

**College of Communication and Information
Diversity Committee 2012-2013**

Member composition: Donald Case, Ning Yu, Kevin Real, Don Lowe, Zixue Tai, Deborah S. Chung, Lisa A. Brown, Emily Sallee, Anthony Limperos, and Alfred Cotton.* Deborah S. Chung is the current diversity officer for the College.

**denotes graduate student representative who has joined the committee starting spring 2013.*

Main College Diversity Committee Activities

This document includes four reports: 1) CCI diversity/inclusivity assessment survey report (pg. 3); 2) CCI unit heads diversity/inclusivity survey report (pg. 31); 3) Recruitment, Retention and Outreach coordinator report—based in the Division of Instructional Communication and Research, which is now part of the School of Information Sciences (pg. 42); and 4) Student and Multicultural Affairs director report—based in the School of Journalism and Telecommunications (pg. 48).

The main goals for this academic year were to conduct a comprehensive assessment of diversity perceptions among college members and to also conduct a separate unit heads assessment of diversity-related curriculum, activities and evaluation.

The spring 2013 CCI Diversity and Inclusivity survey provides an opportunity to reflect upon the perceptions of college members toward diversity/inclusivity. The goal of this assessment is to identify perceptions related to diversity/inclusivity among members of the college, assess its current efforts, and ascertain areas that need continued improvement. Thirty-five closed ended diversity items were included in the survey: six questions were included for comparison purposes from the 2010 college self-study survey, 27 items were adapted from the Miami University Diversity Awareness Scale (MUDAS), and two additional items regarding expression of ideas and respect toward minority faculty (e.g., female, younger and gay/lesbian faculty) were asked. In addition, three open-ended questions were included in the survey to provide an opportunity for participants to fully share their perceptions and experiences as regard to the climate of diversity/inclusivity within the college.

In the context of the spring 2013 CCI Diversity and Inclusivity survey, a separate unit heads assessment was also conducted. The goal of this part of the assessment is to identify diversity addressed in the curriculum and general diversity-related activities pursued by units within the college. While this information has been collected over the past several years to some extent by each unit, the committee recognized a need for uniformity. The committee also assessed that a master file compiling all unit information together would be helpful in providing an overview regarding efforts put forth by the college on curriculum and other activities related to diversity/inclusivity.

The CCI is committed to promoting and protecting diversity among its students, faculty and staff. It recognizes the value and importance of working with diverse individuals and groups as manifested in the full spectrum of socioeconomic, intellectual

and individual dimensions such as race, ethnicity, age, gender, sexual orientation, religion, physical abilities, political beliefs, national or geographic origin. The college is dedicated to creating a welcoming environment and affirming climate in which everyone feels respected and included through its innovative curricula, research, scholarship, and creative activities.

Diversity/Inclusivity Assessment: College of Communication and Information

Summary

The spring 2013 College of Communication and Information Diversity and Inclusivity survey provides an opportunity to reflect upon the perceptions of college members toward diversity/inclusivity. The goal of this assessment is to identify perceptions related to diversity/inclusivity among members of the college, assess its current efforts, and ascertain areas that need continued improvement. Thirty-five closed ended diversity items were included in the survey: six questions were included for comparison purposes from the 2010 college self-study survey, 27 items were adapted from the Miami University Diversity Awareness Scale (MUDAS), and two additional items regarding expression of ideas and respect toward minority faculty (e.g., female, younger and gay/lesbian faculty) were asked. In addition, three open-ended questions were included in the survey to provide an opportunity for participants to fully share their perceptions and experiences as regard to the climate of diversity/inclusivity within the college.

Findings reveal no significant differences in perceptions between 2010 and 2013 among the six base-line items. The majority of mean scores for the 2013 quantitative assessment was above 3.0 (on a scale of 1-5 with higher values representing stronger agreement) but were rarely above 4.0. If the CCI is aiming for excellence in diversity, more discussion, and action, may be needed. There were little significant differences in perceptions across affiliation and roles member serve in the college. The results suggest all three units are generally on par in terms of their perceptions on diversity/inclusivity

and mostly share positive perceptions. However, for roles, a statistically significant difference emerged for the MUDAS dimension of discipline practice.

When data were classified into dominant and target populations, for the most part, target groups (i.e., race/ethnicity, ability/disability variables) were less likely to agree specifically that College media communicate that CCI places a high value on diversity. In regard to the MUDAS questions, the target group for religion (i.e., all religions other than Christianity) agreed significantly more with the value/appreciation dimension than those in the dominant religion classification.

The qualitative analysis reveals most respondents felt the College's diverse faculty was something worth mentioning. The emergent theme that female faculty members felt less respected and have difficulty gaining respect is an important point for concern for the College.

Diversity/Inclusivity Assessment: College of Communication and Information

In the context of the spring 2013 College of Communications and Information Diversity and Inclusivity survey, this report provides a summary of the data collected from undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, staff, and administrators, using an online survey designed by the College Diversity Committee (see Appendix) that went live on January 15, 2013.

Aims

The goal of this assessment is to identify perceptions related to diversity/inclusivity among members of the college, assess its current efforts and ascertain areas that need continued improvement. Six items of the survey will also be used to assess changes in perception between 2010 and 2013. Thirty-five closed ended items and three open-ended questions related to diversity were included in the survey to provide an opportunity for participants to fully share their perceptions and experiences as regard to the climate of diversity/inclusivity within the college. The CCI is committed to promoting and protecting diversity among its students, faculty and staff. It recognizes the value and importance of working with diverse individuals and groups as manifested in the full spectrum of socioeconomic, intellectual and individual dimensions such as race, ethnicity, age, gender, sexual orientation, religion, physical abilities, political beliefs, national or geographic origin. The college is dedicated to creating a welcoming environment and affirming climate in which everyone feels respected and included through its innovative curricula, research, scholarship, and creative activities.

Method

Survey procedures

On January 15, 2013, an email was sent from the College Dean's office to the college email listserv to all students, faculty, staff, and administrators. The e-mail contained details about the survey, mentioned it was voluntary and anonymous, and expressed that the survey is crucial for advancing diversity initiatives for the College by understanding the strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities. Potential respondents were directed toward a link on the university's Qualtrics server containing the survey:

https://uky.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_b2Ueu0QLsDHTthb. The survey closed on February 1, 2013, for faculty/staff and February 8, 2013, for students.

The online survey was designed to take no more than 15 minutes to complete and consisted of a short introductory paragraph informing respondents of the purpose, deadline, and directions related to completion of the survey. The survey contained 35 quantitative questions and three qualitative questions. Response options for the quantitative portion consisted of a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). In addition, a "prefer not to answer" and "don't know" options were provided.

The main quantitative diversity survey items used for this first stand-alone survey in the CCI was adapted from the Miami University Diversity Awareness Scale (MUDAS) that was developed by Miami University faculty/administrators.¹ The MUDAS is designed to assess self-reported levels of student knowledge regarding culture/ethnicity, appreciation of diversity, inter-group interaction, social justice and the degree to which students perceive these constructs should be presented in the college classroom in preparation for their professional practice. The validation study targeting over 1,000 first

¹ The MUDAS was designed by Raymond Terrell and validated by Susan Mosley-Howard, Aimin Wang and Raymond Witte.

year college students found that the instrument items were discrete and consistent measures. The five dimensions/factors are described in more detail below:

Value/appreciation: Examines an individual's perception of the value that diversity brings to the quality of his or her life and the willingness to share that appreciation with his or her friends. The need to expand cultural awareness and the importance of diversity, in its broadest context, is examined with this factor.

Learning/knowledge: Examines each individual's knowledge of and acknowledgment of his or her own personal culture and ethnicity as well as the recognition of the privileges associated with social factors such as class, race, gender, language, sexual orientation, and lack of disability. Additional items within this factor involve the recognition of how the respondent's own culture impacts those from other cultures and backgrounds. Forming opinions based on facts and viable evidence and the difficulty of learning about and understanding the cultures of other people is also reflected within this factor.

