.0%	103	41.5%	145	58.5%	209	84.3%	35	14.1%	4	1.6%	11	4.4%	19	7.7%	1	0.4%	0	0.0%	4	1.6%
NEW PALTZ	325	100.0%	166	51.1%	159	48.9%	265	81.5%	53	16.3%	16	4.9%	14	4.3%	22	6.8%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%	7	2.2%
OLD WESTBURY	133	100.0%	65	48.9%	68	51.1%	87	65.4%	43	32.3%	16	12.0%	10	7.5%	17	12.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	2.3%
ONEONTA	243	100.0%	98	40.3%	145	59.7%	202	83.1%	29	11.9%	7	2.9%	4	1.6%	18	7.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	4.9%
OSWEGO	312	100.0%	126	40.4%	186	59.6%	249	79.8%	48	15.4%	18	5.8%	9	2.9%	16	5.1%	3	1.0%	2	0.6%	15	4.8%
PLATTSBURGH	282	100.0%	116	41.1%	166	58.9%	240	85.1%	33	11.7%	5	1.8%	13	4.6%	12	4.3%	3	1.1%	0	0.0%	9	3.2%
POTSDAM	261	100.0%	111	42.5%	150	57.5%	228	87.4%	25	9.6%	5	1.9%	5	1.9%	10	3.8%	0	0.0%	5	1.9%	8	3.1%
PURCHASE	154	100.0%	79	51.3%	75	48.7%	129	83.8%	20	13.0%	7	4.5%	2	1.3%	10	6.5%	1	0.6%	0	0.0%	5	3.2%
TECHNOLOGY COLLEGES FACULTY	1,017	100.0%	385	37.9%	632	62.1%	886	87.1%	107	10.5%	34	3.3%	22	2.2%	49	4.8%	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	24	2.4%
ALFRED	157	100.0%	43	27.4%	114	72.6%	149	94.9%	8	5.1%	1	0.6%	1	0.6%	6	3.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
CANTON	113	100.0%	45	39.8%	68	60.2%	93	82.3%	8	7.1%	2	1.8%	1	0.9%	4	3.5%	1	0.9%	0	0.0%	12	10.6%
COBLESKILL	100	100.0%	34	34.0%	66	66.0%	92	92.0%	7	7.0%	0	0.0%	4	4.0%	3	3.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.0%
DELHI	120	100.0%	44	36.7%	76	63.3%	109	90.8%	11	9.2%	6	5.0%	2	1.7%	3	2.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
FARMINGDALE	208	100.0%	98	47.1%	110	52.9%	171	82.2%	35	16.8%	10	4.8%	10	4.8%	15	7.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	1.0%
IMMARTIME	73	100.0%	14	19.2%	59	80.8%	65	89.0%	4	5.5%	3	4.1%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	5.5%
MORRISVILLE	152	100.0%	71	46.7%	81	53.3%	137	90.1%	14	9.2%	7	4.6%	2	1.3%	5	3.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.7%
UTICA/ROME	94	100.0%	36	38.3%	58	61.7%	70	74.5%	20	21.3%	5	5.3%	2	2.1%	12	12.8%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	4	4.3%
COMMUNITY COLLEGES FACULTY	4,498	100.0%	2,404	53.4%	2,094	46.6%	4,099	91.1%	378	8.4%	155	3.4%	96	2.1%	109	2.4%	17	0.4%	1	0.0%	21	0.5%

NB: Total = Female + Male; Total = White + Total Minorities + Non-Resident Aliens

FOOTNOTES

- Includes the new IPEDS racial/ethnic categories: (1) Hispanic (regardless of race), and for non-Hispanics, (2) American Indian or Alaska Native, (3) Asian, (4) Black or African American, (5) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, (6) White, and (7) Two or more races. In addition, (8) Nonresident alien is not included in the minority subtotal because it is a visa status and not a racial/ethnic category. In this table, the seven Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islanders are reported with Asians.
- The aggregated data for White, non-Hispanic staff at SUNY Colleges and Universities includes 608 full-time employees of unknown racial/ethnic identity. (21 at State-operated institutions and 587 at Community Colleges). Campus unknowns are identified, when appropriate, after the service/maintenance employee data.
- This report does not include employees of the Research Foundation or Construction Fund, which are separate legal entities with separate information and accounting systems.
- Includes medical faculty and other medical employees for Buffalo University, Stony Brook University, Downstate Medical and Upstate Medical Universities. In addition, includes hospital employees for Stony Brook University, Downstate Medical and Upstate Medical Universities.

