

TASK FORCE CHARGE

Bob Shulstad, then ESCOP Chair, communicated the following in the charge to the newly appointed Diversity in Research Leadership Task Force members:

Conversations about all facets of diversity and inclusion are increasingly common in higher education institutions with frequent initiatives directed at undergraduate students, and to a lesser extent, graduate students. Faculty activities are also targeted to enhance the diversity in academic departments and programs. These efforts are beginning to assist with the complex and challenging goal to enhance diversity and inclusion. At the ESCOP meeting this past July, it was decided that a focused study and discussion on diversity in research administration and leadership across the Land-grant universities may facilitate progress with this effort in that realm.

This task force is charged to explore the topic of diversity in research leadership across the Land-grant university system, to provide ideas and actions for consideration, and to supplement institutional, regional and national diversity and inclusion efforts. The focus should be primarily on enhancing diversity among the Experiment Station Directors, Research Directors, and their associates and assistants.

Answers to the following questions may be helpful in completing your task:

- *Where are we positioned currently within the land-grant university system in terms of research leadership diversity and its potential pipeline?*
- *Are there actions and programmatic activities that might contribute to increasing this diversity?*
- *What best practices can be identified and shared throughout our regional and national associations that would complement on-going efforts?*

BACKGROUND

The world population is projected to steadily increase from 7.3B in 2015 to 8.5B in 2030 and 9.7B in 2050 (United Nations report). The U.S. population was 321.4M in 2015 and is projected to reach nearly 400M in 2050. At the same time, the percentage of people identifying as Hispanic/Latino and Black is expected to increase (Table 1; U.S. Census Bureau). Gender distribution in the U.S. is projected to remain virtually the same from 2015 to 2050, at 49.6% male and 50.4% female. By 2050 timeframe, the U.S. share of the world population is projected to decline from 6.2% to 4.0%. Demographics continually change.

Table 1. Estimates and Projections (percentage) in the U.S. population across male and female (no shading) and females only (gray shading) from 2015 to 2050.

Year	White (non-Hispanic)	Hispanic or Latino	Black	Asian
2015	62.4	17.7	5.8	13.8
2050	46.3	30.3	9.2	15
2015	61.7	17.1	12.7	5.7
2050	47.5	25.8	13.1	8.7

As a microcosm of U.S. society, we evaluated the diversity of full-time faculty at 1862 and 1890 institutions based upon the fall 2013 information published in the Chronicle of Higher Education (October

23, 2015, pp. B30-B47). This data set includes information on 4,457 faculty at 19 1890 institutions and 76,016 faculty at 53 1862 institutions. This information is self-reported at each institution and submitted to the Department of Education. Regional and institution-type differences in gender and race are apparent (Table 2). Several observations to note: 1) the type and quality of data needed to benchmark progress does not routinely exist, 2) the specificity to a given demographic and geographic area identifies other deficiencies, and 3) while additional and quality data would be useful, the diversity gaps are self-evident and should not limit innovation through implementation of relevant change practices and processes over the long-term.

Table 2. Summary of Diversity (percentage) for Full-time Faculty at 1862 and 1890 Land-grant Institutions by Region.

Faculty Diversity	ARD (1890)	Average (1862)	North Central (1862)	Northeast (1862)	South (1862)	West (1862)
Female	42.9	37.9	36.5	40.5	35.9	38.8
Male	57.1	62.1	63.5	59.5	64.1	61.2
Total Non-white	67.0	21.0	22.1	21.3	20.4	20.3
White	30.7	74.6	76.9	71.5	77.8	72.8
Race Unknown	1.4	3.4	0.9	6.4	0.8	5.3

We evaluated the participant demographics from two well-known leadership development programs: Leadership for the 21st Century (LEAD21, www.lead-21.org) and Food Systems Leadership Institute (FSLI, www.fсли.org). These programs are extensively supported and used by Land-grant institutions. LEAD21 was not able to provide any demographic information about participants, while FSLI retroactively identified all participants (participants did not self-identify). Both LEAD21 and FSLI have begun to collect this information from participants going forward.

