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1. Preface

Emory’s Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ODEI) commissioned the following report to synthesize insights about Emory community members’ perceptions and experiences of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) from the results of eleven community surveys conducted from 2015 to 2020. ODEI plans to conduct a new wave of campus culture and climate surveys at Emory University and across the enterprise; the wave will start with the Fall 2021 administration of the National Assessment of Collegiate Campus Climates. The insights from past surveys document the current state of DEI at Emory, set a baseline for future trends, and help develop research questions to examine upcoming surveys and whose answers can inform existing and new initiatives.

The offices of Institutional Research and Decision Support, Academic Affairs, and Undergraduate Affairs, the Department of Title IX, and Laney Graduate School partnered with ODEI to make this report possible, making available reports and instruments from the eleven surveys available and participating in informational interviews.
2. Background

The year 2020 was transformative for Emory University. In April, Emory’s Board of Trustees elected President Claire Sterk’s successor. President-Elect Gregory Fenves’s term started in August, on the heels of a summer of civil unrest over police brutality and amid the COVID-19 global pandemic and its consequent economic crisis. In the face of these challenges, the university remained firm in its commitment to the values of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI), as attested by open letters and public statements from Emory leaders and community members. The institution also acted on its mission to create and apply knowledge in the service of humanity by deploying the Emory Vaccine Center’s expertise and resources in the fight against COVID-19.

Although the public’s awareness of diversity and equity issues intensified in 2020, Emory University began institutional research on these topics in 2016, with its first Diversity Engagement Survey. Also, results from other surveys dating back to 2015 can provide insights into different aspects of DEI at the institution. Before reviewing those surveys and synthesizing DEI-related insights from their results, I summarize recent activity to support DEI at Emory.

Soon after taking office, President Fenves issued a letter to the community, “Actions Emory Is Taking for Racial Justice,” which underscored the institution’s commitment to diversity, respect, and mutual support among faculty, students, staff, and the larger world. In appreciation for the late Congressman John Lewis’s lifelong dedication to the cause of equality and justice and acknowledgment of black and other student groups’ demands following a season of nationally salient police violence, Fenves reaffirmed Emory’s stance in favor of diversity, equity, and inclusion, and he announced two important decisions. First, Fenves reappointed the University Committee on Naming Honors. Second, he established a new initiative to memorialize the enslaved black persons who built the original campus in Oxford, Georgia.

---

1 Emory University, “Emory Board of Trustees Names Gregory L. Fenves as 21st President.”
3 Staff of the Center for Contemplative Science and Compassion-Based Ethics, “Black Lives Matter: Seeking a Compassionate and Ethical World for All”; Cooper, “Statement on Systemic Racism and the Libraries’ Commitment”; Emory University, “Emory Leaders Speak out against Racist Violence; Vigils Planned.”
4 Woodruff Health Sciences Center, “Emory-Developed COVID-19 Vaccine Safe, Effective in Animal Models”; Emory Vaccine Center, “EVC Responds to COVID-19.”
5 Fenves, “Actions Emory Is Taking for Racial Justice.”
6 Without a compelling reason to do otherwise, I follow the American Sociological Associations’ Sixth Edition Style Guide (2019), including the recommendations not to capitalize black or white in reference to ethnicity.
7 Tate, Jenkins, and Rich, “Fatal Force: 1,000 People Have Been Shot and Killed By Police in the Past Year”; #Say Their Names, “Say Their Names List 2020.”
In “Actions Emory is Taking,” President Fenves also discussed initiatives to recognize and support persons from other racialized groups. In Fall 2021, a conference on the legacy of slavery and racism [italics added] at Emory and other universities will link back to the national conference Emory held in 2011, “Slavery and the University.” \(^8\) That conference gathered scholars, Emory University members, and community partners seeking to reconcile an accurate understanding of the connections between U.S. higher education institutions and slavery with current values of diversity, inclusion, and equity. The addition of “and racism” to this year’s conference theme is highly significant, as it opens the door to examining other human experiences of exclusion, stigmatization, and marginalization in higher education due to ethnicity, culture, religion, national origin, and immigration status.

Rightly so, as other persons with diverse identities, affiliations, and experiences have experienced discrimination and exclusion in America and become allies of Black Lives Matter. Leaders of feminist, LGBTQ, Hispanic, Asian American, Jewish, and Islamic organizations have joined in the public denunciation of anti-black racism. \(^9\) Persons with experiences of race discrimination jointly with other stigmatized identities have also spoken up. For example, trans activists have marched for #BLM and Afro-Latinx and Asian Americans have called for the rejection of racism in their communities. \(^10\)

At Emory, the different divisions have shown their support. For example, Emory’s medical community participated in the “White Coats for Black Lives” vigil after George Floyd’s death. Counseling and Psychological Services has reached out to Emory’s black community with expressions of support and information about available mental health services. \(^11\)

Let us recall that groups not typically considered disadvantaged also experience discrimination, harassment, exploitation, and violence in American society. \(^12\) Early in 2020, Asian American and Pacific Islander students at Emory and other universities reported receiving

---

\(^8\) Emory University, “Slavery and the University: Histories and Legacies.”


\(^11\) Emory University, “Emory Leaders Speak out against Racist Violence; Vigils Planned”; Emory University CAPS, “Black Lives Matter.”

\(^12\) McMurtry et al., “Discrimination in the United States: Experiences of Asian Americans.”
insults, slurs, and even hate mail from their peers. Faculty have also noticed this trend. Chinese students at Emory were the butt of friends’ jokes labeling them as coronavirus vectors. Gravely, the recent Atlanta Spa Shootings, two of which took place a fifteen-minute drive away from Emory’s campus, set a tragic milestone in the year-long trend of increasing violence against Asians and Asian Americans.

The global pandemic and issues of social inequity were bound to converge, metaphorically speaking. In the United States, COVID-19 has been more harmful to those disadvantaged in society. Black and Hispanic persons have suffered disproportionate rates of COVID-19 infection and death. They are more likely to report pandemic-related economic challenges such as depleting their savings and difficulty paying for necessities. Black and Hispanic persons, women, and persons with low income have experienced more symptoms of anxiety and depression. Besides, remote learning environments may place additional difficulties on students in already challenging circumstances such as poverty, linguistic isolation, and disability status.

Emory University has responded to the pandemic with various health sciences efforts, such as conducting vaccine trials and helping the federal government develop therapeutic guidelines. Emory is also investing in public health approaches to understand and address the factors that put some groups at higher health and economic risk from COVID-19. For example, a team of researchers at the Rollins School of Public Health designed the “COVID-19 Health Equity Interactive Dashboard” as a resource for policymakers and public health researchers, among other audiences. The dashboard tracks COVID-19 incidence, mortality, and vaccination rates by race/ethnicity down to the county level, as well as social factors that affect health,

---

14 Kreutz, “Emory Students Battle Fear, Misinformation Surrounding Coronavirus.”
19 Woodruff Health Sciences Center, “Phase III of COVID-19 Vaccine Trial Launches at Emory.”
providing a comparative perspective of communities’ COVID-19 metrics and their social and economic health.\textsuperscript{21}

In 2021, amid this context of complex challenges, Emory continues to pursue its mission \textit{to create, preserve, teach, and apply knowledge in the service of humanity}.\textsuperscript{22} As it does so, the university emphasizes the importance of inviting and welcoming, respecting and protecting, and recognizing and rewarding persons from \textit{diverse ethnic, cultural, socioeconomic, religious, national, and international backgrounds}.\textsuperscript{23}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{21} Woodruff Health Sciences Center, “Emory Launches New Vaccination Tracker as Part of Its Online Health Equity Dashboard”; Mckenzie, “New National Dashboard Targets COVID-19 Disparities.”
\item \textsuperscript{22} \textit{Italics} denote the verbatim language from Emory’s vision and mission statement.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Emory University Office of the President, “Mission and Vision.”
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
3. Report Summary

Between 2015 and 2020, Emory University conducted at least 11 surveys with members from its community. Jointly, those surveys captured over 22,000 responses from subjects in different roles at Emory, including students, faculty, staff, fellows, and post-docs at Emory and Oxford Colleges, the Laney Graduate School, and Emory’s professional schools. Starting late in 2020, Emory’s Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ODEI) contracted Ximena Leroux, Ph.D., to synthesize results from the eleven surveys and track the status of initiatives resulting from the surveys.24

The 11 surveys reviewed for this report covered a broad set of topics, from the high school learning experiences of incoming first-year students to graduating college seniors’ and M.A. students’ and Ph.D. candidates’ reports of their Emory experience overall. Other survey topics included community members’ perceptions of the campus climate against sexual violence and their agreement that Emory is an inclusive environment. Finally, the surveys also addressed full-time faculty’s satisfaction with different aspects of academic work and employee’s assessment of the enterprise’s organizational and strategic alignment.

The body of information Emory has gathered through these surveys results from the collaboration between different Emory divisions, the Office of the Provost, and private and public research partners. That information has driven change at Emory, whether in the form of new initiatives recommended by the surveys’ sponsors or as indirect influences on ongoing and new programs across the institution. Collaboration of the Emory Provost’s offices of Institutional Research and Decision Support, Undergraduate Affairs, Department of Title IX, Planning and Budgeting, and Academic Affairs, and the Laney Graduate School with ODEI made this report possible.25

Although only one out of the 11 surveys expressly focused on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI), results from five of the other ten surveys also allowed for insights into the state of DEI at Emory. The reports for the remaining surveys, another five, only included a few DEI-related items or did not include analyses of results by demographic group, so this report does not include results from those reports. However, these reports may yield helpful information should further research be deemed appropriate.

Two positive insights from the review of the surveys’ results are that Emory community members share a strong sense of common purpose, perceive that all persons on campus receive respect, and have access to professional development opportunities. Also, Emory’s college

---

24 Please refer to Appendix A for the project’s proposed scope of work and final deliverables.
25 Please refer to Appendix B for a list of the Emory staff interviewed in the course of this project.
students perceive higher institutional support for diversity than their peers at other R1 universities and colleges.

