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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is a product of the UC Davis Staff Diversity Data Workshop, which was generously supported by a UC Davis Diversity & Inclusion Innovation Grant. It is intended to provide a brief analysis of UC Davis non-academic staff demographic data and substantive recommendations to campus leadership. While there is excellent work being done to improve equity, diversity, and inclusion for students and faculty, relatively little focus has been dedicated to staff. Staff comprise the second largest constituent group on campus, second only to students.¹ There are compelling reasons for the university to better align staff demographics across all professional levels with that of its increasingly diverse student body, given:

- the positive impact diversity has on innovation and creative thinking for the institution,
- staff have a key responsibility in providing critical services, support and mentoring to students, particularly Student Affairs staff;
- the impact and influence that management staff have as role models to students; and
- the positive correlations of equitable representation between staff of color and students of color to increased retention, graduation and overall success of students.

It is vital that staff have the opportunity to review staff diversity data, engage in critical dialogue about equity, diversity and inclusion concerns, and have a voice in shaping recommendations.

The UC Davis Staff Diversity Data Workshop was held on August 24, 2017, and was coordinated in collaboration with Staff Assembly and the Staff Diversity Administrative Advisory Committee. The workshop brought together 40 staff participants from a wide range of campus departments and professional levels (selected from a pool of over 80 applicants), as well as eight staff members who facilitated table discussions, and campus diversity data experts. Our primary purpose in hosting the workshop was to offer staff an opportunity to review, analyze, and engage with staff diversity data, in an effort to promote a culture of data-driven decision making, and to operationalize the information provided.

The workshop also served as a professional development opportunity. The planning committee intentionally selected staff with a wide range of data analysis proficiency, and facilitators at each group were charged with guiding participants in the data analysis. While time constraints and the broadness of the data limited the depth of learning, all groups had dynamic and productive dialogues around the data in relation to campus policies, practices and climate. More than anything, in this process we learned that staff are eager to engage with staff diversity data and to partake in development opportunities focused on utilizing data to inform their work. Furthermore, participants expressed appreciation for the chance to

¹ To be serious about establishing a truly diverse organization, understanding how staff – 80% of the UC workforce – can play a critical role in building such an environment is an opportunity that must be addressed.”

UC CORO 2016 Northern California Cohort Report “Creating a More Equitable and Inclusive Environment”
provide their perspectives in reviewing the data and were heartened to see that the campus supports staff diversity initiatives.

Workshop groups reviewed staff data in areas of race, ethnicity, and gender across professional levels, as well as in STEMii areas and UC Davis Health; staff trends were analyzed in comparison to student enrollment demographics. While the findings from the workshop are by no means groundbreaking, and echo results from previously published reports (such as the UC Davis Diversity & Inclusion Strategic Vision Plan), the real value of this exercise was in bringing staff together in discussions around equity, diversity, and inclusion issues, and exploring how their experiences contextualize the data. The collaborative spirit of the workshop has since inspired other advisory committees to partner on projects of institutional significance – for example, the Status of Women at Davis Administrative Advisory Committee now seeks to investigate the gender pay gap in alliance with affinity groups. Below are the key findings and recommendations, followed by detailed analyses and further recommendations from each of the focus areas of the workshop.

KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**Finding 1:** Staff demographic data collection practices do not provide inclusive gender or racial and ethnic identity options.

**Recommendation:** Improve data collection for staff at the point of application and after employment that more accurately captures multiple, inclusive and intersecting identity categories. Make staff diversity data more accessible.

- Provide inclusive options for gender identities beyond the binary, gender expression, and sexual orientation in the data collected and maintained in the UC Path system, both at point of employment and as a staff member decides to update their personnel record.
- Provide more options of racial and ethnic identities, including multiracial identities, in data collected in the UC Path system.
Finding 2: There are notable disparities across professional levels. Women and staff from underrepresented minority (URM) backgrounds are more heavily represented in lower levels, but drop off steeply in higher management positions. Compared to URM students, who make 23% of the student body, URM staff hold only 14% of management positions.

![Bar chart showing URM and Non-URM representation in students, all staff, and management staff by URUM/Non-URM, 2016.]

In 2016, students totaled 36,462, staff 21,844, and Management 145.

Recommendation 1: Increase support for strategic outreach and recruitment efforts for staff from diverse and underrepresented backgrounds.

- Implement required implicit bias training for all staff involved in recruitment, hiring, and promotions.
- Grow the campus database of professional and community-based organizations that support underrepresented communities, to cultivate stronger relationships and improve outreach.