Intercultural interaction: Examines an individual's comfort level in discussing his or her personal culture and ethnicity with others, and his or her interest in learning about cultures and seeking out opportunities to interact with people from other cultures including the student's desire to study abroad. Items in this factor also demonstrate respondents' acknowledgment of whether they possess close friends from different cultures and/or ethnic groups and their interest in examining and addressing class differences.

Social justice: Examines an individual's perceived value for different cultures existing within and enhancing the dominant cultural landscape as well as the desire to

support and promote diversity in general and the inclusion of all, particularly those perceived as being different (e.g., ethnically, physically). In addition, the respondent's level of commitment in speaking up when instances of social injustice occur as well as his or her willingness to be a change agent of this cause are reflected in this factor.

Discipline practice: Examines an individual's desire and willingness to address and teach cultural awareness to others, use conflict management skills when dealing with culture-based issues, as well as to address the needs of special learners. Further, the individual's belief in whether all students are capable of learning at a high level, irrespective of background or culture, is examined in this factor. Finally, the existence of actual instruction relative to diversity issues within the higher education classroom is explored.

The College diversity committee had discussed various other survey instruments, such as the frequently used Miville-Guzman Universality_Diversity Scale (M-GUDS), to measure diversity within the college. However, the committee reached an agreement in fall 2012 that the MUDAS survey more appropriately addressed the climate of diversity in contemporary U.S. society.²

For the present survey, eight items assess value/appreciation of diversity, seven assess learning, or knowledge, about culture/ethnicity, five questions assess intercultural interaction, three assess social justice, and four assess discipline practice. The original question wording was modified to more appropriately suit all participants (e.g., faculty and staff) within the college.

² The findings of the MUDAS are published in 2011: Mosley-Howard, G. S., Witte, R., & Wang, A. (2011). Development and validation of the Miami University Diversity Awareness Scale (MUDAS). *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 4(2), 65.

The survey also included questions that were asked previously in a college self-study survey administered in fall 2010 (see Appendix). Those items include questions assessing the (welcoming) environment within the college (four questions) and perceptions of disparate treatment (two questions— originally a single item that was split into two). Here, too, the original question wording was modified for clarity purposes. The question measuring perceptions of disparate treatment was split into two items to separately measure perceptions between faculty/staff vs. students. Thus, a total of six questions were based on the original college self-study survey.

Finally, two additional items regarding expression of ideas and respect toward minority faculty (e.g., female, younger and gay/lesbian faculty) were asked (see Appendix).

Along with demographic questions, the survey included three open-ended questions asking about “...things you think the College is doing well,” “...What areas do you think the College may need to address in order to improve diversity,” and “Other comments.”

In analyzing the quantitative data, standard statistical procedures, such as frequencies/percentages/means were used. Summated scales were constructed for the five MUDAS dimensions, and a series of one-way ANOVAs were performed to assess difference between mean scores. For the qualitative data, we used the constant-comparative method and grounded theory (Butler-Kisber, 2009) approach and analyzed the responses for the most salient themes. Constant comparison allows researchers to isolate, systematically, the most important themes resulting from a dataset. A single coder

read through the responses, looking for recurrent themes, patterns in responses, and relationships among responses as they emerged from the data.

Respondents

Links to the online survey were distributed to all CCI undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, staff, and administrators. An initial sample of 240 cases was available for download. However, after eliminating only *absolutely*³ unusable cases, a total of 163 cases was available for analysis [**42 undergraduate students** (Department of Communication ($n=10$); School of Journalism and Telecommunications ($n=29$); **School of Library and Information Science ($n=1$)**; and College ($n=2$)), **40 graduate students** (School of Library and Information Science ($n=23$); the CI Graduate Program ($n=15$); the College ($n=2$)), **40 faculty** (Department of Communication ($n=13$), School of Journalism and Telecommunications ($n=14$), School of Library and Information Science ($n=8$), and College ($n=3$)), and **13 staff** (Department of Communication ($n=2$); School of Journalism and Telecommunications ($n=2$); and College ($n=8$)). Table 1 below illustrates the identifiable participants by affiliation and roles they serve in the College.

Table 1

Participant Crosstabulation

Count	Affiliation	College Role				Total
		Undergraduate Students	Graduate Students	Faculty	Staff	
	Department of Communication	10	14	13	2	39
	Department School of Journalism and Telecommunications	29	1	14	2	46
	School of Library and Information Science	1	23	8	0	32

³ Due to the low response rate, we also include partially completed survey responses.

	College	2	2	3	8	15
Total		42	40	38	12	132

Results

The final sample consisted of data collected from 163 participants. All “don’t know” and “prefer not to answer” responses were coded as missing in order to accurately reflect group means.

Baseline survey items

Aggregate mean scores for participants ($n = 132-142$) who responded to the 6 baseline survey items modified from fall 2010 were all found to be higher than 3.0. Respondents generally agreed that: Faculty and staff work proactively to remove barriers to success for diverse populations ($n=140$, $M=3.68$, $SD=.98$) (compared to $n=166$, $M=3.63$, $SD=1.07$ from the 2010 survey); CI promotes diversity as an essential part of a high quality education ($n=142$, $M=3.57$, $SD=.93$) (compared to $n=167$, $M=3.57$, $SD=1.02$ from the 2010 survey); Policies and procedures in CI help diverse individuals feel welcome ($n=132$, $M=3.54$, $SD=1.00$) (compared to $n=152$, $M=3.60$, $SD=1.08$ from the 2010 survey); I have (not) heard CI faculty and/or staff express stereotypes about different groups of people ($n=139$, $M=3.5$, $SD=1.22$); College media (e.g., newsletters, website content) communicate that CI places a high value on diversity ($n=132$, $M=3.44$, $SD=.95$) (compared to $n=158$, $M=3.59$, $SD=.92$ from the 2010 survey); and I have (not) heard CI students express stereotypes about different groups of people ($n=136$, $M=3.07$, $SD=1.28$).

In 2010 we had asked whether respondents *have heard College faculty, staff, or students expressing stereotypes about different groups of people* ($n=191$, $M=3.51$,

$SD=1.21$). A composite score of perceptions regarding expression of stereotypes among College faculty, staff and students was created for the purpose of comparison with the 2010 survey item ($n= 136, 139$), $M=3.27$, $SD=1.15$).

A series of one-way ANOVAs were used to examine differences of means between the assessments of these six measures between fall 2010 and spring 2013. The findings show there are no significant differences between the perceptions assessed between the two years.

Another series of one-way ANOVAs were performed to assess differences of perceptions among the units/affiliation and the roles among members within the college for the 2013 data. No significant differences emerged.

In terms of unit/affiliation, two questions were marginally significant: College *media* (e.g., *newsletters*, *website content*) communicate that CCI places a high value on diversity, $F(3,100)=2.28$, $p=.084$; and I have (not) heard CCI *students* express stereotypes about different groups of people, $F(3,103)=2.30$, $p=.082$.

