

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

|       |  |    |
|-------|--|----|
| I.    | Introduction .....   | 2  |
| II.   | Executive Summary .....  | 3  |
| III.  | Survey Design and Methodology.....   | 7  |
|       | a. Sample Design .....   | 7  |
|       | b. Survey Instrument.....  | 7  |
|       | c. Study Methodology.....  | 8  |
|       | d. Post-Survey Adjustment and Weighting .....  | 9  |
| IV.   | Survey Respondents .....   | 10 |
| V.    | Survey Responses .....   | 19 |
|       | a. Satisfaction with Overall Campus Climate/Environment .....                                  | 19 |
|       | b. Perceptions of the General Climate and the Climate Relative to DEI.....                     | 21 |
|       | c. Perceptions of Institutional Commitment & Inclusive and Equitable<br>Treatment at U-M ..... | 23 |
|       | d. Perceptions of Fair Treatment at U-M.....   | 27 |
|       | e. Intergroup Interaction in the Past 12 Months .....  | 29 |
|       | f. Discrimination—Felt .....   | 35 |
|       | g. Discrimination—Experienced.....   | 36 |
| VI.   | Multivariate Risk Models of Key Measures .....   | 43 |
| VII.  | Take Away Points and Action Steps .....  | 48 |
| VIII. | Methods Appendix .....   | 49 |
|       | a. Respondent Communications .....   | 49 |
|       | b. Study Phase Transition.....   | 49 |
|       | c. Confidentiality .....   | 49 |
| IX.   | References .....   | 51 |

## I. INTRODUCTION

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

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

The 2016 U-M Student Campus Climate Survey on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion explores the student 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 students, designed to adequately represent the approximately 47,000 undergraduate and graduate students enrolled at the university as of October 1, 2016. The survey used a special two-phase design to better represent the full diversity of students and produced an overall response rate of 59%.

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 strong response rate and sophisticated design, it provides more reliable estimates of the demographic composition of the student body. Thus, we have more accurate estimates of the religious background, sexual orientation, disability status, veteran status, and the social class of our students. We also are able to collect new information about our students that we have never collected before such as the proportion of students who ethnically identify as Middle Eastern and North African.

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

The majority of students (58%) identify as White, followed by Asian American/Asian, Hispanic/Latino/a, a member of two or more racial groups, African American/Black, Middle Eastern or North African, Native American or Alaskan Native and Other.

More than half of students (51%) identify their sex as male, with 49% identifying their sex as female. Similarly, gender identity is nearly split between male and female, while approximately 1% of students identifying as transgender or gender non-conforming. Students largely identify as heterosexual (87%) followed by bisexual and gay or lesbian.

Approximately 8% of students identify as first-generation college students. Five percent of students report having a disability. One percent of students are veterans.

A large portion of the student body identify as having no religious background (36%). That is followed by Christian, Catholic, Jewish, Hindu, Muslim, Other and Buddhist.

### Climate

The majority (72%) of students 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, U-M students vary in the way they experience campus climate as a result of their social identities.

For example, among both undergraduate and graduate students, females and underrepresented minorities have less positive experiences on campus than males and majority students, respectively. Additionally, underrepresented students at both the undergraduate and graduate level experience the DEI elements of the campus climate in less positive ways.

Students identifying as LGBTQ+, not born in the U.S., those with a disability and first-generation students also are less satisfied with the climate than their counterparts who do not identify as such. African American/Blacks are the least satisfied with the climate, followed by Hispanic/Latino/as, Other and Asian American/Asians in comparison to Whites, who are the most satisfied.

#### Institutional Commitment & Inclusive and Equitable Treatment

Students share modest agreement that U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI. Undergraduates are slightly more likely to agree than graduate students, with females reporting significantly less agreement than males overall. Other students less likely to agree include LGBTQ+, those born in the U.S. or those with a disability. Asian American/Asian and White students are the most likely to agree U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI; underrepresented minority students are the least likely to agree.

Regarding feelings of being valued and a sense of belonging, thriving and growing at U-M, students somewhat agree that they are having these experiences. Underrepresented minority students are less likely to agree that they share these sentiments.

Other student identities that were less likely to agree feeling valued, belonging, thriving and growing at U-M include LGBTQ+, with a disability or first-generation.

#### Fair Treatment

Regarding feelings of receiving fair treatment at U-M, students somewhat agree they are treated fairly. However, underrepresented minority students are less likely to agree they are treated fairly.

Other student identities less likely to agree that they are treated fairly at U-M identified as female, LGBTQ+, with a disability or as first-generation.

#### Intergroup Interactions

A significant portion of students have meaningful interactions with others who are different from them. U-M students had the greatest interactions with people of another race or ethnicity, followed by national origin, social class, sexual orientation and those with different political opinions.

#### Discrimination

Approximately one in six U-M students report that they felt discriminated against in the past 12 months. Undergraduate underrepresented minority students are more likely to report feeling being discriminated against.

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

- Undergraduate students are 16% more likely than graduate students to report feeling discriminated against.
- Female students are 14% more likely than male students.
- LGBTQ+ students are 123% more likely than heterosexual students.
- Students with a disability are 287% more likely than those without a disability.

- First-generation students are 86% more likely than non-first-generation students.
- African American/Black (519%), Hispanic/Latino/a (132%), Asian American/Asian students (86%), and Other students (63%) are all more likely than White students to report experiencing discrimination.

Gender identity (20%), racial identity (20%) and political orientation (21%) are the most frequent reasons students reported experiencing at least one discriminatory event in the past 12 months. Followed by social class, national origin, sexual orientation and disability.

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 students report experiencing at least one discriminatory event in the past 12 months related to their specific identity group:

- 37% of female undergraduate and 28% of female graduate students.
- 30% of students not born in the U.S.
- 31% of LGBTQ+ students.
- 48% of students with a disability.
- 44% of underrepresented minority students.

Overall, the report finds that the U-M student body varies across a number of different social identities. Graduate and undergraduates vary on a variety of demographic dimensions such as age, national origin, first-generation college status, and racial composition but do not differ significantly in others such as sex, disability status, and sexual orientation. Overall, both undergraduate and graduate students 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. Students 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, students 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 students. In fact, there are systematic differences in students' experience 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 students from traditionally majority groups. Perhaps most striking is the consistent finding that African American/Black students (regardless of undergraduate or graduate) report having the least positive experiences than any other social identity on campus. Approximately one out of six students report feeling as though they had been discriminated against in some form within the past year. Again, students 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 student'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 student body are to experience the same positive experiences that are enjoyed by the majority of students. 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 non-trivial reports of experiencing discriminatory incidents by the students. Ongoing efforts to make campus facilities more accessible to all also address some of the differential experiences that were reported by students with disabilities and members of the LGBTQ+ communities. Current DEI plan initiatives such as assessing and improving in coming students' skill level in interacting with individuals from backgrounds that differed from their own, the implementation of professional development for faculty to enhance their ability to effectively teach students from more diverse backgrounds effectively, the completion of a new William Monroe Trotter Multicultural Center, as well as initiatives

that are designed to diversify the student body 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 students' 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 students 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 during 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 and equitable 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 student population at the University of Michigan, this study used a sample survey approach rather than a census of all students. 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 students.

#### 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 students could seek assistance if they had questions or if they experienced issues relating to diversity, equity and/or inclusion while studying 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, citizenship, majors, and enrollment status. 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 student 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 students please see the Methods Appendix.

### **C. STUDY METHODOLOGY**

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

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

#### **Population Sample Frame and Sample Selection**

The eligible population for this survey included all graduate and undergraduate students (part- and full-time) at the U-M Ann Arbor campus who were enrolled as of October 1, 2016. The University of Michigan Registrar provided the sample frame (approximately 47,000 students).

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

#### **Data Collection**

The overall data collection design protocol for students was:

- A USPS mailed pre-notification letter sent to each selected student, inviting them to participate in a web-based survey. Any student who lacked 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 non-response differences.
- A Second Phase interviewer telephone prompt to complete the survey.
- All participating students 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 student non-responders were selected to be included in a "Phase II" responsive design. For the Phase II design, student 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 student 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 nonresponse bias – however, they do not specifically identify a bias.

We use the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) standard response rates<sup>1</sup> 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.

| <b>Table 1. Response Rate and Completion Time</b> |               |
|---|---------------|
| Weighted Final Response Rate (AAPOR RR02)         | 59.0%         |
| Mean Completion Time                              | 11.47 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 students. The original sample design included oversampling of Native Americans/Alaskan Natives, African Americans/Blacks and Hispanic/Latino/a students, 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 students. 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, U-M term, etc.), non-response adjustment factors were developed that weight the respondents (weighted using the selection weight) to match the sample on the selected characteristics. The

---

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

product of the selection weight and these nonresponse adjustment factors then become a nonresponse-adjusted selection weight.

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

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

#### IV. SURVEY RESPONDENTS

The first results we present describe the characteristics of the target population of our survey. Throughout the report we provide the population estimates of U-M students based upon responses to the survey itself. **Each section of the report displays percentages of the student 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 students are based on a sample of the students, 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).

To protect the identity of respondents from any risk of disclosure no statistics are reported when the specific category contains fewer than 10 cases. **Throughout the report, an empty table cell with the notation “\*” denotes fewer than 10 cases are in the data in that specific category.**

##### Demographics

Like the university as a whole, students are very diverse. The mean age of all U-M students was 23 years old, the mean age for undergraduate students was 20 years old, and 27 years old for graduate students (Table 2). The percentage of male U-M students is roughly 51%, while the percentage of female U-M students is roughly 49%. (Table 3). Sex is nearly equally distributed for both undergraduates and graduate students, with roughly 50% of undergraduates being male, and roughly 50% being female. For graduate students, roughly 54% are male with 46% being female (Table 4). The percentage of U-M students who identify their gender as a man is roughly 51%, while the percentage of students identifying as a woman is roughly 48%, in addition to 1% of students identifying as either transgender or gender non-conforming (Table 5), with no differences by undergraduate vs. graduate status (Table 6).

Roughly 87% of U-M students identify as heterosexual, approximately 4% identify as bisexual, and 4% as gay/lesbian (Table 7). We find no significant differences between undergraduate and graduate students among any categories of sexual orientation (Table 8).

Approximately 58% of U-M students identify as White, 24% as Asian American/Asian, 6% as Hispanic/Latino/a, 4% as African American/Black, 2% as Middle Eastern/North African, less than 1% as Native American/Alaskan Native, 1% as Other and 5% selecting more than one option (Table 9). Significantly more graduate students (29.8%) as compared to undergraduate students (20.7%) report being Asian American/Asian, and conversely, significantly fewer graduate students (50.2%) as compared to undergraduate students (62.7%) report being White (Table 10).

Overall, approximately 75% of students report being born in the U.S. (Table 11). Significantly more undergraduate students reported being born in the U.S. (83.5%), compared to graduate students (61.7%) (Table 12). Overall, 58.7% of students report that both of their parents were born in the U.S. 6.6% report that only one of their parents was born in the U.S., while 34.7% reported that neither of their parents were born in the U.S. (Table 13). Graduate students (44.5%) are more likely than undergraduate students (28.5%) to report that neither of their parents were born in the U.S. (Table 14).

U-M has a very pluralistic population with regard to religious beliefs. Overall, 38.4% of students report identifying as Agnostic, Atheist, or having no religious background. 19.3% of students report being Catholic with significantly more undergraduate students (22.4%) as compared to graduate students (14.5%) report being Catholic. 22.2% of students report being Baptist, Episcopalian, LDS, Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian, Protestant (Non-denominational), Seventh Day Adventist, Unitarian, Christian (Non-Denomination), or Other Christian. Another 8% of students report having a Jewish religious background, 4.6% of students report a Hindu religious background, 2.7% of students report having a Muslim religious background, and 1.3% of students report having a Buddhist religious background (Tables 15 and 16).