FSLI program participants were predominately male and white (Table 3). Participants in FSLI tend to be those with prior leadership experience (e.g. deans, department chairs/heads) and not members of the faculty. For this reason, we do not compare the results with the previously described data on faculty diversity. The finding that the FSLI dataset has a higher percentage of whites than the faculty dataset suggests that whites dominate leadership positions. Diversity is specifically mentioned as a “Secondary Competency” in the LEAD21 program, while the ability to “serve broader and more diverse constituencies” is listed as a goal for those who complete the FSLI program.

Our final evaluation of diversity under the ESS-focused umbrella involved reviewing and classifying individuals in leadership positions in college administrative units (Table 4). The five Executive Directors collected (2015) this information without distinguishing between the many different structures and naming conventions across the core “College of Agriculture” units or the core “department” units that reside in the core college. Gender and race were estimated based on names and photos of individuals (supplemented with phone queries) and then summarized in broad categories (e.g. female/male and white/non-white). Data was then aggregated by region and within a region. For the purposes of this exercise, “Dean” units will include the highest ranking administrative head of the college, the highest ranking CES administrator, the highest ranking academic administrator, and all research administrators (dean, associate dean, assistant dean). We grouped department heads/chairs under “Department” units. Individuals in an “acting” or “interim” position were counted in the same way as the department group which only includes core departments to a College of Agriculture as head/chair not associate head/chair.

Table 3. Estimates of Diversity (percentage) in FSLI Program Participants (n=217).

Diversity Groups	Number	Participant Distribution
Total Female	63	29
Total Male	154	71
White Female	48	22
Non-white Female	15	7
White Male	122	56
Non-white Male	32	15
Total Non-white	47	22
White	170	78

The leadership in “Colleges of Agriculture” units is predominantly male and white. These trends are similar to those noted above for FSLI participants. White male and non-white male representations across FSLI and dean units were similar. However, with the department unit, white males predominant. Racial diversity in the dean unit appears to be substantially more than the department units; this may be problematic if one considers that departments are the likely source of the next generation of leadership. FSLI participants and dean units have similar racial diversity. In-depth review of the administrative diversity reveal regional differences, 1862 and 1890 differences, specific gender and minority issues, and pipeline issues (data not presented).

Table 4. Estimates of Administrative* Diversity (percentage) in Dean (n=318) and Department (n=551) Offices in 1862 and 1890 Land-grants.

Diversity Groups	Dean	Department
Total Female	23	23
Total Male	77	77
White Female	17	18
Non-white Female	6	5
White Male	59	68
Non-white Male	18	9
Total Non-white	25	15
White	75	85

*The Dean grouping includes one top administrative head, one top CES administrator, one top academic administrator, and all research administrators (dean, associate dean, assistant dean). The Department group includes core departments to a College of Agriculture as head/chair not associate head/chair. Acting/interim administrators were counted in both.

These packages of data attempt to depict, in a semi-quantitative manner, the significant challenge universities face to train, attract, and retain diverse administrative leadership groups for a resilient research enterprise. Trends are reported to elevate awareness and start a conversation about diversity and inclusiveness. *Collectively, the quantitative and qualitative information reinforces a need to evolve with a keen sense of urgency to a more diverse and inclusive organization. Failure to do so may lead some to question the connection between our mission and our relevance to society.*

TASK FORCE DELIBERATIONS

To the best of our knowledge the ESCOP Diversity in Research Leadership Task Force is the first group to be charged with assisting in the creation of a recommendation for a more diverse and inclusive community for our body. The Task Force uses “diversity” to reflect a diverse, equitable, and inclusive ESS organization. The members of the Task Force brought their backgrounds, experiences, and perspectives to bear on discussions creating a rich environment to communicate and share ideas, listen to experts, review literature, and synthesize information. In addition, the Task Force worked to prioritize innovative activities and best practices that will start our long-term efforts. The Task Force recognizes that diversity and inclusion, in general, is absolutely intertwined and fundamental to success with diversity in research leadership. In addition, we agreed to enhance the initial charge to reflect these questions:

- How do we create diversity in ESCOP leadership and its pipeline?
- Where are we now? Where do we want to go? What does success look like?
- Are there actions and programmatic activities that might contribute to advancing this critical issue?
- What best practices could we adopt in our regional and national associations that would complement on-going efforts?

