Morehead State University Campus Diversity Plan

2017 - 2021

Morehead State University

June 21, 2017

Introduction

Morehead State University (MSU) is a comprehensive public university with robust undergraduate and graduate programs, emerging doctoral programs and an emphasis on regional engagement. MSU aspires to be the best public regional university in the South through a commitment to academic excellence, student success, building productive partnerships, improving infrastructure, enhancing resources and improving enrollment and retention.

MSU is located in the foothills of the Daniel Boone National Forest in Rowan County, Kentucky. Founded in 1887 as Morehead Normal School, it was a private, church-supported institution known as "a light to the mountains." In 1926, it became part of the state-supported system and was renamed Morehead State Normal School and Teacher's College. An increase in enrollment and degree programs resulted in successive renaming as Morehead State College (1948) and its current designation as Morehead State University (1966). The mission statement/purpose of MSU is as follows:

> As a community of lifelong learners, we will
>
> - Educate students for success in a global environment;
> - Engage in scholarship;
> - Promote diversity of people and ideas;
> - Foster innovation, collaboration, and creative thinking; and
> - Serve our communities to improve the quality of life.

MSU has an eleven-member Board of Regents that serves by statute as the governing body of the University. The board is dedicated to the promotion of the mission and goals of the University. The board is also responsible for the creation or dissolution of degrees upon approval of the Council on Postsecondary Education.

MSU has 135 undergraduate and 70 graduate degree programs in four colleges: Caudill College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences; College of Business and Technology; College of Education; and College of Science. MSU offers associate, baccalaureate, masters, specialist, and doctoral degrees as well as undergraduate and graduate certificates.

In the fall of 2016, MSU employed 408 total faculty members: 333 full-time (76.3% tenured or tenure track) and 75 part-time faculty members in addition to 730 full-time staff and 127 part-time staff.

MSU's annual operating budget, approved by the Board of Regents each June, is based on projected funds from tuition and fees, state appropriation, sales and services of educational activities, and auxiliary enterprise revenue. The University's independent external auditors conduct an annual audit and disclose concerns and recommendations to the Board if needed. MSU has received no audit concerns or recommendations in recent history.

MSU is part of the Kentucky public postsecondary education system. Our service region consists of 22 counties in eastern Kentucky; however, our outreach extends far beyond the service region. The University's main campus is located in Morehead, Kentucky with regional campuses in Ashland, Mt. Sterling, Prestonsburg and West Liberty.

Diversity Planning Process

In the fall of 2016, MSU developed a Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Task Force to develop the campus diversity plan under the direction of the Chief Diversity Office and the Provost. The taskforce was charged with the following:

- Propose the new Morehead State University diversity, equity and inclusion plan.
- Develop a process that considers input from campus and community stakeholders in developing the plan.
- Follow CPE requirements associated with the new plan.
- Consider other elements/metrics for the new plan unique to Morehead State that are not necessarily included in CPE requirements.
- Propose how the plan might be implemented and maintained (see Diversity
- Follow the established timeline provided by CPE.

The following working committees were created and their membership was purposefully designed to represent a cross-section of campus stakeholders including faculty, staff, and students:

MSU Ad Hoc Committee:

Steven Ralston, Provost
Charles Holloway, Chief Diversity Officer
Laurie Couch, Interim Associate VP of Academic Affairs – Academic Programs
Chris Miller, Interim Dean, College of Education
Sandra Riegle, Associate Professor of Education
Jamie Thomas, Assistant Director of Athletics,
Shannon Colvin, Coordinator of Student Leadership and Advocacy
Jessica Thompson, Technology Business Analyst II

MSU Workgroup Committee:

MSU Ad Hoc Committee
Dora Admadi, Associate Professor Mathematics
Bill Redwine, Auxiliary Services
Bernadette Barton, Professor Sociology
J.T. Blackledge, Associate Professor Psychology
Christopher Blakely, Minority Retention Coordinator
Ophelia Chapman, Systems Librarian
Cory Clark, Minority Academic Coordinator
Kristina Durocher, Associate Professor History
Tori Henderson, Student – SGA
Jami Hornbuckle, Assistant to the President/Chief Market and Public Relations Office
Michelle Hutchinson, Employment & Training Manger
Robert Sparks, Area Coordinator Housing
J. Marshall, Executive Director Regional Engagement
Hope Mills, Student – Student Activities
Fatma Mohamed, Associate Professor Management

Donna Murphy, Community and Alumni
Shondrah Nash, Professor Sociology
David Peyton, Professor Biology
Jill Ratliff, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs - Institutional Effectiveness
Tim Rhodes, Assistant Vice President Enrollment Services
Lexius Yarbrough, Student – NPHC
Capp Yess, Associate Professor Physics

Opportunity Members:

Dora Admadi, Associate Professor Mathematics
Ophelia Chapman, Systems Librarian
Tori Henderson, Student – SGA
Michelle Hutchinson, Employment & Training Manger
Fatma Mohamed, Associate Professor Management
Tim Rhodes, Assistant Vice President Enrollment Services
Shondrah Nash, Professor Sociology

Student Success Members:

Christopher Blakely, Minority Retention Coordinator
Cory Clark, Minority Academic Coordinator
Kristina Durocher, Associate Professor History
Hope Mills, Student – Student Activities
Robert Sparks, Area Coordinator Housing
Capp Yess, Associate Professor Physics

Impact Members:

J.T. Blackledge, Associate Professor Psychology
Bernadette Barton, Professor Sociology
Jami Hornbuckle, Assistant to the President/Chief Market and Public Relations Office
Jill Ratliff, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs/Institutional Effectiveness
J. Marshall, Executive Director Regional Engagement
Donna Murphy, Community and Alumni
David Peyton, Professor Biology
Sandra Riegle, Associate Professor of Education
Lexius Yarbrough, Student – NPHC

After teams were developed by the Ad Hoc Committee, the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Chief Diversity Officer met with the committees to inform them of the necessary tasks to assist with developing the campus diversity plan.

Each subcommittee held their own individual meetings to discuss and develop strategies related to diversity. Each subcommittee also had authorization to engage other campus constituents if needed.

After the subcommittees had developed strategies, they reported to the entire group with their recommendations for developing the diversity plan. The strategies for this plan was developed by the taskforce, and the other information has been provided as a part of the campus strategic plan.

Key Terms

As a part of our plan development, MSU believes there is a campus community need to have agreement on definitions that will be a part of our diversity plan.

Cultural Competence - Cultural competence requires that organizations:

- Have a defined set of values and principles, and demonstrate behaviors, attitudes, policies and structures that enable them to work effectively cross-culturally.
- Have the capacity to (1) value diversity, (2) conduct self-assessment, (3) manage the dynamics of difference, (4) acquire and institutionalize cultural knowledge and (5) adapt to diversity and the cultural contexts of the communities they serve.
- Incorporate the above in all aspects of policymaking, administration, practice, service delivery and involve systematically consumers, key stakeholders and communities.

Cultural competence is a developmental process that evolves over an extended period. Both individuals and organizations are at various levels of awareness, knowledge and skills along the cultural competence continuum. (National Center for Cultural Competence)

Diversity – Individual differences (e.g., personality, learning styles, and life experiences) and group/social differences (e.g., race/ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, country of origin, and ability as well as cultural, political, religious, or other affiliations). (American Association of Colleges & Universities)

Equity – Appropriate access and right to needed resources, processes, opportunities, and participation to provide for equal, successful outcomes. The term is often confused with equality. Equity aims to level the playing field. (Gorski, 2013; Gorski & Pothini, 2013; Gorski & Swalwell, 2015)

Equity-Mindedness – A demonstrated awareness of and willingness to address equity issues among institutional leaders and staff. (Center for Urban Education, University of Southern California).

