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Excellence. Commitment. Results-Driven.
Update the University’s Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan. Leveraging The Barthwell Group’s D&I Assessment, update CMU’s Diversity and Inclusion Plan. The plan should emphasize specific goals to be completed within a certain timeframe, and should include quantifiable objectives, metrics, and a timeline.

Create a Sustainable Diversity and Inclusion Committee. The Committee should be chaired by a senior leader appointed by the President and include student, faculty, and staff leadership, particularly of D&I organizations. The Committee will enhance the coordination, visibility, communications, and effectiveness of CMU’s D&I programs, and suggest enhancements, as needed, to the University’s D&I infrastructure. The Committee will have an annual budget which will be overseen by the chairperson.

Assess and Enhance CMU’s Diversity and Inclusion Online Information. Assess and engage students, faculty, and staff to provide input to ensure maximum engagement and participation by CMU’s stakeholders. Ensure accessibility of information about D&I events, programs, and services in a user-friendly format. Promote monitored discussions for community stakeholders to contribute ideas about enhancing D&I, and to express feelings when campus or societal D&I challenges occur.

Create CMU-Specific Diversity and Inclusion Fellowships. These new fellowships will be associated with CMU exclusively and encourage enrollment of highly qualified diverse graduate students in specific disciplines. The fellowships will be endowed and will offer substantial tuition waivers and generous annual stipends.

Create the Inclusion Implementation Fund. The Inclusion Implementation Fund will have a specific endowment, and be managed through the University’s investment infrastructure, but as a separate fund. Administrators of the Fund, appointed by the President, will consider proposals (submitted by CMU stakeholders) annually for projects, programs, or infrastructural improvements that will enhance an inclusionary environment where all persons are respected, valued, and able to maximize their full potential.

Enhance Diversity and Inclusion Training and Education. Ensure that all CMU stakeholders are encouraged to participate in training, info sessions and educational events designed to increase D&I knowledge. Increase self-help videos, webinars, and other interactive learning tools, to encourage greater cultural competency and multicultural awareness. Consider developing “Equity Ambassadors”, a corps of students (selected through a competitive process), who receive D&I and cultural competency training, and encourage fellow students to engage in inclusionary discussions.

Ensure Greater D&I Accountability. Collaborate with the appropriate CMU stakeholders to encourage greater accountability regarding the implementation of D&I goals. The University should consider integrating D&I goals into performance appraisals, developing D&I scorecards (where appropriate, to measure annual progress against D&I benchmarks), enhancing D&I
feedback in climate surveys, ensuring effective processes to resolve D&I challenges, and
enhancing institutional recognition for innovative and effective D&I practices.

**Develop Semi-Annual D&I Institutional Town Halls.** Led by the President, with senior
leadership, and coordinated with appropriate diversity leadership and the D&I Committee, host
semi-annual D&I Institutional Town Halls. These town halls should provide D&I workshops,
measure progress against D&I benchmarks, and offer “listening circles” at the conclusion where
campus stakeholders can engage in structured discussions regarding D&I, and receive instruction
in replicating thoughtful, constructive, D&I conversations.

**Encourage Greater D&I Content in the Curriculum.** Leverage best practices of peer
institutions to ensure innovative practices to increase D&I content in the curriculum. Collaborate
with the appropriate faculty leaders, coordinated by Academic Affairs leadership, to ensure
innovative support to encourage collaborative assistance in providing D&I materials. Encourage
diverse visiting faculty, post-graduate fellows, and other relationship-building which may result
in more diverse faculty.

**Improve Multicultural Representation and Engagement in All Residential Halls.** Convene a
meeting of appropriate leaders (e.g., administrators, students, and staff) to develop an action plan
to encourage greater multicultural engagement in all residential halls. Leverage peer institutional
best practices to promote greater socialization and multicultural interaction.

**Encourage Greater Multicultural Engagement in Mount Pleasant.** Host a meeting of
municipal, law enforcement, and university leadership to discuss the challenges and propose
solutions. Establish a University-Mount Pleasant roundtable which will be convened quarterly to
develop and implement key actions items to encourage greater inclusion and multicultural
appreciation and sensitivity in Mount Pleasant.
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Summary of Key Findings
Introduction
The Barthwell Group, a strategic management consulting firm, was engaged to assess the current status of diversity and inclusion at Central Michigan University (“CMU” or the “University”). The assessment was designed to measure whether the University has an environment that values diversity and fosters an inclusive environment for all members of the campus community. Our review took into account, among other things, CMU’s current diversity and inclusion programming, student services, academic curriculum, and organizational infrastructure. Our assessment methodology (described below) was comprehensive and included document analyses, one-on-one interviews, focus groups, and an online survey. More than 2,700 stakeholders have participated in our assessment. The assessment was conducted in two main stages during the Spring (“Phase I”) and Fall (“Phase II”) of calendar year 2016. This summary presents an overview of our methodology, and key findings. It is followed by our recommendations and the detailed results of the Online Survey. An overview of our report was presented during a Town Hall held on November 30, 2016 at the University.

Methodology

Phase I
During this Phase, we conducted a thorough review of materials related to CMU’s past diversity and inclusion efforts, as well as the findings and conclusions of campus climate surveys. We facilitated a 90-minute video conference with a cross-section of CMU stakeholders (faculty, staff, administration, and students) to obtain further feedback regarding diversity and inclusion at the University. Using customized assessment instruments, we conducted 60 in-person interviews with faculty and staff and students. The student interviews were approximately 45 minutes, and the faculty and staff interviews were approximately 30 minutes. The 20 faculty and staff interviewed included persons who have been involved in diversity and inclusion activities at the University (either formally or informally), and who could provide substantive insights. In addition, we facilitated 13 90-minute focus groups1. We collaborated with the University to determine the members of the focus groups which reflected a cross section of key stakeholder interests and identities at the University. Approximately 85% of the participants identified themselves as members of underrepresented groups2.

The interviews and focus groups were designed to obtain insights regarding the effectiveness of CMU’s diversity and inclusion efforts over time, as well as the current state of inclusion, and to obtain confidential feedback regarding students’ experiences with inclusion at the University. We analyzed the results of our work in Phase I in a brief executive summary which highlighted key findings.

---

1 Student focus groups included specific sessions focusing on: women, international, African-Americans / Blacks, Hispanic/Latinx, LGBTQ individuals, and fraternity and sorority life. Staff focus groups included specific sessions focusing on Admissions-Financial Aid, staff of color, LGBTQ staff, women staff, faculty, faculty of color, diversity directors, and women faculty.
2 Interviewees and focus group members were asked to self-identify whether they considered themselves to be a member of an underrepresented group. There were no definitions provided.
**Phase II**
During this Phase, we conducted an additional focus group and four supplemental in-person interviews. The purpose of this additional outreach was to ensure that representatives of all of the University’s key interest and identity groups had an opportunity to participate in the in-person assessment process. However, the principal focus of our work in Phase II was to conduct an online survey.

**Online Survey**
We leveraged what we had learned during the previous stages of our assessment to develop a customized online survey instrument (in collaboration with the University). The survey consisted of 36 questions which were designed to gain additional insight on the University’s environment for diversity and inclusion. More than 2,500 stakeholders participated in the survey. Approximately, 65% of the participants were students, and 81% were undergraduates (of which 33% were freshmen). The vast majority (87%), of the online survey participants were affiliated with the main campus. Approximately 8% were online community members, and 5% were students at an affiliate campus. Participants included females (64%), males (36%), and transgender individuals (1%). Approximately 38% self-identified as being members of an underrepresented group. Participants represented a broad cross-section of races and ethnicities and demographic groups. A detailed analysis of the results is included in this report, along with recommendations to enhance CMU’s inclusion environment.

**Key Findings**

**Most interviewees are generally satisfied with the CMU experience.** Most students (79%), interviewed during Phase I are generally satisfied with their CMU experience, and rated it as “good” or “very good”. Similarly, the majority of faculty and staff interviewed during Phase I (57%), rated their overall CMU experience as “good” or “very good”.

**While most interviewees felt that CMU’s student body is not diverse, most online survey respondents felt that it is diverse.** During Phase I, most students (52%), and faculty and staff (55%), who were interviewed, felt that the student body is not diverse. Some students reported frequently being the only person of color in classes, and others reported feeling marginalized due to their sexual orientation and/or gender identity, particularly in residential housing. However, some faculty and staff with longer institutional experience at the University, indicated that they are confident that diversity at the University is improving; and that there is a genuine commitment to ensure that it will increase.

---

3 The additional focus group was with students with disabilities.
4 Specifically, we sought to obtain feedback regarding the importance of D&I to CMU and its key stakeholder groups, perceptions regarding diversity among key stakeholder groups (and suggestions to enhance diversity), feedback on identity-related unfair and marginalizing treatment at the University, and recommendations to enhance D&I and to create a more inclusionary environment.
5 Every participant did not respond to every question. Therefore, the number of respondents varies according to each question.
However, during Phase II, the majority (73%), of 1,709 online survey respondents felt that the University’s student body is diverse. However, the majority of the faculty (56%) did not agree, nor did large percentages of African-American / Black (43%), and Hispanic Latinx (41%) online survey respondents. Most (70%), of the online survey respondents felt that the greatest opportunity to increase the diversity of the student body is through increasing the representation from non-majority racial and ethnic groups.

Ironically, although most of the online survey respondents felt that CMU’s faculty is diverse, most of the online faculty respondents did not agree. Seventy-two percent of 1,976 online survey respondents felt that CMU’s faculty is diverse. However, the majority (53%), of the online faculty survey respondents did not agree, nor did most (59%), of the African-American / Black online survey respondents. Even though the majority of online survey respondents felt that CMU’s faculty is diverse, there was a wide variance among different groups. For example, only 56% of the online survey respondents from underrepresented groups felt that the faculty is diverse, compared with 81% of those who were not from underrepresented groups. Most (68%), online survey respondents believed that increasing racial and ethnic representation is the greatest opportunity to improve faculty diversity.

Similarly, although most of the online survey respondents felt that CMU’s staff is diverse, most of the online faculty, African-American / Black, and persons of international origin respondents did not agree. Sixty-six percent of 1,832 online survey respondents felt that CMU’s staff is diverse. However, the majority, of the online faculty (68%), African-American / Black (57%), and persons of international origin (56%), survey respondents did not agree. Most (71%), online survey respondents felt that the greatest opportunity to increase staff diversity is through more racial and ethnic diversity.

Although the majority of online survey respondents felt that CMU’s senior leadership is diverse, the majority of the staff, and religious minority respondents did not agree. Sixty-seven percent of 1,419 online survey respondents felt that CMU’s staff is diverse. However, the majority (53%), of the staff and religious minority respondents (52%), did not agree. Again, the majority (62%), of online survey respondents believed that the greatest opportunity to diversify senior leadership is through racial and ethnic diversity.

Although many interviewees during Phase I did not feel that CMU has achieved an inclusive environment, the majority of the online survey respondents felt that the University has achieved an inclusive environment. During Phase I, many interviewees, including students, faculty, and staff, felt that in spite of the University’s efforts to increase diversity, it has not been successful in creating an inclusive environment where all people feel valued, respected, and have access to the same opportunities. In contrast, most (78%), online survey respondents felt that CMU has an inclusive environment. However, there was significant

---

6 Some of the discrepancies between Phase I and Phase II analyses may be due to the differences in demographic composition of the participants. 85% of Phase I participants self-identified as being from underrepresented groups, compared to 38% in Phase II.
variation in the percentage of respondents who felt that CMU’s environment is inclusive. For example, although 87% of online survey respondents who are not members of underrepresented groups felt that CMU’s environment is inclusive, only 62% of those from underrepresented groups agreed. Similarly, while 88% of the veteran respondents felt that CMU’s environment is inclusive, only 58% of members of a minority religious group felt that way.

**Although CMU values both diversity and inclusion, the commitment needs to be stronger.** Students varied in their opinions of the status of diversity and inclusion at CMU. During Phase I, the majority of students interviewed felt that the University values both diversity (62%), and inclusion (66%). However, some felt that the commitment needs to be stronger, and must include more funding, social justice education, and greater administrative support.

The vast majority of online survey respondents generally agreed that CMU values both diversity (90%), and inclusion (89%). However, there is great variance in the percentages which agree. For example, students (93%), persons not from underrepresented groups (96%), veterans (95%), and Asians / Asian-Americans (93%) have the highest percentages of constituents who believed that the University values diversity. Similarly, veterans (92%), and persons who did not self-identify as being from an underrepresented group (94%), are the greatest believers that the University values inclusion. Although the majority of online survey respondents believed that diversity and inclusion are important to faculty, staff, students, and senior leadership, only between 35%-40% of online survey respondents thought that diversity and inclusion are “extremely important” to any of these groups.

**Most interviewees (including students, faculty, and staff), focus group participants, and online survey respondents agreed that diversity is important for CMU’s success as an academic institution.** Both Phase I interviewees and focus group participants believed that diversity is “important” or “very important” to CMU’s success. This was confirmed during Phase II where 51% of the online survey respondents indicated that diversity is extremely important to the University’s success as an institution. Faculty respondents (67%), were among the strongest advocates of the extreme importance of diversity to the academic success of the University.

Although the majority of online survey respondents have not experienced unfair or marginalizing treatment at CMU because of an aspect of their personal identity, significant percentages have. Most (69%), online survey respondents indicated that they have not experienced a personal encounter with unfair or marginalizing treatment because of an aspect of their personal identity. However, significant percentages of the online survey respondents have experienced unfair treatment. For example, 54% of persons with disabilities, 52% of members of underrepresented groups, 49% of socioeconomically disadvantaged students, 49% of LGBTQ individuals, 47% of members of a minority religious group, and 42% of the faculty have experienced unfair or marginalizing treatment at CMU. This contrasts with 27% of Whites who reported experiencing unfair treatment. Most attributed the cause of their unfair treatment to be their gender (35%), or race (35%). Most (66 %), online survey respondents indicated that they did not know anybody who had been treated unfairly at CMU because of their personal identity.
However, most of the faculty (53%), LGBTQ individuals (57%), members of a minority religious group (55%), members of underrepresented groups (52%), and socioeconomically disadvantaged students (51%), did. Race / ethnicity and gender identity were most frequently identified as the causes of the unfair treatment.

The majority of online survey respondents did not believe that significant tensions exist on campus due to race, gender identity, sexual orientation, religion, socioeconomic status, country of origin, veteran status, or disability status. On a scale from “1 – No tension” to “5 – Significant tension,” the majority (54%) of online survey respondents believed that no tensions exist due to veteran status. Forty-one percent of the online survey respondents believed that no tensions exist because of disability status. The highest percentage of online survey respondents believed that the level of tensions regarding race / ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, socioeconomic status, and country of origin, is equivalent to a “2.” The highest level of tensions was attributed to gender identity. The highest percentage of online survey respondents felt that these tensions are equivalent to a “3.”

There is a perception that “safe” physical spaces are needed for underrepresented groups to foster a more inclusive environment. During Phase I, a common theme appearing in 62% of the focus groups, and 36% of the interviews was the need for additional spaces dedicated to supporting students through identity-related challenges. One recurring theme appearing in 46% of the focus groups was the desire for a women’s and gender equity center. Interviewees and participants in the focus groups felt that spaces for underrepresented groups, such as this center, would provide students with a safe space to discuss identity challenges, as well as provide targeted services and support. Some viewed the availability of these spaces as a physical manifestation of the University’s commitment to diversity. This was confirmed during Phase II, when 49% of online survey respondents indicated that it is “extremely important” to have spaces dedicated to supporting students through identity-related challenges.

Although most respondents in both Phases felt that residential housing is inclusive, some concerns were expressed frequently during Phase I. Even with 52% of students interviewed feeling that housing on campus was inclusive or indicating that they did not know (17%), there were frequent assertions during Phase I that residential housing appears to be racially segregated. Nearly one-third (31%) of the interviewees indicated that residential housing options were not inclusive. In six of the focus groups (46%), and in 42% of student interviews, participants indicated that residential housing feels racially segregated. One interviewee indicated that the Towers is referred to as “the jungle” because of the large number of minority residents. The vast majority (83%) of online survey respondents, however, felt that residential housing is inclusive. This was true among every constituent category of online survey respondents.

Mount Pleasant is viewed as a hostile environment for minorities. During Phase I, ten focus groups (77%), and 81% of interviewees, reported concerns related to living in Mount Pleasant. Several interviewees and focus group participants identified specific examples of mistreatment in the town. The surrounding community environment impacts perceptions of campus stakeholders regarding the overall environment of the University. During Phase II, the majority (55%) of the
online survey respondents (1,230), confirmed that they do not believe that all CMU community members feel comfortable in Mount Pleasant based on their identity. However, the majority of students (57%), persons not from an underrepresented group (54%), veterans (54%), Asians / Asian-Americans (60%), and males (51%), felt that CMU community members feel comfortable in Mount Pleasant.

**Better coordination and collaboration among CMU’s diversity and inclusion efforts is needed.** During Phase I, it was apparent that although students, faculty, and staff, are somewhat aware that CMU offers diversity and inclusion support, the lack of visibility and adequate communication causes students to feel that it is up to them to advocate and develop their own resources. Seven focus groups (54%), and 28% of interviewees, discussed the necessity of student-led actions to supplement current CMU diversity and inclusion programming.

While interviewees and focus group participants during Phase I believed that the University needs to do a better job of integrating diversity and inclusion in the curriculum, most online survey respondents believed that the curriculum is inclusive of diverse perspectives. During Phase I, every faculty focus group, and more than half of the student focus groups, believed that the University could do a better job of integrating diversity and inclusion content into the curriculum. Sixty-four percent of interviewees discussed the importance of using a diversity and inclusion lens to develop the curriculum. However, the majority (75%), of the online survey respondents believed that the curriculum is inclusive of diverse perspectives. Although there was variance among the percentages, a majority of every stakeholder group represented in the online survey agreed that the curriculum is inclusive.

**Diversity and inclusion training for faculty, staff, and students should be increased.** During Phase I, all faculty and staff focus groups, and 55% of the interviewees (including 100% of the faculty interviewees), referenced the need for additional faculty and staff training on diversity and inclusion. Several stakeholders indicated the importance for the training to be considered as necessary for promotion and tenure evaluation. In addition, interviewees and focus groups discussed the need for students to be provided with more institutional or historical knowledge of the role diversity and inclusion plays in organizational success.

During Phase II, online survey participants were given several options regarding diversity and inclusion training, including offering additional training to faculty and staff and students either on an optional, mandatory, or incentivized basis. Participants also had the option of declining all choices. The greatest percentage (51%) of respondents, selected additional training for faculty and staff. Individuals who identified as LGBTQ individuals had the highest percentages, believing both that additional training should be offered for faculty and staff (62%), and that it should be mandatory (65%). Persons of international origin (59%), had the highest percentage favoring mandatory training for students (which only 28% of students favored). Veterans (32%), had the highest percentage to select “none of the above.”

**There needs to be more funding, administrative support, and visibility for University diversity and inclusion programming and infrastructure.** During Phase I, many
representatives of diversity and inclusion organizations reported feeling undervalued because administrators or senior leadership do not attend their social justice programming or cultural events. Thirty-eight percent of interviewees highlighted feelings that senior leadership is not genuinely committed to diversity and inclusion. Seven out of the 13 (54%) focus groups, and 45% of interviewees, recommended increased funding for diversity and inclusion programming. During Phase II, although the majority of online survey respondents believed that both administrative support (74%), and funding (62%), are adequate for diversity and inclusion efforts, there were constituent groups which did not agree. This was particularly true regarding the adequacy of diversity and inclusion funding. The faculty (60%), members of underrepresented groups (58%), LGBTQ individuals (66%), persons with disabilities (52%), members of a minority religious group (59%), socioeconomically disadvantaged students (52%), Hispanics / Latinx (54%), and African-Americans / Blacks (52%), all felt that this funding is inadequate.

**There is room for improvement in the service of persons with disabilities.** During a focus group for students with disabilities, several students expressed concern about the difficulty in obtaining accommodations to help them with their disability. Some complained that it was necessary to make multiple requests before receiving assistance. In the online survey, the majority of all respondents (58%) rated the University’s effectiveness at creating an academic and physical environment on campus where disability is neutral as a “4” or as a “5” on a scale of “1 – Not at all effective” to “5 – Very effective”. However, over a third of persons with disabilities (36%), rated the effectiveness as only a “1” or as a “2”. Additionally, 55% of the online survey respondents, and 72% of the persons with disabilities online survey respondents, indicated that they believe there are specific actions which CMU could take to be more effective in the service of individuals with disabilities. Some of their suggestions were physical accommodations, which would facilitate accessibility for physically handicapped individuals, and increased awareness and improved resources for persons with disabilities.
Recommendations
Update the University’s Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan. Leveraging The Barthwell Group’s D&I Assessment, update CMU’s Diversity and Inclusion Plan. The plan should emphasize specific goals to be completed within a certain timeframe, and should include quantifiable objectives, metrics, and a timeline.

Create a Sustainable Diversity and Inclusion Committee. The Committee should be chaired by a senior leader appointed by the President and include student, faculty, and staff leadership, particularly of D&I organizations. The Committee will enhance the coordination, visibility, communications, and effectiveness of CMU’s D&I programs, and suggest enhancements, as needed, to the University’s D&I infrastructure. The Committee will have an annual budget which will be overseen by the chairperson.

Assess and Enhance CMU’s Diversity and Inclusion Online Information. Assess and engage students, faculty, and staff to provide input to ensure maximum engagement and participation by CMU’s stakeholders. Ensure accessibility of information about D&I events, programs, and services in a user-friendly format. Promote monitored discussions for community stakeholders to contribute ideas about enhancing D&I, and to express feelings when campus or societal D&I challenges occur.

Create CMU-Specific Diversity and Inclusion Fellowships. These new fellowships will be associated with CMU exclusively, and encourage enrollment of highly qualified diverse graduate students in specific disciplines. The fellowships will be endowed and will offer substantial tuition waivers and generous annual stipends.

Create the Inclusion Implementation Fund. The Inclusion Implementation Fund will have a specific endowment, and be managed through the University’s investment infrastructure, but as a separate fund. Administrators of the Fund, appointed by the President, will consider proposals (submitted by CMU stakeholders) annually for projects, programs, or infrastructural improvements that will enhance an inclusionary environment where all persons are respected, valued, and able to maximize their full potential.

Enhance Diversity and Inclusion Training and Education. Ensure that all CMU stakeholders are encouraged to participate in training, info sessions and educational events designed to increase D&I knowledge. Increase self-help videos, webinars, and other interactive learning tools, to encourage greater cultural competency and multicultural awareness. Consider developing “Equity Ambassadors”, a corps of students (selected through a competitive process), who receive D&I and cultural competency training, and encourage fellow students to engage in inclusionary discussions.

Ensure Greater D&I Accountability. Collaborate with the appropriate CMU stakeholders to encourage greater accountability regarding the implementation of D&I goals. The University should consider integrating D&I goals into performance appraisals, developing D&I scorecards (where appropriate, to measure annual progress against D&I benchmarks), enhancing D&I
feedback in climate surveys, ensuring effective processes to resolve D&I challenges, and enhancing institutional recognition for innovative and effective D&I practices.

**Develop Semi-Annual D&I Institutional Town Halls.** Led by the President, with senior leadership, and coordinated with appropriate diversity leadership and the D&I Committee, host semi-annual D&I Institutional Town Halls. These town halls should provide D&I workshops, measure progress against D&I benchmarks, and offer “listening circles” at the conclusion where campus stakeholders can engage in structured discussions regarding D&I, and receive instruction in replicating thoughtful, constructive, D&I conversations.

**Encourage Greater D&I Content in the Curriculum.** Leverage best practices of peer institutions to ensure innovative practices to increase D&I content in the curriculum. Collaborate with the appropriate faculty leaders, coordinated by Academic Affairs leadership, to ensure innovative support to encourage collaborative assistance in providing D&I materials. Encourage diverse visiting faculty, post-graduate fellows, and other relationship-building which may result in more diverse faculty.

**Improve Multicultural Representation and Engagement in All Residential Halls.** Convene a meeting of appropriate leaders (i.e., administrators, students, and staff) to develop an action plan to encourage greater multicultural engagement in all residential halls. Leverage peer institutional best practices to promote greater socialization and multicultural interaction.

**Encourage Greater Multicultural Engagement in Mount Pleasant.** Host a meeting of municipal, law enforcement, and university leadership to discuss the challenges and propose solutions. Establish a University-Mount Pleasant roundtable which will be convened quarterly to develop and implement key actions items to encourage greater inclusion and multicultural appreciation and sensitivity in Mount Pleasant.
Online Survey Assessment Results
Overview of Online Survey Respondents

Respondents Relationship with CMU
Respondents were asked to identify their relationship with CMU. Two thousand, five hundred eighty-nine respondents provided a response to this question. As shown in Figure 1, the greatest numbers of respondents were students (65%).

