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Statement From the President

Dear Friends,

Since I first set foot on The University of Toledo campus, I have felt warmly welcomed by this institution and the Toledo community.

In November, I asked Dr. Willie McKether to lead the development of UT’s first Strategic Diversity Plan to ensure that all members of the University community feel that same sense of belonging.

Throughout the past eight months, thousands of members of this University and this community have had a challenging and constructive conversation about the ways we can all do more to see the strengths in our differences. This document is the result.

This plan is an outline of the findings of those discussions. It shows where we are strong, and it makes very clear where we have more work to do.

And we are starting immediately.

Also included in the Strategic Diversity Plan are goals and strategies designed to help us achieve the cultural changes we need to make. Beginning on July 1, Dr. McKether will begin his new role as UT’s first Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion. It will be his responsibility to coordinate the implementation of these strategies with the help of members of the University and through engagement with our many external publics.

This document is an important step forward, but much work remains ahead of us. I look forward to taking this journey together.

Sincerely,

Sharon L. Gaber, Ph.D.
President
The University of Toledo
The University of Toledo
Mission Statement

The mission of The University of Toledo is to improve the human condition; to advance knowledge through excellence in learning, discovery and engagement; and to serve as a diverse, student-centered public metropolitan research university.

The core values are:

1. **Compassion, Professionalism and Respect:** Treat every individual with kindness, dignity and care; consider the thoughts and ideas of others inside and outside of the University with a strong commitment to exemplary personal and institutional altruism, accountability, integrity and honor;

2. **Discovery, Learning and Communication:** Vigorously pursue and widely share new knowledge; expand the understanding of existing knowledge; develop the knowledge, skills and competencies of students, faculty, staff and the community while promoting a culture of lifelong learning;

3. **Diversity, Integrity and Teamwork:** Create an environment that values and fosters diversity; earn the trust and commitment of colleagues and the communities served; provide a collaborative and supportive work environment, based upon stewardship and advocacy, that adheres to the highest ethical standards;

4. **Engagement, Outreach and Service:** Provide services that meet students’ and regional needs and where possible exceed expectations; be a global resource and the partner of choice for education, individual development and health care, as well as a center of excellence for cultural, athletic and other events;

5. **Excellence, Focus and Innovation:** Strive, individually and collectively, to achieve the highest level of focus, quality and pride in all endeavors; continuously improve operations; engage in reflective planning and innovative risk-taking in an environment of academic freedom and responsibility; and

6. **Wellness, Healing and Safety:** Promote the physical and mental well-being and safety of others, including students, faculty and staff; provide the highest levels of health promotion, disease prevention, treatment and healing possible for those in need within the community and around the world.
Dear Colleagues,

I am pleased to have led the University through this historic milestone by completing our first Strategic Diversity Plan. As UT’s first Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion, I look forward to working with the campus community as we begin implementation of the plan this summer.

This moment in the University’s history could not have occurred without the vision and foresight of President Sharon Gaber. In addition to President Gaber’s unwavering support and encouragement, the volunteer Ad Hoc Diversity Advisory Committee played a pivotal role in helping to bring this project to fruition. And for certain, it was our amazing students, faculty and staff that made the process work.

As a cultural anthropologist, my methodological approach always includes a focus on the lived experiences of the people involved in my work. Their voices take center stage in the conclusions I draw and the inferences I make. In this diversity plan, while recognizing the critical importance of numerical data, I have included important student, faculty and staff voices; as many as I could in a way that added value to important themes that emerged from the data.

I look forward to this important work.

Willie McKether, Ph.D.
Special Assistant to the President for Diversity
Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion (Beginning July 1)
What We Mean by Inclusion and Diversity

One of the first tasks of the Ad Hoc Diversity Committee included defining diversity and inclusion. What initially appeared to be a straightforward task turned out to be a lengthy and critically important first step in our work.

This effort was so important. It was one of our first tasks in working together as a team, and it also helped us to understand the job ahead of us. Once we agreed on a common language that we felt comfortable with, both statements were vetted with the campus community at an Ad Hoc Committee-sponsored event during the University’s first Diversity Month celebration in April, an expansion of Diversity Week that was inspired by the Ad Hoc Diversity Advisory Committee and endorsed by President Gaber.

Diversity

Diversity is a core value of The University of Toledo. As a scholarly community that encourages diversity of thought as reflected in our broad array of disciplines, we embrace the many things in life that makes us different. The University welcomes people of all racial, ethnic, cultural, socioeconomic, national and international backgrounds. We embrace diversity of pedagogy, religion, age, ability, sexual orientation, gender identity/expression, and political affiliation. Diversity is essential to our ability to survive and thrive. Every individual is a necessary asset, and we demonstrate this every day in our policies, practices, and operating procedures.

Inclusion

An inclusive environment provides opportunity for full participation in the life of the University by each of its members. The inclusive university embraces differences and fosters a sense of belonging among all its members, including faculty, staff, students, and the community.
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Methodology and Data Findings

Data for this Diversity Plan is comprised of two sources:

1. University institutional data
   A. Faculty
   B. Students
   C. Staff

2. Feedback from town hall meetings and a University-wide diversity assessment survey that included students, faculty, staff and members of the Toledo community.
1. UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL DATA

A1 – Faculty Institutional Data: 2011 - 2015

Using the base years of 2011 to 2015, University institutional data in Table 1 below show that faculty numbers decreased by 131, or 7.83 percent, from 2011 to 2015. Within that decrease, however, the three ethnic groups with the largest decreases were Race and Ethnicity Unknown (down 35.29 percent), Black or African American (down 15.71 percent), and White (down 9.67 percent). See Appendix A for ethnic group descriptions. During the time period, the gap between male and female faculty decreased from 11.8 percent in 2011 to 9.6 percent in 2015. See Appendix B and C for faculty demographics by gender and ethnicity. For females, the three ethnic groups with the largest decreases include Black or African American (-5 employees), Nonresident Alien (-4 employees), and White (-46 employees). For males, the three ethnic groups with the largest decreases include Asian (-13 employees), Black or African American (-6 employees) and White (-84 employees).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Alien</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Ethnicity Unknown</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>-130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>-131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1: UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO FACULTY ETHNICITY 2011 – 2015

Source: Office of Institutional Research

The years 2011 to 2015 were selected to show both change over time and to provide a recent historical context related to faculty, staff and students at The University of Toledo. Fall 2015 provides a base from which new numerical goals are assessed against and is the most recent semester to demonstrate a fall to fall analysis.
A review of the 2010 United States Census of demographic data for Ohio, Lucas County, and the City of Toledo and The University of Toledo’s Fall 2015 headcount data in Table 2 below shows a gap (or difference) exists between the University and Ohio, including Black or African American (-8.4 percent), White (-2.3 percent), Two or More Races (-1.8 percent), and Hispanic or Latino (-.4 percent).

