Berkeley
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

MY EXPERIENCE SURVEY 2019

Campus Findings and Recommendations

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

Overview

UC Berkeley is arguably the premier public research university in the world. It is internationally known for its innovation and entrepreneurial spirit while raising the consciousness of our nation about social justice and our public mission. An important component of our public mission is to increase educational equity and justice by providing a quality education to students from diverse communities and fostering a workplace that is inclusive and equitable. Therefore, conducting surveys to assess the campus climate is a practice towards learning and continuous improvement to meet our strategic plan goals. The campus climate is informed by three elements: campus culture, experiences, and resources. We are also cognizant that the campus climate is a microcosm of broader societal trends, and interrupting and eliminating gaps in access, experiences, and opportunities is the foundational work of a public university. According to the 2019 Pew Research Center study on Race in America, six out of ten Americans believe that race relations are bad and half report that race relations have gotten worse. [1] Similar to the Pew Research Center Study, the results of the 2019, UC Berkeley My Experience Survey show that since 2013, when the campus last undertook a climate survey, the protected class groups report dissatisfaction with the campus climate at a higher rate than their white counterparts.

The University of California, Berkeley is dedicated to creating a healthy campus climate that will foster equity of experience and ensure that staff, students, and faculty of all backgrounds feel safe, welcome, and included. [2] The goal of the survey is to update our knowledge about how members of the UC Berkeley community experience the campus on a daily basis – with the intent of using the data to analyze and build on what is working and address what is not.

What is working?

We are pleased to see that the majority of the respondents of the 2019 My Experience Survey report having a positive experience at UC Berkeley. Almost all respondents (97%) agreed that diversity, equity, and inclusion were important values to uphold. A substantial majority (87%) reported that diversity, equity, and inclusion are values promoted at Berkeley. More than four out of five (82%) of respondents were comfortable with the climate. Overall, undergraduates rated their academic experiences positively. Roughly nine in ten undergraduates felt they were treated with respect in their department (92%); reported that degree requirements are taken seriously and applied systematically to all students (91%); and agreed that their program articulated clear expectations and guidelines (89%) around degree completion. Roughly four in five undergraduates reported having faculty role models (83%); feeling valued by faculty in the classroom (82%); feeling valued by other students in the classroom (80%); and having opportunities for academic success similar to their peers (80%). Chicanx/Latinx undergraduate respect rates showed improvements in 2019 up from 2016.

Graduate students rated their academic experiences generally positively with roughly nine in ten feeling valued by other students in the classroom (91%); feeling valued by faculty (88%); and having faculty role models (88%). Over four in five graduate students agreed that their advisors were concerned about the welfare of their graduate students (85%) and postdocs (83%); praised them when they did their work well (84%); and supported their career development (83%).

Most employee respondents (86%) reported being satisfied with their job overall. Generally, academic employees reported positive experiences with their managers and supervisors. Around four in five (81%) academic employees agreed that their managers/supervisors were concerned about the welfare of those they supervise.

Multiple committees and task forces have been convened and reports have been produced to illustrate and illuminate the structural and institutional collective work we must do to make our campus a place for all. Further research will be conducted on the type of structure the campus needs to implement on the recommendations for culture change, the access to opportunities available, and the type and number of resources we offer to address these findings.

Finally, leadership matters a great deal. In two of the four areas about leadership honesty, ethics, and concern for people's rights, the majority of respondents (80%) agreed that the campus leadership dealt with them honestly and ethically and (79%) agreed that they showed genuine concern for people's rights.

What is not working?

While we celebrate these results, we still have more work to do to improve the campus experiences for the 18% of respondents, majority protected class groups (African-American/Black, Chicanx-Latinx, Native American/Alaska Native, Pacific Islanders, LGBTQ, Communities with Disability, and women) and socio-economically disadvantaged (e.g. low-income, working class, or poor) who experienced discomfort with regards to climate. To lead our institution towards meeting our goals of ensuring that every member experiences belonging, access, and opportunities, we must examine more closely which groups are experiencing the campus in positive ways, which groups are not, and why.

Protected class groups and minoritized and marginalized communities at UC Berkeley continue to report experiencing discomfort with the campus climate. These patterns of negative campus experiences are cross-cutting among populations - affecting students, faculty and staff alike - in five critical areas: belonging; basic needs; mental health; leadership opportunities; and institutional trust of campus leadership, police, and faculty. The campus climate was measured through 4-6 point Likert scales that measured satisfaction, comfort, and experiences.

Belonging

One in four respondents (25%) regularly experienced exclusionary behaviors. Exclusionary behavior typically came from peers in settings with multiple people. Undergraduate students reported the highest experiences with exclusionary behaviors of any population (34%), and African American undergraduates reported the highest rates of any affinity group (68%) -- an increase from 2013 (53%).

Basic Needs

Roughly one in four respondents (27%) were food insecure, two in five (41%) were housing insecure, and one in twenty (5%) were homeless. Undergraduates had the highest levels of food insecurity of any population at 39%, and postdocs had the highest levels of housing insecurity (54%). System-impacted undergraduates reported the highest levels of food security (69%) of any affinity group, while undergraduates with dependents had the highest levels of housing insecurity (71%).

Mental Health

Almost half of respondents (49%) experienced symptoms of depression, and over half (56%) experienced symptoms of anxiety. Undergraduates reported the highest symptoms of depression (60%) and anxiety (66%). Undergraduates with disabilities had the highest symptoms of depression (77%) and anxiety (83%). National mental health trends show increased symptoms of depression and anxiety in 2020, particularly for college students. [3, 4]

The number of Berkeley community members experiencing basic needs insecurity and mental health symptoms has increased since the campus went into shelter-in-place due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Services, including pop-up food pantries and remote health services are helping to address the disparate impact.

Leadership Opportunities

About two in three postdocs, staff, and faculty respondents (68%) wanted more mentoring for leadership positions and over three in four (77%) were interested in leadership training programs in the future.

Institutional Trust

In terms of being trusted in interactions and decision-making, respondents rated faculty as most trustworthy followed by campus police and then campus leadership (e.g., cabinet, administrators, deans etc.). Undergraduates expressed the least trust for campus leadership (ranging from 61% to 77% for the four questions about campus leadership) and police (71% to 81%) while staff rated faculty (61% to 85%) the lowest. Of all subgroups, undergraduate African American

and trans gender/gender non-conforming students reported the least trust for the campus police, the lowest of any institutional group with only a third rating them trustworthy.

Institutional Responses

A preliminary analysis of the data was shared with the following institutional governing bodies prior to the finalized and official release to the campus: the Chancellor, Executive Vice Provost & Chancellor (EVCP), the Cabinet, the Council of Deans, and the Chancellor's advisory groups.

Prior to, during, and after the launch of the survey, several institutional approaches, committees and task forces were set in motion to address the issues of belonging, basic needs, mental health, leadership opportunities, and institution trust including but not limited to:

▶ UC Berkeley 2019 strategic plan

▶ African American Initiative

▶ Anti-Racism Initiatives

▶ Basic Needs Impact Report

▶ Becoming an Anti-Racist Campus - initiative will be announced soon.

▶ Building Name Review Committee

▶ Chancellor's Independent Advisory Board on Police Accountability and Community Safety

▶ Chancellor's Advisory Committee on the Status of Womxn

▶ Graduate Division

▶ Graduate Student Diversity Task Force

▶ Hispanic Serving Institution Task Force

▶ Office of Faculty, Equity, and Welfare

▶ SB 179 Committee

▶ Undergraduate Student Diversity Project Report

▶ University Health Services

Introduction

The My Experience Survey seeks to assess the campus climate of UC Berkeley in broad terms to help the institution fulfill its public mission and current strategic plan goals by understanding where climate progress has been made and where it has not. It builds on the work of the 2013 UC-wide climate survey, which at Berkeley found a mostly healthy climate for majority groups while generally over a quarter of the respondents from protected- class groups reported an unhealthy climate. [5] Launched in 2019, the My the Experience Survey set out to understand campus experiences across and within populations in the following areas: 1) campus climate; 2) basic needs; 3) health (including mental health); 4) career development; 5) mentoring and advising; 6) departmental/unit climate; 7) social norms around sexual violence and sexual harassment; and 8) perceptions of institutional legitimacy and trust.

Survey Instrument Development and Distribution

The Division of Equity & Inclusion partnered with students, faculty, and staff from across the campus to develop the My Experience Survey instrument starting in 2017. Once the survey instrument was developed, it was translated into Spanish and Mandarin; the Mandarin version was provided in both simplified and traditional characters. To understand the experiences across multiple affinity groups and their intersections, the survey asked extensive demographic questions. Given the potential for identifiability of respondents, precautions were taken to ensure respondent privacy and confidentiality throughout the survey administration, analysis, and reporting. The instrument and the administration process were reviewed and approved by the UC Berkeley Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects. In March 2019, the My Experience Survey launched with a campus-wide message from the Chancellor. Follow-up messages from various campus leaders followed over the next two months until the survey closed in May 2019. The analysis team validated and compiled initial findings and reported them out to the Chancellor's Cabinet, Council of Deans, and other internal governing bodies on campus in Fall 2019. In addition, the data have been used to inform academic program reviews, climate-centered student initiatives, and other important bodies on campus including the Independent Advisory Board on Police Accountability and Community Safety.

The My Experience Survey results were scheduled for campus-wide release in Spring 2020, however, once the COVID-19 pandemic and shelter-in-place took hold in March 2020, a comprehensive, sustained response to the

pandemic superseded the release of the survey results. Nevertheless, we believe that the My Experience Survey results reported here may be used as a foundational set of trends that should be addressed at the individual, departmental, and institutional levels. For example, the Office of Faculty Equity and Welfare provided analysis and reporting on faculty climate results. In addition, the Graduate Division produced a survey and report concerning climate and needs. These two examples are ways academic departments can use the My Experience Survey data to inform climate goals.

Respondent Overview

Response Rates

Of the 55,764 individuals invited to take the 2019 My Experience Survey, 12,120 individuals responded for a campus response rate of 22%. This rate was similar to (though slightly lower than) other full campus surveys (24% for the 2013 Campus Climate Survey and 26% for the 2018 My Voice Survey). [5, 6] Across populations, faculty had the highest response rate (55%), and academic employees had the lowest response rate (12%). There was relatively little variation in response rates across affinity groups though as is typical for surveys, women had slightly higher response rates. [7] By comparison, there was wide variation in response rates across units with some units over 50% while a few were under 10%.

Respondent Demographics

Survey participants had the option to respond to dozens of demographic questions. Many of those questions allowed for multiple responses so categories are not always distinct. The following tables show respondent demographics by gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, class while growing up, parental education, and disability. These are selected to highlight the dimensions of marginalization by subgroup. By collecting data through the lens of a particular subgroup, structural patterns emerge. As you read through the data, an unsurprising and familiar pattern will demonstrate that the structures that manifest in the Berkeley campus community are those at work in broader U.S. society. These subgroups are not intrinsically at higher sensitivity about campus experiences but are more likely to be impacted by structural and institutional policies and practices that disparately impact particular subgroups.

Table 1. Survey Responses by Population

Counts of survey invitees and respondents by population, and response rates by population

Group	Campus	Undergraduate Students	Graduate Students	Postdocs	Faculty	Academic Employees	Staff
Invited	55,764	28,926	11,330	1,156	1,519	3,421	9,412
Responded	12,108	5,642	2,309	153	841	426	2,737
Response Rate	22%	20%	20%	13%	55%	12%	29%

Gender Identity

Mirroring the campus, most respondents were women (53%). Transgender/gender non-conforming individuals were 3% of respondents, an increase from 2013, which was under 2%.

Table 2. Gender Identity by Population

Percentage of respondents by gender identity (multiple categories allowed)

Group	Undergraduates	Grad Students	Postdocs	Faculty	Academic Staff	Staff	All
Total	5,644	2,311	154	842	426	2,743	12,120
Men	37%	46%	52%	58%	42%	30%	39%
Women	55%	43%	45%	32%	50%	64%	53%
Transgender/GNC	4%	3%	n/a	n/a	n/a	2%	3%
Non-Binary	2%	1%	n/a	n/a	n/a	1%	1%
Genderqueer	1%	1%	n/a	n/a	n/a	1%	1%
Agender	1%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.4%
Trans Men	0.4%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.2%
Trans Women	0.3%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.2%
Another Gender	0.5%	0.5%	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.4%	0.4%

Race/Ethnicity

Mirroring the campus, most respondents were white (46%). Respondents were also categorized as multiracial if they reported as two or more of the following: white, Asian, SWANA, Pacific Islander, Chicanx/Latinx, Native American/Alaska Native, or African American/Black.

