



2023-2024 BIAS ANNUAL REPORT



Office of the Provost – Princeton University

Contents

INTRODUCTION	3
TERMINOLOGY & POLICIES	5
BIAS PREVENTION	7
BIAS REPORTING & RESPONSE	9
LOOKING FORWARD.....	13
BY THE NUMBERS.....	14
ABOUT US	22

INTRODUCTION

Princeton University is committed to creating and maintaining an educational, working, and living environment that is free from discrimination and harassment and allows every member to thrive. Princeton's [Policy on Discrimination and/or Harassment](#) is guided by federal and state law and protects members of the University community from discrimination and harassment on the basis of protected characteristics including those covered by Title VI and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination.

The Bias Annual Report at Princeton University presents trends and observations related to reported bias incidents and complaints of discrimination and harassment from July 1, 2023 through June 30, 2024. The report summarizes the following:

- Related University policies and key definitions (e.g., bias, harassment, discrimination, and protected identity characteristics)
- Bias prevention and mitigation initiatives to foster community engagement (e.g., departmental climate and inclusion committees and Employee Resource Groups) and community education workshops around topics such as bias awareness and reduction, inclusive community, and bystander intervention
- University reporting options (direct, online, and anonymously) and the bias review process
- The intersection of bias and the University's principles of free expression
- Non-disciplinary approaches to address bias incidents that do not constitute violations of University policy
- Cumulative hostile environment assessment and mitigation strategies
- Commitments to strengthen the University's bias prevention, reporting, and response program going forward
- Data summarizing bias reports, discrimination and harassment complaints, and investigations and outcomes, including data related to campus concerns about the Israel/Hamas war.

The University responds to all bias-related reports. In those circumstances where a reported incident could constitute a violation of policy, a formal investigation is initiated, with the possibility of disciplinary consequences. However, the majority of bias-related reports do not involve conduct that would be considered a violation of policy. Princeton responds to these concerns using mitigation efforts such as individualized support measures and meetings; facilitated dialogues, conflict resolution, or other restorative strategies; community programming and training opportunities; public statements and/or other appropriate activities. All reports of bias, discrimination, and harassment are assessed through the policy lenses of equity, inclusivity, and freedom of expression.

Annually, the University provides a variety of educational sessions to the campus community related to preventing and responding to bias, harassment, and discrimination. Learning sessions cover topics including bias awareness and reduction, inclusive community, and bystander intervention, and are delivered in-person, online, and on virtual platforms.

Inquiries or requests for more information regarding this report may be directed to the [Director for Institutional Equity and EEO](#).

TERMINOLOGY & POLICIES

Key Terms

Princeton's bias prevention, reporting, and response program is grounded in its nondiscrimination and free expression policies, which are guided by federal and state law. The following key terms are defined in the University's policies and FAQs:

Bias is a broad category of behaviors including discrimination, harassment, and other actions which demean or intimidate individuals or groups because of personal characteristics or beliefs or their expression. Some forms of bias, including discrimination and harassment on the basis of protected characteristics, are prohibited by University policy as well as federal and state laws.

Cyber Harassment, which is prohibited by University policy, describes unwelcome, abusive, intimidating, threatening, or harassing communication that is directed at a person through the use of electronic technologies (e.g., email, telephone, voicemail, text messages, social media, or other internet use) and sufficiently severe and/or pervasive to have the effect of unreasonably impacting an individual's educational experience, working conditions, or living conditions by creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive environment.

Discrimination, which is prohibited by University policy, is defined as adverse treatment of an individual based on a protected characteristic, rather than individual merit.

Free Speech and Expression is a core value at the University. Princeton has a fundamental commitment to the free and open exchange of ideas and guarantees members of the campus community broad latitude to engage in speech and expression, including academic inquiry, peaceful protest, ordinary conversation, and online discussion, even when such speech is unwelcome, disagreeable or offensive. The University may restrict expression in limited instances.

Harassment, which is prohibited by University policy, is defined as unwelcome verbal or physical behavior which is directed at a person based on a protected characteristic, when these behaviors are sufficiently severe and/or pervasive to have the effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's educational experience, working conditions or living conditions by creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive environment.