When compared to Lucas County, the three ethnic groups with a University-local environment gap include Black or African American (-15.2 percent), Hispanic or Latino (-3.4 percent), and Two or More Races (-2.8 percent). The Toledo City comparison shows that the three ethnic groups with the largest University-local environment gap include Black or African American (-23.4 percent), Hispanic or Latino (4.7 percent) and Two or More Races (-3.6 percent). While the recruitment area for faculty is worldwide, this data provides a snapshot of the local environment.

---

**TABLE 2: FALL 2015 UT FACULTY HEADCOUNT AND 2010 CENSUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Ohio</th>
<th>Lucas County</th>
<th>Toledo City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>Female: 51.20%</td>
<td>Male: 48.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.20% (+0.30)</td>
<td>0.30% (+0.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
<td>1.70% (+8.90)</td>
<td>1.5% (+9.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>12.20% (-8.40)</td>
<td>19.00% (-15.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>3.10% (-0.40)</td>
<td>6.10% (-3.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Alien</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Ethnicity Unknown</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>2.10% (-1.80)</td>
<td>3.10% (-2.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>78.80%</td>
<td>81.10% (-2.30)</td>
<td>71.00% (+7.80)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research

---

*In this analysis as well as the Student and Staff analysis in this plan, no assumption is made that Ohio, Lucas County or Toledo City are the exclusive areas from which University faculty, staff and students are recruited. Rather, this analysis is primarily intended to describe the extent to which the University reflects the populations it most serves.*

Institutional data in Table 3 below show that the University’s overall student population decreased by 2,252 students, or 9.95 percent, from Fall 2011 to Fall 2015. The three ethnic groups with largest decreases were Black or African American (down 32.57 percent), Race and Ethnicity Unknown (down 27.59 percent) and White (down 10 percent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY – STUDENT</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>3273</td>
<td>2207</td>
<td>-1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Alien</td>
<td>1302</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Ethnicity Unknown</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>-266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15168</td>
<td>13589</td>
<td>-1579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,623</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,371</strong></td>
<td><strong>-2,252</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A review of the 2010 Ohio, Lucas County and City of Toledo demographic data with The University of Toledo’s Fall 2015 headcount show in Table 4 below that compared to the State of Ohio, the ethnic groups in which the University lags behind are White (-14.4 percent), Black or African American (-1.4 percent) and American Indian (-.18 percent). When compared to Lucas County, the three ethnic groups with the largest University-local environment gap include Black or African American (-8.2 percent), White (-4.3 percent) and Hispanic/Latino (-1.8 percent). The Toledo City comparison shows that the three ethnic groups with the largest gap are Black or African American (-16.4 percent), Hispanic or Latino (-3.1 percent), and Two or More Races (1.3 percent).

### TABLE 4: FALL 2015 UT STUDENT HEADCOUNT AND 2010 CENSUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th></th>
<th>Student</th>
<th></th>
<th>Student</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Population: 11,536,504</td>
<td></td>
<td>Population: 441,815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.20% (-)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3% (-0.10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>1.70% (+1.30)</td>
<td>1.5% (+1.50)</td>
<td>1.1% (+1.90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>2207</td>
<td>10.80%</td>
<td>12.20% (-1.40)</td>
<td>19.0% (-8.20)</td>
<td>27.2% (-16.40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.10% (+1.20)</td>
<td>6.1% (-1.80)</td>
<td>7.4% (-3.10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Alien</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Ethnicity Unknown</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>2.10% (+0.50)</td>
<td>3.1% (-0.50)</td>
<td>3.9% (-1.30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>13,589</td>
<td>66.70%</td>
<td>81.10% (-14.40)</td>
<td>71.0% (-4.30)</td>
<td>61.4% (+5.30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20,371</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>Female: 51.20%</td>
<td>Male: 48.80%</td>
<td>Female: 51.60%</td>
<td>Male: 48.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research
1. UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL DATA

B3 – Student Achievement Data

Student retention data in Table 5 below, measured by fall to fall return rates, show that during the five-year period of 2010 to 2015, with exception of the 2011 to 2012 time period, overall student retention rates showed gradual improvement at The University of Toledo. Noting this exception, overall retention increased from 65.1 percent from 2010 to 2011 to 68 percent from 2012 to 2013 to 69.45 percent from 2013 to 2014 to 71.86 from 2014 to 2015. However, the improved retention of University students was not achieved across all ethnic groups during the five-year period.

### TABLE 5: UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO STUDENT RETENTION RATES 2010 - 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>88.30%</td>
<td>66.70%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>89.29%</td>
<td>89.23%</td>
<td>84.51%</td>
<td>76.56%</td>
<td>87.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>44.59%</td>
<td>37.14%</td>
<td>41.99%</td>
<td>47.39%</td>
<td>44.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>62.89%</td>
<td>57.31%</td>
<td>56.60%</td>
<td>63.35%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Alien</td>
<td>77.08%</td>
<td>88.24%</td>
<td>88.64%</td>
<td>82.56%</td>
<td>88.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Ethnicity Unknown</td>
<td>68.37%</td>
<td>60.27%</td>
<td>84.85%</td>
<td>75.76%</td>
<td>67.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>55.66%</td>
<td>48.28%</td>
<td>52.59%</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
<td>61.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>71.93%</td>
<td>71.58%</td>
<td>76.15%</td>
<td>75.91%</td>
<td>80.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>65.10%</strong></td>
<td><strong>62.35%</strong></td>
<td><strong>68.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>69.45%</strong></td>
<td><strong>71.86%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research
The uneven retention rates in Table 6 show that while the overall retention increased from 65.1 percent from the 2010 to 2011 time period to 72 percent for the 2014 to 2015 time period, and that while White student retention increased by 8.33 percent, other University ethnic groups did not fare as well. In particular, the retention rates of Asian (-2.19 percent), Race and Ethnicity Unknown (-.83 percent) and Hispanic/Latino (-.39 percent) students decreased during the same time period. A closer examination of the 2014 to 2015 time period, however, shows an even greater disparity in retention at the University. A comparison of the overall retention rate of 72 percent for 2014 to 2015 to each ethnic group further highlights the ethnic retention gap at the University. When compared to the overall 72 percent retention rate, the ethnic groups with the largest spread and hence worse retention rates at the University are Black or African American (-26.92 percent), Hispanic or Latino (-9.4 percent), and Two or More Races (-10.6 percent).