Recommendation 2: Implement sustainable retention efforts for staff from diverse and underrepresented backgrounds.

- Expand professional development, leadership training and mentorship opportunities targeted to underrepresented groups and women in STEM.
- Support increased diversity and inclusion trainings and activities for staff and management.
- Conduct qualitative and quantitative analyses on staff separations and turnover.
- Research salary equity for staff.
HIGHER LEVEL TRENDS

Two groups at the workshop reviewed higher level trends in staff representation data compared to student data, across categories of race/ethnicity and gender. Discussion in these groups focused on how identity categories are defined in the staff data sets compared to student data sets, what information is missing, what the gaps reveal about institutional assumptions, and the need for more nuanced and inclusive data collection. The groups found it problematic that the disaggregated staff data sets contain simplistic identity categories that do not reflect the full range of racial, ethnic and gender identities. For example, the Asian/Pacific Islander category is extremely broad and does not capture the many distinct ethnicities and cultures within the umbrella of “Asian.” Staff data collection needs to capture inclusive and complex identity categories, and an analysis of intersectional identities is essential.

Higher level trends show staff numbers growing by 6.3% from 2012 to 2016, a rate eclipsed by the faster total student enrollment growth of 9.9% during that time. During this period of growth, the demographic composition of staff racial and ethnic backgrounds have shifted, with small percentage point increases of Hispanic/Chicanx/Latinx (+1.8%) and Asian/Pacific Islander (+1.6%) staff. African American and American Indian/Alaska Native staff percentages have remained relatively stagnant, at approximately 6% and 0.9%, respectively, of the total staff. While the number of White/Caucasian staff has increased, the percentage compared to all staff has dipped slightly since 2011. The percentages of female to male staff have remained at approximately 63% to 37% throughout the last five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20,552</td>
<td>20,833</td>
<td>21,108</td>
<td>21,301</td>
<td>21,844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RACE AND ETHNICITY

In 2016, staff totaled 21,844, Student Affairs staff 1,165, and students 36,462. Chart excludes international students.

Findings

- The staff and student data on race/ethnicity do not currently include categories for individuals with multiple racial and ethnic identities, which is an important growing population in national demographics we need to consider as an institution.iv

- Comparison of all staff and all student data from 2012-2016 reveal the following trends:
  - **Underrepresented Minority (URM)** Comparison: There is a greater percentage of URM students (23%) than URM staff (21%), and there is a significant difference in percentages of URM students to URM management staff (14%).
  - **African American** staff percentages remained flat at around 6%, while **African American students increased slightly from 3% to 3.5%**. In 2016, the African American staff percentage was slightly higher than students by 2.6 percentage points, and the Student Affairs staff percentage higher by 3.9 percentage points. Although this difference is relatively small, UC Davis’ higher percentage of African American staff compared to students does reflect a trend seen at ten large public universities nationwide.vi
  - **American Indian/Alaskan Native** staff percentages remained flat at about 0.9%, and student percentages dropped slightly from 1% to 0.9%.
  - **Asian/Pacific Islander** staff percentages have increased slightly from 20.7% to 22.3%, and student percentages have dropped from 35.5% to 31.5%. Similar to the trend seen in the nationwide sample of public universities (Kwon, 2016), Asian American and Pacific Islander students at UC Davis consistently represent a significantly higher percentage than Asian and
Pacific Islander staff over the last five years. While that gap has narrowed, **there remains a 9.2 percentage point difference** in 2016.

- **Hispanic, Latinx and Chicano/a** staff percentages have increased from 12.5% in 2012 to 14.3% in 2016, and student percentages increased from 14.6% to 18.8%. While both Chicano/Latinx staff and student percentages are increasing, students are growing at more than double the rate of staff, and the difference between the two has widened. However, the Chicano/Latinx Student Affairs staff percentage is higher than the student body at just over 25%.

- **White/Caucasian** staff percentages are much higher than student percentages, with a **difference of 24.2 percentage point in 2016**. White/Caucasian staff numbers have increased from 2012-2016, even though the percentage to total staff has dipped from 57.1% to 53.9%, and student percentages have shifted from 33.9% to 29.7%.

- Staff demographics across increasing professional levels reveals a downward trajectory in the percentage representation of staff of color, while white staff experience higher percentages of representation at higher levels. It is interesting to note that representation is close or nearly equal at the lower levels and Sr. Professional level, and there are wide gaps at the supervisor and upper management levels.