Figure 1: Online Survey Respondents’ Relationship with CMU (All Respondents) (n=2,589)

[Diagram showing the distribution of respondents:
- 65% Students
- 23% Faculty Member
- 12% Staff Member
]

The online survey respondents who identified as students were asked what type of student they are. All 1,674 student respondents provided a response to this question. As shown in Figure 2, most respondents were undergraduate students (81%).
The respondents who identified as undergraduate students were asked to identify their academic year. One thousand, three hundred thirty-three respondents provided a response to this question. As shown in Figure 3, the greatest numbers of respondents (33%) were in their first year as an undergraduate student. There was at least 10% representation from each segment of the undergraduate population, including those who are in their fifth year or beyond.
Respondents’ Affiliation with the University

Respondents were asked to indicate their affiliation with the University. Two thousand, five-hundred fifty-two respondents provided a response to this question. The vast majority of respondents (87%) were located on the Mount Pleasant campus. Five percent of respondents were located at an affiliate campus, and 8% were online community members (Figure 4).

The majority of faculty (97%), staff (90%), and student (85%) respondents were located on the Mount Pleasant campus. However, as shown in Figure 5, this majority was greater among faculty, compared to staff and students. The representation of respondents located on an affiliate campus was largest among staff (9%), and the representation of online respondents was largest among students (11%).

Figure 4: Affiliation with the University (All Respondents) (n=2,552)
Respondents’ Gender

Respondents were asked to identify their gender. Two-thousand, five hundred fifty-eight respondents provided a response to this question. As shown in Figure 6, the majority of respondents (64%) identified themselves as female. Less than one percent of respondents identified themselves as transgender individuals, or a gender not listed.

As shown in Figure 7, while faculty respondents were almost equally distributed between male and female (49% female, compared to 51% male), a larger portion of staff and student respondents identified as female (71% female, compared to 28% male for staff, and 64% female, compared to 35% male for students). There was only one faculty member, and no staff members who identified as transgender individuals, compared to nine students.
Respondents’ Race / Ethnicity
Respondents were asked to identify their race / ethnicity based on the eight choices indicated in Figure 8. Two thousand, five hundred fifteen respondents provided a response to this question. The vast majority of respondents (74%), identified as White. This was true for faculty, staff, and student respondents (Figure 9). They had similar race / ethnicity distributions overall as well. However, a higher percentage of student respondents identified as African-American / Black compared to staff and faculty, and a smaller percentage of staff identified as Asian / Asian-American, compared to faculty and students.
Figure 8: Respondents' Race / Ethnicity (All Respondents) (n=2,515)

- African-American / Black: 10%
- American Indian or Alaskan Native: 1%
- Asian / Asian-American: 6%
- Hispanic / Latinx: 3%
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: <1%
- Other: 2%
- Two or more races: 4%
- White: 74%

Figure 9: Respondents' Race / Ethnicity (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

- African-American / Black: 13%
- American Indian or Alaskan Native: 5%
- Asian / Asian-American: 6%
- Hispanic / Latinx: 3%
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: <1%
- Other: 2%
- Two or more races: 7%
- White: 86%
Membership in One or More Demographic Groups
Respondents were provided a list of demographic groups that included persons of international origin, LGBTQ individuals, persons with disabilities, veterans, members of a minority religious group, first generation students, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students (collectively, the “Demographic Groups”). Two thousand, five hundred six respondents provided a response to this question. The majority of respondents (60%), indicated that they are not a member of any of the Demographic Groups (Figure 10).

As shown in Figure 11, first generation students were the Demographic Group with the greatest representation, followed by LGBTQ individuals.

Among faculty, the greatest number of respondents indicated that they are persons of international origin, and among staff, the greatest number indicated that they are LGBTQ individuals (Figure 12). CMU staff had the lowest percentage of respondents who identified as being a member of a least one of the Demographic Groups.

Among racial groups (Figure 13), White students had the lowest percentage of respondents who were a member of a least one of the Demographic Groups. Those respondents who identified as being a member of one or more races, or of an unlisted race / ethnicity, were the most likely to identify as being a member of one of the Demographic Groups.

Males and females had similar identification as being a member of a Demographic Group, and their overall responses were similar (Figure 14). All ten transgender respondents indicated that they are a member of one or more of the Demographic Groups. All of the transgender respondents, and almost all of the “other gender” respondents (91%) self-identified as being LGBTQ individuals.

Figure 10: Membership in One or More of the "Demographic Groups" (All Respondents)
Figure 11: "Demographic Groups" Membership (All Respondents) (n=2,506)

- First generation students: 369
- LGBTQ individuals: 255
- Socioeconomically disadvantaged students: 167
- Members of a minority religious group: 147
- Persons of international origin: 117
- Veterans: 90
- Persons with disabilities: 79

Figure 12: "Demographic Groups" Membership (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

- None of the above: 54% (Students), 59% (Staff), 78% (Faculty)
- Socioeconomically disadvantaged students: 10% (Students), 0% (Staff), 6% (Faculty)
- First generation students: 23% (Students), 0% (Staff), 0% (Faculty)
- Members of a minority religious group: 4% (Students), 1% (Staff), 11% (Faculty)
- Veterans: 4% (Students), 3% (Staff), 4% (Faculty)
- Persons with disabilities: 3% (Students), 4% (Staff), 4% (Faculty)
- LGBTQ individuals: 5% (Students), 6% (Staff), 13% (Faculty)
- Persons of international origin: 4% (Students), 4% (Staff), 15% (Faculty)
Figure 13: "Demographic Groups" Membership (Racial Group Respondents)

- None of the above
  - None of the above: 37%
  - Two or more races (n=97): 55%
  - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (n=3): 65%
  - African-American / Black (n=251): 57%
  - White (n=1814): 55%
  - Hispanic / Latino (n=72): 50%
  - Asian / Asian-American (n=127): 22%
  - Persons of international origin: 7%
  - Veterans: 5%
  - Persons with disabilities: 5%
  - LGBTQ individuals: 22%

- Socioeconomically disadvantaged students
  - Persons of international origin: 19%
  - None of the above: 15%
  - Two or more races (n=97): 13%
  - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (n=3): 10%
  - African-American / Black (n=251): 9%
  - White (n=1814): 6%
  - Hispanic / Latino (n=72): 5%
  - Asian / Asian-American (n=127): 4%

- First generation students
  - None of the above: 29%
  - Two or more races (n=97): 27%
  - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (n=3): 29%
  - African-American / Black (n=251): 22%
  - White (n=1814): 22%
  - Hispanic / Latino (n=72): 18%
  - Asian / Asian-American (n=127): 13%

- Members of a minority religious group
  - None of the above: 13%
  - Two or more races (n=97): 13%
  - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (n=3): 6%
  - African-American / Black (n=251): 6%
  - White (n=1814): 6%
  - Hispanic / Latino (n=72): 5%
  - Asian / Asian-American (n=127): 3%

- Veterans
  - None of the above: 1%
  - Two or more races (n=97): 1%
  - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (n=3): 1%
  - African-American / Black (n=251): 1%
  - White (n=1814): 1%
  - Hispanic / Latino (n=72): 1%
  - Asian / Asian-American (n=127): 1%

- Persons with disabilities
  - None of the above: 1%
  - Two or more races (n=97): 1%
  - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (n=3): 1%
  - African-American / Black (n=251): 1%
  - White (n=1814): 1%
  - Hispanic / Latino (n=72): 1%
  - Asian / Asian-American (n=127): 1%

- LGBTQ individuals
  - None of the above: 21%
  - Two or more races (n=97): 11%
  - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (n=3): 11%
  - African-American / Black (n=251): 7%
  - White (n=1814): 7%
  - Hispanic / Latino (n=72): 3%
  - Asian / Asian-American (n=127): 2%

- Persons of international origin
  - None of the above: 34%
  - Two or more races (n=97): 8%
  - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (n=3): 8%
  - African-American / Black (n=251): 8%
  - White (n=1814): 7%
  - Hispanic / Latino (n=72): 6%
  - Asian / Asian-American (n=127): 6%
Figure 14: "Demographic Groups" Membership (Gender Group Respondents)

Membership in One or More Underrepresented Groups
Respondents were asked if they consider themselves to be a member of one or more underrepresented groups. Respondents were free to determine their own definition of underrepresented group. Two thousand, four hundred twenty-eight respondents provided a response to this question. The majority of respondents (62%), indicated that they do not consider themselves to be a member of an underrepresented group. However, 38% of the respondents, believed they are a member of one or more underrepresented groups, as shown in Figure 15.

As shown in Figure 16 nearly half of the faculty respondents (49%), indicated that they identify as a member of one or more underrepresented groups, which is well above the average of all respondents.

Among different races / ethnicities (Figure 17), the majority of respondents of every race / ethnicity (excluding those who were White) indicated that they consider themselves to be a member of one or more underrepresented groups. Approximately 77% of African-American / Black, Hispanic / Latinx, American Indian or Alaskan Native, and multiracial respondents indicated that they consider themselves to be a member of one or more underrepresented group.
About one-third of both male and female respondents indicated that they consider themselves to be a member of one or more underrepresented group (Figure 18). Every transgender respondents, and all except one respondent, who self-identified as being of an “other gender”, indicated that they were a member of one or more underrepresented groups.

**Figure 15: Membership in One or More Underrepresented Groups (All Respondents) (n=2,428)**

![Pie chart showing 38% Yes and 62% No]

**Figure 16: Membership in One or More Underrepresented Groups (Faculty, Staff, and Students)**

![Bar charts showing Yes and No percentages for Faculty, Staff, and Students]

Faculty (n=293)  
Staff (n=556)  
Students (n=1579)
Figure 17: Membership in One or More Underrepresented Groups (Racial Group Respondents)

Figure 18: Membership in One or More Underrepresented Groups (Gender Group Respondents)

CMU’s Environment for Diversity and Inclusion

Importance of Diversity to CMU’s Success

The respondents were asked to rate the importance of diversity to CMU’s success. Two thousand, five hundred forty-five respondents provided an answer to this question using a scale of “1 – Not at all important” to “5 – Extremely important”. The majority of respondents (51%)
rated diversity as being “5 - Extremely important” to CMU’s success, and only 7% of respondents rated it as a “1” or as a “2”, as shown in Figure 19.

As shown in Figure 20, this trend was consistent among faculty, staff, and students. However, a higher percentage of faculty respondents (67%), felt that diversity is extremely important to CMU’s success, as compared with staff (54%), and student (47%) respondents.

As shown in Figure 21, respondents who identified as being a member of an underrepresented group had a similar percentage of respondents who rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s success as a “4” or as a “5” (82%), compared to those who did not (78%). However, the percentage of respondents who identified as being a member of an underrepresented group had a higher percentage who felt that diversity is extremely important (60%, compared to 46%).

Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 22), over 75% of every Demographic Group rated the important of diversity to CMU’s success as a “4” or as a “5” and the greatest percentage of every group felt that diversity is extremely important to CMU’s success. However, there was a large variance in these percentages. Persons of international origin (61%), had the highest percentage of respondents who felt that diversity is extremely important, while veterans (45%) had the lowest. Veterans also had the greatest percentage of respondents who felt that diversity is not at all important (8%).

Among the races / ethnicities (Figure 23), the greatest percentage of every group felt that diversity is extremely important to CMU’s success. However, there was a large variation in these percentages. Asian / Asian-American (65%) and African-American / Black (65%), respondents had the highest percentage of respondents who felt that diversity is extremely important, while White respondents (48%), had the lowest. However, over 75% of every race / ethnicity (with the exception of Other race / ethnicity respondents) rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s success as a “4” or as a “5”. (This analysis excludes Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander respondents because there were not enough respondents to draw meaningful conclusions about this population).

As shown in Figure 24, the ratings on the importance of diversity to CMU’s success were similar among males and females. However, a greater percentage of females rated the importance as a “5” (55%, compared to 44%), and a greater percentage of males rated the importance as a “1” or as a “2” (12%, compared to 5%). Although the sample sizes were small, the vast majorities of transgender individuals (80%), and Other gender respondents (73%), felt that diversity is extremely important to CMU’s success.
Figure 19: Importance of Diversity to CMU's Success (All Respondents) (n=2,545)

Figure 20: Importance of Diversity to CMU's Success (Faculty, Staff, and Students)
Figure 21: Importance of Diversity to CMU's Success (Underrepresented Group Respondents)
Figure 22: Importance of Diversity to CMU's Success ("Demographic Group" Respondents)

- Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (n=166)
- First generation students (n=365)
- Members of a minority religious group (n=145)
- Veterans (n=87)
- Persons with disabilities (n=78)
- LGBTQ individuals (n=254)
- Persons of international origin (n=113)
Figure 23: Importance of Diversity to CMU's Success (Racial Group Respondents)
Belief that CMU Values Diversity

Respondents were asked if they believe that CMU values diversity. Two thousand, two hundred thirty-six respondents provided a response to this question. The vast majority of respondents (90%), indicated that they believed CMU values diversity (Figure 25).

This was generally true among faculty, staff, and students. However, as shown in Figure 26, a smaller percentage of CMU staff (78%), believed that CMU values diversity as compared with students (93%), and faculty (90%).

A smaller percentage of respondents who identified as being a member of an underrepresented group indicated that they believe that CMU values diversity (80%), compared to those who did not consider themselves to be part of an underrepresented group (96%) (Figure 27).

Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 28), members of minority religious groups had the smallest percentage of respondents who believed that CMU values diversity (74%). Veterans had the largest percentage of respondents who believed that CMU values diversity (95%).

Among the races / ethnicities (Figure 29), Asian / Asian-American (93%), and White (93%) respondents, had the greatest percentages of respondents who believed that CMU values diversity, and African-American / Black (79%), and “other” race / ethnicity (76%), respondents had the lowest. (This analysis excludes Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander respondents.
because there were not enough respondents to draw meaningful conclusions about this population).

There was not significant variance in the responses, as compared to the responses among all respondents, when analyzed by gender.

**Figure 25: Belief that CMU Values Diversity (All Respondents) (n=2,236)**

![Pie chart showing belief in CMU values diversity for all respondents.]

**Figure 26: Belief that CMU Values Diversity (Faculty, Staff, and Students)**

![Bar chart showing belief in CMU values diversity for faculty, staff, and students.]

Faculty (n=266): 90% Yes, 10% No

Staff (n=523): 78% Yes, 22% No

Students (n=1447): 93% Yes, 7% No
Figure 27: Belief that CMU Values Diversity (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

- Member of an underrepresented group (n=742)
  - Yes: 80%
  - No: 20%

- Not a member of an underrepresented group (n=1379)
  - Yes: 96%
  - No: 4%

Figure 28: Belief that CMU Values Diversity (“Demographic Group” Respondents)

- Members of a minority religious group (n=142)
  - Yes: 74%
  - No: 26%

- Persons with disabilities (64)
  - Yes: 80%
  - No: 20%

- Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (n=133)
  - Yes: 81%
  - No: 19%

- LGBTQ individuals (n=219)
  - Yes: 79%
  - No: 21%

- Persons of international origin (n=96)
  - Yes: 82%
  - No: 18%

- First generation students (318)
  - Yes: 84%
  - No: 16%

- Veterans (n=83)
  - Yes: 95%
  - No: 5%
Importance of Diversity to CMU’s Faculty

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of diversity to CMU’s faculty. Two thousand, three hundred thirty-six respondents provided a response to this question on a scale of “1 – Not at all important” to “5 – Extremely important.” As shown in Figure 30, the majority of respondents (61%), rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s faculty as either a “4” or “5”.

As shown in Figure 31, the majority of faculty (65%), staff (64%), and students (59%), rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s faculty similarly (i.e., as a “4” or as a “5”). However, students rated diversity as not being as important to faculty, when compared to other groups.

As shown in Figure 32, respondents who identified as being a member of an underrepresented group, had a higher percentage of respondents who rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s faculty as a “5” (31%), compared to those who did not (29%). However, respondents who identified as being a member of an underrepresented group also had a higher percentage of respondents who rated the importance as a “1” or as a “2” (16%), compared to those who did not (11%).

As shown in Figure 33, there was significant variance among the Demographic Groups in their rating of the importance of diversity to CMU’s faculty. Respondents of international origin rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s faculty higher than respondents in general. Seventy-one percent of these respondents rated the importance of diversity to faculty as a “4” or “5,”
compared to 61% for respondents in general. Veterans rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s faculty similarly to respondents in general, with no rating having more than a four percentage point variance. Respondents from the other Demographic Groups rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s faculty lower than respondents in general. Respondents who identified themselves as socioeconomically disadvantaged students rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s faculty the lowest (with only 49% rating the importance as a “4” or a “5”). Respondents who identified themselves as persons with disabilities had a higher percentage who rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s faculty as a “5”, compared to the average across all respondents (40%, versus 30%), and a significantly lower percentage of individuals who rated it as a “4” compared to the average across all respondents (15%, versus 34%).

As shown in Figure 34, there was also significant variance in the rating of the importance of diversity to CMU’s faculty among the races / ethnicities. Asian / Asian-American (73%), and American Indian or Alaskan Native (72%) respondents, had the greatest percentage of respondents who rated the importance “4” or as a “5”, while African-American / Black respondents had the lowest (54%). (This analysis excludes Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander respondents because there were not enough respondents to draw meaningful conclusions about this population).

There was not significant variance in the ratings of the importance of diversity to CMU’s faculty, as compared to the ratings among all respondents, when analyzed by gender.

**Figure 30: Importance of Diversity to CMU’s Faculty (All Respondents) (n=2,336)**
Figure 31: Importance of Diversity to CMUs Faculty (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

Figure 32: Importance of Diversity to CMUs Faculty (Underrepresented Group Respondents)
Figure 33: Importance of Diversity to CMU's Faculty (“Demographic Group” Respondents)

- Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (n=148)
- First generation students (n=328)
- Members of a minority religious group (n=135)
- Veterans (n=77)
- Persons with disabilities (n=73)
- LGBTQ individuals (n=228)
- Persons of international origin (n=102)
Respondents were asked to rate the importance of diversity to CMU’s staff. Two thousand, three hundred sixteen respondents provided a response to this question on a scale of “1 – Not at all important” to “5 – Extremely important.” As shown in Figure 35, the greatest percentage of respondents rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s staff as a “4” (32%), and the majority of respondents rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s staff as a “4” or as a “5” (61%).

Faculty, staff, and students ranked the importance of diversity to CMU’s staff similarly, both when compared to the rankings of all respondents, and among the relationship groups (Figure 36). However, a greater percentage of faculty (33%), rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s staff as a “5”, as compared with students (29%), and staff (30%).

As shown in Figure 37, respondents who identified as being a member of an underrepresented group had a higher percentage of respondents who rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s
staff as a “5” (30%), compared to those who did not (28%). However, respondents who identified as being a member of an underrepresented group also had a higher percentage of respondents who rated the importance as a “1” or as a “2” (16%), compared to those who did not (10%).

Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 38), persons of international origin had the highest percentage of respondents who rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s staff as a “5” (41%). The highest percentage of respondents who ranked the importance of diversity to CMU’s staff as a “1”, were those of a religious minority (9%).

As shown in Figure 39, there was significant variance in the rating of the importance of diversity to CMU’s staff among the races / ethnicities. Asian / Asian-American (77%) and American Indian or Alaskan Native (74%) respondents had the greatest percentage of respondents who rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s staff as a “4” or as a “5”, while Hispanic / Latinx (50%), and African-American / Black (56%) respondents had the lowest. (This analysis excludes Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander respondents because there were not enough respondents to draw meaningful conclusions about this population).

There was not significant variance in the ratings of the importance of diversity to CMU’s staff, as compared to the ratings among all respondents, when analyzed by gender.

**Figure 35: Importance of Diversity to CMU’s Staff (All Respondents) (n=2,316)**
Figure 36: Importance of Diversity to CMU's Staff (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

Figure 37: Importance of Diversity to CMU's Staff (Underrepresented Group Respondents)
Figure 38: Importance of Diversity to CMU's Staff (“Demographic Group” Respondents)

- Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (n=146)
- First generation students (n=324)
- Members of a minority religious group (n=133)
- Veterans (n=75)
- Persons with disabilities (n=71)
- LGBTQ individuals (n=228)
- Persons of international origin (n=101)
Importance of Diversity to CMU’s Senior Leadership

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of diversity to CMU’s senior leadership. Two thousand, two hundred seventy-two respondents provided a response to this question on a scale of “1 – Not at all important” to “5 – Extremely important.” As shown in Figure 40, the greatest percentage of respondents rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s senior leadership as a “5” (35%), and the majority rated it as a “4” or as a “5” (68%).

As shown in Figure 41, the distribution of ratings for faculty, staff, and students was similar. However, a greater percentage of faculty gave low ratings regarding the importance of diversity to CMU’s senior leadership (i.e., a “1” or a “2”) (19%), compared to staff and students (7%, and 10%, respectively).
As shown in Figure 42, respondents who identified as being a member of an underrepresented group had a higher percentage of respondents who rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s senior leadership as a “1” or as a “2” (16%), compared to those who did not (8%).

Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 43), veterans were the group with the greatest percentage of respondents who rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s senior leadership as a “4” or as a “5” (71%). The highest percentage (9%) among the Demographic Groups, which rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s senior leadership as a “1”, was among members of a minority religious group.

As shown in Figure 44, there was significant variance in the rating of the importance of diversity to CMU’s senior leadership among the races / ethnicities. Asians / Asian-Americans (81%), had the greatest percentage of respondents who rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s senior leadership as a “4” or as a “5”, while Hispanic / Latinx (50%), and African / Black (58%), and Other race (57%) respondents had the lowest. (This analysis excludes Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander respondents because there were not enough respondents to draw meaningful conclusions about this population).

There was not significant variance in the ratings of the importance of diversity to CMU’s senior leadership, as compared to the ratings among all respondents, when analyzed by gender.

**Figure 40: Importance of Diversity to CMU's Senior Leadership (All Respondents)**

(n=2,272)
Figure 41: Importance of Diversity to CMU's Senior Leadership (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

Figure 42: Importance of Diversity to CMU's Senior Leadership (Underrepresented Group Respondents)
Figure 43: Importance of Diversity to CMU’s Senior Leadership (“Demographic Group” Respondents)

- Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (n=143)
- First generation students (n=306)
- Members of a minority religious group (n=132)
- Veterans (n=78)
- Persons with disabilities (n=69)
- LGBTQ individuals (n=218)
- Persons of international origin (n=99)
**Figure 44: Importance of Diversity to CMU’s Senior Leadership (Racial Group Respondents)**

**Importance of Diversity to CMU’s Students**

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of diversity to CMU’s students. Two thousand, three hundred eleven respondents provided a response to this question. As shown in Figure 45, the greatest percentage of respondents rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s students as a “5” (35%), and the majority of respondents rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s students as a “4” or as a “5” (65%).

As shown in Figure 46, a higher percentage of staff rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s students as a “4” or as a “5” (71%), compared to faculty and students (60%, and 65%, respectively). A higher percentage of faculty rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s students as a “1” or as a “2” (18%), compared to staff and students (7%, and 13%, respectively).
As shown in Figure 47, respondents who identified as being a member of an underrepresented group had a higher percentage of respondents who rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s students as a “5” (38%), compared to those who did not (33%). However, respondents who identified as being a member of an underrepresented group also had a higher percentage of respondents who rated the importance as a “1” or a “2” (15%), compared to those who did not (10%).

Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 48), persons with disabilities were the group with the greatest percentage of respondents who rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s students as a “4” or as a “5” (76%), and veterans comprise the Demographic Group which most frequently selected a “1” when describing the importance of diversity to students (7%).

As shown in Figure 49, there was significant variance in the rating of the importance of diversity to CMU’s students among the races / ethnicities. Asian / Asian-American (82%), and American Indian or Alaskan Native (77%), respondents had the greatest percentage of respondents who rated the importance of diversity to CMU’s students as a “4” or as a “5”, while Hispanic / Latinx (62%), and multiracial (63%) respondents had the lowest. (This analysis excludes Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander respondents because there were not enough respondents to draw meaningful conclusions about this population).

There was not significant variance in the ratings of the importance of diversity to CMU’s students, as compared to the ratings among all respondents, when analyzed by gender.

**Figure 45: Importance of Diversity to CMU's Students (All Respondents) (n=2,311)**
Figure 46: Importance of Diversity to CMU’s Students (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

- Faculty (n=287)
- Staff (n=535)
- Students (n=1489)

Figure 47: Importance of Diversity to CMU’s Students (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

- Member of an underrepresented group (n=810)
- Not a member of an underrepresented group (n=1368)
Figure 48: Importance of Diversity to CMU’s Students (“Demographic Group” Respondents)
**Diversity of CMU’s Faculty**

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they believe CMU’s faculty is diverse. One thousand, nine hundred seventy-six respondents provided a response to this question. The vast majority of respondents (72%), indicated that they believe CMU’s faculty is diverse (Figure 50).

As shown in Figure 51, similar percentages of students and staff respondents shared this belief (78%, and 70%, respectively). However, the majority of faculty respondents (53%), indicated that they do not believe CMU’s faculty is diverse.

