The Diversity Scorecard is a tool and process Kent State University has employed to examine data and identify gaps in achievement for African American, Native American, and Latino subpopulations—groups that have been historically underrepresented in higher education and marginalized in United States history. The purpose of analyzing this data is to find “equity gaps” which are defined as instances of underrepresentation among people of color in particular measures such as university enrollment, hiring, retention, or graduation (Dowd & Bensimon, 2015). It is a tool intended to initiate self-assessment and dialogue to examine how or why these gaps exist, and identify the direct efforts or initiatives to help mitigate these disparities (Dowd & Bensimon, 2015). The Diversity Scorecard was adopted by Kent State in 2010 when the Provost, VP Enrollment Management and Student Affairs, VP Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, and VP Human Resources articulated what the aggregated aspirational goals (i.e., access, retention, excellence) would be university-wide for underrepresented faculty, staff and students of color. Thus, colleges, divisions and regional campuses established their own diversity and equity goals for success for their areas. AY2009-10 was set as the baseline academic year and AY2015-16 was set as the goal academic year.

This final report depicts data regarding access, retention and excellence for Kent State University (all campuses combined) during the baseline academic year and the goal academic year for African American, Native American, and Latino faculty, staff, and students. Highlighted in Table 1 are the results.

**Goals Met**

- Kent State University increased underrepresented full-time/first-time freshmen enrollment from 11% during the baseline year to 14.2% during the goal year. Therefore, the goal of 14% was met.

- During the timeframe observed, the percentage of underrepresented classified staff hires increased from 17% to 22.7%. Therefore, the goal of 20% was met.

- During the timeframe observed, underrepresented student first year retention rates stayed the same at 71%. Therefore, the goal of 71-72% was met.

- During the timeframe observed, underrepresented student second year retention rates increased from 52% to 56.9%. Therefore, the goal of 55% was met.

- Kent State University increased underrepresented tenure track faculty annual retention rates from 80% during the baseline year to 100% during the goal year. Therefore, the goal of 100% was met.

- During the timeframe observed, Kent State University maintained underrepresented non-tenure track faculty annual retention rates at 100%. Therefore, the goal of 100% was met.

- Kent State University increased underrepresented masters degrees awarded from 6% during the baseline year to 7.2% during the goal year. Therefore, the goal of 7% was met.
**Percentages Increased, but Goals Not Met**

- Kent State University increased underrepresented tenure track faculty new hires from 3% during the baseline year to 8.6% during the goal year. However, the goal of 9% was not met.
- Kent State University increased underrepresented non-tenure track faculty new hires from 0% during the baseline year to 4.2% during the goal year. However, the goal of 7-9% was not met.
- During the timeframe observed, the percentage of underrepresented unclassified staff hires increased from 13% to 16.8%. However, the goal of 21% was not met.
- Kent State University increased underrepresented doctoral degrees awarded from 2% during the baseline year to 3.8% during the goal year. However, the goal of 7% was not met.

**Goals Not Met**

- Kent State University’s underrepresented bachelors six-year graduation rates decreased from 30% during the baseline year to 27.9% during the goal year. Therefore, the goal of 37% was not met.

### Table 1: Kent State University Diversity Scorecard Final Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Baseline Year 2009-2010</th>
<th>Goal Year 2015-2016</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access Goal 1: Increase access for African American, Native American, &amp; Latino faculty, staff and students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time/First-Time Freshmen</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure track Faculty - New Hires</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure track Faculty - New Hires</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>7-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified Staff - New Hires</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff - New Hires</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retention Goal 2: Increase retention of African American, Native American, &amp; Latino faculty and students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student first year retention rate</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71-72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student second year retention rate</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track Faculty Annual Retention</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Track Faculty Annual Retention</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excellence Goal 3: Increase graduation rate and degrees awarded to African American, Native American &amp; Latino Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors Six-Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degrees Awarded</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degrees Awarded</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Strengths, Best Practices, and Opportunities for Improvement

Each vice president and dean was sent a Diversity Scorecard Assessment table asking for current strengths and best practices regarding Scorecard measures underway in each unit. The table also included areas for vice presidents and deans to add opportunities for improvement and goals for their respective areas. The feedback was instrumental in understanding practices and unique challenges. The following highlights common themes reported July 2015.

Strengths/Best Practices

- Diverse events and opportunities
- Community outreach to recruit diverse students
- Progressively hired and promoted employees of diversity
- Featured an increased number of diverse students in marketing/recruiting materials
- Diverse recruitment and retention programs
- Diversity Statement in job postings
- DEI Database to recruit candidates
- Diverse Student Mentoring

Opportunities for Improvement

- Recruit more diverse students
- Improve community connections
- Improve visibility of programs to current and prospective students
- Coordinate with DEI Training Lab and hiring authorities to attend unconscious bias training
- Utilize minority publications, listservs, and professional associations for advertising job openings
- Continue to look for collaborative opportunities with various diverse groups, initiatives, etc.
- Find a better way to identify diverse students and encourage them to apply for scholarships

Goals

- Improve recruitment and retention strategies (students, faculty, and staff)
- More hiring authorities will attend diversity training sessions
- Increase diversity among faculty and staff
- Maintain strong collaborations with institutional diversity areas
- Stay current with federal and state legislation and best practices
- Develop a mentoring program for diverse faculty and staff
- Increase exposure of faculty and staff to diversity issues
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