Post-hoc analyses reveal that participants from the School of Journalism and Telecommunication ($n=41$, $M=3.63$, $SD=.97$) were more likely to agree that College *media* (e.g., *newsletters*, *website content*) communicate that CCI places a high value on diversity and their participants' rankings were considerably *higher* than participants from the Department of Communication ($n=28$, $M=3.11$, $SD=.97$) ($p=.18$). Findings also show participants from the School of Library and Information Science ($n=23$, $M=3.65$, $SD=1.30$) reported considerably higher ratings that they had (not) heard CCI *students* express stereotypes about different groups of people significantly *more* than participants

from the School of Journalism and Telecommunications ($n=41$, $M=2.93$, $SD=1.17$) ($p=.029$) and Department of Communication ($n=33$, $M=2.82$, $SD=1.26$) ($p=.016$).⁴

For relationship regarding roles, Policies and procedures in CCI help diverse individuals feel welcome was also marginally significant, $F(3,105)=2.40$, $p=.072$. Post-hoc analyses reveal that college staff ($n=10$, $M=2.90$, $SD=1.29$) disagreed significantly *more* than undergraduate students ($n=37$, $M=3.68$, $SD=.85$) ($p=.027$) and faculty ($n=36$, $M=3.65$, $SD=.88$) ($p=.034$).⁵

Demographic variables analysis

The survey asked participants to share basic demographic information (e.g., gender, disability). While participants were given detailed classifications for race/ethnicity, sexual orientation and religion, in order to assess potential perceptual

⁴ In 2010, there were two statistically significant differences based on *affiliation* related to whether *policies and procedures in the College help diverse individuals feel welcome* [$F(3,148)=3.88$, $p<.01$] and whether *individuals had heard College faculty, staff, or students express stereotypes about different groups of people* [$F(3,183)=6.09$, $p=.001$]. Post-hoc analyses for *affiliation* revealed that participants from the College ($n=19$, $M=2.84$, $SD=1.34$) disagreed that *policies and procedures helped diverse individuals feel welcome* and that the College participants' rankings were considerably *lower* than participants from the School of Journalism and Telecommunications ($n=31$, $M=3.77$, $SD=1.26$) ($p=.003$), participants from the School of Library and Information Science ($n=69$, $M=3.71$, $SD=.93$) ($p=.002$), and participants from the Department of Communication ($n=33$, $M=3.64$, $SD=.86$) ($p=.009$). Post-hoc analyses for *affiliation* revealed that participants from the Department of Communication ($n=36$, $M=3.14$, $SD=1.13$) reported that *they had heard College faculty, staff, or students express stereotypes about different groups of people* significantly *more* than participants from the School of Journalism and Telecommunications ($n=35$, $M=2.46$, $SD=1.27$) ($p=.015$) and participants from the School of Library and Information Science ($n=96$, $M=2.20$, $SD=1.13$) ($p=.0001$).

⁵ In 2010, the only statistically significant difference in the role of diversity revealed with a one-way analysis of variance based on *college role* was related to whether *individuals had heard College faculty, staff, or students express stereotypes about different groups of people* [$F(3,183)=6.05$, $p=.001$]. Post-hoc analyses for *role* revealed that graduate students ($n=95$, $M=2.15$, $SD=1.08$) reported significantly *fewer* stereotypes expressed in the College than undergraduate students ($n=34$, $M=2.76$, $SD=1.33$) ($p=.009$), faculty ($n=43$, $M=2.77$, $SD=1.21$) ($p=.004$), and staff ($n=15$, $M=3.20$, $SD=1.15$) ($p=.001$).

differences between dominant vs. target, or protected, groups, we recoded variables based on common distinctions between dominant vs. target populations.⁶ The final sample consists of 81 (65.9 percent) women, 110 white (88 percent), 83 Christians (66.9 percent), 108 (90 percent) heterosexuals and 121 (89.6 percent) individuals without disabilities.

A series of one-way ANOVAs were used to examine differences of means between the dominant vs. target groups.⁷ The findings show there is no significant difference in perceptions assessed between the two groups regarding gender, religion, and sexual orientation. However, for the race/ethnicity variable, target group members ($n=12$, $M=2.92$, $SD=1.38$) agreed less with *College media* (e.g., newsletters, website content) communicate that CCI places a high value on diversity than did those in the dominant group ($n=88$, $M=3.51$, $SD=.76$ [$F(1,98)=5.16$, $p<.05$]). CCI promotes diversity as an essential part of a high quality education [$F(1,108)=2.83$, $p=.095$] and Faculty and staff work proactively to remove barriers to success for diverse populations [$F(1,105)=2.84$, $p=.095$] also were marginally significant with, again, target members less likely to agree with these statements. Those who also reported having disabilities ($n=5$, $M=2.20$, $SD=.84$) disagreed with the statement regarding *College media* compared to those who reported not having disabilities ($n=97$, $M=3.47$, $SD=.87$) [$F(1,100)=10.30$, $p<.01$]). CCI promotes diversity as an essential part of a high quality education also was marginally significant [$F(1,111)=3.00$, $p=.086$] with those with disabilities reporting less agreement with this statement than those without disabilities.

⁶ Hardiman, R., & Jackson, B. W. (1997). Conceptual foundations for social justice courses, In M. Adams, L. Bell & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A sourcebook*, New York: Routledge.

⁷ Dominant groups include whites, men, heterosexuals, Christians, able persons, etc.

Questions adapted from the MUDAS

A total of 27 items were modified from the MUDAS. Items measuring the five factors that were identified from this questionnaire were conceptually grouped.

Value/appreciation was measured by asking respondents to rate their agreement with eight items: a) I appreciate and welcome the challenges and opportunities that diversity brings, b) A conscious effort should be made to teach cultural expectations in CCI learning environments, c) A wide variety of religious diversity is good for our country, d) Although individuality is important in the United States, excessive differences in beliefs can hurt our society, e) I would welcome the opportunity to work in a community different from my own (e.g., urban, rural), f) It is not important to value different sexual orientations, g) CCI faculty should be trained to effectively introduce issues of diversity in the classroom, and h) I view promoting diversity wherever I can as an essential part of my role as [a CCI student], [CCI faculty], [CCI staff]. An index was then created by summing and then averaging the eight items ($n=125$, $M=3.99$, $SD=.54$, Cronbach's $\alpha=.75$).

Learning/knowledge was measured by asking respondents to rate their agreement with seven items: a) I am aware of my own culture and ethnicity, b) I am not comfortable talking about my culture and ethnicity, c) I recognize the privileges I might enjoy because of my race, class, gender, sexual orientation, lack of disability, etc., d) It is not important for me to learn a second language, e) I am aware of the effects that my culture has on those whose culture is different from mine, f) I check myself to see if an assumption I am making about a person(s) is based on facts, not stereotypes about a group, and g) I do not know how to learn about people and culture unfamiliar to me without being offensive. An

index was then created by summing and then averaging the seven items ($n=131$, $M=4.07$, $SD=.45$, Cronbach's $\alpha=.55$).

Intercultural interaction was measured by asking respondents to rate their agreement with five items: a) I seek opportunities to interact with people from different cultures, b) I do not share my appreciation of diversity with my friends, c) I consider cultural issues in my daily life, d) I would welcome the opportunity to study/teach abroad, and e) Addressing economic class difference tends to be divisive in everyday life. An index was then created by summing and then averaging the five items ($n=122$, $M=3.74$, $SD=.51$, Cronbach's $\alpha=.40$).

Social justice was measured by asking respondents to rate their agreement with three items: a) I do not speak up when I witness instances of social injustice, b) I do not have close friends from different cultures, and c) I realize that if I commit to promoting social justice I too must change. An index was then created by summing and then averaging the three items ($n=130$, $M=3.97$, $SD=.51$, Cronbach's $\alpha=.46$).

Discipline practice was measured by asking respondents to rate their agreement with four items: a) Students with special learning needs should not be included in regular college classrooms, b) I will be comfortable working with individuals who have a variety of learning needs, c) I believe that all individuals are capable of learning at a high level no matter what their personal background or culture might be, and d) CCI faculty should receive training in working with students who have diverse needs. An index was then created by summing and then averaging the four items ($n=127$, $M=3.94$, $SD=.66$, Cronbach's $\alpha=.62$).

As evident in the above paragraphs, participants agreed with the statements from the five dimensions with the learning/knowledge factor yielding highest mean values ($n=131$, $M=4.07$, $SD=.45$) and intercultural interaction yielding lowest mean scores ($n=122$, $M=3.74$, $SD=.51$).

A series of one-way ANOVAs were performed to assess differences of perceptions among the units/affiliation and the roles among members within the college for the five MUDAS factors. No significant differences emerged for affiliation. However, for roles, a statistically significant difference emerged for discipline practice, $F(3,118)=2.66$, $p \leq .05$, in which a post-hoc analysis reveals that undergraduates ($n=41$, $M=3.71$, $SD=.64$) rated their agreement lower than by staff members ($n=11$, $M=4.23$, $SD=.39$) ($p < .05$), graduate students ($n=33$, $M=4.02$, $SD=.70$) ($p < .05$), and faculty ($n=37$, $M=3.99$, $SD=.68$) ($p=.062$) and were more likely to agree with this dimension.

