

A Report on the Participation and Success of Underrepresented Students and Staff

University of Illinois at Springfield

Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic
Affairs

Submitted to the Illinois Board of Higher Education
January 2007

Acknowledgments

The annual Underrepresented Groups Report can be produced only through the cooperation of many people. The Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs would like to thank the following individuals for their contributions to this year's report:

Marilyn Marshall, Director, University Academic Programs and Services
Karla Carwile, Director, Office of Disability Services
Laura Dorman, Resource and Policy Analyst, Institutional Studies
Jonathan R. GoldbergBelle, Director, International Programs
Terri Jackson, Coordinator, Office of Multicultural Student Affairs
Marya Leatherwood, Associate Vice Chancellor and Director of Enrollment Management
Jeff Maras, previously Associate Dean of Students
Mary Ellen McElligott, Coordinator, Conference Services
Christopher Miller, Vice Chancellor for Student and Administrative Services
Margaret Noe, Associate Chancellor for Access and Equal Opportunity
Lynn Otterson, Director, Women's Center
LaMar Rice, Graduate Assistant, Office of Multicultural Student Affairs
Richard Schuldt, Director, Survey Research Office
Aaron Shures, Associate Provost

prepared by:

Beverly Bunch
Faculty Associate, Provost's Office / Associate Professor, Public Administration and
Institute for Legal and Policy Studies

University of Illinois at Springfield 2007 Underrepresented Groups Report

Table of Contents

Institutional Report

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Increasing Participation of Underrepresented Groups – Campus Climate..... | 1 |
| 2. Institutional Effective Practice: The Diversity Task Force | 28 |
| 3. Personnel and Funds Budgeted for Programs Serving Underrepresented Groups | 29 |
| 4. Enrollment of Students with Disabilities | 29 |
| 5. Freshmen Retention Rates by Racial/Ethnic Category and by Gender | 29 |
| 6. Status Report on Web Accessibility | 29 |

Appendix

| | |
|--|--|
| Attachment A: Definitions for Annual Report on Underrepresented Groups in Higher Education | |
| Table 1: Dollars and Staff Years Budgeted to Programs Serving Underrepresented Students and Staff at Public Universities, Fiscal Years 2005 and 2006 | |
| Table 2: Students with Disabilities, Academic Year 2005-2006 | |
| Table 3: Freshmen Retention Rates – Fall 2005 New Beginning Freshmen Cohorts by Racial/Ethnic Category and Gender | |
| Table A: Summary of Enrollments by Ethnic Categories, Fall 1996 to Fall 2005 | |
| Table B: Student Enrollment – Total, African American, Other Minority, and Total Minority, Fall 1996 to Fall 2005 | |
| Table C: Undergraduate Total Head Count Enrollment by College, Degree Program, Racial/Ethnic Category, and Gender, Fall 2005 | |
| Table C-1: Undergraduate Total Head Count Enrollment – Non-Resident Alien by College, Degree Program, Racial/Ethnic Category, and Gender, Fall 2005 | |
| Table C-2: Summary of Enrollments and Retention by Ethnic Categories, Undergraduate Total Head Count Enrollment – Capital Scholars Program, Fall 2001 to Spring 2006 | |

- Table C-3: Summary of Enrollments by Gender: Undergraduate Total Head Count Enrollment – Capital Scholars Program, Fall 2001 to Spring 2006
- Table D: Master’s and Doctoral Total Head Count Enrollment by College, Degree Program, Racial/Ethnic Category, and Gender, Fall 2005
- Table D-1: Master’s and Doctoral Total Head Count Enrollment – Non-Resident Alien, by College, Degree Program, Racial/Ethnic Category, and Gender, Fall 2005
- Table E: Student Head Count Enrollment by Gender and Level, Fall 1996 to Fall 2005
- Table F: Summary Report of Full-Time Employees by Gender and Ethnicity, Fall 2005
- Table G: Summary Report of Full-Time Employees from Underrepresented Populations, Fall 1996 to Fall 2005



University of Illinois at Springfield 2007 Underrepresented Groups Report

Public Act 85-283 and subsequent legislation direct public institutions of higher education in Illinois to develop plans and implement strategies to increase the participation and achievement of minorities, women, and individuals with disabilities who traditionally have been underrepresented in higher education. Institutions are to report annually to the Illinois Board of Higher Education on efforts to implement these plans and strategies. The Board, in turn, is to report annually to the Governor and General Assembly on the effectiveness of institutional methods and strategies for increasing representation and the success of underrepresented students at public institutions. The purpose of this document is to update the Illinois Board of Higher Education on the campus' efforts to meet this mandate.



Campus Climate as it Relates to Underrepresented Students, Faculty, and Staff

This report describes the results of several surveys on the UIS campus climate that relate to students, faculty, and staff from underrepresented groups. Following the summary of the survey findings, an action plan is presented as to how the campus intends to respond to the survey findings. This report also describes the UIS Diversity Task Force as an effective practice in improving the campus climate for students, faculty, and staff from underrepresented groups. The report concludes with an update on the implementation of the UIS plan for Web Accessibility.

Overview of Representation

The University of Illinois at Springfield's enrollment of minority students as a percentage of all students increased from 12.2% in Fall 2004 to 12.8% in Fall 2005. Both the number of minority students (576) and the percentage of minority students represented the highest levels in the history of the campus. African American students numbered 365 in Fall 2005, representing 8.1% of the total student enrollment. This is the highest number of African American students in UIS history and returns the university to the 8.0% levels experienced

during the period 2000-2002. Hispanic students numbered 76 in Fall 2005, which was 1.7% of the total student enrollment. In Fall 2004, UIS had 67 Hispanic students, accounting for 1.5% of total enrollment. The Fall 2005 Hispanic student figures are the highest in the history of UIS.

Women accounted for 60.1% of the undergraduate students in Fall 2005, compared to 60.2% in Fall 2004. Among graduate students, 57.9% were women compared to 57.4% in Fall 2004. Women represented 59.2% of total student enrollment in Fall 2005.

Women accounted for 43.5% of the faculty in Fall 2005, compared to 39.3% in Fall 2004. The number of women faculty increased from 64 in Fall 2004 to 77 in Fall 2005.

In Fall 2005, minority faculty accounted for 11.3% of the faculty, compared to 13.5% in Fall 2004. The number of minority faculty decreased from 22 in Fall 2004 to 20 in Fall 2005. In Fall 2005, black faculty accounted for 6.8%, Asian faculty accounted for 3.4%, and Hispanic faculty accounted for 1.1% of the total faculty.

*** Highlights ***
In Fall 2005, the UIS campus achieved its highest percentage of minority enrollment. African American students accounted for 8.1% and Hispanic students accounted for 1.7% of total enrollment.

1. INCREASING PARTICIPATION OF UNDERREPRESENTED GROUPS CAMPUS CLIMATE

A. Evaluation of Campus Climate

The evaluation of the campus climate is based on the results of three surveys: (1) a Student Campus Climate Survey conducted by the Diversity Task Force in the spring of 2006, (2) a Faculty/Staff Campus Climate Survey conducted by the Diversity Task Force in the fall of 2006, and (3) the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) conducted in the spring of 2006. The campus climate surveys were developed by a subcommittee of the Diversity Task Force and staff and were designed to be similar to a student campus climate survey that was administered in the late 1990s.

The results from the Student Campus Climate Survey and Faculty/Staff Campus Climate Survey are presented first, followed by an analysis of the results for NSSE questions that relate to diversity. The analysis of the Student Campus Climate Survey addresses the responses for all students and, depending on the nature of the question, the responses by particular groups of students. The groups of students that are addressed include (1) female students, (2) male students, (3) minority students, (4) international students, (5) students with disabilities, and (6) students who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or questioning their sexual orientation/sexual identity (LGBTQ). A similar approach is used in analyzing the results of the Faculty/Staff Campus Climate Survey. Female faculty are addressed

separately from female staff; however, for the other groups (minorities, people with disabilities, and LGBTQ) the faculty and staff responses are combined due to the small number of respondents in those categories. When interpreting the responses by LGBTQ faculty/staff, one should note that the percentage figures are based on a very small number of responses.

Student Campus Climate Survey Methodology

A sample of 2,251 selected UIS students were sent Campus Climate questionnaires in the Spring of 2006. This represents about half (51.7%) of the total number of UIS students registered (4,350). All minority students and all international students were surveyed while random samples of white female and male students were surveyed (with some over sampling of males because of their lower response rates in past surveys). Thus, the sample can be characterized as a non-proportional stratified sample of students. Students in this sample received a prior email notification, a mail-out questionnaire (with cover letter and postage-paid return envelope), a postcard reminder, and an email reminder.

In addition, efforts were made to supplement this sample by soliciting questionnaire responses from students with disabilities and from LGBTQ students who were not in the sample. The Office of Disability Services encouraged students who came to the office to fill out a survey and arranged for the survey to be converted to a different format if that would be helpful to the student. Also, emails were sent to all students not in the sample inviting them to participate. (All of these solicited surveys were coded so they could be identified as coming from students not in the actual sample of students.)

About 400 students (n = 401) responded to the Spring 2006 Campus Climate Survey. Of these, 394 were part of the selected student sample, for a response rate of 17.5%. An additional seven returned questionnaires that were not part of this initial sample. (Thus, sample and non-sample responses are not differentiated in the analysis.) A sample of this size, if randomly chosen and non-biased in terms of the characteristics of those who responded, would have a sampling error of +/- 4.7%, at a confidence level of 95%.

In terms of student characteristics most relevant to student diversity issues, females had a higher response rate than males (22% vs. 13%), American white students had a higher response than American minority students (22% vs. 12%), and students who are American citizens had a higher response rate than did international students (19% vs. 7.5%). We have no information on comparative response rates for students with and without disabilities and for students who are and are not LGBTQ.

In terms of other characteristics, there is no difference in response rates between undergraduate and graduate students (17% and 18%, respectively). But, full-time students had a higher response rate than part-time students (22% vs. 14%); and students who were 40 years of age or older (31.5%) had a higher response rate than did students who were 30 to 39 (18%), students who were 26 to 29 (16%), students who were 22 to 25 (11%), and students who were 21 or younger (14.5%).

While the response rate is not high, of more concern is the representativeness of the students who returned surveys. As shown in the table below, the resulting sample can be characterized as very representative in terms of the known student characteristics most relevant to diversity issues (gender; race/ethnicity; and citizenship status). This degree of representativeness was achieved because relevant student groups with the lower response rates (males, minorities, international students) were over sampled in the initial sample.

Comparison of Survey Respondents to Total Student Population

| Gender | Students | Respondents |
|---------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Female | 57.7% | 58.9% |
| Male | 42.3% | 38.7% |
| Unknown | 0.1% | 2.5% |
| Ethnic Group | | |
| White | 76.0% | 72.3% |
| Black | 7.8% | 10.2% |
| Asian | 2.5% | 2.7% |
| Hispanic | 1.9% | 2.0% |
| International | 6.5% | 6.5% |
| Unknown/Other | 5.4% | 6.1% |

Faculty/Staff Campus Climate Survey Methodology

All UIS faculty and staff were sent a Campus Climate questionnaire during the first week of November, 2006. Both full-time and part-time faculty were surveyed as well as both civil service and academic professional staff. Full-time faculty and staff located on the UIS campus were sent surveys through campus mail. Part-time faculty and staff located off-campus were sent surveys through U.S. mail. Each survey package consisted of a cover letter over the Chancellor's signature, a questionnaire, and return envelope to the UIS Survey Research Office. (Only off-campus staff received a postage-paid return letter.)

Just prior to the mailing, UIS faculty and staff were sent an email notification that a questionnaire was being sent to them. At the end of November, another email was sent to all faculty and staff thanking those who had returned their questionnaire and reminding those who had not. An email address was also given to request an additional questionnaire if the original had been misplaced or if the faculty/staff member had not received a questionnaire.

The questionnaire was anonymous. No identifying number was placed on the questionnaire. Data input, computer "runs," and initial table preparation were conducted by staff of the Survey Research Office.

Nearly 300 (n=295) questionnaires were returned, 172 from staff and 123 from faculty. This represents an overall response rate of about 35%—37% for faculty and 34% from staff. A further breakdown shows response rates of about: 39% for full-time faculty, 27% from part-time faculty, 27% from civil service staff, and 45% from academic professional staff. (Seven

faculty questionnaires did not indicate full-time or part-time status, and two staff questionnaires did not indicate civil service or academic professional status.)

1. ACADEMIC/CLASSROOM EXPERIENCE

Student Campus Climate Survey

The Student Campus Climate Survey asked students to indicate the extent of their agreement or disagreement with eleven statements about whether specified conditions exist in academic programs on campus. Most of the statements included a series of subquestions that addressed particular types of diversity such as race/ethnicity/culture, gender, disability status, and sexual orientation/gender identity.

A summary of the findings is provided below.