**TABLE 6: RETENTION RATES OVER TIME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>2010 to 2011</th>
<th>2014 to 2015</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Compare to Avg.: 14 to 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>88.30%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>11.70%</td>
<td>28.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>89.29%</td>
<td>87.10%</td>
<td>-2.19%</td>
<td>15.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>44.59%</td>
<td>44.94%</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
<td>-26.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>62.89%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>-0.39%</td>
<td>-9.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Alien</td>
<td>77.08%</td>
<td>88.00%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>16.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Ethnicity Unknown</td>
<td>68.37%</td>
<td>67.54%</td>
<td>-0.83%</td>
<td>-4.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>55.66%</td>
<td>61.26%</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
<td>-10.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>71.93%</td>
<td>80.26%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>65.10%</strong></td>
<td><strong>71.86%</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.76%</strong></td>
<td>8.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Office of Institutional Research*
1. UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL DATA

B4 – Graduation Rates by Ethnicity

While retention rates as an achievement measure show student progression from year to year, student graduation rates provide an indication of student success and reflect the University’s ability to successfully move students to graduation. Table 7 shows that the average University cohort six-year graduation rate for years 2010 through 2015 is 44 percent for all students.

TABLE 7: SIX-YEAR GRADUATION RATES BY ETHNICITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cohort Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.44%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.46%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.45%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.46%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.44%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.41%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.44%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research

However, of the reported six-year graduation rates, the graduation rates of three ethnic groups fall below the University cohort average, including African American (20 percent, with a low of 18 percent in 2015), Hispanic (37 percent, with a low of 31 percent in 2014), and Unknown Race (37 percent, with a low of 30 percent in 2012). In addition, whereas the graduation rates of all ethnic groups fluctuated during the six-year period, in 2015 all ethnic groups’ rates either increased or remained the same except for African Americans, which saw a 0.6 percent decrease from 2010 to 2015, and Two or More Races, which saw a 0.33 percent decrease from 2012 to 2015.
1. UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL DATA
C1 – STAFF INSTITUTIONAL DATA: 2011-2015

Institutional data in Table 8 show that staff levels increased by 169 (3.7 percent). Despite the overall increase in staff during this time period, staff members in three ethnic groups slightly decreased, including American Indian or Alaskan Native (down 25 percent), Asian (down 15.53 percent), and Race and Ethnicity Unknown (down 15.11 percent). Staffing levels increased in each of the other ethnic groups.

TABLE 8: UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO STAFF ETHNICITY 2011 - 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Alien</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Ethnicity Unknown</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3476</td>
<td>3569</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4567</td>
<td>4736</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research
1. UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL DATA

C2 – Fall 2015 Staff Demographics and the 2010 U.S. Census

“I think you are hitting the nail right on the head. I think there are so many hungry staff on this campus on every single level… I think we are willing to get our job done and take on these responsibilities. By you involving as many people as possible, I think that will do more good than anything else.

– Staff Member, Town Hall Session

A review of 2010 Ohio, Lucas County and City of Toledo demographic data with The University of Toledo’s Fall 2015 headcount show in Table 9 that compared to the State of Ohio, the three ethnic groups with the largest University-local environment gap between staff demographics and the State of Ohio include White (-5.7 percent) and Two or More Races (-1.4 percent). When compared to Lucas County, the three ethnic groups with the largest gap include Black or African American (-6.6 percent), and an equal gap (-2.4 percent) for Hispanic/Latino and Two or More Races. The Toledo City comparison show the three ethnic groups with the largest gaps include Black or African American (-14.8 percent), Hispanic/Latino (-3.7 percent), and Two or More Races (-3.2 percent).

TABLE 9: FALL 2015 UT STAFF HEADCOUNT AND 2010 CENSUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Ohio</th>
<th>Lucas County</th>
<th>Toledo City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,736</td>
<td>11,536,504</td>
<td>441,815</td>
<td>287,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.20% (-)</td>
<td>0.30% (-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>1.70% (+2.0)</td>
<td>1.50% (+2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>12.40%</td>
<td>12.20% (+.2.0)</td>
<td>19.00% (-6.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>3.10% (+.6.0)</td>
<td>6.10% (-2.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident alien</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Ethnicity Unknown</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>2.10% (-1.40)</td>
<td>3.10% (-2.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3,569</td>
<td>75.40%</td>
<td>81.10% (-5.70)</td>
<td>71.00% (+4.40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research
CAMPUS AND COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

Town Hall Meetings

A total of eight town hall sessions were held between Jan. 26 and Feb. 4, 2016. Of the eight sessions, three were comprised of students from the Main and Health Science Campuses, two were comprised of staff, two were comprised of faculty, and one was held for the community at the Kent Public Branch of the Toledo-Lucas County Library system. Approximately 300 stakeholders in total participated in the town hall sessions. Each of the town halls was facilitated where participants were asked to respond to questions related to diversity, inclusion and equity. Each of the town halls was audio recorded, transcribed and analyzed for themes and common responses. In addition to the prompts, participants were encouraged and allowed to include comments about matters not addressed specifically by the facilitator.

Diversity Assessment Survey

During the 2016 semester, an anonymous university-wide diversity assessment survey was administered to faculty, staff and students. The survey was developed, in part, based on results from the town hall meetings as well as institutional knowledge related to diversity. The anonymous diversity assessment survey was comprised of a series of open-ended and close-ended questions designed to learn how students, faculty and staff feel about and perceive inclusion and diversity, as well as to solicit their opinions on strategies for addressing these issues. The survey was open to the campus community for 25 days between Feb. 23 and March 18, 2016 and included an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant version. In addition to the online version, paper copies of the survey were made available at eight locations throughout Main Campus, Health Science Campus and Scott Park Campus. 4,150 students, faculty and staff members participated in the survey, representing an overall 17 percent participation rate. For the University’s faculty, staff and student population of 24,607, a sample of 1,023 respondents was necessary to have an appropriate sample size (Salant and Dillman, 1994).
2. CAMPUS AND COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

TOWN HALL AND SURVEY SUMMARY DATA

FACULTY

45 University faculty across all colleges participated in two different town hall sessions. One session was held on the Main Campus and the second was held on Health Science Campus. Each session was facilitated, recorded and data analyzed to determine themes. See Appendix D for listing of themes that emerged from the discussions. In each of the sessions, faculty members were asked an identical set of questions centered around the topics of diversity, inclusion, equity and their opinions on how to address these areas where warranted. As appropriate, other related topics were allowed and discussed during the sessions. In addition to the town hall forums, all faculty members also were invited to participate in an online diversity assessment survey. Of the University’s 1,513 faculty members, 624 (41 percent) participated in the survey. The survey instrument was comprised of nearly 40 questions, including demographic questions. Of the 611 faculty members who responded to the campus location question, 72 percent said they spent the majority of their time on Main Campus, 25 percent on the Health Science Campus, and 1 percent at the Center for the Visual Arts located on the Toledo Museum of Art Campus.