Hostile Environment is defined as a form of harassment that describes a situation created when unwelcome conduct based on a protected characteristic is sufficiently severe and/or pervasive to have the effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's educational experience, working conditions or living conditions by creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive environment.

Protected Characteristics include personal traits such as race, creed, color, sex, pregnancy and related conditions, gender identity or expression, age, national origin, ancestry, religion, physical or mental disability, veteran status, marital or domestic partnership status, affectional or sexual orientation, and/or other characteristics protected by law.

Retaliation or “retaliatory action” is prohibited against any member of the University community who in good faith: (1) files a report, complaint or grievance under this policy (or with an external entity); (2) opposes in a reasonable manner an action believed to constitute a violation of University policy; (3) participates in University investigations, compliance reviews, or discipline proceedings; or (4) files a request for an accommodation under a University policy. (For purposes of this policy, “retaliatory action” is defined as intimidation, threat, coercion, discrimination, or adverse educational or employment action; acts of impoliteness and the like typically do not qualify.)

Policies

For more information on the related University policies and Frequently Asked Questions (“FAQs”), see:

[Addressing Concerns of Bias, Harassment and Discrimination](#)

[Policy on Discrimination and/or Harassment](#) and related [FAQs](#)

[Statement on Freedom of Expression](#) and related [FAQs](#)

[Disability and Accessibility](#)

[Retaliation FAQs](#)

BIAS PREVENTION

Princeton's initiatives and strategies to prevent and mitigate bias, harassment, and discrimination within the campus community take several forms. Members of the University community play an important role in setting the tone and supporting an inclusive culture for all.

Community Engagement

The Offices of Institutional Equity and Diversity and Human Resources provide support and resources for inclusion and climate committees and/or designated representatives in academic and administrative departments. More than **35** administrative and academic units have inclusion and climate committees or representatives. These committees are intentionally composed to capture a variety of perspectives within departments. In administrative departments, committees include members representing different types and levels of positions; in academic departments, committee representatives include undergraduates, graduate students, postdocs, staff and faculty.

With the support of central University offices, some of the initiatives these committees have advanced include:

- Developing departmental community values statements
- Issuing departmental policies on professional conduct
- Administering departmental climate surveys to gather relevant information about experiences of department members
- Hosting speakers and professional development workshops on topics related to bias prevention, bystander intervention, and inclusive mentoring, teaching, and innovation

In addition to establishing such formal departmental committees and department-level roles, the University has invited individual community members to engage in this effort through the creation and support of campus-wide working groups and task forces, such as the Jewish Experience Working Group, the Muslim Experience Working Group, and the CPUC Ad Hoc Committee on Sexual Climate, Culture and Conduct; as well as student organizations focused on issues related to campus climate and inclusion.

For employees at all levels, the University has supported the formation of **12** different [Employee Resource Groups](#) (volunteer, employee-led organizations based on shared interests, experiences, and/or identities), which are charged with promoting a more inclusive campus community through efforts including bias prevention education.

Community Education

On an ongoing basis, the University offers a variety of learning opportunities to all members of the campus community related to promoting inclusion and preventing bias, harassment, and discrimination. Workshops on bias prevention topics (e.g., bias awareness and reduction, inclusive community, and bystander intervention) are delivered in-person, asynchronously online, and on virtual platforms. These collective learning opportunities include, but are not limited to:

- Workshops on *Fostering Inclusion* for students, faculty, and staff
- Workshops on religious diversity and cross-cultural allyship for students, faculty, and staff
- Workshops on understanding Jewish identity and antisemitism for students, faculty, and staff
- Workshops on understanding Muslim identity and Islamophobia for staff
- *Allies for Access* (supporting disability access) workshops for students, faculty, and staff
- *Ally Project* (supporting the LGBTQIA+ community) workshops for faculty and staff
- Workshops on mitigating bias in admissions/hiring, inclusive mentoring, and communicating inclusively for faculty and staff
- Workshops related to understanding free expression on university campuses for staff, facilitated by [PEN America](#)
- Workshops on bias awareness, support resources, bystander intervention, and reporting options for students, faculty, and staff
- Certificate programs in Digital Accessibility and Inclusion & Diversity for staff
- Annual programming on related topics for students through student orientation sessions, residential colleges, and various identity centers and offices (e.g., Carl A. Fields Center; Gender + Sexuality Resource Center; Davis International Center; AccessAbility Center; Office of Religious Life; Office of Access, Diversity and Inclusion-Graduate School; Campus Life Office of Diversity & Inclusion)

BIAS REPORTING & RESPONSE

Members of the University community are encouraged to report all acts of bias, harassment, and discrimination so that the University can take appropriate action. Designated [confidential resources](#) are available to help individuals process their experiences and consider their options should they wish to address the incident.