We acknowledge that many higher education institutions have existing programs, activities, experiences, practices, personnel, and mandates that are connected to the culture and climate in the state and specific institutions, and, to some extent, professions. These diversity efforts may engage undergraduate students, graduate students, post-docs, faculty, staff, and/or administrators. In addition, there are high quality programs and conferences/forums and other venues that provide new insights in defining, assessing, and increasing diversity (e.g. NSF Advance

<http://www.portal.advance.vt.edu/index.php/categories/initiatives>; Women in Agribusiness

<http://www.womeninag.com>, ACE – Inclusive Excellence Group,

<http://www.acenet.edu/leadership/Pages/default.aspx> and Latinos in Agriculture

<http://www.latinosinagriculture.com/>.

We discussed how ESS conducts its business and activities through its governing body (ESCOP) and standing committees, task forces, working groups, and other short-term assignments. At the national level, leadership is selected through a regional rotation and nomination process based upon prior engagements with ESS and the ability to engage over a multiple year period. With ESCOP standing committees and other ad hoc appointments, interest, expertise, and time in the committee generally determines leadership. Committee support is through Executive Directors and Assistant Directors. Personnel in the regional offices provide continuity and support throughout the ESS. A combination of written policies and guidelines/practices govern the activities of ESS. However, there are none that pertain to diversity, inclusiveness, or personal behavior.

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

While we recognize the continuum and strong connections to the aforementioned diversity and inclusion programs, our task was to focus on research leadership by identifying the need for and developing ideas for our implementation to address diversity and inclusion. The Task Force has collectively worked to create and propose initial ideas for implementation and fully recognizes that this effort is dynamic and may require a long-term commitment for success. We have highlighted some key areas – ***Recruitment and Mentoring***, ***System Integration***, and ***Training*** that provide key action elements for adoption and implementation over the next several years **(I, II, III)**. It offers positive actions for all executives in research leadership positions to evaluate, modify, and integrate into their operations. Collectively, the ***Best Practices*** section provides numerous additional ideas. We believe that diversity and inclusion within ESS will help catalyze progress towards diversity in research leadership.

Recruitment and Mentoring

To broaden the diversity of individuals holding research administrative positions, we must increase awareness and mentor faculty as they explore their interest in administrative positions. In order to accomplish long-term change, we must move from a compliance mentality (we have to do it) to an inclusive mindset (we embrace these opportunities). The recommendations we present below are not standalone actions, but instead will support the concept of integrated recommendations. There is a balance between mandatory and voluntary actions that will likely give variable results and require further refinement. Individuals will make a choice to value diversity, in all of its forms, rather than compliance mechanisms.

Create awareness of administrative positions and encourage individuals to apply for these positions to enhance recruitment

- In administrative searches build a broader pool and a larger final candidate group by following best practices for inclusive searches and include diversity culture/issues questions in interview processes. We recommend that each institution provides an update on this item at their regional meeting and then contributes one success story as part of the ESS meeting each year in a best practice session. **(II, III)**
- Create a mentoring committee or similar group to provide a regular sounding board as a new career of a ‘diverse’ hire is being launched. In addition, administrators must stay engaged and provide an on-going connection and supportive environment that takes into account cultural, academic, and work environment needs of a diverse workforce.
- Conduct institutional workshops/discussion panels on administrative careers - discussion of skill sets, different career paths, and general differences between faculty and administrative positions, and diversity issues and needs. Each institution should hold at least one workshop/seminar on this topic or incorporate this topic into an existing program (for example, mid-career workshop series). **(II)**
- Encourage and support (through sponsoring) professional societies to provide workshops focused on administrative career paths diverse or underserved groups. Suggest that current AES administrators serve as workshop organizers and/or speakers. **(II, III)**

Provide faculty with development activities/programs that increase leadership capacity and administrative experience through mentoring activities

- Identify underserved groups (not just individuals) for development opportunities including leadership programs, shadowing activities, and short-term projects that will provide learning experiences related to administrative careers. **(II)**

- Develop and promote institutional mentoring programs that offer an opportunity for the mentee to undertake an administrative role – recommend release time for these programs. **(II, III)**
- Sponsor faculty participation in leadership workshops and trainings through their professional societies. **(II, III, \$\$)**