There are differences in community members’ perceptions, experiences, and expectations across different genders, races, sexual orientations, and first-generation college status. Some of these differences are in line with broader social trends, such as the higher proportion of women than men who report experiencing sexual harassment or violence before and after joining the Emory community. However, that sexual harassment and victimization is a social fact does not make it acceptable at Emory. The Senate Committee for the Prevention of Sexual Violence’s goal is “to create [a] community where all members ‘learn, work, play, and love’ without experiencing or fearing sexual assault or violence,” and the committee has sponsored three of the 11 surveys reviewed here.

Another unsurprising survey result is that Emory’s first-generation college students had a lower engagement with key learning practices and quantitative reasoning during high school. They also expect to work more hours for pay each week during college than other students. The Office of Undergraduate Affairs has responded to this social fact with a bevy of initiatives and partnerships to support, recognize, and celebrate first-generation college students and those from non-traditional backgrounds.

Other insights indicate that there are further opportunities to enhance Inclusion and Equity at Emory. For example, a smaller proportion of females than male respondents consistently assess diversity and inclusion at Emory favorably, especially in their perceptions of equitable rewards and recognition. In terms of race and ethnicity, a larger proportion of faculty of color than other faculty identify lack of diversity as one of the worst aspects of working at Emory, and more professors of color and from historically underrepresented groups are dissatisfied with their departments’ recognition of the professors’ service to the institution around diversity issues. Overall, only a small proportion of faculty identify diversity as one of the best aspects of working at the university. Finally, black and multiracial community members are among those with the least favorable perceptions of inclusion at Emory, in contrast with international, white, and Asian members.

An important reminder for readers is that this report’s goal and the eleven surveys’ goals are different. This report aims to glean insights into the community’s perception of DEI and differences in the experiences, perceptions, and assessments of life at Emory across groups by gender, race and ethnicity, international status, and other characteristics. Therefore, the principal

26 Emory University Senate Committee for the Prevention of Sexual Violence, “Title IX Prevention Recommendations.”
27 Please refer to section 6.2 for a comprehensive list of those initiatives.
results and critical lessons from most of the surveys are not summarized in this report, as the theme of most of the surveys was not DEI or group differences.28

An example to illustrate how the source reports and the insights synthesized here differ follows. According to the 2020 COACHE Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey results, female professors’ responses about Tenure Expectations—Clarity place Emory only slightly below the national average. In contrast, responses from male faculty place Emory above the national average in this area. Furthermore, Emory’s female faculty’s responses compared to those from female faculty at the peer institutions rank the university in the bottom 30 percent of its peer group. As a result, Emory’s research partner, the Collaborative for Academic Careers in Higher Education,29 labeled this result as an Area of Concern for Emory.30

One caveat is worth noting. Participation in eight of the 11 surveys was voluntary, making it possible that survey results are not generalizable to the Emory community or the specific Emory groups targeted. Graduating students had to complete the exit surveys. Those surveys capture the perspectives of students who have completed all other degree requirements but are not representative of all students at Emory College and the Laney Graduate School.

28 Please refer to Table 2, “DEI Overview of Emory Community and Exit Surveys, 2015-2020” for the main concepts in each of the 11 surveys.
29 Emory’s research partner in the survey
30 Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education, “Chief Academic Officer Report, Emory University.”
4. Approach and Organization

In the following paragraphs, I provide a roadmap for the rest of the report. I present the approach I followed alongside the roadmap.\(^{31}\)

A note about my use of acronyms: Following the practice of presenting the abbreviation for a name or title after its first appearance and using that abbreviation for all further mentions would require the reader to keep present at least a dozen acronyms. Based on feedback from my project partners, I decided not to put that onus on readers who may not be familiar with Emory’s administration side or with the field of higher education surveys. I introduce acronyms for repeated terms at the beginning of each section. I hope I have not erred on the side of repetitiveness.

In Section 5, “Defining Emory’s Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Values,” I introduce the specific meanings of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) in the Emory context. The Intercultural Development Advisory Group developed a “Glossary of Foundational Terms” to help Emory community members develop the intercultural fluencies they need to engage with DEI. I use those descriptions to frame and organize the insights drawn from past survey results.

In Section 6, “Synthesizing Our DEI Insights,” I provide an overview of the 11 surveys,\(^{32}\) discuss the type of DEI insights obtainable from the surveys’ results, and then present the insights. Only one of the surveys, the 2016 Diversity and Engagement Survey, focused on DEI. The other ten addressed different topics, such as faculty job satisfaction, employee engagement, and student engagement with learning practices. However, one of those ten, the 2020 National Survey of Student Engagement, included a DEI-related topical module, the Inclusiveness and Engagement with Cultural Diversity (IECD) module. Therefore, I extract DEI results from two sources: the Diversity Engagement Survey and the National Survey of Student Engagement’s IECD module.

Although the remaining nine surveys included only a few specific items about DEI, six of their reports present results by demographic group. Of those surveys, five are incremental to the two I identify in the previous paragraph. I label the results I obtained from those reports as “HUG Insights,” using the acronym for historically underrepresented groups.\(^{33}\)

\(^{31}\)Ximena Leroux, Ph.D. I use the first person, singular from here on because I made decisions about how to approach the material that Dr. Carol Henderson and her colleagues Emory made available to me, which results to highlight from the 11 reports, and how to present them.

\(^{32}\)Please see Table 1, on page 18.

\(^{33}\)Please refer to Table 2, on page 21, where I identify the surveys from which I extracted DEI and HUG insights.
Most of the DEI and HUG insights I present reflect community members’ experiences and perceptions about how Emory University ensures inclusion. I also identify insights about how Emory achieves equity. These insights are summarized in Table 3, “Summary of Insights by DEI Value.”

Insights about how Emory shapes diversity are not available from the 11 surveys, but the diversity dashboards that IRDS publishes document Emory’s diversity trends.

The surveys’ results have driven specific initiatives and informed existing and new efforts across Emory. In Section 7, “Tracking Emory’s DEI Initiatives,” I present a partial list of actions for DEI connected to results from the surveys I have included in this report. The list consists of Department of Title IX initiatives directly resulting from the three surveys sponsored by the University Senate’s Committee for the Prevention of Sexual Violence and ongoing and new Office of Undergraduate Affairs initiatives informed by undergraduate students’ surveys. The list does not include initiatives from other schools or offices as they are not available for sharing at this time.

Section 8 concludes this report. I provide detailed supporting information in six appendices and present a seventh one, Appendix F, under separate cover.

34 On page 26.
35 Including two 2015 Campus Climate surveys, one for students and one for faculty and staff, and the 2018 Student Community Well-Being Survey
36 Including the 2019 BCSSE and the 2020 NSSE, plus two recurring, annual surveys: College Exit and the Emory Undergraduate Project (EmoryUP); the latter is not in scope for this report. Please see Table 1 for the complete survey titles.
5. Defining Emory's Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Values

What does the commitment to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) mean for Emory University? A necessary first step to answer this question is to gain community-wide agreement about the meaning of DEI. Otherwise, one can expect different answers from different community members to questions such as:

- What is diversity in higher education beyond admitting students and hiring faculty and staff from different genders, backgrounds, and identities?
- Does having a diverse campus community constitute proof that Emory is inclusive?
- How can Emory ensure equitable outcomes when we know each person shapes their own path at Emory according to their intelligence, commitment, and hard work?
- How can Emory ensure equitable outcomes when we know personal experiences, socioeconomic status, and external community resources affect the chances of individual success here?

I look to the Intercultural Development Advisory Group’s work for the meanings that ground the common understanding of DEI at Emory. Early in 2020, ODEI convened this group of 13 administrators and faculty members and charged them to propose strategies for Emory’s enterprise-wide advancement of DEI through intercultural education.

The Advisory Group grounded its task on extant work at leading national organizations advocating for inclusion in higher education. For example, the Advisory Group adopted the Association of American Colleges and Universities’ guiding principle of making excellence inclusive and its definitions of the values of diversity, inclusion, and equity, as well as the principle of equity-mindedness from the University of Southern California’s Center for Urban Education, enhancing those terms to reflect Emory’s values.

5.1. Emory's Institutional Diversity Statement

One of the Advisory Group’s first deliverables was the document Institutional Diversity Statement and Glossary of Foundational Terms. Working with Dr. Carol Henderson, Chief Diversity Officer and Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion, the Advisory Group read critical

---

37 From here on, “the Advisory Group.”
38 Association for American Colleges and Universities, “Making Excellence Inclusive”; Center for Urban Education, “Equity Mindedness.”
new understandings about higher education institutions’ mission and the many facets of human diversity onto Emory University’s mission statement. The result is the enhancement and expansion of the second paragraph of the original mission statement into Emory’s first Institutional Diversity Statement, as follows:  

The Emory community is open to all who have a commitment to the highest ideals of intellectual engagement, critical inquiry, and integrity. We welcome a diversity of gender identities, sexual orientations, abilities, disabilities, ethnic, cultural, socioeconomic, religious, national, and international backgrounds, believing that the academic and social energy that results from such diversity is essential to advancing knowledge, addressing society’s most pressing issues, and attending to the full spectrum of human needs in service to the common good.

5.2 Emory's DEI Values

The Advisory Group crafted a companion Glossary of Foundational Terms for the statement of diversity, which describes the meanings of the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) values in accordance with the Emory ethos. The glossary is a first step towards developing the intercultural fluencies needed for productive engagement with DEI across the university. In the following three paragraphs, I present brief overviews of each value’s meaning and the imperative each represents for Emory University. I offer more details about the descriptions in the glossary in Appendix A.

The Advisory Group describes diversity as inclusive of the broad representations of human existence, including the usual categories such as gender, race and ethnicity, and sexual orientation, and other aspects of difference, such as neurodiversity, gender identity and expression, disability, age, health status, nationality, and immigration status, among others. The imperative is for Emory to cultivate intellectual communities rooted in respect for [all] individuals.

Action is a crucial component in the Advisory Group’s description of inclusion. The Group indicates that inclusion is the active, intentional, and ongoing engagement with the principles of diversity in all aspects of Emory’s activities. The imperative is for Emory to create [a campus community] in which faculty, staff, and students can thrive, [...] feel appreciated, and [...] see themselves in the images, traditions, and culture.
Equity is the guarantee of fair treatment, access, opportunity, and advancement for all students, faculty, and staff. The imperative is for Emory to identify and eliminate barriers that have prevented the full participation of some groups. The corresponding value of equity-mindedness requires calling attention to patterns of inequity in outcomes among community members, as well as taking personal and institutional responsibility for the success of all its students, faculty, and staff.

