

**RESULTS OF THE
2021 UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
FACULTY
CAMPUS CLIMATE SURVEY ON
DIVERSITY, EQUITY AND INCLUSION**

Table of Contents

- I. Executive Summary 1
- II. Introduction..... 5
- III. Survey Design and Methodology..... 6
 - A. Sample Design 6
 - B. Survey Instrument 6
 - C. Study Methodology 7
 - D. Post-Survey Adjustment and Weighting..... 9
 - E. Confidentiality 10
 - F. Data Analysis 11
- IV. Survey Respondents 12
 - A. Data Presentation in this Report 12
 - B. Demographics..... 12
- V. Survey Responses 18
 - A. Satisfaction with Overall Campus Climate/Environment 18
 - B. Perceptions of the General Climate and the DEI Climate..... 20
 - C. Perceptions of Institutional Commitment, Inclusive/Equitable Treatment at U-M 24
 - D. Departmental Norms: Valued, Fair/Equitable Treatment at U-M..... 30
 - E. Intergroup Interactions in the Prior 12 Months 34
 - F. Discrimination 46
 - G. DEI Participation and Progress with DEI Initiatives 64
 - H. Well-Being 72
- VI. Conclusion 76

I. Executive Summary

In the fall of 2021, the University of Michigan (U-M) conducted a random-sample survey of 1,500 faculty that was designed to adequately represent the approximately 5,400 faculty members employed as of October 1, 2021. The survey used a special two-phase design to better represent the full diversity of faculty and it produced an impressive overall response rate of 64%.

The data collected in this study is designed to provide a representative snapshot of U-M faculty in the fall of 2021. In this report, this snapshot is at times compared with a similar snapshot taken in the fall of 2016. While this information provides a gross assessment of change over time, it is important to recognize that the differences in responses across the time periods of the studies do not necessarily reflect changes in the way that any single set of individuals have experienced the university over that time. That is, the pool of faculty has changed between the two reports.

In addition, new questions have been asked to directly assess faculty's perceptions of the progress that has been made as a result of the U-M DEI strategic plan as well as the faculty's self-report of their health and well-being. Bivariate and multivariate analyses were used to provide an overview of the faculty's responses to the 2021 DEI climate survey.

Demographics

A key contribution of the survey is that, as a result of its high response rate and sophisticated design, it provides reliable estimates of the demographic composition of the faculty. Like all estimates, however, the exact proportions of different groups in the U-M community are only approximate. It is important to use other institutional data (e.g., Registrar and HR) for the most accurate assessment of the composition of the U-M community. The survey is most useful in providing reliable estimates of the composition of the faculty regarding social identities that are not captured in other traditional data sources.

There were significant demographic differences between the 2016 sample and the 2021 sample. These differences include:

- The 2021 sample included significantly more tenure-track faculty (58%) compared to the 2016 sample (44%).
- The 2021 sample included significantly more faculty who report being born outside of the US (38%) compared to the 2016 sample (32%).
- The percent of faculty in the 2021 sample who reported having a disability (7%) doubled the percentage in the 2016 sample (3.5%).

A new item was introduced into the 2021 survey that asked faculty to report their political beliefs ranging from very liberal to very conservative. Overall, 78% of the faculty described their political beliefs as being very liberal, liberal, or slightly liberal; 13% described their political beliefs as moderate/middle of the road; and 6% characterized their political beliefs as slightly conservative, conservative or very conservative. Approximately 3% reported that they had not thought about it or did not know.

Institutional Climate

Overall, faculty in the 2021 sample reported moderately positive general climate experiences at U-M. Those experiences, however, are significantly less positive than the experiences reported in the 2016 sample. This difference was found across both DEI-related climate indicators as well as general climate indicators. In general, faculty in less privileged groups reported less positive climate experiences. These findings are not surprising given the substantial upheavals that have occurred globally (COVID pandemic), nationally (racial reckoning, toxic political environment), and locally (provost and presidential firings) over the past five years and that have contributed to a general erosion of trust and sense of security.

While the majority of faculty (51%) were satisfied with the overall climate at U-M in the previous 12 months, that percentage represented a significant decrease from the responses of the faculty in the 2016 sample (74%). Specifically, women and persons who report having a disability felt less satisfied with the climate.

Regarding individual attributes that make up the general climate and the DEI climate, overall, the faculty in the 2021 sample reported experiencing the climate in moderately positive ways. The 2021 sample, however, reported experiencing the general climate less positively than the 2016 sample. Again, women and persons with disabilities rate the general climate less positively.

Considering attributes in the campus climate related to DEI, faculty also tended to report experiencing the climate in moderately positive ways. Once again, however, the 2021 sample was less positive than the 2016 sample. Women, members of the LGBTQ+ community, faculty not born in the US, faculty with disabilities, and younger faculty all rated the DEI climate less positively. Similarly African American and Hispanic/Latinx faculty rated the DEI climate as less positive than did their White colleagues.

Individuals' Assessment of Being Valued at U-M

Overall, faculty in the 2021 sample viewed U-M as a place where they feel they are valued and belong as well as a place where they can grow and develop. These assessments, however, were significantly less positive than they were in the 2016 sample. Across several indicators, women, faculty with disabilities, and faculty not born in the US were less likely to report feelings of being valued, belonging, personal growth and thriving.

Intergroup Interactions

Overall, faculty in the 2021 sample reported significant engagement in meaningful ways at U-M with individuals who differed from themselves. The extent of this engagement varied significantly depending on the differences examined. For the six social identities assessed (political opinion, religion, national origin, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation and social class), the extent to which faculty reported engaging often or very often in meaningful ways with others who differed from them ranged from 38% (political opinions) to 82% (both national origin and race/ethnicity).

For the most part, faculty reports of such interactions did not differ between the 2021 and 2016 samples. Two exceptions were interactions with persons who differed in political orientation and in religion; there was significantly more interaction in the 2021 sample.

Discrimination¹

Overall, significant numbers of faculty reported experiencing discrimination at U-M. Approximately 24% of the 2021 sample reported feeling that, in general, over the previous 12 months they have been discriminated against at U-M, an increase of 7 percentage points from the 2016 sample. With respect to discrimination based on specific social identities, the most frequent reports of faculty experiencing at least one discriminatory event were based on sex (27%) and race (18%). These represent significant increases of 7 and 6 percentage points, respectively, from the 2016 sample. Out of the eight social identities assessed, five identities (ability status, race/ethnicity, sex, sexual orientation, national origin) yielded discrimination outcomes that were significantly higher than the 2016 sample.

One especially noteworthy finding is that while only 7% of the total faculty reported having a disability, 4.5% of the total faculty reported experiencing at least one discriminatory event based on their ability/disability status. Across the different indicators of discrimination, less-privileged identities reported experiencing discrimination more frequently than the majority social identity being examined.

Engagement with DEI-Related Activities

In general, faculty self-reported significant engagement in DEI-related activities. On average, faculty engaged in the past 12 months in 3.7 out of 5 DEI-related activities assessed. These activities included: attended a DEI-related training/workshop; attended a DEI-related talk or seminar; attended a DEI-related event in my unit; attended a DEI-related event at the U-M level; and had a DEI-related conversation with a colleague/peer. Overall, women faculty, faculty with disabilities, tenure-track faculty, and under-represented ethnic minority faculty reported engaging in more DEI-related activities. It should be noted that African American/Black faculty reported engaging in more DEI-related activity than all other ethnic group identities with the exception of faculty of “Other” race/ethnicity.

Assessment of DEI 1.0

Although they reported being less satisfied with the overall climate at U-M and feeling less positive about both the general and DEI climates than the 2016 sample, in general, faculty in the 2021 sample reported positive assessments of the impact that DEI 1.0 has had at U-M. Specifically, 61% of the faculty rate the current DEI climate as being somewhat or much better than the DEI climate at the start of the DEI strategic plan in 2016. Only 11% rated the DEI climate as being somewhat or much worse. In addition, 41% of the faculty were satisfied or very satisfied with the progress that was made via the DEI plan since its implementation compared to 20% who reported being dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the progress.

¹ Throughout this report, whenever we refer to "reporting" in reference to discrimination, we are referencing the reporting of responses to the survey questions when respondents were asked about their feelings and experiences with various forms of discrimination. This does not necessarily indicate any official reporting to any university department involving any discriminatory event experienced by an individual.

Finally, with regard to U-M's DEI efforts in comparison to other institutions, 40% of the faculty reported that they think that U-M is doing better than most or among the very best, while only 8% rated U-M's DEI efforts as being worse than most or the worst.

Summary

In conclusion, the current report utilized high-quality data from a campuswide climate survey to obtain an empirical assessment of faculty perceptions of the U-M Ann Arbor campus and their experiences on it. These data provide several benefits to the U-M community. First, the data offer improved estimates of the composition of faculty on several variables, including religion, disability status, political identity, and Middle Eastern/North African (MENA) racial/ethnic group membership. The data also create a snapshot of our current context that can be compared with our original survey in 2016. Further, the data will serve as an important baseline for the beginning of the DEI 2.0 strategic planning process.

Finally, as with the 2016 data, the plan is to report to the entire U-M community the findings of this study. We will also provide broad public access to a de-identified version of the data set to allow members of the community to explore the data on their own. In doing so, we are planning to model inclusion and transparency with the goal of fostering new and better ideas that will aid our efforts to make the U-M more diverse, equitable, and inclusive.

II. Introduction

The University of Michigan (U-M) in Ann Arbor, Michigan, is dedicated to cultivating a university community that fosters constructive participation in a diverse, multicultural world. The University has a history of supporting initiatives that foster an inclusive living, learning and working environment.

An important step in creating a truly diverse, equitable and inclusive community is to understand faculty perspectives and experiences related to their work at U-M. The U-M Campus Climate Survey on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) was designed to help administrators develop a strong understanding about diversity, equity and inclusion by learning about the community's perspectives and experiences related to these topics.

The data collected in this study is designed to provide a representative snapshot of U-M faculty in the fall of 2021. This snapshot is at times compared with a similar snapshot taken in the fall of 2016. In addition to replicating the earlier survey, new questions have been asked to directly assess faculty perceptions of the progress that has been made as a result of the U-M DEI strategic plan as well as the faculty's self-reports of their health and well-being.

While this information provides a gross assessment of change over time, it is important to recognize that the differences in responses across the time periods of the studies do not necessarily reflect changes in the way that one particular set of individuals have experienced the University over that time. It is important to recognize that data from the two time points represent two different sets of individuals who participated in the studies at the different time points. Nonetheless, the data presented in this report will be useful to help inform current and future decisions about supporting a diverse, inclusive and vibrant campus community as the University community begins planning for its second iteration of its five-year DEI strategic plan, DEI 2.0.

