

Source Documents

- **H.1 American Community Survey Demographic Information**
- **H.2 Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Local Government Employment Data**
- **NASPAA Diversity Report 2013**

U.S. Census Bureau



DP05

ACS DEMOGRAPHIC AND HOUSING ESTIMATES

2012 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates

Supporting documentation on code lists, subject definitions, data accuracy, and statistical testing can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Data and Documentation section.

Sample size and data quality measures (including coverage rates, allocation rates, and response rates) can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Methodology section.

Although the American Community Survey (ACS) produces population, demographic and housing unit estimates, it is the Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program that produces and disseminates the official estimates of the population for the nation, states, counties, cities and towns and estimates of housing units for states and counties.

Subject	United States			
	Estimate	Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
SEX AND AGE				
Total population	313,914,040	*****	313,914,040	(X)
Male	154,436,243	+/-25,554	49.2%	+/-0.1
Female	159,477,797	+/-25,554	50.8%	+/-0.1
Under 5 years	19,910,326	+/-18,345	6.3%	+/-0.1
5 to 9 years	20,480,578	+/-60,408	6.5%	+/-0.1
10 to 14 years	20,777,987	+/-56,368	6.6%	+/-0.1
15 to 19 years	21,550,469	+/-33,340	6.9%	+/-0.1
20 to 24 years	22,463,182	+/-28,591	7.2%	+/-0.1
25 to 34 years	42,100,846	+/-29,972	13.4%	+/-0.1
35 to 44 years	40,698,086	+/-29,156	13.0%	+/-0.1
45 to 54 years	44,204,952	+/-32,797	14.1%	+/-0.1
55 to 59 years	20,622,207	+/-39,293	6.6%	+/-0.1
60 to 64 years	17,964,930	+/-41,352	5.7%	+/-0.1
65 to 74 years	24,004,760	+/-14,380	7.6%	+/-0.1
75 to 84 years	13,302,316	+/-31,037	4.2%	+/-0.1
85 years and over	5,833,401	+/-28,718	1.9%	+/-0.1
Median age (years)	37.4	+/-0.1	(X)	(X)
18 years and over	240,203,630	+/-31,813	76.5%	+/-0.1
21 years and over	226,383,309	+/-75,312	72.1%	+/-0.1
62 years and over	53,566,283	+/-43,066	17.1%	+/-0.1
65 years and over	43,140,477	+/-16,604	13.7%	+/-0.1
18 years and over	240,203,630	+/-31,813	240,203,630	(X)
Male	116,741,774	+/-22,952	48.6%	+/-0.1
Female	123,461,856	+/-19,422	51.4%	+/-0.1
65 years and over	43,140,477	+/-16,604	43,140,477	(X)
Male	18,805,263	+/-8,996	43.6%	+/-0.1
Female	24,335,214	+/-11,229	56.4%	+/-0.1
RACE				
Total population	313,914,040	*****	313,914,040	(X)

Subject	United States			
	Estimate	Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
One race	304,840,426	+/-79,997	97.1%	+/-0.1
Two or more races	9,073,614	+/-79,997	2.9%	+/-0.1
One race	304,840,426	+/-79,997	97.1%	+/-0.1
White	231,992,377	+/-113,230	73.9%	+/-0.1
Black or African American	39,623,138	+/-57,930	12.6%	+/-0.1
American Indian and Alaska Native	2,563,505	+/-26,160	0.8%	+/-0.1
Cherokee tribal grouping	276,381	+/-8,078	0.1%	+/-0.1
Chippewa tribal grouping	113,262	+/-4,002	0.0%	+/-0.1
Navajo tribal grouping	312,039	+/-8,016	0.1%	+/-0.1
Sioux tribal grouping	121,503	+/-5,386	0.0%	+/-0.1
Asian	15,555,530	+/-32,545	5.0%	+/-0.1
Asian Indian	3,049,201	+/-45,887	1.0%	+/-0.1
Chinese	3,660,659	+/-43,534	1.2%	+/-0.1
Filipino	2,658,354	+/-36,836	0.8%	+/-0.1
Japanese	780,210	+/-16,603	0.2%	+/-0.1
Korean	1,450,401	+/-30,731	0.5%	+/-0.1
Vietnamese	1,675,246	+/-37,509	0.5%	+/-0.1
Other Asian	2,281,459	+/-40,508	0.7%	+/-0.1
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	543,198	+/-14,210	0.2%	+/-0.1
Native Hawaiian	175,299	+/-8,616	0.1%	+/-0.1
Guamanian or Chamorro	72,738	+/-6,964	0.0%	+/-0.1
Samoan	103,079	+/-9,508	0.0%	+/-0.1
Other Pacific Islander	192,082	+/-10,408	0.1%	+/-0.1
Some other race	14,562,678	+/-120,810	4.6%	+/-0.1
Two or more races	9,073,614	+/-79,997	2.9%	+/-0.1
White and Black or African American	2,275,588	+/-42,089	0.7%	+/-0.1
White and American Indian and Alaska Native	1,799,343	+/-20,812	0.6%	+/-0.1
White and Asian	1,733,309	+/-27,845	0.6%	+/-0.1
Black or African American and American Indian and Alaska Native	316,788	+/-14,096	0.1%	+/-0.1
Race alone or in combination with one or more other races				
Total population	313,914,040	*****	313,914,040	(X)
White	239,645,013	+/-120,154	76.3%	+/-0.1
Black or African American	43,140,238	+/-42,355	13.7%	+/-0.1
American Indian and Alaska Native	5,226,034	+/-36,047	1.7%	+/-0.1
Asian	18,326,450	+/-28,093	5.8%	+/-0.1
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	1,250,274	+/-22,377	0.4%	+/-0.1
Some other race	16,232,503	+/-128,387	5.2%	+/-0.1
HISPANIC OR LATINO AND RACE				
Total population	313,914,040	*****	313,914,040	(X)
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	52,961,017	+/-9,501	16.9%	+/-0.1
Mexican	34,038,599	+/-86,331	10.8%	+/-0.1
Puerto Rican	4,970,604	+/-51,856	1.6%	+/-0.1
Cuban	1,957,557	+/-33,125	0.6%	+/-0.1
Other Hispanic or Latino	11,994,257	+/-82,408	3.8%	+/-0.1
Not Hispanic or Latino	260,953,023	+/-9,501	83.1%	+/-0.1
White alone	197,243,423	+/-20,601	62.8%	+/-0.1
Black or African American alone	38,464,192	+/-50,829	12.3%	+/-0.1
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	2,084,472	+/-18,586	0.7%	+/-0.1
Asian alone	15,375,460	+/-31,145	4.9%	+/-0.1
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	497,807	+/-12,333	0.2%	+/-0.1
Some other race alone	614,725	+/-23,147	0.2%	+/-0.1
Two or more races	6,672,944	+/-58,407	2.1%	+/-0.1
Two races including Some other race	307,162	+/-13,273	0.1%	+/-0.1
Two races excluding Some other race, and Three or more races	6,365,782	+/-54,271	2.0%	+/-0.1

Subject	United States			
	Estimate	Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
Total housing units	132,452,249	+/-3,899	(X)	(X)

Data are based on a sample and are subject to sampling variability. The degree of uncertainty for an estimate arising from sampling variability is represented through the use of a margin of error. The value shown here is the 90 percent margin of error. The margin of error can be interpreted roughly as providing a 90 percent probability that the interval defined by the estimate minus the margin of error and the estimate plus the margin of error (the lower and upper confidence bounds) contains the true value. In addition to sampling variability, the ACS estimates are subject to nonsampling error (for a discussion of nonsampling variability, see Accuracy of the Data). The effect of nonsampling error is not represented in these tables.

The ACS questions on Hispanic origin and race were revised in 2008 to make them consistent with the Census 2010 question wording. Any changes in estimates for 2008 and beyond may be due to demographic changes, as well as factors including questionnaire changes, differences in ACS population controls, and methodological differences in the population estimates, and therefore should be used with caution. For a summary of questionnaire changes see http://www.census.gov/acs/www/methodology/questionnaire_changes/. For more information about changes in the estimates see <http://www.census.gov/population/hispanic/files/acs08researchnote.pdf>.

For more information on understanding race and Hispanic origin data, please see the Census 2010 Brief entitled, Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin: 2010, Issued March 2011. (pdf format)

While the 2012 American Community Survey (ACS) data generally reflect the December 2009 Office of Management and Budget (OMB) definitions of metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas; in certain instances the names, codes, and boundaries of the principal cities shown in ACS tables may differ from the OMB definitions due to differences in the effective dates of the geographic entities.