System Integration

The Land-grant system is a complex national organization of institutions (1862, 1890, and 1994) that has had far-reaching impacts in the U.S. and beyond and across its teaching, research, and outreach missions. In that, our focus is on research leadership, we have focused on the 1862s and 1890s. There may be opportunities to more fully utilize the spirit of the Land-grant mission to increase diversity in research leadership. The Task Force recognizes the need to consciously increase our efforts to engage across the institution's leadership. First, Task Force members recognize that we need to be more deliberate in engaging a diverse team of individuals for leadership tasks. Second, diversity discussions must become a regular part of future meetings. Lastly, we must fully engage individuals and leaders across 1862 and 1890 institutions. Groups would discuss and hopefully develop strong ideas and plans to explore collaborative and futuristic paths that will collectively enhance research programs and research leadership.

While our specific focus is to enhance diversity in leadership across experiment stations, we know that a broader vision requires a multi-faceted approach which starts with enhancing diversity in PreK-12, 4H, and undergraduate and graduate students. Where feasible and going beyond the 1862s and 1890s research focus, we could partner with other divisions such as the Academic Program and Cooperative Extension Sections in order to achieve the broader goals while focusing our efforts on diversity and integration in research leadership and university environments as a whole.

Build relationships and programs leading to enhanced integration across research leadership and key institutions

- Participate in diversity discussions with other Sections and integrate plans for future training sessions at APLU meetings and Joint COPs. Routinely engage with other institutions and regions at meetings. **(I, II, \$)**
- Create regular opportunities for active and interactive discussions (e.g. topics of diversity and inclusion) with research leadership across institution types (1862s, 1890s, and possibly others (e.g. non-land grants, minority serving)) in joint discussions that serve to enhance all research programs. **(II)**
- Convene an executive group(s) across 1862 and 1890 institutions to fully explore opportunities for meaningful and long-lasting collaborations across institutions with a goal of building research programs and research leadership. **(II)**

Review and suggest modifications to the ESS Rules of Operation and any associated guidelines/practices that incorporate diversity

- Create a small group to review and make recommendations on the Rules of Operation; Multistate Guidelines; general practices; expected behaviors; websites, and any other documents affiliated with ESS assignments to ensure open and inclusive processes, procedures and appointments. **(I)**
- Engage with some experts (e.g., The Social Justice Training Institute <http://www.sjti.org/>, Hackman Consulting Group <http://www.hackmanconsultinggroup.org/>, Dr. Bailey Jackson at UMASS <https://www.umass.edu/education/faculty-staff-listings/BaileyJackson>, Dr. Kathy Obear <https://drkathyobear.com/>) to target future programs to serve ESS. **(I, \$\$)**

- Add a diversity statement to all websites, publications, meeting agendas, and minutes throughout ESS functions. **(I)**
- Identify and work to resolve gaps between current mission/values statements, and policies/reporting procedures (i.e. non-discrimination policy, behaviors, sexual harassment, personal grievances). **(I)**

Recognize excellence through regional and national diversity and inclusion awards

- Enhance the Multistate Research Award to acknowledge contributions to diverse stakeholders. **(II)**
- Enhance the Leadership Award to include diversity and inclusion efforts as an element of the award criteria. **(II)**
- Create criteria for regional and/or national awards that recognize excellence in diversity and inclusion in ESS. **(II, \$)**

Training

Life-long learning is a core professional development practice for professionals such as faculty and administrators at Land-grant Universities. Informed by the Association of American Colleges and Universities Breakthrough Advances in Faculty Diversity report, Damon Williams' Achieving Inclusive Excellence: Strategies for Creating Real and Sustainable Change in Quality and Diversity, and Creating Multicultural Change on Campus by Pope, Reynolds, and Mueller, the ESCOP Diversity in Research Leadership Task Force believes in creating a long-term strategic agenda of topics and activities to be implemented with ESCOP leadership and ESS that builds a shared understanding of current practices and behaviors and creates future successes.