III. Survey Design and Methodology

A. Sample Design

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

B. Survey Instrument

The U-M DEI survey was developed via a collaboration between the 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 repeat the 2016 assessment of the current campus climate with respect to diversity, equity and inclusion.

This survey is part of a five-year comprehensive diversity, equity and inclusion 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 composed of four sections:

Consent

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

Demographics—Survey Part I

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

Campus Climate—Survey Part II

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

Thank You and 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 of Washtenaw County, or neither receive nor donate.
- All data relating to incentives, including contact information used 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 response 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 varies by question in the data tables.

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 when the system detected that a mobile-sized screen was in use.

Population Sample Frame and Sample Selection

The study design employed scientific sampling techniques applied to sample frames (population of all U-M Ann Arbor faculty) to generate simple random samples. The eligible population for this survey included all faculty employed as of October 1, 2021. The U-M Human Resources Department provided the sample frame (approximately 5,400 faculty).

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

Data Collection

The overall data collection design protocol for faculty entailed two phases, as follows:

- Phase I: A USPS-mailed pre-notification letter to each selected faculty member, inviting them to participate in a web-based survey. Any faculty member lacking an adequate USPS mailing address received an email pre-notification letter.
 - An email invitation to participate in the web-based survey.
 - A series of four email reminders to participate in the web-based survey.
- Phase II: To adjust for nonresponse differences, a second phase sample of n=525 faculty nonresponders was selected. The Phase II effort included: a mailed survey packet (including a paper-and-pencil survey, business reply return envelope and invitation to participate letter); a reminder postcard; and a replacement survey packet.
- All participating faculty received an option to receive a \$15 cash incentive (as defined in the incentive description below), mailed to an address they provided, after the completion of the study. Additionally, a random drawing for one of ten \$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 prenotification with email invitations and reminders), the study employed a responsive survey design to minimize nonresponse and reduce potential for nonresponse bias by targeting demographic groups who are less likely to respond to initial requests. This effort was designed to maximize data quality.

After the standard contact and incentive protocol was administered (Phase I), a random sample of 525 faculty nonresponders was selected to be included in a “Phase II” responsive design. For the Phase II design, faculty nonresponders were contacted via a special USPS mail survey effort. The initial mailing included a packet with an invitation to participate, a paper-and-pencil survey instrument, and a business reply return envelope. Those faculty in the Phase II sample who did not respond to this mailing then received a reminder postcard. Faculty selected for Phase II who still did not respond were mailed a replacement survey packet.

The Phase II cases were added to the final data set and weighted using the inverse of the probability of being selected for Phase II.

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 several batches between November 2021 and January 2022). Participants could elect to donate the incentive to the United Way or to neither receive nor donate the cash. To receive the \$15 incentive, participants were required to complete the survey.

A random drawing for one of ten \$100 gift cards was offered as 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 (Table 1). Response rates are useful to measure the potential for nonresponse bias—however, they do not specifically identify bias.

We use the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) standard response rates² 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 (RR2), as described in the AAPOR Standard Definitions guide.

Table 1. Response Rate and Completion Time	
Weighted Final Response Rate (AAPOR RR2)	63.8%
Mean Time to Complete Survey (Web Survey Responses Only)	18.1 minutes

The mean time to complete the survey was calculated through the following procedures in order to remove outliers who responded over multiple sessions or who likely left the survey open for long periods of inactivity:

1. Only cases where the participant completed the survey in one sitting (one single login) were included in the time calculation.
2. Outliers were identified by taking the median value of all cases remaining following step 1.
3. An upper bound was set to be three times the median value, and all cases that fell above that upper bound were flagged as outliers.
4. After excluding all cases identified in steps 1 and 3, a new mean time to complete the survey was calculated.

D. Post-Survey Adjustment and Weighting

Statistical weighting was performed to ensure that the data, based on this sample, correctly represent the entire population of faculty. The original sample design included oversampling of Native American/Alaskan Natives, African American/Blacks and Hispanic/Latinx Americans, who were selected at higher rates than those of other racial/ethnic groups.

During data collection, a subsample of nonresponding cases was selected for additional follow-up (Phase II) including telephone contact attempts from interviewers. The sample selection weights were updated using the inverse of the probability of selection for Phase II. The two-phase sampling introduced differential weights for some faculty. 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.

² The American Association for Public Opinion Research. 2016. *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys*. 9th edition. AAPOR.

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, race/ethnicity, gender, full-time vs part-time, categorical tenure status, citizenship status, appointment period, and quartile of salary), nonresponse adjustment factors were developed that weighted the respondents (using the selection weight) to match the sample on the selected characteristics. The 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 (gender, race/ethnicity, and age) 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 for the respondents were matched to the distribution of these same characteristics in the population.

These adjustments allowed us to assume that there are no differences in the survey measures between responders and nonresponders 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 population. These estimates have an associated sampling error. This error is expressed as “95% confidence limits,” which indicates that over repeated sampling, an estimate within this interval would occur 95 out of 100 times.

E. Confidentiality

To ensure success of this survey given the sensitive nature of several questions, a key element of the study design was to limit direct access between U-M Ann Arbor employees who were being surveyed and the analysts. 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 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 responses to individual identity. All staff involved in conducting the survey, including interviewers, were SoundRocket employees and/or contractors. This fact was openly disclosed during contacts with respondents so that they were assured that their responses would not be linked back to them. After the study was complete and a final data set provided to U-M, SoundRocket destroyed all identifiable data (electronic and paper) received during the effort.

F. Data Analysis

For the data analysis phase of this study, we utilized a number of techniques. Univariate analysis (e.g., frequency distributions of all demographic variables) was conducted to display the count or percentage of values within a particular group. Bivariate analysis was conducted to explore the relationship between two different variables (e.g., crosstabulations between the race/ethnicity variable and perceptions of discrimination). Multivariate analysis, explained below, was also conducted.

Significance Testing

To aid the process of comparing responses, we conducted formal significance testing to connote when an observed difference is statistically significant. This type of testing is important because it helps quantify whether a result is due to chance or is a genuine effect.

Unless otherwise noted in the text, a statistically significant difference is recorded when $p < 0.05$, or when there is a less than 5% possibility of the difference being due to chance, the gold standard threshold for significance testing. Significance is indicated by an asterisk.

Multivariate Analysis

To further explore relationships (or associations in the data), and in addition to the bivariate analyses, we also analyzed a series of predictive models. These models utilize multivariate analysis, which yields more real-world results since it considers the effects of more than one variable at a time on a dependent variable of interest.

For these models, two forms of multiple regression were used. In some cases, we used a standard multiple linear regression technique known as Ordinary Least-Squares (OLS) regression which allowed us to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on the level of individuals' feelings about specific aspects of the U-M DEI climate (e.g., perceptions of belonging). In other cases, and when a dependent variable of interest was dichotomous (e.g., "Have you felt discriminated against in the past 12 months - Yes/No?"), we used multiple logistic regression to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on the odds of having each specific experience or response type (e.g., perception of discrimination). 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 statistical significance of all of the multivariate models is assessed with a t-statistic, presented in parentheses directly below either the regression coefficient or odds ratio in the multivariate tables. The levels of significance are also identified by asterisks. Further detail is provided where the multivariate models are presented.

IV. Survey Respondents

The first results we present describe the characteristics of the target population of our survey.

A. Data Presentation in this Report

Throughout this report we provide the population estimates of U-M faculty based upon responses to the survey itself. **Each section of this report displays percentages of the faculty population for each item or question in the 2021 survey followed by, in parentheses, the relevant difference between the 2016 and the 2021 survey estimates.**

As explained in our methodological discussion (section III above), because our estimates for the entire population of U-M faculty are based on a sample of the faculty, each statistic we report has some associated sampling variability. The same is true for the 2016 estimates. To assess the statistical significance of the differences between the 2016 and the 2021 estimates, we conducted measurement-appropriate statistical tests. **Differences between the two survey estimates that are statically significant (at the $p < 0.05$ level) are marked with an asterisk.** If a 2016 to 2021 difference is *not* marked with an asterisk, it is *not a statistically significant difference*, even if it appears to be a large difference.

B. Demographics

Tenure Track vs. Non-Tenure Track

Faculty at the University of Michigan are quite heterogeneous with respect to their duties, responsibilities, activities, and experiences. This variation is a function of disciplinary differences as well as differences in the nature of the scholarship and teaching required. In this report, faculty are divided into tenure-track and non-tenure-track in an attempt to account for some of this variation. Tenure track faculty consist of all faculty who are in a rank in which tenure may be granted, regardless of whether tenure has yet been achieved by the faculty member.

A majority of the faculty (58%) in the 2021 sample are on tenure track (Table 2). This figure represents a significant difference from the 2016 sample, in which 56% of the faculty were on the non-tenure track.

Table 2. Respondent's Appointment on the Tenure Track	
	Percent of U-M Faculty and Amount of Change Since 2016
Tenure Track	57.6% (+13.4)*
Non-Tenure Track	42.4% (-13.4)*

Age

The mean age of the faculty in the 2021 sample is 49.5 years of age, which does not differ significantly from the 2016 sample (Table 3).

Table 3. What is your current age (in years)?, by Tenure Track Status	
	Mean Age and Amount of Change since 2016
Total Faculty	49.5 (+1.1)
Tenure Track	51.5 (+0.8)
Non-Tenure Track	46.7 (+0.2)

Gender

Of the total faculty in the 2021 sample, roughly 58% identify as man, 41% identify as woman, less than 1% identify as transgender/gender nonconforming and approximately 1% report that their preferred response was not listed (Table 4). The 2021 sample does not differ significantly from the 2016 in any category of gender/gender identity.

Table 4. What is your gender/gender identity? (Select all that apply), by Tenure Track Status			
	Percent of U-M Faculty and Amount of Change Since 2016		
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total Faculty
Man	60.4% (-4.0)	54.6% (+3.4)	57.9% (+0.9)
Woman	37.8% (+3.2)	44.2% (-4.2)	40.5% (-1.8)
Transgender/Gender Nonconforming	0.8% (+0.7)	–	0.5% (+0.3)
Preferred Response Not Listed	1.0% (+0.1)	1.3% (+1.1)	1.1% (+0.6)

Sexual Orientation

With respect to the sexual orientation of the faculty in the 2021 sample, roughly 90% of the total faculty report being heterosexual, followed by approximately 4% reporting being gay/lesbian, and approximately 2% reporting being bisexual (Table 5). There are significant differences between the 2016 and 2021 samples. Overall, approximately 3 percentage points fewer faculty in the 2021 sample identify as heterosexual and approximately 1.3 percentage points more faculty indicate that their preferred response was not listed compared to the 2016 sample. The significant differences in the proportions of the total faculty are driven by the faculty on tenure track. There are no other significant differences across the two samples.