For all students and for all student groups, the percentage of “agree” responses exceeded the percentage of “disagree” responses for each of the following items:

- The faculty members with whom you have come into contact at UIS are diverse in terms of race/ethnicity/culture, gender, and sexual orientation/gender identity.
- The students in your UIS classes have been diverse.
- Students have sufficient access to academic support services (tutoring, study skills center).
- Students with disabilities have sufficient access to adaptive equipment and/or aids.
- In my UIS classes, the course content and assigned materials have reflected viewpoints and contributions of different groups.
- Students feel comfortable expressing their opinions and viewpoints in class at UIS.
- UIS faculty are fair in their evaluations of the course performance.
- From your experience, UIS faculty are fair in the out-of-class attention and advice they give to students.
- UIS faculty encourage diverse types of students to interact with each other in course-related activities.
- At UIS, students have equal opportunities to participate in professional activities (attending conferences, writing articles, etc.).

There were only a few items for which the percentage of “disagree” responses exceeded the percentage of “agree” responses. These included:

- For all students (and for students with disabilities), “The faculty members with whom you have come into contact at UIS are diverse in terms of disability status.”

- For students with disabilities, “In my UIS classes, the course content and assigned materials have reflected the viewpoint and contributions of persons with disabilities.”
- For international students, “In my UIS classes, the course content and assigned materials have reflected the viewpoints and contributions of racial/ethnic/cultural minorities.”

For some items in which the percentage “agree” responses exceeded the percentage of “disagree” responses, the differences in the “agree” versus “disagree” responses were less than 10 percentage points. Therefore, these items should be viewed as areas for further analysis.

- For all students, these items included:
 - The students in your UIS classes have been diverse in terms of disability status.
 - In your UIS classes, the course content and assigned materials have reflected the viewpoints and contributions of persons with disabilities.
 - In your UIS classes, the course content and assigned materials have reflected the viewpoints and contributions of LGBTQ individuals.
- Among student groups, these items included:
 - Minority students: “The faculty members with whom you have come into contact at UIS are diverse in terms of race/ethnicity/culture” and “In my UIS classes, the course content and assigned materials have reflected the viewpoints and contributions of racial/ethnic/cultural minorities.”
 - Students with disabilities: “Students with disabilities have sufficient access to adaptive equipment and/or aids.”
 - LGBTQ students: “In my UIS classes, the course content and assigned materials have reflected the viewpoints and contributions of LGBTQ individuals” and “LGBTQ students feel comfortable expressing their opinions and viewpoints in class at UIS.”

Most students reported that their major program is better or the same as UIS as a whole in supporting diversity.

2. CAMPUS LIFE/EXPERIENCE

Student Campus Climate Survey

The portions of the Campus Climate Survey that addressed student life/campus experience included sections on campus climate/atmosphere, perceptions about whether discrimination exists on campus, and experiences respondents have had or seen or heard about on the UIS campus.

Campus Climate/Atmosphere: This section of the survey explained that colleges can be viewed in different ways by students and that this can be described as “climate” or “campus atmosphere.” Students were asked to rate the racial climate, the gender climate, the climate for people with disabilities, and the climate for people who are LGBTQ. The ratings were based on six pairs of opposites, including (1) closed/exclusive vs. open/inclusive, (2) socially separated vs. socially integrated, (3) unsupportive vs. supportive, (4) tense vs. relaxed, (5) hostile vs. friendly, and (6) worsening vs. improving. For each pair, the students were asked to circle a number ranging from 1–5, e.g., “tense 1... 2... 3... 4...5 relaxed.”

Among all students who responded, the percentage who rated the climate/atmosphere as positive (ratings of either 4 or 5) was higher than the percentage who rated the climate/atmosphere as negative (ratings of either 1 or 2) for all of the pairs of opposites for *each* of the four climates (except for one pair under the climate for LGBTQ students). For example, for the pair “hostile vs. friendly,” 70% of students rated the racial climate as positive compared to 7% who rated the racial climate as negative. For that same pair, 76% of students rated the gender climate as positive compared to 5% who rated it as negative. (In both cases, the remaining students either did not answer the question or rated the pair as a “3.”) The pair in which the percentage of negative responses exceeded the percentage of positive response was “tense vs. relaxed” for the climate for LGBTQ students.

In examining the response by particular groups, the responses generally were positive for all groups with the exception of LGBTQ students.

- In rating the racial climate, the responses from minority students had a higher percentage of positive ratings than negative ratings for each of the pairs of opposites. The pair with the closest percentages between negative and positive ratings was socially separated versus socially integrated (32% vs. 34%). For the other pairs, the percentage of positive replies exceeded the percentage of negative replies by 20 percentage points or more.
- In rating the gender climate, the percentage of positive replies among female students ranged from 66% to 77% for the pairs. The positive replies among male students also were positive ranging from 56% to 73%
- Among students with disabilities, the ratings of the climate for people with disabilities were positive for all pairs and were especially positive for a supportive and friendly environment. The closest percentages between negative and positive responses were for closed/exclusive versus open/inclusive (24% vs. 41%).
- In contrast to the positive replies for the racial, gender, and students with disabilities climates, the percentage of negative replies for the climate for LGBTQ students exceeded the percentage of positive replies for each of the six pairs.

The survey also addressed the extent to which students believe there is open discussion of diversity issues on campus.

- Among all respondents, a higher percentage of students agreed than disagreed with the statements that there was open discussion of racial/ethnic/cultural issues, gender issues, issues, concerns of people with disabilities, LGBTQ issues, issues associated with diverse religions views, and issues associated with diverse political views.
- Among the group responses, the only item in which the percentage of “disagree” responses exceeded the percentage of “agree” responses was for international students’ views of whether there is open discussion of racial/ethnic/cultural issues. (It should be noted, however, that only 15 international students responded to this question.)

Perceptions about Whether Discrimination Exists on Campus: Students were asked nine questions about their perceptions of the extent to which discrimination exists on the UIS campus. The choices were “often,” “sometimes,” “seldom,” “never,” and “don’t know/no opinion.” The findings presented below focus on the responses from the groups that are the most germane to the question that was asked; for example, in the analysis of questions that address discrimination based on race/ethnicity/culture, the focus is on responses from minority students and international students.

- Female respondents: discrimination against women occurs on campus “often” (5%) or “sometimes” (24%)
- Male respondents: discrimination against men occurs on campus “often” (10%) or “sometimes” (21%)
- Minority students: discrimination based on race/ethnicity/culture/nationality occurs “often” (11%) or “sometimes” (39%)
- International students: discrimination based on race/ethnicity/culture/nationality occurs “often” (11%) or “sometimes” (44%)
- Students with disabilities: discrimination against people with disabilities occurs “often” (20%) or “sometimes” (40%)
- LGBTQ students: discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation occurs “often” (44%) or “sometimes” (35%)
- Among responses from students who live on campus,
 - 33% reported that tension in housing due to differences regarding race/ethnicity/culture occurs “often” (8%) or “sometimes” (25%).
 - 43% reported that tension in housing due to differences regarding sexual orientation occurs “often” (14%) or “sometimes” (29%).

Experiences Respondents Have Had or Seen or Heard About on the UIS Campus: The Campus Climate questionnaire asked nine questions about students' experiences on campus. The questions addressed negative graffiti, property destruction, incidents of discrimination, physical violence, and insensitive or disparaging remarks or comments.

- For all students, the reported frequency of the occurrence of insensitive or disparaging remarks made by faculty or staff about particular groups ranged from 0 to 2% for “often” and 2% to 5% for “sometimes.” The reported frequencies for insensitive or disparaging remarks made by students were higher, ranging from 4%–9% for “often” and 8%–19% for “sometimes.” The types of insensitive student remarks that had the highest frequency were those made in regard to racial/ethnic minorities and LGBTQ people.
- Among student groups, insensitive or disparaging remarks were reported as “often” or “sometimes” by 10% or more of the respondents for the following:
 - Minority students: remarks made about racial/ethnic minorities by faculty (2% often, 8% sometimes) and students (17% often, 23% sometimes)
 - International students: remarks made about racial/ethnic minorities by faculty (4% often, 9% sometimes), staff (5% often, 10% sometimes) and students (18% often, 32% sometimes)
 - Females: remarks made about women by students (6% often, 15% sometimes)
 - Students with disabilities: remarks made about people with disabilities by faculty (15% often, 18% sometimes), staff (6% often, 6% sometimes), and students (18% often, 18% sometimes)
 - LGBTQ students: remarks about LGBTQ people by faculty (0% often, 18% for sometimes), staff (3% often, 22% sometimes), and students (34% often, 19% sometimes).
- For all students, experiences that had 10% or more “yes” responses included:
 - Negative graffiti directed at LGBTQ people (32%)
 - Property destruction directed at LGBTQ people (23%)
 - Personally experienced discrimination on the basis of race/ethnicity/culture/nationality (10%)
 - Heard or seen incidents of discrimination on the basis of race/ethnicity/culture/nationality (19%)
 - Heard or seen incidents of sexual discrimination (18%)
 - Heard or seen incidents of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation (26%).

- Among student groups, experiences that had 10% or more “yes” responses included:
 - Minority students: graffiti negative toward race/ethnicity/culture (12%), property destruction directed toward race/ethnicity/culture/nationality (17%), personally experienced discrimination on the basis of race/ethnicity/culture/nationality (36%), heard or seen incidents of discrimination on the basis of race/ethnicity/culture/nationality (35%)
 - International students: graffiti negative toward race/ethnicity/culture/nationality (14%), property destruction directed toward race/ethnicity/culture/nationality (19%), personally experienced discrimination on the basis of race/ethnicity/culture/nationality (45%), heard or seen incidents of discrimination on the basis of race/ethnicity/nationality (32%), heard or seen incidents of physical violence based on race/ethnicity/culture/nationality (10%).
 - Students with disabilities: personally experienced discrimination because of disabilities (37%) and heard or seen incidents of discrimination on the basis of disabilities (37%)
 - Female students: heard or seen incidents of sexual discrimination (20%)
 - Male students: heard or seen incidents of sexual discrimination (17%)
 - LGBTQ students: graffiti negative toward LGBTQ people (62%), property destruction directed toward LGBTQ people (55%), personally experienced discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation (16%), heard or seen incidents of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation (58%), heard or seen incidents physical violence on the basis of sexual orientation/gender identity (13%).

Faculty/Staff Campus Climate Survey

Campus Climate/Atmosphere: This section of the survey asked faculty and staff to rate the racial climate, the gender climate, the climate for people with disabilities, and the climate for people who are LGBTQ on the basis of six pairs of opposites, including (1) closed/exclusive vs. open/inclusive, (2) socially separated vs. socially integrated, (3) unsupportive vs. supportive, (4) tense vs. relaxed, (5) hostile vs. friendly, and (6) worsening vs. improving. For each pair, the students were asked to circle a number ranging from 1-5, e.g., “tense 1... 2... 3... 4...5 relaxed.”

Highlights of the findings from this section are noted below.

- Among all faculty/staff who responded, the percentage who rated the climate/atmosphere as positive (ratings of either 4 or 5) was higher than the

percentage who rated the climate/atmosphere as negative (ratings of either 1 or 2) for all of the pairs of opposites for *each* of the four climates.

- In examining the response by particular groups, the responses generally were positive for all groups with the exception of LGBTQ faculty/staff.
 - In rating the racial climate, the responses from minority faculty/staff had a higher percentage of positive ratings than negative ratings for each of the pairs of opposites. The pairs with the closest percentages between negative and positive ratings were socially separated versus socially integrated (35% vs. 41%) and closed versus open (31% vs. 45%). For the other pairs, the percentage of positive replies exceeded the percentage of negative replies by 20 percentage points or more.
 - In rating the gender climate, the percentage of positive replies among female faculty ranged from 51% to 73% for the pairs and the percentage among female staff ranged from 56% to 70%. The percentage of positive replies among male faculty ranged from 55% to 74% for the pairs and the percentage among male staff ranged from 71% to 80%.
 - Among faculty/staff with disabilities, the ratings of the climate for people with disabilities were positive for all pairs and were especially positive for a relaxed and friendly environment.
 - In contrast to the positive replies for the racial, gender, and individuals with disabilities climates, the percentage of negative replies for the climate for LGBTQ faculty/staff exceeded the percentage of positive replies for each of the six pairs.
- The survey also addressed the extent to which faculty/staff believe there is open discussion of diversity issues on campus.
 - Among all respondents, a higher percentage of faculty/staff agreed than disagreed with the statements that there was open discussion of racial/ethnic/cultural issues, gender issues, concerns of people with disabilities, LGBTQ issues, issues associated with diverse religious views, and issues associated with diverse political views.
 - Among the group responses, the only item in which the percentage of “disagree” responses exceeded the percentage of “agree” responses was for LGBTQ faculty/staff views of whether there is open discussion of LGBTQ issues/concerns and open discussion of diverse religious views.

Perceptions about Whether Discrimination Exists on Campus: Faculty and staff were asked eight questions about their perceptions of the extent to which discrimination exists on campus. The choices were “often,” “sometimes,” “seldom,” “never,” and “don’t know/no opinion.” The findings presented below focus on the responses from the groups that are the most germane to the question that was asked, e.g., for questions that address discrimination

based on race/ethnicity/culture/nationality, the focus is on the responses from minority faculty/staff.

