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PREFACE

The following report culminates a two-year planning and research initiative undertaken by the Midwestern Higher Education Commission (MHEC). MHEC was established in 1991 by the Midwestern Regional Education Compact, an interstate statutory agreement among several states. Current compact members are: Illinois, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio and Wisconsin. Eligible states that have not yet joined the compact include Indiana, Iowa, North Dakota and South Dakota. The Commission's mission is to assist Midwestern states in advancing higher education through interstate cooperation and resource sharing. The commission is comprised of five members from each state, appointed by the governor and the legislature.

The objective of this MHEC project was to provide essential background and planning information on minority faculty representation in Midwestern higher education, and to propose regional strategies the Commission might pursue to advance minority faculty recruitment and retention in Midwestern higher education.

MHEC adopted the following goal in July 1991:

To develop a plan to encourage the expansion of minority faculty in underrepresented academic disciplines at public and independent colleges, universities, community colleges, and technical colleges throughout the Midwest.

The Commission developed a preliminary proposal in May 1992 to develop a pipeline fellowship project that would facilitate the matriculation of minority graduates of Midwestern institutions into Ph.D. programs at Midwestern research universities. The project's aim was to recruit graduates of these Ph.D. programs back into faculty positions at Midwestern institutions.

In March 1993, the Commission appointed Dr. Samuel L. Myers, Jr., Roy Wilkins Professor of Human Relations and Social Justice at the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota, as principal investigator to explore the problems of underrepresentation, assess the merits of the preliminary proposal and other possible options, and recommend regional strategies to facilitate the representation of minority faculty among member institutions. Dr. Caroline Sotello Viernes Turner, Associate Professor, Department of Educational Policy and Administration, University of Minnesota, served as coprincipal investigator.

This document is their report to the Commission.

As a first step in organizing the project, an Oversight Committee was established to give general direction to planning and to assess progress towards the accomplishment of objectives. The Committee reviewed and approved the preliminary organizational format.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

FINDINGS

Extent of Minority Representation.

1. Varying definitions of representation yield alternative estimates of the degree of underrepresentation of minority faculty.

2. When measured in comparison with the percentage of the entire population, representation among full-time faculty in Midwestern Higher Education Commission (MHEC) states differs by minority group: African Americans are severely underrepresented in all states; American Indians are underrepresented in seven out of eight states; Hispanics are underrepresented in six of eight states; Asian Americans are not underrepresented.

3. When measured in comparison with the percentage of the population ages 24 to 70, representation among higher education faculty in Midwestern Higher Education Commission (MHEC) states differs by minority group: African Americans and American Indians are severely underrepresented; Hispanics are also substantially underrepresented in most MHEC states; Asian/Pacific Islanders, in contrast, are represented at higher proportions among faculty than among the population in all eight MHEC states.

- The percentage of African American faculty members in MHEC states (3.7 percent) is considerably less than half the percentage of African Americans ages 24 to 70 in the population (9.5 percent).
- The percentage of American Indian faculty members (0.2 percent) is half the percentage of American Indians ages 24 to 70 in the population (0.4 percent).
- In seven states the percentages of Hispanic faculty members were less than the percentage of Hispanics ages 24 to 70 in the population. In one state—Wisconsin—the percentage of Hispanic faculty members was somewhat greater than the percentage of Hispanics ages 24 to 70 in the population.
- The percentage of Asian/Pacific Islander faculty members in MHEC states ranges from 1.5 percent in Nebraska to 6.3 percent in Illinois. But Asian/Pacific Islanders as a percentage of the population ages 24 to 70 range from less than one percent in four MHEC states to 2.5 percent in Illinois.

4. Moreover, African American and American Indian faculty representation in MHEC states is lower than the national average, using the measure based on age groups 24-70. The representation of Asian/Pacific Islanders and Hispanics in MHEC states is above the national average, although representation of Hispanic males is lowest of all racial groups.
5. When measured in comparison with the percentage of individuals with master's or Ph.D. degrees, nonwhites as a group are underrepresented as faculty members in MHEC states.

Nonwhites as a group are only 76 percent as prevalent among faculty members in MHEC states as among people with master's or Ph.D. degrees living in MHEC states.

6. National data show that African American, American Indian and Hispanic faculty representation in science and engineering (which includes social sciences, physical sciences and engineering fields) is lower than in other fields. MHEC data also show these patterns.

Causes of Underrepresentation.

1. African Americans, Hispanics, and American Indians are substantially underrepresented nationally along every step of the collegiate education pipeline culminating in the doctorate. Asians are represented at higher proportions than in the population all along the pipeline to the doctorate.