Individuals who feel they have experienced bias, harassment, or discrimination have several options to report the incident including: filing a formal report or complaint [online](#), by email to bias@princeton.edu, or in person to the Director for Institutional Equity and EEO in the Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity.

Reports may also be submitted anonymously through the [EthicsPoint Hotline](#), a third-party service provided by the University. However, the University may not be able to conduct a full investigation of an anonymous report due to limited information or access to the individual who submitted the report.

Individuals who feel that safety is a concern or wish to report a criminal incident motivated by bias or animus against the victim on the basis of their actual or perceived identity characteristics (i.e., a hate crime) may contact the [Department of Public Safety](#).

University policy prohibits retaliation against any individual who utilizes these mechanisms to report concerns of bias, harassment, and discrimination. For more information regarding how the University addresses concerns of retaliation see these [Retaliation FAQs](#).

Bias Review Steps

All reports of bias, harassment, or discrimination made to campus offices, Public Safety, or to the EthicsPoint Hotline are routed to the Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity.

After submitting a bias report or complaint of harassment or discrimination, the reporting individual receives an acknowledgement of receipt and information about support resources available on campus. (Reports made to the EthicsPoint Hotline will receive reply communications via EthicsPoint.)

Report details are reviewed, and an initial assessment is conducted to determine appropriate next steps based on the information provided. Reports that indicate a potential violation of University policy are referred to the appropriate office(s) for review under existing disciplinary processes; reports that do not indicate a potential violation of University policy may be dismissed from further review under disciplinary processes. Not every experience can or should be addressed through a disciplinary process, but there are campus resources available to help individuals manage the experience and, as discussed in the next section, non-disciplinary responses to address it.

For more information on the reporting process (step-by-step guidance), policy, definitions, procedures and FAQs related to bias, harassment, and discrimination, see [Addressing Concerns](#).

Non-disciplinary Response and Resources

Many reported instances of bias are not appropriate for investigation, which may result in disciplinary action. In some cases, the alleged offender is unknown or not affiliated with the University and therefore not subject to University jurisdiction. In other cases, the reported behavior, especially that involving speech or expression, may not satisfy the threshold to constitute a violation of University policy.

The intersections of bias and protected speech can be challenging given the University's dual commitments to free expression and inclusivity. When bias-related incidents involve offensive speech, the University's response is determined in light of the [Statement on Freedom of Expression](#). Because most forms of speech are protected, the University will only take disciplinary action against offensive speech and expression in limited, narrowly defined situations. For more information, see [FAQs on Free Expression and Inclusivity](#).

Sometimes reports of bias involve faculty or staff in the context of academic evaluation, pedagogical inquiry, or faculty-student interactions in the classroom or other academic setting. When such academic-related incidents of bias are reported, the matter is considered in light of the University's [Statement on Freedom of Expression](#) and the [Policy on Classroom Learning Environment](#), and often includes a consultation with or referral to a Dean or Director of Studies.

Although discipline generally is not the appropriate response to offensive protected speech, that does not mean the conduct goes unaddressed. Because unwelcome speech can create emotional distress, undermine campus culture and workplace morale or create a hostile environment, there are a variety of non-disciplinary resources and strategies to address offensive speech and support those who have been affected, as appropriate. Such measures include, but are not limited to, the following:

- All members of the campus community have the right to use their own speech to counter speech that they find problematic
- The University may call the offending individual to a meeting with a Dean, Assistant Dean for Student Life, supervisor or other appropriate administrator to explain the concerns regarding the speech-related incident, how it impacted others, and reinforce Princeton's expectations for promoting community
- The University may offer informal conflict resolution resources such as mediation, facilitated group dialogues, or employ other restorative strategies between the parties
- The University may sponsor debates or discussions on the topic, or offer awareness programs and trainings to the campus community, in whole or in part

