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Executive Summary

In February 2020, The Pennsylvania State University launched the Community Survey. The first of its kind, the University-wide survey was implemented as part of ongoing efforts to promote community, inclusion, and diversity on campus, and to support Penn State’s strategic priorities in these areas. The data collected by the survey are extensive and rich, and interpreting results requires intention and care. While topline descriptive statistics may present a positive narrative, they also frequently obscure the perspectives of subgroups of respondents—including those that have been historically under-represented or marginalized. This summary includes results revealed in this report as well as in the accompanying dashboards. We do not present these as an exhaustive account, but rather as an invitation to explore beyond surface statistics and to promote a deeper understanding of the communities that make Penn State a vibrant university.

Background

In 2018, University leadership charged a working group to implement a University-wide “community survey” for students and employees. The working group gathered input from stakeholders to identify six priority topic areas for the survey:

1. Belonging and inclusion
2. Institutional commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion
3. Engaging across difference
4. Cultural competence and knowledge
5. Experiences with stereotyping, microaggressions, and harassment
6. Off-campus contexts

Based on these priority areas, the working group chose the Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium’s (HEDS) Diversity and Equity Campus Climate Survey. This survey was further adapted and customized to better address the specific context and needs of Penn State. The online survey was administered independently by HEDS and sent to all Penn State students and employees early in the spring semester,\(^1\) 2020. Over 20,000 responses were collected, yielding an overall University response rate of 17 percent. After the survey was administered, HEDS provided anonymized data to representatives of the Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research (OPAIR) for analysis. Working in collaboration with the working group and representatives from the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity, OPAIR staff produced this University-wide report and the accompanying dashboards, incorporating feedback from stakeholders to ensure they were served appropriately.

\(^1\) The survey was completed prior to the COVID-19 outbreak when students and employees worked remotely for the remainder of the academic year.

https://opair.psu.edu/community-survey
Survey Goals and Support Resources

Executive Vice President and Provost, Nicholas P. Jones, sponsored the Community Survey project and consistently communicated his expectation to University leaders that survey results be used by all units to inform strategic planning. By engaging with survey results to learn more about Penn State’s communities, and by choosing items that align with and speak to their needs, colleges, campuses, and administrative units will be able to target change efforts and operationalize the Penn State strategic plan foundation of “Advancing Inclusion, Equity, and Diversity” through the creation of DEI related action plans linked to unit strategic plans. Penn State intends to administer the survey every three to four years in order to support long-term efforts and the measurement of change over time.

To help units put Community Survey data to productive use, the Office of Educational Equity offers consultants to all University units to provide comprehensive support to build human capacity in the diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) space; create action plans for DEI-focused practice; and measure the success of those efforts. As part of this support, Educational Equity developed a SharePoint site of DEI Resources, accessible at https://pennstateoffice365.sharepoint.com/sites/DiversityEquityandInclusionResources, that is available for use by all University employees and students. These resources include research articles, models and frameworks, guides, reports, podcasts, videos, and more. The wide range of materials was developed to provide users easy access to a curated sampling of DEI-focused work engaging, for example, the six topics listed above that influenced the creation of the Penn State Community Survey.

In addition to their use by leaders across the University, the Community Survey report and dashboards are available to individuals, interest groups, and the public to help develop or inform bottom-up, self-governance, or other educational uses for the results—uses that are made possible given the level of transparency provided through public availability.

Still, while this report and its supporting dashboards provide a wealth of information, they cannot address all questions that might be posed using the rich data provided by the Community Survey. The Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research is collecting suggestions for additional analyses and dashboards to be considered in phase two of the Community Survey analyses. Suggestions may be submitted at https://pennstate.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_00wSwT8i8xCTvHT or addressed to OPAIR@psu.edu.

Summary of Results

Respondent profile in brief

To aid in the interpretation of these summary results, we present an abbreviated respondent profile. Detailed information on the 20,483 individuals who completed the survey is outlined beginning on page 23. Fifty-eight percent of survey respondents were students and 42 percent were employees. Sixty-one percent identified as female, 38 percent male, and 1 percent as nonbinary, gender nonconforming, genderqueer, or other gender. Eighty percent were White; 11 percent Asian, Asian American, South Asian, or Southeast Asian; 7 percent African, African American, Black, Caribbean or West Indian; 6 percent Hispanic, Latinx, or Latin American; 2 percent Middle Eastern; and 2 percent Alaska Native, Native American, American Indian, Native Hawaiian, or other Pacific Islander. As compared to the
overall Penn State community, employees, women, and White individuals were overrepresented in the sample, while students, men, and individuals from historically marginalized minority groups were underrepresented.

Attention: Individual race and ethnicity selections from the survey were collapsed into aggregate groups for reporting to support presenting information by role without presenting any individual demographic group (e.g., executive or administrator Native Americans) in which respondents numbered less than twenty individuals.

- **Asian** includes those who identified as Asian, Asian American, South Asian, and/or Southeast Asian.
- **Black** includes those who identified as African, African American, Black, Caribbean, and/or West Indian.
- **Latinx** includes those who identified as Hispanic, Latinx, and/or Latin American.
- **Indigenous** includes those who identified as Alaska Native, Native American, American Indian, Native Hawaiian, and/or other Pacific Islander.

---

### Campus climate, experience, environment, belonging

Seventy-nine percent of respondents reported being satisfied\(^2\) with the overall climate on their campus; 8 percent were dissatisfied. Double that proportion (17 percent) of Black respondents expressed dissatisfaction, as did 22 percent of nonbinary, gender nonconforming, and genderqueer respondents. Incorporating respondent roles into analysis reveals that 30 percent of Black executives and administrators, as well as 31 percent of Black faculty and postdocs were dissatisfied with overall campus climate. Across all racial/ethnic groups more than one in ten faculty (12 percent) expressed similar negative sentiments.

Sixty-nine percent of respondents expressed satisfaction with the experience or environment regarding diversity on their campuses; another 12 percent were dissatisfied, including almost half (45 percent) of Penn State’s Black employees, and one-third (32 percent) of Penn State’s Black students. Overall, White respondents viewed their diversity experience more positively than any other racial/ethnic group, and dissatisfaction varied by race/ethnicity from 9 percent of White respondents to 36 percent among Black respondents. Intersecting respondents’ roles and their race/ethnicity reveals the substantial dissatisfaction expressed by several other groups including 56 percent of Black and 33 percent of Latinx faculty. Almost one-third (31 percent) of nonbinary, gender nonconforming, and genderqueer respondents were likewise dissatisfied.

Seventy percent of respondents reported being satisfied with the extent to which they personally experience a sense of belonging or community on their campus, while 13 percent were dissatisfied. Across roles, undergraduate students and executives/administrators were most satisfied (73 percent

\(^2\) Throughout the Summary of Results, “satisfied” aggregates the response options “generally satisfied” and “very satisfied” and “dissatisfied” aggregates “generally dissatisfied” and “very dissatisfied.”

https://opair.psu.edu/community-survey
and 77 percent, respectively); faculty/postdocs\(^3\) (15 percent), postdocs (15 percent) and graduate students\(^4\) (15 percent) expressed the greatest dissatisfaction. Thirty percent of Black, as well as 19 percent of people identifying with two or more races, 18 percent of Middle Eastern, 17 percent of Latinx, and 15 percent of indigenous respondents were dissatisfied. Likewise, 27 percent of nonbinary, gender nonconforming, and genderqueer respondents reported dissatisfaction. Among employees, 37 percent of Black respondents expressed dissatisfaction.

Fifty-eight percent of respondents reported being satisfied with the extent to which they felt all community members experience a sense of belonging or community on their campus; 16 percent reported being dissatisfied, including 35 percent of Black respondents. Further, 48 percent of Penn State’s Black employees reported dissatisfaction, as did over half (53 percent) of Black women employees. Overall, 35 percent of nonbinary, gender nonconforming, and genderqueer respondents were dissatisfied as well.

Additional trends across these four measures of climate, belonging, and inclusion can be revealed using the Community Survey dashboards. For example, dissatisfaction rate among nonbinary, gender nonconforming, and genderqueer respondents was at least twice that among all respondents for each of these items. Further, between 19 percent and 45 percent of Bisexual, Gay, Lesbian, Pansexual, Queer, and Questioning respondents expressed dissatisfaction at their campus experience regarding diversity, personal experience of belonging, and feeling that all community members experience belonging on campus. Across each of these four items, Queer respondents expressed the highest levels of dissatisfaction.

**Rating institutional priorities**

Just over half (53 percent) of all respondents agreed\(^5\) that their campus environment is free from tension related to individual or group differences; 26 percent disagreed, including 44 percent of executives/administrators and 39 percent of faculty/postdocs. Substantial proportions of several other groups, such as 48 percent of employees and 28 percent of students with disabilities, disagreed as well. Fifty-eight percent of Black and 49 percent of Latinx employees disagreed, increasing to 63 percent and 55 percent, respectively, among women in those groups. Thirty-eight percent of all women employees disagreed with the statement.

Fifty-six percent of respondents agreed that the recruitment of marginalized students, faculty, and staff is an institutional priority; 13 percent disagreed. Across role, faculty/postdocs disagreed at the highest rates (21 percent), followed by graduate/professional students (18 percent), and executives/administrators (17 percent). Thirty-five percent of Black respondents disagreed, as did 20

---

\(^3\) The primary role question on the survey gave a single option for “Faculty or Postdoc” and the role-based tables beginning on page 28 in this report retain that aggregation. Disaggregated results for these two groups can be found in the Community Survey Dashboards and are sometimes included for reference in this Summary of Results.

\(^4\) The primary role question on the survey gave a single option for “Graduate Student or Professional School Student” and the role-based tables beginning on page 28 in this report retain that aggregation. Disaggregated results for these two groups can be found in the Community Survey Dashboards and are sometimes included for reference in this Summary of Results.

\(^5\) Throughout the Summary of Results, the percent “agreed” aggregates the survey response options of “agree” and “strongly agree” and the percent “disagreed” aggregates the options of “disagree” and “strongly disagree.”
percent of Latinx and 20 percent of two or more race respondents. Twenty-seven percent of nonbinary, gender conforming, and genderqueer respondents did not feel that the recruitment of marginalized people is an institutional priority.

Roughly half of respondents (52 percent) agreed that the retention of marginalized students, faculty, and staff is an institutional priority. Agreement about this varied from 48 percent among undergraduate students to 67 percent of executives/administrators. Thirty-five percent of Black respondents disagreed, as did 20 percent of Latinx and 22 percent of multiracial race respondents. Thirty-four percent of nonbinary, gender conforming, and genderqueer respondents likewise disagreed that the retention of marginalized students, faculty, and staff is an institutional priority.

Sixty-five percent of respondents agreed that Penn State senior leadership demonstrates a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion on campus. Fifteen percent of all Penn State employees, including 18 percent of faculty/postdocs, disagreed with this statement, as did substantial proportions of several groups including 38 percent of Black, 32 percent of Latinx, and 29 percent of multiracial race employees.

**Interactions with others on campus and in the community**

Overall, in excess of two-thirds of respondents reported they engaged with others across a variety of types of difference at least weekly. Exceptions included interactions across disability, undocumented immigration, and military veteran status—identity components that often are not outwardly apparent. Respondents also resoundingly reported high levels of comfort with interacting across such differences, typically in excess of 85% of respondents. The lowest level of comfort reported was with undocumented immigrants at 71%.

- Two-thirds (68 percent) of all respondents reported having daily interactions (88 percent weekly) with people of racial/ethnic backgrounds different than their own over the last year; 95 percent expressed comfort with such interactions.
- Most respondents (93 percent) reported interacting at least weekly with people across gender differences in the last year; 95 percent said they were comfortable doing so. Sixty-four percent had at least weekly interactions with people of a different sexual orientation than their own, and 90 percent reported being comfortable with those interactions.
- Eight in ten respondents (82 percent) reported interacting at least monthly with individuals from a country other than their own, and 94 percent said they were comfortable doing so. Similarly, 77 percent had interacted at least monthly with people with a different native language, and 90 percent reported being comfortable doing so. Further, while three quarters of respondents (78 percent) were unaware if they had interacted with undocumented immigrants in the last year, 71 percent indicated they would be comfortable doing so.
- Just over half (53 percent) of respondents reported interactions with individuals with a disability at least monthly, and 91 percent expressed comfort with such interactions; still, 15 percent said they were not aware if they had experienced those types of interactions.

---

6 Throughout the Summary of Results, the percent “comfortable” aggregates the survey response options of “somewhat comfortable” and “very comfortable.”
• Though 57 percent reported daily interactions across socioeconomic differences (77 percent at least weekly), 93 percent expressed being comfortable doing so.
• Interactions across religious backgrounds were a daily occurrence for 60 percent of respondents (83 percent at least monthly); 93 percent said they would be comfortable with those interactions.
• A majority (56 percent) reported daily interactions with people holding different political affiliations, philosophies, or views (83 percent at least monthly), and 93 percent expressed comfort doing so.
• While 59 percent said they had daily interactions with someone significantly older or younger than themselves in the last year (80 percent at least weekly), almost all (93 percent) said they were comfortable interacting across age differences.
• While just over half (53 percent) of respondents reported interacting with military veterans on at least a monthly basis, 20 percent said they were unaware of having such interactions. Most, however, (91 percent) suggested they would be comfortable doing so.

Attitudes about diversity, equity, and inclusion

Most respondents (88 percent) agreed that diversity on campus improves experiences and interactions in the classroom, workplace, and the overall community. A lower proportion (69 percent) reported feeling comfortable sharing their views on diversity, equity, and inclusion at Penn State.

The Community Survey asked respondents if participating in a range of activities had somewhat or greatly increased or decreased their support of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI), or if they had participated in such activities at all.