Estimates of urban and rural population, housing units, and characteristics reflect boundaries of urban areas defined based on Census 2000 data. Boundaries for urban areas have not been updated since Census 2000. As a result, data for urban and rural areas from the ACS do not necessarily reflect the results of ongoing urbanization.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2012 American Community Survey

Explanation of Symbols:

1. An "N" entry in the margin of error column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute a standard error and thus the margin of error. A statistical test is not appropriate.
2. An "E" entry in the estimate column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute an estimate, or a ratio of medians cannot be calculated because one or both of the median estimates falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution.
3. An "L" following a median estimate means the median falls in the lowest interval of an open-ended distribution.
4. An "U" following a median estimate means the median falls in the upper interval of an open-ended distribution.
5. An "LM" entry in the margin of error column indicates that the median falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution. A statistical test is not appropriate.
6. An "LM" entry in the margin of error column indicates that the estimate is controlled. A statistical test for sampling variability is not appropriate.
7. An "N" entry in the estimate and margin of error columns indicates that data for this geographic area cannot be displayed because the number of sample cases is too small.
8. An "(X)" means that the estimate is not applicable or not available.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
Employment Data

Employment Data for Cities, 2011

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

http://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/statistics/employment/jobpat-eeo4/2011/table3/table3_3_city_.html

**EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION
STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFORMATION (EEO-4), 2011
NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT SUMMARY**

TYPE: 3 CITY

TABLE 3: TYPE SUMMARY

REPORTING UNITS: 2124

TOTAL FULL TIME EMPLOYMENT

ANNUAL SALARY \$K		TOTAL		WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC		ASIAN		INDIAN	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
MALE	0.1-15.9	4,756	57.6	3,242	39.2	907	11.0	475	5.8	83	1.0	49	0.6
	16.0-19.9	7,256	58.2	2,939	23.6	2,714	21.8	1,415	11.4	96	0.8	92	0.7
	20.0-24.9	25,272	62.8	11,832	29.4	8,131	20.2	4,741	11.8	390	1.0	178	0.4
	25.0-32.9	85,667	61.1	45,731	32.6	25,241	18.0	12,337	8.8	1,755	1.3	603	0.4
	33.0-42.9	159,143	62.6	99,886	39.3	34,736	13.7	18,998	7.5	4,438	1.7	1,085	0.4
	43.0-54.9	199,180	69.3	138,522	48.2	30,557	10.6	23,641	8.2	5,244	1.8	1,216	0.4
	55.0-69.9	195,562	75.3	141,825	54.6	23,914	9.2	22,390	8.6	6,287	2.4	1,146	0.4
	70.0 PLUS	258,158	79.4	187,865	57.8	23,298	7.2	32,851	10.1	12,983	4.0	1,161	0.4
	TOTAL	934,994	70.4	631,842	47.6	149,498	11.3	116,848	8.8	31,276	2.4	5,530	0.4
	MEDIAN SALARY		54,169.0		56,456.2		44,185.9		53,383.5		63,664.9		50,479.6
FEMALE	0.1-15.9	3,504	42.4	1,858	22.5	1,167	14.1	388	4.7	73	0.9	18	0.2
	16.0-19.9	5,204	41.8	1,904	15.3	2,218	17.8	970	7.8	62	0.5	50	0.4
	20.0-24.9	14,975	37.2	6,859	17.0	4,749	11.8	2,840	7.1	412	1.0	115	0.3
	25.0-32.9	54,522	38.9	26,708	19.1	18,264	13.0	8,132	5.8	1,088	0.8	330	0.2
	33.0-42.9	95,178	37.4	47,647	18.7	31,455	12.4	12,229	4.8	3,219	1.3	628	0.2
	43.0-54.9	88,381	30.7	48,440	16.8	23,893	8.3	11,529	4.0	4,044	1.4	475	0.2
	55.0-69.9	63,990	24.7	36,790	14.2	14,773	5.7	7,998	3.1	4,071	1.6	358	0.1
	70.0 PLUS	66,848	20.6	38,442	11.8	14,027	4.3	8,746	2.7	5,280	1.6	353	0.1
	TOTAL	392,602	29.6	208,648	15.7	110,546	8.3	52,832	4.0	18,249	1.4	2,327	0.2
	MEDIAN SALARY		46,111.5		47,792.7		42,178.9		44,932.7		55,834.5		43,568.4
TOTAL	0.1-15.9	8,260	100.0	5,100	61.7	2,074	25.1	863	10.4	156	1.9	67	0.8
	16.0-19.9	12,460	100.0	4,843	38.9	4,932	39.6	2,385	19.1	158	1.3	142	1.1
	20.0-24.9	40,247	100.0	18,691	46.4	12,880	32.0	7,581	18.8	802	2.0	293	0.7
	25.0-32.9	140,189	100.0	72,439	51.7	43,505	31.0	20,469	14.6	2,843	2.0	933	0.7
	33.0-42.9	254,321	100.0	147,533	58.0	66,191	26.0	31,227	12.3	7,657	3.0	1,713	0.7
	43.0-54.9	287,561	100.0	186,962	65.0	54,450	18.9	35,170	12.2	9,288	3.2	1,691	0.6
	55.0-69.9	259,552	100.0	178,615	68.8	38,687	14.9	30,388	11.7	10,358	4.0	1,504	0.6
	70.0 PLUS	325,006	100.0	226,307	69.6	37,325	11.5	41,597	12.8	18,263	5.6	1,514	0.5
	TOTAL	1,327,596	100.0	840,490	63.3	260,044	19.6	169,680	12.8	49,525	3.7	7,857	0.6
	MEDIAN SALARY		51,692.6		54,015.6		43,097.0		50,613.2		60,587.3		48,538.3

TOTAL PART TIME EMPLOYMENT

		TOTAL		WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC		ASIAN		INDIAN	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
MALE	OFF/ADMIN	5,553	62.1	4,640	51.9	454	5.1	345	3.9	101	1.1	13	0.1
	PROF	8,711	38.0	5,581	24.3	1,265	5.5	1,176	5.1	584	2.5	105	0.5
	TECH	6,076	57.4	4,579	43.3	665	6.3	526	5.0	272	2.6	34	0.3
	PROT-SERV	22,468	60.9	17,618	47.7	2,627	7.1	1,684	4.6	419	1.1	120	0.3
	PARA-PROF	38,760	43.6	25,429	28.6	6,498	7.3	4,904	5.5	1,712	1.9	217	0.2
	ADM SUPRT	23,270	34.4	14,152	20.9	4,679	6.9	3,282	4.9	1,030	1.5	127	0.2
	SKILLED	8,771	57.5	6,523	42.8	968	6.4	1,012	6.6	208	1.4	60	0.4
	SVC/MAINT	71,752	59.9	50,836	42.5	10,748	9.0	8,328	7.0	1,466	1.2	374	0.3
	TOTAL	185,361	50.0	129,358	34.9	27,904	7.5	21,257	5.7	5,792	1.6	1,050	0.3
FEMALE	OFF/ADMIN	3,395	37.9	2,694	30.1	379	4.2	236	2.6	82	0.9	4	0.0
	PROF	14,211	62.0	9,122	39.8	1,758	7.7	1,702	7.4	1,574	6.9	55	0.2
	TECH	4,501	42.6	3,204	30.3	633	6.0	429	4.1	202	1.9	33	0.3
	PROT-SERV	14,438	39.1	8,599	23.3	4,148	11.2	1,424	3.9	217	0.6	50	0.1
	PARA-PROF	50,042	56.4	34,261	38.6	7,237	8.1	6,183	7.0	2,110	2.4	251	0.3
	ADM SUPRT	44,308	65.6	29,078	43.0	7,521	11.1	5,714	8.5	1,794	2.7	201	0.3
	SKILLED	6,471	42.5	4,922	32.3	722	4.7	636	4.2	143	0.9	48	0.3
	SVC/MAINT	47,982	40.1	34,812	29.1	7,115	5.9	4,722	3.9	1,083	0.9	250	0.2
	TOTAL	185,348	50.0	126,692	34.2	29,513	8.0	21,046	5.7	7,205	1.9	892	0.2
TOTAL	OFF/ADMIN	8,948	100.0	7,334	82.0	833	9.3	581	6.5	183	2.0	17	0.2
	PROF	22,922	100.0	14,703	64.1	3,023	13.2	2,878	12.6	2,158	9.4	160	0.7
	TECH	10,577	100.0	7,783	73.6	1,298	12.3	955	9.0	474	4.5	67	0.6
	PROT-SERV	36,906	100.0	26,217	71.0	6,775	18.4	3,108	8.4	636	1.7	170	0.5
	PARA-PROF	88,802	100.0	59,690	67.2	13,735	15.5	11,087	12.5	3,822	4.3	468	0.5
	ADM SUPRT	67,578	100.0	43,230	64.0	12,200	18.1	8,996	13.3	2,824	4.2	328	0.5
	SKILLED	15,242	100.0	11,445	75.1	1,690	11.1	1,648	10.8	351	2.3	108	0.7
	SVC/MAINT	119,734	100.0	85,648	71.5	17,863	14.9	13,050	10.9	2,549	2.1	624	0.5
	TOTAL	370,709	100.0	256,050	69.1	57,417	15.5	42,303	11.4	12,997	3.5	1,942	0.5

TOTAL NEW HIRE EMPLOYMENT

		TOTAL		WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC		ASIAN		INDIAN	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
MALE	OFF/ADMIN	2,706	63.2	2,095	49.0	283	6.6	187	4.4	124	2.9	17	0.4
	PROF	6,337	45.9	3,994	28.9	929	6.7	643	4.7	703	5.1	68	0.5
	TECH	4,786	68.3	3,268	46.6	569	8.1	663	9.5	254	3.6	32	0.5
	PROT-SERV	21,314	84.4	15,872	62.8	2,453	9.7	2,328	9.2	546	2.2	115	0.5
	PARA-PROF	2,472	40.4	1,487	24.3	506	8.3	314	5.1	148	2.4	17	0.3
	ADM SUPRT	4,383	28.5	2,672	17.4	736	4.8	751	4.9	187	1.2	37	0.2
	SKILLED	7,080	94.6	4,806	64.2	950	12.7	1,075	14.4	187	2.5	62	0.8
	SVC/MAINT	16,793	75.8	7,561	34.1	5,169	23.3	3,411	15.4	471	2.1	181	0.8
	TOTAL	63,871	64.9	41,755	41.1	11,595	11.4	9,372	9.2	2,620	2.6	529	0.5