5% of the overall student population reports having a disability (Table 17) with no significant differences between undergraduate and graduate students (Table 18). Overall, 1.2% of students report having served in the Armed Forces, Military Reserves, or National Guard (Table 19). There are no significant differences between undergraduate and graduate students (Table 20). Overall, 7.9% of students report being first-generation college students (Table 21). Significantly fewer undergraduate students (6.2%) report being first-generation as compared to graduate students (10.5%) (Table 22).

| <b>Table 2. What is your current age (in years)?</b> |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
| <b>Mean (Confidence Limits)</b>                      |                          |
| Total Students                                       | <b>22.7</b> (22.4, 23.0) |
| Undergraduate  | <b>20.0</b> (19.8, 20.1) |
| Graduate/Professional                                | <b>27.0</b> (26.4, 27.5) |

| <b>Table 3. What is your current sex?<sup>2</sup></b> |   |
|---|---|
|   | <b>Percentage of U-M Students (Confidence Limits)</b> |
| Male  | <b>51.2</b> (48.3, 54.1)                              |
| Female  | <b>48.6</b> (45.7, 51.5)                              |

<sup>2</sup> Fewer than 10 respondents chose a category not represented here.

| <b>Table 4. What is your current sex?, by Student Status</b> |   |                              |
|--|---|------------------------------|
|  | <b>Percentage of U-M Students (Confidence Limits)</b> |                              |
|  | <b>Undergraduate</b>                                  | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |
| Male   | <b>49.6</b> (45.9, 53.3)                              | <b>53.7</b> (49.0, 58.5)     |
| Female   | <b>50.2</b> (46.6, 53.9)                              | <b>46.0</b> (41.3, 50.7)     |

| <b>Table 5. What is your gender/gender identity?<sup>3</sup></b> |   |
|--|---|
|  | <b>Percentage of U-M Students (Confidence Limits)</b> |
| Man  | <b>50.6</b> (47.7, 53.5)                              |
| Woman  | <b>48.3</b> (45.4, 51.2)                              |
| Transgender/Gender Non-Conforming                                | <b>1.1</b> (0.5, 1.8)                                 |

| <b>Table 6. What is your gender/gender identity?<sup>4</sup>, by Student Status</b> |   |                              |
|---|---|------------------------------|
|   | <b>Percentage of U-M Students (Confidence Limits)</b> |                              |
|   | <b>Undergraduate</b>                                  | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |
| Man   | <b>48.8</b> (45.1, 52.5)                              | <b>53.4</b> (48.7, 58.1)     |
| Woman   | <b>50.1</b> (46.4, 53.7)                              | <b>45.4</b> (40.7, 50.2)     |
| Transgender/Gender Non-Conforming   | <b>1.1</b> (0.4, 1.8)                                 | <b>1.2</b> (0.0, 2.4)        |

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

<sup>4</sup> Fewer than 10 respondents chose the Transgender/Gender Non-Conforming & Preferred Response Not Listed options. Those two categories are pooled into a single group here.

| <b>Table 7. What is your sexual orientation?</b> |   |
|--|---|
|  | <b>Percentage of U-M Students (Confidence Limits)</b> |
| Heterosexual                                     | <b>87.1</b> (85.2, 89.0)                              |
| Bisexual   | <b>4.0</b> (2.9, 5.1)                                 |
| Gay/Lesbian                                      | <b>3.8</b> (2.7, 5.0)                                 |
| Queer  | <b>0.8</b> (0.3, 1.4)                                 |
| Questioning                                      | <b>0.4</b> (0.1, 0.8)                                 |
| Asexual  | <b>0.7</b> (0.1, 1.2)                                 |
| Preferred Response Not Listed [write in]         | <b>1.1</b> (0.5, 1.6)                                 |
| More Than One Selection                          | <b>2.1</b> (1.3, 2.9)                                 |

| <b>Table 8. What is your sexual orientation?, by Student Status</b> |   |                              |
|---|---|------------------------------|
|   | <b>Percentage of U-M Students (Confidence Limits)</b> |                              |
|   | <b>Undergraduate</b>                                  | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |
| Heterosexual  | <b>87.1</b> (84.6, 89.5)                              | <b>87.1</b> (84.0, 90.3)     |
| Bisexual  | <b>4.9</b> (3.3, 6.4)                                 | <b>2.7</b> (1.5, 3.9)        |
| Gay/Lesbian   | <b>3.9</b> (2.5, 5.3)                                 | <b>3.8</b> (1.9, 5.7)        |
| Queer/Questioning/Asexual   | <b>1.9</b> (0.9, 3.0)                                 | <b>1.9</b> (0.5, 3.2)        |
| Preferred Response Not Listed [write in]                            | <b>1.1</b> (0.4, 1.8)                                 | <b>0.9</b> (0.2, 1.6)        |
| More Than One Selection   | <b>1.1</b> (0.5, 1.8)                                 | <b>3.6</b> (1.7, 5.5)        |

| <b>Table 9. Please indicate the racial or ethnic groups with which you identify.</b> |   |
|--|---|
|  | <b>Percentage of U-M Students (Confidence Limits)</b> |
| African American/Black   | <b>4.3</b> (3.6, 5.0)                                 |
| Asian American/Asian   | <b>24.2</b> (21.6, 26.8)                              |
| Hispanic/Latino/a  | <b>6.3</b> (5.3, 7.3)                                 |
| Middle Eastern/North African   | <b>1.7</b> (1.0, 2.3)                                 |
| Native American/Alaskan Native   | <b>0.1</b> (0.1, 0.1)                                 |
| White  | <b>57.9</b> (55.0, 60.7)                              |
| Other (Please specify): [write in]   | <b>1.0</b> (0.4, 1.6)                                 |
| More Than One Selection  | <b>4.6</b> (3.5, 5.8)                                 |

| <b>Table 10. Please indicate the racial or ethnic groups with which you identify. (by Student Status)</b> |   |                              |
|---|---|------------------------------|
|   | <b>Percentage of U-M Students (Confidence Limits)</b> |                              |
|   | <b>Undergraduate</b>                                  | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |
| African American/Black  | <b>4.5</b> (3.5, 5.4)                                 | <b>3.9</b> (2.9, 5.0)        |
| Asian American/Asian  | <b>20.7</b> (17.5, 23.8)                              | <b>29.8</b> (25.5, 34.2)     |
| Hispanic/Latino/a   | <b>5.3</b> (4.4, 6.3)                                 | <b>7.7</b> (5.6, 9.8)        |
| Middle Eastern/North African  | <b>1.7</b> (0.8, 2.5)                                 | <b>1.7</b> (0.7, 2.7)        |
| Native American/Alaskan Native  | <b>0.1</b> (0.0, 0.1)                                 | <b>0.1</b> (0.1, 0.2)        |
| White   | <b>62.7</b> (59.2, 66.2)                              | <b>50.2</b> (45.4, 55.0)     |
| Other (Please specify): [write in]  | <b>0.6</b> (0.1, 1.1)                                 | <b>1.6</b> (0.4, 2.9)        |
| More Than One Selection   | <b>4.5</b> (3.1, 5.9)                                 | <b>4.8</b> (2.8, 6.8)        |

**Table 11. Were you born in the United States?**

| Percentage of U-M Students (Confidence Limits) |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
| No   | <b>25.0</b> (22.4, 27.5) |
| Yes  | <b>75.0</b> (72.5, 77.6) |

**Table 12. Were you born in the United States?, by Student Status**

|     | Percentage of U-M Students (Confidence Limits) |                          |
|-----|--|--------------------------|
|     | Undergraduate                                  | Graduate/Professional    |
| No  | <b>16.5</b> (13.7, 19.4)                       | <b>38.3</b> (33.7, 43.0) |
| Yes | <b>83.5</b> (80.6, 86.3)                       | <b>61.7</b> (57.0, 66.3) |

**Table 13. Please indicate your generation status:**

|  | Percentage of U-M Students (Confidence Limits) |
|--|--|
| All of my grandparents and both of my parents were born in the United States | <b>45.6</b> (42.7, 48.6)                       |
| Both of my parents were born in the United States                            | <b>13.1</b> (11.1, 15.0)                       |
| One of my parents was born in the United States                              | <b>6.6</b> (5.4, 7.8)                          |
| Neither of my parents were born in the United States                         | <b>34.7</b> (31.9, 37.5)                       |

**Table 14. Please indicate your generation status: (by Student Status)**

|  | Percentage of U-M Students (Confidence Limits) |                          |
|--|--|--------------------------|
|  | Undergraduate                                  | Graduate/Professional    |
| All of my grandparents and both of my parents were born in the United States | <b>48.4</b> (44.7, 52.1)                       | <b>41.3</b> (36.5, 46.0) |
| Both of my parents were born in the United States                            | <b>15.6</b> (12.9, 18.2)                       | <b>9.1</b> (6.3, 11.8)   |
| One of my parents was born in the United States                              | <b>7.5</b> (5.9, 9.2)                          | <b>5.2</b> (3.5, 6.8)    |
| Neither of my parents were born in the United States                         | <b>28.5</b> (25.1, 31.9)                       | <b>44.5</b> (39.8, 49.2) |



| <b>Table 15. With what religious background, if any, do you most identify?</b> |   |
|--|---|
|  | <b>Percentage of U-M Students (Confidence Limits)</b> |
| Agnostic   | <b>12.3</b> (10.2, 14.3)                              |
| Atheist  | <b>11.5</b> (9.8, 13.3)                               |
| Baptist  | <b>1.5</b> (1.0, 2.0)                                 |
| Buddhist   | <b>1.3</b> (0.8, 1.9)                                 |
| Catholic   | <b>19.3</b> (17.0, 21.6)                              |
| Christian: Non-Denominational  | <b>10.4</b> (8.5, 12.2)                               |
| Eastern Orthodox   | <b>1.1</b> (0.5, 1.7)                                 |
| Episcopalian   | <b>0.7</b> (0.3, 1.1)                                 |
| Hindu  | <b>4.6</b> (3.4, 5.9)                                 |
| Muslim   | <b>2.7</b> (1.8, 3.5)                                 |
| Jewish   | <b>8.0</b> (6.3, 9.6)                                 |
| LDS (Mormon)   | <b>0.8</b> (0.2, 1.3)                                 |
| Lutheran   | <b>2.1</b> (1.2, 3.0)                                 |
| Methodist  | <b>2.3</b> (1.4, 3.3)                                 |
| Presbyterian   | <b>1.7</b> (1.0, 2.3)                                 |
| Protestant: Non-Denominational   | <b>1.0</b> (0.5, 1.5)                                 |
| Seventh Day Adventist  | <b>0.4</b> (0.0, 0.8)                                 |
| Unitarian/Universalist   | <b>0.6</b> (0.1, 1.2)                                 |
| None   | <b>14.6</b> (12.6, 16.7)                              |
| Other Christian  | <b>0.7</b> (0.2, 1.3)                                 |
| Other  | <b>2.4</b> (1.6, 3.1)                                 |