![Staff by Professional Levels, 2016](chart.png)

*Note: MSP stands for Managers and Senior Professionals, the highest levels of staff positions.*
Recommendations

- Provide multiple racial and ethnic options in staff data collection. Conduct intersectional analyses and reporting on staff data on a regular basis.
- Increase support for Human Resources Talent Acquisition to expand their strategic outreach and recruitment efforts to diverse and underrepresented communities.
- Grow the campus database of professional and community-based organizations to cultivate stronger relationships with those community organizations and conduct outreach.
- Conduct an assessment of our current implicit bias training for staff supervisors. Investigate current social psychology research on implicit bias to see how we can improve our training and practices to ensure the best outcomes. Then create a manageable process for all staff who serve on recruitment committees to participate in the training.
- Strengthen and further invest in professional and leadership development programs for staff.
- Narrow the growing gap between Chicano/Latino students and staff and ensure that representation is equitable across professional levels. This is especially important as we strive to reach and exceed the threshold of 25% Chicano/Latino student enrollment required to apply for designation as a Hispanic Serving Institution.

GENDER

Findings

- Overall, 63.4% of staff identify as women (13,840) and 36.6% as men (8,004). However, there is currently no data collected on inclusive gender identities beyond this binary, and some staff are not able to accurately identify themselves.
- The percentages of women in Management Mid or Upper, Senior Professionals Mid or Upper and Supervisor Mid or Upper are slightly lower than the overall staff gender composition. In contrast, the percentage of women in lower level Supervisor and Non-Supervisor positions are noticeably higher than the overall staff percentage.
- As noted in the UC Davis Diversity & Inclusion Strategic Plan, women are overrepresented in fields such as Nursing, Education, Veterinary Medicine, and administrative areas.
- Women are underrepresented in primarily STEM-related divisions such as Campus Planning, Engineering, Information and Education Technology, and Mathematics and Physical Sciences.
Recommendations

- Conduct longitudinal studies on gender representation by job classifications, educational level, career progression, promotions and separations (exit interviews), and salary equity. Share the findings with administrative advisory committees that can offer insight in how to address these trends.

- Create and promote more professional development, leadership training and mentorship opportunities, particularly for women in STEM-related areas.

- Include multiple and expansive gender identities (beyond the binary of man/woman), gender expression, and sexual orientation in the data collected at the point of the employment application, and as a staff member decides to update their personnel record.
  
  - California Assembly Bill 620 (signed in 2011) requested that UC provide the opportunity for students, faculty and staff to report their sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression on any forms used to collect demographic data. In 2014, UC President Napolitano formed the President’s Advisory Council on LGBT Students, Faculty and Staff, and charged the group with making UC a gold standard in LGBT issues. As a result of this Council’s work, the UC admission application now (as of Fall 2016) offers more inclusive gender
categories for students to identify, and the aggregate student gender data provided for this workshop has three categories: “Male,” “Female,” and “Other.”

- Support efforts to improve campus climate, such as:
  - a Lived Name Policy that would allow staff to change their first name for outward facing programs, such as Aggie Travel, AggieBuy, etc. This policy would not affect official personnel documents that require the use of a legal name (like a paycheck), but would make a tremendous positive impact on transgender staff, who experience high levels of discrimination in the workplace when their gender identity is not perceived to align with their legal name.
  - a child care facility at the UC Davis Health Campus, so we can better recruit and retain quality faculty and staff, and offer a better work life balance. The Davis campus currently has three child care facilities, but nothing is offered at the Health Campus, which houses the highest number of staff affiliated with UC Davis (over 11,300 out of just over 21,800 total).

# SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING, MATHEMATICS (STEM)

STEM areas for the workshop and this paper include: College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CAES), College of Biological Sciences (CBS), College of Engineering (COE), the College of Letters and Science’s divisions of Mathematical and Physical Sciences (MPS) and Social Sciences, and the School of Veterinary Medicine (Vet Med). The School of Medicine and School of Nursing are included in the UC Davis Health section of this report.

In 2016, STEM staff totaled 4,391, and students 31,092. These charts exclude international students.
Findings

- While overall campus staff numbers have increased by 6.3% between 2012 to 2016, staff in the STEM areas have declined by 2.8% in that same timeframe. STEM majors make up over 50% of student enrollment. There have been very slight shifts in the demographic percentages of STEM staff by race and ethnicity over the last five years, with Hispanic/Chicano/Latino staff increasing by 1.4 percentage points, African American staff by .5 percentage points, and Asian staff by .9 percentage points.

- Compared to students, white staff are overrepresented with nearly a 30 percentage point difference, while there are large gaps between the percentage of Asian/Pacific Island students and staff (staff percentage difference is 11.2 points lower) and Hispanic/Chicano/Latino students and staff (staff percentage difference is 6.3 points lower).

- A focused look at STEM staff across the different colleges and divisions shows that Underrepresented Minority (URM) staff range from just under 10% to nearly 18%.

In 2016, there were 646 URM staff (14.7%), and 3,745 Non-URM staff (85.3%) in STEM areas.
Women comprise more than half of staff in the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, the College of Biological Sciences, the division of Social Sciences, and the School of Veterinary Medicine. Men have significantly higher representation in the College of Engineering (66.9%) and the division of Mathematical and Physical Sciences (63%).

In 2016, STEM staff who identified as women totaled 2,480, and men 1,911.

**Recommendations**

- Conduct qualitative and quantitative analyses on separations and turnover in STEM areas.
- Investigate reasons for overall loss of staff positions in STEM fields.
- Create and promote more professional development and mentoring opportunities for women and URMs in STEM fields.
- Offer diversity and inclusion training specific to staff in STEM fields.
- Bolster STEM staff recruitment and outreach efforts to diverse communities, particularly URM communities.
UC DAVIS HEALTH

For this report, UC Davis Health data includes the UC Davis Medical Center, the School of Medicine and the School of Nursing.

Findings

- Over the five-year span from 2012-2016, UC Davis Health has seen an 8.8% growth in staff, reaching over 11,300 in 2016. In that period of growth, Asian staff have increased by 2.5 percentage points, and Hispanic/Chicana/Latinx staff have increased very slightly by 1.1 percentage points. Percentages for American Indian and African American staff have remained relatively flat, but it is intriguing to note that there is a higher percentage of African American staff at UC Davis Health (8.5%) than the overall UC Davis percentage (6.1%).

When comparing percentages of staff to students in the School of Medicine and School of Nursing, we find that there are higher percentages of students of color than staff of color, and conversely, there is a much higher percentage of white staff compared to white students in these programs.
In 2016, the School of Medicine staff totaled 2,385.

In 2016, the School of Nursing staff totaled 65.
Recommendations

- Conduct analysis of Health campus staff representation in comparison with patient population and available pool. Include Temporary Employment Services (TES), contractors, and volunteers in future research for a better understanding of the data.
- Support increased efforts to recruit and retain staff of color at the Health campus.
  - It is particularly important that staff demographics reflect both student and patient demographics, as both the training of future doctors and serving the healthcare needs of patients have a significant impact to the surrounding community. Creating a more inclusive environment and fostering staff diversity at the Health campus will contribute to higher levels of excellence and innovation, and has the potential to reduce health disparities.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the data reviewed in the workshop showed that staff demographics are not reflective of either our student body or the state of California, whom we serve. Diversity, equity and inclusion are key to fostering greater innovation, creative thinking, and better serving the needs of our changing student body. We must expand our outreach and recruitment, consistently implement equitable hiring practices, and invest in retention efforts to keep and promote diverse and underrepresented staff. As Evans and Chun (2007) assert, “we cannot achieve organizational change regarding equity and inclusion without a combination of human resource policies, institutional support mechanisms, and professional development on issues of inclusion and diversity.”  It is our sincere hope that campus leadership thoughtfully consider these recommendations and prioritize staff-focused diversity and inclusion efforts at UC Davis.
DATA SOURCES AND METHODOLOGY

The data utilized for this workshop was procured through collaboration with the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan steering committee and the Office of Budget and Institutional Analysis (BIA). BIA provided raw workforce and student enrollment data. Staff workforce data is based on an October 27, 2016, snapshot and includes only those active on that date. Staff categories exclude Academic Senate and Federation categories, as well as students (undergraduates and graduate) but do include medical interns and residents. Unless otherwise noted, student enrollment data referenced in this document includes undergraduate, graduate, and professional students.

The workshop planning committee disaggregated and compiled the data into the five areas of interest, as described above: higher level trends; race/ethnicity; gender; STEM areas; and Health campus. The planning committee worked collaboratively to separate the data into packets to provide each working group with enough information to look for trends, patterns and other emergent themes. In addition to the raw data, each group was provided with graphs and resources from the Strategic Diversity and Inclusion plan. These documents served as helpful references for each group to guide their thinking. Facilitators were provided with the data several weeks prior to the workshop to review and prepare.
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i Data provided by the UC Davis Office of Budget and Institutional Analysis, June 2017.
ii STEM stands for science, technology, engineering and mathematics.
iii Underrepresented minority (URM) is comprised of African American, American Indian, and Chicano/Latino populations.
vi Underrepresented minority (URM) is comprised of African American, American Indian, and Chicano/Latino groups.