RESULTS OF
THE 2016 UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
FACULTY
CAMPUS CLIMATE SURVEY ON
DIVERSITY, EQUITY AND INCLUSION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

The University of Michigan is dedicated to cultivating a campus community that fosters constructive participation in a diverse, multicultural world. Our efforts build on a long history of supporting initiatives that foster an inclusive living, learning and working environment.

In 2016, U-M announced a universitywide strategic plan for building a more diverse, equitable and inclusive campus community. An important step toward reaching this goal is to develop a strong understanding of the student, faculty, and staff community's perspectives and experiences related to diversity, equity and inclusion on the campus in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

The **2016 U-M Faculty Campus Climate Survey on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion** explores the faculty perspective and experience related to these topics. The data collected in this study will be used in many ways: as baseline for understanding the present climate at U-M; to help inform current and future decisions about supporting a diverse, inclusive and vibrant campus community; and as a benchmark against which to measure change over time.

II.   EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The University of Michigan (U-M) conducted a random sample survey of 1,500 faculty, designed to adequately represent the approximately 6,700 faculty members employed as of September 1, 2016. The survey used a special two-phase design to better represent the full diversity of faculty and produced an overall response rate of 71%.

The survey captures information and perceptions that can be grouped into six key areas: Demographics, Climate, Institutional Commitment & Inclusive and Equitable Treatment, Departmental Norms, Intergroup Interactions and Discrimination.

<u>Demographics</u>

A key contribution of the survey is that as a result of its high response rate and sophisticated design, it provides more reliable estimates of the demographic composition of the faculty. Thus, we have more accurate estimates of the religious background, sexual orientation, disability status, veteran status, and the social class of our faculty. We also are able to collect new information about our faculty that we have never collected before such as the proportion of faculty who ethnically identify as Middle Eastern and North African.

The results of the survey indicate that the faculty at U-M is a robust mix of people with varying backgrounds and experiences.

The majority of faculty (69%) identify as white followed by Asian/Asian American, Hispanic/Latinx, African American/Black, a member of two or more racial groups, Other, Middle Eastern or North African, and Native American or Alaskan Native.

More than half of faculty (57%) identify their sex as male with 42% identifying their sex as female. Significant differences were found for tenure track faculty with more males in this group (65%) compared to females (35%).

Gender identity for faculty follows a similar pattern as sex with the addition of 1% of faculty identifying as transgender or gender non-conforming. Faculty also largely identify as heterosexual (93%) followed by gay or lesbian and bisexual.

Four percent of faculty report having a disability. Three percent of faculty are veterans.

A large portion of faculty identify as having no religious background (32%). That is followed by Christian, Catholic, Jewish, Hindu, Other, Buddhist and Muslim.

<u>Climate</u>

The majority (74%) of faculty are satisfied with the campus climate on the Ann Arbor campus. They also experience the DEI elements of the climate in positive ways.

However, faculty vary in the way they experience campus climate as a result of their social identities.

For example, Hispanic/Latinx faculty are the least satisfied with the campus climate among all other racial groups, followed by African American/Black faculty, then Other faculty. Those identifying as female, LGBTQ+, not born in the U.S. or age 41 or older also are less satisfied with the campus climate.

Among tenure track faculty, females and underrepresented minorities have less positive experiences on campus. Non-tenure-track underrepresented minority faculty also experience the campus climate in less positive ways than their majority counterparts.

Female faculty and underrepresented minority faculty also experience the DEI elements of the climate in less positive ways.

Institutional Commitment & Inclusive and Equitable Treatment

Faculty share modest agreement that U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI. Those identifying as tenure track, female, LGBTQ+, born in the U.S. or as an underrepresented minority are less likely to agree with this statement. African American/Black faculty, followed by Hispanic/Latinx faculty, are less likely than all other racial groups to agree that U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI.

When asked about feelings of being valued and a sense of belonging and thriving and growing at U-M, faculty agree that they are having these experiences.

Faculty who identified as female, LGBTQ+ or with a disability are less likely to report that they are valued and belong at U-M. With respect to race, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx and Other faculty are less likely to report that they are valued and belong at U-M than Asian/Asian American, and white faculty.

Also, faculty who identified as being non-tenure track, female, LGBTQ+, with a disability or age 41 or older are less likely to agree that they are thriving and growing at U-M. With respect to race, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx and Other faculty are less likely than Asian/Asian American and white faculty to report that they are thriving and growing at U-M.

Departmental Norms

When asked about feelings of being valued by their department, in general, faculty agree that their activities are valued by their department. There are few differences by social identity status with the exception that faculty who identify as LGBTQ+ and who were born in the U.S. are less like to report that their actions are valued by their department.

Overall, on average, faculty neither agree nor disagree that they are treated fairly by their department. Those identifying as female, LGBTQ+ or age 41 or older agree less with this idea.

Intergroup Interactions

A significant number of faculty have meaningful interactions with others who are different from them. Faculty had the greatest interactions with people of another national origin (85%) followed by race or ethnicity, sexual orientation, social class and those with different political opinions.

Discrimination

Approximately one in six U-M faculty report that they felt discriminated against in the past 12 months. Those identifying as female, LGBTQ+, with a disability, age 41 or older or tenure track are more likely to report feeling being discriminated against. With respect to race, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx and Other faculty are significantly more likely to feel discriminated against than Asian/Asian American and white faculty.

The social identity group differences in the likelihood of faculty reporting that the felt that they had been discriminated against at U-M in the past 12 months is striking. For instance:

- LGBTQ+ faculty are 199% more likely than heterosexual faculty.

- Female faculty are 130% more likely than male faculty.
- Faculty with a disability are 73% more likely than those without a disability.
- Faculty age 41 or older are 51% more likely than faculty 41 or younger.
- Tenure track faculty are 22% more likely than non-tenure track faculty.
- African American/Black (371%), Hispanic/Latinx (246%), Other faculty (333%), and Asian/Asian American faculty are 49% more likely than white faculty to report experiencing discrimination.

Faculty were asked the frequency in which they experienced several forms of discrimination. Sex (20%) is the most frequently reported form of discriminatory event that faculty reported experiencing in the past 12 months. That is followed by racial identity, national origin, political orientation, social class, disability and sexual orientation.

The survey also examined the frequency in which different social identity groups report experiencing discriminatory events related to that identity group. These results indicate that significant portions of U-M faculty report experiencing at least one discriminatory event in the past 12 months related to their specific identity group. For instance, in the past 12 months, the percent of each group that reported experiencing at least one discriminatory event related to their identity:

- 41% of female faculty.
- 23% of faculty not born in the U.S.
- 28% LGBTQ+ faculty.
- 25% of faculty with a disability.
- 40% of underrepresented minority faculty.
- 24% of Asian/Asian American faculty.

Overall, the report finds that faculty vary across a number of different social identities. The majority of faculty on campus are tenure-track though there is a sizeable number of faculty in non-tenure track positions. Faculty differ with respect to tenure-track and non-tenure track on a variety of demographic dimensions (such as the fact that tenure-track faculty tend to be slightly older and more likely to be male), but do not differ in others such as racial composition and national origin.

Overall, faculty report being satisfied with the climate at the U-M and feel the institution is committed to diversity, equity, and inclusion. They also feel that they belong, grow, and thrive at the university. In general, faculty report that they interact in meaningful ways across a variety of social identities.

However, these positive experiences with the U-M campus are not equally distributed across all faculty. While there are instances where no group differences exist, in general, members of traditionally marginalized groups across race, sex, sexual orientation, age, ability status, and national origin experience the campus less positively than faculty from traditionally majority groups. Seventeen percent of all faculty report feeling as though they had been discriminated against in some form within the past year. Again, those faculty from traditionally marginalized groups are much more likely to report feeling that they had been discriminated against than members of traditionally majority groups. This pattern of finding also holds when looking at faculty reports of experiencing specific discriminatory events across a number of social identity categories.

Together the findings clearly reinforce the need for a systematic institutional effort to address issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion if all members of the U-M faculty are to experience the same positive experiences that are enjoyed by the majority of faculty. In many ways, the findings presage specific initiatives and efforts that have been proposed by the current DEI strategic plans. For instance, U-M's efforts to better coordinate and create greater awareness around the institution's bias response resource

are directly relevant to the findings of reports of experiencing discriminatory incidents by faculty. Ongoing efforts to make campus facilities more accessible to all also address some of the differential experiences that were reported by faculty with disabilities and members of the LGBTQ+ communities. Current DEI plan initiatives such as including DEI contributions into the faculty annual review process, the establishment of the Distinguished Diversity and Social Transformation Professorships and Distinguished Diversity Career Scholars award, as well as initiatives that are designed to diversify the faculty are also implicated in the present findings. In addition, the university is sponsoring a series of events focusing on the issue of free speech with participants from a variety of perspectives in an effort to encourage greater productive interactions across different political orientations and ideologies.

In conclusion, the present report utilizes high-quality data from a campuswide climate survey to obtain an empirical assessment of faculty perceptions of the U-M Ann Arbor campus and their experiences on it. These data provide several benefits to the U-M community. First, the data provide improved estimates of the composition of faculty on several variables, including religion, disability status, and Middle Eastern/North African (MENA) racial/ethnic group membership. The data also provide a baseline assessment of where we are as a community as well as a benchmark by which to measure the university's progress over the five-year DEI planning progress. In addition, the data produced by the campuswide survey will provide a rich reservoir of information that will be used by the entire U-M community for a variety of reasons. The results presented here only scratch the surface with respect to what questions may be asked and information that can be gleaned from the data set. We are committed to providing the U-M community with as broad access to the data as possible while also making sure that we protect the anonymity of individual respondents. Consistent with the spirit of the DEI planning process, the data is not simply a resource for the administration, but instead is to be used by the entire U-M community.

Set forth below is a more detailed discussion of the survey design and methodology, survey response, including the responses to questions about (1) demographic background, (2) overall campus climate/environment experienced at U-M, (3) institutional commitment and inclusion at U-M, (4) departmental norms (5) interactions with individuals from other backgrounds and (6) experience with discrimination.

For more information about the U-M Climate Survey on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, including a copy of the survey instrument, please go to http://diversity.umich.edu/strategic-plan/climate-survey/.

a.   SAMPLE DESIGN

Given the large faculty population at the University of Michigan, this study used a sample survey approach rather than a census of all faculty. A carefully selected sample, with randomization, allows researchers to make scientifically based inferences to the population as a whole. The sample survey approach also allows researchers to focus finite research resources on successfully contacting and encouraging the participation of the broadest, most inclusive, most representative group of faculty.

b.   SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The U-M DEI survey was developed via a collaboration between the University of Michigan (U-M) Office of the Provost, U-M's Survey Research Center (SRC) and SoundRocket, all located in Ann Arbor, Michigan. The survey design process originated when U-M decided to implement a study to assess the current campus climate with respect to diversity, equity and inclusion; this survey is part of a five-year comprehensive plan that focuses on efforts to strengthen and foster these principles in and around the campus community. It should be noted that the Office of the Provost sought input from committees of students, faculty and staff, which was used to help develop the questions included in the survey.

The survey was designed as a self-administered, highly interactive, web-based survey that would take less than 15 minutes to complete on average. The survey structure was comprised of four sections:

Consent
- At the start of the survey, all respondents were provided with a Survey Information page, and were asked to click "Next" if they agreed to what was described. This page served as an informed consent to participate.
- The consent form included information about where faculty could seek assistance if they had questions or if they experienced issues relating to diversity, equity and/or inclusion while working at U-M Ann Arbor.

Demographics – Survey Part I
- Questions were asked to capture the demographics of each participant, including: gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, religious affiliation, disability, military status, and citizenship. Faculty were also asked in what department and school they work and how long they have been employed at the university. These variables were used in the primary analysis, as well as to better understand any non-response bias that emerged as a result of some respondents not participating.

Campus Climate – Survey Part II
- Questions were asked about feelings of safety on campus; perceptions of U-M overall on various aspects related to diversity, equity and inclusion; individual experiences as a faculty member at U-M; any discriminatory events personally experienced at U-M; and other ratings about how U-M is doing in terms of diversity, equity and inclusion.

Thank You & Incentive Related Questions
- At the conclusion of the survey, respondents were thanked for their time and participation and passed to an "incentive" decision question. They were reminded of the $15 cash incentive and asked to indicate whether they would like to receive the incentive, donate it to the United Way, or neither receive nor donate. All data relating to incentives, including contact information for where to mail incentives (where appropriate) were collected in a separate survey instrument to ensure that contact information was not retained in the same database as survey data.

Due to the nature of the survey, respondents were not required to answer any questions other than the consent question; if a potential respondent did not consent to participate, they were not shown subsequent survey questions. Because participants could choose to skip any questions they did not wish to answer, the number of

respondents in data tables varies by question. For the full questionnaire administered to faculty please see the Methods Appendix.

c. STUDY METHODOLOGY

The U-M Campus Climate Survey on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (U-M DEI) was administered as an online web survey; the survey was optimized so that it could be completed successfully on mobile devices and tablets, as well as on desktop or laptop computers. Mobile optimization was implemented dynamically during the survey if the system detected that a mobile-sized screen was in use.

The study design employed scientific sampling techniques applied to sample frames (population of all U-M Ann Arbor faculty) to generate simple random samples.

Population Sample Frame and Sample Selection
The eligible population for this survey included all Faculty employed as of September 1, 2016. The Human Resources Department provided the sample frame (approximately 6,700 faculty).

Using the sample frame, the U-M Survey Research Center selected a representative random sample of faculty with an over sampling of Native American/Alaskan Native, African American/Black and Hispanic/Latinx faculty. The final sample comprised 1,500 faculty. This scientific sample was designed to adequately represent all current U-M faculty. As a quality check, the sample selected was compared against the sample frame and the population of faculty on available demographic characteristics.

Data Collection
The overall data collection design protocol for faculty was:

- A USPS mailed pre-notification letter sent to each selected faculty member, inviting them to participate in a web-based survey. Any faculty member lacking an adequate USPS mailing address received an email pre-notification letter.
- An email invitation to participate in the web-based survey.
- A series of four reminders to participate in the web-based survey.
- A Second Phase sample selection of n=525 non-responders designed to adjust for nonresponse differences.
- A Second Phase mail survey effort that included mailing: a survey packet (including a $2 bill, paper and pencil survey, business reply return envelope, and invitation to participate letter); a reminder postcard; and a replacement survey packet (with no $2 bill).
- All participating faculty received a $15 incentive, mailed to an address they provide, after the completion of the study. Additionally, a random drawing for one of 10 $100 gift cards was administered among those selected to participate in the overall study.

Responsive Survey Design
As noted, in addition to the initial contact strategies (i.e. mailed pre-notification with email invitations and reminders), the study employed a responsive survey design to minimize non-response and reduce potential for non-response bias by targeting demographic groups who are less likely to respond to initial requests. This effort was designed to maximize data quality.

After the standard contact and incentive protocol was administered (Phase I), a random sample of 525 faculty non-responders were selected to be included in a "Phase II" responsive design. For the Phase II design, faculty were contacted via special mail survey effort. The initial mailing included a packet with an invitation to participate, a $2 bill as a token of appreciation, paper and pencil survey instrument, and a business reply return envelope. Those faculty in the Phase II sample who did not respond to this mailing then received a reminder postcard. Faculty selected for Phase II who still did not respond were mailed a replacement survey packet, this time with no $2 bill.

The Phase II cases were added to the final data set and weighted in proportion to their likelihood of selection for the Phase II protocol.

Incentives

As previously stated, all participants who responded to – and completed – the survey were eligible to receive $15 cash along with a thank you letter (mailed in early February 2017). Participants could elect to donate the incentive to the United Way or to neither receive nor donate the cash.

A random drawing for one of ten $100 gift cards was an additional incentive for everyone *selected* to participate in the overall study (students, faculty, staff): Every person in the scientific sample, regardless of whether they completed the survey, was eligible to win a gift card.

Non-responders selected into Phase II of the study who received a mail survey also received a $2 bill in their initial USPS mailed survey packet. (Replacement mail surveys did _not_ include the $2 incentive.)

Response Rates

Response rates were monitored during data collection, and were used to help target specific efforts in the responsive design stage of the study. Response rates are useful to measure the potential for nonresponse bias – however, they do not specifically identify a bias.

We use the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) standard response rates[1] in the calculation of all response rates in this report. Specifically, the response rates presented in this report utilize a weighted version of AAPOR's Response Rate #2 (RR02), as described in the AAPOR Standard Definitions guide.

Table 1. Response Rate and Completion Time	
Weighted Final Response Rate (AAPOR RR02)	70.7%
Mean Completion Time	13.26 minutes

d. POST-SURVEY ADJUSTMENT AND WEIGHTING

Statistical weighting was performed to ensure that the data based on this sample correctly represent the entire population of faculty. The original sample design included oversampling of Native American/Alaskan Natives, African American/Blacks and Hispanic Americans, who were each selected at higher rates than those of other racial/ethnic groups. During data collection, a subsample of non-responding cases was selected for additional follow-up including telephone contact attempts from interviewers.

After data collection was complete, information on the sampling frame and from population counts provided by U-M was used to develop additional weighting adjustment factors. First, using characteristics on the sampling frame (age, sex, race, ethnicity, U-M term, etc.), non-response adjustment factors were developed that weight the respondents (weighted using the selection weight) to match the sample on the selected characteristics. The product of the selection weight and these non-response adjustment factors then become a non-response-adjusted selection weight.

Second, using the population counts supplied by U-M, the characteristics of the respondents (weighted using the nonresponse-adjusted selection weights) were weighted to match those of the population. This technique, known as post-stratification, reduces sampling error and may reduce any bias related to the factors used in the post-stratification. The cross-classification of several characteristics were matched to the distribution of these characteristics for the respondents to those of the population.

---

[1] The American Association for Public Opinion Research. 2016. Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys. 9th edition. AAPOR.

These adjustments assume that there are no differences in the survey measures between responders and non-responders after controlling for the characteristics used in the nonresponse modeling and post-stratification. Under this assumption, the weighting adjustments allow analysts to make inferences regarding the entire populations. These estimates have an associated sampling error. This error is expressed as "95% confidence limits," which indicate that over repeated sampling, an estimate within this interval would occur 95 out of 100 times.

IV.   SURVEY RESPONDENTS

The first results we present describe the characteristics of the target population of our survey. Throughout the report we provide the population estimates of U-M faculty based upon responses to the survey itself. **Each section of the report displays percentages of the faculty population for each item in the survey and 95% Confidence Limits (CL).** As explained in our methodological discussion (section III above), because our estimates for the entire population of U-M faculty are based on a sample of the faculty, each statistic we report has some associated sampling variability and the CL describes the size of that sampling variability.

When comparing responses within a table, these 95% Confidence Limits (CL) can be used to quickly and informally determine if two different numbers reflect a statistically significant difference. If the two CLs from the two different numbers **overlap**, then the difference between them **is not statistically significant at the 95% level** (or p< .05). If the two CL from the two different numbers **do not overlap**, then the difference between them **is statistically significant at the 95% level** (or p< .05). We note that these differences should be considered informal and conservative, and formal testing will be needed to identify significant differences. For more on this issue, see Schenker and Gentleman (2001).

Demographics

Faculty at the University of Michigan are quite heterogeneous with respect to their duties, responsibilities, activities, and experiences. This variation is a function of disciplinary differences as well as differences in the nature of the scholarship and teaching required. In the present report, faculty are divided into tenure-track and non-tenure track in attempt to account for some of this variation. Tenure-track faculty consist of all faculty who are in a rank in which tenure may be granted regardless of whether or not tenure has yet been achieved by the faculty member.

The majority of the faculty are currently on tenure track.

Table 2. Respondent's Appointment on the Tenure Track	
	Mean (Confidence Limits)
Tenure Track	**55.8** (52.3, 59.3)
Non-Tenure Track	**44.2** (40.7, 47.8)

Overall, the majority of the faculty report being a part of the instructional track, followed by the clinical track, and then the research track. The overwhelming majority of the tenure track faculty report being instructional track, while the plurality of the non-tenure track faculty (nearly 50%) are on the clinical track.

Table 3. My primary appointment is on the following track, by Tenure Track Status

	Percentage of U-M Faculty (Confidence Limits)		
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total Faculty
Instructional Track	**88.8** (85.4, 92.2)	**27.6** (23.1, 32.0)	**54.1** (50.4, 57.8)
Research Track	**11.1** (7.8, 14.5)	**23.0** (18.9, 27.1)	**17.9** (15.1, 20.6)
Clinical Track	**N/A**	**49.5** (44.5, 54.5)	**28.0** (24.6, 31.5)

The following tables provide a breakdown of faculty positions by tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty separately for instructional, research, and clinical track. Of the instructional faculty, the largest group of faculty are at the rank of Professor with the remaining faculty split relatively evenly between the Assistant and Associate Professor ranks. The overwhelming majority of non-tenure track faculty are lecturers and instructors. Lecturers and instructors make-up approximately one-fourth of the total faculty (combining tenure track and non-tenure track).

Table 4. For Instructional Faculty Only: What is your current rank?, by Tenure Track Status			
	Percentage of U-M Faculty (Confidence Limits)		
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total Faculty
Lecturer/Instructor	N/A	**87.7** (81.5, 93.9)	**25.1** (20.7, 29.6)
Assistant Professor	**24.3** (19.2, 29.3)	**4.1** (0.5, 7.8)	**18.5** (14.6, 22.4)
Associate Professor	**27.3** (22.0, 32.5)	**4.1** (0.5, 7.7)	**20.6** (16.6, 24.7)
Professor	**48.4** (42.5, 54.4)	**4.0** (0.2, 7.9)	**35.7** (30.9, 40.5)

Table 5. Research Faculty Only: What is your current rank?, by Tenure Track Status			
	Percentage of U-M Faculty (Confidence Limits)		
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total Faculty
Research Investigator	N/A	**30.5** (21.0, 40.0)	**22.2** (14.9, 29.5)
Research Scientist (any rank)	N/A	**35.7** (26.0, 45.5)	**26.0** (18.5, 33.5)
Research Assistant Professor	**24.1** (10.4, 37.8)	**13.9** (6.9, 21.0)	**16.7** (10.4, 23.0)
Research Associate Professor	**36.1** (20.0, 52.3)	**10.0** (3.8, 16.2)	**17.1** (10.6, 23.7)
Research Professor	**39.8** (23.2, 56.3)	**9.9** (3.5, 16.2)	**18.0** (11.2, 24.8)

Table 6. Clinical Faculty Only: What is your current rank?, by Tenure Track Status			
	Percentage of U-M Faculty (Confidence Limits)		
	Tenure Track	**Non-Tenure Track**	**Total Faculty**
Lecturer/Instructor	N/A	**27.5** (20.9, 34.2)	**27.6** (21.0, 34.2)
Assistant Professor	N/A	**43.3** (36.0, 50.7)	**43.3** (36.0, 50.6)
Associate Professor	N/A	**17.1** (11.5, 22.7)	**17.1** (11.5, 22.7)
Professor	N/A	**12.1** (7.2, 16.9)	**12.0** (7.2, 16.9)

The mean age of faculty in the survey is 48 years of age with non-tenure track faculty being statistically significantly younger than tenure-track faculty.

Table 7. What is your current age (in years)?	
	Mean
Total Faculty	**48.4** (47.5, 49.2)
Tenure Track	**50.7** (49.4, 52.0)
Non-Tenure Track	**46.5** (45.3, 47.7)

With regard to sex, overall, there are significantly more male faculty than female. There is a statistically significant sex difference for tenure-track faculty, but no significant sex difference for non-tenure-track faculty.

Table 8. What is your current sex?, by Tenure Track Status			
	Percentage of U-M Faculty (Confidence Limits)		
	Tenure Track	**Non-Tenure Track**	**Total Faculty**
Male	**64.8** (59.9, 69.8)	**51.4** (46.6, 56.3)	**57.3** (53.8, 60.8)
Female	**34.7** (29.7, 39.6)	**48.1** (43.3, 53.0)	**42.2** (38.7, 45.7)
Preferred Response not Listed	**0.5** (0.0, 1.3)	**0.4** (0.0 1.0)	**0.5** (0.01, 1.0)

With respect to gender/gender identity, 57% of faculty identify as Man, 42% identified as Woman, and approximately 1% identify as Transgender or Gender Non-Conforming. There is a statistically significantly greater proportion of Tenure-track faculty who identify as Man than non-tenure track faculty. Also, tenure-track faculty are less likely to identify as Woman than non-tenure track faculty.

Table 9. What is your gender/gender identity?[2], by Tenure Track Status			
	Percentage of U-M Faculty (Confidence Limits)		
	Tenure Track	**Non-Tenure Track**	**Total Faculty**
Man	**64.4** (59.4, 69.3)	**51.0** (46.1, 55.8)	**56.9** (53.4, 60.44)
Woman	**34.7** (29.8, 39.6)	**48.1** (43.3, 53.0)	**42.1** (38.6, 45.6)
Transgender/Gender Non-Conforming	**1.0** (0.0, 1.9)	**0.9** (0.0, 1.8)	**0.9** (0.3, 1.6)

With respect to sexual orientation, approximately 93% of faculty report being heterosexual, 3% report being gay/lesbian, and 1% bisexual, with no significant differences between tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty.

Table 10. What is your sexual orientation?, by Tenure Track Status			
	Percentage of U-M Faculty (Confidence Limits)		
	Tenure Track	**Non-Tenure Track**	**Total Faculty**
Heterosexual	**92.7** (90.1, 95.3)	**93.8** (91.4, 96.2)	**93.3** (91.6, 95.1)
Bisexual	**1.1** (0.0, 2.3)	**1.6** (0.3, 2.8)	**1.4** (0.5, 2.2)
Gay/Lesbian	**3.8** (1.9, 5.6)	**2.8** (1.2, 4.4)	**3.2** (2.0, 4.4)
Queer	**0.9** (0.0, 1.9)	**0.5** (0.0, 1.1)	**0.7** (0.1, 1.2)
Questioning	**0.0** (0.0, 0.1)	**0.3** (0.0, 0.9)	**0.2** (0.0, 0.5)
Asexual	0	0	0
Preferred Response Not Listed [write in]	**0.8** (0.0, 1.6)	**0.8** (0.0, 1.5)	**0.8** (0.2, 1.3)
More Than One Selection	**0.7** (0.0, 1.6)	**0.4** (0.0, 0.9)	**0.5** (0.0, 1.00)

---

[2] Fewer than 10 respondents chose the Transgender/Gender Non-Conforming & Preferred Response Not Listed options. Those two categories are pooled into a single group here.

Racially 69% of the overall faculty identify as White, 18% as Asian/Asian American, 5% as Hispanic/Latinx, 3% as African American/Black, 3% as a member of 2 or more racial groups, 1% as Middle Eastern/North African, less than 1% as Native American/Alaskan Native, and approximately 2% as Other with no significant differences in proportions by tenure-track or non-tenure-track faculty.

