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University Mission Statement

Georgetown is a Catholic and Jesuit, student-centered research university.

Established in 1789 in the spirit of the new republic, the University was founded on the principle that serious and sustained discourse among people of different faiths, cultures, and beliefs promotes intellectual, ethical, and spiritual understanding. We embody this principle in the diversity of our students, faculty, and staff, our commitment to justice and the common good, our intellectual openness, and our international character.

An academic community dedicated to creating and communicating knowledge, Georgetown provides excellent undergraduate, graduate, and professional education in the Jesuit tradition for the glory of God and the well-being of humankind.

Georgetown educates women and men to be reflective lifelong learners, to be responsible and active participants in civic life, and to live generously in service to others.
Introduction

The Student Commission for Unity was founded as a manifestation of Contemplation in Action at work. Our research and advocacy is not merely an academic or professional exercise for undergraduate students. Instead, we endeavor earnestly to confront a society that allows the hungry to go unfed, the homeless to go without a place to rest, the poor to go uneducated, the victim to go without justice, and the alien to become marginalized.

Our research has been an opportunity for students to develop a deeper understanding of social problems in our immediate communities, truly preparing undergraduates to go into the world and engage the service of social reconstruction, social justice, education, philanthropy, community service, ministry, law enforcement, politics, or any enterprise unique to Georgetown’s pioneering graduates that enter the world “living generously for others.”
We have never restricted ourselves to a limited vision of our world, as it exists within Healy Gates. The Student Commission for Unity was founded for the work of social justice, to instigate the grander fulfillment of our Jesuit Ideals, upon which a just society ought to abide.

Our vision for Georgetown is one that actively pursues our Jesuit Ideals with all deliberate speed. In spite of societal injustice abounding throughout America and institutional barriers residing in higher education, which are heeded but unchallenged, the Student Commission for Unity hopes in the untapped potential of a humanity that deliberately seeks the good of our neighbor before the luxury of the self.

Our research is our testament, our recommendations are the vehicle of transformation. The following work has been done as an offering for social justice and for the betterment of humanity, which Georgetown can accomplish by embedding knowledge and understanding in the consciousnesses of every student who passes through Healy Gates.
Within the scope of our research, campus conceptions of class and school, education background, gender and sexual orientation, race and religion are explored in the following pages. This unprecedented student-led exploration of demographic perspectives enabled our researchers to understand in depth the problems and communities at risk at Georgetown, including but not limited to minority communities vulnerable to discrimination and marginalization, as well as majority and privileged communities who risk being complicit in the perpetuation of social inequality.

With this project, we hope not only to enhance community dialogue, but also to usher in an era of advocacy on behalf of the voiceless, and provide a space for growth for all students in our community. Together we strive towards a collective humanity that embodies a peaceful Community in Diversity of Women and Men for Others.
Research Methods

The Student Commission for Unity received Institutional Review Board approval status in March of 2008 and administered a forty-two (42) question survey on April 1st, 2008 through SurveyMonkey.com. 1,339 of the 1,517 students who began our survey online completed the full survey.

Our survey was developed from October 2007 until it was submitted to the Institutional Review Board in February of 2008. In addition to consulting with over thirty students and forty faculty, staff and administrators, our nine member Executive Board was chiefly responsible for developing the survey.

To analyze the data, we double verified SPSS cross tabulations against SurveyMonkey.com filters that were manually entered into Excel spreadsheets.

We openly recruited Georgetown University undergraduate students, organizing five research teams to conduct interviews, analyze best practices and study responses to our survey. Those research teams are:

- Class and School
- Education Background
- Gender and Sexual Orientation
- Race
- Religion

The full demographic breakdown of the students completing our survey can be found in the FULL SURVEY DATA section of our report. The full Eight Week plan each research team used can be found in the RESEARCH RESOURCES section of our report.
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Research Methods
Of the 1517 students who began the survey, 1339 (88.3%) identified their demographic information. The following breakdown occurred:

CLASS AND SCHOOL:
Enrolled in Georgetown College (COL)
- Class of 2008: 183 Students (13.7% of sampled population)
- Class of 2009: 149 Students (11.1% of sampled population)
- Class of 2010: 192 Students (14.3% of sampled population)
- Class of 2011: 194 Students (14.5% of sampled population)

Enrolled in McDonough School of Business (MSB)
- Class of 2008: 35 Students (2.6% of sampled population)
- Class of 2009: 43 Students (3.2% of sampled population)
- Class of 2010: 46 Students (3.4% of sampled population)
- Class of 2011: 63 Students (4.7% of sampled population)

Enrolled in School of Foreign Service (SFS)
- Class of 2008: 87 Students (6.5% of sampled population)
- Class of 2009: 68 Students (5.1% of sampled population)
- Class of 2010: 95 Students (7.1% of sampled population)
- Class of 2011: 89 Students (6.5% of sampled population)

Enrolled in Nursing and Health Services (NHS)*
- Class of 2008: 29 Students (2.7% of sampled population)
- Class of 2009: 19 Students (1.4% of sampled population)
- Class of 2010: 24 Students (1.8% of sampled population)
- Class of 2011: 23 Students (1.7% of sampled population)

EDUCATION BACKGROUND
- Public High School: 732 Students (54.7% of sampled population)
- Private, Non-Religious High School: 272 Students (20.3% of sampled population)
- Parochial/Religious High School: 332 Students (24.8% of sampled population)
- International Education in Grades 10-12 (Educated Outside of the U.S.): 62 Students (4.6% of sampled population)
- Home School: 4 Students (0.3% of sampled population)

GENDER AND SEXUAL ORIENTATION
- Female: 845 Students (63.1% of sampled population)
Student Commission for Unity

- Male: 476 Students (35.6% of sampled population)
- Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender or Questioning (LGBTQ): 83 Students (6.2% of sampled population)
- Did not identify as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender or Questioning (Heterosexual): 1,254 Students (93.8% of sampled population)

**RACE**
- White/Non-Hispanic: 1025 Students (76.5% of sampled population)
- Black/African American/Non Hispanic: 96 Students (7.2% of sampled population)
- Hispanic/Latino/Latin American: 105 Students (7.8% of sampled population)
- Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander: 144 Students (10.8% of sampled population)
- South Asian: 42 Students (3.1% of sampled population)
- Middle Eastern: 36 Students (2.7% of sampled population)
- Other: 37 Students (2.8% of sampled population)
- Multiracial: 80 Students (6% of sampled population)

* We are less confident in the statistical significance of demographics with less than 30 subjects

**RELIGION**
- Roman Catholic: 552 Students (41.2% of sampled population)
- Protestant Christian: 297 Students (22.2% of sampled population)
- Jewish: 87 Students (6.5% of sampled population)
- No Affiliation: 341 Students (25.5% of sampled population)
- Other: 66 Students (4.9% of sampled population)

The following populations were under-sampled and were not statistically significant. For the purposes of including them in the report, they have been grouped together. There are certain differences and trends between these groups, and their group can only be taken to represent three distinct religious minorities.

- Muslim: 23 Students (1.7% of sampled population)
- Hindu: 23 Students (1.7% of sampled population)
- Buddhist: 16 Students (1.2% of sampled population)
The following demographics were recorded. However, research teams did not analyze their specific answers to questions on our survey.

**NCAA/Club Student Athlete**
- NCAA/Club Student Athletes: 189 (14.1% of sampled population)
- Non Student Athletes: 1,150 (85.9% of sampled population)

**International Students**
- International Students: 70 (5.2% of sampled population)
- Non International Students: (94.8% of sampled population)

**Research Question:** How do Georgetown undergraduate students perceive institutional resources and conditions in relation to racism, homophobia and self-segregation?

**Assumptions:**
- Most students are tired of discussing diversity on mandatory terms.
- Students are resistant to engaging conversations where they feel they are being labeled “the problem” majority and minority students.
- Problems facing students of color are more contested than conditions for LGBTQIA students.
- Students are largely unaware of university resources.
- Resources for minorities are presumed to be targeted more explicitly for African American students.
- Lack of advertising for the Bias Reporting System would probably create a lack of awareness.
- Students from majority backgrounds (white, heterosexual, catholic) are less likely to report situations to the Bias Reporting System because they may be less likely to experience discrimination.
- Racial and sexual orientation discrimination may be more likely from students who are not from backgrounds that had integrated or accepting environments for minorities.

**Hypothesis:** Data will indicate that students are unfamiliar with and/or unsympathetic to issues relating to race, sexual orientation, and diversity.

**Defining terms:**
- AGREEMENT: This term is used in combination with graphs to indicate the combined Agree and Strongly Agree responses.
- DISAGREEMENT: This term is used in combination with graphs to indicate the combined Disagree and Strongly Disagree responses.
Observations and Facts:
1. Almost three-quarters (72.7%) of students are not familiar with the Bias Reporting System.
If you answered "Yes," have you ever reported anything to the Bias Reporting System?

Observations and Facts:
1. Only 4% of students have ever reported something to the BRS.
   - 4% is roughly one in 25 students at Georgetown.
   - 96% of students would be 24 out of 25 students.
Do you feel that Campus resources for reporting, preventing and disciplining incidents of bias are adequate?

Observations and Facts:
1. The margin between students who agreed and disagreed was 5%.
2. A narrow margin of students were more satisfied than students who were unsatisfied.
3. 47.5% of students felt that campus resources were inadequate.
Observations and Facts:
1. 81.6% of respondents AGREED or STRONGLY AGREED.
2. 8.8% of respondents DISAGREED or STRONGLY DISAGREED.
3. Students were most decisive about this question of the 21a-e group, only 9.6% of students were UNSURE.
Observations and Facts:
1. 63.2% of students AGREED or STRONGLY AGREED.
2. 17.6% of students DISAGREED or STRONGLY DISAGREED.
3. Students were also most decisive about 22a, as they were about 21a. Only 19.1% of students were UNSURE, the lowest rate in the 22 grouping.
Observations and Facts:
1. 74% of respondents AGREED or STRONGLY AGREED.
2. 9% of respondents DISAGREED or STRONGLY DISAGREED.
3. This questions responses fell in the middle of the 21a-e group: none of them had the highest or lowest response rate in the group.
Observations and Facts:
1. 63% of students AGREED or STRONGLY AGREED.
2. 14.7% of students DISAGREED or STRONGLY DISAGREED.
Observations and Facts:
1. 83.6% of students AGREED or STRONGLY AGREED.
2. 5.8% of students DISAGREED or STRONGLY DISAGREED.
3. Only 10.6% of students were UNSURE.
4. This question had the highest AGREEMENT and lowest DISAGREEMENT of the 21 grouping.
Observations and Facts:
1. 65.3% of students AGREED or STRONGLY AGREED.
2. 13.2% of students DISAGREED or STRONGLY DISAGREED, which is also the lowest level of DISAGREEMENT, as in 21c.
Observations and Facts:
1. 65.1% of students AGREED or DISAGREED.
2. 15.4% of students DISAGREED or STRONGLY DISAGREED.
3. In contrast to Interreligious Understanding, students were in least AGREEMENT with this question, and most likely to DISAGREE or STRONGLY DISAGREE with this question of the 21 grouping.
Observations and Facts:
1. 49.7% of students AGREED or STRONGLY AGREED, which is the second lowest level of AGREEMENT in the 22 group.
2. 27.5% of students DISAGREED or STRONGLY DISAGREED, which is the highest level of DISAGREEMENT in the 22 group.
Observations and Facts:
1. 65.7% of students AGREED or STRONGLY AGREED.
2. 7.5% of students DISAGREED or STRONGLY DISAGREED.
3. 26.8% of students were UNSURE. This was the highest level of UNCERTAINTY in the 21 grouping, with over a quarter of students being UNSURE.
Observations and Facts:
1. 49.3% of students AGREED or STRONGLY AGREED, the lowest level of AGREEMENT in the 22 group.
2. 12.4% of students DISAGREED or STRONGLY DISAGREED.
3. 38.3% of students were UNSURE, the highest level of UNCERTAINTY in the 22 grouping.
I ______ witness instances of discrimination by Georgetown students.

Observations and Facts:
1. 78.5% of students have at least RARELY witnessed instances of discrimination by students.
2. 36.5% of students have SOMETIMES, OFTEN or REGULARLY witnessed discrimination by students.
I ______ witness instances of discrimination by Georgetown faculty, staff or administrators.

Observations and Facts:
1. 43.8% of students have witnessed discrimination by Georgetown faculty, staff or administration.
2. 12% of students have SOMETIMES, OFTEN or REGULARLY witnessed discrimination by faculty, staff or administrators.
Observations and Facts:

1. 46.5% of students have felt targeted by discrimination by students.
2. 17.6% of students SOMETIMES, OFTEN or REGULARLY feel the target of discrimination by students.
I _____ feel I am the target of discriminatory words, actions and/or decisions by Georgetown faculty, staff or discrimination.

Observations and Facts:
1. 25.4% of students have felt targeted by discrimination by faculty, staff or discrimination (typo).
2. 5.2% of students have SOMETIMES, OFTEN or REGULARLY felt targeted by discrimination by faculty, staff or discrimination (typo).
Observations and Facts:
1. 48.6% of students have ignored discrimination in the past.
2. Similar proportions of students APPROACHED a situation or COMFORTED a victim.
3. Students were most likely to DISCUSS the situation with family or friends.
4. There is little connection between students and faculty/staff, as only 15.7% of students discuss these situations with each other.
I ______ feel uncomfortable at Georgetown because of my identity.

Observations and Facts:
1. 53.2% of students have felt uncomfortable at Georgetown because of their identity.
2. 24.8% of students have SOMETIME, OFTEN or REGULARLY felt uncomfortable.
I ______ attend religious services.

Observations and Facts:
1. Proportions of students attending religious services are fairly evenly distributed.
2. 78.3% of students have attended religious services.
3. 31.2% of students REGULARLY or OFTEN attend religious services.
Observations and Facts:

1. 50.6% of students have attended religious services of a group other than their own.
2. 2.5% of students OFTEN or REGULARLY attend religious services of a group other than their own.
Alcohol is a factor in instances of discrimination at Georgetown.

Observations and Facts:
1. 62% of student AGREE or STRONGLY AGREE.
2. 16.4% of students DISAGREE or STRONGLY DISAGREE.
3. One-fifth (21.6%) of students were UNSURE.
Georgetown students do form their opinion of others based on stereotypes.

Observations and Facts:
1. 66.4% of students AGREED or STRONGLY AGREED.
2. 12.6% of students DISAGREED or STRONGLY AGREED.
Observations and Facts:
1. 76.2% of students AGREE or STRONGLY AGREE.
2. 8.1% of students DISAGREE or STRONGLY DISAGREE.
3. The UNCERTAINTY of the responses is very low for this question. Students seem to be very familiar or very opinionated with the term Self Segregation.
Observations and Facts:
1. 54.5% of students AGREE or STRONGLY AGREE.
2. 30.6% of students DISAGREE or STRONGLY DISAGREE.
Observations and Facts:
1. Students were four times as likely to STRONGLY DISAGREE that Self Segregation was a problem in High School than a problem at Georgetown. This is surprising given the segregated housing patterns in America.
2. There are strikingly similar levels of UNCERTAINTY.
Racism does influence the behavior or attitudes of students, faculty and staff.

Observations and Facts:
1. 33.3% of students AGREE or STRONGLY AGREE.
2. 37.4% of students DISAGREE or STRONGLY DISAGREE.
3. There is a fairly symmetrical pattern to this graph.
4. Questions of race found results that were most polarized, while also the highest levels of UNCERTAINTY in the 51 group.
Racism is a problem at Georgetown.

Observations and Facts:
1. 33.6% of students AGREED or STRONGLY AGREED.
2. 34.7% of students DISAGREED or STRONGLY AGREED.
3. This graph also features symmetrical features.
4. Questions of race found results that were most polarized, while also the highest levels of UNCERTAINTY in the 51 group.
Observations and Facts:
1. 34% of students AGREE or STRONGLY AGREE
2. 32.1% of students DISAGREE or STRONGLY AGREE.
3. This graph also features symmetrical features.
4. Questions of race found results that were most polarized, while also the highest levels of UNCERTAINTY in the 51 group.
Homophobia is a problem at Georgetown.

Observations and Facts:
1. 60.6% of students AGREE or STRONGLY AGREE.
2. 17% of students DISAGREE or STRONGLY DISAGREE.
3. Questions relating to Sexual Orientation found more affirmation than questions of Race.
Observations and Facts:
1. 56.6% of students AGREE or STRONGLY AGREE.
2. 16.3% of students DISAGREE or STRONGLY DISAGREE.
3. Questions relating to Sexual Orientation found more affirmation than questions of Race.
4. Students were less UNSURE about Sexual Orientation issues than Racial issues.
Observations and Facts:
1. 91.9% of students AGREED or STRONGLY AGREED.
2. 2.7% of students DISAGREED or STRONGLY DISAGREED.
3. Students indicated very little UNCERTAINTY, only 4.4% were UNSURE.
Observations and Facts:
1. 23.3% of students AGREE or STRONGLY AGREE.
2. 53.7% of students DISAGREE or STRONGLY DISAGREE.
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Introduction

Every student at Georgetown has a different experience that in large part is determined by their school and year at Georgetown. These factors determine in large part the people that students will interact with on a daily basis. The classes that students are required to take impact their interactions with other students. This portion of the project especially explores the role of school and year on students' perception of the state of affairs at Georgetown.
Of the 1517 students who began the survey, 1339 (88.3%) identified their Class Year. The following breakdown occurred:

**Enrolled in Georgetown College**
- Class of 2008: 183 Students (13.7% of sampled population)
- Class of 2009: 149 Students (11.1% of sampled population)
- Class of 2010: 192 Students (14.3% of sampled population)
- Class of 2011: 194 Students (14.5% of sampled population)

**Enrolled in McDonough School of Business**
- Class of 2008: 35 Students (2.6% of sampled population)
- Class of 2009: 43 Students (3.2% of sampled population)
- Class of 2010: 46 Students (3.4% of sampled population)
- Class of 2011: 63 Students (4.7% of sampled population)

**Enrolled in School of Foreign Service**
- Class of 2008: 87 Students (6.5% of sampled population)
- Class of 2009: 68 Students (5.1% of sampled population)
- Class of 2010: 95 Students (7.1% of sampled population)
- Class of 2011: 89 Students (6.5% of sampled population)

**Enrolled in Nursing and Health Services**
- Class of 2008: 29 Students (2.7% of sampled population)
- Class of 2009: 19 Students (1.4% of sampled population)
- Class of 2010: 24 Students (1.8% of sampled population)
- Class of 2011: 23 Students (1.7% of sampled population)

*We are less confident in the statistical significance of demographics with less than 30 subjects than those with more than 30 subjects.*

**Research Question:**
How do Hoyas views and awareness of others change throughout their time at Georgetown and how is the level of awareness different across schools at Georgetown?

**Assumptions:**
It is assumed that the opinions of freshman are more salient because they answer the survey from a fresher viewpoint.
It is assumed that seniors are more likely to report that the state of affairs at Georgetown is acceptable.
It is assumed that there are more incidents than are actually reported. It is assumed that juniors and seniors will not be at either extreme and that the classes will follow a relatively linear progression. It is assumed that freshmen are less likely to know people unlike themselves and seniors are less likely to hang out with new people because they are set in their ways. It is assumed that freshmen are less likely to know how to report incidents, sophomores are the least likely to put themselves out there to meet new people, and juniors and seniors are less likely to see people unlike themselves due to living conditions. It is assumed that juniors and seniors are more exposed to bias incidents and freshmen and sophomores are more isolated in Georgetown so they are less likely to notice incidents. It is assumed that students in the MSB are most likely to lack awareness of problems at Georgetown and students in the SFS are most likely to be acutely aware of any issues of discrimination at Georgetown. It is assumed that students in the NHS will be overall more agreeable and have better interactions with others.

Hypothesis:
As a person advances through their years at Georgetown they will be more likely to assume that relations and responses to incidents at Georgetown are adequate. People in the MSB are most likely to have an optimistic view of Georgetown, while the SFS will be most likely to have a pessimistic view of Georgetown.
Observations and Facts:

1. SFS was the most familiar and the NHS was the least familiar with the system.

2. MSB 09 (14%) was the least familiar class with the Bias Reporting System.

3. The classes of 08 and 09 were the most familiar with Bias Reporting System.

4. However, considering the lack of publicity the numbers are relatively high.

5. SFS 09 (42.6%) has the highest overall familiarity.
Observations and Facts:

1. There are a very high number of no reports (MSB 09, 11, NHS 09, 10, 11).
2. SFS 09 (10.5%) is the most likely to use the system and the MSB 09 was not responsive. Similar trends as question 11.
3. COL and MSB are pretty proportional, with similar amounts of people who knew about it.
4. As a whole, the SFS is more likely to make a report.
Do you feel that Campus resources for reporting, preventing and disciplining incidents of bias are adequate?

Observations and Facts:
1. 2011 found resources generally adequate.
2. More people say it’s adequate than knew about BRS.
3. 09 say it’s least adequate, except for SFS 09 (44.6%).
4. 71.4% of NHS 10 says it’s adequate.
5. SFS is most constant.
Observations and Facts:

- Over 70% of people in every category are in AGREEMENT with this statement.
- Freshmen tend to STRONGLY AGREE most with this statement.
- MSB students are in AGREEMENT with this statement more than any other school.
- No one in the NHS STRONGLY DISAGREED with this statement.
- SFS classes ’10 (18.1%) and ’11 (20.2%) have a high percentage of people UNSURE of this statement.
- MSB ’10 (6.5%) is only class in MSB that STRONGLY DISAGREE with this statement.
Observations and Facts:

- All 4 freshman classes STRONGLY AGREED more than the senior classes for the same school.
- MSB tends to AGREE less and DISAGREE more as they progress through Georgetown.
- Approximately 75% of each class in the NHS are in AGREEMENT with this statement.
- MSB ’08 has highest DISAGREE bar with 28.6% of respondents disagreeing.
Georgetown promotes Women and Men for Others.

Observations and Facts:
- **MSB** has the highest rate of **UNCERTAINTY**.
- **MSB** has the lowest rate of **AGREEMENT**. All the other classes and schools have between 70 and 80% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statements.
- No respondents in the **NHS** **STRONGLY DISAGREED** with this statement.
- **SFS** has the highest rate of **DISAGREEMENT** and strongly disagreement combined.
- Relatively few people **STRONGLY DISAGREE** with this statement.
- **SFS 09** most likely to **AGREE** with this statement (63.2%)
Georgetown students exhibit Women and Men for Others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COL '08</th>
<th>COL '09</th>
<th>COL '10</th>
<th>COL '11</th>
<th>MSB '08</th>
<th>MSB '09</th>
<th>MSB '10</th>
<th>MSB '11</th>
<th>SFS '08</th>
<th>SFS '09</th>
<th>SFS '10</th>
<th>SFS '11</th>
<th>NHS '08</th>
<th>NHS '09</th>
<th>NHS '10</th>
<th>NHS '11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:

- No one in the NHS STRONGLY DISAGREED with this statement.
- In the MSB, there is a clear downward trend in respondents STRONGLY AGREED with this statement as they get older.
- COL respondents tend to DISAGREE more as they get older (except for the senior class).
- UNSURE bars relatively high across all classes and schools as compared with previous Jesuit Ideals
Georgetown promotes Interreligious Understanding

### Observations and Facts:
- Fewer NHS students STRONGLY AGREE with this statement, but have the highest agree percentage.
- SFS is most UNSURE about this statement.
- A lot fewer people STRONGLY DISAGREE with this statement than previous Jesuit Ideals.
- COL and SFS have a steady AGREE percentage over the different classes.
- Freshmen are most likely to find DISAGREEMENT with this statement.
Observations and Facts:

- COL respondents answer this question relatively steadily across different academic years.
- NHS ’11 has as many respondents UNSURE as AGREE with this statement.
- There is a downward trend in percentage of respondents who STRONGLY AGREE with this statement in the MSB as they get older.
- No one in the NHS STRONGLY DISAGREE with this statement.
- 0% of NHS ’08 and ’09 STRONGLY AGREE with this statement.
Observations and Facts:

- More people are UNSURE about this statement, especially in the SFS.
- There was less overall AGREEMENT with this statement except in the NHS.
- NHS respondents tend to DISAGREE more with this statement as they get older.
- 1 in 4 respondents of COL ’09 DISAGREE with this statement.
- Approximately 1 in 5 respondents in the SFS disagree with this statement.
- Almost no one in MSB STRONGLY DISAGREED with this statement except MSB ’10.
Observations and Facts:

- 0% of NHS ‘08 STRONGLY AGREE with this statement.
- DISAGREEMENT with this statement is very high across the all classes and schools.
- SFS ‘10 respondents DISAGREE with this statement at a higher frequency than AGREE with this statement.
- This statement had a higher percentage of respondents STRONGLY DISAGREEING than any of the other Jesuit Ideals.
Observations and Facts:

- There is a lot higher percentage of people UNSURE about this statement. This could possibly be because they do not know the meaning of this statement.
- NHS '10 has the highest STRONGLY DISAGREE mark (4.2%).
- NHS STRONGLY AGREED with this statement the most.
- Overall AGREEMENT with this statement dropped possibly because people were more UNSURE.
- COL, SFS, and MSB have steady AGREEMENT over the different classes.
Observations and Facts:

- High percentage of respondents answering this question UNSURE in all classes and schools.
- Responses in the COL are relatively similar across all classes.
- NHS has the highest overall AGREEMENT with this statement.
- SFS has the highest overall DISAGREEMENT with this statement.
Observations and Facts:

- COL, MSB, and SFS respondents tend to answer never to this question at a lower percentage as they progress through their education at Georgetown.
- MSB ’08 and ’09 respond SOMETIMES and OFTEN much more frequently than MSB ’10 and ’11.
- NHS ’10 has one of the highest percentage of respondents answering REGULARLY (4.2%) but none of the other NHS classes had any respondents answer REGULARLY.
- NHS ’08 and ’10 have very similar percentage breakdowns for each response.
Observations and Facts:

- NEVER bars are much higher than the same question about Georgetown students.
- Respondents in all four schools tend to answer SOMETIMES with an increasing frequency as they get older.
- Responses of RARELY and OFTEN are reported more frequently with age in COL.
- Very few respondents answered REGULARLY.
- Respondents reported much fewer instances of OFTEN witnessing instances of discrimination when compared with students. This could possibly be due to the fact that students do not spend as much time with faculty, staff and administrators.
Observations and Facts:

- In the MSB there is an upward trend in percentage of people responding RARELY as they get older.
- MSB, COL, and SFS have downward trends in percentage of people responding NEVER as they get older.
- MSB ’10 and NHS ’11 have relatively high REGULARLY bars at 4.3% but all of the other classes in both schools report 0% of people answering REGULARLY to this question.
- The percentage of respondents answering REGULARLY to this question in the SFS stays fairly steady across classes except for ’08.
- MSB answers OFTEN and REGULARLY at a much lower frequency than all the other schools.
- There is an upward trend in percentage of people answering SOMETIMES in the COL and SFS as they get older.
Observations and Facts:

- A very clear majority answer NEVER to this question (between 62.5 and 85.7% of any given class).
- There is an upward trend in percentage responses of RARELY in COL and MSB as they get older.
- COL, MSB, and SFS have downward trends in the percentage of respondents answering NEVER as they get older.
- MSB ’10 has the highest percentage of respondents answering REGULARLY (4.3%).
- Every school and class has over 90% of respondents answering NEVER or RARELY.
Observations and Facts:

- Most people DISCUSS instances, and few REPORT it.
- Only MSB 10 and NHS 08 had over 10% REPORT it.
- MSB 10 is the outlier for the MSB.
- Seniors (except in the SFS) are more likely to talk to professors than freshman.
- There may be an international correlation for SFS.
- 48.3% of the MSB 08 APPROACHED the person.
- NHS REPORTS the most and REPORTS the least.
I ______ feel uncomfortable at Georgetown because of my identity.