- In some instances, University officials may make public statements regarding problematic speech to reaffirm institutional values
- [No communication and no contact orders](#) can be put in place between parties
- In limited circumstances, certain privileges may be revoked or curtailed
- Instances of cyber harassment may be addressed through various strategies (e.g., cease-and-desist communications, restricted access to campus networks, removal of postings on University-sponsored web platforms, concealment or removal of profile/contact information from University web pages, engagement of external mitigation resources)

Despite the limitations for a disciplinary response, reporting concerns about offensive protected speech can help to identify hostile environments or patterns of problematic behavior and assist the University administration in identifying opportunities to educate the campus community with the goal of improving the campus climate.

Cyber Harassment Response Working Group

The use of digital tools, particularly social media, to harass or offend the sensibilities of members of the Princeton University community has accelerated in recent years. This conduct can arise in many forms (e.g., unwelcome messages/images, online threats, doxing, cyberstalking). The public and often threatening nature of electronic and online incidents requires a coordinated response process and the use of internal and external [resources](#), as appropriate, to support community members who experience a threat or risk of physical, financial, reputational or similar harm from electronic/online harassment.

A campus-wide administrative group manages incidents of cyber harassment, serves as a clearinghouse for communications to the University community about cyber harassment, and develops appropriate cyber-related response protocols, policies, and procedures. This group is composed of representatives from Institutional Equity and Diversity, Information Technology, Communications, Admission, Campus Life, Human Resources, Dean of the Faculty, Dean of the College, Dean of Undergraduate Students, Graduate School, Public Safety, and Athletics.

Hostile Environment Assessment and Mitigation Efforts

In addition to assessing individual reports of bias incidents for appropriate next steps, regular assessments of cumulative bias incidents are conducted to determine whether a hostile environment exists for students, faculty, or staff. Assessing a hostile environment is a fact-specific exercise, based on the totality of circumstances, and not all situations rise to the level of a hostile environment. For example, isolated incidents or the mere expression of offensive views, words, symbols, or thoughts, while problematic, are generally not sufficient to create a hostile environment. The conduct must be objectively evaluated, using the reasonable person standard, as *sufficiently severe or pervasive to*

deny or limit an individual's access or ability to participate in the educational program or activity, or adversely affect an individual's working or living conditions. Importantly, the impact of the conduct is evaluated and factors such as the context, nature, scope, frequency, duration and location of the conduct, and the identity, number, age, and relationships of the persons involved are considered.

When the existence of a hostile environment has been determined, the University will employ steps that are reasonably calculated to eliminate it in a timely and effective manner, remedy its effects on impacted individuals, and prevent its recurrence. Such mitigation strategies may include, but are not limited to:

- Individualized outreach and response, including counseling and support resources
- Institutional statements of values
- Investigation and discipline when appropriate
- Climate assessment and appropriate interventions
- Freedom of expression facilitation and appropriate [time/place/manner restrictions](#)
- Professional development and educational programming
- Facilitated discussions, mediation, and other restorative practices
- Social media content moderation policies and execution
- Removal of offensive posters, fliers, stickers that are inconsistent with University policies

LOOKING FORWARD

Bias Prevention, Reporting and Response Program: Action Plan 2024 – 2027

During the three-year period 2024 - 2027, the Office for Institutional Equity and Diversity will focus on the following strategic actions to further strengthen the University's efforts toward preventing, reporting, and responding to bias, harassment, discrimination, and cyber harassment.

Policies and procedures

- Continually review policies and procedures to ensure compliance with state and federal laws and regulations and to identify opportunities for clarity, alignment, and consistent application of the University's values and standards across campus populations

Community Awareness and Education

- Expand communication and educational strategies regarding identifying, preventing, and reporting bias, harassment, and discrimination, as well as disciplinary and non-disciplinary response options
- Expand learning opportunities regarding freedom of expression, bias awareness, hostile environment, and promoting an inclusive campus community
- Identify opportunities to link to positive reinforcements of a healthy and respectful campus culture (e.g., identity-based programming, climate-focused activities, inclusive pedagogy strategies)

Intervention and response strategies

- Regularly assess bias-related incidents, individually and cumulatively, for the existence of a hostile environment
- Implement restorative practices and other mediation/conflict resolution strategies to support community well-being and combat residual effects of bias incidents