Fidelity: Faithfulness in implementing programs or strategies as they were designed. Evidence of fidelity may include, but is not be limited to the following:

- Dedicated staff (i.e., the number of staff, their level of expertise, and the amount of professional development, mentoring, and coaching provided to staff responsible for implementation).
- Specific examples of student or staff participation.
- Data collected on strategy inputs and outputs.
- Participation rate of students.
- Dedicated funding.
- Development of implementation timetables and milestones achieved.
- Narrative descriptions of the implementation process.

Identity - The social and historical construction of the self/individual/person that creates a sense of community, belonging, and uniqueness. Identity (-ies) may intersect or overlap and most often do. Key facets of identity include sex, gender, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, social class, age, ability, and religion/spirituality. (Capper & Young, 2014; Gorski, 2013; Griffiths, 2003; Page, 2007; Samuels, 2014)

Inclusion – The active, intentional, and ongoing engagement with diversity in the curriculum, in the co-curriculum, and in the communities (intellectual, social, cultural, geographical) with which individuals might connect – in ways that increase awareness, content knowledge, cognitive sophistication, and empathic understanding of the complex ways individuals interact within systems and institutions. (American Association of Colleges & Universities)

Inclusive Excellence – The recognition that a community or institution's success is dependent on how well it values diversity and engages diversity, and includes the rich diversity of students, faculty, administrators, and alumni constituents. (University of Denver)

Low-Income: Pell recipients at entry or during specific semesters (varies depending on the specific metric)

Power and privilege – The institutional, systemic, systematic, and cyclical process that bestow unearned rights, benefits, or privileges on some chosen groups or populations while exerting control over and manipulation of marginalized and oppressed groups. (Davis & Harrison, 2013; Irving, 2014; Loewen, 1995; Tochluk, 2010)

Social justice – The goal of social justice is both full and equal participation of all groups in society wherein that society be mutually shaped to meet the needs of all groups. Social justice is both individual and collective. Advocates for social justice work to provide access and opportunity for everyone, particularly those in greatest need. (Dantley, Beachum, & McCray, 2008; Davis & Harrison, 2013; Normore & Brooks, 2014)

Underrepresented Minority (URM): – Students who categorized themselves as a) Hispanic or Latino, b) American Indian or Alaska Native, c) Black or African American, d) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, or e) Two or more Races or marginalized.

Opportunity

- In the fall of 2015, MSU enrolled 10,875 students
- MSU retained 65% of first-time freshmen from fall of 2014 to fall 2015 (58% of the underrepresented minorities).
- First-time freshmen headcount decreased by 3.4% from the fall of 2014 to 1,461 but 99.4% of these students were full-time.
- The average ACT composite score for first-time students was 22.4, 1.4 points higher than the national average composite score of 21.
- A total of 6,209 (63.4%) undergraduate students attended MSU on a full-time basis while 3,574 (36.5%) undergraduate students attended MSU part-time.
- The majority of graduate students, 875 (80.1%), attended MSU as part-time students while 217 (19.9%) attended as full-time students.

- The 2015-16 undergraduate student population was 59.5% female, 40.5% male.
- The 2015-16 graduate student population was 64% female, 35.7% male.
- Sixty-two percent of MSU's undergraduates were between the ages of 18-24 while 15% of MSU undergraduates were older than 24.
- MSU's 22 county service region attracted 6,135 (56.4%) students to the university in the fall of 2015, and 3,504 (32.2%) of those students came from counties not included in MSU's service region. Accordingly, 88.6% of MSU students originated from the state of Kentucky.
- Under-represented minorities (American Indian, Black, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and two or more races) represented 7% of the institutional enrollment.
- MSU provided community outreach by offering a substantial number of dual-credit courses to high school students. There were 177 dual-credit courses offered at 48 different high schools across the state of Kentucky.
- During the 2015-16 academic year, MSU awarded 20 Doctoral degrees, 291 Master's degrees, 1,331 Bachelor's degrees, 28 Specialist degrees and 168 Associate's degrees.

Supporting Documentation for Morehead State University Target Setting

The targets selected for each of the metrics that follow were chosen based on extensive analysis of MSU trend data, the pipeline for each metric, census data for the service region and benchmark data when available. Tables of data along with a brief summary describing their impact are followed by the final selection of a target for each metric.

1A: Fall Undergraduate Enrollment of African American Students as a Percent of Total Fall Undergraduate Enrollment (Diversity Plan)

Recommended target: 2% annual growth

The following elements informed this target:

Table 1: African American Undergraduate Students as Percent of Undergraduate Population

Institution	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Change
African American Students (UG)	3.4%	3.2%	3.3%	3.3%	3.6%	3.4%	3.4%	0.0

- Table 1 shows that the proportion of undergraduate African American students has been stable over time. This stability is deceptive because the data analyzed in successive tables reveals a picture of growth and performance, despite the demographic constraints of MSU's service region.

Table 2: African American Undergraduate Students at MSU				
Institution	**African American Students**	**Total UG Enrollment**	**African American Enrollment as Percent UG**	**Census Data**
MSU	330	9,873	3.4%	1.5%

- Table 2 shows that MSU is already out-performing 2 out of 3 non-urban peer institutions given the demographics of the respective service regions. In the baseline year, Census data showed that African Americans are 1.5% of MSU's service region. The baseline number of 3.4% reveals that the composition of African American undergraduate students is more than 2 times higher than the demographic composition of MSU's service region.

Table 3: African American Undergraduate Students by Classification								
Classification	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**Change Since 2012**
Freshman	83	94	125	126	114	80	82	-34.4%
Sophomore	34	47	51	55	74	61	41	-19.6%
Junior	46	42	39	50	43	64	64	64.1%
Senior	64	69	62	56	60	59	71	14.5%
UG Non-Degree	12	9	12	8	16	24	33	175.0%
Early College	10	34	29	33	45	40	43	48.3%
Post-Bac, Degree-Seeking	3	6	7	5	4	1	1	-85.7%
Craft Academy	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	100%
Total	252	301	325	333	356	330	336	3.4%

- As shown in Table 3, the enrollment of freshmen African American students declined substantially in the fall of 2015 and 2016. These recruiting shortfalls will weaken enrollment in the coming years as the larger groups of African American students graduate and leave MSU. The current numbers of incoming freshmen are below replacement levels. As shown earlier, the demographics of the service region make it difficult to achieve a critical mass of African American students, which is a challenge for recruitment and retention. Despite these barriers, the data in Table 3 show that the number of African American students increased remarkably since 2010; however, as displayed in Table 1, these big numerical increases did not produce a substantial change in the proportion of African American students, due to the small size of this group relative to the overall undergraduate population.
- MSU has been casting a wide net to generate additional enrollment. This means that even if the numerator increases, (i.e. the number of African American students) the denominator is also likely to increase (number of non-African American students). If the denominator increases faster than the numerator, there will be little change in the proportion or even a decrease. Thus, because the numerator is such a small number, it will be extremely hard to move, especially if overall enrollment increases.

Table 4: Fall African American Enrollment Target							
Target	**Baseline**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**% UG Enrollment**
2% annual increase	330	336	343	350	357	364	3.8%

- As shown in the target calculation Table 4, a 2% annual increase generates a numerical difference even though the percentage does not increase a significantly. A 2% annual increase would produce substantial numerical improvement and moderate improvement in the proportion of the undergraduate population that is African American.

1B: Fall Undergraduate Enrollment of Hispanic Students as a Percent of Total Fall Undergraduate Enrollment (Diversity Plan)

Recommended target: 2% annual growth

The following elements informed this target:

Table 5: Hispanic Undergraduate Students as Percent of Undergraduate Population								
Institution	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**Change**
Hispanic (UG)	0.9%	0.9%	1.2%	1.1%	1.5%	1.4%	1.9%	1.0

- Table 5 demonstrates that progress has been slow and steady with regard to the proportion of Hispanic students in MSU's undergraduate population. By the end of the period, it is clear that two years, 2014 and 2016, account for most of the change that occurred on this metric.