There was a significant variance in the results to this question when analyzed by membership in an underrepresented group. While 81% of respondents who do not consider themselves to be part of an underrepresented group believed that CMU’s faculty is diverse, only 56% of respondents in underrepresented groups indicated that they believe CMU’s faculty is diverse. (see Figure 52).
As shown in Figure 53, the majority of respondents from all Demographic Groups felt that CMU’s faculty is diverse. However, there was significant variance in the size of that majority. Among the Demographic Groups, veterans had the greatest percentage of respondents who indicated that CMU’s Faculty is diverse (83%), and members of a minority religious group had the least (58%).

As shown in Figure 54, there was a large variance in the responses by race / ethnicity. Asian / Asian-American respondents had the greatest percentage of respondents who believed CMU’s faculty is diverse (79%), while African-American / Black respondents had the lowest (41%). African-American / Black respondents were the only race / ethnicity in which the majority of respondents did not believe CMU’s faculty is diverse. (This analysis excludes Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander respondents because there were not enough respondents to draw meaningful conclusions about this population).

There was not significant variance in the percentages of respondents who believed CMU’s faculty is diverse, as compared to the percentage among all respondents, when analyzed by gender.

**Figure 50: Belief that CMU's Faculty is Diverse (All Respondents) (n=1,976)**
Figure 51: Belief that CMU’s Faculty is Diverse (Faculty, Staff, and Students)
Figure 52: Belief that CMU's Faculty is Diverse (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

- **Member of an underrepresented group (n=693):** 56% Yes, 44% No
- **Not a member of an underrepresented group (n=1177):** 81% Yes, 19% No

Figure 53: Belief that CMU's Faculty is Diverse (“Demographic Group” Respondents)

- **Members of a minority religious group (n=113):** 42% Yes, 58% No
- **Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (n=137):** 40% Yes, 60% No
- **Persons of international origin (n=91):** 38% Yes, 62% No
- **LGBTQ individuals (n=198):** 37% Yes, 63% No
- **Persons with disabilities (n=58):** 31% Yes, 69% No
- **First generation students (n=300):** 30% Yes, 70% No
- **Veterans (n=66):** 17% Yes, 83% No
Figure 54: Belief that CMU’s Faculty is Diverse (Racial Group Respondents)

Greatest Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU’s Faculty

Respondents were asked where they think there are opportunities for increased diversity in CMU’s faculty. One thousand, five hundred sixty-four respondents selected 5,867 opportunities for increased diversity in CMU’s faculty. The greatest number of respondents (68%), selected race / ethnicity as an area where CMU has an opportunity to increase the diversity of its faculty (Figure 55). Large numbers of respondents also selected disability status (51%), and gender identity (50%), as opportunities for increased diversity.

As shown in Figure 56, the greatest percentage of faculty, staff, and students all selected race / ethnicity as an area where there is an opportunity for increased diversity in CMU’s faculty. However, a smaller percentage of students (63%) selected race / ethnicity as an area where there is an opportunity to increase the diversity to CMU’s faculty, compared to the other groups (71% for staff, and 82% for faculty). A much smaller percentage of students selected disability status (45%) as an area where there is an opportunity to increase the diversity to CMU’s faculty, compared to faculty (61%), and staff (63%).

As shown in Figure 57, a higher percentage of members of an underrepresented group selected each opportunity, with the exceptions of veteran status and disability status. This difference was largest among race / ethnicity where 78% of members of an underrepresented group selected it, compared to only 61% of those who are not a member of an underrepresented group.
Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 58), a higher percentage of respondents tended to select the opportunity to increase diversity associated with their Demographic Group. A higher percentage of persons with disabilities selected disability status as an opportunity for increased diversity, compared to the average among all respondents (88%, compared to 51%). A higher percentage of veterans selected veteran status, compared to the average among all respondents (78%, compared to 39%). A higher percentage of persons of international origin selected country of origin, compared to the average among all respondents (53%, compared to 35%). A higher percentage of socioeconomically disadvantaged students selected socioeconomic status, compared to the average among all respondents (62%, compared to 40%). A higher percentage of members of a minority religious group selected religion, compared to the average among all respondents (70%, compared to 41%). A higher percentage of LGBTQ individuals selected sexual orientation and gender identity, compared to the averages among all respondents (80%, compared to 46% for sexual orientation, and 69%, compared to 50% for gender identity).

Among the races / ethnicities (Figure 59), White respondents had a smaller percentage of respondents who selected race / ethnicity compared to the other races / ethnicities. Asians / Asian-Americans had the lowest percentage of respondents select sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and veteran status. (Some races / ethnicities had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).

Among the genders (Figure 60), a higher percentage of females selected each opportunity, compared to males, with the exception of veteran status. This difference was largest among gender identity (57%, compared to 39%) and disability status (57% compared to 39%). (Other genders had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).

**Figure 55: Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU's Faculty (All Respondents) (n=1,564)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race / ethnicity</td>
<td>1059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability status</td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender identity</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic status</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran status</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of origin</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 56: Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU’s Faculty (Faculty, Staff, and Students)
Figure 57: Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU’s Faculty (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

- Disability status
- Veteran status
- Country of origin
- Socioeconomic status
- Religion
- Sexual orientation
- Gender identity
- Race / ethnicity

- Not a member of an underrepresented group (n=837)
- Member of an underrepresented group (n=646)
Figure 58: Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU's Faculty ("Demographic Group" Respondents)

- **Disability status**: 48% of respondents believe in increased diversity for people with disabilities, 54% for socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and 88% for veterans.
- **Veteran status**: 48% for first generation students, 78% for veterans.
- **Country of origin**: 53% for members of a minority religious group.
- **Socioeconomic status**: 62% for LGBTQ individuals, 70% for persons with disabilities.
- **Religion**: 70% for persons of international origin.
- **Sexual orientation**: 80% for persons of international origin.
- **Gender identity**: 69% for members of a minority religious group.
- **Race / ethnicity**: 79% for members of a minority religious group.
Figure 59: Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU’s Faculty (Racial Group Respondents)
Respondents were then asked to rank the opportunities for increased diversity in CMU’s faculty. Race / ethnicity was the top ranked opportunity to increase the diversity of CMU’s faculty on average, and country of origin was the lowest ranked.

### Rank | Diversity Opportunity
---|---
1 | Race / ethnicity
2 | Gender identity
3 | Disability status
4 | Veteran status
5 | Socioeconomic status
6 | Sexual orientation
7 | Religion
8 | Country of origin

**Diversity of CMU’s Staff**

Respondents were asked whether they believe that CMU’s staff is diverse. One thousand, eight hundred thirty-two respondents answered the question. The majority of respondents (66%), believed that CMU’s staff is diverse (see Figure 61).
However, faculty, students, and staff varied greatly in their beliefs regarding the diversity of CMU’s staff (see Figure 62). While a substantial majority of students (77%), feel CMU’s staff is diverse, the majority of the faculty did not believe that CMU’s staff is diverse (68%). Only 51% of staff believed that CMU’s staff is diverse.

Only 52% of respondents from underrepresented groups believed that CMU’s staff is diverse, compared with 73% of those who are not members of underrepresented groups (see Figure 63).

As shown in Figure 64, there was significant variance regarding the diversity of CMU’s staff among the Demographic Groups. Veterans were the group with the greatest percentage of respondents (79%), who believed that CMU’s staff is diverse. Respondents of international origin had the smallest percentage who believed that CMU’s staff is diverse (44%), and were the only Demographic Group where the majority of respondents did not believe that CMU’s staff is diverse.

Among the races / ethnicities (Figure 65), there was also a large variance in the responses. Asian / Asian-American respondents had the greatest percentage of respondents who believed that CMU’s staff is diverse (74%), while African-American / Black respondents had the lowest (43%). African-American / Black respondents were the only race in which the majority of respondents did not believe that CMU’s staff is diverse. (This analysis excludes Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander respondents because there were not enough respondents to draw meaningful conclusions about this population).

There was not significant variance in the percentages of respondents who believed that CMU’s staff is diverse, as compared to the percentage among all respondents, when analyzed by gender.

**Figure 61: Belief that CMU's Staff is Diverse (All Respondents) (n=1,832)**
Figure 62: Belief that CMU’s Staff is Diverse (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

- Faculty (n=217): 32% Yes, 68% No
- Staff (n=439): 51% Yes, 49% No
- Students (n=1176): 77% Yes, 23% No

Figure 63: Belief that CMU's Staff is Diverse (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

- Member of an underrepresented group (n=637): 52% Yes, 48% No
- Not a member of an underrepresented group (n=1097): 73% Yes, 27% No
Figure 64: Belief that CMU's Staff is Diverse ("Demographic Group" Respondents)

- Persons of international origin (n=75): 44% Yes, 56% No
- Members of a minority religious group (n=102): 44% Yes, 56% No
- LGBTQ individuals (n=179): 39% Yes, 61% No
- Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (n=123): 36% Yes, 64% No
- Persons with disabilities (n=58): 29% Yes, 71% No
- First generation students (n=269): 27% Yes, 73% No
- Veterans (n=68): 21% Yes, 79% No

Figure 65: Belief that CMU's Staff is Diverse (Racial Group Respondents)

- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (n=3): 67% Yes
- African-American / Black (n=174): 43% Yes, 57% No
- Hispanic / Latinx (n=56): 43% Yes, 57% No
- Other (n=25): 40% Yes, 60% No
- Two or more races (n=59): 36% Yes, 64% No
- White (n=1351): 32% Yes, 68% No
- American Indian or Alaskan Native (n=26): 31% Yes, 69% No
- Asian / Asian-American (n=94): 26% Yes, 74% No
Greatest Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU’s Staff

Respondents were asked where they think there are opportunities for increased diversity in CMU’s staff. One thousand, two hundred twenty-one respondents provided 4,209 responses to this question. The greatest number of respondents selected race / ethnicity (71%) as an area where CMU has an opportunity to increase the diversity of its staff, as shown in Figure 66.

As shown in Figure 67 this was true for faculty, students, and staff. However, a smaller percentage of students (64%), selected race / ethnicity as an area where there is an opportunity to increase the diversity to CMU’s staff, compared to the other groups (78%, for staff, and 85%, for faculty). A much smaller percentage of students selected disability status (37%), as an area where there is an opportunity to increase the diversity to CMU’s staff, compared to the other groups as well (51% for staff, and 55% for faculty).

As shown in Figure 68, respondents selected the opportunities for increased diversity similarly regardless of underrepresented group status. However, a higher, or equal, percentage of members of an underrepresented group selected each opportunity, with the exception of veteran status.

Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 69), a higher percentage of respondents tended to select the opportunity to increase diversity associated with their Demographic Group. A higher percentage of persons with disabilities selected disability status as an opportunity for increased diversity, compared to the average among all respondents (68%, compared to 43%). A higher percentage of veterans selected veteran status, compared to the average among all respondents (70%, compared to 35%). A higher percentage of persons of international origin selected country of origin, compared to the average among all respondents (45%, compared to 33%). A higher percentage of socioeconomically disadvantaged students selected socioeconomic status, compared to the average among all respondents (54%, compared to 33%). A higher percentage of members of a minority religious group selected religion, compared to the average among all respondents (68%, compared to 35%). A higher percentage of LGBTQ individuals selected sexual orientation and gender identity compared to the averages among all respondents (78%, compared to 44% for sexual orientation, and 63%, compared to 47% for gender identity).

Among the races / ethnicities (Figure 70), White respondents had a smaller percentage of respondents who selected race / ethnicity compared to the other races / ethnicities. Asians / Asian-Americans had the lowest percentage of respondents who selected sexual orientation, religion, socioeconomic status, veteran status, and disability status. (Some races / ethnicities had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).

Among the genders (Figure 71), the responses for males and females had little variance, with the exceptions of gender identity (where 53% of female respondents selected this opportunity, compared to 36% of males) and disability status (where 47% of females selected this opportunity, compared to 35% of males). Additionally, a higher percentage of females selected each opportunity, compared to males. (Other genders had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).
Figure 66: Greatest Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU’s Staff (All Respondents) (n=1,221)

- Race / ethnicity: 866
- Gender identity: 578
- Sexual orientation: 532
- Disability status: 527
- Veteran status: 429
- Religion: 422
- Country of origin: 406
- Socioeconomic status: 402
- Other: 47

Figure 67: Greatest Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU’s Staff (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

Other
- Students (n=719): 2% (9%)
- Staff (n=330): 37% (51%)
- Faculty (n=172): 55% (55%)
- Disability status
  - Students (n=719): 31% (31%)
  - Staff (n=330): 33% (32%)
  - Faculty (n=172): 41% (41%)
- Veteran status
  - Students (n=719): 31% (42%)
  - Staff (n=330): 38% (41%)
  - Faculty (n=172): 43% (41%)
- Country of origin
  - Students (n=719): 31% (32%)
  - Staff (n=330): 31% (32%)
  - Faculty (n=172): 41% (41%)
- Socioeconomic status
  - Students (n=719): 33% (32%)
  - Staff (n=330): 33% (32%)
  - Faculty (n=172): 41% (41%)
- Religion
  - Students (n=719): 34% (41%)
  - Staff (n=330): 34% (41%)
  - Faculty (n=172): 43% (41%)
- Sexual orientation
  - Students (n=719): 43% (49%)
  - Staff (n=330): 43% (49%)
  - Faculty (n=172): 49% (49%)
- Gender identity
  - Students (n=719): 49% (49%)
  - Staff (n=330): 49% (49%)
  - Faculty (n=172): 49% (49%)
- Race / ethnicity
  - Students (n=719): 64% (78%)
  - Staff (n=330): 78% (85%)
  - Faculty (n=172): 85% (85%)
Figure 68: Greatest Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU's Staff (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

- Disability status: 42% Not a member of an underrepresented group; 45% Member of an underrepresented group
- Veteran status: 37% Not a member of an underrepresented group; 33% Member of an underrepresented group
- Country of origin: 32% Not a member of an underrepresented group; 34% Member of an underrepresented group
- Socioeconomic status: 31% Not a member of an underrepresented group; 35% Member of an underrepresented group
- Religion: 33% Not a member of an underrepresented group; 37% Member of an underrepresented group
- Sexual orientation: 40% Not a member of an underrepresented group; 50% Member of an underrepresented group
- Gender identity: 44% Not a member of an underrepresented group; 53% Member of an underrepresented group
- Race / ethnicity: 66% Not a member of an underrepresented group; 79% Member of an underrepresented group
Figure 69: Greatest Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU's Staff ("Demographic Group" Respondents)
Figure 70: Greatest Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU's Staff (Racial Group Respondents)
Respondents were then asked to rank the opportunities for increased diversity in CMU’s staff. Race / ethnicity was the top ranked opportunity to increase the diversity of CMU’s staff on average, and country of origin was the lowest ranked.

**Figure 72: Greatest Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU's Staff Ranked**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Diversity Opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Race / ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gender identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Veteran status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Socioeconomic status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Disability status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Country of origin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diversity of CMU’s Senior Leadership
Respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they believe CMU’s Senior Leadership is diverse. One thousand, four hundred nineteen respondents provided a response to this question. The majority of respondents (67%), indicated that they think CMU’s senior leadership is diverse (see Figure 73).

As shown in Figure 74, while the majority of faculty (67%), and students (62%), indicated that they believe CMU’s senior leadership is diverse, only 47% of staff held the same opinion.

Regardless of underrepresented group status, the majority of respondents believed that CMU’s senior leadership is diverse (Figure 75). However, a much larger percentage (48%), of respondents who identify as a member of an underrepresented group indicated that they do not believe CMU’s senior leadership is diverse, compared to those who are not members of underrepresented groups (24%).

As shown in Figure 76, there was significant variance in the belief that CMU’s senior leadership is diverse among the Demographic Groups. Veterans were the group with the greatest percentage of respondents (78%) who believed that CMU’s senior leadership is diverse. Members of a minority religious group were the Demographic Group with the smallest percentage of respondents who believed that CMU’s senior leadership is diverse (48%), closely followed by persons of international origin (51%).

Among the races / ethnicities (Figure 77), there was also a large variance in the responses. Asian / Asian-American (72%), and White (71%), respondents had the greatest percentage of respondents who believed CMU’s senior leadership is diverse, while African-American / Black (50%), and Hispanic / Latinx (56%), respondents had the lowest. (This analysis excludes Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander respondents because there were not enough respondents to draw meaningful conclusions about this population).

There was little variation in the percentages of respondents who believe CMU’s senior leadership is diverse, as compared to the percentage among all respondents, when analyzed by gender.
Figure 73: Belief that CMU's Senior Leadership is Diverse (All Respondents) (n=1,419)

Figure 74: Belief that CMU's Senior Leadership is Diverse (Faculty, Staff, and Students)
Figure 75: Belief that CMU’s Senior Leadership is Diverse (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

Figure 76: Belief that CMU’s Senior Leadership is Diverse (“Demographic Group” Respondents)
Greatest Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU’s Senior Leadership

Respondents were asked where they think there are opportunities for increased diversity in CMU’s senior leadership. Nine hundred eighteen respondents provided 2,974 responses to this question. The greatest number of respondents selected race / ethnicity (62%) as an area where CMU has an opportunity to increase the diversity of its senior leadership (Figure 78).

As shown in Figure 79, this was true for faculty (61%), staff (60%), and students (64%). The second area of greatest opportunity to increase diversity among senior leadership, selected by faculty (60%), staff (51%), and students (41%), was gender identity.

As shown in Figure 80, respondents selected the opportunities for increased diversity similarly regardless of underrepresented group status. However, a higher, or equal, percentage of members of an underrepresented group selected each opportunity, with the exceptions of veteran status and disability status.

Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 81), a higher percentage of respondents tended to select the opportunity to increase diversity associated with their Demographic Group. A higher percentage of persons with disabilities selected disability status as an opportunity for increased diversity, compared to the average among all respondents (57%, compared to 36%). A higher percentage of veterans selected veteran status, compared to the average among all respondents (72%, compared to 29%). A higher percentage of persons of international origin selected
country of origin, compared to the average among all respondents (51%, compared to 32%). A higher percentage of socioeconomically disadvantaged students selected socioeconomic status, compared to the average among all respondents (53%, compared to 35%). A higher percentage of members of a minority religious group selected religion, compared to the average among all respondents (66%, compared to 33%). A higher percentage of LGBTQ individuals selected sexual orientation and gender identity compared to the averages among all respondents (73%, compared to 41% for sexual orientation, and 69%, compared to 53% for gender identity).

Among the races / ethnicities (Figure 82), White respondents had a smaller percentage of respondents who selected race / ethnicity compared to the other races / ethnicities. Asians / Asian-Americans had the lowest percentage of respondents select sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, veteran status, and disability status. (Some races / ethnicities had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).

Among the genders (Figure 83), the responses for males and females had little variance, with the exceptions of gender identity (where 59% of female respondents selected this opportunity, compared to 40% of males) and disability status (where 40% of females selected this opportunity, compared to 30% of males). (Other genders had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).

**Figure 78: Greatest Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU’s Senior Leadership (All Respondents) (n=918)**

![Bar chart showing the greatest opportunities for increased diversity among respondents, with race / ethnicity being the most selected, followed by gender identity, sexual orientation, disability status, socioeconomic status, religion, country of origin, veteran status, and other.](chart.png)
Figure 79: Greatest Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU’s Senior Leadership (Faculty, Staff, and Students)
Figure 80: Greatest Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU’s Senior Leadership (Underrepresented Group Respondents)
Figure 81: Greatest Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU’s Senior Leadership ("Demographic Group" Respondents)
Figure 82: Greatest Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU’s Senior Leadership (Racial Group Respondents)
Respondents were then asked to rank the opportunities for increased diversity in CMU’s senior leadership. Race / ethnicity was the top-ranked opportunity to increase the diversity of CMU’s senior leadership on average, and country of origin was the lowest ranked.

**Figure 84: Greatest Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU’s Senior Leadership Ranked**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Diversity Opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Race / ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gender identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Veteran status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Socioeconomic status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Disability status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Country of origin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diversity of CMU’s Student Body
Respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they believed CMU’s student body is diverse. One thousand, seven hundred nine respondents provided a response to this question. The majority of respondents (73%), indicated that they think CMU’s student body is diverse (see Figure 85).

As shown in Figure 86, while the vast majority of staff (75%), and students (79%), indicated that they believe CMU’s student body is diverse, only 44% of faculty held the same opinion.

Regardless of underrepresented group status, the majority of respondents believed that CMU’s student body is diverse (Figure 87). However, although 82% of those not in an underrepresented group believed that CMU’s student body is diverse, only 58% of those in underrepresented groups shared this belief.

As shown in Figure 88, there was significant variance in the belief that CMU’s student body is diverse among the Demographic Groups. Veterans were the group with the greatest percentage of respondents (82%), who believed that CMU’s student body is diverse. Persons of international origin were the Demographic Group with the smallest percentage of respondents who believed that CMU’s student body is diverse (52%).

As shown in Figure 89, there was also significant variance in the responses among races / ethnicities. Whites (76%), and Asians / Asian-Americans (75%), were the races / ethnicities with the highest percentages of respondents who believed that CMU’s student body is diverse. African-Americans / Blacks (59%), and Hispanics / Latinx (57%), were the races / ethnicities with the lowest percentage of respondents who believed that CMU’s student body is diverse. (This analysis excludes Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander respondents because there were not enough respondents to draw meaningful conclusions about this population).

There was little variation in the percentages of respondents who believe CMU’s student body is diverse, as compared to the percentage among all respondents, when analyzed by gender.
Figure 85: Belief that CMU's Student Body is Diverse (All Respondents) (n=1,709)

Figure 86: Belief that CMU's Student Body is Diverse (Faculty, Staff, and Students)
Figure 87: Belief that CMU's Student Body is Diverse (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

Figure 88: Belief that CMU's Student Body is Diverse (“Demographic Group” Respondents)
As shown in Figure 91, faculty (84%), staff (75%), and students (64%), all felt that the greatest opportunity to increase the student body’s diversity was through race / ethnicity (although a higher percentage of faculty respondents felt this way). Students felt that the next greatest opportunities for diversifying the student body were through focusing on socioeconomic status (46%), gender identity (45%), and disability status (44%). In contrast, faculty felt that the next three greatest opportunities to diversify the student body would be through focusing on country of origin (56%), disability status (56%), and socioeconomic status (53%). Staff felt that the emphasis should be on socio-economic status (51%), disability status (51%), and veteran status (45%).

As shown in Figure 92, a higher percentage of members of an underrepresented group selected each opportunity, with the exception of veteran status.
Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 93), a higher percentage of respondents tended to select the opportunity to increase diversity associated with their Demographic Group. A higher percentage of persons with disabilities selected disability status as an opportunity for increased diversity, compared to the average among all respondents (74%, compared to 47%). A higher percentage of veterans selected veteran status, compared to the average among all respondents (61%, compared to 36%). A higher percentage of persons of international origin selected country of origin, compared to the average among all respondents (65%, compared to 42%). A higher percentage of socioeconomically disadvantaged students selected socioeconomic status, compared to the average among all respondents (67%, compared to 49%). A higher percentage of members of a minority religious group selected religion, compared to the average among all respondents (72%, compared to 41%). A higher percentage of LGBTQ individuals selected sexual orientation and gender identity compared to the averages among all respondents (67%, compared to 41% for sexual orientation, and 65%, compared to 45% for gender identity).

Among the races / ethnicities (Figure 94), White respondents had a smaller percentage of respondents who selected race / ethnicity compared to the other races / ethnicities. Asians / Asian-Americans had the lowest percentage of respondents select sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and veteran status. (Some races / ethnicities had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).

Among the genders (Figure 95), a higher percentage of females selected each of the opportunities compared to males. (Other genders had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).

**Figure 90: Greatest Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU's Student Body (All Respondents) (n=1,123)**
Figure 91: Greatest Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU's Student Body (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

- Race / ethnicity
- Gender identity
- Sexual orientation
- Religion
- Socioeconomic status
- Country of origin
- Veteran status
- Disability status
- Other

- Students (n=675)
- Staff (n=261)
- Faculty (n=187)
Figure 92: Greatest Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU's Student Body (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

- Disability status
- Veteran status
- Country of origin
- Socioeconomic status
- Religion
- Sexual orientation
- Gender identity
- Race / ethnicity

- Not a member of an underrepresented group (n=601)
- Member of an underrepresented group (n=471)
Figure 93: Greatest Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU's Student Body
("Demographic Group" Respondents)
Figure 94: Greatest Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU's Student Body (Racial Group Respondents)
Figure 95: Greatest Opportunities for Increased Diversity in CMU's Student Body (Gender Group Respondents)

Belief that CMU has an Inclusive Environment
Respondents were asked if they believe that CMU has an inclusive environment. One thousand, six hundred twelve respondents provided a response to this question. The vast majority of respondents (78%), indicated that they believe CMU has an inclusive environment (see Figure 96).

As shown in Figure 97, the majority of faculty (62%), staff (73%), and student (84%) respondents believed that CMU has an inclusive environment, but there were significant differences among them.

A significantly higher percentage of those who are not members of underrepresented groups (87%), believed that CMU has an inclusive environment as compared to those in underrepresented groups (62%) (Figure 98).