		TOTAL		WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC		ASIAN		INDIAN	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
FEMALE	OFF/ADMIN	1,573	36.8	1,117	26.1	236	5.5	121	2.8	84	2.0	15	0.4
	PROF	7,477	54.1	4,125	29.9	1,844	13.3	840	6.1	637	4.6	31	0.2
	TECH	2,226	31.7	1,286	18.3	450	6.4	337	4.8	139	2.0	14	0.2
	PROT-SERV	3,949	15.6	2,155	8.5	1,066	4.2	629	2.5	78	0.3	21	0.1
	PARA-PROF	3,654	59.6	1,807	29.5	1,035	16.9	548	8.9	240	3.9	24	0.4
	ADM SUPRT	10,977	71.5	6,124	39.9	2,316	15.1	2,117	13.8	320	2.1	100	0.7
	SKILLED	404	5.4	276	3.7	89	1.2	26	0.3	10	0.1	3	0.0
	SVC/MAINT	5,349	24.2	1,256	5.7	2,890	13.1	949	4.3	184	0.8	70	0.3
	TOTAL	35,609	35.1	18,146	17.9	9,926	9.8	5,567	5.5	1,692	1.7	278	0.3
TOTAL	OFF/ADMIN	4,279	100.0	3,212	75.1	519	12.1	308	7.2	208	4.9	32	0.7
	PROF	13,814	100.0	8,119	58.8	2,773	20.1	1,483	10.7	1,340	9.7	99	0.7
	TECH	7,012	100.0	4,554	64.9	1,019	14.5	1,000	14.3	393	5.6	46	0.7
	PROT-SERV	25,263	100.0	18,027	71.4	3,519	13.9	2,957	11.7	624	2.5	136	0.5
	PARA-PROF	6,126	100.0	3,294	53.8	1,541	25.2	862	14.1	388	6.3	41	0.7
	ADM SUPRT	15,360	100.0	8,796	57.3	3,052	19.9	2,868	18.7	507	3.3	137	0.9
	SKILLED	7,484	100.0	5,082	67.9	1,039	13.9	1,101	14.7	197	2.6	65	0.9
	SVC/MAINT	22,142	100.0	8,817	39.8	8,059	36.4	4,360	19.7	655	3.0	251	1.1
	TOTAL	101,480	100.0	59,901	59.0	21,521	21.2	14,939	14.7	4,312	4.2	807	0.8

Officials Administrators State and Local, 2011

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

http://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/statistics/employment/jobpat-eeo4/2011/table2/table2_1_officials_administrators_.html

**EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION
STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFORMATION (EEO-4), 2011
NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT SUMMARY**

**JOB CATEGORY: OFFICIALS ADMINISTRATORS
TABLE 2: JOB CATEGORY SUMMARY
REPORTING UNITS: 4987
TOTAL FULL TIME EMPLOYMENT**

ANNUAL SALARY \$K		TOTAL		WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC		ASIAN		INDIAN	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
MALE	0.1-15.9	3,133	69.7	2,685	59.7	278	6.2	113	2.5	53	1.2	4	0.1
	16.0-19.9	740	55.8	595	44.8	94	7.1	38	2.9	13	1.0	0	0.0
	20.0-24.9	1,611	51.9	1,286	41.4	167	5.4	146	4.7	6	0.2	6	0.2
	25.0-32.9	2,929	39.2	2,362	31.6	390	5.2	149	2.0	15	0.2	13	0.2
	33.0-42.9	10,028	48.3	8,216	39.6	1,131	5.4	547	2.6	72	0.3	62	0.3
	43.0-54.9	21,049	51.8	17,644	43.5	2,095	5.2	983	2.4	226	0.6	101	0.2
	55.0-69.9	34,893	55.0	28,735	45.3	3,543	5.6	1,659	2.6	769	1.2	187	0.3
	70.0 PLUS	130,403	63.9	105,989	52.0	11,352	5.6	7,410	3.6	5,099	2.5	553	0.3
	TOTAL	204,786	59.3	167,512	48.5	19,050	5.5	11,045	3.2	6,253	1.8	926	0.3
	MEDIAN SALARY		72,148.0		72,097.7		71,609.4		72,547.2		73,868.4		71,627.5
FEMALE	0.1-15.9	1,364	30.3	1,082	24.1	190	4.2	67	1.5	20	0.4	5	0.1
	16.0-19.9	587	44.2	450	33.9	84	6.3	46	3.5	5	0.4	2	0.2
	20.0-24.9	1,493	48.1	1,126	36.3	222	7.2	131	4.2	10	0.3	4	0.1
	25.0-32.9	4,543	60.8	3,560	47.6	665	8.9	268	3.6	31	0.4	19	0.3
	33.0-42.9	10,728	51.7	8,343	40.2	1,630	7.9	591	2.8	108	0.5	56	0.3
	43.0-54.9	19,551	48.2	14,908	36.7	2,974	7.3	1,247	3.1	318	0.8	104	0.3
	55.0-69.9	28,605	45.0	21,491	33.8	4,416	7.0	1,774	2.8	734	1.2	190	0.3
	70.0 PLUS	73,545	36.1	53,006	26.0	11,873	5.8	4,904	2.4	3,388	1.7	374	0.2
	TOTAL	140,416	40.7	103,966	30.1	22,054	6.4	9,028	2.6	4,614	1.3	754	0.2
	MEDIAN SALARY		70,453.7		70,193.0		70,712.5		70,795.3		73,190.7		69,762.2
TOTAL	0.1-15.9	4,497	100.0	3,767	83.8	468	10.4	180	4.0	73	1.6	9	0.2
	16.0-19.9	1,327	100.0	1,045	78.7	178	13.4	84	6.3	18	1.4	2	0.2
	20.0-24.9	3,104	100.0	2,412	77.7	389	12.5	277	8.9	16	0.5	10	0.3
	25.0-32.9	7,472	100.0	5,922	79.3	1,055	14.1	417	5.6	46	0.6	32	0.4
	33.0-42.9	20,756	100.0	16,559	79.8	2,761	13.3	1,138	5.5	180	0.9	118	0.6
	43.0-54.9	40,600	100.0	32,552	80.2	5,069	12.5	2,230	5.5	544	1.3	205	0.5
	55.0-69.9	63,498	100.0	50,226	79.1	7,959	12.5	3,433	5.4	1,503	2.4	377	0.6
	70.0 PLUS	203,948	100.0	158,995	78.0	23,225	11.4	12,314	6.0	8,487	4.2	927	0.5
	TOTAL	345,202	100.0	271,478	78.6	41,104	11.9	20,073	5.8	10,867	3.1	1,680	0.5
	MEDIAN SALARY		71,537.0		71,462.7		71,150.9		71,849.5		73,597.9		70,938.5

Professionals State and Local, 2011

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

http://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/statistics/employment/jobpat-eeo4/2011/table2/table2_1_officials_administrators_.html

**EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION
STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFORMATION (EEO-4), 2011
NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT SUMMARY**