Table 5. Full-Time SUNY Faculty by Campus, Gender, and Race-Ethnicity in 2003

Institution	Total	Total Men	Total Women	White Men	White Women	African American Men	African American Women	Hispanic Men	Hispanic Women	Asian/Pac. Is. Men	Asian/Pac. Is. Women	American Indian/Alaska Nat. Men	American Indian/Alaska Nat. Women	Non-Resident Alien Men	Non-Resident Alien Women
Research University															
University at Albany	601	406	195	343	153	10	12	9	12	24	9	0	1	18	8
University at Binghamton	496	324	172	248	131	9	7	8	6	40	18	0	1	19	9
University at Buffalo	1486	1048	438	778	343	40	35	19	8	137	32	6	5	63	14
Stony Brook University	1296	889	407	701	312	30	24	27	9	87	48	1	1	43	13
Comprehensive Colleges															
Brockport	327	186	141	148	122	13	6	3	6	12	3	1	1	9	3
Buffalo	393	240	153	202	133	14	8	5	4	13	4	1	1	5	3
Cortland	264	153	111	131	102	7	3	7	2	7	3	0	0	1	1
Empire State	152	76	76	65	66	7	4	2	2	1	2	0	0	1	2
Fredonia	248	147	101	126	86	1	3	5	3	9	1	1	2	5	6
Geneseo	250	147	103	129	89	0	1	4	6	10	5	0	0	4	2
New Paltz	296	160	136	121	112	6	5	6	6	13	6	2	0	12	7
Old Westbury	121	57	64	37	48	7	7	4	4	7	5	0	0	2	0
Oneonta	219	142	77	122	66	3	3	0	1	7	4	0	0	10	2
Oswego	333	197	136	164	118	7	6	5	3	11	1	2	0	8	8
Plattsburgh	253	162	91	139	76	4	1	7	3	5	3	1	1	6	7
Potsdam	230	146	84	133	71	1	0	3	3	6	4	0	0	3	5
Purchase	139	76	63	63	54	4	1	3	1	2	5	0	1	4	1
Technology Colleges															
Alfred	147	114	33	105	31	1	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	2	0
Canton	85	51	34	49	31	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Cobleskill	108	72	36	67	34	1	0	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Delhi	95	59	36	57	34	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Farmingdale	171	98	73	85	65	2	2	5	4	6	2	0	0	0	0
Maritime	45	38	7	35	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0
Morrisville	139	79	60	70	56	4	3	2	0	1	1	0	0	2	0
Utica-Rome	94	64	30	48	26	1	1	3	0	7	2	0	0	5	1
Total	7988	5131	2857	4166	2366	174	134	132	87	413	159	15	16	224	94

Source: IPEDS Data Center, Institute for Education Studies (IES), National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education

Table 6. Full-Time SUNY Faculty by Campus, Gender, and Race-Ethnicity in 1997

Institution	Total	Total Men	Total Women	White Men	White Women	African American Men	African American Women	Hispanic Men	Hispanic Women	Asian/Pac. Is. Men	Asian/Pac. Is. Women	American Indian/Alaska Nat. Men	American Indian/Alaska Nat. Women	Non-Resident Alien Men	Non-Resident Alien Women
Research University															
University at Albany	559	395	164	348	130	10	8	11	14	19	10	1	1	6	1
University at Binghamton	456	325	131	271	109	8	7	10	6	30	5	0	1	6	3
University at Buffalo	1213	896	317	725	247	39	35	14	8	83	17	3	3	28	6
Stony Brook University	1235	892	343	763	288	25	14	15	5	71	29	0	0	18	7
Comprehensive Colleges															
Brockport	310	188	122	154	107	12	7	2	5	15	2	1	1	4	1
Buffalo	424	278	146	240	130	13	9	6	4	14	2	0	0	5	1
Cortland	213	142	71	123	68	4	2	6	0	8	0	0	0	1	1
Empire State	135	75	60	69	51	4	4	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	1
Fredonia	207	153	54	134	50	2	0	4	3	11	0	0	1	2	0
Geneseo	250	160	90	150	78	2	2	1	3	6	6	0	0	1	1
New Paltz	266	166	100	141	86	5	4	5	4	11	4	2	0	2	2
Old Westbury	114	59	55	38	42	7	6	6	4	8	3	0	0	0	0
Oneonta	215	144	71	133	62	6	2	1	2	4	4	0	0	0	1
Oswego	309	210	99	170	88	7	5	8	3	12	0	4	1	9	2
Plattsburgh	249	168	81	154	72	1	1	3	2	9	5	0	0	1	1
Potsdam	206	138	68	121	61	1	0	3	2	10	2	1	1	2	2
Purchase College	108	63	45	53	40	4	1	3	1	1	3	0	0	2	0
Technology Colleges															
Alfred	132	104	28	98	28	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	2	0
Canton	76	55	21	54	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0
Cobleskill	111	76	35	72	30	1	2	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0
Delhi	97	70	27	67	25	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Farmingdale	195	117	78	101	70	4	2	3	2	9	4	0	0	0	0
Maritime	49	44	5	41	5	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Morrisville	110	69	41	63	39	2	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Utica-Rome	81	61	20	49	17	1	0	2	0	7	3	0	0	2	0
Total	7320	5048	2272	4332	1942	159	115	111	73	339	102	12	9	91	30

Source: IPEDS Data Center, Institute of Education Studies (IES), National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education.

indicates that, “the College believes that its mission as an institution of higher education demands that it also be committed to increasing the representation of protected groups throughout the workforce, and promoting pluralism and diversity among its administration, faculty, staff and student body.” An apparent outcome of this commitment is that 10% of Empire State’s faculty is African American, more than double the 4.5% that is the average on SUNY liberal arts campuses; nonetheless, Empire State’s faculty is just 1.6% Latino, only half of the liberal arts average of 3.2%.

SUNY-Old Westbury’s history, rather than its structure, is unique and since the 1970s, it has been one the most diverse and inclusive campuses in terms of the composition of its faculty and student bodies. At 32.2%, Old Westbury employs more than twice as many minority faculty as the average liberal arts campus (14.3%). Not surprisingly, they have the highest percentages of all three specific groups our report focuses upon: 12.0% African American, 7.5% Latino, and 12.8% Asian origin faculty.

Six other liberal arts campuses stand out for their comparatively high employment of at least one protected group of faculty. New Paltz (51.1%) and Purchase (51.3%), along with Empire State, hire the most female faculty. After Old Westbury and Empire State, the Brockport campus (6.4%) has the next most African American faculty. After Old Westbury, Geneseo (4.4%), New Paltz (4.3%), and Plattsburgh (4.6%) hire the next most Latino faculty. And, also after Old Westbury, Geneseo (7.7%) and Oneonta (7.4%) hire the next most Asian faculty.

Change over Time (1997 to 2009)

We can examine the change over time in faculty diversity by comparing Table 4 (2009 data) with Tables 5 and 6 (2003 and 1997 data, respectively). We discuss the changes for the three most prominent groups of minority faculty, beginning with the smallest group—Latinos(as).