Demographic variables and MUDAS items

A series of one-way ANOVAs were performed to assess differences of perceptions among the dominant vs. target populations for the five MUDAS dimensions. No significant differences emerged for gender, sexual orientation and disability. However, for the religion variable, target group members ($n=36$, $M=4.13$, $SD=.51$) agreed significantly more with value/appreciation items than did those in the dominant group ($n=75$, $M=3.89$, $SD=.51$), [$F(1,109)=5.00$, $p < .05$]. The race/ethnicity variable also yielded a marginally significant difference in which target group members ($n=14$, $M=4.26$, $SD=.62$) agreed significantly more with social justice items than did those in the dominant group ($n=102$, $M=3.93$, $SD=.60$), [$F(1,114)=3.61$, $p=.06$].

Additional perceptions

The survey also included two additional items regarding expression of ideas and respect toward minority faculty. Participants agreed that they felt comfortable expressing views or ideas in the College ($n=137$, $M=3.91$, $SD=.93$). They rated their agreement lower regarding the statement that white faculty members are more respected ($n=113$, $M=3.25$, $SD=1.26$).

One-way ANOVA analyses reveal there were no statistically significant differences in perceptions regarding these two variables across affiliation and role served in the College. No statistically significant differences emerged, also, in relation to the demographic variables.

Qualitative question analyses

While the quantitative section provides general, overall assessments and is helpful in identifying differences among select populations when present, the open-ended questions provide a deeper look into the perceptions regarding the CCI climate on diversity and inclusivity.

Undergraduate Students. The largest group of respondents, undergraduate students, found quite a few positive aspects of the College's diversity endeavors. Students felt the College did a lot to promote its desire for diversity. They felt diversity was promoted well for potential and incoming students to the college and the major. Undergraduates also felt the College demonstrated an acceptance of individual differences. Those students were not specific in their responses of which types of differences the college was more accepting. Undergraduate students also felt diversity initiatives were evident in the hiring of diverse faculty and the presence of faculty from diverse backgrounds.

At the same time, undergraduate students also felt there were areas for improvement. Quite a few did answer the second question about what the college could do to improve diversity saying “nothing” and similar statements that they felt the college was doing well. Outside of those responses, many students mentioned there was a need for recruiting nonwhite students as well as more discussion of LGBT issues.

Graduate Students. Graduate students, the second highest represented group in the survey, felt similarly to undergraduates, saying the diverse faculty backgrounds were an important positive aspect of the College. Graduate students also felt the college did a lot to preach inclusivity and acceptance. In addition, discussion of diversity in classes was a point of pride for many graduate students.

These students were also quite critical of the College. They felt there was not enough inclusion of “nonwhite perspectives” in the course content, nor did they feel they were being prepared well, as future teachers, for teaching to diverse groups of undergraduate students. Several graduate students from the College of Library and Information Science (LIS) felt there should be more acknowledgement of white and majority cultures. Outside of that suggestion, there were not more requests for improvement from LIS graduate students.

Faculty. Faculty, in a similar vein as both groups of student, agreed hiring of diverse faculty was worth noting as something the college was doing well. They also responded that the College was very welcoming to “all people.” They felt the presence of a diversity committee was a positive step for the College in improving diversity efforts.

There were a few noteworthy and conflicting themes emerging from faculty responses to the question of where the college could improve. Even though a number of

faculty mentioned they liked that there were diverse faculty in the College, a number of faculty thought the college should do more to recruit more diverse faculty. Faculty in Journalism and Telecommunications also felt there should be greater classroom discussion of diversity issues. Faculty also felt women have a difficult time gaining respect from other faculty.

Staff. College staff did not have many positive responses for what the College is doing for diversity. They thought this survey and the presence of the diversity committee, as indicative of the College's recognition it could do more, were positives. They also agreed recruitment of diverse students was a positive step for the College.

Considering this group was the smallest represented in the survey, it is not surprising staff had little to say about either positive or negative efforts by the college. They did offer one major improvement worth noting: They felt the College could be more inclusive and diverse in administrative and college board representation.

Demographic Variables. We additionally chose to compare responses from different groups based on the demographic variables race, gender, sexual orientation, and physical ability. Our assessment here reports the emergent themes from specific demographic groups as compared to other groups within that category.

With regard to gender, there were a number of important thematic differences in the perceptions of the College's diversity efforts. Women tended to be more critical of the College than men. Women were more apt to perceive the College as unwelcoming to women. One female faculty participant responded, "I feel that sometimes my perspectives are dismissed both because they may be different from my male [colleagues'] perspectives and [because] I voice them differently than [my] male

colleagues.” Female respondents also felt the College faculty and staff are “overwhelmingly white.” Male respondents were less critical of the College. Four out of the 15 male respondents to the qualitative portion of the survey responded to the question asking where the college could improve with, “nothing” “none” or “not much” or left that answer blank after answering the question of what the college was doing well. Both men and women seemed to agree there was a great deal of diverse faculty in the College. This finding becomes a consistent theme across the survey.

Concerning sexual orientation, individuals classifying themselves as “gay” or “bisexual” did tend to respond to the qualitative questions in the terms of their sexual orientation. Gay respondents did feel accepted by the College and felt, “the College DOES [*emphasis in original*] do a good job addressing gay/lesbian culture.” Straight respondents did not discuss diversity in terms of their sexuality.

There were no noticeably consistent themes emerging from an analysis based upon race. This could be in part due to the low number of responses of African-American respondents ($n = 7$), Asian and Pacific Islander respondents ($n = 3$), Hispanic/Latino respondents ($n = 2$), and Middle Eastern respondents ($n = 1$), compared to white respondents ($n = 110$). Those white respondents did, in general, seem more positive of how the college handles diversity compared to the groups of racial minorities. Those responses were not specifically related to race in all cases, however.

With regard to physical ability, those classifying themselves as having a disability ($n = 7$) did not have any consistent themes among themselves as a group.

Conclusions

This survey assesses present perceptions regarding the general CCI environment and disparate treatment along with perceptions of questions related to diversity and inclusivity in contemporary society. The survey provided an opportunity to reflect upon the perceptions of college members toward diversity/inclusivity and experiences regarding how the college is performing in relation to those issues.

The six base-line questions provided an opportunity for comparison between 2010 and 2013 perceptions, but we found no significant differences. As the 2010 diversity report states the College has much work to do in raising awareness of diversity issues and creating a more inclusive environment, the findings here are not overwhelmingly positive but are not necessarily negative. The majority of mean scores for the 2013 data were above 3.0 but were rarely above 4.0. If the CCI is aiming for excellence in diversity, more discussion, and action, may be needed. Mean scores lower than 3.0 were identified in the race/ethnicity and disability target groups in relation to perceptions regarding College media. These lower scores were also identified for the question related to not hearing CCI students expressing stereotypes about different groups of people among participants from the School of Journalism and Telecommunications and Department of Communication.

Overall, there were little significant differences across affiliation and roles member serve in the college. The results suggest all three units are generally on par in terms of their perceptions on diversity/inclusivity and mostly share positive perceptions. These findings can be interpreted in different ways. Certain units require students to enroll in diversity courses and also maintain unit-specific diversity committees. Despite these efforts, however, there were no conspicuous differences between those units that

carried out those specific efforts and those that did not. A significant relationship emerged with one of the MUDAS dimensions in that undergraduate students, while agreeing with this dimension, rated their agreement significantly lower than staff, graduate students and faculty in terms of the discipline practice factor. While the mean scores here are high, this finding may warrant further discussion regarding the College's undergraduate curriculum in that this dimension examines an individual's desire and willingness to address and teach cultural awareness to others, use conflict management skills when dealing with culture-based issues, as well as to address the needs of special learners.