Table 5. What is your sexual orientation?, by Tenure Track Status			
	Percent of U-M Faculty and Amount of Change Since 2016		
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total Faculty
Heterosexual	88.2% (-4.5)*	93.5% (-0.3)	90.4% (-2.9)*
Bisexual	2.0% (+0.9)	2.6% (+1.0)	2.3% (+0.9)
Gay/Lesbian	4.4% (+0.6)	2.5% (-0.2)	3.6% (+0.4)
Queer	1.5% (+0.5)	--	0.8% (+0.2)
Questioning	0.2% (+0.2)	--	0.1% (-0.1)
Asexual	0.2% (+0.2)	--	0.1% (+0.1)
Preferred Response Not Listed	2.8% (+2.0)*	1.0% (+0.3)	2.0% (+1.3)*
More Than One Selection	0.7% (0)	0.4% (0)	0.5% (0)

Race and Ethnicity

Racially, approximately 69% of the total faculty in the 2021 sample identify as White, 17% as Asian American/Asian³, 3.7% as Hispanic/Latinx, 3.6% as African American/Black, 2.5% as Middle Eastern/North African, 1.8% as Other Race/Ethnicity, 3.0% as more than one selection and 0.2% as Native American/Alaskan Native (Table 6). The proportions did not differ significantly across samples for any racial group except for Middle Eastern/North African tenure-track faculty who increased from 0.7% of the sample in 2016 to 2.7% of the 2021 sample.

Table 6. Please indicate the racial or ethnic group(s) with which you identify (select all that apply), by Tenure Track Status			
	Percent of U-M Faculty and Amount of Change Since 2016		
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total Faculty
African American/Black	4.2% (+0.4)	2.6% (-0.4)	3.6% (+0.2)
Asian American/Asian	12.5% (-4.3)	22.2% (+4.2)	16.7% (-0.8)
Hispanic/Latinx	3.7% (-1.2)	3.8% (-0.6)	3.7% (-0.8)
Middle Eastern/North African	2.7% (+2.0)*	2.3% (+1.0)	2.5% (+1.5)
Native American/Alaskan Native	0.3% (0)	--	0.2% (0)
White	71.2% (+2.5)	65.1% (-3.6)	68.6% (-0.1)
Other Race/Ethnicity	2.3% (+1.5)	1.1% (-1.4)	1.8% (0)
More Than One Selection	3.1% (-1.0)	2.9% (+0.8)	3.0% (0)

³ This category includes Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander throughout the report.

In some of our subsequent analyses, the sample sizes for individual racial/ethnic categories become too small to make reliable bivariate comparisons. In those instances, we created a condensed set of categories in which faculty are divided into three segments: White, Asian/Asian American, and Underrepresented (Table 7). The Underrepresented category includes all other categories. There are no significant differences in the total faculty for White, Asian American/Asian and Underrepresented faculty across the 2016 and 2021 samples.

Table 7. Please indicate the racial or ethnic group(s) with which you identify (select all that apply), Condensed Categorization by Tenure Track Status			
	Percent of U-M Faculty and Amount of Change Since 2016		
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total Faculty
White	71.2% (+2.5)	65.1% (-3.6)	68.6% (-0.1)
Asian American/Asian	12.5% (-4.3)	22.2% (+4.2)	16.7% (-0.8)
Underrepresented	16.3% (+1.8)	12.7% (-0.6)	14.7% (+0.9)

Country of Origin

Approximately 62% of the 2021 sample report being born in the United States, which is 6 percentage points fewer faculty than in the 2016 sample (Table 8). Much of this significant difference is driven by the non-tenure track faculty, where the difference between the two samples is also statistically significant.

Table 8. Were you born in the United States, Puerto Rico, a US island area, or born abroad of US citizen parents?, by Tenure Track Status			
	Percent of U-M Faculty and Amount of Change Since 2016		
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total Faculty
No	36.6% (+4.8)	39.2% (+7.6)*	37.7% (+6.1)*
Yes	63.4% (-4.8)	60.8% (-7.6)*	62.3% (-6.1)*

Religious Identity

While the faculty in both the 2016 and 2021 samples are quite pluralistic with respect to their religious identity, the two samples do differ in several ways (Table 9). Overall, there are sample differences in the total faculty's reports of religious beliefs. The 2021 sample, as compared to the 2016, was more likely to identify as Agnostic and with no religion, and less likely to identify as Catholic, Episcopalian, and Jewish.

Table 9. With what religious affiliation, if any, do you most strongly identify?, by Tenure Track Status			
	Percent of U-M Faculty and Amount of Change Since 2016		
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total Faculty
Agnostic	15.9% (+4.0)	12.5% (+5.5)*	14.5% (+5.3)*
Atheist	14.2% (+1.2)	12.1% (-0.2)	13.3% (+0.7)
Baptist	0.7% (-0.8)	0.8% (-0.3)	0.7% (-0.6)
Buddhist	2.8% (+0.9)	2.3% (-0.9)	2.6% (-0.1)
Catholic	9.9% (-5.0)*	17.1% (-3.3)	13.0% (-5.0)*
Christian: Nondenominational	6.4% (-0.3)	6.3% (-1.0)	6.4% (-0.7)
Eastern Orthodox	0.5% (-1.7)	1.8% (+0.6)	1.1% (-0.6)
Episcopalian	1.5% (-2.4)*	1.5% (-1.3)	1.5% (-1.8)*
Hindu	1.8% (-1.6)	3.7% (-1.4)	2.6% (-1.7)
Muslim	2.3% (+1.7)	3.3% (-0.1)	2.7% (+0.5)
Jewish	8.9% (-2.7)	4.5% (-4.4)*	7.0% (-3.1)*
Lutheran	0.9% (-1.2)	2.2% (+0.3)	1.4% (-0.5)
Methodist	2.3% (-1.5)	3.9% (+2.4)	3% (+0.4)
Presbyterian	2.6% (+0.9)	3.4% (-0.6)	2.9% (-0.1)
Protestant: Nondenominational	3.4% (+1.0)	2.2% (-0.1)	2.9% (+0.6)
Unitarian Universalist	1.3% (0)	1.2% (-0.2)	1.2% (-0.1)
None	16.4% (+5.7)*	16.1% (+6.6)*	16.3% (+6.2)*
Other Christian	3.2% (+0.2)	1.1% (-1.4)	2.3% (-0.4)
Other	4.9% (+1.7)	4.0% (-0.2)	4.5% (+0.7)

Disability

Approximately 7% of the total faculty in the 2021 sample identify as having a disability. Thus, twice as many faculty in the 2021 sample (7.0%) than the 2016 sample (3.5%) report having a disability (Table 10). Although there is a clear trend for both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty, the difference is statistically significant only for the non-tenure track faculty.

Table 10. Do you have a disability?, by Tenure Track Status			
	Percent of U-M Faculty and Amount of Change Since 2016		
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total Faculty
Yes, I have a disability	8.0% (+2.6)	5.6% (+3.7)*	7.0% (+3.5)*
No, I do not have a disability	92.0% (-2.6)	94.4% (-3.7)*	93.0% (-3.5)*

Military Service

Overall 2.3% of the faculty in the 2021 sample report that they have ever served in the United States military with no significant differences between the 2021 and 2016 samples (Table 11).

Table 11. Have you ever served in the U.S. Armed Forces, Military Reserves or National Guard?, by Tenure Track Status			
	Percent of U-M Faculty and Amount of Change Since 2016		
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total Faculty
Ever or currently serving	2.0% (0)	2.7% (-1.4)	2.3% (-0.9)
Never served	98.0% (0)	97.3% (+1.4)	97.7% (+0.9)

Political Views

Overall, the faculty in the 2021 sample lean heavily liberal in their reported political views (Table 12). Roughly three-quarters of the faculty report that their political views can best be categorized as liberal while only 6.4% characterize their views as being conservative. Roughly 13% characterize their political views as moderate/middle of the road. Because this question was not asked of the 2016 sample, no comparisons can be made.

Table 12. When it comes to politics, where would you place yourself on the scale below arranged from “Very liberal” to “Very conservative”?, by Tenure Track Status			
	Percent of U-M Faculty		
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total Faculty
Very Liberal/Liberal/Slightly Liberal	82.1% (-)	71.4% (-)	77.6% (-)
Moderate/Middle of the Road	10.8% (-)	17.0% (-)	13.4% (-)
Slightly Conservative/Conservative/ Very Conservative	5.3% (-)	7.9% (-)	6.4% (-)
Not Thought About It/Don't Know	1.8% (-)	3.7% (-)	2.6% (-)

V. Survey Responses

A. Satisfaction with Overall Campus Climate/Environment

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

Q: 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? (If you have been at U-M for under 12 months, please consider the time that you have been here.)

A: Very Dissatisfied; Dissatisfied; Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied; Satisfied; Very Satisfied

The 2021 sample is significantly less satisfied with the overall climate than was the 2016 sample (Table 13). Specifically, approximately 51% of the 2021 sample, compared to 74% of the 2016 sample, report being satisfied or very satisfied with the overall climate within the past 12 months. This nature of the sample difference is consistent across tenure and non-tenure tracks.

	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Very Satisfied/Satisfied	45.0% (-27.0)*	58.4% (-16.8)*	50.7% (-23.1)*

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 a person can be a member of more than one category, yet each category is an independent risk factor for specific experiences or responses.

The model in Table 14, below, estimates the risk of faculty reporting that they were either very satisfied or satisfied with the U-M environment during the 12 months before the survey versus the other three response options. The effects displayed in Table 14 are odds ratios. Odds ratios are multiplicative, so an odds ratio of 1.0 means no association, an odds ratio of statistical significance that is greater than 1.0 means the odds of an experience are increased, and an odds ratio of significantly 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 indicated with asterisks, with the levels of significance identified.

The results from this multivariate analysis indicate that there are significant differences in satisfaction with the overall climate by gender, disability status, and tenure status. Specifically, faculty who identify as a woman are 36% less likely than faculty who identify as a man to report that they are very satisfied or satisfied with the overall climate at U-M. Faculty who report having a disability are 67% less likely to report this satisfaction than faculty who do not report having a disability, and non-tenure track faculty are 61% more likely than tenure track faculty to report that they are very satisfied or satisfied with the overall climate at U-M. There are no significant race differences in satisfaction with the overall climate.