• More than 60 percent of respondents reported that performing community service, or participating in discussions, training, or activities on racial/ethnic issues had increased their support of DEI. One third of respondents had neither engaged in activities focused on racial/ethnicity issues, nor performed community service.
• Between 50 percent and 56 percent suggested that participating in discussions, training, or activities on gender/gender identity, sexual orientation, or disability issues, as well as attending presentations, performances, or exhibits related to diversity had increased their support of DEI. Still, roughly 40 percent had not engaged in activities focused on gender/gender identity or sexual orientation, nor attended presentations, performances, or exhibits related to diversity. Forty-eight percent had not participated in activities related to disability.
• Between 40 percent and 48 percent of all respondents felt that participating in discussions, training, or activities on socioeconomic status issues, political issues, religious diversity issues, or immigration issues had positively impacted their support of DEI. Close to half had not participated in activities centered on socioeconomic status, political, or religious diversity issues, and a majority (56 percent) had not engaged in such activities related to immigration.
• Finally, 36 percent of respondents indicated that participating in discussions, training, or activities focused on military veterans’ issues had increased their support of DEI; 61 percent reported they had not participated in activities related to veterans’ issues.

7 While the survey asked respondents to indicate whether they had participated in several types of activities, it did not inquire as to the extent to which such trainings were available.
The survey also asked respondents to rate their agreement with several statements about diversity and inclusion:

- 76 percent agreed they feel welcomed in the community surrounding their campus.
- 82 percent agreed they feel safe in the community surrounding their campus.
- 63 percent agreed the community around their campus welcomes people of different backgrounds.
- 84 percent agreed they value campus events exploring different perspectives.
- 90 percent agreed they enjoy working with people different from themselves.
- 64 percent agreed they know where to find help to facilitate difficult or crucial conversations.
- 76 percent agreed they are aware they hold implicit or unconscious biases.
- 68 percent agreed they can identify microaggressions.
- 64 percent agreed that their unit, college, or campus supports people with disabilities.

The survey also asked respondents if they thought that Penn State senior leaders would act based on the survey results. Overall, 47 percent of respondents agreed with this statement. Across roles, disagreement varied from 15 percent (executive/administrator) to 26 percent (faculty/postdoc). Thirty-four percent of indigenous people, 27 percent of Black, 25 percent of two or more race respondents, and 32 percent of respondents with some other unspecified race or ethnicity, as well as 30 percent of respondents with a disability disagreed that leaders will take action based on the survey.

**Experiences with discrimination and harassment**

Respondents were asked about derogatory remarks and incidents of discrimination or harassment they might have experienced, as well as where those incidents had occurred. They were further asked about the source of remarks and incidents and whether they had intervened.

Remarks based on political affiliation or view were the most highly reported, with 75 percent of all respondents having heard them (rarely, sometimes, often, and very often, combined). Insensitive remarks about racial or ethnic identities, people for whom English was not a native language, age or generation, people from other countries, gender or gender identity, and sexual orientation were heard by between 61 percent and 65 percent of all survey respondents; roughly 10 percent of respondents heard such remarks often or very often. Remarks focused on religious background, immigrants, and socioeconomic background were reported by between 55 percent and 57 percent of respondents. Forty-five percent reported disparaging remarks about disability status including 4 percent who heard such remarks often or very often. Disparaging remarks about veterans were cited the least frequently, comparatively, at 28 percent.

Upon hearing derogatory or disparaging remarks, just under half (47 percent) of all respondents reported intervening. Across roles, the percentage of respondents who had intervened ranged from 40 percent (graduate/professional students, undergraduate students), to 77 percent (executives/administrators).

While insensitive and disparaging remarks can come from many sources, 78 percent of respondents reported having heard such remarks from students. At 66 percent, the local community was the next most frequent source. Faculty and staff were heard making disparaging comments by 49 percent of
respondents, and administrators/executives were heard by 33 percent of respondents. Compared to other role groups, administrators/executives tended to report hearing disparaging remarks made by faculty, staff, and administrators at the highest rates. Professional students and faculty most often cited students as the source of the remark.

Across roles, between 25 percent and 32 percent experienced incidents of discrimination or harassment off-campus at locations not affiliated with Penn State. Between 12 percent (undergraduate students) and 19 percent (faculty/postdoc) had such experiences on their campus, at off-campus residences, or at off-campus programs or events affiliated with Penn State. The number of reported experiences of discrimination and harassment also varied by campus location, with rates as low as 23 percent and as high as 41 percent of respondents.

### Respondents who experienced discrimination and harassment

Overall, between 52 percent and 59 percent of respondents cited gender or gender identity, physical appearance, political affiliation and views, or age and generation as the reason for their discrimination or harassment experiences. Forty-three percent identified racial or ethnic identity as the reason. Socioeconomic and religious background were cited by 36 percent and 31 percent of respondents, respectively. Some other, unlisted aspect of identity (22 percent) and sexual orientation (21 percent) were cited, as was country of origin and disability status, each of which were identified as a reason by 17 percent. Immigration status was identified by 14 percent of respondents and 4 percent cited military veteran status as the reason for such an experience. Overall, 63 percent of respondents indicated that their experiences of discrimination or harassment had occurred within the last year.

### Respondents who experienced discrimination and harassment in the last year

Respondents who indicated that they had experienced discrimination or harassment in the last year were asked to indicate the type or form it took. While all insidious, some types were experienced at much higher rates than others, including: experiencing derogatory remarks (60 percent), being deliberately ignored, isolated, left out, or excluded (59 percent), being stared at (41 percent), being intimidated/bullied (35 percent), and being racially/ethnically profiled (26 percent).

The most cited categories of discriminatory or harassing incidents varied by role, but some types were cited by all or most role groups. Specifically, being deliberately ignored, isolated, left out, or excluded by others, being the target of derogatory remarks, and intimidation or bullying were among the most cited by members of each role group. Though not in the top five across each group, being stared at, as well as being the victim of racial or ethnic profiling were each experienced by substantial numbers of members of specific demographic groups (20 percent and 33 percent among multiracial respondents; 12 percent and 23 percent among Black respondents).

Respondents were asked to indicate where the incidents they had cited occurred. While locations varied across roles, some locations were cited consistently. Specifically, locations including: in a departmental office or conference room (36 percent), in a classroom (31 percent), in an individual faculty or staff member's office (25 percent), at a house or residence off-campus (22 percent), and at a program or event affiliated with or sponsored by Penn State (20 percent) were the most commonly cited, overall.

https://opair.psu.edu/community-survey
Open-Ended Survey Questions

The survey also included six open-ended questions that invited respondents to further describe their experiences and present their perspectives. These questions will be addressed in Phase Two of the Community Survey project.

Conclusion

The data collected by the Community Survey reflect a wide range of experiences and perspectives from across Penn State. Exploring them in this report and accompanying dashboards reveal that a more nuanced picture of our community’s experiences can be found just beneath the surface of the survey’s highest-level results. To fulfill the survey’s purpose, including promoting community, inclusion, and diversity across Penn State campuses, it is critical that we engage fully with the data as we seek understanding of the lived experiences of colleagues and our students. Results reveal significant opportunities for growth for individuals, as well as for colleges, campuses, and units. Be certain to further explore the Penn State Community Survey results with the dashboards found at https://opair.psu.edu/community-survey.
Introduction

University Climate Survey Working Group

In August 2018, as part of ongoing efforts to promote diversity and inclusion on campus and plan for related strategic initiatives, University leadership charged a working group to implement the first University-wide “community survey” for students and employees. The charge of the working group was to:

1. Determine criteria for selecting an instrument.
2. Select a national survey instrument(s) with established validity and reliability to address the goals and allow for benchmarking against peer institutions.
3. Provide recommendations for survey implementation.
4. Advise regarding the dissemination of the findings.
5. Develop guidance for the creation of unit-level action plans in response to survey findings.

Members of the working group included:

Sonia DeLuca Fernández (co-chair), Associate Vice Provost, Educational Equity (2018– )
Karen Vance (co-chair), Assistant Vice Provost, Institutional Research (2018– )
Katherine Allen, Associate General Counsel (2019– )
Adeah Anderson, Undergraduate Student, Biobehavioral Health, University Park (2018)
Jake Benfield, Associate Professor, Psychology, Penn State Abington (2018– )
Dawn Blasko, Executive Director, Faculty Senate (2018– )
Carmen Borges, Associate Director, Affirmative Action (2018– )
Heidy Canales, University Park Undergraduate Association Representative (2019– )
Adam Christensen, Director, Student Affairs, Research and Assessment (2018– )
Niki Dickerson vonLockette, Associate Professor, Labor and Employment Relations, African American Studies (2018– )
Ryan Godbey, Vice President, Council of Commonwealth Student Governments (2019– )
Madhavi Kari, Assistant Director, Inclusion and Diversity Engagement, Information Sciences and Technology, University Park (formerly of the Office of Human Resources, 2018– )
Anthony Mitchell, Associate Teaching Professor, African and African American Studies, History, Penn State Greater Allegheny (2018– )
Daniel Newhart, Assistant Vice Provost, Planning (2018– )
Leticia Oseguera, Associate Professor, Higher Education (2018– )
Michael Polgar, Professor, Sociology, Penn State Hazleton (2018– )
Brianne Pragg, President, Graduate and Professional Student Association (2018–2020)
Stephanie Danette Preston, Associate Dean, Graduate School (2018– )
Brandi Robinson, Assistant Teaching Professor, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences; Faculty Senate (2019– )
Aubrey Waddick, Graduate Student, Political Science, University Park (2018–2019)
Denita Wright Watson, Associate Director, Equity, Inclusion, and Advocacy, World Campus Student Affairs (formerly of Great Valley; 2018– )
Stephanie Wehnau, Director, Center for Survey Research, Harrisburg (2018– )
Amy Salinas Westmoreland, Director of Assessment, Educational Equity (2018– )
Survey selection

Input from stakeholders from across the Penn State community was gathered and consolidated to inform the selection of the survey instrument. Members of the working group met with small groups of employees and students to gather priorities for the content of the survey. In addition, input was solicited through an anonymous feedback form, which was broadly advertised in University communications. Working group members reviewed the feedback from the stakeholders and identified six common themes or priorities. The selection of the survey was influenced by these six topics or priorities:

1. Belonging and inclusion
2. Institutional commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion
3. Engaging across difference
4. Cultural competence and knowledge
5. Experiences with stereotyping, microaggressions, and harassment
6. Off-campus contexts

These six priority areas are closely mirrored in the order of survey results as presented in this report. Still, as there are some overlaps within and across the topic areas, some adjustments in order and language were made for clarity and to better guide the reader.

Because the survey was to be administered to all Penn State faculty, staff, and students, the role of the respondent was a lens through which surveys were assessed. Working group members reviewed each of several instruments through not only the six priorities, but through how the respondents’ roles were addressed by survey questions. After much discussion, the working group chose the Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium’s (HEDS) Diversity and Equity Campus Climate Survey.

Communication and awareness campaign

The Penn State Community Survey communications plan had four main objectives. The first objective was set on counsel from the Office of Strategic Communications; the working group prioritized the remainder:

1. Connect with audiences using general language, as opposed to DE&I-specific language.
2. Emphasize the University’s commitment to act upon results.
3. Establish trust in the survey mechanism and that results are confidential.
4. Set the expectation for transparency in the findings.

Robust communications were distributed throughout the Commonwealth, including via Penn State News, electronic and paper posters, social media, targeted emails, shuttle buses, and community interaction. Visual assets, including print and digital signage, developed in large part by Penn State's Office of Strategic Communications, appeared in numerous buildings across Penn State’s twenty-four campuses. Social graphics were shared widely via Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram channels. Penn State News stories were published before and during the administration window. Email messages from the University President, student leaders, and employee leaders encouraged participation in the survey. These emails were delivered before the opening of the administration window to increase awareness, as well as during the administration window to increase participation rates.
Survey Administration

The online administration of the survey was conducted independently by the survey vendor, HEDS. In preparation for the survey administration, Penn State supplied HEDS with a file containing the names, email addresses, and administrative organization data for all Penn State students and employees. HEDS, in turn, distributed email invitations with personalized survey links to all students and employees. The survey launched February 3 and closed March 6, 2020. Median time spent completing the survey was 14 minutes and 80 percent of respondents were able to complete the survey in 30 minutes or less. Modest incentives were provided (i.e., drawings for gift certificates in an amount up to $50).

Data Preparation

The raw data file received from HEDS included 20,635 survey responses. Cases (2) in which the respondent did not answer questions other than demographic questions were eliminated from analysis. Cases (150) in which respondents appeared to “straight-line” (provide the same answer choice repeatedly throughout the survey, suggesting lack of thought about responses) were identified and likewise eliminated. The resulting working dataset consisted of 20,483 cases.

Some demographic questions including respondent gender, sexual orientation, religion, and aggregate race or ethnicity categories included an “other” option that respondents could fill in if they did not identify with one of the provided choices. A small number of respondents for these questions utilized this “other” and wrote in additional details. This information was reviewed by representatives from the Office of Educational Equity, and where a case could be made for including a response in one of the existing categories from the survey, that demographic selection was re-coded and counted among responses in that demographic group. This approach was taken in order to give voice to as many survey respondents as possible when viewing the data for different demographic categories.

In addition to the questions highlighted in this report and the Community Survey dashboards, the survey included six open-ended questions prompting respondents to provide additional details or clarification about their experiences. The number of responses to these questions ranged from 957 to 17,725. To provide quantitative findings to the Penn State community and budget units for strategic planning, the analyses in this report and associated dashboards were prioritized over analysis of these rich data. Phase Two of the Community Survey project will explore and analyze the qualitative responses to the following questions:

- What one word or sentence would you use to describe the sense of community you feel at your Penn State campus?
- What makes Penn State a good place to learn and work?
- What one change would you make in order to enhance the sense of community at your Penn State campus?
- You indicated that you were unsure about whether you have experienced discrimination or harassment at Penn State. Please tell us more about why you selected that response.
- You indicated that you did not report incident(s) of discrimination/harassment that you experienced at Penn State to campus officials. We would appreciate it if you would explain why you chose not to report the incident(s).
- If there is any other information that you would like to provide about your experiences with discrimination or harassment at Penn State, please use the box below.