JOB CATEGORY: PROFESSIONALS
TABLE 2: JOB CATEGORY SUMMARY
REPORTING UNITS: 4987
TOTAL FULL TIME EMPLOYMENT

ANNUAL SALARY \$K		TOTAL		WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC		ASIAN		INDIAN	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
MALE	0.1-15.9	2,139	45.5	1,900	40.4	138	2.9	61	1.3	38	0.8	2	0.0
	16.0-19.9	645	29.8	531	24.6	62	2.9	42	1.9	9	0.4	1	0.0
	20.0-24.9	2,374	25.4	1,573	16.8	509	5.4	228	2.4	55	0.6	9	0.1
	25.0-32.9	22,599	26.4	14,929	17.5	5,219	6.1	1,801	2.1	460	0.5	190	0.2
	33.0-42.9	71,806	31.6	51,515	22.7	12,633	5.6	5,188	2.3	1,909	0.8	561	0.2
	43.0-54.9	118,369	36.3	88,090	27.0	15,874	4.9	8,305	2.5	5,246	1.6	854	0.3
	55.0-69.9	152,660	41.1	115,250	31.0	16,728	4.5	10,585	2.9	9,251	2.5	846	0.2
	70.0 PLUS	246,157	53.6	182,054	39.7	19,993	4.4	17,639	3.8	25,323	5.5	1,148	0.3
	TOTAL	616,749	41.5	455,842	30.7	71,156	4.8	43,849	3.0	42,291	2.8	3,611	0.2
	MEDIAN SALARY		63,886.1		64,029.7		56,024.9		63,926.4		71,649.7		58,342.0
FEMALE	0.1-15.9	2,564	54.5	2,178	46.3	226	4.8	103	2.2	51	1.1	6	0.1
	16.0-19.9	1,516	70.2	1,174	54.3	205	9.5	113	5.2	17	0.8	7	0.3
	20.0-24.9	6,904	74.6	4,405	47.1	2,012	21.5	439	4.7	100	1.1	28	0.3
	25.0-32.9	62,875	73.6	36,535	42.7	19,099	22.3	5,696	6.7	877	1.0	668	0.8
	33.0-42.9	155,467	68.4	100,901	44.4	37,385	16.4	12,590	5.5	3,387	1.5	1,204	0.5
	43.0-54.9	207,474	63.7	140,956	43.3	40,372	12.4	16,632	5.1	8,151	2.5	1,363	0.4
	55.0-69.9	218,565	58.9	142,488	38.4	41,508	11.2	18,204	4.9	15,145	4.1	1,220	0.3
	70.0 PLUS	212,719	46.4	134,612	29.3	31,955	7.0	17,308	3.8	27,653	6.0	1,191	0.3
	TOTAL	860,164	50.5	563,249	37.9	172,762	11.6	71,085	4.8	55,381	3.7	5,687	0.4
	MEDIAN SALARY		54,837.2		54,613.8		51,159.6		54,977.0		69,961.9		51,191.5
TOTAL	0.1-15.9	4,703	100.0	4,078	86.7	364	7.7	164	3.5	100	1.9	8	0.2
	16.0-19.9	2,161	100.0	1,705	78.9	267	12.4	155	7.2	100	1.2	8	0.4
	20.0-24.9	9,358	100.0	5,978	63.9	2,521	26.9	667	7.1	100	1.7	37	0.4
	25.0-32.9	85,474	100.0	51,464	60.2	24,318	28.5	7,497	8.8	100	1.6	858	1.0
	33.0-42.9	227,273	100.0	152,416	67.1	50,018	22.0	17,778	7.8	100	2.3	1,765	0.8
	43.0-54.9	325,843	100.0	229,046	70.3	56,246	17.3	24,937	7.7	100	4.1	2,217	0.7
	55.0-69.9	371,225	100.0	257,738	69.4	58,236	15.7	28,789	7.8	100	6.6	2,066	0.6
	70.0 PLUS	458,876	100.0	316,666	69.0	51,948	11.3	34,947	7.6	100	11.5	2,339	0.5
	TOTAL	1,484,913	100.0	1,019,091	68.6	243,918	16.4	114,934	7.7	100	6.6	9,298	0.6
	MEDIAN SALARY		58,541.2		58,774.4		52,487.0		58,266.1		70,781.5		53,678.4

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFORMATION (EEO-4), 2011

NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT SUMMARY

JOB CATEGORY: ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT
 TABLE 2: JOB CATEGORY SUMMARY
 REPORTING UNITS: 4987
 TOTAL FULL TIME EMPLOYMENT

ANNUAL SALARY \$K		TOTAL		WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC		ASIAN		INDIAN	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
MALE	0.1-15.9	1,424	18.6	986	12.9	235	3.1	140	1.8	20	0.3	43	0.6
	16.0-19.9	1,719	13.5	935	7.3	346	2.7	381	3.0	39	0.3	18	0.1
	20.0-24.9	8,378	11.2	5,097	6.8	1,752	2.3	1,238	1.7	219	0.3	72	0.1
	25.0-32.9	25,112	12.4	15,845	7.8	4,718	2.3	3,435	1.7	908	0.4	206	0.1
	33.0-42.9	36,231	14.0	20,957	8.1	6,626	2.6	5,510	2.1	2,860	1.1	278	0.1
	43.0-54.9	24,967	15.9	14,121	9.0	4,162	2.6	4,294	2.7	2,131	1.4	259	0.2
	55.0-69.9	11,592	20.9	6,088	11.0	2,505	4.5	1,669	3.0	1,126	2.0	204	0.4
	70.0 PLUS	4,073	23.4	2,854	16.4	515	3.0	502	2.9	169	1.0	33	0.2
	TOTAL	113,496	14.4	66,883	8.5	20,859	2.6	17,169	2.2	7,472	0.9	1,113	0.1
	MEDIAN SALARY		38,551.3		38,047.2		38,098.3		39,152.7		41,915.2		40,823.0
FEMALE	0.1-15.9	6,220	81.4	4,483	58.6	856	11.2	750	9.8	83	1.1	48	0.6
	16.0-19.9	11,052	86.5	7,173	56.2	2,420	18.9	1,304	10.2	98	0.8	57	0.4
	20.0-24.9	66,508	88.8	42,199	56.4	15,243	20.4	7,764	10.4	852	1.1	450	0.6
	25.0-32.9	177,035	87.6	115,752	57.3	36,366	18.0	21,180	10.5	2,549	1.3	1,188	0.6
	33.0-42.9	223,353	86.0	138,056	53.2	44,314	17.1	30,830	11.9	8,738	3.4	1,415	0.5
	43.0-54.9	132,300	84.1	77,607	49.3	26,072	16.6	20,833	13.2	6,742	4.3	1,046	0.7
	55.0-69.9	43,937	79.1	24,803	44.7	9,224	16.6	6,936	12.5	2,602	4.7	372	0.7
	70.0 PLUS	13,344	76.6	8,326	47.8	2,481	14.2	1,828	10.5	605	3.5	104	0.6
	TOTAL	673,749	85.6	418,399	53.1	136,976	17.4	91,425	11.6	22,269	2.8	4,680	0.6
	MEDIAN SALARY		36,405.0		35,867.6		36,069.4		37,772.3		41,642.4		37,218.7
TOTAL	0.1-15.9	7,644	100.0	5,469	71.5	1,091	14.3	890	11.6	103	1.3	91	1.2
	16.0-19.9	12,771	100.0	8,108	63.5	2,766	21.7	1,685	13.2	137	1.1	75	0.6
	20.0-24.9	74,886	100.0	47,296	63.2	16,995	22.7	9,002	12.0	1,071	1.4	522	0.7
	25.0-32.9	202,147	100.0	131,597	65.1	41,084	20.3	24,615	12.2	3,457	1.7	1,394	0.7
	33.0-42.9	259,584	100.0	159,013	61.3	50,940	19.6	36,340	14.0	11,598	4.5	1,693	0.7
	43.0-54.9	157,267	100.0	91,728	58.3	30,234	19.2	25,127	16.0	8,873	5.6	1,305	0.8
	55.0-69.9	55,529	100.0	30,891	55.6	11,729	21.1	8,605	15.5	3,728	6.7	576	1.0
	70.0 PLUS	17,417	100.0	11,180	64.2	2,996	17.2	2,330	13.4	774	4.4	137	0.8
	TOTAL	787,245	100.0	485,282	61.6	157,835	20.0	108,594	13.8	29,741	3.8	5,793	0.7
	MEDIAN SALARY		36,704.6		36,154.8		36,333.3		37,981.6		41,709.7		37,810.5

Administrative Support State and Local, 2011

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

http://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/statistics/employment/jobpat-eeo4/2011/table2/table2_6_administrative_support_.html

**EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION
STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFORMATION (EEO-4), 2011
NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT SUMMARY**

JOB CATEGORY: ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

TABLE 2: JOB CATEGORY SUMMARY

REPORTING UNITS: 4987

TOTAL FULL TIME EMPLOYMENT

ANNUAL SALARY \$K		TOTAL		WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC		ASIAN		INDIAN	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
MALE	0.1-15.9	1,424	18.6	986	12.9	235	3.1	140	1.8	20	0.3	43	0.6
	16.0-19.9	1,719	13.5	935	7.3	346	2.7	381	3.0	39	0.3	18	0.1
	20.0-24.9	8,378	11.2	5,097	6.8	1,752	2.3	1,238	1.7	219	0.3	72	0.1
	25.0-32.9	25,112	12.4	15,845	7.8	4,718	2.3	3,435	1.7	908	0.4	206	0.1
	33.0-42.9	36,231	14.0	20,957	8.1	6,626	2.6	5,510	2.1	2,860	1.1	278	0.1
	43.0-54.9	24,967	15.9	14,121	9.0	4,162	2.6	4,294	2.7	2,131	1.4	259	0.2
	55.0-69.9	11,592	20.9	6,088	11.0	2,505	4.5	1,669	3.0	1,126	2.0	204	0.4
	70.0 PLUS	4,073	23.4	2,854	16.4	515	3.0	502	2.9	169	1.0	33	0.2
	TOTAL	113,496	14.4	66,883	8.5	20,859	2.6	17,169	2.2	7,472	0.9	1,113	0.1
	MEDIAN SALARY		38,551.3		38,047.2		38,098.3		39,152.7		41,915.2		40,823.0
FEMALE	0.1-15.9	6,220	81.4	4,483	58.6	856	11.2	750	9.8	83	1.1	48	0.6
	16.0-19.9	11,052	86.5	7,173	56.2	2,420	18.9	1,304	10.2	98	0.8	57	0.4
	20.0-24.9	66,508	88.8	42,199	56.4	15,243	20.4	7,764	10.4	852	1.1	450	0.6
	25.0-32.9	177,035	87.6	115,752	57.3	36,366	18.0	21,180	10.5	2,549	1.3	1,188	0.6
	33.0-42.9	223,353	86.0	138,056	53.2	44,314	17.1	30,830	11.9	8,738	3.4	1,415	0.5
	43.0-54.9	132,300	84.1	77,607	49.3	26,072	16.6	20,833	13.2	6,742	4.3	1,046	0.7
	55.0-69.9	43,937	79.1	24,803	44.7	9,224	16.6	6,936	12.5	2,602	4.7	372	0.7
	70.0 PLUS	13,344	76.6	8,326	47.8	2,481	14.2	1,828	10.5	605	3.5	104	0.6
	TOTAL	673,749	85.6	418,399	53.1	136,976	17.4	91,425	11.6	22,269	2.8	4,680	0.6
	MEDIAN SALARY		36,405.0		35,867.6		36,069.4		37,772.3		41,642.4		37,218.7
TOTAL	0.1-15.9	7,644	100.0	5,469	71.5	1,091	14.3	890	11.6	103	1.3	91	1.2
	16.0-19.9	12,771	100.0	8,108	63.5	2,766	21.7	1,685	13.2	137	1.1	75	0.6
	20.0-24.9	74,886	100.0	47,296	63.2	16,995	22.7	9,002	12.0	1,071	1.4	522	0.7
	25.0-32.9	202,147	100.0	131,597	65.1	41,084	20.3	24,615	12.2	3,457	1.7	1,394	0.7
	33.0-42.9	259,584	100.0	159,013	61.3	50,940	19.6	36,340	14.0	11,598	4.5	1,693	0.7
	43.0-54.9	157,267	100.0	91,728	58.3	30,234	19.2	25,127	16.0	8,873	5.6	1,305	0.8
	55.0-69.9	55,529	100.0	30,891	55.6	11,729	21.1	8,605	15.5	3,728	6.7	576	1.0
	70.0 PLUS	17,417	100.0	11,180	64.2	2,996	17.2	2,330	13.4	774	4.4	137	0.8
	TOTAL	787,245	100.0	485,282	61.6	157,835	20.0	108,594	13.8	29,741	3.8	5,793	0.7
	MEDIAN SALARY		36,704.6		36,154.8		36,333.3		37,981.6		41,709.7		37,810.5

Protective Service State and Local, 2011

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/statistics/employment/jobpat-eeo4/2011/table2/table2_4_protective_service_.html

**EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION
STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFORMATION (EEO-4), 2011
NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT SUMMARY**

JOB CATEGORY: PROTECTIVE SERVICE

TABLE 2: JOB CATEGORY SUMMARY

REPORTING UNITS: 4987

TOTAL FULL TIME EMPLOYMENT

ANNUAL SALARY \$K		TOTAL		WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC		ASIAN		INDIAN	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
MALE	0.1-15.9	3,120	68.3	2,482	54.4	272	6.0	315	6.9	19	0.4	32	0.7
	16.0-19.9	2,329	71.2	1,679	51.3	406	12.4	214	6.5	18	0.6	12	0.4
	20.0-24.9	14,061	66.7	10,173	48.3	2,733	13.0	972	4.6	100	0.5	83	0.4
	25.0-32.9	97,656	69.6	69,023	49.2	19,467	13.9	7,521	5.4	871	0.6	774	0.6
	33.0-42.9	172,334	75.5	123,694	54.2	27,625	12.1	17,519	7.7	2,324	1.0	1,172	0.5
	43.0-54.9	193,449	83.1	146,685	63.0	24,824	10.7	17,656	7.6	3,048	1.3	1,236	0.5
	55.0-69.9	198,443	86.4	150,443	65.5	21,954	9.6	21,130	9.2	3,715	1.6	1,201	0.5
	70.0 PLUS	225,503	86.5	156,481	60.0	22,389	8.6	37,701	14.5	7,862	3.0	1,070	0.4
	TOTAL	906,895	80.9	660,660	59.0	119,670	10.7	103,028	9.2	17,957	1.6	5,580	0.5
	MEDIAN SALARY		53,169.1		53,084.4		47,510.7		60,193.9		65,491.2		49,960.6
FEMALE	0.1-15.9	1,445	31.7	834	18.3	489	10.7	97	2.1	8	0.2	17	0.4
	16.0-19.9	941	28.8	520	15.9	330	10.1	76	2.3	7	0.2	8	0.2
	20.0-24.9	7,007	33.3	3,883	18.4	2,402	11.4	637	3.0	49	0.2	36	0.2
	25.0-32.9	42,568	30.4	20,538	14.6	17,671	12.6	3,743	2.7	274	0.2	342	0.2
	33.0-42.9	55,888	24.5	28,111	12.3	20,012	8.8	6,651	2.9	620	0.3	494	0.2
	43.0-54.9	39,404	16.9	23,000	9.9	11,199	4.8	4,434	1.9	510	0.2	261	0.1
	55.0-69.9	31,197	13.6	18,016	7.8	8,234	3.6	4,197	1.8	534	0.2	216	0.1
	70.0 PLUS	35,094	13.5	17,168	6.6	9,363	3.6	7,392	2.8	959	0.4	212	0.1
	TOTAL	213,544	19.1	112,070	10.0	69,700	6.2	27,227	2.4	2,961	0.3	1,586	0.1
	MEDIAN SALARY		42,806.3		44,121.1		39,974.1		49,520.4		55,351.1		40,893.9
TOTAL	0.1-15.9	4,565	100.0	3,316	72.6	761	16.7	412	9.0	27	0.6	49	1.1
	16.0-19.9	3,270	100.0	2,199	67.2	736	22.5	290	8.9	25	0.8	20	0.6
	20.0-24.9	21,068	100.0	14,056	66.7	5,135	24.4	1,609	7.6	149	0.7	119	0.6
	25.0-32.9	140,224	100.0	89,561	63.9	37,138	26.5	11,264	8.0	1,145	0.8	1,116	0.8
	33.0-42.9	228,222	100.0	151,805	66.5	47,637	20.9	24,170	10.6	2,944	1.3	1,666	0.7
	43.0-54.9	232,853	100.0	169,685	72.9	36,023	15.5	22,090	9.5	3,558	1.5	1,497	0.6
	55.0-69.9	229,640	100.0	168,459	73.4	30,188	13.1	25,327	11.0	4,249	1.9	1,417	0.6
	70.0 PLUS	260,597	100.0	173,649	66.6	31,752	12.2	45,093	17.3	8,821	3.4	1,282	0.5
	TOTAL	1,120,439	100.0	772,730	69.0	189,370	16.9	130,255	11.6	20,918	1.9	7,166	0.6
	MEDIAN SALARY		51,392.8		51,869.4		44,091.9		58,134.3		64,216.8		47,913.4



NASPAA Diversity Report 2013

Over a Decade in Review

By

Nicholas Primo

NASPAA Project Assistant

8/5/13

NASPAA Diversity Report 2013

Purpose

The value of diversity has and continues to be a major point of debate in higher education. With the decision by the Supreme Court to put off its ruling until further scrutiny of standards by the lower Circuit Court in the affirmative action case *Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin, et al.* on June 24, 2013, the fate of diversity policies remains uncertain. Whether policies that promote diversity are worthwhile or effective is also a question currently being debated among policymakers at universities across the United States. There is, however, positive news from NASPAA concerning the state of diversity in public service higher education that can act as a starting point in this ongoing debate for the fate and purpose of diversity in all fields of education.

NASPAA promotes diversity within MPA/MPP faculty, student bodies, and curricula because of its stated mission to prepare students for future work environments in public service. Diverse faculties “invigorate discourse” with students. Diverse student bodies help students prepare for the “workplace of the 21st century,” which is increasingly becoming a global one. Courses and curriculums with competencies that promote interaction with diverse groups are similarly beneficial to open interaction between diverse individuals and groups. Overall, those graduate programs that strive for and implement policies that promote and retain diversity better train their students for the future and connect disparate ideas to solve larger issues.

Still, many programs continue to struggle to attract and maintain diverse student and faculty groups. For the most part, programs agree with and wish to promote diversity but simply cannot due to restrictions such as financial constraints and lack of infrastructure. Many schools in past site visits and COPRA findings have repeated similar issues preventing them from improving their program’s diversity. Examples include competition with more prestigious programs that have the staff, infrastructure, and funds to attract potential candidates for students and faculty alike. Others have mentioned geographic issues such as rural isolation as being a primary hindrance to recruitment. Issues of lack of diversity from the primary recruiting areas of certain states where racial diversity is low are also prominent concerns. Overall, these programs have a desire to improve their programs to be more diverse, but cannot due to lack of resources or lack of ability. These also have the most hope of changing, should opportunities and information arise that shows simple but effective ways of promoting program diversity.

Some programs also may agree with diversity policies and even implement diversity policies, but their policies still fail to attract minority or underrepresented groups for other underlying reasons. Underlying issues could be community misconceptions of higher education, such as high costs, high levels of debt, or assumed lack of approachability to content and faculty. Financial or familial reasons, such as entering the work force immediately to support family members, could also be a factor. Such issues can then be split into areas where programs can continue to reach out to communities, and areas in which communities, or other policymakers, must work to remove inherent guardedness among minority groups.

Looking at national trends in higher education, one also might feel less optimistic at the state of diversity. In 2012, the U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) released a report titled “The Condition of Education 2001.” In it, the NCES described the rates of participation of students in master’s degree programs among racial minorities and women between 1999-2000 and 2009-2010. NCES found that over the span of a decade, all master’s programs in all fields increased from 20% minority students in 2000 to 27% in 2010. Concerning gender, the report found that master’s programs had 60% female students in 2000 and 63% in 2010. Despite these gains, the Department argued that there

was still great disparity within higher education, especially considering projections of minority and underrepresented groups increasing significantly over the next few decades.¹

Figure 1.1: Racial Diversity, All Master's Degrees, 1999-2000 & 2009-2010





Figure 1.2: Gender Diversity, All Master's Degrees, 1999-2000 & 2009-2010



Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). "The Condition of Education 2012," (NCES 2012-045), Indicator 47

Despite these issues and what appears to be a lack of diversity on many levels in higher education, there is reason for hope. Diversity has and can continue to grow and benefit students, faculties, and programs, specifically in public service higher education. In 1999, NASPAA's Diversity Committee, with the support of the Executive Council, surveyed and analyzed diversity data from NASPAA member programs. They surveyed programs from years 1992-1998, using data from Annual Accreditation Maintenance Reports to find the state of diversity at the beginning of the 21st Century. The report titled "NASPAA Diversity Report 2000," showcased the state of student and faculty diversity as well as suggestions for struggling programs on how to increase diversity.

To better understand the true state of racial and gender diversity in American MPA/MPP programs, NASPAA has developed this diversity report as a continuation of the research it developed in its Diversity Report 2000. Using statistical data from accreditation and self-study reports from member programs from 2009-2013, NASPAA endeavors to highlight the changes and improvements in the state of diversity in graduate public service education for readers. It also reflects on the questions and possible solutions to the process of diversification overall. NASPAA provides this report in the hope that programs may use it as a guide to better tailor future policy and implementation of strategies to improve overall diversity for the betterment of students and faculty alike.

¹ Please refer to National Center for Education Statistics (2012). "Fast Facts: Degrees conferred by sex and race" <<http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=72>>

Methodology

For this report, all data used derive from submitted data on faculty and student numbers within self-study reports. NASPAA requires programs seeking accreditation to complete a self-study report, which includes internal and confidential statistics on the demographics of their students and faculty. Students are defined as active enrollees and participants in the program. Faculty members are defined as all full- or part-time tenure, non-tenure, and practitioners as counted by the administration of the program. The total data come from consecutive self-study report cohorts of 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013 and is combined to form a large pool of participants for significant statistical data. Each year uses its most recent data, or data from the previous year (i.e. 2007-2008 self-study data come from the 2006-2007 academic year).

The questions are an attempt to allow member programs the opportunity to define their own qualities and express their own understanding of the intricacies of their program based on the standards espoused by NASPAA. The primary standards, which the Diversity Report focuses on, are Standards 3.2, 4.4 and 5.1. Standard 3.2 states, "The program will promote diversity and a climate of inclusiveness through its recruitment and retention of faculty members." Standard 4.4 similarly states, "The program will promote diversity and a climate of inclusiveness through its recruitment, admissions practices, and support services" of students. Finally, Standard 5.1 states, "The program will adopt a set of required competencies." This Diversity Report focuses solely on the competency to, "communicate and interact productively with a diverse and changing workforce and citizenry." To meet these standards, programs collect data on the outcome of policies toward their faculty, student and program diversity. It is this data from self-study reports, which are used in this report.

For student data in the years prior to 2011-2012, there are three categories. They include "Minority," "White," and "Unknown." This is based on the self-study report submitted by schools to NASPAA, which only asked for totals rather than specific minority groups. The "Minority" category is all-encompassing of minority racial groups. "White" includes all white and non-minority groups. Both categories are also divided into "Male" and "Female" subgroups for the sake of gender diversity.

The "Unknown" category includes those students who for whatever reason did not report their race in their application or registration to the program. This also includes nonresidents/international students whose country of origin is not shared in the data. For the sake of continuity, the findings of the Diversity Report 2000, which did not include data on "Unknown" students, is compared to the Diversity Report 2013 with "Unknown" students removed from the sample population. Complete samples with the "Unknown" category included in the population are available in the Excel Data found in Appendix B. They include individual years of data as well as the cumulative data of years 2007-2008 to 2012-2013.

For the most recent years (2011-2012 and 2012-2013 respectively), due to changes in survey questioning, the "Minority" category expanded to separate groups of "African American," "Asian," and "Hispanic." The category of "White" maintains their definitions from previous years. For the sake of continuity with the past years, the totals of the "African American," "Asian," and "Hispanic" categories are aggregated into a "Minority" percentage for the years '11-'12 and '12-'13.

For the faculty body, the diversity data are more descriptive than that of the student body. Faculty members are divided into several categories based on racial groups. These include "African American," "Asian," "Hispanic," "American Indian," and "White." "White" again encompasses all white and non-minority faculty in the program. All of these categories are further subdivided into "Male" and "Female" for the sake of gender diversity. Though the faculty are divided between full-time and part-time, this report focuses solely on full-time faculty. For data from self-study reports before 2011-2012, the faculty nucleus is the primary population used for the statistical analysis.

Some restraints have been put on the dataset for the Diversity Report 2013. First, several universities with incomplete or missing data were removed from the sample. Similarly, NASPAA accredited universities outside the U.S. were removed from the sample. While in part because of the differences in definition of diversity between U.S. and non-U.S. based programs, more generally these few programs located around the globe were removed for their lack of data on diversity standards overall. Finally, outlier data points from large universities with large populations in both student and faculty bodies were removed in order to limit potential skew on the findings.

Included below are the demographic percentages within the United States as recorded the U.S. Census Bureau for the year 2010. They are references to the current demographics of all racial groups and gender among ages 18-24 in the United States in comparison to the state of MPA/MPP diversity.²

White: 60%
Black: 15%
Asian: 4%
Hispanic: 18%

Male: 51%
Female: 49%

Results

The following data are the results of the Diversity Report 2013. The data are compared to the data found in the Diversity Report 2000 to convey the trends and changes in the state of diversity over the past decade. The first section focuses on the racial and gender diversity changes in the student body. The second section focuses on the racial and gender diversity trends in the faculty body. Finally, the third section will show the state of universal competency analysis and implementation in terms of communication with diverse communities and changing workforces.

Standard 4.4: Student Diversity

The Diversity Report 2000 had an N = 8,274 students from NASPAA member programs. The amount of programs represented is not given in the report. This data came from the combined data from Annual Reports from 1992-1998. These students were defined as "enrolled" students in programs as defined by old standards. This means all students enrolled (new and current) in a program for a single year were included. It found that 35% of students were Minority students, while Whites were a majority at 65%.

The Diversity Report 2013 has an N = 9,589 students from NASPAA accredited programs. They include data from Self-Study Reports from 2007-2013. The students were defined as "registered" students of the specific year. The most recent years of data for students are defined as "registered." Student data from 2007-2010 during the old standards had students split into different categories. These categories included "applicant," "registered" and "active." The category "registered" was used for the sake of continuity, while "applicant" and "active" were not used for representation of a single program's single year of student body. The entire sample found that after thirteen years, the number of Minority students had increased to 49%, with Whites at 51%.

² Please refer to U.S. Census Bureau (2012). "2012 Statistical Abstract - Resident Population by Sex and Age" and "2012 Statistical Abstract - Resident Population by Race, Hispanic Origin, and Age"
<<http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/cats/population.html>>

Figure 2.1: Diversity Report 2000 (1992-1998)





Figure 2.2: Diversity Report 2013 (2007-2013)



Finally, gender diversity among students was not included in the final data of the Diversity Report 2000. For the sake of comparison, the report uses the gender demographics of All Master's Programs found in the NCES 2012 Report. It shows a split of 40% male and 60% female. Looking at data from years ranging from 2007-2013, there has been very little change in the overall demographics of graduate public service programs based on gender. With minor fluctuations from year to year, the diversity Report 2013 found the overall population of students to be 41% Male with the majority being 59% Female.

Figure 2.3: All Master's Degrees, 1999-2000





Figure 2.4: Diversity Report 2013 (2007-2013)



Standard 3.2: Faculty Diversity

The Diversity Report 2000 had an N = 508 full-time faculty in NASPAA member programs. Part-time faculty members are excluded in this comparison. The number of programs was not reported in the report. This combined data come from Annual Accreditation Maintenance Reports from 1992-1998. The report found that Minority faculty was roughly 9% of the faculty population, with Whites as a large majority at 91%. The Minority faculty can be split into individual Minority groups. African American professors made up 5% of the population, Asian professors 2%, Hispanic professors 2% and American Indian professors less than 1%.

The Diversity Report 2013 has an N = 1,644 full-time faculty from NASPAA member programs. Part-time faculty members were excluded from the comparison. The reports include data from self-study reports from years 2007-2013. The report found that Minority faculty had increased to 23% of the population, with Whites still a majority at 77%. All Minority groups similarly increased, with African American faculty making up 12%, Asian faculty 7%, Hispanic faculty 4% and American Indian faculty less than 1%.

Figure 3.1: Diversity Report 2000 (1992-1998)





Figure 3.2: Diversity Report 2013 (2007-2013)



Using the same data, the Diversity Report 2000 also found that 12% of faculty members in NASPAA accredited programs were Female. Males made up the majority at 88% of the population. The Diversity Report 2013, using data from 2007-2008 to 2012-2013, found that 34% of faculty members from NASPAA member programs were Female. Males continued to make up the majority of the faculty population at 66%.

