Penn State Harrisburg’s strategic plan emphasizes diversity and inclusion throughout with detailed data snapshots and impressive diversity enterprises. “Diversity and Inclusiveness as a Way of Life” is one of its six planning themes, commitment to diversity is prominent in the Vision Statement, and the Statement of Values has “Respect, Cooperation, and Diversity” as one of its three major sections alongside other core values like academic excellence. The campus community has one of the most diverse student populations at Penn State, and the Diversity and Educational Equity Committee (DEEC), which reports to the chancellor and receives an annual budget, is a prominent diversity structure whose reach extends across campus through its sponsorship of numerous events. Among other activities, DEEC is responsible for leading continuous climate assessment efforts and coordinating the annual Faculty and Staff Awards to recognize employees who help create a welcoming campus climate. Some of the other major themes in the plan, such as “Promoting Community/Civic Engagement” and “Fostering Social Responsibility and Ethical Decision Making,” have clear diversity connections, and the plan contains language that aptly expresses President Barron’s “diversity and demographics” theme. Also, diversity programming at Harrisburg appears to be a prominent part of the student experience in particular, and the Multicultural Academic Excellence Program (MAEP), a long-standing support office for multicultural students, appears to offer excellent services.

Despite the accomplishments outlined above, the plan does not adequately leverage the campus’ outstanding diversity infrastructure for its future goals. The basic shortfall is that the plan does not connect the many fine pronouncements, aspirations, programs and services, partnerships, and so on to rigorous strategic planning conventions. It might be a good annual report for a strong diversity unit, but it is not an exemplary strategic plan. For example, data are used extensively and are a major strength of the plan, but at key points, they drop off: the DEEC committee receives a budget, but we aren’t given the amount; periodic climate assessment occurs, but without actual results (a link to findings was provided, but the link was dead); MAEP is considered a best practice, but without concrete evidence (activities are reported without specific outcomes); and monitoring the percentage of diversity courses occurs using University Park as a benchmark, but these percentages are not reported. Further, the use of metrics for future planning is not as skillfully done as for marking progress. Planning tends to use open-ended words like “enhance,” “revive,” “increase,” “expand,” and so on without specific thresholds for success. Several undertakings, such as DEEC, which the review team regards as key to campus diversity engagement, MAEP’s broad role, including community participation in its activities, the plan’s sophisticated use of data, and the diversity awards could be best practices, but only if connected to positive outcomes.

While several Framework Challenges are addressed in the plan, responses to the questions posed for diversity in the planning guidelines are uncoordinated. Neither the Framework nor the Challenges are explicitly mentioned, and updates and planning for the Challenges abruptly end after Challenge 5. One diversity best practice is proffered instead of one for each Challenge, and the current plan doesn’t appear to explicitly base its planning on the 2010–15 unit diversity strategic plan. Both of these foci were expressly delineated in the guidelines.

Harrisburg is poised to assume an even stronger leadership position for diversity at Penn State, which can be facilitated by better planning. The review team encourages the campus to become a benchmark diversity strategic planning unit to not only amplify its own diversity endeavors but to serve as a model for the University.

**Campus Climate and Intergroup Relations**

**Challenge 1: Developing a Shared and Inclusive Understanding of Diversity**

- An optimal approach to diversity includes a more sophisticated use of terminology, such as for the word “minority,” especially when such words can mean different things in different contexts. Since the National Center for Education Statistics now states that racial/ethnic “minority” children are actually the majority of children in United States public schools as of fall 2014, this term is becoming less and less attractive.
• Planning for some diversity constituents, such as LGBT and veterans, seems thin.

**Challenge 2: Creating a Welcoming Campus Climate**
• The Office of Human Resources’ emphasis on diversity training is appreciated. Providing data on some outcomes, like attendance and responses to post-program questionnaires, would better inform an understanding of the overall impact.

**Representation (Access and Success)**

**Challenge 3: Recruiting and Retaining a Diverse Student Body**
• Data are disaggregated for various student groups by diversity characteristics, a real plus. The next step is to locate these data within disciplinary groupings, as is done for faculty (see below under Challenge 4).
• The NSF-funded Research Experiences for Undergraduates program is an obvious candidate for further assessment. How diverse undergraduate students proceed through the STEM pipeline has enormous consequences for Penn State, our nation, and the world. Indeed, given Harrisburg’s otherwise strong diversity STEM emphasis, such as the Capital Area Institute for Mathematics and Science, summer STEM camps and workshops, and the Learning Center’s plans to increase its support for underrepresented/underserved students in STEM, a systemic assessment of all STEM programs serving diverse students is called for. It appears that women are not part of the campus’ STEM programming.
• A strong focus on international students comes through in the plan. Care should be taken to ensure that domestic diversity does not fall behind.
• The 2010–15 unit strategic plan mentioned peer-tutoring training for “Tutoring Students from a Culture Different from Yours.” This initiative represents out-of-the-box thinking, but it was not picked up in the current plan. Does the program still exist and, if so, what are the results?

