1.0 Introduction and Year in Review

We are pleased to bring you the Third Annual Dean’s Report on Diversity and Inclusion in which we present data and information to show where we are making progress and where we need to redouble our efforts to reduce barriers to recruitment and retention of students, staff, and academic appointees from all backgrounds and identities. Diversity and inclusion are central to the mission of the Harvard Chan School. Above all, the Harvard Chan School’s efforts to increase diversity and inclusion are an expression of our commitment to equity and social justice, not only in our work as public health professionals, but also on our campus and in our community. There is also extensive scientific evidence\(^1\) that diversity with inclusion is not only beneficial to individuals in target groups but also enhances the creativity, productivity, and well-being of the community as a whole.

We reiterate our working definitions of diversity and inclusion as they are used in this report. **Diversity** refers to the composition of the community in terms of the representation of individuals with different backgrounds, identities, capabilities, and life experiences. Diversity is not limited in scope to race, ethnicity, gender, or nationality, though we often focus our data analyses on these dimensions of identity because of historic and structural inequities that continue to influence opportunities for students, staff, faculty and research appointees. Implicit in the way we use the term diversity in the context of the mission of the school is the notion that differences among students, staff, faculty, and research appointees along all dimensions can lead to stronger teamwork, a richer intellectual and cultural life at the school, and ultimately more impactful research, teaching, and policy translation in public health. **Inclusion** is the process by which the structures and policies at the school as well as the actions of groups and

---

individuals make it possible for people to thrive and contribute to their full extent at the school, regardless of background, identity, capability, and life experiences. The work of inclusion has policy elements to it that we will describe below, but to an even greater extent than diversity requires ongoing engagement by everyone in the school community through dialogue, openness to new ideas, and self-awareness.

Soon after our last Annual Report on Diversity and Inclusion, Dr. Samuel Museus of the Culturally Engaging Campus Environments initiative presented the findings and recommendations of our schoolwide climate assessment. The complete report can be found on the Office of Diversity and Inclusion website here. In brief, Dr. Museus recommended the school take the following steps to improve the climate of inclusion at the Harvard Chan School: (1) commit to providing resources and a strategic plan for diversity and inclusion; (2) enhance diversity in admissions; (3) integrate diversity and inclusion programming into orientation; (4) create more diversity and inclusion support structures; (5) foster collaboration across silos; (6) engage and recognize research associates and research scientists; (7) provide faculty professional development; (8) foster transparency and communication; and (9) add diversity and inclusion questions in course evaluations. We have made significant progress in each of these areas, which we describe below.

The school has committed substantial new resources to diversity and inclusion, through the retention of outside experts to design and implement training programs, support for speakers, events and student initiatives, and increased staffing. With regards to the last item, Dr. Betty Johnson was appointed this spring to the role of Assistant Dean for Faculty and Staff Diversity, Development and Leadership. In her new position in the Office of Academic Affairs, Dr. Johnson is developing a schoolwide strategy to support the recruitment, retention, and success of academic appointees and staff from underrepresented groups.

For the first time, Student Orientation in August (and again in January) included a day of engagement on the subject of diversity and inclusion. Self, Social and Global Awareness brought students together in small groups to examine power, privilege and identity as they affect the way we experience the world and impact others. Self, Social and Global Awareness will become a permanent part of orientation, and we will update and improve the content and experience based on feedback and lessons learned this year. The short course, Power and Differences, was also offered again this spring and for the first time opened up to everyone in
the community. Participants this year included students, staff and faculty. The Office of Diversity and Inclusion launched the Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Micro-credential as an opportunity for individuals to earn recognition for participating in an array of workshops and experiences (including those mentioned above as well as workshops offered by the Office of Diversity and Inclusion and Human Resources) that build awareness and personal mastery in the skills required to promote equity, diversity and inclusion.

Faculty professional development in support of diversity and inclusion has also been a high priority this academic year. In the fall, the Office of Diversity and Inclusion partnered with the Office of Faculty Affairs to develop a mandatory implicit bias training for all faculty search committees. In April 2017, more than 100 faculty participated in a three-hour cultural awareness and communication workshop, which focused inclusive teaching and cultural competence to promote positive student experiences. The workshop was framed using data from newly added course evaluation questions that ask students to reflect on inclusive environments and the management of microaggressions that arise in teaching or student-student interactions.

Thanks to leadership from the Student Voices Subcommittee of the Dean’s Advisory Committee on Diversity and Inclusion, the Office of Diversity and Inclusion launched an anonymous bias-related incident reporting system using a University platform supported by the Office of Risk Management and Audit Services. The system allows the School to track and address concerns as they arise and better support members of the Harvard Chan community who experience bias. A total of six reports have been received since the system launched in October 2016.

The Office of Admissions and the Office of Diversity and Inclusion conducted an admissions practices survey at the end of the last academic year. In the fall of 2016, staff from the Office of Diversity and Inclusion met individually with all departments and programs at the School to share the survey findings, review admissions data, and encourage adoption of best practices for identifying and recruiting talented students from diverse backgrounds.

Within the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, our staff continued to support many ongoing programs that have been described in previous reports and are featured on our website. A few examples of new developments this year include:
1. the Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) Fellowship program. EDI Fellows, who are trained and employed by the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, work to improve the climate of inclusion at the Harvard Chan School through the development and implementation of specific projects.

2. The establishment of the Harvard Chan Community Advisory Network, which gives community leaders a voice in shaping the School’s growing community engagement strategy.

3. The launch of a portal to identify and match students from diverse backgrounds with internship, research assistantship, and postdoctoral fellowship programs.

4. The launch of a new system to facilitate the graduate application process for prospective students. Forty percent of individuals who used this support and applied for the 2017 admissions cycle were accepted into programs.

This past year has brought new challenges to our ideas around diversity, inclusion and belonging, which appear to be under assault from political conflict, fear, and divisive rhetoric. Our campus is not untouched by the forces at play on the national and global stages, but the predominant spirit we have seen is allyship and activism. Now more than ever it is critical that we train talented students and researchers from all the communities we serve, develop the awareness and skills needed to engage with others across lines of privilege and culture, and bring our best science and communication to the most pressing public health problems.

2.0 Diversity

The Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health is committed to improving the health of people and communities in our neighborhood and around the globe. In the service of that mission, we recruit students, faculty, and researchers from around the world. Chart 2.0 (all attachments follow the text) shows the percentage of students, faculty, and researchers at the Harvard Chan School from the U.S. (citizens and permanent residents) and from all other countries combined. Approximately one third of our students, one quarter of faculty, and nearly half of research appointees are from outside the U.S.

Last year we sought to better understand the “international” category for the student population at Harvard Chan School and reviewed the number of students from 2012-2015 based on country of citizenship. We learned that in terms of global diversity, we have student
representation from 50 countries, with the majority of students coming from 10 countries. In looking at the 2016-2017 data, we notice a similar trend; we have student representation from 49 countries with the majority of students from the following countries in order of percentage: China, Canada, India, Nigeria, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Brazil and the United Kingdom.

Most of the remaining data analyses (except the analysis of gender diversity in the faculty) in this report are focused on individuals from specific U.S. racial and ethnic groups that are historically underrepresented in the public health sciences. Where we show statistics on the percentage of individuals in a particular category from U.S. underrepresented minority groups, these are calculated relative to all U.S. citizens and permanent residents in that category. In this report, the term “underrepresented minority” is used to denote U.S. citizens and permanent residents who identify as Hispanic/Latino, American Indian/Alaska Native, Black or African American, and/or Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander or mixed race with any one or more of the above identifications; these are the categories the Admissions Office is required to report according to the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System. Our methodology for computing and reporting these percentages follows the Association of Schools and Programs of Public Health (ASPPH) reporting of comparable statistics. For faculty, we also report the percentage of women because they are underrepresented and have been shown to face barriers to advancement.

### 2.1 Students

**Table 2.1.1** shows the numbers of applications, admission rates, and yield rates (the percent of admitted students who agree to attend) by degree program for the 2016 admissions cycle. The table also shows the percentage of U.S. enrolled students who are from underrepresented minority groups (labeled U.S. URM), and the percentage of all students who are from outside of the U.S. (labeled International). In reporting URM rates as a share of U.S. students, we follow the convention of the Association of Schools and Programs in Public Health. This approach is also consistent with the meaning of “underrepresented” which is in relation to the composition of the U.S. population. For completeness, however, we also report the percentage of all students that U.S. URM students represent. Prior years of data are available on the ODI website in the 2015 Dean’s Report on Diversity and Inclusion.

Representation of students from underrepresented groups varied substantially across degree programs in patterns consistent with historical trends. Among enrolled U.S. students in the MPH
program the percentage from underrepresented groups was 18.1% which is half a percentage point below last year. The SM2 program, whose overall size decreased by about one-third for the second year in a row due to implementation of educational reforms, experienced a decrease in the share of URM students that was of a similar magnitude to the previous year’s increase (about 5 percentage points). This decline was driven primarily by a reduction in the share of applications from URM candidates, although the yield also fell for this group. In the DrPH program— the URM percentage fell from 38.5% in 2015 to 23.1%. The primary cause of this decline was a reduced yield: in both years 5 URM students were admitted and the admission rate was about 10%. In 2015 all 5 URM students matriculated while only 3 of 5 did so in 2016. Across all programs and groups, the school’s yield has declined from 68.3% to 62.1%. This decline has been greater for students from URM groups, however, where the yield in 2016 was twelve percentage points below the 2015 rate.

Chart 2.1.2 plots the percentage of U.S. students from underrepresented groups from 2013 to 2016 by degree. We note that the composition of some degree programs changed in 2015 and 2016 in terms of the fields represented (e.g., several departments eliminated their SM2 programs). Across all programs, the share of U.S. students across all programs from underrepresented minority groups was 17.5% in 2016, a decrease of 0.4 percentage points relative to last year’s high of 17.9%.

Charts 2.1.3 and 2.1.4 show the average Harvard financial aid award and the percentage of students receiving Harvard aid among underrepresented minority students and all other U.S. students, respectively, by program for the academic years 2013 through 2016. Harvard aid does not include outside awards, loans or work (such as teaching assistantships). Like the admissions numbers, financial aid allocations within programs is affected by changes in degree programs that have been implemented over the past year. Many students who would have been in SM2 programs in previous years entered the MPH program in 2016; financial aid dollars have followed them, resulting in a nearly doubling of the percentage of MPH students receiving aid in 2016. The increase in the share of students receiving some aid was accompanied by a decrease in the average award. The share of students receiving financial aid in the SM2 has declined somewhat as that program has changed composition, though the average award for both URM and non-URM students increased in 2016. Financial aid awards for URM doctoral students increased in 2016 while those for non-URM doctoral students decreased by a similar increment, bringing them into rough parity.
2.2 Staff
Chart 2.2.1 shows the percentage of Harvard Chan School staff from underrepresented minority groups by union status by year for 2013 to 2016. In general, jobs at grade levels 56 and below qualify as union positions, although some jobs at the grade 56 level are non-union. The gradual increase in the percentage of union staff from underrepresented groups from 2013 plateaued in 2016 just below the 2015 rate at 18.1%. The percentage of non-union staff from underrepresented groups saw a small increase from 9.7% in 2015 to 10.0% in 2016.

2.3 Primary Faculty and Research-based Academic Appointees
The Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health relies on and is enriched by many different types of academic appointees including primary and secondary faculty, research appointees, and adjunct faculty. In this report, we present diversity data for two of these groups: primary faculty and research-based academic appointees, which include post-doctoral fellows, research associates, and research scientists. Our institution offers a range of faculty positions; however, for the purpose of this report, within the full professor category we do not include Professors of the Practice and Research Professors.

Chart 2.3.1 shows the percentage of U.S. primary faculty from underrepresented groups by rank (i.e., assistant, associate, full professor, lecturer/senior lecturer) by year for 2013 through 2016. Overall the share of URM faculty at the school has improved by 0.7% since 2015, most notably in the Associate Professor category.

Chart 2.3.2 shows the percentage of female primary faculty by rank (i.e., assistant, associate, full professor, lecturer/senior lecturer) by year for 2013 through 2016. For the first time, more than one-third of these faculty are women with the strongest gains among full professors, which represent the largest subgroup of primary faculty.

Chart 2.3.3 shows the percentage of U.S. research-based non-faculty academic appointees (i.e., postdoctoral fellows, research associates, and research scientists) from underrepresented groups by year for 2013-2016. Notably, these appointees are the most international group at the school so the denominator for these graphs represents about half of the group. In 2016, the percentage of research scientists from URM groups increase by almost 4 percentage points,
while the share of research associates and postdoctoral fellows declined by approximately 3 percentage points.

3.0 Conclusion

Looking back across all the diversity data for the school we see evidence of both challenges and successes, most notably with advancement of women faculty. For students, we find a growing need to address the admissions gap and declining yield, which is differentially affecting students from URM groups. For staff, faculty, and postdoctoral fellows we need to build on programs that exist at the school and university that create pipelines for individuals from underrepresented groups, while supporting success and wellbeing for everyone on our campus. In partnership with the Offices of Faculty Affairs and Human Resources, our new Assistant Dean for Faculty and Staff Diversity, Development and Leadership will begin plotting a course to do just that.
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## Table 2.1.1

Applications, Admitted and Confirmed Students for U.S. URM, non-URM, and International Students by Degree, 2016 Admission Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. URM</th>
<th>Applied</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Confirmed</th>
<th>Admission rate</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>U.S. Non-URM</th>
<th>Applied</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Confirmed</th>
<th>Admission rate</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>Total U.S.</th>
<th>URM as % of U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM1/MPH</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>SM1/MPH</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>SM2</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>SM60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DrPH</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>DrPH</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1368</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International</th>
<th>Applied</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Confirmed</th>
<th>Admission rate</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Applied</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Confirmed</th>
<th>Admission rate</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>URM as % of All Students</th>
<th>International as % of All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM1/MPH</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>SM1/MPH</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM2</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>SM2</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>SM60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DrPH</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>DrPH</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2964</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Because of its small size we omit the SM60 as a separate column but those students are included in the All Degrees column. 34.7% of HSPH students are International, therefore are not included in this chart.
Chart 2.1.3 Percentage Receiving Harvard Financial Aid among U.S. students from URM and non-URM Groups by Program, by Year

**MPH/SM1**

- U.S. URM: 37.5% (2013), 47.1% (2014), 69.6% (2015), 21.8% (2016)
- U.S. Non-URM: 32.7% (2013), 22.3% (2014), 12.1% (2015), 22.8% (2016)

**SM2/SM60**

- U.S. URM: 85.7% (2013), 87.5% (2014), 80.0% (2015), 66.7% (2016)
- U.S. Non-URM: 66.4% (2013), 64.1% (2014), 58.6% (2015), 56.2% (2016)

**SD/DrPH/DPH**

- U.S. URM: 89.3% (2013), 100.0% (2014), 100.0% (2015), 92.1% (2016)
- U.S. Non-URM: 90.4% (2013), 87.7% (2014), 88.5% (2015), 90.6% (2016)

Notes: 34.7% of HSPH students are International, therefore are not included in this chart. Financial aid excludes work and loans. Harvard aid only.
Chart 2.1.4 Average Harvard Financial Aid for U.S. students from URM and non-URM Groups by Program, by Year

**MPH/SM1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. URM</td>
<td>$33,977</td>
<td>$35,733</td>
<td>$58,470</td>
<td>$47,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Non-URM</td>
<td>$18,986</td>
<td>$22,684</td>
<td>$23,844</td>
<td>$23,844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SM2/SM60**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. URM</td>
<td>$27,807</td>
<td>$25,505</td>
<td>$26,636</td>
<td>$28,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Non-URM</td>
<td>$17,737</td>
<td>$17,809</td>
<td>$19,514</td>
<td>$22,568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SD/DrPH/DPH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. URM</td>
<td>$30,102</td>
<td>$31,646</td>
<td>$32,089</td>
<td>$28,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Non-URM</td>
<td>$32,161</td>
<td>$33,850</td>
<td>$32,378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 34.7% of HSPH students are International, therefore are not included in this chart. Financial aid excludes work and loans. Harvard aid only.
Chart 2.2.1 Percentage of U.S. Harvard School Union and non-Union Staff from Underrepresented Minority Groups, 2013-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Union %</th>
<th>Non-Union %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 2.3.1 Percentage of U.S. Harvard Chan School Primary Faculty from Underrepresented Minority Groups, 2013-2016

Note: 22.4% of HSPH faculty are International, therefore are not included in this chart.
Chart 2.3.2 Percentage Female Harvard Chan School Primary Faculty, 2013-2016

- **All Ranks**
  - 2013: 32.7%
  - 2014: 31.8%
  - 2015: 31.5%
  - 2016: 35.2%

- **Assistant Professor**
  - 2013: 37.0%
  - 2014: 40.0%
  - 2015: 32.0%
  - 2016: 33.3%

- **Associate Professor**
  - 2013: 45.2%
  - 2014: 41.9%
  - 2015: 40.0%
  - 2016: 40.7%

- **Full Professor**
  - 2013: 24.7%
  - 2014: 23.6%
  - 2015: 25.5%
  - 2016: 30.2%

- **Lecturer/Senior Lecturer**
  - 2013: 39.3%
  - 2014: 40.0%
  - 2015: 41.4%
  - 2016: 42.9%
Chart 2.3.3 Percentage of U.S. Harvard Chan School Research-focused Academic Appointees from Underrepresented Minority Groups, 2013-2016

Note: 48.9% of HSPH Research Scientists and Research Associate/Fellows are International, therefore are not included in this chart.