Table 14. U-M Climate Satisfaction: Estimated Odds Ratios (Wald Chi-Square) for Key Social Identity Variables Predicting the Probability of Reporting Being Very Satisfied or Satisfied with the Overall Climate, Generated from Multivariate Logistic Regression Analysis	
	Satisfaction “Very Satisfied/Satisfied” vs. Other Response
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	0.64 ** (6.98)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	1.14 (0.16)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	0.79 (1.5)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	0.33 ** (8.79)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	0.97 (0.03)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	1.61** (7.25)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	1.05 (0.04)
African American/Black	0.84 (0.57)
Hispanic/Latinx	0.70 (1.86)
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.58 (2.26)
Respondents	807
-2 Log-likelihood	6,580.31
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant differences (p<.05) with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. Odds ratio with Wald Chi-Square shown in Parentheses. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 two-tailed tests</i>	

B. Perceptions of the General Climate and the DEI Climate

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

Q: 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**:

A: 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
Transphobic ⁴	1	2	3	4	5	Non-transphobic

In the 2016 report, the items described above were used in an exploratory factor analysis that yielded two clear factors. To maintain consistency with the factors originally established in the 2016 report, in this 2021 report we utilize the same two factors, although we add one new item to the second factor.

Factors combine several related response items into one measure. The first factor we describe as “General Climate Elements” and include the 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 include the items for racist vs. non-racist, homogeneous vs. diverse, sexist vs. non-sexist, homophobic vs. non-homophobic, and ageist vs. non-ageist. The 2021 version of this second factor (“DEI Climate Elements”) now adds a new item measuring transphobic vs. non-transphobic.

We constructed an index value for each factor; we provide means for those two indices 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.

⁴ The transphobic vs. non-transphobic measure was added to the 2021 DEI survey; there is no comparison data in the 2016 DEI survey data.

General Climate Elements

Overall, faculty in the 2021 sample report experiencing general elements of the campus climate in moderately positive ways (mean of 3.5 out of 5, Table 15). Despite the mean responses being on the positive end of the response scale, the 2021 sample reports significantly less positive general climate elements than the 2016 sample. This pattern of responses is consistent for both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty.

	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
General Climate Elements	3.5 (-0.3)*	3.6 (-0.3)*	3.5 (-0.3)*

In Table 16 below, ordinary least-squares (OLS) regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on the individuals' feelings about specific aspects of the U-M climate. The model in Table 16 estimates these effects on ratings of the general climate elements at U-M.

The effect estimates represent the average change in mean index score 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 indicated with asterisks, with levels of significance identified.

The results of the multivariate analysis indicate that faculty who identify as a woman or who report having a disability report less positive general climate elements after accounting for the other identities. There are no other differences.

Table 16. U-M General Climate Elements: Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Feelings on U-M General Climate	
	General Climate Elements
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	-0.29*** (-4.38)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	-0.10 (-0.79)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	-0.06 (-0.83)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	-0.51** (-3.13)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	-0.09 (-1.25)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	0.01 (0.08)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	0.08 (0.72)
African American/Black	-0.07 (-0.72)
Hispanic/Latinx	-0.12 (-1.09)
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.17 (-1.17)
Respondents	797
R-Squared	0.07
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant differences (p<0.05) with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. OLS regression coefficient with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 two-tailed tests.</i>	

DEI Climate Elements

Faculty in the 2021 sample report experiencing the DEI elements of the climate in moderately positive ways (mean of 3.5 out of 5, Table 17). The 2021 sample, however, reports significantly less positive DEI climate elements than the 2016 sample. This pattern of responses is consistent for both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty.

Table 17. U-M DEI Climate Elements: Estimated Mean of U-M Faculty and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
DEI Climate Elements	3.4 (-0.2)*	3.6 (-0.3)*	3.5 (-0.3)*

The model in Table 18 below estimates the effects of rating the DEI climate elements at U-M. The effect estimates represent the average change in mean index score 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 indicated with asterisks, with levels of significance identified.

The results of the multivariate analysis indicate that significantly less positive DEI climate elements at U-M are reported by faculty who identify as being a woman, who identify as LGBTQ+, who were not born in the US, who report having a disability, or who are younger, relative to their majority comparison group. There are significant race/ethnicity differences in the perception of DEI climate elements such that African American/Black faculty and Hispanic/Latinx faculty each report less positive DEI climate elements than do White faculty.

Table 18. U-M DEI Climate Elements: Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Feelings on U-M DEI Climate Elements	
	DEI Climate Elements
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	-0.49*** (-8.25)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	-0.22* (-1.97)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	0.13* (1.97)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	-0.39*** (-3.21)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	-0.16* (-2.47)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	0.07 (1.18)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	-0.13 (-1.25)
African American/Black	-0.25** (-2.94)
Hispanic/Latinx	-0.26** (-2.72)
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.11 (-0.92)
Respondents	796
R-Squared	0.15
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant differences (p<0.05) with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. OLS regression coefficient with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 two-tailed tests.</i>	

C. Perceptions of Institutional Commitment & Inclusive/Equitable Treatment at U-M

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

Q: Considering your experiences over the past 12 months at U-M, please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements: (If you have been at U-M for under 12 months, please consider your experiences during the time that you have been here.)

A: 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”. To maintain consistency with the factors as originally established in the 2016 report, in this 2021 report we keep the same three factors. 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.
- U-M provides sufficient programs and resources to foster the success of a diverse faculty.

Factor 2: Valued and Belonging

- I feel valued as an individual at U-M.
- I feel I belong at U-M.
- I have considered leaving U-M because I felt isolated or unwelcomed.
- I am treated with respect at U-M.
- I feel others don't value my opinions at U-M.
- 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.
- My experience at U-M has had a positive influence on my professional growth.

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

Institutional Commitment

Overall, the faculty in the 2021 sample convey modest agreement with the idea that U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI (mean of 3.3 out of 5, Table 19). There are no significant differences between the 2021 and 2016 overall samples in their assessments of U-M's institutional commitment to DEI even though there was a small statistically significant difference for non-tenure track faculty in which the 2016 sample reported a slightly higher belief that U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI.

Table 19. U-M Institutional Commitment to DEI: Estimated Mean for Faculty and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Institutional Commitment	3.3 (0)	3.2 (-0.1)*	3.3 (-0.1)

The model in Table 20 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 effect estimates represent the average change in mean index score 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 indicated with asterisks, with the levels of significance identified.

The results of the multivariate analysis indicate that faculty who identify as women or who report having a disability are less likely to agree with the idea that U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI relative to men or to those without disability, respectively. The analysis also indicates significant race differences. African Americans and Hispanic/Latinx faculty each report less agreement with the idea that U-M is committed to DEI than do White faculty.

Table 20. U-M Institutional Commitment to DEI: Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Faculty Feelings on Institutional Commitment to DEI Goals	
	Institutional Commitment
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	-0.45*** (-7.31)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	-0.08 (-0.75)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	0.08 (1.16)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	-0.41** (-2.95)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	-0.02 (-0.28)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	-0.10 (-1.63)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	-0.14 (-1.39)
African American/Black	-0.29*** (-3.64)
Hispanic/Latinx	-0.22* (-2.25)
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.21 (-1.71)
Respondents	791
R-Squared	0.12
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant differences (p<0.05) with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. OLS regression coefficient with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 two-tailed tests.</i>	

Valued and Belonging

Overall, the faculty in the 2021 sample report modest agreement with the idea that they are valued and feel that they belong at U-M (3.5 out of 5, Table 21). The 2021 sample are significantly less likely to report that they feel valued and belong than the 2016 sample. This sample difference is significant for both faculty tracks.

Table 21. U-M Key Dimensions: Estimated Mean Valued/Belonging and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Valued and Belonging	3.5 (-0.3)*	3.6 (-0.3)*	3.5 (-0.3)*

The model in Table 22 estimates the effects on the levels of agreement that the individual has feelings of being valued by and belonging at U-M (strongly agree = 5, strongly disagree = 1). The effect estimates are the average change in mean index score 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 indicated with asterisks, with levels of significance identified.

The results of the multivariate analysis indicate that faculty who identify as being a woman, who identify as being LGBTQ+, who were not born in the US, or who report having a disability are less likely to report feeling like they are valued or feel they belong at U-M compared to their relevant majority group. The analysis does not indicate any race differences after accounting for the other identities.

Table 22. U-M Key Dimensions: Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Faculty Feelings of Being Valued and Belonging at U-M	
	Valued/Belonging
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	-0.27** (-3.77)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	-0.25* (-2.03)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	-0.18* (-2.20)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	-0.47** (-3.17)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	-0.08 (-1.11)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	-0.02 (-0.27)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	-0.09 (-0.80)
African American/Black	0.03 (0.24)
Hispanic/Latinx	-0.14 (-1.22)
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.23 (-1.71)
Respondents	792
R-Squared	0.07
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant differences (p<0.05) with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. OLS regression coefficient with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 two-tailed tests.</i>	

Thriving and Growth

Overall, the faculty in the 2021 sample report modest agreement with the idea that they are thriving and growing at U-M (3.5 out of 5, Table 23). The 2021 sample are less likely to report that they feel that they are thriving and growing at U-M than the 2016 sample and these sample differences are significant across faculty tracks.

Table 23. U-M Key Dimensions: Estimated Mean Thriving/Growth of U-M Faculty and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Thriving and Growth	3.5 (-0.3)*	3.6 (-0.3)*	3.5 (-0.3)*

The model in Table 24 estimates the effects on the levels of agreement that U-M is a place where the individual can thrive and grow (strongly agree = 5, strongly disagree = 1). The effect estimates represent the average change in mean index score 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 indicated with asterisks, with the levels of significance identified.

The results of the multivariate analysis indicate that the following groups are less likely to report feeling like they are thriving and growing at U-M, compared to their majority category: faculty who identify as a woman, who were not born in the US, or who report having a disability. The analysis also indicates significant race differences. White faculty are more likely than Hispanic/Latinx faculty and faculty in the Other race/ethnic identity category to report feelings of thriving and growth at U-M.

Table 24. U-M Key Dimensions: Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Faculty Feelings of Thriving and Growth at U-M	
	Thriving/Growth
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	-0.26*** (-3.49)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	-0.07 (-0.56)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	-0.17* (-2.03)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	-0.58*** (-4.28)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	-0.14 (-1.88)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	-0.03 (-0.46)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	-0.21 (-1.72)
African American/Black	-0.18 (-1.69)
Hispanic/Latinx	-0.31* (-2.45)
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.26* (-1.97)
Respondents	792
R-Squared	0.08
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant differences (p<0.05) with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity.) OLS regression coefficient with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 two-tailed tests.</i>	

D. Departmental Norms: Valued by Department & Fair/Equitable Treatment at U-M

Valued by the Department

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

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

I am valued in my department/unit for my...

- Teaching
- Research/scholarship/creativity
- Service contributions
- Mentoring of students
- Mentoring of faculty
- Clinical practice

A: Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Neither Agree nor Disagree; Agree; Strongly Agree

In order to assess faculty’s perception of how they are valued within their department, an index was created that comprised responses to the above six survey statements on departmental value. 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). We provide means for this index below.

On average, faculty in the 2021 sample report that they feel valued by their department (mean of 3.7 out of 5, Table 25). The 2021 sample, however, report feeling less valued by their department than the 2016 sample. This significant sample difference is for both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty.