Response Rates

Table 1. Overall response rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>117,096</td>
<td>20,483</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents could hold multiple roles at Penn State (e.g., a person might be a full-time staff member and part-time student). Throughout most of this report, response rates are presented comparatively by respondent role; those primary roles are based on a self-reported prompt in the survey. Use of the self-reported role was an approach recommended by the Working Group on the belief that role is one of the most salient factors impacting how respondents answered questions, and because respondents were offered additional questions based on the role they had identified. In order to calculate response rates, however, Table 2 is based on Penn State categorizations and not the self-identified role because this allows for comparison between respondents and the original population.

Table 2. Response rate by primary role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>21,334</td>
<td>6,691</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>7,504</td>
<td>2,233</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>15,961</td>
<td>2,011</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>71,942</td>
<td>9,852</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response rates were also estimated for each budgetary planning unit. These units include colleges, campuses, and administrative support units. Academic units (colleges and campuses) include both employees and students. As a result, some individual survey responses were assigned to more than one unit. For example, student respondents might be assigned to a campus and a college (e.g., Berks and the College of Agricultural Sciences). Similarly, an employee respondent might belong to a central unit but work at a non-University Park campus (e.g., Development and Alumni Relations and Hershey). To estimate these response rates, members of the population were assigned to budgetary units based on a primary classification as a student or employee based on Penn State’s records. Survey respondents were assigned to units based on their survey self-reported primary role as a student or employee for the reasons described above. As the population and respondents were not assigned to units in the same way, response rates in Table 3 are estimates.
Table 3. Response rate by budgetary planning unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Unit</th>
<th>Response Rate Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Park</strong> (presented for comparison, not a budgetary planning unit)</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UP Colleges</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Architecture</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth and Mineral Sciences</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Development</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Sciences and Technology</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Affairs, School of</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law, Penn State</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commonwealth Campuses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abington</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behrend</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuBois</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Allegheny</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazleton</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh Valley</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont Alto</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kensington</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuylkill</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenango</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes-Barre</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Unit</th>
<th>Response Rate Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Mission Units</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson Law, Carlisle</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Medicine, Hershey</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Graduate and Professional Studies, Great Valley</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Units</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Action*</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Office*</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Government Relations*</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and Alumni Relations</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Equity</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Affairs*</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Business</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Programs</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Security*</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schreyer Honors College*</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Communications</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Education</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Campus</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Units with an asterisk did not have enough respondents to meet the survey threshold of 20 cases for reporting.
How to Use this Report

This report provides an introductory summary of data from the Penn State Community Survey (2020). The purpose of the report is to orient the reader to the nature of the data, structure of the survey, and avenues for additional analyses and comparisons that are supported by what was collected. Results are broken out by respondents’ self-reported roles at the University (executive/administrator, staff member, faculty/postdoc, grad/prof student or undergraduate student). Readers seeking additional details, such as response comparisons by race and gender, or other demographics should refer to the Community Survey Dashboard at https://opair.psu.edu/community-survey (see Taking a Deeper Dive Using the Dashboards for additional information about the dashboard).

The data in this report and the associated dashboards are better used to compare the experiences of one group with another than to provide an exact representation of what proportion of people feel a certain way.

Data Presentation

To best represent small differences in categories for some of the reported demographics, all demographic variables are reported to the tenth of a percent. Throughout the rest of the report, percentages are reported as whole numbers. All percentages reported are valid percentages. Valid percent is the percentage of respondents to have answered the question, not the percentage of all respondents. Respondents did not answer every question, nor was every question presented to every respondent (i.e., some questions were presented to respondents who answered a prior question in a specific way). For most questions posed to all survey takers, less than two percent of respondents chose not to answer any individual question. Some survey questions presented to all survey takers were not necessarily relevant to all survey takers, for example, “During your time at Penn State, have you ever intervened when you heard insensitive or disparaging remarks?” (emphasis added).

All information in this report and in the supporting dashboards is aggregated to a level that protects the confidentiality of individual respondents. For data to be presented for a demographic group (e.g., Middle Eastern women), that group must include at least twenty members among the survey respondents. Further, questions not answered by at least twenty respondents in total are suppressed. These aggregation and data suppression rules are in adherence with the assurances given to potential respondents prior to taking the survey. For these reasons, some of the tables in this report are broken down into a finer level of detail than others (e.g., five role categories versus two).

Many of the survey questions prompted respondents to select all choices or categories that applied to them. In these cases (noted in the table title) percentages may add up to more than 100 percent because individual respondents chose more than one. Presentation of these questions does not require suppression of any table cell in which n<20, but if an inquiry isolated responses of Latinx-identified staff, for example, the responses would be suppressed if there were fewer than twenty in this group. So, in the examples below, the data presented in A would not be suppressed even though some of the cells represent fewer than twenty people because a total of thirty people responded to the question. In contrast, the data in B would be suppressed because only seventeen people responded.
Navigating the Report

A Table of Contents is provided on page i to help readers find specific areas of interest in the report. Given the report length and number of tables, visual navigational cues are provided to assist readers. Each section of the report, preceded by an underlined header, begins with an overview of the section and a summary of results from it. These summaries appear in text boxes with a blue background. Survey question stems are highlighted in bold with lines above and below. The tables following each survey question relate specifically to that question or question stem.

Taking a Deeper Dive Using the Dashboards

While this report provides a foundation for reviewing the Community Survey results, we hope it also serves as a call to explore the results with greater nuance. In a study of this nature, it is critical that we review and compare results between different groups of respondents. To facilitate that exploration, Penn State has provided the public with access to an online Community Survey Dashboard. This digital dashboard format provides an interactive and customizable way for users to view the data. Users of the dashboard can find a link to its user guide at the bottom of each page (Figure 1).

For example, a reader of this report can see in Table 23 (p. 32) that among all respondents, 70 percent reported being (generally or very) satisfied with their sense of belonging on their Penn State campus. Though 70 percent expressing satisfaction is a majority of respondents, many might not necessarily interpret it positively. Still, others might think of it as a sufficient measure, and a visualization such as a pie chart further encourages a positive interpretation.
Figure 1. A link to the dashboard user guide is found at the bottom of every dashboard page.

Figure 2. Example of an accurate but incomplete visualization of the data.
Looking more closely, readers can see that satisfaction varied across roles from a low of 64 percent among graduate students to a high of 77 percent among executives and administrators, and further that respondents’ roles appear to be related to their campus climate experience. A reader might suspect that other respondent characteristics, particularly characteristics that relate to membership (or not) in a historically marginalized group or groups, may also be related to their sense of belonging.

1. The Community Survey Dashboard provides users an opportunity to further explore survey questions. For example, “sense of belonging.” To start, a viewer would see a visual representation of the “All Respondents” or overall data presented in this report. Selecting the Role option visually replicates the breakdown presented in Table 22 of this report with additional detail parsing out faculty from postdocs and graduate students from professional students.

Figure 3. Dashboard presentation of sense of belonging or community with the option to further explore by role highlighted in red.

2. While this report presents University-level results, most users will find more utility in the data for their unit (campus, college, or administrative unit). Within the dashboards, users may select specific units (or groups of units) to view. Figure 4 reveals little difference between University Park, as an example, and the overall data. This could reflect either consistency across locations or the fact that large numbers of University Park respondents may suppress potentially distinctive results of other locations. Users can explore these hypotheses by examining responses for different locations.
3. A user might next wish to explore whether sense of belonging differs by race and ethnicity. As the dashboard reveals, for students who identify within the gender binary (i.e., woman-identified or man-identified), sense of belonging is very different for White students as compared to historically underrepresented students at University Park. Only 38 percent of Black (African, African American, Black, Caribbean, and West Indian) respondents report satisfaction with their sense of belonging, compared to 73 percent of White respondents. If we limit ourselves to only examining the overall data, there is a significant risk that the numeric majority White sense of belonging will drown out the voices of other racial and ethnic groups. In the dashboard, a similar breakdown can be viewed by gender.
4. Given that individuals have multiple identities and that the intersections of these identities can make them more vulnerable to stereotyping, microaggressions, harassment, and discrimination, a user might want to know how different subgroups of the various racial and ethnic populations feel about their sense of belonging. Digging deeper into the dashboard, we can see 71 percent of White men and 75 percent of White women are satisfied with their sense of belonging, compared to 48 percent of Black men and 31 percent of Black women (Figure 6 and Figure 7).
Figure 6. Satisfaction of University Park men with their sense of belonging and community on campus by race/ethnicity.

Figure 7. Satisfaction of University Park women with their sense of belonging and community on campus by race/ethnicity.

As this example illustrates, the full picture is often more complicated than it appears at first glance. Using the Community Survey Dashboard to explore different components of diversity, equity, and inclusion on campus for different subgroups of the University population can help to provide a more holistic picture of the experiences, perceptions, and attitudes of the entire University community.
The Community Survey collected information about personal and demographic characteristics of respondents. The majority of respondents (58 percent) were students. Respondents tended to come from families with higher levels of formal education—two-thirds had at least one parent with at least a bachelor’s degree and 37 percent had at least one parent with a graduate degree.

Among all respondents, 92 percent were U.S. citizens; faculty and postdocs (14 percent) and graduate students (27 percent) were most likely to international students or scholars. Eighty percent were White; 11 percent Asian, Asian American, South Asian, or Southeast Asian; 7 percent African, African American, Black, Caribbean, or West Indian; 6 percent Hispanic, Latinx, or, Latin American; 2 percent Middle Eastern; and 2 percent Alaska Native, Native American, American Indian, Native Hawaiian, or, other Pacific Islander. Among U.S. citizens, the distribution is more skewed, with 86 percent of respondents self-reporting as White.

Respondents who identified as women made up 61 percent of the sample. The only role group in which women did not exceed half of the respondents was the executive and administrator category. One percent of all respondents identified as nonbinary, gender nonconforming, genderqueer or other gender, and one percent identified as transgender. Almost half of all respondents (46 percent) were younger than 25; 77 percent of all students were less than 25-years-old, but three quarters (77 percent) of employees ranged from ages 35 to 64. Among all respondents, 86 percent identified as heterosexual or straight, 5 percent as bisexual, 3 percent as gay or lesbian, 2 percent as asexual, 1 percent as each of the following: pansexual, queer, questioning, and other.

In terms of spiritual and religious beliefs, the majority of respondents were Catholic (22 percent), agnostic or atheist (19 percent), Protestant (18 percent), or other Christian (18 percent). Four percent of respondents were veterans. Respondents more often identified as “far left” or “liberal” (39 percent) than “conservative” or “far right” (20 percent), but the largest proportion (41 percent) considered themselves “middle-of-the-road.” Among all respondents, 8 percent have a permanent or temporary disability.

Table 4. Which of the following best describes your primary role at Penn State?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive or administrator</th>
<th>Staff, exempt</th>
<th>Staff, non-exempt</th>
<th>Technical staff</th>
<th>Faculty or postdoc</th>
<th>Graduate student or professional school student</th>
<th>Undergraduate student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Primary role at Penn State collapsed to the five categories used throughout this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Executive or administrator</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Faculty or postdoc</th>
<th>Grad/prof student</th>
<th>Undergraduate student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Staff includes staff exempt, staff nonexempt, and technical staff.

Table 6. What is your citizenship status?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>U.S. citizen</th>
<th>U.S. permanent resident but not a U.S. citizen</th>
<th>Not a U.S. citizen or permanent resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin/staff</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Executives, administrators, and staff are combined in this table in order to create groups in which the number of people represented in each cell is ≥ 20.

Table 7. Which of the following racial or ethnic categories applies to your identity? (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial or ethnic category</th>
<th>U.S. Citizens</th>
<th>Not U.S. Citizens</th>
<th>All respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American or Black</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Native</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean or West Indian</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latinx</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American or American Indian</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race or ethnicity</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Values are suppressed where a specific group of respondents is <20 or where the presentation of the value for one group would allow for the calculation of the smaller group.
Table 8. Aggregate racial and ethnic categories by role: All respondents regardless of citizenship. (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregate group</th>
<th>Exec/admin</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Faculty/postdoc</th>
<th>Grad/prof student</th>
<th>Undergrad. student</th>
<th>All respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinx</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Individual race and ethnicity selections from the survey were collapsed into aggregate groups for reporting in order to break information out by role without presenting any individual demographic group (e.g., Exec/admin Native Americans) where respondents numbered less than 20. Asian includes those who identified as Asian, Asian American, South Asian, and/or Southeast Asian. Black includes those who identified as African, African American, Black, Caribbean, and/or West Indian. Latinx includes those who identified as Hispanic, Latinx, and/or Latin American. Indigenous includes those who identified as Alaska Native, Native American, American Indian, Native Hawaiian, and/or other Pacific Islander.
- Values are suppressed where a specific group of respondents is <20 or where the presentation of the value for one group would allow for the calculation of the smaller group.

Table 9. Racial and ethnic categories by role: U.S. citizens only. (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregate group</th>
<th>Exec/admin</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Faculty/postdoc</th>
<th>Grad/prof student</th>
<th>Undergrad. student</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinx</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Individual race and ethnicity selections from the survey were collapsed into aggregate groups for reporting in order to break information out by role without presenting any individual demographic group (e.g., Exec/admin Native Americans) where respondents numbered less than 20. Asian includes those who identified as Asian, Asian American, South Asian, and/or Southeast Asian. Black includes those who identified as African, African American, Black, Caribbean, and/or West Indian. Latinx includes those who identified as Hispanic, Latinx, and/or Latin American. Indigenous includes those who identified as Alaska Native, Native American, American Indian, Native Hawaiian, and/or other Pacific Islander.
- Values are suppressed where a specific group of respondents is <20 or where the presentation of the value for one group would allow for the calculation of the smaller group.
Table 10. Racial and ethnic categories by role: Non-U.S. citizens only. (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregate group</th>
<th>Exec/admin</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Faculty/postdoc</th>
<th>Grad/prof student</th>
<th>Undergrad. student</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinx</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Individual race and ethnicity selections from the survey were collapsed into aggregate groups for reporting in order to break information out by role without presenting any individual demographic group (e.g., Exec/admin Native Americans) where respondents numbered less than 20. Asian includes those who identified as Asian, Asian American, South Asian, and/or Southeast Asian. Black includes those who identified as African, African American, Black, Caribbean, and/or West Indian. Latinx includes those who identified as Hispanic, Latinx, and/or Latin American. Indigenous includes those who identified as Alaska Native, Native American, American Indian, Native Hawaiian, and/or other Pacific Islander.
- Values are suppressed where a specific group of respondents is <20 or where the presentation of the value for one group would allow for the calculation of the smaller group.

