Overview of Presentation

- History of the Project
- Brief Overview of the Equity Scorecard Process
- Team Leader Panel Presentations
- Next Steps and Closing
- Questions and Answers
History of the EqS Project

- **Plan 2008**
  - Mid-point Review, Phase II – Close the Achievement Gaps in Recruitment and Retention (2004)
  - BOR Resolution 8970 – Equity Scorecard, Institutional Accountability

- **Equity Scorecard Project Timeline**
  - December 2005 - EqS Workshop for UWS OADD Team, Team Leaders, and other UWS Representatives
  - March 2006 - EqS Workshop UWS Teams in the Project
  - Fall 2006, Winter 2007 - Follow-up Workshops
  - Team Meetings – At Least Monthly
  - Interim Reports to the Chancellors and Key Stakeholders at the Institutions
Overview of the Equity Scorecard Process

ACCESS
- Objective
- Baseline
- Improvement
- Target
- Equity

RETENTION
- Objective
- Baseline
- Improvement
- Target
- Equity

EXCELLENCE
- Objective
- Baseline
- Improvement
- Target
- Equity

INSTITUTIONAL RECEPTIVITY
- Objective
- Baseline
- Improvement
- Target
- Equity

Equity in Educational Outcomes
Team Leader Panel Presentation

- **Access Perspective** - Greg Lampe  
  Associate Vice Chancellor, UW Colleges

- **Access & Retention** – Al Thompson  
  Assistant to the Chancellor, UW-La Crosse

- **Retention** – Michelina Manzi  
  Assistant Vice Chancellor, UW-Oshkosh

- **Access & Retention** – Eugene Fujimoto  
  Assistant to the Chancellor, UW-Parkside

- **Access & Retention** – Rita Cheng  
  Provost, UW-Milwaukee

- **Excellence** – Don Sorenson  
  Professor, UW-Whitewater
UW Colleges

Access
UW Colleges: Access

- **Access**: This perspective refers to access to the institution
- The UWC Equity Scorecard Evidence Team examined the following variables/vital signs:
  - Full-Time/Part-Time Status
  - Transfers
  - Financial Aid
  - Recruitment and Potential Student Populations
UW Colleges: Access

- Recruitment and Potential Student Populations Findings:
  - Each of the UWC campuses draws from a specific geographic region within Wisconsin.
  - Therefore, different campuses recruit from markedly different communities with markedly different prospective student populations.
  - The Evidence Team focused on each campus within the UWC.
UW Colleges: Access

- Campus High School Enrollment Equity Model:
  - The model determines by high school whether or not we are enrolling proportionally based on race.
  - Equity = rate of enrollment equal to that for white students at a given high school.
## UW Colleges: Access

### The High School Enrollment Equity Model Example – 5 Year Aggregate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neenah High School</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Native American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12th graders*</td>
<td>2,581</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Freshman</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Rate</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Enrollment***</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Difference</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The sum of 12th graders enrolled in the 5 years 2000-01 through 2004-05 (DPI census data)
**The sum of fall term new freshmen from this school enrolled 2001-02 through 2005-06
***12th graders x enrollment rate for white students = equity
UW-La Crosse

Access & Retention
Selected Access Indicators

- Pipeline: High School graduation through matriculation
  - Do students of color enroll as first year students at UW-L in equal proportions to HS graduation proportions?
  - Do students of color apply to UW-L in equal proportions to those who take the ACT?
  - Are students of color admitted in equal proportions to applications?
  - Do students of color enroll in equal proportions to those admitted?
## Access Equity Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Asian / PI</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Hispanic / Latino</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year to WI HS Grad</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants to ACT takers</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>SE Asian</th>
<th>Other Asian</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Hispanic / Latino</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admitted to Applicants</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled to Admitted</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selected Retention Indicators

- Are the proportions of students of color who return for a second year equal to first year proportions?

- Are the proportions of students of color who graduate from UW-L within six years equal to the proportions who started as new freshmen?

- Are the proportions of students of color who receive passing grades in General Education courses equal to the proportions of students who register for the courses?
## Retention Equity Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>SE Asian</th>
<th>Other Asian</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Hispanic / Latino</th>
<th>All Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY retention to FY enrollment</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 year graduation to FY</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to FY enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education passing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grades to enrolled students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Lit.</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sci.</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Sci.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Retention
The DFW Report

(DFW is the % of students in a class receiving a ‘D’, ‘F’, or ‘W’ [withdrawal])

- A DFW report was completed for 32 of our introductory and gateway courses
- 30% or higher DFW designates a class as “high risk.” (National standard)
- 50% or higher DFW designates a class as “very high risk.” (Our standard)
What We Expected

High risk classes would include:

- Math
- Science
What We Discovered

Nearly all courses in the General Education curriculum were determined to be at the high risk or very high risk level for most race/ethnic groups.
## Analysis of High Risk Courses by Race and Ethnicity
**Fall 1999 to Fall 2006 (including Spring Semesters)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Level</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>% DFW</th>
<th>Af Am</th>
<th>Am Ind</th>
<th>SE Asian</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hisp</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Int'l</th>
<th>Unk.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math 100</td>
<td>% DFW</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Course</td>
<td>n =</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>(85)</td>
<td>(5,128)</td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,487)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology 200</td>
<td>% DFW</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Course</td>
<td>n =</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(2,902)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3,095)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 200</td>
<td>% DFW</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Course</td>
<td>n =</td>
<td>(103)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(98)</td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>(74)</td>
<td>(6,252)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6,676)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy 100</td>
<td>% DFW</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Course</td>
<td>n =</td>
<td>(73)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(97)</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td>(5,343)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,718)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Red** – Very High Risk Course (50% or more with DFW)

**Yellow** – High Risk Course (30% to 50% with DFW)
Discussion

- We are still in the beginning stages of our evaluation. Progress thus far:
  - 1) Review our advising, tutoring and supplemental instruction practices;
  - 2) Develop a first year experience initiative;
  - 3) Assist the Counseling Center in expanding its student risk assessment;
  - 4) Create a campus climate study;
  - 5) Determine the meaning of this data for faculty and departments.
  - 6) Apply for a UW System OPID grant to address the needs expressed by the DFW report (College of L&S initiative).
ACCESS: Enrollment
Fall 2005

Undergraduates

- White, 78.8%
- African American, 9.9%
- Hispanic/Latino/a, 6.3%
- Asian American, 3.1%
- Native American, 0.7%
- International, 1.2%

Entering First-Year Class

- White, 75.2%
- African American, 15.3%
- Hispanic/Latino/a, 6.2%
- Asian American, 2.1%
- Native American, 0.7%
- International, 0.6%
ACCESS: Action steps

Increase enrollment for **Latino/a students**
- Hire Latino/a focused Admissions counselor
- Develop long-term Precollege strategies

Increase enrollment of **African Am males**
- Develop long-term Precollege strategies

Improve success for all **students of color** in **academic skills courses**
- Hire full-time lecturer to teach academic skills in Mathematics
- Develop long term First-Year Experience strategies
New Freshmen Who Entered UW-Parkside Fall 2000
Number and Percentage by Race/Ethnicity
Total = 823

- White: 634 (77.0%)
- Asian: 14 (1.7%)
- Internat'l: 16 (1.9%)
- Southeast Asian: 8 (1.0%)
- Hispanic/Latino: 59 (7.2%)
- Black/African American: 85 (10.3%)
- American Indian/Alaska Native: 7 (0.9%)
- American Indian/Alaska Native: 0 (0.0%)
- Asian: 3 (1.3%)

New Freshmen Who Entered UW-Parkside Fall 2000 and Graduated Within Six Years
Number and Percentage by Race/Ethnicity
Total = 231

- White: 195 (84.4%)
- Asian: 3 (1.3%)
- Internat'l: 5 (2.2%)
- Southeast Asian: 2 (0.9%)
- Hispanic/Latino: 13 (5.6%)
- Black/African American: 13 (5.6%)
- American Indian/Alaska Native: 0 (0.0%)
- Asian: 3 (1.3%)

RETENTION: From Enrollment to Graduation
Fall 2000 New Freshmen
Graduation rates

FIGURE 5
6-Year Graduation Rate by Race/Ethnicity
New Freshmen Entering Fall 1997-2000

The fraction above each bar shows the number who graduated within six years over the total number who entered.
RETENTION: Next Steps

- **Areas of concern**
  - Black/African Americans
  - Latinos (males)
  - American Indian/Alaska Natives
  - Southeast Asians (males)
  - Students not returning for second semester
  - Part-time students
  - Institutional research capacity

- **Potential Action Steps**
  - Collaborate with feeder high schools
  - Refine programs for new students
  - Research and develop innovative ways of teaching and supporting diverse students
UW-Milwaukee

Access & Retention
Key Findings-Access

- Milwaukee Public Schools are important to our access goals but other districts and schools contribute as well to ethnic diversity at UWM.
- The yield of applicants to admits to enrollees can be improved for students of color, e.g. decreasing the number of incomplete applications.
- UWM provides access to many students needing pre-college math and/or English coursework.
- UWM leads the system in transfer admissions; MATC is a key partner.
Key Responses: Access

- Recruitment and pre-college efforts target high schools with high ethnic diversity
- Individual follow-up with all applicants of color
- Access to Success focuses on institutional responsibility to “meet students where they are” and create an environment in which they succeed
- UWM and MATC launch PantherTracks
- NSF $20M Math Partnership with MPS & MATC
Key Findings - Retention

- Retention varies by School/College
- Financial concerns explain why satisfactory completers do not re-enroll
- Gap in first year retention between students of color and majority students is 15%
- Course re-design is critical in ensuring student success in both performance and retention
## UW-Milwaukee: Retention

First-Year Retention Rate  
Fall 2001 through Fall 2005 Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>African Am</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Am Indian</th>
<th>SEA</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undecided Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students with Majors or Pre-Majors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;S Pre-Prof</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;S Humanities</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;S Natural Sci</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;S Social Sci</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Welfare</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Retention: Closing the Gap with Access to Success

• 15.1% (first bar) Gap between targeted and non-targeted populations overall
• Remaining bars represent gaps between targeted and non-targeted populations who participated in each intervention. The closer the bar gets to 0, the more the gap has closed.
  • Bridge: targeted populations was retained at a higher rate than the non-targeted population
  • Residence Halls: Retention gap virtually non-existent at .8%. Targeted and non-targeted population retention rates within 1% of each other.
Key Responses-Retention

- Sharing strategies between schools and colleges
- Increasing financial assistance through scholarships, student employment, etc.
- Expand Access to Success programs to include more students
- Provide additional support for course re-design, e.g. Psychology
UW-Whitewater

Excellence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UWW Students Entering Full-Time in Fall 1999 and Graduating Within 6 Years</th>
<th>Not Receiving University Honors (GPA below 3.4)</th>
<th>Receiving University Honors (GPA 3.4 – 4.0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino(a)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Academic and Extra-Curricular Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Six Programs Denoting Excellence (Honors, UG Research, Study Abroad, Peer Mentor, Campus Ambassadors, Resident Advisers)</th>
<th>Participants in One or More Programs</th>
<th>Comparison Representation in Student Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>#</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino(a)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>320</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Graduate Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UWW Bachelor’s Degree Recipients (1998-99 - 2002-03)</th>
<th>Enrolled in UW System graduate program within three years of their degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino(a)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7,430</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>7,813</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps & Conclusion

- Complete the Remaining Perspectives
- Finalize Institution Reports
- Communicate Findings to Academic and Administrative Departments
- Define and Develop Interventions and Solutions
- Assess and Evaluate Impacts and Effectiveness
- “Train-the-Trainer” Model and Approach
- Future Strategic Planning for Diversity and Inclusion