**Table 16. With what religious background, if any, do you most identify?, by Student Status**

|                               | Percentage of U-M Students (Confidence Limits) |                          |
|-------------------------------|--|--------------------------|
|                               | Undergraduate                                  | Graduate/Professional    |
| Agnostic                      | <b>13.1</b> (10.4, 15.8)                       | <b>11.0</b> (7.8, 14.1)  |
| Atheist                       | <b>10.7</b> (8.5, 12.9)                        | <b>12.8</b> (9.9, 15.7)  |
| Baptist                       | <b>1.8</b> (1.0, 2.6)                          | <b>1.0</b> (0.4, 1.6)    |
| Buddhist                      | <b>1.0</b> (0.4, 1.7)                          | <b>1.8</b> (0.8, 2.9)    |
| Catholic                      | <b>22.4</b> (19.3, 25.5)                       | <b>14.5</b> (11.3, 17.7) |
| Christian: Non-Denominational | <b>10.2</b> (8.0, 12.5)                        | <b>10.6</b> (7.4, 13.8)  |
| Hindu                         | <b>3.9</b> (2.5, 5.3)                          | <b>5.8</b> (3.4, 8.2)    |
| Muslim                        | <b>2.5</b> (1.5, 3.6)                          | <b>2.9</b> (1.4, 4.4)    |
| Jewish                        | <b>8.9</b> (6.8, 11.0)                         | <b>6.5</b> (4.0, 9.1)    |
| Lutheran                      | <b>2.4</b> (1.2, 3.6)                          | <b>1.6</b> (0.3, 2.9)    |
| Methodist                     | <b>2.7</b> (1.4, 4.0)                          | <b>1.7</b> (0.4, 3.0)    |
| Presbyterian                  | <b>1.7</b> (0.8, 2.5)                          | <b>1.7</b> (0.7, 2.7)    |
| None                          | <b>12.5</b> (10.1, 14.9)                       | <b>18.0</b> (14.4, 21.6) |
| Other Christian               | <b>4.1</b> (2.8, 5.4)                          | <b>7.2</b> (4.5, 10.0)   |
| Other                         | <b>2.1</b> (1.2, 3.0)                          | <b>2.8</b> (1.6, 4.1)    |

| <b>Table 17. Do you have a disability?</b> |   |
|--|---|
|  | <b>Percentage of U-M Students (Confidence Limits)</b> |
| Yes, I have a disability                   | <b>5.0</b> (3.8, 6.3)                                 |
| No, I do not have a disability             | <b>95.0</b> (93.7, 96.2)                              |

| <b>Table 18. Do you have a disability?, by Student Status</b> |   |                              |
|---|---|------------------------------|
|   | <b>Percentage of U-M Students (Confidence Limits)</b> |                              |
|   | <b>Undergraduate</b>                                  | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |
| Yes, I have a disability                                      | <b>5.1</b> (3.7, 6.5)                                 | <b>5.0</b> (2.8, 7.2)        |
| No, I do not have a disability                                | <b>94.9</b> (93.5, 96.3)                              | <b>95.0</b> (92.8, 97.2)     |

| <b>Table 19. Have you ever served in the U.S. Armed Forces, Military Reserves, or National Guard?</b> |   |
|---|---|
|   | <b>Percentage of U-M Students (Confidence Limits)</b> |
| Ever or currently serving   | <b>1.2</b> (0.6, 1.8)                                 |
| Never served  | <b>98.8</b> (98.2, 99.4)                              |

| <b>Table 20. Have you ever served in the U.S. Armed Forces, Military Reserves, or National Guard?, by Student Status</b> |   |                              |
|--|---|------------------------------|
|  | <b>Percentage of U-M Students (Confidence Limits)</b> |                              |
|  | <b>Undergraduate</b>                                  | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |
| Ever or currently serving  | <b>0.5</b> (0.1, 0.9)                                 | <b>2.3</b> (0.8, 3.8)        |
| Never served   | <b>99.5</b> (99.1, 99.9)                              | <b>97.7</b> (96.2, 99.2)     |

| <b>Table 21. Which of the following best describes the educational experience of your parents/guardians?</b> |   |
|--|---|
|  | <b>Percentage of U-M Students<br/>(Confidence Limits)</b> |
| Neither parent or guardian attended college  | <b>7.9</b> (6.5, 9.3)                                     |
| All others   | <b>92.1</b> (90.7, 93.5)                                  |

| <b>Table 22. Which of the following best describes the educational experience of your parents/guardians?, by Student Status</b> |   |                              |
|---|---|------------------------------|
|   | <b>Percentage of U-M Students (Confidence Limits)</b> |                              |
|   | <b>Undergraduate</b>                                  | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |
| Neither parent or guardian attended college   | <b>6.2</b> (4.7, 7.7)                                 | <b>10.5</b> (7.8, 13.3)      |
| All others  | <b>93.8</b> (92.3, 95.3)                              | <b>89.5</b> (86.7, 92.2)     |

## V. SURVEY RESPONSES

### a. SATISFACTION WITH OVERALL CAMPUS CLIMATE/ENVIRONMENT

The tables below describe U-M students' 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 undergraduate and graduate students report being satisfied or very satisfied with the overall climate within the past 12 months (Table 23). Although there is no statistically significant difference between undergraduate and graduate students, there is a statistically significant sex difference across all students, with women being less satisfied than men (Table 24). Also, there is a statistically significant race difference across all students with Underrepresented minority students being less satisfied with the campus climate than both White and Asian American/Asian students (Table 25).

| <b>Table 23. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Student Status</b> |                          |                              |                          |
|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
|  | <b>Undergraduate</b>     | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> | <b>Total</b>             |
| Very Satisfied/Satisfied   | <b>71.7</b> (68.0, 75.4) | <b>71.9</b> (67.2, 76.5)     | <b>71.8</b> (68.9, 74.7) |

| <b>Table 24. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Sex and Student Status</b> |                          |                          |                              |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
|  | <b>Undergraduate</b>     |                          | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |                          |
|  | <b>Female</b>            | <b>Male</b>              | <b>Female</b>                | <b>Male</b>              |
| Very Satisfied/Satisfied   | <b>67.3</b> (62.4, 72.3) | <b>76.1</b> (70.6, 81.7) | <b>67.0</b> (59.9, 74.1)     | <b>76.2</b> (70.0, 82.3) |

| <b>Table 25. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Race and Student Status</b> |                             |                              |                                      |                              |                              |                             |
|---|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
|   | <b>Undergraduate</b>        |                              |                                      | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |                              |                             |
|   | <b>White</b>                | <b>Asian American /Asian</b> | <b>Under-represented<sup>5</sup></b> | <b>White</b>                 | <b>Asian American /Asian</b> | <b>Under-represented</b>    |
| Very Satisfied/Satisfied  | <b>73.3</b><br>(68.5, 78.1) | <b>75.3</b><br>(66.6, 83.9)  | <b>62.1</b><br>(55.0, 69.2)          | <b>76.2</b><br>(69.2, 83.1)  | <b>76.5</b><br>(68.1, 84.8)  | <b>55.4</b><br>(45.9, 64.9) |

The multivariate analyses examined the relative impact of student status (undergraduate relative to graduate), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), First generation status (yes vs. no), and race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes of interest. In this case, we are examining students’ satisfaction with the overall campus climate/environment (see Table 80 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, p. 44). Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

**The results indicate that:**

- Female students are 52% more likely than male students to report feeling neutral, unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied.
- LGBTQ+ students are 59% more likely than heterosexual students to report feeling neutral, unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied.
- Students not born in the U.S. are 23% less likely than students born in the US to report feeling neutral, unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied.
- Students with disabilities are 145% more likely than students without a disability to report feeling neutral, unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied.
- First-generation students are 127% more likely than other students to report feeling neutral, unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied.
- With respect to race, African American/Black students are significantly more likely to report feeling neutral, unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied with the climate than all other ethnicities. Hispanic/Latino/a students are significantly more likely to report feeling neutral, unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied with the climate than White, and Asian American/Asian students. Asian American/Asian students are significantly more likely to report feeling neutral, unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied with the climate than White students and less likely than students in the other racial categories. White students are less likely to report feeling neutral, unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied than students in all of the other racial categories.
- White students are 331% less likely than African American/Black students and 75% as likely as Hispanic/Latino/a students to report feeling neutral, unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied.

<sup>5</sup> Includes all other racial/ethnic identities throughout.

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

**Descriptions of General Climate and DEI Climate**

The results below describe U-M student responses to the following survey directions:

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

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

The items described above were also used in an exploratory factor analysis that yielded two clear factors. The first factor we describe as “General Climate Elements” and includes items for hostile vs. friendly, disrespectful vs. respectful, contentious vs. collegial, individualistic vs. collaborative, competitive vs. cooperative, unsupportive vs. supportive, and unwelcoming vs. welcoming. The second factor we describe as “DEI Climate Elements” and includes items for racist vs. non-racist, homogeneous vs. diverse, sexist vs. non-sexist, homophobic vs. non-homophobic, and ageist vs. non-ageist. We constructed an index value for each factor and we provide means for those two index values below. In both cases a perfect score of “5” would mean as positive as possible and a perfect score of “1” would mean as negative as possible.

Overall, students report experiencing the general elements of the climate in moderately positive ways (mean=3.7). Undergraduate students report experiencing general elements of the climate in significantly more negative ways than graduate students (Table 26). For both undergraduate and graduate students, no significant differences are found between female and male students (Table 27). For undergraduate students, Underrepresented minority students report experiencing general elements of the climate in significantly more negative ways than both White and Asian American/Asian students; and no significant difference is reported between White and Asian American/Asian students. For graduate students, Underrepresented minority students report experiencing general elements of the climate in significantly more negative ways than Asian American/Asian students; there are no other significant race differences (Table 28).

Overall, students report experiencing the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) elements of the climate in moderately positive ways (mean=3.7). No significant differences are found between graduate and undergraduate students (Table 26). For both undergraduate and graduate students, female students report experiencing DEI elements of the climate in significantly more negative ways than male students (Table 27). For undergraduate students, Underrepresented minority students report experiencing DEI elements of the climate in significantly more negative ways than White students; there are no other significant race differences. For graduate students, both White and

Underrepresented minority students report experiencing DEI elements of the climate in statistically significant more negative ways than Asian American/Asian students; no significant differences are found between White and Underrepresented minority students (Table 28).

**Table 26. Key Dimensions: General Climate Elements and DEI Climate Elements and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Student Status**

|                          | Undergraduate         | Graduate/Professional | Total                 |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| General Climate Elements | <b>3.6</b> (3.6, 3.6) | <b>3.8</b> (3.7, 3.9) | <b>3.7</b> (3.6, 3.7) |
| DEI Climate Elements     | <b>3.8</b> (3.7, 3.8) | <b>3.7</b> (3.6, 3.8) | <b>3.7</b> (3.7, 3.8) |

**Table 27. Key Dimensions: General Climate Elements and DEI Climate Elements and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Sex and Student Status**

|                          | Undergraduate         |                       | Graduate/Professional |                       |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
|                          | Female                | Male                  | Female                | Male                  |
| General Climate Elements | <b>3.6</b> (3.5, 3.6) | <b>3.6</b> (3.6, 3.7) | <b>3.7</b> (3.7, 3.8) | <b>3.9</b> (3.8, 3.9) |
| DEI Climate Elements     | <b>3.6</b> (3.6, 3.7) | <b>3.9</b> (3.8, 4.0) | <b>3.5</b> (3.4, 3.6) | <b>3.9</b> (3.8, 4.0) |

**Table 28. Key Dimensions: General Climate Elements and DEI Climate Elements and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Race and Student Status**

|                          | Undergraduate            |                          |                          | Graduate/Professional    |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|                          | White                    | Asian American /Asian    | Under-represented        | White                    | Asian American /Asian    | Under-represented        |
| General Climate Elements | <b>3.6</b><br>(3.6, 3.7) | <b>3.7</b><br>(3.6, 3.8) | <b>3.4</b><br>(3.4, 3.5) | <b>3.8</b><br>(3.7, 3.9) | <b>4.0</b><br>(3.9, 4.1) | <b>3.6</b><br>(3.5, 3.7) |
| DEI Climate Elements     | <b>3.8</b><br>(3.8, 3.9) | <b>3.7</b><br>(3.6, 3.8) | <b>3.5</b><br>(3.4, 3.6) | <b>3.7</b><br>(3.6, 3.8) | <b>4.0</b><br>(3.9, 4.1) | <b>3.5</b><br>(3.3, 3.6) |

In addition to the bivariate analyses of climate perceptions presented in tables 26, 27, and 28, multivariate analyses were performed and examined the relative impact of student status (undergraduate relative to graduate), 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), First generation status (yes vs. no), and race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes of interest (see Table 83 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, p. 47). Unless otherwise stated, all

differences noted are statistically significant. Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

**The results indicate that:**

- Undergraduates report less positive general climate perceptions than graduate and professional students. However, there are no differences in DEI climate perceptions between undergraduate and graduate students.
- Females report less positive perceptions of both the general and DEI climate as compared to males.
- LGBTQ+ students report less positive perceptions of both general and DEI climate as compared to heterosexual students.
- Students born outside the U.S. report more positive general climate perceptions than students born in the U.S. However, there are no differences in DEI climate perceptions based on native born status.
- Students with a disability report less positive perceptions for both general and DEI climate as compared to students without a disability.
- First-generation college students report less positive perceptions for both general and DEI climate as compared to students with parents/guardians with college education.
- Students who identify as African American/Black and an Other racial/ethnic group report less positive perceptions for both general and DEI climate as compared to White students.
- Students who identify as Hispanic/Latino/a report less positive DEI climate as compared to White students. However, Hispanic/Latino/a students do not differ from White students on their perceptions of the general climate.