Table 3. Race/Ethnicity by Population

Percentage of respondents by race/ethnicity (multiple categories allowed)

Group	Undergraduates	Grad Students	Postdocs	Faculty	Academic Staff	Staff	All
Total	5,644	2,311	154	842	426	2,743	12,120
White	34%	48%	56%	67%	69%	56%	46%
Asian	44%	32%	29%	11%	14%	19%	32%
East Asian	30%	22%	22%	7%	9%	12%	22%
South Asian	6%	5%	n/a	3%	n/a	2%	5%
Southeast Asian	9%	3%	n/a	n/a	n/a	6%	6%
Other Asian	1%	1%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1%
SWANA	5%	4%	n/a	2%	2%	2%	4%
URM	22%	15%	13%	9%	10%	22%	19%
Chicanx/Latinx	18%	11%	12%	5%	6%	12%	14%
Native Am./Alaska Native	1%	1%	n/a	n/a	n/a	2%	1%
Pacific Islander	1%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1%	1%
African Am./Black	3%	4%	n/a	4%	3%	8%	5%
Another Race/Eth.	2%	1%	n/a	3%	3%	3%	2%
Multiracial	12%	9%	6%	5%	6%	9%	10%

Table 4. Sexual Orientation by Population

Percentage of respondents by sexual orientation (multiple categories allowed)

Group	Undergraduates	Grad Students	Postdocs	Faculty	Academic Staff	Staff	All
Total	5,644	2,311	154	842	426	2,743	12,120
Heterosexual	70%	67%	80%	75%	74%	71%	70%
LGBQ+	22%	20%	14%	8%	14%	17%	19%
Bisexual	8%	5%	n/a	2%	4%	4%	6%
Gay	3%	4%	n/a	3%	4%	4%	4%
Asexual	3%	3%	n/a	n/a	n/a	2%	3%
Questioning	3%	1%	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.5%	2%
Queer	2%	4%	n/a	n/a	n/a	2%	2%
Lesbian	1%	1%	n/a	1%	n/a	3%	2%
Pansexual	2%	1%	n/a	n/a	n/a	1%	1%
Another	1%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.4%	0.4%

Sexual Orientation

Mirroring the campus, most respondents were heterosexual/straight (70%). LGBQ+ individuals were 19% of respondents, an increase from 16% in 2013.

Table 5. SES While Growing Up by Population

Percentage of respondents by SES while growing up

Group	Undergraduates	Grad Students	Postdocs	Faculty	Academic Staff	Staff	All
Total	5,644	2,311	154	842	426	2,743	12,120
High SES	31%	35%	21%	33%	25%	18%	29%
Wealthy	3%	3%	n/a	n/a	n/a	1%	2%
Upper-class	28%	32%	21%	32%	24%	18%	26%
Middle SES	30%	32%	45%	38%	45%	37%	33%
Low SES	34%	24%	27%	21%	27%	42%	32%
Working-class	17%	15%	21%	16%	21%	29%	19%
Low-income/poor	17%	9%	n/a	5%	6%	13%	13%

Socioeconomic Status (SES) While Growing Up

Respondents were roughly evenly split between being middle-class growing up (33%), high SES (29%), and low SES (32%).

Table 6. Parental Education by Population

Percentage of respondents by parental education

Group	Undergraduates	Grad Students	Postdocs	Faculty	Academic Staff	Staff	All
Total	5,644	2,311	154	842	426	2,743	12,120
4-Year Degree+	61%	72%	67%	66%	67%	56%	63%
No 4-Year Degree	28%	17%	25%	21%	25%	34%	26%

Parental Education

Most respondents have at least one parent who has earned at least a four-year degree (63%).

Disability

Table 7. Disability by Population

Percentage of respondents by disability

Group	Undergraduates	Grad Students	Postdocs	Faculty	Academic Staff	Staff	All
Total	5,644	2,311	154	842	426	2,743	12,120
No disability	48%	48%	51%	54%	58%	54%	50%
1+ Disability	35%	25%	23%	21%	23%	27%	30%

Nearly half (48%) of all respondents reported having no disability, whereas over one third of respondents (35%) had one or more self-identified disability. Respondents could decline to respond to the question, so totals do not add up to 100%.

Intersections of Marginalization

Six dimensions of marginalization - gender identity, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, SES growing up, parental education, and disability - are combined to categorize respondents according to how many marginalized dimensions each respondent identifies. This categorization ranges from zero to six. While there are other dimensions that could have been included, these were chosen to cut across all campus populations.

Table 8. Number of Marginalizations by Population

Percentage of respondents by number of marginalizations along six dimensions

Group	Undergraduates	Grad Students	Postdocs	Faculty	Academic Staff	Staff	All
Total	5,644	2,311	154	842	426	2,743	12,120
0 Marginal Factors	4%	6%	8%	15%	10%	5%	6%
1 Marginal Factors	14%	19%	21%	24%	25%	16%	17%
2 Marginal Factors	21%	20%	20%	16%	20%	20%	20%
3 Marginal Factors	18%	14%	10%	6%	12%	17%	16%
4 Marginal Factors	14%	6%	7%	3%	6%	11%	11%
5 Marginal Factors	7%	3%	n/a	n/a	n/a	4%	5%
6 Marginal Factors	1%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0%	1%

Overall Climate

Comfort

Over four in five respondents (82%) were comfortable with the climate at UC Berkeley. Those who reported discomfort were disproportionately from marginalized subgroups when disaggregating by protected classes: gender,

race/ethnicity, sexuality, class, and disability. Across populations, women, trans gender and gender-non-conforming, African American/Black, Chicanx/Latinx, Native American/Alaska Natives, Pacific Islanders, Southeast Asians, Southwest Asians/North Africans, LGBQ+, those from low socioeconomic backgrounds, foster youth who earned four-year degrees, and disabled respondents all reported lower levels of comfort with the campus climate. At the intersections of these marginalized groups, a worse climate accumulates with each added marginalized identity. Throughout this report, these groups will be collectively referred to as marginalized/minoritized groups.

Table 9. Comfort Rates by Affinity Group

Percentage of respondents comfortable with the climate at UC Berkeley

Category	Group	Comfort Rate
Population	UC Berkeley	82%
	Undergraduates	82%
	Graduate Students	85%
	Postdocs	92%
	Faculty	81%
	Academic Employees	78%
	Staff	77%
Gender	Men	85%
	Women	81%
	Transgender/Gender Non-Conforming	67%
Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual	83%
	LGBQ+	79%
Race/Ethnicity	White	84%
	East Asian	87%
	South Asian	84%
	Southeast Asian	80%
	Southwest Asian/North African	78%
	Underrepresented Minority	74%
	Chicanx/Latinx	77%
	Native American/Alaska Native	69%
	Pacific Islander	69%
	African American/Black	65%
	Multiracial	79%
Disability	No Disability	85%
	Disability	74%
SES Growing Up	High SES	86%
	Middle SES	84%
	Low SES	77%
Intersections	0 Marginal Factors	90%
	1 Marginal Factors	87%
	2 Marginal Factors	83%
	3 Marginal Factors	79%
	4 Marginal Factors	78%
	5 Marginal Factors	68%
	6 Marginal Factors	68%

Support for Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity

Almost all respondents (97%) agreed that diversity, equity, and inclusion were important to them. There was minimal variation across demographic groups and populations. While a lower if still strong majority (87%) agreed that diversity, equity, and inclusion are values promoted at Berkeley, there was much more variation across groups. As with feelings of comfort and respect, marginalized and minoritized groups had lower agreement that diversity, equity, and inclusion were values promoted at Berkeley. Correlated with their lower sense of respect, African American/Black respondents had notably lower agreement that diversity, equity, and inclusion were promoted at Berkeley (64%).

Table 10. Perceived Campus Support for EID by Affinity Group

Percentage of respondents who agree that EID are values promoted at Berkeley

Category	Group	Percent
Population	UC Berkeley	87%
	Undergraduates	86%
	Graduate Students	88%
	Postdocs	92%
	Faculty	92%
	Academic Employees	86%
	Staff	87%
Intersections	0 Marginal Factors	94%
	1 Marginal Factors	93%
	2 Marginal Factors	89%
	3 Marginal Factors	85%
	4 Marginal Factors	81%
	5 Marginal Factors	70%
	6 Marginal Factors	72%

Interpersonal Relationships/Belonging

Introduction

Interpersonal relations are a critical component of campus culture. [8] The My Experience Survey measured various aspects of interpersonal relations with the goals of updating findings from previous surveys and identifying how these metrics related to other aspects of campus culture.

The first section of this report focuses on respect and the second section focuses on belonging (e.g. inclusion, exclusionary, and bullying behaviors) across six dimensions of marginalization/minorization: gender, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, disability, socioeconomic status, and parental education. Respondents can have none of these marginalizations or up to all six.

Respect

Across different affinity groups, most respondents (ranging from 85% to 95%) felt that members of their affinity group are respected at UC Berkeley. For marginalized and minoritized groups, however, respondents felt their affinity groups were less respected. Much lower feelings of respect for their groups was reported by African American/Black (43%), Central American (62%), Native American/Alaska Native (64%), and transgender/gender non-conforming (61%) respondents across populations.

Table 11. Respect Rates by Population

Percentage of respondents reporting their affinity group being respected on campus

Group	Undergraduates	Grad Students	Postdocs	Faculty	Academic Staff	Staff	All
Men	94%	96%	91%	97%	98%	94%	95%
Women	89%	88%	90%	84%	84%	86%	88%
Transgender/ GNC	59%	57%				73%	61%
Heterosexual	97%	98%	96%	97%	95%	95%	97%
LGBQ+	85%	93%	70%	87%	92%	91%	88%
White	90%	95%	92%	96%	96%	96%	94%
East Asian	94%	95%	88%	82%	83%	88%	93%
South Asian	95%	96%		100%		88%	95%
Southeast Asian	88%	97%				87%	89%
SWANA	83%	87%		89%	80%	71%	82%
URM	63%	71%	70%	59%	61%	64%	65%
Chicanx/Latinx	67%	78%	74%	69%	70%	74%	70%
Native Am./Al. Native	59%	71%				72%	64%
Pacific Islander	70%					76%	71%
African American/ Black	39%	49%		47%	42%	43%	43%
No Disability	95%	89%	75%	79%	76%	81%	89%
Disability	76%	75%	57%	65%	64%	74%	74%
Grew Up High SES	94%	97%	97%	98%	94%	96%	95%
Grew Up Middle SES	92%	92%	91%	94%	94%	90%	92%
Grew Up Low SES	70%	74%	79%	81%	81%	78%	74%
Not System Impacted	96%	91%					94%
System Impacted	76%	81%					77%
No Dependents	96%	91%	83%	86%	81%	84%	93%
Has Dependents	83%	80%	82%	87%	78%	85%	84%
Agnostic	95%	95%	79%	92%	86%	90%	94%
No Religion	96%	94%	96%	95%	85%	87%	93%
Atheist	96%	96%	79%	87%	87%	89%	93%
Hindu	96%	95%		64%		83%	92%
Spiritual	95%	92%		95%	88%	86%	91%
Buddhist	92%	93%		90%	71%	87%	90%

Table 11. Respect Rates by Population (continued)

Percentage of respondents reporting their affinity group being respected on campus

Group	Undergraduates	Grad Students	Postdocs	Faculty	Academic Staff	Staff	All
Humanist	92%	87%		82%	87%	90%	88%
Shinto	93%	90%				80%	88%
Sikh	87%						88%
Another Religion	88%	89%			64%	89%	87%
Christian	80%	85%	86%	80%	81%	83%	82%
Pagan	88%					71%	80%
Jewish	65%	85%		89%	82%	84%	79%
Muslim	77%	84%				73%	78%
Traditional Native American	73%					82%	73%

Exclusionary Behaviors

One in four respondents (25%) experienced at least one of 25 different exclusionary behaviors somewhat often, often, or very often at UC Berkeley within the past 12 months. The most common exclusionary behaviors experienced were being stared at; fearing for one's personal safety; experiencing hostile/offensive behaviors; and being singled out as a spokesperson for one's group. Minoritized and marginalized communities experienced higher rates of exclusionary behaviors. African American/Black, Native Americans/Alaska Natives, Pacific Islanders, and transgender/gender non-conforming respondents experienced nearly twice as much exclusion as the campus overall (48%, 43%, 43%, and 46% respectively).

Table 12. Experiences with Exclusion by Population

Percentage of respondents reporting regularly experiencing exclusionary behavior

Group	Undergraduates	Grad Students	Postdocs	Faculty	Academic Staff	Staff	All
Total	34%	19%	16%	9%	16%	19%	25%
0 Marginal Factors	18%	10%	17%	0%	9%	7%	10%
1 Marginal Factors	21%	8%	9%	7%	11%	7%	13%
2 Marginal Factors	31%	21%	16%	10%	9%	17%	24%
3 Marginal Factors	38%	28%	19%	9%	28%	22%	31%
4 Marginal Factors	42%	31%	36%	20%	29%	26%	36%
5 Marginal Factors	55%	52%				42%	51%
6 Marginal Factors	56%					18%	52%

Peers commit exclusionary behaviors most often. This means that for undergraduate students, fellow students are most often the source of exclusionary behaviors (56%). For graduate students, fellow students are also the most frequent source of exclusionary behaviors (52%) but faculty members are also a frequent source of these behaviors

(32%). For postdocs and staff members, co-workers are the most common source of exclusionary behaviors (46% and 40% respectively). For the faculty, fellow faculty members are the most common source followed by administrators (64% and 32%). For academic employees, the sources are split among faculty (35%), students (32%), and administrators (35%).

