

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Executive Summary	2
III.	Survey Design and Methodology.....	6
	a. Sample Design	6
	b. Survey Instrument.....	6
	c. Study Methodology.....	7
	d. Post-Survey Adjustment and Weighting	8
IV.	Survey Respondents	10
V.	Survey Responses	15
	a. Satisfaction with Overall Campus Climate/Environment	15
	b. Perceptions of the General Climate and the Climate Relative to DEI.....	16
	c. Perceptions of Institutional Commitment & Inclusion and Equitable Treatment at U-M	18
	d. Perceptions of Fair Treatment at U-M.....	21
	e. Intergroup Interaction in the Past 12 Months	23
	f. Discrimination—Felt	29
	g. Discrimination — Experienced.....	30
VI.	Multivariate Risk Models of Key Measures	35
VII.	Take Away Points and Action Steps.....	40
VIII.	Methods Appendix	41
	a. Respondent Communications	41
	b. Study Phase Transition	41
	c. Confidentiality	41
IX.	References	43

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 understand the community's perspectives and experiences related to their work on the campus in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

The 2016 U-M Staff Campus Climate Survey on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion explores the staff 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 planning 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 3,500 staff, designed to adequately represent the approximately 32,000 individuals employed as of September 1, 2016. The survey used a special two-phase design to better represent the full diversity of staff and produced an overall response rate of 74%.

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

Demographics

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 staff. Thus, we have more accurate estimates of the religious background, sexual orientation, disability status, veteran status, and the social class of our staff. We also are able to collect new information about our staff that we have never collected before such as the proportion of staff who ethnically identify as Middle Eastern and North African.

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

The majority of staff (75%) identify as White followed by African American/Black, Asian American/Asian, Hispanic/Latino/a, a member of two or more racial groups, Middle Eastern/North African, and Native American/Alaskan Native and Other.

The majority of staff (70%) identify their sex as female compared to 30% identifying their sex as male. Similarly, gender identity is about 70% female and almost 30% male with less than 1% of staff identifying as transgender or gender non-conforming. Staff also largely identify as heterosexual (93%).

Seventy percent of staff have a bachelor's degree or higher. Six percent of staff report having a disability. Three percent of staff are veterans.

A large portion of staff identify as Christian (43%), followed by Catholic, no religious background, Other, Jewish, Hindu, Muslim and Buddhist.

Climate

The majority (72%) of staff are satisfied with the campus climate on the Ann Arbor campus. They also experience the diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) elements of the climate in positive ways.

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

For example, African American/Black staff are the least satisfied with the campus climate among all other racial groups, followed by Middle Eastern/North African staff, then Other staff. Also, those identifying as born outside the U.S. and those with a disability are less satisfied with the campus climate than their counterparts.

African American/Black staff, Middle Eastern/North African staff, and staff with a disability also experience the DEI elements of the climate in less positive ways.

Institutional Commitment & Inclusive and Equitable Treatment

Staff share modest agreement that U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI. African American/Black staff are less likely to agree that U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI, followed by female, LGBTQ+, those with a bachelor's degree, born in the U.S. or with a disability.

When asked about feelings of being valued and a sense of belonging and thriving and growing at U-M, staff agree that they are having these experiences. African American/Black staff are less likely to agree with experiencing these states than all other racial groups.

Staff with a disability are less likely than those without a disability to report that they are valued and belong at U-M.

Also, staff who identified as age 41+, without a bachelor's degree, with a disability or born in the U.S. are less likely to agree that they are thriving and growing at U-M.

Fair Treatment

When asked about feelings of fair treatment at U-M, overall staff agree that they experience fair treatment. However, African American/Black staff are less likely to agree with experiencing fair treatment than all other racial groups. Additionally, staff without a bachelor's degree, with a disability or born in the U.S. are less likely to agree that they are treated fairly at U-M.

Intergroup Interactions

A significant number of staff have meaningful interactions with others who are different from them. Staff have the greatest interactions with people of another race or ethnicity (86%), followed by national origin, social class, those with a different political opinion and sexual orientation.

Discrimination

Approximately one in six U-M staff report that they felt discriminated against in the past 12 months. Those identifying as African American/Black, Middle Eastern/North African, Other or a member of two or more racial groups are more likely to report feeling being discriminated against.

The social identity group differences in the likelihood of staff reporting feeling that they had been discriminated against at U-M in the past 12 months is striking:

- Staff with a disability are 140% more likely than staff without a disability.
- Staff without a bachelor's degree are 21% more likely than staff with a bachelor's degree.
- Asian American/Asian staff are 42% more likely than White staff.
- African American/Black staff are 367% more likely than White staff.
- Hispanic/Latino/a staff are 90% more likely than White staff.
- Other racial/ethnic staff are 156% more likely than White staff.

Sex (15%) is the most frequently reported form of discriminatory event that staff report experiencing in the past 12 months. That is followed by racial identity, political orientation, social class, national origin, disability and sexual orientation.

The survey also examined the frequency with which different social identity groups report experiencing discriminatory events related to that identity group. These results indicate that significant portions of U-M staff 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 specific identify group:

- 17% of female staff.
- 25% of staff not born in the U.S.
- 23% LGBTQ+ staff.
- 33% of staff with a disability.
- 51% of African American/Black staff.
- 27% of Hispanic/Latino/a staff.
- 34% of Middle Eastern/North African staff.

Overall, the report finds that U-M staff vary across a number of different social identities, such as age, national origin, racial composition, sex, religious background, disability status, and sexual orientation. Overall, staff report being satisfied with the climate at the U-M (both generally and as it relates to DEI). They report that, for the most part, they believe the U-M is committed as an institution to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Staff also report feelings of being valued, and that they belong at U-M. They are also reporting that they are both growing and thriving at the university. In general, staff 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 staff. In fact, there are systematic differences in staff's experiences at the university. 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 significantly less positively than staff from traditionally majority groups.

Perhaps most striking is the consistent finding that African American/Black staff report having the least positive experiences when compared with any other social identity on campus. Roughly one out of six staff report feeling they had been discriminated against in some form within the past year. Again, staff 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 held in looking at staff's 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 staff are to experience the same positive experiences that are enjoyed by the majority of staff. 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 the staff. Ongoing efforts to make campus facilities more accessible to all also address some of the differential experiences that were reported by staff with disabilities and members of the LGBTQ+ communities. Current DEI plan initiatives such as assessing and improving staff's skill level in interacting with individuals from backgrounds that differed from their own, efforts to infuse DEI into the annual review processes for staff, as well as initiatives that are designed to diversify the staff 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 the staff's perceptions of the U-M Ann Arbor campus and their experiences on it. These data provide several benefits to the U-M community. For instance, the data provide improved estimates of the composition of staff 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) fair treatment (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/>.

III. SURVEY DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

a. SAMPLE DESIGN

Given the large staff population at the University of Michigan, this study used a sample survey approach rather than a census of all staff. 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 staff.

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 staff 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. Staff were also asked in what department and school they work and how long they have been employed. These variables will be used in the primary analysis, as well as to better understand any non-response bias that may exist 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 staff member at U-M; any discriminatory events personally experienced; 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 staff please go to <http://diversity.umich.edu/strategic-plan/climate-survey/>.

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 staff) to generate simple random samples.

Population Sample Frame and Sample Selection

The eligible population for this survey included all staff at the U-M Ann Arbor campus who were employed as of September 1, 2016. The Human Resources Department at the University of Michigan provided the sample frame (approximately 32,000 staff).

Using the sample frame, U-M Survey Research Center selected a representative random sample of staff with over sampling of Native American/Alaskan Native, African American/Black and Hispanic/Latino/a staff members. The final sample consisted of 3,500 staff. This scientific sample was designed to adequately represent all current U-M staff. As a quality check, the sample selected was compared against the sample frame and the population of staff on available demographic characteristics.

Data Collection

The overall data collection design protocol for staff was:

- A USPS mailed pre-notification letter sent to each selected staff member, inviting them to participate in a web-based survey. Any staff 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 email 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 interviewer telephone prompt to complete the survey.
- All participating staff 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 staff non-responders were selected to be included in a “Phase II” responsive design. For the Phase II design, staff non-responders were contacted via telephone by professionally trained interviewers to encourage their participation and answer any questions they may have about the study or the questionnaire. Under no circumstance were any survey questions asked or answered via the interviewers. To preserve confidentiality, if the participant agreed to participate in the study as a result of the telephone call, the interviewer resent the email invitation to the individual so the staff member could complete the survey on their own. For respondents who could not be

contacted, as a courtesy, interviewers also emailed a new survey link to potential participants after leaving them a voice mail message about the survey.

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 10 \$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.