Use of data/systems/resources to increase effectiveness

- Strengthen use of climate/engagement surveys, workforce/affirmative action and other data to more effectively identify trends, patterns, and "hot spots"
- Identify and utilize resources and evaluative methods to assess effectiveness of initiatives and processes in this area (e.g., pre/post-initiative attitude surveys, internal spot audits)

Transparent communication of reporting trends

- Increase transparency of communication to the University community regarding the nature and prevalence of reported bias incidents, prevention initiatives, and response efforts, as broader communication of such information can support improving campus climate over time

We will report progress toward these goals in the next annual report. Inquiries or requests for more information regarding this report may be directed to the [Director for Institutional Equity and EEO](#).

BY THE NUMBERS

This section presents trends and observations related to **181** bias-related complaints and reports involving members of the University community from July 1, 2023 through June 30, 2024. The first subsection presents data trends and observations for reported incidents of bias, harassment, and discrimination in two categories: disciplinary investigations and non-disciplinary bias reports. The second subsection presents a snapshot of reported incidents impacting the campus climate in connection with the Israel/Hamas war.

Title IX/sexual misconduct complaints and reports are not included in this report; information regarding those complaints is available on the [Sexual Misconduct & Title IX website](#).

Disciplinary Investigations

When a complaint constitutes alleged harassment or discrimination based on a protected characteristic, it may be investigated; if the behavior violates University policy, such conduct is subject to appropriate discipline. The range of penalties for violation of University-wide rules of conduct are referenced in [Rights, Rules, Responsibilities 1.1.7](#).

In 2023-2024, the University received **40** complaints of harassment, discrimination, and retaliation (unrelated to the Israel/Hamas war). The University formally investigated **16** of those complaints under the Policy on Discrimination and/or Harassment. A total of **24** complaints were not investigated under the Policy on Discrimination and/or Harassment because they were withdrawn by the complainant; referred externally if the University lacked jurisdiction over the alleged perpetrator; dismissed on initial assessment because the alleged conduct did not implicate the Policy on Discrimination and/or Harassment; or referred to another University office if the alleged conduct potentially violated a different University policy under that office's jurisdiction. (In appropriate cases, the concerns were addressed by non-punitive interventions, e.g., individual discussions regarding the impact of offensive protected speech and reinforcement of University values, delivery of community training). *See the Snapshot on page 17 for discussion of reported incidents related to the Israel/Hamas War.*

In 2023-2024, the largest number of complaints alleged retaliation, followed by those which alleged discrimination or harassment based on race and age.

Complaints of Discrimination and/or Harassment	
Retaliation	22
Race	18
Age	6
National Origin	5
Disability	4
Sexual Orientation	3
Non-Protected Characteristics	3
Sex	3
Color	1
Pregnancy and Related Conditions	1

Some complaints included allegations based on multiple types of protected characteristics.

In 2023-2024, approximately **48%** of all complaints were brought against specific supervisors/managers or department/University leadership in general; these complaints involved allegations of discriminatory decision-making (e.g., promotion, termination, denial of accommodations) in the workplace, unfair treatment, and retaliation. Approximately **35%** of all complaints (unrelated to campus climate in connection with the Israel/Hamas war) alleged harassing interpersonal interactions by staff and students.

Nature of Complaints Based on Alleged Perpetrator	
Alleged Perpetrator	Nature of conduct alleged
Department/University	Discriminatory decision making – 3 Retaliation – 4 Unfair treatment – 2
Supervisors/Managers	Discriminatory decision making - 3 Retaliation - 4 Unfair treatment – 7
Staff	Discriminatory decision making – 2 Harassing interpersonal interactions – 9
Faculty	Retaliation – 10 Unfair treatment – 1
Students	Harassing interpersonal interactions – 5 Retaliation – 1

Some complaints alleged multiple types of conduct.

Investigation Outcomes

Investigations of harassment and discrimination complaints in 2023-2024 resulted in no finding of violation of the Policy on Discrimination and/or Harassment and **four** findings of violation of other related University policies. [Rights, Rules, Responsibilities 1.1.7](#) provides for a range of penalties from a warning to separation from the University for policy violations; however, the applicability and exact nature of the penalty may vary for faculty, staff, and students.