Observations and Facts:
- A greater percentage of respondents answered REGULARLY to this question.
- It is interesting that people do not report facing discrimination but are still uncomfortable at Georgetown because of their identity.
- There is a downward trend in respondents in the SFS answering REGULARLY as they get older.
- NHS ’10 have the exact same percentage of respondents answering NEVER as RARELY.
- There is a downward trend in percentage of respondents in the MSB answering NEVER as they get older.
Observations and Facts:
- Increase in percentage of respondents answering RARELY as class year increases in SFS
- Responses of REGULARLY decrease with age in COL
- Every Freshman class other than MSB answered REGULARLY most frequently
- Responses of REGULARLY and OFTEN are inversely related
Observations and Facts:
- MSB has highest percentage of respondents answering NEVER
- There is a decreasing trend in percentage of respondents answering SOMETIMES in NHS with age
Observations and Facts:

- SFS ’08 over 70% in AGREEMENT with this statement
- NHS has lower levels of DISAGREEMENT as a whole than other schools
- 1 in 5 respondents in COL are UNSURE
- 50% of all classes except MSB ’10 are in AGREEMENT with this statement
- Upward trend as respondents got older in AGREEMENT with this statement in the SFS
Georgetown students do form their opinion of others based on stereotypes.

Observations and Facts:

- 2/3 of all respondents except MSB ’10 and ’11 in AGREEMENT with this statement
- Approximately 70% of every senior class in AGREEMENT
- NHS has a much lower UNSURE rate
- There is a much higher level of AGREEMENT with age in the MSB
- NHS ’10 and MSB ’11 have a high rate of DISAGREEMENT in comparison with other classes
Observations and Facts:

- COL and SFS have the highest levels of STRONGLY AGREE
- DISAGREEMENT decreases with age in COL MSB and SFS
- 0% of NHS STRONGLY DISAGREE with this statement
- There is a downward trend in responses of UNSURE as respondents got older in the COL and SFS
- 0% of NHS ’09 DISAGREE with this statement
Observations and Facts:

- AGREEMENT with this statement was lower than previous question therefore people think that self-segregation is more of a problem at Georgetown
- More NHS respondents AGREE with this statement than the previous
- Higher percentage of people responding UNSURE except for in the NHS
- DISAGREEMENT is much higher than previous question
Racism does influence the behavior or attitudes of students, faculty and staff.

Observations and Facts:

- A lot higher DISAGREEMENT with this statement than previous questions
- DISAGREEMENT decreases with age in the COL
- COL tends to AGREE more with age
- STRONGLY DISAGREE and UNSURE responses decrease with age in the MSB
- UNSURE bars are very high
Racism is a problem at Georgetown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COL '08</th>
<th>COL '09</th>
<th>COL '10</th>
<th>COL '11</th>
<th>MSB '08</th>
<th>MSB '09</th>
<th>MSB '10</th>
<th>MSB '11</th>
<th>SFS '08</th>
<th>SFS '09</th>
<th>SFS '10</th>
<th>SFS '11</th>
<th>NHS '08</th>
<th>NHS '09</th>
<th>NHS '10</th>
<th>NHS '11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>6.6% 7.4% 5.2% 7.7%</td>
<td>2.9% 9.3% 10.9% 19.0%</td>
<td>4.6% 4.5% 5.3% 6.7%</td>
<td>0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19.7% 27.9% 43.5% 24.8%</td>
<td>34.9% 23.2% 31.5% 21.7%</td>
<td>20.7% 26.3% 26.1% 21.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>33.9% 29.1% 31.9% 30.9%</td>
<td>14.3% 38.5% 28.3% 31.7%</td>
<td>25.3% 28.4% 30.5% 30.3%</td>
<td>48.3% 42.1% 43.5% 36.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30.6% 23.6% 23.0% 22.7%</td>
<td>20.0% 18.6% 13.0% 9.5%</td>
<td>29.9% 34.3% 29.5% 22.5%</td>
<td>24.1% 26.3% 17.4% 17.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9.3% 10.8% 9.4% 7.7%</td>
<td>11.4% 4.7% 4.3% 4.8%</td>
<td>17.2% 7.5% 11.6% 9.0%</td>
<td>6.9% 5.3% 13.0% 4.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:

- NHS has very high UNSURE percentage
- MSB has much higher rates of DISAGREEMENT
- AGREEMENT increases with age
- NHS doesn’t STRONGLY DISAGREE at all
- SFS ’08 (17.2%) has the highest percentage of respondents STRONGLY AGREEING
Observations and Facts:

- 1/3 of respondents answered UNSURE
- AGREEMENT increase with age in MSB and COL
- STRONGLY DISAGREE decreases with age in the SFS
- MSB has the highest rates of DISAGREEMENT with this statement
- NHS has slightly higher rates of AGREEMENT than the other schools
Homophobia is a problem at Georgetown.

Observations and Facts:

- Majority of respondents in AGREEMENT with this statement
- Higher rates of AGREEMENT in '08 classes than '11 classes
- STRONGLY AGREE is higher in COL and SFS than MSB and NHS
- MSB has high percentage of people responding UNSURE
- Percentage of people responding UNSURE decreases with age in COL, MSB, and SFS
LGBTQ students do face discrimination or alienation at Georgetown.

Observations and Facts:
- Fewer respondents STRONGLY DISAGREE with this statement than previous question
- SFS ’09 and MSB ’10 have highest rate of STRONGLY DISAGREE
- DISAGREEMENT decreases with age in SFS and MSB
- AGREEMENT decreases with age in MSB
- Rates of responses of UNSURE decrease with age in COL
Observations and Facts:

- Almost every class has 70% responding in AGREEMENT
- MSB ’10 has the highest percentage of people responding STRONGLY DISAGREE
- SFS has the highest rates of people responding STRONGLY AGREE
- Class of ’08 answered STRONGLY AGREE more than any other classes except in NHS
- NHS ’10 is only class in NHS that has any respondents answering STRONGLY DISAGREE
Student Commission for Unity

Class: Q51k

Observations and Facts:

- High rate of overall DISAGREEMENT
- AGREEMENT with this statement decreases with age
- MSB ’10 has a very high percentage of respondents answering STRONGLY AGREE
- High percentage of respondents answering UNSURE
- NHS ’10 is only class in NHS that STRONGLY AGREE with this statement
Critical Analysis

Uncertainty

One of the major trends that our data exposed was a degree of uncertainty that respondents possessed about the state of affairs of Georgetown as a campus.

A large proportion of people stated that they were unsure about how well Georgetown is promoting and living up to the Jesuit Ideals (21a-22e). This is particularly significant because Georgetown has set these ideals as a goal for them to live up to, and yet, the student population is not sure whether the students reflect these goals. Respondents feel that the Jesuit Ideals are a way to ensure that Georgetown as a community is a tolerant and accepting place to live. They see a promotion of the Jesuit Ideals as a possible solution to diversity problems on campus. A member of COL ’08 wrote that Georgetown should “make sure to promote the Jesuit ideals and try not to stray from the schools identity with the Catholic Church,” when asked how Georgetown could solve diversity related problems on campus. It is clear from this example, as one of many, that respondents do not generally believe that Georgetown has done an adequate job of explaining and promoting the Jesuit Ideals as a whole. Some respondents chose specific Jesuit Ideals that Georgetown has not publicized enough, whereas emphasizing them could create real change on campus. “There must be a strong commitment to ‘men and women for others’ as a founding principle of Catholic education. It is too often a slogan that people use to paper
over real instances of discrimination and privilege at Georgetown,” wrote a member of SFS ’08. Respondents point to the promotion of Jesuit Ideals as a relatively simple first step to solving a large, complex problem.

Respondents were also relatively unsure whether Georgetown students form their opinions of others based on stereotypes (51b). Although the majority agreed with this statement, over 20% of most classes answered “Unsure” to this question, this was most likely to be the case in the class of 2010. This answer may stem from respondents unwillingness to postulate about what others think, but could just as easily be a lack of awareness as to how people categorize and speak about their friends or peers. Those who agreed with this statement often stated that Georgetown as a campus overemphasized one ideal. Respondents feel that Georgetown should, “Make sure students of all types and backgrounds are made to feel welcome at Georgetown. [Georgetown should] place less emphasis on embodiment of the white, affluent, suburban East Coast ideal,” wrote a member of COL ’08. As can be noted from this response, this student speaking against the promotion of stereotypes is employing the stereotype of Jane and Joe Hoya that is widely noted on campus.

Respondents were also unsure as to whether racism influences the attitudes and behavior of faculty, staff, and administrators (51e). It was posited that this could be due to the limited number of interactions that students have with faculty, staff, and administrators as opposed to the number of interactions they have with their peers. This is ultimately supported by the fact that both the
COL and the MSB displayed a trend of respondents being less likely to be unsure and more likely to agree as they progressed through their career at Georgetown. However, it could also be due to the types of classes that students are taking, that clearly differ from freshman year to senior year. As a freshman, one tends to be in larger classes that provide less interaction on a personal level with the professor than the classes one would take as a senior.

Approximately one-third of respondents were unsure as to whether students of color do face alienation or discrimination at Georgetown (51g). This could be the result of a general lack of familiarity with the experiences of students of color at Georgetown, which points to the larger problem of a lack of interaction between students of color and white students. The same result was reported for the question of whether LGBTQ students face alienation or discrimination at Georgetown. This is particularly interesting due to the fact that many more publicized incidents occurred involving discrimination against LGBTQ students. Many students feel that the solution to this problem is addressing the issues of self-segregation that exist on campus. One member of COL '11 stated that “a lot of the problem boils down to admissions: despite what entering undergraduates are told, Georgetown does not have a lot of minorities. As a result, minorities often self-segregate and do not integrate with the larger community, because they often feel left out and different from the majority.” Students would therefore like to see self-segregation addressed in order to reduce the uncertainty about the experiences of their fellow Hoyas.
Another main trend was how profoundly different the perception of diversity on Georgetown’s campus was among students in the NHS as opposed to students in the COL, SFS, and MSB. NHS respondents very rarely strongly disagreed with the questions put forth and were more likely to feel that Georgetown had a non-discriminatory campus. NHS respondents had a greater tendency to respond that what was being done currently on campus was an adequate method of dealing with diversity issues on campus. NHS respondents also seemed to be the most tolerant and accepting of a more diverse group of students. One member of NHS ’11 stated that she has “no problem hanging out with people of other races or ethnicities but it is very daunting because everyone seems to hang out with their own "kind." It makes it very hard to branch out and make Georgetown truly feel like a community.” This feeling implies that many students in the NHS would like to reach out to students unlike themselves but feel that Georgetown’s campus does not do enough to promote these types of interactions among students. The dispersion of data could be in part due to the smaller sample size from the NHS. It was posited that this could be due to the nature of the education that nursing students receive that puts a lesser degree of emphasis on competition among students. It was also posited that these responses could be driven by the gender makeup of the NHS as a whole, which tends to be predominantly female.
Although the MSB followed the same trends as COL and SFS, MSB as a whole was less likely to think that diversity issues were a problem on campus. It was found that the MSB was least likely to feel that LGBTQ Hoyas and students of color face discrimination on Georgetown’s campus. The MSB as a school was also least likely to feel that racism and homophobia were a problem on Georgetown’s campus. One member of MSB ’09 stated “I don't really think racism or stereotyping is a problem.” It is also significant that the MSB is the least religiously active school on campus with approximately 45% of respondents attending religious services rarely to never. MSB respondents also disagree that racism influences the behavior and attitudes of students, faculty, and staff to a greater extent than any of the other schools. One member of MSB ’10 stated “diversity and tolerance are ideals to which everyone should strive both personally and professionally however I feel like this campus is developing into a culture where a vocal minority is put before the concerns of the majority. This is a Roman Catholic School and I believe that in many ways the school fails to live up to that identity and respect the beliefs and needs of the majority of the student body.” This respondent emphasizes that the administration should act in the interest of the majority rather than creating centers for minority groups on campus. MSB students were also the least likely to agree that interacting with people unlike myself does enrich my college experience (51j). Other than the class of ’08, MSB students feel that diversity is discussed too much on campus 33.2% of the time, as opposed to 21.7% in the College, 23.9% in the SFS and 15.8%
in the NHS. One member of MSB ’10 stated that “there is a feeling of forced diversity on campus; the diversity efforts seem to take themselves too seriously.” Additionally, one member of MSB ’09 stated that “constantly discussing diversity and the need to embrace it, how it is best to enjoy diversity etc. just brings more attention to the fact that Georgetown is a diverse place which, while it is a good thing that we appreciate, also brings negative attention. I think people get tired of hearing about it- I think that most of us are really good about enjoying the diversity on our own and already accepting it, and constantly talking about makes it seem like it is something that we haven't already accepted, as if it’s a problem.” This is an example of the feeling that many MSB respondents have that Georgetown students are fully embracing the diversity of Georgetown and that more attempts on behalf of the administration will seem too preachy.

**Apparent Contradictions**

A third important fact to note was the fact that witnessing instances of discrimination did not translate to the feeling that that same type of discrimination was a problem on Georgetown’s campus. For example, MSB ’09 respondents answered the question “Students of color do face alienation or discrimination” with 31% of people agreeing or strongly agreeing; however, MSB ’09 also respond to the question “Racism is a problem at Georgetown” with only 22% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing. This fact points to the possibility that people see their own experiences with discrimination as isolated
incidents. On the other hand, these same people may also not feel that the instances of discrimination that they have witnessed or are aware of are not particularly problematic in their own right. This is demonstrated by this member of COL ’11, “We have a strong and unified undergrad community. There are some people who are not tolerant of others, but their actions should not be counted as the reflection of the undergrad community as a whole.” Freshmen tended to be the exemplar of this trend by over-indexing in having witnessed an instance of discrimination, but also having a more idealistic view of Georgetown as a campus. As a class, the class of 2011 was less likely than the other classes to think that any of the types of discrimination discussed were problems on campus. “The university is doing a fine job. I believe last semester was an aberration, and [they] dealt with appropriately,” stated a member of MSB ’11. This was an interesting statement for a freshman to have made since there experience with Georgetown was limited to only two semesters, one of which saw serious discrimination problems. This was a trend that when considered was surprising as approximately 85% of respondents from each class had witnessed at least one incident that they consider discrimination, yet only 40% of respondents agree or strongly agree that racism is a problem at Georgetown and only 70% agree or strongly agree that homophobia is a problem at Georgetown. One member of COL ’09 stated, “…I have encountered very few instances where people were genuinely disrespectful or unkind because of prejudice. Those who do exhibit those behaviors are almost always universally condemned. As far as
homophobia or prejudice against homosexuals, I think Georgetown is certainly better than most college schools. There's definitely a baseline bias against homosexuality, but again, it's lower than the norm, and even if it's not, it only rarely (with idiots who should be severely penalized) manifests itself in mistreatment or abuse.” Some of these incidents are also reported in the student newspapers so they are widely publicized on campus and are difficult to be unaware of. As a member of MSB ‘11 stated that, “the majority of students in general are happy the way things are, regardless of the correctness of the situation. However, the problem is that the minority groups might be unhappy (LGBTQ discrimination happens more frequently than we'd like).” From this example, it can be noted that students are not unaware of any instances of discrimination on campus, but as they are not on the receiving end of any discrimination they do not feel the urgency of making changes to make all students on campus more accepted and included.

A trend that ran contrary to this idea was also noted, namely that many students feel uncomfortable at Georgetown because of their identity but do not feel they are the target of discrimination on campus. This could be in part due to the transitional nature of college years but points to a larger problem with Georgetown not being as inclusive or supportive as it could be in making this transition easier for its students. Although people do not feel they are the target of discrimination, there are clear stereotypes that are held to be the “typical” Georgetown student. As one respondent noted, this archetype is “Jane/Joe Hoya
-- white, rich, preppy, East Coast, private-school educated,"” and if a person does not match the description it is easy to understand why they might feel uncomfortable. One of the more common causes of discomfort on campus is socio-economic differences, a category that this study was unable to capture. Many students feel that money is an inhibiting factor in their social lives. One member of NHS ’08 stated that Georgetown should create “more ways on campus for kids to interact without having to spend money. Spending money is a large limiting factor in my social life here and I find it to be the most alienating aspect of my social interaction here.” This comment shows the underlying idea that there are clearly defined stereotypes and if a person does not fit them then they will be uncomfortable. It is also significant that these students often alter their persona in order to better match the stereotypes.

Polarizing Questions

Another interesting factor of the responses was that respondents tend to have very strong opinions on the topics being discussed, namely diversity. Overall, these diversity questions seemed to be polarizing with a substantial number of people either strongly agreeing or strongly disagreeing. These students exhibit either a strong confirmation of a problem that faces Georgetown or a strong denial of the existence of a problem. One member of SFS ’10 stated that “self-segregation is one of the most important issues to address, and one way of doing so is to hold more events that are collaborations between student groups representing different religions, cultures, backgrounds, etc.” On the other
hand, one member of COL ’11 stated that Georgetown should “eliminate the LGBTQ center. Stop discussing diversity so much.” This student also stated that, “We don't have serious problems of that nature at Georgetown.” It is apparent that this student does not recognize the pervasiveness of discrimination against many members of the Georgetown community. One interviewee in NHS ’11 even stated that for the question “I _____ witness instances of discrimination by students faculty and staff, both my boyfriend and I would respond ‘rarely,’ and we were hard-pressed to come up with examples from the last few months to warrant this response (as opposed to "never"). It's quite shocking that these percentages of Georgetown students feel this way.” This lack of awareness of the feelings of Georgetown students on these sensitive subjects was something this survey strove to rectify.

It was also noted that when words such as “racism” and “homophobia” were used in questions people tended to agree and strongly agree less than when the word “discrimination” was used. This could be a result of people tending to shy away from the labels and the negativity that words such as “racism” and “homophobia” imply over and above that which “discrimination” implies. One member of MSB ’11 stated, “Students don't want to be force-fed information about diversity and the wrongs of homophobia, the two things that likely most divide the community.” This trend also led to many respondents moving from agreeing with questions that employed the word “discrimination” to disagreeing with questions using the words “racism” and “homophobia.” This is an
interesting trend since all of these words have essentially the same underlying meaning. One interviewee stated that she is unsure “if the people who reported some level of discrimination were responding to things like off-color jokes or more to actual limitations they felt were placed on people for their religion, race, gender, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, religion etc. Georgetown is admittedly not the most politically correct place, and so I can see how certain jokes or comments could be taken the wrong way.” It was important in the making of the survey that multiple ways of asking these questions about the state of affairs at Georgetown as it relates to these subjects were brainstormed, so that the true feelings of the Georgetown community on these topics could be understood.

Publicity

Another publicity problem that Georgetown faces is that students are unaware about the existence of the Bias Reporting System. If students are not aware of the Bias Reporting System, they are not able to report anything. Not only that, but those who are aware of its existence are not likely to have reported any instances of discrimination either. Some respondents felt that the Bias Reporting System is not a particularly effective system even if it were better publicized because it promotes oversensitivity to bias issues. “The bias-reporting program worries me too. While it's important and great to have a system where students can report crimes and injustices, the added sensitivity to hate crimes may be a little too much. As in, what's the difference between a hate crime and a
bias-related crime? Should we be adding this type of [nuance] to this issue? It's one thing to be racially sensitive and to promote a hate-crime free campus, but it's another to make our campus too sensitive to racial issues that everyone becomes too afraid to voice their true opinions," stated a member of SFS '08. It is also perhaps a problem that students are largely unaware of the large variety of incidents that are encouraged to be reported to the Bias Reporting System and what sort of results reporting incidents will have. It is also significant that some faculty and staff are unwilling to report incidents to the Bias Reporting System. If the administration on campus does not buy into the program, it is exponentially more difficult to get students to buy into it and to go out of their way to report the incident. Additionally, students feel that because there are not tangible repercussions from a bias incident being reported, except in the case of extreme incidents, it is not worthwhile to take time out to of their busy schedules to fill out the report. Many students even feel that a no tolerance policy for bias incidents would be more appropriate than the current standard, which has so many shades of grey. One member of COL '11 stated that Georgetown should “expel anyone [proven] guilty in a hate-bias crime.” This, however, points to the next problem that needs to be addressed namely that it is so difficult to prove that someone is guilty of a bias incident because many Georgetown students would be unlikely to say or do anything that was not politically correct in front of friends.
It was also significant that at a school with such a strong religious affiliation, only about 20% of each class regularly attend the services of their own religion, and only 50% of students had ever attended religious services of a religion different from their own. One member of SFS ’08 stated that “Only certain people choose to engage in inter-religious/intercultural communication on a regular basis -- there are lots of opportunities, and those who do benefit a lot, and make this campus as great as it is. But, this needs to be inculcated into everyone beginning freshmen year, so that people don’t just hang out with others like them (this is very often the case). Perhaps having residence halls do fun events pertaining to these events would be a good idea.” It is apparent that there is a divide between what some students think should be involved in their Georgetown education and what they actually seek out to be involved with on campus. This implies that students have only limited interaction with religion on a school which promotes as one of the Jesuit Ideals “Inter-religious Understanding.” This is particularly interesting because students believe that this is the Jesuit Ideal that Georgetown is most successful at promoting and that students are most truly reflecting.

Overall the research points to a degree of uncertainty on the campus. There were distinct trends across years that proved to be relatively constant across all questions. Responses were also characterized by apparent
contradictions between witnessing discrimination and the perception of a problem of discrimination on campus.
Class and School Research Team Recommendations

Academic Life
1) Cross-list classes for diversity related courses for those who are interested in such things. Given the best practices of other universities, Georgetown is behind in incorporating justice and diversity into its curriculum.

2) A Pro Seminar possibly taught by seniors that engages students in diversity and social justice issues.

Student Life
Community Service day that is required because self-selection is a problem
Pluralism in Action should either feature stats about the diversity of Georgetown like convocation or have quotes from upperclassmen
Follow-up research about self-perceptions vs. community at large

Bias Reporting System
Bias Reporting System needs to be better advertised, de-stigmatized, and the stats need to be published and accessible
Conclusion

This research project has taken an in-depth look at the differences between classes and schools at Georgetown. It is apparent that each school is characterized by a different experience than in any of the other schools. This leads to differing viewpoints on topics of sociological interest. It is encouraging to note that students feel that Georgetown is successful in Interreligious Understanding and promoting Women and Men for Others. However, it is clear that Georgetown students feel that self-segregation is a problem at Georgetown. The Student Commission for Unity has resolved to work to solve this problem.
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Introduction

The Student Commission for Unity decided to investigate Education Background when considering what kinds of backgrounds Georgetown Students come from. While we are interested in pursuing research concerning socio-economic status at Georgetown, we intended to develop a less conventional approach to understanding the backgrounds of students at Georgetown. In this research, we will explore how students from Public, Private, Parochial and International backgrounds respond to questions concerning their experiences at Georgetown. Where students are referred to as “Domestic”, a grouping of Public, Private and Parochial students is being described.
Research Methods

Of the 1517 students who began the survey, 1339 (88.3%) identified their Education Background. The following breakdown occurred:

- Public High School: 732 Students (54.7% of sampled population)
- Private, Non-Religious High School: 272 Students (20.3% of sampled population)
- Parochial/Religious High School: 332 Students (24.8% of sampled population)
- International Education in Grades 10-12 (Educated Outside of the U.S.): 62 Students (4.6% of sampled population)
- Home School: 4 Students (0.3% of sampled population)

Research Question: How does Education Background affect student perceptions of diversity within their experiences at Georgetown?

Assumptions:

1. Public school student are more likely to be sensitive to discrimination, self segregation issues.
2. Depending on what state you’re from, you will be more likely to be prepared or less prepared for Georgetown.
3. People from certain racial backgrounds, such as Black students, are less likely to have attended boarding school.
4. Depending on geographical location within a city or town would determine whether or not you are academically prepared for Georgetown. So a student from an inner city is much less likely to be prepared for Georgetown University and you would be more likely to feel alienated, unless, or even if you develop a social circle of people from inner city backgrounds.
5. Specialized education programs can help students be more prepared for Georgetown.
6. Minority students at Georgetown are either from the top of their class at a public school that was not strong academically or were from a strong magnet program.
7. Some minority students went to good schools too depending on their parent’s education, if they went to college.
8. Not all minorities come from poor schools of bad schools. But those that do go to good schools probably had parents with at least some secondary education.
9. If you went to a poor public high school you would need a lot of positive influences to help you get to Georgetown.
10. Public school students are more likely to self segregate than other students.
11. Private school students also self segregate because they are not used to diversity.
12. High schools had less demographic self segregation, instead it was more based on popularity or personality based.
13. Self segregation in Public high school solidifies in college. Its negative in college according to comfort lines in High School.
14. Most minority students from Private or Parochial schools attended those schools on scholarship.
15. If you came from a state that isn't open to you going to private colleges, then you are more likely to be an independent minded person.
16. People at Georgetown from public schools are more likely to be individuals if they are not from the DC area, as many other places have an emphasis on staying in-state for college.
17. If that has scholarships in state, public school kids are more likely to seek outside resources to attend a private college like Georgetown.
18. Coming to Georgetown develops prejudices that students coming from minority backgrounds and communities may not have known they had.

**Hypothesis:** Education Background may be a predictor of student perceptions, with Public school students being more sensitive to racial and sexual orientation issues, while Private and Parochial students may be more familiar with University ideals and confident in University resources.
Are you familiar with the Bias Reporting System (BRS)?

Observations and Facts:
1. Less than a third of the student body is aware of the BRS.
2. International students were most aware of the BRS (32.3%).
3. Parochial students were least aware of the BRS (26.1%).
4. Private and Parochial students gave similar responses.
If you answered "Yes," have you ever reported anything to the Bias Reporting System?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parochial</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. No International students reported cases of bias to BRS.
2. Public and Parochial students were equally likely to use the BRS (5.4%).
3. Although International students are most aware of the BRS (32.3%), they are least likely to use it (0%).
4. Public and Parochial students were most likely to use the BRS.
5. Private school students are more likely than International students to report to BRS.
Do you feel that Campus resources for reporting, preventing and disciplining incidents of bias are adequate?