As shown in Figure 99, the majority of respondents from all of the Demographic Groups believed that CMU has an inclusive environment, although there is variance in the size of the majorities. Veterans (88%), persons of international origin (79%), and first generation students (78%), had the highest percentages among the Demographic Groups who believed that CMU has an inclusive environment. Respondents who identified as members of a minority religious group...
(58%), and LGBTQ individuals (61%), had the lowest percentages of persons believing that CMU has an inclusive environment among the Demographic Groups.

As shown in Figure 100, Asian / Asian-American (80%), and White (81%) respondents had a slightly higher percentage of respondents who believed that CMU has an inclusive environment, compared to the average of respondents in general, while the other races / ethnicities had percentages below respondents in general.

There was not significant variance in the percentage of respondents who indicated that CMU has an inclusive environment, as compared to the percentage among all respondents, when analyzed by gender.

**Figure 96: Belief that CMU Has an Inclusive Environment (All Respondents) (n=1,612)**
Figure 97: Belief that CMU Has an Inclusive Environment (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

![Bar chart showing belief in inclusive environment by faculty, staff, and students.]

- Faculty (n=214): 62% Yes, 38% No
- Staff (n=399): 73% Yes, 27% No
- Students (n=999): 84% Yes, 16% No

Figure 98: Belief that CMU Has an Inclusive Environment (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

![Bar chart showing belief in inclusive environment by underrepresented group members.]

- Member of an underrepresented group (n=545): 62% Yes, 38% No
- Not a member of an underrepresented group (n=980): 87% Yes, 13% No

Figure 99: Belief that CMU Has an Inclusive Environment (“Demographic Group” Respondents)
Belief that CMU Values Inclusion
The respondents were asked if they believe that CMU values inclusion. One thousand, six hundred six respondents provided a response to this question. The vast majority of respondents (89%) indicated that CMU values inclusion, as shown in Figure 101. This was true for all
respondents regardless of their relationship with CMU, underrepresented group status, Demographic Group, gender, or race / ethnicity.

As shown in Figure 102, students (91%), and staff (89%), have higher percentages who believed that CMU values inclusion, as compared to faculty (79%).

Persons who are not members of underrepresented groups (94%), have higher percentages of their members who believed that CMU values inclusion, as compared with those in underrepresented groups (78%) (Figure 103). In fact, the persons who are not in underrepresented groups believed more affirmatively that CMU values inclusion as compared with the percentage of all respondents, and has the highest percentage of affirmative believers of any of the comparative analytical groups.

Members of the Demographic Groups also vary in the percentage of their members who believed that CMU values inclusion (although the majority in each Demographic Group believes that the institution does) (Figure 104). Veterans not only have the highest percentage of their members who believed that CMU values inclusion among the Demographic Groups (92%), but their belief exceeds the percentage of affirmative believers among all respondents. Members of a minority religious group (75%), and LGBTQ individuals (78%), had the lowest percentages among the Demographic Groups who believed that CMU values inclusion.

As shown in Figure 105, four of the races / ethnicities had similar percentages of respondents who believed that CMU values inclusion, as compared to the percentage among all respondents (i.e., Asians / Asian-Americans (90%), Whites (90%), Hispanics / Latinx (89%), and respondents of Other races / ethnicities (89%)). However, African American / Black (84%), American Indian or Alaskan Native (84%), and multiracial (81%) respondents had percentages slightly below the average among all respondents. (Some races / ethnicities had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).

There was not significant variance in the percentage of respondents who indicated that CMU values inclusion, as compared to the percentage among all respondents, when analyzed by gender.
Figure 101: Belief that CMU Values Inclusion (All Respondents) (n=1,606)

Figure 102: Belief that CMU Values Inclusion (Faculty, Staff, and Students)
Figure 103: Belief that CMU Values Inclusion (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

- Member of an underrepresented group (n=536): 78% Yes, 22% No
- Not a member of an underrepresented group (n=988): 94% Yes, 6% No

Figure 104: Belief that CMU Values Inclusion (“Demographic Group” Respondents)

- Members of a minority religious group (n=87): 25% No, 75% Yes
- LGBTQ individuals (n=159): 22% No, 78% Yes
- Persons with disabilities (n=47): 19% No, 81% Yes
- Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (n=107): 15% No, 85% Yes
- Persons of international origin (n=70): 13% No, 87% Yes
- First generation students (n=212): 12% No, 88% Yes
- Veterans (n=66): 8% No, 92% Yes
Importance of Inclusion to CMU’s Faculty

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of inclusion to CMU’s faculty. One thousand, six hundred forty-one respondents provided a response to this question on a scale of “1 – Not at all important” to “5 – Extremely important.” In general, respondents felt that inclusion is important to CMU’s faculty with 36% rating it at the highest level of importance. As shown in Figure 106, the majority of respondents (68%), rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s faculty as either a “4” or a “5”.

As shown in Figure 107, the highest percentages of students (38%) and faculty (43%), believed that inclusion is “5-Extremely important” to CMU’s faculty. However, the greatest percentage of the staff respondents rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s faculty as a “4” (37%). Very few faculty (4%), students (3%), or staff (4%) believed that inclusion is not at all important to CMU’s faculty.

As shown in Figure 108, respondents who identified as being a member of an underrepresented group had a higher percentage of respondents who rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s faculty as a “1” or as a “2” (13%), compared to those who did not (7%).

As shown in Figure 109, there was significant variance among the Demographic Groups in their rating of the importance of inclusion to CMU’s faculty. Respondents of international origin rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s faculty higher than respondents in general. 80%
rated it as a “4” or as a “5”, compared to 68% for respondents in general. Respondents from the other Demographic Groups rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s faculty lower than respondents in general. Members of a minority religious group (8%), had the highest percentage of any Demographic Group who believed that the importance of inclusion to CMU’s faculty is not at all important.

As shown in Figure 110, there was significant variance in the rating of the importance of inclusion to CMU’s faculty among the races / ethnicities. Asian / Asian-American respondents (81%), had the greatest percentage of respondents rate the importance of inclusion to CMU’s faculty as a “4” or as a “5”, while Hispanic / Latinx (64%), and African-American / Black (61%), respondents had the lowest. (This analysis excludes Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander respondents because there were not enough respondents to draw meaningful conclusions about this population).

There was not significant variance in the rating of the importance of inclusion to CMU’s faculty, as compared to the ratings among all respondents, when analyzed by gender.

**Figure 106: Importance of Inclusion to CMU’s Faculty (All Respondents) (n=1,641)**
Figure 107: Importance of Inclusion to CMU's Faculty (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

Figure 108: Importance of Inclusion to CMU's Faculty (Underrepresented Group Respondents)
Figure 109: Importance of Inclusion to CMU’s Faculty (“Demographic Group” Respondents)
Figure 110: Importance of Inclusion to CMU’s Faculty (Racial Group Respondents)

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of inclusion to CMU’s staff. One thousand, six hundred twenty-two respondents provided a response to this question on a scale of “1 – Not at all important” to “5 – Extremely important.” As shown in Figure 111, the majority of respondents (68%) rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s staff as either a “4” or a “5”.

As shown in Figure 112, faculty, staff, and students, generally rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s staff similarly. However, although students (37%), and faculty (35%), rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s staff as “5-Extremely important”, the greatest percentage of the staff (39%), rated the importance as a “4”.

As shown in Figure 113, respondents who identified as being a member of an underrepresented group had a higher percentage of respondents who rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s staff as a “1” or as a “2” (14%), compared to those who did not (6%).
As shown in Figure 114, there was significant variance among the Demographic Groups in their rating of the importance of inclusion to CMU’s staff. Respondents of international origin rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s staff higher than respondents in general. Seventy-five percent rated it as a “4” or as a “5” compared to 68% for respondents in general. Respondents from the other Demographic Groups rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s staff lower than respondents in general. Respondents who identified themselves as members of a minority religious group had the highest percentage of members who believed that the importance of inclusion to CMU’s staff is not at all important (8%), followed by veterans (6%), and socioeconomically disadvantaged students (6%).

As shown in Figure 115, there was also significant variance in the rating of the importance of inclusion to CMU’s staff among the races / ethnicities. Asian / Asian-American (82%), and American Indian or Alaskan Native (77%), respondents had the greatest percentage of respondents who rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s staff as a “4” or as a “5” while Hispanic / Latinx (58%) and African-American / Black (62%), respondents had the lowest. (This analysis excludes Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander respondents because there were not enough respondents to draw meaningful conclusions about this population).

There was not significant variance in the ratings of the importance of inclusion to CMU’s staff, as compared to the ratings among all respondents, when analyzed by gender.

**Figure 111: Importance of Inclusion to CMU’s Staff (All Respondents) (n=1,622)**
Figure 112: Importance of Inclusion to CMU's Staff (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

Figure 113: Importance of Inclusion to CMU's Staff (Underrepresented Group Respondents)
Figure 114: Importance of Inclusion to CMU's Staff (“Demographic Group” Respondents)
Figure 115: Importance of Inclusion to CMU's Staff (Racial Group Respondents)

Importance of Inclusion to CMU’s Senior Leadership
Respondents were asked to rate the importance of inclusion to CMU’s senior leadership. One thousand, five hundred ninety respondents provided a response to this question on a scale of “1 – Not at all important” to “5 – Extremely important.” As shown in Figure 116, the majority of respondents (72%), rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s senior leadership as either a “4” or a “5”.

As shown in Figure 117, faculty, staff, and students, generally rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s senior leadership similarly. The highest percentage of both students (41%), and faculty (41%), rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s senior leadership as a “5-Extremely important”. However, the highest percentage of the staff (36%), rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s senior leadership as a “4”. A larger percentage of faculty also rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s senior leadership as either a “1” or a “2” (17%) compared to the overall average of all respondents (9%).
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As shown in Figure 118, respondents who identified as being a member of an underrepresented group had a higher percentage of respondents who rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s senior leadership as a “1” or as a “2” (14%), compared to those who did not (6%).

As shown in Figure 119, there was significant variance among the Demographic Groups in their rating of the importance of inclusion to CMU’s senior leadership. Respondents of international origin rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s senior leadership the highest among the Demographic Groups (75% rated it as a “4” or as a “5”). Respondents from the other Demographic Groups rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s senior leadership lower than respondents in general. Respondents who identified themselves as members of a minority religious group rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s senior leadership the lowest, with only 55% rating the importance of inclusion to CMU’s senior leadership either as a “4” or as a “5”. Members of a minority religious group also had the highest percentage (10%) of any Demographic Group who felt that inclusion was not at all important to senior leadership.

As shown in Figure 120, there was also significant variance in the rating of the importance of inclusion to CMU’s senior leadership among the races/ethnicities. Asian/Asian-American (80%), and American Indian or Alaskan Native (82%), respondents had the greatest percentage of respondents who rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s senior leadership as a “4” or as a “5” while Hispanic/Latinx (66%), and African-American/Black (62%), respondents had the lowest. (This analysis excludes Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander respondents because there were not enough respondents to draw meaningful conclusions about this population).

There was not significant variance in the ratings of the importance of inclusion to CMU’s senior leadership, as compared to the ratings among all respondents, when analyzed by gender.
Figure 116: Importance of Inclusion to CMU's Senior Leadership (All Respondents) (n=1,590)

Figure 117: Importance of Inclusion to CMU's Senior Leadership (Faculty, Staff, and Students)
Figure 118: Importance of Inclusion to CMU's Senior Leadership (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

- Member of an underrepresented group (n=541)
- Not a member of an underrepresented group (n=958)
Figure 119: Importance of Inclusion to CMU's Senior Leadership (“Demographic Group” Respondents)

5 – Extremely Important
- Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (n=102)
  - 32% extremely important
- First generation students (n=203)
  - 40% extremely important
- Members of a minority religious group (n=92)
  - 41% extremely important
- Veterans (n=68)
  - 53% extremely important

4
- Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (n=102)
  - 31% important
- First generation students (n=203)
  - 31% important
- Members of a minority religious group (n=92)
  - 22% important
- Veterans (n=68)
  - 24% important

3
- Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (n=102)
  - 13% somewhat important
- First generation students (n=203)
  - 19% somewhat important
- Members of a minority religious group (n=92)
  - 24% somewhat important
- Veterans (n=68)
  - 22% somewhat important

2
- Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (n=102)
  - 6% not important
- First generation students (n=203)
  - 6% not important
- Members of a minority religious group (n=92)
  - 9% not important
- Veterans (n=68)
  - 11% not important

1 – Not At All Important
- Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (n=102)
  - 3% very not important
- First generation students (n=203)
  - 6% very not important
- Members of a minority religious group (n=92)
  - 7% very not important
- Veterans (n=68)
  - 7% very not important
Figure 120: Importance of Inclusion to CMU's Senior Leadership (Racial Group Respondents)

Importance of Inclusion to CMU’s Students
Respondents were asked to rate the importance of inclusion to CMU’s students. One thousand, six hundred fifty respondents provided a response to this question on a scale of “1 – Not at all important” to “5 – Extremely important.” As shown in Figure 121, the majority of respondents (71%) rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s students as either a “4” or a “5”.

As shown in Figure 122, faculty, staff, and students, generally rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s students similarly. The highest percentage of students (42%), faculty (40%), and staff (38%) rated the importance of inclusion as a “5-Extremely important”. However, a smaller percentage of faculty (64%), rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s students as either a “4” or a “5” compared to the overall average of all respondents (71%).
As shown in Figure 123, respondents who identified as being a member of an underrepresented group had a higher percentage of respondents who rated the importance of inclusion to CMU’s students as a “5” (42%), compared to those who did not (40%). However, respondents who identified as being a member of an underrepresented group also had a higher percentage of respondents who rated the importance as a “1” or as a “2” (11%), compared to those who did not (8%).

As shown in Figure 124, there was some variance among the Demographic Groups in their rating of the importance of inclusion to CMU’s students, but generally, the different groups provided similar ratings. The highest percentage among each Demographic Group rated the importance of inclusion to students as a “5-Extremely important”. Persons of international origin had the greatest percentage (53%) of respondents select a “5” among the Demographic Groups, closely followed by persons with disabilities (51%). Members of a minority religious group had the highest percentage of respondents among the Demographic Groups who believed that inclusion was not at all important to students (6%).

As shown in Figure 125, there was significant variance in the rating of the importance of inclusion to CMU’s students among the races / ethnicities. Asian / Asian-American (83%), and American Indian or Alaskan Native (86%), respondents had the greatest percentage of respondents rate the importance of inclusion to CMU’s students as a “4” or as a “5”, while Hispanic / Latinx (60%), and African-American / Black (67%), respondents had the lowest. (This analysis excludes Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander respondents because there were not enough respondents to draw meaningful conclusions about this population).

There was not significant variance in the ratings of the importance of inclusion to CMU’s students, as compared to the ratings among all respondents, when analyzed by gender.

**Figure 121: Importance of Inclusion to CMU’s Students (All Respondents) (n=1,650)**
Figure 122: Importance of Inclusion to CMU's Students (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

Figure 123: Importance of Inclusion to CMU's Students (Underrepresented Group Respondents)
Figure 124: Importance of Inclusion to CMU's Students (“Demographic Group” Respondents)
Figure 125: Importance of Inclusion to CMU's Students (Racial Group Respondents)

Personal Encounter with Unfair or Marginalizing Treatment at CMU Because of an Aspect of Personal Identity

The respondents were asked if they have experienced a personal encounter with unfair or marginalizing treatment at CMU because of an aspect of their personal identities. One thousand, six hundred sixty-three respondents provided a response to this question. The majority of respondents (69%), indicated that they have not experienced a personal encounter with unfair or marginalizing treatment at CMU because of an aspect of their personal identities, as shown in Figure 126.

As shown in Figure 127, the majority of faculty (58%), staff (66%), and students (73%) have not experienced any unfair or marginalizing treatment. However, there was a greater percentage of faculty (42%), who indicated they had experienced a personal encounter with unfair or marginalizing treatment at CMU because of an aspect of their personal identity (and this percentage was greater than that experienced on average by respondents as a whole (31%)).
The majority of members of underrepresented groups (52%), in contrast to both those not in these groups, and respondents as a whole, have experienced unfair or marginalizing treatment at CMU because of an aspect of their personal identity. Their experiences contrasted sharply with those who are not members of underrepresented groups, where only 18% reported these types of unfair or marginalizing experience (Figure 128).

Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 129), there was a large variance in the prevalence of having experienced a personal encounter with unfair or marginalizing treatment at CMU because of an aspect of personal identity. The majority of persons with disabilities (54%), indicated that they have experienced unfair or marginalizing treatment. Although they were the only Demographic Group where the majority of members reported an unfair or marginalizing experience, significant percentages of socioeconomically disadvantaged students (49%), LGBTQ individuals (49%), and members of minority religious groups (47%), have also experienced unfair or marginalizing treatment. Veterans were the Demographic Group with the lowest percentage (28%), of respondents who have experienced a personal encounter with unfair or marginalizing treatment at CMU.

Among respondents of different races / ethnicities (Figure 130), Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders (67%), were the only racial group where a majority reported unfair or marginalizing experiences. However, there were only three respondents in this group. Over 40% of Asians / Asian-Americans (47%), American Indians or Alaskan Natives (45%), or respondents with two or more races (42%), have experienced unfair or marginalizing treatment; and more than 30% of members of other racial groups have experienced similar treatment (i.e., African American/Black (39%), Other (35%), and Hispanic / Latinx (34%). The exception was White respondents, of whom, only 27% have experienced a personal encounter with unfair or marginalizing treatment at CMU.

There was not significant variance in the percentages of respondents who have experienced a personal encounter with unfair or marginalizing treatment at CMU because of an aspect of their personal identities, as compared to the percentage among all respondents, when analyzed by gender.
Figure 126: Have Experienced a Personal Encounter with Unfair or Marginalizing Treatment at CMU Because of an Aspect of Personal Identity (All Respondents) (n=1,663)

Figure 127: Have Experienced a Personal Encounter with Unfair or Marginalizing Treatment at CMU Because of an Aspect of Personal Identity (Faculty, Staff, and Students)
Figure 128: Have Experienced a Personal Encounter with Unfair or Marginalizing Treatment at CMU Because of an Aspect of Personal Identity (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

Figure 129: Have Experienced a Personal Encounter with Unfair or Marginalizing Treatment at CMU Because of an Aspect of Personal Identity (“Demographic Group” Respondents)
Respondents were then asked what aspect of their identity they believe the unfair or marginalizing treatment was related to. Respondents were able to select more than one aspect of their identity that they believed their unfair or marginalized treatment was related to. Four hundred sixty-seven respondents selected 769 aspects. The greatest number of respondents selected gender (35%), closely followed by race / ethnicity (35%) (Figure 131).

As shown in Figure 132, the aspect of identity related to the unfair or marginalizing treatment varied widely between faculty, staff, and students. The greatest percentage of student respondents (45%) attributed their unfair or marginalizing treatment to race / ethnicity. The greatest percentage of faculty (47%), and staff (37%), attributed their unfair or marginalizing treatment to gender identity. In addition to race / ethnicity and gender identity (30%), significant percentages of students indicated that they had experienced unfair or marginalizing treatment because of sexual orientation (24%), socioeconomic status (22%), or disability status (10%).

As shown in Figure 133, most members of Demographic Groups believed that the causes of their unfair or marginalizing treatment were due to their affiliation with their specific Demographic Group. For example, 74% (the highest percentage of any Demographic Group with respect to any attribution) believed that their unfair or marginalizing treatment is the result of their sexual orientation.

---

7 Although the percentages were identical, there was one more gender respondent as compared to the racial respondents.
orientation. Most veterans (55%), attributed their unfair treatment to their veteran status. Similarly, most persons with disabilities (63%), attributed their unfair or marginalizing treatment to their disability status. Most members of a minority religious group (60%), attributed their unfair treatment to their religious affiliation. Most international persons (44%), attributed their unfair or marginalizing treatment to the fact that they come from another country. However, more socioeconomically disadvantaged students attributed their unfair or marginalizing treatment to race / ethnicity (47%), as opposed to their socioeconomic status (43%). Similarly, most first generation students attributed their unfair or marginalizing treatment to their race / ethnicity (46%), as opposed to their socioeconomic status (31%).

Figure 134 indicates how members of different racial groups attributed their unfair or marginalizing treatment. Respondents could select more than one factor. With the exception of Whites (15%), and those who identified as “other” (40%), over 50% of respondents in every racial group attributed their unfair or marginalized treatment to race / ethnicity. Among some racial groups, very large percentages of the respondents attributed their unfair or marginalizing treatment to race / ethnicity (i.e. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (100%), American Indian or Alaskan Native (100%), African-American / Black (98%), Asian / Asian-American (74%)). With the exception of Hispanic / Latinx (13%), and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (0%) respondents, more than 20% of the respondents in every racial group attributed unfair or marginalizing treatment to gender identity (i.e., Two or more races (29%), American Indian or Alaskan (33%), White (39%), African-American / Black (24%), and Asian / Asian-American (29%)). Sixty percent of those who identified their racial identity as “other” also attributed their unfair treatment to sexual orientation. With the exception of Hispanic / Latinx respondents (13%), more than 15% of the respondents from every race / ethnicity also attributed unfair or marginalizing treatment to their socioeconomic status (i.e., two or more races (17%), Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (50%), American Indian or Alaskan Native (33%), White (18%), African-American / Black (16%), Asian / Asian-American (16%)). The factor which was most infrequently attributed to unfair or marginalizing treatment by members of racial groups was being a veteran (which was not attributed as a causal factor except by a small percentage of White (4%), and Asian / Asian-American (10%) respondents).

As shown in Figure 135, although males (16%), generally did not attribute their unfair or marginalizing treatment to their gender identity, every transgender respondent (100%), attributed unfair or marginalizing treatment to gender identity, as did 43% of female respondents. However, a greater percentage of males (46%), selected race / ethnicity as an aspect of their identity they believed the unfair or marginalizing treatment was related to, compared to other genders (i.e., 30% of female respondents attributed unfair treatment to race / ethnicity, and 14% of those who classified their gender as “other”).
Figure 131: Aspect of Identity the Unfair or Marginalized Treatment Was Related to (All Respondents) (n=467)

Gender identity - 163
Race / ethnicity - 162
Other - 111
Socioeconomic status - 85
Sexual orientation - 85
Religion - 76
Disability status - 42
Country of origin - 29
Veteran status - 16

Figure 132: Aspect of Identity the Unfair or Marginalized Treatment Was Related to (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

Other - 16% 10% 28%
Disability status - 10% 6% 28%
Veteran status - 6% 1% 36%
Country of origin - 2% 7% 28%
Socioeconomic status - 8% 17% 22%
Religion - 11% 11% 19%
Sexual orientation - 12% 11% 24%
Gender identity - 11% 30% 37%
Race / ethnicity - 23% 22% 45%

Students (n=250)
Staff (n=129)
Faculty (n=88)
Figure 133: Aspect of Identity the Unfair or Marginalized Treatment Was Related to (“Demographic Group” Respondents)
Figure 134: Aspect of Identity the Unfair or Marginalized Treatment Was Related to (Racial Group Respondents)
The respondents were asked if they are aware of someone else being treated in an unfair or marginalizing way at CMU because of an aspect of his, her, or their identity. One thousand, six hundred four respondents provided a response to this question. The majority of respondents (66%), indicated that they are not aware of someone else being treated in an unfair or marginalizing way at CMU because of an aspect of his, her, or their identity (Figure 136).

As shown in Figure 137, while the majority of staff (65%), and students (70%), were not aware of someone else being treated unfairly, the majority of faculty (53%), indicated that they were aware of persons who have been treated unfairly because of an aspect of their identity. Also, the majority (52%), of respondents in underrepresented groups indicated that they are aware of someone else being treated in an unfair or marginalizing way (Figure 138).

Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 139), significant percentages of the members of most Demographic Groups were aware of unfair treatment of others because of an aspect of the individual’s identity. For example, the majority of LGBTQ individuals (57%), members of a minority religious group (55%), and socioeconomically disadvantaged students (51%) were all aware of unfair treatment of others. More than 40% of respondents from all other Demographic Groups indicated that they are aware of someone else being treated in an unfair or marginalizing way.
Groups (with the exception of veterans (16%)) were aware of unfair treatment of others due to an aspect of the individual’s identity (i.e., persons of international origin (46%), persons with disabilities (46%), and first generation students (42%)).

Among respondents of different races (Figure 140), Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (50%) and Asian / Asian-American (47%) respondents had the highest percentages of persons who were aware of the unfair treatment of others at CMU based on some aspect of the individual’s identity. However, every race / ethnicity (with the exception of those identifying themselves as Other) had at least 30% of its respondents who were aware of unfair treatment of others (i.e., African-American / Black (42%), American Indian or Alaskan Native (39%), Hispanic / Latinx (39%), two or more races (38%), and White (32%)).

There was little variation in the responses, as compared to the responses among all respondents, when analyzed by gender.