Table 11. What is your gender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Man</th>
<th>Woman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Demographics for nonbinary, gender nonconforming, genderqueer, and other are not reported or included in Table 11 because response numbers for those groups are <20.

Table 12. Gender identity detail for employees and students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Man</th>
<th>Woman</th>
<th>Nonbinary, gender nonconforming, genderqueer</th>
<th>Not listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://opair.psu.edu/community-survey
**Table 13. Are you transgender?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Transgender</th>
<th>Not transgender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 14. What is your current age?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Younger than 25</th>
<th>25–34</th>
<th>35–44</th>
<th>45–54</th>
<th>55–64</th>
<th>65 or older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 15. Which term best describes your sexual orientation?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>All respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asexual</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pansexual</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight (Heterosexual)</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not listed above</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16. Please indicate which of the below categories best captures your spiritual or religious affiliation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>All respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agnostic/atheist</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Christian</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual, but not religious</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Religious options from the survey were collapsed into aggregate groups for reporting to break information out by role, but without presenting any individual demographic group based on role and religion where respondents numbered less than 20. Protestant includes Baptist, Episcopalian, Lutheran, Methodist, Orthodox Christian, and Presbyterian. Other Christian includes The Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-Day Saints, Jehovah’s Witness, Nondenominational Christian, and other Christian.

Table 17. Are you a former member of the Armed Forces of the United States (Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard) who served on active duty and was discharged under conditions which were other than dishonorable?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin/staff</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Executives, administrators, and staff are combined in this table in order to create groups in which the number of people represented in each cell is ≥ 20.

Table 18. How would you characterize your political views?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Far left/liberal</th>
<th>Middle-of-the-road</th>
<th>Far right/conservative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19. Do you currently have a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities such as seeing, hearing, learning, interacting with others, or walking?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Temporary disability</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin/staff</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Executives, administrators, and staff are combined in this table in order to create groups in which the number of people represented in each cell is ≥ 20.

Table 20. What is the highest level of education completed by any of your parents (or those who raised you)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental education</th>
<th>Exec/admin/staff</th>
<th>Faculty/postdoc</th>
<th>Grad/prof student</th>
<th>Undergrad student</th>
<th>All respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not finish high school</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or G.E.D.</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended college but did not complete degree</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree (A.A., A.S., etc.)</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree (B.A., B.S., etc.)</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree (M.A., M.B.A., M.S., etc.)</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral or professional degree (Ph.D., J.D., M.D., etc.)</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions for All Respondents

Campus climate, experience, environment, belonging

The Community Survey asked respondents to rate their level of satisfaction with the overall climate, and to express their level of agreement with a range of statements about diversity, and both personal and community senses of belonging on their campus.

Section summary:
Among all respondents, 79 percent reported being generally or very satisfied with the overall climate on their campus; satisfaction varied across roles from a low of 71 percent (faculty/postdoc), to a high of 83 percent (undergraduate student). Dissatisfaction (very and generally dissatisfied) was highest among faculty/postdocs, at 12 percent.

With respect to satisfaction with the experience/environment regarding diversity on their campus, 69 percent of respondents expressed being generally or very satisfied. Faculty/postdoc (20 percent), exec/admin (18 percent), and grad/prof students (17 percent) reported the highest levels of dissatisfaction with the environment regarding diversity.

Overall, 70 percent reported being generally or very satisfied with the extent to which they personally experienced a sense of belonging or community at their campus, and 13 percent of respondents reported being generally or very dissatisfied with their own sense of belonging on campus.

Fifty-eight percent of respondents reported being generally or very satisfied with the degree to which they felt all community members experience a sense of belonging or community on their campus. Some role groups, including exec/admin (25 percent) and faculty/postdocs (25 percent), reported higher levels of dissatisfaction with community belonging, comparatively.

It is important to note that while the levels of satisfaction may appear rather high overall, or among members or some specific role groups, substantial numbers of respondents expressed varying levels of dissatisfaction with these overarching measures. Specifically, it is critical for readers to further explore these results in the Community Survey dashboards where differences in satisfaction can be presented in high relief by demographic groups other than respondent role, including by race/ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation (dis)ability, and veteran status.
Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following at your Penn State campus.

**Table 21. Overall campus climate.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Generally dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>Generally satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 79 percent reported being generally or very satisfied, combined with the overall climate on their campus. Across roles, satisfaction varied from 71 percent (faculty/postdoc) to 83 percent (undergraduate student). Dissatisfaction (very and generally dissatisfied, combined) ranged from 6 percent (undergraduate) to 12 percent (faculty/postdoc). Between 11 percent and 16 percent of each group reported being neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

**Table 22. The campus experience/environment regarding diversity at your campus.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Generally dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>Generally satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 69 percent reported being generally or very satisfied with the experience/environment regarding diversity on their campus. Across roles, satisfaction varied from a low of 58 percent (faculty/postdoc) to a high of 74 percent (undergraduate student). Between 10 percent and 20 percent of respondents reported being very or generally dissatisfied with faculty/postdoc (20 percent), exec/admin (18 percent), and grad/prof students (17 percent) reporting the highest levels of dissatisfaction. On average, 19 percent across groups were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.
Table 23. The extent to which you experience a sense of belonging or community at your campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Generally dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>Generally satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 70 percent reported being generally or very satisfied with the extent to which they experienced a sense of belonging or community at their campus. Across role groups, satisfaction varied from 64 percent (grad/prof student) to 77 percent (executives/administrators). Of all respondents, 13 percent were very or generally dissatisfied, and 18 percent of all respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

Table 24. The extent to which you feel all community members experience a sense of belonging or community at your campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Generally dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>Generally satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 58 percent reported being generally or very satisfied with the extent to which they felt all community members experience a sense of belonging or community on their campus. Across role groups, satisfaction varied from 48 percent (executives/administrators) to 64 percent (undergraduate student). Of all respondents, 16 percent reported being very or generally dissatisfied; however, across roles, up to one quarter of some groups such as exec/admin (25 percent) and faculty/postdoc (25 percent) expressed dissatisfaction. Across each role group, between 23 percent and 30 percent of respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.
Rating institutional priorities

Respondents to the Community Survey were asked to rate their agreement with statements about institutional priorities related to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Section summary:

Just over half (53 percent) of all respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their campus environment is free from tension related to individual or group differences. Likewise, substantial numbers disagreed or strongly disagreed, including 44 percent of exec/admin and 39 percent of faculty.

Slightly greater numbers (56 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that the recruitment of marginalized students, faculty, and staff is an institutional priority. Faculty/postdocs (21 percent), grad/prof students (18 percent), and exec/admin (17 percent) were among those who disagreed or strongly disagreed at the highest rates.

Roughly half of respondents (52 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that the retention of marginalized students, faculty, and staff is an institutional priority. Agreement varied from 48 percent (undergraduate student) to 67 percent exec/admin, and groups that disagreed or strongly disagreed the most included faculty/postdoc (21 percent), grad/prof students (18 percent), and exec/admin (17 percent).

Finally, respondents were asked if they agreed that Penn State senior leadership demonstrates a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion on campus. While 65 percent agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, others disagreed or strongly disagreed, including 18 percent of faculty/postdocs.

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements about your Penn State campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Just over half (53 percent) of all respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their campus environment is free from tension related to individual or group differences. Across roles, that agreement ranged from as low as 32 percent (exec/admin) to as high as 63 percent (undergraduate students). The highest levels of disagreement (disagree and strongly disagree combined) were seen among exec/admin (44 percent) and faculty (39 percent). Overall, 20 percent of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed.

**Table 26. Recruitment of historically marginalized students, faculty, and staff is an institutional priority.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 56 percent agreed or strongly agreed that the recruitment of marginalized students, faculty, and staff is an institutional priority. Across roles, agreement varied from 48 percent (undergraduate student) to 67 percent exec/admin. Groups that disagreed most (strongly disagree and disagree, combined) included faculty/postdoc (21 percent), grad/prof students (18 percent), and exec/admin (17 percent). With the exception of exec/admin (16 percent), between 25 percent and 34 percent of respondents in each group expressed neither agreement nor disagreement.

**Table 27. Retention of historically marginalized students, faculty, and staff is an institutional priority.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 52 percent agreed or strongly agreed that the retention of marginalized students, faculty, and staff is an institutional priority. Across roles, there was substantial variation in agreement, from as low as 45 percent (grad/prof student) to as high as 61 percent. Groups that disagreed most (strongly disagree and disagree, combined) included faculty/postdoc (24 percent) and exec/admin (22 percent). With the exception of exec/admin (17 percent), between 28 percent and 37...
percent of respondents in each group expressed neither agreement nor disagreement about the prioritization of retention.

Table 28. Senior leadership demonstrates a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion on this campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 65 percent agreed or strongly agreed that senior leadership demonstrates a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion on campus. Across roles, agreement varied substantially from a low of 57 percent (grad/prof student) to a high of 73 percent (exec/admin). Disagreement (strongly disagree and disagree, combined) was highest among faculty/postdoc (18 percent). With the exception of exec/admin (16 percent), between 23 percent and 29 percent of respondents in each group expressed neither agreement nor disagreement.

Interactions with others on campus and in the community

The Community Survey asked respondents about how often they had interacted with people different from themselves on their campus over the last year. It then asked respondents to rate their comfort interacting with people from those groups.
Section summary:

Two-thirds (68 percent) of all respondents reported daily interactions (88 percent reported weekly interactions) with people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds different from their own in the last year, and 95 percent expressed being somewhat or very comfortable interacting with people who have a racial and/or ethnic identity different from their own.

Most respondents reported interacting with people across gender differences in the last year (93 percent at least weekly); 95 percent said they were somewhat or very comfortable doing so. Sixty-four percent had at least weekly interactions with people of a different sexual orientation different from their own, and 90 percent reported being somewhat or very comfortable interacting with people who have a sexual orientation different from their own.

About eight in ten (82 percent) respondents had at least monthly interactions with individuals from a country other than their own; 94 percent said they were comfortable or very comfortable doing so. Similarly, 77 percent had at least monthly interactions with people for whom English is not their native language and 90 percent reported being somewhat or very comfortable interacting with people for whom English is not their native language. In contrast, over three quarters of respondents (78 percent) were unaware whether they had interacted with undocumented immigrants in the last year, though 71 percent said they were somewhat or very comfortable interacting with people who are undocumented immigrants.

Just over half (53 percent) had at least monthly interactions with individuals with a disability and 91 percent said they were somewhat or very comfortable interacting with people with a disability. Another 15 percent said they were not aware they had experienced such interactions. Though 57 percent reported daily interactions across socioeconomic differences (77 percent at least weekly), 93 percent expressed being somewhat or very comfortable doing so. Interactions across religious backgrounds were a daily occurrence for 60 percent of respondents (83 percent at least monthly), and 93 percent said they were somewhat or very comfortable interacting with people from a religious background different from their own.

A majority (56 percent) reported daily interactions with people holding different political affiliations, philosophies, or views (83 percent at least monthly), and 93 percent expressed being somewhat or very comfortable doing so. While 59 percent said they had interacted daily with someone significantly older or younger than themselves in the last year (80 percent at least weekly), almost all (93 percent) said they were comfortable interacting across age differences.

While just over half (53 percent) of respondents reported interacting with military veterans on at least a monthly basis, 20 percent said they were unaware of having such interactions. Most (91 percent), however, suggested they were somewhat or very comfortable interacting with people who are veterans of U.S. military service.
In the last year, about how often have you interacted with the following people while at your Penn State campus?

Table 29. Interacted with people who have a racial and/or ethnic identity other than your own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Not that I’m aware of</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A few times</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 68 percent reported interacting with people of different racial or ethnic backgrounds different from their own daily in the last year; 88 percent had such interactions at least weekly. Across all roles, between 85 percent (staff) and 93 percent (exec/admin) respondents reported interacting across different race or ethnicity at least weekly.

Table 30. Interacted with people from a socioeconomic background other than your own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Not that I’m aware of</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A few times</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 57 percent reported interacting with people of different socioeconomic backgrounds different from their own daily in the last year; 77 percent had similar interactions at least weekly. Faculty/postdoc (67 percent), undergraduate students (66 percent), and grad/prof students (59 percent) experienced the fewest interactions, at least weekly.
Among all respondents, 41 percent reported daily interactions with people with a sexual orientation different from their own in the last year; 64 percent had similar interactions at least weekly. Grad/prof students (59 percent), staff (62 percent), and undergraduate students (66 percent) experienced the fewest interactions, at least weekly. While 16 percent, overall, reported being unaware of interactions across sexual orientation, 6 percent of exec/admins and 22 percent of grad/prof students reported being unaware of interactions across sexual orientation.

Most respondents (84 percent daily; 93 percent at least weekly) reported interacting with people across gender in the last year. Exec/admins reported a high for at least weekly interactions (99 percent); grad/prof students reported the lowest level of interactions at 91 percent.
Table 33. Interacted with people for whom English is not their native language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Not that I'm aware of</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A few times</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just over three quarters (77 percent) of all respondents reported interacting with someone for whom English is not their native language at least monthly over the last year. Grad/prof students reported the highest level of such interactions at least monthly (90 percent); staff reported the lowest level at 73 percent.