- Female respondents
 - Female faculty: discrimination against women occurs on campus “often” (7%) or “sometimes” (28%)
 - Female staff: discrimination against women occurs on campus “often” (11%) or “sometimes” (32%)
- Male respondents
 - Male faculty: discrimination against men occurs on campus “often” (2%) or “sometimes” (11%)
 - Male staff: discrimination against men occurs on campus “often” (2%) or “sometimes” (9%)
- Minority faculty/staff: discrimination based on race/ethnicity/culture/nationality occurs “often” (14%) or “sometimes” (28%)
- Faculty/staff with disabilities: discrimination against people with disabilities occurs “often” (0%) or “sometimes” (24%)
- LGBTQ faculty/staff: discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation occurs “often” (27%) or “sometimes” (54%).

*** Highlights ***

Among all faculty and staff respondents, a higher percentage agreed than disagreed that UIS fostered open discussion of gender issues, concerns of people with disabilities, LGBTQ issues, issues associated with diverse religions views, issues associated with diverse political views, and racial/ethnic/cultural issues.

Experiences Respondents Have Had or Seen or Heard About on the UIS Campus: The questionnaire asked ten questions about experiences of faculty/staff on campus. The questions addressed negative graffiti, property destruction, incidents of discrimination, physical violence, and insensitive or disparaging remarks or comments.

- For all faculty/staff, experiences that had 10% or more “yes” responses included:
 - Graffiti that is negative toward racial/ethnic/cultural groups (13%), LGBTQ people (36%)
 - Property destruction directed at racial/ethnic/cultural groups (10%), LGBTQ people (21%)

- Personally experienced discrimination on the basis of race/ethnicity/culture/nationality (10%), sexual discrimination (14%)
 - Heard or seen incidents of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation (26%), race/ethnicity/culture/nationality (28%), sexual discrimination (28%).
- Among faculty/staff groups, experiences that had 10% or more “yes” responses included:
 - Minority faculty/staff: graffiti negative toward race/ethnicity/culture/nationality (10%), personally experienced discrimination on the basis of race/ethnicity/culture/nationality (31%), heard or seen incidents of discrimination on the basis of race/ethnicity/culture/nationality (45%)
 - Faculty/staff with disabilities: personally experienced discrimination because of disabilities (12%), heard or seen incidents of discrimination on the basis of disabilities (12%)
 - Female faculty: negative graffiti toward women (14%), property destruction directed at women (14%), personally experienced sexual discrimination (19%), heard or seen sexual discrimination (31%)
 - Female staff: personally experienced sexual discrimination (20%), heard or seen sexual discrimination (34%)
 - LGBTQ faculty/staff: graffiti negative toward LGBTQ people (82%), property destruction directed toward LGBTQ people (73%), personally experienced discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation (46%), heard or seen incidents of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation (82%), heard or seen physical violence based on sexual orientation (18%).
 - For all faculty/staff, the reported frequencies of the occurrence of insensitive or disparaging remarks made about particular groups (women, racial/ethnic minorities, people with disabilities, LGBTQ people) were as follows:
 - Comments made by administrators ranged from 1% to 2% for “often” and 1% to 8% for “sometimes.”
 - Comments made by faculty ranged from 0 to 2% for “often” and 2% to 9% for “sometimes.”
 - Comments made by staff ranged from 0 to 2% for “often” and 3% to 14% for “sometimes.”
 - Comments made by students ranged from 1% to 5% for “often” and 7% to 17% for “sometimes.”

- Among faculty/staff groups, insensitive or disparaging remarks were reported as “often” or “sometimes” by 10% or more of the respondents for the following:
 - Female faculty: remarks made about women by administrators (2% often, 10% sometimes), faculty (2% often, 22% sometimes), students (5% often, 19% sometimes)
 - Female staff: remarks made about women by administrators (1% often, 11% sometimes), faculty (1% often, 10% sometimes), staff (0 often, 12% sometimes), students (2% often, 12% sometimes)
 - Minority faculty/staff: remarks made about racial/ethnic minorities by administrators (0 often, 10% sometimes), faculty (3% often, 21% sometimes), staff (3% often, 24% sometimes), and students (10% often, 28% sometimes)
 - Faculty/staff with disabilities: remarks made about people with disabilities by students (4% often, 12% sometimes)
 - LGBTQ faculty/staff: remarks about LGBTQ people by administrators (0 often, 36% sometimes), faculty (0 often, 36% sometimes), staff (9% often, 9% sometimes), and students (27% often, 64% sometimes).

3. INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND RESOURCES

Student Campus Climate Survey

One portion of the Student Campus Climate Survey addressed student perceptions about the University of Illinois at Springfield. Students were asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement with 16 statements about UIS. Some of these statements had subquestions that addressed the following groups: (1) students of all races/ethnic groups/cultures/nationalities, (2) female students, (3) male students, (4) students with disabilities, and (5) LGBTQ students.

- Among students who responded to these questions, the percentage who “agreed” with the statement exceeded the percentage who “disagreed” for each of the 16 statements, including each of the subquestions.
 - You feel comfortable at UIS and have a sense of belonging.
 - If you could start over, you would still attend UIS.
 - Campus publications reflect a diverse campus community.
 - There is equitable funding for student organizations on campus.
 - The orientation programs and services to help new students adjust to college/campus life are sufficient.

- Buildings and facilities at UIS are accessible to people with disabilities.
- This institution is knowledgeable and understands the needs of (lists each of the five groups).
- This institution cares and is concerned about the needs of (lists each of the five groups).
- This institution is responsive to the needs of (lists each of the five groups).
- The following have an equal opportunity to become involved in campus-wide activities, such as committees, activities, governance, etc. (lists each of the five groups).

★ Campus Climate Highlights ★

Undergraduate and graduate student responses to the Spring 2006 Campus Climate Survey indicate that the majority of students feel comfortable at UIS and would make the same educational choice if starting over.

Moreover, a majority responded that they “feel comfortable expressing their opinions or viewpoints in class.”

- The following have an equal opportunity to hold management or leadership positions in student organizations (lists each of the five groups).
- The following have sufficient access to counseling services (lists each of the five groups).
- The following have equal opportunities when it comes to student employment on campus (lists each of the five groups).
- The following are treated fairly in student grievance/disciplinary processes (lists each of the five groups).
- The following are treated equally by campus police (lists each of the five groups).
- The following feel comfortable in campus housing (lists each of the five groups).

The table below shows responses to the first two statements (“You feel comfortable at UIS and have a sense of belonging” and “If you could start over, you would still attend UIS”), broken down by groups. These figures show that the majority of students in each of the groups feel comfortable at UIS and would attend UIS again if they were to start over. The percentage of students agreeing with each of these statements ranged from about two-thirds (or a little lower in the case of “would attend again” by international students and LGBTQ students) to three-fourths.

Student Campus Climate Survey Responses to Statements About UIS

| Groups | “Feel Comfortable at UIS” | | “Would Still Attend if Started Over” | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| | % Agree* | % Disagree* | % Agree* | % Disagree* |
| All Students | 75 | 10 | 73 | 13 |
| Female Students | 76 | 9 | 75 | 12 |
| Male Students | 72 | 11 | 73 | 15 |
| White Students | 77 | 9 | 76 | 13 |
| Minority Students | 69 | 12 | 66 | 15 |
| International Students | 69 | 12 | 62 | 15 |
| Students with Disabilities | 68 | 14 | 77 | 15 |
| LGBTQ Students | 72 | 14 | 63 | 23 |

* The remaining respondents checked “Neutral.”

- When examining the responses by student groups, the percentage of “agree” responses exceeded the percentage of “disagree” responses for each of the 16 items, including the subquestions, except for one. Students with disabilities had an equal percentage of “agree” and “disagree” responses for the statement regarding “equitable funding for student organizations.”
- Among the six survey items in this section that did not have subquestions about particular groups of students (see the first six items listed above), “equitable funding for all student organizations” received the highest percentage of “disagree” responses (21%), followed by “orientation programs/services are sufficient” (18%). Among students with disabilities, 31% disagreed with “buildings/facilities are easily accessible for people with disabilities.”
- Among the other ten survey items listed above, the following student groups had 20% or more “disagree” responses for the subquestion that was the most germane to their particular group (e.g., subquestions addressing “students of all races/ethnic groups/cultures” were the most germane to the following groups—white students, minority students, and international students). In each case, however, the percentage of “agree” responses exceeded the percentage of “disagree” responses.
 - Institution is knowledgeable, concerned, and responsive about the needs of students (minority students, international students, LGBTQ students)

- Equal opportunity for student employment on campus (international students, students with disabilities)
- Equal opportunity to be involved in campus-wide activities (international students)
- Treated fairly in student grievance/disciplinary processes (minority students, international students)
- Treated fairly by the police (students with disabilities)
- Feel comfortable in campus housing (international students, minority students, LGBTQ students)

Faculty/Staff Campus Climate Survey

The Faculty/Staff Campus Climate Survey included ten items that addressed faculty/staff perceptions about the University of Illinois at Springfield. These items are a subset of the 16 items that were on the student survey (see above).

Among faculty/staff who responded to these questions, the percentage who “agreed” with the statement exceeded the percentage who “disagreed” for each of the ten items, including each of the subquestions.

The responses to the first two statements, broken down by groups, are shown in the following table. These figures indicate that about two-thirds or more of the faculty/staff respondents in each of the groups feel comfortable at UIS and would still decide to take a job at UIS if they were to start over.

Faculty and Staff Campus Climate Survey Responses to Statements About UIS

| Faculty and Staff | “Feel Comfortable at UIS” | | “Would Still Decide to Take a Job at UIS” | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---|-------------|
| | % Agree* | % Disagree* | % Agree* | % Disagree* |
| All Faculty | 75 | 9 | 78 | 10 |
| Female Faculty | 72 | 10 | 75 | 13 |
| Male Faculty | 80 | 7 | 84 | 7 |
| All Staff | 77 | 9 | 79 | 12 |
| Female Staff | 78 | 6 | 84 | 6 |
| Male Staff | 78 | 13 | 70 | 23 |
| White Faculty/Staff | 80 | 6 | 83 | 9 |
| Minority Faculty/Staff | 64 | 18 | 71 | 14 |
| Faculty/Staff with Disabilities | 72 | 12 | 68 | 16 |
| LGBTQ Faculty/Staff | 73 | 0 | 100 | 0 |

* The remaining respondents checked “Neutral.”

- An examination of responses by faculty/staff groups reveals that the percentage of “agree” responses exceeded the percentage of “disagree” responses for each

item for all groups except LGBTQ faculty/staff. For LGBTQ faculty/staff, the percentage of “disagree” responses exceeded the percentage of “agree” responses for the university is knowledgeable, concerned, and responsive to the needs of LGBTQ faculty/staff and LGBTQ faculty/staff are treated fairly in grievance/disciplinary procedures. (The percentage of “agree” responses equaled the percentage of “disagree” responses for LGBTQ faculty/staff are treated fairly by campus police.)

- Among the statements that had subquestions about particular groups of faculty/staff, the following groups had 20% or more “disagree” responses for the subquestion that was the most germane to their particular group (e.g., subquestions addressing “faculty/staff of all races/ethnic groups/cultures” were the most germane to white faculty/staff, minority faculty/staff). In each case, however, the percentage of “agree” responses exceeded the percentage of “disagree” responses.
 - Institution is knowledgeable, concerned, and responsive to the needs of faculty/staff (female faculty, minority faculty/staff, faculty/staff with disabilities, female staff – only the responsive subquestion)
 - Treated fairly in grievance/disciplinary procedures (female staff, minority faculty/staff)

4. RESULTS FROM THE NATIONAL SURVEY OF STUDENT ENGAGEMENT (NSSE)

The National Survey of Student Engagement was administered to UIS first-year students and seniors during Spring 2006. A total of 68 first-year students and 136 seniors completed the survey, resulting in a response rate of 53% and 51%, respectively.

The results for five NSSE questions that relate to diversity either within the classroom or more broadly are shown in the following table. The percentage of students who reported that these situations (discussion of diverse perspectives, conversations with others who are different, or consideration of a different perspective) occur “very often” or “often” ranged from 46% to 63%.

NSSE Results for Questions Related to Diversity

| Question | % Very Often | % Often | % Very Often or Often |
|---|--------------|---------|-----------------------|
| Included diverse perspectives in class discussions or writing assignments | 27 | 34 | 61 |
| Had serious conversations with students of different race or ethnicity than your own | 22 | 24 | 46 |
| Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values | 24 | 29 | 53 |
| Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept | 21 | 36 | 57 |
| Tried to better understand someone else's view by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective | 21 | 42 | 63 |

The NSSE also asks students to rate the institution in regard to a couple of issues related to diversity (see the table below). One-half (50%) of the respondents indicated that UIS encourages contact among diverse students “very much” or “quite a bit,” and 42% reported that UIS contributed to an understanding of people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds “very much” or “quite a bit.”