Table 6: Hispanic Undergraduate Students by Classification								
Classification	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**Change Since 2012**
Freshman	21	25	31	33	38	32	35	12.9%
Sophomore	8	10	12	16	18	26	19	58.3%
Junior	13	12	12	11	22	15	25	108.3%
Senior	14	14	25	18	17	29	32	28.0%
UG Non-Degree	0	3	5	2	5	6	5	0.0%
Early College	6	18	31	30	46	31	66	112.9%
Post-Bac, Degree-Seeking	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	100.0%
Total Hispanic	64	84	117	113	148	141	184	57.3%
Total Non-URM	7,046	8,960	9,162	9,481	9,282	9,111	9,005	-1.7%

- As shown in Table 6, the enrollment of freshman Hispanic students increased 12.9%; however, this large percentage increase only represents four students. Since 2012, the number of Hispanic students increased 57.3%, which is an exceptionally strong growth. The largest numerical increase has been early college students, but there has also been robust growth across all student classifications.

- Table 6 provides greater insight into the changes in 2014 and 2016. In 2014, the number of non-URM students decreased by 2.1% and in 2016 the number of non-URM students decreased from the 2015 number by 1.2%. Concurrently between fall of 2013 and fall of 2014, undergraduate Hispanic students increased by 30.9%, and a similar increase occurred between fall of 2015 and fall of 2016. This pattern demonstrates how difficult it is to move a proportional metric that has a small numerator and a large denominator. Thus, the numerator (undergraduate Hispanic students) had to increase by almost 31% AND then a significant portion of the denominator (Non-URM students) had to decrease to produce change of 0.4% and 0.5% for 2014 and 2016.

Table 7: Hispanic Undergraduate Students at MSU

Institution	Hispanic Students	Total UG Enrollment	Hispanic Enrollment as Percent UG	Census Data
MSU	141	9,783	1.4%	1.0%

- Table 7 demonstrates that MSU is currently over-performing based on the demographics of the service region. In the baseline year, Census data showed that Hispanics are 1.0% of the MSU service region. The baseline number of 1.4% reveals that the composition of Hispanic undergraduate students is slightly higher than the demographic composition of the service region.
- MSU has been casting a wide net to generate additional enrollment. This means that even if the numerator increases (i.e. the number of Hispanic students) the denominator is also likely to increase (number of non-Hispanic students). If the denominator increases faster than the numerator, there will be little change in the proportion or even a decrease. Thus, because the numerator is such a small number, it will be extremely hard to move, especially if overall enrollment increases. This dynamic must be taken into consideration when setting targets.

Table 8: Fall Hispanic Enrollment Target, Morehead State University

Target	3 Year Mean	Baseline	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	% UG Enrollment
2% annual increase	134	141	184	147	150	153	156	1.6%

*Three year average includes 2013, 2014, and 2015.

- As shown in the target calculation in Table 8, a 2% annual increase creates quite a numerical difference even though the percentage does not increase a great deal. Thus, in this case, a 2% annual increase would produce numerical improvement and moderate improvement in the proportion of the undergraduate population that is Hispanic.
- The model trend will look a bit odd because the target setting builds off the established baseline of 141 rather than the current year number of 184. Thus, the calculation of annual increases discounted the current 2016 number because a big part of the enrollment increase is due to early college. These students are not a stable source of enrollment, so it is unwise to assume that 2017 will maintain and continue the growth that was modeled in 2016.

1C: Fall Undergraduate Enrollment of Underrepresented Minority Students as a Percent of Total Fall Undergraduate Enrollment (Diversity Plan)

Recommended target: 2% annual growth

The following elements informed the target:

Table 9: URM Undergraduate Students as Percent of Undergraduate Population								
Institution	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**Change**
URM (UG)	4.8%	4.9%	5.8%	5.9%	6.7%	6.9%	7.7%	2.9

- Table 9 reveals that the percentage of URM students changed by almost three percentage points since 2010, when 4.8% of the undergraduate population was classified as URM. In 2016, 7.7%, which is growth of 2.9% and represents a percent change of 60%.

Table 10: Fall UG Enrollment Trend Data									
	2010	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**Change Since 2012**	**Change Since 2010**
Black, Non-Hispanic	252	301	325	333	356	330	336	3.4%	33.3%
American Indian	19	23	22	26	18	12	16	-27.3%	-15.8%
Native Hawaiian	2	2	5	7	12	11	12	140.0%	500.0%
Hispanic/Latino	64	84	117	113	148	141	184	57.3%	187%
Two or More Races	16	50	94	116	136	178	201	113.8%	1,156%
URM	353	460	563	595	670	672	749	33.0%	112%
Non-URM	7,046	8,960	9,162	9,481	9,282	9,111	9,005	-1.7%	27.8%
Enrollment Total	7,399	9,420	9,725	10,076	9,952	9,783	9,754	0.2%	31.8%

- Table 10 shows that Hispanic/Latino students were one driver of URM growth, but the biggest driver of URM growth is two or more races. 2010 was the first year that this was an ethnicity category in CPE reporting, so obviously the growth has been tremendous during this period. Even since 2012, this category grew consistently every year increasing by 114% in this period.

- 2014 was the year in which the proportion of URM students started to increase, but this was only possible because the number of non-URM students declined while URM students were increasing and or stable. Thus, the fall of 2014 showed a decrease of 2.1% in non-URM students, and the decline continued into 2015 (1.8%) and 2016 (-1.2%).

Table 11: Undergraduate Fall URM Enrollment by Classification								
Classification	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Change Since 2012
Freshman	**119**	**140**	**194**	**219**	**198**	**177**	**168**	**-13.4%**
Sophomore	**44**	**71**	**83**	**91**	**121**	**110**	**96**	**15.6%**
Junior	**61**	**60**	**65**	**73**	**88**	**108**	**113**	**73.8%**
Senior	**87**	**92**	**101**	**93**	**97**	**116**	**146**	**44.6%**
UG Non-Degree	**10**	**15**	**20**	**14**	**23**	**31**	**41**	**105%**
Early College	**22**	**70**	**87**	**93**	**136**	**122**	**175**	**101%**
Post-Bac Degree	**10**	**12**	**13**	**12**	**7**	**4**	**5**	**-61.5%**
Craft Academy	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
Total	**353**	**460**	**563**	**595**	**670**	**672**	**749**	**33.0%**

- Table 11 shows total URM enrollment peaked in years 2012-2014 followed by a decline in 2015 that continued in 2016. The URM freshmen pipeline is also collapsing similar to what we saw with African American freshmen (Table 3). All other categories yielded increases, but the weakness at the beginning of the pipeline is a concern because this change will reverse the positive trends with regard to sophomores, juniors, and seniors. Early college growth has been quite strong and growth in this category is one of the main factors that drove the increase between 2015 and 2016.

Table 12: Fall Undergraduate URM Enrollment at MSU				
Institution	**URM Enrollment**	**Total UG Enrollment**	**URM Enrollment as Percent of Total (2015)**	**Census Data**
MSU	**672**	**9,783**	**6.9%**	**3.8%**

- Table 12 shows that MSU is outperforming the demographics of its service region. In the current year, 2016, MSU has 7.7% of the undergraduate population in the URM category, which is twice the rate of underrepresented minorities in the service region.

Table 13: Fall URM Undergraduate Enrollment Target							
Target	**Baseline**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**% UG Enrollment**
2% annual increase	672	749	699	713	727	742	7.6%

- As shown in the target calculation in Table 13, a 2% annual increase yields a robust numerical difference even though the percentage does not increase significantly. A 2% annual increase would produce numerical improvement and moderate improvement in the proportion of the undergraduate population that is URM.

1C: Fall Graduate and Professional Enrollment of Underrepresented Minority Students as a Percent of Total Fall Graduate and Professional Enrollment (Diversity Plan)

Recommended target: 1% annual growth

The following elements informed this target:

Table 14: Fall Graduate URM Enrollment as Percent of Total Fall Graduate Enrollment

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Change Since 2012
URM Grad. and Prof.	4.0%	6.2%	5.7%	5.6%	6.8%	8.1%	6.5%	2.5

- As shown in the Table 14, the percent of URM graduate students at MSU rose 2.5 percentage points since fall of 2010. 2015 was a peak year, and 2016 suggests a return to the mean, which is 6.1%.

