Town Hall Meeting on Diversity
**Strategic Plan 2015 Timeline**

**ANNOUNCEMENT**

**OCT 16, 2014:** Dr. Suresh announces kick-off of strategic planning to the Carnegie Mellon community

**TOWN HALLS & WEBCASTS**

**2014**

**NOV 17** First university-wide

**2015**

**JAN 28** Second university-wide

**FEB 3** Staff Council and Faculty Senate no webcast

**11** Transformative CMU Experience

**17** Transformative CMU Research, Creativity, Innovation and Entrepreneurship

**18** Transformative Teaching and Learning

**MAR 25** Third university-wide

**RETREATS**

**2014**

**DEC 12** Academic Leadership Council

**2015**

**FEB 26,27** Board of Trustees

**PLAN DEVELOPMENT**

**2015**

**APRIL-MAY:** Plan drafting; review at May Board of Trustees meeting

**JUNE-AUGUST:** Revisions and editing, layout and design

**SEPTEMBER:** Public release

**2016 and beyond:** Annual progress review and plan update
Key Upcoming Meetings

• **Town Hall Meeting on Diversity** *TODAY*
  - March 16, 4:30-6:00 PM, Posner Center

• **Town Hall Meeting on Progress on the Overall Plan**
  - March 25, 4:30-6:00 PM, Posner Center

• **Town Hall Meeting on International Strategy**
  - April 14, 12:30-2:00 PM, Posner Center *NOTE NEW TIME*

• **Additional Campus Outreach** - to key stakeholder groups and individual community members in the coming months
I. Definition and Value of Diversity - Current Statistics (10 minutes)
John Lehoczky, Interim Executive Vice President
Everett Tademy, Assistant Vice President for Diversity & Equal Opportunity

II. Recruitment (25 minutes)
Karen Clay, Heinz College

III. Success and Leadership (25 minutes)
Diana Marculescu, College of Engineering
Fred Gilman, Dean, Mellon College of Science

IV. Culture and Climate (25 minutes)
Bryan Lewis, Executive Associate, Office of the Provost
Holly Hippensteel, Assistant Dean of Student Affairs

V. Wrap-up and Next Steps (5 minutes)
Amy Burkert, Vice Provost for Education

Optional: 6:00 – 7:00 Roundtable Discussions
Definition and Value of Diversity - Current Statistics

- John Lehoczky
- Everett Tademy
The Importance of Diversity to the Success of Carnegie Mellon is Broad and Cross-Cutting

- In the student experience, both academic and residential (Focus Areas 1 and 3).
- In research, creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship (Focus Area 2).
- Carnegie Mellon must position itself to be able to recruit and engage “world talent” in the student body, staff, and the faculty, and to provide an environment within which every member of the community can excel and benefit from each other’s perspectives.
Value of Diversity

• Advance institutional excellence by involving individuals from diverse backgrounds in research and education

• Increase problem solving ability of teams; increase collective intelligence

• Broaden the perspective of our students to enhance their ability to become leaders in their fields

• Create a campus culture that welcomes and supports all

A Guiding Principle for University Culture, December, 2009
Dimensions of Diversity

• What we count versus what we value

• Federal law and our statement of assurance require us to count and report on dimensions such as race/ethnicity and gender.

• At Carnegie Mellon diversity often is reduced to gender and race/ethnicity (African American, Hispanic, American Indian).

• These are very important cognizable groups, and we must find ways to increase the representativeness of these groups in the student body, faculty and staff.

• Moreover, we must be aware that some members of these groups may have special needs that require special accommodation.

• Nevertheless, we must have a broader view of diversity than just these groups.
Defining Diversity

“Universities often describe their diversity in terms of race, citizenship, and gender, as they are three recognizable and easily measurable characteristics. However, there are many other characteristics that also comprise our identities such as spiritual or religious affiliation, political opinion, sexual orientation, nationality, and socio-economic status. Although these characteristics are often unmeasured, they are also critical determinants of the diversity of talent and perspective we seek. We will develop reliable measures for these characteristics, yet our end goal is not achieving a set of numerical targets but rather the embodiment of meaningful engagement within our community.”

https://www.cmu.edu/diversity-guide/pdfs/dac-guiding-principle_120209_revised-draft.pdf
### Five-year Student Trends by Degree Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Level</th>
<th>F10 Numbers</th>
<th>F14 Numbers</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>6,020</td>
<td>6,237</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>3,702</td>
<td>4,981</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage Breakdowns:**

- **Female**:
  - UG: 42.4% F10, 44.3% F14
  - MA: 31.7% F10, 35.2% F14
  - PhD: 29.5% F10, 28.3% F14