Table 25. Estimated Mean Department Value Index of U-M Faculty and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Department Value Index	3.7 (-0.4)*	3.6 (-0.6)*	3.7 (-0.5)*

The model in Table 26 estimates the effects on the faculty responses to questions regarding the extent to which they feel valued (Departmental Value Index) by their department (higher scores are more highly valued). The effect estimates represent the estimated average change in mean index score 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 indicated with asterisks, with the levels of significance identified.

The results of the multivariate analysis indicate that faculty who identify as being a woman or who are non-tenure track report being less valued for their efforts by their department. The analysis also indicates significant race differences. African American faculty are more likely than Hispanic/Latinx and Other Race/Ethnicity faculty to report feeling valued by their department.

Table 26. Results from OLS Regression Estimates of a Multivariate Model of Demographic Associations with the Departmental Value Index	
	Departmental Value Index
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	-0.26*** (-3.81)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	-0.02 (-0.21)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	-0.28 (-0.36)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	-0.28 (-1.91)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	-0.04 (-0.47)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	-0.12* (-1.82)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	-0.07 (-0.62)
African American/Black	0.18 (1.84) H, O
Hispanic/Latinx	-0.24 (-1.93) AA
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.19 (-1.50) AA
Respondents	772
R-Squared	0.05
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant differences (p<0.05) with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. OLS regression coefficient with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 two-tailed tests.</i>	

Fair and Equitable Departmental Treatment

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

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

- The teaching workload is fairly and equitably distributed in my department.
- There are fair and equitable expectations regarding research in my department.
- There are fair and equitable expectations regarding service in my department.
- There are fair and equitable processes for determining compensation in my department.
- Support is provided fairly and equitably in my department.
- Rewards for work performance are fairly and equitably distributed in my department.
- DEI work is valued in my department.

A: Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Neither Agree nor Disagree; Agree; Strongly Agree

In order to assess faculty’s perception of how fair and equitable their department is, an index was created that was composed of responses to the above seven survey statements. The 2021 index added the item measuring “DEI work is valued in my department”, which was not asked in the 2016 survey. 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). We provide means for this index below.

On average, faculty in the 2021 sample report that they are equivocal in their belief that their department holds fair and equitable expectations toward faculty (mean of 3.3 out of 5, Table 27). There are no significant differences between the 2021 and 2016 responses to the fair treatment index.

Table 27. Department Fair Treatment Index: Estimated Mean of U-M Faculty and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Fair Treatment Index	3.3 (0)	3.3 (0)	3.3 (0)

In Table 28 below, the model estimates the effects on the faculty responses to questions regarding the fairness of treatment (Fair Treatment Index) by their department (higher scores indicate fairer treatment).

The effect estimates are the estimated average change in mean index score 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 indicated with asterisks, with levels of significance identified.

The results of the multivariate analysis indicate that faculty who identify as being a woman or who report having a disability report less fair treatment in their department. The analysis does not indicate any race differences after accounting for the other identities.

Table 28. Department Fair Treatment Index: Results from OLS Regression Estimates of a Multivariate Model of Demographic Associations with the Fair Treatment Index for U-M Faculty	
	Fair Treatment
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	-0.31*** (-4.00)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	-0.11 (-0.82)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	-0.06 (-0.70)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	-0.44** (-2.93)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	-0.15 (-1.72)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	-0.03 (-0.32)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	-0.02 (-0.13)
African American/Black	0.01 (0.09)
Hispanic/Latinx	-0.20 (-1.75)
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.20 (-1.22)
Respondents	774
R-Squared	0.05
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant differences (p<0.05) with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. OLS regression coefficient with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 two-tailed tests.</i>	

E. Intergroup Interactions in the Prior 12 Months

Political Opinions

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

Q: During the past 12 months, how often have you interacted in a **meaningful** way with people at U-M **whose political opinions are different from your own?** (If you have been at U-M for under 12 months, please consider your experiences during the time that you have been here.)

A: Never; Seldom; Sometimes; Often; Very Often

Approximately 38% of faculty in the 2021 sample report interacting in a meaningful way “Very Often” or “Often” in the past 12 months with people whose political opinions differ from their own (Table 29). Overall, significantly fewer faculty (by 5.4 percentage points) in the 2021 sample than in the 2016 sample report having this type of interaction. Interestingly, the tenure-track faculty report no significant differences between the two samples while there is a 10-percentage point difference in the non-tenure track faculty.

	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Very Often/Often	33.5% (+2.5)	42.6% (-10.1)*	37.5% (-5.4)*

In Table 30 below, ordinary least-squares regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on individuals’ meaningful interactions with others of various differing characteristics. The model in Table 30 estimates the effects on the average level of interaction with others with different political opinions (varying from 1 = never, 2 = seldom, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, to 5 = very often).

The effect estimates are the average change in response categories 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 indicated with asterisks, with levels of significance identified.

The results of the multivariate analysis indicate that faculty who identify as a woman are less likely to report having meaningful interactions in the past 12 months with people whose political opinions differ from their own (compared to men faculty). Also, non-tenure track faculty are more likely to report having such interactions compared to tenure-track faculty. There are also significant racial differences such that Asian American/Asian faculty are less likely to report having meaningful interactions with people whose political opinions differ from their own compared to White, African American, and Other Race/Ethnicity faculty.

Table 30. U-M Meaningful Interaction with Others of Different Political Opinions: Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Such Interactions	
	Interaction: Political Opinions
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	-0.31*** (-3.47)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	-0.16 (-1.03)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	0.02 (0.19)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	0.22 (1.34)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	-0.06 (-0.54)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	0.33*** (3.50)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	-0.29* (-1.99) AA, O
African American/Black	0.20 (1.66) A
Hispanic/Latinx	0.03 (0.21)
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.19 (1.00) A
Respondents	771
R-Squared	0.05
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant differences (p<0.05) with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. OLS regression coefficient with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 two-tailed tests.</i>	

Religious Beliefs

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

Q: During the past 12 months, how often have you interacted in a **meaningful** way with other people at U-M **whose religious beliefs are different than your own?** (If you have been at U-M for under 12 months, please consider your experiences during the time that you have been here.)

A: Never; Seldom; Sometimes; Often; Very Often

Approximately 74% of faculty in the 2021 sample reported interacting in a meaningful way “Very Often” or “Often” in the past 12 months with people whose religious beliefs differed from their own (Table 31). Overall, significantly fewer faculty in the 2021 sample report having this type of interaction than in the 2016 sample. Although both are trending in the same direction, the sample difference is statistically significant only with the tenure track faculty.

Table 31. U-M Meaningful Interaction with Others of Different Religious Beliefs: Estimated Percent of U-M Faculty and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Very Often/Often	72.8% (-7.7)*	74.4% (-4.9)	73.5% (-6.4)*

In Table 32 below, ordinary least-squares regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on individuals’ meaningful interactions with others of various differing characteristics. The model in Table 32 estimates the effects on the average level of interaction with others of different religious beliefs (varying from 1 = never, 2 = seldom, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, to 5 = very often).

The effect estimates are the average change in response categories 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 indicated with asterisks, with the levels of significance identified.

The results of the multivariate analysis indicate that faculty who identify as being a woman and those who identify as LGBTQ+ are less likely to report having meaningful interactions in the past 12 months with people whose religion differs from their own. There are also significant racial differences such that Hispanic/Latinx faculty are less likely to report having meaningful interactions with people whose religious beliefs differ from their own as compared to White and Other Race/Ethnicity faculty.

Table 32. U-M Faculty Meaningful Interaction with Others of Different Religious Beliefs: Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Such Interactions	
	Interaction: Religion
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	-0.18* (-2.23)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	-0.33* (-2.38)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	-0.02 (-0.24)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	0.11 (0.66)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	-0.1 (-1.21)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	-0.01 (-0.13)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	-0.09 (-0.73)
African American/Black	0.02 (0.14)
Hispanic/Latinx	-0.2* (-1.54)
Other Race/Ethnicity	O 0.22 (1.41) H
Respondents	765
R-Squared	0.03
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant differences (p<0.05) with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. OLS regression coefficient with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 two-tailed tests.</i>	

National Origin

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

Q: During the past 12 months, how often have you interacted in a **meaningful** way with people at U-M **who are of a different nationality than your own?** (If you have been at U-M for under 12 months, please consider your experiences during the time that you have been here.)

A: Never; Seldom; Sometimes; Often; Very Often

Approximately 82% of faculty in the 2021 sample report interacting in a meaningful way “Very Often” or “Often” with people whose nationality differs from their own in the past 12 months (Table 33). The 2021 sample did not differ significantly from the 2016 sample.

Table 33. U-M Meaningful Interaction with Others of Different National Origin: Estimated Percent of U-M Faculty and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Very Often/Often	84.5% (-4.5)	78.5% (-3.0)	81.9% (-3.0)

In Table 34 below, ordinary least-squares regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on individuals’ meaningful interactions with others of various differing characteristics. The model in Table 34 estimates the effects on the average level of interaction with others of different nationality (varying from 1 = never, 2 = seldom, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, to 5 = very often).

The effect estimates are the average change in response categories 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 indicated with asterisks, with levels of significance identified.

The results of the multivariate analysis indicate that faculty that are more likely to report having meaningful interactions in the past 12 months with people whose nationality differs from their own include those who identify as being a man, those who are not born in the US, and those who are on tenure track. There are also significant racial differences such that Asian American/Asian faculty are less likely to report having meaningful interactions with people whose nationality differs from their own as compared to Hispanic/Latinx and to Other Race/Ethnicity faculty.

Table 34. U-M Meaningful Interaction with Others of Different National Origin: Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Such Interactions	
	Interaction: Nationality
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	-0.27*** (-3.73)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	-0.23 (-1.94)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	0.22** (3.00)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	0.17 (1.19)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	-0.07 (-0.94)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	-0.22** (-3.06)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	-0.21 (-1.81) H, O
African American/Black	-0.005 (-0.05)
Hispanic/Latinx	0.10 (1.05) A
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.12 (0.93) A
Respondents	777
R-Squared	0.07
<p><i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant differences ($p < 0.05$) with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. OLS regression coefficient with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.001$ two-tailed tests.</i></p>	

Race/Ethnicity

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

Q: During the past 12 months, how often have you interacted in a **meaningful** way with people at U-M **who are of a different race or ethnicity than your own?** (If you have been at U-M for under 12 months, please consider your experiences during the time that you have been here.)

A: Never; Seldom; Sometimes; Often; Very Often

Approximately 82% of the 2021 sample report interacting in a meaningful way “Very Often” or “Often” in the past 12 months with people whose race/ethnicity differs from their own (Table 35). The 2021 sample did not differ significantly from the 2016 sample.