Respondents most often experienced exclusionary behaviors in public or group settings such as campus worksites, public spaces, group meetings, or classes/labs/clinics. The specific locations varied across populations, but tended to be in the common locations for a population (e.g., offices and meetings for faculty and staff; classes and labs for grad students).

Table 13. Sources of Exclusion by Population

Percentage of respondents who reported a group as a source of exclusionary behavior

Group	Undergraduates	Grad Students	Postdocs	Faculty	Academic Staff	Staff	All
Student	56%	52%	13%	25%	32%	16%	47%
Stranger	38%	28%	25%	8%	18%	14%	31%
Faculty member	8%	32%	13%	64%	35%	20%	16%
Co-worker	4%	23%	46%	26%	28%	40%	14%
Administrator	8%	11%	0%	32%	35%	26%	13%
Staff member	6%	11%	8%	16%	19%	35%	12%
Supervisor	2%	4%	13%	1%	16%	31%	7%
Department head	2%	6%	4%	19%	16%	14%	5%
Faculty advisor	3%	13%	17%	1%	1%	1%	4%

Table 14. Locations of Exclusion by Population

Percentage of respondents who reported a location as a place of exclusionary behavior

Group	Undergraduates	Grad Students	Postdocs	Faculty	Academic Staff	Staff	All
Campus worksite	39%	31%	25%	16%	26%	19%	34%
Public space	38%	28%	21%	22%	28%	20%	33%
Group meeting	16%	26%	25%	51%	34%	31%	21%
Class/lab/clinic	21%	39%	46%	12%	22%	4%	21%
While walking	24%	16%	17%	4%	4%	6%	19%
UC Berkeley event	15%	17%	13%	19%	15%	13%	15%
UC Berkeley office	4%	13%	8%	36%	24%	45%	13%
Campus housing	18%	4%	0%	0%	3%	3%	12%
1-on-1 meeting	6%	10%	13%	23%	16%	23%	10%
Staff office	3%	4%	0%	6%	15%	39%	9%
Campus transport	3%	5%	17%	16%	22%	24%	7%
Faculty office	4%	16%	13%	32%	24%	6%	7%

Table 15. Experiences with Bullying by Population

Percentage of respondents reporting regular experiences with bullying behavior

Group	Undergraduates	Grad Students	Postdocs	Faculty	Academic Staff	Staff	All
Total	26%	17%	18%	9%	13%	20%	21%
0 Marginal Factors	25%	20%	8%	2%	9%	11%	16%
1 Marginal Factors	21%	12%	9%	8%	13%	13%	15%
2 Marginal Factors	25%	20%	26%	10%	7%	21%	21%
3 Marginal Factors	30%	22%	19%	6%	16%	21%	26%
4 Marginal Factors	30%	26%	45%	24%	21%	24%	28%
5 Marginal Factors	34%	35%				35%	34%
6 Marginal Factors	44%					18%	40%

Bullying

One in five respondents (21%) experienced at least one of seventeen different bullying behaviors somewhat often, often, or very often at UC Berkeley within the past twelve months. The most common bullying behaviors experienced were being interrupted; being mocked; being isolated/ostracized; being gossiped or lied about. Minoritized and marginalized communities experienced higher rates of bullying. African American/Black (34%), Native Americans/ Alaska Natives (37%), Pacific Islanders (38%), disabled respondents (33%), and transgender/gender non-conforming respondents (37%) experienced nearly one-and-a-half times as much bullying as the campus overall.

As with exclusionary behavior, bullying is primarily from peers and most common associates. For undergraduates, fellow students are the most common source of bullying (74%), and for graduate students other students (57%) as well as faculty members (37%) are the most common sources of bullying. For postdocs and staff, co-workers are the highest source of bullying (50% and 47% respectively). Among the faculty, fellow faculty members are the most common source of bullying (78%). Among academic employees, there is a broad range of sources with faculty (43%) being the highest followed by co-workers (36%).

Table 16. Sources of Bullying by Population

Percentage of respondents who reported a group as a source of bullying behavior

Group	Undergraduates	Grad Students	Postdocs	Faculty	Academic Staff	Staff	All
Student	74%	57%	21%	21%	21%	10%	55%
Co-Worker	5%	28%	50%	19%	36%	47%	19%
Faculty member	9%	37%	21%	78%	43%	16%	18%
Other	19%	8%	7%	16%	30%	12%	15%
Manager/ Super..	4%	12%	29%	12%	32%	38%	13%
UC Berkeley staff	8%	7%	11%	8%	23%	32%	13%
Supervisee	1%	1%	0%	0%	5%	5%	2%

Trends

UC Berkeley has measured respect rates for undergraduate students going back to 2012 using three different surveys (My Experience Survey in 2019; UC Campus Climate Survey in 2013; and UC Undergraduate Experience Survey in 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018, and 2020). There is no uniform trend across racial/ethnic groups. White and Asian undergraduates have held relatively steady with high respect rates. Native American/Alaska Native undergraduate respect rates have steadily declined from 2012 to 2019, but rose in 2020. African American undergraduate respect rates held somewhat steadily around 50% until 2014 after which they dropped to the 35-40% range. Chicanx/Latinx undergraduate respect rates declined steadily from 2012 to 2016 but have improved since then to around 65-70%.

Table 17. Trends in Undergraduate Respect

Percentage of respondents reporting that their race/ethnicity is respected on campus

Group	2012*	2013**	2014*	2016*	2018*	2019**	2020*
African American	53%	51%	52%	36%	42%	39%	39%
Chicanx/Latinx	78%	77%	71%	57%	63%	67%	66%
Native American/ Alaska Native	92%	80%	76%	77%	68%	59%	77%
Asian	93%	93%	91%	86%	90%	93%	91%
White	94%	92%	91%	89%	87%	90%	90%

Correlations

Experiences with exclusionary and bullying behavior are highly correlated with overall campus climate. Respondents who strongly agreed that they were comfortable with the overall campus climate had the lowest exclusion and bullying rates (10% and 8%). As overall campus climate decreased, exclusion and bullying rates increased. Respondents who strongly disagreed that they were comfortable with the overall campus climate had exclusion and bullying rates seven times higher (71% and 60%) than the respondents who strongly agreed. These correlations provide a measure of internal reliability for the survey responses. They also suggest a potential lever for improving campus climate - reducing experiences with exclusionary and bullying behaviors.

Recommendations

Table 18. Correlations Between Campus Comfort and Negative Experiences

Percentage of respondents regularly experiencing exclusionary or bullying behaviors

Group	Undergraduates	Grad Students	Postdocs	Faculty	Academic Staff	Staff
Total	34%	19%	16%	9%	16%	19%
Strongly disagree	77%	69%		55%	64%	69%
Disagree	68%	51%		33%	40%	43%
Somewhat disagree	57%	35%		29%	25%	30%
Somewhat agree	39%	26%	26%	7%	14%	18%
Agree	23%	12%	7%	3%	10%	10%
Strongly agree	16%	7%	6%	1%	7%	6%

The My Experience Survey Team reviewed campus committee reports and findings and selected high leverage recommendations from the Undergraduate Student Diversity Project (USDP), the Graduate Student Diversity Project (GSDP), the OFEW senate faculty climate survey report (OFEW) to address the area of belonging for undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty:

- USDP: "A4. Invest in symbols on campus (e.g., pictures, art, personal care products at the student store, etc.) that communicate belonging for students who feel the greatest levels of exclusion and marginalization on campus (see 2013 campus climate report and 2019 My Experience Report)."

- USDP: "A5. Invest in and support programs and initiatives that serve students who experience the greatest degrees of exclusion (e.g., Fannie Lou Hamer Resource Center, Multicultural Community Center, Stiles Hall, African American Initiative, etc.)."

- USDP: "A12. Consider and treat experiences of policing as a key dimension of campus belonging and address the needs and concerns reported by students who have experienced negative encounters with the police (directly or vicariously), especially Black students, LGBTQ+ students, non-traditional students, and students from URM backgrounds."

- USDP: "C8. Make sure that there is sufficient representation of faculty and staff who can mentor underrepresented students and that departments across disciplines use best practices to attract robust and diverse applicant pools and ensure equitable hiring processes."

- USDP: "C9. Design and execute a multi-pronged strategy for creating cultural change around teaching, geared toward improving the experiences of URMs and marginalized groups (see C10-C22). Such an approach will also benefit undergraduate education more generally. Our holistic set of recommendations includes attending to institutional signals, norms and expectations, selection and evaluation processes, incentives for inclusive practices, and connecting instructors with resources and support."

- GSDP: "Conduct annual reviews of faculty mentorship and advising and incorporate climate questions into the tenure and promotional review process"

- GSDP: "Create an incentives program for faculty to participate in ongoing trainings on teaching, mentorship, advising, and recognizing/correcting implicit bias"

- GSDP: "Improve local-level infrastructure, support, and assessment of climate for graduate students"

- GSDP: "Conduct a review of building facilities for accessible and gender-inclusive facilities"

- GSDP: "Increase trained staff resources to address climate and retention issues with mediations and restorative justice practices"

- GSDP: "Continue to build on earlier initiatives announced by UCPD"

- OFEW: "Further promote and expand the Faculty Leadership Academy to increase leadership and administrative skills and create a diverse pipeline of faculty prepared to serve in administrative leadership positions."

- OFEW: "Continue efforts to diversify the faculty and to hire faculty with the skills and commitment to promoting a diverse, equitable, and inclusive environment to support a positive and inclusive campus climate."

- OFEW: "Address the clear need for housing support for faculty at the lower ends of the pay scale. We recommend that the campus consider purchasing several University Terrace condominiums, as they come on the market, and rent them to newly hired faculty on the Clark Kerr model."

Progress Underway

- Berkeley has made progress in the beginning phases of actively creating a campus that has a visibly inclusive culture by honoring Indigenous and other underrepresented communities. Longstanding wrongs are being addressed and future approaches are being guided by the relevant communities. Removal of building names and other historical references that celebrate people that have caused great harm to marginalized communities - Kroeber Hall, LeConte and Barrows Halls

  - Repatriation of human remains and cultural items to Native tribes communities. For the most current information, go to the UC Berkeley Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) Standing Committee webpage.

Basic Needs

Introduction

A significant number of the Berkeley community face basic needs insecurities. The rates of insecurity are particularly high among minoritized and marginalized groups (women; LGBTQ+; Southeast Asian; Pacific Islander; Southwest Asian/ North African; African American/Black; Chicanx/Latinx; Native American/Alaska Native; disabled; growing up working class or poor; and not having parents with 4-year degrees). Respondents at the intersections of marginalization have higher rates of basic needs insecurities. Students with dependents; current or former foster youth; and system impacted students are also much more likely to be basic needs insecure.

Basic Needs findings from the My Experience Survey align with other surveys of UC Berkeley, the University of California, and other colleges and universities. [9, 10, 11] Basic needs insecurities are correlated with overall health and mental health.

Food and housing insecurity along with homelessness can have a significant negative impact on the individuals of the campus community. Previous surveys have found widespread basic needs insecurities among students at UC Berkeley. The My Experience Survey measured various aspects of basic needs with the goals of updating findings from previous surveys, expanding understanding of health across all UC Berkeley communities, and identifying how these health metrics related to other aspects of campus climate.

Food Insecurity

Food security is a derived measure defined using five individual questions per USDA standards. [12] Respondents were categorized as having high, low, or very low food security based on this measure; the low and very low were combined to form the aggregate category of food insecure. Overall, more than one in four respondents (27%) were categorized as food insecure. There is wide variation in food insecurity across populations ranging from almost no faculty (1%) to just under two in five (39%) undergraduates along with one in twenty (5%) academic employees, one in six (16%) postdocs and staff, and one in four graduate students (24%). Minoritized and marginalized communities experienced much higher (up to 50% higher) rates of food insecurity. Food insecurity worsens with each added marginalization. Undergraduates with dependents (66%) and current/former foster youth (68%) also faced notably higher rates of food insecurity.

Table 19. Food Insecurity by Population

Percentage of respondents categorized as food insecure

Group	Undergraduates	Grad Students	Postdocs	Faculty	Academic Staff	Staff	All
Total	39%	24%	16%	1%	5%	16%	27%
0 Marginal Factors	17%	14%	25%	0%	0%	8%	10%
1 Marginal Factors	23%	15%	12%	0%	1%	10%	15%
2 Marginal Factors	27%	24%	3%	2%	7%	12%	21%
3 Marginal Factors	45%	31%	19%	0%	4%	19%	34%
4 Marginal Factors	57%	37%	36%	0%	8%	23%	45%
5 Marginal Factors	73%	53%				35%	62%
6 Marginal Factors	69%					27%	60%

Housing Insecurity

Housing security is a derived measure defined using six individual questions per the methodology of the Hope Center for College, Community, and Justice. [10] Respondents were categorized as housing insecure based on this measure. Overall, more than two in five respondents (41%) were categorized as housing insecure. There is wide variation in housing insecurity across populations ranging from one in ten faculty (10%) to over half (54%) of postdocs along with one in three academic employees (31%), two in five (43%) undergraduates and staff, and almost half (48%) of graduate students. Minoritized and marginalized communities experienced much higher (up to 50% higher) rates of housing insecurity. Housing insecurity worsens with each added marginalization. As with food insecurity, undergraduates with dependents also faced notably higher rates of housing insecurity (71%).