**Challenge 4: Recruiting and Retaining a Diverse Workforce**
• Appendix G, Table G1’s disaggregation of diverse faculty by disciplinary groupings and availability percentages is sophisticated and should be emulated across Penn State (though the plan originally stated that this approach would occur in Appendix A). The data reveal that the biggest gap between utilization and availability is for women in STEM fields, which should make this need a top priority.

**Education and Scholarship**

**Challenge 5: Developing a Curriculum That Fosters U.S. and International Cultural Competencies**
• The large contingent of international faculty with scholarly ties around the world should be leveraged to better promote study abroad and international scholarship among students. Through planning, the potential certificate programs in Global, Holocaust, and Jewish Studies could be better integrated into holistic and multifaceted curricula to promote international diversity.

**Institutional Viability and Vitality**

**Challenge 6: Diversifying University Leadership and Management**
• Table G2 demonstrates good progress for this Challenge even though planning does not appear to be robust. When positive outcomes cannot be connected to planning, it raises the possibility that they are a result of happenstance. Strong planning will facilitate consistent progress for this and other Challenges.
Challenge 7: Coordinating Organizational Change to Support Our Diversity Goals

- The 2010–15 unit diversity strategic plan described the functions of a multicultural officer as existing among various units in Student Affairs. The next logical move would seem to be the appointment of a formal position, but it appears from the current plan that even the function has been discontinued.

RESPONSE: See slides below.
Penn State Harrisburg – Enrollment Growth

- 13 years of uninterrupted growth
- Increase of 39.5% (1,280) students
• From Fall 2001 to Fall 2014 students from 78 different countries have studied at Penn State Harrisburg.

• Fall 2014 enrollment includes 456 international students from 44 countries.
FALL 2001
Total Enrollment 3,239
Graduate 46%  Undergraduate 54%

FALL 2014
Total Enrollment 4,519
Graduate 18%  Undergraduate 82%
PENN STATE HARRISBURG – RESIDENCY

Fall 2001
Total Enrollment 3,239

PA Resident 94%
Non-Resident 6%

Fall 2014
Total Enrollment 4,519

PA Resident 77%
Non-Resident 23%

FALL 2014 Freshman Class is 40.6% Non-Resident
Fall 2014 Freshman Class – Ethnicity

- White American: 47.5%
- International: 18.5%
- Hispanic American: 6.5%
- Asian American: 10.8%
- Black American: 11.9%
- American Indian or Alaskan Native: 0.1%
- Unknown: 1.1%
- Multiple Races: 3.5%
Fall 2014 College Enrollment – Ethnicity

Fall 2010
Total Enrollment 4,224

- ASIAN: 5.2%
- AFRICAN AMERICAN: 7.9%
- NATIVE HAWAIIAN OR OTHER PACIFIC ISLANDER: 0.1%
- HISPANIC: 4.2%
- AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKA NATIVE: 0.1%
- INTERNATIONAL STUDENT: 3.0%
- MULIPLE RACES: 1.8%
- UNKNOWN: 3.6%

Fall 2014
Total Enrollment 4,519

- WHITE: 62.3%
- ASIAN: 7.4%
- AFRICAN AMERICAN: 9.3%
- HISPANIC: 5.9%
- INTERNATIONAL STUDENT: 10.1%
- MULTIPLE RACES: 2.5%
- UNKNOWN: 2.2%
- NATIVE HAWAIIAN OR OTHER PACIFIC ISLANDER: 0.1%
- AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKA NATIVE: 0.3%
Fall 2014 Graduate Enrollment – Ethnicity

- **White**: 73.9%
- **Asian**: 3.9%
- **African American**: 4.1%
- **Hispanic**: 3.0%
- **American Indian or Alaska Native**: 0.5%
- **Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander**: 0.1%
- **International Student**: 10.4%
- **Multiple Races**: 0.8%
- **Unknown**: 3.3%
Fall 2014 Undergraduate Enrollment – Ethnicity

WHITE: 59.7%
AFRICAN AMERICAN: 10.5%
ASIAN: 8.2%
HISPANIC: 6.5%
INTERNATIONAL STUDENT: 10.0%
MULIPLE RACES: 2.8%
UNKNOWN: 1.9%
AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKA NATIVE...
NATIVE HAWAIIAN OR OTHER PACIFIC ISLANDER: 0.1%
Fall 2014 College Enrollment – Gender

Fall 2010
Total Enrollment 4,224

- MALE 51%
- FEMALE 49%

Fall 2014
Total Enrollment 4,519

- MALE 56%
- FEMALE 44%
Fall 2014 College Enrollment – Adult/Traditional

Fall 2010
Total Enrollment 4,224
TRADITIONAL 54.5%
ADULT 45.5%

Fall 2014
Total Enrollment 4,519
TRADITIONAL 67%
ADULT 33%
Fall 2010
Total Number of Full-Time Faculty 173

Fall 2014
Total Number of Full-Time Faculty 234
Fall 2010
Total Number of Full-Time Staff 198

Fall 2014
Total Number of Full-Time Staff 236