**Figure 136: Awareness of Someone Else being Treated in an Unfair or Marginalizing Way at CMU Because of an Aspect of His, Her, or Their Identity (n=1,604)**
Figure 137: Awareness of Someone Else Being Treated in an Unfair or Marginalizing Way at CMU Because of an Aspect of His, Her, or Their Identity (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

![Bar chart showing percentage of awareness by group and role]

- Faculty (n=227): 53% Yes, 47% No
- Staff (n=396): 35% Yes, 65% No
- Students (n=981): 30% Yes, 70% No

Figure 138: Awareness of Someone Else Being Treated in an Unfair or Marginalizing Way at CMU Because of an Aspect of His, Her, or Their Identity (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

![Bar chart showing percentage of awareness by group and role]

- Member of an underrepresented group (n=532): 52% Yes, 48% No
- Not a member of an underrepresented group (n=988): 25% Yes, 75% No
Figure 139: Awareness of Someone Else Being Treated in an Unfair or Marginalizing Way at CMU Because of an Aspect of His, Her, or Their Identity ("Demographic Group" Respondents)

- LGBTQ individuals (n=155) 43% No, 57% Yes
- Members of a minority religious group (n=91) 45% No, 55% Yes
- Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (n=107) 49% No, 51% Yes
- Persons of international origin (n=69) 46% No, 54% Yes
- Persons with disabilities (n=50) 46% No, 54% Yes
- First generation students (n=212) 42% No, 58% Yes
- Veterans (n=67) 84% No

Figure 140: Awareness of Someone Else Being Treated in an Unfair or Marginalizing Way at CMU because of an Aspect of His, Her, or Their Identity (Racial Group Respondents)

- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (n=2) 50% No, 50% Yes
- Asian / Asian-American (n=68) 53% No, 47% Yes
- African-American / Black (n=155) 42% No, 58% Yes
- American Indian or Alaskan Native (n=23) 39% No, 61% Yes
- Hispanic / Latinx (n=44) 39% No, 61% Yes
- Two or more races (n=55) 38% No, 62% Yes
- White (n=1198) 32% No, 68% Yes
- Other (n=17) 29% No, 71% Yes
Respondents were then asked to indicate which aspect(s) of the individual’s identity that the unfair or marginalizing treatment was related to. Five hundred fifteen respondents selected 1,310 aspects. The greatest number of respondents selected race / ethnicity (63%), followed by gender identity (51%) (Figure 141).

As shown in Figure 142, the highest percentages of students (65%), staff (64%), and faculty (58%), attributed the unfair or marginalizing treatment of others to race / ethnicity. Gender identity was the next most frequently identified factor associated with the unfair or marginalizing treatment of others by students (49%), staff (55%), and faculty (53%), followed by sexual orientation (i.e., students (45%), staff (40%), and faculty (29%)). The factor least frequently attributed to unfair or marginalizing treatment of others was veteran status (i.e., students (5%), staff (9%), and faculty (3%)).

As shown in Figure 143, the greatest percentages of Demographic Group respondents attributed unfair or marginalizing treatment of others to race / ethnicity. More than 50% of the respondents in each Demographic Group (with the exception of persons with disabilities) attributed the unfair or marginalizing treatment of others to race / ethnicity (i.e., socioeconomically disadvantaged students (70%), first generation students (61%), members of minority religious groups (57%), veterans (73%), persons with disabilities (39%), LGBTQ individuals (62%), and persons of international origin (53%)). The least frequently attributed cause of unfair or marginalizing treatment was veteran status.

Figure 144 describes the aspects of the identity of someone who has been treated unfairly or marginalized from the perspectives of members in racial groups. The highest percentages of the respondents of racial groups attributed the unfair or marginalizing treatment of others based on aspects of their identity to race / ethnicity. The majority of the respondents from every racial group attributed the unfair treatment of others to race / ethnicity (i.e., Other (100%), two or more races (68%), Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (100%), American Indian or Alaskan Native (75%), White (56%), Hispanic / Latinx (59%), African-American / Black (94%) and Asian / Asian-American (69%)). Significant percentages of racial group respondents also attributed the causes of unfair or marginalizing treatment to gender identity and sexual orientation.

Figure 145 describes how members of various gender respondent groups attributed causation to the unfair or marginalizing treatment of others because of aspects of the individual’s identity. With the exception of transgender individuals (20%), more than 60% of the other Demographic Group respondents attributed unfair treatment of other individuals related to their identity to race / ethnicity (i.e., Other (80%), female (64%), and males (62%)). The next two most frequently selected identity attributes by gender groups to explain unjust or marginalizing treatment of others were gender identity and sexual orientation.
Figure 141: Identity Aspect Attributable to Another Individual's Unfair / Marginalizing Treatment (All Respondents) (n=515)

Figure 142: Identity Aspect Attributable to Another Individual's Unfair/Marginalizing Treatment (Faculty, Staff, and Students)
Figure 143: Identity Aspect Attributable to Another Individual’s Unfair/Marginalizing Treatment (“Demographic Group” Respondents)
Figure 144: Identity Aspect Attributable to Another Individual’s Unfair/Marginalizing Treatment (Racial Group Respondents)
Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they believe there is tension on CMU’s campus related to race / ethnicity. One thousand, five hundred one respondents provided a response to this question on a scale of “1 – No tension” to “5 – Significant tension”. The greatest percentage of respondents rated the extent of tension on CMU’s campus related to race / ethnicity as a “2” out of “5” (33%), and the majority of respondents rated the extent of tension on CMU’s campus related to race / ethnicity as a “1” or as a “2” (55%). Only 3% rated the tension as significant (Figure 146).

As shown in Figure 147, although the greatest percentage of faculty (36%), rated the level of racial tension on CMU’s campus as a “3”, the greatest percentage of both staff (36%), and students (33%), rated the tension as a “2”. However, a greater percentage of faculty rated the extent of tension on CMU’s campus related to race / ethnicity as a “4” or as a “5” compared to the average across all respondents (26%, compared to 14%). Significantly, 27% of the student respondents indicated that there is no racial tension on CMU’s campus.

Respondents who identified as being a member of an underrepresented group were more likely to rate the extent of tension on CMU’s campus related to race / ethnicity as a “4” or as a “5”, compared to those who did not (26%, compared to 8%) (Figure 148).
Figure 149 describes the ratings of the Demographic Groups. Six of the seven Demographic Groups have their highest ratings as a “2” (i.e., Persons of international origin (29%), First generation students (39%), and Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (31%)) or as a “3” (i.e., LGBTQ individuals (35%), persons with disabilities (32%) and members of a minority religious group (32%)). In contrast, the majority (33%) of veteran respondents believed that there are no racial tensions on campus.

Figure 150 describes the ratings of racial group respondents regarding racial tension on CMU’s campus. Although there is variance among the ratings of the various racial groups, three of the racial groups (i.e., Asian / Asian-Americans (35%), American Indian or Alaskan Native (27%), and Other (44%)) believed there is no racial tension on CMU’s campus. The highest percentages of Hispanic / Latinx (41%), and White (35%), respondents rated racial tensions as a “2”. An equal percentage of American Indian or Alaskan Native (27%) rated racial tensions as a “1”, “2” and “3”. The highest percentage of African-American / Black respondents (34%), rated racial tensions as a “3”.

As shown in Figure 151, the highest percentage of males (31%), and females (35%), rated the race / ethnicity tensions on CMU’s campus as a “2”. However, a larger percentage of males (30%) believed there are no tensions on CMU’s campus related to race / ethnicity compared to females (18%).

Figure 146: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Race / Ethnicity (All Respondents) (n=1,501)
Figure 147: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Race / Ethnicity (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

Figure 148: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Race / Ethnicity (Underrepresented Group Respondents)
Figure 149: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Race / Ethnicity (“Demographic Group” Respondents)
Figure 150: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Race / Ethnicity (Racial Group Respondents)
Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they believe there is tension on CMU’s campus related to gender. One thousand, four hundred forty-seven respondents provided a response to this question on a scale of “1 – No tension” to “5 – Significant tension”. The greatest percentage (32%), of respondents rated the extent of tension on CMU’s campus related to gender identity as a “3”. The next highest percentage (27%), rated the tension as a “2”, as shown in Figure 152.

As shown in Figure 153, the highest percentage of faculty (35%), staff (35%), and students (29%) rated the extent of gender identity tensions on CMU’s campus as a “3”.

The greatest percentage of both respondents from underrepresented groups (32%), and those not in those groups (31%), rated the extent of gender identity tensions on CMU’s campus as a “3”. However, members of underrepresented groups were more likely to rate the extent of gender identity tension on CMU’s campus as a “4” or as a “5”, compared to those who are not members of underrepresented groups (29%, compared to 11%) (Figure 154). Similarly, while 27% of the respondents who were not from underrepresented groups felt that there are no gender identity tensions on campus, only 18% of those from underrepresented groups felt this way.
Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 155), the highest percentage of members of four groups rated the extent of gender identity tensions as a “3” (i.e., members of a minority religious group (29%), first generation students (33%), LGBTQ individuals (38%), and socioeconomically disadvantaged students (35%)). However, the greatest percentage of persons of international origin (32%), and veterans (37%), felt that there is no gender identity tension on CMU’s campus. Persons with disabilities respondents, in contrast, rated the gender identity tensions as a “4” (29%).

Although there is significant variance among the respondents regarding their ratings on the extent of gender identity tensions on CMU’s campus, the highest percentage of four groups of racial respondents (i.e., Native Americans (33%), American Indians or Alaskan Natives (33%), Asian / Asian-Americans (41%), and those identifying themselves as Other (47%)), believed that there are no gender identity tensions on CMU’s campus. However, the greatest percentage of African-American / Black (31%), Hispanic / Latinx (38%), respondents of two or more races (37%), and Whites (32%) rated the extent of gender identity tensions as a “3” (Figure 156).

As shown in Figure 157, the highest percentage of males (34%) felt that there are no gender identity tensions on CMU’s campus. However, the largest percentage of both transgender individuals (38%), and females (35%), rated the extent of gender identity tensions on campus as a “3”.

Figure 152: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Gender Identity (All Respondents) (n=1,447)
Figure 153: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Gender Identity (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

![Chart showing the extent of tension on CMU’s campus related to gender identity for faculty, staff, and students.]

- Faculty (n=208):
  - No tension: 17%
  - Significant tension: 28%

- Staff (n=355):
  - No tension: 26%
  - Significant tension: 31%

- Students (n=884):
  - No tension: 35%
  - Significant tension: 29%

Figure 154: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Gender Identity (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

![Chart showing the extent of tension on CMU’s campus related to gender identity for underrepresented group members and non-members.]

- Member of an underrepresented group (n=518):
  - No tension: 27%
  - Significant tension: 31%

- Not a member of an underrepresented group (n=900):
  - No tension: 18%
  - Significant tension: 22%
Figure 155: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Gender Identity
(“Demographic Group” Respondents)
Figure 156: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Gender Identity (Racial Group Respondents)
Figure 157: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Gender Identity (Gender Group Respondents)

**Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Sexual Orientation**
Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they believe there is tension on CMU’s campus related to sexual orientation. One thousand, four hundred fifty-seven respondents provided a response to this question on a scale of “1 – No tension” to “5 – Significant tension”. The greatest percentage of respondents rated the extent of tension on CMU’s campus related to sexual orientation as a “2” (31%), and the majority (56%) of respondents rated the extent of tension related to sexual orientation as a “1” or as a “2”. Only 4% of the respondents felt that there is significant sexual orientation tension on campus, and 25% felt that there is no tension, as shown in Figure 158.

As shown in Figure 159, the highest percentage (30%) of students believed that there are no sexual orientation tensions on campus. Thirty-six percent of the staff, rated the extent of sexual orientation tensions on campus as being a “2”, while the greatest percentage (32%) of the faculty rated the extent of sexual orientation tensions as a “3”. Only 3% of students and staff, and 5% of faculty felt that sexual orientation tensions are significant.

The highest percentage of members of underrepresented groups (32%), rated the extent of sexual orientation tensions as a “3”, while the highest percentage of those who are not members of underrepresented groups (34%), rated the extent of the tensions as a “2”. Six percent of members of the underrepresented group feel that sexual orientation tensions are significant (compared to only 2% of those who are not in an underrepresented group). In contrast, while
29% of members not in underrepresented groups felt that there are no sexual orientation tensions on campus, only 18% of those from underrepresented groups felt this way (Figure 160).

As shown in (Figure 161), the greatest percentage of five of the Demographic Groups rated campus tensions regarding sexual orientation as a “3” (i.e., LGBTQ individuals (35%), persons with disabilities (26%), members of a minority religious group (29%), first generation students (30%), and socioeconomically disadvantaged students (32%)). However, there were three Demographic Groups where 10% of their respondents felt that sexual identity tensions on campus are significant (i.e., members of a minority religious group, persons with disabilities, and LGBTQ individuals). In contrast, the highest percentage of veteran respondents (38%), believed that there are no tensions related to sexual orientation.

Six racial groups had 30%, or more, of their respondents who rated the extent of sexual orientation tensions on CMU’s campus as a “3”, as described in Figure 162. However, only 8% of the group representing two or more races, and 7% of the African-American / Black respondents, felt that sexual orientation tensions are significant. In contrast, 47% of those identifying themselves as “Other”, 41% of Asian / Asian-Americans, 36% of American Indian or Alaskan Natives, and over 20% of respondents from four other racial groups (i.e., Hispanic / Latinx (26%), White (24%), African-American / Black (23%), and two or more races (22%)) felt that there are no tensions related to sexual orientation on campus.

As shown in Figure 163, the highest percentage of males (34%), believed there are no sexual orientation tensions on CMU’s campus, while the greatest percentage of females (33%), rated the tensions as a “3”.

Figure 158: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Sexual Orientation (All Respondents) (n=1,457)
Figure 159: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Sexual Orientation (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

Figure 160: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Sexual Orientation (Underrepresented Group Respondents)
Figure 161: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Sexual Orientation
(“Demographic Group” Respondents)
Figure 162: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Sexual Orientation (Racial Group Respondents)
Figure 163: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Sexual Orientation (Gender Group Respondents)

Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Religion
Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they believe there is tension on CMU’s campus related to religion. One thousand, four hundred forty respondents provided a response to this question on a scale of “1 – No tension” to “5 – Significant tension”. The greatest percentage (32%), of respondents rated the extent of religion-related tension as a “2”, and the majority of respondents (58%), rated the extent of tension as a “1” or a “2”, as shown in Figure 164.

As shown in Figure 165, although the highest percentage of respondents for both the faculty (31%), and the staff (38%), rated the extent of religious tension as a “2”, most students (31%), felt that there is no religious tension. Of those who felt there is significant tension, the percentages were extremely small (i.e., faculty (7%), students (6%), and staff (3%)).

The highest percentage of respondents from underrepresented groups (29%), rated the tension level as a “3”, while most of those not from underrepresented groups, selected a “2” rating (Figure 166). Nine percent of members of underrepresented groups felt that there are significant religious tensions. However, 29% of those not underrepresented felt that there is no religious tension.

Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 167), the highest percentage of three groups rated the tensions as a “3” (i.e., LGBTQ individuals (29%), members of a minority religious group (29%),
and socioeconomically disadvantaged students (37%). The highest percentage of persons of international origin (33%) felt that there is no religious tension. In contrast, 15% of LGBTQ individuals felt there was significant tension.

The highest percentage of four racial groups rated the extent of religious tensions as a “2” (i.e., Hispanic / Latinx (37%), White (33%), American Indian or Alaskan Native (30%), and two or more races (33%)). However, the highest percentage of Asian / Asian-Americans (40%), African-Americans / Blacks (35%), and “Other” races (47%) felt that there is no tension related to religion (Figure 168).

As shown in Figure 169, the highest percentage of males (35%), believed there are no religious tensions on CMU’s campus, while the greatest percentage of females (34%), rated the tensions as a “2”.

**Figure 164: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Religion (All Respondents) (n=1,440)**
Figure 165: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Religion (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

Figure 166: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Religion (Underrepresented Group Respondents)
Figure 167: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Religion (“Demographic Group” Respondents)
Figure 168: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Religion (Racial Group Respondents)
Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they believe there is tension on CMU’s campus related to socioeconomic status. One thousand, four hundred forty-seven respondents provided a response to this question on a scale of “1 – No tension” to “5 – Significant tension”. The greatest percentage (38%), of respondents rated the extent of tension on CMU’s campus related to socioeconomic status as a “2”. The majority of respondents (66%), rated the extent of tension on CMU’s campus related to socioeconomic status as a “1” or a “2”. Twenty-eight percent felt that there is no tension. Only 3% felt that there is significant tension, as shown in Figure 170.

As shown in Figure 171, the highest percentage of faculty (38%), staff (45%), and students (35%), rated the extent of socioeconomic status tensions as a “2”. Thirty-three percent of students felt there are no tensions, and only 3% of students and faculty (and 1% of the staff) felt there are significant tensions.

The highest percentage of respondents (whether from underrepresented groups or not) rated the level of socioeconomic tensions as a “2”. However, 33% of those not in underrepresented groups, and 20% of those from underrepresented groups felt that there is no tension. Only 4% of members of underrepresented groups, and 2% of those not in these groups, felt that there are significant tensions (Figure 172).
Among the Demographic Groups, the highest percentage of respondents in six groups rated the level of socioeconomic tensions as a “2” (i.e., socioeconomically disadvantaged students (32%), first generation students (34%), members of a minority religious group (37%), veterans (34%), persons with disabilities (33%), and LGBTQ individuals (40%)). An equal percentage of veterans (34%) felt that there are no tensions and rated the tensions as a “2”. The highest percentage of persons of international origin (40%) also felt there are no tensions related to socioeconomic status. Of those who felt there are significant socioeconomic tensions, the Demographic Group with the highest percentage of respondents feeling this way were persons with disabilities (10%) (Figure 173).

Among the racial groups (Figure 174), the highest percentages in four groups rated the extent of tensions as a “2” (i.e., Hispanic / Latinx (43%), Whites (40%), Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (67%), and two or more races (45%)). However, the highest percentages in three groups felt there was no tension (i.e., “Other” races (47%), American Indian or Alaskan Native (33%), and Asian / Asian-American (41%)).

As shown in Figure 175, the highest percentage of males (36%) believed there are no tensions related to socioeconomic status on CMU’s campus, while the greatest percentage of females (39%), rated the tensions as a “2”.

**Figure 170: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Socioeconomic Status (All Respondents) (n=1,447)**
Figure 171: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Socioeconomic Status (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

Figure 172: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Socioeconomic Status (Underrepresented Group Respondents)
Figure 173: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Socioeconomic Status
(“Demographic Group” Respondents)
Figure 174: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Socioeconomic Status (Racial Group Respondents)
Figure 175: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Socioeconomic Status
(Gender Group Respondents)

**Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Country of Origin**

Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they believe there is tension on CMU’s campus related to a person’s country of origin. One thousand, four hundred forty respondents provided a response to this question on a scale of “1 – No tension” to “5 – Significant tension”. The greatest percentage (31%) of respondents rated the extent of tensions as a “2”. The majority (59%) of respondents rated the tension as a “1” or a “2”, as shown in Figure 176.

As shown in Figure 177, the highest percentage of faculty (33%), rated the tension as a “3”, and staff (38%), as a “2”. However, the highest percentage of students (35%), felt that there are no tensions related to country of origin. Faculty (6%), had the highest percentage of those who felt there is significant tension.

The highest percentage of respondents in underrepresented groups (32%), rated the level of tensions related to country of origin as a “3”. The highest percentage of those who are not in underrepresented groups (34%), rated the level of tensions related to country of origin as a “2”. Thirty-two percent of those not in underrepresented groups felt that there are no tensions. In contrast, only 20% of those in underrepresented groups felt that there are no tensions (Figure 178).
Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 179), the highest percentages of six groups rated tensions related to country of origin as a “2” (i.e., LGBTQ individuals (40%), persons with disabilities (33%), members of a minority religious group (37%), veterans (34%), first generation students (34%), and socioeconomically disadvantaged students (32%)). An equivalent number of veterans (34%), felt there are no tensions related to country of origin. In addition, the greatest number of persons of international origin (40%), and over 20% of the respondents of three other Demographic Groups (i.e., persons with disabilities (21%), first generation students (27%), and socioeconomically disadvantaged students (20%)), felt that there were no tensions related to country of origin. The largest percentage (10%), of any Demographic Group which felt there are significant tensions, were persons with disabilities.

Among racial group respondents (Figure 180) the highest percentage in four groups felt that there are no tensions based on country of origin (i.e., Asian / Asian-American (35%), African-American / Black (33%), American Indian or Alaskan Native (25%), and “Other” race (43%)). The highest percentage among those who felt there are significant tensions, was 10% of the American Indian or Alaskan Native respondents.

As shown in Figure 181, the highest percentage of males (35%), believed there are no tensions related to country of origin on CMU’s campus, while the greatest percentage of females (34%), rated the tensions as a “2”.

Figure 176: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Country of Origin (All Respondents) (n=1,440)
Figure 177: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Country of Origin (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

Figure 178: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Country of Origin (Underrepresented Group Respondents)
Figure 179: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Country of Origin
(“Demographic Group” Respondents)

- Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (n=96)
- First generation students (n=189)
- Members of a minority religious group (n=82)
- Veterans (n=50)
- Persons with disabilities (n=41)
- LGBTQ individuals (n=150)
- Persons of international origin (n=59)
Figure 180: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Country of Origin (Racial Group Respondents)
Figure 181: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Country of Origin (Gender Group Respondents)

Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Veteran Status
Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they believe there is tension on CMU’s campus related to veteran status. One thousand, four hundred one respondents provided a response to this question on a scale of “1 – No tension” to “5 – Significant tension”. The majority of respondents (54%), felt that there are no tensions related to veteran status. The vast majority (83%), of respondents rated the extent of these tensions as a “1” or as a “2”, as shown in Figure 182.

As shown in Figure 183, the highest percentage of faculty (45%), staff (44%), and students (61%), felt there are no tensions. However, this percentage was much higher among student respondents.

As shown in Figure 184, members of both underrepresented groups (48%), and those who are not in underrepresented groups (58%), felt that there are no tensions related to veteran status.

As shown in Figure 185, the highest percentage of every group, including veterans, felt that there are no tensions regarding veteran status. However, 30% of veteran respondents rated the level of tensions as at “2”. About 4% of veterans felt that there is significant tension on campus regarding veteran status.
The highest percentage of every racial group felt that there are no tensions regarding veteran status, as illustrated in Figure 186.

As shown in Figure 187, the majority of males (62%), believed there are no tensions related to veteran status on CMU’s campus. The greatest percentage of females (50%), also believed there are no tensions related to veteran status on CMU’s campus. However, this percentage is smaller than the percentage for males.

**Figure 182: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Veteran Status (All Respondents) (n=1,401)**
Figure 183: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Veteran Status (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

Figure 184: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Veteran Status (Underrepresented Group Respondents)
Figure 185: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Veteran Status (“Demographic Group” Respondents)
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Figure 186: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Veteran Status (Racial Group Respondents)
Figure 187: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Veteran Status (Gender Group Respondents)

Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Disability Status
Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they believe there is tension on CMU’s campus related to disability status. One thousand, four hundred three respondents provided a response to this question on a scale of “1 – No tension” to “5 – Significant tension”. The greatest percentage of respondents (41%), felt that there are no tensions regarding disability status. The majority of respondents (73%), rated the extent of these tensions as a “1” or as a “2”, as shown in Figure 188.

As shown in Figure 189, while the highest percentage of faculty (34%), and staff (40%), rated the tensions as a “2”, the highest percentage of students (47%), felt that there are no tensions on campus related to disability status.

High percentages of both respondents in underrepresented groups (33%), as well as those who were not in underrepresented groups (45%), felt that there are no tensions regarding disability status at CMU. However, significant percentages of both respondents in underrepresented (33%), and those not in underrepresented groups (33%), felt that the tensions regarding disability status on campus should be a “2”. Five percent of respondents in underrepresented groups felt that there is significant tension regarding disability status (Figure 190).
Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 191), the highest percentage of three groups (i.e., persons of international origin (49%), veterans (43%), and first generation students (46%)) felt that there are no tensions regarding disability status. The highest percentage of another three groups (i.e., LGBTQ individuals (34%), members of a minority religious group (37%), and socioeconomically disadvantaged students (35%)) rated the tensions as a “2”. The majority of persons with disabilities rated the tensions related to disability status as a “3”, and 14% of persons with disabilities felt there are significant tensions.

As shown in Figure 192, the highest percentage of every race / ethnicity felt that there are no tensions regarding disability status.

As shown in Figure 193, the majority of males (53%), believed there are no tensions related to disability status on CMU’s campus. The greatest percentage of females (34%), rated the tensions as a “2”. A similar percentage of females (34%), believed there are no tensions related to disability status on CMU’s campus. However, this percentage is considerably smaller compared to that of males.

**Figure 188: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Disability Status (All Respondents) (n=1,403)**
Figure 189: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Disability Status (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

Figure 190: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Disability Status (Underrepresented Group Respondents)
Figure 191: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Disability Status
(“Demographic Group” Respondents)
Figure 192: Extent of Tension on CMU’s Campus Related to Disability Status (Racial Group Respondents)
Understanding of the Distinct Roles of the Diversity Units, Their Offerings, and Their Initiatives

Respondents were asked if they themselves have a good understanding of the distinct roles of the diversity units (i.e., the Center for Inclusion and Diversity, Office of Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual, Transgender, and Queer Services, etc.), their offerings, and their initiatives. One thousand, five hundred twenty-two respondents provided a response to this question. The majority of respondents (64%), believed that they have a good understanding of these roles and units (Figure 194).