Table 20. Housing Insecurity by Population

Percentage of respondents categorized as housing insecure

Group	Undergraduates	Grad Students	Postdocs	Faculty	Academic Staff	Staff	All
Total	43%	48%	54%	10%	31%	43%	41%
0 Marginal Factors	29%	37%	42%	9%	24%	24%	26%
1 Marginal Factors	34%	39%	42%	8%	24%	32%	32%
2 Marginal Factors	37%	49%	55%	10%	27%	37%	38%
3 Marginal Factors	45%	56%	87%	9%	36%	47%	46%
4 Marginal Factors	52%	63%	64%	8%	42%	53%	53%
5 Marginal Factors	62%	73%				61%	63%
6 Marginal Factors	67%					55%	65%

Homelessness

Homelessness is a derived measure defined using five individual questions per the methodology of the Hope Center for College, Community, and Justice. [10]. Respondents were categorized as homeless based on this measure. Overall, one in twenty respondents (5%) were categorized as homeless. There is variation in homelessness across populations ranging from almost no faculty and academic employees (1%) to one in fourteen (7%) undergraduates and postdocs along with one in thirty (3%) staff and one in twenty (5%) graduate students. Minoritized and marginalized communities experienced much higher (up to three times higher) rates of homelessness. The rates increase with each added marginalization. As with food and housing insecurity, undergraduates with dependents also faced notably higher rates of homelessness (19%). Current and former foster youth had the highest rates of homelessness with just over one in four (26%) being categorized as homeless.

Table 21. Homelessness by Population

Percentage of respondents categorized as homeless

Group	Undergraduates	Grad Students	Postdocs	Faculty	Academic Staff	Staff	All
Total	7%	5%	7%	1%	1%	3%	5%
0 Marginal Factors	2%	3%	8%	0%	2%	1%	2%
1 Marginal Factors	5%	3%	3%	1%	1%	4%	4%
2 Marginal Factors	4%	5%	3%	1%	1%	2%	4%
3 Marginal Factors	9%	6%	19%	0%	2%	4%	7%
4 Marginal Factors	12%	8%	9%	0%	4%	5%	9%
5 Marginal Factors	10%	8%				6%	9%
6 Marginal Factors	13%					0%	11%

Broader Context of Basic Needs Findings

Previous studies of basic needs provide context for understanding the My Experience Survey results. In 2018, the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) used the same methodology to assess food insecurity for UC undergraduates and found 42% of Berkeley undergraduates were food insecure. [13] The results from the My Experience Survey are consistent with previous studies They suggest a possible slight decline in food insecurity at Berkeley from 2018 to 2019 across most racial/ethnic groups available.

Table 22. Undergraduate Food Insecurity Trends

Percentage of undergraduate respondents categorized as food insecure

Category	2018 [UCUES]	2019 [MES]	Change
All	42%	39%	-3%
African American	65%	58%	-7%
Chicanx/Latinx	64%	61%	-3%
Native American/Alaska Native	58%	62%	+4%
Asian	38%	31%	-7%
White	36%	35%	-1%

Studies from 2018 of food insecurity among California and national college students provide additional context although that study looked at food insecurity over the previous 30 days as opposed to the previous 12 months used on the My Experience Survey and UCUES. One study found that nationally 41% of four-year college students were food insecure in the past 30 days while another found that 35% of California college students were food insecure in the past 30 days. [10, 11]

A 2018 study of national college students found that 48% of them were housing insecure in the past 30 days. [10] These results are broadly aligned with the results of the My Experience Survey (43% of undergraduates found to be housing insecure in the past 12 months) though they are not directly comparable. They also show that the experiences of basic needs insecurity at Berkeley are not isolated but part of broader patterns at colleges and universities across California and the United States.

Correlations

Food insecurity is derived from a food security score which ranges from zero to six (zero or one is food secure and two or higher is food insecure). Both housing insecurity and homelessness are strongly correlated with food insecurity. Respondents who have a food security score of zero have the lowest housing security rate (31%) and homelessness rate (2%). Respondents with the highest food security score of six have much higher housing insecurity (76%) and homelessness (21%). These correlations provide internal reliability for the survey responses. They also show that housing and food security are often co-occurring, so interventions addressing one basic needs area may need to look at basic needs more holistically.

Table 23. Correlations between Basic Needs and other Climate Experiences

Percentage of respondents experiencing mental health symptoms and basic needs insecurities

Food Security Score	Depression	Anxiety	Housing Insecure	Homeless
Food Security Raw Score 0	39%	46%	31%	2%
Food Security Raw Score 1	56%	62%	53%	6%
Food Security Raw Score 2	59%	67%	60%	7%
Food Security Raw Score 3	63%	72%	60%	7%
Food Security Raw Score 4	65%	70%	66%	11%
Food Security Raw Score 5	70%	75%	71%	15%
Food Security Raw Score 6	80%	84%	76%	21%

Recommendations

The recommendations in this section were derived from engagement with a small basic needs workgroup and leveraging the Annual Basic Needs Impact Report for improvement best practices.UC Berkeley should move towards a campus culture that centers and prioritizes student basic needs in the following ways:

► **Conduct basic needs assessments**

► **Integrate basic needs center/services into student online portal(s)**

► **Coordinated communication across students, staff, faculty, and administrators, and campus policy collaborations and/partnerships**

► **Scale CalFresh towards enrolling the majority of students that are potentially eligible by targeting direct messaging that affirms and encourages eligible students to apply**

► **Partner with Alameda County Social Services to improve infrastructure to keep staff trained on supporting college students, process applications, conduct in-take interviews that consider the life circumstances of a college student, enroll students, and support them by sustaining their benefits until they are no longer needed.**

► **Design a revenue model that sustains costs of CalFresh operations**

► **Provide resources to students that are ineligible for CalFresh, and campus student support services that improve the health and success of experiences with higher rates of basic needs challenges.**

Housing Insecurity Recommendations

► **Expand and communicate efforts to address housing insecurity in the interim before new student housing plans can be enacted.**

► **Innovate to increase affordable housing such as subsidized housing for low-income students.**

Some efforts are already underway:

► **Campus launched Housing Support Protocol creating a streamlined process for homeless students to be referred for emergency housing.**

► **Continued staff & faculty-facing messages and information about basic needs specific to housing insecurities**

► **Collaborations among the Basic Needs Center, Cal Housing, and off-campus housing provider, Brill Housing, to add "medium-**

term" housing on our spectrum of housing services

▶ **State allocation of rapid rehousing dollars for emergency housing resources.**

The survey findings align with existing recommendations from the Annual Basic Needs Impact Report, Chancellor's Independent Advisory Board on Police Accountability and Community Safety, the Undergraduate Student Diversity Project, and the Graduate Diversity Task Force.

Health

Introduction

General campus climate experiences can have a direct impact on one's physical and mental health. Previous surveys have found widespread mental health needs among graduate students at UC Berkeley. The My Experience Survey measured various aspects of self-reported health with the goals of updating findings from previous surveys, expanding understanding of health across all UC Berkeley communities, and identifying how these health metrics relate to other aspects of campus climate.

This report focuses on six dimensions of marginalization/minoritization: gender, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, disability, socioeconomic status growing up, and parental education. Respondents can be classified as being marginalized in none of these factors or up to all six. Other affinity groups will be mentioned when they stand out as particularly notable for a given metric of health.

Many members of the Berkeley community have poor self-reported health including mental health. Health metrics are worse among women; transgender and gender non-conforming; LGBQ+; Southeast Asian; Pacific Islander; Southwest Asian/North African; African American/Black; Chicanx/Latinx; Native American/Alaska Native; disabled; growing up working class or poor; and respondents not having parents with 4-year degrees. Intersections of marginalization have worse health. Students with dependents; current or former foster youth; and system impacted students are also more likely to have worse health.

Health metrics strongly correlate with each other and with other metrics such as basic needs and interpersonal experiences. The mental health metrics reveal patterns that are consistent with surveys of mental health at other colleges and universities.

Table 24. Overall Health by Population

Percentage of respondents reporting Excellent, Very Good, or Good overall health

Group	Undergraduates	Grad Students	Postdocs	Faculty	Academic Staff	Staff	All
Total	77%	88%	92%	94%	92%	89%	84%
0 Marginal Factors	91%	97%	100%	98%	100%	93%	95%
1 Marginal Factors	90%	95%	97%	97%	96%	94%	93%
2 Marginal Factors	82%	89%	94%	92%	93%	91%	87%
3 Marginal Factors	73%	82%	94%	89%	86%	87%	79%
4 Marginal Factors	69%	82%	82%	80%	79%	80%	73%
5 Marginal Factors	53%	66%				75%	59%
6 Marginal Factors	54%					73%	56%

Overall Health

Overall, most respondents (84%) rated their general health as good, very good, or excellent. The faculty had the highest self-rated health with almost all faculty members (94%) rating their health positively, while undergraduates had the lowest with just over three quarters (77%) rating their health positively. Minoritized and marginalized communities reported lower self health assessments. Undergraduates with dependents, system impacted respondents, and current or former foster youth all reported notably lower overall health.

Stress

Almost all respondents reported finding their work or studies stressful. This was true across populations and affinity groups with little variation.

Anxiety Symptoms

Overall, just over half of respondents (56%) reported symptoms of anxiety at a level that suggests further inquiry from a clinician might be helpful (though this is distinct from a clinical diagnosis of anxiety)[1]. Academic staff had the lowest reported endorsement of anxiety symptoms (31%) while undergraduate students had the highest (66%). Minoritized and marginalized communities had the higher endorsements with people with disabilities and transgender/gender non-conforming respondents having significantly higher (around 30% higher) than the campus overall. Anxiety endorsement accumulates with each added marginalization. Undergraduates with dependents, Muslims, system-impacted respondents, and current or former foster youth all reported notably higher endorsement of anxiety symptoms.

Table 25. Anxiety Symptoms by Population

Percentage of respondents endorsing symptoms of anxiety (not a clinical diagnosis)

Group	Undergraduates	Grad Students	Postdocs	Faculty	Academic Staff	Staff	All
Total	66%	54%	46%	NA	31%	41%	56%
0 Marginal Factors	45%	38%	33%	NA	17%	28%	37%
1 Marginal Factors	49%	41%	47%	NA	28%	34%	42%
2 Marginal Factors	65%	60%	42%	NA	28%	39%	56%
3 Marginal Factors	73%	65%	63%	NA	39%	45%	63%
4 Marginal Factors	76%	66%	45%	NA	25%	49%	67%
5 Marginal Factors	86%	74%				64%	81%
6 Marginal Factors	85%					82%	84%

Depression Symptoms

Overall, just under half of respondents (49%) reported symptoms of depression at a level that suggests further inquiry from a clinician might be helpful (though this is distinct from a clinical diagnosis of depression). Academic staff had the lowest reported endorsement (26%) while undergraduate students had the highest endorsement (60%). Minoritized and marginalized communities had the higher endorsements with disabled and transgender/gender non-conforming respondents having significantly higher (around 25% higher) than the campus overall. Depression endorsement accumulates with each added marginalization. As with anxiety, undergraduates with dependents, Muslims, system impacted respondents, and current or former foster youth all reported notably higher endorsement of depression symptoms.

[1]Per the American Psychiatric Association, "The DSM-5 Level 1 Cross-Cutting Symptom Measure is a self- or informant-rated measure that assesses mental health domains that are important across psychiatric diagnoses. It is intended to help clinicians identify additional areas of inquiry that may have significant impact on the individual's treatment and prognosis." [14]

Table 26. Depression Symptoms by Population

Percentage of respondents endorsing symptoms of depression (not a clinical diagnosis)

Group	Undergraduates	Grad Students	Postdocs	Faculty	Academic Staff	Staff	All
Total	60%	44%	41%	NA	26%	35%	49%
0 Marginal Factors	37%	35%	42%	NA	24%	27%	33%
1 Marginal Factors	44%	30%	28%	NA	19%	26%	34%
2 Marginal Factors	55%	49%	32%	NA	27%	32%	47%
3 Marginal Factors	67%	52%	63%	NA	31%	39%	56%
4 Marginal Factors	71%	57%	36%	NA	25%	41%	61%
5 Marginal Factors	81%	65%				41%	71%
6 Marginal Factors	87%					64%	82%

Mental health was assessed using the DSM-5 Self-Rated Level 1 Cross-Cutting Symptom Measure—Adult and the methodology given by the American Psychiatric Association. [14] It is not intended as a clinical diagnostic but a measure to identify endorsement of symptoms and to suggest where additional inquiry may be useful.