NSSE Results for Questions Related to Institutional Issues

| Question | % Very Much | % Quite a Bit | % Very Much or Quite a Bit |
|--|-------------|---------------|----------------------------|
| Extent to which your institution encourages contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds | 20 | 30 | 50 |
| Extent to which your institution contributed to understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds | 18 | 24 | 42 |

The NSSE results also can be used to compare responses between groups of students. A breakdown of the results for selected questions for female vs. male students and for minority vs. non-minority students is shown in the following table.

The responses for female and male students are fairly comparable, with female students tending to rate the quality of their relationships with other students and administrative

personnel and offices a little higher than the comparable ratings by male students. The results for minority and non-minority students also are fairly similar, except minority students rated the quality of relationships with other students lower and the quality of relationships with administrative personnel and offices higher than the comparable ratings by non-minority students.

In the table below, the first three items listed (quality of relationships) are based on a scale of 1-7, with 7 being the highest rating. The remaining five items are based on a scale of 1-4, with 4 being the highest rating.

Mean NSSE Results for Female vs. Male and Minority vs. Non-Minority Students

| Question | Females | Males | Minority | Non-Minority |
|--|---------|-------|----------|--------------|
| Quality – your relationships with other students | 5.8 | 5.4 | 5.2* | 5.7* |
| Quality – your relationships with faculty members | 5.4 | 5.4 | 5.5 | 5.4 |
| Quality – your relationships with administrative personnel and offices | 4.8 | 4.5 | 5.2 | 4.6 |
| Institutional emphasis – providing support to succeed academically | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 2.9 |
| Institutional emphasis- providing support to thrive socially | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 2.0 |
| Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of the academic advising | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.9 |
| How would you evaluate your entire educational experience | 3.2 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.1 |
| If you could start over, would you go to UIS | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.1 |

*The difference in means is statistically significant at a 5% or less significance level.

B. Continuous Improvement Plan

This section summarizes the major findings from the Campus Climate Survey and describes what the university is currently doing and is planning to do in the future to address the findings. In addition to the activities and plans described below, the Diversity Task Force will review the results of the surveys and will make recommendations as to how the university can improve the climate for students, faculty, and staff from underrepresented groups. It is anticipated that the Diversity Task Force will consider options such as the use

of focus groups or an Intercultural Development Inventory to further assess the campus climate and provide direction for strategies to enhance the climate.

1. ACADEMIC/CLASSROOM EXPERIENCE

Summary of Survey Findings

The Student Campus Climate Survey results indicate that

- Most students are positive about their academic/classroom experience in areas such as having access to academic support services, feeling comfortable about expressing their viewpoints in class, faculty being fair in their evaluations of course performance, and faculty encouraging diverse types of students to interact with each other in course-related activities.
- The majority of students indicated that UIS course content and assigned materials reflect the viewpoints and contributions of different groups. However, international students and students with disabilities tended to disagree in regard to racial/ethnic/cultural minority groups and individuals with disabilities, respectively.
- Students reported that they believe the faculty with whom they have come into contact at UIS are diverse in terms of race/ethnicity/culture/nationality, gender, and sexual orientation/gender identity, but not in terms of disability status.

UIS Improvement Plan

UIS provides academic support services to students from underrepresented groups through a variety of campus entities, including the Office of Disability Services, the Office of Multicultural Student Affairs, the Women's Center, the Office of International Student Services, and the Center for Teaching and Learning. These units will continue to examine their effectiveness to determine ways to improve their services. Examples of recent improvements are noted below.

- The Office of Disability Services administers an annual survey to obtain student feedback on services provided by the office. As a result of student input, the Office of Disability Services expanded its hours to accommodate students' transportation schedules and needs. It also has made improvements to its text conversion process and alternate testing procedures as a result of student feedback.
- The Office of Disability Services has recently received a donation of several pieces of equipment and software, including a new document camera to assist individuals with visual impairments, a scanner that allows text material to be converted to alternative formats in a more timely manner, and software that converts textbooks into an audio format for students with print disabilities.

- The Office of Multicultural Student Affairs has started a new Student Academic Improvement (SAI) Program, which is designed to increase academic retention and graduation of at-risk undergraduate students. Participants in this program meet with a graduate assistant in the Office of Multicultural Student Affairs on a weekly basis to discuss course work and other issues related to academic progress.

Academic units also have undertaken and will continue to undertake initiatives that address diversity and the needs of students from underrepresented groups. Recent examples of these types of initiatives are noted below.

- In 2005-06, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences sponsored a campus-wide workshop on “Pluralism in the Classroom,” which was presented by Diana Eck, professor of Comparative Religion and Indian Studies at Harvard University and director of the Pluralism Project. Dr. Eck discussed productive ways to engage students in dialogues regarding differences, especially as they involve issues of religious identity and values. She included strategies for conducting “difficult dialogues,” conflict resolution, and legal issues surrounding discussions of religion in public universities.
- Starting in Fall 2007, UIS will offer a new graduate certificate in Women’s Studies.

As part of efforts for continual improvement in addressing diversity issues within the academic/classroom environment, UIS has adopted the following action steps as part of its strategic plan:

- “Recognizing that intercultural awareness is an important institutional value, we will strengthen relevant programs and enhance diversity in the curriculum by increasing the number of courses that deal in whole or in part with multicultural issues and perspectives, including ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation” (UIS Strategic Plan, Action Step #17).
- “Provide faculty development funds to encourage the inclusion of multicultural perspectives throughout the curriculum, both specialized and mainstreamed” (UIS Strategic Plan, Action Step #18).
- “Consider hybrid delivery models to integrate populations and allow for greater interaction of student populations” (UIS Strategic Plan, Action Step #40).

2. STUDENT LIFE/CAMPUS EXPERIENCE

Summary of Survey Findings

- Most students and faculty/staff are positive about the campus climate/atmosphere in terms of its being inclusive, supportive, relaxed, friendly, and improving.

However, students as a whole noted tension regarding the climate for LGBTQ students. The survey responses by LGBTQ students and LGBTQ faculty/staff also noted other concerns regarding the climate for LGBTQ people.

- Despite the generally positive replies about campus climate, some students and faculty/staff reported perceptions about the existence of discrimination and/or incidents of discrimination that they have heard, seen, or experienced.
- For students as a whole, the reported frequency of insensitive or disparaging remarks made by faculty or staff about particular groups was relatively low. Students with disabilities and LGBTQ students noted a higher level of frequencies than other students. The survey results indicated a higher level of frequency for insensitive or disparaging remarks made by other students.
- Among faculty/staff as a whole, the reported frequency of insensitive or disparaging remarks made by administrators, faculty, staff, or students about particular groups was relatively low. Female faculty, minority faculty/staff, and LGBTQ faculty/staff reported higher frequencies of insensitive or disparaging remarks than other faculty/staff.

UIS Improvement Plan

The UIS Non-Discrimination and Equal Opportunity Policy states:

“The University of Illinois at Springfield is committed to maintaining an educational and work environment of equal opportunity and non-discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, ancestry, age, marital status, physical or mental disability, sexual orientation, status as a Vietnam era or disabled veteran, and unfavorable discharge from military service.”

Violations of this policy are grounds for corrective and/or remedial action. The university will continue to educate the campus community about the importance of adhering to this policy.

In response to the tension on campus related to LGBTQ issues, a SAFE ZONE program has been established. The mission of the program states that “The UIS SAFE ZONE program strives to reduce homophobia and heterosexism at the University of Illinois at Springfield. Through education, advocacy, and awareness, SAFE ZONE ALLIES contribute to developing acceptance of individual differences and ideas in an open climate that is safe and inclusive for all members of the University.”

- The SAFE ZONE program is supported by the Division of Student Affairs and is guided by a Steering Committee of students, faculty, and staff.

- This program provides training for faculty, students, and staff on LGBTQ-related issues, including effective strategies for communicating with individuals who are seeking a SAFE ZONE to discuss concerns.
- There also is a SAFE ZONE Website that provides information about the program and its mission and activities.

A variety of diversity-related initiatives have been implemented in the Housing Office within the past year. The staff members are utilizing new outreach strategies to attract a more diverse pool of Resident Assistant (RA) applicants. This has resulted in a large pool of applicants in which one-third were persons of color. In addition, the interview process now contains more questions related to diversity/sensitivity.

New diversity training requirements for Resident Assistants and Housing staff have been implemented. In addition, the director of the Counseling Center made a presentation to the RAs on diversity and respect, the impact of prejudice, and conflict resolution.

In Spring 2007, a Graduate Assistant (GA) will be hired to serve as a student affairs specialist. The GA's primary job responsibility will be to provide services and coordinate programming and activities for underrepresented student communities, with special emphasis on the concerns of LGTBQ students.

As part of the UIS strategic plan, the university has adopted a strategic thrust of "Providing a Culturally Diverse Campus Environment." The intent of this thrust is described below:

"Students, faculty, staff, outside partners, and other constituents will be exposed to a university community that is infused with an appreciation of diverse cultural perspectives. The UIS environment will be characterized as an inclusive and safe place for different perspectives to be explored" (UIS Strategic Plan, Strategic Thrust #3).

To help achieve a culturally diverse campus environment, UIS has adopted the following action steps:

- "Utilize a standardized multicultural sensitivity survey to determine baseline data regarding the current cultural climate of UIS" (UIS Strategic Plan, Action Step #13).
- "Utilize the findings from the sensitivity survey to enhance the cultural climate at UIS; re-examine the climate periodically. Emphasize tolerance and respect for a diversity of opinions" (UIS Strategic Plan, Action Step #14).
- "Develop and implement action plans to address the gaps identified in the assessments of the multicultural climate" (UIS Strategic Plan, Action Step #21).

3. INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND RESOURCES

Summary of Survey Findings

The Student and Faculty/Staff Campus Climate Survey results indicate that

- Most students “feel comfortable” at UIS and would still attend UIS if they could start over.
- Most faculty and staff “feel comfortable” at UIS and would work at UIS if they were to start over.
- Students are generally positive about the institution in terms of the university being responsive to the needs of students, providing equal opportunities for students to become involved in campus-wide activities and to be employed on campus, being treated fairly in student grievance/disciplinary processes and by campus police, and feeling comfortable in campus housing.
- There were some survey items in which the satisfaction levels were lower for some student groups compared to the satisfaction levels for other student groups, although in each of these cases the percentage of positive replies exceeded the percentage of negative replies. The groups that had lower satisfaction levels are shown in parentheses.
 - the university’s knowledge, concern, and responsiveness to the needs of students (minority students, international students, and LGBTQ students)
 - student employment opportunities on campus (international students and students with disabilities) and ability to be involved in campus-wide activities (international students)
 - fair treatment in grievance/disciplinary processes (international students and minority students) and fair treatment by campus police (students with disabilities)
 - facilities being accessible to people with disabilities (students with disabilities)
 - feeling comfortable in campus housing (international students, minority students, and LGBTQ students).
- Faculty and staff are generally positive about the institution in terms of the university being knowledgeable, caring, and responsive to their needs; having an equal opportunity to become involved in campus-wide activities; and being treated fairly in the grievance/disciplinary processes and by campus police.
- There were some survey items in which satisfaction levels were lower for some faculty/staff groups compared to the levels for other faculty/staff groups.

However, for all groups except the LGBTQ faculty/staff, the percentage of positive responses exceeded the percentage of negative responses. The groups that had lower satisfaction levels are shown in parentheses.

- the university's knowledge, concern, and responsiveness to the needs of faculty/staff ((female faculty, minority faculty/staff, faculty/staff with disabilities, LGBTQ faculty/staff, female staff—only the responsive subquestion)
- treated fairly in grievance/disciplinary procedures (female staff, minority faculty/staff, LGBTQ faculty/staff)

UIS Improvement Plan

UIS will continue to offer programs and activities that are designed to promote diversity on campus and to provide individuals from diverse groups a sense of belonging. Examples of the programs held in 2005-2006 are listed below.

- In celebration of International Women's Day, the Women's Center, along with the Center for State Policy and Leadership, sponsored a speaker, Dr. Zakia Salime, an assistant professor from Michigan State University, who spoke on "The Feminization of Islamist Women and the Power of Women's Rights."
- The UIS 28th International Festival, titled "The Spirit of Diversity," featured entertainment, food, and cultural booths from around the world. This is an event coordinated by faculty, staff, and students.
- The African American Studies program, along with several co-sponsors, hosted a two-day symposium entitled "In the Mix: Cross-Dialogues Regarding HipHop Culture."
 - Activities included panel presentations, breakout discussions, a workshop, performances, films and critiques, a fashion show, and an awards banquet.
 - The event also included a teacher workshop on "Using Contemporary Youth Culture in the Classroom" presented by the nationally known scholar Jon Yasin, a professor in the English Basic Skills program at Bergen Community College, Paramus, New Jersey.
- The Office of Disability Services hosted its 9th Disability Awareness Week, which included a variety of workshops (Transition Planning, Understanding and Helping Individuals with Learning Disabilities, Working the Job Market, Alternative Formats), films, an open house, and a wheelchair basketball game.

UIS will continue to support student clubs and organizations that encourage a sense of belonging by students from underrepresented groups. Examples of these organizations

include the Descendants of Africa, Sankofa, the Indian Student Organization, the Chinese Student Association, the Queer Straight Alliance, and the Women's Issues Caucus.

As part of the UIS strategic plan, the university has adopted the following action step:

“Develop an institutional definition of diversity; more important, establish benchmarks that are appropriate for the institution. Determine how the institution will know when the benchmarks regarding diversity have been attained” (UIS Strategic Plan, Action Step #15).

The strategic plan also includes a strategic thrust to “Improve Access and Opportunity for Traditional and Nontraditional Students.” This thrust states:

“Recognizing the shifting demographics and economics of our state's citizenry, UIS will be recognized as a leader in providing access and opportunity for traditional and nontraditional learners. The Office of Enrollment Management will discuss plans with the Academic Cabinet to ensure that goals are communicated effectively. Assure that no Illinois resident is denied a UIS education based solely on need constraints” (UIS Strategic Plan, Strategic Thrust 1).

To achieve this thrust, the university has identified the following action steps:

- “Annually align recruitment plans with state demographics to increase the diversity of the student body to mirror ethnic, racial, economic, geographic, physical abilities, and family educational backgrounds” (UIS Strategic Plan, Action Step #18).
- “Expand participation in Project Midstate Student Support for Teaching (MSST), PAP (President's Award Program), UIS Leadership in Public Service Program (LPSP), and Whitney M. Young Fellowship Program to support and encourage a diverse student body” (UIS Strategic Plan, Action Step #20).
- “Increase the percentage of minorities who make up the student body” (UIS Strategic Plan, Action Step #24).



2. INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVE PRACTICE ON CAMPUS CLIMATE THE DIVERSITY TASK FORCE

This section provides a description of the UIS Diversity Task Force, chosen as an institutional “effective practice” that supports a positive campus climate for students, faculty, and staff from underrepresented groups.

The Diversity Task Force was established during the late 1980s. Its mission is as follows:

“The Diversity Task Force is committed to learn and educate about; advocate for; nurture; honor; and model effective practices that foster an inclusive campus community rich in diversity, justice, respect, and dignity.”

General membership in the Diversity Task Force is open to UIS students, faculty, staff, and community members, while voting membership is restricted to UIS students, faculty, and staff who actively participate in the Task Force. The Task Force meets on a monthly basis during the academic calendar year and is chaired by a UIS employee who is elected on an annual basis.

One of the main activities of the Diversity Task Force is to support and encourage diversity awareness initiatives by funding events or programs that promote diversity. UIS individuals (student, faculty, or staff), “recognized organizations,” or administrative units may apply for funding up to \$400 for eligible events or programs. To promote cooperation and appreciation among diverse organization, funding requests submitted by two or more differing organizations may be given preference and receive an award up to \$500. Examples of events that have been funded in the past include an Indian Percussion & Vocals event sponsored by the Indian Student Organization and a talk on “Feminization of Islamist Women and the Power of Women’s Rights” sponsored by the Women’s Center and the Center for State Policy and Leadership.

** Highlights **

Next year, the first Chancellor’s Award on Diversity, cosponsored by the Diversity Task Force, will honor a student, faculty member, staff member, or office for extraordinary contributions towards advancing diversity on the UIS campus.

The Diversity Task Force is in the process of establishing the Chancellor’s Award on Diversity. This annual award will honor a student, faculty member, staff member, or unit for extraordinary contributions towards advancing and promoting diversity at UIS. The award will be presented at a ceremony hosted by the Diversity Task Force and the Chancellor’s Office.

The Diversity Task Force, through its inclusiveness and activities to promote and recognize diversity, has had a positive impact on the UIS campus climate for underrepresented groups. It provides an open forum where people can come to discuss concerns, ideas, and initiatives to promote diversity.

3. PERSONNEL AND FUNDS BUDGETED FOR PROGRAMS SERVING UNDERREPRESENTED GROUPS

The Underrepresented Groups Report guidelines request that public universities provide data on staffing and funds budgeted for programs serving minorities, women, and persons with disabilities. UIS data on those topics appear in Table 1.



4. ENROLLMENT OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

The Underrepresented Groups Report guidelines request that public institutions provide data on the enrollment of persons with disabilities and the services provided to them. UIS data on those topics appear in Table 2.



5. FRESHMEN RETENTION RATES BY RACIAL/ETHNIC CATEGORY AND BY GENDER

The Underrepresented Groups Report guidelines request that public universities provide data on freshmen retention rates by racial/ethnic category. UIS data on retention rates are shown in Table 3.



6. STATUS REPORT ON WEB ACCESSIBILITY

This is the second report on the status of Web Accessibility at the University of Illinois at Springfield. This section was prepared by Sherry Hutson, director of the Office of Web Services. Ms. Hutson is also responsible for conducting the evaluation of the UIS Web pages.

Accessibility Standard

In accordance with the options offered by the Illinois Board of Higher Education, UIS has chosen the *W3C Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 1.0* (WCAG 1.0) as the university's Accessibility Standard. The W3C document defines three levels of conformance. Further, the W3C offers a Validation Tool for use in checking conformance to the standard. If a Web page passes validation using this tool, it is assumed that the Web page meets all three levels of conformance.

UIS intends to meet all three levels of the WCAG 1.0 standard. The university is using the W3C Validation services to measure conformance.

In addition, the university is utilizing the Functional Accessibility Evaluator developed by the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Evaluation of Institutional Web Pages

For the initial evaluation of the UIS Web pages, the university used option "A" as suggested by the IBHE: "Beginning with the institution's home page, evaluate that page and each institutional page linked from the home page, going only one link deep from the home page." Since the previous report, the university has redesigned the campus home page, and some of the links have changed.

One of the first steps in creating an accessible Web site is to construct pages with markup that validates. Web languages are defined by organizations such as the W3C, and the underlying code of any individual Web page must conform to such specifications in order to be considered valid. Browsers that use accessibility technology rely heavily on valid code. For example, a screen reader might render useless a page that does not validate.

The university has reviewed the above noted pages using the W3C Markup Validation Service and the W3C CSS Validation Service. Both services check Web documents in formats like HTML, CSS and XHTML for conformance to W3C recommendations and other standards.

Below is a summary of the errors found in the 46 pages that are one link deep from the campus Home Page using the W3C Validation Tool. Results from the Spring 2006 report are shown in parentheses:

- 37%, or 17 pages pass validation with no errors (0 passed last Spring)
- 26%, or 12 pages show 1 to 10 errors; one of these pages is outside the uis.edu domain and thus outside the university's control (51% or 23 pages last Spring)
- 30%, or 14 pages show 11 to 75 errors; five of these pages are outside the uis.edu domain and thus outside the university's control (42% or 19 pages last Spring)

- 7%, or 3 pages show over 75 errors; one of these pages is outside the uis.edu domain and thus outside the university's control (same as last Spring).

The university also tested its primary CSS (Cascading Style Sheets) documents, and they passed validation with no errors. Additional information on the results of the W3C and FAE tests is available upon request.

Further, the university tested the 46 pages with UIUC's *Functional Accessibility Evaluator* tool (FAE). The summary report generated by the FAE is shown below.

| Main Categories | Status | % Pass | % Warn | % Fail |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Navigation & Orientation | Partially Implemented | 43 | 2 | 54 |
| Text Equivalents | Partially Implemented | 80 | 7 | 12 |
| Scripting | Partially Implemented | 66 | 0 | 33 |
| Styling | Partially Implemented | 54 | 4 | 41 |
| HTML Standards | Partially Implemented | 56 | 0 | 43 |

Plans for Continuous Improvement

University efforts to redesign all primary UIS Web pages continue. Since the last report, the university has completely redesigned 27 primary Websites using the campus template. The template was designed with accessibility in mind. Further, the university has added these sites to the Content Management System that controls user editing in such a way as to prevent accessibility errors.

Progress continues at the rate that staff is able to achieve, considering resource challenges. The university anticipates that it will be able to redevelop all of the pages that link directly to the homepage and conduct direct usability and accessibility testing by May 2007.

Further, the university will continue to work with all of its sites that do not link directly from the home page. And, the university will continue to use the Functional Accessibility Evaluator tool to make further changes to Web pages in order to meet those guidelines as well.

In addition, the university will enlarge its effort to consider additional evaluation tools and additional Web pages. The university will follow the procedures outlined in the W3C Conformance Evaluation, and will conduct manual testing, as described by the W3C:

“A conformance evaluation determines if a Web site meets accessibility standards, such as the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG). This page describes a conformance evaluation method that combines automatic, semiautomatic, and manual testing of Web site accessibility. It can be used when developing a new site, or to evaluate an existing site.”

Summary

The university continues to implement the use of a Content Management System and templates designed with accessibility in mind. The university also continues to tighten up the standards, policies, and practices related to all Web page development at UIS. University staff are confident that the UIS primary Web pages will meet the university's accessibility and Universal Design standards in the very near future.

The university also continues to train department Web personnel in regularly scheduled monthly workshops that deal with the Web accessibility for at least half of the two-hour long sessions.

The university has formed a Web Accessibility Committee that is planning for usability and accessibility testing by actual users.

In addition, the UIS Web staff are members of the Illinois Center for Instructional Technology Accessibility ListServ and utilize the software resources provided by this UIUC group. The UIS staff attended the Workshop of CIC Institutions on Information Technology Accessibility and participate in that group's ListServ and Webinars.

UIS' online course management system (CMS) is Blackboard, and UIS staff regularly participate in discussions and meetings with Blackboard personnel to convey concerns and recommendations related to CMS accessibility. UIS has moved all classes to Blackboard version 7.0, which addresses accessibility compliance by meeting section 508 standards in all sections except section *m* as it relates to the chat tool, which does not provide a transcript of voice chats. Testing is underway now to determine whether the application meets W3C standards in areas where they vary from section 508.

UIS campus offices that deal with technology for academic and community-related functions are closely involved in the Web accessibility efforts. Among these offices are the Chancellor's Division, Office of Web Services, Campus Web Team, Web Production Team, Provost's Office, Office of Disability Services, Office of Enrollment Management, Office of Technology-Enhanced Learning, and Information Technology Services.

For additional information, please see: <http://www.uis.edu/Webservices/>.

Appendix

- Attachment A: Definitions for Annual Report on Underrepresented Groups in Higher Education
- Table 1: Dollars and Staff Years Budgeted to Programs Serving Underrepresented Students and Staff at Public Universities, Fiscal Years 2005 and 2006
- Table 2: Students with Disabilities, Academic Year 2005-2006
- Table 3: Freshmen Retention Rates – Fall 2005 New Beginning Freshmen Cohorts by Racial/Ethnic Category and Gender
- Table A: Summary of Enrollments by Ethnic Categories, Fall 1996 to Fall 2005
- Table B: Student Enrollment – Total, African American, Other Minority, and Total Minority, Fall 1996 to Fall 2005
- Table C: Undergraduate Total Head Count Enrollment by College, Degree Program, Racial/Ethnic Category, and Gender, Fall 2005
- Table C-1: Undergraduate Total Head Count Enrollment – Non-Resident Alien by College, Degree Program, Racial/Ethnic Category, and Gender, Fall 2005
- Table C-2: Summary of Enrollments and Retention by Ethnic Categories, Undergraduate Total Head Count Enrollment – Capital Scholars Program, Fall 2001 to Spring 2006
- Table C-3: Summary of Enrollments by Gender: Undergraduate Total Head Count Enrollment – Capital Scholars Program, Fall 2001 to Spring 2006
- Table D: Master’s and Doctoral Total Head Count Enrollment by College, Degree Program, Racial/Ethnic Category, and Gender, Fall 2005
- Table D-1: Master’s and Doctoral Total Head Count Enrollment – Non-Resident Alien, by College, Degree Program Racial/Ethnic Category, and Gender, Fall 2005
- Table E: Student Head Count Enrollment by Gender and Level, Fall 1996 to Fall 2005
- Table F: Summary Report of Full-Time Employees by Gender and Ethnicity, Fall 2005
- Table G: Summary Report of Full-Time Employees from Underrepresented Populations, Fall 1996 to Fall 2005

Attachment A
Definitions for Annual Report on Underrepresented Groups in Higher Education

Staff-Year - A staff year is defined as a 12-month contract providing for at least one month of vacation.

White (not of Hispanic origin) - A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East.

Black (not of Hispanic origin) - A person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa.

Hispanic - A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin regardless of race.

Asian or Pacific Islander - A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian subcontinent, or the Pacific Islands. The area includes, for example, China, Japan, Korea, the Philippine Islands, and Samoa.

American Indian or Alaskan Native - A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North America, and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition.

Students with Disabilities – See Table 2.

TABLE 1
Dollars and Staff Years Budgeted to Programs Serving
Underrepresented Students and Staff at Public Universities
Fiscal Years 2005 and 2006

| University of Illinois at Springfield | Type of Program | Staff Years Budgeted | | Dollars Budgeted | | | | Change in Dollars Budgeted | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|------|------------------|---------|---------|---------|----------------------------|-------|
| | | FY05 | FY06 | State | | Other | | State | Other |
| | | | | FY05 | FY06 | FY05 | FY06 | | |
| Office of Multicultural Student Affairs | O | 1.83 | 1.88 | 59,100 | 63,100 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 4,000 | 0 |
| TANF/Low Income Degree Scholarship Program | O | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Leadership in Public Service Program | O | 0.00 | 0.00 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Midstate Student Support for Teaching*** | O | 1.21 | 1.21 | 81,200 | 81,000 | 0 | 0 | (200) | 0 |
| Diversity Task Force | O | 0.10 | 0.10 | 13,800 | 13,700 | 0 | 0 | (100) | 0 |
| Whitney M. Young Fellowship Program | O | 0.45 | 0.45 | 135,200 | 140,400 | 0 | 0 | 5,200 | 0 |
| Women's Center | O | 1.86 | 1.38 | 60,900 | 58,800 | 10,200 | 10,200 | (2,100) | 0 |
| Disability Services | O | 4.00 | 3.38 | 110,400 | 121,000 | 6,500 | 6,600 | 10,600 | 100 |

***This program serves underrepresented secondary school students.

TABLE 2
University of Illinois at Springfield
Students with Disabilities
Academic Year 2005-2006

| Students Who Registered | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------|----------|-------|-------|
| <u>Type of Disability</u> | Undergraduate | Graduate | Other | Total |
| Learning | 33 | 21 | | 54 |
| ADHD | 7 | 8 | | 15 |
| Psychological | 20 | 8 | | 28 |
| Developmental | 1 | 0 | | 1 |
| Mobility | 17 | 9 | | 26 |
| Blind/Low Vision | 13 | 10 | | 23 |
| Deaf/Hard of Hearing | 4 | 9 | | 13 |
| Systemic/Chronic Health Problems | 4 | 10 | | 14 |
| Other | 5 | 2 | | 7 |

| Registered Students Who Used Services | | | | |
|--|---------------|----------|-------|-------|
| <u>Type of Disability</u> | Undergraduate | Graduate | Other | Total |
| Learning | 33 | 21 | | 54 |
| ADHD | 7 | 8 | | 15 |
| Psychological | 20 | 8 | | 28 |
| Developmental | 1 | 0 | | 1 |
| Mobility | 17 | 9 | | 26 |
| Blind/Low Vision | 13 | 10 | | 23 |
| Deaf/Hard of Hearing | 4 | 9 | | 13 |
| Systemic/Chronic Health Problems | 4 | 10 | | 14 |
| Other | 5 | 2 | | 7 |

University of Illinois at Springfield
Faculty/Staff with Disabilities
Academic Year 2005-2006

| <u>Type of Disability</u> | Faculty/Staff | Other |
|----------------------------------|---------------|-------|
| Learning | 2 | 1 |
| ADHD | 0 | 0 |
| Psychological | 4 | 2 |
| Developmental | 0 | 0 |
| Mobility | 6 | 0 |
| Blind/Low Vision | 2 | 0 |
| Deaf/Hard of Hearing | 1 | 1 |
| Systemic/Chronic Health Problems | 22 | 13 |
| Other | 10 | 6 |

TABLE 3
Freshmen Retention Rates
Fall 2005 New Beginning Freshmen Cohorts
by Racial/Ethnic Category and Gender

| | <u>American Indian or Alaskan Native</u> | | | <u>Asian or Pacific Islander</u> | | | <u>Black/Non-Hispanic</u> | | | <u>Hispanic</u> | | | <u>White/Non-Hispanic</u> | | | <u>Non-Resident Alien</u> | | | <u>Unknown/Other</u> | | | <u>Total</u> | | |
|------|--|--------|-------|----------------------------------|--------|-------|---------------------------|--------|-------|-----------------|--------|-------|---------------------------|--------|-------|---------------------------|--------|-------|----------------------|--------|-------|--------------|--------|-------|
| | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| 2005 | 100 | N/A | 100 | 60 | 67 | 64 | 100 | 75 | 86 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 77 | 79 | 78 | N/A | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 67 | 79 | 78 | 78 |

NOTE: Due to the small number of students, the percentage figures should be interpreted with caution.

TABLE A
Summary of Enrollments by Ethnic Categories
Fall 1996 to Fall 2005

| Year | American Indian | | Hispanic | | African American | | White | | Asian | | Unknown/ Other* | | Non-Resident Alien | | Total | |
|------|-----------------|-----|----------|-----|------------------|-----|-------|------|-------|-----|-----------------|-----|--------------------|-----|-------|-----|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| 1996 | 11 | 0.2 | 51 | 1.1 | 343 | 7.4 | 4,055 | 87.9 | 71 | 1.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 80 | 1.7 | 4,611 | 100 |
| 1997 | 18 | 0.4 | 58 | 1.3 | 339 | 7.6 | 3,882 | 87.0 | 76 | 1.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 90 | 2.0 | 4,463 | 100 |
| 1998 | 14 | 0.3 | 49 | 1.1 | 320 | 7.4 | 3,779 | 87.2 | 71 | 1.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 101 | 2.3 | 4,334 | 100 |
| 1999 | 15 | 0.4 | 51 | 1.3 | 311 | 7.6 | 3,521 | 86.3 | 68 | 1.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 113 | 2.8 | 4,079 | 100 |
| 2000 | 13 | 0.3 | 49 | 1.2 | 315 | 8.0 | 3,391 | 86.0 | 63 | 1.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 111 | 2.8 | 3,942 | 100 |
| 2001 | 9 | 0.2 | 63 | 1.5 | 355 | 8.3 | 3,607 | 84.1 | 77 | 1.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 177 | 4.1 | 4,288 | 100 |
| 2002 | 10 | 0.2 | 60 | 1.3 | 356 | 8.0 | 3,757 | 84.4 | 85 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 183 | 4.1 | 4,451 | 100 |
| 2003 | 15 | 0.3 | 62 | 1.4 | 363 | 7.9 | 3,840 | 84.0 | 121 | 2.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 173 | 3.8 | 4,574 | 100 |
| 2004 | 13 | 0.3 | 67 | 1.5 | 338 | 7.7 | 3,457 | 78.6 | 118 | 2.7 | 192 | 4.4 | 211 | 4.8 | 4,396 | 100 |
| 2005 | 16 | 0.4 | 76 | 1.7 | 365 | 8.1 | 3,460 | 76.6 | 119 | 2.6 | 227 | 5.0 | 254 | 5.6 | 4,517 | 100 |

* NOTE: Prior to 2004, students with an unknown or other race/ethnic code were counted as White.

TABLE B**Student Enrollment - Total, African American, Other Minority, and Total Minority
Fall 1996 to Fall 2005**

| Year | Total Enrollment | African American Enrollment | | Other Minority Enrollment ¹ | | Total Minority Enrollment | |
|------|------------------|-----------------------------|------------|--|------------|---------------------------|------------|
| | | N | % of Total | N | % of Total | N | % of Total |
| 1996 | 4,611 | 343 | 7.44 | 133 | 2.88 | 476 | 10.32 |
| 1997 | 4,463 | 339 | 7.60 | 152 | 3.41 | 491 | 11.00 |
| 1998 | 4,334 | 320 | 7.38 | 134 | 3.09 | 454 | 10.48 |
| 1999 | 4,079 | 311 | 7.62 | 134 | 3.29 | 445 | 10.91 |
| 2000 | 3,942 | 315 | 7.99 | 125 | 3.17 | 440 | 11.16 |
| 2001 | 4,288 | 355 | 8.28 | 149 | 3.47 | 504 | 11.75 |
| 2002 | 4,451 | 359 | 8.07 | 155 | 3.48 | 514 | 11.55 |
| 2003 | 4,574 | 363 | 7.94 | 198 | 4.33 | 561 | 12.26 |
| 2004 | 4,396 | 338 | 7.69 | 198 | 4.50 | 536 | 12.19 |
| 2005 | 4,517 | 365 | 8.08 | 211 | 4.67 | 576 | 12.75 |

¹ Does not include non-resident aliens; includes American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Hispanic.

TABLE C

**Undergraduate Total Head Count Enrollment by College, Degree Program, Racial/Ethnic Category, and Gender
Fall 2005**

| College/Degree Program | Non-Resident Alien | | Black Non-Hispanic | | Amer. Indian/Alaskan Native | | Asian Pacific Islander | | Hispanic | | White Non-Hispanic | | Other/Unknown | | Total | | TOTAL |
|---|--------------------|----------|--------------------|------------|-----------------------------|----------|------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | |
| College of Business and Management | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accountancy | 0 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 48 | 91 | 1 | 5 | 56 | 113 | 169 |
| Business Administration | 2 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 79 | 97 | 7 | 6 | 102 | 114 | 216 |
| Economics | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 15 |
| Management | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 64 | 65 | 2 | 0 | 73 | 78 | 151 |
| Subtotal | 4 | 3 | 16 | 25 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 198 | 256 | 10 | 11 | 242 | 309 | 551 |
| College of Education and Human Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Social Work | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 63 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 81 | 93 |
| Subtotal | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 63 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 81 | 93 |
| College of Liberal Arts and Sciences | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Biology | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 71 | 3 | 5 | 50 | 90 | 140 |
| Chemistry | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 32 |
| Clinical Laboratory Science | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 27 | 37 |
| Communication | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 42 | 68 | 5 | 3 | 52 | 86 | 138 |
| Computer Science | 5 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 108 | 19 | 12 | 0 | 143 | 28 | 171 |
| English | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 85 | 4 | 6 | 23 | 101 | 124 |
| History | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 62 | 34 | 6 | 5 | 74 | 46 | 120 |
| Liberal Studies | 0 | 0 | 4 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 49 | 117 | 6 | 15 | 61 | 164 | 225 |
| Mathematical Sciences | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 33 | 2 | 3 | 28 | 40 | 68 |
| Philosophy | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 22 | 9 | 31 |
| Psychology | 0 | 0 | 1 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 36 | 173 | 7 | 10 | 49 | 215 | 264 |
| Sociology/Anthropology | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 23 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 28 | 36 |
| Visual Arts | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 18 | 3 | 3 | 21 | 25 | 46 |
| Subtotal | 8 | 1 | 24 | 100 | 3 | 3 | 21 | 21 | 16 | 16 | 433 | 680 | 52 | 54 | 557 | 875 | 1,432 |
| College of Public Affairs and Administration | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Criminal Justice | 0 | 0 | 9 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 73 | 67 | 2 | 3 | 85 | 89 | 174 |
| Legal Studies | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 21 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 40 | 61 |
| Political Studies | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 46 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 53 | 28 | 81 |
| Subtotal | 0 | 0 | 11 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 8 | 140 | 119 | 7 | 5 | 159 | 157 | 316 |
| Undeclared/Unclassified | 0 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 68 | 131 | 4 | 10 | 82 | 160 | 242 |
| Subtotal | 0 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 68 | 131 | 4 | 10 | 82 | 160 | 242 |
| Total Undergraduates | 12 | 5 | 60 | 170 | 5 | 6 | 32 | 36 | 23 | 32 | 846 | 1,249 | 74 | 84 | 1,052 | 1,582 | 2,634 |

TABLE C-1

**Undergraduate Total Head Count Enrollment - Non-Resident Alien by College, Degree Program, Racial/Ethnic Category, and Gender
Fall 2005**

| College/Degree Program | Non-Resident Alien | | Asian Pacific Islander | | Hispanic | | Black Non-Hispanic | | White Non-Hispanic | | Other | |
|---|--------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|----------|----------|--------------------|----------|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| College of Business and Management | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accountancy | 0 | 3 | | 2 | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Business Administration | 2 | 0 | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Economics | 2 | 0 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Management | 2 | 0 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | |
| Subtotal | 6 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| College of Education and Human Services | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subtotal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| College of Liberal Arts & Sciences | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Biology | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Chemistry | 1 | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Clinical Laboratory Science | 1 | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Computer Science | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | | 2 | 0 | | |
| Subtotal | 6 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| College of Public Affairs & Administration | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subtotal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Undeclared/Unclassified Undergraduate | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 12 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

TABLE C-2
Summary of Enrollments and Retention by Ethnic Categories
Undergraduate Total Head Count Enrollment - Capital Scholars Program
Fall 2001 to Spring 2006

| First Year | Retention | American Indian | | Hispanic | | African American | | White | | Asian | | Non-Resident Alien | | Total | |
|------------|-------------|-----------------|-----|----------|-----|------------------|-----|-------|------|-------|-----|--------------------|-----|-------|-----|
| | | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Fall 2001 | | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 5.2 | 101 | 87.1 | 8 | 6.9 | 1 | 0.9 | 116 | 100 |
| | Spring 2002 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 4.5 | 97 | 87.4 | 8 | 7.2 | 1 | 0.9 | 111 | 100 |
| | Fall 2002 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 4.7 | 93 | 86.9 | 8 | 7.5 | 1 | 0.9 | 107 | 100 |
| | Spring 2003 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 4.9 | 89 | 86.4 | 8 | 7.8 | 1 | 1.0 | 103 | 100 |
| | Fall 2003 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 6.2 | 69 | 85.2 | 6 | 7.4 | 1 | 1.2 | 81 | 100 |
| | Spring 2004 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 6.6 | 66 | 86.8 | 5 | 6.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 76 | 100 |
| | Fall 2004 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 4.0 | 66 | 88.0 | 6 | 8.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 75 | 100 |
| | Spring 2005 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 4.2 | 64 | 88.9 | 5 | 6.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 72 | 100 |
| | Fall 2005 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 2.9 | 63 | 91.3 | 4 | 5.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 69 | 100 |
| | Spring 2006 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 4.3 | 62 | 89.9 | 4 | 5.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 69 | 100 |
| Fall 2002 | | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 4.1 | 9 | 9.3 | 79 | 81.4 | 2 | 2.1 | 3 | 3.1 | 97 | 100 |
| | Spring 2003 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 4.8 | 5 | 6.0 | 71 | 84.5 | 2 | 2.4 | 2 | 2.4 | 84 | 100 |
| | Fall 2003 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 5.3 | 5 | 6.6 | 64 | 84.2 | 1 | 1.3 | 2 | 2.6 | 76 | 100 |
| | Spring 2004 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 5.4 | 4 | 5.4 | 63 | 85.1 | 1 | 1.4 | 2 | 2.7 | 74 | 100 |
| | Fall 2004 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 4.9 | 4 | 6.6 | 51 | 83.6 | 1 | 1.6 | 2 | 3.3 | 61 | 100 |
| | Spring 2005 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 6.6 | 4 | 6.6 | 51 | 83.6 | 1 | 1.6 | 1 | 1.6 | 61 | 100 |
| | Fall 2005 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 6.8 | 4 | 6.8 | 49 | 83.1 | 1 | 1.7 | 1 | 1.7 | 59 | 100 |
| | Spring 2006 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 6.8 | 4 | 6.8 | 49 | 83.1 | 1 | 1.7 | 1 | 1.7 | 59 | 100 |
| Fall 2003 | | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 2.6 | 5 | 4.3 | 105 | 90.5 | 2 | 1.7 | 1 | 0.9 | 116 | 100 |
| | Spring 2004 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 2.8 | 5 | 4.6 | 98 | 89.9 | 2 | 1.8 | 1 | 0.9 | 109 | 100 |
| | Fall 2004 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 3.2 | 3 | 3.2 | 84 | 90.3 | 2 | 2.2 | 1 | 1.1 | 93 | 100 |
| | Spring 2005 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 3.3 | 3 | 3.3 | 82 | 90.1 | 2 | 2.2 | 1 | 1.1 | 91 | 100 |
| | Fall 2005 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 3.5 | 3 | 3.5 | 76 | 89.4 | 2 | 2.4 | 1 | 1.2 | 85 | 100 |
| | Spring 2006 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 3.5 | 3 | 3.5 | 76 | 89.4 | 2 | 2.4 | 1 | 1.2 | 85 | 100 |
| Fall 2004 | | 1 | 1.1 | 2 | 2.2 | 7 | 7.8 | 75 | 83.3 | 4 | 4.4 | 1 | 1.1 | 90 | 100 |
| | Spring 2005 | 1 | 1.2 | 2 | 2.4 | 6 | 7.1 | 71 | 83.5 | 4 | 4.7 | 1 | 1.2 | 85 | 100 |
| | Fall 2005 | 1 | 1.3 | 1 | 1.3 | 5 | 6.6 | 65 | 85.5 | 4 | 5.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 76 | 100 |
| | Spring 2006 | 1 | 1.3 | 1 | 1.3 | 6 | 7.9 | 64 | 84.2 | 4 | 5.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 76 | 100 |
| Fall 2005 | | 2 | 1.4 | 3 | 2.2 | 7 | 5.1 | 114 | 82.6 | 11 | 8.0 | 1 | 0.7 | 138 | 100 |
| | Spring 2006 | 2 | 1.6 | 3 | 2.3 | 7 | 5.5 | 106 | 82.8 | 9 | 7.0 | 1 | 0.8 | 128 | 100 |

Data as of each semester's census. Retention was operationalized as all students who were enrolled or had graduated.

NOTES: Race/ethnic categories of "other" and "not indicated" are collapsed into "white." Five students were not enrolled in one or two semesters but subsequently returned to UIS. Students who left the Capital Scholars program but remained at UIS are included. Students are excluded for all terms subsequent to earning their bachelor's degree if they remain at UIS to complete graduate coursework.

Table C-3
Summary of Enrollments by Gender: Undergraduate
Total Head Count Enrollment - Capital Scholars Program
Fall 2001 to Spring 2006

| First Year | Retention | Male | | Female | | Total | |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------|-------|---------------|-------|--------------|------|
| Fall 2001 | | 51 | 44.0% | 65 | 56.0% | 116 | 100% |
| | Spring 2002 | 50 | 45.0% | 61 | 55.0% | 111 | 100% |
| | Fall 2002 | 48 | 44.9% | 59 | 55.1% | 107 | 100% |
| | Spring 2003 | 47 | 45.6% | 56 | 54.4% | 103 | 100% |
| | Fall 2003 | 36 | 44.4% | 45 | 55.6% | 81 | 100% |
| | Spring 2004 | 31 | 40.8% | 45 | 59.2% | 76 | 100% |
| | Fall 2004 | 31 | 41.3% | 44 | 58.7% | 75 | 100% |
| | Spring 2005 | 29 | 40.3% | 43 | 59.7% | 72 | 100% |
| | Fall 2005 | 27 | 39.1% | 42 | 60.9% | 69 | 100% |
| | Spring 2006 | 27 | 43.5% | 35 | 56.5% | 62 | 100% |
| Fall 2002 | | | | | | | |
| | Spring 2003 | 39 | 46.4% | 45 | 53.6% | 84 | 100% |
| | Fall 2003 | 35 | 46.1% | 41 | 53.9% | 76 | 100% |
| | Spring 2004 | 34 | 45.9% | 40 | 54.1% | 74 | 100% |
| | Fall 2004 | 32 | 52.5% | 29 | 47.5% | 61 | 100% |
| | Spring 2005 | 32 | 52.5% | 29 | 47.5% | 61 | 100% |
| | Fall 2005 | 30 | 50.8% | 29 | 49.2% | 59 | 100% |
| | Spring 2006 | 30 | 50.8% | 29 | 49.2% | 59 | 100% |
| Fall 2003 | | | | | | | |
| | Spring 2004 | 38 | 34.9% | 71 | 65.1% | 109 | 100% |
| | Fall 2004 | 31 | 33.3% | 62 | 66.7% | 93 | 100% |
| | Spring 2005 | 29 | 31.9% | 62 | 68.1% | 91 | 100% |
| | Fall 2005 | 26 | 30.2% | 60 | 69.8% | 86 | 100% |
| | Spring 2006 | 26 | 30.6% | 59 | 69.4% | 85 | 100% |
| Fall 2004 | | | | | | | |
| | Spring 2005 | 35 | 41.2% | 50 | 58.8% | 85 | 100% |
| | Fall 2005 | 30 | 39.5% | 46 | 60.5% | 76 | 100% |
| | Spring 2006 | 30 | 39.5% | 46 | 60.5% | 76 | 100% |
| Fall 2005 | | | | | | | |
| | Spring 2006 | 56 | 43.8% | 72 | 56.3% | 128 | 100% |

NOTE: Data as of each semester's census.

NOTE: Students who left the Capital Scholars program but remained at UIS are included.

Retention was operationalized as all students who were enrolled or had graduated.

TABLE D

**Master's and Doctoral Total Head Count Enrollment by College,
Degree Program, Racial/Ethnic Category, and Gender
Fall 2005**

| GRADUATE College/Degree Program | Non-Resident Alien | | Black Non-Hispanic | | Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Native | | Asian Pacific Islander | | Hispanic | | White Non-Hispanic | | Other Unknown | | Total | | TOTAL | |
|---|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|----------|------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|--------------------|------------|---------------|-----------|------------|--------------|--------------|--|
| | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | | |
| College of Business and Management | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accountancy | 5 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 36 | 2 | 0 | 35 | 48 | 83 | |
| Business Administration | 5 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 42 | 47 | 4 | 0 | 52 | 55 | 107 | |
| Management Information Systems | 18 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 62 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 99 | 39 | 138 | |
| Subtotal | 28 | 14 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 3 | 2 | 128 | 102 | 9 | 1 | 186 | 142 | 328 | |
| College of Education and Human Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Educational Leadership | 1 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 249 | 3 | 14 | 113 | 278 | 391 | |
| Human Development Counseling | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 53 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 57 | 66 | |
| Human Services | 1 | 1 | 2 | 18 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 56 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 81 | 97 | |
| Subtotal | 2 | 1 | 8 | 34 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 122 | 358 | 3 | 17 | 138 | 416 | 554 | |
| College of Liberal Arts and Sciences | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Biology | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 13 | 23 | |
| Communication | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 29 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 34 | 54 | |
| Computer Science | 101 | 51 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 35 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 144 | 68 | 212 | |
| English | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 27 | 38 | |
| History | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 27 | 55 | |
| Individual Option | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 27 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 32 | 41 | |
| Subtotal | 101 | 51 | 6 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 103 | 128 | 2 | 2 | 222 | 201 | 423 | |
| College of Public Affairs and Administration | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Environmental Studies/Sciences | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 27 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 30 | 44 | |
| Legal Studies | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 22 | |
| Political Studies | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 29 | 3 | 2 | 39 | 36 | 75 | |
| Public Administration | 3 | 1 | 6 | 15 | | | 1 | | 3 | 1 | 29 | 29 | 1 | 2 | 43 | 48 | 91 | |
| Public Affairs Reporting | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 19 | |
| Master of Public Health | 18 | 4 | 2 | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 2 | 2 | 23 | 22 | 45 | |
| Subtotal | 22 | 11 | 10 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 81 | 118 | 6 | 9 | 129 | 167 | 296 | |
| Undeclared/Unclassified | 3 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 93 | 118 | 7 | 13 | 110 | 154 | 264 | |
| Total Master's | 156 | 79 | 37 | 96 | 2 | 5 | 24 | 25 | 12 | 9 | 527 | 824 | 27 | 42 | 785 | 1,080 | 1,865 | |
| Doctor of Public Administration | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 18 | |
| Subtotal Doctoral | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 18 | |
| Total Graduate Enrollment | 157 | 80 | 37 | 98 | 2 | 5 | 24 | 25 | 12 | 9 | 533 | 832 | 27 | 42 | 792 | 1,091 | 1,883 | |

TABLE D-1

**Master's and Doctoral Total Head Count Enrollment by College, Degree Program – Non-Resident Alien
Fall 2005**

| College/Degree Program | Non-Resident Alien | | Asian Pacific Islander | | Hispanic | | Black Non-Hispanic | | Amer. Indian/Alaskan Native | | White Non-Hispanic | | Other | |
|---|--------------------|-----------|------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|--------------------|----------|-----------------------------|----------|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| College of Business & Management | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accountancy | 5 | 6 | 2 | 5 | | | 2 | 1 | | | 1 | | | |
| Business Administration | 5 | 4 | | 3 | 1 | | | | | | 4 | 1 | | |
| Management Information Systems | 18 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Subtotal | 28 | 14 | 16 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| College of Education & Human Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Educational Leadership | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| Human Services | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Subtotal | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| College of Liberal Arts & Sciences | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Computer Science | 101 | 51 | 96 | 48 | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 3 | 2 |
| Subtotal | 101 | 51 | 96 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| College of Public Affairs & Administration | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Environmental Studies | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Legal Studies | 0 | 3 | | 2 | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| Political Studies | 0 | 2 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Public Administration, MPA | 3 | 1 | | 1 | | | 2 | | | | | | 1 | |
| Masters of Public Health | 18 | 4 | 17 | 4 | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Subtotal | 22 | 11 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Undeclared/Unclassified Graduates | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal Master's | 156 | 79 | 130 | 71 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 3 |
| Doctor of Public Administration | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Public Administration, DPA | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Total | 157 | 80 | 130 | 72 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 7 | 3 |

TABLE E
Student Head Count Enrollment by Gender and Level
Fall 1996 to Fall 2005

| Year | Undergraduate Enrollment | | | | | Master's Enrollment | | | | | Doctoral Enrollment ¹ | | | | | Total Enrollment | | | | Total Enrollment |
|------|--------------------------|------------|-------|------------|-------|---------------------|------------|------|------------|-------|----------------------------------|------------|------|------------|-------|------------------|------------|-------|------------|------------------|
| | Female | | Male | | Total | Female | | Male | | Total | Female | | Male | | Total | Female | | Male | | |
| | N | % of Total | N | % of Total | | N | % of Total | N | % of Total | | N | % of Total | N | % of Total | | N | % of Total | N | % of Total | |
| 1996 | 1,602 | 64.6 | 876 | 35.4 | 2,478 | 1,229 | 57.6 | 904 | 42.4 | 2,133 | | | | | | 2,831 | 61.4 | 1,780 | 38.6 | 4,611 |
| 1997 | 1,540 | 63.9 | 871 | 36.1 | 2,411 | 1,208 | 58.9 | 844 | 41.1 | 2,052 | | | | | | 2,748 | 61.6 | 1,715 | 38.4 | 4,463 |
| 1998 | 1,513 | 63.8 | 860 | 36.2 | 2,373 | 1,157 | 59.7 | 781 | 40.3 | 1,938 | 9 | 39.1 | 14 | 60.9 | 23 | 2,679 | 61.8 | 1,655 | 38.2 | 4,334 |
| 1999 | 1,352 | 61.9 | 831 | 38.1 | 2,183 | 1,092 | 58.2 | 784 | 41.8 | 1,876 | 6 | 30.0 | 14 | 70.0 | 20 | 2,450 | 60.1 | 1,629 | 39.9 | 4,079 |
| 2000 | 1,353 | 63.9 | 765 | 36.1 | 2,118 | 1,032 | 57.2 | 771 | 42.8 | 1,803 | 8 | 38.1 | 13 | 61.9 | 21 | 2,393 | 60.7 | 1,549 | 39.3 | 3,942 |
| 2001 | 1,466 | 63.7 | 834 | 36.3 | 2,300 | 1,110 | 56.5 | 856 | 43.5 | 1,966 | 8 | 36.4 | 14 | 63.6 | 22 | 2,584 | 60.3 | 1,704 | 39.7 | 4,288 |
| 2002 | 1,512 | 61.8 | 933 | 38.2 | 2,445 | 1,144 | 57.7 | 839 | 42.3 | 1,983 | 13 | 56.5 | 10 | 43.5 | 23 | 2,669 | 60.0 | 1,782 | 40.0 | 4,451 |
| 2003 | 1,574 | 61.3 | 995 | 38.7 | 2,569 | 1,174 | 59.1 | 813 | 40.9 | 1,987 | 14 | 77.8 | 4 | 22.2 | 18 | 2,762 | 60.4 | 1,812 | 39.6 | 4,574 |
| 2004 | 1,511 | 60.3 | 996 | 39.7 | 2,507 | 1,073 | 57.3 | 801 | 42.7 | 1,874 | 11 | 73.3 | 4 | 26.7 | 15 | 2,595 | 59.0 | 1,801 | 41.0 | 4,396 |
| 2005 | 1,582 | 60.1 | 1,052 | 39.9 | 2,634 | 1,080 | 57.9 | 785 | 42.1 | 1,865 | 11 | 61.1 | 7 | 38.9 | 18 | 2,673 | 59.2 | 1,844 | 40.8 | 4,517 |

¹ UIS introduced its first doctoral program, the Doctor of Public Administration, in fall 1998.

Table F
Summary Report of Full-Time Employees by Gender and Ethnicity
Fall 2005

| Category | Male | | Female | | Total | |
|------------------------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|
| | N | % of Category | N | % of Category | N | % of Category |
| Faculty | | | | | | |
| Unknown | 2 | 1.1% | 1 | 0.6% | 3 | 1.7% |
| Asian/Pacific Isl. | 5 | 2.8% | 1 | 0.6% | 6 | 3.4% |
| Black | 6 | 3.4% | 6 | 3.4% | 12 | 6.8% |
| Hispanic | 1 | 0.6% | 1 | 0.6% | 2 | 1.1% |
| White | 74 | 41.8% | 63 | 35.6% | 137 | 77.4% |
| Native American | 1 | 0.6% | 1 | 0.6% | 2 | 1.1% |
| International | 11 | 6.2% | 4 | 2.3% | 15 | 8.5% |
| Subtotal | 100 | 56.5% | 77 | 43.5% | 177 | 100.0% |
| Academic Professional | | | | | | |
| Unknown | 1 | 0.7% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.7% |
| Asian/Pacific Isl. | 3 | 2.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 2.1% |
| Black | 4 | 2.8% | 2 | 1.4% | 6 | 4.1% |
| Hispanic | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.7% | 1 | 0.7% |
| White | 50 | 34.5% | 81 | 55.9% | 131 | 90.3% |
| Native American | 1 | 0.7% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.7% |
| International | 1 | 0.7% | 1 | 0.7% | 2 | 1.4% |
| Subtotal | 60 | 41.4% | 85 | 58.6% | 145 | 100.0% |
| Civil Service | | | | | | |
| Unknown | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Asian/Pacific Isl. | 1 | 0.4% | 1 | 0.4% | 2 | 0.8% |
| Black | 6 | 2.3% | 4 | 1.5% | 10 | 3.8% |
| Hispanic | 2 | 0.8% | 4 | 1.5% | 6 | 2.3% |
| White | 101 | 38.4% | 144 | 54.8% | 245 | 93.2% |
| Native American | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| International | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Subtotal | 110 | 41.8% | 153 | 58.2% | 263 | 100.0% |
| All Employees | | | | | | |
| Unknown | 3 | 0.5% | 1 | 0.2% | 4 | 0.7% |
| Asian/Pacific Isl. | 9 | 1.5% | 2 | 0.3% | 11 | 1.9% |
| Black | 16 | 2.7% | 12 | 2.1% | 28 | 4.8% |
| Hispanic | 3 | 0.5% | 6 | 1.0% | 9 | 1.5% |
| White | 225 | 38.5% | 288 | 49.2% | 513 | 87.7% |
| Native American | 2 | 0.3% | 1 | 0.2% | 3 | 0.5% |
| International | 12 | 2.1% | 5 | 0.9% | 17 | 2.9% |
| Total | 270 | 46.2% | 315 | 53.8% | 585 | 100.0% |

Source: October 2005 Frozen Pay File

TABLE G
Summary Report of Full-Time Employees for Underrepresented Populations
Fall 1996 to Fall 2005

| Employee Category/Year | Black | | Asian | | Hispanic | | Disabled | | Female | | Employment Category Total | | Campus Total |
|------------------------|-------|------|-------|------|----------|------|----------|------|--------|-------|---------------------------|-------|--------------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N |
| Faculty | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1996 | 11 | 6.88 | 8 | 5.00 | 4 | 2.50 | 3 | 1.9 | 51 | 31.88 | 160 | 31.19 | 513 |
| 1997 | 10 | 6.25 | 8 | 5.00 | 4 | 2.50 | 2 | 1.3 | 53 | 33.13 | 160 | 30.77 | 520 |
| 1998 | 10 | 6.10 | 6 | 3.66 | 3 | 1.83 | 3 | 1.8 | 60 | 36.59 | 164 | 31.12 | 527 |
| 1999 | 9 | 5.66 | 6 | 3.77 | 2 | 1.26 | 4 | 2.5 | 60 | 37.74 | 159 | 30.06 | 529 |
| 2000 | 9 | 5.52 | 5 | 3.07 | 2 | 1.23 | 5 | 3.1 | 62 | 38.04 | 163 | 30.13 | 541 |
| 2001 | 10 | 5.95 | 9 | 5.36 | 2 | 1.19 | 5 | 3.0 | 65 | 38.69 | 168 | 28.67 | 586 |
| 2002 | 7 | 4.22 | 10 | 6.02 | 2 | 1.20 | 5 | 3.0 | 67 | 40.36 | 166 | 28.38 | 585 |
| 2003 | 6 | 3.57 | 13 | 7.74 | 2 | 1.19 | 4 | 2.4 | 69 | 41.07 | 168 | 29.63 | 567 |
| 2004 | 11 | 6.75 | 9 | 5.52 | 2 | 1.23 | 5 | 3.1 | 64 | 39.26 | 163 | 28.50 | 572 |
| 2005 | 12 | 6.78 | 6 | 3.39 | 2 | 1.13 | 16 | 9.0 | 77 | 43.50 | 177 | 30.26 | 585 |
| Acad. Prof. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1996 | 7 | 7.61 | 0 | 0.00 | 2 | 2.17 | 2 | 2.2 | 48 | 52.17 | 92 | 17.93 | 513 |
| 1997 | 6 | 5.94 | 0 | 0.00 | 2 | 1.98 | 1 | 1.0 | 55 | 54.46 | 101 | 19.42 | 520 |
| 1998 | 5 | 4.63 | 1 | 0.93 | 1 | 0.93 | 0 | 0.0 | 61 | 56.48 | 108 | 20.49 | 527 |
| 1999 | 6 | 5.41 | 2 | 1.80 | 2 | 1.80 | 0 | 0.0 | 63 | 56.76 | 111 | 20.98 | 529 |
| 2000 | 6 | 4.88 | 2 | 1.63 | 1 | 0.81 | 0 | 0.0 | 72 | 58.54 | 123 | 22.74 | 541 |
| 2001 | 7 | 4.67 | 4 | 2.67 | 1 | 0.67 | 3 | 2.0 | 83 | 55.33 | 150 | 25.60 | 586 |
| 2002 | 8 | 5.33 | 6 | 4.00 | 2 | 1.33 | 2 | 1.3 | 83 | 55.33 | 150 | 25.64 | 585 |
| 2003 | 5 | 3.57 | 4 | 2.86 | 1 | 0.71 | 2 | 1.4 | 79 | 56.43 | 140 | 24.69 | 567 |
| 2004 | 5 | 3.31 | 3 | 1.99 | 1 | 0.66 | 5 | 3.3 | 88 | 58.28 | 151 | 26.40 | 572 |
| 2005 | 6 | 4.14 | 3 | 2.07 | 1 | 0.69 | 18 | 12.4 | 85 | 58.62 | 145 | 24.79 | 585 |
| Civil Service | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1996 | 19 | 7.28 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 6 | 2.3 | 149 | 57.09 | 261 | 50.88 | 513 |
| 1997 | 21 | 8.11 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 5 | 1.9 | 150 | 57.92 | 259 | 49.81 | 520 |
| 1998 | 18 | 7.06 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 1.2 | 150 | 58.82 | 255 | 48.39 | 527 |
| 1999 | 18 | 6.95 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 1.2 | 156 | 60.23 | 259 | 48.96 | 529 |
| 2000 | 15 | 5.88 | 1 | 0.39 | 1 | 0.39 | 3 | 1.2 | 160 | 62.75 | 255 | 47.13 | 541 |
| 2001 | 19 | 7.09 | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 1.12 | 9 | 3.4 | 164 | 61.19 | 268 | 45.73 | 586 |
| 2002 | 17 | 6.32 | 0 | 0.00 | 4 | 1.49 | 2 | 0.7 | 166 | 61.71 | 269 | 45.98 | 585 |
| 2003 | 10 | 3.86 | 0 | 0.00 | 4 | 1.54 | 2 | 0.8 | 158 | 61.00 | 259 | 45.68 | 567 |
| 2004 | 10 | 3.91 | 2 | 0.78 | 4 | 1.56 | 4 | 1.6 | 151 | 58.98 | 256 | 44.76 | 572 |
| 2005 | 10 | 3.80 | 2 | 0.76 | 6 | 2.28 | 15 | 5.7 | 153 | 58.17 | 263 | 44.96 | 585 |
| All Employees | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1996 | 37 | 7.21 | 8 | 1.56 | 6 | 1.17 | 11 | 2.1 | 248 | 48.34 | N/A | N/A | 513 |
| 1997 | 37 | 7.12 | 8 | 1.54 | 6 | 1.15 | 8 | 1.5 | 258 | 49.62 | N/A | N/A | 520 |
| 1998 | 33 | 6.26 | 7 | 1.33 | 4 | 0.76 | 6 | 1.1 | 271 | 51.42 | N/A | N/A | 527 |
| 1999 | 33 | 6.24 | 8 | 1.51 | 4 | 0.76 | 7 | 1.3 | 279 | 52.74 | N/A | N/A | 529 |
| 2000 | 30 | 5.55 | 8 | 1.48 | 4 | 0.74 | 8 | 1.5 | 294 | 54.34 | N/A | N/A | 541 |
| 2001 | 36 | 6.14 | 13 | 2.22 | 6 | 1.02 | 17 | 2.9 | 312 | 53.24 | N/A | N/A | 586 |
| 2002 | 32 | 5.47 | 16 | 2.74 | 8 | 1.37 | 9 | 1.5 | 316 | 54.02 | N/A | N/A | 585 |
| 2003 | 21 | 3.70 | 17 | 3.00 | 7 | 1.23 | 8 | 1.4 | 306 | 53.97 | N/A | N/A | 567 |
| 2004 | 26 | 4.55 | 14 | 2.45 | 7 | 1.22 | 14 | 2.4 | 303 | 52.97 | N/A | N/A | 572 |
| 2005 | 28 | 4.79 | 11 | 1.88 | 9 | 1.54 | 49 | 8.4 | 315 | 53.85 | N/A | N/A | 585 |

Note: The 2005 figures for employees with disabilities are based on data from the university's online human resources database, as well as the self-identification of employees through the Office of Disability Services. For the years 1996-2004, the figures were based solely on data contained in the university's online human resources database.