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

The results below describe U-M student 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 student body.

**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).

### **Perceptions of Institutional Commitment**

Overall, students report, on average, modest agreement with the idea that the University of Michigan has an institutional commitment to DEI. When compared to graduate students, undergraduates report significantly greater agreement than graduate students with the idea that the University of Michigan has an institutional commitment to DEI (Table 29).

| <b>Table 29. Key Dimensions: Institutional Commitment, Valued/Belonging, and Thriving/Growth and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Student Status</b> |                       |                              |                       |
|---|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
|   | <b>Undergraduate</b>  | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> | <b>Total</b>          |
| Institutional Commitment  | <b>3.5</b> (3.4, 3.5) | <b>3.3</b> (3.2, 3.3)        | <b>3.4</b> (3.3, 3.4) |
| Valued and Belonging  | <b>3.9</b> (3.9, 4.0) | <b>3.9</b> (3.9, 4.0)        | <b>3.9</b> (3.9, 4.0) |
| Thriving and Growth   | <b>3.8</b> (3.8, 3.9) | <b>3.9</b> (3.8, 3.9)        | <b>3.9</b> (3.8, 3.9) |

For both undergraduate and graduate students, females report significantly less agreement than males with the idea that the University of Michigan has an institutional commitment to DEI (Table 30).

| <b>Table 30. Key Dimensions: Institutional Commitment, Valued/Belonging, and Thriving/Growth and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Sex and Student Status</b> |                       |                       |                              |                       |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
|   | <b>Undergraduate</b>  |                       | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |                       |
|   | <b>Female</b>         | <b>Male</b>           | <b>Female</b>                | <b>Male</b>           |
| Institutional Commitment  | <b>3.3</b> (3.2, 3.3) | <b>3.6</b> (3.6, 3.7) | <b>3.1</b> (3.0, 3.2)        | <b>3.4</b> (3.3, 3.5) |
| Valued and Belonging  | <b>3.9</b> (3.9, 4.0) | <b>3.9</b> (3.9, 4.0) | <b>3.9</b> (3.8, 3.9)        | <b>4.0</b> (3.9, 4.1) |
| Thriving and Growth   | <b>3.8</b> (3.8, 3.9) | <b>3.9</b> (3.8, 3.9) | <b>3.8</b> (3.7, 3.9)        | <b>3.9</b> (3.9, 4.0) |

For undergraduate students, Underrepresented minority students report significantly less agreement than White students with the idea that the University of Michigan has an institutional commitment to DEI; and no significant differences are reported between Asian American/Asian students and both White and Underrepresented minority students. Asian American/Asian graduate students reported significantly more agreement than both White and Underrepresented minority students with the idea that the University of Michigan has an institutional commitment

to DEI. No significant differences are reported between White and Underrepresented minority students; however, Underrepresented graduate students report the least amount of agreement with the idea that the University of Michigan has an institutional commitment to DEI than the other groups of students (Table 31).

| <b>Table 31. Key Dimensions: Institutional Commitment, Valued/Belonging, and Thriving/Growth and Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Race and Student Status</b> |                          |                             |                          |                              |                             |                          |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
|   | <b>Undergraduate</b>     |                             |                          | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |                             |                          |
|   | <b>White</b>             | <b>Asian American/Asian</b> | <b>Under-represented</b> | <b>White</b>                 | <b>Asian American/Asian</b> | <b>Under-represented</b> |
| Institutional Commitment  | <b>3.5</b><br>(3.5, 3.6) | <b>3.4</b><br>(3.2, 3.5)    | <b>3.2</b><br>(3.1, 3.3) | <b>3.2</b><br>(3.1, 3.3)     | <b>3.5</b><br>(3.4, 3.6)    | <b>3.0</b><br>(2.9, 3.1) |
| Valued and Belonging  | <b>4.0</b><br>(3.9, 4.0) | <b>3.9</b><br>(3.8, 4.0)    | <b>3.8</b><br>(3.7, 3.8) | <b>4.0</b><br>(3.9, 4.1)     | <b>4.0</b><br>(3.9, 4.1)    | <b>3.7</b><br>(3.6, 3.8) |
| Thriving and Growth   | <b>4.0</b><br>(3.9, 4.0) | <b>3.7</b><br>(3.6, 3.8)    | <b>3.6</b><br>(3.6, 3.7) | <b>4.1</b><br>(4.0, 4.2)     | <b>3.7</b><br>(3.6, 3.8)    | <b>3.6</b><br>(3.5, 3.7) |

In addition to the bivariate analyses of institutional commitment presented in tables 29, 30, and 31, multivariate analyses were performed and examined the relative impact of student status (undergraduate relative to graduate), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), First generation status (yes vs. no), and race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes of interest (see Table 81 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, p. 45). Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

**The results indicate that:**

- Undergraduates are more likely than graduate students to agree with the idea that U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI.
- Female students are less likely than males to agree with the idea that U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI.
- LGBTQ+ students are less likely than heterosexual students to agree with the idea that U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI.
- Students not born in the U.S. are more likely than students born in the U.S. to agree with the idea that U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI.
- Students with disabilities are less likely than students without disabilities to agree with the idea that U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI.
- There are no significant differences between first-generation and other students with the idea that U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI.
- With respect to race, African American/Black students are less likely than all other racial groups to agree with the idea that U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI.
- Hispanic/Latino/a students are less likely than all other racial groups (except African American/Blacks) to agree with the idea that U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI.

- Students who are in the other racial group category are less likely than Whites and Asian American/Asians to agree with the idea that U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI.
- Asian American/Asians and Whites are most likely of all students to agree with the idea that U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI.

### **Perceptions of Being Valued/Belonging**

Overall, students report, on average, somewhat agreeing with the idea that they are valued and have sense of belonging at U-M. There are no significant differences between undergraduate and graduate students (Table 29). For both undergraduate and graduate students, there are no significant sex differences (Table 30). For undergraduates, Underrepresented minority students report significantly less agreement than White students for the idea that they are valued and have sense of belonging at U-M; and no significant differences are reported between Asian American/Asian students and both White and Underrepresented minority students. For graduate students, Underrepresented minority students report significantly less agreement than both White and Asian American/Asian students for the idea that they are valued and have sense of belonging at U-M; and no significant differences are reported between White and Asian American/Asian students (Table 31).

In addition to the bivariate analyses of being valued/belonging presented in tables, 29, 30, and 31 the multivariate analyses examined the relative impact of student status (undergraduate relative to graduate), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), First generation status (yes vs. no), and race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Blacks, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes of interest (see Table 81 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, p. 45). Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

#### ***The results indicate that:***

- There are no differences between undergraduate and graduate students with respect to the extent to which they feel as if they are valued and belong at U-M.
- There are no sex differences with respect to the extent to which students feel as if they are valued and belong at U-M.
- LGBTQ+ students are less likely than heterosexual students to report feeling that they are valued and belong at U-M.
- There are no differences between students not born in the U.S. and students born in the U.S. with respect to the extent to which they feel as if they are valued and belong at U-M.
- Students with disabilities are less likely than students without disabilities to report feeling that they are valued and belong at U-M.
- First-generation students are less likely than other students to report feeling that they are valued and belong at U-M.
- With respect to race, African American/Black students are less likely than all other racial groups to report feeling that they are valued and belong at U-M. Students in the Other race group category are less likely than White students to report feeling that they are valued and belong at U-M. No other race differences are found.

### **Perceptions of Thriving and Growth**

Overall, students report, on average, somewhat agreeing with the idea that they are thriving and growing while at U-M. There are no significant differences between undergraduate and graduate students (Table 29). For both undergraduate and graduate students, there are no significant sex differences (Table 30). For both undergraduate and graduate students, Underrepresented minority students and Asian American/Asian students report significantly

less agreement than White students for the idea that they are thriving and growing while at U-M; there are no significant differences between Underrepresented minority students and Asian American/Asian students (Table 31).

In addition to bivariate analyses of thriving and growth presented in tables 29, 30, and 31 multivariate analyses were performed and examined the relative impact of student status (undergraduate relative to graduate), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), First generation status (yes vs. no), and race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes of interest (see Table 81 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, p. 45). Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

***The results indicate that:***

- Undergraduate students compared to graduate students 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 students feel as if they are thriving and growing at U-M.
- LGBTQ+ students are less likely than heterosexual students to report feeling that they are thriving and growing at U-M.
- There are no differences between students not born in the U.S. and students born in the U.S. with respect to the extent to which they feel as if they are thriving and growing at U-M.
- Students with disabilities are less likely than students without disabilities to report feeling that they are thriving and growing at U-M.
- First-generation students with disabilities are less likely than other students to report feeling that they are thriving and growing at U-M.
- With respect to race, African American/Black students are less likely than all other racial groups to report feeling that they are thriving and growing at U-M. Hispanic/Latino/a students, Asian American/Asian students, and students in the other race group category are less likely than White students to report feeling that they are thriving and growing at U-M.

**d. PERCEPTIONS OF FAIR TREATMENT AT U-M**

The tables below describe students' 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 students' perception of being treated fairly and equitably on campus, an index was created that was comprised of responses to three survey statements on fairness. The index was found to be highly reliable ( $\alpha = .89$ ). The items used in this index are listed below:

- I am treated fairly and equitably on campus in general.
- I am treated fairly and equitably in classrooms and classroom settings.
- I am treated fairly and equitably in out-of-classroom University spaces.

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, students report somewhat agreeing with the idea that they receive fair treatment at U-M, with no significant difference between undergraduate and graduate students (Table 32). For undergraduate students, there are no significant sex differences; however, for graduate students, male students report agreeing significantly more than

female students with the idea that they receive fair treatment at U-M (Table 33). For both undergraduate and graduate students, Underrepresented minority students report significantly less agreement than White students with the idea that they receive fair treatment; there are no other significant race differences Underrepresented (Table 34).

| <b>Table 32. Treatment Composite Index and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Student Status</b> |                       |                              |                       |
|---|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
|   | <b>Undergraduate</b>  | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> | <b>Total</b>          |
| Fair Treatment Index  | <b>4.1</b> (4.1, 4.2) | <b>4.2</b> (4.1, 4.2)        | <b>4.1</b> (4.1, 4.2) |

| <b>Table 33. Treatment Composite Index and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Sex and Student Status</b> |                       |                       |                              |                       |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
|   | <b>Undergraduate</b>  |                       | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |                       |
|   | <b>Female</b>         | <b>Male</b>           | <b>Female</b>                | <b>Male</b>           |
| Fair Treatment Index  | <b>4.1</b> (4.0, 4.1) | <b>4.2</b> (4.1, 4.3) | <b>4.0</b> (4.0, 4.1)        | <b>4.3</b> (4.2, 4.3) |

| <b>Table 34. Treatment Composite Index and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Race and Student Status</b> |                       |                             |                          |                              |                             |                          |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
|  | <b>Undergraduate</b>  |                             |                          | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |                             |                          |
|  | <b>White</b>          | <b>Asian American/Asian</b> | <b>Under-represented</b> | <b>White</b>                 | <b>Asian American/Asian</b> | <b>Under-represented</b> |
| Fair Treatment Index   | <b>4.2</b> (4.1, 4.3) | <b>4.0</b> (3.9, 4.1)       | <b>4.0</b> (3.9, 4.0)    | <b>4.3</b> (4.2, 4.4)        | <b>4.1</b> (4.0, 4.2)       | <b>3.9</b> (3.8, 4.0)    |

Multivariate analyses examined the relative impact of student status (undergraduate relative to graduate), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), First generation status (yes vs. no), and race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes of interest (see Table 81 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, p. 45). Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

**The results indicate that:**

- There are no differences between undergraduate and graduate students in their agreement with the idea that they receive fair treatment at U-M.
- Female students report agreeing less than male students with the idea that they receive fair treatment at U-M.
- LGBTQ+ students report agreeing less than heterosexual students with the idea that they receive fair treatment at U-M.
- There are no differences between students not born in the U.S. and students born in the U.S. in their agreement with the idea that they receive fair treatment at U-M.
- Students with disabilities report agreeing less than students without a disability with the idea that they receive fair treatment at U-M.
- First-generation students report agreeing less than other students with the idea that they receive fair treatment at U-M.