In the synthesis of results, which I present next, I organize insights according to these DEI values.
6. Synthesizing the Survey Insights

This section provides an overview of 11 surveys that Emory University conducted from 2015 to 2020, and it summarizes insights collected from the surveys’ results. The insights I present describe the community’s perceptions of the state of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) at Emory and some group differences in the experiences and perceptions of life and work at Emory.

Between 2015 and 2020, Emory University conducted at least eight voluntary surveys of its community,44 in addition to three recurring annual student exit surveys for graduating students from the Emory College of Arts and Sciences45 and the Laney Graduate School.46 Emory’s Office of Institutional Research and Decision Support (IRDS) coordinated all survey implementations, sometimes in partnership with external institutions.47 Altogether, the surveys have targeted all campus populations (faculty, leadership, staff, and students) and generated rich information about Emory community members’ experiences and perceptions.

I present an overview of the 11 surveys in Table 1. The first three columns in the table indicate each survey’s year of application, name or acronym, and sponsor at Emory. In the fourth column, I identify the survey’s target population. The last columns include each survey’s average response rate, its number of complete responses, and its target population’s estimated size.

6.1. Populations and Survey Topics

All campus populations by role (students, faculty, and staff) have participated in the two general community surveys: the 2015 Campus Climate Surveys (with one version for students and another one for faculty and staff) and the 2016 Diversity Engagement Survey. The other nine studies surveyed the student population or a subset thereof, faculty alone or faculty and staff. Collectively they elicited insights about experiences, expectations, concerns, and engagement with topics such as pre-college learning, job satisfaction, sexual harassment and victimization, and organizational alignment.

---

44 Emory University, “Emory Student Community Well-Being Survey Report”; Center for Postsecondary Research, “BCSSE First-Year Institutional Report, Emory University”; Center for Postsecondary Research, “BCSSE Transfer Student Institutional Report, Emory University”; Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education, “Chief Academic Officer Report, Emory University”; Emory University, “Emory Organizational Health Index”; Center for Postsecondary Research, “National Survey of Student Engagement, Emory University”; Office of Planning and Budgeting, “Diversity Engagement Survey”; Emory University, “Summary Report of the Emory University Student Campus Climate Survey 2015.”

45 Institutional Research and Decision Support, “Emory College Senior Exit Survey Results.”


47 Surveys conducted with external partners: BCCSE & NSSE (Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research), COACHE (Harvard Graduate School of Education), Diversity Engagement (DataStar), Enterprise Health Report (McKinsey & Co.), Well-Being (RTI International).
Table 1. Overview of Emory Community and Exit Surveys, 2015-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name or Acronym48</th>
<th>Sponsor Office49</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Response Rate50</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Campus Climate Survey</td>
<td>CPSV</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2,615 (out of ~14k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Campus Climate Survey</td>
<td>CPSV</td>
<td>All faculty and staff</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2,290 (out of ~11k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Diversity Engagement Survey</td>
<td>OEI</td>
<td>All students, faculty, staff</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4,899 (out of ~29k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Enterprise Report (Org. Health Index) (B)</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>All faculty and staff</td>
<td>37%51</td>
<td>3,813 (out of ~10k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Student Community Well-Being Survey</td>
<td>OUA</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>4,390 (out of ~14k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>BCCSE52 Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement</td>
<td>OUA</td>
<td>1st-yr; transfer undergraduates</td>
<td>~50%</td>
<td>1,095; 56 (~2K; n/a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>COACHE Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey (B)</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Full-time faculty53</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1,119 (out of ~3.5k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>NSSE National Survey of Student Engagement (B)</td>
<td>OUA</td>
<td>1st-yr; senior undergraduates</td>
<td>25% 20%54</td>
<td>449; 374 (each out of ~2k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>College Exit Survey</td>
<td>OUA</td>
<td>Graduating college seniors</td>
<td>N/A55</td>
<td>1,13156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Master’s Exit Survey</td>
<td>LGS</td>
<td>Graduating master’s students</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Ph.D. Exit Survey</td>
<td>LGS</td>
<td>Graduating doctoral candidates</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48 **Bold** type denotes the name, acronym, term used at Emory for each survey is indicated. Other notation: (B) indicates benchmarking surveys conducted by external institutions; COACHE is the acronym for the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education.

49 Emory acronyms AA: Academic Affairs; LGS: Laney Graduate School; OEI: Office of Equity and Inclusion (precursor to the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion); OP: Office of the President; OUA: Office of Undergraduate Affairs; CPSV (University Senate’s Committee for the Prevention of Sexual Violence)

50 Calculated as the number of respondents who answered at least one survey question divided by the number of persons invited to complete the survey.

51 Response rates vary by division. Campus Services (18 percent) is on the low end, while Research Administration and Office of the General Council (74 and 78 percent, respectively) are on the high end.

52 In the rest of the report, I refer to two surveys by their acronyms, the Beginning College Survey and the National Survey of Student Engagement. Persons familiar with those surveys refer to them as “Bessie” and “Nessie,”

53 Excludes faculty hired the same year as the report or in terminal year after denial of tenure.

54 Participation in the exit surveys is required of students filing for degree completion.

55 Counts of exit survey responses are five-year averages, from 2015-2016 to 2019-2020.
Three of the 11 surveys addressed topics of concern to the whole Emory community; these are also the three oldest surveys listed in Table 1. One pair of surveys, the 2015 Campus Climate Surveys, invited all students and all faculty and staff to participate in different surveys, both about experiences of sexual violence and perceptions of the climate against it on campus. All Emory University members were invited to complete the 2016 Diversity Engagement Survey on the state of diversity and inclusion at Emory, a topic of general interest to all.

Emory invited all employees\(^{57}\) to participate in the Organizational Health Index (OHI) survey, better known at Emory as the 2018 Enterprise Report. The goal of OHI was to diagnose “how [Emory] aligns itself, executes with excellence, and renews itself to sustain exceptional performance over time”\(^{58}\) in comparison with over 1,500 organizations around the world, including some institutions of higher education. In 2018, Emory conducted another survey addressing sexual harassment and violence (Well-Being), but only with students.

The remaining six surveys targeted specific populations within the Emory community. Three of the surveys focused on undergraduate life (the BCCSE\(^ {59}\), NSSE, and College Exit Survey). In the BCCSE, incoming first-year and transfer students were asked to provide information about their engagement with different learning practices during their last year of high school and their expectations about their academic experience at Emory. The NSSE gathers responses from first-year and senior students about the characteristics and quality of their undergraduate experience. Also, each year the college requires graduating undergraduate students to participate in the College Exit Survey and provide feedback about their satisfaction with the past years’ educational experiences and social, cultural, and community life at Emory.

Two of the remaining six are annually recurring surveys of graduate students. The Laney Graduate School requires doctoral and master-degree students filing for degree completion to complete exit surveys. Survey topics include satisfaction with aspects of the Emory experience, such as quality of coursework, clarity about departmental expectations, and professional development. Items can be as broad as the students’ overall satisfaction with their academic experience and as specific as the existence of faculty mentors other than their academic advisors.

The last of the remaining six surveys was specific to faculty. The 2020 COACHE Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey targeted full-time faculty members. Items in the survey addressed

\(^{57}\) Including staff, faculty, post-docs, persons with additional appointments, staff librarians, and academic deans.

\(^{58}\) Emory University, “Emory Organizational Health Index,” 4.

\(^{59}\) Recall that BCCSE stands for the Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement and NSSE stands for the National Survey of Student Engagement.
professors’ satisfaction with their research, teaching, and service work at Emory University. Other topics included were the adequacy of support from the institution, aspects of the tenure and promotion process, and experiences with multi-disciplinary collaboration and mentoring.

6.2. Survey Representativity

Since participation in most of the surveys was voluntary and given some low response counts, it is possible that some survey results are not generalizable to the broader Emory community. One example will help illustrate this issue. The global survey response rate for the Diversity Engagement Survey (17 percent) seems sufficient given the size of Emory’s population. Still, the survey has low response counts for some of the smaller subpopulations. The counts for Multi-racial (4), Hispanic (200), and Resident/Fellow respondents (145) may be too low to provide sufficient statistical power, indicating that we need to be more careful when interpreting group differences in survey responses.60

The three exit surveys, required of graduating college, master’s, and doctoral students, have a different representativity issue. Those surveys capture the feedback of graduating students, that is, of academically successful students. To the degree that the attitudes, experiences, and assessments of different aspects of these students’ experiences at Emory are different from those of students who did not (yet) complete their degrees, exit survey results are not representative of all Emory students at the Laney Graduate School and Emory College.61

Whether survey results are generalizable to the populations targeted can be established through a procedure called non-response analysis. Only the 2018 Student Community Well-Being Survey report indicated that Emory’s research partner conducted a non-response analysis. RTI International found minimal non-response effects. Based on the information available, it is unclear whether there are non-response analyses for the other surveys. For those concerned with this issue, Indiana University has an excellent web resource.62

6.2. Survey Focus on DEI

Table 2 summarizes the extent to which the surveys’ results provide insights about DEI at Emory. After listing the survey’s identifying information in the first four columns, I indicate how much of each survey’s focus was on DEI.