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 non-response bias – however, they do not specifically identify a bias.

We use the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) standard response rates¹ 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.

Weighted Final Response Rate (AAPOR RR02)	73.8%
Mean Completion Time	12.66 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 staff. The original sample design included oversampling of Native American/Alaskan Natives, African American/Blacks and Hispanic/Latino/a staff, 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 (Phase II) including telephone contact attempts from interviewers. The two-phase sampling introduced differential weights for some staff. Those sampled for the second phase of recruitment received an adjustment weight, equal to the inverse of the rate at which they were selected. These weights allowed this second-phase sample to represent the sample members who were not selected for the second phase.

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, 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 non-response-adjusted selection weights) were weighted to match those of the population. This technique, known

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

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.

These adjustments assume that there were no differences in the survey measures between responders and non-responders after controlling for the characteristics used in the non-response 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 staff based upon responses to the survey itself. **Each section of the report displays percentages of the staff 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 staff are based on a sample of the staff, 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

The mean age of U-M staff is 43 years (Table 2). The majority of the staff report being female (70%) with male being 30% (Table 3). Similarly, roughly 70% report their gender identity as female and 30% as male, with less than 1% of the staff identifying as transgender or gender non-conforming (Table 4), and 93% of staff report being heterosexual (Table 5).

Three out of four staff (75%) identify their race as White with the next largest group being African American/Black, followed by Asian American/Asian, then Hispanic/Latino/a (Table 6). 18% of the staff are classified as Underrepresented minority (Table 6A).

The majority of the staff report being born in the U.S. (89%) (Table 7), and 81% of staff report that both parents were born in the United States (Table 8).

U-M has a very pluralistic population with regard to religious beliefs. 23% of staff report being either Agnostic, Atheist, or having no religious background. 25% of staff report being Catholic. 43% of staff report being either Baptist, Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian, Christian (Non-Denomination), or Other Christian. 2% of staff report as Jewish. 1% report being Muslim, and 1% of staff report as Hindu (Table 9).

6% of staff report having a disability (Table 10). 3% report having served in the Armed Forces, Military Reserves, or National Guard (Table 11). 70% of staff report having a Bachelor's degree or higher, and 31% have no Bachelor's degree (Table 12).

Table 2. What is your current age (in years)?
Mean (Confidence Limits)
43.2 (42.6, 43.9)

Table 3. What is your current sex?²	
	Percentage of U-M Staff (Confidence Limits)
Male	29.5 (26.9, 32.1)
Female	70.4 (67.8, 73.0)

Table 4. What is your gender/gender identity?³		
		Percentage of U-M Staff (Confidence Limits)
Man		29.1 (26.5, 31.7)
Woman		70.8 (68.2, 73.3)
Transgender/Gender Conforming	Non-	0.1 (0.0, 0.2)

Table 5. What is your sexual orientation?	
	Percentage of U-M Staff (Confidence Limits)
Heterosexual	93.4 (92.2, 94.7)
Bisexual	2.0 (1.3, 2.7)
Gay/Lesbian	2.7 (1.8, 3.6)
Queer	0.2 (0.0, 0.4)
Questioning	0.1 (0.0, 0.2)
Asexual	0.1 (0.0, 0.2)
Preferred Response Not Listed [write in]	1.0 (0.6, 1.5)
Two or More Selections	0.5 (0.2, 0.8)

² Fewer than 10 respondents chose a category not represented here.

³ Fewer than 10 respondents chose each of the Transgender/Gender Non-Conforming & Preferred Response Not Listed options. Those two categories are pooled into a single group here.

Table 6. Please indicate the racial or ethnic groups with which you identify.	
	Percentage of U-M Staff (Confidence Limits)
African American/Black	10.3 (9.0, 11.6)
Asian American/Asian	6.4 (5.0, 7.7)
Hispanic/Latino/a	2.8 (2.5, 3.2)
Middle Eastern/North African	0.7 (0.2, 1.2)
Native American/Alaskan Native	0.5 (0.1, 0.9)
White	75.4 (73.3, 77.6)
Other (Please specify): [write in]	1.3 (0.6, 1.9)
Two or More Selections	2.7 (1.9, 3.5)

Table 6A. Please indicate the racial or ethnic groups with which you identify- Condensed Categorization	
	Percentage of U-M Staff (Confidence Limits)
White	75.4 (73.3, 77.6)
Asian American/Asian	6.4 (5.0, 7.7)
Underrepresented	18.2 (16.5, 19.9)

Table 7. Were you born in the United States?	
	Percentage of U-M Staff (Confidence Limits)
No	11.1 (9.3, 12.8)
Yes	88.9 (87.2, 90.7)

Table 8. Please indicate your generation status:	
	Percentage of U-M Staff (Confidence Limits)
All of my grandparents and both of my parents were born in the United States	57.4 (54.7, 60.1)
Both of my parents were born in the United States	23.9 (21.5, 26.2)
One of my parents was born in the United States	5.6 (4.4, 6.9)
Neither of my parents were born in the United States	13.1 (11.2, 15.0)

Table 9. With what religious background, if any, do you most identify?	
	Percentage of U-M Staff (Confidence Limits)
Agnostic	7.0 (5.5, 8.4)
Atheist	4.8 (3.7, 5.9)
Baptist	5.2 (4.1, 6.3)
Buddhist	1.1 (0.5, 1.0)
Catholic	25.1 (22.7, 27.5)
Church of Christ	0.7 (0.3, 1.0)
Christian: Non-Denominational	17.2 (15.1, 19.3)
Episcopalian	1.8 (1.0, 2.5)
Hindu	1.1 (0.5, 1.8)
Muslim	0.9 (0.3, 1.4)
Jehovah's Witness	1.0 (0.4, 1.5)
Jewish	1.5 (0.9, 2.0)
Lutheran	5.6 (4.3, 7.0)
Methodist	5.0 (3.9, 6.2)
Pentecostal	2.2 (1.4, 3.0)
Presbyterian	1.6 (1.0, 2.3)
Protestant: Non-Denominational	1.5 (0.9, 2.0)
Seventh Day Adventist	0.3 (0.1, 0.5)
Unitarian/Universalist	0.6 (0.2, 0.9)
None	11.2 (9.4, 13.0)
Other Christian	1.5 (0.8, 2.3)
Other	3.2 (2.3, 4.1)

Table 10. Do you have a disability?	
	Percentage of U-M Staff (Confidence Limits)
Yes, I have a disability	6.2 (4.9, 7.5)
No, I do not have a disability	93.8 (92.5, 95.1)

Table 11. Have you ever served in the U.S. Armed Forces, Military Reserves, or National Guard?	
	Percentage of U-M Staff (Confidence Limits)
Ever or currently serving	3.2 (2.2, 4.3)
Never served	96.8 (95.7, 97.8)

Table 12. What is the highest degree you have earned?	
	Percentage of U-M Staff (Confidence Limits)
No Bachelor's Degree	30.5 (27.9, 33.1)
Bachelor's Degree or Higher	69.5 (66.9, 72.1)

V. SURVEY RESPONSES

a. SATISFACTION WITH OVERALL CAMPUS CLIMATE/ENVIRONMENT

The tables below describe U-M staff 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, 72% of staff report being satisfied with the overall climate at U-M in past 12 months, with equal levels of satisfaction (72%) for female and male staff (Table 13). Asian American/Asian staff report the highest level of satisfaction among staff (83%), while African American/Black staff report the lowest level of satisfaction (46%). African American/Black staff are statistically significantly different in their satisfaction from White, Asian American/Asian, and Hispanic/Latino/a staff. Hispanic/Latino/a staff are midway between Asian American/Asian and African American/Black staff in their perceptions, with 63% reporting being satisfied with the overall climate at U-M within the past 12 months (Table 14).

Table 13. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Sex			
	Female	Male	Total
Very Satisfied/Satisfied	72.0 (69.2, 74.8)	71.6 (66.6, 76.6)	71.9 (69.5, 74.4)

Table 14. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Race								
	White	Asian American /Asian	African American /Black	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Middle Eastern/ North African	Native American /Alaskan Native⁴	Other	Two or More
Very Satisfied/Satisfied	75.5 (72.6, 78.4)	82.7 (75.0, 90.5)	46.2 (39.7, 52.6)	62.9 (56.4, 69.3)	57.5 (12.7, 100.0)	76.7 (43.5, 100.0)	55.4 (28.1, 82.8)	70.5 (57.2, 83.9)

In addition to the bivariate analyses of satisfaction presented in tables 13 and 14, multivariate analyses were performed and examined the relative impact of age 41+ (relative to staff age 41), education level, sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (non-native born relative to native born), ability status (Disability relative to no disability), and race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes of interest. In this case, we were examining staff satisfaction with the overall campus climate/environment (see Table 51 in the *Multivariate Risk Model* section of this report, pg. 36). Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

The results indicate that:

- There are no differences between staff age 41+ and 41- in their satisfaction with the overall campus climate/environment.