Observations and Facts:
1. Public and Parochial students are most likely to think the resources are adequate (53.1% each).
2. International students are least likely to think the resources are adequate (41.7%).
3. Private students are less likely than International students to believe resources are adequate.
4. Public and Parochial students are equally likely to think the resources are inadequate.
Observations and Facts:

1. More than 75% of the student body is in AGREEMENT with the statement.
2. International students were most likely to STRONGLY DISAGREE with the statement.
3. Very few students STRONGLY DISAGREE with the statement.
4. Parochial students are most likely in AGREEMENT with the statement.
Observations and Facts:
1. Parochial students were most likely to find AGREEMENT that GU students exhibit Educating the Whole Person (68.3%).
2. International students were most likely to STRONGLY DISAGREE (4.8%).
3. Public students were most likely to be UNSURE (21.3%).
4. International students were least likely to be UNSURE (12.9%).
Georgetown promotes Women and Men for Others.

Observations and Facts:
1. No International students STRONGLY DISAGREE that GU promotes Women and Men for Others.
2. Parochial students were the most likely group to be in AGREEMENT.
3. More than 70% of student body AGREE with the statement.
4. International students were most UNSURE.
Observations and Facts:
1. International students were most likely to be UNSURE that GU students exhibit Women and Men for Others (32.3%).
2. Parochial students were least likely to be UNSURE (18.4%).
3. Parochial students were most likely to have AGREEMENT (69%).
4. Public students were most likely to have DISAGREEMENT (16.8%)
Georgetown promotes Interreligious Understanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public</strong></td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private</strong></td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parochial</strong></td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:

1. No international students STRONGLY DISAGREE that GU promotes Interreligious Understanding.
2. Parochial students, by a small margin, were most likely to STRONGLY AGREE (34.8%).
3. International (16.1%) and Private school (14%) students were most likely to be UNSURE.
4. Parochial students were half as likely to be UNSURE (6.7%) as Private or International.
Observations and Facts:
1. Parochial students are most likely to AGREE that GU students exhibit Interreligious Understanding (72.4%).
2. International students were least likely to AGREE (37.1%).
3. International students were most likely to STRONGLY AGREE (16.1%). However, their total AGREEMENT was lower than the other three backgrounds.
4. International students were most likely to have DISAGREEMENT (25.8%)
Student Commission for Unity

Education: Q21d

Georgetown promotes Community in Diversity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parochial</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:

1. Respondents more likely to have DISAGREEMENT with 21d than any other question in the 21 group.
2. Parochial students were most likely to have AGREEMENT (73.7%) that GU promotes community in diversity.
3. International students were the least likely group to have AGREEMENT (51.7%).
4. International students do not STRONGLY DISAGREE that GU promotes community in diversity.
5. Public school students were the second most likely group to AGREE (45.7%).
**Observations and Facts:**

1. Responses had much lower AGREEMENT to this question within the 22 group.
2. Public students were the group least likely to STRONGLY AGREE that GU students exhibit Community in Diversity (10%).
3. Parochial students were most likely to have AGREEMENT (58.3%).
4. International students were most likely to STRONGLY DISAGREE (9.7%).
5. Parochial students were least likely to have DISAGREEMENT (33.9%).
Observations and Facts:

1. Parochial students were most likely to have AGREEMENT that GU promotes Cura Personalis (71.3%).
2. International students were least likely to have AGREEMENT (55.8%).
3. International students were most likely to be UNSURE (36.2%).
4. No international students STRONGLY DISAGREE.
Observations and Facts:

1. International students were the least likely to have AGREEMENT that GU students exhibit Cura Personalis (32.8%).
2. International students were most likely to be UNSURE (54.1%), the highest level of UNCERTAINTY for any question in the 21-22 grouping.
3. Parochial students were most likely to AGREE (45%).
4. Private students were the second most likely group to AGREE (40.2%) and most likely to STRONGLY AGREE (10.3%).
5. STRONGLY AGREE was the lowest across the board for this question in group 22.
Observations and Facts:

1. Private school students were most likely to respond NEVER (19.9%).
2. International students were most likely to respond SOMETIMES at 37.1%
3. Private School students were most likely to respond OFTEN or REGULARLY at 11%.
I ______ witness instances of discrimination by Georgetown faculty, staff or administrators.

Observations and Facts:
1. Parochial students responded least to SOMETIMES, OFTEN or REGULARLY (9.7%) than any of the other groups, and most to NEVER (61.3%).
2. International students responded NEVER the least, at 51.6%.
3. Rates of SOMETIMES, OFTEN and REGULARLY were similar for Public (13%), Private (12.9%), and International (12.9%).
I ______ feel I am the target of discriminatory words, actions and/or decisions by Georgetown students.

Observations and Facts:
1. International students least likely to respond NEVER (41.9%) 
2. International students twice as likely to respond SOMETIMES (24.2%) than Parochial students (10.3%). However, no International students recorded OFTEN or REGULARLY responses.
3. Private students were second most likely to record SOMETIMES, OFTEN or REGULARLY answers at 17.8%. Public was third at 16.1% and Parochial last at 14.2%.
I _____ feel I am the target of discriminatory words, actions and/or decisions by Georgetown faculty, staff or discrimination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Regularly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parochial</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. International students are most likely to feel discriminated against by University staff (NEVER only 64.5%).
2. The majority of student body has never been discriminated against by University staff.
3. International students are most likely to respond RARELY (30.6%).
4. Private school students are the most likely to say SOMETIMES (6.6%).
If you have witnessed an instance of discrimination in the past, have you (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ignored</th>
<th>Approached</th>
<th>Reported</th>
<th>Comfort</th>
<th>Discuss w/fam</th>
<th>Discuss w/prof</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parochial</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:

1. International students were least likely to REPORT (0%) bias or APPROACH the assailant (25.6%).
2. Public (6%) and Parochial (6.9%) students were most likely to REPORT an instance of discrimination.
3. Most students would DISCUSSED the instance of bias with their family or friends.
4. Almost half of each group IGNORED the instance of discrimination.
5. International students were most likely to COMFORT (41.9%) the victim, or DISCUSS it with their family or friends (67.4%).
I _____ feel uncomfortable at Georgetown because of my identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Regularly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parochial</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. Private school students most likely to answer SOMETIMES, OFTEN or REGULARLY at 28%.
2. International students least likely to respond NEVER at 37.1%.
3. Parochial students most likely to respond NEVER, at 48.9% of the time.
4. Public students respond OFTEN or REGULARLY (9.3%) almost twice as often as Parochial students (5.4%).
Observations and Facts:

1. Parochial school students are the most likely to attend church. REGULARLY (28.9%), which was almost three times as likely as Private students (10%).
2. A quarter of Public school students (24.4%) and Private school students (25.8%) do not attend religious services.
3. International students were most likely to attend religious services, either SOMETIMES, OFTEN or REGULARLY (54.1%).
4. Students are most likely to RARELY attend religious services.
I _____ attend religious services of a different religious group than my own.

Observations and Facts:

1. International students are most likely to attend services other than their own, marking SOMETHING, OFTEN or REGULARLY (29%).
2. Parochial students were least likely to attend, recording SOMETHING, OFTEN or REGULARLY (14.5%)
Alcohol is a factor in instances of discrimination at Georgetown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parochial</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. Private school students are in AGREEMENT with this question most (65.8%).
2. All of the groups that answered the question have almost the same percentage representation in DISAGREEING with the question.
3. Of those that STRONGLY AGREE, public (21%) and International students (21%) are the highest and Parochial school students are the lowest (14.8%).
4. Of those that AGREE, International students are the lowest (33.9%).
5. These responses follow the pattern that most responses to questions follow - increase, then decrease.
Observations and Facts:
1. Most students AGREE.
2. International students are the most UNSURE (30.6%) in the group, as opposed to Public school, which recorded UNSURE 17.6%.
3. Private school students STRONGLY DISAGREE the least (1.1%).
4. Public school students find AGREEMENT the most (70.2%).
5. Of those that find DISAGREEMENT, Parochial students are the highest (16.3%).
Self-segregation is a problem at Georgetown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parochial</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. Most students AGREE, with Private (78.1%) and Parochial (74.5%) students AGREEING the most.
2. Few Private school students STRONGLY DISAGREE (0.7%).
3. Public school students STRONGLY AGREE the most (33%).
4. The graph follows the normal patterns in group 51.
5. Of those that are UNSURE, Parochial students are the highest (16.7%).
Observations and Facts:

1. This graph does not follow normal patterns and graph structures of those we have observed in group 51.
2. Of those that STRONGLY AGREE, Public school students are the most (21.8%), as opposed to Private (12.5%) and International (6.5%) responses.
3. Of those that STRONGLY DISAGREE, International school students are the most (17.7%).
4. Public (15.1%) and Private school (15.4%) students have almost the same percentages for being UNSURE.
5. Parochial (37.3%) and International (37.1%) students have almost the same percentages for AGREE, but they diverge at STRONGLY AGREE.
Student Commission for Unity

Education: Q51e

Racism does influence the behavior or attitudes of students, faculty and staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parochial</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. This graph does not follow our normal patterns in group 51.
2. International school students AGREE the most (35.5%).
3. Parochial (10%) and International school students (9.7%) have about the same percentages for STRONGLY DISAGREEING, which is double Private students (4.4%).
4. Private school students have nearly symmetrical responses.
Racism is a problem at Georgetown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parochial</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. Again, this graph does not follow the usual graph patterns. It is unusually symmetrical again on questions of Race.
2. International students (14.5%) STRONGLY DISAGREE the most, much more than Private (4.1%) or Public (6.2%).
3. Most students were UNSURE.
4. Public (34.6%) and Private (35.6%) shared comparable levels of AGREEMENT.
5. Of those that were UNSURE, International students were the most UNSURE (33.9%).
6. International students STRONGLY AGREE the least (4.8%).
Students of color do face alienation or discrimination at Georgetown.

Observations and Facts:

1. For the most part, we witness another symmetrical pattern for a question of Race.
2. Parochial students are the least UNSURE (12.3%), while Private school students (37.3%) were most UNSURE.
3. International students STRONGLY DISAGREE the most (17.7%), while Private school students STRONGLY DISAGREED least (4.1%).
4. Public school students STRONGLY AGREE the most (10.4%).
5. All percentages are very close in DISAGREE.
Homophobia is a problem at Georgetown.

Observations and Facts:
1. Most students AGREE.
2. This graph follows normal graph patterns in the 51 group.
3. Private school students find AGREEMENT the most (66.4%).
4. International students STRONGLY DISAGREE the most (9.7%).
5. Of those that STRONGLY AGREE, Private school students represent the most (26.2%).
6. There were steady responses of UNSURE across the demographics.
LGBTQ students do face discrimination or alienation at Georgetown.

**Observations and Facts:**

1. This graph follows the normal patterns in group 51, though UNSURE is slightly elevated.
2. Private (59.1%) and Public (58.1%) school students find AGREEMENT the most.
3. Private school students STRONGLY AGREE the most (22.9%), while International students STRONGLY AGREE the least (16.1%).
4. International students STRONGLY DISAGREE the most (12.9%), as opposed to 2.6% of Private school students.
5. Parochial and International students have almost the same percentages when comparing each other in DISAGREE and in being UNSURE.
Observations and Facts:
1. Most students STRONGLY AGREE.
2. There are no Private school students represented in STRONGLY disagreeing.
3. Public, Private and Parochial students have close to the same percentages in STRONGLY AGREE (66.2-66.5).
4. International students DISAGREE the most (4.8%).
5. International students are the least UNSURE (3.2%).
Diversity is discussed too much on campus.

Observations and Facts:
1. Most people DISAGREE.
2. This graph follows normal patterns in group 51.
3. Private school students are least likely to STRONGLY AGREE (4.4%), against 11.3% of International and 10.2% of Parochial students.
4. Private school students found the highest DISAGREEMENT at 52.6%.
Critical Analysis

The Education Background research team conducted research comparing responses to our survey by Public, Private, Parochial and International education background. In our research, we developed several themes and arguments that will be expressed in this analysis. At times, this piece will refer to students who indicated a Private, Public or Parochial background as "domestic" students, while students who indicated an International education background may be referred to as International students.

Marginal Difference in Responses by Education Background

Education Background is an intriguing demographic to study at Georgetown University. Our researchers assumed that Education Background would directly correlate to socio-economic status and could therefore be a predicting factor in survey responses. However, our research found limited themes and conclusions could be determined according to Education Background at Georgetown. Our analysis therefore will discuss the notable trends that our research team observed, while considering possible explanations for the narrow range of responses in this demographic.

Our assumption that Education Background may be a predictor of perceptions at Georgetown was errant. By synthesizing Education Background into three domestic groups (Public, Private and Parochial), our results produced an unusual amount of homogeneity. Further analysis revealed that our
categories were compounded by intense variations within each category due to a range of characteristics: size, demographics, teaching philosophy and identity, technology, quality of instructors and wealth, yet Georgetown students indicated marginal differences in responses despite these variants through Private, Public and Parochial schools.

However, wealth and income remain determinant factors in educational access and success in society as well as in Georgetown's student body. According to the Office of Planning and Institutional Research in 2007, nearly 87.5% of Georgetown parents reported an income above the median American household income of $50,233 (U.S. Census Bureau). In addition, 20.2% of Georgetown parents fill the largest income bracket of above $300,000 per year. Clearly, Georgetown students require considerable income and/or seek out environments in higher education that mirror their previous environments.

In addition, other universities can afford more considerate financial aid packages that serve to accommodate students with financial need. At Georgetown, only 5.4% of parents report an income of under $25,000, and only 35% of parents earn less than $100,000 per year; clearly disproportionate figures to American distribution of wealth. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that wealth is indeed a factor in student perceptions due to an extreme stratification of previous experiences and economic means for students from varied socio-economic backgrounds in higher education. It is difficult for students from low income backgrounds to participate in the same social activities or compare
experiences with students from higher income brackets. Yet at Georgetown, there are as many students who come from families that make over $300,000 per year (20.2%) as students whose parents make less than $74,999 per year (21.4%). In this environment, students from lower income brackets not only face social and cultural difficulties when trying to fit into different social circles, but also may suffer from lower quality equipment or fewer personal items, creating a sense of inferiority in lower income students, while implanting a sense of guilt in students who come from more wealthy backgrounds. In this regard, it seems evident that while Public school students may be more racially diverse (White students comprise of 74.7% of Public, 78.3% of Private and 82.5% of Parochial/Religious schools), socio-economic factors did not present themselves in our research because we did not adequately identify social class, and perhaps because Georgetown recruits primarily from Public schools with similar resources as Private and Parochial schools, indicating high property tax contributions to those Public institutions.

Bias Reporting

The Georgetown University community is not comprised only of students from all over the United States but also of students of various nationalities. In order to ensure that every student experiences a fruitful and memorable education, administrators have created a Bias Reporting System to confront intolerance, bias, and hate within the university community. Although the Bias
Reporting System (BRS) has been functional for some time now, there seems to be a general lack of awareness throughout the student body.

Our research indicates that less than 30% of domestic students are aware of the Bias Reporting System. Of those surveyed, 32% of International students reported that they had some knowledge of the BRS. Based on our research, international students may be aware of the BRS because of their efforts to become familiar with the new environment and university efforts to orient international students to their new environment. Perhaps this assumption also helps to explain why International students, aside from being the most aware group of students on campus, are also the least likely to report any incident of bias. When students were asked how they have reacted to incidents of bias they had witnessed, 5.4% of domestic students and 0% of international students indicated that they had reported the incident to the Department of Public Safety or the Bias Reporting System. These troubling numbers suggest faulty elements of a system that students are largely unaware of its existence and aren't confident in the system enough to actually utilize it.

International students are more likely to ignore or discuss incidents of bias with others but fail to report any such incident. Unlike other groups that researched student's level of awareness of the BRS, the educational background group found a narrow range between members of different educational backgrounds. When students were asked how they respond to incidents of bias, Private, Parochial, Public and International Education responses had a range
7.1%, compared to 20.1% for the same questions when examining responses by Race. The findings of our research suggest that there needs to be an extensive promotional campaign to raise the level of awareness throughout the entire student body. Even if students are somewhat aware of the BRS they might not be familiar with its purpose, as may be the case for International students, and therefore students do not use this valuable resources as it should be used.

In general, students who were most aware of the Bias reporting system are less likely to report any incidence of bias. In the case of International students, the respondents who were most likely to be familiar with the BRS (32.3%) were also least likely to be satisfied with resources for preventing, reporting and disciplining incidents of bias (41.7%). This is an issue that needs to be addressed promptly as it possesses the potential to hinder future institutional changes. With a low level of general awareness, it is difficult to assess the effectiveness of the BRS it is therefore essential that all students become familiar with the resource so that it can be improved to meet the needs of the Georgetown Students.

Jesuit Ideals

When looking at Georgetown’s Jesuit ideals and ideals inherent in the campus culture, it is difficult to see a major difference between students that attended a public, private, parochial or international high school. This is due to the fact that the four groups tended to provide very similar data. However, out of all four groups, parochial students tended to best identify Georgetown ideals
such as “Women and Men for Others” or “Cura Personalis” and believe that Georgetown both promotes and exhibits these ideals. Parochial students consistently were in agreement in the promotion and implementation of these ideals at a higher rate than the three other groups. They tended to be more familiar with the ideals and what the ideals meant, likely from their experiences at their Parochial schools, which might have promoted these ideals, as well.

Out of the five ideals in the survey (Educating the Whole Person, Women and Men for Others, Interreligious Understanding, Community in Diversity and Cura Personalis) the question that had the strongest agreement from all four groups was that Georgetown University promotes Educating the Whole Person. For all ten questions about the five ideals, although students may have stated that Georgetown promoted these ideals, a lower percentage of students felt that students exhibited said ideals. For example, about a quarter of students strongly agreed that Georgetown promotes Educating the Whole Person but less than 15% strongly agreed that Georgetown students exhibit this ideal. Overall, more than 30% of all students from the four groups strongly agreed that Georgetown promotes interreligious understanding, although that number dropped to less than 14% when asked if students exhibit that ideal. All students were most confused about the ideal of cura personalis.

These findings speak to the core of the ideals and educational standards that make up Georgetown University and the issues that abounds when asked if these ideals are represented on campus. Whereas the five ideals are greatly
promoted and spoken about, it is less common to find them in practice on campus, particularly by students. These ideals directly relate to the goal of diversity, be it related to race, religion, or broadness of education. For this reason, it is recommended that changes are made to certain aspects of student life to include diversity and help ensure that students exhibit the goals that Georgetown promotes. The Center for Student Programs and the Student Activities Commission should require student Treasurers and Presidents of organizations to attend a diversity training. Similar adjustments or requirements should be added to RA, OA and Peer Advisor positions.

*Self Segregation*

Self-segregation and racism among Georgetown students are topics of concern. Students can only benefit from a diverse student body if they interact with others unlike themselves. In order to gain an understanding of student perspectives, survey respondents were asked a variety of questions (questions 51a- 51k) regarding these issues on campus. Responses indicated that international students are less inclined to perceive racism or self-segregation as issues of concern on campus than domestic students.

As compared to public, parochial, and private school students, international students were least likely to agree that self segregation is a problem at Georgetown. When asked if self segregation was a problem at their high schools, most Georgetown students agreed. Nonetheless, 45.1% of international
students disagreed or strongly disagreed as compared to 33.4% of parochial students, 33.4% of parochial students, and 27.5% of public students (graph 51d).

Clearly, a large percentage of international students feel that they did not, and do not, observe self-segregation. This may stem from skepticism regarding whether or not diversity enhances one's college experience. Question 51j posed this question and although a majority of students agreed that diversity enhances one's college experience, international students were slightly less likely than domestic students to strongly agree or agree as well as the most likely to strongly disagree or disagree. If one doesn't believe that having a diverse group of friends is important, it will be easier to self-segregate oneself.

Moreover, there may be a difference in perspectives of what segregation and/or racism truly is among international students and U.S. students. If racism or segregation is more overt in other countries and an American education experience fails to expose the many forms of systemic racism in the United States as true prejudice, then international students would be less likely to acknowledge it at Georgetown. In addition, Graph 51f demonstrates further distinction between international and domestic students, which asks students to determine if racism is a problem at Georgetown. Many students disagreed, but international students were the most likely to strongly disagree as well as the least likely to strongly agree. Additionally, 33.9% of international students were unsure of how they felt, making them the education group with the largest percentage of unsure respondents.
In light of the survey responses, it is imperative that the University specifically reach out to the international population. Through the already mandatory International Student Orientation, these students can be made aware of bias-related incidents. They can also be encouraged to meet people unlike themselves and learn how race may affect many American lives.
Education Background Research Team Recommendations

Bias Reporting System

1) Change the name of Bias Reporting System (BRS).
   a. Bias is too vague and not a strong enough of a word. The name of the reporting system should convey more urgency and mention “discrimination” or hate crime explicitly.
   b. If name is not changed, we should explain what constitutes “bias” more clearly.

2) Aggressively market the (BRS)
   a. During New Student Orientation (NSO), BRS information should be distributed. Preferably, BRS information should be added to the Emergency Preparedness memorabilia that is handed out to students (magnets, key chains, etc.)
   b. Door-hangers and magnets should be placed on the doors of all incoming freshmen, providing them with all of the necessary information regarding reporting bias-related incidents. Moreover, BRS link should be placed visibly on the Georgetown homepage.
   c. All bias-related incidents ought to be emailed and reported to student body to
      1. Keep student body in the loop, and
      2. Create more awareness about bias on Georgetown’s campus and the BRS as a whole.

Student Life and the Freshman Experience

3) Training and Student Development
   a. Just as the Center for Social Programs (CSP) requires trainings for all student group Treasurers, club presidents should be required to participate in diversity training, which would
      1. Help student leaders become better acquainted with diversity nomenclature, and
      2. Help promote open interaction and build a common understanding among a continually diversifying Georgetown community.

4) Orientation Advisor (OA) groups should no longer be based on geographic location, but with the diversity of the groups in mind.
5) Diversity component should be added to RA, OA, and Peer Advisor application process to ensure that potential mentors are sensitive to the needs and interests of the diverse Georgetown community.

6) Encourage student group collaboration and co-sponsorship initiatives (25 days, Expressions of a Better Georgetown) with University funding, University resources, etc.

7) Create mandatory or incentive-based weeklong seminar for all freshman, facilitated by groups like LEAD that train students about bias-related issues, and asks participants to break into small groups and discuss their various experiences.

8) Recruit peer-advisors for all incoming freshman with students from different perspectives. This program could pair up incoming freshmen with students from different experiences.

9) Require seminar for International Student Orientation (ISO) that highlights some past bias-related incidents and stresses the importance of using the BRS.

### Academic Life

10) Require students to take (1) diversity-related course (D) at Georgetown. Classes would be designated diversity-related based on a set of criteria arrived at by working group including Georgetown professors, administrators, and students.

11) University ought to provide incentives for attendance of lectures that focus on diversity-related issues.

### Admissions

12) Require diversity-related essay during application process, wherein they reflect on the experience of a student of a different race, religion, culture, sexual orientation, or ethnicity (for COL, NHS, SFS, and MSB)

13) Highlight Georgetown’s diversity-related initiatives, diverse student body, and demonstration of commitment to diversity in welcome-packet for incoming freshmen and recruiting packet for prospective students.
Conclusion

The research of the Education Background team discovered surprising results that contradicted many of our team’s assumptions. We uncovered few distinct trends through the Domestic backgrounds, while International students stood out in some responses. This research helps us to understand the homogeneity of Georgetown and how Georgetown recruits undergraduate students from different backgrounds.
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Introduction

Georgetown has seen progress in its institutional resources in the past decade with the opening of the Women’s Center and the new Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Questioning Resource Center. In this research, we endeavor to determine the perceptions and comfort of LGBTQ students as a minority community at Georgetown, as well as the perspectives of Heterosexual students, Male students and Female students. In our report, we did not have a significant sample of students identify as neither Male nor Female, though students did have that option in our survey.
Research Methods

Of the 1517 students who began the survey, 1339 (88.3%) identified their Gender and Sexual Orientation. The following breakdown occurred:

- Female: 845 Students (63.1% of sampled population)
- Male: 476 Students (35.6% of sampled population)
- Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender or Questioning (LGBTQ): 83 Students (6.2% of sampled population)
- Did not identify as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender or Questioning (Heterosexual): 1,254 Students (93.8% of sampled population)

General Research Questions:

- How do particular student demographics concerning gender and sexual orientation at Georgetown University perceive the problems of and approaches to diversity on campus differently and/or similarly?
  
  a) What are the underlying causes of such potential differing perspectives among certain demographics?
  
  b) More specifically, how do women and LGBTQ-identified students view discrimination on campus?
  
  c) How familiar is the student body with administrative efforts to end incidents of bias and discrimination?

- Lastly, what can the University do to better learn about and ultimately address possible issues of alcohol, discrimination, bias, alienation, self-segregation and diversity in order to provide for the present needs of its student body?

Assumptions: Let it be assumed that:

a) The LGBTQ community is and has been a target group for discrimination on campus and...

b) is therefore more exposed to and knowledgeable about general issues of diversity on campus

c) Population demographics represented in the following study are not entirely mutually exclusive.

d) Sample statistics are merely a representation of the student body population from Spring 2008.
e) Survey participants were able, but not encouraged, to abstain from answering any one of the following research questions.
f) Demographic subgroups within the “LGBTQ” and “Female” categories, such as race, gender, class, school, religion, etc. are not delineated.
g) The following hypotheses were outlined prior to data and research analysis.
h) The Gender/ Sexual Orientation research group of the Student Commission for Unity is composed of Georgetown undergraduate students, each with different class, school, race, religion, sexual orientation and gender identifications.
i) The term “research group” or “research team” refers to the Gender/ Sexual Orientation subdivision of the greater Student Commission for Unity.
j) The following observations focus specifically on the LGBTQ- and female-identified sample populations.
k) The following sample sizes are taken as representative of the Georgetown student body population.
l) The following observations are the direct result of group discussion and reflect only the viewpoints of the Gender/Sexual Orientation research team at the time of discussion.
m) The findings in this study were deciphered for the sole purpose of providing the University with recommendations as agreed upon by the Gender/Sexual Orientation research team, and are done so with limited bias.

**Hypotheses**: Outlined in corresponding research categories.

Bias Reporting and Resources:

1) The student body, regardless of gender, is largely unaware of campus resources for reporting incidents of bias and discrimination, given the unfamiliarity of this research group with
2) LGBTQ-identified students are more knowledgeable about the Bias Reporting System.
3) The University needs to better market resources for bias reporting.

The Spirit of Georgetown:

1) The student body, regardless of gender and sexual orientation, is not fully knowledgeable about Georgetown’s Jesuit identity, and
2) … is unsure how the University community can live out certain Jesuit phrases and beliefs.
3) LGBTQ-identified students are less satisfied with the student body’s representation of and University’s promotion of Jesuit ideals.
4) The University can promote the practicality of such values more precisely to the student body.

Discrimination: Experience and Response:

1) LGBTQ-identified students experience more discrimination than heterosexual students at Georgetown: from faculty and their peers.
2) When confronted with discrimination, most students choose to speak to friends and family or just ignore the issue rather than utilizing campus resources or speaking to faculty members.
3) LGBTQ-identified students as a demographic feel the most uncomfortable about expressing their identity and being accepted at Georgetown.