61 The Office of Undergraduate Affairs runs other surveys to assess students’ experience, but I did not include them in this report to avoid a further expansion of the scope of work.
62 National Survey of Student Engagement, “Response Rate FAQ.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Main Concepts</th>
<th>DEI Focus</th>
<th>HUG Results&lt;sup&gt;63&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Campus Climate</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>Sexual harassment, violence</td>
<td>No&lt;sup&gt;64&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Campus Climate</td>
<td>All faculty and staff</td>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Diversity Engagement</td>
<td>All students, faculty, and staff</td>
<td>Diversity and Inclusion</td>
<td>Main Focus</td>
<td>A, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Enterprise Report</td>
<td>All faculty and staff</td>
<td>Alignment, execution, and renewal</td>
<td>Items</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Well-Being</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>Sexual harassment, violence</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>BCCSE</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;-yr, transfer undergraduates</td>
<td>College preparedness and expectations</td>
<td>Items</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>COACHE</td>
<td>Full-time faculty</td>
<td>Faculty job satisfaction</td>
<td>Items</td>
<td>A, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>NSSE</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;-yr, senior undergraduates</td>
<td>Learning practices, engagement with Diversity</td>
<td>Module, Items</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>College Exit</td>
<td>Graduating college seniors</td>
<td>Academic experience, student life</td>
<td>Items</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Master’s Exit</td>
<td>Graduating master’s candidates</td>
<td>Academic experience, professionalization</td>
<td>Items</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Ph.D. Exit</td>
<td>Graduating doctoral candidates</td>
<td>Academic experience, professionalization</td>
<td>Items</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Count by DEI focus and HUG results**

| 2 | 5 |

**Count of surveys with DEI/HUG results to synthesize**

| 6 |

**Count of surveys without results to synthesize**

| 5 |

<sup>63</sup> Indicates whether HUG-specific results were reported. Key: (A) Gender, (B) Race/Ethnicity, (C) International status, (D) Sexual orientation, (E) Gender identity, and (F) First generation in the student’s family to attend college.

<sup>64</sup> “No” and “Items” answers in the last two columns are shown in lighter font to emphasize other answers.
The last column indicates whether the survey reports include results by categories of Historically Underrepresented Groups (HUG). I provide more details about the last column in section 3.3.

The last three rows in Table 3 present summary counts of the surveys. The first one indicates how many surveys focused on DEI and reported HUG-specific results (two and five, respectively). The second-to-last row adds up the counts from the previous row, accounting for one survey counted in both categories, for a total of six surveys that had DEI or HUG results to synthesize. Finally, I show the number of surveys with no DEI focus or HUG results (five out of eleven surveys). I do not present insights or results from those surveys in this report.

6.3 DEI Results Reported

The 2016 Diversity Engagement Survey is the only survey with DEI as its primary focus. However, for the administration of the 2020 NSSE at Emory, the Office of Undergraduate Affairs chose to include the newly available topical module, Inclusiveness and Engagement with Cultural Diversity (IECD). Since other surveys have none to a few questions related to DEI, I only discuss the 2015 Diversity Engagement Survey and 2020 NSSE-IECD module results in the following subsection.

It merits pointing out that there are a few items addressing DEI aspects in the surveys from which I did not extract DEI insights. For example, the Ph.D. and master’s Exit surveys include an item about students’ agreement with the statement, *Students in my program are treated with respect by faculty.* Questions about students’ satisfaction with ESL tutors, learning specialists, and services for disabled students in the College Exit Survey are another example. Those surveys may merit further examination later.

Appendix B presents more details about the 2016 Diversity Engagement Survey’s and 2020 NSSE-IECD module’s results.

6.3.1. DEI Insights

The primary insight from the 2016 Diversity Engagement Survey results is that while the community’s perception of Access to Opportunity at Emory University is high, respondents’

---

65 “DEI Focus” and “HUG Results” are explained next.
66 Recall NSSE stands for the National Survey of Student Engagement.
67 While the topic of the 2015 Faculty and Staff Climate Culture survey and the 2018 Student Well-Being survey address topics of inclusion and equity, results were only reported by gender, so I present those results in section 3.4.1.
68 *Italicized* font indicates the key concepts from the surveys.
agreement that the institution provides for *Equitable Rewards and Recognition* is not as favorable:

- A large majority (79%) of respondents agreed that they could obtain and benefit from support for their development and advancement at Emory (*Access to Opportunity*), while
- A smaller proportion of respondents (64%) agreed that the university has equitable compensation practices and nonfinancial incentives (*Equitable Reward and Recognition*).

Other results from the Diversity Engagement Survey indicate that *Common Purpose* and *Respect* are *Areas of Strength*, and *Trust* and *Cultural Competence* are *Areas for Improvement.*

The first of two insights from the 2020 NSSE-IECD is that Emory’s first-year and senior undergraduate students consistently report higher *Curricular Emphasis on Diversity and Inclusion* and *Personal Participation in Activities Promoting Diversity and Inclusion* relative to first-year and senior students attending R1 peer institutions.

The second insight is that there is a difference between the benchmarked scores for *Institutional Emphasis on Diversity and Inclusion* and *Institutional Support for Different Types of Diversity* between Emory’s first-year students (at-par or higher than students at the peer institutions) and seniors (at-par and lower). Emory’s senior students reported relatively lower perceptions than their peers in other institutions about:

- Emory’s emphasis on *Creating a Community Among Students* and aspects of *Coursework Emphasis* on DEI, and
- How much Emory provides a *Supportive Environment for Diversity in Economic Background, Political Affiliation, and Disability Status*.

### 6.4. HUG Results Reported

The last column in Table 2 indicates whether the survey results included HUG-status comparisons. All surveys collected self-reported demographic characteristics from their subjects

---

69 The Diversity Engagement Survey report does not indicate whether there are statistically significant differences in the responses from different groups. In this section I present the proportions that struck as most relevant for the topic of DEI, in the section “HUG Insights,” I present the largest differences observed in the proportions across groups. The designations of *Areas of Strength* and *Areas for Improvement*, from the survey report, identify the three concepts with highest and lowest favorable responses overall, out of eight concepts. The designations merit careful interpretation, as the spread between the lowest *Strength* are and the highest *Improvement* area is only four percentage points.
or link respondent identification numbers to their profiles in the university’s administrative systems, but not all surveys included analyses by demographic categories.

However, only five of the eleven 2015-2020 survey reports present the results separately for subjects from HUG categories. Of the five, only one, the 2018 Well-Being Survey, includes results for the HUG categories of gender, race/ethnicity, and disability, in addition to international status and sexual orientation. Two reports include gender and race/ethnicity (2016 Diversity Engagement Survey and 2020 COACHE), and one contains results by first-generation status70 (2019 BCSSE).

Appendix C presents more details about the results of the six surveys with HUG results.

6.4.1. HUG Insights

I draw two insights from the 2015 Faculty and Staff Well-Being Survey. The first one is that relative to male professors, female faculty were more likely to report witnessing and experiencing sexual harassment.71 The second one is less than two percent of the faculty and staff who experienced harassment incidents reported the incidents through formal channels.

I draw two insights from the 2016 Diversity Engagement Survey Report. The first is that White, Asian, and Native American subjects reported the highest average perceptions of inclusion and equity at Emory University.72 In contrast, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, black, and multiracial individuals had the least favorable answers.73 The second insight is that female respondents had lower perceptions of inclusivity and equity at Emory than male ones.

Two HUG-specific insights from the 2018 Well-Being Survey Report are that, overall, female students report higher rates of sexual victimization since enrolling at Emory and before their enrollment than male students.74 The second one is that among Atlanta campus undergraduate students, those of Hispanic ethnicity report higher victimization rates.

70 Defined as having no parent or guardian who graduated with a 4-year college degree.
71 The survey for faculty and staff did not include questions about sexual violence.
72 Only a brief summary of results is available for this survey. I assume the abbreviation “Am. Indian” refers to the racial category American Native and Indigenous populations and that “Multi” refers to individuals who self-identified with more than one racial/ethnic category.
73 For more detail on this survey, please see Section 1 in Appendix B. Note that the count of responses for the category Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander was very low (four), and the response rates for this and the multiracial categories were only 12 and 14 percent, respectively. Such low counts and proportions increase the risk of biased responses, especially since the samples were not drawn at random.
74 An important caveat of the Well-Being results is that some patterns of victimization may be true across broader student groups than indicated here. The reason is that low counts of respondents in some subgroups prevent reporting due to the risk of deductive disclosure or result in large standard errors that negate statistical
Other student characteristics are associated with an elevated risk of victimization, including:

- Bisexual and Other sexual orientation among undergraduate female students at both campuses,
- White and Other race/ethnicity among graduate and professional female students,
- Gay sexual orientation, among graduate and professional male students, and
- Disability status among Atlanta undergraduate female students.

From the 2019 BCCSE, I draw two insights about differences in the high-school academic experiences of first-generation students coming to Emory as first-year college students and those whose parents or guardians attended college. First-generation students report lower high-school engagement with activities in the scales Quantitative Reasoning, Learning Strategies, and Perceived Academic Preparation. The second insight is that, among transfer students, first-generation students report higher scores on the Expected Academic Perseverance scale.

Some of the items that roll into the 11 scales that comprise the BCSSE are also noteworthy. For example, first-generation first-year students at Emory Worked for Pay more hours in their last year of high school than non-first-generation students, and they also expect to spend more hours Working for Pay On- or Off-campus while attending Emory. First-generation students are more likely to expect that Paying for College Expenses will be difficult. Finally, they are less likely to report that they will Ask Family Members for Help with Coursework.

The 2020 COACHE Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey provides three key insights about the differences in faculty experiences of their jobs by demographic group. First, faculty of color are more likely than other faculty at Emory to indicate that Lack of Diversity or Absence of Others Like Me is one of the two worst aspects of working at the institution.

Second, the average responses from Emory’s female pre-tenure faculty and tenured faculty of color about two aspects of the Tenure and Promotion processes place Emory’s disaggregated results for those faculty and items in the bottom 30 percent of the 110 colleges and universities in the COACHE benchmark group for 2019-2020. These aspects constitute “Areas of Concern”. Pre-tenure female faculty’s perceptions of Clarity in Expectations for Promotion and tenured’s responses about Promotion to Full [Professor].

 significance. For example, it is possible that Hispanic students overall have a higher risk of victimization, but their counts at the graduate/professional level are too low to allow for reporting of significant results. This designation was made by COACHE.
Finally, the proportion of respondents indicating they are dissatisfied with the recognition and support they receive for their service to Emory around diversity issues is higher for FOC and respondents from Under-Represented Minorities (URM): 18% and 24%, respectively, vs. 12% for all faculty.

6.5. The Balance of Our Insights

With the participation of community members, through the efforts of numerous staff and leaders at the Emory offices and schools sponsoring and administering the 11 surveys reviewed above, and in partnership with external public and private institutions, Emory has collected over 22,000 survey responses. This report has gathered insights about Emory community members’ experiences and perspectives with DEI at the university.

Table 3 presents a summary of these insights. In the first column of the table, I categorize insights by DEI value. In the second column, I list the general insights gathered. In the last column, I present insights for specific HUG categories.