- African Americans' share of all degrees drops from 4.9 percent of bachelor's to 4.3 of master's to 3.1 percent of doctorates.
- Hispanics share of all degrees declines from 3.1 percent of bachelor's to 2.8 percent of master's to 2.5 percent of doctorates.
- American Indians' share of all degrees remains nearly stable at .39 percent of bachelor's, .36 percent of master's, and .31 percent of doctorates.
- Asian Americans' share of all degrees increases from 4.1 percent of bachelor's to 4.7 percent of master's to 5.3 percent of doctorates.

2. The number and share of bachelor's degree recipients increased nationally for Asians, Hispanics, and American Indians between 1977 and 1990. For African Americans, though, the number increased slightly, while the share declined. The results were generally less positive -- and, for African Americans, negative -- for master's degrees and Ph.D.s.

- The share of all bachelor's degrees earned by Asians more than doubled; the share earned by Hispanics increased by 40 percent; the minuscule share earned by American Indians increased by 10 percent; and the share earned by African Americans declined by more than 11 percent.
- For Asians, Hispanics, and American Indians the increase in share of master's degrees awarded did not keep pace with the increase in share of bachelor's degrees awarded. The share of master's degrees earned by Asians less than doubled; the share earned by Hispanics rose by 18 percent, less than half the increase in the share of bachelor's degrees; and the share earned by American Indians barely increased by six percent -- about half the
Increase in the share of bachelor's degrees earned. For African Americans the news was worse: the number of master's degrees earned by African Americans declined by 31 percent, while the share declined by one-third.

- For Hispanics the increase in the share of Ph.D. degrees -- 51 percent -- outpaced the increase in the share of bachelor's and master's degrees. For Asians the increase in the share of Ph.D. degrees awarded -- 26 percent -- did not keep pace with the increase in share of bachelor's or master's degrees. The tiny share earned by American Indians increased by 28 percent while the share earned by African Americans declined by 20 percent.

3. In the science and engineering fields, where there has been a historic underrepresentation of African Americans, Hispanics and American Indians, the pathways toward the Ph.D. differ for each minority group nationally. But at the critical junction where doctorates move to faculty tenure at four-year colleges and universities, there is a drop-off among all minority groups, including Asians, who are adequately represented at earlier points along the pipeline.

- African American, American Indian, and Hispanic shares of tenured science and engineering faculty at four-year colleges and universities around the country are considerably below their shares of bachelor's degree recipients in science and engineering. This is not true of Asians, for whom the share of tenured faculty is greater than the share of bachelor's degree recipients.

- However, all minority groups are represented at lower percentages among tenured science and engineering faculty at four-year colleges and universities than among employed science and engineering Ph.D.s. The comparison of percentage of tenured science and engineering faculty to employed science and engineering Ph.D.s is as follows:
  - Whites: 91.7 percent of tenured faculty to 85.4 percent of employed Ph.D.s;
  - African Americans: 1.6 percent to 2.1 percent;
  - Asians: 6.2 percent to 10.2 percent;
  - American Indians: 0.16 percent to 0.20 percent;
  - Hispanics: 1.5 percent to 1.7 percent.

4. Low faculty salaries have a greater effect than the quantity of minority Ph.D.s on the supply of minority faculty members in MHEC states.

- Increasing the supply of minority Ph.D.s would have only small effects on their representation rates among faculty members in MHEC states. In some cases, it would have negative effects.

- The supply of faculty is very responsive to earnings potential in academia. This responsiveness is much more pronounced among nonwhites as a group than among whites, especially in MHEC states.

- The reduction of minority faculty supply as a result of increased private sector wages is less than the increase in supply as a result of increased faculty salaries in MHEC states.

- Salaries of minority and majority faculty members are generally lower than the national
average in MHEC states.

5. MHEC states are exporters of Ph.D.s generally and -- to an even greater extent -- of minority Ph.D.s.

- Collectively, the institutions of higher education in MHEC states annually confer approximately 23 percent of all Ph.D.s produced in the nation.
- Almost two-thirds (63.5 percent) of the doctoral graduates produced in the Midwest are "exported" to other places.
- The Midwest is also an exporter of minority doctorates -- to a higher degree than for white doctorates. While 63.1 percent of white Ph.D.s produced in MHEC states are exported to other places, 66.7 percent of minority Ph.D.s produced in MHEC states are exported.
- This exporter effect is higher among minority doctorates employed in academia than among white doctorates employed in academia. Among MHEC-produced white Ph.D.s who are employed in academia, 38.8 percent were employed in MHEC states in 1991. For MHEC-produced minority Ph.D.s employed in academia, the percentage who were employed in MHEC states ranged from 32.9 percent for African Americans to 36.4 percent for American Indians.