- **International**:
  - UG: 15.6% F10, 20.9% F14
  - MA: 60.7% F10, 55.2% F14

- **Minority**:
  - UG: 4.9% F10, 4.5% F14
  - MA: 3.1% F10, 2.4% F14

---

**Notes:**
- All degree-seeking students, all locations.
- Data represents trends from Fall 2010 to Fall 2014.
## Five-year Employee Trends by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Employees, All Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>1,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>3,704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty**

- **Female**
  - F10: 28.4%
  - F14: 28.1%
- **International**
  - F10: 12.5%
  - F14: 12.9%
- **Minority**
  - F10: 3.9%
  - F14: 6.9%

**Staff**

- **Female**
  - F10: 48.3%
  - F14: 47.9%
- **International**
  - F10: 5.3%
  - F14: 5.5%
- **Minority**
  - F10: 7.6%
  - F14: 8.2%
### Undergraduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Undergraduate Women (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emory</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash U</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMU</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Tech</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPI</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graduate Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Graduate Women (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emory</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash U</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMU</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPI</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Tech</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are IPEDS data and therefore include students at US locations only.
## Fall 2013 Peer Comparisons of Minorities

### Undergraduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Single race minority</th>
<th>Two or more races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMU</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Tech</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash U</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPI</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graduate Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Single race minority</th>
<th>Two or more races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emory</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash U</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Tech</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPI</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMU</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are IPEDS data and therefore include students at US locations only. For peer data, it is not possible to determine which students reporting two or more races are minorities. For CMU, approximately 2/3 of both undergraduates and graduate students reporting two or more races are minorities.
Fall 2013 Peer Comparisons of Women

These are IPEDS data and therefore include employees at US locations only.
# Fall 2013 Peer Comparisons of Minorities

These are IPEDS data and therefore include employees at US locations only.
For peer data, it is not possible to determine which employees reporting two or more races are minorities.
For CMU, approximately 1/2 of both faculty and staff students reporting two or more races are minorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Single race minority</th>
<th>Two or more races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emory</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPI</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash U</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Tech</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMU</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Single race minority</th>
<th>Two or more races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Tech</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash U</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPI</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMU</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recruitment

> Karen Clay*

Recruitment Working Group
Amy Burkert
Karen Clay*
Suzie Laurich-McIntyre
Everett Tademy

*working group leader
A Focus on Recruitment

Recruiting involves four main activities:

- Creating and nurturing pipelines
- Actively expanding candidate pools
- Objectively evaluating candidates
- Optimizing candidates’ experiences and decisions
Creating and Nurturing Pipelines

• Developing and nurturing the pipeline of diverse candidates requires commitment, effort, and resources

• We have several pipeline initiatives ongoing such as B.O.N.D., SAMS, Fusion Forum, and numerous summer research programs.

• What additional pipeline programs should we invest in?

• How can we sustain and advance the impact of our existing pipeline programs?
Actively Expanding Candidate Pools

- Most successful institutions have practices and policies in place to expand diverse candidate pools through active outreach.
- Additional resources and unit level accountability are often critical.
- What are successful competitors doing that could be helpful to our efforts?
- Are there promising practices in units on campus that we should look to for broader adoption?
Objectively Evaluating Candidates

• Unconscious biases can lead to good candidates being overlooked

• Best practices involve training and review processes designed to reduce unconscious bias

• What people, training, processes, or other resources do we need to enhance our approaches?

• What are successful competitors doing that could be helpful to our efforts?
Interview schedules and the overall experience of the candidates during campus visits can have a great influence on their final decision.

Candidates compare offers along multiple dimensions such as: prestige, location, finances, and success with diversity.

- Are our financial offers competitive?
- Do we show sensitivity to the needs of diverse candidates?
- Are diverse individuals successful and happy at CMU?
Success and Leadership

> Fred Gilman*
> Diana Marculescu*

Success and Leadership Working Group
  Amy Burkert
  Fred Gilman*
  Suzie Laurich-McIntyre
  Diana Marculescu*
  Everett Tademy
  Ty Walton

*working group leaders
Focus on the Individual and the Community/Institution

**Community**
- Mentor and mentee training for long-term success
- Unconscious bias: train, identify, mitigate

**Individual**
- Mentoring
- Leadership training with a purpose
- Professional development (Competencies)

**Institution**
- Create and support institutional policies
- Commitment from leadership and CMU community
- Create new institutional resources
- Expand existing institutional resources
Overarching Ideas for All Groups

- Implement a transparent and shared commitment to diversity.
- Establish an accountability framework.
- Set **goals** for matching/exceeding peers (5 years/10 years).
- Review, renew or create policies, practices, initiatives. For example:
  - Train to identify and mitigate unconscious bias;
  - Establish family friendly policies.
Focus on Faculty

• **New/junior faculty mentoring**
  - Identify and implement **best practices** – e.g., LAUNCH @ UMichigan, soon to be implemented in CIT Center for Faculty Success

• **Unconscious bias identification/mitigation**
  - **Standard** at peer institutions through formal **university-wide** training
  - Needed during **recruiting, mentoring, P&T**

• **Support all faculty with family friendly policies**
  - But prioritize mindfully of individual – what is our current practice?
  - **Accessible and affordable** dependent-care

• **“Leaking Pipeline”** – Support and Retain Talent
  - Need longitudinal and shifting demographics data at CMU.
  - Stay **competitive** when our faculty are given external offers.
  - Build internal or support external **executive leadership** programs (e.g., ELATE).