Figure 3.3: Diversity Report 2000 (1992-1998)






Figure 3.4: Diversity Report 2000 (2007-2013)



COPRA also considers program efforts at retaining diverse faculty as a whole in Standard 3.1.2. The data from 2011-2013, which include N = 91 programs, provides some clarity on programmatic practices in retaining diverse faculty. The four most commonly used policies programs implemented were as follows. The first with 100% application is programs provide information on tenure track options to new professors. The second most used option by 89% of programs is for new faculty to meet with their program director to discuss progress and other issues. The third most used option by 68% of programs is an orientation program that aids new professors in integrating into the faculty. Roughly half of programs (52%) have a mentorship program in which new faculty are mentored by full-time faculty.

Figure 3.5: Diversity Report 2013 (2011-2013), Faculty Retention Practices



Standard 5.1: Universal Competencies

The Diversity Report 2000 does not include data or an analysis of universal competencies in the realm of diversity due to the fact that they were not a requirement for accreditation before the current, 2009 Standards. It is important to note that these are new requirements of programs that represent a substantial change from the previous standards. Thus, many programs are still in the process of creating measurements and fully implementing them as policies that COPRA can assess. Only the most recent years from NASPAA's Data Center had data on the state of analysis and implementation of competencies concerning program diversity. Specifically, this report focuses on the competency which discusses the program's ability, "to communicate and interact productively with a diverse and changing workforce and citizenry."


All data come from self-studies submitted to COPRA. The data provided below show how programs define and portray themselves in terms of their ability to analyze and implement the universal competency expected by COPRA. The four questions asked concerning the competency are, 1) If the learning outcome of the competency has been defined, 2) If that evidence of learning has been gathered by the program, 3) If that same evidence has then been analyzed and 4) If that analysis of the evidence is used to make programmatic decisions and policies. To clarify, these questions only ask whether or not a program has defined the competency. It is not meant to signify that all programs define the competency in the same generic way. Furthermore, these four questions apply to each universal competency.

First, in order to gain insight on the level of implementation of all universal competencies by programs, Figure 4.1 shows the average rate of participation in all four questions among all five competencies as reported by site visit teams in their observational reports. The first is the "Lead and Manage in Public Governance" competency domain. The second is "Participate in and Contribute to Public Policy Process" competency domain. The third is the "Analyze, Synthesize, and Think Critically" competency domain. The fourth is the "Articulate and Apply Public Service Perspective" competency domain. The fifth and final competency domain is the aforementioned "Communicate and Interact with a Diverse and Changing Workforce."

The Diversity Report 2013 has an N = 56 programs from the combined years of 2011-2012 and 2012-2013. According to the findings of the report, 85% of programs define their learning outcomes based on


the competency domains in some way. 74% of programs consider themselves to gather evidence of the learning that takes place from the defined competency. 64% of programs then analyze that evidence of learning. Roughly half of all programs (51%) then use that evidence to make programmatic decisions to further the competency's impact on learning.

Figure 4.1: Diversity Report 2013 (2011-2013), Average Participation in All Universal Competencies



Looking specifically at the fifth competency, the Diversity Report 2013 found that the majority of programs define the learning outcomes. Only 68% of programs "gather evidence of learning based on this competency." 55% of programs analyze the evidence they find. Only 43% of programs use their analysis to inform programmatic change. The majority of programs do not yet use their evidence of this competency to inform their mission and goals.

Figure 4.2: Diversity Report 2013 (2011-2013), Communicate w/Diverse Communities



Conclusions

Overall, based on the comparison between the data of NASPAA's first Diversity Report in 2000 and the most recent Diversity Report in 2013, public service higher education programs have increased their diversity in both the student and faculty bodies. Minority students have increased from 35% to 43% (+8%) of the population over the last decade. Similarly, faculty had major gains from 2000 to 2013. Major gains include the racial diversity from 9% to 24% (+15%) minority of the faculty population. It also includes gender diversity from 12% to 35% (+23%) female of the faculty population.

Compared to the figures for all graduate programs provided by the NCES of roughly the same time period, it is clear that public service higher education degrees within NASPAA exceed the national average. Specifically under student diversity, NASPAA MPA/MPP programs have minority students as 43% of their population, while all Master's degrees have 27% (+16%). In terms of gender diversity, NASPAA member schools have 59% Female students compared to the rate of 63% female students (-4%) among all Master's programs. While some may argue that there is a certain lack of diversity in higher education, it is less the case concerning NASPAA schools and public service degrees in the U.S, in the aggregate.

In total, many groups, primarily African Americans, are now well represented in the field. The one group that continues to have limited representation is Hispanic students and faculty. As census data points out, Hispanics continue to be one of the fastest growing minority groups in the U.S. Thus, programs should take into account this rising population when it comes to policies in attracting and retaining Hispanic students, and all minority groups.

While these are marked improvements that show that programs overall have diversified and improved their diversification processes on a programmatic level, there are still opportunities where there can be even greater improvement and inclusion. For the faculty body particularly, programs can continue their efforts to improve their diversity even further. Retention practices of faculty also showed some potential areas for improvement. All programs provide basic assistance and information on the program to new faculty. However, fewer programs go beyond this practice or provide greater orientation, with only half providing personal mentorship. Programs can consider the other options such as a mentor program as another possibility to improve retention further.

Programs, as seen by the programs' own admission in difficulty implementing policies when interacting with diverse communities, can also improve on their universal competencies. Compared to the average rate of participation by programs in all universal competencies, the fifth competency on communicating effectively with diverse groups is slightly lower. 55% of programs analyze outcomes for the fifth competency, while 64% do so for all competencies (-9%). Still, while all programs can endeavor to maintain and improve their programmatic diversity, the overall improvement is still quite remarkable.

In conclusion, while some programs may continue to have issues diversifying their student bodies and faculty rosters as well as their implementation of universal competencies, overall programs have made a commitment to diversification and are showing results for their efforts. Compared to the first glimpse of the state of diversity in higher education in public service in the Diversity Report 2000, all areas of racial and gender demographics have improved considerably.

Further Research

One question that arises from this data report is the state of Ph.D. admissions in public policy and administration. Despite large majorities of women in graduate MPA/MPP programs, there are still a sizeable minority in faculties. It would be assumed that large numbers of graduate females would mean larger number of doctoral candidates and later faculty candidates, yet this does not match with reality. This leads one to the conclusion that either Ph.D. programs are not making efforts to reach out and retain women students, or that even if there are large numbers of women with Ph.D.'s, programs still do not hire women. More data and research are required to make any conclusions, and should be a concern and focus going forward in discovering this lack of gender diversity in MPA/MPP faculties.

Another question to consider moving forward is the place of international institutions within the discussion of diversity. For this report, the primary focus was the analysis of diversity within U.S. institutions. As NASPAA continues to move into international accreditation, however, the needs to understand and define diversity within a global context will become more and more necessary. Thus, programs should continue efforts to reach out to international programs and take note of the diversity of their students that come from international backgrounds, in order to bring clarity to the state of MPA/MPP degrees in the global context.

As a further note, the study of potential overrepresentation of certain minority groups, mainly by the inclusion of minority-serving institutions such as Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) and Hispanic Serving Institutes (HSI) could be considered. The correlation to MPA/MPP degrees from schools where quality of education might be an issue is also something that could not be addressed in the confines of this report but warrant further study. This report looks only at the aggregate percentages, not the distribution across programs.

Another area of interest for further research is defining and quantifying for analytical purposes the climate of inclusiveness in programs. Whether programs should consider taking polls of its staff and students to get a clear picture of how they perceive the inclusiveness of their program or if NASPAA should develop further standards to form a more comprehensive and quantifiable means of tracking program policies on diversity are all options to consider. Beyond anecdotal evidence from site visit report and responses, defining and studying inclusiveness and going beyond demographics could be another route of research in the future.

Besides these questions, the next step becomes what programs that struggle with diversity can do to improve it. Attached to the report in Appendix A are four examples of best practices and diversity policies that NASPAA member programs have implemented and achieved results. The categories are Faculty Diversity, Diversity Planning, Geographic Diversity and Student Diversity. Using these programs and their policies as a starting point, programs that struggle with diversity can begin to draft and implement their own versions into their unique context.

Notes

All data comes from NASPAA's Data Center. Please see Appendix B for all data in Excel form.

Should you want more information, please contact copra@naspaa.org.

Appendix A: Diversity Best Practices

The following schools are examples of breakthrough practices in 2012 which have proven successful in promoting and increasing diversity in a broad array of areas in graduate programs.

Faculty Diversity Best Practices

University of New Orleans

The University of New Orleans' Master of Public Administration Program is a leader in diversity outreach on a variety of levels in higher education. The program's primary success has been through its intense outreach network to recent graduating minority Ph.D. students in their hiring practices for staff and faculty positions. This breakthrough practice includes an online infrastructure that merges existing data sets of graduating minority Ph.D. students. After compiling lists of the most prominent potential candidates, the program makes contact and begins the hiring process.