6. Minority faculty members believe a "chilly climate" exists on many campuses in MHEC states.

Minority faculty members expressed the following key concerns:
- Racial, gender and ethnic bias;
- Isolation and unsupportive work environment;
- Lack of information about tenure and promotion;
- Language/accent barriers;
- Lack of mentors and lack of support from superiors.

Despite concerns about a chilly climate for minority faculty members, most of those interviewed indicated they plan to stay in academia.

7. Midwestern institutions reported few organized programs for supporting minority faculty development, although a few institutions reported "exemplary programs."

Despite the fact that 77 percent of the 48 Midwestern institutions surveyed reported minority faculty retention as a high or very high priority, most offer little organized support for supporting minority faculty development:
- Only six percent have a special office for minority faculty professional development;
- Only nine percent offer funding for minority faculty mentoring programs;
- Only 20 percent offer what they judge as "excellent" support of faculty in recognizing diversity (such as supporting and valuing a faculty member's efforts to recruit minority students);
• Fifty-four percent said they allocate less than five percent of their faculty development budgets for minority faculty. Forty-three percent allocate less than one percent for minority faculty.

But 10 percent of the institutions surveyed reported exemplary programs for minority faculty recruitment and five percent for minority faculty retention.

CONCLUSIONS

Strategies for Increasing Minority Faculty Representation.

1. Since representation differs among various minority groups, various types of institutions and various states, strategies developed to increase minority faculty representation must address these differences.

2. Higher faculty salaries would improve the representation of currently underrepresented minorities in higher education. Increasing the salaries of faculty members in MHEC states would have a greater effect on improving the representation of minority faculty members in MHEC states than would increasing the supply of minority Ph.D.s alone.

3. Because the Midwest has been a historic exporter of minority doctorates, steps to encourage Midwest-produced minority doctorates to stay in the region would help increase representation of minority faculty in MHEC states.

Such steps would likely have a greater effect on increasing the representation of minority faculty in MHEC states than would strategies simply to increase the production of minority Ph.D.s. If there are no attempts to recruit and retain Midwestern minority graduates as faculty members in the region, there can be little confidence that Midwestern institutions will directly benefit from participation in a national or regional minority Ph.D.-production effort.

4. Minority faculty development through networking, mentoring and research support would likely increase representation of minority faculty, because it would improve the attractiveness of the Midwest as a place to work relative to other parts of the country.

A number of minority faculty members recommended focusing on retention through the development of a more positive and encouraging professional environment, and through targeted faculty development initiatives. The main recommendations advocated networks of minority scholars, senior faculty mentors, and support for research and publications.
RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Salaries: MHEC should initiate a regional effort to assist institutions and states in making the case for raising faculty salaries to be more competitive with other regions and with private industry.

- MHEC should call attention to the significant role of market forces in the supply of minority faculty and disseminate information on regional faculty salaries.
- MHEC should draft model industry/higher education partnerships. One approach could encourage joint appointments of personnel in faculties and industry. Another approach could encourage more industry-sponsored faculty chairs. Both could help increase salary levels of faculty members.

2. Retaining Midwestern Ph.D.s: MHEC should initiate an effort to assist institutions in the region to recruit and retain a higher percentage of MHEC-produced minority Ph.D.s.

3. “Chilly climate”: MHEC should convene a regional summit of higher education leadership to identify problems of chilly climates on campuses for minority faculty members.

A summit would offer the opportunity:
- for minority faculty members to share their experiences related to campus climates and help identify the factors that exacerbate chilly climates;
- to elevate the consciousness of the nature and scope of chilly climates on campuses;
- for faculty members and other higher education officials to develop strategies to improve the climate for minority faculty members;
- to highlight successful practices and initiatives for dealing with climate issues.

4. Demonstration projects: MHEC should seek proposals from teams of institutions for demonstration projects that would develop, implement, and extend successful models of improving the climate and reducing turnover among minority faculty members. Using grant money, MHEC would select proposals to fund and then disseminate information on successful programs.

5. Pipeline efforts: MHEC should support further evaluation of the workings of pipelines and the strengths and cost-effectiveness of various approaches for various minority groups. MHEC should then propose ways to refine pipeline approaches.