The reader will notice the empty cell at the top of Table 3, in the intersection of general insights and the topic of diversity. I did not find information for this cell in the surveys I reviewed. Possible information for this cell might describe Emory’s diverse composition over time; this information is likely available from other sources at Emory University, such as the Diversity Dashboards published by IRDS.
Table 3. Summary of Insights by DEI Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEI Value</th>
<th>General Insights(^76,77)</th>
<th>Insights about Specific Demographic Groups(^78)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>FOC</strong> are more likely to identify <em>Lack of Diversity</em> as one of the two worst aspects of working at Emory (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>First-generation</strong>, first-year students report lower high school <em>Engagement with Learning Practices</em> and <em>Quantitative Skills</em> and more hours spent <em>Working for Pay</em> while in high school (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>First-generation</strong> transfer students report the highest levels of <em>Expected Academic Resilience</em> (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td><strong>Community</strong> perceptions of <em>Respect</em> and <em>Common Purpose</em> at Emory are high, but those about <em>Cultural Competence</em> indicate an area for improvement (D)</td>
<td><strong>First-generation</strong>, first-year students expect to spend more hours working for pay and fewer hours relaxing during college and report greater concerns about paying for college (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only a small portion of <strong>faculty</strong> identify DEI in the top two aspects of working at Emory(^79) (C)</td>
<td>Groups at higher risk for sexual violence include <strong>U/G</strong> and <strong>female</strong> students, and among female U/G students: <em>Hispanic</em> ethnicity, <em>disability</em> status, <strong>non-straight</strong> sexual orientation (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>U/G, graduate, and professional students</strong> share experiences of sexual harassment and violence (W)</td>
<td><strong>Female faculty</strong> are at higher risk for witnessing and experiencing sexual harassment (FS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>First-year and senior students</strong> alike report higher levels of <em>Participation in Diversity and Inclusion Activities</em> and <em>Institutional Emphasis on and Support for Diversity</em> than their peers at other R1 institutions (N)</td>
<td><strong>Senior students</strong> report lower <em>Institutional Emphasis on a Sense of Community Among Students, Providing Information About Policies Against Harassment and Discrimination, Taking Reports of Discrimination/Harassment Seriously, and Supporting Diversity in Economic Background, Political Affiliation, and Disability Status</em> (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Perception that all <strong>community members</strong> have <em>Access to Opportunity</em> is strong, but that of <em>Equitable Recognition</em> is relatively low (D)</td>
<td>Comparing the scores of Emory’s faculty with the scores from the peer institutions’ professors reveals that <em>Clarity in Expectations</em> for tenure among <strong>pre-tenure female faculty</strong> and <em>Promotion to Full (Professor)</em> among tenured <strong>FOC</strong> are areas of concern for Emory (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>FOC</strong> and <strong>URM</strong> faculty are more likely to be dissatisfied with Emory’s <em>Recognition and Support for their Service to the Institution around Areas of Diversity</em> (C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^76\) Acronyms used: **FOC** Faculty of Color, **U/G** Undergraduate, **URM** Under-represented Minority; source studies are indicated at the end of each statement as: (B) 2019 BCSSSE, (C) 2020 COACHE Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey, (D) 2016 Diversity and Engagement Survey, (FS) 2016 Faculty and Staff Campus Climate Survey, (N)
6.5.1. The Other Four Surveys

To conclude section 3, “Synthesizing Our Insights,” I present brief observations about the reason I excluded five surveys from this review.

- The 2015 Student Campus Climate survey report does not include results by demographic group, and the overall results reported are not comparable with the 2018 Well-Being survey.
- The 2018 Enterprise Report was not designed for DEI-related insights, results were not reported by demographics, and Emory does not have access to the survey’s dataset.
- When I gathered the information for this report, the Office of Institutional Research and Decision Support did not analyze results from the three annual exit surveys (College, Master’s, and Ph.D.) by demographic characteristics to avoid the risk of deductive disclosure that would violate research subjects’ confidentiality.

Emory’s Office of Institutional Research and Decision Support has begun to look for differences by HUG category from the exit surveys. The COACHE report illustrates one way to conduct such an analysis. The report presents results by gender and race/ethnicity if there are enough respondents in the subcategories studied. COACHE presents scores for Emory faculty’s overall satisfaction with different aspects of the tenure process but elides some of those scores in detailed views. For instance, in the detailed disciplinary view, most scores are reported for non-tenured faculty in the physical sciences, social sciences, and humanities departments (among others), but not for those in the biological science (and other) departments with lower subject counts.

---

77 Bold font indicates the group from which each insight was generated.
78 Bold font indicates the demographic group to which the insight applies.
79 However, a similarly small proportion of faculty reported DEI as one of the worst two aspects.
80 A slide titled Demographic Heatmaps is blank in the report.
81 Personal communication with Dr. Justin Shepherd.
82 Deductive disclosure happens when individuals or groups are identified based on their traits and characteristics (see Kaiser, “Protecting Respondent Confidentiality in Qualitative Research.”) For example, someone with knowledge of the social sciences departments at LGS may be able to identify a married, Hispanic, 2020 doctoral graduate of a certain gender and age group.
7. Tracking Emory’s DEI Initiatives

The various surveys conducted between 2015 and 2020 have driven change at Emory University. Some initiatives at Emory were direct responses to survey results, such as those started by the Department of Title IX (DTIX) due to the 2015 Campus Climate and 2018 Well-Being survey’s results. Other actions have been shaped and informed indirectly by survey results, as in the case of the Office of Undergraduate Affairs’ (OUA) initiatives and its various surveys of Emory’s undergraduates. In this section, I track the DTIX OUA initiatives.

Before presenting those initiatives, a note about survey impacts at the Laney Graduate School, Office of Equity and Inclusion, and Academic Affairs: While the Laney Graduate School reviews the results from its annual exit surveys and incorporates the insights gained from this review as it emphasizes Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) in all its work, a list of their initiatives was not available for this report. Also, at the time information was gathered for this report, Academic Affairs had not completed their review of the 2020 COACHE survey results. I could only connect with this office late in our information-gathering process and could not obtain a list of their existing DEI initiatives. Finally, I have not found a record of recommendations or resulting initiatives from the 2015 Diversity Engagement Survey, which the Office of Equity and Inclusion sponsored.

7.1. Department of Title IX’s Initiatives for Inclusion

The Senate’s Committee for the Prevention of Sexual Violence (CPSV) formulated recommendations based on the 2015 Campus Climate Surveys and the 2018 Student Well-Being Survey. The committee documented the initiatives carefully, noting their rationales, required resources, and expected outcomes, and DTIX tracks the initiative’s status. This comprehensive program management results from the CPSV’s governance structure and intentionality.

Table 4 presents an overview of DTIX initiatives and their status at the end of calendar year 2020. Seven of the DTIX initiatives are complete or in-process.

---

83 Personal communications with Dr. Cathryn Johnson, LGS Senior Associate Dean.
84 Personal communications with Dr. Justin Shepherd, IRDS Director, and Nicole Ingram, ODEI Director of Programs & Special Initiatives.
85 Department of Title IX, “Summary of Recommendations from the 2018 Well-Being Survey and 2015 CCS.”
86 Personal communication with Dr. Justin Shepherd, Yoland Buckner, University Title IX Coordinator, and Judith Pannell, Title IX Coordinator for Students.
### Table 4. Recommended Initiatives to Prevent Sexual Violence and 2020 Year-End Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>2020 Status and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. In partnership with IRDS\(^{87}\), to conduct periodic campus climate surveys every 2 years for students and every 4 for faculty and staff | Delayed  
The Senate Committee and the DTIX decided to address the 2018 recommendations before proceeding with the 2020 student survey |
| 2. Create a new DTIX staff position accountable for implementing, monitoring, and evaluating prevention strategies across faculty/staff and student populations | Complete  
The Office of Respect was created at Emory’s Campus Life; it is the central hub for interpersonal violence prevention education and training |
| 3. Collaborate with local colleges and universities to plan and implement prevention efforts and intervention development on campus | In Process  
DTIX is currently working with the Office of Respect and the subcommittee of the Senate to research this topic |
| 4. Continue to support existing prevention efforts and prevention programming for undergraduate students at ECAS and Oxford College, with a focus on evaluating these programs’ impact | In Process  
The Office of Respect and DTIX have created and conducted training based on survey results; they continually evaluate their programming |
| 5. Offer evidence-based, skills-based bystander intervention programming at multiple time points through a student’s career at ECAS and Oxford College | Ongoing  
The Office of Respect conducts bystander intervention training |
| 6. Develop multi-level interventions to address the intersection of alcohol abuse and sexual violence, specifically by preventing serving alcohol to underage students. | Complete  
The Office of Health Promotion created an online training platform for undergraduate students |
| 7. Extend faculty and staff Title IX training to graduate and professional students to prepare them for their professional responsibilities. | In Process  
DTIX has met with the Office of Health Promotion to inquire about their experience implementing mandatory U/G online training and partnered with the Office of Respect to engage the graduate and professional school deans |
| 8. Provide sexual harassment prevention training to doctoral-level graduate students, faculty, and staff. | Ongoing  
DTIX provides online training to faculty, staff, undergrads, grads, fellows, and residents and is working with the training subcommittee of the Committee for the Prevention of Sexual Violence to develop a university-wide sexual harassment curriculum. The next milestone will be to finish research on best practices and complete the curriculum by May 2021 |

---

\(^{87}\) Acronyms used: DTIX, Department of Title IX; ECAS: Emory College of Arts and Sciences; IRDS, Office of Institutional Research and Decision Support; U/G, Undergraduate
7.2. The Office of Undergraduate Affairs’ Initiatives for DEI

The Office of Undergraduate Affairs (OUA), which sponsored the 2019 BCCSE\textsuperscript{88} and 2020 NSSE and the annual College Exit Surveys, does not tie initiatives directly to survey findings or recommendations. However, OUA incorporates survey results to inform and adjust its programs for DEI among Emory College students.