Some patterns emerged within our analyses in relation to demographic variables. When data were classified into dominant and target populations, for the most part, target groups (i.e., race/ethnicity, ability/disability variables) were less likely to agree specifically that College media (e.g., newsletters, website content) communicate that CCI places a high value on diversity. These findings suggest that the College can place more effort in producing college material that is more inclusive in its presentation of diverse populations. In regard to the MUDAS questions, the target group for religion (i.e., all religions other than Christianity) agreed significantly more with the value/appreciation dimension than those in the dominant religion classification. It appears that those in the religion target group agree more with the need to expand cultural awareness and the importance of diversity, in its broadest context.

We note the reliability measures for three MUDAS dimensions were poor (i.e., reliability scores below .6). The dimensions as identified in the original MUDAS report do not appear to be a good fit for the CCI. Future assessments may consider identifying

factors surfacing within the college instead of conceptually grouping the MUDAS items based on the original published report.

In terms of the qualitative analyses, there are a few interesting takeaways from this report, with regard to both the supportive and critical comments. In general, most groups and respondents within the groups felt the College's diverse faculty was something worth mentioning. This should be seen as a great first step for the College. Successfully promoting the College is represented by faculty members of diverse races, religions, sexes, genders, and sexual orientations, perceptions could lead to more positive perceptions of the College. Diverse faculty members could help improve diversity college-wide on a number of fronts. Diverse faculty could have an impact on the diversity of course content, diversity of undergraduate enrollment and retention, and visibility for the college and its majors.

As a college we understand the importance of standpoint and positionality as they affect our perceptions of the world. Naturally, people from diverse backgrounds will have different approaches to the same and similar content and this intellectual diversity is the best way to achieve the widest array of views in the classroom. The unique contributions of a diverse faculty are crucial to producing better scholarship as well as better and more well rounded students. With this, the College must continue both to recruit and retain diverse faculty.

The emergent theme that female faculty members felt less respected and have difficulty gaining respect is an important point for concern for the College. This speaks to a need for the college to work on the occupational climate for its female faculty. Ideally,

through both formal and informal processes, the College can implement procedures to make the work environment more equitable.

A diverse student body is an indication of a 21st century college seeking to advance an educational mission. By placing an emphasis on both recruiting and retaining students of diverse backgrounds, we can increase interest in the College's majors for those students who might otherwise choose another area of study. Additionally, a focus on student diversity will increase interest in the University of Kentucky from students who might not otherwise due to geographic or cultural reasons. The College should also consider financial incentives where certain populations of students may be deterred by the cost of education at the University and our graduate school. Having a diverse student body means the graduates of the College who move on into the workforce representing the College will have continued success and reflect well onto the College.

Finally we wish to also point out that graduate students are overrepresented in the sample, and LIS graduate students' views dominate the graduate student population perceptions. Undergraduate students are also overrepresented by students within the School of Journalism and Telecommunications. Additionally, women are overrepresented although 75 percent of LIS graduates are female. While the findings provide a helpful overview of perceptions/views from the CCI, we caution generalizations made from this data.

Appendix

QUANTITATIVE QUESTIONS:

ORIGINAL ITEMS/MODIFIED ITEMS
<i>College media (e.g., newsletters, website content) communicate that CCI places a high value on diversity</i>
CCI promotes diversity as an essential part of a high quality education
Faculty and staff work proactively to remove barriers to success for diverse populations
Policies and procedures in CCI help diverse individuals feel welcome
I have heard CCI <i>students</i> express stereotypes about different groups of people
I have heard CCI <i>faculty and/or staff</i> express stereotypes about different groups of people
MUDAS QUESTIONS WITH DISTINCT DIMENSIONS
1. I am aware of my own culture and ethnicity.
2. I am not comfortable talking about my culture and ethnicity.
3. I seek opportunities to interact with people from different cultures.
4. I appreciate and welcome the challenges and opportunities that diversity brings.
5. I do not share my appreciation of diversity with my friends.
6. A conscious effort should be made to teach cultural expectations in CCI learning environments.
7. I recognize the privileges I might enjoy because of my race, class, gender, sexual orientation, lack of disability, etc.
8. I consider cultural issues in my daily life.
9. I do not speak up when I witness instances of social injustice.
10. I do not have close friends from different cultures.
11. It is not important for me to learn a second language.
12. A wide variety of religious diversity is good for our country.
13. I would welcome the opportunity to study/teach abroad.
14. Addressing economic class difference tends to be divisive in everyday life.
15. Although individuality is important in the United States, excessive differences in beliefs can hurt our society.
16. I am aware of the effects that my culture has on those whose culture is different from mine.
17. I check myself to see if an assumption I am making about a person(s) is based on facts, not stereotypes about a group.
18. I realize that if I commit to promoting social justice I too must change.
19. I do not know how to learn about people and culture unfamiliar to me without being offensive.
20. I would welcome the opportunity to work in a community different from my own (e.g., urban, rural).
21. It is not important to value different sexual orientations.

22. Students with special learning needs should not be included in regular college classrooms.
23. I will be comfortable working with individuals who have a variety of learning needs.
24. I believe that all individuals are capable of learning at a high level no matter what their personal background or culture might be.
25. CCI faculty should be trained to effectively introduce issues of diversity in the classroom.
26. CCI faculty should receive training in working with students who have diverse needs.
27. I view promoting diversity wherever I can as an essential part of my role as [a CCI student], [CCI faculty], [CCI staff].
ADDITIONAL ITEMS
28. I am comfortable expressing my views or ideas in CCI <i>classes/events</i> .
29. In general, students in CCI respect <i>minority faculty (e.g., female faculty, younger faculty, gay/lesbian faculty)</i> less than white faculty.

*Strongly disagree— disagree—neither agree nor disagree—agree— strongly agree (5-point scale)

Factor 1: Value/appreciation

Factor 2: Learning/knowledge

Factor 3: Intercultural interaction

Factor 4: Social justice

Factor 5: Discipline practice

OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS:

In regard to diversity, what are some things you think the College is doing well?

What areas do you think the College may need to address in order to improve diversity?

Other comments:

DEMOGRAPHIC/DESCRIPTIVE QUESTIONS

•Please select **ONE** of the categories below that best reflects your **DEPARTMENTAL AFFILIATION** in the College of Communication and Information.

Department of Communication
School of Journalism and Telecommunications
School of Library and Information Science
College

•Next, we need to know which category best applies to your situation and role in the college.

Please select **ONE** of the categories below that best reflects your **PRIMARY ROLE** in the College of Communication and Information.

Undergraduate Student
Graduate Student
Faculty
Staff

Are you primarily a distance-learning student?

Yes
No

•What is your sex?

Female
Male
PREFER NOT TO ANSWER

•What is your religion?

Christian
Buddhist
Hindu
Jewish
Muslim
No religion
Other: (Please specify) _____
PREFER NOT TO ANSWER

Do you currently have a disability that substantially limits a major life activity (such as seeing, hearing, learning, walking, etc.)?

Yes

No

PREFER NOT TO ANSWER

•Please indicate the **primary** racial/ethnic group with which you identify. (If you are of a multi-racial or multi-ethnic background, indicate that group with which you identify **most of the time.**)

African American/Black

American Indian/Alaskan Native/Aleut

Asian/Pacific Islander

Chicano/Latino/Hispanic

Middle Eastern

White/Caucasian

Other: (Please specify) _____

PREFER NOT TO ANSWER

•What is your sexual orientation?

Bisexual

Gay

Heterosexual

Lesbian

Transgender

PREFER NOT TO ANSWER

Diversity/Inclusivity Assessment: College of Communication and Information

In the context of the spring 2013 College of Communications and Information Diversity and Inclusivity survey, this part of the report provides a summary of the data collected from unit heads. In collecting the data we used an online survey and also received additional information through personal email communications.

Aims

The goal of this part of the assessment is to identify diversity addressed in the curriculum and general diversity-related activities pursued by units within the college. While this information has been collected over the past several years to some extent by each unit, the committee recognized a need for uniformity. The committee also assessed that a master file compiling all unit information together would be helpful in providing an overview regarding efforts put forth by the college on curriculum and other activities related to diversity/inclusivity.