Table 34. Interacted with people from a religious background other than your own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Not that I’m aware of</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A few times</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 83 percent reported interacting with people of a religious background different from their own at least monthly. At 80 percent, grad/prof students reported the lowest levels of at least monthly interactions. On average, 10 percent of respondents were unaware of having any interactions across religious backgrounds.
Table 35. Interacted with people with a disability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Not that I’m aware of</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A few times</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just over half (53 percent) of all respondents reported interacting with people with a disability at least monthly over the last year. By including “a few times” a year, that percentage increased to 77 percent. Across roles, at least monthly interactions varied from as high as 69 percent (exec/admin), to as low as 39 percent (grad/prof student). Rates of respondents not being aware of interactions with people with a disability was 15 percent, on average, and ranged across roles from as low as 8 percent (exec/admin) to as high as 28 percent (grad/prof student).

Table 36. Interacted with people who are undocumented immigrants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Not that I’m aware of</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A few times</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 78 percent were unaware of whether they had interacted with people who are undocumented immigrants. Across roles, exec/admin respondents reported the highest rate of interactions with people who are undocumented immigrants at any frequency, at 17 percent.
Table 37. Interacted with people from a country other than your own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Not that I'm aware of</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A few times</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 82 percent reported interacting with people from a different country at least monthly; 93 percent a few times a year. Across roles, at least monthly interactions ranged from as high as 93 percent (faculty/postdoc) and as low as 79 percent (staff). Across all roles, 6 percent or fewer were unaware of interactions with people from a country other than their own.

Table 38. Interacted with people who hold a political affiliation, philosophy, or view that differs from yours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Not that I'm aware of</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A few times</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 80 percent reported interacting with people with political affiliations, philosophies, or views different from their own at least monthly in the last year. Across roles, rates of these interactions ranged as high as 90 percent (exec/admin), and as low as 70 percent (grad/prof student). In contrast, a high of 17 percent of grad/prof students reported being unaware of such interactions, while 6 percent of exec/admin respondents were unaware of such interactions.
**Table 39. Interacted with people who are significantly older or younger than you.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Not that I’m aware of</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A few times</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 59 percent reported interacting with someone significantly older or younger daily, while 80 percent reported them at least weekly. Rates of at least weekly interactions varied substantially across roles, ranging as low as 70 percent (undergraduate student), and as high as 95 percent (exec/admin).

**Table 40. Interacted with people who are veterans of U.S. military service.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Not that I’m aware of</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A few times</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just over half (53 percent) of all respondents reported interacting with U.S. military veterans at least monthly over the last year. Across roles, at least monthly interaction rates ranged as high as 77 percent (exec/admin), and as low as 44 percent (grad/prof student), or 46 percent (undergraduate student). Twenty percent of all respondents were unaware of interactions with U.S. military veterans.
How comfortable are you interacting with the following people?

Table 41. People who have a racial and/or ethnic identity other than your own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Very uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat uncomfortable</th>
<th>Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat comfortable</th>
<th>Very comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A large majority of all respondents (95 percent) reported being either somewhat or very comfortable interacting with people of a racial or ethnic identity different from their own. While respondents across all roles expressed high levels of comfort, exec/admin expressed the highest overall (99 percent).

Table 42. People from a socioeconomic background other than your own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Very uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat uncomfortable</th>
<th>Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat comfortable</th>
<th>Very comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 93 percent reported being somewhat or very comfortable interacting across differences in socioeconomic background. While respondents across all roles expressed high levels of comfort, exec/admin expressed the highest overall (98 percent).
Table 43. People who have a sexual orientation other than your own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Very uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat uncomfortable</th>
<th>Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat comfortable</th>
<th>Very comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 90 percent expressed being somewhat or very comfortable interacting with people with a sexual orientation different from their own. Across roles, comfort level varied substantially, from 97 percent (exec/admin), to 88 percent (undergraduate student). Groups such as undergraduate students (4 percent) and staff (3 percent) included respondents who expressed being very or somewhat uncomfortable interacting with people who have a sexual orientation different from their own.

Table 44. People whose gender differs from yours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Very uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat uncomfortable</th>
<th>Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat comfortable</th>
<th>Very comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 95 percent were somewhat or very comfortable interacting with people of a gender different from their own. Across roles, comfort ranged from 93 percent (undergraduate students) to 99 percent (exec/admin). A small percentage of undergraduate students (2 percent) also indicated that they were very or somewhat uncomfortable interacting with people of a different gender than their own.
Table 45. People for whom English is not their native language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Very uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat uncomfortable</th>
<th>Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat comfortable</th>
<th>Very comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 90 percent reported being somewhat or very comfortable interacting with people for whom English is not their native language. Exec/admin showed the highest comfort (96 percent), while staff (89 percent) and undergraduate students (88 percent) expressed the lowest levels of comfort. Four percent of staff and undergraduate students reported being very or somewhat uncomfortable interacting with people for whom English is not their native language.

Table 46. People from a religious background other than your own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Very uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat uncomfortable</th>
<th>Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat comfortable</th>
<th>Very comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 93 percent of respondents reported being somewhat or very comfortable interacting with people from a religious background different from their own. A small percentage of undergraduate students (2 percent) expressed being very or somewhat uncomfortable with interactions across differences in religious background.
Table 47. People with a disability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Very uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat uncomfortable</th>
<th>Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat comfortable</th>
<th>Very comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 91 percent reported being somewhat or very comfortable interacting with people with a disability. Across roles, undergraduate students expressed the lowest comfort (89 percent) while exec/admin expressed the highest (97 percent). Further, 3 percent of undergraduate students reported being very or somewhat uncomfortable interacting with people with a disability.

Table 48. People who are undocumented immigrants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Very uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat uncomfortable</th>
<th>Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat comfortable</th>
<th>Very comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 71 percent reported being somewhat or very comfortable interacting with undocumented immigrants. Across roles, comfort ranged from 65 percent (staff) to 80 percent (exec/admin). Overall, 22 percent of respondents were neither comfortable nor uncomfortable, and 7 percent of all respondents reported being very or somewhat uncomfortable. Discomfort ranged from 2 percent (exec/admin) to 9 percent (undergraduate students).
Table 49. People from a country other than your own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Very uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat uncomfortable</th>
<th>Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat comfortable</th>
<th>Very comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 94 percent reported being somewhat or very comfortable interacting with people from a country other than their own. Across roles, comfort ranged from 92 percent (undergraduate students) to 97 percent (exec/admin). Two percent, overall, indicated they were somewhat or very uncomfortable interacting with people from a country different than their own.

Table 50. People who hold a political affiliation, philosophy, or view that differs from yours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Very uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat uncomfortable</th>
<th>Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat comfortable</th>
<th>Very comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 82 percent reported being somewhat or very comfortable interacting with people holding political affiliations, philosophies, or views different from their own. On average, 10 percent across roles were neither comfortable nor uncomfortable, and 7 percent, overall, expressed being very or somewhat uncomfortable interacting with people holding political affiliations, philosophies, or views different from their own.
Table 51. People who are significantly older or younger than you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Very uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat uncomfortable</th>
<th>Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat comfortable</th>
<th>Very comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 93 percent reported being somewhat or very comfortable interacting across significant age differences. Across roles, this comfort varied from 91 percent (undergraduate students), to 99 percent (exec/admin).

Table 52. People who are veterans of U.S. military service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Very uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat uncomfortable</th>
<th>Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat comfortable</th>
<th>Very comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 91 percent reported being somewhat or very comfortable interacting with people who are veterans of military service. Across roles, comfort ranged from 91 percent (undergraduate students) to 98 percent (exec/admin).

Attitudes about diversity, equity, and inclusion

The Community Survey asked respondents a range of questions regarding their attitudes related to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). It also asked respondents whether participation in a list of specific activities that focused on a range of issues had impacted their support for DEI. The section also prompted respondents to indicate whether they believe Penn State leadership would take action based on survey results.
Section summary:

A majority of respondents (88 percent), overall, agreed or strongly agreed that diversity on campus improves experiences and interactions in the classroom, workplace, and the overall community. A smaller proportion (69 percent) reported feeling somewhat or very comfortable sharing their views on diversity, equity, and inclusion at Penn State.

Over 60 percent of respondents, overall, reported that performing community service, and participating in discussions, training, or activities on racial/ethnic issues had increased their support of DEI. Between 50 percent and 56 percent suggested that participating in discussions, training, or activities on gender/gender identity, sexual orientation issues, or disability issues, as well as attending presentations, performances, or exhibits related to diversity had increased their support of DEI. Between 40 percent and 48 percent of all respondents felt that participating in discussion, training, or activities on socioeconomic status issues, political issues, religious diversity issues, or immigration issues had positively impacted their support of DEI. Finally, 36 percent of respondents indicated that participating in discussions, training, or activities focused on military veterans’ issues had increased their support of DEI.

Responses also revealed that many individuals had not participated in the types of discussions, trainings, or activities highlighted by the question. One-third of respondents had not engaged in such activities around racial/ethnic issues, nor performed community service. Roughly 40 percent had not engaged in activities focused on gender/gender identity or sexual orientation, nor attended presentations, performances, or exhibits related to diversity. Close to half of all respondents had not participated in activities centered on disability, socioeconomic status, political, or religious diversity issues. A majority (56 percent) had not engaged in activities related to immigration, and 61 percent reported they had not participated in activities related to veterans’ issues.

Respondents were asked to rate their agreement with several statements about diversity. Seventy-six percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed they feel welcomed in the community surrounding their campus, 82 percent agreed they feel safe in the community surrounding their campus, 63 percent agreed the community around their campus welcomes people of different backgrounds, and 84 percent agreed they value campus events exploring different perspectives.

Ninety percent agreed they enjoy working with people different from themselves, and 64 percent agreed they know where to find help to facilitate difficult or crucial conversations. Seventy-six percent agreed they are aware they hold implicit or unconscious biases and 68 percent agreed they can identify microaggressions. Finally, 64 percent of all respondents agreed that their unit, college, or campus supports people with disabilities.

The survey also asked respondents if they thought that Penn State senior leaders would take action based on the survey. Overall, 47 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. Across roles, that agreement ranged from 41 percent (faculty/postdoc) to 64 percent (exec/admin). Disagreement likewise varied across roles, from 15 percent (exec/admin) to 26 percent (faculty/postdoc).
Table 53. To what extent do you agree that diversity on campus improves experiences and interactions within the classroom, the workplace, and the overall community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 88 percent agreed or strongly agreed that diversity on campus improves experiences and interactions within the classroom, workplace, and overall community. Across roles, agreement ranged from 87 percent (undergraduate student) to 95 percent (exec/admin).

Table 54. Overall, how comfortable would you be sharing your views on diversity, equity, and inclusion at your Penn State campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Very uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat uncomfortable</th>
<th>Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat comfortable</th>
<th>Very comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 69 percent reported feeling somewhat or very comfortable sharing their views on diversity, equity, and inclusion at Penn State. Across roles, agreement ranged from 63 percent (staff) to 84 percent (exec/admin).
How have the following activities influenced your support of diversity, equity, and inclusion?

Table 55. Influenced support for DEI: Performed community service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Have not engaged in this activity</th>
<th>Greatly decreased my support</th>
<th>Somewhat decreased my support</th>
<th>Somewhat increased my support</th>
<th>Greatly increased my support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 64 percent reported that performing community service had increased their support for diversity, equity, and inclusion. Another 33 percent reported they had not engaged in community service. Less than 2 percent of all respondents felt community service had decreased their support for DEI.

Table 56. Influenced support for DEI: Participated in discussions or activities concerning political issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Have not engaged in this activity</th>
<th>Greatly decreased my support</th>
<th>Somewhat decreased my support</th>
<th>Somewhat increased my support</th>
<th>Greatly increased my support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 44 percent reported that participating in discussions or activities concerning political issues had increased their support for diversity, equity, and inclusion. Another 49 percent reported they had not engaged in similar activities. Overall, 7 percent felt such activities had decreased their support for DEI.
Table 57. Influenced support for DEI: Attended presentations, performances, or art exhibits related to diversity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Have not engaged in this activity</th>
<th>Greatly decreased my support</th>
<th>Somewhat decreased my support</th>
<th>Somewhat increased my support</th>
<th>Greatly increased my support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 56 percent reported that attending presentations, performances, or art exhibits related to diversity had increased their support for diversity, equity, and inclusion. Another 40 percent reported they had not engaged in such activities. Overall, 4 percent felt such activities had decreased their support for DEI.

Table 58. Influenced support for DEI: Participated in discussions, training, or activities on racial/ethnic issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Have not engaged in this activity</th>
<th>Greatly decreased my support</th>
<th>Somewhat decreased my support</th>
<th>Somewhat increased my support</th>
<th>Greatly increased my support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 62 percent reported that participating in discussions, training, or activities on racial/ethnic issues had increased their support for diversity, equity, and inclusion. Another 34 percent reported they had not engaged in similar activities. Overall, 4 percent felt such activities had decreased their support for DEI.
Table 59. Influenced support for DEI: Participated in discussions, training, or activities on gender issues and/or gender identity issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Have not engaged in this activity</th>
<th>Greatly decreased my support</th>
<th>Somewhat decreased my support</th>
<th>Somewhat increased my support</th>
<th>Greatly increased my support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 56 percent reported that participating in discussions, training, or activities on gender issues had increased their support for diversity, equity, and inclusion. Another 39 percent reported they had not engaged in similar activities. Overall, 6 percent felt such activities had decreased their support for DEI.