Table 5 presents an overview of current and recent Emory College initiatives supporting DEI at Emory.\textsuperscript{89}

Table 5. Office of Undergraduate Affairs Initiatives (OUA), by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type\textsuperscript{90}</th>
<th>Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| General initiatives     | • Focused work reviewing retention and graduation rates of underrepresented student populations  
                          • Review of Gateway courses and completion rates, with specific attention to underrepresented student populations  
                          • Identification of support initiatives to connect students to resources they need to be successful |
| Equity focused initiatives: support for first-generation and low-income students at Emory | • The First-Gen Faculty Committee brings together faculty to identify areas where faculty can help support the first-gen community and to offer perspectives on students’ experience  
                          • The Emory First-Gen and Low-Income University Committee is a standing committee that brings together faculty, students, and staff supporting our FGLI students. It includes representatives from all parts of the campus (established 2020)  
                          • Emory First-Gen Office Hours are regular office hours for first-gen students run by the Office of Undergraduate Affairs, allowing students to connect with OUA staff for support, mentorship, and collaboration  
                          • The OUA sponsors the QuestBridge\textsuperscript{91} Breakfast during QuestBridge Scholars week to host current QSN students and interviewees and participates in regular QuestBridge scholar events  
                          • The OUA co-sponsors the First-Gen Dinner for first-generation undergraduates and coordinates first-generation staff and faculty to speak with students about their experiences  
                          • In conjunction with National First-Gen Day, Emory celebrates first-generation students with Emory First-Gen Week in November. OUA coordinates activities and initiatives across campus that are related to the first-gen experience. For 2020, the OUA sent out communications to all Emory students, faculty, and staff asking them to self-identify as first-generation and developed marketing materials for first-generation campus members to be more visible on campus. (established 2020) |

\textsuperscript{88} Recall that BCCSE stands for the Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement and NSSE stands for the National Survey of Student Engagement.

\textsuperscript{89} Office of Undergraduate Affairs, “OUA Initiatives in Support of DEI at Emory University.”

\textsuperscript{90} OUA categorized the initiatives as shown.

\textsuperscript{91} See the entry for QuestBridge, farther down in the table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Educational Access &amp; Equity Committee</strong> (2018-2019) is a collaboration between OUA and Campus Life to improve our understanding of the needs of low income, underrepresented, and first-generation students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive partnership and Engagement with Emory Office of Advancement and Alumni Engagement: Vice Provost Scully and OUA have made it a priority to advise the Advancement Office through their insight into the barriers under-resourced students face. The SVP of Advancement was a first-generation student, understands and empathizes with the students’ challenges, and recognizes that Emory will need to commit financial resources to support students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEM Pathways</strong> is a pre-orientation program providing support to natural science and mathematics students who are the first generation in their families to attend college or are in identity groups underrepresented in STEM fields. The program introduces students to STEM opportunities and faculty at Emory and seeks to create a supportive community among participants and peer mentors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QuestBridge</strong> is a national nonprofit program that identifies high-achieving, low-income students nationwide and connects them with the nation’s best colleges and universities. Emory’s Office of Admission has partnered with QuestBridge since 2008, and Emory’s QuestBridge Scholars Network (QSN) is one of the largest in the country, including almost 300 students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emory FLIP (First-Generation Low-Income Emory)</strong> is dedicated to fostering a community for first-generation and/or low-income students at Emory. FLIP is a national 501(c)(3) nonprofit established to promote equal opportunity for first-generation and low-income students in higher learning institutions. FLIP is housed in the Department of Sociology, with Professor Tim Dowd as faculty advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emory Grad FLIP (EGFLIP)</strong> is a new organization (established 2020) to promote equal opportunity for FLI graduate students through collaboration with various units around the university. It aims to build a community of FLI graduate students and alums from different departments to improve their educational, professional, and lived experiences. It plans to partner with the Emory Undergraduate FLIP chapter to mentor FLI undergraduate students to promote and increase their enrollment in graduate and professional education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The 1915 Scholars Program</strong> provides informational mentoring and social support to a cohort of FLI students to alleviate some of the barriers they commonly encounter. It comprises peer and alumni mentoring, specialized orientation programs, ongoing academic workshops, and community-building events through structured interactions with Campus Life, the Office of Undergraduate Education, the Alumni Association, and various support services (established 2020 and situated in Belonging, Community, and Justice within Campus Life)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OxFirst</strong> is Oxford College’s first-generation student organization. It holds events to help strengthen the first-generation and low-income community on campus and provide its members with as many resources as possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The American Talent Initiative (ATI)</strong> brings top colleges and universities together with the philanthropy and research communities to expand access and opportunity for talented low- and moderate-income students. By 2025, ATI aims to attract, enroll, and graduate an additional 50,000 lower-income students at the 327 colleges and universities that consistently graduate at least 70 percent of their students in six years. Emory joined ATI in 2018, committing to attract, enroll and support more high-achieving, lower- and moderate-income students from before they arrive on campus to graduation and beyond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type90</td>
<td>Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In 2020, OUA applied to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) for membership in First Generation Forward, a recognition program for higher education institutions committed to first-generation student success</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Conclusion

The Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ODEI) and its partners at Emory University have collected the insights to begin filling in the picture about the current state of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) at Emory University. The positives show that Emory has already started the journey and is working from a good start, as evidenced by the strong perceptions of Respect, Common Purpose, and Access to Opportunity in the 2016 Diversity Engagement Survey and undergraduate students reports of higher levels of Participation in Diversity and Inclusion Activities and Institutional Emphasis/Support for Diversity than the institutions’ peers, according to the module on Inclusiveness and Engagement with Cultural Diversity in the 2020 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

The surveys conducted from 2015 to 2020 have resulted in change at Emory. I included the lists of Department of Title IX initiatives driven by the 2015 Campus Climate and 2018 Well-Being surveys and the Office of Undergraduate Affairs’ initiatives indirectly shaped by the 2019 Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement, 2020 NSSE, and annual College Surveys. Although I could not share their list in this report, the Laney Graduate School also pursues enhanced DEI at the graduate school in all its initiatives. I expect Academic Affairs and other offices and schools at Emory can compile lists of their DEI-related initiatives.

Insights included in Table 3 indicate the continued importance of specific programs that Emory already has in place or is likely to have planned to achieve the goals to:

- Continue to build a culture that rejects all forms of harassment and discrimination, with particular emphasis against sexual violence, and establishes mechanisms for accountability,
- Continue to support first-generation and low-income students to address the headwinds they face, and
- Ensure all untenured faculty members, especially women, and all associate professors, especially faculty of color, have a solid understanding of tenure and promotion requirements, respectively.

As ODEI plans to conduct new campus culture and climate surveys at Emory University and across the whole Emory enterprise, insights from past surveys provide a point of comparison for future survey results. Also, those areas where fewer insights are available may indicate opportunities for future institutional research.
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Appendix A. Proposed Scope of Work

In October 2020, I proposed the project *Preparing for the Fall 2021 Survey* to Dr. Carol Henderson at Emory’s Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ODEI). The paragraphs and table that follow are an excerpt of that proposal and subsequent Statement of Work.

A.1. My Understanding

Living up to its stated value of diversity is a vital task for Emory University. In this ongoing endeavor, the Offices of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ODEI) and Institutional Research and Decision Support (IRDS) are crucial partners to the President’s Office.

Individually, jointly and in partnership with other organizations, the two offices have conducted or cataloged several studies to understand diversity engagement, well-being and career satisfaction, and campus climate (which I refer to as “the DEWSC studies”) at the school, campus, or enterprise level. Table 1 lists the relevant studies, from oldest to most recent, indicating the organizations responsible and, where applicable, their outside partners.

Table 6. Emory University DEWSC Studies, 2015-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Student Campus Climate Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Faculty and Staff Campus Climate Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Diversity Engagement Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Student Community Well-Being Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>M.A. and Ph.D. Exit Surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{92}\) Center for Postsecondary Research, Indiana University School of Education  
\(^{93}\) Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education, Harvard Graduate School of Education
A.2. Proposed Deliverables

Three deliverables will enable ODEI to prepare the campus for the upcoming Fall 2021 campus climate and culture survey:

1. A synthesis of common themes across the DEWSC studies and trends tracked through the executive dashboards (*Synthesis of common themes*). This synthesis will include a high-level methodology review to confirm that findings incorporated into the common themes are statistically significant.

2. A tracker of all the recommendations from the DEWSC studies, indicating the status of resulting initiatives and actions (*Tracker of recommendations*)

3. An outline and the first draft of the information ODEI will communicate to IRDS to begin preparing for the Fall 2021 survey (*ODEI-to-IRDS input*)

A.3. Proposed Approach

My approach will consist of leveraging the reports from the previous DEWSC studies as much as possible, relying on the organizational owners of initiatives and actions resulting from those studies for status updates, and collaborating with IRDS to identify the input IRDS requires from ODEI to prepare for the Fall 2021 survey. I understand the need to balance the requirements of speed and economy with the imperative to deliver rigorous analysis, relevant insights, and actionable recommendations.
Appendix B. Meetings and Work Completed

This appendix includes two tables. Table 7 provides information about Zoom meetings and email consults conducted for this project; Table 8 covers the work products proposed and delivered.

Table 7. Meetings and Consults with Emory Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type / Contacts</th>
<th>Office/Division</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Starting on 12/02/20 | Meetings and consults Justin Shepherd<sup>94</sup> | Institutional Research and Decision Support | ✓ Access to survey results and reports  
✓ IRDS requirements for new campus climate & culture survey         |
| 12/21/20        | Meetings        | Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion       | ✓ Project Check-ins  
✓ Report feedback  
✓ Guidance for the public report                                    |
| 01/02/20, 01/25/20 | Carol Henderson |                                                   |                                                                      |
| 12/09/20        | Meeting         | Laney Graduate School                            | ✓ LGS Exit Surveys  
✓ LGS Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion initiatives               |
| 12/14/20        | Consult         | Administration & Planning                        | ✓ Enterprise Health Report  
• Availability of a detailed report  
• Recommendations                                               |
| 01/06/21        | Consult         | Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion       | ✓ Diversity Engagement Survey:  
• Availability of a detailed report and any study recommendations |
| 01/12/21        | Consult         | Office of the Provost                             | ✓ Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey:  
• Availability of a narrative report and study recommendations |
| 01/15/21        | Meeting         | Office of Undergraduate Affairs                  | ✓ OUA Surveys:  
• National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)  
• Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE)  
• College Exit Survey  
• Emory UP Student Experience Survey  
✓ OUA DEI Initiatives                                                |
| 01/22/21        | Meeting         | Department of Title XI                           | ✓ DTIX Surveys:  
• Student Campus Climate Survey  
• Faculty & Staff Campus Climate Survey  
✓ Senate Committee Initiatives                                      |
|                 |                 |                                                   |                                                                      |
|                 |                 |                                                   |                                                                      |

<sup>94</sup> Dr. Justin Shepherd supported delivery of this project, assisting with introductions and access to information, participating in all Zoom meetings and email consults except for the 12/02 and 01/06 ones, and providing feedback on this document’s earlier draft.
Table 8 summarizes the work products that Dr. Henderson and I agreed on per my October 2020 proposal in the first column, the date and mode of delivery to Dr. Henderson in the second column, and explanatory comments about each deliverable in the third column.