Self-segregation, Racism, Homophobia, and Diversity:

1) LGBTQ-identified students overall believe that homophobia is still an issue on campus, while the majority of men, women and heterosexual students do not.
2) Over any other demographic, LGBTQ-identified students find racism to be a significant problem at Georgetown.
3) The student body finds diversity an integral part of their experience at Georgetown.
4) More students, regardless of gender or sexual orientation, find self-segregation to have been more prevalent in their high schools than at Georgetown, however...
5) The LGBTQ demographic is more likely to believe that self-segregation at Georgetown is a problem.
6) Students from all four demographics believe that stereotypes exist on campus, and
7) … believe that alcohol can instigate acts of discrimination.

Definitions:
Homosexual: having a sexual desire for the same sex.
Heterosexual: having a sexual desire for the opposite sex.
Sexual identity: how a person identifies their sexuality.
Sexual orientation: a pattern of romantic and/or sexual attractions to a particular sex or to no sex at all.
LGBTQ: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Questioning. (Includes all of the above categories.)
   Lesbian: a homosexual woman.
   Gay: in the collegiate setting, this term is often applied only to homosexual men.
Bisexual: a sexual desire for both sexes.
Transgender: a person who does not identify with their assumed biological birth gender and/or has a desire to be accepted as a member of the opposite sex they were born with.
Questioning: refers to a person who is questioning their gender, sexual identity, or sexual orientation.
The University/Georgetown University: both terms are meant to indicate, for the purpose of this study,

1) The administration and departments that comprise the bureaucratic sector that oversees the well-being, activities, academics, etc. of the student body at this institution as well as...
2) those offices that actively assist in the actual development of the campus community and deal directly with the student population, such as Campus Ministry, the Career Center, and the Center for Social Justice.
Observations and Facts:
1. LGBTQ-identified students are the most knowledgeable demographic about the BRS (57.8%).
2. Female students were least knowledgeable at 24.4%. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you answered "Yes," have you ever reported anything to the Bias Reporting System?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. Over half of LGBTQ students reported that they were aware of the BRS, but only 10.3% have ever reported a bias incident.
2. Students that have heard of the BRS are not utilizing it. This occurs regardless of gender or sexual orientation.
3. Female students were also least likely to use the BRS, at 3.3%.
Do you feel that Campus resources for reporting, preventing and disciplining incidents of bias are adequate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. Females (57.3%) and LGBTQ-identified students (71.6%) find that reporting incidents of bias are not adequate.
2. On the other hand, Male (63%) and Heterosexual-identified (53.2%) students feel that resources are adequate.
Observations and Facts:

1. LGBTQ is the demographic that DISAGREE (12%) and are UNSURE (13.3%) most about whether or not the University promotes the “Education of the Whole Person.”

2. There is no strong disparity between women and men: most find that the University does promote the “education of the whole person.”

3. Male students were second most likely to find DISAGREEMENT, at 10.3%.

4. LGBTQ students were least likely to STRONGLY AGREE (14.5%).
Observations and Facts:

1. The LGBTQ-identified student demographic is most unconvinced that the majority of Georgetown students exhibit the ideal of “Educating the Whole Person.” DISAGREEMENT was 33.7%.

2. Most Females, Males and Heterosexual-identified students believe that Georgetown students do embody this phrase.

3. Male students were most UNSURE at 14.5%.
Observations and Facts:

1. The LGBTQ demographic DISAGREE (16.9%) more so than the Male, Female and Heterosexual-identified groups that Georgetown promotes “Women and Men for Others.”

2. However, most students overall believe that the University does promote this ideal.

3. Males were second most likely to find DISAGREEMENT (12%) and most likely to be UNSURE (21.2%).
Observations and Facts:

1. The majority of students believe that Georgetown students exhibit “Women and Men for Others,” especially the Female (67%) and Heterosexual-identified (63.9%) population find AGREEMENT.

2. The LGBTQ sample is the significantly low in AGREEMENT (48.2%), as well as the highest in the DISAGREEMENT (28.2%).

3. Male students are most UNSURE again at 26.3%.
Observations and Facts:
1. The LGBTQ demographic DISAGREE (9.6%) more so than the Male, Female and Heterosexual-identified groups that Georgetown promotes Interreligious Understanding.
2. Overall, however, the student body feels that Georgetown does a good job promoting Interreligious Understanding.
Observations and Facts:
1. LGBTQ-affiliated students, as compared to those students who are not LGBTQ-identified, do not believe as readily that Interreligious dialogue and respect is displayed in the general student body.
2. This finding deviates from how LGBTQ students perceive the University actually promoting aspects of Interreligious understanding (see graph 21c).
3. Heterosexual-identified students have the highest AGREEMENT (66.9%), with Females following (66.8%).
4. Heterosexual, Male and Female students share comparable levels of UNCERTAINTY.
Student Commission for Unity

Gender/Sexual Orientation: Q21d

Observations and Facts:

1. The LGBTQ-identified group have a high level of DISAGREEMENT (40.3%) that Georgetown promotes “Community in Diversity.”
2. LGBTQ was least UNSURE at 14.6%.
3. Women, men and heterosexual-identified students overall believe that the University promotes this phrase.
**Observations and Facts:**

1. That Georgetown students exhibit “Community in Diversity” is of even more concern for LGBTQ-identified students, the vast majority of whom do not find that Georgetown students effectively portray this ideal. LGBTQ DISAGREEMENT was at 54.2%.

2. Females found the most AGREEMENT (51.1%), followed by Heterosexual-identified students (51%).

3. There is an easily identifiable difference between perceptions campus-wide on promotion of diversity versus exhibition.
Observations and Facts:
1. Many students AGREE that the University promotes the term “Cura Personalis.”
2. LGBTQ-identified students are the highest demographic in DISAGREEMENT (15.6%) and UNSURE (37.3%).
3. Females are least likely to find AGREEMENT (67.8%).
Observations and Facts:

1. UNCERTAINTY prevails across the represented demographics.
2. Men (14.7%), Women (10.5%), and Heterosexual-identified (10.9%) students find slight DISAGREEMENT.
3. There is little gender disparity in this graph.
4. However, the LGBTQ-identified students, above all other demographics find DISAGREEMENT most (23.7%).
I _______ witness instances of discrimination by Georgetown students.

Observations and Facts:
1. LGBTQ students were least likely to respond NEVER at 8.4%, while Male students responded 24%.
2. LGBTQ students answer SOMETIMES, OFTEN or REGULARLY most, at 71.1%, followed by Heterosexual-identified and Male students at 34.7%, who responded least.
3. Female students 36.6% responded SOMETIMES, OFTEN or REGULARLY.
**Student Commission for Unity**

**Gender/Sexual Orientation: Q32**

**Observations and Facts:**

1. LGBTQ students responded NEVER least at 34.9%. Male students responded NEVER most at 57.6%.
2. LGBTQ students responded SOMETHING, OFTEN or REGULARLY most at 20.5%.
3. Very little disparity exists between Male and Female.
I ______ feel I am the target of discriminatory words, actions and/or decisions by Georgetown students.

Observations and Facts:
1. LGBTQ students responded SOMETIMES, OFTEN or REGULARLY 53.7%, and NEVER least at 13.4%.
2. There is otherwise little disparity between Male, Female and Heterosexual-identified respondents.
I ___ feel I am the target of discriminatory words, actions and/or decisions by Georgetown faculty, staff or discrimination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Regularly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. LGBTQ students responded NEVER the least at 55.4%.
2. Male students were the second most likely to respond SOMETIMES, OFTEN or REGULARLY at 6.1%, yet also most likely to respond NEVER at 79.8%.
3. This graph has similar trends to the others in the 31-34 series.
If you have witnessed an instance of discrimination in the past, have you (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ignored</th>
<th>Approached</th>
<th>Reported to DPS or BRS</th>
<th>Comforted</th>
<th>Discussed with family or friends</th>
<th>Discussed with professor or staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. Male students are most likely to IGNORE a situation at 62.1%, while Female students are least likely at 42.4%.
2. LGBTQ students were most likely to APPROACH a situation (58.3%), while Females were least likely (34.2%).
3. Male students were least likely to DISCUSS the situation with family or friends (53.5%), while Female students were most likely (72.2%).
4. LGBTQ students were nearly twice as likely as other students to DISCUSS situations with a professor or staff member than any other group (33.3%).
I ___ feel uncomfortable at Georgetown because of my identity.

Observations and Facts:
1. LGBTQ students were least likely to report NEVER (12%), while Male students were most likely (53.5%).
2. REGULARLY received similar responses.
3. LGBTQ students responded SOMETIMES or OFTEN most at 61.5%, and Males least at 16.9%.
4. Female students were second most likely to report SOMETIMES, OFTEN or REGULARLY at 26.4%.
Observations and Facts:

1. LGBTQ students were least likely to attend services REGULARLY (2.4%) and most likely to respond NEVER or RARELY (65%).

2. Female students (52.2%) were slightly more likely to respond SOMETHING, OFTEN or REGULARLY than Male students (49.9%).

3. There was little overall disparity between Heterosexual, Male and Female responses.
Observations and Facts:

1. LGBTQ students were most likely to SOMETIMES, OFTEN or REGULARLY attend services (24.2%). Male students were least likely (15.2%).
2. Female students were most likely to rank RARELY or SOMETIMES (51.9%)
3. Male students most likely to mark NEVER (54.9%).
Observations and Facts:

1. LGBTQ students were most likely to find AGREEMENT (73.5%), followed by Females (64.7%).
2. LGBTQ students were the least UNSURE.
3. Male students were most likely to have DISAGREEMENT at 21.6%.
Georgetown students do form their opinion of others based on stereotypes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. LGBTQ students were least likely to have DISAGREEMENT (4.8%), while Males were most likely to have DISAGREEMENT (16.8%).
2. Males were most likely to be UNSURE (24%).
3. LGBTQ students were most likely to have AGREEMENT (81.9%), followed by Females (70.2%).
Self-segregation is a problem at Georgetown.

Observations and Facts:
1. LGBTQ students were least likely to have DISAGREEMENT (3.6%), while Males were most likely to have DISAGREEMENT (12.9%).
2. Males were most likely to be UNSURE at 17.1%.
3. LGBTQ students were most likely to have AGREEMENT (81.9%), followed by Females (70.2%).
4. This graph looks nearly identical in trends to 51b and is similar to 51a.
Observations and Facts:

1. Female students most likely to have AGREEMENT at 57.7%, followed by LGBTQ students at 56.6%.
2. DISAGREEMENT is fairly stable across groups, with Males leading at 34.9%. Males were also most UNSURE at 16.4%.
3. Males were again most UNSURE at 16.4%.
Racism does influence the behavior or attitudes of students, faculty and staff.

Observations and Facts:
1. LGBTQ students were most likely to have AGREEMENT at 53%, followed again by Females at 36.1%.
2. Males were again most likely to DISAGREE at 47.2%.
3. Females were most likely to be UNSURE at 31.5%.
4. Responses for UNSURE were about 10% higher than previous 51a-d questions.
Observations and Facts:
1. LGBTQ students were most likely to have AGREEMENT at 59%, while Males were least likely at 25.7%.
2. Female students were most likely to be UNSURE at 34.3%.
3. Males were most likely to have DISAGREEMENT at 46.4%.
4. Graphs relating to Race (51e,f,g) defy normal trends in the 51 group.
Students of color do face alienation or discrimination at Georgetown.

Observations and Facts:
1. LGBTQ students were most likely to have AGREEMENT (60.3%), while Males were least likely (29.3%).
2. Males were most likely to have DISAGREEMENT at 43%.
3. Females were most likely to be UNSURE, at 37.4%.
Observations and Facts:

1. Heterosexual students were the most UNSURE (23.1%), while LGBTQ students were least UNSURE (8.4%).
2. Male students were most likely to find DISAGREEMENT (28.1%), while LGBTQ students were least likely (6%).
3. LGBTQ students found AGREEMENT 85.5% of the time, followed by Female students at 66.5%.
Observations and Facts:
1. This graph is nearly a mirror of 51h in its trends.
2. Heterosexual students were the most UNSURE (28.4%), while LGBTQ students were least UNSURE (6%).
3. Male students were most likely to find DISAGREEMENT (27%), while LGBTQ students were least likely (7.2%).
4. LGBTQ students found AGREEMENT 86.7% of the time, followed by Female students at 61.9%.
Observations and Facts:

1. Respondents found high levels of AGREEMENT.
2. Males were most likely to be UNSURE (6.5%) or in DISAGREEMENT (6.3%)
**Observations and Facts:**

1. LGBTQ students were most likely to STRONGLY DISAGREE (39.8%), while Males were least likely (10.9%).
2. Males were most likely to have AGREEMENT with this question (36%), while LGBTQ students were least likely (13.2%).
3. Females were twice as likely to STRONGLY DISAGREE (22.4%), than Males (10.9%).
4. Males (16.4%) were almost five times more likely to respond STRONGLY AGREE than Females (3.4%), who responded least to STRONGLY AGREE.
Critical Analysis

After analyzing the data for the Gender and Sexual Orientation demographic group, four distinct issues have been identified as concerns for Georgetown students: self-segregation, religious diversity, racial diversity, and discrimination.

Self Segregation

There were a surprising number of students who agreed that self-segregation was an apparent problem. Students participating in the study were asked to give their opinion on the statement, “Self-segregation is a problem at Georgetown.” The results of the graph show that self-segregation is not an issue of self-consciousness. More than half of the students in each group either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Out of the four groups LGBTQ students agreed the most.¹ Those who identify themselves as LGBTQ may believe that self-segregation is a problem because they feel the most alienated at Georgetown. As stated by a professor who wishes to remain anonymous, many students feel “shy, embarrassed and ashamed” of their identity, adding to the fuel of self-segregation. LGBTQ students would thus feel compelled to associate themselves with people who go through the same issues of alienation. This is also true for women; it is common to stay around those who have similar demographics.

Students have been able to recognize the divisions amongst different groups on

¹ Refer to Graph 51c: “Self-segregation is problem at Georgetown.”
Many agree that there are issues of alienation causing people to associate themselves only with people who are like themselves. Because so many students believe self-segregation is a problem, it is necessary to find solutions that will appease the students and their concerns. If Georgetown promoted diversity in new and innovative ways, students may feel more comfortable about their identity and would not feel the need to self-segregate themselves.

Many groups have become self-segregated according our research. The ideal solution would be for students to join new clubs and sports that spark their interest but are also open to diversity. However, Students in these clubs or sports may still find themselves hanging out with people that are similar to them.

Other possible solutions to this issue could be inter-group activities such as a GUGS barbeque for groups to intermingle or a leadership conference for all club presidents that targets discrimination and self-segregation. It is necessary to compel students to attend these because it is always a necessary and important issue. Also students will be more prepared to take an active role in organizations. By attending a leadership conference, students will become more knowledgeable and respectable leaders. This would not only enhance students’ experience at Georgetown but also contribute to a more positive atmosphere around campus. Students would become more comfortable around each other and eventually eliminate the boundaries that are keeping different groups of students from freely interacting.
When looking further into the root of self-segregation at Georgetown, the Student Commission for Unity asked students if self-segregation was a problem at their own high school. The LGBTQ/ Gender Equality research group found startling results in which less than fifty percent in each group did not find self-segregation to be a problem at their high school. Women were as a group, a significant demographic in this study, indicating that self-segregation was an issue prior to college. Out of the four categories they showed the most agreement with the statement, “Self-segregation was a problem at my high school.”² Yet at Georgetown, the research group believes that women do not self-segregate themselves based on gender.

Despite this, the research team has found that self-segregation in high school was not a problem as it is at Georgetown. Part of this may stem from the fact that most of these high schools were not as diverse as Georgetown. For example, most private schools educate students with the same socio-economic and/or religious background. Thus they are unprepared for the culture shock they receive when they attend such a diverse school as Georgetown. On the other hand, the LGBTQ Gender/ Equality found that further research may be needed in order to investigate and understand the University’s policy on admission in order to further diversify the students.

Jesuit Ideals

² Refer to Graph 51d: “Self-segregation was a problem at my high school.”
Georgetown as a Jesuit university is supposed to primarily consider the Jesuit ideals when developing goals in both educational and social aspects of campus life. The Jesuit ideals are supposed to dictate the spirit of Georgetown University.

In the study, a series of questions asked if students felt that Georgetown University promotes the Jesuit ideals and whether or not students exhibited them. The first Jesuit ideal that students were asked about was Educating the Whole Person, which endorses “the development of the spiritual, intellectual, artistic, social, and physical aspects of each person.” The graphs are very similar and show that surveyed students overwhelmingly agree that this ideal is represented. These results were encouraging to the SCU Gender/LGBTQ research group because there was very little discrepancy between reactions of the different categories. LGBTQ students disagreed more than their heterosexual counterparts by a small margin. Father Christopher Steck, a Jesuit priest and Theology professor at Georgetown University also found the results impressive. He claims, “the fact that almost half of the student body thinks we are achieving such a ‘whole’ education is pretty impressive.” However, he also points out that as a Jesuit, “I know well what ‘educating the whole person’ means, but even I’m not sure what it would mean for a student to ‘exhibit’ that feature of education.”

Steck recommends that in order to improve the number of student who agree,
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the first step “would be to develop a campus conversation about what ‘educating the whole person’ means, and, related to this question, what characteristic should be ‘exhibited’ in students if Georgetown does its job well.” The group came to a similar conclusion and would also recommend more dialogue on campus about the Jesuit ideals as a whole and what they mean to students at Georgetown. Possible activities could be having lectures on the ideals with panel discussions and question and answer periods.

Next, students were asked about Women and Men for others, which promotes “service-learning; our local, national and international service projects; and the commitments of our graduates to serve in organizations such as the Jesuit Volunteer Corps, Teach for America and the Peace Corps.” The graphs also showed that students overwhelmingly that Georgetown promotes this ideal. However, LGBTQ students disagreed more than heterosexual students. The group concluded that this difference could largely be attributed to the fact that LGBTQ students on campus might feel alienated. By the definition of women and men for others, it is possible that LGBTQ students might feel more discriminated against because they feel that students are not as considerate to others as they could be. The group recommends that Georgetown dedicate more funding to community service activities on campus so that more opportunities
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6 Father Christopher Steck, SJ. Interviewed by Rehana Mohammed.
7 Graphs 21 b and 22 b
could be available for students. There could also be more discussions about the importance of community service on campus.

When students were asked about whether or not Georgetown promotes Interreligious Understanding, the results were more mixed. The majority of students agreed that Georgetown promotes Interreligious Dialogue. LGBTQ students were unsure and disagreed in large numbers compared to their heterosexual classmates when asked if the student body reflects this ideal. The group thought that the cause for this discrepancy was that students who experience discrimination are more in tuned to other students experiencing discrimination, so the LGBTQ students might be more aware of religious discrimination happening on campus. The group would also like to investigate how other Jesuit universities promote the Jesuit ideals on their campuses so that methods could perhaps be implemented here. The group found that the discrepancies between responses by male and female students to all of these questions were not as large as the ones between heterosexual and LGBTQ students.

The responses about “Community in Diversity” showed a similar trend. Men and women felt similarly about the issue but there was a huge discrepancy between answers from heterosexual students and members of the LGBTQ community. While heterosexual students largely agreed that the university
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promotes “Community in Diversity” and that students reflect this ideal, the views of LGBTQ students were not as homogeneous about whether or not the university promotes “Community in Diversity”\textsuperscript{12}, and overwhelmingly disagreed about whether students exhibit “Community in Diversity”\textsuperscript{13}. The group recommends that there be more dialogue about LGBTQ issues on campus to promote understanding and equality, which could possibly be in the form of activities during New Student Orientation. Orientation Assistants could engage incoming freshmen in a discussion of sexuality and gender, which would at least get students thinking about the issue.

Next students were asked if “Cura Personalis,” which promotes faculty and staff providing individual attention to students, is reflected in Georgetown and the student body\textsuperscript{14}. The majority of students agree that “Cura Personalis” is promoted and reflected\textsuperscript{11}, which the group attributed to the fact that many students cannot readily define “Cura Personalis”. However, LGBTQ students disagreed when asked if students reflect this ideal more than heterosexual students\textsuperscript{15}. This might indicate that LGBTQ students do not feel supported as individuals by the Georgetown faculty and staff, and also might be party explained by the fact that the LGBTQ Resource Center was less than a year old and perhaps not publicized enough when the survey was taken. However, the

\textsuperscript{12} Graph 21 d
\textsuperscript{13} Graph 22 d
\textsuperscript{14} Graphs 21 e and 22 e
\textsuperscript{15} Graph 22 e
group still recommends more discussions and panels about LGBTQ issues on campus to help solve this problem.

Religious Diversity

Later in the survey, students were asked to describe how often they attended religious services\(^{16}\). The majority of students responded that they rarely attend services; the results were pretty evenly split. However, the majority of LGBTQ students responded that they never or rarely attend religious services. The group determined that this was probably mostly due to the fact that LGBTQ students probably do not feel welcomed at most religious services. The group recommends lectures and/or discussions about homosexuality and religion to help LGBTQ students reconcile those two parts of their identity. The group would ask Campus Ministry to be more involved in promoting and respecting LGBTQ issues on campus so that these students feel more welcomed in the Georgetown community.

When students were asked to describe how often they attended religious services for a religion other than their own the vast majority of students either never or rarely attend them\(^{17}\). While this could be improved upon for the benefit of Interreligious Understanding, the group did not see these results as indicating a major problem because it does not indicate that students are necessarily ill-

\(^{16}\) Graph 41
\(^{17}\) Graph 42
informed about other religions, just that they do not worship with other religions.

Diversity

Many students see racism as an issue on campus and in many ways this is directly related to issues of diversity. Racism is a larger concern that goes beyond the front gates of Georgetown but steps can be taken on campus to help educated the future citizens of the world. To address issues of racism and diversity three major steps must be taken: diversify within admissions, examine how race and gender intersect, and develop a well articulated definition of diversity so that the entire campus is aware of what diversity means. Working towards and achieving these goals will foster an inclusive community in which students feel their differences are hindering their educational experience.

The issues of diversity and the wide range of topics that can be included in the discussion confuse students and there needs to be a campus wide campaign that articulates what diversity means for Georgetown. When asked if diversity is discussed too much on campus, 38.8% of those who identified themselves as LGBTQ and 22.4% of women strongly disagree with the statement while 16.4% of males strongly agreed with the statement compared to 3.6% of LGBTQ and 3.4% of women.18 Yet the question preceding this one asked if students thought that interacting with people unlike themselves enrich their college experience and 73.5% of LGBTQ, 65.1% of Heterosexuals, 56.2% of males

18 “Diversity is Discussed too much on Campus” Gender and Sexual Orientation Graph Question 51k.
and 70.1% women all strongly agreed with the statement.\textsuperscript{19} What this shows is that students think that diversity is an added benefit to their overall college experience but those in minority groups in terms of gender and sexual orientation thinks that Georgetown does not talk about diversity enough even when students know that they would benefit from the diverse interactions. In constructing a definition it will be very important to include the issues that both women and LGBTQ students face on campus.

In the process of constructing a campus wide understanding of diversity we must also be cognizant of the intersection between race and gender. When asked is racism a problem at Georgetown 11% of males and 4.2% of woman strongly disagree in comparison with 8.4% of males and 9.1% of women who strongly agree.\textsuperscript{20} In another question asking if students of color face discrimination and alienation on campus 11.8% of males and 4.6% of women strongly disagreed and 7.4% of males and 9.7% of females strongly agreed.\textsuperscript{21} What these graphs show is that women see racism more of a problem than men and exploring this issue more carefully may aid in understanding how to combat the issues of racism on campus.

Students cannot be the only group on campus creating a definition of diversity but admissions office will have to play an active role as well. The

\textsuperscript{19} “Interacting with people unlike myself does enrich my college experience” Gender and Sexual Orientation Graph Question 51j.

\textsuperscript{20} “Racism is a Problem at Georgetown” Gender and Sexual Orientation Graph Question 51f.

\textsuperscript{21} “Students of color do face discrimination and Alienation at Georgetown” Gender and Sexual Orientation Graph 51g.
admission office has to become more open to the diverse needs of the students and actively recruit students from a range of different backgrounds. One action that can be taken in direct response to issues of diversity is to include a section on diversity within the application process in which students explain their background and their diverse experiences. This will give the admissions office a way to examine what they could bring to Georgetown in terms of diversity.

**Bias Reporting**

The University has taken steps to address issues of discrimination through such services as the Bias Reporting System (BRS) yet it is not marketed effectively rendering it ineffective. In our survey only half the LGBTQ students are familiar with the BRS. The majority of the student population has an inadequate amount of people familiar with the Bias Reporting System. Out of the students in LGBTQ who replied that they were aware of the BRS only 10% of the students claim to have reported anything to the system and only 4% of heterosexual students have reported anything. When asked if campus resources for reporting and preventing bias are adequate 71.6 % of LGBTQ disagreed while only about the majority of the campus were half and half on the topic.

With these results it can be concluded that simply having the BRS exist is not enough and more must be done so that a larger percentage of students feel that resources for reporting and preventing bias are adequate. The BRS should be marketed so that it is on the same level Georgetown’s Department of Public
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Safety, GERMS, and Safe Ride. All of these organizations' names and numbers of contact are on key chains handed out across campus in dorms. A high percentage of the campus knows about these three organizations as they are but unfortunately the BRS is excluded from that recognition. If the BRS received the attention and was placed on the card (there is a nice space for it) then it would make more common and more people would become aware of it.

It appears as though the people who do know about the BRS do not have adequate information and are not educated on what to exactly report to the BRS. 57.8% of LGBTQ students reported that they were aware of BRS, yet, only 10.3% have ever reported anything. There is no guideline on what to report to the BRS and people may also feel uncomfortable reporting anything, as they may not feel anything will happen as a result. Students when faced with discrimination only 9.7% of LGBTQ students even used the BRS system even though they knew about. It is more often discussed with friends and family or other people that causes more of a divide between the minorities and the majority on this campus.
Gender and Sexual Orientation Research Team
Recommendations

Academic Life
1) Incorporate diversity into academic requirements. This includes having faculty improve the variety of required reading materials and assignments (authors and literature topics); expand Theology, English/Writing and Philosophy course choices; create a diversity requirement within the General Education requirements; incorporate diversity issues into proseminars. Offering a course that discusses sexual identity would be beneficial.

Religious Life
2) Have Campus Ministry better represent (even if it cannot promote) the viewpoints, beliefs and concerns of the LGBTQ community concerning religion.

3) Encourage Campus Ministry to openly welcome LGBTQ students to religious services.

Housing, Student Life and the Freshman Experience
4) Increase diversity in campus housing assignments and programs deliberately.

5) Train Resident Assistants (RAs) on diversity issues; have the Living and Learning Communities (LLC) market themselves better and admit students with a variety of backgrounds.

6) Provide campus organizations with greater opportunities to promote diversity in their agendas and their membership.