- With respect to race, African American/Black students are less likely than all other racial groups to report agreeing with the idea that they receive fair treatment at U-M. White students are more likely than all other racial groups to report agreeing with the idea that they receive fair treatment at UM.

e. INTERGROUP INTERACTIONS IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS

**Political Opinions**

Overall, approximately 48% of the students report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose political opinions differ from their own within the past 12 months. Undergraduates are significantly more likely than graduate students to report such interactions (Table 35).

| <b>Table 35. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Sex and Student Status</b> |                          |                              |                          |
|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
|  | <b>Undergraduate</b>     | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> | <b>Total</b>             |
| Very Often/Often   | <b>55.0</b> (50.8, 59.3) | <b>38.3</b> (33.4, 43.2)     | <b>48.0</b> (44.7, 51.3) |

No significant sex differences are found for either graduate or undergraduate students (Table 36). In terms of race, Asian American/Asian undergraduate students are significantly less likely to report such interactions than White undergraduate students; there are no other significant race differences (Table 37).

| <b>Table 36. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Sex and Student Status</b> |                          |                          |                              |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
|  | <b>Undergraduate</b>     |                          | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |                          |
|  | <b>Female</b>            | <b>Male</b>              | <b>Female</b>                | <b>Male</b>              |
| Very Often/Often   | <b>53.2</b> (47.6, 58.7) | <b>57.0</b> (50.5, 63.4) | <b>34.3</b> (27.3, 41.4)     | <b>41.7</b> (34.8, 48.6) |

| <b>Table 37. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Race and Student Status</b> |                             |                             |                             |                              |                             |                             |
|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
|   | <b>Undergraduate</b>        |                             |                             | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |                             |                             |
|   | <b>White</b>                | <b>Asian American/Asian</b> | <b>Under-represented</b>    | <b>White</b>                 | <b>Asian American/Asian</b> | <b>Under-represented</b>    |
| Very Often/Often  | <b>61.5</b><br>(56.1, 66.9) | <b>37.9</b><br>(28.3, 47.5) | <b>53.3</b><br>(45.7, 60.8) | <b>42.0</b><br>(34.3, 49.6)  | <b>30.5</b><br>(22.1, 38.9) | <b>41.3</b><br>(31.8, 50.8) |

The multivariate analyses examined the relative impact of student status (undergraduate relative to graduate), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), First generation status (yes vs. no), and race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes of interest (see Table 82 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, p. 46). Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

**The results indicate that:**

- Undergraduates are more likely than graduate students to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose political opinions are different from their own during the past 12 months.
- Female students are less likely than males to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose political opinions are different from their own during the past 12 months.
- LGBTQ+ students are less likely than heterosexual students 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 students 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 students with disabilities and students 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.
- There are no differences between first-generation students and other students 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, African American/Black students are less likely than Hispanic/Latino/a and White students to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose political opinions are different from their own during the past 12 months.
- Asian American/Asian students are less likely than White students, Hispanic/Latino/a students and students in the Other category to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose political opinions are different from their own during the past 12 months.

**National Origin**

Overall, approximately 77% of students reported interacting in a meaningful way with people whose National origin is different from their own during the past 12 months (Table 38). There are no significant differences between undergraduate and graduate students or by sex (Table 39).

| <b>Table 38. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Student Status</b> |                          |                              |                          |
|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
|  | <b>Undergraduate</b>     | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> | <b>Total</b>             |
| Very Often/Often   | <b>73.8</b> (70.1, 77.5) | <b>80.6</b> (76.4, 84.8)     | <b>76.7</b> (73.9, 79.5) |

| <b>Table 39. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Sex and Student Status</b> |                          |                          |                              |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
|  | <b>Undergraduate</b>     |                          | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |                          |
|  | <b>Female</b>            | <b>Male</b>              | <b>Female</b>                | <b>Male</b>              |
| Very Often/Often   | <b>72.7</b> (67.8, 77.6) | <b>74.8</b> (69.2, 80.5) | <b>77.5</b> (70.6, 84.3)     | <b>83.1</b> (78.0, 88.3) |

The multivariate analyses examined the relative impact of student status (undergraduate relative to graduate), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), First generation status (yes vs. no), and

race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes of interest (see Table 82 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, p. 46). Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

***The results indicate that:***

- Undergraduates are less likely than graduate students to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose national origin is different from their own during the past 12 months.
- There are no differences between females and males in the likelihood that they reported interacting in a meaningful way with people whose national origin is different from their own during the past 12 months.
- There are no differences between LGBTQ+ and heterosexual students in the likelihood that they reported interacting in a meaningful way with people whose national origin is different from their own during the past 12 months.
- There are no differences between students 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 national origin is different from their own during the past 12 months.
- Students with a disability are less likely than students without a disability to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose national origin is different from their own during the past 12 months.
- First-generation students are less likely than other students to report that they interacted in a meaningful way with people whose national origin is different from their own during the past 12 months.
- With respect to race, Hispanic/Latino/a students are more likely than African American/Black, White and Asian American/Asian students to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose national origin is different from their own during the past 12 months.

**Race/Ethnicity**

Overall, approximately 81% of students reported interacting in a meaningful way with people whose race/ethnicity are different from their own during the past 12 months with no significant differences between undergraduate and graduate students (Table 40). There are no significant sex differences (Table 41) and no significant race differences (Table 42).

The multivariate analyses examined the relative impact of student status (undergraduate relative to graduate), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), First generation status (yes vs. no), and race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes of interest (see Table 82 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, p. 46). Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

***The results indicate that:***

- There are no significant differences between graduate and undergraduate students in their likelihood to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose racial identity is different from their own during the past 12 months.
- Female students are less likely than males to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose racial identity are different from their own during the past 12 months.
- LGBTQ+ students did not differ from heterosexual students in the likelihood of interacting in a meaningful way with people whose political opinions are different from their own during the past 12 months.



- Students not born in the U.S. are less likely than students born in the U.S. to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose racial identity are different from their own during the past 12 months.
- There are no differences between students with disabilities and students without disabilities in the likelihood that they reported interacting in a meaningful way with people whose racial identity are different from their own during the past 12 months.
- First-generation students are less likely than other students to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose racial identity are different from their own during the past 12 months.
- With respect to race, Hispanic/Latino/a students are more likely than White, Asian American/Asian, and students in the Other category to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose racial identity are different from their own during the past 12 months.

**Table 40. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Student Status**

|                  | Undergraduate            | Graduate/Professional    | Total                    |
|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Very Often/Often | <b>80.6</b> (77.1, 84.1) | <b>82.4</b> (78.2, 86.6) | <b>81.3</b> (78.7, 84.0) |

**Table 41. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Sex and Student Status**

|                  | Undergraduate            |                          | Graduate/Professional    |                          |
|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|                  | Female                   | Male                     | Female                   | Male                     |
| Very Often/Often | <b>80.5</b> (75.7, 85.2) | <b>80.7</b> (75.5, 85.8) | <b>78.9</b> (72.1, 85.8) | <b>85.6</b> (80.5, 90.7) |

**Table 42. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Race and Student Status**

|                  | Undergraduate               |                             |                             | Graduate/Professional       |                             |                             |
|------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                  | White                       | Asian American/Asian        | Under-represented           | White                       | Asian American/Asian        | Under-represented           |
| Very Often/Often | <b>79.6</b><br>(74.8, 84.3) | <b>79.6</b><br>(71.5, 87.7) | <b>85.7</b><br>(80.4, 91.0) | <b>85.8</b><br>(80.1, 91.6) | <b>76.8</b><br>(68.3, 85.2) | <b>83.3</b><br>(74.7, 91.8) |

### **Sexual Orientation**

Overall, approximately 53% of the students reported interacting in a meaningful way in the past 12 months with people whose sexual orientation is different from their own, with no significant differences between undergraduate and graduate students (Table 43). There are no significant sex differences for either graduate or undergraduate students (Table 44). No significant race differences are found for undergraduates. For graduate students, White students and Underrepresented minority students are significantly more likely to report such interactions than Asian American/Asian students (Table 45).

The multivariate analyses examined the relative impact of student status (undergraduate relative to graduate), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), First generation status (yes vs. no), and race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes of interest (see Table 82 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, p. 46). Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

**The results indicate that:**

- Undergraduates are less likely than graduate students to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose sexual orientation is different from their own during the past 12 months.
- Females are more likely than males to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose sexual orientation is different from their own during the past 12 months.
- LGBTQ+ students are more likely than heterosexual students to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose sexual orientation is different from their own during the past 12 months.
- Students not born in the U.S. are less likely than students born in the U.S. to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose sexual orientation is different from their own during the past 12 months.
- Students with a disability did not differ from students without a disability 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.
- First-generation students did not differ from other students 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.
- With respect to race, Asian American/Asian students are less likely than Hispanic/Latino/a, White and Other students to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose sexual orientation is different from their own during the past 12 months.

**Table 43. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Student Status**

|                  | Undergraduate     | Graduate/Professional | Total             |
|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Very Often/Often | 49.6 (45.3, 53.8) | 56.7 (51.7, 61.8)     | 52.6 (49.3, 55.8) |

**Table 44. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Sex and Student Status**

|                  | Undergraduate     |                   | Graduate/Professional |                   |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
|                  | Female            | Male              | Female                | Male              |
| Very Often/Often | 53.4 (47.9, 59.0) | 45.7 (39.2, 52.1) | 62.7 (55.4, 70.0)     | 51.6 (44.5, 58.7) |

**Table 45. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Race and Student Status**

|                  | Undergraduate     |                      |                   | Graduate/Professional |                      |                   |
|------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
|                  | White             | Asian American/Asian | Under-represented | White                 | Asian American/Asian | Under-represented |
| Very Often/Often | 52.7 (47.1, 58.3) | 37.6 (27.4, 47.7)    | 53.3 (45.7, 60.9) | 71.6 (64.7, 78.5)     | 31.0 (22.7, 39.3)    | 59.4 (50.1, 68.7) |

**Social Class**

Overall, approximately 61% of students reported interacting in a meaningful way with people whose social class is different from their own during the past 12 months. Undergraduates are significantly more likely than graduate

students to report such interactions (Table 46). No significant sex differences are found for either graduate or undergraduate students (Table 47). For undergraduate students, Asian American/Asian students are significantly less likely than Underrepresented students to report such interactions. For graduate students, Asian American/Asian students are significantly less likely than both White and Underrepresented minority students to report such interactions; there are no other significant race differences (Table 48).