The first half of the survey focused on curriculum. The initial question asked for the availability of courses *specifically* focused on diversity. It further asked for the title of the course, course number and course description. A follow-up question also asked about how diversity is addressed in other classes (e.g., topics, assignments, exercises, and discussions). We asked for a brief description of these activities as well as course title and number.

The second half of the survey asked about general diversity assessment and activities carried out by each unit. The survey asked specifically about support for organizations related to diversity (e.g., BEA), events/speakers promoting diversity

awareness, recruitment (e.g., students and faculty), evaluation plan on diversity efforts, and a strategic plan for diversity.

Method

Survey procedures

On January 15, 2013, an email was sent from the College Dean's office to all unit heads. The e-mail contained details about the survey and expressed that the survey is crucial for advancing diversity initiatives for the College. Respondents were directed toward a link on the university's Qualtrics server containing the survey:

https://uky.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_3fVSBx3DNN9J2df. The survey closed on February 1, 2013. Some unit heads chose to provide (additional) information through personal email communications.

The participants included representation from all departments of the College: *The Department of Communication, The School of Journalism and Telecommunications, The School of Library and Information Science, The Graduate Program, The Division of Instructional Communication, and The College.*

The interpretations from the data obtained from the current survey are intended as an assessment of unit head perceptions—as an aggregate—about the quality of diversity in the College. This report describes in as much detail as possible the emergent themes as evidenced by *unit head* experiences. Our interpretations of individual unit head experiences, as highlighted in our results, should illuminate the strengths, weaknesses, and potential future direction of the College with regard to diversity. We decided to analyze the emergent themes of the entire group of unit heads as a single community under observation.

Results

The first two questions were related to the curriculum of the individual units, followed by eight general diversity assessment questions, concluding with a question asking the participant's department affiliation.

List of Diversity Courses

The first question of the survey asked participants, *Does your unit offer courses specifically focused on diversity?* The question then asks participants to give the course titles, numbers, and descriptions. The respondents listed seven courses from three units of the College. Not all who listed courses provided us with descriptions of the courses and those who did simply listed the course description from the University Course Catalog. Considering the way the participants responded, we provided the University catalog course description for those courses where no description was provided.

Table 1
List of Courses Focused on Diversity

Course Title	Unit	Official University Catalog Description
JOU 455: Mass Media & Diversity	JAT	This course will examine gender and minority issues in the media. The course offers a critical framework for analysis of socio-cultural issues pertaining to women, ethnic groups, disabled persons, and others, and of their presentation in the media. May be repeated to a total of nine hours under different subtitles.
CJT 719: Seminar in International/Intercultural Communication	Graduate Program	
LIS 690 Special Topics: Youth Literature for a Diverse Society	LIS	A survey and historical study of culturally diverse literature for youth of all ages. Students will engage in extensive reading, evaluation, and discussion of literature and the issues related to developing an understanding of various cultures and special populations within the United States.

		Prerequisite: Children's Literature (LIS610 or comparable) is preferred.
CIS 110	Instructional Communication	Composition and Communication I is the introductory course in a two-course sequence designed to engage students in composing and communicating ideas using speech, writing, and visuals. Students will develop interpersonal communication, critical thinking, and information literacy skills by exploring what it means to be engaged, twenty-first century citizens. Students will practice composing, critiquing, and revising ideas based on personal experience, observation, and fieldwork in the community, culminating in several discrete projects using oral, written, and visual modalities.
COM 312: <u>Learning Intercultural Communication Through Media And Film</u>	Communication	This course will examine intercultural and co-cultural divides using a skills-based approach. Students will be exposed to cultural communication situations and will apply skills using lecture and various media formats (e.g., news, radio, film, blogs), equipping students with more effective skills for communicating with other groups, communities, and cultures
COM 315: <u>Business Communication For Survival And Success In A Diverse Society</u>	Communication	This course addresses contemporary concepts about the meanings and functions of communication in business organizations in an increasingly diverse U.S. society. It deals with a large number of ideas in substantial depth with the aim of developing an understanding of effective and responsible participation in diverse workplaces.
COM 462: Intercultural Communication	Communication	An overview of problems, issues, processes and assumptions involved with communicating with people of different cultural and subcultural backgrounds. Theories of cognition and communication will be used to explore and explain communication with people from other cultures. Differences in both verbal and nonverbal communication among different cultural groups will be discussed.

Diversity in Other Courses

The second question of the survey asked participants, *In the rest of your classes, how is diversity addressed in the classroom?* Participants were asked to give details on the assignments, topics, exercises, etc. that address diversity issues in those non-diversity courses. There were three responses to this question. One unit head mentioned the task of assessing the entire curriculum might best be left to faculty members and a second unit head stated diversity is not addressed in courses outside those explicitly dedicated to diversity. Another offered that all courses address diversity in some respect. Only one unit head replied with information on courses of this nature. That participant replied that the respective department has provided students with courses having an international focus. One unit head did refer the researchers to contact the individual instructors of the course(s) this participant listed in the previous question regarding courses directly addressing diversity.

Support Organizations for Diversity

The first of the eight general diversity assessment questions asked, *Is your unit involved with/support organizations related to diversity?* Participants were then asked to list examples of those organizations. Four such organizations were mentioned: the International Communication Association, the National Association of Black Journalists, the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, and the School Diversity Committee.

Unit-Sponsored Diversity Events

The second general diversity assessment question asked, *Does your unit regularly schedule events, extra-curricular activities and/or speakers that promote*

diversity? Participants were then asked to list examples of the activities in which their unit was involved. Of the five unit heads who responded to this question, two simply responded with “no.” One other unit head responded in the negative but expressed a willingness to improve in this area. Two unit heads responded with a description of their efforts in including extra-curricular activities that promote diversity. One participant responded, “We try to do at least one diversity-focused event each year, generally by bringing in an outside speaker.” This respondent did not say how long that department has been holding those diversity events. Another unit head responded saying, “We are beginning to [...] we exhibited at the Joint Conference of Librarians of Color this fall. This conference is not held on a regular basis, but we plan to exhibit again when it is held next.” The remaining responses to this question were left blank by the participants.

Recruiting Diverse Students

The third general diversity assessment asked, *What method(s) does your unit employ to recruit diverse STUDENTS?* Six of the eight unit heads responded to this question. Each listed a different method of recruitment, with one unit reporting multiple methods. Among the responses listed were: 1) A student services person who handles recruitment of diverse students, this person is also involved in outside organizations dedicated to diversity. 2) A department mentioned many students being recruited from China but did not discuss the specific methods of that recruitment. 3) Another department listed an individual dedicated to handling recruitment. 4) One department mentioned they promote scholarships designated for diverse populations. 5) One particular department/unit listed its website as its primary recruitment tool. 6) A sixth method listed by the unit heads was exhibitions at various recruitment fairs. 7) Finally,

one unit mentioned there is a special section in one of their courses reserved for a specific diverse student population.

Recruiting Diverse Faculty and Staff

The fourth general assessment asked, *What method(s) does your unit employ to recruit diverse FACULTY?* Three of the unit heads did not respond to this question. Because the graduate school pools its faculty from the other units of the College, its response was not considered in this question. Though, the graduate school's response was that they recruit from other areas of the College. One unit responded they do not hire as often as others in the College but when they do, they post position announcements with specific professional organizations dedicated to diversity. This was not a purely unique response in that another unit head responded they post position openings with professional organizations. However, this unit head made sure to point out they ultimately secure, "the person who is the best fit for the position." A third respondent mentioned posting with professional organizations, while also stressing they "actively recruit" at those meetings, though they did not mention this recruitment is pursued with diversity in mind. A fourth unit mentioned the specific organization within whose diversity interest groups they e-mail and post job openings.

With regard to hiring staff, the fifth general assessment asked, *What method(s) does your unit employ to recruit diverse STAFF?* Of the five unit heads who responded to this question, all but one mentioned they personally have not been involved in the hiring of staff in "years." The other simply mentioned their staff hiring is handled by the University's human resources office.