7) Increase the requirements of clubs, including more co-sponsorships, and leadership and general membership seminars; engage in more trans-club events.

8) Educate incoming students and recruitment workers of the challenges of diversity on campus and the need to confront these challenges.
9) Provide incoming students with the resources to deal with issues of discrimination and/or bias.

10) Train the Orientation Assistants on diversity more extensively;

11) Expand the Pluralism in Action program to include LGBTQ issues and general diversity discussion;

12) Host diversity lecturers for New Student Orientation (NSO);

13) Expand the topics for the reading requirement for incoming Freshmen

14) Increase diversity of Blue & Grey tour guides.

Admissions and Financial Aid
15) Admit students who come from more diverse backgrounds.

16) Provide greater financial aid to students who cannot afford tuition.

17) Examine the University’s admission outreach programs and work closely with each of the school’s diversity and admission student councils.

18) Review information about the admissions process and the admitted student demographics to determine success factors in undergraduate students.

19) Create an application essay that highlights diverse experiences and/or engages prospective students in diversity issues; broaden the applicant pool.

University Policies and Programs:
20) Improve and make explicit the University policies and sanctions regarding incidents of bias, alcohol and discrimination.

21) Market and update the Bias Reporting System (BRS) statistics to clarify the nature of the incident and whether or not alcohol was a component;

22) Reform the Student Code of Conduct to outline sanctions for bias-related violations and make hate crimes explicit in the Code;

23) Investigate the effectiveness of the AlcoholEdu program.
Campus Security:

24) Improve Campus Security’s ability to assess and report incidents of bias, while also training officers better to look for discrimination factors.
Conclusion

Our research shows that there are key areas in which significant changes need to be made in regards to gender on campus. Many of our initiatives for change will be geared towards those students who identify themselves as LGBTQ. LGBTQ students often feel alienated and tend to have a conflicting opinion from the majority of students. Though we have placed significant emphasizes on the LGBTQ community, we will also address the issues of women and other issues due to gender biases. What we suggest is that we need to foster constant dialogue between different groups on campus to encourage diverse understandings; this includes dialogue between not only students but the University administration. Change will not only initiated by students but the University must also take an active role in mediating the changes that students seek.
Georgetown University’s
Student Commission for Unity
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Introduction

Race is a highly contentious issue in America and abroad. This research endeavors to understand how students from different racial backgrounds engage each other and perceive the social/cultural climate of Georgetown University. In this project, we explore racism and its consequences at Georgetown, while developing assumptions and themes that develop throughout our research.
Research Methods

Of the 1517 students who began the survey, 1339 (88.3%) identified their Race. The following breakdown occurred:

- White/Non-Hispanic: 1025 Students (76.5% of sampled population)
- Black/African American/Non Hispanic: 96 Students (7.2% of sampled population)
- Hispanic/Latino/Latin American: 105 Students (7.8% of sampled population)
- Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander: 144 Students (10.8% of sampled population)
- South Asian: 42 Students (3.1% of sampled population)
- Middle Eastern: 36 Students (2.7% of sampled population)
- Other: 37 Students (2.8% of sampled population)
- Multiracial: 80 Students (6% of sampled population)

Research Question: Is there a discord between students of different races on Georgetown's campus? Why or why not?

Assumptions:
1. There are students of different racial groups on campus.
2. There are differing numbers of students with respect to their racial backgrounds.
3. Of these different groups there are differing views on discrimination.
4. There are some races that find themselves more at ease and more comfortable on campus than other races.
5. The racial makeup and dynamics on campus mirror—to some extent—the racial makeup and dynamics in America as a whole.

Hypothesis:
1. There are differing levels of comfort across the board when it comes to different racial groups on campus.
2. The racial group that is in the majority will be the most comfortable.
3. The minority groups will feel less comfortable.
4. Students in the majority will be on the opposite side of the spectrum as compared to students in the minorities regarding issues of race and discrimination.
Observations and Facts:
1. Blacks (44.8%), multiracial (35%), Hispanics (35.2%) and South Asians (35.7%) were much more familiar with the BRS than the other racial groups.
2. Of the minorities, the Asians (25%) were the least aware of the BRS.
3. Overall, almost 70% of all Georgetown students were not familiar with the BRS.
4. There was a gap in knowledge between the (Asians, Whites, and others) and the (Blacks, Hispanics, South Asians, Middle Easterners, and Multiracial students).
If you answered "Yes," have you ever reported anything to the Bias Reporting System?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. No South Asian reported to the BRS, despite boasting a 35.7% familiarity.
2. Hispanics reported more than any other racial group by a wide margin (17.1%, against 5% of Middle Eastern students).
3. Whites (3.4%) and Blacks (3.3%) reported to the BRS in similar percentages.
4. Asians had the second lowest percentage among the racial groups (1.6%).
5. The vast majority of people who were familiar with the BRS never reported an incident to the BRS.
Do you feel that Campus resources for reporting, preventing and disciplining incidents of bias are adequate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. The white group was the only group to have a majority of people answer YES (55.1%).
2. Blacks were the least satisfied with Campus resources (33.3%).
3. Asians (42.1%) and Multiracial (42.3%) had similar percentages.
4. Middle Easterners (36.1%) as well as Other (35.1%) were largely dissatisfied with the campus resources.
Georgetown University promotes Educating the Whole Person.

Observations and Facts:
1. Most of the students AGREE across the board.
2. Asians (15.3%) and Blacks (14.7%) are the most UNSURE.
3. Across the board, each race has similar percentages for AGREEMENT.
4. South Asian students tended to STRONGLY AGREE more than any other group (33.3%).
Observations and Facts:
1. Most students were in AGREEMENT.
2. Black students DISAGREE the most with 25.0%.
3. Asian students AGREE the most with 56.9%.
4. Middle Eastern students STRONGLY AGREE the most with 16.7%.
5. Hispanic students were the most UNSURE with 28.6%.
Student Commission for Unity

Georgetown promotes Women and Men for Others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>South Asian</th>
<th>Middle Eastern</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Multiracial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. Hispanic (13.3%), Middle Eastern (13.9%), and Asian (12.5%) students have DISAGREEMENT the most.
2. Many students are UNSURE.
3. Again most students were in AGREEMENT.
4. Black students (74.7%) had the largest percentage in AGREEMENT again, followed by White students (74.5%).
Observations and Facts:
1. Hispanic students were the most UNSURE with 31.4%.
2. White and Black students agreed the most with 51% both.
3. South Asian students were the most sure with only 19.0% UNSURE.
4. South Asian students STRONGLY DISAGREE the most with 4.8%.
5. Black students Strongly Agreed the least with 7.3%.
Observations and Facts:

1. Asian students found DISAGREEMENT the most (9.8%).
2. Half of the Middle Eastern students (50%) STRONGLY AGREE, more than any other race.
3. Asian students are the most UNSURE (16.1%).
4. Asians students found AGREEMENT the least at 74.2%.
5. Black students DISAGREED the least (2.1%) and AGREED the most (62.5%).
Student Commission for Unity

Race: Q22c

Georgetown students exhibit Interreligious Understanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>South Asian</th>
<th>Middle Eastern</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Multiracial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. Middle Eastern and Multiracial students did not have anyone who STRONGLY DISAGREE.
2. South Asian students STRONGLY DISAGREE the most 4.8%.
3. Middle Eastern Students were UNSURE the most with 27.8%.
4. Black students AGREE the most with 58.3%, followed by 52.4% of White students.
5. Middle Eastern students STRONGLY AGREE the most with 16.7%.
Observations and Facts:

1. Students found DISAGREEMENT with this question much more than the other questions in the 21 group.
2. White students were most likely to have AGREEMENT (65.6%), while Other students were least likely (43.2%).
3. The students to have DISAGREEMENT the most are Other students at 29.7%, followed by Black students at 24%.
4. This graph shows the highest percent of UNSURE students (18.3%-27.5%).
Observations and Facts:
1. This graph has less AGREEMENT than others in the 22 group.
2. White (51.6%), Asian (46.5%), South Asian (50%), and Middle Eastern (50%) students have AGREEMENT much more than Black (33.3%), Hispanic (38.1%), Multiracial (38.8%), and Other (41.5%).
3. Black (40.6%), Hispanic (38.1%), and Other (35.1%) students had DISAGREEMENT the most.
4. White students were the only group in which over 50% have AGREEMENT.
5. Black (26%) and Multiracial students were also the most UNSURE (36.3%).
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Race: Q21e

Georgetown promotes Cura Personalis.

Observations and Facts:
1. A large amount of black students were UNSURE (42.1%).
2. The range of students who are UNSURE are 25-42%
3. Those who were not UNSURE usually found AGREEMENT.
4. Hispanic (11.5%), Asian (11.9%), and Middle Eastern (11.1%) students found DISAGREEMENT more than the other groups.
5. Hispanic, Asian, and Middle Eastern students seem to feel similarly about a majority of these questions.
Observations and Facts:
1. Many students were UNSURE.
2. White students had AGREEMENT the most, at 51.9%.
3. DISAGREEMENT was most common with Middle Eastern (16.7%), Black (14.6%) and Other students (18.9%).
4. White students were least UNSURE (36.4%), while Black and Hispanic students tied for most UNSURE (51% each)
Observations and Facts:
1. White students were the ones to say NEVER the most with 23.5%.
2. Black students were the least to say they NEVER witnessed discrimination with 11.5%.
3. Black students were the one to have witnessed discrimination most REGULARLY with 6.3%.
4. The SOMETIMES bar for Asians (44.4%) was much higher than its OFTEN or REGULARLY bars.
5. No Middle Eastern students REGULARLY saw discrimination.
Observations and Facts:
1. White students had an overwhelming majority NEVER witnessing discrimination with 59.5%.
2. Among the minorities, Hispanics, South Asians and Other races had the highest percentages saying NEVER with 54%.
3. Black students were the lowest to say NEVER with only 36.8%.
4. There were very few to have OFTEN or REGULARLY witnessed discrimination with 5.4% being the highest (for Other students).
Observations and Facts:

1. White students overwhelmingly said NEVER with 60.2%.
2. Black and Asian students were the only groups which NEVER was not the most common answer (27.1% and 36.2%).
3. The SOMETIMES and RARELY bars were higher than the NEVER bar for Black students (32.3% and 27.1%).
4. Asians had a much larger RARELY bar than everyone else with 42.6%.
5. Middle Easterns, Others, and Multiracials were similar.
I ______ feel I am the target of discriminatory words, actions and/or decisions by Georgetown faculty, staff or discrimination.

Observations and Facts:
1. White students had the highest percentage of NEVER with 78.9%.
2. White students also had the lowest percentage to say RARELY with only 16.8% (next lowest is 22.2%).
3. Almost no people felt they were OFTEN or REGULARLY discriminated against.
4. Middle Easterners had the largest SOMETIMES with 13.9%.
5. Blacks and Hispanics had comparable figures.
Observations and Facts:
1. Asian students IGNORE these incidents the most with 61.6%.
2. South Asian students COMFORT the victim the most with 62.5%.
3. Asian students APPROACH the least with 31.3% and Reported third lowest with 5.4%.
4. Middle Eastern students DISCUSS it with professors the most with 24.0%.
5. South Asian students were the least to DISCUSS with professors because 6.3%
Observations and Facts:

1. White students had highest NEVER by some distance (52.6%).
2. Black students had the highest REGULARLY and SOMETIMES with 6.3% and 35.4% respectively.
3. Asians and South Asians stand out in the RARELY section with 41.3% and 42.9% respectively.
4. Middle Easterners felt uncomfortable most OFTEN with 13.9%.
5. Black, Asian, South Asian and Multiracial were the groups to not have NEVER as their most common answer.
Observations and Facts:

1. Asians responded NEVER (34%) more than any other group, Hispanics were least likely (10.6%).
2. Hispanics were more likely to attend services REGULARLY than any other group (23.1%).
3. Middle Easterners stand out in RARELY (13.9%), SOMETIMES (44.4%), and REGULARLY (16.2%) columns.
Observations and Facts:

1. Almost no students attended religious services REGULARLY.
2. The Other group stood out in OFTEN (5.4%) and REGULARLY (2.7%)
3. South Asians had highest SOMETIMES (35.7%).
4. Hispanics were most likely to say RARELY (45.7%).
Observations and Facts:
1. Most people AGREE that alcohol is a factor in instances of discrimination.
2. Black students were the ones to AGREE the most with 72.6%.
3. Students of Other races DISAGREE the most with 33.3%.
4. Black students were the ones to DISAGREE the least with 11.6%.
5. There were many students UNSURE.
Georgetown students do form their opinion of others based on stereotypes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. A majority of people AGREE.
2. Percentage of Black students who STRONGLY AGREE is much higher than any other group at 31.3%.
3. Other than Multiracial students (12.5%), White students (13.1%) and Asian students (13.3%) are the least percentage in saying that they STRONGLY AGREE.
4. South Asian students were the ones to DISAGREE the most with 16.7%
5. Black students of most sure with only 8.3% as UNSURE.
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Observations and Facts:
1. Black students are the ones who are in AGREEMENT the most at 86.4%.
2. South Asian students are again the ones to DISAGREE the most with 14.3%.
3. Less students were UNSURE as compared to the results for Stereotypes.
4. Black students DISAGREE the least with 3.3%.
5. Middle Eastern students were second highest to STRONGLY AGREE with 41.7%.
Observations and Facts:
1. There were a sizeable number of students who were UNSURE.
2. White students were the most to AGREE with 56.1%.
3. Black students STRONGLY AGREE the most with 22.9%.
4. Middle Eastern students were the ones to STRONGLY DISAGREE the most with 13.9%.
5. Hispanic students AGREE the least with only 40.3%
Racism does influence the behavior or attitudes of students, faculty and staff.

Observations and Facts:
1. Black students AGREE the most with 59.4%.
2. White students DISAGREE the most with 41%.
3. Middle Eastern students were the most Sure (only 11.1% UNSURE)
4. White students AGREE the least with only 27.9% (compare to Black students).
5. Of the minorities Asian students were the least to AGREE with 29.2%.
Observations and Facts:
1. South Asians were more UNSURE than anything else at 40.5%.
2. Only White students DISAGREE more than they AGREE (38.2% and 28.5%, respectively).
3. Black students found AGREEMENT the most with 62.5%.
4. At least 25% of every group was UNSURE.
5. Middle Eastern students STRONGLY DISAGREE the most with 11.4%.
Observations and Facts:
1. Asian students were almost as numerous as White students in DISAGREE (33.3\% for Asians v/s 34.8\%).
2. Black students AGREE the most with 71.9\%.
3. Black students were the most sure with only 17.7\% reporting UNSURE.
4. White students were the least to AGREE with only 27\%.
5. Hispanic students were the most to DISAGREE with 10.6\%.
Homophobia is a problem at Georgetown.

Observations and Facts:
1. Most students find AGREEMENT.
2. Middle Eastern students find DISAGREEMENT the most with 19.5%.
3. Black students have AGREEMENT the most with 78.2%.
4. Asian students have AGREEMENT the least with 55.6%
Observations and Facts:
1. Middle Eastern students find DISAGREEMENT most at 19.5%, followed by Hispanic students at 18.3%.
2. Asian students were the most UNSURE with 32.2%.
3. Asian students were the least to STRONGLY AGREE with 14.7%.
4. South Asian students STRONGLY DISAGREE the least with 2.4%.
5. Black students STRONGLY AGREE the most with 32.3%, closely followed by South Asian students at 31.0%
Observations and Facts:
1. An overwhelming number of students AGREE.
2. Asian students were the most to DISAGREE with 10.4%, by a large margin too.
3. 63.9%-70.3% of students to STRONGLY AGREE are consistent across the board.
4. Asian students were the least to find AGREEMENT with 84%.
Diversity is discussed too much on campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. Black student DISAGREE the most at 71.9%.
2. Hispanic students AGREE the most with 30.8%.
3. Over 20% of all responses were UNSURE.
4. Black students AGREE the least with only 9.4%.
5. Of the minorities, Middle Eastern students STRONGLY AGREE the most with 8.3%.
Critical Analysis

The survey administered to more than 1,500 students across Georgetown University’s undergraduate student body revealed a deep-lying discord between students of different racial groups as one of the most principle themes. This was evident in the disparate answers recorded from students of different racial backgrounds towards questions regarding the racial harmony on campus and the existence of problems like racism and discrimination. Throughout the survey, minority students and White students would trade places as the isolated outliers in their responses.

The data gathered from the surveys led to a number of conclusions. There are patterns present in the answers recorded from different racial groups. These conclusions are presented in this Critical Analysis with the goal of shedding light on oft neglected issues. Additionally, this Critical Analysis will serve as the empirical evidence in advocating for change at Georgetown University. The findings in our graphs, complemented by the text in this analysis will be the backbone for the action teams that will carry the work of the Student Commission for Unity forward.

Self Segregation: A Tool of Separation

Getting into the data, there was a clear trend that showed that self segregation was a prominent theme in the data results. In the open ended
among themselves and identify with racially exclusive groups.

That White students answered to not witnessing as much discrimination as other groups is attributed to the fact that they associate with themselves mostly and do not go outside of the group. In attempting to uncover the different perceptions of self segregation across campus, one of the members of the SCU Race Research Team took the onus upon himself to conduct an impromptu experiment. Everyday he went to the cafeteria for an entire week, he made it a point to go and sit with a group of people he did not know. He made sure that the groups would be of different racial backgrounds. In his experiment, he noted that the response was a generally positive one. While he did not always get welcomed with open arms, his approach was never met with negativity. This led him to come to the conclusion that race does not have everything to do with the segregation, at least not in the cafeteria. If people are willing to make the effort, they will not be turned away.
However, the situation is not always clear. There are students who believe that self-segregation is not a problem and that it merely serves as a mirage for those who want to prematurely claim that there is racism on campus. In one of the open-ended responses to the survey, one student said that, “I do find self-segregation to be irritating because the effects of self segregation often give the appearance of racism even though it actually isn't there.” This parity in opinions is shown in the data as well. While 86.4% of Black students agreed that self-segregation is a problem at Georgetown, 74.3% of Asian students agreed. Differing figures on each side of the coin go to show how divisive an issue can be, while most students overwhelmingly express the existence of self segregation at Georgetown as a problem.

That South Asian students were also had a sizeable number disagreeing (14.3%) exhibits the fact that this is not an obvious case like many think. It is not something that everyone looks at as a problem. However, that does not mean that the issue can continue being ignored. That so many Black students feel it is a problem is alone reason enough to confront the issue. While designing programs to work past this, it needs to be remembered that many think this problem is not a problem at all. As such, advocacy plans have to be tied in with awareness. The sentiments of one group should be expressed to the entire community. Even if it is a problem for only one group, at an institution like college that is—for all intents and purposes—your home for four years it needs to be addressed and dealt with accordingly.
A lot of this has to do with the students’ background, too. When asked about whether self segregation was a problem at their high school, 13.9% of Middle Eastern students answered saying that they strongly disagreed. This goes to show that there are students coming from backgrounds that are unfamiliar with the idea of self segregated groups within social settings. This is another important issue to keep in mind when dealing with advocacy. If you don’t know which communities feel polarized or marginalized, then it is difficult to address those communities.

**Racism and Discrimination: Underlying Problems**

An open ended response in the SCU survey signaled at the idea that racism is a non-factor within the Healy gates. Using the example of racially segregated student groups, the student pointed out that the separation was not due to racism but due to a differing set of interests. In other words, White students don’t get involved with the Black Student Alliance (BSA) because the interests of the BSA don’t necessarily match their own. While this may hold true for some students the actual survey data points at the contrary.

When asked if racism influences the behavior or attitudes of students, faculty and staff at Georgetown University an astounding 59.4% of Black students agreed. At an institution like Georgetown in a time when the nation is supposedly moving into a post-racial era, this is something that sticks out like a sore thumb. That a majority of Black students believe racism is present on campus shows that there is something amiss on campus. To make it worse, a
Similarly surprising 41% of White students disagreed with the same claim (while only 27.9% of them agreed—less than half the percentage as compared to Black students). Again, we see a clear discord between two race groups on campus on the same issue. In this, Black and White students stand almost as polar opposites to each other. Almost half of White students don’t think racism influences the behavior of people on campus while more than half of Black students do. This encapsulates the differences that exist between students of different races at Georgetown.

Similarly, when asked if racism is a problem at Georgetown White students were the only group which disagreed more than they agreed (38.2% disagreed while 28.5% agreed). These sets of statistics show that White students are outliers when it comes to issues of racism and discrimination on campus. Race relations sometimes tend to pit Black against White in a two-pronged scenario. However, the reality is more complex and there is more to it than just black and white. Other minorities comprise the grey area.

Regarding discrimination, a large number of Black students—71.9% to be exact—agreed with the claim that students of color do face discrimination on the Georgetown campus. In stark contrast, only 27% of White students agreed. Here, again, there is a huge gulf in the views held by Black and White students. They stand on the opposite side of the fence on this issue. Another interesting fact is that 34.8% of White students disagreed, making them the largest group to disagree. Again, displaying the complexity of the issue, 33.3% of Asian also
disagreed that students of color face discrimination at Georgetown. This again shows that it isn’t just White students who are impervious to the claims of discrimination that is voiced by minority groups.

When asked about how often they feel that they are the target of discrimination by fellow Georgetown students, White students overwhelmingly said never with 60.2%. Conversely, only 27.1% of Black students responded with “never” for the same question. This furthers the divide between White students and Black students. While these statistics may seem repetitive, the lesson to be learned is that there is clear disconnect, especially when it comes to (but not limited to) Black and White students. This is a problem that needs to addressed before the actual issue at hand. As such, before tackling racism and discrimination at its core, efforts must be made for each side to be aware of the other’s predicament. In a small setting like Georgetown, it is a shame that there can be such opposing views on the same things even though everything that happens here occurs within a 5 minute radius. For this, a student suggested that professors should take the onus upon themselves and make themselves available to augment the solidarity in the community — “If I hear about an issue regarding discrimination of racism, I want to be able to discuss it in the class room, not just see a protest in red square.”

**Identity: Struggles with the Self**

According to the results of the SCU survey, it is clear that identity figures greatly in the comfort levels of students on campus. When asked about whether
they feel uncomfortable within the premises of the Healy Gates, more than half of White students—52.6%—answered and said they have never felt uncomfortable. This percentage was the highest by some distance as compared to students of other races. Of the Black students, on the other hand, 35.4% responded and said that they sometimes feel uncomfortable because of their identity. This disparity can be attributed to the fact that White students number in the clear majority on campus. Also, that most of the racial groups on campus may have a tendency to self-segregate explains this level of comfort. This, in essence, explains that very pattern of self-segregation.

Because students feel uncomfortable at Georgetown because of their identity—which is an amalgamation of their race, socioeconomic background, nationality, religion, gender and sexual orientation—they naturally try to find ways to offset that discomfort. The most direct and easiest way to do this is to associate yourself with others just like you. The common factor that attributes to this bond varies from person to person but one of the things that frequently unites strangers (for lack of a better term) is race. Students find it easy to relate to people who look like them. This is why race becomes such a unifying factor. This is why racial dynamics on campus contribute so much to students feeling comfortable or uncomfortable.

However, there are instances where the racial power structure is reversed within the walls of 37th and O. A recent example of this was Michael Eric Dyson’s Hip Hop Culture, Origins and Traditions class that was comprised of a majority
of African American students. Such classes provide unique opportunities for students to find themselves. Such is the power of an educational institution like Georgetown. Unfortunately, this capability is not tapped into enough. Classes like Dr. Dyson’s do exist and are reminders that Georgetown has the ability to alter the way students look at race relations and dynamics. As a corollary, a concerted approach by the administration in this regard would allow students to finally transcend issues of race, sexual orientation, gender, socio economic background, etc. and to simply be Hoyas.

While it may sound too simplistic, the power of school spirit is one that cannot be ignored. Especially at a institution like Georgetown with a long history of school pride, there would be nothing wrong with reaping the benefits of the positive externalities of this unified pride. When students go to basketball games and scream “We Are Georgetown”, all issues and differences are forgotten. The administration can learn a lesson from this and push forth the idea of a Hoya identity that necessarily is post-discriminatory. If a Hoya is necessarily a unifying force then it will translate onto the 6,500 strong student body. It may sound like a secondary plan but identity plays a big part in people’s mentalities. National identities are strong enough to start wars. Hence, there is no reason why school identity cannot be used to unite students.

Divided Perspective: Deep Lying Discord

With that being said, there are still many challenges in the way. Perhaps none is bigger than the differences of opinion illustrated in this Critical Analysis.
That problems exist is bad enough. But that there are so many who are unaware of these problems really exacerbates the situation further. This means that before concrete steps can be taken to fight the disunity on campus, efforts must be focused on bringing these problems to light. This is why SCU is publishing this report in the first place. The report is here so that excuses can no longer be made about how incidents of discrimination are isolated occurrences. It must be known that there are actual problems and divides underneath the surfaces. While the campus has and will continue to function smoothly on the surface without any hiccups, it will only take a small spark to ignite the volatile undertones.

This is what happened in October of 2007 when coverage (or lack thereof) of students protesting the Jena Six case led to a period of tension between students on campus. The elephant in the room in that case was race. And while many wanted to ignore that and say that race had nothing to do with it, it was clear that race was the catalyst of the conflict then. So, the campus community needs to take steps to remove the threat of another such conflict.

While other data and surveys may point towards Georgetown as harmonious and without problems, this report will serve as the evidence that things are not all peaches and cream. This was perfectly exemplified when Black Enterprise ranked Georgetown an impressive 5th in its list of Top 50 Colleges for African Americans. While the ranking added prestige to Georgetown’s image of diversity, reaction to it was lukewarm at best at Georgetown, while confusion abounded. Prominent campus leaders in the Black community responded with
optimism that was tied in with skepticism. President of the Caribbean Culture Circle, Garvey Pierre (COL ’09) stated that he appreciated the report and how it “took into account the historical context into which Georgetown was born” seeing the positives the ranking could bring to the institution. However, president of the Georgetown University Women of Color, Courtney Richardson (MSB ’09) said that she was hesitant in accepting the ranking with open arms because she felt there were more than just four other colleges that are better for African American students. If 76% of Black students feel uncomfortable at Georgetown because of their identity (Question 36), it is troubling to consider how uncomfortable they may feel at other Universities.

Finally, concerning the infamously hot topic of diversity, 30.8% of Hispanic students agreed with the statement that diversity is discussed too much on campus. On the contrary, only 9.4% of Black students agreed with the same statement. For people to think that diversity is discussed too much on a campus as divided as Georgetown shows that these discussions are unwanted by a minority of students. It is likely that many students would prefer these problems to be swept under the rug. But this cannot be allowed and (at the very least) diversity has to be talked about. Without dialogue and institutional change, there cannot be any progress. Without discussion none of the blind eyes will be opened.
Outreach: Keeping the Campus’s Ear

There was also a clear indication that the campus resources in place to assist students in matters of racism, discrimination and the like were being under-utilized, under-funded, and under-promoted. This lack of usage of campus resources is due in large part to an inefficient approach to publicity. In the survey, many students across all the racial groups responded and said that they were not aware of the Bias Reporting System (BRS), which is the campus resource in place to allow students to report any instances of bias and/or discrimination so that the proper procedures can be undertaken by the respective authorities. This displays an ineffective approach by the BRS in reaching the students. This completely negates the purpose of the BRS existing in the first place.