STUDENTS

170 students participated in three town hall sessions during a two-week period between Jan. 27 and Feb. 3, 2016. Two of the town hall sessions were held on Main Campus and one session was held on Health Science Campus. The first town hall was an invited session comprised of multicultural student leaders (presidents of student organizations), and the second and third sessions were open to all students at the University. Each session was facilitated, audio recorded and data analyzed to determine themes. See Appendix D for listing of themes that emerged from the sessions. In addition to the town hall sessions, all University students were invited to participate in an online diversity assessment survey. Of the University’s 18,556 student population, 2,270 (12.2 percent) students completed the survey. Of the students who completed the survey, 597 (26 percent) were graduate students and 1,673 (75 percent) were undergraduate students.

STAFF

75 University staff members participated in two different town hall sessions. One session was held on Main Campus and the other session was held on Health Science Campus. Each session was facilitated, audio recorded and data was analyzed to determine themes. See Appendix D for summary of themes. In addition to the town hall sessions, all staff members at the University were invited to participate in an online diversity assessment survey. Of the 1,513 staff members employed at the University, 1,272 (84 percent) completed the survey. Of the 1,259 staff members who responded to the campus location question, 600 (49 percent) said they spent the majority of their time on Main Campus, 618 on the Health Science Campus (49 percent), four at the Lake Erie Center, and two at Scott Park Campus.

3 This is a summary of highlights from the town halls and online survey. To facilitate the analysis herein, a few tables from the survey are included. By late fall 2016, a more comprehensive set of survey data will be posted to the diversity and inclusion website. Other questions should be directed to the author of this report: Dr. Willie L. McKether at willie.mckether@utoledo.edu.
2. CAMPUS AND COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

INCLUSION EXPERIENCES

“The student body is diverse, but I don’t think our administrative structure is diverse at all. I think we’re way too white and we’re way too male at the upper levels of our administration. If what inclusion means is having a voice in decision-making bodies and structures, we have a long way to go. A few women deans and a woman president of course helps, but it doesn’t change the structure.”

– Female Faculty Member, Online Survey

FACULTY

On the scale of 1 to 7, 407 of 566 faculty members (72 percent) rated 5 (134 responses), 6 (153 responses) or 7 (120 responses) as feeling included at The University of Toledo. The mean response was 5.15, with a 1.56 standard deviation. When asked why they gave the above rankings, of the faculty who did not feel a sense of inclusion, 88 faculty (15 percent) recorded the prompt, “The University pays little attention to what I think and feel,” 87 (15 percent) recorded the prompt, “I feel excluded from opportunities available only to an ‘inner circle’ where skill and talent are not most important,” and 49 (9 percent) recorded the prompt, “There is not strategy of inclusion for people like me.” The comments and themes centered around exclusion largely focused around faculty feeling excluded from opportunities for upward mobility related to a race and gender-based structure tilted in favor of white males. One faculty member said for example, “Since coming to UT, I’ve been very disturbed by the old boy’s club attitude amongst both administrators and senior faculty. This old boys club has tended to conserve racial and gender prerogatives, to say nothing of class.” It is worth noting that these feelings were raised by faculty across all colleges.

Not only did faculty themes center around race and gender, they also included feeling of exclusion based on disability as well as sexual orientation. One faculty member said in a town hall session, “…the University is far from inclusive toward people with disabilities. I think that it’s better in general than it was when I got here, but only incrementally. I am not sure I could identify all the problems I see, but there were still serious issues around accessibility of course materials.”
STUDENTS

Many multicultural student leaders, as well as non-student leaders, expressed strong feelings of being historically excluded, marginalized and voices ignored by The University of Toledo. One female student leader of two organizations said:

“\textbf{The University does not care. This is not the first time we have had diversity talks… most of the largest traditions on campus are not with multicultural organizations on campus. They have nothing to do with minorities. So then you don’t have minorities turn out. It’s segregation because those things don’t attract us. Some are really great, but they either don’t seek participation from minority organizations or minority organizations don’t know.}”

In addition, these students said they did not feel included in decision making with and among majority White Greek and non-Greek lettered organizations, and that they did not feel their unique cultures were very well understood or respected. The leaders expressed concern not only that majority White students retain leadership and control over organizations such as Campus Activity Programming (CAP) and the Student Governmentootnote{These students did not suggest they were precluded from joining these campus organizations.}, but that campus-wide activities are geared toward the interests of the White students on campus, as reflected in the student’s comment.

The exclusion from mainstream university life, defined in part as exclusion from leadership opportunities in major student organizations, resources, campus programming, alienation and marginalization by majority White students, has resulted in many multicultural students living a university life where their survival strategy is centered around life in a bubble, a segregated life that affords them respectability and a sense of belonging. Another student added:

“\textbf{… I feel like I am included but only within a certain population in the University. I feel like I am only included in the minority population. I don’t think I am that included in the entire University as a whole. Even though I feel like I try to do as much as I could to be completely included, it seems like even when I go to certain events, I am still pushed to the side, looked at like, oh man you came through? That’s crazy. I don’t want people to think it’s so crazy that I am going to a certain event because I am brown.}”

Students also expressed concern about the divisiveness among majority White student organizations and multicultural student organizations. These student leaders suggested that there is little incentive as well as interest among student organizations to collaborate and/or support others’ events.
“

Even though Dr. Sharon Gaber is a female in charge of the University, the University is still predominantly a white, old, male environment. When I attend senior administration meetings and look around the table, I think to myself, “How in the world do these old white men know what the students and staff want?” The men promote their old-timer friends based on relationships instead of knowledge and skills.

– Staff Member, Town Hall Session

STAFF

On the scale of 1 to 7, 769 staff members (67 percent) rated 5 (275 responses), 6 (275 responses), or 7 (219 responses) as their feelings of inclusion at The University of Toledo. The mean response was 5.04 with a 1.56 standard deviation. When asked why they gave the above rankings, of the staff members who do not feel a sense of inclusion, 184 staff (16 percent) recorded the prompt, “The University pays little attention to what I think and feel,” 144 (12 percent) recorded the prompt, “I feel excluded from opportunities available only to an ‘inner circle’ where skill and talent are not most important,” and 84 (7 percent) recorded the prompt, “There is not strategy of inclusion for people like me.” Staff comments and themes centered around exclusion largely focused around staff not having opportunities for upward mobility related to the University structure that makes it difficult for promotion unless someone in a position leaves or retires, too few opportunities to network with other staff members in order to establish a sense of belonging, and the personal nature in which promotions are granted through an inner circle to which they do not have access. One staff member said, for example, “The environment is a good old boys club, and I am not a boy.” While staff members indicated they felt mostly included in their own departments, they felt less included within the University as a whole.
2. CAMPUS AND COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

DIVERSITY AND DIVERSITY TRAINING

“I came for a number of reasons, but certainly I came to listen and be uncomfortable, as somebody who is starting conversations about race and racism in her class after avoiding it for many years because it was so uncomfortable and I did not feel qualified to do it. I realized part of it was me feeling uncomfortable, too … I am really good at teaching to middle class students because I was a middle class student.”