⁴ This category includes native Hawaiians throughout

- There are no differences between staff who possessed a Bachelor’s degree and those that did not in their satisfaction with the overall campus climate/environment.
- There are no differences between male and female staff in their satisfaction with the overall campus climate/environment.
- There are no differences between LGBTQ+ staff and heterosexual staff in their satisfaction with the overall campus climate/environment.
- Staff born outside the U.S. are 56% less likely than staff born in the U.S. to report feeling neutral, unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied with the overall campus climate/environment.
- Staff with disabilities are 100% more likely than staff without a disability to report feeling neutral, unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied with the overall campus climate/environment.
- With respect to race, African American/Black staff are more likely to report feeling neutral, unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied with the overall campus climate/environment than all other racial groups. Hispanic/Latino/a staff are more likely than all other racial groups (except African American/Black) to report feeling neutral, unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied with the overall campus climate/environment.
- Asian American/Asian staff are more likely to report feeling neutral, unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied with the overall campus climate/environment, compared to White staff.
- Hispanic/Latino/a staff are more likely to report feeling neutral, unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied with the overall campus climate/environment, compared to White staff.
- White staff are the least likely to report feeling neutral, unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied with the overall campus climate/environment.
- White staff are nearly 4 times more likely than African American/Black staff and more than two times more likely as Hispanic/Latino/a staff to report feeling satisfied, or very satisfied with the overall campus climate/environment.

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

Descriptions of General Climate and DEI Climate

The tables below describe U-M staff 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

Given the expansive nature of this survey question, the items described above were used in an exploratory factor analysis. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) is a statistical technique that condenses data by grouping variables into factors (sets of variables) based on shared variance, the statistical index of the degree to which two variables were associated (shared variance is indicated by correlation coefficients). Thus, the goal of EFA is to identify related underlying constructs within the survey responses to help make the data more comprehensible and useful for practical applications. The EFA conducted on the semantic differential items in this study identified two 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, there is a statistically significant difference in staff’s perception of the climate staff in DEI terms, compared to general terms, with staff reporting a more positive assessment of the climate in DEI terms. There were no significant differences between males and females in their perceptions of both general climate elements and DEI (Table 15).

With regard to general climate, African American/Black staff reported significantly lower ratings compared to all other racial/ethnic groups, except the Other and the Middle Eastern/North African racial/ethnic categories. With regard to the DEI climate, White, Asian American/Asian, Hispanic/Latino/a, and Native American/Alaskan Native staff rate the climate significantly higher than African American/Black and Middle Eastern/North African staff, with no significant difference in the assessment among White, Asian American/Asian, Hispanic/Latino/a, and Native American/Alaskan Native staff (Table 16).

Table 15. Key Dimensions: General Climate Elements and DEI Climate Elements and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Sex

	Female	Male	Total
General Climate Elements	3.7 (3.6, 3.7)	3.7 (3.7, 3.8)	3.7 (3.7, 3.7)
DEI Climate Elements	3.8 (3.8, 3.8)	3.9 (3.8, 3.9)	3.8 (3.8, 3.8)

Table 16. Key Dimensions: General Climate Elements and DEI Climate Elements and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Race

	White	Asian American /Asian	African American /Black	Hispanic /Latino/ a	Middle Eastern /North African	Native American /Alaskan Native	Other	Two or More
General Climate Elements	3.7 (3.7, 3.8)	3.9 (3.8, 4.0)	3.3 (3.2, 3.4)	3.7 (3.6, 3.7)	3.4 (2.9, 4.0)	4.1 (3.8, 4.5)	3.3 (3.0, 3.6)	3.5 (3.3, 4.7)
DEI Climate Elements	3.9 (3.8, 3.9)	3.9 (3.8, 4.1)	3.4 (3.3, 3.4)	3.8 (3.7, 3.9)	3.3 (2.7, 3.8)	4.2 (3.8, 4.5)	3.3 (3.0, 3.6)	3.7 (3.5, 3.9)

In addition to the bivariate analyses of satisfaction presented in tables 15 and 16, multivariate analyses were performed and examined the relative impact of age 41+ (relative to staff age 41-), education level, sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (non-native born

relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), and race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes of interest. In this case, we examined staff perceptions of general and DEI climate elements (see Table 54 in the *Multivariate Risk Model* section of this report, pg. 39). Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

The results indicate that:

- There are no differences between staff age 41+ and 41- in their perception of general climate elements. However, staff age 41+ report less positive perceptions of DEI climate elements compared to staff age 41 and lower.
- There are no differences based on education level in staff perceptions of general climate elements. However, staff without a bachelor's degree report more positive perceptions of DEI climate elements than staff with a bachelor's degree.
- There are no sex differences in staff perceptions of general or DEI climate elements.
- There are no differences based on sexual orientation in staff perceptions of general climate elements. However, LGBTQ+ staff report less positive perceptions of DEI climate elements than heterosexual staff.
- Staff born outside the U.S. report better perceptions of both the general and DEI climate as compared to U.S.-born staff.
- Staff with a disability report less positive perceptions of both the general and DEI climate as compared to staff without a disability.
- Staff who identify as African American/Black and an Other racial/ethnic group report less positive perceptions of both the general and DEI climate as compared to White staff.
- While Hispanic/Latino/a staff did not differ from White staff in their perceptions of the general climate, Hispanic/Latino/a staff report less positive perceptions of the DEI climate as compared to White staff.

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

The tables below describe U-M staff 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 three 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 staff.

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).

Table 17. Key Dimensions: Institutional Commitment, Valued/Belonging, and Thriving/Growth and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Sex

	Female	Male	Total
Institutional Commitment	3.4 (3.3, 3.4)	3.4 (3.4, 3.5)	3.4 (3.3, 3.4)
Valued and Belonging	3.7 (3.7, 3.7)	3.7 (3.7, 3.8)	3.7 (3.7, 3.7)
Thriving and Growth	3.6 (3.5, 3.6)	3.5 (3.5, 3.6)	3.6 (3.5, 3.6)

Table 18. Key Dimensions: Institutional Commitment, Valued/Belonging, and Thriving/Growth and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Race

	White	Asian American /Asian	African American /Black	Hispanic /Latino/a	Middle Eastern /North African	Native American /Alaskan Native	Other	Two or More
Institutional Commitment	3.5 (3.4, 3.5)	3.4 (3.2, 3.5)	2.7 (2.7, 2.8)	3.3 (3.2, 3.4)	3.3 (2.7, 3.8)	3.0 (2.6, 3.3)	3.4 (3.2, 3.7)	3.2 (3.1, 3.4)
Valued and Belonging	3.8 (3.8, 3.8)	3.8 (3.7, 3.9)	3.3 (3.2, 3.3)	3.7 (3.6, 3.7)	3.8 (3.0, 4.6)	3.5 (3.2, 3.8)	3.2 (2.9, 3.6)	3.4 (3.3, 3.6)
Thriving and Growth	3.7 (3.6, 3.7)	3.6 (3.4, 3.7)	3.0 (2.9, 3.1)	3.5 (3.4, 3.6)	3.0 (2.3, 3.8)	3.3 (3.0, 3.6)	3.0 (2.6, 3.3)	3.5 (3.3, 3.7)

Perceptions of Institutional Commitment

Overall, staff report, on average, modest agreement with the idea that the U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI, with no statistically significant differences between male and female staff in their perceptions of institutional commitment (Table 17).

White, Asian American/Asian, Hispanic/Latino/a, and Other staff reported statistically significant higher levels of agreement with the idea of U-M institutional commitment to DEI, when compared to African American/Black staff who reported the lowest level of agreement with this idea among any of the racial/ethnic groups. African American/Blacks did not differ significantly from Middle Eastern or Native American respondents in their perceptions of institutional commitment (Table 18).