Worse yet is that there are students who do know about the BRS but will not seek it out when they have witnessed an instance of discrimination. This is perhaps the most severe testimonial against the BRS. The students’ hesitancy in reaching out to the BRS shows that there is something missing in terms of accessibility. While there are other factors involved like the students level of comfort and familiarity in seeking the ear of friends and/or family, this is also a damning testimonial against the BRS. Simply being there is not good enough when it comes to things as sensitive as incidents of discrimination. The BRS needs to not only makes it presence know but approach students in a nuanced
manner that makes them know that the BRS is cognizant of the sensitivity involved in such matters.

Students remain wary of the influence of the BRS. There is a feeling that things like the BRS blur the line between reporting discrimination and overt political correctness. Students fear that the existence of a resource for reporting bias and discrimination can lead to an atmosphere of paranoia where they will have to watch each and every little thing they say. Such extreme political correctness will, in their view, lead to a shunting of speech and expression. As such, the BRS needs to be aware of such sentiments and tread softly.

These are the things that the BRS needs to take into account. It is clear that there need to be reforms implemented not only in publicity and outreach but also in the way it projects its image onto students.

**Other Stumbling Blocks: Persistent Problems**

One of the biggest obstacles in implementing any reforms is that it is very difficult to reach all of the students at Georgetown at once. In fact, it is near impossible to reach all of the undergraduate body. Theoretically, there are methods that can be implemented where all of the students can be reached. However, in practice it is much different. For instance, broadcast emails can be sent out where campus resources that promote diversity are advertised. However, it cannot be guaranteed that those emails will actually be read. This typifies the difficulty associated with trying to reach a 6,500 student population.
It is also impractical to enforce mandatory methods across the board that have to be read by the entire college population.

It is, however, possible to have all of the incoming freshmen class under one umbrella. This is during New Student Orientation (NSO). As such there is extra pressure on activities during NSO week to maximize that time that they have the ear of 1,600 incoming students and push a message of diversity and unity. One student hinted at this in the open ended responses—“There must be a concerted effort immediately upon arrival to Georgetown to discourage social self-segregation and to bring up the aforementioned issues of identity and difference in a positive, meaningful way.”

This, along with a multitude of other approaches forms the basis for the recommendations that complement the findings of the survey data, graphs and Critical Analysis. These recommendations aim to target several different resources on campus to allow for a sustainable and well rounded reform process.


**Race Research Team Recommendations**

**Admissions**

1) Include an optional essay question on the undergraduate admissions application that: (A) Describes what diversity means at Georgetown with respect to the Jesuit Ideals and, (B) Asks the applicants to reflect on this meaning and describe what diversity means to them by using a personal experience.

**Academic Life**

2) Change the Humanities and Writing section of the General Education requirement to include one class that is centered on Diversity (e.g. a class that tours and explores the multicultural parts of the District of Columbia).

**Student Life and Housing**

3) Make activities during New Student Orientation more diversity oriented. Since this is the only time to get the attention of all incoming freshmen, push forth the importance of diversity. Hold film screenings of culturally diverse films (e.g. Crash) and have a tour of the District of Columbia (e.g. a tour of Anacostia).

4) Train Resident Assistants on diversity oriented facilitating to continue the momentum of Pluralism in Action. Hold discussions, group talks, etc. regarding diversity. Have the RAs host events on floors where people from diverse backgrounds (who don’t live on the floor) come and discuss issues important to them (e.g. a representative from the Black Student Alliance discussing race relations on campus).

5) Diversify every floor in the freshman residence halls by having a ratio of Minority:White::1:4 to broaden the experience of first year students. While this does not force them to live with someone who is unlike them, it does bring them into close contact with them, especially considering the camaraderie usually present in first year residence halls.
Conclusion

This research project has undertaken a close study of race relations at Georgetown. Some of our findings were surprising in the depth of the problems and the stratification of racial groups, while other results indicating strength, solidarity and reflected well upon our University. Race continues to be a defining issue in America, and our research demonstrates that racism remains an issue on campus. Even as Barack Obama is elected President of the United States, racism and the consequences of race permeate the consciousness of students at Georgetown, preventing our campus from living up to our Jesuit Ideals and Mission Statement for all students, not just those who are uncomfortable or oppressed. More research must be done, but for now the evidence is apparent that the University must change to promote the well being of humankind in a community that lives generously in service to others.
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Introduction

Religion plays a unique role in the Georgetown University community. While the University is Roman Catholic and has a Jesuit affiliation, it funds the Office of Campus Ministry, which serves students of several religious backgrounds. Do these positions on religion help to unify or discourage the student campus community? This portion of the project especially explores the role of religious minorities on campus and students' perception of the University's Jesuit identity.
Research Methods

Of the 1517 students who began the survey, 1339 (88.3%) identified their Race. The following breakdown occurred:

- Roman Catholic: 552 Students (41.2% of sampled population)
- Protestant Christian: 297 Students (22.2% of sampled population)
- Jewish: 87 Students (6.5% of sampled population)
- No Affiliation: 341 Students (25.5% of sampled population)
- Other: 66 Students (4.9% of sampled population)

The following populations were under sampled and were not statistically significant. For the purposes of including them in the report, they have been grouped together. There are certain differences and trends between these groups, and their group can only be taken to represent three distinct religious minorities.

- Muslim: 23 Students (1.7% of sampled population)
- Hindu: 23 Students (1.7% of sampled population)
- Buddhist: 16 Students (1.2% of sampled population)

Research Question: Despite a strong emphasis on various faiths in the Office of Campus Ministry, many religious groups, particularly nonbelievers, feel excluded at Georgetown because of their beliefs.

Assumptions:

a) GU’s Jesuit identity often “hidden”

b) Many students are Catholic even if they aren’t public about it

c) Almost all the buildings are named after Jesuits

d) Crosses in classrooms

e) Birth control issue

f) Fairly conservative for a college campus

g) Very active MSA, strong presence in Abrahamic religions

h) Problem of God often focuses on Abrahamic faiths exclusively

i) Whether or not a religion has an on-campus chaplaincy makes a big difference

j) Seems to be a serious attempt to reach out to different religious groups (DeGioia’s comparative theology talks)

k) Campus can be awkward/uncomfortable for atheists and agnostics (also the admissions process…)

l) Prep-school “Joe Hoya” may simply have a lack of experience interacting with religious minorities (including nonreligious)

m) Religious presences on campus are in general more “vocal”
n) ADMISSIONS POLICY – is there a vested interest in maintaining a majority-Catholic student body? Is there a form of religious affirmative action at Georgetown?

**Hypothesis:** Religious identity directly affects perceptions, attitudes and behaviors at Georgetown across all religious groups at our Jesuit University.
Are you familiar with the Bias Reporting System (BRS)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Affiliation</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. How much does the BRS publicize what it does?
2. Most people have never used the BRS, and probably don’t know many people who have.
3. Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist (37.1%) students most likely to be aware of the BRS, with Jewish students right behind them (36.8%).
4. Catholic, Protestant and No Affiliation students least aware.
If you answered "Yes," have you ever reported anything to the Bias Reporting System?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Affiliation</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. Two groups that identify as the most adequate were the least likely to report (Catholic and Other).
2. Could correlating religious and ethnic identities explain some of this data?
3. Catholic students very unlikely to have reported, at 2%.
4. Protestant students most likely at 7.4%.
5. Even though Jewish and Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist students were most aware, their rate of usage was not higher.
Observations and Facts:
1. Catholics are least familiar with the system, yet they felt that it was most adequate (26% aware, 57.7% agree it is adequate)
2. Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist seem to have the least faith in the adequacy of the system
3. Protestants also seemed largely unfamiliar with the system, yet they feel it was adequate; however they are the group that have used the system the most
Observations and Facts:

1. Students who aren’t Catholic or Jewish are almost twice as likely to be UNSURE.

2. Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist and NA almost three times as likely to DISAGREE than Catholic or Protestant.

3. How objective is the Jesuit identity to Catholic students? Are they more likely to have them ingrained in them if they are from a Catholic family? A legacy family? From a Jesuit HS?

4. Since we attend a Jesuit institution, the University will be geared more towards Catholic students-& they will probably feel as if they are getting the most out of their education.
Georgetown students exhibit Educating the Whole Person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Affiliation</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. More people in AGREEMENT, but people shifted out of STRONGLY AGREE and into the other categories (though not necessarily directly)
2. Jewish students (21%), Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist students (22%) again about twice as likely to be in DISAGREEMENT than Catholic students (12.9%).
Student Commission for Unity

Religion: Q21b

Georgetown promotes Women and Men for Others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Affiliation</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:

1. Students more likely to be UNSURE about this question than Educating the Whole Person.
2. Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist students still lower, though strong in AGREEMENT.
3. Women and Men for Others could be perceived as volunteer work… which ministries are involved in volunteer work?
4. Catholic least likely to be UNSURE
5. How does each religion promote social justice?
6. Catholic twice as likely to STRONGLY AGREE than No Affiliation, Other and Jewish.
Observations and Facts:

1. Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist students may be more cynical about the student body responding to the Jesuit values.

2. DISAGREEMENT of Catholic (10.5%) and Other students (10.6%) is again almost half what Jewish (18.7%), Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist (19.3%), and No Affiliation (19.6%).

3. Catholic students are again least UNSURE at 19.4%.
Georgetown promotes Interreligious Understanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Affiliation</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. This question boasts the highest AGREEMENT.
2. Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist answers very high for STRONGLY AGREE at 56.5%.
3. What schools did they attend before Georgetown? How did that affect them?
4. Are there Buddhist resources at Georgetown?
5. Christian – Muslim understanding emphasized here a lot.
6. Very active Jewish Chaplaincy contributes to these high numbers.
7. Catholics, surprisingly, were not the overwhelming majority in terms of AGREE; they were the most likely to STRONGLY AGREE, but the numbers for AGREEMENT very similar to the alternative responses.
Observations and Facts:
1. Respondents in most AGREEMENT for the 22 group.
2. Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist most UNSURE at 32.3%, Catholics were 18.8%.
3. Jewish (5.9%) and Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist (4.8%) for STRONGLY AGREE is much higher than the next highest response, Catholics at (2%)
4. Catholic (8.9%) DISAGREEMENT was again half of many other groups: Jewish (23.4%) and Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist (22.5%)
5. Jewish (53.1%) and Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist (45.2%) also least likely to be in AGREEMENT.
Student Commission for Unity

Religion: Q21d

Georgetown promotes Community in Diversity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Affiliation</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. DISAGREEMENT much more likely for this question than other ideals.
2. Catholics seemed to be consistently confident in the ideals of the university.
3. Jewish most likely to be UNSURE (30.2%). does that make Diversity more ambiguous to a Jewish person?
4. Respondents are fairly confident, similar responses for demographics.
5. Protestant and No Affiliation DISAGREEMENT fairly high.
6. Does the University cater more towards Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist students when dealing with diversity?
Georgetown students exhibit Community in Diversity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Affiliation</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations and Facts:**

1. Respondents most likely to be in DISAGREEMENT with this question in the 22 group.
2. Respondents were least UNSURE for this question in the 22 group.
3. Catholic students most likely to be in AGREEMENT at 46.2%.
4. Large Jewish response for DISAGREE (39.5%) may be related to respondents' experience with healthy diversity in the community: Jewish people are often used to being isolated from a majority community.
5. Students from minority religious backgrounds may be more used to being in the minority so coming to Georgetown is not a major transition.
### Georgetown promotes Cura Personalis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Affiliation</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Observations and Facts:

1. Many students UNSURE-possibly because the meaning is unclear.
2. Catholic students more likely to have heard of Cura Personalis before, but why Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist (Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist) students similarly least likely to be UNSURE?
3. Jewish (10.5%), Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist (11.5%), and No Affiliation (10.7%) almost twice as likely to be in DISAGREEMENT as Catholic students (5.8%).
Observations and Facts:
1. Students are extremely UNSURE, ranging from Catholic at 32.9% to Other students, who were UNSURE 47% of the time.
2. Students were less likely to be in DISAGREEMENT for this question than the other questions in 22.
3. Catholic students remained the least UNSURE, and were also in the most AGREEMENT at 57.5%
Observations and Facts:

1. Catholics tend to be least aware of discrimination, answering NEVER 26.1% of the time, as opposed to

2. Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist students are the leaders in SOMETIMES, OFTEN or REGULARLY (51.6%).

3. If you have NEVER seen discrimination it may be affected by your social groups.

4. Protestant students answered OFTEN or REGULARLY 10.5% of the time, as opposed to Catholics, who answered 5.3% of the time.
Observations and Facts:

1. In general, students trust University faculty, staff and administrators more than other students.

2. Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist become leaders in more pessimistic responses (SOMETIMES, OFTEN, REGULARLY) at 22.5%, as opposed to Catholics at 9.1% or Protestants at 12.8%.

3. Catholic students witness instances of discrimination the least, responding NEVER 62.3% of the time.
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Religion: Q33

I ______ feel I am the target of discriminatory words, actions and/or decisions by Georgetown students.

Observations and Facts:
1. Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist (26.6%) and Jewish (24.5%) answer at similarly high rates for SOMETIMES, OFTEN and REGULARLY.
2. Catholic students (62.2%) responded NEVER nearly twice as frequently as Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist (31.7%) students.
3. "Target" is a word that suggests deliberate discrimination, so this does not account for more pervasive, unconscious forms of discrimination.
4. Catholic NEVER responses strikingly similar in 32(62.3%) and 33(62.2%).
I ______ feel I am the target of discriminatory words, actions and/or decisions by Georgetown faculty, staff or discrimination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Regularly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Affiliation</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations and Facts:**

1. More people witness discrimination than feel targeted (graph 32): the difference is between targeting their own group or targeting any group.
2. Is there a distinction between personally interacting with faculty and curricular material?
3. Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist SOMETIMES response (12.9%) is much higher than any other religious group’s response, except for Other (9.1%)
Observations and Facts:
1. Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist were most likely to ignore a situation (58.8%), while Other was most likely to approach the situation (62.2%).
2. Protestant students (7.3%) most likely to have reported an instance of discrimination. Other students did not report any instances (0%).
3. Students across religious groups respond to instances of discrimination fairly similarly.
4. Few students discuss discrimination with faculty.
I ______ feel uncomfortable at Georgetown because of my identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Regularly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Affiliation</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations and Facts:**

1. Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist (22.6%) were half as likely to respond NEVER than Catholic students (54.4%).
2. Other represents multiple groups, meaning that some did and some didn't necessarily feel uncomfortable.
3. Jewish second least likely to respond NEVER, at 32.6%, while Protestant, Other and No Affiliation ranked similarly to each other at the mid 40%.
4. Other students responded highest at SOMETIMES, 25.8%.
Observations and Facts:

1. No Affiliation students do in fact still attend services, though infrequently.
2. Catholic students most likely to OFTEN or REGULARLY attend religious services at 42.9%.
3. Jewish students least likely to attend services OFTEN or REGULARLY at 16.2%.
I ______ attend religious services of a different religious group than my own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Protestant</th>
<th>Jewish</th>
<th>Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist</th>
<th>No Affiliation</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist most likely to attend SOMETIMES (35.5%). Catholic students least likely to attend SOMETIMES at 8.3%.
2. No Affiliation students second least likely (after Catholics) to attend services other than their own SOMETIMES, OFTEN or REGULARLY (19%).
3. If you only occasionally attend your own services, you're unlikely to attend those of another group.
4. Protestant students most likely to OFTEN and REGULARLY attend at 5%. Perhaps some Protestants attend Catholic services?
Alcohol is a factor in instances of discrimination at Georgetown.

Observations and Facts:

1. Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist most likely to be in DISAGREEMENT at 25.8%.
2. Most students are in AGREEMENT.
3. Protestant students least likely to be in DISAGREEMENT, at 10.6%.
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Georgetown students do form their opinion of others based on stereotypes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Affiliation</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. Fairly consistent response across groups
2. Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist may lead in STRONGLY DISAGREE because they are used to being more stereotyped outside the Georgetown community than they are on-campus
3. Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist are more visibly identifiable (more racial minorities) for stereotyping
Observations and Facts:
1. Responses fairly consistent across groups.
2. Catholic students most likely to be UNSURE (17.5%), while Jewish students were more deliberate (5.7%).
3. Jewish and Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist are very sure about self-segregation being a problem; this may reflect the tendency of minority groups to stay together, or they may be more sensitive to being excluded by self-segregators, or simply more sensitive to the idea of self-segregation in general.
4. Some students may see the question as indicating self-segregation as inherently problematic, while others may see it as meaning that the phenomenon causes other problems.
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Observations and Facts:
1. Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist least likely to STONRGLY AGREE at 11.3%
2. Students were slightly more UNSURE about this question than 51c.
3. Compared to the previous question, many respondents see self-segregation as much more of an issue in their past experience than in the present at Georgetown.
4. There are at least two ways to honestly disagree with this statement. A high school can be very homogeneous, where self-segregation cannot realistically exist; or a genuinely diverse, non-self-segregating community.
5. Some respondents may believe that their high school self-segregated but not identify that as a problem.
Observations and Facts:

1. Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist are especially sensitive (17.7% to STRONGLY AGREE) to this because there are those out there who see “an Arab” and automatically think “Muslim”. This group also had high answers to STRONGLY DISAGREE (9.7%), which were offset by the low responses to DISAGREE (16.1%).

2. The Jewish community is sensitive to this too because “Jewish” has taken on increasingly “racial” connotations rather than distinctly religious.

3. This question has extremely high levels of UNCERTAINTY.

4. Catholic students most likely to STRONGLY DISAGREE at 10.7%.
Observations and Facts:
1. Similar assumptions could explain Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist responses as in 51e.
2. Again, the Jewish community is up there in AGREEMENT at 40.3%.
3. It is possible that African Americans account for a lot more of the Protestant population than any other population represented here.
4. Catholic students most likely to be in DISAGREEMENT at 40%, as opposed to only 19.7% of Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist students.
5. Other students most UNSURE at 37.9%. This question saw a nearly symmetrical pattern and high levels of UNCERTAINTY.
Observations and Facts:
1. Extremely high levels of UNCERTAINTY.
2. Catholic students most likely to be in DISAGREEMENT at 35.5%.
3. Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist most likely to be in AGREEMENT at 50%.
4. Uncertainty could represent unfamiliarity with terms or with experiences of students of color.
Homophobia is a problem at Georgetown.

Observations and Facts:
1. Other students most likely to be in DISAGREEMENT at 22.8%.
2. Catholic students were second most likely to be in DISAGREEMENT at 21.6%
3. It is possible that either some students who deny that there is homophobia, or they want to deny that there are even enough people who are in the LGBTQ community for this to be a problem.
4. Perhaps Jewish community and Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist are more sensitive to those in the LGBTQ community than others seem to be. Is this a direct result of their religious traditions?
5. Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist are least UNSURE at 9.7%.
LGBTQ students do face discrimination or alienation at Georgetown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faith</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Affiliation</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and Facts:
1. No Affiliation, Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist, Other, and the Jewish communities are high in AGREEMENT, as the question could be taken as very similar to the most previous one.
2. Catholics most likely to be in DISAGREEMENT at 20.9%.
Observations and Facts:

1. Most people are in AGREEMENT with this statement.
2. Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist leads for STRONGLY AGREE. Some Hindus may be used to a caste system, or to the Hindu notion that non-Hindus must wait for another life for the privilege of becoming Hindu.
**Observations and Facts:**

1. As has been said in previous graphs, those minorities (esp. Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist and No Affiliation) who answered high in DISAGREEMENT may feel “backed against the wall” in a place like this with very strong Christian overtones.

2. Perhaps people are not only UNSURE about the statement, directly, but may also/rather be UNSURE about what kind of affects all the diversity talk on campus has accomplished.

3. Catholic (26.1%), Jewish (27.6%) and Other (27.3%) students lead in AGREEMENT.
Critical Analysis

"Catholic comfort"

Across the board, research indicates that on issues pertaining to the standards of diversity on campus, Roman Catholic students are almost always more confident and trusting of both the university administration and the student body. This is revealed in the responses to countless questions, such as Question 33, “I ___ feel I am the target of discriminatory words, actions and/or decisions by Georgetown students”. Many explanations are possible for this phenomenon. Some of our researchers have suggested that there may be some correlation among Georgetown students between being Catholic and having a more privileged financial or social background. Others have raised the notion that Catholic students at Georgetown, being members of the best-represented group on campus as well as cohering with the university’s own religious affiliation, have less experience with social exclusion or being on the receiving end of discrimination.

A related idea raised by our researchers was the possibility of religion's influence on the admissions process. One survey respondent (a religiously unaffiliated LGBTQ white male) specifically linked admissions decisions to maintaining financial support from "old mainly Catholic alums". It is not inconceivable that, for any of a number of reasons, the Office of Admissions has incentives to maintain the proportion of Catholics in the student body at a certain
level. It was also pointed out that it is very easy simple to list a religious affiliation on an application without any real level of observance: data indicates that among Catholics at Georgetown attendance of religious services is lower than the frequently served Masses would indicate. While Georgetown's Catholic identity is a boon to the university community as a whole, at times the student body seems divided along the fault line of religion.

Jesuit Ideals

Student reaction to the implementation of the "Jesuit ideals" on campus is decidedly mixed. One survey respondent (#58, a white male atheist) insists that "Catholicism is inherently bigoted" and demands that the university cast off its Jesuit identity, while another (#493, an unaffiliated white male) believes that the Jesuit ideals "alone support toleration of other groups". There are also nuanced beliefs between these two opinions: #1400 (an Asian male Catholic) stated that "a willingness to embrace [Georgetown's] religious heritage... can in itself promote unity," but others believe more strongly in focusing more explicitly on promoting social justice at the expense of strongly identifying with the Catholic Church.

As far as knowing the meaning of the Jesuit ideals, Catholic students are (unsurprisingly) more likely to understand phrases such as "Cura Personalis." However, students in general are far less confident in the student body's exhibiting of the ideals than of the administration promoting them. Overall, students believe that the Jesuit ideals are a positive force on campus but that they are often too ignored to do real good. While the administration upholds these
ideals, in students' view, the campus community does not respond adequately to their presence, promotion or enactment.

**Improvement of BRS**

In the spring of 2004, University President John J. DeGioia began a Hate and Bias Reporting Working Group to improve the awareness of and response to acts of intolerance, bias, and hate within the University community. The group included University administrators, staff and students who worked collaboratively to compile and provide resources to better aid the University community in confronting intolerance. This group came to be known as the Bias Reporting System, and it still claims to be promoted by the University in order to help curtail any incident of bias at Georgetown. Our research, however, indicates that this effort has been unsatisfactory. Out of the six different categories that we identified among religious groups, only two of them had a familiarity rate (with the system) that was over 35%. Furthermore, the overwhelming majority reported unfamiliarity with the BRS, led by Catholics which reported a 74% rate. This indicates that despite the fact that the BRS identifies itself as a valuable resource for students, most students are not even aware of its existence or purpose. It seems like more needs to be done regarding the publicity of this group, so students at least know that they have a resource to deal specifically with the problems bias and discrimination if necessary.

There also appears to be an inconsistency regarding those who do happen to be familiar with the Bias Reporting System. Those who identified them selves
as Jewish and Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist, while being the highest two groups in terms of affirming their familiarity with the system, were some of the least likely to report anything. While this could be attributed to these students having nothing to report, this is still something to keep in mind. Not that students who know about should be overusing the system, but they should be doing their part in educating other students about it and making sure that people at least know that when there is a bias incident, students have somewhere to turn to. Another issue seems to be with the integrity of those who are familiar with the BRS. There seems to be an attitude of complacency in some of the groups given the inconsistency of some of their responses. Protestants, for example, reported as being the third least familiar (28.6%) with the system but, despite this, also the second highest (51.9%) in reporting that they felt that resources for reporting incidents of bias were adequate. This is an issue that needs to be addressed because it can potentially make it difficult for the necessary adjustments to be made in the system. When a group that is unfamiliar with the BRS and hardly ever uses it reports that it is a great, effective system, the group seems to be communicating that the BRS is unimportant to them and, thus, it is not necessary to spend time changing it. In order for the BRS to be the resource it has set out to be, we as students need to be familiar with it so we can give it honest feedback in order to make it better.
Alcohol, Identity, and Discrimination

Although there are many things that need to be worked on, as a Religion Team, there many positives that we were able to identify in this research project. In terms of religious identity, most students feel like they have a place here at Georgetown. Catholics (54.4%) were the highest in reporting that they never felt uncomfortable, and most Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist students (45.2%) communicated that they have rarely felt uncomfortable at Georgetown with their religious identity. These statistics are encouraging because they point to the idea that when religion is concerned, most students feel like they can find a place to be comfortable at Georgetown. On the other hand, stereotyping was identified as a major issue when considering religious groups. 50% or more of five of the six groups reported that Georgetown students based their decisions of others based on stereotypes. Similarly, across the board religious groups are in pretty strong agreement that alcohol is a factor when discrimination does happen. Given what we know about alcohol, it can be surmised that it can bring out underlying beliefs or characterizations that one may not normally express to others. In this way, alcohol is not the root problem of discrimination, but it is these underlying stereotypes that we hold. While there may not be a tangible thing that SCU can provide to help combat this problem, we all need to self-reflect on the stereotypes that we each hold, and seek to live above the stereotypes that people may try to impose on us.
Religion Research Team Recommendations

Campus Ministry
1) More diversity in campus ministry and chaplains in residence program.

2) Better publicize & encourage attendance to programs/services related to minority/underrepresented religions

3) Encourage the university to treat Atheist/Agnostic Hoyas not as those who lack religion but as communities that should be acknowledged (perhaps by bringing speakers to campus to discuss these belief systems and secularity)

4) Encourage religious figures on campus (chaplains, Jesuits, theology professors) to attend services not pertaining to their own religion. Their presence might create interest and foster Interreligious Understanding.

5) Present Jesuit ideals less as connected to the University's Jesuit identity and more as connected with the idea that these ideals are truly universal and transcend culture, religion, etc.

Academic Life
6) Review the Problem of God course and encourage professors to survey more religions than Christianity and those that fall under the Abrahamic tradition.

Student Life
7) Foster a closer relationship among student-run religious groups on campus (perhaps they could co-run more events, coordinate in fundraising, etc). Greater extension of the Interfaith Council.