	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Very Often/Often	83.2% (-0.4)	80.0% (-1.6)	81.8% (-0.7)

In Table 36 below, ordinary least-squares regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on individuals’ meaningful interactions with others of various different characteristics. The model in Table 36 estimates the effects on the average level of interaction with others of different race/ethnicity (varying from 1 = never, 2 = seldom, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, to 5 = very often).

The effect estimates are the average change in response categories 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 indicated with asterisks, with levels of significance identified.

The results of the multivariate analysis indicate that faculty who are on tenure track are more likely than their relevant counterparts to report having meaningful interactions in the past 12 months with people whose racial/ethnic identity differs from their own.

There are also statistically significant racial differences. Specifically, African American/Black faculty are more likely to report having meaningful interactions with people whose racial/ethnic identity differs from their own compared to White, Asian American/Asian, Hispanic/Latinx, and Other Race/Ethnicity faculty. Hispanic/Latinx faculty are more likely than White faculty to report these interactions; and Asian American/Asian faculty are also more likely than White faculty to report meaningful interactions with individuals whose racial/ethnic identity differs from their own.

Table 36. U-M Meaningful Interaction with Others of Different Race/Ethnicity: Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Such Interactions	
	Interaction: Race/Ethnicity
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	-0.15 (-1.93)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	-0.35 (-1.93)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	0.03 (0.36)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	0.26 (1.94)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	-0.14 (-1.58)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	-0.19* (-2.45)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	0.23* (2.08) AA
African American/Black	0.64*** (9.09) A, O
Hispanic/Latinx	0.25* (2.29) AA
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.12 (0.71) AA
Respondents	776
R-Squared	0.06
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant differences (p<0.05) with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. OLS regression coefficient with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 two-tailed tests.</i>	

Sexual Orientation

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

Q: During the past 12 months, how often have you interacted in a **meaningful** way with people at U-M **whose sexual orientation is different than your own?** (If you have been at U-M for under 12 months, please consider your experiences during the time that you have been here.)

A: Never; Seldom; Sometimes; Often; Very Often

Of the 2021 sample, 60% report interacting in a meaningful way “Very Often” or “Often” in the past 12 months with people whose sexual orientation differs from their own (Table 37). The 2021 sample did not differ significantly from the 2016 sample.

Table 37. U-M Meaningful Interaction with Others of Different Sexual Orientation: Estimated Percent of U-M Faculty and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Very Often/Often	64.8% (+1.3)	53.6% (-2.3)	60.0% (+0.6)

In Table 38 below, ordinary least-squares regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on individuals’ meaningful interactions with others of various differing characteristics. The model in Table 38 estimates the effects on the average level of interaction with others of different sexual orientation (varying from 1 = never, 2 = seldom, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, to 5 = very often).

The effect estimates are the average change in response categories 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 indicated with asterisks, with levels of significance identified.

The results of the multivariate analysis indicate that faculty who identify as LGBTQ+, who were born in the US, and who report having a disability are more likely than their counterparts to report having meaningful interactions in the past 12 months with people whose sexual orientation differs from their own.

There are also significant racial differences. Specifically, Asian American/Asian faculty are less likely to report having meaningful interactions with people whose sexual orientation differs from their own when compared to African American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx and White faculty.

Table 38. U-M Meaningful Interaction with Others of Different Sexual Orientation: Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Such Interactions	
	Interaction: Sexual Orientation
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	0.04 (0.43)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	0.45* (2.26)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	-0.30** (-3.02)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	0.35* (2.08)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	-0.03 (-0.22)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	-0.18 (-1.88)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	-0.40** (-2.70) AA, H
African American/Black	0.04 (0.31) A
Hispanic/Latinx	0.00 (0.03) A
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.08 (-0.41)
Respondents	775
R-Squared	0.09
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant differences ($p < 0.05$) with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. OLS regression coefficient with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.001$ two-tailed tests.</i>	

Social Class

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

Q: During the past 12 months, how often have you interacted in a **meaningful** way with people at U-M **who are from a different social class?** (If you have been at U-M for under 12 months, please consider your experiences during the time that you have been here.)

A: Never; Seldom; Sometimes; Often; Very Often

Approximately 57% of the 2021 sample report interacting in a meaningful way “Very Often” or “Often” in the past 12 months with people whose social class differed from their own (Table 39). The 2021 sample did not differ significantly from the 2016 sample.

Table 39. U-M Meaningful Interaction with Others of Different Social Class: Estimated Percent of U-M Faculty and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Very Often/Often	56.2% (0)	58.5% (-1.2)	57.2% (-0.9)

In Table 40 below, ordinary least-squares regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on individuals’ meaningful interactions with others of various differing characteristics. The model in Table 40 estimates the effects on the average level of interaction with others of different social class (varying from 1 = never, 2 = seldom, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, to 5 = very often).

The effect estimates are the average change in response categories 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 indicated with asterisks, with levels of significance identified.

The results of the multivariate analysis indicate that faculty who report having a disability are more likely than those without a disability to report having meaningful interactions in the past 12 months with people whose social class differs from their own. There are no other significant differences.

Table 40. U-M Meaningful Interaction with Others of Different Social Class: Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Such Interactions	
	Interaction: Social Class
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	-0.12 (-1.43)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	0.23 (1.58)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	-0.07 (-0.74)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	0.47** (2.94)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	0.10 (1.04)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	0.11 (1.28)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	-0.12 (-0.89)
African American/Black	0.19 (1.61)
Hispanic/Latinx	0.02 (0.14)
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.25 (1.38)
Respondents	769
R-Squared	0.04
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant differences (p<0.05) with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity.) OLS regression coefficient with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001, two-tailed tests.</i>	

F. Discrimination

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

Felt Discriminated Against

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

Q: In general, over the past 12 months, **have you felt discriminated against at U-M?**
(If you have been at U-M for under 12 months, please consider the time that you have been here.)

A: Yes; No

Overall, approximately 24% of the 2021 sample report feeling that in general over the prior 12 months they have been discriminated against at the U-M (Table 41). Compared to the 2016 sample, faculty in the 2021 sample were more likely to report feeling that they had been discriminated against, by an increase of 7 percentage points. The difference was significant across both tenure and non-tenure tracks.

Table 41. Felt Discriminated Against at U-M: Estimated Percent of U-M Faculty and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Yes	26.1% (+6.5)*	20.7% (+6.4)*	23.8% (+7.2)*

The model in Table 42 estimates the risk of faculty experiencing discrimination during the 12 months before the survey. The effects displayed in the table are odds ratios. Odds ratios are multiplicative, so a significant odds ratio of 1.0 means no association, an odds ratio of statistical significance that is greater than 1.0 means the odds of an experience are increased, and an odds ratio of significantly 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 indicated with asterisks, with the levels of significance identified.

The results from the multivariate analysis indicate that there are significant differences in the extent to which faculty report feeling that they have been discriminated against at U-M in the past year. Specifically, faculty who identify as being a woman are 137% more likely than faculty who identify as being a man to report that they have been discriminated against. Also, faculty who report having a disability are 111% more likely than faculty who do not report having a disability to report that they have been discriminated against at U-M in the past year.

There are also a number of significant race differences. Specifically, White faculty are 305% less likely than Asian American/Asian faculty, 169% less likely than African American faculty, 219% less likely than Hispanic/Latinx and 166% less likely than Other Race/Ethnicity faculty to report feeling that they have been discriminated against at U-M in the past year.

Table 42. Felt Discriminated Against at U-M: Estimated Odds Ratios (Wald Chi-Square) for Key Social Identity Variables Predicting the Probability of Reporting Having Experienced Discrimination at U-M in the Past Year, Generated from Multivariate Logistic Regression Analysis	
	Discrimination "Yes" vs. "No"
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	2.37*** (17.09)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	1.20 (0.29)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	1.39 (2.11)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	2.11* (4.61)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	1.14 (0.33)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	0.69 (2.93)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	4.05*** (23.76)
African American/Black	2.69*** (13.77)
Hispanic/Latinx	3.19*** (18.16)
Other Race/Ethnicity	2.66* (6.44)
Respondents	781
-2 Log-likelihood	4,608.11
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant differences (p<0.05) with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity.) OLS regression coefficient with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001, two-tailed tests.</i>	

Discrimination Experienced: Disability

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

Q: Over the past 12 months, how often have YOU experienced discriminatory events at U-M **because of your ability or disability status?** (If you have been at U-M for under 12 months, please consider your experience during the time that you have been here.)

A: Never; 1-2 times; 3 or more times

Approximately 5% of all faculty in the 2021 sample report having experienced at least one discriminatory event as a result of their disability status at the U-M in the past 12 months (Table 43). It should be noted, however, that only 7% of the faculty in the 2021 sample report having a disability. Overall, faculty in the 2021 sample are more likely to report experiencing a discriminatory event as a result of their ability status than the 2016 sample.

	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
1 or more times	5.9% (+3.0)*	2.7% (+0.3)	4.5% (+1.9)*

The model in Table 44 estimates the risk of faculty experiencing a discriminatory event as a result of their ability status 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 significantly greater than 1.0 means the odds of an experience are increased, and an odds ratio of significantly 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 indicated with asterisks, with levels of significance identified.

The results from the multivariate analysis indicate that there are significant differences in the extent to which faculty report feeling that they have been discriminated against at U-M in the past year as a result of their ability status. Specifically, faculty who report having a disability are 9,269% more likely than faculty who do not report having a disability to report that they experienced a discriminatory event as a result of their ability status. Also, faculty who identify as LGBTQ+ are 213% more likely than faculty who identify as heterosexual to report that they have been discriminated against in this manner. There are no significant race differences after accounting for other identities.

Table 44. Experienced Discrimination at U-M Based on Ability or Disability Status: Estimated Odds Ratios (Wald Chi-Square) for Key Metrics within the Past 12 Months at U-M, from Multivariate Logistic Regression Analysis	
	Discrimination Due to Ability or Disability “Ever/1 or more times”
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	1.83 (1.31)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	3.13* (4.43)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	0.57 (0.58)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	93.69*** (73.85)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	1.76 (1.20)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	1.18 (0.10)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	1.38 (0.16)
African American/Black	2.47 (1.46)
Hispanic/Latinx	1.09 (0.02)
Other Race/Ethnicity	1.18 (0.02)
Respondents	777
-2 Log-likelihood	795.02
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant (p<0.05) differences with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. Odds ratio with Wald chi-square shown in parentheses. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 two-tailed tests.</i>	

Discrimination Experienced: Racial Identity

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

Q: Over the past 12 months, how often have YOU experienced discriminatory events at U-M **because of your racial or ethnic identity**? (If you have been at U-M for under 12 months, please consider your experience during the time that you have been here.)