In addition to the bivariate analyses of institutional commitment presented in tables 17 and 18, multivariate analyses were performed and examined the relative impact of age 41+ (relative to staff age 41-), education level, sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (non-native born relative to native born), ability status (Disability relative to no disability), and race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes of interest. In this case, we

were examining staff perceptions of institutional commitment to Diversity Equity and Inclusion (DEI) (see Table 52 in the *Multivariate Risk Model* section of this report, pg. 37). Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

The results indicate that:

- There are no differences between staff age 41+ and 41- in their likelihood to agree with the idea that U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI.
- Staff with no Bachelor's degree are more likely than staff with a Bachelor's degree to agree with the idea that the University of Michigan has an institutional commitment to DEI.
- Female staff are less likely than males to agree with the idea that the University of Michigan has an institutional commitment to DEI.
- Staff not born in the U.S. are more likely than staff born in the U.S. to agree with the idea that the University of Michigan has an institutional commitment to DEI.
- LGBTQ+ staff are less likely than heterosexual staff to agree with the idea that the University of Michigan has an institutional commitment to DEI.
- Staff with disabilities are less likely than staff without disabilities to agree with the idea that the University of Michigan has an institutional commitment to DEI.
- With respect to race, African American/Black staff are less likely than all other racial groups to agree with the idea that the University of Michigan has an institutional commitment to DEI.
- Hispanic/Latino/a staff are less likely than all other racial groups (except African American/Black) to agree with the idea that the University of Michigan has an institutional commitment to DEI.
- Asian American/Asian staff, and staff who were in the Other racial group category are less likely than Whites to agree with the idea that the University of Michigan has an institutional commitment to DEI.
- Whites are most likely of all the racial group categories to agree with the idea that the University of Michigan has an institutional commitment to DEI.

Perceptions of Being Valued/Belonging

Overall, staff report, on average, agreement with the idea that they are valued and have a sense of belonging at the U-M with no differences by sex (Table 17). African American/Black staff report feeling less support than all other racial groups (except for Other) for the idea that they are valued and have a sense of belonging at U-M. White, Asian American/Asian and Middle Eastern/North African staff have the highest levels of support for this idea (Table 18).

In addition to the bivariate analyses of being valued/belonging presented in tables 17 and 18, multivariate analyses were performed and examined the relative impact of age 41+ (relative to staff age 41-), education level, sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (non-native born relative to native born), ability status (Disability relative to no disability), and race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes of interest. In this case, we were examining staff perceptions of their ability to feel as if they were valued and belong at U-M (see Table 52 in the *Multivariate Risk Model* section of this report, pg. 37). Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

The results indicate that:

- There are no differences between staff age 41+ or 41- with respect to the extent to which they felt as if they are valued and belong at U-M.
- There are no differences between staff who have a Bachelor's degree and those that do not with respect to the extent to which they felt as if they are valued and belong at U-M.
- There are no sex differences with respect to the extent to which they felt as if they are valued and belong at U-M.

- There are no differences for LGBTQ+ staff (relative to heterosexual staff) with respect to the extent to which they felt as if they are valued and belong at U-M.
- There are no differences between staff not born in the U.S. and staff born in the U.S. with respect to the extent to which they felt as if they are valued and belong at U-M.
- Staff with disabilities are less likely than staff without disabilities to report feeling that they are valued and belong at U-M.
- With respect to race, African American/Black staff are less likely than all other racial groups to report feeling that they are valued and belong at U-M. Staff in the Other race group category are less likely than White staff to report feeling that they are valued and belong at U-M.

Perceptions of Thriving and Growth

Overall, staff report, on average, agreement with the idea that they are thriving and growing while at U-M with no sex differences (Table 17). African American/Black, Middle Eastern/North African, and staff who identify as Other report significantly less support than White and Asian American/Asian staff for the idea that they are thriving and growing at U-M (Table 18).

In addition to the bivariate analyses of thriving and growth presented in tables 17 and 18, multivariate analyses were performed and examined the relative impact of age 41+ (relative to staff age 41-), education level, sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (non-native born relative to native born), ability status (Disability relative to no disability), and race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes of interest. In this case, we were examining staff perceptions of their ability to thrive and grow at U-M (see Table 52 in the *Multivariate Risk Model* section of this report, pg. 37). Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

The results indicate that:

- Staff age 41+ as compared to staff age 41- are less likely to feel as if they are thriving and growing at U-M.
- Staff with no Bachelor's degree compared to those with the degree, are less likely to feel as if they are thriving and growing at U-M.
- There are no sex differences with respect to the extent to which staff felt as if they are thriving and growing at U-M.
- There are no differences for LGBTQ+ staff (relative to Heterosexual staff) with respect to the extent to which they felt as if they are thriving and growing at U-M.
- Staff who were not born in the U.S. are more likely to report feeling as if they are thriving and growing at U-M.
- Staff with disabilities are less likely than staff without disabilities to report feeling that they are thriving and growing at U-M.
- With respect to race, African American/Black staff are less likely than all other racial groups to report feeling that they are thriving and growing at U-M. Hispanic/Latino/a staff and staff in the Other race group category are less likely than White staff to report feeling that they are thriving and growing at U-M. Asian American/Asian staff are less likely than White staff to report feeling that they are thriving and growing at U-M.

d. PERCEPTIONS OF FAIR TREATMENT AT U-M

The tables below describe staff'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

In order to assess staff’s perception of being treated fairly and equitably in their unit, an index was created that was comprised of responses to four survey statements on fairness. The index was found to be highly reliable ($\alpha = .87$). The items used in this index are listed below:

- The workload is fairly and equitably distributed in my unit.
- There are fair and equitable processes for determining compensation in my unit.
- Support is provided fairly and equitably in my unit.
- Rewards for work performance are fairly and equitably distributed in my unit.

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).

Overall, staff report, on average, modest agreement with the idea that they are treated in a fair and equitable manner at U-M with no sex differences in response (Table 19). With regard to race, African American/Black staff, and staff who identify as Other or Two or More racial identities report significantly less support than the other racial/ethnic groups for the idea that they are treated in a fair and equitable manner at U-M (Table 20).

Table 19. Unit Treatment Index and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Sex			
	Female	Male	Total
Fair Treatment Index	3.2 (3.2, 3.2)	3.3 (3.2, 3.3)	3.2 (3.2, 3.3)

Table 20. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Race								
	White	Asian American/Asian	African American/Black	Hispanic/Latino/a	Middle Eastern/North African	Native American/Alaska Native	Other	Two or More
Strongly Agree/Agree	3.3 (3.2, 3.3)	3.4 (3.2, 3.6)	2.8 (2.7, 3.0)	3.1 (3.0, 3.2)	3.2 (2.5, 4.0)	3.2 (2.9, 3.6)	2.8 (2.4, 3.2)	2.9 (2.6, 3.2)

In addition to the bivariate analyses of fair treatment at U-M presented in tables 19 and 20, multivariate analyses were performed and examined the relative impact of age 41+ (relative to staff age 41-), education level, sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (non-native born relative to native born), ability status (Disability relative to no disability), and race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes of interest. In this case, we were examining staff perceptions being treated in a fair and equitable manner at U-M (see Table 52 in the *Multivariate Risk Model* section of this report, pg. 37). Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

The results indicate that:

- There are no differences between staff age 41+ or 41- with respect to the extent to which they felt as if they are treated in a fair and equitable manner at U-M.
- Staff with no Bachelor’s degree are less likely than those with the degree to report feeling that they are treated in a fair and equitable manner at U-M.
- There are no sex differences with respect to the extent to which staff reported feeling as if they are treated in a fair and equitable manner at U-M.

- There are no differences for LGBTQ+ staff (relative to Heterosexual staff) with respect to the extent to which they reported feeling that they are treated in a fair and equitable manner at U-M.
- Staff who were not born in the U.S. are more likely to report feeling that they are treated in a fair and equitable manner at U-M, compared to staff born in the U.S.
- Staff with disabilities are less likely than staff without disabilities to report feeling that that are were treated in a fair and equitable manner at U-M.
- With respect to race, African American/Black staff are less likely than White and Asian American/Asian staff to report feeling like they are treated in a fair and equitable manner at U-M. Staff in the Other racial/ethnic category are less likely than White staff to report feeling that they are treated in a fair and equitable manner at U-M.

e. INTERGROUP INTERACTIONS IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS

Political Opinions

The tables below describe U-M staff 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...

Never; Seldom; Sometimes; Often; Very Often

...whose political opinions were different from your own

Table 21. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Sex

	Female	Male	Total
Very Often/Often	66.0 (62.9, 69.0)	64.4 (58.8, 69.9)	65.5 (62.9, 68.2)

Table 22. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Race

	White	Asian American /Asian	African American /Black	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Middle Eastern/North African	Native American /Alaskan Native	Other	Two or More
Very Often/Often	68.0 (64.8, 71.1)	46.5 (34.5, 58.4)	64.6 (58.2, 70.9)	59.6 (53.1, 66.2)	25.2 (0.0, 60.3)	89.8 (78.1, 100.0)	45.9 (18.5, 73.3)	69.8 (55.9, 83.6)

Overall, nearly seven out of 10 staff reported very often or often interacting in a meaningful way with people whose political opinions were different from their own in the past 12 months, with no significant differences between male and female staff (Table 21). Native American/Alaskan Native staff reported most often having these meaningful interactions (90%). Compared to all remaining racial/ethnic groups, White and African American/Black, and staff who identify as Two or More racial identities are more likely to report such interactions. Middle Eastern/North African, Asian American/Asian, and the Other racial category are least likely to report such interactions (Table 22).

In addition to the bivariate analyses of political interactions at U-M presented in tables 21 and 22, multivariate analyses were performed and examined the relative impact of age 41+ (relative to staff age 41-), education level, sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (non-native

born relative to native born), ability status (Disability relative to no disability), and race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes of interest. In this case, we were examining staff perceptions of interacting in a meaningful way with people whose political opinions were different from their own during the past 12 (see Table 53 in the *Multivariate Risk Model* section of this report, pg. 38). Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

The results indicate that:

- There are no differences between staff age 41+ and 41- in the likelihood that they reported interacting in a meaningful way with people whose political opinions are different from their own during the past 12 months.
- Staff with no Bachelor’s degree are more likely to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose political opinions are different from their own during the past 12 months, compared to staff with a Bachelor’s degree.
- There are no differences between female staff and male staff in the likelihood that they reported interacting in a meaningful way with people whose political opinions are different from their own during the past 12 months.
- LGBTQ+ staff are less likely than heterosexual staff to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose political opinions are different from their own during the past 12 months.
- There are no differences between staff born in the U.S. and outside of the U.S. in the likelihood that they reported interacting in a meaningful way with people whose political opinions are different from their own during the past 12 months.
- There are no differences between staff with disabilities and staff without disabilities in the likelihood that they reported interacting in a meaningful way with people whose political opinions are different from their own during the past 12 months.
- With respect to race, Asian American/Asian staff are less likely than all other groups to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose political opinions are different from their own during the past 12 months.
- White staff are most likely to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose political opinions are different from their own during the past 12 months.

Nationality

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

...who were of a different nationality than your own

Table 23. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Sex			
	Female	Male	Total
Very Often/Often	80.0 (77.4, 82.6)	81.4 (76.8, 85.9)	80.5 (78.3, 82.7)

Table 24. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Race								
	White	Asian American /Asian	African American /Black	Hispanic /Latino/ a	Middle Eastern /North African	Native American /Alaskan Native	Other	Two or More
Very Often/Often	80.7 (78.0, 83.3)	78.2 (68.5, 88.0)	82.3 (77.4, 87.2)	81.2 (75.3, 87.1)	51.4 (2.6, 100.0)	97.0 (92.3, 100.0)	73.4 (45.9, 100.0)	86.7 (76.8, 96.7)

Overall, nearly eight out of 10 staff report very often or often interacting in a meaningful way with persons of a different nationality their own in the past 12 months, with no significant differences between male and female staff (Table 23). Native American/Alaskan Native staff reported most often having these meaningful interactions (97%). There are no significant differences between all other racial/ethnic categories (Table 24).

In addition to the bivariate analyses of nationality interactions at U-M presented in tables 23 and 24, multivariate analyses were performed and examined the relative impact of age 41+ (relative to staff age 41-), education level, sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (non-native born relative to native born), ability status (Disability relative to no disability), and race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes of interest. In this case, we were examining staff perceptions of interacting in a meaningful way with people who were a different nationality than their own during the past 12 months (see Table 53 in the *Multivariate Risk Model* section of this report, pg. 38). Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

The results indicate that:

- There are no differences between staff age 41+ and 41- in the likelihood that they reported interacting in a meaningful way with people who are of a different nationality than their own during the past 12 months.
- Staff with no Bachelor’s degree are less likely to report interacting in a meaningful way with people who are of a different nationality than their own during the past 12 months, compared to staff with a Bachelor’s degree.
- There are no sex differences.
- LGBTQ+ staff are less likely to report interacting in a meaningful way with people who are of a different nationality than their own during the past 12 months, compared to heterosexual staff.
- Staff who were not born in the U.S. are more likely to report interacting in a meaningful way with people who are of a different nationality than their own during the past 12 months, compared to staff born in the U.S.
- Staff with a disability are less likely to report interacting in a meaningful way with people who are of a different nationality than their own during the past 12 months, compared to staff with no disability.
- With regard to race, Asian American/Asian staff are less likely than White staff, African American/Black staff, and Hispanic/Latino/a staff to report interacting in a meaningful way with people who are of a different nationality than their own during the past 12 months.

Race/Ethnicity

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

...who were of a different race or ethnicity than your own

Table 25. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Sex			
	Female	Male	Total
Very Often/Often	86.6 (84.4, 88.7)	82.6 (78.0, 87.2)	85.5 (83.5, 87.5)

Table 26. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Race								
	White	Asian American /Asian	African American /Black	Hispanic /Latino/ a	Middle Eastern/ North African	Native American /Alaskan Native	Other	Two or More
Very Often/ Often	85.8 (83.5, 88.2)	82.0 (73.9, 90.1)	86.9 (82.4, 91.4)	88.6 (83.0, 94.1)	60.3 (8.0, 100.0)	98.9 (96.5, 100.0)	65.1 (37.2, 93.1)	93.5 (86.3, 100.0)

Overall, nearly nine out of 10 staff report very often or often interacting in a meaningful way with persons of a different race/ethnicity their own in the past 12 months, with no significant differences between male and female staff (Table 25). While staff across all racial/ethnic groups report a high rate of interactions with those from different races/ethnicities, Native American staff reported a significantly higher rate than any other group (99%) (Table 26).

In addition to the bivariate analyses of racial/ethnic interactions at U-M presented in tables 25 and 26, multivariate analyses were performed and examined the relative impact of age 41+ (relative to staff age 41-), education level, sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (non-native born relative to native born), ability status (Disability relative to no disability), and race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes of interest. In this case, we were examining staff perceptions of interacting in a meaningful way with people who were a different racial/ethnic group than their own during the past 12 months (see Table 53 in the *Multivariate Risk Model* section of this report, pg. 38). Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

The results indicate that:

- There are no differences between staff age 41+ and 41- in their likelihood to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose race/ethnicity is different from their own during the past 12 months.
- Staff who do not have a Bachelor’s degree are less likely to report interacting in a meaningful way with people who are of a different race/ethnicity than their own during the past 12 months, compared to staff with a Bachelor’s degree.
- There are no differences between male and female staff in their likelihood to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose race/ethnicity is different from their own during the past 12 months.
- There are no differences between LGBTQ+ staff (relative to heterosexual staff) in their likelihood to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose race/ethnicity is different from their own during the past 12 months.
- There are no differences between staff not born in the U.S. and those born in the U.S. in their likelihood to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose race/ethnicity is different from their own during the past 12 months.
- There are no differences between staff with a disability and those without in their likelihood to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose race/ethnicity is different from their own during the past 12 months.
- With respect to race, African American/Black staff are more likely than White, Asian American/Asian, and staff in the Other category to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose race/ethnicity is different from their own during the past 12 months.

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

Table 27. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Sex			
	Female	Male	Total
Very Often/Often	57.3 (54.1, 60.5)	55.4 (49.7, 61.1)	56.9 (54.1, 59.7)

Table 28. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Race								
	White	Asian American /Asian	African American /Black	Hispanic /Latino/ a	Middle Eastern /North African	Native American /Alaskan Native	Other	Two or More
Very Often/Often	60.0 (56.7, 63.3)	28.3 (17.7, 38.8)	56.2 (49.8, 62.6)	52.2 (45.6, 58.8)	33.8 (0.0, 74.0)	73.5 (40.7, 100.0)	41.1 (15.3, 66.9)	57.0 (41.7, 72.3)

Nearly six out of 10 staff report very often or often interacting in a meaningful way with people whose sexual orientation was different from their own in the past 12 months, with no significant differences between male and female staff (Table 27). Asian American/Asian staff are significantly less likely than any other racial/ethnic group (except for those identifying as Other), to report often interacting in a meaningful way with people whose sexual orientation was different from their own in the past 12 months (28%) (Table 28).

In addition to the bivariate analyses of racial interactions at U-M presented in tables 27 and 28, multivariate analyses were performed and examined the relative impact of age 41+ (relative to staff age 41-), education level, sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (non-native born relative to native born), ability status (Disability relative to no disability), and race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes of interest. In this case, we were examining staff perceptions of interacting in a meaningful way with people who were a different sexual orientation than their own during the past 12 months (see Table 53 in the *Multivariate Risk Model* section of this report, pg. 38). Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

The results indicate that:

- There are no differences between staff age 41+ and 41- in their likelihood to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose sexual orientation is different from their own during the past 12 months.
- Staff who do not have a Bachelor’s degree are less likely to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose sexual orientation was different than their own during the past 12 months, compared to staff with a Bachelor’s degree.
- There are no differences between male and female staff in their likelihood to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose sexual orientation is different from their own during the past 12 months.
- LGBTQ+ staff (relative to heterosexual staff) were more likely to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose sexual orientation is different from their own during the past 12 months.

- Staff not born in the U.S. are less likely to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose sexual orientation was different than their own during the past 12 months, compared to staff born in the U.S.
- Staff with a disability are less likely to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose sexual orientation was different than their own during the past 12 months, compared to staff without a disability.
- With respect to race, Asian American/Asian, Middle Eastern/North African, and Other staff are less likely than all other groups to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose sexual orientation was different than their own during the past 12 months.

Social Class

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

...who were from a different social class

Table 29. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Sex			
	Female	Male	Total
Very Often/Often	68.8 (65.9, 71.8)	65.6 (60.1, 71.1)	68.0 (65.4, 70.6)

Table 30. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Race								
	White	Asian American/Asian	African American/Black	Hispanic/Latino/a	Middle Eastern/North African	Native American/Alaskan Native	Other	Two or More
Very Often/Often	69.7 (66.6, 72.8)	47.9 (36.0, 59.8)	72.7 (66.9, 78.5)	68.3 (61.8, 74.8)	43.0 (0.0, 88.1)	34.0 (0.0, 72.3)	46.4 (19.7, 73.2)	72.3 (58.6, 86.0)

Overall, 68% of staff report very often or often interacting in a meaningful way with people whose social class was different from their own in the past 12 months, with no significant differences between male and female staff (Table 29). African American/Black staff, followed by White staff, and then Hispanic/Latino/a staff report higher levels of interacting with individuals from a different social class compared to the remaining racial/ethnic groups (Table 30).

In addition to the bivariate analyses of racial interactions at U-M presented in tables 29 and 30, multivariate analyses were performed and examined the relative impact of age 41+ (relative to staff age 41-), education level, sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (non-native born relative to native born), ability status (Disability relative to no disability), and race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes of interest. In this case, we were examining staff perceptions of interacting in a meaningful way with people who were a different social class than their own during the past 12 months (see Table 53 in the *Multivariate Risk Model* section of this report, pg. 38). Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

The results indicate that:

- There are no differences between staff age 41+ and 41- in their likelihood to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose social class is different from their own during the past 12 months.

- There are no differences between male and female staff in their likelihood to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose social class is different from their own during the past 12 months.
- There are no differences between male and female staff in their likelihood to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose social class is different from their own during the past 12 months.
- There are no differences between LGBTQ+ staff (relative to heterosexual staff) in their likelihood to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose social class is different from their own during the past 12 months.
- There are no differences between staff not born in the U.S. and those born in the U.S. in their likelihood to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose social class is different from their own during the past 12 months.
- There are no differences between staff with a disability and those without in their likelihood to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose social class is different from their own during the past 12 months.
- With respect to race, Asian American/Asian staff are less likely than White staff, African American/Black staff and staff in the Other category to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose social class is different from their own during the past 12 months. Staff in the Other category are less likely than African American/Black staff to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose social class is different from their own.

f. DISCRIMINATION— FELT

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

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

Table 31. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Sex

	Female	Male	Total
Yes	16.8 (14.6, 19.0)	17.9 (13.8, 22.0)	17.1 (15.2, 19.0)

Table 32. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Race

	White	Asian American /Asian	African American /Black	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Middle Eastern/ North African	Native American /Alaskan Native	Other	Two or More
Yes	12.7 (10.6, 14.8)	16.3 (6.9, 25.7)	40.9 (34.8, 46.9)	21.1 (15.8, 26.4)	24.4 (0.0, 58.6)	28.3 (0.0, 62.7)	39.7 (13.7, 65.6)	24.9 (12.2, 37.6)

Overall, approximately 17% of staff report feeling that in general over the past 12 months they have felt discriminated against at U-M. No significant sex differences are found for staff. However, significant race differences are found for staff. African American/Black and Hispanic/Latino/a staff are statistically significant from White staff, in that they more often reported feeling discriminated against at U-M (Table 32).

In addition to the analyses presented in Tables 31 and 32, multivariate analyses were performed and examined the relative impact of age 41+ (relative to staff age 41-), education level, sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (non-native born relative to native born), ability status (Disability relative to no disability), and race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes of interest. In this case, we were examining staff experiences of discrimination within the past 12 months (see Table 51 in the *Multivariate Risk Model* section of this report, pg. 36). Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

The results indicate that:

- There is no difference between staff age 41+ and 41- in their feeling of being discriminated against in the past 12 months.
- Staff who do not have a Bachelor's degree are more likely to report feeling that they have been discriminated against in the past 12 months, compared to staff with a Bachelor's degree.
- There are no differences between female and male staff in their feelings of being discriminated against in the past 12 months.
- There are no differences between LGBTQ+ staff and heterosexual staff in their feelings of being discriminated against in the past 12 months.
- There are no differences between staff who were not born in the U.S. and those who were in their feeling of being discriminated against in the past 12 months.
- Staff with disabilities are more likely than staff without disabilities to report feeling as if they have been discriminated against in the past 12 months.
- With respect to race, African American/Black staff are more likely than all other racial groups to report feeling as if they have been discriminated against in the past 12 months. African American/Black staff are nearly five times more likely than White staff to feel as if they have been discriminated against in the past 12 months.
- Staff who identified in the Other racial category are more likely than all other racial groups (except African American/Black) to feel as if they have been discriminated against in the past 12 months. They are 2.5 times more likely than White staff to feel as if they have been discriminated against in the past 12 months.
- Asian American/Asian staff are more likely than Whites to feel as if they have been discriminated against in the past 12 months.
- Hispanic/Latino/a staff are more likely than Whites to feel as if they have been discriminated against in the past 12 months
- White staff are the least likely racial group to feel as if they have been discriminated against in the past 12 months.

g. DISCRIMINATION—EXPERIENCED

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

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

Never; 1-2 times; 3 or more times

Disability Status

Overall, approximately 5% of staff report experiencing at least 1 discriminatory event as a result of their disability status at U-M in the past 12 months. There are no significant sex differences (Table 33). Staff who report a disability are more than 10 times more likely to report experiencing discrimination compared to staff that do not have a disability (Table 34). There are no significant race differences (Table 35).

Table 33. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Sex			
	Female	Male	Total
1 or more	4.6 (3.4, 5.8)	3.9 (1.7, 6.0)	4.6 (3.5, 5.7)

Table 34. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Sex and Disability Status			
	Female	Male	Total
Disability	37.7 (24.9, 50.6)	12.7 (0.1, 25.2)	32.5 (21.7, 43.3)
No Disability	2.6 (1.8, 3.5)	3.3 (1.2, 5.5)	2.9 (2.0, 3.8)

Table 35. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Race								
	White	Asian American /Asian	African American /Black	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Middle Eastern/ North African	Native American /Alaskan Native	Other	Two or More
1 or more	3.7 (2.5, 4.9)	3.1 (0.0, 6.4)	8.9 (5.1, 12.8)	6.0 (1.7, 10.3)	0	0	14.0 (0.0, 30.2)	14.2 (0.0, 29.4)

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

Racial/Ethnic Identity

Overall, approximately 13% of staff report experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their racial identity at U-M in the past 12 months. There are no significant sex differences (Table 36). Although not statistically significant from the Middle Eastern/North African racial category, African American/Black staff and staff who identify as Other report the highest level of experienced discrimination because of their race/ethnicity (Table 37).

Table 36. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Sex			
	Female	Male	Total
1 or more	12.0 (10.2, 13.8)	15.4 (11.6, 19.2)	13.2 (11.5, 14.9)

Table 37. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Race								
	White	Asian American /Asian	African American /Black	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Middle Eastern/ North African	Native American /Alaskan Native	Other	Two or More
1 or more	4.2 (2.9, 5.5)	33.6 (22.3, 45.0)	51.4 (45.1, 57.7)	27.0 (21.4, 32.6)	33.7 (0.0, 73.9)	7.6 (0.0, 16.0)	52.7 (25.3, 80.1)	28.8 (13.1, 44.5)

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

Sex

Overall, approximately 15% of staff report experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their sex at U-M in the past 12 months. Female staff are significantly more likely than male staff to report experiencing a sex discriminatory event (Table 38). There are no significant race differences (Table 39).