8) Encourage active engagement in diversity (possibly mandatory freshman diversity tutorial)

Bias Reporting System
9) Publicize the bias reporting system. Perhaps this can be incorporated into talks freshman receive during NSO from their OAs and RAs.
Conclusion

This research project has taken a comprehensive look at religious life at Georgetown University. While there have been many positive aspects of religious life of Georgetown, including the comfort in their identity that most students seem to have, there are many things that need to change. Those of us involved with the Student Commission for Unity research team have committed to help foster the change that needs to take place on the campus of Georgetown University, and we hope to motivate others to do the same.
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Introduction

This research project has attempted to identify and assess how students perceive institutional resources and conditions in relation to racism, homophobia and self-segregation on Georgetown's campus. The results of the survey were analyzed for each of the five demographic subsets (class and school; education background; gender and sexual orientation; race; religion), as well as for the aggregate of all respondents. We have identified three major sectors from which problems have arisen and a set of solutions that the Commission intends to advocate in moving beyond the research. The major focus of our analysis consists of the following: (1) awareness of resources, (2) social stratification and polarization, and (3) lack of social justice in curriculum and campus culture. We will highlight statistical evidence for the existence of problems. Then, using the same data, we will articulate solutions for fostering a more egalitarian and equitable learning environment that aspires to our mission statement’s commitments to “serious and sustained discourse among people of different faiths, cultures, and beliefs promotes intellectual, ethical, and spiritual understanding. We embody this principle in the diversity of our students, faculty, and staff, our commitment to justice and the common good, our intellectual openness, and our international character… Georgetown educates women and men to be reflective lifelong learners, to be responsible and active
participants in civic life, and to live generously in service to others.”

Awareness of University Resources.

The first major area of interest in this analysis concerns University resources. We believe that students need resources that will be effective in at least playing a part in permeating a culture on campus that is responsive to bias and discrimination—a culture that recognizes bias, knows where to report it, and believes that it will be adequately castigated. The survey attempted to gather data about several pertinent questions revolving around student perceptions of resources available to them. More specifically, questions we posed addressed (1) the adequacy of the Bias Reporting System (i.e. students awareness and use of this resource), (2) the way that students realistically deal with discrimination and bias, and (3) how they recognize and interact with the efforts and the messages sent by the University (i.e. Jesuit Ideals: implications of the message's ability to permeate and foster community).

Lack of awareness of Bias Reporting System (Q11)

To begin, the University has attempted to monitor and quantify occurrences of bias with the Bias Report System. This structure must be an efficient and reliable resource for our University. Our results show that only 27.3% of the entire sampled population can attest to being familiar with the Bias Reporting System (see University Graph 11). Within this alarmingly small
number, there are even more telling statistics from which we might derive greater appreciation for the inadequacy of the Bias Reporting System. We entered the project with the basic assumption that minorities would be more aware of the Bias Reporting System than members of majority groups, and the data provides evidence to substantiate this claim. Among those with the highest rates of awareness were: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Questioning (LGBTQ) students (57.8%), Black students (44.8%), Muslim, Hindu, and Buddhist students (37.1%), and Jewish students (36.8%) stated that they were aware. Conversely, those who were least familiar with the Bias Reporting System were: Asian students (25%), White students (26.6%), Catholic students (26%), Private school students (26.1%), and Heterosexual students (26.3%). Across this spectrum, it is striking that even groups reporting the highest levels of awareness of the Bias Reporting System, LGBTQ students are the only demographic recognized by the study to have more than 50% report familiarity with the Bias Reporting System. We draw no causal relationships, but further analysis will show that students do indeed deal with instances of bias and discrimination in different ways. The Bias Reporting System cannot take names or move to discipline someone who has been reported, which perhaps explains why it is hardly utilized.

The Bias Reporting System is one of the most important resources put in place by the University for students to directly report bias and discrimination. While options like seeking consolation in professors, family, friends, etc. are
important to deal with bias on a personal level, the University implemented the Bias Reporting System in order to take responsibility and deal systematically with bias and discrimination on our campus. This study makes clear, however, that in its present state it is not marketed effectively enough to reach enough students. A true marker of success for the Bias Reporting System would be a significant increase in the number of students who are familiar with it and also in the amount bias that is reported through the Bias Reporting System.

Are Resources Adequate (Q13)?

Beyond the Bias Reporting System, the survey asked students if campus resources were adequate to deal with bias (see Q13). Among those with the highest rates of agreement that resources are adequate were: students in the class of 2011 (62.9%), Male students (63%), Catholic students (57.7%), and White students (55.1%). One noteworthy finding is the negative relationship between class year and believing resources are adequate. This means that as students progress though the years, they will be more likely to be dissatisfied with campus resources. For example, 63% of 2011 students comprise the highest belief in resource adequacy, while students in the class of 2008 were among the lowest, with only 42.7% affirming resource adequacy. Another interesting finding exists within the race demographic analysis. While 63% of White student reported that resources were adequate, every other racial group reported less than 50% of respondents believing campus resources are adequate, as did only 28.4% of
LGBTQ students affirmed resource adequacy, along with only 33.3% of Black students, 36.1% of Middle Eastern students, 41.7% of International students, 42.7% of Female students, and 42.9% of Jewish students. Most interesting about this data is that among all respondents, there is only a 5% average difference between those who believe resources adequate (52.5%) and those believing them inadequate (47.5%). It is surprising to see half of all respondents claiming that resources are adequate. It becomes increasingly apparent that there is a conflict when the data shows that only 27.3% are even familiar with the Bias Reporting System, then, when asked how students dealt with past experiences with bias or discrimination, only 5.4% of students chose to report anything (Q35).

Thus, most students chose options outside University resources to deal with the situation. It appears that minorities are more likely to be familiar with the resources available to them, as stated above, but are also most likely to say they are inadequate. Conversely, majority groups are less likely to be familiar with resources, and yet make up the largest percentage of those claiming that resources are adequate for dealing with bias. The next step is to analyze how people actually handle situations in which they witnessed bias.

*How Do Students Respond to Discrimination (Q35)?*

We have discussed that the Bias Reporting System and campus resources in general are inadequate for dealing with instances of discrimination or bias. Question 35 of the survey allowed us to analyze what action students actually
took when confronted by instances of discrimination or bias. There were many outliers in the data that suggested unusual facts for our analysis. The results yielded very valuable information, particularly in elucidating which students report information to campus authorities, which students approach the perpetrators, the distinction between female and male response, and which students approach professors and staff.

The most alarming statistics showed that some demographic groups responded that they almost never reported an incidence of bias. When asked how students dealt with bias, 0% of International students said they reported bias incidents they witnessed, while only 2.6% of Catholics and only 1.6% of Private School students said that they reported the bias they encountered. The weight of these statistics is intensified by the fact that these demographic make up such a large part of the Undergrad community. According to our responses, 20.3% of Georgetown students reported a Private school education and 41.2% of students reported affiliation with Roman Catholicism.

The insightful dynamic between females and males appeared again where students responded that they ignored situations of bias. Males (62.1%) were more likely than females (42.4%) to say that they ignored the situation. This can be paralleled to Q13 where students were asked if resources were adequate. In almost identical fashion, 63% of males and 42.7% of females said that resources were adequate. There is a disconnect between what students perceive the University provides as a resource and the initiative students use to actually
utilize those resources. Students report that they know about resources and how to deal with bias, but statistically, never report bias, or speak to a professor or University official. Instead, they ignore the instance (48.6%), try to comfort the target of the discrimination (37.5%), approach the perpetrator (38.1%) or discuss it with friends and family (64.4%). While being proactive to confront discrimination is crucial, students do not include University resources in the process, preventing broader institutional awareness or problems on campus.

Only 15.7% of students who have witnessed instances of discrimination in the past said that they have discussed the event with a professor. The relationships between identity and discussing discrimination with professors is perhaps counterintuitive. LGBTQ students were most likely to speak with a professor at 33.3%, with Black students following at 23.8%, Hispanic students at 22.7% and Middle Eastern students at 24%. On the other hand, Catholic students were among the lowest response rates with only 12.6% and Protestant students only reported 14.6%. White students responded at a similar rate of 15.1%. These statistics do not illuminate causal relationships but rather allow us to ask why students who most closely identify with Georgetown’s normative communities are least likely to approach a faculty or staff members about something as personal as witnessing or experiencing discrimination. We should be encouraged that racial minorities, who clearly report that they experience more bias, are attempting to engage the University in alleviating stress and dealing with bias. On the other hand, even the students for which a dominant identity and ideology
are espoused are unlikely to use the University as a resource to deal with bias. The assumption goes that the normative majority communities, of all groups, should theoretically feel most comfortable about engaging faculty or staff. Therefore, our research suggests that we must begin to question the message and ideas for which this University stands for, linking them to the way that students perceive and interact with those ideals and connect with one another.

**Jesuit Ideals**

This Commission has attempted to understand the way students perceive the resources that are available to them and further the way that messages permeate campus culture. The survey took a number of Jesuit ideals into account and asked how student feel that the University promotes the ideals and how the students themselves exhibit the ideals. We recognize how essential the founding ideas are to the heart and soul of this University and therefore we give special attention to the implications of the efforts and messages that the University attempts to promote, including how those messages are exhibited by the student body. We used the following ideals and: (1) Educating the Whole Person, (2) Women and Men for Others, (3) Inter-religious Understanding, (4) Community in Diversity, and (5) Cura Personalis.

The major trend that our analysis recognized was a belief that the University does a better job promoting the ideals than the students do exhibiting those ideals. On average, students reported agreement that the Jesuit Ideals in
question were promoted 74% of the time, while respondents reported agreement that the student body exited those ideals 58.1% of the time. The results show that the University may be effective in explaining what the ideals are. There is a disconnect, however, between what is promoted and how the ideals are permeated within our campus culture and exhibited by the student body. Across the five Jesuit ideals, we found that there is an average discrepancy of 15.9% between belief that University promotes the ideal and the how students feel that they are exhibiting them.

This is a good sign because we are not interested in strengthening or endorsing a parental model in which we measure success solely on the work that the Jesuit community, faculty and administration does. It is encouraging to see that students believe that the University stands by its ideals. This Commission seeks to identify strengths, as well as problems that students see within our own circles and for ways to work with the University to create a community that fosters universal growth and exploration of our human condition. The largest discrepancies between perceptions of University promotion and student exhibition were in Educating the Whole Person (18.4%) and Inter-Religious Understanding (18.3%). The student body believes that the University is promoting these ideals, but herein lies the greatest disparity in the translation to student behavior. We are unsure as to why these ideals have the largest disparity. Our results show that these trends are mostly uniform across the demographics and that most respondents agree that there is a disconnect
between which ideals are promoted and how they are exhibited by students. There is such a small difference between demographics when it comes to comparing the level of agreement between University efforts and student behavior, that it is more important to look at which ideals appear most problematic in this disconnect.

Though the results show a stark discontinuity, there is encouraging information here as well. Across the board, students feel that the Jesuit ideals are promoted well. The three best promoted ideals were Educating the Whole Person (81.6%), Women and Men for Others (74%), and Inter-Religious Understanding (83.6%). However, our attention was drawn immediately to Community in Diversity (65.1%) and Cura Personalis (65.7%), which have the lowest levels of agreement and show the most uncertainty amongst the aggregate.

Among all of the ideals, Community in Diversity and Cura Personalis were almost identical with about 65% of students agreeing that the University promotes them and only 49% agreeing that students exhibit them. This is a huge discrepancy and departs significantly from the aggregate. Our analysis allowed us to differentiate between Community in Diversity and Cura Personalis — to find dynamics that suggest a different conclusion to be drawn about the student body.

Community in Diversity stands out in stark contrast to Cura Personalis. While they may appear strikingly similar, it is critical to observe deliberate shift
that occurs. While they both lose about 16% of the agreement when students select whether Georgetown promotes the ideal and the student body exhibits that ideal. 26.8% of students were unsure that the University promoted Cura Personalis and 38.3% of students were unsure if students exhibited the ideal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promote Community in Diversity</th>
<th>Exhibit Community in Diversity</th>
<th>Promote Cura Personalis</th>
<th>Exhibit Cura Personalis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.4% →</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>26.8% →</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4% →</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>7.5% →</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The agreement levels for promoting Community in Diversity (65.1%) and student exhibition (49.7%) is nearly identical to agreement levels for Cura Personalis promotion (65.7%) and student exhibition (49.3%). Yet the levels of disagreement are most striking, in that 15.4% of students disagreed that Georgetown promotes Community in Diversity, and 29.5% disagreed that students exhibited Community in Diversity, much higher than the levels of disagreement for Cura Personalis.

The greatest disagreement observed in student responses was about Community in Diversity. For both University promotion (15.4%) and student exhibition (29.5%), students demonstrated the least confidence in Community in Diversity. When we looked closely at student exhibition, we noticed very strong responses in disagreement. Among the different demographics in disagreement, the strongest respondents were Jewish students (46.5%), Black students (40.6%), and Hispanic students (38.1%). Catholic students were least likely to disagree.
however, with 21.8%. It is interesting that the very worst aspect of our ideals, as far as promotion and exhibition of Community in Diversity, is defended most fervently by the Catholic base.

One huge outlier that our analysis illuminated was the difference between LGBTQ students and the aggregate in regards to University promotion and student exhibition of the ideal. On average, students disagreed with the promotion and exhibition of the Jesuit Ideals was 13.7%. On average, LGBTQ students disagreed that the University promoted and the student body exhibited the ideals at almost double the rate that the aggregate did at 28.1%.

Social Stratification and Polarization

The second major area of interest in the research concerns the nature of social stratification and polarization on this campus. The survey attempted to delve into difficult questions regarding self-segregation and student awareness, response, and engagement with discrimination and bias. The analysis has allowed us to grapple with (1) Self-segregation at Georgetown, (2) Discrimination and (3) Racism and Homophobia. We compare the demographic responses and determine how likely certain groups of respondents are to be aware of these problems.

Self-segregation at Georgetown

There is a major difference between minority and majority groups, though there was a large amount of agreement across the board. The answers here were among the highest levels of agreement of any questions of 51 a-k. Students were
far more concerned with the existence of self-segregation than racism or homophobia. The average level of agreement was 76.2% for the aggregate, while only 14.7% said they were unsure and 9.1% disagreed.

Among the groups agreeing that self-segregation is a problem at the highest rate were: LGBTQ students (88%), Black students (86.4%), Jewish students (86.2%), and Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist students (82.3%). The lowest agreement levels were Males (70.1%) and Catholic students (72.3%), which came as no surprise considering the trends throughout the research and analysis. The severely different disagreement for the Community in Diversity ideal reinforces these extremely high numbers concerning self segregation.

Students were asked in 51c and 51d how they perceive self segregation in their high school setting versus Georgetown. Students were more likely to view self segregation as a problem at Georgetown (76.2%) than in High School (54.5%). While our results drew no causal relationships here, we made a couple conjectures. For one, there maybe reason to believe that there was more homogeneity in the High School setting and therefore the problem becomes more apparent at Georgetown. Another possibility may be the fact that the greater awareness of self segregation at Georgetown indicates a culture of stratification that may have been less prevalent than in High School. Whatever the reason, the evidence shows virtually absolute agreement that the problem of self segregation exists on Georgetown’s campus, even if students did not perceive it to exist in High School.
Discrimination

The survey asked several questions that dealt with discrimination, specifically questions 31-34 and 36, which asked students how often they witnessed discrimination by students or by faculty, staff and administration, as well as how often they feel uncomfortable about their identity. The results were striking and each question revealed valuable information about trends in regards to the problem of discrimination.

There was a major difference in the results between students being the agents of discrimination as opposed to faculty, staff or administration. On average, 78.5% of students said that they have (rarely, sometimes, often or regularly) witnessed discrimination by students, while 21.5% of students say that they never have. On the other hand, only 43.8% of students said that they have (rarely, sometimes, often, or regularly) witnessed discrimination by faculty, staff or administration, while 56.2% said they never have. As with the Jesuit Ideals, it is clear that students feel that the University does a much better job than students in promoting ideals and acting in accordance with . Likewise, with Questions 33 and 34, the trend remains consistent, where students are more likely to say that they have never felt that they were the target of discrimination by the faculty, staff or administration (74.6%) than by the students (53.5%).

There were serious demographic outliers for these questions that deserve greater scrutiny, as they are consistent with aforementioned trends. In Question 34, regarding students as agents of discrimination, we noticed
discrepancies between LGBTQ and Heterosexual students. In the case of LGBTQ students, an alarming 71.1% of LGBTQ students "sometimes, often or regularly" witnessed discrimination by students, compared to 34.7% of Heterosexual students. Religious groups also showed interesting variance—especially between Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist students as opposed to Catholics. Muslim, Hindu, and Buddhist students reported only 12.9% saying they have "never" witnessed discrimination, while Catholics reported twice that, at 26.1%. We found another important discrepancy between White students and students of color. White students had the highest response rate with 23.5% saying they have "never" witnessed discrimination by students—which is twice the percentage of Black students (11.5%) and greatly outnumbers Asian students (13.9%), South Asian students (14.3%), and Middle Eastern students (16.7%). Hispanic students, strangely, did not follow the trend and responded at about the same rate as White students.

White (60.2%) and Catholic (62.2%) students were most likely to say that they have "never" felt the target of discrimination by students. It is interesting to note that no other racial demographic responded with more than 50% saying that they "never" felt like the target in this way. Much like the Questions 31 and 32, there is a similar division between students feeling targeted ("rarely, sometimes, often, or regularly") by students as opposed to students feeling targeted ("rarely, sometimes, often, or regularly") by faculty, staff, and administration. On average, 46.5% feel targeted by students, while only 25.4% feel targeted by faculty, staff,
or administration.

_Racism and Homophobia_

Our survey asked students if racism is a problem at Georgetown and if students of color face discrimination or alienation. In similar fashion, students were asked if homophobia is a problem at Georgetown and if LGBTQ students face discrimination or alienation. 60.6% of students were in agreement (agree or strongly agree) that homophobia is a problem at Georgetown, while only 33.6% of students are in agreement that racism is a problem. Our results thus show that there is far more uncertainty about the existence of racism than homophobia. In fact, almost a third of all students (31.7%) were unsure about racism being a problem and another third (34.7%) were in disagreement about the question (disagreed or strongly disagreed). On the other hand, only 17% of students were in disagreement that homophobia is a problem. Our analysis delves into some of the implications that emerge from the discrepancy in perceptions of racism and homophobia.

_Racism_

We need only look at the racial demographics to understand the dynamics behind such low agreement that racism is a problem at Georgetown. Only 28.5% of White students are in agreement that it is a problem. Black students on the other hand are the polar opposite with 62.5% in agreement that it is a problem. Other racial minorities hover closely around 40% in agreement [Hispanic 41.3%;
South Asian 38.1%; Asian 36.8%; Middle Eastern 37.2%. It is clear that the issue of racism is most salient for the Black community. When asked if students of color face discrimination or alienation, White students (28.5%) hardly agreed at all, whereas most Black students (71.9%) were in agreement. The trend remained the same here as other racial minorities fit in the spectrum between White and Black perceptions [Hispanic 42.3%; South Asian 40.5%; Asian 38.2%; Middle Eastern 33.3%].

These pertinent findings might explain why Black students report 86.4%, the highest percentage of all demographics, in agreement (agree or strongly agree) that self-segregation is a problem at Georgetown. Self-segregation may be a source of comfort with such salient issues as racism when White students are least likely to see it as a problem and other racial minorities find it much less problematic, while all groups recognize homophobia as a major problem. This trend is reinforced by Question 36, where 76% of Black students have felt uncomfortable about their identity compared to 47.4% of White students.

Homophobia

It is not surprising at all that only 6% of LGBTQ students were in disagreement (disagree or strongly disagree) that Homophobia is a problem at Georgetown. There is an interesting gap between male and female responses in which Males (28.1%) were more than twice as likely as Females (11.2%) to be in disagreement that homophobia is a problem at Georgetown. When asked if
LGBTQ students face discrimination or alienation, the results were almost identical to questions about. One compelling trend was the Catholic demographic. Catholic students were most likely to be in disagreement with homophobia being a problem at Georgetown (21.6%), as well as racism being a problem at Georgetown (40%). These results are not entirely surprising given our University's recent conflict with the opening of the LGBTQ resource center and it's implications for our Catholic and Jesuit identity. Reaction to Pope Benedict XVI's visit to the United States in April of 2008 was quite indicative of the controversy surrounding President DeGoia's full promotion of a resource center for LGBTQ students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>LGBTQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students of color face alienation or discrimination at Georgetown.</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ students face alienation or discrimination at Georgetown.</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most intriguing finding in our analysis of racism and homophobia was the response of Black and LGBTQ student about the plight of the other. Our research shows that these two groups above all other demographics are most sensitive to issues affecting their identity. The pattern might suggest then that these groups would also be the most sympathetic to discrimination and bias directed towards other groups. In the case of racism and homophobia, we found
that Black students are about as likely to perceive sexual orientation
discrimination as LGBTQ students were to perceive racial exclusion. However,
the gap between LGBTQ responses are decidedly larger than the responses of
Black students.

While only 58.6% of White students are in agreement that homophobia is
a problem at Georgetown, 78.2% of Black students are in agreement that
homophobia is a problem at Georgetown. Only 59% LGBTQ students, on the
other hand, were in agreement about racism. This is more than half of all LGBTQ
students, but it is not nearly as close to the majority of Black students that are in
agreement about homophobia being a problem at Georgetown. 18.1% of LGBTQ
students were in disagreement that racism is a problem at Georgetown. Granted,
the average response for all students was 34.7%. However, it is notable that
18.1% is more than double the percentage of Black students that were in
disagreement that homophobia is a problem at Georgetown (8.2%), perhaps
indicating divisions between the black and LGBTQ community that may not
have been expected.

Question 51b asked if Georgetown students form opinions of others based
on stereotypes. There was an average agreement of 66.4% of all students. While
many groups were at about the average [South Asian students 66.6%; White
students 64.1%; Hispanic and Asian students 65.7%; and even Middle Eastern
students 61.1%], Black students (87.6%) were in the greatest agreement that
Georgetown students form opinions of others based on stereotypes.
Lack of Social Justice

The third major area of analysis in this research addresses the lack of social justice in Georgetown’s core curriculum and in the community that is permeated and fostered by students, faculty, staff and the administration. There were incredible differences in the school demographic analysis. The NHS is the only school within Georgetown that has infused social justice into it's core curriculum and pedagogical methodology. There is a large emphasis on community based learning incorporated into the NHS, and many of the NHS student’s responses reflected a greater sensitivity to others.

There are many great programs, resources and centers that our University already provides. The major problem lies in the way that the University is attempting to make sure that ideals and the great work that many of these centers do, like that of CMEA, IDEAA, and CSJ, permeate the dominant culture and reach all students. Our interviews with students on campus have lead us to realize that the same groups of like-minded students are drawn to these programs or take full advantage of them. For example, many students enjoy the 4th credit option through the CSJ, the Justice and Diversity in Action floor and other Living Learning Communities through the Resident Life. Other students engage in CSJ mentoring and outreach, while other join student organizations like Serve NEXT, the NAACP, or 25 Days of Service. The University provides pre-orientation programs for incoming freshmen like YLEAD and FOCL, while upperclassmen in the College of Arts and Sciences are invited to apply for
fellowships like Patrick Healy Fellows and Baker Scholars. The Center for Multicultural Equity and Access provides the Myers Institute for College Preparation and Community Scholars for incoming students of color.

We recognize fully that there are numerous ways that students can get involved and do in fact get involved. We posit, however, that all of these are voluntary, and can in a certain sense be avoided by students who don't care for this aspect of our University's mission. Students must seek these resources out in order to participate in them. The orientation program, Pluralism in Action, is the most commonly referenced program when the University attempts to provide evidence for permeating cultural ideals to the entire student body. The program is mandatory but many students do not attend and those who do are often let down by the incompetence of Orientation Advisors to lead meaningful discussion afterwards or the lack of safe space available to engage in serious dialogue. Many students feel that this is the only situation in which the University attempts to explain many of the powerful ideas behind our Jesuit ideal of Community in Diversity. Our analysis has shown that students agree that this ideal is least promoted and exhibited by the University. There are many other examples of the way in which the University has opportunities to exercise its will to permeate ideals upon which this University was founded.

One major area of concern is the curriculum. Little has done with the curriculum requirements of the University aside from the recent change in the History requirement. Georgetown unfortunately has fallen far behind many of
the major Universities with which it claims to contend. We had one interview with Professor Dennis Williams, the Director of CMEA, Associate Dean of Students. He explained to us poignantly, “I took my first African American History course in 1973. Georgetown provided it’s first African American History course in 2003.” This discrepancy is comparably true of cultural history courses as well as courses emphasizing diversity. Our study of best practices among the top 100 Universities, according to US News, revealed that Georgetown is far behind the curve and lacks many of the cultural departments and curriculum made prominent at other Jesuit Universities, as well as non-religious, public and private universities. For example, thirty out of the top fifty Universities have curricular requirements in diversity, multiculturalism or social justice, while Georgetown does not. In addition, of the five Jesuit universities in the top 125, Georgetown is the only school to lack diversity as part of its core requirements.

It is also very notable that Georgetown lags behind other competitive Universities in terms of racial minority enrollment. Presently, 24% of Georgetown students identify as Black, Hispanic or Asian, compared with average among the top 30 universities according to US News. While Georgetown fits in well with the other Jesuit and Catholic institutions in terms of low minority enrollment (University of Notre Dame, 21%; Boston College, 24%; Fordham University, 24%; Marquette University, 15%; Villanova University, 16%; Loyola University of Chicago, 27%; St. Joseph’s University, 14%), such low numbers do not create offer students a realistic opportunity for an inclusive
community, but instead are more likely to foster assimilation and self segregation. While Georgetown may not have the resources or endowment of other Universities with higher levels of minority enrollment, Georgetown could utilize its resources and willing student communities to take greater advantage of the diverse city around the Hilltop. As an institution, we must strive to make Georgetown proportionally reflect the society we live in, pressing minority enrollment closer to 35% in order for Georgetown to truly be a place where students engage each other equitably. Many such ideas are outlined in our recommended initiatives.

Our Commission would like to see changes in the curriculum, the addition of more dialogue based 4\textsuperscript{th} credit options, and an emphasis in community service and community based learning in the academic experience. Our research necessitates a greater commitment to diversity and inclusively in the Resident's Halls, which means rethinking Resident Assistant training and an inclusion of a social justice programming value, in addition to the civic engagement value. This process would be aided by recruiting more intentionally from minority communities on campus and allies who set positive and inclusive tones in their living spaces. Diversity training for SAC Presidents should also be mandatory for students who are role models to their communities. These group trainings would create opportunities for student leaders to make connections and go on to utilize the Commissions proposed co-sponsorship incentives. But it is not enough to consider how to shape our existing community. We must look at
the profile of our University, seeking to create an environment that is a reflection of our society before we can live up to the Jesuit Ideals to which we ascribe.