— Faculty Member, Town Hall Session

FACULTY

391 (67 percent) of faculty respondents said they had participated in diversity training and 191 (32 percent) said they have never participated in diversity training at The University of Toledo. Of the 188 faculty members who said they had not received training, 90 (49 percent) said they would not want to receive such training. Of the respondents who had not received diversity training, 59 (31 percent) said it was never offered to them, 57 (30 percent) said they were not aware of diversity training at the University, 24 (13 percent) said they didn’t need it, 11 (6 percent) said they never thought about it. In response to the question “What can be done to improve the understanding and respect for “others” at The University of Toledo” for faculty, staff, students and administration, the faculty ranked number 1, required diversity training/instruction for all incoming students, faculty, staff and administrators, and ranked number 2, required diversity training/instruction for all current students, faculty, staff and administrators. In the survey, faculty suggested the best way to structure diversity training is schedule a few hours in a single session followed by discussions and forums as well as monthly discussions and forums.

STUDENTS

Among the students, there was a clear distinction in student views about diversity and inclusion among students who attended the town hall forums and students who completed the online survey. Students who attended the student forums spoke clearly about feeling excluded and marginalized based on characteristics such as religion, sexual orientation, gender and gender identity, disability, and skin color. One female student said, for example:

“I am a lesbian and I know I do not look it, so there are times when I am in my classes and people make comments and I don’t know if I am comfortable outing myself to say that is not right what you are saying, but when I go to Spectrum I do not need to worry about those comments. I know I can be comfortable and I can learn more about the community because there’s so much beyond what you see. There’s a lot to learn about other people and how they express themselves and how they view the world.”

“I do feel like we have a bubble and hang out with our groups, but there are certain events held on campus where I don’t feel like they fit everybody in. For this to be such a diverse campus, I feel like I should be able to relate to certain events that are happening. Maybe like the opening welcoming events. I feel like they are directed towards a certain group of people. I wish that they would be more open to ideas from all groups like BSU, LSU, Spectrum, so we can all have fun.”

— Student, at Student Forum
Another female student expressed discomfort when being stared at because of her religious beliefs, saying:

“I would say as a Muslim woman who wears a hijab or head scarf, I honestly feel people sometimes look at me like I have three heads. I know people look at with me with a fearful look around here. I don’t know if it has to do with a lack of knowledge, which I can understand, or just bigotry, but I do feel like sometimes I am stared at like I am about to commit this big crime. All eyes are on me. I get really strange looks and sometimes ignorant comments.”

A male student recounts moments when his ethnicity was compared to a fictional Hollywood movie:

“So I am from India. People are so misinformed about my country. They ask, is ‘Slumdog Millionaire’ like India? Random people have come up to me and asked about my religion, about the movie, do we live like that? Sometimes, yeah, it’s okay. You can answer that. But it’s not like always. You can explain to your friends, but when you have random people just coming up to you and asking you stuff like that, it’s not comfortable.”

During the open town hall session from which the above student voices were collected, students, in particular non-White students, said they felt diversity and diversity-related issues at the University were primarily the responsibility of minority student populations. While this point of view may not reflect the reality, students pointed out that the vast majority of attendees at the session to discuss diversity were largely students from minority populations at the University. Even though students who attended the forum agreed that some type of required diversity training for students would help address ethnic and cultural misunderstandings, biases and stereotypes, not all University students agree with the importance or need for diversity training. For example, an online student wrote:

“When the University attempts to help students with diversity issues, it causes more harm than good because it shows how everyone is different. If the University doesn’t engage in diversity awareness or training, it gives the impression that everyone is equal and the same. Demonstrating diversity only allows for diversification issues to escalate.”

Incidentally, the overwhelmingly majority of invited staff and faculty who participated in invited town hall sessions were from minority populations.
Of the 2,105 students who responded to the question asking whether they had received diversity training at The University of Toledo, 1,390 (66 percent) said they had not received diversity training and 715 said they had received some form of training at the University. Of the students who have never received diversity training, 928 (68 percent) said they would not like to receive such training. One such student said, “I don’t remember it being offered, but even if it was, I probably wouldn’t take it up, because I think I am sufficiently culturally competent,” while another student lamented, “Diversity training is the equivalent of educating someone not to be a jerk. While honorable, I would like to think that I am not, in fact, a jerk and am culturally aware enough not to offend anyone.” Of the 1,377 students who had not participated in diversity training at the University, 379 (28 percent) said they were not aware such training existed, 333 (24 percent) said it was never offered to them, 262 (19 percent) said they never thought about it, 242 (18 percent) said they did not need diversity training, 92 (7 percent) reported other, and 69 (5 percent) said they did not have time for diversity training. In response to the question “What can be done to improve the understanding and respect for ‘others’ at The University of Toledo” for faculty, staff, students and administration, students ranked number 1, required diversity training/instruction for all incoming students and ranked second that diversity training should be optional for all current students. Students, however, said diversity training should be required for all incoming as well as current faculty, staff and administrators. In the survey, students suggested the best way to structure diversity training is hold monthly discussions/forums, followed by a few hours in a single session followed by discussions and forums.

“I came from an institution where there wasn’t a lot of diversity, so coming to The University of Toledo it was breathtaking just to see the diversity on campus. I was pleased with that. But when you start getting engrossed into the campus, you see there still needs to be more diversity engagement for student’s sake, for faculty’s sake, for everyone’s sake. When you are sitting around a roundtable discussion similar to this one, everyone is going to bring different ideas and thoughts which are going to be great not only for that particular department, but for the University in general.