**Table 46. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Student Status**

|                  | Undergraduate            | Graduate/Professional    | Total                    |
|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Very Often/Often | <b>68.2</b> (64.1, 72.4) | <b>50.6</b> (45.5, 55.8) | <b>60.8</b> (57.5, 64.1) |

**Table 47. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Sex and Student Status**

|                  | Undergraduate            |                          | Graduate/Professional    |                          |
|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|                  | Female                   | Male                     | Female                   | Male                     |
| Very Often/Often | <b>67.9</b> (62.6, 73.2) | <b>68.5</b> (62.2, 74.9) | <b>49.0</b> (41.5, 56.5) | <b>52.2</b> (45.0, 59.3) |

**Table 48. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Race and Student Status**

|                  | Undergraduate               |                             |                             | Graduate/Professional       |                             |                             |
|------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                  | White                       | Asian American/Asian        | Under-represented           | White                       | Asian American/Asian        | Under-represented           |
| Very Often/Often | <b>69.0</b><br>(63.7, 74.3) | <b>57.3</b><br>(47.1, 67.6) | <b>79.7</b><br>(73.8, 85.7) | <b>57.3</b><br>(49.4, 65.2) | <b>35.9</b><br>(27.7, 44.1) | <b>57.0</b><br>(47.2, 66.8) |

The multivariate analyses examined the relative impact of student status (undergraduate relative to graduate), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), First generation status (yes vs. no), and race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes of interest (see Table 82 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, p. 46). Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

**The results indicate that:**

- Undergraduates are more likely than graduate students 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 significant sex differences in students’ 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 significant differences between LGBTQ+ and heterosexual students 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 significant differences between students born in the U.S. and students not 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 students with disabilities and students without disabilities in the likelihood that they reported interacting in a meaningful way with people whose social class are different from their own during the past 12 months.
- First-generation students are less likely than other students 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 students are less likely than all other student racial groups to report interacting in a meaningful way with people whose social class is different from their own during the past 12 months.

f. **DISCRIMINATION—FELT**

Overall, approximately 16% of students reported feeling that in general over the past 12 months they have been discriminated against at U-M. There are no significant differences between undergraduate and graduate students (Table 49). No significant sex differences are found for either graduate or undergraduate students (Table 50). Significant race differences are found for undergraduates, but not graduate students. Specifically, Underrepresented minority students who are undergraduates are significantly more likely to report feeling that in general, they had been discriminated than both White and Asian American/Asian undergraduate students (Table 51).

| <b>Table 49. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Student Status</b> |                          |                              |                          |
|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
|  | <b>Undergraduate</b>     | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> | <b>Total</b>             |
| Yes  | <b>17.1</b> (14.6, 19.6) | <b>15.3</b> (11.9, 18.8)     | <b>16.4</b> (14.3, 18.4) |

| <b>Table 50. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Sex and Student Status</b> |                          |                          |                              |                         |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|
|  | <b>Undergraduate</b>     |                          | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |                         |
|  | <b>Female %</b>          | <b>Male %</b>            | <b>Female %</b>              | <b>Male %</b>           |
| Yes  | <b>18.4</b> (14.9, 21.8) | <b>15.5</b> (11.9, 19.2) | <b>17.0</b> (11.9, 22.2)     | <b>13.8</b> (9.1, 18.5) |

| <b>Table 51. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Race and Student Status</b> |                             |                             |                             |                              |                             |                             |
|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
|   | <b>Undergraduate</b>        |                             |                             | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |                             |                             |
|   | <b>White</b>                | <b>Asian American/Asian</b> | <b>Under-represented</b>    | <b>White</b>                 | <b>Asian American/Asian</b> | <b>Under-represented</b>    |
| Yes   | <b>13.5</b><br>(10.4, 16.7) | <b>16.6</b><br>(10.8, 22.4) | <b>31.0</b><br>(25.2, 36.8) | <b>12.6</b><br>(7.6, 17.6)   | <b>14.7</b><br>(8.3, 21.0)  | <b>22.5</b><br>(15.3, 29.6) |

The multivariate analyses examined the relative impact of student status (undergraduate relative to graduate), sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQ+ relative to heterosexual), Native born status (not native born relative to native born), Ability status (Disability relative to no disability), First generation status (yes vs. no), and race (Asian American/Asian, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other, relative to White) on our outcomes

of interest (see Table 80 in the Multivariate Risk Model section of this report, p. 44). Unless otherwise stated, all differences noted are statistically significant.

***The results indicate that:***

- Undergraduate students are 16% more likely than graduate students to feel as if they had been discriminated against in the past year at U-M.
- Female students are 14% more likely than male students to feel as if they had been discriminated against in the past year at U-M.
- LGBTQ+ students are 123% more likely than heterosexual students born in the U.S. to feel as if they had been discriminated against in the past year at U-M.
- Students not born in the U.S. are 32% less likely than students born in the U.S. to feel as if they had been discriminated against in the past year at U-M.
- Students with disabilities are 287% more likely than students without disabilities to feel as if they had been discriminated against in the past year at U-M.
- First-generation students are 86% more likely than other students to feel as if they had been discriminated against in the past year at U-M.
- With respect to race, African American/Black students are more likely than all other racial groups to feel as if they had been discriminated against in the past year at U-M. African American/Black students are 519% more likely than White students to feel as if they had been discriminated against in the past year at U-M.
- Hispanic/Latino/a students are more likely than all other racial groups (except African Americans/Blacks) to feel as if they had been discriminated against in the past year at U-M. Hispanic/Latino/a students are 132% more likely than White students to feel as if they had been discriminated against in the past year at U-M.
- Asian American/Asian students are 86% more likely than Whites to feel as if they had been discriminated against in the past year at U-M.
- Other students are 63% more likely than Whites to feel as if they had been discriminated against in the past year at U-M.
- Whites are the least likely racial group to feel as if they had been discriminated against in the past year at U-M.

**g. DISCRIMINATION—EXPERIENCED**

The tables below describe U-M students’ responses to the following survey questions:

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

**Ability or Disability Status**

Overall, approximately 4% of students reported experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their disability status at U-M in the past 12 months (Table 52). There are no significant differences between undergraduate and graduate students (Table 52). There are no significant sex (Table 54) or race differences (Table 55). For both undergraduate and graduate students, students with disabilities are significantly more likely than students without disabilities to report experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their disability

status at U-M in the past 12 months. Note that 48% of students with a disability report experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their disability status at U-M in the past 12 months (Table 53).

**Table 52. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Student Status**

|           | Undergraduate  | Graduate/Professional | Total          |
|-----------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| 1 or more | 4.4 (3.1, 5.7) | 3.8 (1.7, 5.9)        | 4.1 (3.0, 5.3) |

**Table 53. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Student Status and Disability Status**

|               | Undergraduate     | Graduate/Professional | Total             |
|---------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Disability    | 47.7 (33.0, 62.5) | 48.2 (23.0, 73.4)     | 47.9 (34.9, 60.9) |
| No Disability | 2.1 (1.1, 3.0)    | 1.5 (0.2, 2.8)        | 1.9 (1.1, 2.6)    |

**Table 54. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Sex and Student Status**

|           | Undergraduate  |                | Graduate/Professional |                |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|
|           | Female         | Male           | Female                | Male           |
| 1 or more | 5.1 (3.2, 7.0) | 3.4 (1.7, 5.2) | 4.1 (1.1, 7.1)        | 3.3 (0.3, 6.3) |

**Table 55. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Race and Student Status**

|           | Undergraduate  |                      |                   | Graduate/Professional |                      |                   |
|-----------|----------------|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
|           | White          | Asian American/Asian | Under-represented | White                 | Asian American/Asian | Under-represented |
| 1 or more | 4.9 (3.0, 6.7) | 1.8 (0.0, 3.8)       | 5.8 (3.0, 8.6)    | 4.8 (1.4, 8.3)        | 1.5 (0.0, 3.3)       | 4.5 (0.0, 9.8)    |

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

**Racial or Ethnic Identity**

Overall, approximately 20% of students reported experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their racial identity at U-M in the past 12 months (Table 56). There are no significant differences between undergraduate students and graduate students. There are no significant sex differences (Table 57). For both undergraduate students and graduate students, Underrepresented minority students and Asian American/Asian students are significantly more likely to report experiencing a racially discriminatory event than White students. Nearly 44% of Underrepresented minority undergraduate students and 35% Asian American/Asian undergraduate students report experiencing at least one racially discriminatory event within the past 12 months at U-M (Table 58).

**Table 56. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Student Status**

|           | Undergraduate     | Graduate/Professional | Total             |
|-----------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| 1 or more | 19.2 (16.7, 21.8) | 19.8 (16.1, 23.5)     | 19.5 (17.3, 21.6) |

**Table 57. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Sex and Student Status**

|           | Undergraduate            |                          | Graduate/Professional    |                          |
|-----------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|           | Female                   | Male                     | Female                   | Male                     |
| 1 or more | <b>20.5</b> (17.0, 24.0) | <b>18.0</b> (14.2, 21.8) | <b>22.7</b> (16.7, 28.6) | <b>17.0</b> (12.5, 21.4) |

**Table 58. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Race and Student Status**

|           | Undergraduate            |                             |                             | Graduate/Professional     |                             |                             |
|-----------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
|           | White                    | Asian American/Asian        | Under-represented           | White                     | Asian American/Asian        | Under-represented           |
| 1 or more | <b>7.5</b><br>(5.1, 9.8) | <b>34.8</b><br>(26.9, 42.7) | <b>43.8</b><br>(37.4, 50.2) | <b>7.2</b><br>(3.0, 11.4) | <b>32.7</b><br>(24.4, 41.0) | <b>31.1</b><br>(23.8, 38.4) |

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

**Sex**

Overall, approximately 20% of students reported experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their sex at U-M in the past 12 months. Undergraduate students are significantly more likely than graduate students to report experiencing at least one discriminatory event because of sex in the past 12 months at U-M (Table 59). For both undergraduate students and graduate students, female students are significantly more likely than male students to report experiencing a sex discriminatory event. Note that 37% of women undergraduate students report experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their sex at U-M in the past 12 months (Table 60). There are no significant differences for undergraduate students. For graduate students, Asian American/Asian students are less likely than both White and Underrepresented minority students to report experiencing at least one discriminatory event because of sex in the past 12 months at U-M (Table 61).

**Table 59. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Student Status**

|           | Undergraduate            | Graduate/Professional    | Total                    |
|-----------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 or more | <b>22.9</b> (19.9, 25.9) | <b>15.3</b> (11.9, 18.7) | <b>20.0</b> (17.7, 22.2) |

**Table 60. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Sex and Student Status**

|           | Undergraduate            |                        | Graduate/Professional    |                       |
|-----------|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
|           | Female %                 | Male %                 | Female %                 | Male %                |
| 1 or more | <b>37.1</b> (32.5, 41.7) | <b>8.4</b> (5.3, 11.6) | <b>28.0</b> (21.8, 34.2) | <b>4.4</b> (1.7, 7.2) |

| <b>Table 61. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Race and Student Status</b> |                             |                              |                             |                              |                              |                             |
|---|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
|   | <b>Undergraduate</b>        |                              |                             | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |                              |                             |
|   | <b>White</b>                | <b>Asian American/ Asian</b> | <b>Under-represented</b>    | <b>White</b>                 | <b>Asian American/ Asian</b> | <b>Under-represented</b>    |
| 1 or more   | <b>25.2</b><br>(21.1, 29.4) | <b>15.6</b><br>(10.0, 21.1)  | <b>23.7</b><br>(18.2, 29.2) | <b>21.0</b><br>(15.1, 26.9)  | <b>3.9</b><br>(1.0, 6.8)     | <b>17.9</b><br>(11.9, 23.9) |

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

### **Sexual Orientation**

Overall, approximately 5% of students reported experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their sexual orientation at U-M in the past 12 months (Table 62). There are no significant differences between undergraduate students and graduate students. There are no significant sex (Table 64) and race differences (Table 65). For both undergraduate students and graduate students, LGBTQ+ students are significantly more likely than heterosexual students to report experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their sexual orientation at U-M in the past 12 months (Table 63). Note that 30% of LGBTQ+ students report experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their sexual orientation at U-M in the past 12 months (Table 63).

| <b>Table 62. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Student Status</b> |                       |                              |                       |
|--|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
|  | <b>Undergraduate</b>  | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> | <b>Total</b>          |
| 1 or more  | <b>5.2</b> (3.7, 6.7) | <b>5.1</b> (2.7, 7.6)        | <b>5.2</b> (3.9, 6.5) |

| <b>Table 63. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Student Status and Sexual Orientation</b> |                          |                              |                          |
|---|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
|   | <b>Undergraduate</b>     | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> | <b>Total</b>             |
| LGBTQ+  | <b>29.3</b> (20.5, 38.1) | <b>32.6</b> (18.9, 46.3)     | <b>30.6</b> (23.0, 38.1) |
| Heterosexual  | <b>1.6</b> (0.7, 2.5)    | <b>1.2</b> (0.0, 2.5)        | <b>1.4</b> (0.7, 2.2)    |

| <b>Table 64. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Sex and Student Status</b> |                       |                       |                              |                       |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
|  | <b>Undergraduate</b>  |                       | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |                       |
|  | <b>Female</b>         | <b>Male</b>           | <b>Female</b>                | <b>Male</b>           |
| 1 or more  | <b>4.0</b> (2.3, 5.8) | <b>6.3</b> (3.9, 8.7) | <b>4.0</b> (1.0, 7.0)        | <b>5.8</b> (2.1, 9.5) |

| <b>Table 65. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Race and Student Status</b> |                          |                              |                           |                              |                              |                          |
|---|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
|   | <b>Undergraduate</b>     |                              |                           | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |                              |                          |
|   | <b>White</b>             | <b>Asian American/ Asian</b> | <b>Under-represented</b>  | <b>White</b>                 | <b>Asian American/ Asian</b> | <b>Under-represented</b> |
| 1 or more   | <b>4.6</b><br>(2.7, 6.4) | <b>5.3</b><br>(1.8, 8.8)     | <b>7.3</b><br>(3.8, 10.9) | <b>7.1</b><br>(2.6, 11.6)    | <b>1.6</b><br>(0.0, 3.4)     | <b>4.8</b><br>(1.7, 7.9) |



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

**National Origin**

Overall, approximately 11% of students reported experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their national origin at U-M in the past 12 months (Table 66). There are no significant differences between undergraduate students and graduate students (Table 66). There are no significant sex differences (Table 68). For both graduate students and undergraduate students, White students are significantly less likely than Asian American/Asian and Underrepresented minority students to report experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their national origin at U-M in the past 12 months (Table 69). No other racial differences are found. For both undergraduate students and graduate students, students who are not born in the U.S. are more likely than students born in the U.S. to report experiencing discrimination based on their national origin within the past 12 months at U-M (Table 67). Note that 30% of students who are not born in the U.S. reported experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their national origin at U-M in the past 12 months.