Table 38. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Sex			
	Female	Male	Total
1 or more	17.4 (15.1, 19.8)	7.6 (5.0, 10.3)	14.5 (12.7, 16.3)

Table 39. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Race								
	White	Asian American /Asian	African American /Black	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Middle Eastern/ North African	Native American /Alaskan Native	Other	Two or More
1 or more	14.1 (11.9, 16.3)	10.4 (2.7, 18.1)	20.0 (15.2, 24.8)	16.0 (12.1, 19.9)	33.3 (0.0, 73.2)	5.6 (0.0, 12.1)	15.0 (0.0, 31.4)	13.3 (3.7, 22.9)

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

Sexual Orientation

Overall, approximately 3% of staff report experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their sexual orientation at U-M in the past 12 months. There are no significant sex differences (Table 40). Staff who report being LGBTQ+ are more than 20 times more likely to report experiencing discrimination compared to staff who are not LGBTQ+ (Table 41). There are no significant race differences (Table 42).

Table 40. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Sex			
	Female	Male	Total
1 or more	2.5 (1.5, 3.6)	2.6 (1.3, 3.8)	2.6 (1.7, 3.4)

Table 41. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Sex and Sexual Orientation			
	Female	Male	Total
LGBTQ+	23.5 (12.5, 34.6)	21.4 (8.5, 34.2)	23.4 (14.9, 32.0)
Heterosexual	1.1 (0.3, 1.9)	1.2 (0.2, 2.1)	1.1 (0.5, 1.7)

Table 42. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Race								
	White	Asian American /Asian	African American /Black	Hispanic/Latino/a	Middle Eastern/ North African	Native American /Alaskan Native	Other	Two or More
1 or more	2.2 (1.2, 3.2)	1.8 (0.0, 4.4)	4.5 (2.0, 7.1)	5.8 (1.5, 10.2)	0	2.0 (0.0, 5.3)	4.8 (0.0, 13.2)	2.4 (0.0, 6.9)

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

National Origin

Overall, approximately 6% of staff report experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their national origin at U-M in the past 12 months. There are no significant sex differences (Table 43). Staff who were not born in the U.S. were nearly six times more likely than staff born in the U.S. to report experiencing discrimination based on their national origin within the past 12 months at U-M (Table 44). Although not statistically significant from Middle Eastern/North African or the Two or More category, White and Native American/Alaskan Native staff report less discrimination due to national origin, compared to all other racial groups (Table 45).

Table 43. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Sex			
	Female	Male	Total
1 or more	6.4 (4.7, 8.1)	6.6 (3.9, 9.2)	6.4 (5.0, 7.8)

Table 44. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Sex and National Origin			
	Female	Male	Total
Not born in the United States	26.3 (16.2, 36.3)	22.3 (9.6, 35.0)	24.9 (17.0, 32.8)
Born in the United States	4.2 (2.8, 5.6)	4.4 (2.0, 6.7)	4.2 (3.0, 5.4)

Table 45. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Race								
	White	Asian American /Asian	African American /Black	Hispanic/Latino/a	Middle Eastern/ North African	Native American /Alaskan Native	Other	Two or More
1 or more	1.9 (0.7, 3.0)	24.1 (13.9, 34.3)	18.5 (13.8, 23.3)	16.9 (11.7, 22.2)	16.0 (0.0, 43.6)	2.8 (0.0, 7.0)	49.9 (21.1, 78.7)	5.8 (0.0, 11.9)

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

Political Orientation

Overall, approximately 11% of staff report experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their political orientation at U-M in the past 12 months. There are no significant sex differences (Table 46). There are no significant race differences (Table 47).

Table 46. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Sex			
	Female	Male	Total
1 or more	10.1 (8.0, 12.2)	11.7 (8.2, 15.2)	10.8 (9.0, 12.7)

Table 47. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Race								
	White	Asian American /Asian	African American /Black	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Middle Eastern/ North African	Native American /Alaskan Native	Other	Two or More
1 or more	10.0 (7.9, 12.2)	5.9 (0.0, 12.6)	12.6 (8.5, 16.7)	17.9 (12.3, 23.4)	7.2 (0.0, 24.8)	26.4 (0.0, 60.3)	24.5 (0.0, 56.6)	19.6 (3.6, 35.6)

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

Social Class

Overall, 10% of staff report experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their social class at U-M in the past 12 months. There are no significant sex differences (Table 48). Staff who had no Bachelor’s degree are more likely to report experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their social class at U-M in the past 12 months (Table 49). White and Asian American/Asian staff report significantly less discrimination as a result of social class, compared to African American/Black and Hispanic/Latino/a staff (Table 50).

Table 48. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Sex			
	Female	Male	Total
1 or more	10.4 (8.6, 12.2)	8.7 (6.0, 11.3)	10.0 (8.5, 11.5)

Table 49. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Highest Degree		
	No Bachelor’s	Bachelor’s Degree or Higher
1 or more	12.8 (10.0, 15.6)	8.7 (6.9, 10.4)

Table 50. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Staff, by Race								
	White	Asian American /Asian	African American /Black	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Middle Eastern/ North African	Native American /Alaskan Native	Other	Two or More
1 or more	7.6 (5.9, 9.3)	5.3 (1.0, 9.6)	25.2 (19.8, 30.6)	19.0 (13.6, 24.5)	7.2 (0.0, 24.8)	16.9 (0.0, 40.1)	24.8 (4.2, 45.4)	9.3 (1.5, 17.1)

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:

- Staff with no bachelor’s degree are 21% more likely to report experiencing discrimination than staff with a bachelor’s degree.
- Staff with a disability are nearly 2.5 times more likely to report experiencing discrimination than staff without a disability.
- Asian American/Asian staff are 42% more likely to report experiencing discrimination than White staff.
- African American/Black staff are nearly five times more likely to report experiencing discrimination than White staff.
- Hispanic/Latino/a staff are 90% more likely to report experiencing discrimination than White staff.
- Staff of other race/ethnicities are more than 2.5 times more likely to report experiencing discrimination than White staff.

Table 51 below summarizes 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 51 below estimates the risk of reporting low satisfaction with the U-M environment during the 12 months before the survey. The second model in Table 51 estimates the risk of experiencing discrimination during the 12 months before the survey.

The effects displayed in the table were odds ratios. Odds ratios were 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 were increased, and an odds ratio of less than 1.0 means the odds of an experience were 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 were displayed in bold, with the levels of significance identified.

Table 51. Estimated Odds Ratios for Key Metrics within the Past 12 Months at the University of Michigan, 2016.
From Multivariate Logistic Regressions: Odds Ratios (Wald Chi-Square). (Letter symbols indicate statistically significant differences with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latino/a, and O=Other.)

	Satisfaction⁵ “Neutral, Unsatisfied or Very Unsatisfied”	Discrimination⁶ “Yes”
Age 41+ (Relative to Staff Age 41-)	0.98 (0.49)	0.99 (0.14)
No Bachelor’s Degree (Relative to Staff with a Bachelor’s Degree)	1.02 (0.43)	1.21*** (31.20)
Female (Relative to Male Staff)	1.04 (1.64)	1.04 (1.16)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Staff)	1.09 (2.27)	1.01 (0.05)
Not Born in U.S. (Relative to Staff Born in the U.S.)	0.44*** (160.32)	0.92 (1.61)
Disability (Relative to Staff with no Disability)	2.00*** (180.10)	2.40*** (242.79)
Race (Relative to White Staff)		
Asian American/Asian	1.24** (6.81) AA, H, O	1.42*** (17.49) AA, H, O
African American/Black	3.91*** (1094.76) A, H, O	4.67*** (1373.44) A, H, O
Hispanic/ Latino/a	2.20*** (96.99) A, AA, O	1.90*** (54.67) A, AA, O
Other	1.69*** (72.69) A, AA, H	2.56*** (224.73) A, AA, H
Respondents	1934	2101
-2Loglikelihood	31986.59	26418.29
<i>Odds ratio with Z Statistics Show in Parentheses. *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 two tailed tests</i>		

In Table 52 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 52 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 52 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 52 estimates the effects on the levels of

⁵ How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the overall campus climate/environment that you have experienced at the University of Michigan within the past 12 months?

⁶ In general, over the past 12 months, have you felt discriminated against at U-M?

agreement that the U-M is a place where the individual can thrive and grow (strongly agree = 5, strongly disagree =1). The fourth model in Table 52 estimates the effects on the levels of agreement that the U-M is a place where the individual receives fair and equitable treatment (strongly agree = 5, strongly disagree =1).

The effect estimates themselves were 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 were displayed in bold, with the levels of significance identified.

Table 52. Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Feelings of Institutional Commitment, Value and Belonging, Thriving and Growth, and Fair Treatment. (Letter symbols indicate statistically significant differences with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latino/a, and O=Other.)