Our advocacy of these changes is based in the discrepancies apparent in the School demographic analysis. The NHS and SFS differed so greatly from the MSB when it came to recognizing bias and discrimination, believing that racism and homophobia exists on Georgetown’s campus, as well as believing that self-segregation is a problem. When students were asked if they have ever witnessed discrimination by students, MSB (29.9%) students were almost twice as likely to report never than NHS student (13.7%) and SFS students (16.3%). When students were asked if they believe that racism is a problem on Georgetown’s campus, only 20.3% of MSB students were in agreement, while 28.7% of NHS students and 40.2% of SFS students were in agreement. The trend remained constant when students were asked if they believed homophobia is a problem on campus. NHS students (67.4%) and SFS students (66.6%) again greatly outnumbered the 46% of MSB students in agreement that homophobia is a problem at Georgetown. One interesting comparison between schools appeared when students where asked in self-segregation is a problem at Georgetown. MSB students (70.9%) were closer to NHS students (73.7%) in agreement that self-segregation is a problem at Georgetown, but SFS students (81.7%) still greatly outnumber MSB students—and the trend remains consistent. The most telling statistic appeared when students were asked if diversity is discussed too much. MSB students (33.2%) again had much higher percentages of agreement than
NHS students (15.8%) and SFS student (23.9%). Consistently, the NHS and the MSB are on different ends of the spectrum and the SFS and COL maintain an average between the polar opposite. These differences exist perhaps due to the demographic profiles of the students in each of these schools, but also because the core values of the MSB are quite different than those of the NHS or the SFS.

As a Catholic and Jesuit Institution of higher learning, committed to creating a community based in our Jesuit heritage, we must take seriously and constantly question the ways that our curriculum permeates ideas, attitudes, and behaviors at Georgetown. We believe that the concerted effort of the administration to create a Social Justice emphasis in the curriculum and culture of the NHS—and the lack thereof in the MSB and College, while the SFS to a lesser extent—explains discrepancy and disparity in perception of problems on campus. We therefore fully advocate that ideals of Social Justice, Service, and Global understanding must be emphasized in creative ways in order to create a more inclusive and enriched community of learners. We reiterate, that as is the case for resources and programs, these ideals must be infused into all classes and for all students—not simply for like-mind students who might gravitate towards the suggestion, but for the benefit of the full community as a part of every student’s undergraduate experience.

Where do we go from here?

There are many domains through which we might think about the power
that the administration has to shape the perception that students have about the environment created as a learning and living space. Recruiting and admissions is at the core of what we are discussing, as they offer the clay the University has to shape in four years.

We have gained valuable information and insight into the perceptions, behaviors and attitudes of Georgetown students and attempted to view these demographics as roughly causal indicators of those perceptions, behaviors, and attitudes. This is in fact the same type of exercise that an admission counsel uses to determine what characteristics in prospective students will enhance our community. There is of course no SAT score that guarantees admission to a place like Georgetown, other factors weigh heavily in the process. We must begin to think about the students that we offer admission to and the implications of their previous experiences as a small piece of humanity that they will bring with them to Georgetown. As our job market becomes global and multi-cultural, Georgetown should join the ranks of its academic competitors and encourage more active recruitment of a diverse student body, ensuring the preparation of students to work in a diverse world. But even more importantly, if we are to create an undergraduate experience that produces Women and Men for Others, Women and Men who live generously in service to others, reform must occur at Georgetown. Based on our research, in order to translate our mission statement and Jesuit heritage from a rhetorical edifice of lofty idealism into an institution that truly endeavors to do the work of social reconstruction in line with Catholic
social teachings with compassion for the poor and oppressed, Georgetown must take seriously the Contemplation in Action directed at institutional change.
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Major Recommendations and Initiatives

Contents
Academic Life
Institutional Resource
Student Activities Commission Groups and ResLife Programming
Recruiting Initiatives and Freshmen Experience
Major Initiative 1: Academic Life

Proposal 1: Institute a diverse, social justice-oriented, “Equity through Diversity” Cross Listing Curriculum Requirement (2) in all four Schools. This would identify courses that presently fulfill General Education Requirements and would also engage students in cultural, social, religious and political diversity. From this listing, students would be required to select two courses in their first four semesters at Georgetown that would simultaneously fulfill General Education Requirements. This will indirectly expand all course offerings into diverse fields by injecting majority of students into small classes, while providing freedom for students and faculty to determine which courses to take and teach from a pool of offered classes.

Parts:
1. Social Justice intentionally included in each syllabus.
2. Recruit, retain and tenure more minority faculty members.
3. Strategic diversity and social justice plans in every academic department and office.
4. Diversity/Social Justice element to review of each course each semester:
   a. Did the course challenge preconceptions?
   b. Did the course experience bias/discrimination?
5. Incorporate knowledge of University resources into the one credit First Year Colloquium in the NHS.
6. Pro-Seminars
   a. Engaging diverse topics to relieve institutional stress by expanding social justice and diversity course listings.
   b. Could potentially be taught by Seniors to reduce institutional costs.
7. Humanities and Writing section of the GenEd requirement to include one class that is centered on Diversity (e.g. a class that tours and explores the multicultural parts of the District of Columbia).
8. Innovative pilot program: student led courses in diverse studies to relieve expansion pressure after one semester as a T.A.

Proposal 2: Match one credit course discussion and dialogue series with Equity through Diversity Curriculum courses.

Parts
1. Develop several one credit options for courses established as “Equity through Diversity” Requirement with concurrent curriculum in all 1 credit options.
2. Possible one credit options could focus on: Race, Religion, Gender and Sexual Orientation, Socio-economic Class, inter-demographic dialogues.
3. Establish Pre, Post and Post-Post evaluation of success of Equity through Diversity curricular and co-curricular elements.
Major Initiative 2: 
Institutional Resources

Proposal 1: Marketing the Bias Reporting System

Parts:

1. Aggressively market the BRS during New Student Orientation (NSO). BRS information should be added to the Emergency Preparedness memorabilia (magnets, key chains, etc.) with the addition of door hangers.

2. All bias-related incidents ought to be emailed and reported to student body to 1) keep students informed, and 2) create more awareness about bias on Georgetown’s campus.

3. Potentially change the name of Bias Reporting System (BRS). To make the purpose clear that the system is for discrimination.
Major Initiative 3:
Student Activities Commission Groups and Residence Life Programming

Proposal 1: Diversity Training for SAC Presidents
1. Club presidents should be required to participate in diversity training, which would 1) help student leaders become better acquainted with diversity nomenclature, and 2) help promote open interaction and build a common understanding in the Georgetown community.
2. Diversity component should be added to RA, Orientation Advisors, and Peer Advisor application process.

Proposal 2: Co-Sponsorship fund in SAC to encourage collaboration of groups with different missions or identities.
1. Set aside $10K for newly co-sponsored events between SAC groups.
2. Assign a Diversity Action Council faculty or staff member to be mentor and assist with the project from the University’s side.
3. Complete a specifically designed proposal (similar to DAC funding application) and review sheet.
4. Establish incentives for SAC groups who send Officers to diversity related lectures/discussions (financial, competition with a prize at end of each semester).

Proposal 3: Train Resident Assistants on diversity oriented facilitating

Parts:
1. Continue the momentum of Pluralism in Action. Hold discussions and group talks regarding diversity. Have the RAs host events where people from diverse backgrounds come and discuss issues important to them.
2. RAs are on the frontlines of inclusion at Georgetown. Ensure they are creating safe and inclusive environments that challenge students by recruiting more diverse students and have diversity as a part of the application process, while emphasizing diversity and inclusion more than discipline.

3. Prepare RAs with creative diversity programming ideas.

4. Train RAs to be sensitive to the diversity of their residents.
Major Initiative 4: Recruiting Initiatives and the Freshman Experience

Proposal 1: Freshmen Programs that engage undergraduate freshmen to establish an inclusive atmosphere and build bridges while social groups begin forming.

Parts
1. Revamp Pluralism in Action and expanding diversity programming into the first and second semesters of each student through programming in ResLife, Student Affairs, Center for Student Programs, Georgetown Programming Board and the Center for Social Justice.
2. Review the book incoming Freshmen are required to read to engage serious social issues and encourage serious dialogue in a safe space for students when they arrive on campus, potentially in their NSO groups.
3. Deliberately create diverse residential experiences for all Freshmen, forming NSO groups by diversity and proximity.
4. Offer more activities during New Student Orientation that emphasize diversity. Since 4. this is the only time to get the attention of all incoming freshmen, push forth the importance of diversity. Potentially hold film screenings of culturally diverse films (e.g. Crash) and have a tour of the District of Columbia (e.g. a tour of Anacostia).
5. Recruit diverse peer-advisors for all incoming freshman.
6. Pair up incoming freshmen with student from different cultural or religious experience.
7. Require seminar for International Student Orientation (ISO) that highlights past bias-related incidents and using the BRS.
8. Promote Inter-Preorientation events that share the specialties of each
9. Publicize BRS in NSO and Freshman Orientation
10. Create mandatory or incentive-based weeklong seminar for all freshman, facilitated by groups like LEAD that train students about bias-related issues, and asks participants to break into small groups and discuss.

Proposal 2: Create and collaborate on initiatives to increase recruitment and retention of minority students.

Parts

1. Support and institutionalize summer programs at Georgetown for DC students.
2. DC Entrepreneurship Admissions Program: Target DC High School freshmen, create college preparation program utilizing Hoyas to mentor, network, and tutor, while bringing students in to take Georgetown classes preparing them for success in the MSB and the business world. The program would work in collaboration with the Ward 7 initiative, the Myers Institute for College Preparation and the Office of Financial Aid to offer scholarships to the MSB to high performing DC students.
3. Utilize student organizations to recruit students in DC.
4. Include optional essay on the undergraduate admissions application that describes what diversity would mean at Georgetown with respect to the Jesuit ideals and in context to personal experience.
5. Highlight Georgetown’s diversity-related initiatives, diverse student body, and commitment to diversity in the welcome-packet for incoming freshmen and the recruiting packet for prospective students.
6. Post and Post-Post review of admissions according to highlighted values of admissions process.
7. Greater institutional support for “Hoya Saxa weekend” with CMEA.
8. Recruit diverse tour guides and engage diversity in the tour of campus.
9. Funnel Center for Social Justice tutoring, mentoring, and outreach within one system in DC to bring in more DC students to Georgetown.
10. Support Georgetown’s commitment to the Cristo Rey Network.
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Survey Instrument
Student Commission for Unity Survey

Are you familiar with the Bias Reporting System (BRS)? Yes No

If you answered “Yes,” have you ever reported anything to the BRS? Yes No

Do you feel that campus resources for reporting, preventing and disciplining incidents of bias are adequate? Yes No

You will be asked in the following section how you feel the faculty, staff and administration of Georgetown University promote each of the following Jesuit Ideals. Please circle one of the options based on the strength of your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

1. Georgetown promotes Educating the Whole Person. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Georgetown promotes Women and Men for Others. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Georgetown promotes Interreligious Understanding. 1 2 3 4 5
4. Georgetown promotes Community in Diversity. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Georgetown promotes Cura Personalis. 1 2 3 4 5

You will be asked in the following section how you feel the students of Georgetown University exhibit each of the following Jesuit Ideals. Please circle one of the options based on the strength of your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

1. Georgetown students exhibit Educating the Whole Person. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Georgetown students exhibit Women and Men for Others. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Georgetown students exhibit Interreligious Understanding. 1 2 3 4 5
4. Georgetown students exhibit Community in Diversity. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Georgetown students exhibit Cura Personalis. 1 2 3 4 5
I __________ witness instances of discrimination by Georgetown students.

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Regularly

I __________ witness instances of discrimination by Georgetown faculty, staff or administrators.

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Regularly

I __________ feel I am the target of discriminatory words, actions or decisions by Georgetown students.

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Regularly

I __________ feel I am the target of discriminatory words, actions and/or decisions by Georgetown faculty, staff or administration.

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Regularly

If you have witnessed an instance of discrimination in the past, have you (check all that apply)

- Ignored the situation.
- Confronted the person exhibiting discrimination.
- Reported the incident to DPS and/or the Bias Reporting System.
- Comforted the person who was the target of the abuse.
- Discussed the situation with your friends and/or family.
- Discussed the situation with a professor or staff member.

I __________ feel uncomfortable at Georgetown because of my identity.

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Regularly
I ________ attend religious services of the group I identify with.

☐ Never
☐ Rarely
☐ Sometimes
☐ Often
☐ Regularly

I ________ attend religious services of a different religious group than the group I currently identify with.

☐ Never
☐ Rarely
☐ Sometimes
☐ Often
☐ Regularly

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

1 = Strongly Disagree  2 = Disagree  3 = Unsure  4 = Agree  5 = Strongly Agree

Alcohol is not a factor in instances of discrimination at Georgetown. 1 2 3 4 5

Georgetown students do not form their opinions of others based on stereotypes. 1 2 3 4 5

Self segregation is not a problem at Georgetown. 1 2 3 4 5

Self segregation was not a problem at my high school. 1 2 3 4 5

Racism does not influence the behavior or attitudes of students, faculty and staff. 1 2 3 4 5

Racism is not a problem at Georgetown. 1 2 3 4 5

Students of color do not face alienation or discrimination at Georgetown. 1 2 3 4 5

Homophobia is not a problem at Georgetown. 1 2 3 4 5

LGBTQ students do not face discrimination or alienation at Georgetown. 1 2 3 4 5

Interacting with people unlike myself does not enrich my college experience. 1 2 3 4 5

Diversity is discussed too much on campus. 1 2 3 4 5

How can we build a stronger, more unified undergraduate community at Georgetown?
Please identify your gender: ________

In which school are you enrolled? ___College ___MSB ___SFS ___NHS

I am a full time undergraduate student expecting to graduate with the class of______
  □  2008           □  2009     □  2010     □  2011

Please indicate your educational background for grades 10-12. Indicate all that apply.
  □  Public High School
  □  Private, non-religious High School
  □  Parochial/religious High School
  □  Home School
  □  International Education in grades 10-12. (Educated Outside of the U.S.)

Do you identify as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender or Questioning (LGBTQ)?
  □  Yes     □  No

Please check mark the options that best describe your own racial background.
  □  White/Non Hispanic          □  Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander
  □  Black/African American/Non Hispanic
  □  Hispanic/Latino/Latin American
  □  Other________

What is your religious affiliation?
  □  Roman Catholic
  □  Protestant Christian
  □  Jewish
  □  Muslim
  □  Hindu
  □  Buddhist

  □  Other _____
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Eight Week Research Plan
Research Timeline – Eight Week Program

We have created an Eight week research program in which Research Teams (RTs) will meet once a week and as necessary to complete our full project.

Week One (9/22 - 9/28) “Laying the Foundation”

Week Two (9/29 - 10/5) “Bias Reporting and Reaction”

Week Three (10/6 - 10/12) “Spirit of Georgetown”

Week Four (10/13 - 10/19) “Discrimination”

Week Five (10/20 - 10/26) “Self Segregation, Racism, Homophobia and Diversity”

Week Six (10/27 - 11/2) “Interview and Testimonial”

Week Seven (11/3 - 11/9) “Analysis and Best Practices”

Week Eight (11/10 - 11/16) “Recommendation Proposals”

Weeks 9 and 10 – SCU Full Body Recommendations
Week One (9/15 - 9/21) “Laying the Foundation”

For this first week, we will establish the RTs as safe spaces where people are strongly encouraged to be honest with each other. Disagreement and discussion is encouraged, but personal attacks are not part of our research.

Once we lay the base for our RT chemistry, we lay the foundation for research.

Agenda:

1. Introductions
   Everyone will introduce themselves and the EBM will describe the process to the RT and establish themselves as the facilitator of the RT.
2. Setting Ground Rules – see materials and facilitation training
3. Question
   What are we trying to find out from our research in this demographic?
4. Assumptions
   What are our assumptions going into this process, about the research, about our data, about our community? We will come back to all of this, so for now it is best to list everything you can think of that is an assumption you bring to the project. We expect dozens of assumptions.
5. Hypothesis
   A hypothesis is a researchable prediction that specifies the relationship between two or more variables. Hypotheses should not be confused with theories.
6. Explain Eight Week Program and share data.
   Overview the Eight weeks to come and share hard copies of the data and forms promising to keep data private until its released or consent is given to share it from an EBM.
7. Assign Roles!

Homework:

1. Complete brainstorm of 5 more assumptions to bring for next meeting
2. Review all graphs, especially graphs 11, 12, 13, and 35 for “Bias Reporting and Reaction” Prepare 5 observations for each graph. Email to EBM prior to meeting.
3. Brainstorm 5 different students, faculty, staff, and/or administrators who might be able to contribute in an interview for graphs 11, 12, 13 and 35. Email to EBM prior to meeting.
4. Meet with 2 professors each to present the project over the course of the next 8 weeks.
Week Two (9/22 - 9/28) “Bias Reporting and Reaction”

This week will focus on questions pertaining to resources for bias reporting, preventing and disciplining, as well as student reactions to bias incidents.

Agenda:
1. Recap previous meeting, finish old business.
2. Confirm previous question, hypothesis and assumptions.
3. Revisit Ground rules
4. Go over the full survey
5. Present observations for graphs 11, 12, 13 and 35, individually.
6. Discuss observations.
7. Present potential interviewers and prepare a plan for Week Six for whom to contact.

Homework:
1. Review graphs 21a – e and 22 a – e for “Spirit of Georgetown.” Prepare 5 observations for each graph. Email to EBM prior to meeting.
2. Brainstorm 5 different students, faculty, staff, and/or administrators who might be able to contribute in an interview for graphs. Email to EBM prior to meeting.
3. Schedule appointments with related subjects for potential interviews.

Week Three (9/29 - 10/5) “Spirit of Georgetown”

This week will focus on analyzing the questions related to the Spirit of Georgetown and our Jesuit identity. We will compare how Georgetown promotes these values and how the student body reflects them.

Agenda:
1. Recap previous meeting, finish old business, get updates on interview Master Schedule.
2. Revisit ground rules
3. Present observations for graphs 21a-22e.
4. Discuss observations.
5. Present potential interviewers and prepare a plan for Week Six for whom to contact.

Homework:
1. Review graphs 31, 32, 33, 34, and 36 for “Discrimination” Prepare 5 observations for each graph. Email to EBM prior to meeting.
2. Brainstorm 5 different students, faculty, staff, and/or administrators who might be able to contribute in an interview for graphs. Email to EBM prior to meeting.
3. Schedule appointments with related subjects for potential interviews.
4. Begin developing reports for graphs.

Week Four (10/13 - 10/19) “Discrimination”

This week will focus on analyzing questions related to discrimination at Georgetown as students witness and are victimized. We will draw on graph 35, which was analyzed in Week One, as well.

Agenda:
1. Recap previous meeting, finish old business, get updates on interview Master Schedule.
2. Revisit Ground rules
3. Present observations for graphs 31, 32, 33, 34 and 36.
4. Discuss observations.
5. Present potential interviewers and prepare a plan for Week Six for whom to contact.

Homework:
1. Review graphs 51a-k for “Self Segregation, Racism, Alienation, Homophobia and Diversity.” Prepare 5 observations for each graph. Email to EBM prior to meeting.
2. Brainstorm 5 different students, faculty, staff, and/or administrators who might be able to contribute in an interview for graphs. Email to EBM prior to meeting.
3. Schedule appointments with related subjects for potential interviews.
4. Begin developing reports for graphs.

Week Five (10/20 - 10/26) “Self Segregation, Racism, Alienation, Homophobia and Diversity”

This week will focus on questions with a 5 point scale relating to Self Segregation, Racism, Alienation, Homophobia and Diversity. We will critically analyze these questions. There is a ton of information here!

Agenda:
1. Recap previous meeting, finish old business, get updates on interview Master Schedule.
2. Revisit Ground Rules
3. Present observations for graphs 51a-k.
4. Discuss observations.
5. Present potential interviewers and prepare a plan for Week Six for whom to contact.
6. Develop strategy to interview all related subjects.

Homework:
1. Schedule appointments with related subjects for potential interviews.
2. Conduct interviews! Transcribe them!
3. Continue to develop graph analysis.

Week Six (11/3 – 11/9) “Interview and Testimonial”
This week will finalize all graphs and begin to condense interview information into the graph pages. A task of this week will be to finalize interviews as well and complete transcribing them. After that, we will really focus on identifying trends in comparison to the assumptions we made in Week 1.

Agenda:
1. Recap all interview information.
2. Revisit Ground Rules
4. Share condensed Graph sections, which should be nearly completed for all questions.

Homework:
1. Finish ALL interviews and transcribe them for next week. Email them to the EBM asap.
2. Review all materials as of this point. The project has nearly completed its shape by now. Begin brainstorming Recommendations and Analysis.
3. Have five recommendations to propose.

Week Seven (11/10 - 11/16) “Analysis and Best Practices”
This week we will have completed all of the Graph sections and will condense our Best Practices section. We will also discuss our recommendations.

Agenda:
1. Recap all Graph sections.
2. Revisit Ground Rules
3. Discuss Terms and definitions.
4. Discuss and plan all recommendations for the demographic and the student body.
5. Delegate writing of Recommendation Proposals.

Homework:
1. Edit and finalize all Graph sections, again. No Mistakes!
2. Turn in Report with Observations

Week Eight (11/10 - 11/16) “Recommendation Proposals”
This week will finalize the project. Everything will be completed. We will reflect, edit and double check everything. We will discuss our recommendations and prepare for publication.

Agenda:
1. Review ALL Materials.
2. Review Recommendation Proposals.
3. Discuss direction of SCU at this point.

Homework:
1. Be proud of yourself! We have made history and changed Georgetown forever 😊
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Best Practices
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>% Acceptance</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Public/Private</th>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>Endowment</th>
<th>Minority Enrollment</th>
<th>Diversity Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>6,648</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$34 Billion</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>Foreign Cultures (1) and Social Analysis (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>4,918</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$16 Billion</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>Social Analysis (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>5,311</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$22 Billion</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>Global Community, American Cultures (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M.I.T.</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>4,172</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$9 Billion</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>6,584</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$17 Billion</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>2,133</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$2 Billion</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$6.6 Billion</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>2,385</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$7.1 Billion</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>4,926</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>$5.3 Billion</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>4,926</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$5.8 Billion</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dartmouth College</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>4,164</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$4.2 Billion</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>8,284</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$4.9 Billion</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wash U in St. Louis</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>7,253</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$5.7 Billion</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>13,510</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$5.4 Billion</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>5,705</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$2.7 Billion</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>6,532</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$3.5 Billion</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>University of California - Berkeley</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>24,636</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$317 Million</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>American Culture (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Carnegie Mellon</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>3,051</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$4.7 Billion</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Emory University</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>6,719</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>$5.8 Billion</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>8,371</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>$6.1 Billion</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>15,078</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$279 Million</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>University of Michigan - Ann Arbor</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>25,928</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$319 Million</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>University of SoCal</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>16,384</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$3.7 Billion</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tufts University</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>5,035</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$1.5 Billion</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Wake Forest Univ.</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>4,412</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$1.3 Billion</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>University of NC - Chapel Hill</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>17,628</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$210 Million</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Brandeis University</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>3,233</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$691 Million</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>College of William and Mary</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>5,792</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$77 Million</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>University of New York</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>21,327</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$2.1 Million</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>9,081</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Jesuit</td>
<td>$1.8 Billion</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Cultural Diversity (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Georgia I.T.</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>12,565</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$120 Million</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Lehigh University</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>4,756</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$1.1 Billion</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>University of Cal - San Diego</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>22,048</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>$208 Million</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Endowment**:
  - Harvard University: $34 Billion
  - University of Pennsylvania: $6.6 Billion
  - University of Michigan: $3.5 Billion
  - University of California: $2.7 Billion
  - Duke University: $7.1 Billion
  - M.I.T.: $5.3 Billion
  - Stanford University: $4.9 Billion
  - Cornell University: $5.4 Billion
  - Johns Hopkins University: $2.1 Billion
  - Vanderbilt University: $6.1 Billion
  - Carnegie Mellon University: $3.5 Billion
  - Emory University: $5.8 Billion
  - University of Notre Dame: $6.1 Billion
  - University of Virginia: $279 Million
  - University of Michigan: $319 Million
  - University of SoCal: $3.7 Billion
  - Tufts University: $1.5 Billion
  - Wake Forest University: $1.3 Billion
  - University of NC - Chapel Hill: $210 Million
  - Brandeis University: $691 Million
  - University of New York: $77 Million
  - Boston College: $1.8 Billion
  - Georgia I.T.: $120 Million
  - Lehigh University: $1.1 Billion
  - University of Cal - San Diego: $208 Million

- **Diversity Requirement**:
  - Foreign Cultures (1) and Social Analysis (2)
  - Social Analysis (2)
  - Global Community, American Cultures (1)
  - Cultural Perspectives (3)
  - Social and Cultural Perspectives (2)
  - Cultural Analysis (0-2)
  - International Cultures (3), Perspectives (2)
  - Non-Western Perspectives (1)
  - Literary and Cultural Analysis (1)
  - Race and Ethnicity (1)
  - Western Cultures (1), Global Cultures (1)
  - Foreign Language/Culture Options (1)
  - Cultural Diversity (1)
  - U.S. Diversity (1), Beyond the National (1)
  - Non-Western and Comparative Studies (1)
  - World Cultures and History (1)
  - Foundations of Contemporary Culture (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Acceptance Rate</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Endowment</th>
<th>Financial Aid</th>
<th>Culture Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Univ. of Rochester</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>5,131</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Univ. of Wisconsin - Madison</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>30,618</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>$294 Million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Univ. of Illinois - Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>30,895</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>$398 Million</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Studies (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Reserve Univ.</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>4,207</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$1.8 Billion</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAGE program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Rensselaer P.I.</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>5,167</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$812 Million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>28,570</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>$372 Million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Univ. of Cal - Davis</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>23,499</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>$233 Million</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social-Cultural Diversity (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Univ. of Cal - Irvine</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>21,696</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>$195 Million</td>
<td></td>
<td>Multicultural Studies (1x), International &amp; Diversity (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Univ. of Cal Santa</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>18,415</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>$163 Million</td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture and Thought (3), World Cultures (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Penn. State Univ - U Park</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>36,815</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United States Cultures (1), International &amp; Diversity (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Univ. of Texas - Austin</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>37,459</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>$372 Million</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global Cultures (1), Cultural Diversity (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Univ. of Florida</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>35,189</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>$168 Million</td>
<td></td>
<td>International &amp; Diversity (3x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Yeshiva Univ.</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>3,017</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$1.3 Billion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>6,449</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$1 Billion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Service Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>10,379</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$741 Million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>George Washington</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>10,701</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$1.4 Billion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>13,203</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$1 Billion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Reflections on Ethical and Cultural Diversity (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Peperdine University</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>25,813</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>$305 Million</td>
<td></td>
<td>Human Cultural Diversity (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>3,398</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td>Church of Christ</td>
<td>$712 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>7,652</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Jesuit</td>
<td>$447 Million</td>
<td>American Pluralism (1) and Global Cultures (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Baylor University</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>11,902</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>$1 Billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Marquette Univ.</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>7,955</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Jesuit</td>
<td>$360 Million</td>
<td>Diverse Cultures(I) and Individual Pluralism (1), Global Cultures (1), World Cultures (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>SUNY - Binghamton</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>11,515</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>$62 Million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Loyola - Chicago</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>9,950</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Jesuit</td>
<td>$373 Million</td>
<td>Understanding Diversity in the United States (1), Global Cultures (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Villanova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>7,350</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>$335 Million</td>
<td>Diversity Requirement (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>St. Joseph's University</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>4,998</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Jesuit</td>
<td>$142 Million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>