Table 8. Work Products Delivered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Product</th>
<th>Date &amp; Method of Delivery</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Synthesis of Common Themes                  | 02/28/21 E-mail to Carol Henderson  
Section 4 in “ODEI Report 2 – 210228.pdf” | ✓ Version 2 included the content specified in the proposal and drafts of the sections created for the public report (see the last row in this table)  
✓ Version 3 included the synthesis of common themes incorporating feedback from Drs. Henderson and Shepherd and the final versions of new sections created for the public report |
| Tracker of Recommendations                  | 02/28/21 E-mail to Carol Henderson  
Section 5 in “ODEI Report 2 – 210228.pdf” | ✓ The Department of Title IX and Office of Undergraduate Affairs provided lists of initiatives for this report  
✓ The Laney Graduate School and Academic Affairs have not |
| ODEI-to-IRDS Input                          | 12/21/20 meeting with Carol Henderson | ✓ Dr. Shepherd indicated that Dr. Henderson should forward the executed contract for the Fall 2021 survey as soon as possible  
✓ On 12/21, Dr. Henderson indicated the contract would not be ready until Spring 2021, completing my responsibility for that deliverable |
| Public Report on the State of DEI at Emory  | 3/22/21 E-mail to Carol Henderson  
All sections in “ODEI Report 3 – 210322.pdf” | ✓ On January 5, Dr. Henderson indicated the final deliverable should be a broader report to the public rather than a narrowly scoped synthesis of survey results and should include a background section on crucial 2020 events and Emory’s responses, as well as all survey instruments in an appendix  
✓ On January 14, Dr. Henderson also requested the report include the new Diversity Statement & Glossary of Foundational Terms |
Appendix C. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Values at Emory University

Table 9. Emory’s DEI Values: Meanings, Rationales, and Imperatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Differences in race, ethnicity, gender, disability, national origin, age, health status, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, socioeconomic standing, immigration status, family background, neurodiversity, intersectional identities, and the broad representations of human existence</td>
<td>Diversity fosters dynamic spaces of engagement that give rise to innovation, critical thinking, creativity, and understanding</td>
<td>To cultivate intellectual communities rooted in mutual respect for individuals whose identities, experiences, gifts, and talents mirror the diversity of the communities surrounding our campus and better reflect the diversity of our world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Active, intentional, and ongoing engagement with the principles of diversity in all aspects of Emory’s curriculum, co-curriculum, business operations, and infrastructure</td>
<td>Inclusion in action increases awareness, content knowledge, perspective-taking, and empathetic understanding of the complex ways in which individuals interact within societies, organizations and institutions, and systems</td>
<td>To create an environment in which faculty, staff, and students can thrive, where they feel appreciated and can see themselves in the images, traditions, and culture of the campus community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Guarantee of fair treatment, access, opportunity, and advancement for all students, faculty, and staff</td>
<td>There are underserved and underrepresented populations, and fairness regarding addressing those unbalanced conditions is needed to assist in the provision of effective opportunities to all groups</td>
<td>To identify and eliminate barriers that have prevented some groups from participating fully in higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity-mindedness</td>
<td>Calling attention to patterns of inequity in outcomes for students, faculty, and staff, and being race-conscious and aware of the social and historical context of exclusionary practices in American higher education</td>
<td>Patterns of inequity in outcomes exist for students, faculty, and staff</td>
<td>To take personal and institutional responsibility for the success of all our community’s members and to critically reassess Emory’s practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

95 The Advisory Group grounded the descriptions of diversity, inclusion, and equity in “Making Excellence Inclusive,” published by the Association for American Colleges and Universities, and on the Center for Urban Education’s publication “Equity Mindedness.”
Appendix D. Surveys with Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Focus

D.1. The 2016 Diversity Engagement Survey

The Diversity Engagement Survey recorded subjects’ degree of agreement\(^{96}\) with 22 statements that map onto eight inclusion factors\(^{97}\). The topics surveyed included subjects’ experiences and perceptions of inclusivity (respect, belonging) and equity (rewards, recognition) at Emory.

The analysis consisted of categorizing subjects’ responses by inclusion factor as favorable, unfavorable, or mixed depending on whether they provided consistently high, consistently low, or a mix of high and low agreement with the statements that comprise each inclusion factor. The results present the proportion of subjects who provided positive, negative, and mixed responses for each inclusion factor. One caveat about this survey is that it was developed for and validated with faculty, staff, and students at academic medical centers and not for a general higher-education population.

\[\text{I map the eight inclusion factors to two of Emory’s Diversity, Engagement, and Inclusion (DEI) values based on the description of each factor as follows:}\]

- **Inclusion**: Appreciation of Individual Attributes, Respect, Sense of Belonging, Trust, Common Purpose, Cultural Competence
- **Equity**: Access to Opportunity, Equitable Reward and Recognition

The Diversity Engagement Survey Summary of Results identifies three areas of strength, those with the higher percentages of favorable responses (Common Purpose, Respect, and Access to Opportunity, with favorable responses from 78% to 81%) and three areas for improvement, those with the lower percentages of favorable responses (Equitable Reward, Trust, and Cultural Competence; 64% to 74% favorable)\(^{98}\).

D.2. The 2020 NSSE-Inclusiveness and Engagement with Cultural Diversity Module

The Inclusiveness and Engagement with Cultural Diversity (IECD) topical module of the 2020 NSSE survey used 26 items grouped into four sets of questions to elicit students’ (1) self-report about the intensity\(^{99}\) of engagement with diversity in their coursework, (2) perceptions about the strength of the university’s emphasis on inclusivity, (3) perceptions of the degree to which their institution provides a supportive environment for various forms of diversity, and (4) the frequency of the students’ participation in activities promoting diversity and inclusivity. Based

\[\text{\textsuperscript{96} Using a 5-point Likert scale.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{97} Person et al., “Measuring Diversity and Inclusion in Academic Medicine: The Diversity Engagement Survey.”}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{98} Office of Planning and Budgeting, “Diversity Engagement Survey.”}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{99} Using a 4-point Likert scale.}\]
on ODEI’s descriptions of the meaning of DEI values at Emory, I map the IECD module’s four question sets onto the DEI imperative to ensure inclusion.

NSSE compared Emory’s first-year and senior students’ mean responses to those of their peers at 14 R1 institutions that Emory selected as its peer group100. NSSE reported the magnitude101 of the difference between the means of Emory’s and the peer institutions’ students’ scores and indicates whether the means are statistically different, using 2-tailed tests of significance.

NSSE results are that half of Emory’s first-year students’ mean scores on the IECD module are significantly higher than those of first-year students at peer institutions. Twelve of the scores show small102 positive effects for Emory, and one (“How much has your coursework emphasized learning about other cultures?”) was moderately positive. Four out of four scores about personal participation in pro-diversity and inclusion events and activities are moderately higher at Emory. All other scores are at par with the peer groups.

Emory senior students reported answers that make for a more complicated picture. Two scores in the coursework section are moderately higher than those for the peer group (learning about other cultures and discussion of issues of equity and privilege.) Three scores in this section are at par with the peer group compared to seven out of seven higher scores among first-year students. In the sections about the institutional emphasis on DEI and how much the institution provides an inclusive environment for different forms of diversity, half of Emory’s seniors’ scores are at par with, and the other half are slightly lower than the peer groups’ scores. Finally, just as first-year students, senior students reported moderately higher scores for all items about personal participation in pro-diversity events and activities.

Table 7 summarizes DEI results from the 2016 Diversity Engagement Survey and 2020 NSSE-IECD module, organizing them by DEI imperative.

---

100 Emory selected these R1 institutions for the peer group comparison: SUNY-Binghamton University (Vestal, NY), Colorado State University (Fort Collins, CO), Kansas State University (Manhattan, KS), Temple University (Philadelphia, PA), Texas Tech University (Lubbock, TX), University of Alabama, The (Tuscaloosa, AL), University of Arkansas (Fayetteville, AR), University of Central Florida (Orlando, FL), University of Colorado Denver (Denver, CO), University of Kentucky (Lexington, KY), University of Missouri (Columbia, MO), University of Nebraska at Lincoln (Lincoln, NE), University of Utah (Salt Lake City, UT), Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Blacksburg, VA).

101 NSSE categorizes significant effects (p<.05) as smaller than .03 or at least .03; I use the terms “slight” and “moderate” for the effects, respectively.

102 Effect sizes lower than .30 are considered small, while effect sizes lower than .50 are considered moderate.
Table 10. DEI Results by Survey and Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Ensuring Inclusion</th>
<th>Achieving Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **2016 Diversity Engagement Survey** | • *Respect* and *Common Purpose* received high favorable responses overall (81% and 78%, respectively)  
   Students, faculty, staff  
   *Internal comparisons*  
   • *Cultural Competence* received lower positive responses overall (74% favorable) | • *Access to Opportunity* received 79% favorable responses, but  
   • *Equitable Reward and Recognition* received the lowest proportion of favorable responses (64%) |
| **2020 NSSE-Inclusiveness and Engagement with Cultural Diversity module** | Relative to students at the R1 peer institutions, Emory first-year and senior students report:  
   Students  
   *External Benchmarks*  
   • Across the board, moderately higher personal participation in five types of inclusion-focused activities  
   • Slightly to moderately higher¹⁰³ coursework emphasis on diversity and inclusion  
   • At-par¹⁰⁴ and slightly higher perceptions of institutional emphasis on inclusion and support for different types of diversity among 1st-year students, but at-par and slightly lower perceptions among seniors  
   ✓ Seniors report relatively lower emphasis on creating an overall sense of community among students, providing information about anti-discrimination and harassment policies, taking allegations of discrimination or harassment seriously, and helping students develop the skill to confront discrimination and harassment  
   ✓ Seniors perceive lower support for diversity of economic background, political affiliation, and disability status |
Appendix E. Surveys with Results by HUG Status

E.1. The 2015 Campus Climate Survey for Faculty and Staff

The 2015 Campus Climate Faculty and Staff Survey’s objective was to capture Emory University employees’ experiences with sexual harassment, training in sexual discrimination, and knowledge of Title IX protections and reporting procedures. The survey invited all faculty and staff. The Emory University Campus Climate Survey Subcommittee of the University Senate Committee designed the survey, as there were no existing sexual harassment experience surveys available for university faculty and staff.