– Staff Member, Staff Town Hall Session

STAFF

910 (78 percent) of staff respondents said they had participated in diversity training and 257 (22 percent) said they had not participated in diversity training at The University of Toledo. Of the staff who had not received training, only 99 (39 percent) said they would not want to receive diversity training while 154 (61 percent) said they would like to receive diversity training. Of the staff members who had not received diversity training, 97 (38 percent) said it was never offered too them, 71 (28 percent) said they were not aware of such training, 35 (14 percent) provided other reason, 34 (13 percent) said they never thought about it, 14 (5 percent) said they didn’t need it, and 4 (1 percent) said they did not have time. In response to the question “What can be done to improve the understanding and respect for ‘others’ at The University of Toledo” for faculty, staff, students and administration, the staff ranked number 1, required diversity training/instruction for all incoming students, faculty, staff and administrators, and ranked number 2, required diversity training/instruction for all current students, faculty, staff and administrators. In the survey, staff suggested the best way to structure diversity training is schedule a few hours in a single session followed by discussions and forums.
The Path Forward

What follow are specific goals and strategies to strengthen a campus culture of diversity and inclusion. The six goals and 44 strategies identify a responsible unit, time period to accomplish the task, and recommendations to measure success. Further, it is important to emphasize that the Strategic Diversity Plan is a living document. Revisions and updates will be made annually, and the plan will be monitored throughout the year, to ensure its goals and strategies reflect the realities of campus and community life at The University of Toledo.
GOAL Timelines

Immediate: 1 to 5 months

Short: 6 to 12 months

Medium: 13 to 24 months

Long: 25 to 36 months

ASSUMPTION: The primary assumption associated with this University Diversity Plan is that the University will allocate resources to establish the appropriate infrastructure for maximum operating efficiency.

The goals and strategies described in this Diversity Plan will focus on the following four areas of the University in order to provide focus and direction for the plan:

• Leadership and Accountability

• Education and Awareness

• Recruitment and Retention

• Community Engagement
Goal 1

Increase the student, faculty and staff experience of inclusiveness, equity and respect incrementally each year over the next five years.

**STRATEGY 1:** Ensure commitment to diversity at the highest level of the institution through approval of this comprehensive Diversity Plan via a resolution of The University of Toledo Board of Trustees.

  RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Office of the President.
  TIME PERIOD: Immediate: 1 to 5 months.
  MEASURE: Plan approved and resolution passed.

**STRATEGY 2:** Incorporate diversity as a performance dimension within the annual employee performance appraisal process for department chairs, deans, directors and administrative staff.

  RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Office of the President, Provost and Human Resources.
  TIME PERIOD: Long: 25 to 36 months.
  MEASURE: How well employee or unit engaged in efforts to promote and support diversity and inclusion.

**STRATEGY 3:** Establish and publish a comprehensive Diversity Calendar of events, celebrations, historic dates, trainings and holidays.

  RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Dean of Students and Marketing/Communications.
  TIME PERIOD: Short: 6 to 12 months.
  MEASURE: Calendar published.

**STRATEGY 4:** Create a Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion position.

  RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Office of the President and Human Resources.
  TIME PERIOD: Immediate: 1 to 5 months.
  MEASURE: Position created and person hired.

**STRATEGY 5:** Establish a new Diversity Council to advise President and Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion.

  RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion.
  TIME PERIOD: Short: 6 to 12 months.
  Measure: Council comprised and functioning.

**STRATEGY 6:** Create multiple required segments in the orientation course labeled “Discovering Diversity and Inclusion at UT” for all incoming freshmen beginning with the Fall 2017 semester.

  RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Created by Department of Sociology and Anthropology and vetted by Diversity Council.
  TIME PERIOD: Short: 6 to 12 months.
  MEASURE: Course offered each semester beginning Fall 2017.
**STRATEGY 7:** All disciplines add required segment in a course that highlights the rich diversity of that discipline.

- RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Each discipline within The University of Toledo.
- TIME PERIOD: Medium: 13 to 24 months.
- MEASURE: Diversity of discipline reflected in new segments.

**STRATEGY 8:** Create a required diversity course titled “Discovering Diversity and Inclusion at UT” for all new and current staff, faculty and administrative members.

- RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Course created by Department of Sociology and Anthropology and vetted by Diversity Council. The Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion will add other University departments as appropriate.
- TIME PERIOD: Short: 6 to 12 months.
- MEASURE: Course offered each semester beginning Fall 2017 semester.

**STRATEGY 9:** Provide required training to all faculty and staff members who teach “Discovering Diversity and Inclusion at UT,” as well as resident assistants and graduate assistants.

- RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion.
- TIME PERIOD: Medium: 13 to 24 months.
- MEASURE: Trained faculty and staff.

**STRATEGY 10:** Create opportunities for open forums on diversity for students, faculty and staff. A monthly forum “Dialogues on Diversity” will focus on a contemporary issue or topic selected by the Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion.

- RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion, Dean of Students and a subcommittee to identify issues.
- TIME PERIOD: Short: 6 to 12 months.
- MEASURE: Forums held monthly beginning Fall 2016.

**STRATEGY 11:** Increase collaboration among student organizations by assessing upcoming events of student groups, identifying events with similar themes, and encouraging collaboration and involvement across student groups.

- RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion and Office of Multicultural Student Success.
- TIME PERIOD: Short: 6 to 12 months.
- MEASURE: Successful collaborative programs.

**STRATEGY 12:** Establish endowed professorships in the names of prominent University of Toledo minority alumni.

- RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Division of Advancement.
- TIME PERIOD: Medium: 13 to 24 months.
- MEASURE: Endowed chairs established.

**STRATEGY 13:** Establish and fund Diversity Speakers Series.

- RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion.
- TIME PERIOD: Medium: 13 to 24 months.
- MEASURE: Prominent multicultural speakers visit campus.
STRATEGY 14: Ensure prominent minorities are considered as part of ongoing awards of honorary degrees, outstanding alumni and other prestigious awards.

RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Office of the President, Provost, administrative leaders and Faculty Senate.

TIME PERIOD: Short: 6 to 12 months.

MEASURE: Accolades awarded.

STRATEGY 15: Ensure campus facilities are accessible and safe by conducting annual tour of campus facilities to ensure accessibility and reviewing policies and procedures with ADA Compliance Officer, the Disability Studies Program and students with disabilities.

RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion, ADA Compliance Officer and Disability Studies Program.

TIME PERIOD: Medium: 13 to 24 months.

MEASURE: Facilities are reviewed annually and action plans initiated.

STRATEGY 16: Review campus facilities, policies and procedures with LGBTQA Community to ensure campus facilities are accessible, safe and accommodating to the LGBTQA community.

RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion, Department of Internal Audit and Compliance, and appropriate affinity groups.

TIME PERIOD: Medium: 13 to 24 months.

MEASURE: Facilities are reviewed annually and action plans are initiated.

STRATEGY 17: Review campus facilities, policies and procedures with the Department of Women and Gender Studies to ensure campus facilities are accessible, safe and accommodating to women.

RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion and appropriate affinity groups.

TIME PERIOD: Medium: 13 to 24 months.

MEASURE: Facilities are reviewed annually and action plans initiated.

STRATEGY 18: Conduct an annual Diversity Assessment Survey to monitor progress toward creating an inclusive environment, publicizing all data and findings, and comparing results to baseline data to make additional recommendations.

RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion and Office of Marketing and Communications.

TIME PERIOD: Short: 6 to 12 months.