Broader Context of Health Findings

In 2014, the UC Berkeley Graduate Well-being survey found that 44% of graduate students expressed symptoms of depression. [15] A follow-up survey in 2016 from the UC Office of the President found that 35% of UC-wide graduate students expressed symptoms of depression. [16] These results align with the results of the My Experience Survey which show 44% of graduate students at the threshold for further screening of depression. The 2018 National College Health Assessment (NCHA) surveyed both undergraduate and graduate students about mental health diagnoses and clinical visits. It found that 17% of all students reported being diagnosed with clinical depression or had been treated by a professional, and 22% of all students reported anxiety diagnoses or treatment. [17] Recent studies of other higher education settings show mental health as a growing concern among graduate students. [18, 19, 20]

Table 26. Other Mental Health Findings

Percentage of respondents endorsing symptoms of depression, anxiety (not a clinical diagnosis)

Source	Depression	Anxiety
My Experience (2019 graduate students)	44%	54%
Graduate Well-Being (2016 UC grad students)	35%	n/a
African American/Black	38%	n/a
Chicanx/Latinx	40%	n/a
LGBTQ+	48%	n/a
Graduate Well-Being (2014 UC Berkeley)	44%	n/a
National College Health Assessment (2018)*	17%	22%
Men*	10%	12%
Women*	20%	26%

Correlations

Responses to the question about overall health strongly correlate with mental health responses as those for basic needs and interpersonal experiences. Respondents who rated their overall health as excellent were much less likely than those reporting poor health to endorse symptoms of depression or anxiety; to report being food insecure, housing insecure, or homeless; or to report regularly experiencing exclusionary or bullying behaviors.

Table 27. Correlations between Health and other Climate Experiences

Percentage of respondents endorsing mental health symptoms, basic needs insecurities, and experiencing exclusion or bullying.

Overall Health	Depression	Anxiety	Food Insecure	Housing Insecure	Homeless	Exclusion	Bullying
Poor	87%	89%	64%	66%	17%	56%	46%
Fair	76%	79%	53%	56%	10%	42%	33%
Good	58%	64%	33%	46%	6%	28%	24%
Very Good	38%	48%	18%	36%	4%	19%	17%
Excellent	25%	33%	9%	28%	3%	14%	14%

Recommendations

These recommendations[2] largely focus on the broader campus environment and infrastructure, as the survey data and demographics indicate that it is essential to deal with issues of inequity, discrimination, and lack of belonging to improve the health of the campus community. COVID-19 findings related to health disparities by marginalized identity groups are consistent with the My Experience Survey findings. Recommendations must engage all key campus units and students. To address the needs identified by these findings, four structural and institutional areas of intervention are suggested:

► Establish a Healthy Academic Culture where teaching and learning are maximized for the well-being of students, faculty, and staff. (Examples: address the culture of overachievement, the role of competition, grading on a curve, lengthy midterm season.)

- Phase 1: Gain knowledge of academic structure and policies. Improve organizational understanding of culture of faculty/academic staff. Identify challenges presented by the current academic setting and impact on the health & wellness of faculty and students.

- Phase 2: Research other institutions' structures and policies. Compile best practices and analyze for appropriateness for use at Berkeley.

- Phase 3: Create and present researched changes in structure and policy.

► Address the campus's institutional infrastructure to close equity gaps and prioritize wellbeing.

- Phase 1 - Prioritize a "Health in all Policies" framework. Establish a review system for assessing the health and wellness impact of campus policies, procedures, and partnerships.

- Phase 2 - Perform an equity audit of campus policies. Identify the issues impacting equity in campus policies, practices, and systems. Identify and address how policies and practices have negative consequences on health and well-being; establish a system for evaluating, intervening, and ameliorating impacts on health and well-being.

- Phase 3 - Prioritize strategies to ensure that campus faculty and administration are representative of the student/State population. Hire postdocs, faculty, and academic employees that represent underrepresented communities, especially: Transgender/GNC, Pacific Islander, Southeast Asian, Native American, and African American/Black.

► Focus efforts on conducting health services from an integrated and comprehensive model:

- Phase 1 - Make health and wellness more accessible, available, and easier to navigate.

- Phase 2 - Address the needs of marginalized groups; identify special populations (e.g. visiting scholars and post-docs) who "fall between the cracks" without adequate coverage or access.

- Phase 3 - Further address how issues of anti-blackness manifest in our health system and exacerbate poor health conditions for marginalized populations.

[2]Recommendations developed by Adisa Anderson, Counseling and Psychological Services, University Health Services (UHS); Cathy Kodama, Health Promotion, UHS; Tiffany Melendez, Health Promotion, UHS; Meckell Milburn, Health Promotion, UHS; Tobirus Newby, Social Services, UHS; Karen Patchell, Be Well at Work, UHS

Professional Development

Introduction

Professional development is a critical aspect of campus climate that complements interpersonal relationships. Previous surveys have found widespread professional development needs among employees at UC Berkeley. The My Experience Survey measured various aspects of professional development with the goals of updating findings from previous surveys and expanding understanding of professional development across all communities.

Across campus populations, respondents reported high levels of need for mentoring and support compared to the current levels they are receiving. This was true particularly for marginalized and minoritized communities (PoC, women, LGBTQ+, disabled, low SES growing up, parents without college degrees). Respondents tended to rate their advisors/supervisors positively though marginalized/minoritized groups were less likely to rate their advisors/supervisors as highly. Most respondents were interested in leadership roles and training/support to become leaders with marginalized/minoritized groups expressing higher interest in leadership.

This report focuses on six dimensions of marginalization/minorization: gender, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, disability, socioeconomic status growing up, and parental education. Respondents can be classified as being marginalized in none of these factors or up to all six. Other affinity groups will be mentioned when they stand out as particularly notable for a given metric of health.

Mentoring/Support Needs

Almost seven in ten graduate students wanted more help getting grants (69%). Around two in three wanted more mentoring around leadership positions (67%); more advice about applying for jobs and early career (65%); and more mentoring for career development (64%). Around three in five wanted more help establishing professional contacts (63%); help with publishing (62%); and help navigating the campus's administrative complexities (60%).

Graduate students from minoritized and marginalized communities reported wanting more mentoring than overall students in all areas. This increased desire for mentoring was highest with help publishing (63% vs. 46%); help getting grants (70% vs. 54%); and help managing negotiations or conflicts (58% vs. 43%).

Table 28. Graduate Student Mentoring Needs by Area

Percentage of respondents who reported wanting more mentorship than they were receiving

Mentoring Area	All	# of Marginalizations	
		None	1+
Help getting grants	69%	54%	70%
Mentoring for leadership positions	67%	60%	68%
Advice about applying for jobs and early career	65%	63%	65%
Mentoring for professional development	64%	59%	65%
Help with establishing professional contacts	63%	56%	63%
Help with publishing	62%	46%	63%
Help navigating the campus's administrative complexities	60%	57%	62%
Help navigating departmental politics	57%	48%	58%
Staff support for grant submission/ administration	55%	47%	57%
Help managing negotiations or conflicts	55%	43%	58%
Advice about thesis or dissertation research	53%	44%	55%
Mentoring for teaching	52%	46%	53%
Support for advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion	50%	42%	54%
Advice about degree requirements and program planning	49%	41%	50%

Overall, postdocs wanted more mentoring across all areas. Seven in ten postdocs wanted more early career advice (72%) and mentorship for leadership positions (70%). Roughly three in five postdocs wanted more mentoring for teaching (63%); more mentoring for professional development (61%); and more help navigating administrative complexities (59%). In most areas, postdocs from minoritized and marginalized communities wanted more mentoring. Areas of particularly increased need were staff support for grants (59% vs. 11%); mentoring for teaching (67% vs. 20%); and help navigating departmental politics (58% vs. 11%).

Table 29. Postdoc Mentoring Needs by Area

Percentage of respondents who reported wanting more mentorship than they were receiving

		# of Marginalizations	
Mentoring Area	All	None	1+
Advice about applying for jobs and early career	72%	50%	74%
Mentoring for leadership positions	70%	45%	75%
Mentoring for teaching	63%	20%	67%
Mentoring for professional development	61%	36%	67%
Help navigating the campus's administrative complexities	59%	50%	61%
Help with establishing professional contacts	56%	58%	57%
Help navigating departmental politics	53%	11%	58%
Help managing negotiations or conflicts	51%	44%	53%
Staff support for grant submission/administration	51%	11%	59%
Help getting grants	49%	38%	49%
Help with publishing	45%	45%	49%
Support for advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion	39%	13%	46%

Faculty reported wanting more mentoring/support across all areas. Almost three quarters (74%) of faculty reported wanting more help navigating administrative complexities, and roughly seven in ten want more help getting grants (71%) and staff support with grant submission/administration (70%).

Faculty from marginalized and minoritized groups reported wanting more mentoring/support than their peers in almost all areas -- particularly around help managing negotiations or conflicts (54% vs. 33%); coaching on the review process (43% vs. 25%); and support for advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion (47% vs. 30%).

Table 30. Faculty Mentoring Needs by Area

Percentage of respondents who reported wanting more mentorship than they were receiving

		# of Marginalizations	
Mentoring Area	All	None	1+
Help navigating the campus's administrative complexities	74%	65%	76%
Help getting grants	71%	63%	73%
Staff support for grant submission/administration	70%	58%	72%
Mentoring for leadership positions	59%	45%	60%
Help managing negotiations or conflicts	52%	33%	54%
Advice about late career and retirement	51%	45%	51%
Mentoring for teaching	50%	46%	47%
Staff support for hiring GSRs, GSIs, postdocs, and/or project scientists	49%	49%	47%
Help with publishing	44%	35%	46%
Support for advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion	43%	30%	47%
Help navigating departmental politics	43%	32%	42%
Help with establishing professional contacts	41%	29%	41%
Coaching on the review process	40%	25%	43%

Academic employees reported wanting more mentoring/support across all areas. Seven in ten (71%) academic employees reported wanting more mentoring for leadership positions. Around two thirds of academic employees wanted help navigating administrative complexities (65%); advice about early career (65%); and mentoring for

professional development (65%). Academic employees from marginalized and minoritized groups reported wanting more mentoring/support than their peers in all areas -- particularly around help establishing professional contacts (64% vs. 46%).

Table 31. Academic Employee Mentoring Needs by Area

Percentage of respondents who reported wanting more mentorship than they were receiving

Mentoring Area		# of Marginalizations	
	All	None	1+
Mentoring for leadership positions	71%	70%	72%
Help navigating the campus's administrative complexities	65%	56%	66%
Advice about applying for jobs and early career	65%	53%	66%
Mentoring for professional development	65%	62%	67%
Help with establishing professional contacts	62%	46%	64%
Advice about late career and retirement	61%	57%	62%
Help navigating departmental politics	60%	48%	62%
Help managing negotiations or conflicts	52%	44%	52%

Staff reported wanting more mentoring/support across all areas. Seven in ten (72%) staff reported wanting more mentoring for leadership positions. Around two thirds of staff wanted advice about early career (63%); advice about late career (64%); and mentoring for professional development (66%).

Staff from marginalized and minoritized groups reported wanting more mentoring/support than their peers in all areas -- particularly around mentoring for leadership positions (72% vs. 56%) and help managing negotiations and conflict (51% vs. 37%).

Table 32. Staff Mentoring Needs by Area

Percentage of respondents who reported wanting more mentorship than they were receiving

Mentoring Area		# of Marginalizations	
	All	None	1+
Mentoring for leadership positions	72%	56%	72%
Mentoring for professional development	66%	56%	66%
Advice about late career and retirement	64%	57%	64%
Advice about applying for jobs and early career	63%	50%	63%
Help navigating the campus's administrative complexities	59%	53%	59%
Help with establishing professional contacts	58%	53%	56%
Help navigating departmental politics	53%	39%	52%
Help managing negotiations or conflicts	51%	37%	51%

Advisor/Supervisor Relationships

Overall, graduate students rated their advisors positively. Over four in five graduate students agreed that their advisors were concerned about the welfare of their graduate students (85%); praised them when they did their work well (84%); and supported their career development (83%). Around three quarters (76%) of graduate students agreed that their advisors provided ongoing feedback to help them improve their performance and helped them through organizational changes. Across advising questions, professional students had lower advising ratings than doctoral students.

Graduate students from minoritized and marginalized communities reported their advisors less positively than students overall. Lower advisor ratings were exacerbated with each added marginalization.

Table 33. Evaluation of Graduate Advisor by Area

Percentage of respondents who agreed with a given prompt

My advisor...	All	# of Marginalizations	
		None	1+
is concerned about the welfare of their advisees	85%	90%	85%
praises me when I do my work well	84%	89%	83%
supports my career development	83%	90%	83%
provides ongoing feedback to help me improve my performance	76%	81%	75%

Overall, postdocs rated their advisors positively. Over four in five postdocs agreed that their advisors praise them (83%); support their career development (82%); and provide ongoing feedback (79%). Around three quarters of postdocs are concerned with the welfare of their advisees (76%) and helped them through changes (74%).

Postdocs from minoritized and marginalized communities often reported their advisors less positively than postdocs overall. Lower advisor ratings were exacerbated with each added marginalization.