Latinos(as): Over this twelve year period, the number of Latino faculty on these 25 SUNY campuses increased slightly from 184 in 1997, to 219 in 2003, and reached 237 in 2009 for a total net gain of 53 Latino faculty. Since the total number of all

faculty in these twenty-five SUNY campuses also increased from 1997 to 2009, the additional Latino faculty only resulted in a very small percentage increase in representation from 2.51% to 2.74% between 1997 and 2003, and then was followed by a slight drop to 2.70% in 2009. Put another way, each institution only netted an average of approximately two new Latino faculty over this 12 year period.

Furthermore, Latino faculty are concentrated on three campuses, the extremely large Stony Brook University and the University at Buffalo, both of which include Health Science campus faculty; and the University at Albany. Both the University at Albany and University at Buffalo have departments of Latin American, Caribbean, and U.S. Latino Studies and of American Studies, respectively, where many Latino faculty are concentrated.²

African Americans: The number of African American faculty on the 25 SUNY four-year campuses increased only slightly more than did the Latino faculty, starting in 1997 with 274 faculty, increasing to 308 in 2003, and reaching 357 in 2009. The net gain was 83 additional African American faculty members, or an average of 3.3 faculty per campus over twelve years. This increased their faculty representation from 3.74% in 1997 to 3.86% in 2003, and reached 4.07% in 2009, a relatively small gain. Similar to Latino faculty, the largest numbers of African American faculty were at the University at Buffalo and Stony Brook University, both with Health Science Centers. In addition, in 1997 and 2003, the campuses at Albany, Brockport, and Buffalo employed 18 to 22 African American faculty. And, by 2009, these five campuses were joined by Binghamton, Oswego, and Empire State in employing at least 18 African American faculty.

Asians: The largest group of minority faculty is Asians, who in 1997 totaled fully 441 people. Six years later (2003), their numbers rose to 572 and reached 793 by 2009, for a net increase of 352 faculty members—an average of 14.1 additional Asian faculty on each of the twenty-five campuses over twelve years. This substantial increase was considerably more rapid than for either Latinos(as) or African Americans: Asians were 6.02% of the faculty in 1997, rising to 7.16% in 2003, and then reaching fully 9.03% in 2009. In 2009, they were

heavily concentrated at the four university centers, but there were at least 20 Asian faculty at three other campuses, including the University at Buffalo and the colleges at Brockport and New Paltz.

Gender Differences among Minority Faculty: As mentioned above, (white) women have had larger increases into full-time faculty roles than have many ethnoracial group members. Nonetheless, among SUNY's Latino, African American, and Asian faculty, there are many more men than women. Indeed, in the 1997-2003 time period, the majority of hires among Latinos(as), African Americans, and Asians were men; although between 2003 and 2009 women of color made some progress.³ The largest gains and the highest proportional representation of women is among African American faculty—women were 42.0% of African American faculty in 1997, but reached 49.6% by 2009. Latinas also increased from 39.7% of the total Latino faculty in 1997 to become 44.4% by 2009. However, in spite of the rather large 56.9% increase in the total number of Asian faculty (from 339 to 532), women were only 23.1% of this group in 1997 and still comprised only 32.7% in 2009, the largest gender disparity among all minority group faculty.

Among the more detailed case studies that we carried out and describe further in the next section, only three campuses were able to provide data on gender differences within the ethnoracial groups represented in their faculty. Here, as elsewhere, we focus on the four largest groups: Whites, African Americans, Latinos(as), and Asians. At Binghamton University, between 2000 and 2010 (see Appendix Table II), there were consistently higher percentages of male than female Asian full-time faculty. On the other hand, on the same campus, since 2000 among African Americans and since 2002 among Latinos(as), there were consistently higher percentages of women than of men serving as full-time faculty.

Two comprehensive liberal arts campuses, New Paltz and Brockport (see Appendix Tables IV and V, respectively), reported faculty gender differences over time. At both campuses, between 2001 and 2009 the percentage of women full-time faculty was higher than that of men among both Latino and white full-time faculty, but there were larger

percentages of men than women among African American and Asian faculty. The actual numbers (not percentages) of white women faculty did not surpass men until 2005 at New Paltz and 2006 at Brockport.

Campus Case Studies: Albany, Binghamton, Brockport, New Paltz, and Purchase (2000-2009/10)

We were able to obtain more detailed information on five campuses, including two research centers and three comprehensive liberal arts campuses, to provide some geographically varied, in-depth insight into any demographic changes among SUNY full-time faculty since 2000. Our findings are described below.

Research University Centers: Full-time faculty members at the two university centers in our case study sample, the University at Albany and Binghamton University (see Appendix Tables I and II), steadily have become less white in the decade beginning in 2000, suggesting some qualified progress in diversifying employees. The percentage of Albany faculty who are white dropped by 10.9%, from 83.7% to 72.8% of the faculty, while Binghamton declined by 5.8%, from 81.7% to 75.9% white faculty.

However, despite this apparent progress, there has been relatively little change for either African American or Latino faculty over the decade. At Albany, the percentage of African American faculty is down by 0.1% and Latino faculty are down by 1.5%; at Binghamton, there was no change in the percentage of African American faculty and only a slight increase of 0.3% for Latino faculty. On both campuses, the increases have been among the Asian faculty category—up by 4.6% at Albany (to reach 10.2% of the faculty) and up by 5.5% at Binghamton (to reach 17.3%). At Albany, the numbers of “non-resident alien” faculty also have increased by 4.6% (to reach 6.4% of the faculty). Thus, while both campuses' faculties have become less white, they are far from being fully diversified, focusing on increases for only one minority group (Asians), but not for Latino and African American faculty—the two largest ethnoracial groups in New York State. The 2009 data suggest that these patterns are similar

at the other two, larger research university centers, Buffalo and Stony Brook.

Given these small changes in African American or Latino faculty over the last decade, we might ask whether or not the faculty who were hired have been retained and promoted. Unfortunately, our cross sectional data cannot tell us what happened to any particular faculty member over time. However, we were able to obtain information on faculty rank, according to race and ethnicity for both these campuses, and this information helps us judge whether there is merely a revolving door at the lowest rank of Assistant Professor, or if some faculty of color are reaching (or being hired at) the upper tenured levels of Associate and Full Professor. (This data is not shown because of the small number of people at each rank).

At the University at Albany, between 2000 and 2009, African American faculty decreased by one Full Professor and two Assistant Professors while Associate Professors increased by seven people, suggesting that African American Assistant Professors were being promoted and new ones hired. Latino faculty increased by two Full Professors, but decreased by three Associate and two Assistant Professors—suggesting that few hires were occurring, while some faculty were leaving or did not receive tenure. Meanwhile, Asian faculty increased by 2 Full Professors, 14 Associate Professors, and 18 Assistant Professors, indicating both a great deal of hiring along with a pattern of promotions. At the beginning of the decade, African American faculty were fairly evenly spread across these three ranks, Latino faculty were most clustered as Associate Professors and fully half of Asian faculty were Full Professors. At the end of the decade, the majority of all these groups were clustered around the Associate Professor rank. In contrast, white faculty started and ended the decade with more than 40% in the Full Professor rank.

At Binghamton University, between 2000 and 2010, African American faculty increased by 5 Full Professors and 3 Associate Professors, but decreased by 3 Assistant Professors, suggesting a pattern of promotions, but little hiring at the lower ranks. Latinos(as) increased by 5 Full Professors and declined by 4 Associate Professors, with no change

in the number of Assistant Professors, suggesting promotions but no hiring. Meanwhile Asians increased by 10 Full Professors, 22 Associate Professors, and 6 Assistant Professors, as at Albany, suggesting a great number of hires and promotions. At the beginning of the decade, African American and Asian faculty were most likely to be Assistant Professors, Latinos(as) were more concentrated as Associate Professors, but white faculty were more likely to be Full Professors, or at least Associates; at the end of the decade, African American, Latino and white faculty were generally Full or Associate Professors, and Asians were now predominantly Associate Professors—reflecting an increase in average rank for all but white faculty.

Comprehensive Liberal Arts Colleges: On the three liberal arts campuses that we studied in more detail, Purchase, New Paltz, and Brockport (see Appendix Tables III, IV, and V), the full-time faculty has remained more white (79.8%, 82.1%, and 83.1%, respectively) and thus less diversified than at the research university centers. However, in other ways, the patterns of change are similar to the university centers. Both Brockport and Purchase have increased the percentage of Asian faculty on their campuses by 3.7% and 3.0%, respectively. At the same time, Brockport's African American and Latino faculty increased only by 0.1% and 0.6%, respectively; while Purchase increased their African American faculty by 0.3% and decreased their Latino faculty by 0.9%—both relatively small changes for these two groups over the decade.

New Paltz faculty composition has remained fairly steady over the last ten years, but they maintain a relatively even balance among the three largest faculty minority groups: 4.7% African American, 4.1% Latino, and 6.8% Asian full-time faculty. Purchase and Brockport faculty's racial-ethnic balance is somewhat more lopsided than at New Paltz, but more evenly balanced than the research university centers. As of 2009, Purchase faculty were 5.4% African American, 2.7% Latino, and 8.1% Asian, and Brockport faculty were 6.4% African American, 3.6% Latino, and 9.7% Asian—both containing more African American and Asian faculty, with comparatively fewer Latino faculty. Thus, while these three college campuses' faculty are more white than those at the research universities,

they maintain a more even balance among these three underrepresented groups than do the research centers which tend to hire two to three times more Asian faculty than African American or Latino faculty.

Because the SUNY liberal arts campuses are smaller than research centers, it is harder to judge whether or not faculty of color are being promoted.

However, we note that on most campuses, as one proceeds higher up the professorial ranks there are fewer minority faculty. For example, at Purchase 76.9% of Assistant Professors, 84.0% of Associate Professors, and 90.7% of Full Professors are white. Yet, even in this context, the Purchase campus data (not shown) suggest some promotion among African American and Asian faculty between 2002 and 2009; and the New Paltz data (2001-2009) indicate both hiring and promotions of African American and Asian faculty. Meanwhile at Brockport, the rank distribution of faculty by race (not shown) suggests both hiring and promotion of Latinos(as) and Asians between 2001 and 2009, as well as promotions among African Americans.

Conclusions

After analyzing the collected data, the following general conclusions about the status of underrepresented minority faculty in the SUNY system can be made:

- The hiring of Latino faculty within SUNY institutions is far from keeping pace with the changing demographics of New York State and the rest of the nation that show a pattern of continuing large increases in this particular sector of the population. In the increasingly multicultural and multiracial profile of the U.S. population and today's global society, diversity efforts at most institutions of higher education still have not been assigned a central place, and the SUNY system is no exception. It is important to state that diversifying the faculty at most SUNY institutions is still unfinished business and many challenges remain in achieving levels of Latino faculty representation and that of other minority groups that better reflect the current state and national demographic profile, or even reflect the comparatively lower percentages found in the pool of Latino and African American doctoral recipients.
- Second, it is evident that despite the support for diversity that SUNY institutions proclaim in their mission statements and the presence of a SUNY Central Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ODEI) and Affirmative Action Offices at most SUNY campuses, the data selected and used in this report from our small sample of five case study university centers and colleges (for the years since 2000), and the SUNY campus-wide data (for the years since 1997), show that the progress in hiring and retaining faculty from underrepresented minorities has been slow, especially in regards to Latinos(as). Because SUNY does not report on Latino groups separately, it is not possible to judge whether or not any particular nationality group is dwindling, as Pimentel found for Puerto Rican faculty in CUNY. While the four SUNY research university centers, the thirteen comprehensive colleges, and the eight technology colleges in combination have increased their numbers of Latino full-time faculty by 53, of African American full-time faculty by 83, and of Asian faculty by 352, the number of white faculty has also been augmented since 1997. As a result, Latinos(as) have increased only from 2.5 to 2.7% among the full-time SUNY faculty, well short of their 17.6% representation in New York State's total population (2010); African Americans have increased only from 3.74 to 4.1%, also well short of their 15.9% in the state's population; and Asians have increased from 6.0 to 9.0%, which does surpass their 7.3% state population figures. Nonetheless, SUNY's Asian faculty are disproportionately men, with slightly less than a third women faculty. In contrast to SUNY, Pimentel's 2002 data show that CUNY's recruitment efforts in their senior colleges and graduate school were more successful in achieving a diverse full time faculty which, at that time, were 11% African American, 7.7% Asian, 6% Latino, and 75.5% white.
- Third, the seemingly low rates of 2.7% Latino and 4.1% African American full-time SUNY

faculty (2009) are not caused by a “pipeline” problem that restricts possible hiring. As of 2000, Latinos(as) represented 5% of the graduate or professional degree holders in New York State (De Jesús and Vásquez 2005). By 2010, Latinos(as) received 5.9% and African Americans received 6.3% of all doctoral degrees conferred nationally to US citizens and permanent residents (NSF 2011). Our campus case studies suggest that the problems vary in each institution—in some cases hiring rates are low, while in others retention seems to be a problem.

- Fourth, since 1997, the percentage of Latino faculty actually has declined on 13 of the 25 SUNY campuses (four research university centers, thirteen comprehensive liberal arts colleges, and eight technology colleges) we focused on; although 4 of the comprehensive liberal arts campuses (Geneseo, New Paltz, Old Westbury, and Plattsburg) did have faculties that were more than 4% Latino. In the same time period, the percentage of African American faculty has increased on 18 of the 25 campuses, including 10 of the comprehensive colleges and 7 of the technology colleges, but only for one of the research university centers (Albany). Nonetheless, only two campuses (Empire State College and Old Westbury) stand out for having over 7% African American faculty (in these cases, 10% and 12%, respectively).
- Fifth, the research literature shows that it is important for institutions to recognize that the burden of making notable progress in achieving a more ethnically, racially, and gender diverse environment in higher education should not rest primarily on the shoulders of members of underrepresented groups. Strong administrative leadership and bold initiatives are needed to actively engage the non-minority sectors of an institution in efforts to diversify the faculty, staff, student body, and the curriculum, and in seeing this endeavor as a central part of the overall academic enterprise and the institution.
- Sixth, understanding and discussing the barriers and factors that contribute to perpetuating the

tremendous gap in the hiring practices for white faculty and faculty from underrepresented minorities in certain disciplines is essential to any progress in achieving diversity goals throughout the many departments and colleges of a particular institution. Because of our increasingly multicultural nation and the globalizing nature of today’s economic, social, and cultural processes, more than ever before, diversity plays a critical role in higher education, and in protecting and reaffirming the values of a just, inclusive, and democratic U.S. society.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are aimed at improving current recruitment practices and the “unfinished business” of implementing campus diversity policies that produce more palpable results in increasing Latino and other faculty from underrepresented groups:

- SUNY institutions should develop consistent ways of collecting, reporting, and monitoring data on minority faculty over a specific time period to make it easier to determine the effectiveness of their Affirmative Action recruitment and retention efforts. Diversity planning needs should be incorporated into all campus-wide strategic planning efforts.
- If progress at increasing the numbers of minority faculty at a particular institution has been stagnant or declining, a review of faculty diversity efforts by individual campuses and SUNY Central is warranted. Consideration should be given to establishing specific hiring goals, and to enhancing individual campuses’ current recruitment practices. Institutions must keep in mind that the limits imposed by the absolute size of the pool can be offset by hiring from within the SUNY system, especially in the social sciences and the humanities where SUNY produces more Latino doctorates than private universities in the state.
- While full-time faculty members of SUNY institutions are not quite as predominantly white as they were in the 1990s, increased faculty diversity tends to be lopsided on most

campuses—focusing on hiring one group, at the apparent expense of others. Efforts should be made to increase Latino, African American, and Asian faculty in tandem with each other on each campus.

- Hiring of women faculty members has progressed more than for any other group of SUNY faculty, especially for white women. Women are also 50% and 44% of African American and Latino faculty as well. However, efforts should be made to hire Asian women faculty, who still are only 32.7% of the Asian origin faculty.
- Bold initiatives and institutional leadership are required in order to develop more successful diversity policies and practices. Clear directives or initiatives from individuals in top administrative posts will contribute to changing the institutional culture of indifference, neglect, or resistance towards diversity.
- In their faculty recruitment searches, departments must be cognizant that following Affirmative Action regulations by just adding a single “token” minority scholar to the candidate pool does not usually result in the hiring of faculty from underrepresented groups.
- Awareness of different forms of institutionalized racism that contribute to a chilly campus environment for faculty of color should be part of the training of department chairs and faculty, and the leadership exercised by top university administrators is key to the success of diversity initiatives being perceived as core to the institution’s culture by different campus constituencies.
- The research literature on diversity in higher education shows that because of their low numbers, faculty of color can often work in isolation, without the benefit of the established support systems that privilege white faculty. Thus, it is important for institutions to have in place effective mentoring programs for junior faculty of color and women, and development workshops about integrating diversity in the curriculum and research activities for all faculty.
- Latino and other minority faculty hiring should not be limited to the junior ranks and institutions need to recognize the benefits of also having prominent senior hires who can bring prestige to the institution and underscore its commitment to a more equitably diverse workforce.
- Discussions about budget cuts that affect an institution’s ability to hire, dismiss, or retain faculty should give consideration to the impact that any extensive programmatic reductions might have in achieving the goal of a diversified campus faculty.

Notes

1. The U.S. Census defines Hispanics/Latinos(as) as the population originating from any of the 19 Spanish-speaking countries of Latin America and the Caribbean, and from Spain. However, the SUNY and the IPEDS data do not separately report figures for these different national origin groups, and only report all groups combined as Hispanic/Latino. Therefore this study provides data about Latinos(as) as a collective rubric and the data is not broken down by nationality. The use of the slashed categories Hispanic/Latino, African American/Black, Asian/Pacific Islander also reflects the categorizing and reporting practices of the U.S. Census and other government agencies, as well as some of the institutions that provided the data for this study. In the interest of brevity, in this study we frequently use the abridged terms Latinos(as), African Americans, and Asians to refer to these groups. Latinos(as) is used to indicate Spanish language gender differences (masculine and feminine, respectively) only for the plural use of the term.
2. Other SUNY institutions have similar programs, but not housed in departments. This means that most of their faculty is based in a wide range of different departments and not in a single departmental unit.
3. Data on gender differences among faculty for 2009 are taken from IPEDS data (not shown), because SUNY data (as shown in Table 4) does not separate racial ethnic groups by gender.

References

- Berger, Michelle Tracy and Katheleen Guidroz, eds. 2009. *The Intersectional Approach: Transforming the Academy through Race, Class, and Gender*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2003. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Lanhan, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bronstein, Phyllis, Esther D. Rothblum, and Sandra E. Salomon. 1993. "Ivy Walls and Glass Walls: Barriers to Academic Careers for Women and Ethnic Minorities" in *Building a Diverse Faculty*, Joanne Gainen and Robert Boice, eds. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 17-32.
- Brown-Glaude, Winnifred, ed. 2009. *Doing Diversity in Higher Education*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Chow, Esther Ngan-Ling and Marcia Texler Segal, and Tan Lin, eds. 2011. *Analyzing Gender, Intersectionality, and Multiple Inequalities: Global-Transnational and Local Contexts*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing.
- Cruz, José E. 2010. "Changing Demographics and Representational Dilemmas: Latinos at SUNY and CUNY Meeting the Diversity Challenge" in *SUNY at Sixty: The Promise of the State University of New York*, John B. Clark, W. Bruce Leslie, and Kenneth P. O'Brien, eds. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 228-243.
- De Jesús, Anthony and Daniel W. Vásquez, 2005. "Exploring the Education Profile and Pipeline for Latinos in New York State." Albany, NY: NYLARNet.
- Delgado Bernal, Dolores and Octavio Villalpando. 2010. "An Apartheid of Knowledge in Academia: The Struggle over the 'Legitimate' Knowledge of Faculty of Color." *Equity & Excellence in Education* 35(2): 169-180.
- El Nasser, Haya and Paul Overberg. 2011. "1990-2010: How America Changed." *USA Today*, August 10, 1, 2A.
- Felder, Pamela and Milagros Castillo. 2011. "A Commentary about the Black and Latino Doctoral Experience in the United States." *Academic Leadership: The Online Journal* 9 (1): 1-5.
- Fulwood III, Sam. 2011. "Race and Beyond: New Study: Americans are Ho-Hum About Changing Demographics." www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/08/rab_083011.html
- Gainen, Joanne and Robert Boice, eds. 1993. *Building a Diverse Faculty*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Hale, Jr., Frank W., ed. 2004. *What Makes Racial Diversity Work in Higher Education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Moreno, José F., Daryl G. Smith, Alma R. Clayton-Pedersen, Sharon Parker, and Daniel Hirooyuki Teraguchi. 2006. *The Revolving Door for Underrepresented Minority Faculty in Higher Education*. San Francisco, CA: James Irvine Foundation.
- National Science Foundation. 2010. *Survey of Earned Doctorates (SED). Doctorate Recipients from U.S. Universities: 2009*. Washington, D.C.: NSF.
- National Science Foundation. 2011. *Survey of Earned Doctorates (SED). Doctorate Recipients from U.S. Universities: 2010*. Washington, D.C.: NSF.

- Pimentel, Felipe. 2005. "The Decline of Puerto Rican Faculty in the CUNY System from 1981-2002." Albany, NY: NYLARNet.
- Smith, Daryll G. 2009. *Diversity Promise for Higher Education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- SUNY Office of Diversity and Educational Equity. 2008. *Keeping Pace: Racial/Ethnic Diversity of Students and Faculty at the State University of New York*. Albany, NY: Office of Diversity and Educational Equity.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2011. *The Hispanic Population: 2010*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1996. Current Population Reports P25-1130. *Population Projections of the United States by Age, Sex, Race, Ethnicity, and Hispanic Origin: 1995 to 2050*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration.
- U.S. Department of Education (DOE), National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). 2009. *2008 Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS)*, Winter 2007-2008. Washington, DC.
- U.S. Department of Education (DOE), National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). 2006. *Digest of Education Statistics*, Chapter 3. Washington, DC.

Appendices

		Appendix Table I. University at Albany All Full-Time Faculty 2000-2009 by Race-Ethnicity										
		Year										
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
1 White	Count	525	524	539	532	532	522	515	483	465	491	
	% within year	83.7%	83.7%	82.8%	83.6%	82.9%	78.5%	75.0%	68.8%	67.4%	72.8%	
2 Black/Afric American	Count	24	27	26	24	25	25	23	22	23	25	
	% within year	3.8%	4.3%	4.0%	3.8%	3.9%	3.8%	3.3%	3.1%	3.3%	3.7%	
3 Hispanic/Latino	Count	28	21	22	21	20	20	21	19	17	20	
	% within year	4.5%	3.4%	3.4%	3.3%	3.1%	3.0%	3.1%	2.7%	2.5%	3.0%	
4 Asian /Pacific Islander	Count	35	38	46	45	51	54	56	55	52	69	
	% within year	5.6%	6.1%	7.1%	7.1%	7.9%	8.1%	8.2%	7.8%	7.5%	10.2%	
5 Amer Ind/ Alask Native	Count	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	% within year	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	
6 NRA	Count	11	12	13	9	9	15	20	36	46	43	
	% within year	1.8%	1.9%	2.0%	1.4%	1.4%	2.3%	2.9%	5.1%	6.7%	6.4%	
7 Unknown	Count	3	2	3	4	4	28	51	86	86	25	
	% within year	0.5%	0.3%	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%	4.2%	7.4%	12.3%	12.5%	3.7%	
Total	Count	627	626	651	636	642	665	687	702	690	674	
	% within year	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Source: Office of Institutional Research, University at Albany, SUNY.