Engage diversity professionals in the benchmarking assessment, training, and planning activities

- Use the Multicultural Organizational Development (MCOB) Model as an assessment tool to benchmark efforts and monitor progress (<https://www.pdx.edu/sites/www.pdx.edu.studentaffairs/files/MCOB%20Best%20Practices.pdf>). **(I, \$\$)**
- Use the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) to assess the cultural competence of our organization <https://idiinventory.com/>. **(I, \$)**
- Engage institutional diversity professionals, preferably from the college level, in the planning process and regularly thereafter. **(I or II)**

Create regular activities, training, readings and other for directors at regional and/or national meetings

- Institutionalize diversity and inclusion training and best practices including sessions at annual ESS meetings (e.g. 2017 meeting) and through periodic webinars. The periodic webinars would be open to all levels of leadership in Experiment Stations. Engage key leaders at 1862 and 1890 campuses to create an enhanced discussion on best practices that aligns with various campus climates **(II, \$\$\$)**
- Communicate expectations for key leadership development programs to contain, and possibly expand, their programmatic emphasis on diversity and inclusion. **(II)**
- Increase participation from underrepresented groups through expansion of scholarship opportunities for key leadership programs. **(III, \$\$)**

- Apply for a National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) conference grant to bring in diversity and inclusion experts to meetings important to ESS functions (e.g. NERAOC). (II)
- Gather good practices and other resources from peer institutions and make these available in a digital library, including on-line tools for ESS members to increase awareness and competency. (I)

Best Practices

A critical element in achieving research preeminence through innovation and impact is through intellectual contributions from a diverse academic populace. Paramount to this on-going effort is the ability of research leadership to nurture, understand, work, transform, and build a diverse and inclusive environment that continually strives for excellence. Identification of best practices (below) for inclusive excellence, adapted and implemented throughout the System over the long-term, is essential for premier organizations in the future. We must reflect a complex society at large and provide solutions to complex and vexing challenges that require diverse thinking and actions to resolve.

- Successfully achieving a diverse workforce must include programs or individuals whose responsibilities are to focus on recruiting, hiring, mentoring, professional development, and retaining professionals from diverse communities. An empowered diversity infrastructure such as a chief diversity officer committed to college-, AES-, and department-level diversity efforts can help establish long-term priorities, action plans, and evaluation of outcomes.
- Civil Rights audits are a requirement for organizations with federally-funded research. This comprehensive evaluation creates an opportunity to critically review processes, procedures, and outcomes to ensure that the principles of diversity and inclusion are reflected throughout the mission. Outcomes of these audits are opportunities to improve diversity programs and/or celebrate successes. This element is currently a component of the federal audit process.
- Resources should be allocated to enhance diversity through targeted investments in graduate assistantships, fellowships, faculty sponsorships, summer support, professional development (e.g. LEAD21, FSLI, NELD, ACE), and other unique advancement opportunities to build additional leadership capacity focused on diversity.
- Create regular training and other interactive opportunities (summits, conferences, panel discussions, seminars, courses) with college and department leadership, and professional societies to elevate the knowledge and conversation of diversity and inclusion to a routine and supportive level that could also be expanded to faculty, staff, and students.
- Create an intellectual community that focuses on ways to enhance diversity and respond to the recommendations of the community.
- Incorporate accountability for diversity and inclusion activities into the annual review process for all administrators and their academic units. Ensure that the accountability measures are meaningful and encourage forward thinking. Reward innovative thinking and actions. Through confidential surveys or other means ensure that the diversity beneficiaries and all other groups have an opportunity to contribute their voice with these accountability measures.
- Create endowed professorships targeting underrepresented groups, enhance cluster hires, build cohorts for common leadership exploration experiences, and support diverse visiting scholars, and faculty/administrative fellows programs.
- Always encourage diversity in any hiring process.