Although most investigations did not result in findings of policy violations, the University uses investigation-related data to identify opportunities to enhance training and promote equitable best practices. Such opportunities have included the development of learning sessions for managers on interrupting bias and fostering equitable decision-making, updates to University policies and processes on reasonable accommodations, enhancements to campus accessibility, and the application of medical accommodations and leaves of absence to the faculty promotion and tenure process.

Non-disciplinary Bias Reports

In 2023-2024, the University received **44** reported incidents of bias unrelated to the campus climate resulting from the Israel/Hamas conflict which were not appropriate for further investigation under University policy. For purposes of this count, duplicate reports of the same incident, especially from anonymous/unknown or non-affiliated individuals are aggregated and counted once.

The largest number of reported bias incidents involved allegations based on race, followed by reports of incidents involving gender identity/expression, and sexual orientation.

Reports of Bias	
Race	22
Gender Identity/Expression	7
Sexual Orientation	4
National Origin	3
Non-Protected Characteristics	3
Religion	3
Disability	3
Sex	2
Age	1
Retaliation	1

Some reports concerned bias incidents involving multiple types of protected characteristics.

In 2023-2024, reports of bias incidents that were unrelated to the Israel/Hamas war were brought against a variety of individuals, spanned several categories, and alleged incidents of varying circumstances.

Harassing interpersonal interactions comprised nearly **41%** of all such bias reports in 2023-2024. Students, faculty, and staff all were the subjects of these reports, but anonymous/unknown and non-affiliated third parties engaged in more incidents of harassing interpersonal interactions on campus grounds than any category of University-affiliated perpetrators.

Anonymous/unknown and third parties not affiliated with the University also committed more than half of all reported incidents of electronic/online harassment in this category. Overall, actors outside of the University community perpetrated **36%** of these reported bias incidents in 2023-2024.

Approximately **27%** of all bias reports in 2023-2024 in this category were brought against specific supervisors/managers, department/University leadership in general, and student organizations/clubs. These reports involved allegations of discriminatory decision-making, denial of accommodations, and denial of access; harassing or unfair treatment; and retaliation.

Nature of Bias Reports Based on Alleged Perpetrator	
Alleged Perpetrator	Nature of conduct alleged
Department/University	Discriminatory decision-making – 5 Unfair treatment – 2 Retaliation – 1
Supervisors/Managers	Unfair treatment – 3
Staff	Harassing interpersonal interactions – 5
Faculty	Electronic/Online harassment – 5 Harassing interpersonal interactions – 1 Unfair treatment – 1
Students	Electronic/Online harassment – 1 Harassing interpersonal interactions – 4
Student organizations/clubs	Discriminatory decision-making – 2
Anonymous/Unknown/Non-affiliated third parties	Electronic/Online harassment – 7 Harassing interpersonal interactions – 7 Offensive visual images/graffiti – 2

Some reports alleged multiple types of conduct.

Bias Incident Reporting Outcomes

The majority of bias incidents reported to the University do not meet the definitions of harassment or discrimination under the Policy on Discrimination and/or Harassment and are addressed through non-disciplinary approaches. See Bias Reporting & Response above for a description of non-disciplinary responses and resources.

Snapshot: Campus Climate Related to the Israel/Hamas War

In 2023-2024, there was a high volume of complaints (**97**) related to the Israel/Hamas war, almost all involving conduct or speech after October 7, 2023. These complaints, which related to views on both sides of the conflict, made up nearly **54%** of the overall 181 complaints during the year. However, it is difficult to compare these complaints with other bias complaints. Many complaints were made by individuals unaffiliated with the University and based on postings found on social media or other reports; and even within the campus community, many complaints were made by individuals who had not directly experienced the alleged conduct. Many complaints were made by a few, repeat complainants. In several cases, multiple complaints were made regarding the same conduct under the same set of facts and circumstances (for example, multiple complaints regarding one incident of anonymous, offensive imagery). For the purpose of this summary, multiple complaints alleging the same conduct under the same set of facts and circumstances are aggregated and counted as a single incident.

The Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity received **65** complaints alleging bias or harassing behavior targeting Jewish individuals, which comprised 33 incidents in the following categories:

- Chants and interpersonal interactions at demonstrations: 23 involving 5 incidents
- Offensive imagery (e.g., posters, fliers, graffiti): 21 involving 17 incidents
- Offensive electronic comments (e.g., social media, group chats, email): 15 involving 5 incidents
- Other interpersonal interactions: 6 involving 6 incidents

The office also received **32** complaints alleging biased or harassing behavior targeting individuals associated with the pro-Palestinian cause (including people of Palestinian, Arab, Muslim, and Jewish identities), which comprised 12 incidents in the following categories:

- Chants and interpersonal interactions at demonstrations: 15 involving 2 incidents
- Offensive imagery (e.g., posters, fliers, graffiti): 1 involving 1 incident
- Offensive electronic comments (e.g., social media, group chats, email): 11 involving 4 incidents
- Other interpersonal interactions: 5 involving 5 incidents

The subjects of the complaints related to the Israel/Hamas war included a variety of individual campus community members, student organizations, and external individuals and entities that are not affiliated with the University. All of the complaints related to the Israel/Hamas war and its impact on campus involved protected speech as defined by University policy. Regardless of the degree of jurisdiction over an actor or the presence of protected speech, the University takes seriously its obligation to maintain an inclusive community and avoid a hostile environment. In addition to assessing complaints individually and cumulatively for the existence of a hostile environment, University administrators implemented mitigation steps in 2023-2024 including, but not limited to:

- Conducted investigations of conduct that implicated policy violations (including investigations by the Department of Public Safety of vandalism and anonymous offensive conduct), revoked or curtailed certain campus privileges, and restricted access to campus spaces and networks, as appropriate
- Provided information, guidance, and support resources through individualized outreach messages and a new website, [Campus Resources for Difficult Times](#)
- Published a new [Protests and Free Expression](#) website to provide information and resources for planning peaceful protests and demonstrations that are consistent with University policies
- Issued appropriate [time/place/manner restrictions](#)
- Trained **more than 125** University administrators to serve as [Free Expression Facilitators](#)
- Through the Free Expression Facilitators program, supported freedom of expression at **more than 100** protests, demonstrations, and related events on campus
- Met with campus community members to discuss the impact of their protected speech on others and reinforce community expectations
- Offered informal conflict resolution strategies such as mediation and facilitated conversations
- Delivered educational programs and trainings, including multiple [PEN America](#) workshops on free expression and [Rose Castle Foundation](#) workshops on engaging through conflict and reconciliation across differences
- Delivered multiple educational programs and workshops on Jewish identity and antisemitism, Islamophobia, and religious pluralism
- Removed offensive postings from University-sponsored web platforms and responded to **nearly two dozen** incidents of anonymous graffiti, posters, fliers and other offensive visual material from campus physical spaces in a timely and effective manner
- Organized listening/conversation circles or other processing spaces
- Assisted individuals with concerns about doxing to protect their online identity and reduce the impacts of online harassment using internal and external mitigation resources, as appropriate
- Made multiple institutional statements regarding problematic speech or conduct to reaffirm institutional values and expectations for promoting a respectful community

ABOUT US

The Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity coordinates Princeton’s commitment to diversity, inclusion, and fair treatment of all members of our community—including undergraduate and graduate students, faculty members, postdoctoral fellows, staff and alumni. Our office facilitates Princeton’s efforts to build an inclusive culture; prevent and respond to bias, harassment, and discrimination; and promote equitable access for people with disabilities. In doing so, we oversee Princeton’s compliance with University policies and laws pertaining to discrimination and harassment (e.g., Title IV, Title VI and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act, Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination).

Our staff is composed of members of the Office of the Provost. The following individuals support our work on issues related to bias, harassment, and discrimination.



[Michele Minter](#)

Vice Provost for Institutional Equity and Diversity Title VI, Title VII, Title IX and ADA/Section 504 Coordinator



[Cheri Burgess](#)

Director for Institutional Equity and Equal Employment Opportunity



[Randy Hubert](#)

Director for Gender Equity and Title IX Administration



[Nicole Barkley-Jones](#)

Associate Director of Title IX Operations



[Felicia Edwards](#)

Assistant Director for Institutional Equity and Diversity



[Donna Maywar](#)

Assistant Director for Institutional Equity Compliance