Table 34. Evaluation of Postdoc Advisor by Area

Percentage of respondents who agreed with a given prompt

My advisor...	All	# of Marginalizations	
		None	1+
praises me when I do my work well	83%	83%	84%
supports my career development	82%	92%	83%
provides ongoing feedback to help me improve my performance	79%	75%	78%
is concerned about the welfare of their advisees	76%	83%	76%
has helped guide me through departmental, organizational, and administrative changes	74%	92%	74%

Generally, academic employees reported positive experiences with their managers and supervisors. Around four in five (81%) academic employees agreed that their managers/supervisors were concerned about the welfare of those they supervise. On the lower end, roughly three in five (58%) academic employees reported that their managers/supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help them improve their performance or help guide them through organizational change. Minoritized and marginalized communities tended to report slightly lower experiences with their managers/supervisors than their peers with the largest difference around providing feedback (56% vs. 67%).

Table 35. Evaluation of Academic Employee Manager/Supervisor by Area

Percentage of respondents who agreed with a given prompt

My manager/supervisor...	All	# of Marginalizations	
		None	1+
is concerned about the welfare of those they supervise	81%	78%	82%
supports my career development	75%	78%	76%
praises me when I do my work well	74%	75%	76%
has helped guide me through campus organizational and administrative changes	64%	68%	64%
provides ongoing feedback to help me improve my performance	58%	67%	56%

Generally, staff reported positive experiences with their managers and supervisors. Almost nine in ten (87%) of staff agreed that their managers/supervisors were concerned about the welfare of those they supervise. On the lower end,

roughly seven in ten (73%) of staff reported that their managers/supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help them improve their performance or help guide them through organizational change.

Minoritized and marginalized communities tended to report slightly lower experiences with their managers/supervisors -- most notably around guidance through organizational change (72% vs. 83%).

Table 36. Staff Evaluation of Manager/Supervisor by Area

Percentage of respondents who agreed with a given prompt

My manager/supervisor...		# of Marginalizations	
	All	None	1+
is concerned about the welfare of those they supervise	87%	93%	87%
praises me when I do my work well	84%	89%	85%
supports my career development	80%	78%	81%
provides ongoing feedback to help me improve my performance	73%	72%	74%
has helped guide me through campus organizational and administrative changes	73%	83%	72%

Leadership Development

In terms of leadership opportunities and development, postdocs varied greatly across areas. Almost all postdocs were interested in becoming or continuing to be a leader in new research areas (94%), while four in five were interested in leadership around undergraduate teaching (78%). Minoritized and marginalized communities tended to report higher interest in leadership areas.

Table 37. Postdoc Leadership Development by Area

Percentage of respondents who agreed with a given prompt

Area		# of Marginalizations	
	All	None	1+
interested in becoming/continuing leader in new research areas	94%	92%	92%
interested in participating in leadership training programs in the future.	86%	55%	86%
interested in becoming/continuing a leader in exemplary graduate teaching methods/practices	84%	73%	82%
interested in becoming/continuing a leader in diversity, equity, and inclusion issues	81%	60%	80%
interested in becoming/continuing a leader in exemplary undergraduate teaching methods/practices	78%	82%	73%
participated in formal leadership training programs in the past/currently	50%	36%	51%

Faculty widely varied in their interest in leadership opportunities depending on the type of leadership. Almost nine in ten faculty were interested in leadership opportunities around new research areas (88%), while only two in five faculty were interested in opportunities around upper-level administration (40%).

Minoritized and marginalized communities tended to report higher interest in leadership positions; higher participation in past trainings; higher interest in future trainings; and less agreement that the process into leadership positions was transparent and equitable.

Table 38. Faculty Leadership Development by Area

Percentage of respondents who agreed with a given prompt

		# of Marginalizations	
Area	All	None	1+
interested in becoming/continuing leader in new research areas	88%	86%	91%
interested in becoming/continuing a leader in exemplary graduate teaching methods/practices	74%	70%	75%
interested in becoming/continuing a leader in diversity, equity, and inclusion issues	68%	61%	70%
interested in becoming/continuing a leader in exemplary undergraduate teaching methods/practices	61%	62%	62%
interested in participating in leadership training programs in the future.	58%	43%	60%
believe the selection process for becoming a department chair is transparent and equitable	57%	66%	57%
interested in serving/continuing in leadership positions in the Academic Senate in the future	45%	30%	47%
interested in serving/continuing as a department chair in the future	45%	36%	46%
interested in serving/continuing as an upper-level academic administrator in the future	40%	29%	44%
believe the selection process for becoming an upper-level administrator is transparent and equitable	37%	41%	37%
participated in formal leadership training programs in the past/currently	32%	30%	30%

Academic employees widely varied in their interest in leadership opportunities depending on the type of leadership. Around two thirds of academic employees were interested in leadership opportunities around being a unit manager (68%), while only two in five academic employees were interested in opportunities around upper-level administration (43%). Minoritized and marginalized communities tended to report lower interest in leadership positions; higher participation in past trainings; and lower interest in future trainings.

Table 39. Academic Employee Leadership Development by Area

Percentage of respondents who agreed with a given prompt

		# of Marginalizations	
Area	All	None	1+
interested in participating in leadership training programs in the future.	76%	90%	73%
interested in serving/continuing as a unit manager/supervisor/director in the future	68%	70%	66%
interested in becoming/continuing a leader in diversity, equity, and inclusion issues	55%	35%	54%
believe the selection process for becoming a unit manager/supervisor/director is transparent and equitable	46%	45%	47%
interested in serving/continuing as an upper-level staff administrator in the future	43%	50%	38%
participated in formal leadership training programs in the past/currently	42%	36%	44%
believe the selection process for becoming an upper-level administrator is transparent and equitable	38%	48%	38%

Staff widely varied in their interest in leadership opportunities depending on the type of leadership. Around four in five staff members were interested in leadership opportunities around being a unit manager (78%), while only half of staff were interested in opportunities around upper-level administration (48%). Staff generally disagreed that the selection processes for both unit managers (44%) and upper-level administrators (38%) were transparent and equitable.

Minoritized and marginalized communities tended to report lower interest in leadership positions with the exception of becoming leaders in diversity, equity, and inclusion issues (61% vs. 40%).

Table 40. Staff Leadership Development by Area

Percentage of respondents who agreed with a given prompt

Area	All	# of Marginalizations	
		None	1+
interested in participating in leadership training programs in the future.	83%	80%	83%
interested in serving/continuing as a unit manager/supervisor/ director in the future	78%	82%	77%
interested in becoming/continuing a leader in diversity, equity, and inclusion issues	61%	40%	61%
participated in formal leadership training programs in the past/ currently	56%	56%	55%
interested in serving/continuing as an upper-level staff administrator in the future	48%	52%	46%
believe the selection process for becoming a unit manager/ supervisor/director is transparent and equitable	44%	49%	44%
believe the selection process for becoming an upper-level administrator is transparent and equitable	38%	40%	37%

Recommendations

The survey findings align with existing recommendations from the UC Berkeley Graduate Diversity Task Force:

▶ "Graduate Student Handbooks should be held to a campus-level standard that includes communication of program milestones and timelines, as well as campus resources."

▶ "Conduct Academic Progress Reviews on an annual basis, with ongoing reevaluation of plans for student support."

▶ "Advisors and students should complete advising agreements that outline expectations for the advising relationship, including meeting frequency, communication preferences, and work styles."

▶ "Develop an onboarding program for new faculty hires on graduate teaching, mentorship, and advising"

▶ "Develop more robust advising plans to help guide students on how to pursue particular tracks in their fields, such as public interest"

▶ "Create opportunities for interdisciplinary mentoring, advising, and community building, modeled on the NSF's "Third Space Model" whereby students share work, develop professional contacts, and engage in a space that is not the campus or department"

▶ "Provide campus-level support for affinity-based mentorship groups"

The survey findings also suggest the need to increase offerings and resourcing of the following campus programs:

▶ Faculty Leadership Academy

▶ Resource Hub for Faculty Professional Development on DEIB and Related Issues

▶ Professional Development for Advisors

Undergraduate Students

Academic Experiences

Overall, undergraduates rated their academic experiences positively. Roughly four in five undergraduates reported having faculty role models (83%); feeling valued by faculty in the classroom (82%); feeling valued by other students in the classroom (80%); and having opportunities for academic success similar to their peers (80%). Almost half of undergraduates (48%) reported being pre-judged by faculty based on their perceived identity/background. And three in five (60%) undergraduates reported not seeing enough faculty or staff members with whom they identify.

Minoritized and marginalized communities reported worse academic experiences compared with their majoritized peers across all areas. Minoritized groups had particularly worse experiences in the following areas: not seeing enough faculty/staff with whom they identify (62% vs. 23%) and feeling prejudged by faculty based on their identities (49% vs. 32%) . Worse academic experiences were exacerbated with each added marginalization.

Table 41. Undergraduate Rating of Program by Area

Percentage of respondents who agreed with a given prompt

		# of Marginalizations	
Area	All	None	1+
I have faculty who I perceive as role models	83%	84%	82%
I feel valued by faculty in the classroom/learning environment	82%	89%	81%
I have opportunities for academic success that are similar to those of my classmates	80%	91%	79%
I feel valued by other students in the classroom/learning environment	80%	90%	78%
I have staff who I perceive as role models	76%	78%	76%
I believe the campus climate encourages free and open discussion of difficult topics	71%	75%	71%
I don't see enough faculty/staff with whom I identify	60%	23%	62%
I have administrators who I perceive as role models	58%	52%	58%
I think faculty pre-judge my abilities based on perceived identity/ background	48%	32%	49%

Student Evaluation of Academic Unit

Overall, undergraduates rated their programs positively. Roughly nine in ten undergraduates felt treated with respect in their department (92%); reported that degree requirements are taken seriously and applied systematically to all students (91%); and agreed that their program articulated clear expectations and guidelines (89%) around degree completion. Three in five undergraduates agreed that if a student is falling behind, department faculty will take action to get them back on track (60%). And around seven in ten undergraduates receive the mentoring or advising they need to achieve their goals (68%); receive adequate support and resources for good mental health (71%); or have a department that supports and encourages a good work-life balance (71%).

Undergraduates from minoritized and marginalized communities reported their programs less positively than students overall. This worsened climate was most notable in support and resources for good mental health (70% vs. 86%) as well as being mentored and supported in achieving their goals (68% vs. 82%). Minoritized and marginalized undergraduates also reported notably lower agreement that faculty would take action to help students falling behind get back on track. Lower program ratings were exacerbated with each added marginalization.

Table 42. Student Evaluation of Academic Unit

Percentage of respondents who agreed with a given prompt

		# of Marginalizations	
Area	All	None	1+
My peers treat me with respect and dignity	92%	95%	92%
Members of the department taken as a whole treat me with respect and dignity	92%	96%	92%
Degree requirements are taken seriously and systematically applied to all students	91%	95%	91%
My department articulates clear expectations and guidelines relevant to completing my degree	89%	92%	89%
I receive adequate resources to help me achieve my goals	80%	88%	80%
I feel well supported by my colleagues to achieve my goals	77%	89%	76%
My department supports and encourages a good work/family/life balance	71%	73%	71%
I receive adequate support and resources for good mental health	71%	86%	70%
I receive the level of mentoring/advising that I need to achieve my goals	68%	82%	68%
If a student is falling behind in the program, department faculty will take action to get them back on track	60%	70%	59%

Graduate Students

Job Satisfaction

Overall, graduate students were mostly satisfied with various aspects of their jobs. Four in five graduate students were satisfied with their opportunities to collaborate with peers in their department (80%) and the way they were welcomed to campus (80%). Fewer than half of graduate students were satisfied with their salary (44%). Across job areas, professional students had higher satisfaction than doctoral students.

Individual job areas saw mostly minor variations across affinity groups though minoritized and marginalized communities often reported slightly lower levels of job satisfaction. The job aspects where minoritized and marginalized communities reported the lowest satisfaction compared to their peers were support for work-family balance (59% vs. 73%) and teaching load (73% vs. 83%).

Table 43. Job Satisfaction by Job Area

Percent satisfied

		# of Marginalizations	
Job Area	All	None	1+
Opportunities to collaborate with peers in home unit	80%	83%	81%
The way you were welcomed to the UC Berkeley campus	80%	80%	80%
Benefits	76%	76%	78%
Course size	73%	69%	75%
Teaching load	73%	83%	73%
Support for diversity, equity, and inclusion in my department	72%	77%	70%
Quality of space for research	69%	68%	69%
Opportunities to collaborate with peers in other units	64%	61%	65%
Support for work-family balance in my department	61%	73%	59%
Current housing situation	57%	59%	60%
Salary	44%	47%	44%

Academic Experiences

Graduate students generally rated their academic experiences positively with roughly nine in ten feeling valued by other students in the classroom (91%); feeling valued by faculty (88%); and having faculty role models (88%). Around half of graduate students reported having not enough faculty or staff with whom they identified (52%) and being pre-judged by faculty (47%). Across academic experiences, professional students had higher satisfaction than doctoral students.

Minoritized and marginalized communities reported worse academic experiences in most areas. This worsened climate was most notable in seeing enough faculty or staff with whom they identified (56% vs. 20%); feeling pre-judged by faculty (48% vs. 32%); and having similar opportunities for academic success to their peers (84% vs. 94%). Worse academic experiences were exacerbated with each added marginalization.