Table 11. Please indicate the racial or ethnic groups with which you identify, by Tenure Track Status			
	Percentage of U-M Faculty (Confidence Limits)		
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total Faculty
African American/Black	**3.8** (2.9, 4.8)	**3.0** (2.3, 3.8)	**3.4** (2.8, 4.0)
Asian/ Asian American	**16.8** (12.7, 21.0)	**18.0** (14.3, 21.8)	**17.5** (14.7, 20.3)
Hispanic/Latinx	**4.9** (3.5, 6.3)	**4.4** (3.3, 5.5)	**4.6** (3.7, 5.5)
Middle Eastern/North African	**0.7** (0.0, 1.5)	**1.3** (0.1, 2.4)	**1.0** (0.2, 1.8)
Native American/Alaskan Native	**0.3** (0.0, 0.5)	0	**0.1** (0.0, 0.2)
White	**68.7** (64.0, 73.4)	**68.7** (64.3, 73.0)	**68.7** (65.5, 71.9)
Other (Please specify): [write in]	**0.8** (0.0, 1.7)	**2.6** (1.0, 4.1)	**1.8** (0.8, 2.7)
More Than One Selection	**4.1** (2.0, 6.1)	**2.1** (0.7, 3.6)	**3.0** (1.8, 4.2)

In some instances, the sample sizes for individual racial ethnic categories become too small to make reliable bivariate comparisons. In those instances, we create a condensed category in which faculty are divided into three categories: White, Asian/Asian American, and Underrepresented. The Underrepresented category includes all other categories.

Table 12. Please indicate the racial or ethnic groups with which you identify – condensed categorization			
	Percentage of U-M Faculty (Confidence Limits)		
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total Faculty
White	**68.7** (64.0, 73.4)	**68.7** (64.3, 73.0)	**68.7** (65.5, 71.9)
Asian/Asian American	**16.8** (12.7, 21.0)	**18.0** (14.3, 21.8)	**17.5** (14.7, 20.3)
Underrepresented	**14.5** (11.6, 17.4)	**13.3** (10.6, 16.0)	**13.8** (11.8, 15.8)

Approximately two-thirds of the faculty report being born in the United States. There are no differences in the proportion born in the U.S. between tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty.

Table 13. Were you born in the United States?, by Tenure Track Status			
	Percentage of U-M Faculty (Confidence Limits)		
	Tenure Track	**Non-Tenure Track**	**Total Faculty**
No	**31.8** (26.9, 36.7)	**31.5** (27.1, 36.0)	**31.7** (28.4, 35.0)
Yes	**68.2** (63.3, 73.1)	**68.5** (64.0, 72.9)	**68.3** (65.0, 71.6)

Table 14. Please indicate your generation status, by Tenure Track Status			
	Percentage of U-M Faculty (Confidence Limits)		
	Tenure Track	**Non-Tenure Track**	**Total Faculty**
All of my grandparents and both of my parents were born in the United States	**34.5** (29.5, 39.5)	**37.9** (33.1, 42.6)	**36.4** (32.9, 39.8)
Both of my parents were born in the United States	**22.7** (18.2, 27.2)	**16.6** (13.0, 20.2)	**19.3** (16.4, 22.1)
One of my parents was born in the United States	**6.0** (3.6, 8.5)	**8.2** (5.6, 10.9)	**7.3** (5.4, 9.1)
Neither of my parents were born in the United States	**36.8** (31.6, 41.9)	**37.3** (32.6, 42.0)	**37.1** (33.6, 40.5)

The faculty has a very pluralistic population with regard to religious beliefs. The variation in religious background for faculty do not differ across tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty.

Table 15. With what religious background, if any, do you most identify?, by Tenure Track Status			
	Percentage of U-M Faculty (Confidence Limits)		
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total Faculty
Agnostic	12.0 (8.5, 15.4)	7.1 (4.6, 9.5)	9.2 (7.1, 11.3)
Atheist	13.0 (9.4, 16.6)	12.3 (9.1, 15.5)	12.6 (10.2, 15.0)
Baptist	1.5 (0.5, 2.5)	1.2 (0.4, 1.9)	1.3 (0.7, 1.9)
Buddhist	1.9 (0.5, 3.4)	3.3 (1.5, 5.0)	2.7 (1.5, 3.8)
Catholic	14.9 (11.2, 18.5)	20.3 (16.4, 24.2)	17.9 (15.2, 20.6)
Christian: Non-Denominational	6.7 (4.1, 9.3)	7.3 (4.8, 9.7)	7.0 (5.2, 8.8)
Eastern Orthodox	2.2 (0.6, 3.9)	1.2 (0.2, 2.3)	1.7 (0.7, 2.6)
Episcopalian	3.9 (1.8, 5.9)	2.8 (1.2, 4.4)	3.3 (2.0, 4.5)
Hindu	3.4 (1.3, 5.5)	5.1 (2.9, 7.3)	4.3 (2.8, 5.9)
Muslim	0.7 (0.0, 1.5)	3.4 (1.5, 5.2)	2.2 (1.1, 3.3)
Jewish	11.6 (8.1, 15.1)	8.9 (6.0, 11.8)	10.1 (7.9, 12.3)
Lutheran	2.1 (0.6, 3.7)	1.9 (0.5, 3.2)	1.98 (0.9, 3.0)
Methodist	3.8 (1.7, 5.8)	1.5 (0.5, 2.6)	2.5 (1.4, 3.6)
Presbyterian	1.7 (0.3, 3.1)	4.0 (2.0, 6.0)	3.0 (1.7, 4.3)
Protestant: Non-Denominational	2.4 (0.7, 4.1)	2.3 (0.8, 3.7)	2.3 (1.2, 3.4)
Unitarian/ Universalist	1.3 (0.2, 2.4)	1.4 (0.4, 2.5)	1.4 (0.6, 2.2)
None	10.8 (7.4, 14.1)	9.5 (6.7, 12.3)	10.1 (7.9, 12.2)
Other Christian	3.0 (1.2, 4.9)	2.5 (1.0, 4.1)	2.7 (1.6, 3.9)
Other	3.3 (1.4, 5.2)	4.2 (2.3, 6.1)	3.8 (2.4, 5.1)

Overall, 3.5% of the faculty report that they have a disability. There are no statistically significant differences between tenure-track faculty and non-tenure track faculty in proportions of faculty with a disability.

Table 16. Do you have a disability?, by Tenure Track Status			
	Percentage of U-M Faculty (Confidence Limits)		
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total Faculty
Yes, I have a disability	**5.4** (3.0, 7.8)	**1.9** (0.7, 3.2)	**3.5** (2.2, 4.8)
No, I do not have a disability	**94.6** (92.2, 97.1)	**98.1** (96.8, 99.3)	**96.5** (95.2, 97.8)

Overall 3% of the faculty report that they have ever served in the U.S. military with no statistically significant differences between tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty.

Table 17. Have you ever served in the U.S. Armed Forces, Military Reserves, or National Guard?, by Tenure Track Status			
	Percentage of U-M Faculty (Confidence Limits)		
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total Faculty
Ever or currently serving	**2.0** (0.6, 3.4)	**4.1** (2.1, 6.1)	**3.2** (1.9, 4.5)
Never served	**98.0** (96.6, 99.5)	**95.9** (93.9, 97.9)	**96.8** (95.5, 98.1)

Overall, approximately 82% of the faculty report having earned a doctoral-level degree. Tenure track faculty are significantly more likely to have earned doctoral level degrees than non-tenure track faculty.

Table 18. What is the highest degree you have earned?, by Tenure Track Status			
	Percentage of U-M Faculty (Confidence Limits)		
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total Faculty
Master's degree or less	**4.2** (2.2, 6.2)	**20.1** (16.3, 23.9)	**13.0** (10.7, 15.4)
Ph.D.	**75.0** (70.4, 79.6)	**35.1** (30.5, 39.7)	**52.7** (49.2, 56.3)
Medical degree (M.D., D.O., DDS, DVM)	**15.7** (11.8, 19.6)	**39.5** (34.7, 44.3)	**29.0** (25.7, 32.3)
Other degree [write in]	**5.1** (2.8, 7.5)	**5.3** (3.1, 7.5)	**5.2** (3.6, 6.8)

a.   Satisfaction with Overall Campus Climate/Environment

The tables below describe U-M faculty responses to the following survey question on satisfaction:

How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the overall campus climate/environment that you have experienced at the University of Michigan within the past 12 months?

Very Dissatisfied; Dissatisfied; Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied; Satisfied; Very Satisfied

Overall 74% of faculty report being satisfied or very satisfied with the overall climate within the past 12 months. Tenure and non-tenure track faculty do not differ in their level of satisfaction with the overall climate.

Table 19. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	**Non-Tenure Track**	**Total**
Very Satisfied/Satisfied	**72.0** (67.3, 76.8)	**75.2** (70.9, 79.5)	**73.8** (70.6, 77.0)

Bivariate sex differences. There is a statistically significant sex difference in satisfaction with the overall climate for tenure-track faculty such that female faculty are less satisfied than male faculty. However, there is no statistically significant sex difference in satisfaction for non-tenure-track faculty.

Table 20. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Sex and Tenure Track Status				
	Tenure Track		**Non-Tenure Track**	
	Female	**Male**	**Female**	**Male**
Very Satisfied/Satisfied	**61.1** (52.4, 69.8)	**78.3** (72.8, 83.9)	**73.7** (67.5, 80.0)	**76.8** (70.8, 82.8)

Bivariate race differences. There are statistically significant race differences in satisfaction with the overall climate for tenure-track faculty such that underrepresented minority faculty report being less satisfied than White and Asian/Asian American faculty, and no statistically significant differences between White and Asian/Asian American tenure-track faculty.

Table 21. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Race and Tenure Track Status						
	Tenure Track			**Non-Tenure Track**		
	White	**Asian/ Asian American**	**Under-represented**[3]	**White**	**Asian/ Asian American**	**Under-represented**
Very Satisfied/Satisfied	**75.6** (69.8, 81.4)	**76.3** (64.1, 88.6)	**55.3** (44.6, 66.0)	**78.5** (73.3, 83.7)	**70.4** (59.0, 81.8)	**66.6** (56.7, 76.5)

---

[3] Includes all other racial/ ethnic identities throughout

Multivariate analysis of group differences. The multivariate analyses examined the relative impact of faculty status (tenure track vs. non-tenure track), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), Age (41+ vs. 41-) and race (Asian/Asian American, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx, Other, relative to White) on faculty satisfaction with the overall campus climate/environment. (see Table 78 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, pg. 42).

The results indicate that:

- There were no significant differences found between tenure vs. non-tenure track faculty.
- Female faculty are more likely than male faculty to report feeling neutral, unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied.
- LGBTQ+ faculty are more likely than heterosexual faculty to report feeling neutral, unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied.
- Faculty not born in the U.S. are more likely than faculty born in the U.S. to report feeling neutral, unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied.
- There are no significant differences found for faculty with disabilities compared to those with no disabilities.
- Faculty age 41+ are more likely than faculty age 41- to report feeling neutral, unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied.
- With respect to race, Hispanic/Latinx faculty are significantly more likely to report feeling neutral, unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied with the climate than all other racial categories, followed by African American/Black, and then Other faculty. Hispanic/Latinx, African American/Black, and Other faculty are more likely than White faculty to report feeling neutral, unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied with the climate.

b. PERCEPTIONS OF THE GENERAL CLIMATE AND THE CLIMATE RELATIVE TO DIVERSITY, EQUITY & INCLUSION (DEI)

The tables below describe U-M faculty responses to the following survey directions:

*For the next few questions, select one option between each set of adjectives that best represents how you would rate U-M based on **your direct experiences***:

Hostile	1	2	3	4	5	Friendly
Racist	1	2	3	4	5	Non-racist
Homogenous	1	2	3	4	5	Diverse
Disrespectful	1	2	3	4	5	Respectful
Contentious	1	2	3	4	5	Collegial
Sexist	1	2	3	4	5	Non-sexist
Individualistic	1	2	3	4	5	Collaborative
Competitive	1	2	3	4	5	Cooperative
Homophobic	1	2	3	4	5	Non-homophobic
Unsupportive	1	2	3	4	5	Supportive
Ageist	1	2	3	4	5	Non-ageist
Unwelcoming	1	2	3	4	5	Welcoming
Elitist	1	2	3	4	5	Non-elitist

The items described above were also used in an exploratory factor analysis that yielded two clear factors. The first factor we describe as "General Climate Elements" and includes items for hostile vs. friendly, disrespectful vs. respectful, contentious vs. collegial, individualistic vs. collaborative, competitive vs. cooperative, unsupportive vs. supportive, and unwelcoming vs. welcoming. The second factor we describe as "DEI Climate Elements" and includes items for racist vs. non-racist, homogeneous vs. diverse, sexist vs. non-sexist, homophobic vs. non-homophobic, and ageist vs. non-ageist. We constructed an index value for each factor and we provide means for those two index

values below. In both cases a perfect score of "5" would mean as positive as possible and a perfect score of "1" would mean as negative as possible.

Overall, faculty report experiencing the general elements of the climate in moderately positive ways (mean-3.8 out of 5). Tenure and non-tenure track faculty do not differ in how they view general elements of the climate at U-M. Faculty report experiencing the DEI elements of the climate in moderately positive ways (mean-3.8 out of 5). There are statistically significant differences between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty such that tenure-track faculty report experiencing DEI elements of the climate significantly less positively than non-tenure rack faculty (see Table 22).

Table 22. Key Dimensions: General Climate Elements and DEI Climate Elements and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	**Non-Tenure Track**	**Total**
General Climate Elements	**3.8** (3.7, 3.9)	**3.8** (3.8, 3.9)	**3.8** (3.8, 3.9)
DEI Climate Elements	**3.7** (3.6, 3.7)	**3.8** (3.8, 3.9)	**3.8** (3.7, 3.8)

Bivariate sex differences. There are no statistically significant sex differences for either tenure-track or non-tenure track faculty in how they view general elements of the climate at U-M. There are statistically significant sex differences for both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty in their view of the DEI elements of the climate at U-M. In both cases, female faculty report experiencing DEI elements of the climate less positively than male faculty.