Table 15: Fall Graduate Enrollment Trend Data

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Change Since 2012
African American	41	57	49	41	53	48	44	-10.2%
American Indian	5	4	5	5	2	3	2	-60.0%
Hispanic/Latino	9	21	15	16	14	23	12	-20.0%
Two or More Races	3	14	13	10	6	12	6	-53.8%
Native Hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	NA
URM	58	96	82	72	75	88	65	-20.7%
Total Enrollment	1,443	1,551	1,447	1,282	1,101	1,092	994	-31.3%

- Table 15 shows that graduate student enrollment at MSU has declined substantially since 2012 decreasing 11.4% from 2012 to 2013 and 14% between fall 2013 and fall 2014. Fall of 2016 was

another decline of 9%. URM graduate student enrollments have not declined as quickly as the total graduate student population, which accounts for the relatively strong growth in URM graduate students as a proportion of the population. However, it is important to note that URM graduate student enrollment did decline by about 1.5 percentage points in 2016.

Table 16: Fall Graduate URM Enrollment at MSU				
Institution	URM Enrollment	Total GR Enrollment	URM Enrollment as Percent of Total	Census Data
MSU	88	1,092	8.1%	3.8%

- Once again, Table 16 demonstrates that MSU is over performing with regard to the demographics of the service region. We have more than twice the proportion of URM in our graduate students as the service region as a whole.

Table 17: Fall Graduate URM Enrollment Target								
Target	**3 Year Mean**	**Baseline**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**% GR Enrollment**
1% annual increase	78	88	65	90	91	92	93	9.4%

3-year average includes 2013, 2014, and 2015.

- As shown in the target calculation in Table 17, a 1% annual increase creates a numerical difference even though the percentage does not increase a great deal. Given the population of our service region, that the baseline year (2015) is higher than our 3- year average, and we are starting behind because our proportion of URM graduate students declined to 6.5% in 2016, the 1% annual increase is realistic.

Strategies

Tactics	Measures	Lead/ Accountability	Internal Collaborators	External Collaborators	Timeline
Strategy 1: Increase First-Time Freshmen Enrollment of Diversity Population.					
1.1 Focus on high-priority areas such as Louisville, Lexington, and Northern Kentucky market	- Number of students who enroll from year to year increases	Enrollment Services	Web Marketing Director, Chief Diversity Officer, Enrollment Counselors	-Schools, -Alumni - Students, - Community	Fall 2017
1.2 Promote Diversity Opportunity Scholarships and Black Achievers Scholarships	- Number of students who enroll from year to year increases	Enrollment Services	Web Marketing Director, Chief Diversity Officer, Enrollment Counselors	-Schools, -Alumni - Students, - Community	Fall 2017- S

Strategy 2: Create a more diverse campus, meaning more diversity among faculty and staff, more diversity among student groups, and a campus environment that is more "friendly" to diversity, so that it becomes easier to recruit and retain a more diverse student body.					
2.1 Implementation of Diversity Training for new employees	- Join NAME - Use NAME resources and curriculum in programming	Chief Diversity Officer, Human Resources,	Academic Affairs	-Morehead Civic Organizations;	Fall 2018

Success

6B: Six-year Graduation Rate of First-time, Full-time Baccalaureate Degree-seeking Undergraduate Students –Low Income (Diversity Plan)

Recommended target: 1% annual growth

The following elements informed this selection:

Table 24: Six-Year Graduation Rates of First-Time, Full-Time Baccalaureate Degree-seeking Low Income Students						
	2005	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
Low Income Cohort	**27.8%**	**33.3%**	**34.5%**	**34.7%**	**31.0%**	**34.1%**

- Table 24 shows that MSU low-income cohort graduation rates have increased from 27.8% in 2005 to 34.1% in 2010. These rates are what would be expected as the low- income cohort has a confidence interval of 29.9-35.3.

Table 25: Status of Low Income Cohort as of January 27, 2017					
Cohort	Adjusted Cohort	Enrolled Fall 2016	Registered for Spring 2017	Current Graduation Rate	Maximum Grad Rate
2011	650	6.8% (n=44)	4.6% (n=30)	28.5%	33.1%
2012	791	22.0% (n=174)	14.2% (n=112)	27.3%	41.5%
2013	805	45.0% (n=362)	40.4% (n=325)	2.7%	43.1%
2014	751	44.7% (n=336)	42.1% (n=316)	0.4%	42.5%
2015	698	67.5% (n=471)	57.8% (n=403)	0.0%	57.8%
2016	509	100% (n=509)	85.9% (n=437)	0.0%	85.9%

- Table 25 shows that the maximum graduation rate for all MSU low income cohorts is below 50% except the 2015 and 2016 cohort based upon the number of students currently enrolled at the end of the last advance registration period. Retention of the 2014 low-income students was especially poor. The percentage of 2013 cohort students that are still actively enrolled in their fourth year is about the same as the 2014 cohort midway through their third year.

Table 26: Graduation Projections for Bachelor's GRS Cohort, Low Income Students								
	2007	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
Fall to Fall	**65.8%**	**63.3%**	**68.0%**	**59.2%**	**66.8%**	**66.3%**	**59.2%**	**67.5%**
Year 1 to Year 3	**51.6%**	**50.3%**	**52.2%**	**46.2%**	**53.4%**	**51.7%**	**44.7%**	**51.4-55.4**
Year 1 to Year 4	**44.9%**	**42.8%**	**47.1%**	**39.2%**	**47.1%**	**45.0%**	**36.6-39.7**	**45.3-48.4**
4 Year Grad Rate	**15.3%**	**14.7%**	**18.4%**	**15.3%**	**21.6%**	**15.4-17.9**	**12.1-14.6**	**16.5-19.0**
5 Year Grad Rate	**13.8%**	**13.2%**	**11.7%**	**11.8%**	**11.3-16.2**	**11.4-13.2**	**8.9-10.7**	**12.1-14.0**
6 Year Grad Rate	**5.3%**	**3.1%**	**4.0%**	**1.4-4.6**	**2.8-4.0**	**3.7-4.3**	**2.9-3.5**	**4.0-4.6**
Total Grad Rate	**34.4%**	**31.0%**	**34.1%**	**28.5-33.1**	**32.9-37.8**	**30.8-35.7**	**23.9-28.8**	**32.6-37.5**

- Unlike the MSU total bachelor's cohort, where there has been improvement in time to graduation, there has not been observable improvement with low-income students. They are not graduating faster, and MSU is not graduating more of them. Even the 2008 cohort, which is not included in the table, had extremely high fall to fall retention of 72.0% and slightly higher first to third retention (55%), by the end of the six years, the 34.7% graduation rate is average.
- A confidence interval was constructed and it shows that the expected graduation rate for the low-income cohort is 30-37.5% based on historical averages. Based on current retention patterns and using past performance as a guide, the current cohorts show that the trajectory has not changed and all projected six-year graduation rates fall within the confidence interval.

Table 27: Six-Year Graduation Rate of Low Income Cohort Target

Target	3 Year Average	Baseline	2011 Cohort	2012 Cohort	2013 Cohort	2014 Cohort	2015 Cohort	Cumulative increase
1.0% annual increase	33.2%	34.1%	34.4%	34.7%	35.0%	35.3%	35.7%	4.7%

- Based on the data that is available, EKU has a four- year graduation rate for low- income students of 28.5%. NKU's four- year average is about 26.4%, Murray's graduation rate is 41.2% and WKU's is about 37.4%. MSU is performing slightly below MuSU and WKU but above NKU and EKU on this metric.
- Our baseline comes from the 2010 cohort and it is 34.1%. Unfortunately, with the 2011 cohort, we would not be able to meet the target for a 1% annual increase based on the students who remain enrolled. The remaining cohorts do have potential, but the 2014 cohort has been an exceptionally poor performing cohort.
- A 1% annual increase target was suggested

6B: Six-year Graduation Rate of First-time, Full-time Baccalaureate Degree-seeking Undergraduate Students –URM (Diversity Plan)

Recommended target: 1% annual growth

The following elements informed this selection:

Table 28: Six-Year Graduation Rates of First-Time, Full-Time Baccalaureate Degree-seeking URM Students						
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
URM Cohort	**37.7%**	**32.8%**	**31.6%**	**42.9%**	**22.4%**	**32.6%**

- Table 28 shows that MSU URM cohort graduation rates have experienced significant volatility. Confidence intervals for this group are 24.7 to 37.6. Thus, the only year that exceeds this threshold is the 2008 URM cohort, which only had 28 students.