Appendix Table II. Binghamton University All Full-Time Faculty 2000-2010 by Gender and Race-Ethnicity

		Year										
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Female	1 White	Count	136	153	146	148	146	170	177	182	182	179
		% within year	82.0%	83.0%	81.0%	79.0%	78.0%	81.0%	80.0%	78.0%	77.0%	75.0%
	2 Black/African American	Count	10	8	8	8	7	6	9	11	11	12
		% within year	6.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	3.0%	4.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	3 Hispanic/Latino	Count	5	6	6	7	7	8	8	9	10	11
	% within year	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	
	4 Asian/Pacific Islander	Count	13	17	20	24	25	24	31	32	34	37
	% within year	8.0%	9.0%	11.0%	13.0%	13.0%	11.0%	12.0%	13.0%	14.0%	14.0%	15.0%
	5 Native American	Count	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	% within year	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Female Total	Count	165	185	181	188	186	209	234	236	242	240
	% within year	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Male	1 White	Count	274	265	269	265	272	272	274	284	285	269
		% within year	81.0%	79.0%	81.0%	79.0%	79.0%	78.0%	78.0%	76.0%	75.0%	77.0%
	2 Black/African American	Count	8	8	9	9	9	8	10	11	11	9
		% within year	2.0%	2.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	2.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	3 Hispanic/Latino	Count	9	11	7	8	10	9	7	7	10	7
	% within year	3.0%	3.0%	2.0%	2.0%	3.0%	3.0%	2.0%	2.0%	3.0%	2.0%	
	4 Asian/Pacific Islander	Count	46	52	47	53	54	58	61	69	75	70
	% within year	14.0%	15.0%	14.0%	16.0%	16.0%	17.0%	17.0%	19.0%	20.0%	19.0%	19.0%
	5 Native American	Count	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
	% within year	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Male Total	Count	337	336	333	335	346	348	361	380	373	350
	% within year	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
All Faculty	1 White	Count	410	418	415	413	418	442	452	466	469	448
		% within year	82.0%	80.0%	81.0%	79.0%	79.0%	79.0%	79.0%	77.0%	76.0%	76.0%
	2 Black/African American	Count	18	16	17	17	16	14	19	22	22	21
		% within year	4.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%
	3 Hispanic/Latino	Count	14	17	14	15	17	17	15	16	20	17
	% within year	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	
	4 Asian/Pacific Islander	Count	59	69	67	77	79	82	87	100	104	102
	% within year	12.0%	13.0%	13.0%	15.0%	15.0%	15.0%	15.0%	17.0%	17.0%	17.0%	
	5 Native American	Count	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	
	% within year	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
	All Faculty Total	Count	502	521	514	523	532	557	574	595	615	590
	% within year	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, Binghamton University.

Appendix Table III. Purchase All Full-Time Faculty 2002-2009 by Race-Ethnicity										
		Year								
		2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
1 White	Count	117	112	116	122	116	118	116	123	
	% within year	85.4%	86.2%	87.2%	85.3%	82.3%	81.9%	84.1%	83.1%	
2 Black/Afric American	Count	7	5	6	8	9	8	7	8	
	% within year	5.1%	3.8%	4.5%	5.6%	6.4%	5.6%	5.1%	5.4%	
3 Hispanic/Latino	Count	5	4	5	5	6	7	4	4	
	% within year	3.6%	3.1%	3.8%	3.5%	4.3%	4.9%	2.9%	2.7%	
4 Asian/Pacific Islander	Count	7	8	5	7	9	11	11	12	
	% within year	5.1%	6.2%	3.8%	4.9%	6.4%	7.6%	8.0%	8.1%	
5 Native American	Count	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	
	% within year	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	
7 Unknown	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	% within year	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Total	Count	137	130	133	143	141	144	138	148	
	% within year	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Source: Institutional Research, Purchase College, SUNY.

Appendix Table IV. New Paltz All Full-Time Faculty 2001-2009 by Gender and Race-Ethnicity