Table 60. Influenced support for DEI: Participated in discussions, training, or activities on sexual orientation issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Have not engaged in this activity</th>
<th>Greatly decreased my support</th>
<th>Somewhat decreased my support</th>
<th>Somewhat increased my support</th>
<th>Greatly increased my support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 52 percent reported that participating in discussions, training, or activities on sexual orientation issues had increased their support for diversity, equity, and inclusion. Another 42 percent reported they had not engaged in similar activities. Overall, 6 percent felt such activities had decreased their support for DEI.
Table 61. Influenced support for DEI: Participated in discussions, training, or activities on socioeconomic status issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Have not engaged in this activity</th>
<th>Greatly decreased my support</th>
<th>Somewhat decreased my support</th>
<th>Somewhat increased my support</th>
<th>Greatly increased my support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 48 percent reported that participating in discussions, training, or activities on socioeconomic status issues had increased their support for diversity, equity, and inclusion. Another 49 percent reported they had not engaged in similar activities. Overall, 3 percent felt such activities had decreased their support for DEI.

Table 62. Influenced support for DEI: Participated in discussions, training, or activities on religious diversity issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Have not engaged in this activity</th>
<th>Greatly decreased my support</th>
<th>Somewhat decreased my support</th>
<th>Somewhat increased my support</th>
<th>Greatly increased my support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 44 percent reported that participating in discussions, training, or activities on religious diversity issues had increased their support for diversity, equity, and inclusion. Another 53 percent reported they had not engaged in similar activities. Overall, 4 percent felt such activities had decreased their support for DEI.
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Table 63. Influenced support for DEI: Participated in discussions, training, or activities on disability issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Have not engaged in this activity</th>
<th>Greatly decreased my support</th>
<th>Somewhat decreased my support</th>
<th>Somewhat increased my support</th>
<th>Greatly increased my support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 50 percent reported that participating in discussions, training, or activities on disability issues had increased their support for diversity, equity, and inclusion. Another 48 percent reported they had not engaged in those activities. Overall, 3 percent felt such activities had decreased their support for DEI.

Table 64. Influenced support for DEI: Participated in discussions, training, or activities on immigration issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Have not engaged in this activity</th>
<th>Greatly decreased my support</th>
<th>Somewhat decreased my support</th>
<th>Somewhat increased my support</th>
<th>Greatly increased my support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 40 percent reported that participating in discussions, training, or activities on immigration issues had increased their support for diversity, equity, and inclusion. Another 56 percent reported they had not engaged in similar activities. Overall, 4 percent felt such activities had decreased their support for DEI.
Table 65. Influenced support for DEI: Participated in discussions, training, or activities on veterans’ issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Have not engaged in this activity</th>
<th>Greatly decreased my support</th>
<th>Somewhat decreased my support</th>
<th>Somewhat increased my support</th>
<th>Greatly increased my support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 36 percent reported that participating in discussions, training, or activities on veterans’ issues had increased their support for diversity, equity, and inclusion. Another 61 percent reported they had not engaged in similar activities. Overall, 2 percent felt such activities had decreased their support for DEI.

Indicate your level of agreement with statements about diversity.

Table 66. I value events on my campus where I can explore different perspectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 84 percent agreed or strongly agreed they value events on campus where they can explore different perspectives. Across roles, agreement ranged from 83 percent (undergraduate student) to 91 percent (exec/admin). Disagreement (strongly disagree and disagree, combined) by any role group did not exceed 3 percent (undergraduate student).
Table 67. I enjoy working with people who are different from me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 90 percent agreed or strongly agreed that they enjoy working with people different from themselves. Across roles, agreement ranged from 87 percent (undergraduate student) to 97 percent (exec/admin). Disagreement (strongly disagree and disagree, combined) did not exceed 1 percent (undergraduate student).

Table 68. My unit or college/campus has a supportive environment for people with disabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 72 percent agreed or strongly agreed that their campus has a supportive environment for people with disabilities. Across roles, agreement ranged from 63 percent (grad/prof student) to 75 percent (undergraduate student). Disagreement (strongly disagree and disagree, combined) also varied, from 5 percent (undergraduate student) to 9 percent (grad/prof student).
Table 69. I can identify microaggressions when they happen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 68 percent agreed or strongly agreed that they can identify microaggressions when they happen. Across roles, agreement ranged from 66 percent (undergraduate student) to 74 percent (exec/admin). Disagreement (strongly disagree and disagree, combined) was 6 percent, overall; 27 percent of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed.

Table 70. I am aware that I hold biases implicitly or unconsciously.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 76 percent agreed or strongly agreed they are aware they hold biases implicitly or unconsciously. Across roles, agreement ranged from 70 percent (staff) to 87 percent (exec/admin). Disagreement (strongly disagree and disagree, combined) was 8 percent, overall; 16 percent of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed.
Table 71. I know where to go to get help with facilitating difficult or crucial conversations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 64 percent agreed or strongly agreed that they know where to go to get help with facilitating difficult or crucial conversations. Across roles, agreement ranged from 57 percent (grad/prof student) to 80 percent (exec/admin). Disagreement (strongly disagree and disagree, combined) was 14 percent, overall; 19 percent of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed.

Table 72. The local community around my campus welcomes people of diverse backgrounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 63 percent agreed or strongly agreed the local community around their campus welcomes people of diverse backgrounds. Across roles, agreement ranged substantially from 41 percent (exec/admin) to 69 percent (undergraduate student). Disagreement (strongly disagree and disagree, combined) was 14 percent, overall, but also ranged from 9 percent (undergraduate student) to 31 percent (exec/admin). Twenty-three percent of all respondents neither agreed nor disagreed.
Table 73. I feel safe in the community surrounding campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 82 percent agreed or strongly agreed they feel safe in the community surrounding their campus. Across roles, agreement ranged from 77 percent (grad/prof student) to 88 percent (exec/admin). Disagreement (strongly disagree and disagree, combined) was low overall, at 5 percent of all respondents. Thirteen percent of all respondents neither agreed nor disagreed.

Table 74. I feel welcome in the community surrounding campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 76 percent agreed or strongly agreed they feel welcome in the community surrounding their campus. Across roles, agreement ranged from 76 percent (undergraduate student) to 81 percent (staff). Seven percent disagreed or strongly disagreed, and on average, 17 percent neither agreed nor disagreed.
Table 75. Senior leaders will take action based on the results of this survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 47 percent agreed or strongly agreed senior leaders will take action based on the results of this survey. Across roles, agreement ranged from 41 percent (faculty/postdoc) to a high of 64 percent (exec/admin). Disagreement also varied, from 15 percent (exec/admin) to 26 percent (faculty/postdoc). Substantial numbers of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed as well, including 33 percent (all respondents), to a low of 21 percent (exec/admin), 34 percent (faculty/postdoc), and a high of 37 percent (staff).
Experiences with Discrimination and Harassment

The Community Survey asked respondents about their experiences with discrimination and harassment, including insensitive remarks they had heard referring to them or others. Almost every type of remark queried on the survey was reported as having been heard or experienced by majorities of respondents, even if only rarely or sometimes; some types were heard much more frequently.

Section summary:

The most cited types of insensitive remarks heard were those focused on political affiliation/view; 75 percent of all respondents had heard them, including 26 percent who heard them often or very often.

Insensitive remarks targeting racial or ethnic identities, people for whom English was not a native language, age or generation, people from other countries, gender or gender identity, and sexual orientation were heard by between 61 percent and 65 percent of all survey respondents, with between 10 percent and 12 percent of respondents hearing such remarks often or very often.

Remarks focused on religious background, immigrants, and socioeconomic background were heard by between 55 percent and 57 percent of respondents, including between 7 percent and 9 percent who heard them often or very often.

Forty-five percent of respondents heard disparaging remarks about disability status including 4 percent who heard such remarks often or very often. Disparaging remarks about veterans were cited the least by 28 percent of respondents with 2 percent hearing them often or very often.

Upon hearing derogatory or disparaging remarks, just under half (47 percent) of all respondents reported having intervened. Across roles, the percentage of respondents who had intervened ranged from 40 percent (grad/prof students, undergraduate students) to 77 percent (exec/admin).

While insensitive and disparaging remarks can come from any number of sources, 78 percent of all respondents reported hearing students as the source. At 66 percent, the local community was the next most frequent source of remarks. Both faculty and staff were heard making disparaging comments by 49 percent of respondents, and admin/execs were heard making disparaging remarks by 33 percent of respondents. As compared to other role groups, admin/execs tended to report hearing disparaging remarks at the highest rates from any sources, apart from students and faculty/postdocs when reporting about hearing students making disparaging remarks.

Respondents were also asked whether they had experienced discrimination or harassment, and where such experiences occurred. Across roles, between 25 percent and 32 percent had such experiences off campus at locations not affiliated with Penn State. Between 12 percent (undergraduate students) and 19 percent (faculty/postdoc) experienced discrimination or harassment on their campus, at off-campus residences, or at off-campus programs/events affiliated with Penn State. Experiences of discrimination and harassment also varied by campus location, with between 23 percent and 41 percent of respondents reporting them.
During your time at Penn State, about how often have you heard someone make an insensitive or disparaging remark about the following?

**Table 76. Remarks about people who have a particular racial and/or ethnic identity.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 65 percent reported having heard insensitive remarks about people who have a particular racial and/or ethnic identity, 53 percent heard such remarks rarely or sometimes, and 12 percent heard them often or very often. Across roles, the proportion of respondents to have heard such remarks at all ranged from 55 percent (grad/prof student) to 66 percent (exec/admin). Undergraduate students reported hearing remarks the most frequently at 14 percent (often and very often, combined).

**Table 77. Remarks about people of a particular sexual orientation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 61 percent reported having heard insensitive remarks about people of a particular sexual orientation, 51 percent heard such remarks rarely or sometimes, and 10 percent heard them often or very often. Across roles, the proportion of respondents to have heard such remarks at all ranged from 48 percent (grad/prof student) to 64 percent (exec/admin). Undergraduate students reported hearing remarks the most frequently at 13 percent (often and very often, combined).
Table 78. Remarks about people of a particular gender or gender identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 62 percent reported having heard insensitive remarks about people of a particular gender or gender identity, 52 percent heard such remarks rarely or sometimes, and 10 percent heard them often or very often. Across roles, the proportion of respondents to have heard such remarks at all ranged from 53 percent (grad/prof student) to 70 percent (exec/admin). Undergraduate students reported hearing remarks the most frequently at 13 percent (often and very often, combined).

Table 79. Remarks about people from a particular socioeconomic background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 55 percent reported having heard insensitive remarks about people from a particular socioeconomic background, 48 percent heard such remarks rarely or sometimes, and 7 percent heard them often or very often. Across roles, the proportion of respondents to have heard such remarks at all ranged from 50 percent (grad/prof student) to 62 percent (exec/admin). Grad/prof students reported hearing remarks the most frequently at 8 percent (often and very often, combined).
Table 80. Remarks about people from a particular religious background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 57 percent reported having heard insensitive remarks about people from a particular religious background, 50 percent heard such remarks rarely or sometimes, and 7 percent heard them often or very often. Across roles, the proportion of respondents to have heard such remarks at all ranged from 53 percent (grad/prof student) to 62 percent (exec/admin). Undergraduate students reported hearing remarks the most frequently at 9 percent (often and very often, combined).

Table 81. Remarks about people with a particular disability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 45 percent reported having heard insensitive remarks about people with a particular disability; 41 percent heard such remarks rarely or sometimes, and 4 percent heard them often or very often. Across roles, the proportion of respondents to have heard such remarks at all ranged from 38 percent (grad/prof student) to 47 percent (undergraduate student). Undergraduate students reported hearing remarks the most frequently at 5 percent (often and very often, combined).

Table 82. Remarks about people who are immigrants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://opair.psu.edu/community-survey
Among all respondents, 57 percent reported having heard insensitive remarks about people who are immigrants, 48 percent heard such remarks rarely or sometimes, and 9 percent heard them often or very often. Across roles, the proportion of respondents to have heard such remarks at all ranged from 50 percent (grad/prof student) to 58 percent (staff). Undergraduate students reported hearing remarks the most frequently at 9 percent (often and very often, combined).

Table 83. Remarks about people with a particular political affiliation/view.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 75 percent reported having heard insensitive remarks about people with a particular political affiliation/view, 49 percent heard such remarks rarely or sometimes, and 26 percent heard them often or very often. Across roles, the proportion of respondents to have heard such remarks at all ranged from 73 percent (undergraduate student) to 89 percent (exec/admin). Exec/admins reported hearing remarks the most frequently at 35 percent (often and very often, combined).

Table 84. Remarks about people of a particular age or generation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 63 percent reported having heard insensitive remarks about people of a particular age or generation, 51 percent heard such remarks rarely or sometimes, and 12 percent heard them often or very often. Across roles, the proportion of respondents to have heard such remarks at all ranged from 56 percent (grad/prof student) to 76 percent (exec/admin). Hearing such remarks often or very often was consistent at 11 percent to 13 percent across groups.
Table 85. Remarks about people for whom English is not their native language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 64 percent reported having heard insensitive remarks about people for whom English is not their native language, 52 percent heard such remarks rarely or sometimes, and 12 percent heard them often or very often. Across roles, the proportion of respondents to have heard such remarks at all ranged from 57 percent (grad/prof student) to 72 percent (exec/admin).

Table 86. Remarks about people who are veterans of U.S. military service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 28 percent reported having heard insensitive remarks about people who are veterans of military service, 26 percent heard such remarks rarely or sometimes, and 2 percent heard them often or very often. Across roles, the proportion of respondents to have heard such remarks at all ranged from 25 percent (grad/prof student) to 30 percent (undergraduate student).

Table 87. Remarks about people from a country other than their own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 63 percent reported having heard insensitive remarks about people from a country other than their own, 52 percent heard such remarks rarely or sometimes, and 11 percent heard them often or very often. Across roles, the proportion of respondents to have heard such remarks at all ranged from 41 percent (grad/prof student) to 65 percent (exec/admin).
remarks at all ranged from 58 percent (grad/prof student) to 68 percent (exec/admin). Undergraduate students reported hearing remarks the most frequently at 14 percent (often and very often, combined).