Diversity Assessment and Evaluation

The sixth question in the general assessment section asked, ***Does your unit have an assessment/evaluation plan on its efforts on diversity and inclusion for STUDENTS?*** Five of the eight unit heads responded with either a “no” response or did not respond to the question. Of the three who did respond, one mentioned the role of the University’s outside accrediting body, a second mentioned they observed international students having trouble making connections and gaining support, and the third simply referred to their unit’s “strategic plan.”

The seventh question of the general assessment portion of the survey asked, ***Does your unit have an assessment/evaluation plan on its efforts on diversity and inclusion for STAFF/FACULTY?*** Only three unit heads answered this question. All three replied with “no” responses.

Diversity Goals

The final of the general assessment questions asked, ***Does your unit have a strategic plan that includes goals related to diversity?*** Four unit heads responded to this question, one of whom simply responded with “no.” Of the other three responses, one simply said, “yes,” they do have a strategic plan. Of the remaining two respondents, both detailed the objectives in their strategic plan. One unit head mentioned their strategic plan included a goal of further diversifying that department’s faculty and staff in addition to maintaining a diverse student body, while promoting diversity throughout the department. The second respondent stated, “diversity will be a topic in all of our classes,” as their unit’s primary goal related to diversity.

Discussion/Recommendations

List of Diversity Courses

- Do we consider seven diversity courses across the College to be sufficient?
- What ways can we improve if seven is not sufficient?
- How might the units benefit from incorporating more diversity in the classroom?
- What are students missing out on when they do not have these courses as part of their major?
- How are these unit heads measuring what constitutes a class *focused* on diversity?

Diversity in Other Courses

- Is this a question best left to faculty members rather than unit heads?
- Do unit heads have a say in which courses include a diversity component?
- What type of impact would increasing the diversity component in courses have on the curriculum and on students (positive or negative)?

Organizations

- Can we think of additional organizations that might be of benefit to the units?
- How exactly do the departments benefit from affiliation with diversity organizations?
- What do the departments do to have not only faculty / staff / and graduate students as members of these groups but undergraduates as well?
- How do we rank in this category with other colleges within the University?
- How do we rank against other colleges of communication?

Diversity Events

- Is there incentive for units to sponsor diversity events?
- What types of events are best for addressing diversity?
- For those “willing to” include more diversity events, how do we as the diversity committee help them include this input?

Recruiting Diverse Students

- Are we doing well in this area?
 - How do we gauge this?
 - Compared to other colleges in the university...
- What is the makeup of our College’s student body in terms of race, sex, sexual orientation, age, region, and other factors?
- Is having a specific section of a course dedicated to one specific group the appropriate way to meet those individuals’ needs?

Recruiting Diverse Faculty and Staff

- How do we promote hiring initiatives aimed at increasing diversity?
- Can faculty diversity provide benefits for students?
- Does faculty diversity benefit the College? How?
- Why such a lack of concern for staff diversity?
- Can we keep a database (or a simple list) of organizations that care about diversity?
- Is there an avenue for faculty to file grievances based on race/sex/gender/sexual orientation/age, etc.?
- How do we make sure all possible “best person[s] for the job” are being considered?
- Is the staff issue only a concern for UK HR or should the college be more involved?

Assessment of Students and Faculty/Staff

- Who is responsible for making these assessments? Should the diversity committee play a larger role?
- Is this primarily the role of accreditors?
- What are the accrediting bodies looking for?
- Are we doing enough to satisfy the accreditors? Exceeding expectations? Doing the bare minimum?
- How are other colleges in the University assessing themselves?
- Should we have college-wide assessment? Should we leave it up to the departments?

Goals

- Is diversity “in all of our classes” the correct path? Doing too much?

Appendix

QUESTIONS TO UNIT HEADS

Dear chair/director:

The diversity committee is collecting information to compile a comprehensive report regarding the College's activities related to diversity/inclusivity in order to report to the College leadership. Please take the time to respond to this message regarding the below information. You may need to ask your faculty to provide this information. Please respond by February 1, 2013, to dchung@uky.edu:

Curriculum:

Does your unit offer courses specifically focused on diversity? Please provide a) course titles, b) course numbers, and c) course descriptions

In the rest of your classes, how is diversity addressed in the classroom? We are looking for topics, assignments, exercises, discussions that are engaged in regard to diversity. Please provide brief descriptions of these activities as well as course title and numbers.

General diversity assessment/activities:

- 1) Is your unit involved with/support organizations related to diversity? Please list examples of these organizations.
- 2) Does your unit regularly schedule events, extra-curricular activities and/or speakers that promote diversity? Please give examples.
- 3)
 - a) What method(s) does your unit employ to recruit diverse students?
 - b) What method(s) does your unit employ to recruit diverse faculty?
 - c) What method(s) does your unit employ to recruit diverse staff?
- 4)
 - a) Does your unit have an assessment/evaluation plan on its efforts on diversity and inclusion for students? If so, please describe briefly.
 - b) Does your unit have an assessment/evaluation plan on its efforts on diversity and inclusion for staff/faculty? If so, please describe briefly.
- 5) Does your unit have a strategic plan that includes goals related to diversity?

Thank you for your attention to this message.

CI Diversity Committee

Recruitment, Retention and Outreach Coordinator Report

College of Communication and Information Diversity Efforts, 2012-2013

Division of Instructional Communication:

The Division is responsible for teaching the University Composition and Communication CORE. Diversity is central to both CIS 110 and CIS 111. During the first sequence, students learn about diverse communities and during the second sequence, students learn to work collaboratively with a diverse group of peers to conduct research for two major projects. For example, in **CIS 110** – students are assigned a major project on diversity: *Composing Community: Exploring Your Surroundings*

During this project, students research and spend time in a community or organization of which they are not already a part of to (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, student group, or religion). In this vein, our students are able to build empathy toward people and groups who do not share the same worldview as they do. The research and field work are compiled for a formal presentation.

During the 2012-2013 academic year CIS 110 serviced 1660 students; CIS 111 serviced 1724 students.

The Division formed a **RRO committee** to coordinate recruitment efforts with the RRO coordinator.

Eight faculty members in the Division of Instructional Communication and Research attended either a Preview Night or CSBFY event in 2012-2013. Their support and attendance, particularly in geographical areas from which they had grown up, gone to school, or currently reside contributed to our ability to connect with and recruit students from diverse communities.

Three faculty members from the Division of Instructional Communication and Research gave a presentation during **First Generation Student/Parent Orientation August 16, 2012**. **The same three faculty taught First Generation LLC sections of CIS 110 in the fall; two of the faculty taught similar sections of CIS 111 in the spring.**

One Division faculty member represented the College at the on-campus **Kentucky Youth Explosion** recruitment event on April 13. Thousands of diverse Kentucky youth were in attendance.

The Division of Instructional Communication and Research organized and advertised **“College Readiness and Communication: A Summer Program for Teachers and Students.”** The summer camp organizers had hoped to draw 100 6th -12th grade teachers

and students from Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, West Virginia, and Tennessee to our campus June 23-28, 2013. Our co-sponsors were Columbia Gas and Cengage Learning. We also partnered with: CI Consulting, School of Library and Information Science, School of Journalism and Telecommunications, College of Education, First Generation Initiative, STEM, Robinson Scholars, and the Appalachian Center. Unfortunately, the Division had to cancel the event due to low enrollment. That being said, much was learned about marketing and launching such an event and the organizers look forward to hosting the camp next summer.

https://exchange.uky.edu/owa/redirect.aspx?C=hm1cG0j1rUewmiAm4FNCJECn7hEBbNAI3y0-_aor4xTmxHJDM4TSw8AuJuDDpcv9_UYdljQCLZw.&URL=http%3a%2f%2fci.uky.edu%2fcd%2fsummercamp

CI RRO Coordinator, Student Services staff, Student Ambassadors and faculty volunteers represented the College at **21 UK Preview Nights last fall (2012)**. During these events, we met with a diverse body of students and parents.

The same set of representatives (see above) **attended 12 on campus Come See Blue For Yourself (CSBFY) events. CSBFY is sponsored by the Office of Multicultural Affairs.**

RRO Coordinator served on a Major Talk Program panel July 11, 2012 at the MLK Center on campus. The Panel was sponsored by the Center for Academic Resources and Enrichment Services (CARES). The talk was part of CARES Freshman Summer Program that focused on career and major exploration.