The breakthrough of the University of New Orleans also includes its hiring practices based on individual interest and not merely diversity for the sake of diversity. The program has had remarkable retention of its diverse faculty due to the program's efforts to foster and include the research interests of its applicants. Several have voiced their overall satisfaction with the program's openness and desire to help them in their individual academic pursuits and research. One new-hire minority faculty member went so far as to say the administration did not hire him, "to check a box," but to allow him time and resources to focus on his research while also providing his expertise to the students and program.


The University of New Orleans has also made strides in creating a strong faculty community with minority and non-minority members. Mainly, senior faculty members become mentors to minority new-hired faculty. These senior staff and tenured professors provide a welcoming and nurturing environment for new minority professors. With these mentor-mentee relationships, new hires have stayed on to contribute their work and perspectives with their students and fellow faculty, thereby promoting the diversity the program desires.

The fact that only roughly half of NASPAA member programs provide this mentorship program for new faculty, especially minority members, leaves a lot of room for programs struggling to diversify their faculty to consider policies like these and see results. It is an opportunity for those programs desiring to improve their faculty diversity further to create and implement a policy of faculty mentorship that will increase hiring and retention rates of minority faculty for programs.

Finally, their Diversity Webpage also provides an excellent resource for other programs to interact and connect with diversity outreach and other minority organizations across the country and the world. It can be used to facilitate contact between programs and groups, or even inspire programs to research their own specific areas for local groups and organizations that can promote and reach out to minority communities and members.

Based on the University of New Orleans reported data for 2012-2013, the overall 16 member faculty is indeed diverse. Whites are the majority group, with other minority groups (Black, Asian and Hispanic) making up almost a third of the population (28%). Like most programs, UNO also struggles with reaching out to women faculty, but considering its success in gaining minority faculty members, perhaps the same practices can be used with similar success to hire and retain female faculty members.

Figure 1.1: University of New Orleans MPA Program, Faculty Demographics 2012-2013



Diversity Plan Best Practices

University of New Mexico

The University of New Mexico's Master of Public Administration program has stand out practices for diversity. Primarily, their contribution is their School of Public Administration Diversity Plan which was created in conjunction with the UNM Office of Equity and Inclusion, the university's own diversity office. Based on the demographics reported by the program in 2011-2012 (see Figures 2.1 and 2.2), the diversity plan has led to significant diversity to the overall student and faculty bodies.

Student numbers are remarkably diverse with Whites as a third of the population, Hispanics at 40%, and other minorities rounding out the rest. Similarly with the program's faculty, including adjuncts, while Whites make up one half of the faculty, Minority members make up the other half (50%). The Minority faculty can further be divided between Hispanics at 17%, Asians at 28% and American Indians at 6%. Overall, this paints a broadly diverse program community, conveying the strength of the goals and implemented policies of the UNM SPA diversity plan.

The diversity plan itself includes several types of policies for implementation. Programs interested in improving their diversity can perform resource analysis for diversity projects, create committees or teams for cultural activities, or establish Cultural Offices for students and staff, to name a few such policies. Above all, a commitment and detailed review of resources and staff are essential to improving diversity. By following certain guidelines, programs can increase diversity to the benefit of its students, staff and program. For more detailed information, please see UNM's "Developing an Institutional Diversity Plan," which the program has generously made available to any and all programs interested in diversity.

Of course, UNM also has an advantage of location in the state of New Mexico (one of four states in the U.S. to have a minority majority population) to aid its diversity efforts. Nearly half of the state's population (46.3%) is Hispanic or Latino in origin. American Indians also make up 10.2% of the population.³

Despite these natural benefits, the program still exemplifies the success of diversity plans within a program. The program, due to its efforts, has a large portion of American Indian students (17%), and

³ <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/35000.html>

retains them effectively beyond the state's average. Similarly, the large portion of Asian faculty members (28%) further conveys the program's ability to attract minority candidates.

The University of New Mexico also contains several online resources, along with its overall plan to promote diversity, which SPA incorporated into its independent program. This includes an extensive guide to creating a diversity plan within any program. It lists not only the UNM plan, but also the plans of nearby community colleges which have large minority populations to consider greater inclusive policies. These plans, which have proven successful for the diversity rates of its students and its successful retention of faculty, are specific examples that can be emulated by programs that continue to struggle with their own efforts of diversification.

While this Diversity plan was originally the primary effort of the university's main administration to increase and promote student and faculty diversity, it stands as an excellent example of how independent programs can use their supporting campus to increase their program's diversity. Based on site visits and discussions with UNM President, Senior Vice Provost, and Vice President of Equity and Inclusion, the SPA understands the importance of diversity. More importantly, UNM shows how greater collaboration between MPA/MPP programs with their provost offices and university administrations can foster shared efforts and campaigns for much needed diversity to the benefit of all participants.

Figure 2.1: University of New Mexico MPA Program, Student Demographics 2011-2012





Figure 2.2: University of New Mexico MPA Program, Faculty Demographics 2011-2012



Geographic Diversity Practices

Tsinghua University

Tsinghua University's Master of Public Administration program became the first international program to receive NASPAA accreditation in July 2013. Along with this distinction, the program also stands as an example of breakthrough practices in diversity within its own unique context of China.

While Tsinghua University still seeks to improve its gender diversity among its student and faculty bodies, its policies to increase geographic diversity have been largely successful. In China, the Western provinces of the country have often produced candidates for the MPA program and government training that have struggled to meet and practice the necessary skills compared to their counterparts in the Eastern provinces. This has led to a lack of diversity in many programs in China, which attract and retain Eastern provincial students and government workers while minimizing the potential of those in the West.

Tsinghua, however, has reached out to Western provincial students to attend the program. In order to increase the percentage of MPA students who are government officials from less developed western provinces, SPPM conducts pre-interviews to those potential applicants before the National Examination is administered. These government officials who pass the interview will be able to audit some courses, and be admitted if they pass the National Examination in two years. It increased their chances to be admitted. While government officials from the western provinces do not perform as well on the National Examination overall, the pre-interview and course auditing continue to allow more admittance. According to program statistics, these policies have not led to a decline in student quality or graduation success.

SPPM has also begun allocating scholarships specifically for government officials from the western region. These scholarships and other forms of financial assistance further allow those candidates with promise but lacking the particular skills and resources to take part in higher education. It also allows for more diversity in the program as well as future diversity among public service careers as more candidates from western provinces become trained and able to meet the needs of the country.

While the provincial context is unique to China, it can be more broadly applied to American programs and universities. Several programs have unique regions and populations to draw from in order to gain diversity. In the West and South West, states have large Hispanic populations to draw from. In the North and Northwest, several states have Native American populations nearby. In large states with large urban centers, programs can have immense connection to diverse groups. Thus, many programs can emulate Tsinghua University by analyzing their surroundings in order to better allocate resources and policies to attract diverse students based on their unique region.

Student Diversity Best Practices

Carnegie Mellon University

Carnegie Mellon University's Master of Science in Public Policy and Management (MSPPM) has several implemented policies that are considered best and breakthrough practices in promoting student diversity.

Firstly, Heinz College has been a long time participant in the Public Policy and International Affairs Program (PPIA) Junior Summer Institute. This unique summer program educates underrepresented undergraduates on the requirements and rewards of graduate education in public service as well as supports students with future employment in public service careers. It has also developed the C squared initiative. This initiative connects incoming students through courses, social activities and events to the

entire campus. Both represent significant investments on behalf of the program to promote student diversity.

Secondly, in addition to traditional recruitment activities, including job fairs, recruitment, and multi-media advertising, Heinz College offers several scholarships targeted to minority students. The program's partnership the Posse Foundation (a national organization) serves underrepresented students on campus. Through this foundation along with other private scholarships based on diversity, CMU identifies students who have the potential to achieve academic success, but are traditionally overlooked in recruitment efforts and offers aid to qualified individuals.

Heinz College initiated a number of tactics to increase the Hispanic populations. For example, Heinz partnered with the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU), Texas Legislative Internship Program, and the University of Texas at San Antonio's Legislative Scholars program to offer scholarship support to students admitted into the program.

Carnegie Mellon University also has a campus in Adelaide, Australia. This campus attracts international students seeking the opportunity to study in a global environment, further promoting the university's and program's diversity. While it is certainly not expected that MPA/MPP programs establish programs in foreign countries, programs could endeavor to reach out to international institutions or other U.S. schools with foreign contacts to inspire connection and collaboration on a global scale.

The combination of the above efforts on the recruitment, assistance and international outlook has created substantial diversity in the Carnegie Mellon MSPPM program. The success of these policies is reinforced by the program's demographics based on the data reported for the 2011-2012 Cohort. 152 total students began the MSPPM program in 2011-12. 105 were U.S. citizens (69% of total). 47 were international students (31%). Amongst the U.S. citizens, the following were the self-reported responses on the application for admission:

19/105 African American= 18% of U.S.-only
49/105 White= 47% of U.S.-only
10/105 Hispanic/Latino= 10% of U.S.-only
17/105 Asian American= 16% of U.S.-only
3/105 American Indian= 3% of U.S.-only
5/105 Blank/No Response= 5% of U.S.-only

While Whites remain the majority of the U.S. population at 47%, almost half of the students are minority students. Both African Americans and Asians make up more than 15% of the U.S. student body. While the program could improve its number of Hispanic students, its impressive student body remains an exemplary body of inclusiveness.

Figure 3.1: Carnegie Mellon University MSPPM, U.S. Student Demographics 2011-2012