- Host leadership opportunities (administrative fellows) for all faculty with upper administrative offices (Associate Dean and above), so that the fellows can evaluate their interest and aptitude for administration.
- Help all leaders see their role in building, mentoring, evaluating, and encouraging a diverse faculty and staff by reflecting on the organization, identifying challenges, and creating opportunities for positive change with attitudes, behaviors, and actions. Consider the use of a climate survey to assess the breadth of issues and opportunities spanning organization environment, culture and resistance defined by values, practices, systems, traditions, and behaviors.
- Develop meaningful recognition and rewards for individuals and groups that successfully incorporate diversity and inclusion into their programs and demonstrate broad impacts.
- Provide mentoring and shadowing to key individuals and create a broader community to enhance their sense of place, a critical mass of people, and an overall positive cultural experience. Consider mentoring efforts that span multiple institutions of varied size and scope.
- Comprehensively review processes, policies, procedures, written and electronic materials, and activities to ensure a positive climate, openness, inclusivity, and a multicultural environment with contemporary communications and actions.
- Participate in groups that have different diverse perspectives, experiences, and views to enhance your knowledge and abilities.
- Create partnerships and relationships with 1862 and 1890 Land-grant institutions, non Land-grants, minority-serving institutions, community colleges, and the private sector.
- Create an environment where diversity practitioners within and outside Land-grant institutions can actively network and share best practices. Consider developing an online database that can be accessed under a secure web environment, so that data can be updated and shared by institutions. An immediate course of action is to work closely with NADOHE – National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education. NADOHE serves as the preeminent voice for diversity officers in higher education. Its vision is to lead higher education towards inclusive excellence through institutional transformation. NADOHE has more than 600 institutional and individual members. (www.nadohe.org)

TASK FORCE CONCLUSIONS

As a collective of individuals associated with many premier institutions, the ESS organization has had a rich history and significant impact on state, regional, national, and international research enterprises. A key facet of this success is looking into the future, engaging colleagues, conceiving innovative concepts and strategies, and, most importantly, deftly executing these plans. As an organization, ESS encourages efforts to mirror all aspects of a diverse, inclusive, and futuristic community. Many of our best practices will require specific external and trained expertise, while others require a change from compliance to enthusiastic acceptance. We acknowledge that there are many tools, training firms, and institutional expertise that can be utilized to ensure success. Several examples are provided throughout to illustrate the choices, but we recognize that others should be fully explored. We have identified the need, offered options and strongly encourage action. ***The ESCOP Diversity in Research Leadership Task Force fully embraces the above recommendations and encourages their adoption and implementation.***

Our highest priority actions for ESCOP are:

Create a permanent ESS Diversity Catalyst Committee that establishes goals, metrics, timelines, implementation activities, and continuity of practice with a rolling three-year plan to champion a long-term diversity and inclusion agenda (I)

Support training for Regional Executive Directors and Assistant Directors to enhance skills and build capacity. This training could be a day long workshop conducted by Dr. Kathy Obear (<http://drkathyobear.com/>) and Dr. Jamie Washington (<http://washingtonconsultinggroup.net/>) focused on Multicultural Organization Development (I, \$\$\$)

ESCOP leadership should collectively participate in a diversity training activity to help to ensure that we are modeling best behaviors and practices as members of the leadership team followed by training for ESS attendees (I or II, \$\$)

ESCOP Diversity in Research Leadership Task Force Members

Karen Plaut (Task Force Chair), Senior Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Affairs, Purdue University

Shannon Archibeque-Engle, Director of Diversity and Retention, Colorado State University

Charles Boyer, Vice President, Dean and Director, Montana State University

Carolyn Brooks, Executive Director, Association of 1890 Research Directors

Jackie Burns, Dean for Research and Director, University of Florida

Doze Butler, Associate Dean College of Sciences and Agriculture, Southern University and A&M College

Cynda Clary, Associate Dean Academic Programs, Oklahoma State University

Sarah Dayton, Assistant Director, Organizational Development and Accountability, Extension Administration, Cornell University

Ali Fares, Associate Director for Research, Prairie View A&M University

Christina Hamilton, Assistant Director, North Central Regional Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors

Jeff Jacobsen (Task Force Support), Executive Director, North Central Regional Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors

Rubie Mize, Assistant to the Executive Director, Northeast Regional Association of State Agricultural Experiment Station Directors

Sarah Lupis, Assistant Director, Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors

Tim Phipps, Associate Dean for Research and Outreach and Associate Director, West Virginia University

Dan Rossi, Executive Director, Northeast Regional Association of State Agricultural Experiment Station Directors

Soyeon Shim, Dean, School of Human Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison