1.0 Introduction and Year in Review

We are pleased to bring you the Fourth Annual Dean’s Report on Diversity and Inclusion. These reports are a vehicle for us to honor our commitment to transparency and dialogue in support of continuous improvement of the conditions, policies, and practices that foster diversity and inclusion on our campus. Here we bring together data for discussion and reflect on our work, including successes, continued challenges, and plans for the next academic year.

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. We add to our lexicon this year the concept of **belonging** which has been embraced by President Faust in her efforts to put the University on a path towards inclusive excellence. As described in the recent Presidential Task Force on Inclusion and Belonging report: “Belonging is the experience that flows from participating fully in the chances Harvard offers to learn, to create, to discover, and to achieve. The experience of belonging also supports full embrace of the responsibilities of stewardship that we all have for the ongoing improvement of our community.”
As we review the academic year through the lens of diversity and inclusion, it is evident how events in the world around us have shaped our work. Even as we seek to identify and address the barriers to diversity and full inclusion on our own campus, we have come together to challenge local, national and global forces that threaten to spread injustice and inequity. We continue to broaden our efforts to host and co-sponsor events and workshops that speak to the wide range and intersections of identities represented in our community. For example, we offer Lunch and Learn, Diversity Dialogues, film screenings, and workshops on a range of topics including weight stigma, negotiation with power differentials, inclusive teaching and allyship with undocumented people. We also helped organize mixers for staff, students, and academic appointees, along with cultural celebrations in honor of the Lunar New Year, Hispanic Heritage Month, Black History Month, and Purim, to name a few.

The Office of Diversity and Inclusion has partnered with many other offices, groups and individuals at the school to create a welcoming environment, strengthen bonds and build bridges this year. We have proactively connected prospective and admitted students with current students from similar backgrounds at critical moments throughout the year. We’ve also endeavored to build deeper connections with the surrounding community, which includes supporting activities such as a Senior (Citizen) Prom and the Mission Main Thanksgiving dinner. Partnering with other offices and individuals at the school, we’ve continued to transform the physical spaces of our school with more inclusive images and symbols, including the Pride flags in building 2 and our Ghost Portraits that have graced the Kresge Atrium since last spring. The brainchild of Kristina Gravellese in the Office of Human Resources, a new series of Community Portraits that reflect the diversity of our campus including students, staff, and academic appointees will take their place in and around the Kresge Atrium.

To increase outreach to and recruitment of candidates from underrepresented groups, the school hosted its inaugural Diversity Open House in the fall of 2017. This initiative was an opportunity for prospective students from diverse backgrounds and identities to visit our campus, gain insight into the application process, and meet directly with faculty members, current students, and department administrators. The Diversity Open house brought together over 60 prospective students from across the U.S. and around the globe. The program included a faculty panel, application workshop, degree programs session, and a community reception.

Another important positive development on our campus this year has been the heightened focus on mental wellness that gained momentum thanks to the work of the Mental Health Student
Alliance along with engaged Student Services staff and faculty partners. In addition to the critical work of identifying and addressing the factors that increase stress, we aspire to become a community in which mental illness is destigmatized, neurodiversity is supported, and a range of mental health supports and services are accessible to all. New access to telephonic counseling and on-site services for students this academic year represent steps in that direction.

Looking ahead to next year, our work to advance diversity, inclusion, and belonging will be framed in part by the Presidential Task Force on Inclusion and Belonging. The report of the Task Force sets forth four broad goals: 1) Recruitment, Retention, and Development Practices for Excellence; 2) Academic, Professional, and Social Integration; 3) Union of Academic Freedom and a Culture of Mutual Respect and Concern, and 4) Inclusive Values, Symbols, and Spaces. In service of these goals, eight recommendations were articulated as follows:

1. Promote Inclusive Symbols and Spaces
2. Establish University-Wide Research Centers to Expand the University’s Research Agenda
3. Resources to Enhance Mental Health Services in Support of Well-Being
4. School and Business Unit Strategic-Planning Work
5. Alignment and Coordination of Inclusive Excellence Work in the Office of the President and Provost
6. Increased Focus of University Human Resources on Enabling Staff Talent and Improving Organizational Culture
7. Transparency, Feedback, and Dialogue: OPP Sponsors a Triennial Assessment of the University’s Progress Toward Inclusive Excellence
8. Increased Resources for Faculty Renewal and Development

While many of these recommendations focus on Harvard’s central administration, almost all have implications for our school and are echoed in our past and ongoing work. As Dean Williams noted in her communication to the School on March 28, 2018: “Enhanced support from the University, as well as the ability to learn from and benchmark against other Harvard schools, will greatly energize and strengthen our continuing work on inclusion and belonging at the School. But meaningful progress will require sustained action and attention by all of us.” We look forward to working together with all of you to strengthen diversity, inclusion and belonging, which are foundational to the pursuit of our mission.
2.0 Diversity Data

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. Forty percent of our students, 20% of faculty, and 49.5% percent of research appointees are from outside the U.S.

During the 2017-2018 academic year there were 49 countries represented among our students – including the United States. As in previous years, there were similar trends in the most represented countries with a majority of international students coming from either China or Canada. However, this year we saw a slight rise in students from Brazil, Taiwan, and Mexico. The following is a list of countries, in order of percentage, with the highest representation: China, Canada, Brazil, India, Taiwan, Nigeria, United Kingdom, Japan, South Korea, and Mexico.

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 2017 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 previous Dean’s Reports 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 18.7% which is half a percentage point above last year. As was the case in previous years the SM2 programs and SM60 programs continued to have lower percentages of students from underrepresented groups at 9.7% and 7.1%, respectively. For the SM2 programs, the low percentage of underrepresented students who matriculate is a function both of low application rates and a somewhat lower admission rate (the SM60 is a very small program and it is hard to make sense of variation year to year). In the DrPH program (also a small program) the underrepresented minority percentage increased from 23.1% in 2016 to 50.0% in 2017.

Chart 2.1.2 plots the percentage of U.S. students from underrepresented groups from 2013 to 2017 by degree. Across all programs, the share of U.S. students from underrepresented minority groups was 17.5% in 2017.

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 2017. Harvard aid does not include outside awards, loans or work (such as teaching assistantships). Nearly all student subgroups saw an increase in the percentage of students with aid (with the exception
of a 4.6% decrease in the % of underrepresented minority MPH students). The increase in the share of students receiving some aid was accompanied by small decreases in the average award across all groups. Note that financial aid for PhD students is managed by GSAS so those data are not reported here.

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 2017. 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 percentage of union staff from underrepresented groups has increased gradually since 2013 and is now at 19%. The percentage of non-union staff from underrepresented groups remained at 10.0% in 2017.

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 scientists, research associates, postdoctoral fellows 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.

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 2017. Overall the share of URM faculty at the school has increased by 0.4% since 2016.

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 2017. This year, we saw continued improvements in the overall share of women among the faculty with increases in all groups except associate professors.
**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 2013-2017. Notably, these appointees are the most international group at the school so the denominator for these graphs represents about half of the group. In 2017, the percentage of research scientists from URM groups decreased by approximately 1 percentage point while the share of research associates and postdoctoral fellows declined by approximately 0.3 percentage points.

### 3.0 Conclusion

As the school’s most recent data indicate, improving representation of those groups who face structural and institutional barriers to success in public health is a long-term effort. The school’s Offices of Admissions, Education, and Diversity and Inclusion continue to introduce new approaches (such as the Diversity Open House) to recruiting students from backgrounds that are underrepresented in our field and addressing barriers to admissions and success in partnership with faculty and program directors. Likewise, increasing application rates from women and underrepresented minority candidates for academic appointments is critical. In this area, we are optimistic that collaborative work Assistant Dean Betty Johnson has begun with peer schools to enhance pipelines into academic careers in public health will be an important platform for future investments.
Chart 2.0
International Students, Faculty and Research-based Academic Appointees at the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, 2017

- Students: 60% International, 40% Domestic
- Faculty: 80% International, 20% Domestic
- Research Appointees: 50.5% International, 49.5% Domestic
## Table 2.1.1 Applications, Admitted and Confirmed Students for U.S. URM, non-URM, and International Students by Degree, 2017

### Admission Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>SM1/MPH</th>
<th>SM2</th>
<th>SM60</th>
<th>DRPH</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>URM as % of US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non URM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>1238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>561</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### International

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>SM1/MPH</th>
<th>SM2</th>
<th>SM60</th>
<th>DRPH</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Intl as % of ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentages of all confirmed students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>URM as % of US</th>
<th>URM as % of all students</th>
<th>INT’L as % of all students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON URM</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL DEGREES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>URM</th>
<th>NON URM</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>2863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>594</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.
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**
  - 2014: 47.1%
  - 2015: 32.7%
  - 2016: 69.6%
  - 2017: 65.0%

- **U.S. Non-URM**
  - 2014: 22.3%
  - 2015: 12.1%
  - 2016: 22.8%
  - 2017: 33.5%

**SM2/SMD0**

- **U.S. URM**
  - 2014: 87.5%
  - 2015: 80.0%
  - 2016: 83.3%
  - 2017: 64.1%

- **U.S. Non-URM**
  - 2014: 64.1%
  - 2015: 58.6%
  - 2016: 56.2%
  - 2017: 61.3%

**SD/DrPH/DPH**

- **U.S. URM**
  - 2014: 100.0%
  - 2015: 100.0%
  - 2016: 100.0%
  - 2017: 87.7%

- **U.S. Non-URM**
  - 2014: 92.1%
  - 2015: 88.5%
  - 2016: 90.6%
  - 2017: 96.7%

**Note:** International students are not included in this chart. Financial aid includes Harvard aid only (excludes work and external loans).
Chart 2.1.4 Average Harvard Financial Aid for U.S. students from URM and non-URM Groups by Program, by Year

**MPH/SM1**


**SM2/SM60**


**SD/DrPH/DPH**


*Note: Financial aid includes Harvard aid only (excludes work and external loans)*
Chart 2.2.1 Percentage of U.S. Harvard School Union and non-Union Staff from Underrepresented Minority Groups, 2013-2017
Chart 2.3.1 Percentage of U.S. Harvard Chan School Primary Faculty from Underrepresented Minority Groups, 2013-2017
Chart 2.3.2 Percentage Female Harvard Chan School Primary Faculty, 2013-2017
Chart 2.3.3 Percentage of U.S. Harvard Chan School Research-focused Academic Appointees from Underrepresented Minority Groups, 2013-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Research Scientists</th>
<th>Research Associate/Fellow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>