Table 23. Key Dimensions: General Climate Elements and DEI Climate Elements and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Sex and Tenure Track Status				
	Tenure Track		**Non-Tenure Track**	
	Female	**Male**	**Female**	**Male**
General Climate Elements	**3.6** (3.5, 3.8)	**3.9** (3.8, 4.0)	**3.8** (3.7, 3.9)	**3.9** (3.8, 4.0)
DEI Climate Elements	**3.4** (3.3, 3.5)	**3.8** (3.7, 3.9)	**3.7** (3.6, 3.8)	**4.0** (3.9, 4.1)

Bivariate race differences (Table 24). For tenure-track faculty, underrepresented minority faculty report experiencing the general elements of the climate more negatively than both White and Asian/Asian American faculty, with no statistically significant difference between White and Asian/Asian American tenure-track faculty. Non-tenure track faculty do not differ with respect to race in their perceptions of the general elements of the climate. In the case of DEI climate elements, tenure-track faculty differ by race such that underrepresented minority faculty report experiencing DEI elements of the climate statistically significantly less positively than both Asian/Asian American and White faculty. Asian/Asian American and White faculty do not differ in their assessment of the DEI climate. In addition, underrepresented minority non-tenure track faculty report experiencing DEI elements of the climate less statistically significantly positively than White non-tenure track faculty.

Table 24. Key Dimensions: General Climate Elements and DEI Climate Elements and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Race and Tenure Track Status						
	Tenure Track			**Non-Tenure Track**		
	White	**Asian/ Asian American**	**Under-represented**[4]	**White**	**Asian/ Asian American**	**Under-represented**
General Climate Elements	**3.8** (3.7, 4.0)	**3.9** (3.7, 4.1)	**3.5** (3.4, 3.6)	**3.9** (3.8, 4.0)	**3.8** (3.6, 4.0)	**3.7** (3.6, 3.8)
DEI Climate Elements	**3.7** (3.6, 3.8)	**3.8** (3.6, 4.1)	**3.3** (3.2, 3.4)	**3.9** (3.8, 4.0)	**3.7** (3.6, 3.9)	**3.6** (3.5, 3.8)

---

[4] Includes all other racial/ ethnic identities throughout

Multivariate analysis of group differences. Multivariate analyses were used to examine the relative impact of faculty status (tenure track vs. non-tenure track), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), Age (41+ vs. 41-) and race (Asian/Asian American, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx, Other, relative to White) on faculty ratings of general and DEI climate elements. (see Table 79 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, pg. 43).

The results indicate that:

- Female faculty report less positive general and DEI climate ratings than male faculty.
- LGBTQ+ faculty report less positive general and DEI climate ratings than heterosexual faculty.
- Faculty over the age of 41 report less positive general climate ratings than faculty aged 41 or lower, but there is no difference in DEI climate ratings based on age.
- Non-Tenure Track faculty report more positive DEI climate ratings than Tenure Track faculty. However, there is no difference in general climate ratings based on tenure-track vs. non-tenure track faculty status.
- There are no differences in general or DEI climate perceptions based on native born status or disability status.
- African American/Black faculty report less positive general and DEI climate ratings than White faculty.
- Hispanic/Latinx faculty less positive general and DEI climate ratings than White faculty.
- Faculty who identify as Asian/Asian American or another racial/ethnic group did not differ from White faculty in their general or DEI climate perceptions.

c. PERCEPTIONS OF INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT & INCLUSIVE AND EQUITABLE TREATMENT AT U-M

The tables below describe U-M faculty responses to the following survey directions:

> *Considering your experiences over the past 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:*
>
> *Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Neither Agree nor Disagree; Agree; Strongly Agree*

The items described below were used in a confirmatory factor analysis for 3 factors, "institutional commitment", "valued and belonging" and "thriving and growth". The items composing each factor are as listed below:

Factor 1, Institutional Commitment:
- U-M has a strong commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- There is too much emphasis put on issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion here at U-M. (reverse-coded)
- U-M provides sufficient programs and resources to foster the success of a diverse faculty.

Factor 2, Valued and Belonging:
- I feel valued as an individual at U-M.
- I feel I belong at U-M.
- I have considered leaving U-M because I felt isolated or unwelcomed. (reverse-coded)
- I am treated with respect at U-M.
- I feel others don't value my opinions at U-M.. (reverse-coded)
- I have found one or more communities or groups where I feel I belong at U-M.

Factor 3, Thriving and Growth:

- U-M is a place where I am able to perform up to my full potential.
- I have opportunities at U-M for professional success that are similar to those of my colleagues.
- I have to work harder than others to be valued equally at U-M. (reverse-coded)
- My experience at U-M has had a positive influence on my professional growth.

We constructed an index value for each factor and we provide means for those three index values below. In each case a perfect score of "5" would mean as positive as possible (strongly agree) and a perfect score of "1" would mean as negative as possible (strongly disagree).

Institutional Commitment to DEI

Overall, faculty report modest agreement with the idea that the U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI (mean-3.3 out of 5). There are no significant differences between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty in their assessment of U-M's institutional commitment to DEI.

	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Institutional Commitment	**3.3** (3.2, 3.3)	**3.4** (3.3, 3.4)	**3.3** (3.3, 3.4)

Bivariate sex differences. There are significant sex differences for both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty. In both cases, female faculty report statistically significantly less agreement than male faculty with the statement that the U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI.

Table 25. Key Dimensions: Institutional Commitment and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Sex and Tenure Track Status

	Tenure Track		Non-Tenure Track	
	Female	**Male**	**Female**	**Male**
Institutional Commitment	**2.9** (2.8, 3.0)	**3.5** (3.4, 3.6)	**3.2** (3.1, 3.3)	**3.5** (3.4, 3.6)

Bivariate race differences. For both tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty, there are no statistically significant differences in their assessments of U-M commitment to DEI.

Table 26. Key Dimensions: Institutional Commitment and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Race and Tenure Track Status

	Tenure Track			Non-Tenure Track		
	White	**Asian/Asian American**	**Under-represented[5]**	**White**	**Asian/Asian American**	**Under-represented**
Institutional Commitment	**3.3** (3.2, 3.4)	**3.3** (3.1, 3.6)	**3.1** (2.9, 3.2)	**3.4** (3.3, 3.5)	**3.3** (3.2, 3.5)	**3.2** (3.1, 3.3)

Multivariate analysis of group differences. The multivariate analyses examined the relative impact of faculty status (tenure track vs. non-tenure track), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), Age (41+ vs. 41-) and race (Asian/Asian American, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx, Other, relative to White) on faculty's assessment of U-M's institutional commitment to DEI (see Table 80 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, pg. 44).

---

[5] Includes all other racial/ ethnic identities throughout

The results indicate that:

- Non-tenure track faculty were more likely than tenure track faculty to agree with the idea that the University of Michigan has an institutional commitment to DEI.
- Females were less likely than males to agree with the idea that the University of Michigan has an institutional commitment to DEI.
- LGBTQ+ faculty were less likely than heterosexual faculty to agree with the idea that the University of Michigan has an institutional commitment to DEI.
- Faculty not born in the U.S. were more likely than faculty born in the U.S. to agree with the idea that the University of Michigan has an institutional commitment to DEI.
- There were no significant differences found for disability status.
- There were no significant differences found for age.
- With respect to race, African American/Black faculty were less likely than all other racial groups to agree with the idea that the University of Michigan has an institutional commitment to DEI.
- Hispanic/Latinx faculty were less likely than all other racial groups (except African American/Blacks) to agree with the idea that the University of Michigan has an institutional commitment to DEI.
- Asian/Asian American faculty were less likely than Whites to agree with the idea that the University of Michigan has an institutional commitment to DEI.

Valued/Belonging

See above for description of how Valued/Belonging variable measure is constructed.

Faculty report, on average, that they agree with the idea that they are valued and have a sense of belonging at U-M (mean-3.9 out of 5). There are no significant differences between tenure-track and non-tenure-track.

	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Valued and Belonging	**3.9** (3.8, 3.9)	**3.9** (3.8, 3.9)	**3.9** (3.8, 3.9)

Bivariate sex differences. Tenure-track faculty did not differ significantly in their agreement with the idea that they are valued and have a sense of belonging at U-M. However, there is a significant sex difference non-tenure track faculty such that female non-tenure track faculty report agreeing less than male non-tenure track faculty with the idea that they are valued and have a sense of belonging at U-M.

Table 27. Key Dimensions: Valued/Belonging, and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Sex and Tenure Track Status				
	Tenure Track		Non-Tenure Track	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Valued and Belonging	**3.6** (3.5, 3.8)	**4.0** (3.9, 4.1)	**3.8** (3.7, 3.9)	**3.9** (3.9, 4.0)

Bivariate race differences (see Table 28). For tenure-track faculty, Underrepresented minority faculty report agreeing less with the idea that they are valued and have a sense of belonging at U-M than Asian/Asian American and White faculty. There are no differences between White and Asian/Asian American faculty. For non-tenure-track faculty, no significant race differences were found.

Table 28. Key Dimensions: Valued/Belonging and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Race and Tenure Track Status						
	Tenure Track			Non-Tenure Track		
	White	**Asian/Asian American**	**Under-represented[6]**	**White**	**Asian/Asian American**	**Under-represented**
Valued and Belonging	**4.0** (3.8, 4.1)	**3.9** (3.7, 4.1)	**3.5** (3.4, 3.6)	**4.0** (3.9, 4.0)	**3.8** (3.6, 3.9)	**3.7** (3.6, 3.9)

Multivariate analysis of group differences. The multivariate analyses examined the relative impact of faculty status (tenure track vs. non-tenure track), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), Age (41+ vs. 41-) and race (Asian/Asian American, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx, Other, relative to White) on faculty's agreement with the idea that they are valued and have a sense of belonging at U-M (see Table 80 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, pg. 44).

The results indicate that:
- Female faculty report significantly less agreement than male faculty with the idea that they are valued and have a sense of belonging at U-M.
- LGBTQ+ faculty report significantly less agreement than heterosexual faculty with the idea that they are valued and have a sense of belonging at U-M.
- There were no significant differences by native born status.
- Faculty with a disability report significantly less agreement than faculty without a disability with the idea that they are valued and have a sense of belonging at U-M
- There were no significant differences by age.
- There were no significant differences by faculty track.
- African American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx, and Other faculty report significantly less agreement than Asian/Asian American and White faculty with the idea that they are valued and have a sense of belonging at U-M. There were no other significant race differences.

Thriving and Growth

Overall, faculty report agreement with the idea that they are thriving and growing at the U-M (mean-3.8 out of 5). There are no statistically significant differences between tenure-track and non-tenure-track.

	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Thriving and Growth	**3.8** (3.7, 3.9)	**3.7** (3.7, 3.8)	**3.8** (3.7, 3.8)

---

[6] Includes all other racial/ ethnic identities throughout

Bivariate sex differences. For tenure-track faculty, female faculty report agreeing less than male faculty with the idea that they are thriving and growing at U-M. Non-tenure track faculty did not differ by sex.

Table 29. Key Dimensions: Thriving/Growth and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Sex and Tenure Track Status				
	Tenure Track		**Non-Tenure Track**	
	Female	**Male**	**Female**	**Male**
Thriving and Growth	**3.5** (3.4, 3.6)	**4.0** (3.9, 4.1)	**3.6** (3.5, 3.7)	**3.8** (3.7, 3.9)

Bivariate race differences (see Table 30). For both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty, White faculty report statistically significantly greater agreement than Underrepresented minority faculty with the idea that they are thriving and growing while at U-M. in both instances, White and Asian/Asian American faculty also do not differ statistically.

Table 30. Key Dimensions: Thriving/Growth and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Race and Tenure Track Status						
	Tenure Track			**Non-Tenure Track**		
	White	**Asian/Asian American**	**Under-represented**[7]	**White**	**Asian/Asian American**	**Under-represented**
Thriving and Growth	**3.9** (3.8, 4.0)	**3.7** (3.5, 4.0)	**3.5** (3.3, 3.6)	**3.8** (3.7, 3.9)	**3.5** (3.3, 3.7)	**3.5** (3.4, 3.6)

Multivariate analysis of group differences. The multivariate analyses examined the relative impact of faculty status (tenure track vs. non-tenure track), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), Age (41+ vs. 41-) and race (Asian/Asian American, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx, Other, relative to White) on faculty's agreement with the idea that they are thriving and growing at U-M (see Table 80 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, pg. 44).

The results indicate that when asked if they are thriving and growing at U-M:

- Female faculty report significantly less agreement with the statement than male faculty.
- LGBTQ+ faculty report significantly less agreement than heterosexual faculty.
- There were no significant differences by native born and non-native status.
- Faculty with a disability report significantly less agreement than faculty without a disability.
- Faculty over 41 years of age report significantly less agreement than faculty 41 years or younger.
- Non-tenure-track faculty report significantly less agreement than tenure-track faculty.
- White faculty report significantly greater agreement than Asian/Asian American, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx and Other faculty. Asian/Asian American faculty report significantly greater agreement than African American/Black faculty with the idea that they are thriving and growing sense of belonging at U-M. There were no other significant race differences.

---

[7] Includes all other racial/ ethnic identities throughout

d. Departmental Norms

Valued by the Department

The tables below describe faculty's responses to the following survey directions:

> *Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:*
>
> *Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Neither Agree nor Disagree; Agree; Strongly Agree; N/A*

In order to assess faculty's perception of how they are valued with in their department, an index was created that was comprised of responses to six survey statements on departmental value. The e index was found to be reliable (α = .84). The items used in this index are listed below:

I am valued in my department/unit for my...
- Teaching
- Research/scholarship/creativity
- Service contributions
- Mentoring of student
- Mentoring of faculty
- Clinical practice

We provide means for this index below. In each case a perfect score of "5" would mean as positive as possible (strongly agree) and a perfect score of "1" would mean as negative as possible (strongly disagree).

On average, faculty report that they agree with the idea that they are valued by their department, with no statistically significant differences between tenure-track and non-tenure track (see Table 31).

Table 31. Department Value Index and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	**Non-Tenure Track**	**Total**
Department Value Index	**4.1** (4.0, 4.2)	**4.2** (4.2, 4.3)	**4.2** (4.1, 4.2)

Bivariate sex differences (see Table 32). For both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty, there were no sex statistically significant differences related to faculty agreement with the idea that they are valued by their department.

Table 32. Department Value Index and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Sex and Tenure Track Status				
	Tenure Track		**Non-Tenure Track**	
	Female	**Male**	**Female**	**Male**
Department Value Index	**4.0** (3.9, 4.1)	**4.0** (3.9, 4.1)	**4.0** (3.9, 4.1)	**4.2** (4.1, 4.3)

Bivariate race differences (see Table 33). For both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty, there were no statistically significant race differences related to faculty agreement with the idea that they are valued by their department.

Table 33. Department Value Index and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Race and Tenure Track Status						
	Tenure Track			Non-Tenure Track		
	White	Asian/ Asian American	Under-represented[8]	White	Asian/ Asian American	Under-represented
Department Value Index	**4.2** (4.1, 4.3)	**4.1** (3.9, 4.4)	**4.0** (3.9, 4.1)	**4.2** (4.1, 4.3)	**4.2** (4.0, 4.4)	**4.2** (4.1, 4.3)

Multivariate analysis of group differences. The multivariate analyses examined the relative impact of faculty status (tenure track vs. non-tenure track), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), Age (41+ vs. 41-) and race (Asian/Asian American, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx, Other, relative to White) on faculty's agreement with the idea that they are valued by their department (see Table 81 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, pg. 45).

The results indicate that:

- LGBTQ+ faculty report significantly less agreement than heterosexual faculty with the idea that they are valued by their department.
- Faculty born in the U.S. report significantly less agreement than faculty born outside of the U.S. with the idea that they are valued by their department.
- There were no significant differences by sex, ability status, age, faculty track or race.

Fair and Equitable Departmental Expectations

The tables below describe faculty responses to the following survey directions:

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Neither Agree nor Disagree; Agree; Strongly Agree

In order to assess faculty's perception of how fair and equitable their department is, an index was created that was comprised of responses to six survey statements. The index was found to be highly reliable (α = .89). The items used in this index are listed below:
- The teaching workload is fairly and equitably distributed in my department.
- There are fair and equitable expectations regarding research in my department.
- There are fair and equitable expectations regarding service in my department.
- There are fair and equitable processes for determining compensation in my department.
- Support is provided fairly and equitably in my department.
- Rewards for work performance are fairly and equitable distributed in my department.

We provide means for this index below. In each case a perfect score of "5" would mean as positive as possible (strongly agree) and a perfect score of "1" would mean as negative as possible (strongly disagree).

---

[8] Includes all other racial/ ethnic identities throughout

Faculty report, on average, that they are equivocal in their belief that their department holds fair and equitable expectations with regard to faculty. There are no significant differences between tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty (Table 34).

Table 34. Fair Treatment Index and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Tenure Track Status

	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Fair Treatment Index	**3.3** (3.2, 3.4)	**3.3** (3.2, 3.4)	**3.3** (3.2, 3.4)

Bivariate sex differences (see Table 35). Female tenure-track faculty report feeling less positive than male tenure-track faculty that their department holds fair and equitable expectations with regard to faculty. There are no statistically significant sex differences for non-tenure track faculty.

Table 35. Fair Treatment Index and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Sex and Tenure Track Status

	Tenure Track		Non-Tenure Track	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Fair Treatment Index	**3.1** (2.9, 3.2)	**3.5** (3.4, 3.6)	**3.3** (3.2, 3.3)	**3.4** (3.3, 3.5)

Bivariate race differences (see Table 36). For both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty, there are no statistically significant race differences in whether they felt that their department holds fair and equitable expectations with regard to faculty.

Table 36. Fair Treatment Index and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Race and Tenure Track Status

	Tenure Track			Non-Tenure Track		
	White	Asian/ Asian American	Under-represented[9]	White	Asian/ Asian American	Under-represented
Fair Treatment Index	3.3 (3.2, 3.4)	3.4 (3.1, 3.7)	3.3 (3.1, 3.4)	3.3 (3.2, 3.4)	3.4 (3.2, 3.6)	3.2 (3.1, 3.4)

Multivariate analysis of group differences. The multivariate analyses examined the relative impact of faculty status (tenure track vs. non-tenure track), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), Age (41+ vs. 41-) and race (Asian/Asian American, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx, Other, relative to White) on faculty feelings that their department holds fair and equitable expectations with regard to faculty (see Table 81 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, pg. 45).

The results indicate that:

- Female faculty report significantly less agreement than male faculty with the idea that their department holds fair and equitable expectations with regard to faculty.
- LGBTQ+ faculty report significantly less agreement than heterosexual faculty with the idea that their department holds fair and equitable expectations with regard to faculty.
- There were no significant differences by Native status, ability, faculty track or race.
- Faculty over 41 years of age report significantly less agreement than faculty 41 years or younger with the idea that their department holds fair and equitable expectations with regard to faculty.

---

[9] Includes all other racial/ ethnic identities throughout

Political Opinions

The tables below describe U-M faculty responses to the following survey question:

> *During the past 12 months at U-M, how often have you interacted in a **meaningful** way with people…*

> *…whose political opinions are different from your own*

> *Never; Seldom; Sometimes; Often; Very Often*

Approximately 43% faculty reported interacting in a meaningful way with people whose political opinions differ from their own in the past 12 months. Tenure-track faculty were less likely than non-tenure track to report having meaningful interactions with people with different political orientation (see Table 37).

Table 37. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	**Non-Tenure Track**	**Total**
Very Often/Often	**31.0** (25.9, 36.2)	**52.8** (47.6, 58.0)	**42.9** (39.1, 46.7)

Bivariate sex differences. There are significant sex differences for tenure-track but no sex differences for non-tenure track faculty. In the case of tenure-track faculty, female faculty are less likely than male faculty to report having meaningful interactions with individuals with different political orientations.

Table 38. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Sex and Tenure Track Status				
	Tenure Track		**Non-Tenure Track**	
	Female	**Male**	**Female**	**Male**
Very Often/Often	**19.9** (12.4, 27.3)	**37.1** (30.4, 43.9)	**49.1** (41.5, 56.7)	**55.9** (48.8, 63.1)

Bivariate race differences (see Table 39). For both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty, there were no statistically significant race differences in faculty's reports of having meaningful interactions with individuals with different political orientations.

Table 39. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Race and Tenure Track Status						
	Tenure Track			**Non-Tenure Track**		
	White	**Asian/Asian American**	**Under-represented**[10]	**White**	**Asian/Asian American**	**Under-represented**
Very Often/Often	**32.3** (25.8, 38.9)	**26.1** (12.9, 39.3)	**30.4** (20.9, 39.8)	**51.2** (44.6, 57.7)	**55.1** (42.2, 68.0)	**59.4** (48.5, 70.3)

---

[10] Includes all other racial/ ethnic identities throughout

Multivariate analysis of group differences. The multivariate analyses examined the relative impact of faculty status (tenure track vs. non-tenure track), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), Age (41+ vs. 41-) and race (Asian/Asian American, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx, Other, relative to White) on faculty's reports of having meaningful interactions with individuals with different political orientations (see Table 82 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, pg. 46).

The results indicate that:

- There was a significant sex difference with female faculty being less likely than male faculty to report having meaningful interactions with people whose political orientation is different from their own.
- Non-tenure track faculty were more likely than tenure-track faculty to report having meaningful interactions with people whose political orientation is different from their own.
- There were no significant differences by sexual orientation, native status, ability, age or race.

National Origin

*During the past 12 months at U-M, how often have you interacted in a **meaningful** way with people…*

…who are of a different nationality than your own

Never; Seldom; Sometimes; Often; Very Often

Overall, approximately 85% of faculty report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose national origin is different from their own, with tenure-track faculty more likely than non-tenure track faculty to report such interactions).

	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Very Often/Often	**88.9** (85.6, 92.3)	**81.5** (77.4, 85.5)	**84.9** (82.2, 87.6)

Bivariate sex differences. No statistically significant sex differences were reported for either tenure-track or non-tenure track faculty.

Table 40. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Sex and Tenure Track Status				
	Tenure Track		Non-Tenure Track	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Very Often/Often	**87.3** (81.4, 93.1)	**90.0** (85.9, 94.1)	**80.3** (74.2, 86.4)	**82.3** (76.8, 87.8)

Bivariate race differences (see Table 41). No statistically significant race/ethnicity differences were found for either tenure-track or non-tenure track.

Table 41. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Race and Tenure Track Status						
	Tenure Track			Non-Tenure Track		
	White	Asian/Asian American	Under-represented[11]	White	Asian/Asian American	Under-represented
Very Often/Often	91.5 (87.8, 95.3)	80.9 (69.1, 92.7)	86.7 (80.4, 92.9)	78.8 (73.5, 84.2)	88.1 (80.1, 96.1)	87.0 (80.2, 93.7)

Multivariate analysis of group differences. The multivariate analyses examined the relative impact of faculty status (tenure track vs. non-tenure track), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), Age (41+ vs. 41-) and race (Asian/Asian American, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx, Other, relative to White) on faculty's reports of having meaningful interactions with individuals with a different national origin (see Table 82 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, pg. 46).

The results indicate that:

- Faculty who were born in the U.S. are less likely than faculty born outside of the U.S. to report having meaningful interactions with people whose national origin is different from their own.
- Non-tenure track faculty were less likely than tenure-track faculty to report having meaningful interactions with people whose national origin is different from their own.
- There were no significant differences by sex, sexual orientation, ability, age or race.

Race/Ethnicity

*During the past 12 months at U-M, how often have you interacted in a **meaningful** way with people…*

…who are of a different race or ethnicity than your own

Never; Seldom; Sometimes; Often; Very Often

Overall approximately 83% of the faculty reported interacting in a meaningful way with people whose race/ethnicity differs from their own in the past 12 months, with no significant differences between tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty.

Table 42. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Very Often/Often	83.6 (79.5, 87.8)	81.5 (77.4, 85.6)	82.5 (79.6, 85.4)

---

[11] Includes all other racial/ ethnic identities throughout

Bivariate sex differences. There are no sex differences for either tenure-track or non-tenure track faculty.

Table 43. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Sex and Tenure Track Status				
	Tenure Track		Non-Tenure Track	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Very Often/Often	**87.8** (81.8, 93.8)	**81.6** (76.1, 87.1)	**80.8** (74.7, 86.9)	**82.0** (76.4, 87.6)

Bivariate race differences. There were no racial/ethnic differences for tenure-track faculty, but among non-tenure track faculty, Underrepresented minority faculty were more likely than White faculty to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose race/ethnicity differed from their own in the past 12 months.

Table 44. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Race and Tenure Track Status						
	Tenure Track			Non-Tenure Track		
	White	Asian/Asian American	Under-represented[12]	White	Asian/Asian American	Under-represented
Very Often/Often	**81.4** (76.0, 86.8)	**87.7** (78.3, 97.2)	**90.8** (83.8, 97.8)	**78.2** (72.8, 83.6)	**85.0** (76.1, 93.9)	**93.7** (88.5, 98.9)

Multivariate analysis of group differences. The multivariate analyses examined the relative impact of faculty status (tenure track vs. non-tenure track), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), Age (41+ vs. 41-) and race (Asian/Asian American, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx, Other, relative to White) on faculty's reports of having meaningful interactions with individuals with a different race or ethnicity (see Table 82 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, pg. 46).

The results indicate that:

- Faculty over age 41 were more likely than faculty who are 41 or younger to report having meaningful interactions with people whose racial identity is different from their own.
- White faculty were less likely than Asian/Asian American, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx, and other faculty to report having meaningful interactions with people whose racial identity is different from their own. There were no other significant differences by race.
- There were no significant differences by sex, sexual orientation, native born status, ability or faculty track.

Sexual Orientation

*During the past 12 months at U-M, how often have you interacted in a **meaningful** way with people…*

…whose sexual orientation is different than your own

Never; Seldom; Sometimes; Often; Very Often

Approximately 59% of faculty report interacting in a meaningful way in the past 12 months with people whose sexual orientation differs from their own, with no differences between tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty.

Table 45. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Very Often/Often	**63.5** (58.2, 68.8)	**55.9** (50.8, 61.1)	**59.4** (55.7, 63.1)

---

[12] Includes all other racial/ ethnic identities throughout

Bivariate sex differences. There are no statistically significant sex differences among tenure-track faculty, but within the non-tenure track, female faculty are significantly more likely than male faculty to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose sexual orientation differed from their own.

Table 46. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Sex and Tenure Track Status				
	Tenure Track		Non-Tenure Track	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Very Often/Often	**71.4** (63.1, 79.8)	**59.6** (52.8, 66.5)	**64.3** (57.1, 71.6)	**48.4** (41.2, 55.7)

Bivariate race differences. There are statistically significant racial/ethnic differences for both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty in their reports of interacting in a meaningful way in the past 12 months with people whose sexual orientation differs from their own. Among tenure-track faculty, Asian/Asian American faculty were significantly less likely than White faculty to report such interactions. Underrepresented minority tenure-track faculty did not differ significantly from White faculty in their interactions. Among non-tenure track faculty, Asian/Asian American were significantly less likely than both White and Underrepresented minority faculty to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose sexual orientation differed from their own.

Table 47. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Race and Tenure Track Status						
	Tenure Track			Non-Tenure Track		
	White	Asian/Asian American	Under-represented[13]	White	Asian/Asian American	Under-represented
Very Often/Often	**68.4** (62.0, 74.8)	**41.5** (26.9, 56.0)	**65.1** (54.5, 75.6)	**59.8** (53.4, 66.2)	**32.6** (20.5, 44.7)	**66.1** (55.8, 76.3)

Multivariate analysis of group differences. The multivariate analyses examined the relative impact of faculty status (tenure track vs. non-tenure track), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), Age (41+ vs. 41-) and race (Asian/Asian American, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx, Other, relative to White) on faculty's reports of having meaningful interactions with individuals with a different sexual orientation (see Table 82 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, pg. 46).

The results indicate that during the past 12 months:

- Female faculty are more likely than male faculty to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose sexual orientation are different from their own.
- LGBTQ+ faculty were more likely than heterosexual faculty to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose sexual orientation are different from their own.
- Faculty who were born in the U.S. are more likely than faculty born outside of the U.S. to report having meaningful interactions with people whose sexual orientation is different from their own.
- There were no significant differences by ability status.
- Faculty over age 41 were more likely than faculty who are 41 or younger to report having meaningful interactions with people whose sexual orientation is different from their own.
- Non-tenure track faculty were less likely than tenure-track faculty to report having meaningful interactions with people whose sexual orientation is different from their own.
- Asian/Asian American faculty are less likely than Hispanic, Other, and White faculty to report having meaningful interactions with people whose sexual orientation is different from their own. African American/Black faculty are less likely than Other faculty to report having meaningful interactions with people whose sexual orientation is different from their own. Hispanic/Latinx faculty are more likely than Asian/Asian American faculty to report having meaningful interactions with people whose sexual orientation is different from their own.

---

[13] Includes all other racial/ ethnic identities throughout

Social Class

*During the past 12 months at U-M, how often have you interacted in a **meaningful** way with people…*

…who are from a different social class

Never; Seldom; Sometimes; Often; Very Often

Approximately 58% of faculty report interacting in a meaningful way in the past 12 months with people whose social class differed from their own. There were no statistically significant differences between tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty, and no significant sex differences *(Table 48)*.

Table 48. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	**Non-Tenure Track**	**Total**
Very Often/Often	**56.2** (50.7, 61.6)	**59.7** (54.6, 64.7)	**58.1** (54.3, 61.8)

Bivariate sex differences. There are no sex differences for either tenure-track or non-tenure track faculty in their reports of interacting in a meaningful way in the past 12 months with people whose social class differed from their own.

Table 49. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Sex and Tenure Track Status				
	Tenure Track		**Non-Tenure Track**	
	Female	**Male**	**Female**	**Male**
Very Often/Often	**59.6** (50.5, 68.7)	**54.8** (47.9, 61.8)	**60.4** (53.1, 67.8)	**59.0** (51.9, 66.1)

Bivariate race differences. There are no race differences for either tenure-track or non-tenure track faculty in their reports of interacting in a meaningful way in the past 12 months with people whose social class differed from their own.

Table 50. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Race and Tenure Track Status						
	Tenure Track			**Non-Tenure Track**		
	White	**Asian/Asian American**	**Under-represented**[14]	**White**	**Asian/Asian American**	**Under-represented**
Very Often/Often	**56.2** (49.3, 63.0)	**59.6** (44.9, 74.3)	**53.5** (42.7, 64.4)	**59.7** (53.4, 66.1)	**54.4** (41.6, 67.2)	**67.6** (56.9, 78.3)

Multivariate analysis of group differences. The multivariate analyses examined the relative impact of faculty status (tenure track vs. non-tenure track), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), Age (41+ vs. 41-) and race (Asian/Asian American, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx, Other, relative to White) on faculty's reports of having meaningful interactions with individuals with a different social class (see Table 82 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, pg. 46).

The results indicate that that there are no significant differences in the social identities assessed.

---

[14] Includes all other racial/ ethnic identities throughout

f. Discrimination

Felt Discriminated Against

The tables below describe U-M faculty responses to the following survey question:

In general, over the past 12 months, have you felt discriminated against at U-M?

> *Yes*
> *No*

Overall, approximately 17% of faculty report feeling that in general over the past 12 months they have been discriminated against at the U-M, with no significant differences between tenure-track and non-tenure track.

Table 51. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	**Non-Tenure Track**	**Total**
Yes	**19.6** (15.6, 23.6)	**14.3** (11.0, 17.6)	**16.6** (14.1, 19.2)

Bivariate sex differences. Female tenure-track faculty are statistically significantly more likely than male faculty to report feeling they had been discriminated against within the past year at U-M, but there were no significant sex differences for non-tenure track faculty.

Table 52. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Sex and Tenure Track Status				
	Tenure Track		**Non-Tenure Track**	
	Female	**Male**	**Female**	**Male**
Yes	**32.2** (24.1, 40.2)	**11.3** (7.3, 15.3)	**18.0** (12.8, 23.1)	**10.9** (6.7, 15.2)

Bivariate race differences. There are significant racial/ethnic differences for both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty in their reports of having been discriminated against in the past 12 months at U-M. For tenure-track faculty, Underrepresented minority faculty were more likely than White faculty to report feeling they had been discriminated against. For non-tenure track faculty, Underrepresented minority faculty were more likely than both Asian/Asian American and White faulty to report feeling that they had been discriminated against in the past 12 months. Asian/Asian American and White faculty did not differ in their reports.

Table 53. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Race and Tenure Track Status						
	Tenure Track			**Non-Tenure Track**		
	White	**Asian/Asian American**	**Under-represented**[15]	**White**	**Asian/Asian American**	**Under-represented**
Yes	**14.0** (9.4, 18.5)	**21.3** (10.2, 32.5)	**37.5** (27.6, 47.5)	**11.5** (7.7, 15.4)	**11.8** (3.9, 19.6)	**31.0** (21.0, 41.0)

Multivariate analysis of group differences. The multivariate analyses examined the relative impact of faculty status (tenure track vs. non-tenure track), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), Age (41+ vs. 41-) and race (Asian/Asian American, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx, Other, relative to White) on faculty's reports of feeling they had been discriminated against with the past year at U-M (see Table 78 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, pg. 42).

---

[15] Includes all other racial/ ethnic identities throughout

The results indicate that when asked whether they felt discriminated against at U-M in the past 12 months:

- Female faculty were 130% more likely than male faculty to report feeling so.
- LGBTQ+ faculty were 199% more likely than heterosexual faculty to report feeling so.
- There were no significant differences by native born status.
- Faculty with a disability were 73% more likely than faculty without a disability to report feeling so.
- Faculty over age 41 were 51% more likely than faculty who are 41 or younger to report feeling so. Tenure-track faculty were 22% more likely than non-tenure track faculty to report feeling so.
- Asian/Asian American faculty were significantly less likely than African American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx, and Other faculty, but significantly more likely than White faculty to report feeling that in general they had been discriminated in the past 12 months at U-M. African American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx, and Other faculty were all significantly more likely than Asian/Asian American and White faculty to report feeling that in general they had been discriminated in the past 12 months at U-M. There were no other significant race differences.

The following section focuses on faculty experiences with different forms of discriminatory events at the University over the past 12 months.

Discrimination Experienced-Disability

*Over the past 12 months, how often have **YOU experienced discriminatory events** at U-M because of your:*

> *Ability or disability status*
> > *Never*
> > *1-2 times*
> > *3 or more times*

Approximately 3% of all faculty reported experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their disability status at the U-M in the past 12 months, with no significant differences between tenure-track and non-tenure track *(Table 54)*.

Table 54. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	**Non-Tenure Track**	**Total**
1 or more	**2.8** (1.2, 4.5)	**2.4** (0.9, 3.9)	**2.6** (1.5, 3.7)

Bivariate sex differences. Neither tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty differ by sex on their reports of experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their disability status at the U-M in the past 12 months.

Table 55. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Sex and Tenure Track Status				
	Tenure Track		**Non-Tenure Track**	
	Female	**Male**	**Female**	**Male**
1 or more	**3.4** (0.2, 6.5)	**1.3** (0.0, 2.7)	**2.1** (0.3, 3.9)	**2.6** (0.3, 4.9)

Bivariate race differences. Similarly, no significant race differences were found for either tenure-track or non-tenure track faculty in their reports of experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their disability status at the U-M in the past 12 months.

Table 56. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Race and Tenure Track Status						
	Tenure Track			Non-Tenure Track		
	White	Asian/Asian American	Under-represented[16]	White	Asian/Asian American	Under-represented
1 or more	2.9 (0.8, 5.1)	1.6 (0.0, 4.7)	2.0 (0.3, 3.6)	2.7 (0.7, 4.8)	0	3.8 (0.2, 7.5)

Bivariate differences for ability status (see Table 57). For both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty, faculty with disabilities were more likely than faculty without disabilities to report experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their disability status at U-M in the past 12 months, however these differences were not statistically significant due to the small cell sizes.

Table 57. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Tenure Track and Disability Status			
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Disability, 1 or more	22.0 (1.6, 42.5)	28.1 (0.0, 61.9)	23.9 (7.1, 40.8)
No Disability, 1 or more	1.7 (0.4, 3.1)	1.9 (0.5, 3.2)	1.8 (0.9, 2.8)

Discrimination Experienced – Racial Identity

> *Over the past 12 months, how often have **YOU experienced discriminatory events** at U-M because of your:*

> *Racial or ethnic identity*
> > *Never*
> > *1-2 times*
> > *3 or more times*

Overall, approximately 13% of faculty reported experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their racial identity at U-M in the past 12 months with no significant differences between tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty.

Table 58. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
1 or more	15.2 (11.8, 18.7)	10.8 (7.9, 13.6)	12.8 (10.5, 15.0)

Bivariate sex differences. With respect to tenure-track faculty, female faculty are more likely than male faculty to report experiencing at least one discriminatory event. For non-tenure track faculty, there were no statistically significant sex differences.

Table 59. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Sex and Tenure Track Status				
	Tenure Track		Non-Tenure Track	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
1 or more	23.0 (16.0, 30.0)	9.9 (6.4, 13.5)	9.3 (5.7, 12.9)	11.7 (7.4, 16.0)

---

[16] Includes all other racial/ ethnic identities throughout

Bivariate race differences. Among tenure-track faculty, Underrepresented minority faculty are significantly more likely than both White and Asian/Asian American faculty to report feeling that they had been discriminated against because of their racial identity in the past 12 months at U-M. Asian/Asian American tenure-track faculty are significantly more likely than White tenure-track faculty to report that they had been discriminated against because of their race. With respect to non-tenure track faculty, Asian/Asian American American/Asian/Asian American and Underrepresented minority faculty did not differ significantly from each other in their reports of racial discrimination, but both were significantly more likely to report discrimination by race than White non-tenure track faculty.

Table 60. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Race and Tenure Track Status						
	Tenure Track			Non-Tenure Track		
	White	**Asian/Asian American**	**Under-represented**[17]	**White**	**Asian/Asian American**	**Under-represented**
1 or more	**5.7** (2.6, 8.7)	**25.4** (13.4, 37.3)	**49.1** (38.7, 59.4)	**3.5** (1.3, 5.8)	**23.1** (12.9, 33.3)	**30.5** (21.0, 39.9)

Discrimination Experienced-Sex

>*Over the past 12 months, how often have **YOU experienced discriminatory events** at U-M because of your:*

>>*Sex*
>>>*Never*
>>>*1-2 times*
>>>*3 or more times*

Overall, approximately 20% of faculty reported experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their sex at U-M in the past 12 months, with no significant differences between tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty.

Table 61. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
1 or more	**22.5** (18.2, 26.8)	**17.9** (14.2, 21.6)	**19.9** (17.1, 22.8)

Bivariate sex differences. Both tenure-track and non-tenure track female faculty were significantly more likely than male faculty to report experiencing sex discrimination.

Table 62. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Sex and Tenure Track Status				
	Tenure Track		Non-Tenure Track	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
1 or more	**50.1** (41.3, 58.9)	**6.6** (3.4, 9.7)	**33.0** (26.3, 39.6)	**3.4** (0.9, 5.9)

Bivariate race differences. There are no significant race differences of faculty's reports of experiencing sex discrimination within the past 12 months at U-M.

---

[17] Includes all other racial/ ethnic identities throughout

Table 63. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Race and Tenure Track Status						
	Tenure Track			Non-Tenure Track		
	White	Asian/Asian American	Under-represented[18]	White	Asian/Asian American	Under-represented
1 or more	**21.5** (16.1, 26.9)	**21.1** (10.0, 32.1)	**28.4** (19.4, 37.4)	**16.7** (12.2, 21.2)	**16.2** (7.2, 25.3)	**24.8** (15.1, 34.5)

Discrimination Experienced-Sexual Orientation

*Over the past 12 months, how often have **YOU experienced discriminatory events** at U-M because of your:*

> *Sexual orientation*
>> *Never*
>> *1-2 times*
>> *3 or more times*

Overall, approximately 2% of faculty report experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their sexual orientation at U-M in the past 12 months, with no significant differences between tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty.

Table 64. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
1 or more	**3.4** (1.6, 5.2)	**1.5** (0.3, 2.6)	**2.3** (1.3, 3.3)

Bivariate sex differences. There are no significant sex differences in faculty's reports of experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their sexual orientation for either tenure-track or non-tenure track faculty.

Table 65. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Sex and Tenure Track Status				
	Tenure Track		Non-Tenure Track	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
1 or more	**1.4** (0.0, 3.0)	**3.6** (1.3, 5.9)	**0.1** (0.0, 0.3)	**2.3** (0.2, 4.4)

Bivariate race differences. Statistically significant race differences were found for both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty in their reports of experiencing at least 1 discriminatory event as a result of their sexual orientation at U-M in the past 12 months. With respect to tenure-track faculty, Underrepresented minority faculty and White faculty are significantly more likely than Asian/Asian American faculty to report feeling that they had been discriminated against because of their sexual orientation. White and Underrepresented minority faculty did not differ in their reports of discrimination based on sexual orientation. With respect to non-tenure track faculty White faculty are significantly more likely than Asian/Asian American American/Asian/Asian American faculty to report feeling they had been discriminated against because of sexual orientation.

Table 66. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Race and Tenure Track Status						
	Tenure Track			Non-Tenure Track		
	White	Asian/Asian American	Under-represented[19]	White	Asian/Asian American	Under-represented
1 or more	**3.5** (1.1, 5.9)	**0.3** (0.0, 0.9)	**6.5** (1.7, 11.4)	**2.0** (0.3, 3.7)	0	**0.7** (0.0, 1.7)

---

[18] Includes all other racial/ ethnic identities throughout
[19] Includes all other racial/ ethnic identities throughout

Bivariate sexual orientation differences. For both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty, LGBTQ+ faculty were more likely than heterosexual faculty to report experiencing at least 1 discriminatory event as a result of their sexual orientation at U-M in the past 12 months.

Table 67. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Tenure Track Status and Sexual Orientation			
	Tenure Track	**Non-Tenure Track**	**Total**
LGBTQ, 1 or more	**33.2** (14.8, 51.5)	**23.4** (5.9, 40.9)	**28.0** (15.6, 40.4)
Heterosexual, 1 or more	**1.1** (0.0, 2.3)	0	**0.5** (0.0, 1.0)

Discrimination Experienced-National Origin

*Over the past 12 months, how often have **YOU experienced discriminatory events** at U-M because of your:*

> National Origin
> > Never
> > 1-2 times
> > 3 or more times

Approximately 10% of faculty reported experiencing at least 1 discriminatory event as a result of their national origin at U-M in the past 12 months with no significant differences between tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty.

Table 68. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	**Non-Tenure Track**	**Total**
1 or more	**10.4** (7.3, 13.5)	**9.0** (6.3, 11.7)	**9.6** (7.6, 11.7)

Bivariate sex differences. There are no significant sex differences in faculty's reports of experiencing at least 1 discriminatory event as a result of their national origin for either tenure-track or non-tenure track faculty.

Table 69. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Sex and Tenure Track Status				
	Tenure Track		**Non-Tenure Track**	
	Female	**Male**	**Female**	**Male**
1 or more	**11.5** (6.2, 16.8)	**8.3** (4.7, 11.9)	**9.4** (5.4, 13.5)	**8.5** (4.8, 12.3)

Bivariate race differences. Significant race differences were found for both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty in their reports of experiencing at least 1 discriminatory event as a result of their national origin at U-M in the past 12 months. For both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty, Underrepresented minority faculty and Asian/Asian American faculty are both significantly more likely than White faculty to report feeling that they had been discriminated against because of their National origin. Asian/Asian American and Underrepresented minority faculty do not differ significantly in their reports of discrimination based on National origin.

Table 70. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Race and Tenure Track Status						
	Tenure Track			**Non-Tenure Track**		
	White	**Asian/Asian American**	**Under-represented**[20]	**White**	**Asian/Asian American**	**Under-represented**
1 or more	**4.6** (1.8, 7.4)	**23.5** (12.0, 35.0)	**22.5** (13.5, 31.5)	**2.2** (0.5, 3.9)	**27.6** (16.7, 38.5)	**18.5** (9.6, 27.4)

---

[20] Includes all other racial/ ethnic identities throughout

Bivariate national origin differences (see Table 71). For both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty, faculty born outside of the U.S. are significantly more likely than faculty born in the U.S. to report experiencing at least 1 discriminatory event as a result of their National origin at U-M in the past 12 months.

Table 71. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Tenure Track Status and National Origin			
	Tenure Track	**Non-Tenure Track**	**Total**
Not born in the United States, 1 or more	**23.1** (15.3, 30.9)	**22.5** (15.3, 29.8)	**22.8** (17.5, 28.1)
Born in the United States, 1 or more	**4.5** (2.0, 7.0)	**3.0** (1.1, 4.9)	**3.7** (2.1, 5.2)

Discrimination Experienced-Political Orientation

> Over the past 12 months, how often have **YOU experienced discriminatory events** at U-M because of your:

> Political Orientation
>> Never
>> 1-2 times
>> 3 or more times

Overall, approximately 8% of faculty reported experiencing at least 1 discriminatory event as a result of their political orientation at U-M in the past 12 months, with no statistically significant differences between tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty.

Table 72. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	**Non-Tenure Track**	**Total**
1 or more	**6.2** (3.7, 8.7)	**9.3** (6.4, 12.1)	**7.9** (6.0, 9.9)

Bivariate sex differences. There are no significant sex differences in faculty's reports of experiencing at least 1 discriminatory event as a result of their political orientation for either tenure-track or non-tenure track faculty.

Table 73. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Sex and Tenure Track Status				
	Tenure Track		**Non-Tenure Track**	
	Female	**Male**	**Female**	**Male**
1 or more	**3.2** (0.2, 6.2)	**6.9** (3.6, 10.1)	**10.0** (5.9, 14.2)	**8.3** (4.3, 12.2)

Bivariate race differences. There are no significant race differences in faculty's reports of experiencing at least 1 discriminatory event as a result of their political orientation for either tenure-track or non-tenure track faculty.

Table 74. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Race and Tenure Track Status						
	Tenure Track			**Non-Tenure Track**		
	White	**Asian/Asian American**	**Under-represented[21]**	**White**	**Asian/Asian American**	**Under-represented**
1 or more	**5.7** (2.7, 8.8)	**4.2** (0.0, 9.7)	**10.9** (3.6, 18.1)	**9.6** (5.9, 13.2)	**4.8** (0.0, 10.3)	**11.1** (3.8, 18.4)

---

[21] Includes all other racial/ ethnic identities throughout

Discrimination Experienced-Social Class

*Over the past 12 months, how often have **YOU experienced discriminatory events** at U-M because of your:*

> *Social Class*
> > *Never*
> > *1-2 times*
> > *3 or more times*

Overall, approximately 5% of faculty reported experiencing at least one discriminatory even as a result of their social class at U-M in the past 12 months with no statistically significant differences between tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty.

Table 75. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	**Non-Tenure Track**	**Total**
1 or more	**6.1** (3.7, 8.5)	**4.8** (2.9, 6.7)	**5.4** (3.8, 6.9)

Bivariate sex differences (see Table 80). There are no significant sex differences in faculty's reports of experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their social class for either tenure-track or non-tenure track faculty.

Table 76. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Sex and Tenure Track Status				
	Tenure Track		**Non-Tenure Track**	
	Female	**Male**	**Female**	**Male**
1 or more	**9.0** (4.1, 13.9)	**3.8** (1.4, 6.2)	**5.8** (2.7, 8.8)	**3.4** (1.1, 5.8)

Bivariate race differences (see Table 77). There are no statistically significant race differences in faculty's reports of experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their social class for either tenure-track or non-tenure track faculty.

Table 77. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Faculty, by Race and Tenure Track Status						
	Tenure Track			**Non-Tenure Track**		
	White	**Asian/Asian American**	**Under-represented**[22]	**White**	**Asian/Asian American**	**Under-represented**
1 or more	**5.3** (2.3, 8.2)	**6.3** (0.0, 13.2)	**9.9** (5.0, 14.9)	**4.2** (1.9, 6.6)	**3.0** (0.0, 7.4)	**10.5** (4.4, 16.6)

---

[22] Includes all other racial/ ethnic identities throughout

VI.   MULTIVARIATE RISK MODELS OF KEY MEASURES

Specific demographic factors have independent correlations with key outcomes in the survey results. For example, the risk reporting any experience of discrimination within the past 12 months varies such that:

- Females were 130% more likely to report experiencing discrimination than males.
- LGBTQ+ faculty were 3 times (199%) more likely to report experiencing discrimination than heterosexual faculty.
- Faculty with a disability were 73% more likely to report experiencing discrimination than faculty with no disability.
- Older faculty (ages 41 or more) were 51% more likely to report experiencing discrimination than younger faculty.
- Faculty not on the tenure track were 18% less likely to report experiencing discrimination than tenure track faculty.
- Asian/Asian American faculty were 49% more likely to report experiencing discrimination than white faculty.
- African American/Black faculty were nearly five times (371%) more likely to report experiencing discrimination than white faculty.
- Hispanic/Latinx faculty were nearly three and half times (246%) more likely to report experiencing discrimination than white faculty.
- Faculty of other race/ethnicities were more than four times (333%) more likely to report experiencing discrimination than white faculty.

Table 78 below summarize the statistical analyses of the survey data producing these results. Multivariate logistic regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on the odds of having each specific experience or response type. This multivariate modeling approach is important because membership in these categories can overlap, but each is an independent risk factor for specific experiences or responses.

The first model in Table 78 estimates the risk of reporting low satisfaction with the U-M environment during the 12 months before the survey. The second model in Table 78 estimates the risk of experiencing discrimination during the 12 months before the survey.

The effects displayed in the table are odds ratios. Odds ratios are multiplicative, so an odds ratio of 1.0 means no association, an odds ratio of greater than 1.0 means the odds of an experience are increased, and an odds ratio of less than 1.0 means the odds of an experience are reduced. We estimate the statistical significance of each odds ration with a Wald chi-square statistic, presented in parentheses directly below the odds ratio. Statistically significant effects of the odds of an experience are displayed in bold, with the levels of significance identified.

	Satisfaction[23] "Neutral, Unsatisfied or Very Unsatisfied"	Discrimination[24] "Yes"
Female (Relative to Male Faculty)	**1.43*** (33.13)	**2.30*** (125.11)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	**1.44** (9.95)	**2.99*** (84.00)
Not Born in U.S. (Relative to Faculty Born in the U.S.)	**1.18*** (4.76)	1.02 (0.06)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with no Disability)	1.38 (3.22)	**1.73** (9.29)
Age 41+ (Relative to Faculty Age 41-)	**1.49*** (32.44)	**1.51*** (25.56)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	.92 (2.00)	**.82** (7.30)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)		
Asian/Asian American	1.20 (3.68) AA, H	**1.49*** (12.79) AA, H, O
African American/Black	**2.50*** (37.64) A, O	**4.71*** (105.55) A
Hispanic/ Latinx	**2.70*** (53.86) A, O	**3.46*** (74.10) A
Other	**1.43** (7.95) AA, H	**4.33*** (131.45) A
Respondents	898	981
-2Loglikelihood	6520.11	5032.85
*Odds ratio with Z Statistics Show in Parentheses. *p<.05,**p<.01,***p<.001 two tailed tests*		

In Table 79 below, ordinary least-squares regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic variable on the faculty's perceptions of Climate at U-M. The first model in Table 79 estimates the effects on the perceptions of General Climate at U-M. The second model in Table 79 estimates the effects on the perceptions of DEI Climate at U-M.

The effect estimates themselves are the estimated change in factor scores obtained from a set of semantic differential adjectives (varying from 1 = negative adjective to 5 = positive adjective) associated with the difference in demographic variables. We estimate the statistical significance of each estimated effect with a t-ratio statistic, presented in parentheses directly below the effect parameter. Statistically significant effects are displayed in bold, with the levels of significance identified.

---

[23] How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the overall campus climate/environment that you have experienced at the University of Michigan within the past 12 months?

[24] In general over the past 12 months, have you felt discriminated against at U-M?

Table 79. Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Perceptions of General and DEI Climate. (Letter symbols indicate statistically significant differences with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian/Asian American, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other.)

	General Climate	DEI Climate
Female	**-0.16***	**-0.34***
	(-3.33)	**(-7.19)**
LGBTQ+	**-0.26**	**-0.46***
	(-2.72)	**(-4.91)**
Not Born in US	-0.03	0.05
	(-0.43)	(0.84)
Disability	-0.07	-0.08
	(-0.54)	(-0.60)
Age 41+	**-0.22***	-0.07
	(-4.25)	(-1.47)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	-0.01	**0.18***
	(-0.12)	**(3.67)**
Race (Relative to White Faculty)		
Asian/Asian American	-0.01	-0.09
	(-0.09)	(-1.28)
	AA, H	AA, H
African American/Black	**-0.42**	**-0.55***
	(-3.20)	**(-4.27)**
	A	**A, O**
Hispanic/Latinx	**-0.27***	**-0.43***
	(-2.29)	**(-3.76)**
	A	**A, O**
Other	-0.12	-0.14
	(-1.11)	(-1.35)
		AA, H
Respondents	986	
R^2	0.05	
OLS regression coefficient with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *p<.05,**p<.01,***p<.001 two tailed tests		

In Table 80 below, ordinary least-squares (OLS) regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on the level individuals' feelings about specific aspects of the U-M DEI climate. The first model in Table 80 estimates the effects on the levels of agreement that the U-M has high institutional commitment to DEI goals (strongly agree = 5, strongly disagree =1). The second model in Table 80 estimates the effects on the levels of agreement that the individual has feelings of being valued by and belonging at U-M (strongly agree = 5, strongly disagree =1). The third model in Table 80 estimates the effects on the levels of agreement that the U-M is a place where the individual can thrive and grow (strongly agree = 5, strongly disagree =1).

The effect estimates themselves are the estimated change in response categories (in this case varying from 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree) associated with the difference in demographic categories. We estimate the statistical significance of each estimated effect with a t-ratio statistic, presented in parentheses directly below the effect parameter. Statistically significant effects are displayed in bold, with the levels of significance identified.

	Institutional Commitment	Value/ Belonging	Thrive/ Growth
Female	**-0.36***** **(-7.42)**	**-0.20***** **(-4.00)**	**-0.29***** **(-5.58)**
LGBTQ+	**-0.37***** **(-3.93)**	**-0.45***** **(-4.65)**	**-0.40***** **(-3.94)**
Not Born in US	**0.21***** **(3.62)**	-0.01 (-0.19)	-0.08 (-1.32)
Disability	0.00 (0.01)	**-0.36*** **(-2.58)**	**-0.36*** **(-2.52)**
Age 41+	-0.04 (-0.79)	-0.07 (-1.30)	**-0.16**** **(-2.92)**
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	**0.19*** **(2.47)**	-0.03 (-0.70)	**-0.12*** **(-2.13)**
Race (Relative to White Faculty)			
Asian/Asian American	**-0.15*** **(-2.01)** **AA**	-0.14 (-1.81)	**-0.24**** **(-3.11)** **AA**
African American/Black	**-0.65***** **(-5.01)** **A,O**	**-0.40**** **(-3.02)**	**-0.55***** **(-3.96)** **A**
Hispanic/ Latinx	**-0.33**** **(-2.83)**	**-0.35**** **(-2.93)**	**-0.37**** **(-3.00)**
Other	-0.01 (-0.14) **AA**	**-0.25*** **(-2.35)**	**-0.24*** **(-2.22)**
Respondents	989	988	988
R²	0.11	0.07	0.10

Table 80. Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Feelings of Institutional Commitment, Value and Belonging, and Thriving and Growth. (Letter symbols indicate statistically significant differences with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian/Asian American, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other.)

OLS regression coefficient with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *p<.05,**p<.01,***p<.001 two tailed tests*

In Table 81 below, ordinary least-squares regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on the level two composite index values, each reflecting a different dimension of experience with the faculty person's home department. The first model in Table 81 estimates the effects on the faculty responses to questions regarding the fairness of treatment (Fair Treatment Index) by their department (higher scores are more fair). The second model in Table 81 estimates the effects on the faculty responses to questions regarding the extent to which they feel valued (Departmental Value Index) by their department (higher scores are more highly valued).

The effect estimates themselves are the estimated change in average response levels associated with the difference in demographic categories. We estimate the statistical significance of each estimated effect with a t-ratio statistic, presented in parentheses directly below the effect parameter. Statistically significant effects are displayed in bold, with the levels of significance identified. The models indicate that females, those that identify as LGBTQ+ and those 41 and older are on average less likely to agree with statements about being treated fairly in their home department.

Table 81. Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Departmental Norms. (Letter symbols indicate statistically significant differences with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian/Asian American, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other.)

	Fair Treatment Index	Departmental Value Index
Female	**-0.21*****	-0.02
	(-3.77)	(-0.27)
LGBTQ+	**-0.52*****	**-0.38*****
	(-4.70)	**(-3.48)**
Not Born in US	0.04	**0.21****
	(.053)	**(3.00)**
Disability	-0.22	0.03
	(-1.38)	(0.21)
Age 41+	**-0.12***	.02
	(-2.04)	(0.30)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	-0.03	0.07
	(-0.52)	(1.21)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)		
Asian/Asian American	0.03	-0.15
	(0.29)	(-1.79)
African American/Black	-0.11	-0.18
	(-0.72)	(-1.23)
Hispanic/ Latinx	-0.12	-0.12
	(-0.91)	(-0.90)
Other	-0.00	-0.19
	(-0.03)	(-1.61)
Respondents	927	936
R^2	0.05	.03
OLS regression coefficient with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *p<.05,**p<.01,***p<.001 two tailed tests		

In Table 82 below, ordinary least-squares regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on the level individuals' interactions in a meaningful way with others of various characteristics. The first model in Table 82 estimates the effects on the levels of interaction with others with different political opinions (very often = 5, never =1). The second model in Table 82 estimates the effects on the on the levels of interaction with others of different race/ ethnicity (very often = 5, never =1). The third model in Table 82 estimates the effects on the levels of interaction with others of different social class (very often = 5, never =1). The fourth model in Table 82 estimates the effects on the levels of interaction with others of different nationality (very often = 5, never =1). The fifth model in Table 82 estimates the effects on the levels of interaction with others of different sexual orientation (very often = 5, never =1).

The effect estimates themselves are the estimated change in response categories (in this case varying from 1 = never, 2 = seldom, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, 5 = very often) associated with the difference in demographic categories. We estimate the statistical significance of each estimated effect with a t-ratio statistic, presented in parentheses directly below the effect parameter. Statistically significant effects are displayed in bold, with the levels of significance identified.

	Interaction: Political Opinions	Interaction: Race/ Ethnicity	Interaction: Social Class	Interaction: Nationality	Interaction: Sexual Orientation
Female	**-0.29***** **(-3.71)**	0.10 (1.68)	0.07 (1.02)	-0.02 (-0.39)	**0.32***** **(4.50)**
LGBTQ+	-0.01 (-0.09)	0.01 (0.12)	-0.20 (-1.42)	0.00 (0.04)	**0.69***** **(5.01)**
Not Born in US	-0.04 (-0.44)	-0.11 (-1.46)	-0.11 (-1.24)	**0.16*** **(2.34)**	**-0.40***** **(-4.54)**
Disability	0.12 (0.44)	0.12 (0.62)	0.11 (0.49)	-0.00 (-0.01)	-0.09 (-0.36)
Age 41+	0.11 (1.31)	**0.14*** **(2.23)**	0.07 (0.91)	0.05 (0.89)	**0.18*** **(2.37)**
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	**0.55***** **(7.18)**	-0.08 (-1.25)	0.04 (0.58)	**-0.20***** **(-3.45)**	**-0.21**** **(-3.02)**
Race (Relative to White Faculty)					
Asian/Asian American	0.02 (0.18)	**0.25**** **(2.75)**	-0.13 (-1.23)	-0.05 (-0.54)	**-0.46***** **(-4.27)** **H, O**
African American/Black	0.22 (1.05)	**0.47**** **(2.87)**	0.15 (0.78)	-0.08 (-0.54)	-0.31 (-1.59) O
Hispanic/ Latinx	0.14 (0.76)	**0.30*** **(2.08)**	0.15 (0.86)	0.02 (0.11)	0.04 (0.22) A
Other	0.25 (1.48)	**0.34**** **(2.59)**	0.07 (0.43)	0.15 (1.21)	0.25 (1.66) A, AA
Respondents	877	891	885	885	880
R²	0.07	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.14

Table 82. Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Interactions in a Meaningful Way with others of different Political Opinions, different Race/Ethnicity, different Social Class, different Nationality or different Sexual Orientation. (Letter symbols indicate statistically significant differences with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian/Asian American, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other.)

OLS regression coefficient with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *p<.05,**p<.01,***p<.001 two tailed tests*

VII.   TAKE AWAY POINTS AND ACTION STEPS

Overall, the report finds that faculty vary across a number of different social identities. The majority of faculty on campus are tenure-track though there is a sizeable number of faculty in non-tenure track positions. Faculty differ with respect to tenure-track and non-tenure track on a variety of demographic dimensions (such as the fact that tenure-track faculty tend to be slightly older and more likely to be male), but do not differ in others such as racial composition and national origin.

Overall, faculty report being satisfied with the climate at the U-M and feel the institution is committed to diversity, equity, and inclusion. They also feel that they belong, grow, and thrive at the university. In general, faculty report that they interact in meaningful ways across a variety of social identities.

However, these positive experiences with the U-M campus are not equally distributed across all faculty. While there are instances where no group differences exist, in general, members of traditionally marginalized groups across race, sex, sexual orientation, age, ability status, and national origin experience the campus less positively than faculty from traditionally majority groups Seventeen percent of all faculty report feeling as though they had been discriminated against in some form within the past year. Again, those faculty from traditionally marginalized groups are much more likely to report feeling that they had been discriminated against than members of traditionally majority groups. This pattern of finding also holds when looking at faculty reports of experiencing specific discriminatory events across a number of social identity categories.

Together the findings clearly reinforce the need for a systematic institutional effort to address issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion if all members of the U-M faculty are to experience the same positive experiences that are enjoyed by the majority of faculty. In many ways, the findings presage specific initiatives and efforts that have been proposed by the current DEI strategic plans. For instance, U-M's efforts to better coordinate and create greater awareness around the institution's bias response resource are directly relevant to the findings of reports of experiencing discriminatory incidents by faculty. Ongoing efforts to make campus facilities more accessible to all also address some of the differential experiences that were reported by faculty with disabilities and members of the LGBTQ+ communities. Current DEI plan initiatives such as including DEI contributions into the faculty annual review process, the establishment of the Distinguished Diversity and Social Transformation Professorships and Distinguished Diversity Career Scholars award, as well as initiatives that are designed to diversify the faculty are also implicated in the present findings. In addition, the university is sponsoring a series of events focusing on the issue of free speech with participants from a variety of perspectives in an effort to encourage greater productive interactions across different political orientations and ideologies.

In conclusion, the present report utilizes high-quality data from a campuswide climate survey to obtain an empirical assessment of faculty perceptions of the U-M Ann Arbor campus and their experiences on it. These data provide several benefits to the U-M community. First, the data provide improved estimates of the composition of faculty on several variables, including religion, disability status, and Middle Eastern/North African (MENA) racial/ethnic group membership. The data also provide a baseline assessment of where we are as a community as well as a benchmark by which to measure the university's progress over the five-year DEI planning progress. In addition, the data produced by the campuswide survey will provide a rich reservoir of information that will be used by the entire U-M community for a variety of reasons. The results presented here only scratch the surface with respect to what questions may be asked and information that can be gleaned from the data set. We are committed to providing the U-M community with as broad access to the data as possible while also making sure that we protect the anonymity of individual respondents. Consistent with the spirit of the DEI planning process, the data is not simply a resource for the administration, but instead is to be used by the entire U-M community.

VIII.   METHODS APPENDIX

a.   RESPONDENT COMMUNICATIONS

Each potential respondent received a series of communications by USPS mail (if a valid USPS address was available) and/or e-mail beginning with an invitation to participate in the study.

Phase I

- Pre-notification Letter mailed via U.S. Mail, and included login instructions: October 19, 2016 *(Cases lacking mailing addresses were sent via email on October 21, 2016.)*
- Email Invitation: October 24, 2016
- Email Reminder #1: October 27, 2016
- Email Reminder #2: October 31, 2016
- Email Reminder #3 *(included explicit opt out)*: November 4, 2016
- U-M Internal Email Reminder: November 7, 2016
- Email Reminder #4 *(included explicit opt out)*: November 7, 2016

Phase II

- Mail Survey Packet Mailing: November 14, 2016
- Postcard Reminder Mailing: November 22, 2016
- Mail Survey Replacement Mailing: December 1, 2016

b.   STUDY PHASE TRANSITION

Phase I of the U-M DEI study was open to all potential participants selected into the samples; Phase II focused on individuals who did not open the survey at all (non-responders), who logged in but did not answer the consent or any questions (logins), or who partially completed the survey (visitors, partials) in Phase I. The Phase I to Phase II transition was implemented as follows:

- Wednesday, November 9, 2016, at 12:00 noon, SoundRocket selects Phase 2 eligible files based on response; the files were sent to U-M SRC.
- Thursday, November 10, 2016, on, U-M SRC completed sample selection and provided selected cases back to SoundRocket.
- Friday, November 11 – Monday, November 14, 2016, SoundRocket prepared the Phase II sample for the paper and pencil mail survey effort.
- Tuesday November 15, 2016, at 9:00 am, the Official Phase 2 Transition was implemented; this was the earliest possible time Phase 2 could reach a respondent.

c.   CONFIDENTIALITY

To ensure success of this survey, given the sensitive nature of several of the questions, a key element of the study design was to limit direct access between U-M Ann Arbor employees who were being surveyed. Integral to this effort was the use of the independent contractor (SoundRocket) for data collection efforts, which provided a firewall between respondents' identity and their survey responses. Consistent with standard practices for cross-sectional data collections such as this, SoundRocket was required to use encryption technologies (including SSL for all web-based interfaces) and adhere to strict guidelines to maintain data security and confidentiality. SoundRocket has been collecting sensitive data from college student populations for over 10 years. Communications, staff training, processes and quality inspections all focused on minimizing disclosure risk. SoundRocket agreed to be held to the same standards prescribed by the U-M IRB to protect respondents before,

during and after this study.

During the course of this study, once the sample list was provided to SoundRocket, no U-M employee came into contact with identifying information on any potential survey respondent in a way that would allow them to link survey response to individual identity. All staff, including interviewers, were SoundRocket employees and/or contractors. This fact was openly disclosed during contacts with respondents so that they were assured that their responses would not be linked back to them. After the study is complete and a final data set provided to U-M, SoundRocket destroyed all identifiable data (electronic and paper) received during the effort.

IX.   REFERENCES

Galesic, M., & Bosnjak, M. (2009). Effects of questionnaire length on participation and indicators of response quality in a web survey. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *73*(2), 349-360.

Crawford, S. D., Couper, M. P., & Lamias, M. J. (2001). Web surveys perceptions of burden. *Social Science Computer Review*, *19*(2), 146-162.