Table 29: Status of URM Cohort as of January 27, 2017					
Total Cohorts	Adjusted Cohort	Enrolled Fall 2016	Registered for Spring 2017	Grad Rate	Maximum Grad Rate
2011	**96**	**7.3% (n=7)**	**5.2% (n=5)**	**28.1%**	**33.3%**
2012	**141**	**27.0% (n=38)**	**17.0% (n=24)**	**23.4%**	**40.4%**
2013	**152**	**50.0% (n=76)**	**46.1% (n=70)**	**0.0%**	**46.1%**
2014	**128**	**49.2% (n=63)**	**46.1% (n=59)**	**0.0%**	**46.1%**
2015	**121**	**67.8% (n=82)**	**58.7% (n=71)**	**0.0%**	**58.7%**
2016	**76**	**100% (n=76)**	**82.9% (n=63)**	**0.0%**	**82.9%**

- Table 29 documents the status of each of the current MSU cohorts at the end of the most recent advance registration period. This data enables us to figure the cohort retention and the maximum graduation rate if every currently enrolled student graduated on time. For the 2011 cohort, the data suggests a graduation rate of 33.3% or less. A review of the remaining cohorts indicates that none has more than 50% of the students still enrolled until we get to the 2015 and 2016 cohorts that have 58.7% and 82.9% respectively of students still enrolled.

Table 30: Graduation Projections for Bachelor's GRS Cohort, URM Students										
	2005	2006	2007	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Fall to Fall	60.0%	56.7%	54.2%	63.8%	66.3%	64.6%	66.2%	69.7%	62.5%	67.8%
Year 1 to Year 3	48.3%	46.7%	37.3%	41.4%	46.5%	44.8%	51.4%	55.3%	49.2%	45.4-57.8%
Year 1 to Year 4	43.3%	40.0%	35.6%	36.2%	40.7%	38.5%	45.8%	50.0%	42.5-47.5%	44.9-49.9%
Year 4 Grad Rate	9.7%	9.8%	10.2%	6.9%	12.8%	9.8%	17.7%	12.2-15.2%	10.3-13.2%	11.2-14.1%
Year 5 Grad Rate	17.9%	19.7%	14.0%	12.1%	17.4%	18.3%	14.3-18.6%	18.3-22.8%	15.7-20.1%	17.0-21.4%
Year 6 Grad Rate	9.7%	3.3%	6.8%	3.4%	2.3%	2.3-5.2%	2.6-3.8%	5.7-7.1%	4.9-6.3%	5.3-6.7%
Total Grad Rate	37.3%	32.8%	31.6%	22.4%	32.6%	30.4-33.3%	34.6-40.4%	36.2-45.1%	30.9-39.6%	33.5-42.2%

Table 31: Six-Year Graduation Rate of URM Cohort Target								
Target	3 Year Average	Baseline	2011 Cohort	2012 Cohort	2013 Cohort	2014 Cohort	2015 Cohort	Cumulative increase
1.0% annual increase	32.6%	32.6%	32.9%	33.2%	33.5%	33.8%	34.1%	4.6%

*Revised on 8/3/2017

- There has been apparent volatility in the graduation rate of MSU URM students because of the small number of students. Due to the apparent instability, there is a wide confidence interval of 23% to 42% using all values, including the extremely high 2008 figure in which there were 28 URM students and the extremely low 2009- graduation rate of 22.4%. Thus, the problem is a large standard deviation, which creates a wide interval.
- Because this interval is so wide, we can't use a confidence interval as a guide to define "improvement" because MSU would have to show consistent increases of more than 4% per year.

- A 1.0% annual increase was selected for this metric. Given the small number of students and the support strategies in place, we think it may be possible to achieve this target beginning with the 2012 cohort.

6C: First- to Second-Year Retention – Low Income (Strategic Agenda, Diversity Plan

Recommended target: 1% annual growth

The following elements informed this selection:

Table 34: First- to Second-Year Retention of Low Income Bachelor's GRS Cohort

Cohort Type	2009 Cohort	2010 Cohort	2011 Cohort	2012 Cohort	2013 Cohort	2014 Cohort	2015 Cohort
Low Income	**62.2%**	**68.0%**	**59.2%**	**66.6%**	**66.3%**	**59.2%**	**67.4%**

- Table 34 demonstrates that the retention of MSU low-income students has had quite a bit of volatility. A 95% confidence interval was-calculated to assess how retention has been and to determine what numbers would yield a statistical improvement.
- The average retention rate for the low-income cohorts is 64%. The confidence interval is 60.6-67.4. Using these numbers, we can see that 2011 and 2014 cohorts had retention declines that are outside the confidence interval. This means the declines are unlikely to be the result of error and general fluctuation in the data. The 2015 cohort is near the top of the confidence interval, but it does not fall outside it. This suggests there has not been a statistical improvement in retention for the 2015 cohort because it stayed within the parameters expected.

Table 35: First- to Second-Year Retention of Low Income Bachelor's GRS Cohort Target

Target	3 Year Mean	Baseline	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Cumulative increase
1% annual increase	**64.2%**	**67.4%**	**68.1%**	**68.8%**	**69.5%**	**70.2%**	**70.9%**	**5.1%**

- MSU's baseline of 67.4% retention is higher than the three-year mean. This is partly because the three-year mean is pull by the retention of the 2014 cohort.

- A 1% annual increase was selected for this metric. This will be a statistical increase that will move the rate outside of the confidence interval.

6C: First- to Second-Year Retention – URM (Strategic Agenda, Diversity Plan)

Recommended target: 1% annual growth

The following elements informed this selection:

Table 36: First- to Second-Year Retention of URM Bachelor's GRS Cohort							
Cohort Type	2009 Cohort	2010 Cohort	2011 Cohort	2012 Cohort	2013 Cohort	2014 Cohort	2015 Cohort
URM Cohort	**63.8%**	**66.3%**	**64.6%**	**66.2%**	**69.7%**	**62.5%**	**67.8%**

- Table 36 shows that retention of URM student has been more stable than retention of low-income students (Table 34). The average retention rate across this period is 65.8%, and the 95% confidence interval is 63.6% to 68.0%. Having calculated the confidence interval, we can see that the 2015 cohort is within that interval, which suggests that the baseline of data is not an improvement from past historical data.
- The current fall to spring retention is preliminary for the 2016 cohort, and shows that 82.8% of the cohort enrolled for the spring semester. This is lower than fall to spring retention for both the 2015 cohort and the 2013 cohort, both of which had URM fall to spring retention rates higher than 90%. The fall to spring retention rate closely matches the retention for the fall 2014 cohort.

Table 37: First- to Second-Year Retention of URM Bachelor's GRS Cohort Target								
Target	3 Year Mean	Baseline	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Cumulative increase
1% annual increase	**66.8%**	**67.8%**	**68.5%**	**69.2%**	**69.9%**	**70.6%**	**71.3%**	**5.2%**

- Table 37 models a 1% annual increase. Retention for the 2016 cohort is close to the fall to spring retention for the 2014 cohort. If this trend continues, MSU would not reach the 16-17 goal with a 1% annual increase.
- As discussed with the confidence intervals, anything above 68% would be durable improvement, but given the high starting baseline, even a 1% annual increase would result in a retention rate in excess of 71%, which would be a significant increase from our current rate.

9B: Bachelor's Degrees Awarded – Low Income (Strategic Agenda, Performance Funding, Diversity Plan)

Recommended target: 1% annual growth

The following elements informed this selection:

Table 46: Low Income Bachelor's Degrees						
	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Low Income Bachelor's Degrees	619	617	666	703	702	779

- Table 46 shows that the three-year change since 2012-13 varied enormously from 5.5%, 0% and 11%. The average annual rate of change is 5.5%.
- 11% annual growth is unlikely to continue. Historically, 2010-11 and 2011-12 showed no rate of change as did 2013-14 and 2014-15. 8% change occurred between 2011-12 and 2012-13.

Table 47: Pipeline of Total Low Income Bachelor's Seeking Student Enrollment

Year	Freshmen	Sophomores	Juniors	Seniors	Seniors Graduate within Year	Seniors Graduated Total*
2009-10	1,198	698	801	1,234	438 (35.5%)	979 (79.3%)
2010-11	1,107	734	846	1,355	585 (43.2%)	1,102 (81.3%)
2011-12	1,254	752	900	1,383	595 (43.1%)	1,129 (81.6%)
2012-13	1,376	762	911	1,391	611 (43.9%)	1,125 (80.9%)
2013-14	1,384	827	896	1,387	658 (47.5%)	1,096 (79.0%)
2014-15	1,206	879	938	1,315	660 (50.5%)	1,000 (76.0%)
2015-16	1,002	766	950	1,304	703 (53.9%)	813 (62.3%)
2016-17	786	639	845	1,238	638 (51.5%)	638 (51.5%)

*Includes unofficial graduates from fall 2016 and winter 2016. Also includes applications to graduate in spring 2017

- The percentage of MSU seniors qualifying as low income has been declining. In 2009-10, the percentage was higher than 60%. MSU reached a maximum of 67% of seniors in 2013-14 and 2014-15. In 2015-16, the number of seniors declined to 63% and in 2016-17, it declined further to 60%. Thus, low-income students are declining in number and in percentage of the student population. This presents a challenge to growth as the demographics are shifting.
- The trends are more concerning among MSUI freshmen with only 54% of 2015-16 freshmen being low income and 49% of 2016-17 freshmen being low income. From 2007-08 to 2012-13, there was relatively parity in the percentage of freshmen and seniors who were low income. For example, in 2011-12, 64% of freshmen were low income and 63% of seniors were low income. Beginning in 2013-14, the numbers begin to diverge with the percentage of low-income seniors rising, and the percentage of low-income freshmen declining. In 2015-16, 54.4% of freshmen were low income whereas 63.2% of seniors were.
- Table 47 shows that MSUI has seen substantial increases in seniors who graduate within the year. In 2009-10 only 35.5% of low income seniors graduated in 2009-10, whereas in 2015-16, almost 54% did.
- The number of low-income seniors has been around 1300-1400 since 2010-11, but it began declining in 2014-15 and reached a new low in 2016-17. The peak was 1,391 and 1,234 is a decline of 11.3%.

Table 48: Low Income First-Time Transfers by Classification							
Classification	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17*
Freshman	74	100	96	89	76	58	49
Sophomore	99	129	117	107	117	109	88
Junior	185	238	242	220	211	184	171
Senior	123	131	100	94	84	82	60
Total	481	598	555	510	488	433	368

*AY is SUR, fall, winter, and spring term. Data from spring 2017 is preliminary and the classification numbers may change as transfer credit is processed. Students from 16-17 have had little opportunity to get a Pell grant during their time at MSU. Thus, the number of Pell recipients is very likely to grow over time, especially for this group.

- Table 48 shows the trends with regard to low-income transfer students. The 2016-17 numbers are likely low because some of these students will receive Pell as they continue at MSU. Despite this caution, the trend suggests a decline in the number of low-income transfer students. As with the total transfer students, the low-income transfer students do not appear to graduate quickly. For the seniors who transferred in 2010-11 and 2011-12, about 50% of the low-income transfers graduated. This is in contrast to the low-income transfers who came during those years, who have an average graduation rate of 27%.
- Regarding low income, since 2010-11, about 62% of first-time transfer students are low income. This is similar to the MSU population, and like the MSU population, the percentage of low-income students has declined in recent years, particularly 2015-16 and 2016-17.
- Historically, the largest number of low-income transfers have come from five of the KCTCS institutions: Big Sandy, Ashland, Maysville, Bluegrass, and Hazard. This is both good and bad news in that there have been enrollment declines in Ashland, Bluegrass, and Maysville. Hazard showed small increases in enrollment, and Big Sandy increased enrollment in 2015-16 by about 600.

Table 49: Low Income Bachelor's Degrees Target								
Target	3 Year Mean	Baseline	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Cumulative Increase
1.0% annual increase	690	779	787	795	803	811	819	5.1%

*3 year mean includes 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15

- Given the data available, this seems as if it will be a hard metric to move, especially with a new high baseline. The three-year mean of 690 is substantially lower than the baseline of 779. This is especially true since the number and percentage of low-income students is declining. The number of low-income seniors, 1,238 is smaller than the previous total of 1,304.
- Table 49 models a 1% annual increase as the target for this metric.

9B: Bachelor's Degrees Awarded – URM (Strategic Agenda, Performance Funding, Diversity Plan)

Recommended target: 4% annual growth

The following elements informed this selection:

Table 50: Underrepresented Minority Bachelor's Degrees						
	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
URM Bachelor's Degrees	**49**	**53**	**46**	**51**	**63**	**69**

- Table 50 shows that the number of MSU's bachelor's degrees awarded to URM students increased by 40.8% since 2010-11. However, there has been a good bit of instability in these increases. For instance, from 2011-12 to 2012-13, URM degree production decreased by 13.2%, whereas in 2013-14 to 2014-15 degree production increased by 23.5%.

Table 51: Pipeline of Total URM Bachelor's Seeking Student Enrollment						
Year	**Freshmen**	**Sophomores**	**Juniors**	**Seniors**	**Seniors Graduated within Year**	**Seniors Graduated Total***
2009-10	**97**	**62**	**51**	**85**	**33 (38.8%)**	**73 (85.9%)**
2010-11	**125**	**40**	**61**	**92**	**43 (46.7%)**	**75 (81.5%)**
2011-12	**145**	**69**	**62**	**105**	**43 (40.9%)**	**81 (77.1%)**
2012-13	**200**	**82**	**62**	**107**	**44 (41.1%)**	**76 (71.0%)**
2013-14	**226**	**96**	**72**	**97**	**45 (46.4%)**	**73 (75.3%)**
2014-15	**203**	**123**	**88**	**97**	**54 (55.7%)**	**73 (75.2%)**
2015-16	**178**	**112**	**111**	**118**	**61 (51.7%)**	**77 (65.2%)**
2016-17	**137**	**98**	**115**	**149**	**58.4%(n=87)***	**58.4% (n=87)**

*Includes grad applications

- Table 51 shows that the number of URM freshmen at MSU increased dramatically reaching a new high in 2013-14, but since then, the numbers have been declining along a similar trajectory

to their rise. As with other bachelor's degrees, the percentage of seniors who graduate during the year has been rising. Based on the preliminary graduates and graduate applications, it is very likely that MSU will surpass the 69 URM degrees produced in 2015-16. This would also be a new high with regard to the percentage of URM seniors who graduated during the year with 58.4%.

Table 52: URM First-Time Transfers by Classification

Classification	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17*	Change from 2010-11
Freshman	**4**	**16**	**17**	**14**	**7**	**12**	**14**	**250%**
Sophomore	**6**	**11**	**15**	**11**	**11**	**15**	**16**	**167%**
Junior	**15**	**21**	**14**	**23**	**17**	**16**	**18**	**20.0%**
Senior	**16**	**14**	**18**	**6**	**8**	**13**	**9**	**-43.7%**
Post-Bac	**6**	**6**	**5**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**-50.0%**
Total	**47**	**68**	**69**	**58**	**44**	**58**	**60**	**27.6%**

*AY is SUR, fall, winter, and spring term. Data from spring 2017 is preliminary and the numbers may change as transfer credit is processed.

- Table 52 shows that first-time transfer students provide an average of 58 URM students a year and are not a huge source of URM students. The source for the most URM transfers is Bluegrass Technical College, which provided 53 transfers from 2010-11 through 2016-17. The next closest sources are Maysville with 25 and Ashland with 23.
- Of the 404 URM transfers, 92 completed their bachelor's degree at MSU, which is about 22.7%. A review of first time transfers from 2010-11 to 2013-14 reveals that 81 out of 242 or approximately 33.5% graduated including all classifications. Freshmen again had the lowest rate of graduation at 21.6% and seniors had the highest graduation rate of 46.3%. Juniors graduated at about 37%.

Table 53: Underrepresented Minority Bachelor's Degrees Target

Target	3 Year Mean	Baseline	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Cumulative Increase
4.0% annual increase	**53**	**69**	**72**	**75**	**78**	**81**	**84**	**21.7%**

*Three year mean includes 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15.

- Table 53 shows that MSU is starting at a very high baseline. This substantial improvement has been partially driven by enrollment increases in URM students. Improvements in the pipeline

can be seen for juniors and seniors; however, the number of freshman enrolled declined significantly in 2015-16 and 2016-17. This will affect the pipeline moving forward because MSU will not have any slack that would allow the loss of students. MSU will have to retain and graduate the enrolled students, or else replenish the numbers by enhancing transfer students. In the current year, it looks as if MSU is set to establish a new high for URM bachelor's degrees.

- URM transfer students have been relatively stable over this period with the exceptions of 2010-11 and 2014-15, which showed substantial dips. The other concern is the weakness in the KCTCS pipeline going forward, especially with regard to declines in enrollment at Bluegrass Community and Ashland, both of which have been the largest sources of URM first-time transfer enrollment during this time.
- The data provided suggests short-term improvement and potential risk over the long term. Thus, if all graduation applications were approved MSU would likely achieve growth of 33.3% this year by hitting 92 URM bachelor's degrees, which is the 2020-21 target for 6% annual increase. However, unless the pipeline is replenished with transfers or improvements occur in the retention and progression of the current freshmen students, MSU will not be able to maintain the current pace of degree production. Thus, if we exclude the 149 seniors that we have in 2016-17, MSU's average number of URM seniors is around 100.
- The target selected for this metric is a 4% annual increase.

Strategies

While maintaining a diverse student body is essential, institutions must commit to helping enrolled students be. Unfortunately, certain diverse student populations historically have exhibited lower graduation and retention rates than the overall student population. In order to improve the success of these students, MSU will implement strategies designed to address the issues.

Tactics	Measures	Lead/ Accountability	Internal Collaborators	External Collaborators	Timeline
Strategy 1: The plan utilizes high impact practices to create strategies designed to support increased student success for Black/African American, Hispanic, low-income, and underrepresented minority students.					
1.1 Institutionalize the Eagle Diversity Education Center (EDEC) programs and services	- Creation of Community Conversations - Number of student programs created for students	Minority Academic Services Coordinator, Minority Retention Coordinator	Chief Diversity Officer, Office of Student Activities, Inclusion & Leadership, Counseling & Health Services, Career Services, Academic Affairs, Undergraduate Research, Center for Regional Engagement		Fall 2017

Strategy 2: Identify annual goals for underrepresented minority students and low income for the student success metric of 1st to 2nd year retention.					
2.1 The Dedication to Retention, Education, and Academic Success at Morehead State program (DREAMS) is a comprehensive academic support and retention program centered on first year transition, mentoring, and leadership.	- Provide direct and supplemental academic support to students who are in jeopardy concerning academic performance and heightened rendition risk.	Director of Academic Advising & Retention	Minority Academic Services Coordinator, Minority Retention Coordinator, Chief Diversity Officer		Fall 2017
Strategy 3: Identify annual goals for underrepresented minority and low income students for the student success metric of graduation rates (6 year for four year institutions)					
3.1 Create a plan to identify underrepresented minority students who have left MSU and attempt to re-enroll them to complete their programs	- Number of students reclaimed	Enrollment Services Dean Graduate School	Enrollment Counselors, Academic Advisors, Program Coordinator		Fall 2017
3.2 Create and implement plan to increase diverse international student enrollment, especially targeting Black and Hispanic population	-Numbers of international students enrolled and maintained	Enrollment Services, Academic Affairs	Enrollment Counselors, Academic Departments, First Year Experience	-SACAM -Foreign Countries	Fall 2018
Strategy 4: Identify annual goals for underrepresented minority and low-income students and for the student success metric of degrees conferred.					
4.1 Assess increase in percentage of degrees awarded	- Compare rates from year to year	Director of Academic Advising & Retention	Undergraduate Research Fellowship Program		Fall 2018

4.2 Have the appropriate units within Academic Affairs and Student Success review the data annually and develop strategies to address areas of concern	-Review graduation metrics	Vice President of Academic Affairs/ Vice President of Student Success	Academic Advising & Retention, Institutional Research, Chief Diversity Officer Academic Affairs		Fall 2018

Impact

Workforce Diversity: URM Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty (Diversity Plan)

Recommended target: 2% annual growth

The following elements informed this selection:

Table 61: Workforce Diversity - URM Tenured and All Tenure-Track Faculty including Academic Chairs and Program Directors						
Institution	2013	2014	2015	2016	Census Data	Change
MSU	**7.7%**	**7.2%**	**7.0%**	**7.5%**	**3.8%**	**-0.2**

*Information from IPEDS HR report and includes tenured and tenure-track faculty members.

- Table 61 shows that MSU has experienced a slight decline of .2% since 2013, but continues to outperform the demographics of the service region with regard to the percentage of URM tenured and tenure-track faculty employed. The percentage of URM tenured and tenure-track faculty at MSU in 2016 is almost twice that of the service region demographics based upon Census data.

Table 62: Workforce Diversity – URM Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty including Acad. Chairs and Program Dir. Target									
Targets	3 Year Mean	Baseline	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Cumulative Increase	% Faculty
2.0% annual increase	**20**	**19**	**19**	**20**	**20**	**21**	**21**	**10.5%**	**7.8%**

*Percentages based on a stable number of 270 total tenured/tenure-track faculty members as shown in IPEDS HR 2015.

- Table 62 models a 2% annual increase in the number of URM tenured and tenure-track faculty employed at MSU. This is somewhat ambitious, given the continued budget cuts that affect the hiring of faculty positions.

Workforce Diversity: URM Management Occupations (Diversity Plan)

Recommended target: 4% annual growth

The following elements informed this selection:

Table 63: Workforce Diversity: URM Management- Executive & Professional-Presidents, Deans, Directors, Etc.						
Institution	2013	2014	2015	2016	Census Data	Change
MSU	5.0%	8.1%	6.9%	2.6%	3.8%	-2.4

*Information from IPEDS HR report and includes all full-time people in SOC code 11

- Table 63 shows that MSU has experienced a decline of 2.4% since 2013 but continues to outperform the demographics of the service region with the percentage of URM managers employed.

Table 64: Workforce Diversity: URM Management Target									
Target	3 Year Mean	Base-line	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Cumulative Increase	% Management
4.0% annual increase	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	20.00%	8.30%

*Percentages based on a stable number of 72 total full-time management positions as shown in IPEDS HR 2015.

As shown in the target calculation Table 64, 4% annual increase will result in an increase in the number of URM managers by one. In order to realize the positive effects of diversity, Kentucky's public institutions must become communities that provide an inclusive and supportive environment for a diverse group of students. Campus climate represents the current attitudes, behaviors and standards of faculty, staff, administrators and students concerning the level of respect for individual needs, abilities and potential.[1] In order for students to be successful and receive the full benefits of diversity, the campus climate must be one that is supportive and respectful of all people.

Furthermore, in order to live and thrive on a diverse campus and in an increasingly diverse world, students must become more culturally competent. If "diversity" refers to the variation in populations as defined in this policy, then "competency" refers to the ability to understand and appropriately address these variations. Cultural competency provides individuals with the knowledge, skills, and

attitudes to increase their effectiveness in relating across cultural differences and prepares them for life in increasingly diverse domestic and international environments. Because of the knowledge and skills obtained, students will gain an appreciation of their own cultural identities and become critically self-reflective in their orientation toward differences in the identities of others.

Strategies

Tactics	Measures	Lead/ Accountability	Internal Collaborators	External Collaborators	Timeline
Strategy 1: Establish a baseline of community members' perceptions of diversity, equity, inclusion and cultural competence at Morehead State University and determine how the institution may advance its goals for diversity and inclusion.					
1.1 Create a bias reporting and response mechanism for students, staff and faculty to address issues that may affect the environment or atmosphere negatively.	- Creation of bias reporting and response mechanism/ system - Number of incidents reported - Nature of incidents (populations impacted) reported	Coordinator Student Leadership and Advocacy	Web Marketing Director, MSU Police; Dean of Students, Chief Diversity Officer, Office of Student Activities, Inclusion & Leadership, Counseling & Health Services, Human Resources	Morehead Police; Rowan County Sheriff; Pathways (other community mental health agencies)	Fall 2017

1.2 Develop an expanded institutional definition of diversity and inclusion that acknowledges and supports intersectionality i.e. support and advocacy for equity regardless of race, ethnicity, veteran status, orientation, identity, gender expression or socio-economic status	- Establish expanded definition - Receive institutional approval through shared governance - Distribute to campus community - Replace in printed/ electronic plans, publications, etc.	Chief Diversity Officer	Human Resources, General Counsel, Student Activities, Inclusion & Leadership, Student Government Association, Faculty Senate, Staff Congress		Fall 2017-Spring 2018
1.3 Systematically administer, analyze, and use feedback from a campus climate survey.	- Assessment instrument selected - Survey administered to faculty, staff and students - Feedback analyzed and utilized to improve campus climate	Office of Institutional Research & Analysis	Human Resources; General Counsel; Student Activities, Inclusion & Leadership; Chief Diversity Officer		Administered in Fall 2017 to establish baseline; administered every three years thereafter

Strategy 2: Create and support an emphasis that would serve as a cross-divisional, interdisciplinary organization to facilitate advocacy, education, and research related to social justice, diversity, inclusion, equality, and equity.					
2.1 Join National Association of Multicultural Education and renew as an institution on an annual basis	- Join NAME - Use NAME resources and curriculum in programming	Chief Diversity Officer			Fall 2018
2.2 Create a database of information about offices and individuals who are doing programming, education, advocacy, and research related to diversity and inclusion on campus.	- Creation of database - Number of programs - Types of programs offered - Programs offered per population - Alignment of programs/ research to campus climate survey feedback	Chief Diversity Officer	Office of Student Activities, Inclusion & Leadership; Chief Diversity Officer; Eagle Education Diversity Center, Academic Affairs		Spring 2019
Strategy 3: Increase representation of diverse faculty, professional staff, and administrators through strategic recruitment and retention efforts.					
3.1 Utilize recruitment networks such as Kentucky Association of Blacks in Higher Education, Blacks in Higher Education, SREB, Diverse Education, etc.	- Jobs advertised in/with diversity recruitment networks/ publications	Human Resources	Hiring supervisors, Academic Affairs	Professional Associations	Ongoing

3.2 Facilitate the development of and provide support for faculty/staff associations based on diverse backgrounds; and embed mentorship dimensions within them for knowledge development and organizational effectiveness.	-Creation of associations - Number of faculty/staff participating compared to number employed - Survey to all diverse faculty/staff to determine why they were/were not involved	Human Resources	Vice Presidents; Faculty and staff of diverse backgrounds; Faculty Senate; Staff Congress	Professional Associations	Fall 2018
Strategy 4: Identify various settings (integrating artwork and signage in common areas) that reflect the diversity of the campus community. Develop communication in venues that promote diversity, inclusion, cultural competence, and Diversity Plan action steps in ways that motivate the community to engage in implementing the actions (e.g., the website, social media, on- and off- campus community forums, blogs, printed publications, exhibits, TV and radio interviews, presentations at conferences).					
4.5 Conceptualize and develop a video during New Student Days highlighting the diversity and commonalities among the incoming freshman class – "What We Share"	- Completion of video - Distribution of video on web and social media	Chief Marketing and Public Relations Officer	Vice President for Student Success; First Year Programs; Chief Diversity Officer; Web Marketing Director; Videographer; Students		Fall 2017; Updated annually

Barriers

In order for the Diversity Plan to be successful, the appropriate resources need to be in place, related to student success and employment. The internal and external collaborators will need to work together to ensure that proper communication channels are in place and that each group understands the expectations or the requirements needed to advance the plan forward. If resources are removed (other projects or leave for other jobs), there will need to be others to step in and complete or implement the strategies that are a part of the plan. The information needed to make decisions will need to be accurate and available in a timely manner to adjust to the plan if needed.

Plan Assessment

Assessment of the plan will be performed annually, with progression and feedback conducted. Institutional Research will coordinate the data collection and analysis. The targets that are a part of

the strategic agenda and contained in the diversity plan will need to be reviewed concurrently. Any adjustments to the plan will be done after careful review. Moreover, the efficacy of the strategies outline in the proposal to achieve success are currently being developed.

Conclusion

Morehead State University has an unwavering commitment to promoting diversity and inclusion on campus, and in the Region, we serve. Accordingly, the plan proposed is complete with campus-wide enthusiasm and support. We look forward to collaborating with the Kentucky Council for Postsecondary Education to improve, implement and asses this important plan.

Implementation Plan

Once approved the MSU Diversity Plan will be subject to two sequential committees. First, an implementation committee will ensure that the plan is place and adjustments made as necessary throughout the coming year. Following initial implementation, an oversight committee thereafter to ensure annual review and updates as necessary.

References

American Association of Colleges & Universities

Capper, C., & Young, M. (2014). Ironies and limitations of educational leadership for social justice: A call to social justice educators. *Theory into Practice, 53*(2), 158-164.

Center for Urban Education, University of Southern California

Dantley, M. E., Beachum, F. D., & McCray, C. R. (2008). Exploring the intersectionality of multiple centers within notions of social justice. *Journal of School Leadership*, *18*(2), 124-133.

Davis, T. L., & Harrison, L. M. (2013). *Advancing social justice: Tools, pedagogies, and strategies to transform your campus*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Gorski, P. C. (2013). *Reaching and teaching students in poverty: Strategies for erasing the opportunity gap*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Gorski, P. C., & Pothini, S. G. (2013). *Case studies on diversity and social justice education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
Gorski, P. C., & Swalwell, K. (2015). Equity literacy for all. *Educational Leadership, 72*(6), 34-40.

Griffiths, M. (2003). *Action for social justice in education: Fairly Different*. Maidenhead, England: Open University Press.

Irving, D. (2014). *Waking up white, and finding myself in the story of race*. Cambridge, MA: Elephant Room Press.

Loewen, J. W. (1995). *Lies my teacher told me*. New York, NY: Touchstone.

National Center for Cultural Competence

Normore, A. H., & Brooks, J. S. (Eds.). (2014). *Educational leadership for ethics and social justice: Views from the social sciences*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Page, S. E. (2007). *The difference: How the power of diversity creates better groups, firms, schools, and societies* (3rd Ed.). Princeton, NJ: University Press.

Samuels, D. R. (2014). *The culturally inclusive educator: Preparing for a Multicultural world*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Tochluk, S. (2010). *Witnessing whiteness: The need to talk about race and how to do it*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
nbcvx
University of Denver