Table 44. Grad Student Rating of Program by Area

Percent agreement

		# of Marginalizations	
Area	All	None	1+
I feel valued by other students in the classroom/learning environment	91%	96%	91%
I have faculty who I perceive as role models	88%	93%	88%
I feel valued by faculty in the classroom/learning environment	88%	90%	88%
I have opportunities for academic success that are similar to those of my classmates	86%	94%	84%
I believe the campus climate encourages free and open discussion of difficult topics	74%	73%	74%
I have staff who I perceive as role models	71%	69%	71%
I have administrators who I perceive as role models	59%	54%	60%
I don't see enough faculty/staff with whom I identify	52%	20%	56%
I think faculty pre-judge my abilities based on perceived identity/ background	47%	32%	48%

Student Evaluation of Academic Unit

Overall, graduate students rated their programs positively. Almost all graduate students felt treated with respect in their department by their peers (96%) and by department members overall (95%). Graduate students had the lowest agreement that if a student is falling behind, department faculty will take action to get them back on track (68%) or that their department supports and encourages a good work-life balance (71%). Across program areas, professional students had higher ratings of their programs than doctoral students.

Graduate students from minoritized and marginalized communities reported their programs less positively than students overall. This worsened climate was most notable in support and resources for good mental health (75% vs. 84%); resources to achieve their goals (81% vs. 92%); and mentoring and support for their goals (73% vs. 83%). Transgender/gender non-conforming and disabled graduate students rated their program environments consistently the lowest among minoritized and marginalized groups. Lower program ratings were exacerbated with each added marginalization.

Table 45. Grad Student Rating of Program by Area

Percent agreement

		# of Marginalizations	
Area	All	None	1+
My peers treat me with respect and dignity	96%	98%	96%
Members of the department taken as a whole treat me with respect and dignity	95%	95%	94%
I feel well supported by my colleagues to achieve my goals	87%	94%	87%
I receive adequate resources to help me achieve my goals	83%	92%	81%
Degree requirements are taken seriously and systematically applied to all students	81%	75%	81%
My department articulates clear expectations and guidelines relevant to completing my degree	80%	80%	80%
I receive adequate support and resources for good mental health	76%	84%	75%
I receive the level of mentoring/advising that I need to achieve my goals	75%	83%	73%
My department supports and encourages a good work/family/life balance	71%	74%	70%
If a student is falling behind in the program, department faculty will take action to get them back on track	68%	70%	68%

Evaluation of Peers

Overall graduate students rate their peers in their units highly. Almost all graduate students agree that their colleagues maintain high research standards (95%) and treat staff with respect (94%). Far fewer agree that their colleagues hold high teaching standards (79%) and work collaboratively (84%). Graduate students from minoritized and marginalized communities tend to rate their colleagues slightly lower. Across questions, professional students had higher ratings of their peers than doctoral students.

Table 46. Graduate Student Evaluation of Peers by Area

Percent agreement

		# of Marginalizations	
Area	All	None	1+
maintain high research standards	95%	99%	95%
treat staff with respect	94%	96%	94%
are collegial	92%	93%	92%
maintain a supportive working environment	88%	89%	88%
work collaboratively	84%	88%	85%
maintain high teaching standards	79%	81%	78%

Evaluation of Unit

Graduate students had more mixed evaluation of their units compared to their evaluation of their peers in their units. Almost nine in ten graduate students agreed that agreements are honored (89%); that graduate students treat each other even-handedly (88%); and that support staff are helpful and competent (88%). Around half of graduate students agreed that there is transparency around the graduate fellowship process (48%) and that everyone shares in making important decisions (51%). Minoritized and marginalized graduate students had slightly lower evaluations of their units.

Table 47. Evaluation of Unit by Area

Percent agreement with prompt

In my unit...	All	# of Marginalizations None	1+
agreements are honored	89%	92%	88%
peers treat each other in an even-handed way	88%	91%	88%
support staff are helpful and competent	88%	90%	88%
peers support work that extends beyond the traditional research in the discipline	82%	83%	82%
peers communicate consistently with one another	77%	85%	78%
the administration is effective	76%	80%	76%
I am assisted in obtaining the resources I need	75%	80%	74%
disputes and problems are resolved effectively	74%	80%	73%
peers are encouraged and empowered	74%	79%	73%
feedback is sought and accepted	74%	72%	73%
I receive constructive feedback about my performance	71%	70%	70%
there is a shared vision	68%	65%	68%
all peers are encouraged to participate in strategic planning for the direction of the unit	57%	55%	56%
every one shares in making important decisions	51%	49%	50%
there is transparency about the graduate student fellowship support process	48%	52%	47%

Postdocs

Job Satisfaction

Overall, postdocs were mostly satisfied with various aspects of their jobs. Nine in ten postdocs were satisfied with their jobs overall (90%). Fewer than half of postdocs were satisfied with their additional compensation and housing (44%).

As with overall satisfaction, individual job areas saw mostly minor variations across affinity groups though minoritized and marginalized communities usually reported lower levels of job satisfaction. The job aspects where minoritized and marginalized communities reported the lowest satisfaction compared to their peers were support for work-family balance (67%% vs. 100%); opportunities to collaborate with peers (66% vs. 82%); and staff support (63% vs. 92%).

Table 48. Postdoc Job Satisfaction

Percent satisfaction with prompt

		# of Marginalizations	
Job Area	All	None	1+
Overall satisfaction	90%	92%	87%
Support for diversity, equity, and inclusion in my department	84%	100%	82%
Committee responsibilities	80%	67%	80%
Benefits	77%	83%	75%
Support for work-family balance in my department	71%	100%	67%
The way you were welcomed to the UC Berkeley campus	71%	92%	65%
Opportunities to collaborate with peers in home unit	71%	82%	66%
Staff support	69%	92%	63%
Quality of space for research	68%	67%	66%
Opportunities to collaborate with peers in other units on the UC Berkeley campus	60%	78%	59%
Salary	51%	58%	44%
Current housing situation	44%	50%	42%
Additional compensation	44%	20%	42%

Academic Experiences

Postdocs generally rated their academic experiences positively with roughly four in five reporting they have faculty role models (84%) and that the campus climate encourages discussion of difficult topics (82%). Around half of postdocs reported having not enough faculty or staff with whom they identified (54%) and being pre-judged by faculty (49%).

Minoritized and marginalized communities reported ambivalent academic experiences compared to their peers. Minoritized postdocs reported similar or higher rates of having faculty, staff, and administrator role models and higher ratings of the climate for discussing difficult topics (82% vs. 67%).They also reported higher rates of being pre-judged by faculty (50% vs. 42%) and not seeing enough faculty with whom they identified (61% vs. 33%). Worse academic experiences were exacerbated with each added marginalization.

Table 49. Postdoc Rating of Program by Area

Percent agreement with prompt

		# of Marginalizations	
Area	All	None	1+
I have faculty who I perceive as role models	84%	83%	83%
I believe the campus climate encourages free and open discussion of difficult topics	82%	67%	82%
I have staff who I perceive as role models	62%	45%	60%
I have administrators who I perceive as role models	52%	45%	49%
I don't see enough faculty/staff with whom I identify	54%	33%	61%
I think faculty pre-judge my abilities based on perceived identity/background	49%	42%	50%

Evaluation of Academic Unit

Overall, postdocs rated their programs positively. Almost all postdocs felt treated with respect in their department by their peers (94%) and by department members overall (94%). Postdocs had the lowest agreement about receiving the level of mentoring/advising they needed to achieve their goals (69%).

Postdocs from minoritized and marginalized communities usually reported their programs less positively than postdocs overall. This worsened climate was most notable in support and resources for good mental health (72% vs. 92%). Lower program ratings were exacerbated with each added marginalization.

Table 50. Postdoc Rating of Academic Unit

Percent agreement with prompt

		# of Marginalizations	
In my unit...	All	None	1+
Members of the department taken as a whole treat me with respect and dignity	94%	100%	93%
My peers treat me with respect and dignity	94%	92%	94%
I receive adequate resources to help me achieve my goals	80%	83%	77%
I feel well supported by my colleagues to achieve my goals	79%	83%	77%
My department supports and encourages a good work/family/life balance	74%	50%	78%
I receive adequate support and resources for good mental health	73%	92%	72%
I receive the level of mentoring/advising that I need to achieve my goals	69%	83%	69%

Evaluation of Peers

Overall postdocs rated their peers in their units highly. Almost all postdocs (95%) agree that their colleagues maintain high research standards and treat staff with respect. Far fewer agree that their colleagues hold high teaching standards (72%) and work collaboratively (79%). Postdocs from minoritized and marginalized communities rated their colleagues lower around working collaboratively (75% vs. 83%) and maintaining high teaching standards (70% vs. 80%).

Table 51. Postdoc Evaluation of Peers by Area

Percent agreement with prompt

		# of Marginalizations	
In my unit, my peers...	All	None	1+
treat staff with respect	95%	92%	95%
maintain high research standards	95%	83%	96%
are collegial	90%	83%	92%
maintain a supportive working environment	87%	83%	87%
work collaboratively	79%	83%	75%
maintain high teaching standards	72%	80%	70%

Evaluation of Unit

Postdocs had more mixed evaluation of their units compared to the evaluation of their unit peers. Most agreed that postdocs treat each other even-handedly (89%) and that agreements are honored (89%). Around two in five (42%) agreed that they are encouraged to participate in strategic planning for the direction of their units, and only half of postdocs (50%) agreed that everyone participates in making important decisions.

Minoritized and marginalized postdocs tend to have lower evaluations of their units particularly around rating the administration as effective (62% vs. 92%) and being encouraged to participate in strategic planning (33% vs. 64%).

Table 51. Postdoc Evaluation of Unit by Area

Percent agreement with prompt

In my unit...	All	# of Marginalizations None	1+
peers treat each other in an even-handed way	89%	92%	89%
agreements are honored	89%	92%	90%
feedback is sought and accepted	77%	83%	74%
I am assisted in obtaining the resources I need	77%	92%	74%
support staff are helpful and competent	76%	92%	70%
disputes and problems are resolved effectively	73%	64%	70%
peers support work that extends beyond the traditional research in the discipline	72%	75%	73%
I receive constructive feedback about my performance	71%	67%	68%
peers are encouraged and empowered	65%	73%	60%
the administration is effective	64%	92%	62%
there is a shared vision	63%	64%	58%
peers communicate consistently with one another	57%	67%	51%
every one shares in making important decisions	50%	55%	48%
all peers are encouraged to participate in strategic planning for the direction of the unit	42%	64%	33%

Faculty

As a follow-up and response to the My Experience Survey results that were internally presented and discussed, the Office for Faculty Equity & Welfare conducted a full analysis of the senate faculty-specific data.

Their report is available here.

Academic Employees

Job Satisfaction

Overall, academic employees (which include researchers, lecturers, academic administrators, and librarians - senate faculty are not included - were mostly satisfied with their jobs across areas. Four in five academic employees were satisfied with their benefits (82%) though fewer than half were satisfied with additional compensation (46%).

Academic employees from minoritized and marginalized communities reported on average slightly lower levels of job satisfaction. The job aspect where minoritized and marginalized communities reported the lowest satisfaction compared to their peers was committee responsibilities (76% vs. 92%).

Table 56. Academic Employee Job Satisfaction by Job Area

Percent satisfaction with job area

		# of Marginalizations	
Job Area	All	None	1+
Overall satisfaction	87%	89%	88%
Benefits	82%	86%	82%
Committee responsibilities	76%	92%	76%
Support for diversity, equity, and inclusion in my department	74%	81%	75%
Support for work-family balance in my department	74%	77%	76%
Opportunities to collaborate with peers in home unit	73%	71%	73%
The way you were welcomed to the UC Berkeley campus	69%	70%	68%
Current housing situation	66%	70%	68%
Salary	62%	59%	66%
Opportunities to collaborate with peers in other units	59%	59%	60%
Promotion and advancement process	57%	64%	59%
Additional compensation	46%	44%	49%

Career Progression

Three in four academic employee respondents (77%) reported their career progressions were average or above average compared to their colleagues. Minoritized and marginalized academic employees reported lower levels of career progression relative to their colleagues.

Table 57. Academic Employee Perceived Average/Fast Career Progression

Percent of respondents who perceived their career profession as average or fast compared to their peers

Category	Group	Percent
Population	Faculty	77%
Intersections	0 Marginal Factors	86%
	1+ Marginal Factors	76%

Evaluation of Peers

Overall academic employees rate their peers in their units highly. Nine in ten agree that their colleagues treat staff with respect (90%). On the low end, seven in ten (71%) agree that their peers work collaboratively. Minoritized and marginalized academic employees don't consistently rate their peers more positively or negatively.

Table 58. Academic Employees Evaluation of Peers by Area

Percent agreement with prompt

Table XX. Academic Employees Evaluation of Peers by Area			
		# of Marginalizations	
Area	All	None	1+
treat staff with respect	90%	82%	91%
are collegial	83%	91%	82%
maintain a supportive working environment	80%	80%	81%
work collaboratively	71%	72%	72%

Evaluation of Unit

Academic employees had more mixed evaluation of their units compared to their evaluation of their unit peers. Most academic employees agreed that support staff are helpful and competent (87%). Around two in five (43%) academic employees agreed that everyone shares in making important decisions.