As shown in Figure 195, the majority of faculty (59%), staff (65%), and students (65%) also indicated that they have a good understanding of the roles and units.

As shown in Figure 196, the majority of every Demographic Group has a good understanding of the distinct roles of the diversity units, their offerings, and their initiatives. However, the percentage of those with the understanding ranged from 71%, for those who identified as socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and 70% for those who identified as members of a minority religious group, to 54% for those who identified as persons of international origin.

As shown in Figure 197, the majority of every race / ethnicity has a good understanding of the distinct roles of the diversity units, their offerings, and their initiatives. However, there was some variation in the percentages. Five of the races / ethnicities had similar percentages who had an understanding, compared to the average among all respondents (i.e., Whites (63%),
Native Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders (66%), Hispanics / Latinx (68%), Asians / Asian-Americans (68%), and Other race respondents (69%). However, African-American / Black respondents (75%) and American Indian or Alaskan Native respondents (80%) had a higher percentage compared to the percentage among all respondents, and respondents of two or more races had a lower percentage (54%).

There was not significant variation in the percentages of respondents who believed they have a good understanding of the distinct roles of the diversity units, their offerings, and their initiatives, as compared to the percentage among all respondents, when analyzed by underrepresented group status or gender.

**Figure 194: Understanding of the Distinct Roles of the Diversity Units, Their Offerings, and Their Initiatives (All Respondents) (n=1,522)**
Figure 195: Understanding of the Distinct Roles of the Diversity Units, Their Offerings, and Their Initiatives (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

- Faculty (n=218): 59% Yes, 41% No
- Staff (n=382): 65% Yes, 35% No
- Students (n=922): 65% Yes, 35% No

Figure 196: Understanding of the Distinct Roles of the Diversity Units, Their Offerings, and Their Initiatives ("Demographic Group” Respondents)

- Persons of international origin (n=68): 46% Yes, 54% No
- Veterans (n=66): 42% Yes, 58% No
- Persons with disabilities (n=43): 40% Yes, 60% No
- LGBTQ individuals (n=158): 38% Yes, 62% No
- First generation students (n=200): 34% Yes, 66% No
- Members of a minority religious group (n=88): 30% Yes, 70% No
- Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (n=107): 29% Yes, 71% No
CMU’s Effectiveness at Creating an Academic and Physical Environment on Campus Where Disability is Neutral

Respondents were asked to rate CMU’s effectiveness at creating an academic and physical environment on campus where disability is neutral. One thousand, forty respondents provided a response to this question on a scale of “1 – Not at all effective” to “5 – Very effective”. The greatest percentage (35%) of respondents rated CMU’s effectiveness as a “4”, and the majority of respondents (58%), provided a response of “4” or “5”, as shown in Figure 198.

As shown in Figure 199, the highest percentage of students (34%), faculty (36%) and staff (37%) rated the effectiveness as a “4”. However, students had a much higher percentage of respondents (27%) who thought that CMU is very effective at creating an academic and physical environment on campus where disability is neutral, compared to faculty (17%), and staff (16%).

While slightly less than half of respondents who identified as members of an underrepresented group (49%), provided a response of “4” or “5”, a larger percentage (64%), of those who did not identify as members of an underrepresented group provided the same responses (Figure 200). Respondents who identified as members of an underrepresented group also had a much higher percentage of respondents (21%), who rated the effectiveness as a “1” or as a “2”, compared to those who did not identify as such (9%).
Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 201), there was a large variance in ratings. Persons of international origin (71%), and veterans (72%), had the highest percentages of respondents who rated CMU’s effectiveness as a “4” or as a “5”. LGBTQ individuals (41%), and members of a minority religious group had the lowest (41%). Persons with disabilities (36%), had a much higher percentage of respondents who rated CMU’s effectiveness as a “1” or as a “2”, compared to respondents in general (13%). This means that persons with disabilities find CMU to be much less effective, compared to the rest of the respondents.

Among the races / ethnicities (Figure 202), a higher percentage of Asian / Asian-American respondents rated CMU’s effectiveness as a “4” or as a “5”, compared to the average of all respondents (74%, compared to 58%). Hispanic / Latinx respondents had the highest percentage of respondents (10%), who believed that CMU is not at all effective at creating an academic and physical environment on campus where disability is neutral. (Some races / ethnicities had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).

As shown in Figure 203, female respondents (15%), had a higher percentage of respondents who rated CMU’s effectiveness as a “1” or as a “2”, compared to males (7%). (Other genders had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).

**Figure 198: CMU’s Effectiveness at Creating an Academic and Physical Environment on Campus Where Disability is Neutral (All Respondents) (n=1,040)**
Figure 199: CMU’s Effectiveness at Creating an Academic and Physical Environment on Campus Where Disability is Neutral (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

Figure 200: CMU’s Effectiveness at Creating an Academic and Physical Environment on Campus Where Disability is Neutral (Underrepresented Group Respondents)
Figure 201: CMU’s Effectiveness at Creating an Academic and Physical Environment on Campus Where Disability is Neutral (“Demographic Group” Respondents)
Figure 202: CMU’s Effectiveness at Creating an Academic and Physical Environment on Campus Where Disability is Neutral (Racial Group Respondents)
Specific Actions that CMU Could Take To Be More Effective in the Service of Individuals with Disabilities

Respondents were asked if they believe there are specific actions that CMU could take to be more effective in the service of individuals with disabilities. Six hundred ninety-eight respondents provided a response to this question. The majority of respondents (55%), indicated that they believed there are specific actions that CMU could take to be more effective (Figure 204).

This was true among faculty (66%), staff (61%), and students (50%) (Figure 205). However, student responses were equally divided among affirmative and negative.

As shown in Figure 206, the majority of respondents who self-identified as a member of an underrepresented group (68%), believed there are specific actions that CMU could take to be more effective, while the majority of those who are not a member of an underrepresented group (53%), did not believe that more specific actions are required.

Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 207), there was a large variance in ratings. Only 30% of veterans believed that additional actions are required, while more than 65% of every other Demographic Group believed that more actions are required.
Among the races / ethnicities (Figure 208), a higher percentage of Asian / Asian-American respondents believed that more actions are required, compared to the average of all respondents (71%, compared to 55%). Respondents of the other races had little variance from the average of all respondents. (Some races / ethnicities had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).

As shown in Figure 209, female respondents (58%), had a higher percentage of respondents who believed that more actions are required, compared to males (49%). (Other genders had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).

**Figure 204: Belief that There Are Specific Actions CMU Could Take To Be More Effective in the Service of Individuals with Disabilities (All Respondents) (n=698)**
Figure 205: Belief that There Are Specific Actions CMU Could Take To Be More Effective in the Service of Individuals with Disabilities (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

- Faculty (n=92): 66% Yes, 34% No
- Staff (n=150): 61% Yes, 39% No
- Students (n=456): 50% Yes, 50% No

Figure 206: Belief that There Are Specific Actions CMU Could Take To Be More Effective in the Service of Individuals with Disabilities (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

- Member of an underrepresented group (n=246): 68% Yes, 32% No
- Not a member of an underrepresented group (n=416): 47% Yes, 53% No
Figure 207: Belief that There Are Specific Actions CMU Could Take To Be More Effective in the Service of Individuals with Disabilities (“Demographic Group” Respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Group</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veterans (n=23)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of a minority religious group (n=35)</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ individuals (n=58)</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First generation students (n=87)</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons of international origin (n=33)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with disabilities (n=25)</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (n=54)</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 208: Belief that There Are Specific Actions CMU Could Take To Be More Effective in the Service of Individuals with Disabilities (Racial Group Respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Group</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races (n=19)</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latinx (n=20)</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (n=508)</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American / Black (n=65)</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (n=9)</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (n=3)</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native (n=12)</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / Asian-American (n=45)</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two hundred six of the respondents provided additional comments regarding the additional actions which CMU should take to be more effective in serving individuals with disabilities. Excluding 25 respondents who indicated they were unaware of specific actions which are necessary, most suggestions were in the three main categories described in Figure 210\(^8\).

**Figure 210: Specific Actions CMU Could Take To Be More Effective in the Service of Individuals with Disabilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve physical layout and design to increase access</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase awareness among professors and students</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide resources and assistance to accommodate students</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents showed both a concern for physically and mentally disabled or handicapped students. Sixty-two percent of individuals suggested improving the physical layout of the campus, including but not limited to, increased wheelchair access, more ramps, and better maintenance of sidewalks. Also, many students (29%) suggested investing more in resources for

---

\(^8\) Since some comments fell into multiple categories, the number of responses is greater than the number of respondents.
students with disabilities, including mental health access, learning materials, and transportation services. Selected examples are presented below for each category.

**Improve physical layout and design to increase access**
- All buildings should be wheelchair accessible. All signage should have large and consistent fonts.
- Improve entrances, ramps, and sound systems. Conduct an overall evaluation of the campus disability access.
- This campus is somewhat accessible to those with disabilities. However, to those with physical disabilities, the buildings are NOT accessible at all.
- A compact, walkable/wheelchair-friendly campus would be nice
- Make ramps more visible and accessible
- Make buildings more handicap accessible, and pave the sidewalks and parking lots a lot better
- More ramps and elevators
- Parking. I can't imagine a disabled person getting into our buildings, from some of the parking areas, without severe frustration.
- Accessibility
- Better sidewalks
- More accessible buildings

**Increase awareness among professors and students**
- Better training for faculty and staff, more directed to course environments, and staff meeting arrangements
- To make students with disabilities feel more welcome; and when a student with a disability comes to staff, there should be more understanding (even if the challenge is not seen as a major disability). For example, anxiety compared to autism. They are both disabilities.
- Better academic help and accessibility. Increase student awareness and compassion.
- Educate faculty on the variety and array of disabilities, and require them to engage services to create classroom environments that are inclusive, and using multi-modal presentation styles
- Actively pursue more informational avenues to educate our campus
- Educate faculty better about disabilities (especially cognitive impairment)

**Provide resources and assistance to accommodate students**
- Live captioning in on- and off-line classes. Better physical accommodations for wheelchairs in every classroom
- Need more staffing for the Office of Student Disability Services
- For physical disabilities, consider accommodations, especially during the winter time. For mental disabilities, consider making them a part of the regular checkups at campus health services. Try to identify, and treat them.
- Services (i.e., medication, help) for individuals with mental illness/disorders should be provided
• The University does not do a good job of clearing snow and ice in the winter months to make the campus accessible to students with disabilities
• Transportation for individuals with physical disabilities during the winter, and other inclement weather conditions
• Don't make it "easier" to get disability standing, but don't turn someone away if the disability is not physical or noticeable at first glance
• Hire a Director of the Disability Office with the training and background to run the disability service office as well as to know how to support disability throughout all aspects of campus life
• Provide better counseling services and assistance to students with mental illnesses
• Being more active with the students who have disabilities whether it is mental or physical ailments

Specific Actions that CMU Could Take To Be More Effective in Providing Assistance to Veterans on Campus
Respondents were asked if they believe there are specific actions that CMU could take to be more effective in providing assistance to veterans (Figure 211). Five hundred seventy-two respondents provided a response to this question. The majority of respondents (53%), indicated that they do not believe that additional actions are required.

While this was true as well among students (56%), the majority of faculty (62%), and staff (51%), believed that more actions are required (Figure 212).

As shown in Figure 213, the majority of respondents from underrepresented groups (58%), believed that more actions are required, while the majority of those not underrepresented (60%), did not believe anything else is required.

Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 214), there was a large variance in ratings. Persons with disabilities (70%), and persons of international origin (73%), had the highest percentages of respondents who believed that additional actions are required, while LGBTQ individuals (44%) had the lowest. The highest percentage of veterans (55%), believed that additional actions are required (which was close to the percentage of all respondents (53%), who believed that additional actions are required).

Among the races / ethnicities (Figure 215), a higher percentage of Asian / Asian-American respondents (64%) believed there are additional actions required, compared to the average of all respondents (64%, compared to 53%), while a lower percentage of African-American / Black (41%) and White (44%) respondents believed that additional actions are required compared to the average of all respondents. (Some races / ethnicities had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).

There was not significant variation in the belief that there are specific actions that CMU could take to be more effective in providing assistance of veterans, as compared to the belief among all respondents, when analyzed by gender.
Figure 211: Belief that There Are Specific Actions that CMU Could Take To Be More Effective in Providing Assistance to Veterans on Campus (All Respondents) (n=572)

Figure 212: Belief that There Are Specific Actions that CMU Could Take To Be More Effective in Providing Assistance to Veterans on Campus (Faculty, Staff, and Students)
Figure 213: Belief that There Are Specific Actions that CMU Could Take To Be More Effective in Providing Assistance to Veterans on Campus (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

![Bar chart showing beliefs about specific actions CMU could take to be more effective in providing assistance to veterans on campus for underrepresented and non-underrepresented groups.]

Figure 214: Belief that There Are Specific Actions that CMU Could Take To Be More Effective in Providing Assistance to Veterans on Campus (“Demographic Group” Respondents)

![Bar chart showing beliefs about specific actions CMU could take to be more effective in providing assistance to veterans on campus for different demographic groups including LGBTQ individuals, first generation students, members of a minority religious group, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, veterans, persons with disabilities, and persons of international origin.]
One hundred two of the respondents provided additional comments regarding specific actions which CMU should take to be more effective in providing assistance to veterans on campus. Excluding 34 of those respondents who indicated that they were unsure or did not have any suggestions, most suggestions fell into the 13 categories described in Figure 216⁹.

**Figure 216: Additional Comments Regarding Specific Actions that CMU Could Take To Be More Effective in Providing Assistance to Veterans on Campus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMU is already doing a good job assisting veterans</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the Veterans’ Resource Center</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer mental health services / counseling</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide additional financial assistance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Veteran’s Resource Center is already doing a good job providing assistance to veterans on campus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁹ Since some comments fell into multiple categories, the number of responses is greater than the number of respondents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased exposure / advertising of current services for veterans</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help veterans get acclimated on campus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate veterans more often</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase others’ awareness of veterans on campus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be more sensitive to veterans special needs (such as greater flexibility regarding class participation)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer veterans student orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally provide more assistance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have veterans’ dorms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The greatest number of responses (17%), indicated that CMU is already doing a good job providing services for veterans. Eight of the responses referenced the Veterans Resource Center and the success it has had. However, 14 other respondents talked about how the Veterans Resource Center could be improved. Many of these responses mentioned the small size of the office, or mentioned staffing issues, such as the fact that the Center is understaffed. Some indicated that the staff is not being properly trained. The comments about offering accommodations to provide flexibility for veteran students mentioned that veterans or active military may have military obligations, and they may have to miss class because of this. Veteran students also have scheduling troubles because of these same obligations. Selected examples are presented below for each category.

**CMU is already doing a good job assisting veterans**
- I think they are doing a great job
- CMU is a leader in service to the military and to veterans
- Veterans are given special pricing and exceptions in class
- I think CMU already does a good job with veteran students
- I feel that veterans are engaged early in the admissions process, and are connected appropriately to the veterans’ services, for both the Main and Global Campus
- CMU does an excellent job in my opinion providing assistance to veterans

**Improve the Veterans’ Resource Center**
- Better space for the VRC
- Having the office in a little more visible place, other than down some secondary hallway
- They are shoved into a small office in Warriner, which is very hard to find
- Dedicated space for a Veterans' Resource Center that is designed with veterans' needs in mind (i.e., don't have seating where students' backs have to face the door); create a space where the students can take care of their business AND gather to study, talk, hang out.
- I believe the Veterans’ [Resource] Center is understaffed
- Give the Veterans' Center a larger office and more staff. Provide a comfortable space for veterans to gather
The leadership in the Veterans office should be someone that is qualified to direct such an office. In addition, the leadership must engage and care for veteran students. The Veterans Office must be focused on veteran students’ well-being, and not the money veteran students bring to the university.

**Offer mental health services / counseling**
- More proactive attention should be paid to the healthcare needs of veterans, particularly with regards to mental healthcare. This is true in every setting in the U.S., including at this institution.
- More psychological services and support
- I suppose PTSD help
- Counseling provided (if veterans need it)
- Mental health and well-being
- Mental healthcare services
- Counseling service access for PTSD sufferers, and a common area for veterans to meet and discuss issues. Better education and understanding as to classroom issues for these vets.

**Provide additional financial assistance**
- Make active duty tuition fall within the limits of the tuition assistance benefit
- We should offer more discounts, tutoring, programming for veterans, and recruit them more aggressively - except those with PTSD and mental disorders.
- Veterans should be given discounted tuition. It is challenging to attend school because in some cases you barely have enough to make ends meet. Now you are taking away veterans’ discounts that made it possible to go to school.
- They could provide more funding for classes or housing or books

The Veteran’s Resource Center is already doing a good job providing assistance to veterans on campus
- The Veterans’ Resource Center is extremely helpful and very effective
- The VRC does a great job of helping this student population. I am very proud of the way CMU works with veterans.
- Our Veterans’ Resource Center is great with working with our military students
- The new veterans’ office is a nice step forward. I was contacted this semester.
- Veterans’ Resource Center does a good job
- We have a great veterans affairs office on this campus

**Increased exposure / advertising of current services for veterans**
- Provide and advertise help for them
- Maybe just talking about this issue in general. I do not hear a lot about it.
- Maybe do more publicizing so veterans know it is available
- I think it’s important to follow up with anyone when you say that you will, and I’ve witnessed a lot of continuing to have to reach out to the VRC because of not getting a call back, or having them take a very long time to provide assistance or answers.
- We have no veterans outreach that I know of, at least make it more accessible and known to those who are
- Make the veterans affairs office more known and accessible, and provide them a bigger
Help veterans get acclimated on campus

- Acclimation efforts should be a top priority when dealing with veterans; this may prove to be more true (for a variety of issues) with female veterans
- My colleagues need to be more accommodating to service members who have to miss class due to military obligations, or even who have to withdraw due to deployment
- Create policies that better accommodate them, and train faculty better
- I think incoming veterans would benefit to take a course regarding study habits
- Just welcoming them and making them feel comfortable

Appreciate veterans more often

- Do more to appreciate our troops and police officers
- More appreciation
- Making certain that days dedicated to the military are supported, and treated as holiday schedules

Increase others’ awareness of veterans on campus

- Alerting the faculty and staff about the existence of veterans among the students and faculty
- Knowing what students are veterans and making sure they don't just get clumped into the general population of students

Be more sensitive to veterans’ special needs (such as greater flexibility regarding class participation)

- Veterans need to have priority registration because they have to take at least 12 credits a semester. If they cannot get into classes for their majors and degrees, then they have to pay out of pocket for classes to meet the 12 credit requirement.
- Veterans are often juggling work and parenting responsibilities. We need to consistently review class schedules and formats that allow for flexibility and options for non-traditional students.
- Unsure, but being flexible when problems arise may be important.

Offer veterans student orientation

- Veterans’ own orientation for services offered
- Give them their own orientation, don't throw them in with all the freshmen. And help them make connections with people on campus. It must be difficult to be thrown back into this system.
- Wider adoption of Cognito training, and specialized orientation/introduction for campus veteran students.

Generally provide more assistance

- More services
- Offer them more support, and more options
- I am sure that there is always more that can be done, but I am not sure what kind of things those would be

Have veterans’ dorms

- Probably better living conditions compared to a dorm
• Require all advisors to go through Veterans on Campus training and offer group veterans residential housing.

Importance of Having Spaces Dedicated to Supporting Students through Identity-Related Challenges

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of having spaces dedicated to supporting students through identity-related challenges. One thousand, five hundred nineteen respondents provided a response to this question on a scale of “1 – Not at all important” to “5 – Extremely important.” The greatest percentage of respondents (49%), rated the importance of having these spaces as a “5”, and the majority of respondents rated the importance as a “4” or as a “5” (70%), as shown in Figure 217.

Although the highest percentages of faculty, staff, and students all rated the importance as a “5” (Figure 218), a lower percentage of the staff rated this as a “5” (38%, as compared to 53% of both faculty and students).

As shown in Figure 219, the majority of respondents in underrepresented groups (61%), and those not in underrepresented groups (43%), rated the importance as a “5”. However, this percentage was much greater among those in underrepresented groups.

As shown in Figure 220, there was significant variance among the responses of the Demographic Groups. LGBTQ individuals had the greatest percentage (76%) of those believing that the spaces are extremely important. Veterans had the lowest percentage among the Demographic Groups of respondents who rated the importance of having spaces dedicated to supporting students through identity-related challenges as a “4” or as a “5” (49%).

Among the races / ethnicities (Figure 221), the highest percentage of every racial group (with the exception of Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islanders (which had too few respondents to draw a meaningful conclusion)) believed that having these spaces is extremely important. Among seven racial groups, more than 45% of the respondents felt this way (i.e., Other (47%), two or more races (46%), White (46%), Hispanic / Latinx (52%), African-American / Black (68%), Asian / Asian-American (57%), and American Indian or Alaskan Native (75%)).

When analyzed by gender (Figure 222), females had a much larger percentage of respondents (78%) who rated the importance of having spaces dedicated to supporting students through identity-related challenges as a “4” or as a “5”, compared to males (56%). (Other genders had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).
Figure 217: Importance of Having Spaces Dedicated to Supporting Students through Identity-Related Challenges (All Respondents) (n=1,519)

Figure 218: Importance of Having Spaces Dedicated to Supporting Students through Identity (Faculty, Staff, and Students)
Figure 219: Importance of Having Spaces Dedicated to Supporting Students through Identity (Underrepresented Group Respondents)
Figure 220: Importance of Having Spaces Dedicated to Supporting Students through Identity-Related Challenges ("Demographic Group" Respondents)
Figure 221: Importance of Having Spaces Dedicated to Supporting Students through Identity-Related Challenges (Racial Group Respondents)
Belief that CMU’s Administrative Support is Adequate for Diversity and Inclusion Efforts

Respondents were asked if they believe that CMU’s administrative support is adequate for diversity and inclusion efforts. One thousand, two hundred sixteen respondents provided a response to this question. The vast majority of respondents (74%), indicated that they believed that CMU’s administrative support is adequate for diversity and inclusion efforts (Figure 223).

As shown in Figure 224, the majority of faculty (53%), staff (72%), and students (79%), also believed that CMU’s administrative support is adequate.

As shown in Figure 225, respondents who were from underrepresented groups were much less likely to believe that CMU’s administrative support is adequate, as compared to those who are not from underrepresented groups (56%, compared to 83%). However, the majority of both still believed that CMU’s administrative support is adequate for diversity and inclusion efforts.

Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 226), veterans (85%), had the greatest percentage of respondents who believed that CMU’s administrative support is adequate, while members of a minority religious group had the lowest (53%).

Among the races / ethnicities (Figure 227), White (77%), and Asian / Asian-American (73%), respondents had the highest percentage of respondents who believed that CMU’s administrative support is adequate for diversity and inclusion efforts, while African-American / Black...
respondents had the lowest (56%). (Some races/ethnicities had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).

There was not significant variance in the belief that CMU’s administrative support is adequate for diversity and inclusion efforts, as compared to the belief among all respondents, when analyzed by gender.

**Figure 223: Belief that CMU’s Administrative Support is Adequate for Diversity and Inclusion Efforts (All Respondents) (n=1,216)**

26% Yes
74% No
Figure 224: Belief that CMU’s Administrative Support is Adequate for Diversity and Inclusion Efforts (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

![Bar graph showing the percentage of Faculty, Staff, and Students who believe CMU’s administrative support is adequate for diversity and inclusion efforts.]

- Faculty (n=174): 53% Yes, 47% No
- Staff (n=295): 72% Yes, 28% No
- Students (n=747): 79% Yes, 21% No

Figure 225: Belief that CMU’s Administrative Support is Adequate for Diversity and Inclusion Efforts (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

![Bar graph showing the percentage of Member of an underrepresented group and Not a member of an underrepresented group who believe CMU’s administrative support is adequate for diversity and inclusion efforts.]

- Member of an underrepresented group (n=416): 56% Yes, 44% No
- Not a member of an underrepresented group (n=735): 83% Yes, 17% No
Figure 226: Belief that CMU’s Administrative Support is Adequate for Diversity and Inclusion Efforts ("Demographic Group" Respondents)

- Members of a minority religious group (n=70): 47% No, 53% Yes
- LGBTQ individuals (n=130): 45% No, 55% Yes
- Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (n=79): 37% No, 63% Yes
- Persons with disabilities (n=35): 34% No, 66% Yes
- First generation students (n=159): 32% No, 68% Yes
- Persons of international origin (n=48): 25% No, 75% Yes
- Veterans (n=52): 15% No, 85% Yes

Figure 227: Belief that CMU’s Administrative Support is Adequate for Diversity and Inclusion Efforts (Racial Group Respondents)

- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (n=3): 33% No, 67% Yes
- American Indian or Alaskan Native (n=16): 50% No, 50% Yes
- African-American / Black (n=109): 44% No, 56% Yes
- Hispanic / Latinx (n=28): 32% No, 68% Yes
- Two or more races (n=42): 31% No, 69% Yes
- Asian / Asian-American (n=67): 27% No, 73% Yes
- Other (n=16): 25% No, 75% Yes
- White (n=905): 23% No, 77% Yes
Belief that CMU’s Funding is Adequate for Diversity and Inclusion Efforts

Respondents were asked if they believe that CMU’s funding is adequate for diversity and inclusion efforts. One thousand, one hundred one respondents provided a response to this question. The majority of respondents (62%), indicated that they believe CMU’s funding is adequate (Figure 228).

As shown in Figure 229, the majority of staff (57%), and students (69%), believed that CMU’s funding is adequate. In contrast, the majority of faculty (60%) did not agree.

Respondents from an underrepresented group were much less likely to believe that CMU’s funding is adequate, as compared to those not from an underrepresented group (42%, compared to 74%).

Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 231), veterans (72%), had the greatest percentage of respondents who believed that CMU’s funding is adequate, while LGBTQ individuals by far had the lowest (34%). The majorities of persons with disabilities (52%), members of a minority religious group (59%), and socioeconomically disadvantaged students (52%), did not believe that CMU’s funding is adequate.

Among the races / ethnicities (Figure 232), White (65%), and Asian / Asian-American (66%) respondents had the highest percentage of respondents who believed that CMU’s funding is adequate, while Hispanic / Latinx (46%), and African-American / Black (48%) respondents had the lowest. (Some races / ethnicities had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).

As shown in Figure 233, male respondents (67%), had a slightly larger percentage of respondents who believed that CMU’s funding is adequate compared to females (60%). (Other genders had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).
Figure 228: Belief that CMU’s Funding is Adequate for Diversity and Inclusion Efforts (All Respondents) (n=1,101)

- Yes: 62%
- No: 38%

Figure 229: Belief that CMU’s Funding is Adequate for Diversity and Inclusion Efforts (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

- Faculty (n=157)
  - Yes: 40%
  - No: 60%
- Staff (n=259)
  - Yes: 57%
  - No: 43%
- Students (n=685)
  - Yes: 69%
  - No: 31%
Figure 230: Belief that CMU’s Funding is Adequate for Diversity and Inclusion Efforts (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member of an underrepresented group</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a member of an underrepresented group</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 231: Belief that CMU’s Funding is Adequate for Diversity and Inclusion Efforts ("Demographic Group" Respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ individuals</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of a minority religious group</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomically disadvantaged students</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with disabilities</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First generation students</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons of international origin</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 232: Belief that CMU’s Funding is Adequate for Diversity and Inclusion Efforts (Racial Group Respondents)

- American Indian or Alaskan Native (n=18): 44% No, 56% Yes
- Hispanic / Latinx (n=26): 46% No, 54% Yes
- African-American / Black (n=101): 48% No, 52% Yes
- Two or more races (n=35): 46% No, 54% Yes
- White (n=813): 35% No, 65% Yes
- Asian / Asian-American (n=62): 34% No, 66% Yes
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (n=3): 33% No, 67% Yes
- Other (n=16): 31% No, 69% Yes

Figure 233: Belief that CMU’s Funding is Adequate for Diversity and Inclusion Efforts (Gender Group Respondents)

- Male (n=434): 33% No, 67% Yes
- Female (n=642): 40% No, 60% Yes
- Transgender individuals (n=7): 14% No, 86% Yes
- Other (n=5): 0% No, 100% Yes
Belief that CMU’s Structural Framework is Adequate for Diversity and Inclusion Efforts
Respondents were asked if they believe that CMU’s structural framework is adequate for
diversity and inclusion efforts. One thousand, one hundred sixty respondents provided a
response to this question. The majority of respondents (73%), indicated that they believe CMU’s
structural framework is adequate (Figure 234).

As shown in Figure 235, the majority of staff (70%), and student (79%), respondents believed
that CMU’s structural framework is adequate. In contrast, the majority of faculty (53%),
disagreed.

A far smaller percentage of respondents from underrepresented groups (52%), believed that
CMU’s structural framework is adequate, compared to those who are not from underrepresented
groups (84%) (Figure 236). However, the majority of both still believed that CMU’s structural
framework is adequate.

Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 237), veterans (85%), had the greatest percentage of
respondents who believed that CMU’s structural framework is adequate, while LGBTQ
individuals had the least (49%). LGBTQ individuals were the only Demographic Group where
the majority of respondents did not believe that CMU’s structural framework is adequate.

Among the races / ethnicities (Figure 238), Asians / Asian-Americans (78%), and Whites (75%),
had the greatest percentages of respondents who believed that CMU’s structural framework is
adequate, while African-Americans / Blacks (55%), and Hispanic / Latinx (59%) had the lowest.
(Some races / ethnicities had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).

A larger percentage of male respondents (77%) believed that CMU’s structural framework is
adequate for diversity and inclusion efforts compared to female respondents (71%). (Other
genders had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions) (Figure 239).
Figure 234: Belief that CMU’s Structural Framework is Adequate for Diversity and Inclusion Efforts (All Respondents) (n=1,160)

Figure 235: Belief that CMU’s Structural Framework is Adequate for Diversity and Inclusion Efforts (Faculty, Staff, and Students)
Figure 236: Belief that CMU’s Structural Framework is Adequate for Diversity and Inclusion Efforts (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

- Member of an underrepresented group (n=404)
  - Yes: 52%
  - No: 48%
- Not a member of an underrepresented group (n=698)
  - Yes: 84%
  - No: 16%

Figure 237: Belief that CMU’s Structural Framework is Adequate for Diversity and Inclusion Efforts ("Demographic Group" Respondents)

- LGBTQ individuals (n=130)
  - No: 51%
  - Yes: 49%
- Members of a minority religious group (n=66)
  - No: 47%
  - Yes: 53%
- Persons with disabilities (n=34)
  - No: 41%
  - Yes: 59%
- Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (n=83)
  - No: 37%
  - Yes: 63%
- Persons of international origin (n=45)
  - No: 31%
  - Yes: 69%
- First generation students (n=154)
  - No: 29%
  - Yes: 71%
- Veterans (n=46)
  - No: 15%
  - Yes: 85%
Figure 238: Belief that CMU’s Structural Framework is Adequate for Diversity and Inclusion Efforts (Racial Group Respondents)

- African-American / Black (n=102): Yes 45%, No 55%
- Hispanic / Latinx (n=29): Yes 41%, No 59%
- American Indian or Alaskan Native (n=18): Yes 39%, No 61%
- Two or more races (n=38): Yes 37%, No 63%
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (n=3): Yes 33%, No 67%
- Other (n=15): Yes 27%, No 73%
- White (n=865): Yes 25%, No 75%
- Asian / Asian-American (n=63): Yes 22%, No 78%

Figure 239: Belief that CMU’s Structural Framework is Adequate for Diversity and Inclusion Efforts (Gender Group Respondents)

- Male (n=449): Yes 77%, No 23%
- Female (n=685): Yes 71%, No 29%
- Transgender individuals (n=9): Yes 56%, No 44%
- Other (n=5): Yes 80%, No 20%
Opinions Regarding Diversity and Inclusion Training

Respondents were asked to indicate their opinions regarding diversity and inclusion training by selecting all the responses that apply from the following choices:

- Additional training regarding diversity and inclusion should be offered to the faculty and staff
- Additional training regarding diversity and inclusion should be offered to students
- Faculty and staff should be required to participate in diversity and inclusion training
- Faculty and staff should be incentivized to participate in diversity and inclusion training
- Students should be required to participate in diversity and inclusion training
- Students should be incentivized to participate in diversity and inclusion training
- None of the above

One thousand, four hundred four respondents selected 3,356 responses in response to this prompt (see Figure 240). The greatest percentage of respondents selected “additional training regarding diversity and inclusion should be offered to the faculty and staff” (51%), and the lowest percentage of respondents selected “additional training regarding diversity and inclusion should be offered to the students” (15%).

As shown in Figure 241, these same trends were consistent among faculty, staff, and students, with the greatest percentages all selecting “additional training regarding diversity and inclusion should be offered to the faculty and staff” most frequently. A slightly larger percentage of faculty selected “faculty and staff should be incentivized to participate in diversity and inclusion training” (41%), compared to the percentage that selected “faculty and staff should be required to participate in diversity and inclusion training” (38%). This was the opposite for staff and students. A much greater percentage of faculty also selected “students should be required to participate in diversity and inclusion training” (45%), compared to students (28%).

As shown in Figure 242, members of an underrepresented group had a higher percentage of respondents who selected each of the categories, with the exception of “none of the above”, compared to respondents who are not members of an underrepresented group. This difference was largest for “faculty and staff should be required to participate in diversity and inclusion training” (53%, compared to 35%), and “students should be required to participate in diversity and inclusion training” (44%, compared to 26%). This means that those who are not members of an underrepresented group had a far smaller percentage of respondents who believed diversity and inclusion training should be required for faculty, staff, or students, compared to members of an underrepresented group.

Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 243), veterans had the lowest percentage of respondents who selected each of the choices, and the highest percentage who selected “none of the above” (32%). Persons of international origin had the highest percentage of respondents who selected “students should be required to participate in diversity and inclusion training” (59%), and this percentage was well above the average across all respondents (36%). LGBTQ individuals and socioeconomically disadvantaged students had higher percentages of respondents who selected “additional training regarding diversity and inclusion should be offered to the
faculty and staff” (62% for LGBTQ individuals, and 58% for socioeconomically disadvantaged students) and “faculty and staff should be required to participate in diversity and inclusion training” (65% for LGBTQ individuals, and 62% for socioeconomically disadvantaged students), compared to the average for each.

Among the races / ethnicities (Figure 244), a smaller percentage of White respondents (49%) selected “additional training regarding diversity and inclusion should be offered to the faculty and staff”, compared to the other races / ethnicities. White respondents also had a smaller percentage of respondents who felt that students or staff and faculty should be required to participate in diversity and inclusion training, compared to the other groups. (Some races had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).

As shown in Figure 245, a higher percentage of females selected every category, with the exception of “faculty and staff should be incentivized to participate in diversity and inclusion training”, compared to males. (Other genders had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).

**Figure 240: Opinions Regarding Diversity and Inclusion Training (All Respondents) (n=1,404)**

- Additional training regarding diversity and inclusion should be offered to the faculty and staff: 714
- Faculty and staff should be required to participate in diversity and inclusion training: 662
- Students should be incentivized to participate in diversity and inclusion training: 555
- Students should be required to participate in diversity and inclusion training: 527
- Faculty and staff should be incentivized to participate in diversity and inclusion training: 444
- Additional training regarding diversity and inclusion should be offered to students: 216
- None of the above: 238
Figure 241: Opinions Regarding Diversity and Inclusion Training (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

- Additional training regarding diversity and inclusion should be offered to the faculty and staff: 40% (Students), 49% (Staff), 53% (Faculty)
- Faculty and staff should be required to participate in diversity and inclusion training: 40% (Students), 43% (Staff), 38% (Faculty)
- Students should be incentivized to participate in diversity and inclusion training: 35% (Students), 30% (Staff), 37% (Faculty)
- Students should be required to participate in diversity and inclusion training: 28% (Students), 37% (Staff), 45% (Faculty)
- Faculty and staff should be incentivized to participate in diversity and inclusion training: 24% (Students), 28% (Staff), 41% (Faculty)
- Additional training regarding diversity and inclusions should be offered to students: 11% (Students), 15% (Staff), 18% (Faculty)
- None of the above: 16% (Students), 12% (Staff), 13% (Faculty)
Figure 242: Opinions Regarding Diversity and Inclusion Training (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

- Additional training regarding diversity and inclusion should be offered to the faculty and staff: 39% (not a member of an underrepresented group), 53% (member of an underrepresented group)
- Faculty and staff should be required to participate in diversity and inclusion training: 35% (not a member of an underrepresented group), 53% (member of an underrepresented group)
- Students should be incentivized to participate in diversity and inclusion training: 31% (not a member of an underrepresented group), 39% (member of an underrepresented group)
- Students should be required to participate in diversity and inclusion training: 26% (not a member of an underrepresented group), 44% (member of an underrepresented group)
- Faculty and staff should be incentivized to participate in diversity and inclusion training: 23% (not a member of an underrepresented group), 34% (member of an underrepresented group)
- Additional training regarding diversity and inclusions should be offered to students: 12% (not a member of an underrepresented group), 16% (member of an underrepresented group)
- None of the above: 9% (not a member of an underrepresented group), 18% (member of an underrepresented group)
Figure 243: Opinions Regarding Diversity and Inclusion Training ("Demographic Group" Respondents)

- Additional training regarding diversity and inclusion should be offered to the faculty and staff
  - Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (n=105)
  - First generation students (n=190)
  - Members of a minority religious group (n=87)
  - Veterans (n=59)
  - Persons with disabilities (n=44)
  - LGBTQ individuals (n=151)
  - Persons of international origin (n=56)

- Faculty and staff should be required to participate in diversity and inclusion training
- Students should be incentivized to participate in diversity and inclusion training
- Students should be required to participate in diversity and inclusion training
- Faculty and staff should be incentivized to participate in diversity and inclusion training
- Additional training regarding diversity and inclusions should be offered to students
- None of the above
Figure 244: Opinions Regarding Diversity and Inclusion Training (Racial Group Respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>White (n=1038)</th>
<th>Hispanic / Latinx (n=35)</th>
<th>Two or more races (n=53)</th>
<th>African-American / Black (n=139)</th>
<th>Asian / Asian-American (n=63)</th>
<th>Other (n=14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional training regarding diversity and inclusion</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should be offered to the faculty and staff</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and staff should be required to participate in</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diversity and inclusion training</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should be incentivized to participate in</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diversity and inclusion training</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should be required to participate in</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diversity and inclusion training</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and staff should be incentivized to participate</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in diversity and inclusion training</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional training regarding diversity and inclusions</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should be offered to students</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Belief that all CMU Community Members Feel Comfortable in Mount Pleasant Based upon Their Identity

Respondents were asked if they believe that all CMU community members feel comfortable in Mount Pleasant based upon their identity. One thousand, two hundred thirty respondents provided a response to this question. The majority of respondents (55%), indicated that they do not believe that all CMU community members feel comfortable in Mount Pleasant based upon their identity, as shown in Figure 246.

As shown in Figure 247, this was true among faculty (77%), and staff (69%). However, the majority of students (57%), believed that all CMU community members feel comfortable in Mount Pleasant based upon their identity.

The majority of respondents who identified as being a member of an underrepresented group (71%), believed that CMU community members do not feel comfortable in Mount Pleasant,
while the majority of those who are not a member of an underrepresented group believed that all CMU community members feel comfortable (54%) (Figure 248).

Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 249), veterans (54%), had the greatest percentage of respondents who believed that CMU community members feel comfortable, and were the only Demographic Group where the majority of respondents had this opinion. LGBTQ individuals (78%), and members of a minority religious group (75%), had the smallest percentages of respondents who believed that all CMU community members feel comfortable in Mount Pleasant based upon their identity.

Among the races / ethnicities (Figure 250), Asians / Asian-Americans (60%) had the greatest percentage of respondents who believed that CMU community members feel comfortable in Mount Pleasant, and were the only race / ethnicity that had this opinion.

As shown in (Figure 251), the majority of male respondents (51%), believed that CMU community members feel comfortable in Mount Pleasant, while the majority of female respondents did not (57%). Every Other gender respondent indicated that they do not believe all CMU community members feel comfortable in Mount Pleasant based upon their identity. However, the sample size was only seven.

**Figure 246: Belief that all CMU Community Members Feel Comfortable in Mount Pleasant Based upon Their Identity (All Respondents) (n=1,230)**
Figure 247: Belief that all CMU Community Members Feel Comfortable in Mount Pleasant Based upon Their Identity (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

Figure 248: Belief that all CMU Community Members Feel Comfortable in Mount Pleasant Based upon Their Identity (Underrepresented Group Respondents)
Figure 249: Belief that all CMU Community Members Feel Comfortable in Mount Pleasant Based upon Their Identity ("Demographic Group" Respondents)

- LGBTQ individuals (n=139): 22% No, 78% Yes
- Members of a minority religious group (n=73): 25% No, 75% Yes
- Persons with disabilities (n=36): 36% No, 64% Yes
- Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (n=98): 38% No, 62% Yes
- Persons of international origin (n=52): 44% No, 56% Yes
- First generation students (n=164): 46% No, 54% Yes
- Veterans (n=41): 46% No, 54% Yes

Figure 250: Belief that all CMU Community Members Feel Comfortable in Mount Pleasant Based upon Their Identity (Racial Group Respondents)

- Hispanic / Latinx (n=31): 29% No, 71% Yes
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (n=3): 33% No, 67% Yes
- African-American / Black (n=107): 34% No, 66% Yes
- American Indian or Alaskan Native (n=18): 44% No, 56% Yes
- Other (n=13): 46% No, 54% Yes
- White (n=912): 46% No, 54% Yes
- Two or more races (n=46): 48% No, 52% Yes
- Asian / Asian-American (n=70): 40% No, 60% Yes
Belief that the Curriculum is Inclusive of Diverse Perspectives
Respondents were asked if they believe that the curriculum is inclusive of diverse perspectives. One thousand, one hundred eighty-six respondents provided a response to this question. The vast majority of respondents (75%), indicated that they believe the curriculum is inclusive of diverse perspectives (see Figure 252).

As shown in Figure 253, this was true to varying degrees for faculty (65%), staff (75%), and student (78%) respondents.

Although the majorities of both agreed, a far smaller percentage of respondents who identified as being a member of an underrepresented group (59%), believed that the curriculum is inclusive of diverse perspectives compared to those who did not identify as such (84%) (see Figure 254).

Among the Demographic Groups (see Figure 255), persons of international origin (80%), and veterans (80%), had the greatest percentages of respondents who believed that the curriculum is inclusive of diverse perspectives, while LGBTQ individuals had the lowest (58%).

Among the races / ethnicities (Figure 256), Asians / Asian-Americans (76%), and Whites (78%), had the greatest percentages of respondents who believed that the curriculum is inclusive of diverse perspectives, while African-Americans / Blacks (58%), and Hispanic / Latinx (58%), had the lowest. (Some races / ethnicities had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).
There was not a significant variance in the percentages of respondents who believed that the curriculum is inclusive of diverse perspectives, as compared to the belief among all respondents, when analyzed by gender.

Figure 252: Belief that the Curriculum is Inclusive of Diverse Perspectives (All Respondents) (n=1,186)

Figure 253: Belief that the Curriculum is Inclusive of Diverse Perspectives (Faculty, Staff, and Students)
Figure 254: Belief that the Curriculum is Inclusive of Diverse Perspectives (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

Figure 255: Belief that the Curriculum is Inclusive of Diverse Perspectives ("Demographic Group" Respondents)
Belief that Co- and Extra-Curricular Student Organizations Are Inclusive

Respondents were asked if they believe that co- and extra-curricular student organizations (i.e., clubs, fraternities / sororities, etc.) are inclusive. One thousand fifty-seven respondents provided a response to this question. The majority of respondents (71%), indicated that they believe that co- and extra-curricular student organizations are inclusive (see Figure 257).

As shown in Figure 258, this was true for faculty (56%), staff (72%), and student (73%) respondents. However, this majority was smaller for faculty compared to staff and students.

A smaller percentage of respondents who identified as being a member of an underrepresented group (62%), believed that co- and extra-curricular student organizations are inclusive compared to those who are not a member of an underrepresented group (77%) (see Figure 259). However, the majority of both still believed that co- and extra-curricular student organizations are inclusive.

Among the Demographic Groups (Figure 260), the percentages of veterans (75%), persons of international origin (74%), first generation students (73%), and socially disadvantaged students (72%), who believed that co- and extra-curricular student organizations are inclusive, were all around the average, while persons with disabilities (63%), LGBTQ individuals (64%), and members of a minority religious group (67%) had percentages below the average.
Among the races / ethnicities (Figure 261), Hispanic / Latinx (85%), and White (73%) respondents, had a higher percentage of respondents who believed that co- and extra-curricular student organizations are inclusive, while the rest of the races / ethnicities had percentages below the average.

There was not a significant variance in the percentages of respondents who believed that co- and extra-curricular student organizations are inclusive, as compared to the belief among all respondents, when analyzed by gender.

**Figure 257: Belief that Co- and Extra-Curricular Student Organizations Are Inclusive (All Respondents) (n=1,057)**
Figure 258: Belief that Co- and Extra-Curricular Student Organizations Are Inclusive
(Faculty, Staff, and Students)

- Faculty (n=108): 56% Yes, 44% No
- Staff (n=210): 72% Yes, 28% No
- Students (n=739): 73% Yes, 27% No

Figure 259: Belief that Co- and Extra-Curricular Student Organizations Are Inclusive
(Underrepresented Group Respondents)

- Member of an underrepresented group (n=364): 62% Yes, 38% No
- Not a member of an underrepresented group (n=638): 77% Yes, 23% No
Figure 260: Belief that Co- and Extra-Curricular Student Organizations Are Inclusive
("Demographic Group" Respondents)

- Persons with disabilities (n=32)
  - No: 38%
  - Yes: 63%
- LGBTQ individuals (n=118)
  - No: 36%
  - Yes: 64%
- Members of a minority religious group (n=60)
  - No: 33%
  - Yes: 67%
- Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (n=89)
  - No: 28%
  - Yes: 72%
- First generation students (n=162)
  - No: 27%
  - Yes: 73%
- Persons of international origin (n=35)
  - No: 26%
  - Yes: 74%
- Veterans (n=36)
  - No: 25%
  - Yes: 75%

Figure 261: Belief that Co- and Extra-Curricular Student Organizations Are Inclusive
(Racial Group Respondents)

- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (n=2)
  - No: 50%
  - Yes: 50%
- Other (n=12)
  - No: 42%
  - Yes: 58%
- African-American / Black (n=105)
  - No: 40%
  - Yes: 60%
- American Indian or Alaskan Native (n=18)
  - No: 39%
  - Yes: 61%
- Two or more races (n=37)
  - No: 35%
  - Yes: 65%
- Asian / Asian-American (n=54)
  - No: 31%
  - Yes: 69%
- White (n=777)
  - No: 27%
  - Yes: 73%
- Hispanic / Latinx (n=26)
  - No: 15%
  - Yes: 85%
Belief that Residential Housing Options Are Inclusive
Respondents were asked if they believe that the residential housing options are inclusive. One thousand six respondents provided a response to this question. The vast majority of respondents (83%), indicated that they believe that the residential housing options are inclusive (see Figure 262).

As shown in Figure 263, this was true for faculty (82%), staff (88%), and student (82%) respondents at similar rates.

The majorities of both respondents who identified as being a member of an underrepresented group (76%), and those that did not (88%), indicated that they believe the residential housing options are inclusive (see Figure 264).

Figure 265 shows that among the Demographic Groups, a large the majority of every group indicated that they believed that residential housing options are inclusive. Veterans (96%), had by far the greatest percentages of respondents who believed that the residential housing options are inclusive, while LGBTQ individuals had the least (70%).

Among the races / ethnicities (Figure 266), White respondents (85%), and multiracial respondents (82%) had the greatest percentages of respondents who believed that the residential housing options are inclusive, while African-Americans / Blacks (76%), and Asians / Asian-Americans (76%), had the lowest. (Some races / ethnicities had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).

As shown in Figure 267, while the vast majority of both males (89%), and females (81%), indicated that they believe the residential housing options are inclusive, this percentage was higher among males. (Other genders had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).
Figure 262: Belief that Residential Housing Is Inclusive (All Respondents) (n=1,006)

- Yes: 83%
- No: 17%

Figure 263: Belief that Residential Housing Is Inclusive (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

- Faculty (n=82): 82% Yes, 18% No
- Staff (n=221): 88% Yes, 12% No
- Students (n=703): 82% Yes, 18% No
Figure 264: Belief that Residential Housing Is Inclusive (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

Figure 265: Belief that Residential Housing Is Inclusive ("Demographic Group" Respondents)
Figure 266: Belief that Residential Housing Is Inclusive (Racial Group Respondents)

- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (n=2)
  - No: 50%
  - Yes: 50%
- Hispanic / Latinx (n=16)
  - No: 25%
  - Yes: 75%
- African-American / Black (n=99)
  - No: 24%
  - Yes: 76%
- Asian / Asian-American (n=55)
  - No: 24%
  - Yes: 76%
- Two or more races (n=38)
  - No: 18%
  - Yes: 82%
- American Indian or Alaskan Native (n=12)
  - No: 17%
  - Yes: 83%
- White (n=749)
  - No: 15%
  - Yes: 85%
- Other (n=9)
  - No: 11%
  - Yes: 89%

Figure 267: Belief that Residential Housing Is Inclusive (Gender Group Respondents)

- Male (n=386)
  - Yes: 89%
  - No: 11%
- Female (n=597)
  - Yes: 81%
  - No: 19%
- Transgender individuals (n=7)
  - Yes: 57%
  - No: 43%
- Other (n=4)
  - Yes: 50%
  - No: 50%
Belief that CMU’s Social Life Is Inclusive

Respondents were asked if they believe that CMU’s social life is inclusive. One thousand, thirty-nine respondents provided a response to this question. The majority of respondents (76%), indicated that they believe that CMU’s social life is inclusive (see Figure 268).