A: Never; 1-2 times; 3 or more times

Overall, approximately 18% of faculty in the 2021 sample reported experiencing at least one discriminatory event in the past 12 months as a result of their racial identity at U-M (Table 45). For the total faculty and for tenure track faculty, the 2021 sample is more likely than the 2016 sample to report experiencing at least one racially discriminatory event at U-M in the last year.

Table 45. Experienced Discrimination at U-M Based on Racial or Ethnic Identity: Estimated Percent of U-M Faculty and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
1 or more times	20.5% (+5.2)*	15.4% (+4.7)	18.3% (+5.5)*

The model in Table 46 estimates the risk of faculty experiencing a discriminatory event during the 12 months before the survey as a result of their racial or ethnic identity. 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 significantly greater than 1.0 means the odds of an experience are increased, and an odds ratio of significantly 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 indicated with asterisks, with the levels of significance identified.

The results from the multivariate analysis indicate that there are significant differences in the extent to which faculty report feeling they have been discriminated against at U-M in the past year because of their race/ethnic identity. Specifically, faculty who were not born in the US are 73% more likely than faculty born in the US to report that they experienced a discriminatory event as a result of their race/ethnicity. Also, tenure track faculty are 40% more likely than non-tenure track faculty to report that they have been discriminated against in this manner.

There are also significant race differences. African American/Black faculty are 971% more likely, Asian American/Asian faculty are 774% more likely, Hispanic/Latinx faculty are 588% more likely and Other Race/Ethnicity faculty are 282% more likely than Whites to report experiencing racial discrimination in the past year. African Americans are also significantly more likely to report such discrimination than Other Race/Ethnicity faculty.

Table 46. Experienced Discrimination at U-M Based on Race/Ethnicity Identity: Estimated Odds Ratios (Wald Chi-Square) for Key Metrics within the Past 12 Months at U-M, from Multivariate Logistic Regression Analysis	
	Discrimination Due to Race/Ethnicity “Ever/1 or more times”
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	0.83 (0.64)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	1.65 (1.74)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	1.73* (4.03)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	1.53 (0.97)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	1.06 (0.05)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	0.60* (4.06)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	8.74*** (38.54)
African American/Black	10.71*** (70.24) O
Hispanic/Latinx	6.88*** (36.41)
Other Race/Ethnicity	3.82** (10.01) AA
Respondents	780
-2 Log-likelihood	3,694.99
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant (p<0.05) differences with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. Odds ratio with Wald chi-square shown in parentheses. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 two-tailed tests</i>	

Discrimination Experienced: Sex

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

Q: Over the past 12 months, how often have YOU experienced discriminatory events at U-M **because of your sex?** (If you have been at U-M for under 12 months, please consider your experience during the time that you have been here.)

A: Never; 1-2 times; 3 or more times

Overall, approximately 27% of faculty in the 2021 sample reported experiencing at least one discriminatory event at U-M in the past 12 months as a result of their sex (Table 47). For the total faculty and within non-tenure track faculty, the 2021 sample is significantly more likely than the 2016 sample to report experiencing at least one sexually discriminatory event at U-M in the last year.

Table 47. Experienced Discrimination at U-M Based on Sex: Estimated Percent of U-M Faculty and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
1 or more times	26.8% (+4.3)	26.0% (+8.1)*	26.5% (+6.5)*

The model in Table 48 estimates the risk of faculty experiencing a discriminatory event during the 12 months before the survey as a result of their sex. 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 significantly greater than 1.0 means the odds of an experience are increased, and an odds ratio of significantly 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 indicated with asterisks, with the levels of significance identified.

The results from the multivariate analysis indicate that there are significant differences in the extent to which faculty report feeling that they have been discriminated against at U-M in the past year because of their sex. Specifically, faculty who identify as a woman are 768% more likely than faculty who identify as a man to report that they experienced a discriminatory event as a result of their sex. There are also significant race differences such that African American/Black faculty are significantly more likely than Other Race/Ethnicity faculty to report experiencing sex discrimination in the past year.

Table 48. Experienced Discrimination at U-M Based on Sex: Estimated Odds Ratios (Wald Chi-Square) for Key Metrics within the Past 12 Months at U-M, from Multivariate Logistic Regression Analysis	
	Discrimination Due to Sex “Ever/1 or more times”
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	8.68*** (98.08)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	1.24 (0.50)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	0.75 (1.49)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	1.60 (1.63)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	1.28 (1.08)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	0.92 (0.16)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	0.84 (0.29)
African American/Black	0.54 (3.62) O
Hispanic/Latinx	0.89 (0.15)
Other Race/Ethnicity	1.59 (1.51) AA
Respondents	781
-2 Log-likelihood	4,488.88
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant (p<0.05) differences with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. Odds ratio with Wald chi-square shown in parentheses. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 two-tailed tests.</i>	

Discrimination Experienced: Sexual Orientation

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

Q: Over the past 12 months, how often have YOU experienced discriminatory events at U-M **because of your sexual orientation?** (If you have been at U-M for under 12 months, please consider your experience during the time that you have been here.)

A: Never; 1-2 times; 3 or more times

Overall, approximately 4% of faculty in the 2021 sample report experiencing at least one discriminatory event at U-M in the past 12 months as a result of their sexual orientation (Table 49). There is a significant difference between the total sample in 2021 and the 2016 sample such that the former is significantly more likely to report experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their sexual orientation at U-M in the past 12 months.

	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
1 or more	5.2% (+1.9)	3.0% (+1.5)	4.3% (+2.0)*

The model in Table 50 estimates the risk of faculty experiencing a discriminatory event during the 12 months before the survey as a result of their sexual orientation. 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 significantly greater than 1.0 means the odds of an experience are increased, and an odds ratio of significantly 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 indicated with asterisks, with levels of significance identified.

The results from the multivariate analysis indicate that there are significant differences in the extent to which faculty report feeling that they have been discriminated against at U-M in the past year because of their sexual orientation. Specifically, faculty who identify as LGBTQ+ are 754% more likely than faculty who identify as heterosexual to report that they experienced a discriminatory event as a result of their sexual orientation.

There are also significant race differences. Hispanic/Latinx faculty are significantly more likely to report experiencing discrimination in the past year based on sexual orientation than Asian American/Asian, African American, and White faculty.

Table 50. Experienced Discrimination at U-M Based on Sexual Orientation: Estimated Odds Ratios (Wald Chi-Square) for Key Metrics within the Past 12 Months at U-M, from Multivariate Logistic Regressions	
	Discrimination Due to Sexual Orientation “Ever/1 or more times”
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	1.23 (0.21)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	8.54*** (19.96)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	0.56 (1.44)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	2.71 (2.74)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	3.39 (3.82)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	0.91 (0.04)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	0.51 (0.54) H
African American/Black	0.76 (0.25) H
Hispanic/Latinx	3.31* (6.14) A, AA
Other Race/Ethnicity	2.63 (1.85)
Respondents	779
-2 Log-likelihood	1,156.43
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant (p<0.05) differences with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity, Odds ratio with Wald chi-square shown in parentheses. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 two-tailed tests.</i>	

Discrimination Experienced: National Origin

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

Q: Over the past 12 months, how often have YOU experienced discriminatory events at U-M **because of your national origin?** (If you have been at U-M for under 12 months, please consider your experience during the time that you have been here.)

A: Never; 1-2 times; 3 or more times

Overall, approximately 13% of faculty in the 2021 sample report experiencing at least one discriminatory event at U-M in the past 12 months as a result of their national origin (Table 51). There is a significant difference between the total sample in 2021 and the 2016 sample such that the 2021 sample is significantly more likely to report experiencing discrimination related to their national origin. This sample difference is driven by the experiences of the non-tenure track faculty.

	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
1 or more times	12.3% (+1.9)	14.8% (+5.8)*	13.4% (+3.8)*

The model in Table 52 estimates the risk of faculty experiencing a discriminatory event during the 12 months before the survey as a result of the respondent's national origin. 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 significantly greater than 1.0 means the odds of an experience are increased, and an odds ratio of significantly 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 indicated with asterisks, with levels of significance identified.

The results from the multivariate analysis indicate that there are significant differences in the extent to which faculty report feeling that they have been discriminated against at U-M because of their national origin in the past year. Specifically, faculty who are not born in the US are 316% more likely than faculty born in the US to report that they experienced a discriminatory event as a result of their national origin. Also, faculty who identify as LGBTQ+ are 218% more likely than faculty who identify as heterosexual to report that they experienced a discriminatory event as a result of their national origin.

There are also significant race differences. Asian American/Asian faculty are 324% more likely, Hispanic/Latinx are 275% more likely and Other Race/Ethnicity faculty are 281% more likely than White faculty to report experiencing discrimination based on national origin. African American faculty are also significantly less likely than Asian American/Asian, Hispanic/Latinx, and Other Race/Ethnic faculty to report experiencing discrimination based on national origin.

Table 52. Experienced Discrimination at U-M Based on National Origin: Estimated Odds Ratios (Wald Chi-Square) for Key Metrics within the Past 12 Months at U-M, from Multivariate Logistic Regressions	
	Discrimination Due to National Origin “Ever/1 or more times”
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	1.23 (0.54)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	3.18** (7.92)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	4.16*** (18.5)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	1.19 (0.1)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	1.17 (0.27)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	1.19 (0.36)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	4.24*** (15.31) AA
African American/Black	1.39 (0.62) A, H, O
Hispanic/Latinx	3.75*** (14.75) AA
Other Race/Ethnicity	3.81** (9.27) AA
Respondents	778
-2 Log-likelihood	3,007.47
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant (p<0.05) differences with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/ Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. Odds ratio with Wald chi-square shown in parentheses. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 two-tailed tests.</i>	

Discrimination Experienced: Religion

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

Q: Over the past 12 months, how often have YOU experienced discriminatory events at U-M **because of your religion?** (If you have been at U-M for under 12 months, please consider your experience during the time that you have been here.)

A: Never; 1-2 times; 3 or more times

Overall, approximately 7% of faculty in the 2021 sample report experiencing at least one discriminatory event at U-M in the past 12 months as a result of their religion (Table 53). There are no significant differences between the 2021 and 2016 samples for either faculty track.

Table 53. Experienced Discrimination at U-M Based on Religion: Estimated Percent of U-M Faculty and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
1 or more times	7.5% (+0.7)	5.3% (-2.4)	6.5% (-0.8)

The model in Table 54 estimates the risk of faculty experiencing a discriminatory event during the 12 months before the survey as a result of their religion. 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 significantly greater than 1.0 means the odds of an experience are increased, and an odds ratio of significantly 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 indicated with asterisks, with the levels of significance identified.