MEASURE: Survey instruments developed, data collected, and reports published and disseminated.

STRATEGY 19: Establish a diversity mini-grant program that advances diversity for student organizations.

RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion and Dean of Students.

TIME PERIOD: Medium: 13 to 24 months.

MEASURE: Grant program developed and grants awarded.
**STRATEGY 20:** Establish a diversity mini-grant program that advances diversity for staff members.

RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion and staff unions.

TIME PERIOD: Medium: 13 to 24 months.

MEASURE: Grant program developed and grants awarded.

**STRATEGY 21:** All marketing and communication messaging in print, digital, web and video developed at UT needs to ensure they reflect the diversity of the campus as well as to promote inclusion through accessibility. Also, ensure UT’s diversity statement is included on print materials where appropriate.

RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion, Office of Marketing and Communications, and Office of Admissions.

TIME PERIOD: Long: 24 to 26 months.

MEASURE: Promotional materials reflect diversity.

**STRATEGY 22:** Create an awareness of groups focused on religious and spiritual issues and such groups’ attendant traditions at The University of Toledo.

RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Center for Religious Studies, Dean of Students, Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion, and Office of Marketing and Communications.

TIME PERIOD: Medium: 13 to 24 months.

MEASURE: Increased campus awareness of groups focused on religious/spiritual issues as reflected in Diversity Assessment Survey.

**STRATEGY 23:** Create a “Dialogues on Women” monthly discussion to focus on the challenges facing women and to highlight accomplishments.

RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion and the Catharine S. Eberly Center for Women.

TIME PERIOD: Medium: 13 to 24 months.

MEASURE: Dialogues established with good attendance.
Goal 2

Based on Fall 2015 headcounts, incrementally increase the recruitment of minority students, persons with disabilities and other underrepresented students until the enrollment of these students reflects the community in Ohio served by The University of Toledo.

STRATEGY 1: Establish a recruitment strategy targeted at recruiting a diverse undergraduate student population from predominantly Latino and African American communities, as well as people who are disabled and other minority populations as appropriate. The strategy must include provisions to support and enhance programs that invite junior and senior high school students to The University of Toledo.

RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion, Office of Admissions, Dean of Students, Vice Provost for Retention and Undergraduate Studies in collaboration with Latino and Black Faculty and Staff Associations, and Disability Studies Program.

TIME PERIOD: Short: 6 to 12 months.

MEASURE: An effective strategy for the recruitment of a diverse student population launched within six months of development.

STRATEGY 2: Invite guidance counselors from high schools throughout Ohio and Michigan, in particular those from racially and ethnically diverse schools, to The University of Toledo for an orientation. This also should include counselors who work with students who are disabled.

RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion, Office of Admissions and Division of Student Affairs.

TIME PERIOD: Short: 6 to 12 months.

MEASURE: A successful orientation session with guidance counselors.

STRATEGY 3: Establish graduate student recruitment strategy that includes a focus on women, ethnic minorities and other underrepresented groups.

RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion and Dean of the College of Graduate Studies.

TIME PERIOD: Short: 6 to 12 months.

MEASURE: An effective strategy for the recruitment of a diverse student population that is launched within six months of development.
Goal 3

Based on Fall 2014 to Fall 2015 retention rates, increase the rate of retention of minority students, persons with disabilities and underrepresented students by 10 percent within five years through targeted programming for groups with rates of retention below the institutional average.

**STRATEGY 1:** Provide University funding and supportive infrastructure to support and expand the Multicultural Emerging Scholars Program and other Early Arrival, Living Learning Communities, and Tutoring and Mentoring programs with proven success for retaining ethnic minorities and other underrepresented student groups.

- RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Provost, Deans, Division of Student Affairs and Office of Admissions.
- TIME PERIOD: Short: 6 to 12 months.
- MEASURE: Increased retention rates for students who participate in programs.

**STRATEGY 2:** Establish University-wide Retention Task Force comprised of faculty, staff and students to develop retention plan for the University.

- RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Provost, Vice Provost for Retention and Undergraduate Studies, and Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion.
- TIME PERIOD: Medium: 13 to 24 months.
- MEASURE: A comprehensive plan for student retention.

**STRATEGY 3:** Establish fund to support faculty research and initiatives on retention programming.

- RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion.
- TIME PERIOD: Medium: 13 to 24.
- MEASURE: Fund established with measurable goals to support new research and initiatives.
Goal 4

Increase and retain the numbers of faculty who are minorities, women, people with disabilities and veterans over the next five years (goals and specific areas pending).

**STRATEGY 1:** Investigate the faculty hiring of minorities, women, people with disabilities and veterans, including but not limited to STEM areas, to assess whether the University’s hiring is consistent with the available labor pool or has other systemic barriers to the success of such candidates. If any such barriers are found, develop appropriate programs to remove them.

  RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion, Human Resources, and the Provost.

  TIME PERIOD: The assessment of faculty hiring, including STEM areas: Immediate: 1 to 5 months. The development of any appropriate programs that may be needed: Long: 25 to 36 months.

  MEASURE: Program(s) created, as needed, and a resulting increase in minority hiring.

**STRATEGY 2:** Develop college and department-level plans to increase diversity of faculty applicant pools.

  RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion, Provost and Deans.

  TIME PERIOD: Long: 25 to 36.

  MEASURE: Plans created and an increase in qualified, diverse applicant pools.

**STRATEGY 3:** Create system to ensure all faculty hires held in conjunction with Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion for the next five years.

  RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion and Provost.

  TIME PERIOD: Short: 6 to 12 months.

  MEASURE: System created and increased minority hiring.

**STRATEGY 4:** Supplement salaries to attract and retain faculty who are minorities, women, people with disabilities and protected veterans.

  RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion, Office of the President and the Provost.

  TIME PERIOD: Medium: 13 to 24.

  MEASURE: Fund developed.

**STRATEGY 5:** Develop a career development program for faculty and staff, in particular women, minorities and members of other underrepresented groups, to provide an opportunity for them to position themselves for advancement within The University of Toledo.

  RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Office of the President, Office of Equity, Diversity and Community Engagement, Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion, Human Resources, and the Provost.

  TIME PERIOD: Medium: 13 to 24.

  MEASURE: Program in place to track and monitor progress.
STRAIGHT 6: In collaboration with external partners, develop a work-life enhancement program that includes assisting employees with child and elder care needs with facilities to balance demands of work and personal life.

RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion, Human Resources and the Catharine S. Eberly Center for Women.

TIME PERIOD: Medium: 13 to 24 months.

MEASURE: Programs developed and benchmarked against similar programs at peer institutions.

STRAIGHT 7: Create a program that trains colleges and departments about recruitment strategies to attract faculty who have disabilities, are from minority populations or other underrepresented groups.

RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion.

TIME PERIOD: Medium: 13 to 24.

MEASURE: Seminars conducted and resources created including a website and annual report detailing efforts to build a broader pool of faculty candidates.
Goal 5

Increase the number of minorities, persons with disabilities, women and veterans in administrative positions (chair level and above) over the next five years (goals and specific areas pending).

STRATEGY 1: Investigate the hiring of minorities, women, people with disabilities and veterans in administrative positions to assess whether the University’s hiring is consistent with the available labor pool or has other systemic barriers to the success of such candidates. If any such barriers are found, develop appropriate programs to remove them.

RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion, Provost, and Human Resources.

TIME PERIOD: Assessment of administrative position hiring: Immediate: 1 to 5 months. Development of any appropriate programs that may be needed: Long: 25 to 36 months.

MEASURE: Program(s) created, as needed, and a resulting increase in minority hiring.

STRATEGY 2: Develop a career development program for faculty and staff, in particular women, minorities and members of underrepresented groups to provide them an opportunity to position themselves for advancement in an administrative appointment within The University of Toledo.

RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion, Human Resources and the Provost.

TIME PERIOD: Medium: 13 to 24 months.

MEASURE: Program in place to track and monitor progress.
Goal 6

Cultivate mutually beneficial community-university partnerships that further the mission of the University to serve Toledo, with an emphasis on historically and currently underserved communities.

STRATEGY 1: Establish biennial Latino Caucus Conference at The University of Toledo designed to educate legislators about efforts and research at the University to encourage an open forum for broader discussion of statewide issues affecting diversity, and to update legislators and others on the state of diversity at The University of Toledo.

RESPONSIBLE UNIT: President, Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion, Division of Student Affairs, and Latino Faculty and Staff Association.

TIME PERIOD: Medium: 13 to 24 months.

MEASURE: Conference organized and well received.

STRATEGY 2: Establish biennial African American Caucus Conference at The University of Toledo designed to educate legislators about efforts and research at the University to encourage an open forum for broader discussion of statewide issues affecting diversity, and to update legislators and others on the state of diversity at The University of Toledo.

RESPONSIBLE UNIT: President, Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion, Division of Student Affairs, and Black Faculty and Staff Association.

TIME PERIOD: Medium: 13 to 24 months.

MEASURE: Conference organized and well received.

STRATEGY 3: Establish a yearly symposium on disability topics at The University of Toledo designed to educate legislators about efforts and research at the University, to encourage an open forum for broader discussion of statewide issues affecting diversity, and to update legislators and others on the state of diversity at The University of Toledo.

RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion, Division of Student Affairs, Disability Studies Program and ADA Compliance Officer.

TIME PERIOD: Medium: 13 to 24 months.

MEASURE: An initial plan and then ongoing meetings.

STRATEGY 4: Establish a University of Toledo-City of Toledo-Lucas County Community Enrichment Board comprised of University faculty and staff, as well as city and county officials and community residents, to identify issues that can be jointly addressed by the University, city and county.

RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion, Jack Ford Urban Affairs Center and Government Relations.

TIME PERIOD: Medium: 13 to 24 months.

MEASURE: Symposium organized and well received.
STRATEGY 5: Increase inclusion of minority suppliers in competitive bid events conducted by the procurement team. Provide education to business units on where to find diverse suppliers for under-bid limit purchases.

RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Supply Chain Management and Minority Business Development Center.

TIME PERIOD: Education: Immediate: 1-5 months; procurement inclusion of minority suppliers ongoing.

MEASURE: Use online bid book to capture minority suppliers included in bid events and report annually. Identify minority spend in annual spend report analysis. Report annually to identify education and efforts to increase spending with diverse suppliers.

STRATEGY 6: Develop a communication strategy to attract potential minority suppliers by hosting a supplier fair.

RESPONSIBLE UNIT: Office of Marketing and Communications, Supply Chain Management, and Minority Business Development Center.

TIME PERIOD: Short: 6-12 months.

MEASURE: Successful completion of the event. Track spending of the diverse suppliers who participated in the event for impact on spend report and increased inclusion.
## APPENDIX A – TOWN HALL THEMES

| Focus Group One: January 26 | Lack of inclusion and respect  
|                            | Lack of transparency  
|                            | Few opportunities for advancement  
|                            | Need networking opportunities for sharing  
| **Invited Staff – Main Campus** |  
| Focus Group Two: January 27 | Student groups not treated equal – race  
|                            | Student groups segregated based on race  
|                            | Need for diversity training  
|                            | Minority groups deal with diversity  
|                            | Powerful organizations controlled by whites  
| **Invited Student – Main Campus** |  
| Focus Group Three: January 28 | See above  
|                            | Sexual and racial disparate treatment in Eng.  
|                            | Racial stereotyping  
|                            | **Students live in “bubbles”**  
|                            | International student services lack  
|                            | Disparate treatment based on sexual orientation and disability  
|                            | Need for widespread diversity training  
|                            | More minority suppliers  
| **Open Students – Main Campus** |  
| Focus Group Four: January 29 | Same people “inner circle”  
|                            | No diversity in administration  
|                            | Eng. Campus white male  
|                            | More resources needed  
| **Invited Faculty – Main Campus** |  
| Focus Group Five: February 1 | UT as diversity leader: training  
|                            | Lack of student, faculty, staff diversity  
|                            | Latino Alliance concern for diversity  
|                            | No diversity on BOT  
|                            | Concern for disability services  
| **Open Community – Kent Library** |  
| Focus Group Six: February 2 | Lack of transparency and trust  
|                            | Different views of disparate treatment based on campus  
|                            | Different campus cultures  
| **Open Faculty – Health Science** |  
| Focus Group Seven: February 3 | Racial discrimination – allegation  
| **Open Students – Health Science** |  
| Focus Group Eight: February 4 | University hierarchy limits staff  
|                            | Lack of acknowledgment of roles  
|                            | Existing diversity training not sufficient  
|                            | Rethink how surveys administered  
| **Open Staff – Health Science** |  

## APPENDIX B – ETHNIC DESCRIPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America) who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community attachment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian Subcontinent, including, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>A person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Alien</td>
<td>A person who is not a citizen or national of the United States and who is in this country on a visa or temporary basis and does not have the right to remain indefinitely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Ethnicity Unknown</td>
<td>Race unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>Two or more races</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Office of Institutional Data*
### APPENDIX C – FACULTY BY ETHNICITY 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident alien</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race or Ethnicity Unknown</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>1,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>1,672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage 44.10% 55.90%

### APPENDIX D – FACULTY BY ETHNICITY 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident alien</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race or ethnicity unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>1,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>1,541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage 45.20% 54.80%