Key concepts explored in the survey included Experience Witnessing or Being Targeted for Sexual Harassment and Knowledge, Comfort with Guiding Students and Colleagues Through a Disclosure Process of Sex Discrimination or Sexual Violence.

E.2. The 2016 Diversity Engagement Survey

See section B.1 for a description of this survey. The Diversity Engagement Survey report includes results by race/ethnicity and international status (in a combined table), and gender.

E.3. The 2018 Student Well-Being Survey

This survey invited Atlanta and Oxford undergraduate students as well as graduate and professional students to participate. Key topics included students’ experiences of witnessing or suffering sexual harassment and victimization, any experiences reporting specific incidents, and perceptions of the campus climate around sexual violence, as well as perceptions about Emory’s climate for sexual harassment/assault\(^{105}\).

E.4. The 2019 Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement

The purpose of the Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE) was to gather information about incoming students’ previous academic and co-curricular experiences and their academic and student life expectations at Emory. The Office of Undergraduate Affairs surveyed Emory’s first-year and incoming transfer students about their high school engagement with Quantitative Reasoning and Learning Strategies, their Perceived Academic Preparedness, and their Expected Academic Perseverance\(^{106}\). The survey also included questions about the number

---

\(^{105}\) Including participation in sexual assault prevention efforts, awareness of university policies and resources, and perceived tolerance for sexual assault in the community, among other topics.

\(^{106}\) BCSSE scale descriptions: Quantitative Reasoning is high school engagement with analysis and numerical information, Learning Strategies is the use of effective learning strategies in high school, Perceived Academic Preparation is the students’ perception of their academic preparation for coursework at Emory University, and Expected Academic Perseverance is the students’ certainty that they will persist in the face of academic adversity.
of hours spent on different activities during a typical week in the last year of high school, including *Preparing for Class*, *Working for Pay*, and *Relaxing and Socializing*.

The analysis entailed comparing Emory’s first-generation students’ responses to students whose parents or guardians graduated from college with a four-year degree. The BCSSE report shows each item’s mean scores in the questionnaire and the combined scores along four scales constructed from the individual items.

**E.5. The 2020 COACHE Survey**

The COACHE\textsuperscript{107} Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey benchmarked Emory University against two groups: a comparison cohort of 110 institutions that have participated in the survey from 2017 to 2020 and five peer institutions selected by Emory. The survey asks respondents to report their level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with eight aspects of their jobs (*Nature of Work, Resources and Support, Cross-Silo Work and Mentorship, Tenure and Promotion, Institutional Leadership, Shared Governance, The Department, and Appreciation and Recognition*) and benchmarked Emory faculty’s mean responses to the comparison groups.

The survey also included items designed for internal comparisons across faculty with different demographic characteristics. The respondents identify the two best and two worst aspects of working at Emory and their satisfaction with the recognition and support for their service to the institution around diversity issues.

Results are that Emory faculty’s overall mean scores place Emory in the top 30\% of institutions for all 25 scales measured, making all 25 scales areas of strength\textsuperscript{108}. However, the proportion of favorable responses varies across the faculty’s demographic groups.

Table 8 summarizes results from the 2015-2020 surveys that present HUG-specific results.

\textsuperscript{107} COACHE stands for the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education

\textsuperscript{108} If a score places Emory in the top 30 percent of institutions, COACHE categorizes that scale as an “Area of Strength.” A score in the bottom 30 percent is categorized as an “Area of Concern.”
### Table 11. HUG Results by Survey and DEI Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>DEI Value</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **2015 Campus Climate Survey**                 | Inclusion   | • Female faculty were more likely than male faculty to have witnessed sexual harassment (59% vs. 44%) and experienced it (28% vs. 19%)  
• Only 2% of those reporting they witnessed harassment indicated they followed formal reporting avenues.  
• Faculty were more aware of and comfortable with the Title IX reporting process than staff, but this result is consistent with each group’s level of training received at the time of the survey |
| Faculty, staff Internal comparisons             |             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| **2016 Diversity Engagement Survey**           | Inclusion   | • International and white respondents provided the highest favorable answers overall, followed by American Indian and Asian subjects  
• Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islanders, black, and Multiracial respondents recorded the lowest proportions of favorable aspects overall  
• Overall, male respondents provided a higher proportion of favorable answers than female ones |
| Students, faculty, and staff Internal comparisons| Equity      | • *Equitable Rewards and Recognition* received the lowest favorable answers from all demographic groups (by race/ethnicity and gender) except for multiracial individuals, for whom the worst factor is *Trust*, and Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islanders, for whom the worst factor is *Sense of Belonging*  
• Women recorded a similar proportion of favorable answers about *Access to Opportunity*, but much lower responses about *Equitable Rewards and Recognition* than male respondents |
| **2018 Student Community Well-Being Survey**   | Inclusion   | Among Atlanta undergraduate women, the following characteristics were associated with higher rates of sexual victimization  
• Hispanic and other race/ethnicity, followed by black and white, with the lowest rates among Asian women  
• Non-International origin  
• Bisexual and Other sexual orientation  
• Having a disability  
For other groups, isolated characteristics are significantly associated with higher rates of sexual victimization:  
• Hispanic men, among Atlanta undergraduate men  
• Bisexual women, among Oxford women  
• White and Other race/ethnicity, among graduate/professional female students  
• Gay men, among graduate/professional male students |
| Students Internal comparisons                   |             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>DEI Value</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **2019 BCCSE**<br>Incoming first-year and transfer undergraduates<br>**Internal Comparisons** | Diversity | • During high school, 1st-gen, 1st-year students took more university or college classes for credit than non-1st-gen ones (1.9 vs. 1.0) but completed fewer writing tasks of 11 pages or more (.7 vs. 1.2) and spent fewer hours applying quantitative skills (2.4 vs. 2.6), summarizing course learnings (2.8 vs. 3.0), including diverse perspectives in coursework (2.8 vs. 3.0), or examining strengths and weaknesses of their views on a topic (2.9 vs. 3.1)\(^{109}\)  
  • In high school, 1st-gen, 1st-year students spent more hours working in a typical 7-day week (6.0 vs. 3.0) and fewer hours relaxing and socializing (10.4 vs. 11.5) |
| Inclusion | | • First-gen 1st-year students expect to spend more hours working for pay (10.3 vs. 6.6), about one hour less relaxing (10.4 vs. 11.5), and more difficulty paying college expenses (average score of 3.7 vs. 3.3) and report that they will need more help from Emory to manage non-academic responsibilities (average score of 4.7 vs. 4.5)  
  • First-gen transfer students report higher expected academic perseverance (scale score of 52.0 vs. 44.0) |
| **2020 COACHE Job Satisfaction Survey**<br>Faculty<br>**External Benchmarks and Internal Comparisons** | Inclusion | • For the question, “What are the Best aspects of working here?” none of the three possible DEI characteristics\(^{110}\) was picked as a top 2 aspect by more than 10% of respondents  
  • For the question, “What are the Worst aspects of working here?” none of the three DEI characteristics was picked by more than 10% in their bottom two aspects overall, but larger proportions of faculty of color picked Lack of Diversity (20% for faculty of color vs. 8% overall) and Absence of Others Like Me (8% for faculty of color vs. 5% overall) as one of the worst aspects |
| | Equity | • For Female faculty, responses were an “Area of Concern” (that is, in the bottom 30% compared to benchmarks) on the scale Tenure Expectations – Clarity  
  • For faculty of color, responses were an “Area of Concern” on the scale Promotion to Full [Professor]  
  • The proportion of respondents indicating they are dissatisfied with the recognition and support for their service to Emory around diversity issues is higher for faculty of color and underrepresented minorities (18% and 24%, respectively, vs. 12% overall). |

\(^{109}\) Only statistically significant results are included here.  
\(^{110}\) Here, DEI aspects in the “Best choices” were Diversity, Presence of Others Like Me, and My Sense of “Fit,” while aspects among the “Worst choices” were Lack of Diversity, Absence of Others Like Me and My Sense of “Fit”.
Appendix F. List of Survey Instruments

Note: I provide the complete Appendix F under separate cover due to its length. Note that some of the material compiled in the appendix is the property of external institutions.

In Appendix G, under separate cover, I include the available instruments for the surveys discussed in the report. I do not have the specific versions implemented at Emory for the 2016 Diversity Engagement Survey, the 2018 Enterprise Report, the 2018 Student Community Well-Being Survey, or the 2020 Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCCSE). To make the appendix as comprehensive as possible, I include the first page of published references with instrument examples for the Diversity Engagement Survey and the Student Community Well-Being Survey. I also place slides from the Enterprise Report showing the survey questions in the appendix, together with a printout of the BCCSE’s web page that lists its survey items.

List of survey instruments included in Appendix G:

1. 2015 Student Campus Climate Survey
2. 2015 Faculty and Staff Campus Climate Survey
3. 2016 Diversity Engagement Survey (First page of published reference)
4. 2018 Enterprise Report (Appendix slides)
5. 2018 Student Community Well-Being Survey (First page of published reference)
6. 2020 Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (Web page)
7. 2018-2019 COACHE Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey
8. 2019 National Survey of Student Engagement
9. 2020 College Exit Survey
10. ND Graduate Education Exit Survey MA
11. 2018 Graduate Education Exit Survey PhD