Minoritized and marginalized academics tend to have lower evaluations of their units than their peers. These differences were most notable around the clarity of the merit and promotion process (46% vs. 63%).

Table 59. Academic Employee Evaluation of Unit by Area

Percent agreement with prompt

		# of Marginalizations	
Area	All	None	1+
support staff are helpful and competent	87%	82%	88%
agreements are honored	79%	87%	78%
the administration is effective	71%	75%	73%
peers treat each other in an even-handed way	69%	74%	69%
disputes and problems are resolved effectively	65%	75%	64%
I am assisted in obtaining the resources I need	65%	71%	63%
there is a shared vision	64%	73%	64%
I receive constructive feedback about my performance	63%	65%	63%
feedback is sought and accepted	63%	68%	63%
peers are encouraged and empowered	61%	74%	60%
peers communicate consistently with one another	59%	58%	59%
there is clarity about the promotion and merit process	48%	63%	46%
all peers are encouraged to participate in strategic planning for the direction of the unit	48%	55%	50%
every one shares in making important decisions	43%	48%	45%

Staff.

Job Satisfaction

Most employee respondents (86%) reported being satisfied with their job overall. Specific aspects of respondent jobs had varied levels of satisfaction. The areas with the highest staff satisfaction were benefits (92%). The areas with the lowest staff satisfaction were the promotion and advancement process (44%) and additional compensation (37%).

Staff from minoritized and marginalized communities generally had lower levels of job satisfaction across job areas -- most notably salary (62% vs. 71%) and support for diversity, equity, and inclusion in their unit (76% vs. 86%).

Table 60. Staff Job Satisfaction by Job Area

Percent satisfaction with job area

		# of Marginalizations	
Job Area	All	None	1+
Overall satisfaction	86%	90%	87%
Benefits	92%	92%	94%
Opportunities to collaborate with peers in home unit	83%	88%	84%
Support for work-family balance in my department	79%	86%	81%
Support for diversity, equity, and inclusion in my department	75%	86%	76%
Committee responsibilities	73%	78%	75%
The way you were welcomed to the UC Berkeley campus	73%	79%	73%
Current housing situation	68%	75%	68%
Opportunities to collaborate with peers in other units on the UC Berkeley campus	67%	69%	69%
Salary	61%	71%	62%
Promotion and advancement process	44%	51%	45%
Additional compensation	37%	43%	37%

Career Progression

Three in four staff respondents (77%) reported their career progressions were average or above average compared to their colleagues. Minoritized and marginalized staff reported lower levels of career progression relative to their colleagues.

Table 61. Staff Perceived Average/Fast Career Progression

Percent of respondents who perceived their career profession as average or fast compared to their peers

Category	Group	Percent
Population	Faculty	77%
Intersections	0 Marginal Factors	89%
	1+ Marginal Factors	77%

Evaluation of Peers

Overall staff members rate their peers in their units highly. Roughly nine in ten agree their colleagues are collegial (90%) and treat staff members with respect (89%), and over four in five agree that their colleagues maintain a supportive working environment (85%) and work collaboratively (83%). Staff members from minoritized and marginalized communities tend to rate their colleagues slightly lower.

Table 62. Staff Evaluation of Peers by Area

Percent agreement with prompt

		# of Marginalizations	
Area	All	None	1+
are collegial	90%	93%	90%
treat staff with respect	89%	94%	89%
maintain a supportive working environment	85%	90%	86%
work collaboratively	83%	87%	84%

Evaluation of Unit

Staff members had more mixed evaluation of their units compared to the evaluation of their unit. Most (86%) of staff members agreed that support staff are helpful and competent. Around three quarters of staff members agreed that staff treat each other even-handedly (78%); that agreements are honored (78%); that they receive constructive feedback (74%); and that they receive assistance in obtaining necessary resources (74%). However, fewer than two in five of staff members (37%) agreed that there was clarity around merit and promotion, and around half of staff members agreed that everyone shares in making important decisions (48%) and that staff members are encouraged to participate in the strategic planning for the direction of the unit (52%).

Minoritized and marginalized staff tend to have lower evaluations of their units - especially reporting that agreements are honored (79% vs. 89%) and that disputes and problems are resolved effectively (64% vs. 74%).

Table 63. Staff Evaluation of Unit by Area

Percent agreement with prompt

		# of Marginalizations	
Area	All	None	1+
support staff are helpful and competent	86%	89%	87%
agreements are honored	78%	89%	79%
peers treat each other in an even-handed way	78%	85%	78%
I receive constructive feedback about my performance	74%	71%	75%
I am assisted in obtaining the resources I need	74%	77%	75%
the administration is effective	72%	76%	72%
peers communicate consistently with one another	68%	71%	69%
feedback is sought and accepted	67%	74%	68%
there is a shared vision	66%	67%	68%
peers are encouraged and empowered	66%	74%	67%
disputes and problems are resolved effectively	64%	74%	64%
all peers are encouraged to participate in strategic planning for the direction of the unit	52%	47%	53%
everyone shares in making important decisions	48%	54%	48%
there is clarity about the promotion and merit process	37%	38%	37%

SVSH

Social Norms

Across all populations and affinity groups, almost all respondents disagreed with statements endorsing sexual violence and sexual harassment. One in twenty respondents agreed with the following statements: "it shouldn't be considered sexual assault if the accused is drunk and didn't realize what they were doing" (6%); "you can't be stalked by someone if you are dating them" (5%); "if a person doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say it was sexual assault" (4%); "sexual harassment occurs only in person; it cannot occur online" (4%); and "being stalked by someone is a creepy thing to have happen, but it's not really dangerous" (4%).

Table 64. SVSH Social Norms by Area

Percent agreement with prompt

Population	Area	Percent
All	It shouldn't be considered sexual assault if the accused is drunk and didn't realize what they were doing.	6%
All	You can't be stalked by someone if you are dating them.	5%
All	Sexual harassment occurs only in person; it cannot occur online.	4%
All	Being stalked by someone is a creepy thing to have happen, but it's not really dangerous.	4%
All	If a person doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say it was sexual assault.	4%

Institutional Trust

Leadership

Survey participants were asked to reflect on campus leadership (chancellor, vice chancellors, deans, and other leadership staff) in four areas: (1) they deal with me honestly and ethically; (2) they show concern for people's rights; (3) they can be trusted to have my best interests in mind; and (4) they can be trusted to make decisions that are good for the campus as a whole. Overall, a majority of respondents agreed with these statements about campus leadership but with large variation across prompts. The highest agreement was for dealing honestly and ethically (80%) and showing concern for people's rights (79%). The lowest agreement was for being trusted to have one's best interests in mind (64%).

Minoritized and marginalized communities had lower agreement with each of the four prompts -- this was particularly true for transgender/gender non-conforming respondents (ranging from 38% to 53%). Low assessment of campus leadership was exacerbated with each added marginalized identity.

Table 65. Institutional Trust of Campus Leadership by Area

Percent agreement with prompt

Population	Area	# of Marginalizations	
		None	1+
Campus Leadership	deal with me honestly and ethically	86%	80%
Campus Leadership	show concern for people's rights	86%	78%
Campus Leadership	can be trusted to have my best interests in mind	73%	63%
Campus Leadership	can be trusted to make decisions that are good for the campus as a whole	79%	71%

Faculty

Survey participants were asked to reflect on faculty in four areas: they deal with me honestly and ethically; they show concern for people's rights; they can be trusted to have my best interests in mind; and they can be trusted to make decisions that are good for the campus as a whole. Overall, a majority of respondents agreed with these statements about the faculty but with some variation across prompts. The highest agreement was for dealing honestly and ethically (92%) and showing concern for people's rights (89%). The lowest agreement was for being trusted to have one's best interests in mind (80%) and being trusted to make decisions that are good for the campus as a whole (82%). Staff had notably lower agreement than other populations.

Minoritized and marginalized communities had lower agreement with each of the four prompts -- this was particularly true for African American/Black (ranging from 66% to 83%), Native American/Alaska Native (63% to 82%), and transgender/gender non-conforming respondents (68% to 80%). Low assessment of faculty was exacerbated with each added marginalization, however, assessment of faculty members had the lowest variation among affinity groups.

Table 66. Institutional Trust of Faculty by Area

Percent agreement with prompt

Population	Area	# of Marginalizations	
		None	1+
Faculty	deal with me honestly and ethically	95%	92%
Faculty	show concern for people's rights	93%	89%
Faculty	can be trusted to have my best interests in mind	84%	80%
Faculty	can be trusted to make decisions that are good for the campus as a whole	85%	81%

Police

Survey participants were asked to reflect on campus police/security in four areas: they deal with me honestly and ethically; they show concern for people's rights; they can be trusted to have my best interests in mind; and they can be trusted to make decisions that are good for the campus as a whole. Overall, a majority of respondents agreed with these statements about campus police/security but with some variation across prompts. The highest agreement was for dealing honestly and ethically (84%). The lowest agreement was for being trusted to make decisions that are good for the campus as a whole (74%), and being trusted to have one's best interests in mind (75%).

Minoritized and marginalized communities had lower agreement with each of the four prompts - this was particularly true for African American/Black (ranging from 49% to 64%) and transgender/gender non-conforming respondents (35% to 49%). Low assessment of campus police/security was exacerbated with each added marginalization. Assessment of campus policy/security had the highest variation among affinity groups with minoritized and marginalized groups having much lower ratings compared with majoritized groups.

Table 67. Institutional Trust of Campus Police by Area

Percent agreement with prompt

		# of Marginalizations	
Population	Area	None	1+
Campus Police	deal with me honestly and ethically	90%	84%
Campus Police	show concern for people's rights	86%	76%
Campus Police	can be trusted to have my best interests in mind	85%	75%
Campus Police	can be trusted to make decisions that are good for the campus as a whole	85%	73%

Conclusion

The 2019 My Experience survey findings provide the campus deeper insights into the decentralized and differentiated experiences that make up campus climate at Berkeley. Campus climate is not just measured based on how individuals feel; it includes real experiences, access to resources and opportunities. The national climate informs and impacts the local climate. The local climate is where each individual, as a member of the institution, has an opportunity to promote our Principles of Community and act intentionally to transform the campus experience. [21] The campus leadership plays a critical role in setting the tone, launching and implementing recommendations from committees, task forces, and governing bodies towards improving the campus experience, access to the university, and the opportunities that are made available to all. It is our hope that this report will generate additional solutions to complex social, political, and financial problems that impact campus climate. To better understand the campus climate, we need to take a comprehensive look at our campus resources. To further build a campus for all, we recommend that each department, unit, and campus leader engage stakeholders in dialogue and strategic planning to address the results in tactical and practical ways.

Acknowledgments

References

[1] How Americans see the state of race relations (https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2019/04/09/how-americans-see-the-state-of-race-relations/)

[2] Strategic Plan Overview (https://strategicplan.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Strategic_Plan_Overview.pdf)

[3] Anxiety and Depression, Household Pulse Survey, 2020 (https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/covid19/pulse/mental-health.htm)

[4] The Healthy Minds Study (https://healthymindsnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/HMS-Fall-2020-National-Data-Report.pdf)

[5] University of California Berkeley Campus Climate Project Final Report (https://campusclimate.ucop.edu/_common/files/pdf-climate/ucb-full-report.pdf)

[6] University of California, Berkeley MyVoice Survey Final Report (https://myvoice.berkeley.edu/lib/img/pdf/MyVoice_Final_Report_Publish.pdf)

[7] Student Survey Response Rates across Institutions: Why Do They Vary? (https://www.jstor.org/stable/40197408?seq=1)

[8] Responding to Educational Inequality (https://haasinstitute.berkeley.edu/system/tdf/haas_institute_race_education_brief_june_2017_1.pdf)

[9] UC Infocenter Student Basic Needs (https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/infocenter/student-basic-needs)

[10] College and University Basic Needs Insecurity: A National #RealCollege Survey Report (https://hope4college.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/HOPE_realcollege_National_report_digital.pdf)

[11] California Student Aid Commission 2018–19 Student Expenses and Resources Survey (https://www.csac.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/2018-19_student_expenses_and_resources_survey_web.pdf)

[12] U.S. Household Food Security Survey Module: Six-Item Short Form (https://www.ers.usda.gov/media/8282/short2012.pdf)

[13] University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) Data Tables, 2018 (https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/infocenter/ucues-data-tables-2018)

[14] The University of California Graduate Student Well-Being Survey Report (https://ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/_files/graduate_well_being_survey_report.pdf)

[15] NCHA Fall 2018 Reference Group Executive Summary (https://www.acha.org/documents/ncha/NCHA-II_Fall_2018_Reference_Group_Executive_Summary.pdf)

[16] Work organization and mental health problems in PhD students (https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2017.02.008)

[17] Evidence for a mental health crisis in graduate education (https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.4089)

[18] PhDs: the tortuous truth (https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-03459-7)

[19] DSM-5 Self-Rated Level 1 Cross-Cutting Symptom Measure—Adult (https://www.psychiatry.org/File%20Library/Psychiatrists/Practice/DSM/APA_DSM5_Level-1-Measure-Adult.pdf)

[19] Principles of Community, UC Berkeley (https://diversity.berkeley.edu/principles-community)