**Table 66. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Student Status**

|           | Undergraduate   | Graduate/Professional | Total            |
|-----------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| 1 or more | 9.4 (7.4, 11.4) | 13.4 (10.2, 16.6)     | 11.0 (9.2, 12.7) |

**Table 67. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Student Status and National Origin**

|                               | Undergraduate     | Graduate/Professional | Total             |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Not born in the United States | 28.1 (20.1, 36.1) | 30.8 (23.8, 37.8)     | 29.7 (24.5, 35.0) |
| Born in the United States     | 5.7 (4.0, 7.3)    | 2.6 (0.7, 4.6)        | 4.7 (3.4, 6.0)    |

**Table 68. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Sex and Student Status**

|           | Undergraduate   |                 | Graduate/Professional |                  |
|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------|
|           | Female          | Male            | Female                | Male             |
| 1 or more | 9.0 (6.5, 11.5) | 9.8 (6.7, 12.9) | 12.1 (7.9, 16.3)      | 14.6 (9.9, 19.3) |

**Table 69. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Race and Student Status**

|           | Undergraduate     |                      |                     | Graduate/Professional |                      |                     |
|-----------|-------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|           | White             | Asian American/Asian | Under-represented   | White                 | Asian American/Asian | Under-represented   |
| 1 or more | 3.6<br>(2.0, 5.3) | 22.8<br>(16.0, 29.6) | 14.1<br>(9.3, 19.0) | 3.3<br>(0.6, 5.9)     | 29.0<br>(21.1, 36.8) | 15.7<br>(8.9, 22.4) |

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

**Political Orientation**

Overall, approximately 21% of students reported experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their political orientation at U-M in the past 12 months (Table 70). Undergraduate students are significantly more likely than graduate students to report experiencing discrimination based on their political orientation within the past 12 months at U-M. There are no significant sex differences for either undergraduate students or graduate students (Table 71). For undergraduate students, Asian American/Asian students are less likely than White students to report experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their political orientation at U-M in the past 12 months; and for graduate students, Asian American/Asian students are less likely than both White and Underrepresented minority students to report this; no other significant race differences are reported (Table 72).

| <b>Table 70. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Student Status</b> |                          |                              |                          |
|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
|  | <b>Undergraduate</b>     | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> | <b>Total</b>             |
| 1 or more  | <b>25.5</b> (22.1, 28.8) | <b>12.7</b> (9.1, 16.2)      | <b>20.5</b> (18.0, 23.0) |

| <b>Table 71. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Sex and Student Status</b> |                          |                          |                              |                         |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|
|  | <b>Undergraduate</b>     |                          | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |                         |
|  | <b>Female</b>            | <b>Male</b>              | <b>Female</b>                | <b>Male</b>             |
| 1 or more  | <b>23.3</b> (19.0, 27.5) | <b>27.8</b> (22.6, 33.0) | <b>10.9</b> (5.8, 15.9)      | <b>13.9</b> (9.0, 18.9) |

| <b>Table 72. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Race and Student Status</b> |                             |                             |                             |                              |                             |                            |
|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
|   | <b>Undergraduate</b>        |                             |                             | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |                             |                            |
|   | <b>White</b>                | <b>Asian American/Asian</b> | <b>Under-represented</b>    | <b>White</b>                 | <b>Asian American/Asian</b> | <b>Under-represented</b>   |
| 1 or more   | <b>29.2</b><br>(24.7, 33.8) | <b>13.9</b><br>(7.2, 20.5)  | <b>25.5</b><br>(19.6, 31.4) | <b>15.5</b><br>(9.8, 21.2)   | <b>4.4</b><br>(0.2, 8.6)    | <b>17.4</b><br>(9.4, 25.3) |

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

**Social Class**

Overall, approximately 14% of students reported experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their social class at U-M in the past 12 months (Table 73). Undergraduate students are significantly more likely than graduate students to report experiencing at least one discriminatory event because of their social class in the past 12 months at U-M. There are no significant sex (Table 74) or race differences for either undergraduate students or graduate students (Table 76). For both undergraduate students and graduate students, students who are first-generation college students are more likely than students who are not first-generation college students to report experiencing discrimination based on their social class within the past 12 months at U-M (Table 75). Note that approximately 29% of first-generation undergraduate students report experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their social class at U-M in the past 12 months.

| <b>Table 73. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Student Status</b> |                          |                              |                          |
|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
|  | <b>Undergraduate</b>     | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> | <b>Total</b>             |
| 1 or more  | <b>16.2</b> (13.5, 18.8) | <b>9.9</b> (7.2, 12.6)       | <b>13.7</b> (11.8, 15.7) |

| <b>Table 74. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Sex and Student Status</b> |                          |                         |                              |                         |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|
|  | <b>Undergraduate</b>     |                         | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |                         |
|  | <b>Female</b>            | <b>Male</b>             | <b>Female</b>                | <b>Male</b>             |
| 1 or more  | <b>19.1</b> (15.2, 23.0) | <b>13.0</b> (9.5, 16.5) | <b>9.7</b> (6.4, 12.9)       | <b>10.1</b> (5.9, 14.3) |

| <b>Table 75. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Parent/Guardian College Attendance and Student Status</b> |  |                          |  |                       |
|---|--|--------------------------|--|-----------------------|
|   | <b>Undergraduate</b>                               |                          | <b>Graduate/Professional</b>                       |                       |
|   | <b>Neither Parent or Guardian Attended College</b> | <b>All Others</b>        | <b>Neither Parent or Guardian Attended College</b> | <b>All Others</b>     |
| 1 or more   | <b>29.4</b> (18.4, 40.5)                           | <b>15.3</b> (12.6, 18.0) | <b>30.3</b> (17.3, 43.3)                           | <b>7.4</b> (4.9, 9.9) |

| <b>Table 76. Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students, by Race and Student Status</b> |                             |                             |                             |                              |                             |                            |
|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
|   | <b>Undergraduate</b>        |                             |                             | <b>Graduate/Professional</b> |                             |                            |
|   | <b>White</b>                | <b>Asian American/Asian</b> | <b>Under-represented</b>    | <b>White</b>                 | <b>Asian American/Asian</b> | <b>Under-represented</b>   |
| 1 or more   | <b>17.5</b><br>(13.9, 21.2) | <b>10.8</b><br>(5.7, 15.9)  | <b>18.0</b><br>(13.3, 22.7) | <b>9.8</b><br>(5.4, 14.3)    | <b>7.5</b><br>(3.6, 11.4)   | <b>13.1</b><br>(8.3, 18.0) |

## 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:

- Undergraduates are 16% more likely to report experiencing discrimination than graduate and professional students.
- Females are 14% more likely to report experiencing discrimination than males.
- LGBTQ+ students are 123% more likely to report experiencing discrimination than heterosexual students.
- Students born outside the U.S. are 32% less likely to report experiencing discrimination than students born in the U.S.
- Students with a disability are nearly four times more likely to report experiencing discrimination than students without a disability.
- Asian American/Asian students are 86% more likely to report experiencing discrimination than White students.
- African American/Black students are more than six times more likely to report experiencing discrimination than White students.
- Hispanic/Latino/a students are more than twice as likely to report experiencing discrimination than White students.
- Students of other race/ethnicities are 63% more likely to report experiencing discrimination than White students.

Table 80 below summarize the statistical analyses of the survey data producing these results. Multivariate logistic regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on the odds of having each specific experience or response type. This multivariate modeling approach is important because membership in these categories can overlap, but each is an independent risk factor for specific experiences or responses.

The first model in Table 80 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 80 estimates the risk of experiencing concern for one's own physical safety during the 12 months before the survey. The third model in Table 80 estimates the risk of experiencing discrimination during the 12 months before the survey.

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

**Table 80. 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.)

|   | <b>Satisfaction<sup>6</sup></b><br>“Neutral, Unsatisfied or Very Unsatisfied” | <b>Discrimination<sup>7</sup></b><br>“Yes”    |
|---|---|---|
| Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)   | 1.00<br>(0.04)  | <b>1.16***</b><br><b>(27.65)</b>              |
| Female (Relative to Male Students)  | <b>1.52***</b><br><b>(292.09)</b>   | <b>1.14***</b><br><b>(22.76)</b>              |
| LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)  | <b>1.59***</b><br><b>(173.67)</b>   | <b>2.23***</b><br><b>(526.34)</b>             |
| Not Born in the U.S. (Relative to Students Born in the U.S.)  | <b>0.77***</b><br><b>(58.53)</b>  | <b>0.68***</b><br><b>(98.29)</b>              |
| Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)  | <b>2.45***</b><br><b>(291.36)</b>   | <b>3.87***</b><br><b>(770.99)</b>             |
| Neither Parent or Guardian Attended College (Relative to All Others)  | <b>2.27***</b><br><b>(405.08)</b>   | <b>1.86***</b><br><b>(201.08)</b>             |
| Race (Relative to White Students)   |   |   |
| Asian American/Asian  | <b>1.17***</b><br><b>(20.23)</b><br>AA, H, O                                  | <b>1.86***</b><br><b>(249.38)</b><br>AA, H, O |
| African American/Black  | <b>4.31***</b><br><b>(604.61)</b><br>A, H, O                                  | <b>6.19***</b><br><b>(1212.55)</b><br>A, H, O |
| Hispanic/ Latino/a  | <b>1.74***</b><br><b>(129.00)</b><br>A, AA                                    | <b>2.32***</b><br><b>(268.62)</b><br>A, AA, O |
| Other   | <b>1.59***</b><br><b>(107.73)</b><br>A, AA                                    | <b>1.63***</b><br><b>(92.72)</b><br>A, AA, H  |
| Respondents   | 1426  | 1767  |
| -2Loglikelihood   | 40775.86  | 36196.65                                      |
| <i>Odds ratio with Z Statistics Show in Parentheses. *p&lt;.05, **p&lt;.01, ***p&lt;.001 two tailed tests</i> |   |   |

<sup>6</sup> 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?

<sup>7</sup> In general over the past 12 months, have you felt discriminated against at U-M?

In Table 81 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 81 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 81 estimates the effects on the levels of agreement that this individual has feelings of being valued by and belonging at U-M (strongly agree = 5, strongly disagree =1). The third model in Table 81 estimates the effects on the levels of agreement that the U-M is a place where the individual can thrive and grow (strongly agree = 5, strongly disagree =1).

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

| <b>Table 81. Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Feelings of Institutional Commitment, Value and Belonging, and Thriving and Growth.</b> (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.) |                                       |                                       |  |                                       |
|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
|   | <b>Institutional Commitment</b>       | <b>Value/ Belonging</b>               | <b>Thrive/ Growth</b>                  | <b>Fair Treatment</b>                 |
| Undergraduate   | <b>0.21***</b><br>(5.52)              | -0.03<br>(-0.83)                      | <b>-0.09**</b><br>(-2.88)              | -0.06<br>(-1.67)                      |
| Female  | <b>-0.31***</b><br>(-8.62)            | -0.03<br>(-0.99)                      | -0.05<br>(-1.76)                       | <b>-0.16***</b><br>(-4.97)            |
| LGBTQ+  | <b>-0.44***</b><br>(-8.11)            | <b>-0.28***</b><br>(-5.77)            | <b>-0.14**</b><br>(-3.04)              | <b>-0.17***</b><br>(-3.43)            |
| Not Born in U.S.  | <b>0.12*</b><br>(2.20)                | 0.02<br>(0.37)                        | -0.06<br>(-1.43)                       | 0.03<br>(0.71)                        |
| Disability  | <b>-0.33***</b><br>(-3.90)            | <b>-0.45***</b><br>(-6.21)            | <b>-0.51***</b><br>(-7.16)             | <b>-0.46***</b><br>(-5.80)            |
| Neither Parent or Guardian Attended College   | -0.10<br>(-1.44)                      | <b>-0.35***</b><br>(-5.91)            | <b>-0.38***</b><br>(-6.73)             | <b>-0.33***</b><br>(-5.54)            |
| <b>Race (Relative to White Students)</b>  |                                       |                                       |  |                                       |
| Asian American/Asian  | -0.09<br>(-1.62)<br>AA                | -0.07<br>(-1.44)<br>AA                | <b>-0.33***</b><br>(-7.36)<br>AA       | <b>-0.21***</b><br>(-4.34)<br>AA      |
| African American/Black  | <b>-0.70***</b><br>(-7.72)<br>A, H, O | <b>-0.51***</b><br>(-6.44)<br>A, H, O | <b>-0.79***</b><br>(-10.37)<br>A, H, O | <b>-0.66***</b><br>(-7.53)<br>A, H, O |
| Hispanic/ Latino/a  | <b>-0.20**</b><br>(-2.59)<br>AA       | -0.03<br>(-0.45)<br>AA                | <b>-0.20**</b><br>(-3.12)<br>AA        | <b>-0.15*</b><br>(-2.15)<br>AA        |
| Other   | <b>-0.17*</b><br>(-2.37)<br>AA        | <b>-0.19**</b><br>(-2.97)<br>AA       | <b>-0.27***</b><br>(-4.50)<br>AA       | <b>-0.15*</b><br>(-2.41)<br>AA        |
| Respondents   | 1777                                  | 1778                                  | 1776                                   | 1408                                  |
| R <sup>2</sup>  | 0.14                                  | 0.09                                  | 0.15                                   | 0.12                                  |
| 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 82 below, ordinary least-squares regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on the level individuals' interactions in a meaningful way with others of various characteristics. The first model in Table 82 estimates the effects on the levels of interaction with others with different political opinions (very often = 5, never =1). The second model in Table 82 estimates the effects on the levels of interaction with others of different race/ ethnicity (very often = 5, never =1). The third model in Table 82 estimates the effects on the levels of interaction with others of different social class (very often = 5, never =1). The fourth model in Table 82 estimates the effects on the levels of interaction with others of different nationality (very often = 5, never =1). The fifth model in Table 82 estimates the effects on the levels of interaction with others of different sexual orientation (very often = 5, never =1).

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

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

|  | Interaction:<br>Political Opinion  | Interaction:<br>Race/ Ethnicity | Interaction:<br>Social Class          | Interaction:<br>Nationality      | Interaction:<br>Sexual<br>Orientation |
|--|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Undergraduate  | <b>0.36***</b><br>(5.66)           | -0.08<br>(-1.56)                | <b>0.31***</b><br>(5.66)              | <b>-0.17**</b><br>(-3.29)        | <b>-0.24***</b><br>(-4.07)            |
| Female   | <b>-0.14*</b><br>(-2.28)           | <b>-0.10*</b><br>(-2.09)        | -0.05<br>(-1.01)                      | -0.10<br>(-1.91)                 | <b>0.17**</b><br>(2.95)               |
| LGBTQ+   | <b>-0.48***</b><br>(-5.03)         | 0.02<br>(0.32)                  | 0.10<br>(1.20)                        | 0.05<br>(0.69)                   | <b>0.99***</b><br>(11.21)             |
| Not Born in U.S.                                     | -0.03<br>(-0.31)                   | <b>-0.21**</b><br>(-3.12)       | -0.13<br>(-1.66)                      | 0.13<br>(1.85)                   | <b>-0.25**</b><br>(-3.07)             |
| Disability   | -0.12<br>(-0.83)                   | 0.15<br>(1.25)                  | 0.10<br>(0.76)                        | <b>-0.28*</b><br>(-2.23)         | 0.18<br>(1.28)                        |
| Neither Parent<br>or Guardian<br>Attended<br>College | -0.10<br>(-1.44)                   | <b>-0.35***</b><br>(-5.91)      | <b>-0.38***</b><br>(-6.73)            | <b>-0.33***</b><br>(-5.54)       | 0.06<br>(0.54)                        |
| Race (Relative to White Students)                    |                                    |                                 |                                       |                                  |                                       |
| Asian<br>American/Asian                              | <b>-0.47***</b><br>(-5.34)<br>H, O | 0.05<br>(0.72)<br>H             | <b>-0.21**</b><br>(-2.75)<br>AA, H, O | -0.06<br>(-0.81)<br>H            | <b>-0.34***</b><br>(-4.09)<br>H, O    |
| African<br>American/Black                            | <b>-0.51**</b><br>(-3.11)<br>H     | 0.22<br>(1.69)                  | 0.16<br>(1.10)<br>A                   | -0.04<br>(-0.31)<br>H            | -0.10<br>(-0.66)                      |
| Hispanic/<br>Latino/a                                | -0.07<br>(-0.50)<br>A, AA          | <b>0.32**</b><br>(3.10)<br>A, O | 0.13<br>(1.16)<br>A                   | <b>0.29**</b><br>(2.68)<br>A, AA | 0.10<br>(0.82)<br>A                   |
| Other  | -0.18<br>(-1.49)<br>A              | 0.03<br>(0.36)<br>H             | 0.09<br>(0.90)<br>A                   | 0.13<br>(1.31)                   | -0.01<br>(-0.09)<br>A                 |
| Respondents  | 1408                               | 1412                            | 1408                                  | 1411                             | 1407                                  |
| R <sup>2</sup>                                       | 0.08                               | 0.02                            | 0.06                                  | 0.03                             | 0.15                                  |

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

In Table 83 below, ordinary least-squares (OLS) regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic variable on the students' perceptions of Climate at U-M. The first model in Table 83 estimates the effects on the perceptions of General Climate at U-M. The second model in Table 83 estimates the effects on the perceptions of DEI Climate at U-M.

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

| <b>Table 83. Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Perceptions of General and DEI Climate.</b> (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.) |   |   |
|---|---|---|
|   | <b>General Climate</b>                              | <b>DEI Climate</b>                                  |
| Undergraduate   | <b>-0.18***</b><br><b>(-5.38)</b>                   | 0.06<br>(1.73)                                      |
| Female  | <b>-0.08*</b><br><b>(-2.40)</b>                     | <b>-0.29***</b><br><b>(-8.42)</b>                   |
| LGBTQ+  | <b>-0.13**</b><br><b>(-2.79)</b>                    | <b>-0.32***</b><br><b>(-6.08)</b>                   |
| Not Born in U.S.  | <b>0.14**</b><br><b>(2.98)</b>                      | 0.05<br>(0.98)                                      |
| Disability  | <b>-0.28***</b><br><b>(-3.81)</b>                   | <b>-0.50***</b><br><b>(-6.17)</b>                   |
| Neither Parent or Guardian Attended College   | <b>-0.22***</b><br><b>(-3.80)</b>                   | <b>-0.24***</b><br><b>(-3.73)</b>                   |
| Race (Relative to White Students)   |   |   |
| Asian American/Asian  | 0.02<br>(0.42)<br>AA, O                             | 0.01<br>(0.27)<br>AA, H, O                          |
| African American/Black  | <b>-0.39***</b><br><b>(-5.02)</b><br><b>H, A, O</b> | <b>-0.53***</b><br><b>(-6.17)</b><br><b>H, A, O</b> |
| Hispanic/ Latino/a  | -0.11<br>(-1.63)<br>AA                              | <b>-0.15*</b><br><b>(-2.04)</b><br><b>AA, A</b>     |
| Other   | <b>-0.20**</b><br><b>(-3.25)</b><br><b>AA, A</b>    | <b>-0.20**</b><br><b>(-2.95)</b><br><b>AA, A</b>    |
| Respondents   | 1785  |   |
| R <sup>2</sup>  | 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 the U-M student body varies across a number of different social identities. Graduate and undergraduates vary on a variety of demographic dimensions such as age, national origin, first-generation college status, and racial composition but do not differ significantly in others such as sex, disability status, and sexual orientation. Overall, both undergraduate and graduate students 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. Students 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, students 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 students. In fact, there are systematic differences in students' experience 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 students from traditionally majority groups. Perhaps most striking is the consistent finding that African American/Black students (regardless of undergraduate or graduate) report having the least positive experiences than any other social identity on campus. Approximately one out of six students report feeling as though they had been discriminated against in some form within the past year. Again, students 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 student'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 student body are to experience the same positive experiences that are enjoyed by the majority of students. 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 non-trivial reports of experiencing discriminatory incidents by the students. Ongoing efforts to make campus facilities more accessible to all also address some of the differential experiences that were reported by students with disabilities and members of the LGBTQ+ communities. Current DEI plan initiatives such as assessing and improving in coming students' skill level in interacting with individuals from backgrounds that differed from their own, the implementation of professional development for faculty to enhance their ability to effectively teach students from more diverse backgrounds effectively, the completion of a new William Monroe Trotter Multicultural Center, as well as initiatives that are designed to diversify the student body 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 students' 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 students 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 during the five-year DEI planning progress. In addition, the data produced by the campuswide survey will provide a rich reservoir of information that will be used by the entire U-M community for a variety of reasons. The results presented here only scratch the surface with respect to what questions may be asked and information that can be gleaned from the data set. We are committed to providing the U-M community with as broad access to the data as possible while also making sure that we protect the anonymity of individual respondents. Consistent with the spirit of the DEI planning process, the data is not simply a resource for the administration, but instead is to be used by the entire U-M community.

## VIII. METHODS APPENDIX

### a. RESPONDENT COMMUNICATIONS

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

#### Phase I

- Pre-notification Letter mailed via U.S. Mail, and included login instructions: October 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 students who were being surveyed. Integral to this effort was the use of the independent contractor (SoundRocket) for data collection efforts, which provided a firewall between respondents' identity and their survey responses. Consistent with standard practices for cross-sectional data collections such as this, SoundRocket was required to use encryption technologies (including SSL for all web-based interfaces) and adhere to strict guidelines to maintain data security and confidentiality. SoundRocket has been collecting sensitive data from college student populations for over 10 years. Communications, staff training, processes and quality inspections all focused on minimizing disclosure risk. SoundRocket agreed to be held to the same standards prescribed by the U-M IRB to protect respondents before, during and after this study.

During the course of this study, once the sample list was provided to SoundRocket, no U-M employee came into contact with identifying information on any potential survey respondent in a way that would allow them to link survey response to individual identity. All staff, including interviewers, were SoundRocket employees and/or contractors. This fact was openly disclosed during contacts with respondents so that they were assured that their

responses would not be linked back to them. After the study is complete and a final data set provided to U-M, SoundRocket destroyed all identifiable data (electronic and paper) received during the effort.

## 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.