	Institutional Commitment	Value/ Belonging	Thrive/ Grow	Fair Treatment
Age 41+	0.02 (0.70)	-0.03 (-0.97)	-0.11** (-3.03)	-0.06 (-1.48)
No Bachelor's Degree	0.16*** (5.02)	-0.05 (-1.34)	-0.08* (-2.01)	-0.11* (-2.40)
Female	-0.08** (-2.59)	-0.03 (-0.90)	0.02 (0.44)	-0.08 (-1.82)
LGBTQ+	-0.32*** (-5.64)	0.01 (0.16)	-0.06 (-0.90)	0.00 (-0.01)
Not Born in U.S.	0.18** (3.02)	0.12 (1.75)	0.18* (2.40)	0.30*** (3.42)
Disability	-0.20** (-3.31)	-0.41*** (-6.18)	-0.35*** (-4.81)	-0.39*** (-4.46)
Race (Relative to White Staff)				
Asian American/Asian	-0.21** (-2.82) AA	-0.11 (-1.30) AA	-0.24** (-2.62) AA	-0.12 (-1.10) AA
African American/Black	-0.75*** (-15.81) A, H, O	-0.52*** (-9.94) A, H, O	-0.66*** (-11.30) A, H, O	-0.41*** (-5.97) A
Hispanic/ Latino/a	-0.27** (-3.09) AA	-0.17 (-1.73) AA	-0.22* (-2.05) AA	-0.24 (-1.94)
Other	-0.24*** (-3.50) AA	-0.30*** (-4.04) AA	-0.39*** (-4.69) AA	-0.31** (-3.15)
Respondents	2115	2115	2115	2098
R ²	0.14	0.07	0.09	0.05
OLS regression coefficient with t-statistics shown in parentheses. * <i>p</i> <.05, ** <i>p</i> <.01, *** <i>p</i> <.001 two tailed tests				

In Table 53 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 53 estimates the effects on the levels of interaction with others with different political opinions (very often = 5, never =1). The second model in Table 53 estimates the effects on the levels of interaction with others of different race/ ethnicity (very often = 5, never =1). The third model in Table 53 estimates the effects on the levels of interaction with others of different social class (very often = 5, never =1).

The fourth model in Table 53 estimates the effects on the levels of interaction with others of different nationality (very often = 5, never =1). The fifth model in Table 53 estimates the effects on the levels of interaction with others of different sexual orientation (very often = 5, never =1).

The effect estimates themselves were 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 were displayed in bold, with the levels of significance identified.

Table 53. 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 American/Asian, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latino/a, and O=Other.)

	Interaction: Political Opinion	Interaction: Race/ Ethnicity	Interaction: Social Class	Interaction: Nationality	Interaction: Sexual Orientation
Age 41+	-0.05 (-1.05)	0.05 (1.23)	0.00 (-0.09)	0.07 (1.69)	0.04 (0.82)
No Bachelor's Degree	0.16** (3.02)	-0.11** (-2.61)	-0.04 (-0.72)	-0.09* (-2.06)	-0.12* (-2.29)
Female	-0.01 (-0.11)	-0.02 (-0.44)	0.10 (1.93)	-0.04 (-0.95)	0.08 (1.52)
LGBTQ+	-0.27** (-2.72)	-0.06 (-0.81)	-0.15 (-1.64)	-0.29*** (-3.36)	0.64*** (6.34)
Not Born in U.S.	0.11 (1.08)	0.02 (0.25)	0.09 (0.92)	0.25** (2.92)	-0.33** (-3.23)
Disability	-0.16 (-1.52)	0.05 (0.59)	-0.16 (-1.62)	-0.33*** (-3.73)	-0.24* (-2.32)
Race (Relative to White Staff)					
Asian American/Asian	-0.74*** (-5.75) AA, H, O	-0.15 (-1.43) AA	-0.57*** (-4.75) AA, H	-0.25* (-2.28) AA, H	-0.70*** (-5.41) AA, H, O
African American/Black	-0.12 (-1.43) A	0.17** (2.59) A, O	0.08 (1.05) A, O	0.10 (1.38) A	-0.10 (-1.19) A
Hispanic/ Latino/a	-0.11 (-0.74) A	0.14 (1.18)	-0.02 (-0.13) A	0.10 (0.78) A	-0.04 (-0.27) A
Other	-0.22 (-1.89) A	-0.10 (-1.14) AA	-0.32** (-3.01) AA	-0.07 (-0.69)	-0.21 (-1.84) A
Respondents	1905	1919	1909	1913	1906
R ²	0.04	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.07

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

In Table 54 below, ordinary least-squares regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic variable on the staff's perceptions of Climate at U-M. The first model in Table 54 estimates the effects on the perceptions of General Climate at U-M. The second model in Table 54 estimates the effects on the perceptions of DEI Climate at U-M.

The effect estimates themselves were 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 were displayed in bold, with the levels of significance identified.

Table 54. 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 American/Asian, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latino/a, and O=Other.)

	General Climate	DEI Climate
Age 41+	-0.06 (-1.93)	-0.15*** (-4.63)
No Bachelor's Degree	0.05 (1.51)	0.16*** (-4.37)
Female	-0.04 (-1.14)	-0.06 (-1.66)
LGBTQ+	-0.01 (-0.08)	-0.22** (-3.27)
Not Born in U.S.	0.22*** (3.32)	0.21** (3.10)
Disability	-0.30*** (-4.39)	-0.31*** (-4.46)
Race (Relative to White Staff)		
Asian American/Asian	0.00 (0.01) AA, O	-0.08 (-0.95) AA, O
African American/Black	-0.46*** (-8.65) H, A, O	-0.56*** (-10.26) H, A, O
Hispanic/ Latino/a	-0.17 (-1.71) AA	-0.20* (-1.99) AA
Other	-0.22** (-2.93) AA, A	-0.31*** (-3.96) AA, A
Respondents	2114	2112
R ²	0.06	0.08
OLS regression coefficient with t-statistics shown in parentheses. * <i>p</i> <.05, ** <i>p</i> <.01, *** <i>p</i> <.001 two tailed tests		

VII. TAKE AWAY POINTS AND ACTION STEPS

Overall, the report finds that U-M staff vary across a number of different social identities, such as age, national origin, racial composition, sex, religious background, disability status, and sexual orientation. Overall, staff report being satisfied with the climate at the U-M (both generally and as it relates to DEI). They report that, for the most part, they believe the U-M is committed as an institution to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Staff also report feelings of being valued, and that they belong at U-M. They are also reporting that they are both growing and thriving at the university. In general, staff 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 staff. In fact, there are systematic differences in staff's experiences at the university. 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 significantly less positively than staff from traditionally majority groups. Perhaps most striking is the consistent finding that African American/Black staff report having the least positive experiences when compared with any other social identity on campus. Roughly one out of six staff report feeling they had been discriminated against in some form within the past year. Again, staff 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 held in looking at staff's 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 staff are to experience the same positive experiences that are enjoyed by the majority of staff. 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 the staff. Ongoing efforts to make campus facilities more accessible to all also address some of the differential experiences that were reported by staff with disabilities and members of the LGBTQ+ communities. Current DEI plan initiatives such as assessing and improving staff's skill level in interacting with individuals from backgrounds that differed from their own, efforts to infuse DEI into the annual review processes for staff, as well as initiatives that are designed to diversify the staff 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 the staff's perceptions of the U-M Ann Arbor campus and their experiences on it. These data provide several benefits to the U-M community. For instance, the data provide improved estimates of the composition of staff 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 bench mark by which to measure the university's progress over the 5-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 25, 2016 (Cases lacking mailing addresses were sent via email on October 27, 2016.)
- Email Invitation: October 31, 2016
- Email Reminder #1: November 4, 2016
- Email Reminder #2: November 9, 2016
- Email Reminder #3 (included explicit opt out): November 13, 2016
- U-M Internal Email Reminder: November 17, 2016
- Email Reminder #4 (included explicit opt out): November 18, 2016

Phase II

- Interviewer Telephone Calls: November 28 – December 14, 2016
- Interviewer In-Person Visits Scheduled (as needed): December 5 – December 14, 2016
- Last Chance to Participate Email Reminder #5: December 5, 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:

- Monday, November 21, 2016, at 12:00 noon, SoundRocket selects Phase 2 eligible files based on response; the files were sent to U-M SRC.
- Tuesday, November 22, 2016, U-M SRC completed sample selection and provided selected cases back to SoundRocket.
- Wednesday, November 23 – Monday, November 28, 2016, SoundRocket prepared the Phase II sample for the interviewer prompt calling effort.
- Monday, November 28, 2016, at 10:00 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 staff members 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 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 was complete and a final data set provided to U-M, SoundRocket destroyed all identifiable data (electronic and paper) received during the effort.

VIII. 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.