• **Goal:** **Match** peers in 5 years and **exceed/reach top** peer institutions in 10 years in:
  - Mentorship, leadership training, coaching, and buy-in mechanisms
  - Tracking **climate** and **progress**
Focus on Students

- Ensure students engage with advisors and mentors and connect to key resources.
- Help students develop leadership and professional competencies (e.g., workshop, internship and externships).
- Develop multicultural competency expectations for students, staff and faculty.
- Foster engagement and community building (NSBE, SHPE, SWE, Women in SCS, Graduate Women’s Gatherings, Inter-University Students of Color, BGSO, LGSA).
- Adopt best practices from other institutions for the retention of underrepresented students (UMBC Meyerhoff Scholars, NSF LSAMP, NSF Bridges to the Doctorate).
- Secure institutional commitment and resources to pursue and implement unique retention programs of undergraduate and graduate students.
Focus on Staff

“Research shows that women and minorities usually are evaluated/promoted on past accomplishments, while majority men tend to be evaluated and promoted based on perceptions of future potential. Professional development opportunities provide a way to turn accomplishments into potential.” [American Council of Education, Wendy Bliss]

• Expand opportunities for staff development that address the changing needs of the institution.

• Create innovative approaches to staff advancement that address the unique challenges of a relatively flat organizational structure.

• Retain high quality talent. The more “resources” an organization spends on employee training and development, the greater the concern that the highly skilled people will leave and take their knowledge somewhere else; however, research has shown that employee training/success actually reduces turnover and absenteeism.

• Provide staff with appropriate tools to increase effectiveness.
Culture and Climate

> Holly Hippensteel
> Bryan Lewis
Motivation

• The culture of diversity and inclusion impacts all corners of the university.

• Demographic data cannot describe the experiences of students, staff, and faculty.
Questions for Consideration

- What does CMU do well when engaging the campus community?
- How can CMU enhance the experiences of diverse populations?
- What are areas of concern within the institution’s culture or climate?
- Going forward, what role should CMU play in the national conversation?
Examples of Issues Raised

CMU’s Level of Commitment to Diversity and Inclusion
- Challenges to recruiting and retaining diverse populations.
- Desire for a robust diversity website.
- Possible re-envisioning of Diversity Advisory Council.
- Fragmented approach to social/academic multicultural programming and initiatives.

CMU’s Changing Student Landscape
- How does growth of international student population map with current diversity and inclusion priorities?
- Strong effect of “silo-ing” among similar groups, especially at graduate levels.

Differing Expectations of Diverse Staff and Faculty
- Ex. Women faculty asked to sit on more committees.

Need for Sensitivity Training
- Some students report use of “outdated” words and mildly offensive language in class settings.
- “Some professors seem to be out of touch.”
Proposed Ideas for Culture and Climate Improvement

• Create a “Chief Diversity Officer” position within senior leadership supported and informed by infrastructure within each college.

• Build on successful initiatives advancing the culture of inclusion.
  - examples: Center for Faculty Success in CIT and Women@SCS

• Creation of a robust diversity website.

• Improved communication and sharing of best practices.

• Regular updates on diversity and engagement initiatives.

• Revisit and possibly revise statement and definition of diversity at CMU.
Wrap-up and Next Steps

> Amy Burkert
Moving Forward – Next Steps

• Develop a shared vision and articulate goals at all levels.

• Review, renew or create policies, practices and initiatives.

• Create new and expand existing resources.

• Measure, recognize and reward effectiveness toward achieving goals and realizing vision.

www.cmu.edu/strategic-plan
Key Discussion Questions

• What strategies can we develop to ensure that we increase the educational benefits of diversity with all students having authentic interactions and exchanges with diverse others?

• How can we significantly improve the inclusion and retention of women and minorities in the student body, staff, faculty, and in the leadership of the university?

• What programs can we introduce or enhance to provide an environment in which all members of our community can excel?

• What should our diversity goals be for 2020 and 2025 – and how can we measure progress and be accountable?
Optional Roundtable Discussion

Facilitators and scribes will be present at each table to engage participants in dialogue and record feedback.

Tables designated by working group themes or open topic discussions.