During your time at Penn State, have you ever intervened when you heard insensitive or disparaging remarks?

Table 88. Intervened when hearing insensitive or disparaging remarks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just under half (47 percent) of all respondents reported that they had intervened when hearing insensitive or disparaging remarks. Across roles, the percentage of respondents who had intervened ranged from 40 percent (grad/prof students, undergraduate students) to 77 percent (exec/admin).

If you heard someone make an insensitive or disparaging remark, about how often was the source of that remark a member of the following groups?

Table 89. Frequency with which students were the source of remarks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 78 percent reported having heard insensitive or disparaging remarks originating from students. Forty-six percent heard such remarks rarely or sometimes, and 32 percent heard them often or very often. Across roles, similar proportions of admin/exec, faculty/postdoc, and undergraduate student respondents (82 percent, 83 percent, 83 percent) reported hearing disparaging comments from students, while staff (68 percent) and grad/prof students (75 percent) heard comments from students less frequently.
Table 90. Frequency with which faculty were the source of remarks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 49 percent reported having heard insensitive or disparaging remarks originating from faculty. Forty-three percent heard such remarks rarely or sometimes, and 6 percent heard them often or very often. Across roles, the proportion to have heard such remarks from faculty varied substantially from a low of 38 percent (undergraduate students) to 82 percent (admin/exec).

Table 91. Frequency with which staff were the source of remarks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 49 percent reported having heard insensitive or disparaging remarks originating from staff. Forty-two percent heard such remarks rarely or sometimes, and 7 percent heard them often or very often. Across roles, the proportion to have heard such comments from staff varied substantially from 31 percent and 34 percent (undergraduate students and grad/prof students, respectively) to 77 percent (staff) and 86 percent (admin/exec).

Table 92. Frequency with which administrators were the source of remarks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among all respondents, 33 percent reported having heard insensitive or disparaging remarks originating from administrators. Thirty percent heard such remarks rarely or sometimes, and 3 percent heard them often or very often. Across roles, the proportion to have heard such comments from administrators varied substantially from 24 percent and 28 percent (undergraduate students and grad/prof students, respectively) to 57 percent (admin/exec).

Table 93. Frequency with which local community members were the source of remarks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 66 percent reported having heard insensitive or disparaging remarks originating from the local community. Fifty-one percent heard such remarks rarely or sometimes, and 15 percent heard them often or very often. Across roles, the proportion to have heard such comments from the local community varied from 58 percent (undergraduate students) to 86 percent (admin/exec).

Table 94. Have you ever been discriminated against or harassed off campus, at a location not affiliated with Penn State?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whether examining all respondents or any of the five role groups, between 25 percent and 32 percent of each group reported experiencing discrimination or harassment off campus or at a non-Penn State affiliated location. Across role groups, faculty/postdocs reported such experiences at the highest rate (32 percent).
Table 95. Have you ever been discriminated against or harassed on your Penn State campus, at an off-campus residence, or at an off-campus program/event affiliated with Penn State?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all respondents, 15 percent reported experiencing discrimination or harassment on their campus, at an off-campus residence, or at an off-campus program/event affiliated with Penn State. Across roles, faculty/postdoc (19 percent), exec/admin (18 percent), and staff (17 percent) reported such experiences at higher rates as compared to the overall rate.
Table 96. Off-campus discrimination/harassment by campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abington</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behrend</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuBois</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Valley</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Allegheny</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazleton</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hershey Med Ctr</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh Valley</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont Alto</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kensington</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuylkill</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenango</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes-Barre</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Campus</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rather than comparing by role, Table 96 presents respondents who reported incidents of discrimination or harassment on their campus, at an off-campus residence, or at an off-campus program/event affiliated with Penn State grouped by each respondent’s home campus. The incidence of incidents ranged from 23 percent to 41 percent.

Only Respondents Experiencing Discrimination or Harassment at Penn State

The Community Survey asked respondents who experienced discrimination or harassment on their campus, off-campus residence, or at an off-campus program/event affiliated with Penn State additional questions designed to identify the reason for that discrimination or harassment. Please note that this section focuses solely on those respondents who indicated they had experienced discrimination or harassment on their Penn State campus, at an off-campus residence, or at an off-campus program/event affiliated with Penn State (see Table 94). Specifically, 2,962 individuals provided an affirmative response to that question.
Section summary:

Between 52 percent and 59 percent of respondents, overall, cited gender or gender identity, physical appearance, political affiliation or views, or age or generation as the reason for their discrimination or harassment experience. Forty-three percent identified racial or ethnic identity as the reason. Religious background and socioeconomic status were cited by 31 percent and 36 percent, respectively. Some other, unlisted aspect of identity, as well as sexual orientation were cited by 22 percent and 21 percent, respectively, while country of origin and disability status were each identified as a reason by 17 percent. Immigration status was identified by 14 percent of respondents and 4 percent cited military veteran status as the reason behind an experience.

Overall, 63 percent of respondents indicated that their experiences of discrimination or harassment had occurred within the last year.

How often have you been discriminated against or harassed on your Penn State campus, at an off-campus residence, or at an off-campus program/event affiliated with Penn State for the following reasons?

Table 97. Discriminated against or harassed because of my racial and/or ethnic identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among respondents reporting discrimination or harassment on their Penn State campus, off-campus residence, or off-campus program or event affiliated with Penn State, 43 percent highlighted the reason being their racial and/or ethnic identity. Across roles, the proportion citing this reason varied from 32 percent (staff) to 55 percent (grad/prof student).
Table 98. Discriminated against or harassed because of my sexual orientation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among respondents reporting discrimination or harassment on their Penn State campus, off-campus residence, or off-campus program or event affiliated with Penn State, 21 percent highlighted the reason being their sexual orientation. Across roles, the proportion citing this reason varied from 14 percent (faculty/postdoc) to 27 percent (grad/prof student).

Table 99. Discriminated against or harassed because of gender or gender identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among respondents reporting discrimination or harassment on their Penn State campus, off-campus residence, or off-campus program or event affiliated with Penn State, 59 percent highlighted the reason being their gender or gender identity. Across roles, the proportion citing this reason varied from 53 percent (undergraduate student) to 68 percent (exec/admin).

Table 100. Discriminated against or harassed because of socioeconomic background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among respondents reporting discrimination or harassment on their Penn State campus, off-campus residence, or off-campus program or event affiliated with Penn State, 36 percent highlighted the reason being their socioeconomic background. Across roles, the proportion citing this reason varied from 29 percent (exec/admin) to 41 percent (grad/prof student).

Table 101. Discriminated against or harassed because of my religious background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among respondents reporting discrimination or harassment on their Penn State campus, off-campus residence, or off-campus program or event affiliated with Penn State, 31 percent highlighted the reason being their religious background. Across roles, the proportion citing this reason varied from 28 percent (grad/prof student) to 32 percent (undergraduate student).

Table 102. Discriminated against or harassed because of my disability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among respondents reporting discrimination or harassment on their Penn State campus, off-campus residence, or off-campus program or event affiliated with Penn State, 17 percent highlighted the reason being their disability. Across roles, the proportion citing this reason varied from 19 percent (exec/admin) to 32 percent (undergraduate student).
Table 103. Discriminated against or harassed because I am an immigrant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among respondents reporting discrimination or harassment on their Penn State campus, off-campus residence, or off-campus program or event affiliated with Penn State, 13 percent highlighted the reason being their immigration status. Across roles, the proportion citing this reason varied from 7 percent (staff) to 21 percent (faculty/postdoc). Note that this question was presented to all respondents.

Table 104. Discriminated against or harassed because of my political affiliation/views.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among respondents reporting discrimination or harassment on their Penn State campus, off-campus residence, or off-campus program or event affiliated with Penn State, 54 percent highlighted the reason being their political affiliation or views. Across roles, the proportion citing this reason varied from 49 percent (faculty/postdoc) to 58 percent (exec/admin).

Table 105. Discriminated against or harassed because of my age or generation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among respondents reporting discrimination or harassment on their Penn State campus, off-campus residence, or off-campus program or event affiliated with Penn State, 52 percent highlighted the reason...
being their age or generation. Across roles, the proportion citing this reason varied from 39 percent (undergraduate students) to 69 percent (exec/admin).

Table 106. Discriminated against or harassed because of my physical appearance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among respondents reporting discrimination or harassment on their Penn State campus, off-campus residence, or off-campus program or event affiliated with Penn State, 57 percent highlighted the reason being their physical appearance. Across roles, the proportion citing this reason varied from 46 percent (exec/admin) to 64 percent (undergraduate student).

Table 107. Discriminated against or harassed because of my veteran status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among respondents reporting discrimination or harassment on their Penn State campus, off-campus residence, or off-campus program or event affiliated with Penn State, 4 percent highlighted the reason being their veteran status. Across roles, the proportion citing this reason varied from 1 percent (faculty/postdoc) to 6 percent (undergraduate student).

Table 108. Discriminated against or harassed because of my country of origin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among respondents reporting discrimination or harassment on their Penn State campus, off-campus residence, or off-campus program or event affiliated with Penn State, 17 percent highlighted the reason being their country of origin. Across roles, the proportion citing this reason varied from 8 percent (exec/admin) to 30 percent (grad/prof student).

Table 109. Discriminated against or harassed because of some other aspect of my identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among respondents reporting discrimination or harassment on their Penn State campus, off-campus residence, or off-campus program or event affiliated with Penn State, 22 percent highlighted the reason being some other aspect of their identity. Across roles, the proportion citing this reason varied from 16 percent (grad/prof student) to 29 percent (faculty/postdoc).

You indicated that you have experienced discrimination or harassment during your time at Penn State. Did any of these incidents of discrimination or harassment at Penn State occur in the last year?

Table 110. Did harassment occur in the last year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among respondents who have experienced discrimination or harassment at Penn State, 63 percent, overall, indicated their experience occurred during the last year. Across roles, this ranged from 51 percent (staff) to 73 percent (grad/prof student).
Only Respondents Experiencing Discrimination or Harassment in the Past Year

Respondents who indicated they had experienced discrimination or harassment in the past year were offered a set of additional questions about the form of the incident(s) and where it/they took place. Please note that this section focuses on those respondents who indicated they had experienced discrimination or harassment at Penn State in the last year (see Table 110). Specifically, 1,845 individuals responded in the affirmative to those questions.

Section summary:

While all types of discrimination or harassment respondents experienced are insidious and unjust, some types were experienced at much higher rates than others. The five most common types of incidents cited, as well as the percentage of all respondents to experience them in the last year included: experiencing derogatory remarks (60 percent), being deliberately ignored, isolated, left out, or excluded (59 percent), being stared at (41 percent), being intimidated/bullied (35 percent), and being racial/ethnic profiled (26 percent).

Across role groups, the most commonly cited types of incidents varied. Still, some types were cited by most, or all role groups. Specifically, being deliberately ignored, isolated, left out, or excluded by others was identified by between 53 percent and 68 percent of respondents in each group. Being the target of derogatory remarks was cited by between 48 percent and 63 percent. Intimidation or bullying was cited by between 27 percent and 49 percent.

While not in the top five, overall, being stared at was highly cited by between 30 percent and 54 percent of respondents in all groups except faculty/postdocs. Likewise, being the victim of racial/ethnic profiling was experienced by between 24 percent and 34 percent of respondents from all groups except staff and faculty/postdocs.

Respondents were further asked to indicate where the incidents they experienced had occurred. Locations varied across role, likely related to the types of environments in which respondents work or study. Specifically, in a departmental office or conference room (36 percent), in a classroom (31 percent), in an individual faculty or staff member’s office (25 percent), at a house or residence off-campus (22 percent), and at a program or event affiliated with or sponsored by Penn State (20 percent) were the most commonly cited locations, overall.

No single location was among the top five across all groups, primarily because locations cited by undergraduate students were substantially different than other groups. Still, between 31 percent and 70 percent of respondents (other than undergraduate students) identified departmental offices or conference rooms as top locations. Individual faculty or staff members’ offices were also cited by between 23 percent and 44 percent of non-undergraduate student respondents. Between 28 percent and 52 percent of faculty/postdocs, grad/prof students, and undergraduate students identified “in a classroom” as a common location. Finally, undergraduate students also identified both on- and off-campus housing, dining halls, recreational and athletic facilities, and Penn State sponsored events or programs as common locations where they had experienced discrimination or harassment.
**Table 11. Please indicate which of the following forms of discrimination or harassment you have experienced in the past year. (Check all that apply)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of incident</th>
<th>Exec/admin</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Faculty/postdoc</th>
<th>Grad/prof student</th>
<th>Undergrad. student</th>
<th>All responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stared at</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberately ignored, isolated, left out, or excluded</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singled out as the resident authority</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnic profiling</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti or other forms of vandalism on campus</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory written comments</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory remarks</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory posts on social media</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory phone calls</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory/unsolicited emails</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received a poor grade because of a hostile classroom environment</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received a low performance evaluation</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied service or access to resources</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidated/bullied</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened with physical violence</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feared for your physical safety</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feared for your family's safety</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault/harassment</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other form of discrimination or harassment</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents who indicated they had experienced discrimination or harassment in the last year were asked to identify the type(s) of incident(s). The types of incidents respondents experienced varied, overall, as well as by role.