RRO Coordinator participated in **GSP/GSA Day** (Governor's Scholars Program/Governor's School for the Arts) College Fair on **Monday, December 17th**. The University hosted nearly 1000 students on campus.

RRO Coordinator participated in the **Visitor Center's Admitted Student Days luncheons Feb. 08, Feb. 15, and Mar. 01**. This was an opportunity to reconnect with students I had met earlier in the year at Preview Nights who had declared a major in CI for the upcoming 2012-2013 academic year. I also met three prospective students and recruited one of them into our program. He has been admitted and registered for fall 2013.

RRO Coordinator attended a **Recruitment Network Meeting with the UK Admissions Recruitment** team on Friday, Feb. 15h. Items discussed included evaluation of the past fall travel season's recruitment events, upcoming recruitment efforts, spring high school visits, and 2013 Preview Nights.

RRO Coordinator attended **National Symposium on Student Retention** in New Orleans, LA, October, 2012

RRO Coordinator attended the **Kentucky Student Success Summit, sponsored by Post-secondary Kentucky Council on Higher Education**, April 2013

RRO Coordinator participated in a webinar entitled, "**The Top 10 Most Successful Student Recruitment Strategies**" on Thursday January 24th.

RRO Coordinator participated in UK After-Office Hours, **First Generation LLC**, October 24, 2012. I visited with and shared information about our College and my experiences as a first generation student to residents.

RRO Coordinator served as a member of the **University Common Reading Experience Selection Committee** December 2012-January 11, 2013. I read eight books and participated in selecting the 2013 Common Reading assignment. The CRE is designed to relate to a diverse student body.

RRO Coordinator gave **two presentations for First Generation LLC Students in Feb and March: 1) Public Speaking Anxiety; 2) Healthcare Communication**

Served on two Major Talks Panels (sponsored by the Office of Multicultural Affairs)

The College appointed **five CI Student Ambassadors** for 2012-2013. Our CI Ambassadors are a dynamic and diverse group of young people who supported the College's diversity recruitment, retention, and outreach efforts throughout the year.

RRO Coordinator coordinated recruitment activities with the **Kentucky High School Speech League, Junior and Senior tournament at UK on March 15, 2013**. Diverse students from throughout the state competed in the tournament.

Meeting with Dean O'Hair, March 06 CI Recruitment and Retention Committee initial meeting:

- **Research.** R. Francies will research mentoring programs and review textbooks for use in a mentoring curriculum
- **Underachieving students.** With the removal of selective enrollment to upper division (beyond the 2.0 GPA required by the university writ large) comes a need to do more to help underachieving students succeed. D. Sellnow and R. Francies will work with faculty in ICD to (1) create a 1 credit course for students on probation to improve what is causing them to fail, (2) develop a mentoring course, and (3) offer professional development lunch and learns for faculty in the college who may be frustrated with trying to work effectively with below average students. The first step will be a lunch and learn to gather information from faculty about their needs in this regard.
- We need to change misleading **retention data collection/reporting processes**, as well as the college's retention success compared to UK overall (even with the misleading data collection/reporting processes). Dean O'Hair will work on this.
- The **college ambassadors**. Each one earns a \$300 scholarship per semester. We will increase the number to 8-9 (including one from LIS). D. Sellnow will work with Jeff Huber to identify an LIS student and R. Francies will check with Emily on increasing the number, hosting an informational event right after spring break, and formalized interview process for all ambassadors (including those who want to return in the role for a second year).

Recruitment, Retention, and Outreach Report, April 12, 2013

Top Four Achievements 2012-2013/Goals for 2013-2014

Achievement:

- Total admits for CI are 23% ahead of this time last year. Numbers are up in all majors except MAS; COM is up 36% and ISC is up 69%.

Goal:

- Continue to increase the number of CI admits next year, particularly MAS majors, since this is our smallest program. We will accomplish this goal by continuing to participate in College Preview Nights, Come See Blue for

Yourself Events, host prospective students and their families on campus and provide them with individualized experiences, and expand our recruitment efforts to include personal visits to high schools.

Achievement:

- Increased the number, diversity, and professional presence of CI Student Ambassadors from the previous year. The number increased from four to six Ambassadors. Their professional presence was enhanced by providing them with “uniforms”, business cards, and name tags. Student Ambassadors extended their participation beyond Preview Nights to include working in the Student Services Center for two hours each week, participating in College events such as the CI Excellence Awards Dinner and meeting with and hosting prospective students in their classes.

Goal:

- Continue to develop our CI Student Ambassador Program by increasing the number from six to eight, expanding their professional presence in the College and throughout the campus and community. We need a more diverse group of Ambassadors who will represent each of our program areas, including LIS. We also are exploring the possibility of offering a one-hour credit course for our Ambassadors in addition to the scholarships each of them receives. We will accomplish these goals by increasing our budget for the Program and curriculum development.

Achievement:

- Created a professional presence for CI at College Preview Nights, CSBFY, and other recruitment events by replacing a poster display with a 42 inch color television monitor featuring our College website, newscasts, programs, etc. We also distributed promotional items along with our College brochures, daily newspapers, and other literature. In addition, faculty from the Division of Instructional Communication volunteered to attend some of the recruitment visits, adding a new dimension to our program. Finally, our “uniformed” Student Ambassadors brought professionalism to our program.

Goal:

- Continue to build upon our professional presence at recruitment events. We will accomplish this by using current technology that will showcase multi-media excellence within our College programs, investing in a new CI tablecloth, recruiting enthusiastic faculty and alumni who will bring a new dimension of professionalism to our table.

Achievement:

- Hosted a successful College Career and Internship Fair on February 07, 2013. We had 35 employers and approximately 200 students participate.

Goal:

- Increase the number of employee and student participants for next year's College Career and Internship Fair. I would like to recommend that we expand the Fair to include a keynote speaker, a panel discussion featuring student interns and internship sponsors, followed by forum discussion. Prior to the event, in addition to Resumania, I want to present a networking workshop to better prepare the students for the Fair.

ANOTHER MAJOR GOAL FOR 2013 is to establish a peer-to-peer mentoring program in our College. I will research undergraduate mentoring programs and work with our current faculty to develop a successful program which includes a CIS Topics course in mentoring. The plans are to begin the pilot for this course spring 2014 with sophomores mentoring their first cohort of incoming Freshmen Fall 2014. Research suggests that peer mentoring is a successful recruitment and retention tool.

Submitted by:

Regina Francies, RRO Coordinator

Student and Multicultural Affairs Director Report

Lisa A. Brown, director of student and multicultural affairs in the School of Journalism and Telecommunications, serves on the advisory committee of the “I Am...” Diversity Project (<http://www.iamdiversityky.org/>), a state-wide initiative focusing on expanding the meaning of diversity. The project aims to promote common humanity, encourage shared ownership, and actively invites participation through social media. Brown and fellow committee members presented at the annual UK Women’s Forum conference. She attended the *Get on the Bus Tour*, a guided tour that highlighted the history and impact of segregated housing in twentieth-century Louisville. The event was sponsored by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Kentucky Housing Corporation, the Louisville Metro Human Relations Commission, the Lexington Fair Housing Council, the Louisville Urban League, the NAACP, the Metropolitan Housing Coalition, the Anne Braden Institute for Social Justice Research, the Fair Housing Coalition, and the Department of Community Services and Revitalization.

Brown assists in the recruitment of a diverse student body by participating in *Come See Blue for Yourself*. Within the College of Communication and Information, she serves on the college-wide diversity committee as well as the departmental diversity committee.

She continues to serve as the advisor to the student chapter of the National Association of Black Journalists. The NABJ has sponsored several guest speakers who address topics that are pertinent to diversity in the media, securing internships and jobs, and changes within the field.

Brown also served as a site advisor for the Alternative Service Break. She took a group of UK students to Atlanta during spring break to participate in the Urban Impact, a week-long labor intensive community service program.