			Year								
			2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Female	1 White	Count	128	117	122	118	124	139	134	151	149
		% within year	85.0%	84.0%	84.0%	84.0%	83.0%	86.0%	82.0%	84.0%	84.0%
	2 Black/African American	Count	4	6	6	6	5	5	6	5	6
		% within year	3.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	3.0%	3.0%	4.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	3 Hispanic/Latino	Count	9	8	8	7	8	6	8	8	9
		% within year	6.0%	6.0%	6.0%	5.0%	5.0%	4.0%	5.0%	4.0%	5.0%
	4 Asian/Pacific Islander	Count	7	8	9	9	8	8	11	9	9
		% within year	5.0%	6.0%	6.0%	6.0%	5.0%	5.0%	7.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	5 American Ind/Alaska Nat	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		% within year	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6 Two or More Races	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
		% within year	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	1.0%
	7 NRA	Count	3	3	1	0	4	3	4	5	4
		% within year	2.0%	2.0%	1.0%	0.0%	3.0%	2.0%	2.0%	3.0%	2.0%
Female Total	Count	151	140	145	140	149	161	163	179	178	
	% within year	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Male	1 White	Count	139	137	129	133	120	121	140	140	130
		% within year	79.0%	81.0%	19.0%	81.0%	75.0%	76.0%	80.0%	81.0%	80.0%
	2 Black/African American	Count	7	8	8	9	7	9	9	11	10
		% within year	4.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	4.0%	6.0%	5.0%	6.0%	6.0%
	3 Hispanic/Latino	Count	6	6	7	6	6	7	5	4	5
		% within year	3.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	3.0%	2.0%	3.0%
	4 Asian/Pacific Islander	Count	15	16	17	15	15	14	13	11	14
		% within year	9.0%	9.0%	10.0%	9.0%	9.0%	9.0%	7.0%	6.0%	9.0%
	5 American Ind/Alaska Nat	Count	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		% within year	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6 Two or More Races	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		% within year	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	7 NRA	Count	7	2	2	2	11	8	9	6	3
		% within year	4.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	7.0%	5.0%	5.0%	3.0%	2.0%
Male Total	Count	176	169	163	165	159	159	176	172	162	
	% within year	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
All Faculty	1 White	Count	267	254	251	251	244	260	274	291	279
		% within year	82.0%	82.0%	81.0%	82.0%	79.0%	81.0%	81.0%	83.0%	82.0%
	2 Black/African American	Count	11	14	14	15	12	14	15	16	16
		% within year	3.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	3 Hispanic/Latino	Count	15	14	15	13	14	13	13	12	14
		% within year	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	4.0%	5.0%	4.0%	4.0%	3.0%	4.0%
	4 Asian/Pacific Islander	Count	22	24	26	24	23	22	24	20	23
		% within year	7.0%	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%	7.0%	7.0%	7.0%	6.0%	7.0%
	5 American Ind/Alaska Nat	Count	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		% within year	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6 Two or More Races	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
		% within year	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	7 NRA	Count	10	3	2	2	15	11	13	11	7
		% within year	3.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	5.0%	3.0%	4.0%	3.0%	2.0%
All Faculty Total	Count	327	309	308	305	308	320	339	351	340	
	% within year	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Source: Institutional Research and Planning, SUNY New Paltz.

Appendix Table V. Brockport All Full-Time Faculty 2001-2009 by Gender and Race-Ethnicity

			Year								
			2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Female	1 White	Count	123	120	124	128	140	147	145	143	146
		% within year	87.0%	87.0%	86.0%	86.0%	87.0%	87.0%	85.0%	85.0%	83.0%
	2 Black/African American	Count	7	7	6	5	6	7	9	9	11
		% within year	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	4.0%	5.0%	4.0%	6.0%
	3 Hispanic/Latino	Count	6	6	6	7	7	6	8	6	7
		% within year	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	5.0%	4.0%	4.0%	5.0%	4.0%	4.0%
	4 Asian/Pacific Islander	Count	5	4	5	7	6	7	7	9	10
		% within year	5.0%	4.0%	5.0%	5.0%	4.0%	5.0%	5.0%	7.0%	6.0%
	5 American Indian	Count	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
		% within year	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
	6 Two or More	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		% within year	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	7 NRA	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		% within year	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Female Total	Count	141	137	142	148	160	168	170	168	175	
	% within year	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Male	1 White	Count	161	156	154	149	141	131	146	146	142
		% within year	83.0%	83.0%	84.0%	82.0%	79.0%	79.0%	81.0%	77.0%	76.0%
	2 Black/African American	Count	14	14	12	13	14	15	15	13	12
		% within year	7.0%	7.0%	7.0%	7.0%	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%	7.0%	6.0%
	3 Hispanic/Latino	Count	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	5	6
		% within year	2.0%	1.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	4 Asian/Pacific Islander	Count	15	13	14	16	19	18	16	22	25
		% within year	8.0%	7.0%	8.0%	9.0%	11.0%	11.0%	9.0%	13.0%	13.0%
	5 American Indian	Count	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
		% within year	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	6 Two or More	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		% within year	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
	7 NRA	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		% within year	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Male Total	Count	195	189	184	181	178	168	181	186	186	
	% within year	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Total	Count	336	326	326	329	338	336	351	354	361	
	% within year	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Source: Office of Research, Analysis, and Planning, The College at Brockport, SUNY.

About the Researchers

Edna Acosta-Belén is a Distinguished Professor Emerita of Latin American, Caribbean, and U.S. Latino Studies (LACS), and Women's Studies and an O'Leary Professor at the University at Albany, SUNY. For almost four decades, through her scholarship, teaching, and service, she has been involved in numerous initiatives to diversify the curriculum and research practices, and promote the recruitment of Latino and women faculty and students at the University at Albany.

Christine E. Bose is a Professor of Sociology, Women's Studies, and LACS. One of her research areas is Latinos(as) in the workforce and she has been involved in many initiatives to diversify the curriculum and research practices, and promote the recruitment and development of women and minority faculty, including serving on the UUP-SUNY Joint Labor Management Committee that administers the Drescher Award program.



NYLARNet

The New York Latino Research and Resources Network (NYLARNet) was created to bring together the combined expertise of U.S. Latino Studies scholars and other professionals from five research institutions within New York State to conduct non-partisan, policy relevant research in four target areas: Health, Education, Immigration and Political Participation. This network is constituted by recognized scholars and other professionals who are engaged in critical thinking, dialogue, and the dissemination of information on U.S. Latino issues. NYLARNet addresses a broad spectrum of concerns related to the four target areas mentioned above, and provides information services to legislators, public agencies, community organizations, and the media on U.S. Latino affairs. NYLARNet also pays special attention to the realities and needs of the largely neglected Latino populations throughout New York State and outside of New York City.

This work was made possible in part through funding from legislative initiative grants from the New York State Legislature, supported by Assembly Speaker Sheldon Silver, and sponsored by Assemblyman Félix Ortiz, Chair of the Assembly's Puerto Rican/Hispanic Task Force. They are not responsible for the contents of this report.