As shown in Figure 269, this was true for faculty (56%), staff (75%), and student (79%) respondents. However, this majority was smaller for faculty, compared to staff and students.

Although both believed it to be true, a smaller percentage of respondents who identified as being a member of an underrepresented group (62%), believed that CMU’s social life is inclusive, compared to those who did not (83%) (see Figure 270).

Among the Demographic Groups (see Figure 271), the percentages of veterans (81%), persons of international origin (81%), and first generation students (76%), who believed that CMU’s social life is inclusive, were all at, or above, the average. All other Demographic Groups had percentages below the average, with members of a minority religious group (61%), and LGBTQ individuals (64%), having the smallest majorities.

Among the races / ethnicities (Figure 272), White (79%), and Asian / Asian-American (76%), respondents had the greatest percentages of respondents who believed that CMU’s social life is inclusive, while African-American / Black respondents had the lowest (58%). (Some races / ethnicities had too small of a sample size to draw meaningful conclusions).

There was not a significant variance in the percentages of respondents who believed that CMU’s social life is inclusive, as compared to the belief among all respondents, when analyzed by gender.
Figure 268: Belief that CMU’s Social Life Is Inclusive (All Respondents) (n=1,039)

- Yes: 76%
- No: 24%

Figure 269: Belief that CMU’s Social Life Is Inclusive (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

- Faculty (n=101):
  - Yes: 56%
  - No: 44%

- Staff (n=213):
  - Yes: 75%
  - No: 25%

- Students (n=725):
  - Yes: 79%
  - No: 21%
Figure 270: Belief that CMU’s Social Life Is Inclusive (Underrepresented Group Respondents)

- Member of an underrepresented group (n=357): 62% Yes, 38% No
- Not a member of an underrepresented group (n=364): 83% Yes, 17% No

Figure 271: Belief that CMU’s Social Life Is Inclusive ("Demographic Group" Respondents)

- Members of a minority religious group (n=56): 39% Yes, 61% No
- LGBTQ individuals (n=120): 36% Yes, 64% No
- Persons with disabilities (n=32): 34% Yes, 66% No
- Socioeconomically disadvantaged students (n=80): 29% Yes, 71% No
- First generation students (n=143): 24% Yes, 76% No
- Persons of international origin (n=56): 19% Yes, 81% No
- Veterans (n=36): 19% Yes, 81% No
Recommendations on What the University Should Be Doing to Create a More Diverse and Inclusive Environment

Three hundred ninety respondents offered an explanatory response when prompted as to what the University should be doing to create a more diverse and inclusive environment. Fourteen respondents simply stated that they had no response. The comments of the remaining 376 individuals fell into roughly nine categories. A breakdown of the responses is presented below in Figure 273.

Figure 273: Comments on What the University Should Be Doing To Create a More Diverse and Inclusive Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses(^{10})</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity and inclusion training and education</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage conversations between groups</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain current environment and efforts. They are sufficient.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{10}\) Since some comments fell into multiple categories, the number of responses is greater than the number of respondents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase diversity recruitment of staff and students</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide resources/ support; improve diversity office</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase LGBTQ and gender diversity programs</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that the University is addressing D&amp;I concerns</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to clubs / residency halls</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More assessment of diversity and inclusion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One hundred seventeen respondents (31%) suggested increasing diversity and inclusion training on campus, including mandatory training for incoming students, and annual training for others. Another significant group of 71 individuals (19%) suggested the encouragement and facilitation of cross-cultural conversations and understandings to increase diversity sensitivity and deepen awareness. Selected examples are presented below for each category.

Diversity and inclusion training and education
- Students need more education on all aspects of minority identities (not just some) through a class such as a UP
- Educate the Mount Pleasant community as well
- Continue to offer training/sessions to educate faculty/staff/students
- Required Diversity and Inclusion training. Bridging the gap between the administration and students
- Provide funding in order to allow for an increase in diversity trainings
- Host an international day or festival, and invite everyone to be represented
- Encourage students to learn about different cultures and gender differences, etc.

Encourage conversations between groups
- Educating people better
- Host a day for religious tolerance, and make sure non-religious students are present. Hold some events for gay pride and to support LGBT people internationally.
- Having more conversations, and allowing authentic dialogue about the topics. Training is essential.
- Continued open discussions
- First, I think there need to be open discussions about religion, especially in light of so many Middle Eastern conflicts that we perceive to be driven by money and power, but which genuinely are driven by a difference in beliefs. If we are going to produce students who truly have competency in the global arena, then we need to produce students who are also aware of global cultures, some of whom may operate on the basis of theocracy, or at the opposite extreme, on atheistic secularism. Second, Americans are viewed as ignorant by many countries not because they don't possess job skills, but because they know nothing about how the world outside of our borders really works. The Study Abroad program and the Alternative Breaks program are probably the biggest assets we have in helping students become more knowledgeable in dealing with those
from other groups, because when they go to another country, or even to another state to work with those of different backgrounds, they become the "minority", and they get first-hand experience in what that is like. Nothing teaches like experience.

- Have forums, round table discussions or workshops periodically on diversity for all students, faculty, staff, etc.

Maintain current environment and efforts. They are sufficient.

- I think the University already does a lot to foster an inclusive environment
- Nothing. They are doing just fine.
- I feel like we are already doing enough
- Pretty good already
- The environment is already extremely diverse and very inclusive. Some organizations are not by their very nature, which is okay, and should not be discouraged. For example, if a group of ladies decide they would like to have a women's Bible study group, it should be clear that it's not intended for men, and it should be okay; and likewise, the reverse should be okay. I also wouldn't expect a Muslim student group to invite Jews to join their group, or vice versa.
- Nothing, stop trying so hard, and let inclusivity be natural, instead of forced
- I think we need to continue the efforts that have been put in place, because we have been progressively becoming more diverse
- Continue to do what the University is doing. I hear all the time that CMU is friendly to everyone and is accepting. I've lived in Mount Pleasant and I've worked at CMU a long time and I agree. We do want to include and accept everyone.

Increase diversity recruitment of staff and students

- Hire more diverse faculty and staff
- Hire individuals that represent more diverse populations, create bridges between ethnic groups, the president should visit pre-college programs sponsored by CMU
- Visiting high schools with different ethnicities. Offering school tours for students from inner city schools. Mentorship programs for new students, and students with disabilities.
- Bring more people in the leadership level from diverse backgrounds
- Bring in more diverse students
- Be better at appealing to potential faculty and students of minority groups. Market student and faculty resources on campus.
- Continue to increase admission to the minorities, and continue with the good work of helping them to be retained in the University

Provide resources/support; improve diversity office

- Give more financial resources to create centers, and institute policies to support individuals who need accommodations, not just due to disability, but to reasons like illness, parental responsibilities (child care would be great! dedicated nursing rooms with facilities that are not shared for other reasons!). Coach deans on being flexible with faculty, and coach faculty on being flexible with students, when they need to use these accommodations.
- Create a Gender Equity Center. Give more funding to diversity-related programs.
• The University needs to invest in ADEQUATE spaces that are safe and prioritized for marginalized groups. There is a need for a gender equity center, a larger veterans’ center and all University computer labs need to be disability accessible (go to each building and see where the printers are). Each building needs to have PROMINENT gender fluid bathrooms, as well as prominent spaces for disability, veterans, new parent needs. There also needs to be stronger support for racial diversity, as well as an inclusive environment for all the students who are not located on the Mount Pleasant campus.

• Student Support Services (TRIO)

• Investing in identity-based centers to support marginalized students. Mandating programs that develop understanding and empathy. Seeing leadership respond at the highest levels when violence is done to marginalized groups.

• I believe if there was a place on campus that was used for social interactions such as (video games, studying, TV, hanging out) outside of the halls for students to meet others, people would be nice to students. As well as an annual event that promotes diversity and inclusion.

Increase LGBTQ and gender diversity programs

• Create conversations, raise the issue to people, educate! I only learned perspectives other than my own at CMU, if I went out of my way to find those voices myself. I also find it absurd that there is not a reliable LGBTQ studies class or inclusion in overlapping class areas (history of entertainment classes, social justice classes, etc.)

• Though Gender Identity was mentioned - women’s issues were not mentioned once. That speaks volumes. There are so many important things overlooked with regard to women - stopping the tenure clock for pregnancy; daycare on campus for faculty, staff, students; prevention, reporting, and convictions in sexual assault cases.

• The University could make the value of diversity and inclusion visible by supporting a gender equity center, providing more funding for LGBTQ services, by hiring someone effective in the Office of Diversity Education, by incentivizing and institutionalizing a commitment to inclusive teaching by writing it into a category of the by-laws. It has to be an overarching vision SUPPORTED by specific actions and policies. THEN CMU may see a change in the data to show that the climate is inclusive for faculty and students.

• Putting people of color, open members of the LGBTQ community, persons with disabilities, veterans, and other folks in high profile positions, and increasing their relative proportion on campus overall

• Scholarships for bisexual men

• Have zero tolerance for racism, sexism, lack of diversity and inclusion. There need to be stronger penalties for sexism in the workplace.

Ensure that the University is addressing D&I concerns

• Should always be looking at ways to bring different backgrounds together. But CMU is doing a very good job.

• Stronger messaging to incoming students about exactly what services are available on campus. Stronger messaging to current students about resources, but also about how they can connect with each other. Cross-cultural conversations are the #1 predictor of change towards inclusion and also to leadership. Clear, direct message to faculty that diversity is a value of the institution, and that hiring practices should mirror that value.
Keep the topic at the forefront of the conversation, and continue to have senior leadership stress the importance of diversity to the faculty, staff and students

CMU should continue to promote diversity and inclusion to strengthen all programs across the campus

CMU needs to stop beating around the bush and address certain topics that might be hard to address. By addressing these problems you might have a better outcome and solution. But if CMU keeps sugarcoating a lot of the stuff (students know when your sugarcoating), then you will not reach an outcome. CMU has to address topics on racism, sexual orientation, gender identity, and sexual assaults. Even though they are uncomfortable for many, you have to be uncomfortable for change.

Address curriculum issues, promote diversity and inclusion more on campus and in the community. Create more diverse marketing images.

Changes to clubs / residency halls

- Eliminate sororities and fraternities
- Eliminate criteria-based residency. Why do all the athletes live in the same dorm? Why separate freshman from upper classmen? Freely mix students, give them a greater chance to meet other people in that way.
- Although CMU works very hard to have inclusion, and there are a lot of groups on campus such as RSOs or Greek life dedicated to diversity, everything is still very separate. There is not a lot of cohesiveness between organizations in order to make inclusion 100%.
- Remove the athletics department
- Keep watch over the clubs, because with only students running them it can get very clique-orientated
- Making sure RSOs and Frats/Sororities are being inclusive, reaching out to minority groups and seeking their opinions and advice on how to help them feel more included
- Spread diversity among ALL residential halls and Greek life along with acceptance and recognition of disabled persons

More assessment of diversity and inclusion

- Continual assessment like this with the CMU/Mount Pleasant community
- Measure it and reward the good role models. Make a bonus incentive.
- Know how everyone feels on the topic
- Understanding more about every single student, instead of looking at them as just a number

Recommendations on What Students and Student Groups Should Be Doing to Create a More Diverse and Inclusive Environment

Two hundred fourteen individuals submitted a response when asked for recommendations on what students and students groups should be doing to create a more diverse and inclusive environment. However, 42 of those respondents simply stated that they had no additional comments. The comments of the remaining 172 respondents fell into ten general categories. The categories, and the number of respondents whose comments fell into each, are presented below in Figure 274.
Figure 274: Recommendations on What Students and Student Groups Should Be Doing to Create a More Diverse and Inclusive Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have a more open mind</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have better communication among groups</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be more educated</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are already doing a good job</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do more outreach</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have more events</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should be more kind</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They should include more people</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership should take more action</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students need increased awareness</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most frequent responses were that students should have more open minds (22%), and that there needs to be better communication between groups (22%). Respondents who provided these comments often indicated that the problem is that there is not enough dialogue between groups, and often times this is because students do not have open minds towards other perspectives. Selected examples are presented below for each category.

Have a more open mind

- Make a point to talk to each other and to understand what it is like to be in uncomfortable situations. Be mindful of others’ feelings, but also try to understand that everyone is not out to offend.
- Continue talking, and be outside of their comfort zone
- Think outside of themselves for once. Check your privilege.
- Being more open to people and their lives. Don't have to necessarily agree with their lifestyle, but respect it.
- Listening, learning, keeping open minds, and realizing that the world doesn't look like white guys from Michigan, and that there are people who are different from them

Have better communication among groups

- Listening to each other
- Allowing more opportunities to have open discussions on race relations, and make them a mandatory thing for all students, because there are people that get uncomfortable when race is talked about, or people that are oblivious to it
- Getting together better. I'm a part of NAISO here on campus, and I have felt as if I have built a relationship with everyone in the club or group. But I feel as if we as a whole

---

11 Since some comments fell into multiple categories, the number of responses is greater than the number of respondents.
should get to know one another better. Because I realized that not many people knew we had a club here on campus for the Native American students, even though we do accept everyone that is willing to learn.

- More community-wide open conversations about differences
- Defend absolutely the free exchange of ideas and speech
- Talk about it, and be respectful and receptive about these discussions

**Be more educated**

- 1. Ask for diversity training!
- Students should educate themselves on a wide range of diversity groups, and be open to learning more
- Education and awareness. Bring in diverse people and talk about feelings, but with a human face to the fears and prejudice to make it real. Talk and listen to people. Being comfortable is not how we gain inclusion. Engagement and empathy are how we begin to care, and that is human to human.
- Take training, and listen to everything that the minority groups have to say
- Attend seminars to learn about different religions and customs
- Creating opportunities for conversation to help understand each other
- Proactive learning activities, and group work can help educate students how to work in diverse groups

**They are already doing a good job**

- I think the students, and student groups are already doing a lot, it needs to be more broad-scale
- Student groups do a great job, but should try to get more faculty and staff involved
- The University and our students have created an environment which already is diverse and inclusive
- They are doing great!
- I think they do a pretty good job
- I think they are doing a good job, just make sure they know to keep diversity in mind, and how it's a sensitive topic

**Do more outreach**

- Reach out more, but not by email, with face-to-face at campus events
- Trying to include more people
- Reach out to more than just their peer groups
- More active recruiting, and becoming more involved in local communities
- Do more to make people aware of them. Having a table in front of one of the buildings for a couple days out of the year, doesn't do much good for the people who don't go to that building.
- Advertise more about meetings around town--apartments, etc.
- Promoting their organizations more, so a larger amount of students will know about the opportunities and organizations on campus
- Actively reach out to those who are different

**Have more events**

- Attend events by the different clubs and organizations from different origins and cultures
- Encourage students to go to diverse events
- Have an optional diversity week, where students from different backgrounds could spend a week shadowing each other’s experiences and college lifestyle
- Have awareness nights or something
- Have a centralized calendar of events - not just the one on the home page (not much depth there).
- Education and events, create further safe spaces for people of minority representation

**Students should be more kind**
- Treat one another respectfully
- Being kind to everyone. I purposely don't join groups if I see members of that group bullying a certain race or sexual orientation.
- They should focus on respecting and caring for others and holding esteem for people with high character, morals, and values
- Be kind to all
- Just be nice to people - we've already pretty much reached this goal. It might also help to vote against Trump though.
- Just be kinder to each other!

**They should include more people**
- Most groups seem inclusive besides Greek life. Not easy to fit in, and feel unwelcomed for certain students.
- Consider also socioeconomic barriers to student participation in events
- All students should focus on inclusion for a more diverse environment. It would help all get along much better.
- Act upon becoming more inclusive--don't just talk about it.
- Include older delayed students in with younger students so no separation would occur
- Using inclusive and appropriate language, reminding students from all backgrounds they are welcome to get involved. Inviting students to social events that involve more than just giving money to support their orgs.
- Making sure to make members and peers feel included, being conscious about others around them.
- Greek life should be more culturally and racially inclusive

**Leadership should take more action**
- I am not sure this is really the students' responsibility. As long as faculty and leadership are not doing what they should be doing, students won't either.
- Student groups do a great job, but should try to get more faculty and staff involved
- encouragement from leadership to include others
- Getting more support from the administration
- The question should be: What are administrators doing to create a more diverse faculty and staff?
- Our students are doing exactly what they should be doing; expressing their displeasure with our current senior leadership. What more can they do? Their concerns made the front page of our student newspaper on October 26, 2015 and February 4, 2016. The university’s president, Dr. George Ross, responded by organizing an open forum. He had
to contact the Office for Institutional Diversity and the Center for Inclusion and Diversity, to ask for their assistance with this issue. Those two offices responsible for such activities never took it upon themselves to meet with students leaders, nor did they respond to the two newspaper articles. The situation was absolutely ridiculous.

Students need increased awareness
- Be aware of what's going on both on campus and across the nation
- More awareness, more insistence on integration
- Being aware of what is happening
- Student groups need to be very aware of their own membership criteria and social and personal biases
- Raising awareness, and educating themselves about other people

Additional Comments
One hundred seventy-seven individuals submitted a response when asked to provide additional comments at the conclusion of the survey. However, 29 of those respondents simply stated that they had no additional comments. The comments of the remaining 148 respondents fell into 11 general categories. The categories, and the number of respondents whose comments fell into each, are presented below in Figure 275.\(^\text{12}\)

**Figure 275: Additional Comments of Respondents by Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions for next steps</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire for change</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey feedback</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMU's diversity and inclusion efforts / environment</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratitude / well wishes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General comments about CMU</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity and inclusion in general</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The off-campus community</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to review survey results</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope for future</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of those who are not underrepresented</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forty-four respondents (30%) provided comments which fall into the largest category, “Suggestions for next steps”. Within this category responses fell into a few sub-categories. In

\(^{12}\) Since some comments fell into multiple categories, the number of responses is greater than the number of respondents.
the suggestions for next steps comments, many respondents showed a concern for wanting real change. These respondents indicated that they have faced real challenges, and would like to have their voices heard. Selected examples are presented below for each category.

Suggestions for Next Steps
- I hope this report will not simply be shelved like so many others have been. If I sound negative, it's because it's been a long struggle and not always a successful one.
- Staff in SDS needs training on various disabilities
- We, as a University, have a chance to create an inclusive and diverse campus. If we continue the way we are now though, it won't happen. We need to buckle down and actually talk to the minorities, talk to the town and see what they want done to better unite them. We need to listen to the students, and follow through with our promises. And overall, we need to just try. I don't think we do that enough.
- Please allow all of campus to honor Martin Luther King Jr day not just students
- I do not like how this survey came about. I am concerned that nothing will come out of this, as are many faculty involved in diversity efforts on this campus. I hope I am wrong about that.
- I don't think safe spaces and politically-correct censorship policies should become a feature of CMU

Desire for Change
- I love CMU, but we can always do better for inclusivity
- Let's make diversity work at CMU. It is overdue.
- Long overdue to address some of these issues. We should be a campus of inclusion and tolerance for differences.

Survey Feedback
- The ranking of the areas was a waste of time - just ask people to rank them!
- Make these surveys shorter
- Many of the responses I answered “unsure”, because I have not personally experienced or have been involved much outside of the classroom. Therefore, I felt I was not in the capacity to respond with “yes” or “no” answer.
- I had to answer three or four questions several times in order for this survey to move me to the next page
- This survey is a waste of time if the student is not on campus
- This survey should include a section for non-traditional students and how they might feel in regards to inclusion at CMU. As a non-traditional student, I sometimes feel "left out" or disconnected.
- Looking forward to hearing the results from this study. Thank you.
- This survey was unnecessarily long and repetitive. I appreciate you looking for my feedback, but wish my time would have been respected while helping
- Whyyyyy are these surveys sooooooooolong??????

CMU’s Diversity and Inclusion Efforts / Environment
- Life is complex. Diversity and inclusion efforts often fail to respect this complexity. We focus on the wrong things to develop a "diverse" community.
• CMU has made some strides toward becoming more diverse in recent years, but much more needs to be done. Many faculty and staff leave CMU every year because of lack of diversity, limited employment options for spouses/partners etc. CMU needs to address these concerns and take them seriously.

• CMU is a shockingly intolerant place--of difference, of knowledge about difference (that it already has in the form of some of the most educated people in the country on the topic), and of efforts to implement change. Its efforts take the form of relatively aggressive, disrespectful micro-management of employees and mostly useless, canned workshops (that NO ONE has time to add on to their already overloaded, frantic schedules).

• I have been subjected to more gender discrimination here at CMU, than any other institution I have ever worked at. I see it daily. Women are treated as second class citizens, as incompetent, and less successful than male counterparts.

Gratitude / Well Wishes
• Good luck
• Thank you for doing this
• Thank you
• I appreciate the effort that you all are putting forth to this project. I wish you the best of luck in this endeavor.
• Thank you for implementing this survey! This is such important work.
• I will say I appreciate that these can be offered and of course confidential as well. It is hard to find resources to voice your opinion and start that ball rolling in the right way.

General Comments about CMU
• I think this campus is way too liberal. It's almost like if you are a republican your opinions are racist, sexist and so on, which is blatantly false.
• I love CMU, but we can always do better for inclusivity.
• As a recent hire and new-to-Michigan staff, the "onboarding" process here at CMU was confusing, way too decentralized, and very poorly communicated. There is AMPLE opportunity to improve on welcoming new folks to Central and to Mount Pleasant: creating/sharing a webpage with links to city and local housing information; a central HR training opportunity; etc.
• Great school, need more things to keep people active on weekends that don’t involve partying. Michigan State does a great job with their "Ski Club" for keeping kids busy.
• CMU is very behind in the times, and I feel that have the University is trying to constantly keep up with other universities in the state. One of the major reasons as to why, is that the University hires its own to serve as fixed term faculty. This is a major problem in establishing diversity and experience. The University doesn't market itself as a university of diversity and cultural competency. The university needs to do a better job of advertising. In Michigan many students, if given the chance, would attend MSU or U of M as these universities provide students with more options. CMU needs to do what it can to emphasize what it excels in, yet it doesn't. Growth in diversity, as well as all other areas, like research, at CMU are behind the times. The days of calling this a teaching university that values research only works, until you don't have the students to teach.
I think CMU offers a great learning environment to those who are willing to work hard. This year is my second year in CMU as a transfer student and so far, I have had nothing but a great experience as a student in CMU.

Diversity and Inclusion in General

- Diversity and inclusion represent an issue where the cure is worse than the disease. Efforts to "force" diversity and inclusion on people are unwise and may yield the polar opposite of what is desired.
- Life is complex. Diversity and inclusion efforts often fail to respect this complexity. We focus on the wrong things to develop a "diverse" community.
- I DO NOT want MY MONEY spent on creating a more diverse University, by causing more of a discrimination of other cultures. All CMU needs to worry about, is providing an EXCELLENT education.
- Stop pretending to care about "creating a diverse learning environment" when all you really want is the appearance of one. Diversity is great, artificial diversity is the reason we have such a divided country right now.

The Off-Campus Community

- It would have been helpful if when the demographic refers to online students, that the questions be geared to not reflect the on campus environment that many of us are unfamiliar with. Questions regarding how the online community that occurs should be addressed, and what services are there to address their inclusion and diversity needs!
- I have never lived on CMU’s campus, so I could not provide an answer for a lot of the questions
- As a Global student I don't see this as an issue nor an area that even matters. We include and accept everyone.
- Sadly this survey does not seem to take into account the online, global, off campus community reactions. Maybe this question should have been asked early on and then "pushed" to the end, when answered “yes”.

Desire to Review Survey Results

- Thank you for the opportunity. Please share all results. Student and faculty voices are important. I look forward to results of the survey and changes towards equity in the near future.
- Looking forward to hearing the results from this study. Thank you.

Hope for Future

- I truly hope that the University can take the comments and information provided by these surveys and make positive changes around the University. The problem with diversity and inclusion is that it is an individual competency, but also part of the campus culture. Students must buy into inclusion, but students filter through the University every few years. It is truly up to the faculty and staff to make the culture prevalent and get the student buy-in with each new class. It is an ongoing effort. It is not something that can be a "hot topic" and then forgotten about.
- Thank you for opportunity to share my thoughts. I truly hope these results in some sort of change for our students and the Mount Pleasant community.
- I hope we actually see the administration do something, stop failing us in this area

Role of Those Who Are Not Underrepresented
I'm glad the University cares enough to want to talk about this, but I'm not sure that I as a white/ Christian/ male really have much to offer other than my own personal desire to see the campus and greater community more inclusive of others

“Unsure” and “prefer not to answer” should be separate. I feel like I don't have a good perspective on this, because I am not part of a minority group.