**All respondents: top incident types**
- Derogatory remarks (60 percent)
- Deliberately ignored, isolated, left out, or excluded (59 percent)
- Stared at (41 percent)
- Intimidated/bullied (35 percent)
- Racial/ethnic profiling (26 percent)

**Exec/admin: top incident types**
- Deliberately ignored, isolated, left out, or excluded (68 percent)
- Derogatory remarks (49 percent)
- Intimidated/bullied (41 percent)
- Stared at (30 percent)
- Racial/ethnic profiling; singled out as the resident authority; other form of discrimination or harassment (24 percent)
Staff: top incident types
- Deliberately ignored, isolated, left out, or excluded (64 percent)
- Derogatory remarks (62 percent)
- Intimidated/bullied (49 percent)
- Stared at (30 percent)
- Other form of discrimination or harassment (24 percent)

Faculty/postdoc: top incident types
- Deliberately ignored, isolated, left out, or excluded (65 percent)
- Derogatory remarks (59 percent)
- Intimidated/bullied (42 percent)
- Received a low performance evaluation (28 percent)
- Other form of discrimination or harassment (25 percent)

Grad/prof students: top incident types
- Deliberately ignored, isolated, left out, or excluded (60 percent)
- Derogatory remarks (48 percent)
- Stared at (44 percent)
- Racial/ethnic profiling (34 percent)
- Intimidated/bullied (28 percent)

Undergraduate students: top incident types
- Derogatory remarks (63 percent)
- Stared at (54 percent)
- Deliberately ignored, isolated, left out, or excluded (53 percent)
- Racial/ethnic profiling (32 percent)
- Intimidated/bullied (27 percent)

Table 112. Did any of these incidents of discrimination or harassment occur in the following locations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of incident</th>
<th>Exec/admin</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Faculty/postdoc</th>
<th>Grad/prof student</th>
<th>Undergrad student</th>
<th>All responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a classroom</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a departmental office or conference room</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an individual faculty or staff member's office</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In on-campus housing/residences</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a house or residence off campus</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a program/event affiliated with or sponsored by this institution</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a dining hall, recreational space, or athletic facility</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via the internet or social media</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other location</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents who indicated they had experienced discrimination or harassment in the last year were asked to identify where incident(s) they had identified took place. The locations respondents cited varied, overall, as well as by role.

**All respondents: top incident locations**
- In a departmental office or conference room (36 percent)
- In a classroom (31 percent)
- In an individual faculty or staff member's office (25 percent)
- At a house or residence off campus (22 percent)
- At a program/event affiliated with or sponsored by this institution (20 percent)

**Exec/admins, top incident locations**
- In a departmental office or conference room (64 percent)
- In an individual faculty or staff member's office (36 percent)
- At a program/event affiliated with or sponsored by this institution (28 percent)
- Other location (22 percent)
- Via the internet or social media (11 percent)

**Staff: top incident locations**
- In a departmental office or conference room (70 percent)
- In an individual faculty or staff member's office (43 percent)
- Other location (19 percent)
- At a program/event affiliated with or sponsored by this institution (17 percent)
- Via the internet or social media (9 percent)

**Faculty/postdocs: top incident locations**
- In a departmental office or conference room (68 percent)
- In an individual faculty or staff member's office (44 percent)
- In a classroom (28 percent)
- Other location (22 percent)
- Via the internet or social media (18 percent)

**Grad/prof students: top incident locations**
- In a classroom (52 percent)
- In a departmental office or conference room (31 percent)
- Other location (24 percent)
- In an individual faculty or staff member's office; at a program/event affiliated with or sponsored by this institution (23 percent)
- Via the internet or social media (21 percent)

**Undergraduate students: top incident locations**
- In a classroom (44 percent)
- At a house or residence off campus (39 percent)
- In on-campus housing/residences (33 percent)
- At a dining hall, recreational space, or athletic facility (26 percent)
- At a program/event affiliated with or sponsored by this institution (22 percent)
Table 113. Was the source of discrimination/harassment a member of the following groups? (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Exec/admin</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Faculty/postdoc</th>
<th>Grad/prof student</th>
<th>Undergrad. student</th>
<th>All respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents who indicated they had experienced discrimination or harassment in the last year were asked to identify the source (perpetrating individual/group).

**All respondents: top sources**
- Students (57 percent)
- Faculty (36 percent)
- Staff (34 percent)
- Local community (24 percent)
- Administration (23 percent)

**Exec/admin: top sources**
- Administration (67 percent)
- Staff (56 percent)
- Faculty (47 percent)
- Local community (24 percent)
- Students (8 percent)

**Staff: top sources**
- Staff (75 percent)
- Administration (37 percent)
- Faculty (27 percent)
- Local community (18 percent)
- Students (16 percent)

**Faculty/postdoc: top sources**
- Faculty (65 percent)
- Administration (50 percent)
- Students (38 percent)
- Staff (29 percent)
- Local community (20 percent)
Grad/prof students: top sources
- Students (73 percent)
- Faculty (50 percent)
- Local community (32 percent)
- Staff (20 percent)
- Administration (13 percent)

Undergraduate students: top sources
- Students (86 percent)
- Faculty (29 percent)
- Local community (28 percent)
- Staff (15 percent)
- Administration (7 percent)

Table 114. Did you report any incident(s) to campus officials?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just under one quarter (24 percent) of respondents who experienced discrimination or harassment in the past year reported the incident(s) to campus officials. Across roles, reporting rates varied from 16 percent (undergraduate student) to 37 percent (faculty/postdoc).
Penn State employees were asked a series of questions about the nature of their work. Employees included faculty, postdoctoral scholars, staff exempt, staff nonexempt, technical staff, administrators, and executives. Most employees work primarily or entirely on campus or at a Penn State facility, although nearly a quarter (24 percent) of faculty report working at least half-time remotely. The majority (92 percent) are employed full-time.

Table 115. Do you work remotely?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of employee</th>
<th>Works primarily or entirely on campus</th>
<th>Works at least half-time remotely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff, nonexempt</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical staff</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive/admin/staff exempt</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 116. How long have you worked at Penn State?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of employee</th>
<th>Less than 1 year</th>
<th>1–4 years</th>
<th>5–9 years</th>
<th>10–14 years</th>
<th>15–19 years</th>
<th>20 years or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/postdoc</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff, exempt</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff, nonexempt</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical staff</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive/admin/staff exempt</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 This survey was conducted prior to the spring 2020 COVID-19 outbreak that forced most employees to work remotely for the remainder of the academic year.
**Table 117. Are you a part-time or a full-time employee at Penn State?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of employee</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty or Postdoc</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff, exempt</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff, nonexempt</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Staff</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive/admin</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty and Postdoc Questions

Penn State faculty members and postdoctoral scholars were asked a series of questions specific to their roles. Overall, faculty respondents were relatively evenly distributed among the primary faculty ranks of professor (21 percent), associate professor (25 percent), and assistant professors (31 percent). The remaining 24 percent were lecturers, clinical lecturers, researchers, and postdocs. Forty-five percent of these respondents were tenured or in tenure-track positions, and 28 percent had at least some formal administrative duties. About one-third (30 percent) had supervisory responsibilities of professional staff (i.e., not exclusively work-study or graduate students). Science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) specialists made up the largest proportion of respondents (37 percent), followed by the arts and humanities (22 percent), social sciences (17 percent), professional education (business, law, education 13 percent), and other academic areas (10 percent).

Nearly three quarters of faculty agreed or strongly agreed that they have access to a research community at Penn State (73 percent) and that leadership in their area support hiring faculty who can contribute to improving the climate for diversity at Penn State (72 percent). Just over two-thirds (68 percent) agreed that leadership in their area supports the development of cultural competence for all faculty. Faculty and postdocs were less confident that their department is accommodating of employees with child and/or eldercare responsibilities (62 percent agreed or strongly agreed), that their campus or college supports equity-minded research (60 percent), and that they feel included in a research community at Penn State (58 percent). The latter is notable, given Penn State’s status as a top research institution. An unusual number of respondents (17 percent to 33 percent) were neutral (neither agreed nor disagreed) on these questions.

Table 118. What is your present academic rank?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Fixed-term or Part-time</th>
<th>Tenured/ Tenure Track</th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor, teaching professor, research professor, or clinical professor</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor, associate teaching professor, associate research professor, or associate clinical professor</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor, assistant teaching professor, assistant research professor, or assistant clinical professor</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer, clinical lecturer, or instructor</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoc</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 119. What is your appointment type?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure track (not tenured)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed-term, multi-year contract</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed-term, one-year contract</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time contract by course</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 120. Do you have formal administrative duties?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, full-time</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, part-time</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 121. Do you have supervisory responsibilities (not including work-study or graduate assistants)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 122. In which of the following areas do you teach primarily?

| Discipline                                                      | Percent |
|                                                                |---------|
| Arts or Humanities                                             | 22%     |
| Social Sciences                                                | 17%     |
| Science, Technology, Engineering, or Math (STEM)               | 37%     |
| Business                                                       | 7%      |
| Education                                                      | 5%      |
| Law                                                           | 1%      |
| Other academic areas                                           | 10%     |
Table 123. Level of agreement with statements about the research and support for research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel included in a research community at Penn State.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have access to a research community at Penn State.</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leadership in my area (department chair, director of academic affairs, or dean) supports the development of cultural competence for all faculty.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leadership in my area (department chair, director of academic affairs, or dean) supports hiring faculty who can contribute to improving the climate for diversity at Penn State.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My campus or college supports conducting equity-minded research.</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department or unit is accommodating of employees with child and/or eldercare responsibilities.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff, Administration, or Executive Questions

Penn State staff were asked a series of questions about the nature of their work and environment in their unit. The staff role group includes respondents who self-reported as an executive, administrator, staff exempt, staff nonexempt, or technical staff. Most executives and administrators (data not presented) and nearly half (45 percent) of staff exempt respondents reported having supervisory responsibilities. Overall, 79 percent of staff agreed or strongly agreed that their supervisor takes responsibility for creating an inclusive environment. Technical staff were more likely to disagree (14 percent, disagreed or strongly disagreed) than any of the other role groups, among whom disagreement ranged from 6 percent to 8 percent. Similarly, staff overall found their units to be accommodating of employees with children and/or eldercare responsibilities (82 percent agreed or strongly agreed), but again technical staff (10 percent) were more likely than other groups (3 percent to 4 percent) to disagree with this statement.

Table 124. Do you have supervisory responsibilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff role</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff, exempt</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff, nonexempt</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Staff</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Values are suppressed where a specific group of respondents is less than 20 or where the presentation of the value for one group would allow for the calculation of the smaller group.

Table 125. My supervisor takes responsibility for creating an inclusive environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff role</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff, exempt</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff, nonexempt</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Staff</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all staff, 79 percent agreed or strongly agreed that their supervisor takes responsibility for creating an inclusive environment. Across different staff roles, agreement (agree or strongly agree) varied from 65 percent (technical staff) to 86 percent (exec/admin).
Table 126. My department or unit is accommodating of employees with child and/or eldercare responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff role</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff, exempt</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff, nonexempt</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Staff</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec/admin</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all staff, 82 percent agreed or strongly agreed that their department or unit is accommodating of employees with child and/or eldercare responsibilities. Across different staff roles, agreement (agree or strongly agree) varied from 63 percent (technical staff) and 87 percent (exec/admin).
Student Questions

Penn State students were asked a series of questions specific to the student experience. Graduate students, including professional students, were less likely to believe that the content of their courses reflects a variety of cultural perspectives. Nineteen percent of graduate students disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement, compared to 10 percent of undergraduate students.

In addition to the questions about where discrimination and harassment occurred that were presented to all survey respondents, student-specific locations were also presented to students. When students experienced discrimination and/or harassment, it most often occurred in class (64 percent), with other academic locations ranging from 3 percent to 25 percent. A common location for undergraduates was also in student organization meetings (28 percent). Locations cited by graduate students included working in a research group, lab, or legal clinic (28 percent), during a meeting (27 percent), and while teaching (24 percent).

Most student respondents (82 percent) attended classes primarily or entirely on campus. About one-third of undergraduates lived on campus (33 percent) or in a residence not within walking distance to campus (35 percent); twenty-four percent lived within walking distance to campus. Most graduate students lived in a residence not within walking distance to campus (63 percent) or within walking distance to campus (23 percent). Undergraduates were relatively evenly distributed in terms of college classification (first-year, sophomore, junior, senior).

Table 127. In general, the content of my courses reflects a variety of cultural perspectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student level</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Across all students, 66 percent agreed or strongly agreed that the content of their courses reflects a variety of cultural perspectives. Among grad/prof students, agreement reached 57 percent and among undergraduate students, agreement reached 68 percent.

---

9 This survey was conducted prior to the spring 2020 COVID-19 outbreak that forced most students to study remotely for the remainder of the academic year.

https://opair.psu.edu/community-survey
Table 128. If you have experienced discrimination or harassment, did any of these incidents of discrimination or harassment occur during the following activities? (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Grad/prof student</th>
<th>Undergraduate student</th>
<th>All respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working in a research group, lab, or legal clinic</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in an administrative office</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching a course, lab, recitation, or discussion</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving as a grader, project manager, or assistant</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an advising meeting</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While in student organization meeting</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While taking a class</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During a meeting not mentioned above</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 129. How do you attend classes at Penn State?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student level</th>
<th>Primarily or entirely on campus</th>
<th>Primarily or entirely online</th>
<th>Split between on campus and online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 130. Which of the following best describes where you are currently living?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student level</th>
<th>Residence hall or other campus housing (not a fraternity or sorority house)</th>
<th>Fraternity or sorority house (including college-owned housing)</th>
<th>Residence (house, apartment, etc.) within walking distance to the institution</th>
<th>Residence (house, apartment, etc.) farther than walking distance to the institution</th>
<th>None of the above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grad/prof student</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 131. What is your college classification for the 2019–2020 academic year? (Undergraduate students only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For more information about the Community Survey

While this report and its supporting dashboards provide a wealth of information, they cannot address all questions that might be posed using the rich data provided by the Community Survey. The Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research is collecting suggestions for additional analyses and dashboards to be considered in phase two of the Community Survey analyses. Suggestions may be submitted at https://pennstate.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_00wSwT8i8xCTvHT or addressed to OPAIR@psu.edu.

In addition to the questions highlighted in this report and the Community Survey dashboards, the survey included six open-ended questions prompting respondents to provide additional details or clarification about their experiences (see Data Preparation on page 12 for additional details). Phase Two of the Community Survey project will explore and analyze the qualitative responses.
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