The results from the multivariate analysis indicate that there are significant racial differences in the extent to which faculty report feeling that they have been discriminated against at U-M in the past year because of their religion. Specifically, Other Race/Ethnicity faculty are 548% more likely than White faculty to report discrimination based on religion. Hispanic/Latinx faculty are 273% more likely than White faculty to report discrimination based on religion. Other Race/ethnicity faculty also are significantly more likely than Asian American/Asian and African American/Black faculty to report experiencing discrimination based on religion, while Hispanic/Latinx faculty are significantly more likely to report religion-based discrimination than their Asian American/Asian colleagues.

Table 54. Experienced Discrimination at U-M Based on Religion: Estimated Odds Ratios (Wald Chi-Square) for Key Metrics within the Past 12 Months at U-M, from Multivariate Logistic Regressions	
	Discrimination Due to Religion “Ever/1 or more times”
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	0.60 (1.81)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	0.97 (0.01)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	0.83 (0.19)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	1.38 (0.29)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	1.49 (0.94)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	0.81 (0.35)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	0.71 (0.22) H, O
African American/Black	1.42 (0.51) O
Hispanic/Latinx	3.73** (8.74) A
Other Race/Ethnicity	6.48*** (14.12) A, AA
Respondents	776
-2 Log-likelihood	2,060.95
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant (p<0.05) differences with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. Odds ratio with Wald chi-square shown in parentheses. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 two-tailed tests.</i>	

Discrimination Experienced: Political Orientation

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

Q: Over the past 12 months, how often have YOU experienced discriminatory events at U-M **because of your political orientation**? (If you have been at U-M for under 12 months, please consider your experience during the time that you have been here.)

A: Never; 1-2 times; 3 or more times

In the 2021 sample, approximately 10% of faculty reported experiencing at least one discriminatory event at U-M in the past 12 months as a result of their political orientation (Table 55). In addition, the faculty's reports of discrimination as a result of their political orientation increased significantly across the 2021 and 2016 samples for tenure track faculty. There were no significant differences for non-tenure track faculty.

	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
1 or more times	10.7% (+4.5)*	8.5% (-0.8)	9.7% (+1.8)

The model in Table 56 estimates the risk of faculty experiencing a discriminatory event during the 12 months before the survey as a result of their political orientation. 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 significantly greater than 1.0 means the odds of an experience are increased, and an odds ratio of significantly 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 indicated with asterisks, with the levels of significance identified.

The results from the multivariate analysis indicate that there are no significant differences in the extent to which faculty report feeling that they have been discriminated against at U-M in the past year because of their political orientation when accounting for other aspects of identity.

Table 56. Experienced Discrimination at U-M Based on Political Orientation: Estimated Odds Ratios (Wald Chi-Square) for Key Metrics within the Past 12 Months at U-M, from Multivariate Logistic Regressions	
	Discrimination Due to Political Orientation “Ever/1 or more times”
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	0.70 (1.31)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	0.90 (0.06)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	1.10 (0.06)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	1.94 (1.82)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	1.27 (0.46)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	0.76 (0.73)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	0.94 (0.01)
African American/Black	1.72 (2.07)
Hispanic/Latinx	1.95 (3.23)
Other Race/Ethnicity	1.17 (0.09)
Respondents	777
-2 Log-likelihood	2,702.82
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) differences with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. Odds ratio with Wald chi-square shown in parentheses. *$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.001$ two-tailed tests.</i>	

Discrimination Experienced: Social Class

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

Q: Over the past 12 months, how often have YOU experienced discriminatory events at U-M **because of your social class?** (If you have been at U-M for under 12 months, please consider your experience during the time that you have been here.)

A: Never; 1-2 times; 3 or more times

In the 2021 sample, approximately 7% of faculty reported experiencing at least one discriminatory event at U-M in the past 12 months as a result of their social class (Table 57). In addition, the faculty's reports of discrimination based on their social class did not differ significantly across the 2021 and 2016 samples.

	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
1 or more times	7.6% (+1.5)	6.1% (+1.3)	6.9% (+1.6)

The model in Table 58 estimates the risk of faculty experiencing a discriminatory event during the 12 months before the survey as a result of their social class. 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 significantly greater than 1.0 means the odds of an experience are increased, and an odds ratio of significantly 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 indicated with asterisks, with levels of significance identified.

The results from the multivariate analysis indicate that there are significant differences in the extent to which faculty report feeling that they have been discriminated against at U-M in the past year as a result of their social class. Specifically, faculty who report having a disability are 265% more likely than faculty who do not report having a disability to report that they experienced a discriminatory event as a result of their social class. Additionally, there are significant race differences. African American/Black faculty are 171% more likely and Hispanic/Latinx faculty are 341% more likely than White faculty to report that they experienced a discriminatory event as a result of their social class.

Table 58. Experienced Discrimination at U-M Based on Social Class: Estimated Odds Ratios (Wald Chi-Square) for Key Metrics within the Past 12 Months at U-M, from Multivariate Logistic Regressions	
	Discrimination Due to Social Class “Ever/1 or more times”
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	1.51 (1.72)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	2.17 (2.63)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	0.88 (0.21)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	3.65** (9.21)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	1.87 (2.41)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	0.89 (0.11)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	1.99 (2.04)
African American/Black	2.71* (6.52)
Hispanic/Latinx	4.41*** (16.59)
Other Race/Ethnicity	1.70 (1.16)
Respondents	776
-2 Log-likelihood	2,147.35
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant (p<0.05) differences with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. Odds ratio with Wald chi-square shown in parentheses. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 two-tailed tests.</i>	

G. DEI Participation and Progress with DEI Initiatives

DEI Actions Index

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

Q: Over the past 12 months, please indicate whether you have participated in any of the following U-M DEI-related activities and events: (If you have been at U-M for under 12 months, please consider the time that you have been here.)⁵

- Attended a DEI-related training/workshop
- Attended a DEI-related talk or seminar
- Attended a DEI-related event in my unit
- Attended a DEI-related event at the U-M level
- Had a DEI-related conversation with a colleague/peer

A: (For each type of activity or event) Never; 1-2 times; 3 or more times

In order to assess faculty's participation in DEI-related activities, an index was created composed of responses to the above five survey statements on participation in DEI actions. **The composite score represents the number of DEI-related actions that the person has engaged in at least once, on a scale going from 0 = no participation in any of the actions to 5 = participation in all five actions.** We provide means for this index below.

In general, faculty self-report engaging in more than half of the five DEI actions (Table 59). Specifically, the mean number of events that faculty report participating in at least once in the prior 12 months is 3.7 out of 5.

	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
DEI Action Index	4.02 (-)	3.26 (-)	3.70 (-)

In Table 60 below, ordinary least-squares regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on individuals' reports of their participation in DEI activities. Table 60 presents estimates of the effects on the average level of participation in DEI activities. The effect estimates are the average change in response categories 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 indicated with asterisks, with the levels of significance identified.

The results of the multivariate analysis indicate that faculty who identify as being a woman, who report having a disability, and who are on tenure track self-report having engaged in more DEI-related activities. There are also significant racial differences. Specifically, African American

⁵ This is a new question in the 2021 DEI survey, therefore there is no comparison data to the 2016 DEI survey data.

faculty self-report engaging in more DEI activities than Asian American/Asian, Hispanic/Latinx, and White faculty.

Table 60. DEI Action Index: Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Five DEI Actions	
	DEI Actions (Five-Variable Index)
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	0.25* (2.06)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	0.13 (0.71)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	-0.18 (-1.32)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	0.52** (2.91)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	0.21 (1.42)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	-0.74*** (-5.73)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	0.16 (0.78) AA
African American/Black	0.69*** (5.67) A, H
Hispanic/Latinx	0.13 (0.57) AA
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.28 (1.31)
Respondents	754
R-Squared	0.10
<p><i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) differences with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. OLS Regression Coefficients with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.001$, two-tailed tests.</i></p> <p>Note: Index items include (i) Attended a DEI-related training/workshop session (ii) Attended a DEI-related talk or seminar (iii) Attended a DEI-related event in my unit (iv) Attended a DEI-related event at the U-M level and (v) Had a DEI-related conversation with a colleague/peer.</p>	

DEI Progress: DEI Climate Now vs. 2016

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

Q: Compared to the DEI climate at the start of the DEI strategic plan (2016), how would you rate the current DEI climate at U-M?⁶

A: Much worse now than it was before; Somewhat worse now than it was before; About the same now as it was before; Somewhat better now than it was before; Much better now than it was before

The majority of the faculty report seeing progress being made with the DEI climate at U-M since the start of the DEI strategic plan (Table 61). Overall, 61% of the faculty report that the DEI climate is much better or somewhat better than at the start of the DEI plan. At the same time, roughly 28% report that things are about the same, and only approximately 1 in 10 (11%) report feeling that things have gotten worse.

	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Much/Somewhat Better	57.4% (-)	65.7% (-)	61.0% (-)
About the Same	27.8% (-)	28.1% (-)	27.9% (-)
Much/Somewhat Worse	14.8% (-)	6.2% (-)	11.1% (-)

In Table 62 below, ordinary least-squares regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on individuals' assessments of the progress made by the U-M DEI plan since 2016. Table 62 presents estimates of the effects on the average assessment of the progress made by the U-M DEI plan since 2016. The effect estimates are the average change in response categories (in this case varying from 1 = "Much worse now than it was before" to 5 = "Much better now than it was before") 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 indicated with asterisks, with the levels of significance identified.

The results of the multivariate analysis indicate that faculty who report having a disability, and faculty who were not born in the U.S. report that less progress has been made by the U-M DEI plan since 2016.

There are no significant racial differences in the faculty's assessment of U-M DEI plan progress.

⁶ This is a new question in the 2021 DEI survey, therefore there is no comparison data to the 2016 DEI survey data.

Table 62. U-M DEI Climate vs 2016: Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Rating of DEI Climate at U-M Compared to 2016	
	DEI Climate: 2021 vs. 2016
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	-0.03 (-0.42)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	-0.01 (-0.04)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	-0.20* (-2.33)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	-0.35* (-2.55)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	0.01 (0.07)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	0.15 (1.94)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	-0.10 (-0.82)
African American/Black	0.03 (0.33)
Hispanic/Latinx	<0.01 (0.03)
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.31 (-1.51)
Respondents	700
R-Squared	0.04
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant (p<0.05) differences with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. OLS Regression Coefficients with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 two-tailed tests.</i>	

DEI Progress: Satisfaction with Plan Progress

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

Q: How satisfied are you with the progress that has been made at U-M as a result of the 5-year campus-wide diversity, equity and inclusion initiative? (If you have been at U-M for less than 5 years, please consider progress you have seen during the time that you have been here.)⁷

A: Very Dissatisfied, Dissatisfied, Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied, Satisfied, Very Satisfied

The plurality of faculty report being satisfied with the progress that has been made with U-M's DEI plan over the past five years (Table 63). Approximately 41% of the faculty report being very satisfied or satisfied with the U-M's DEI plan progress and only 1 in 5 (20%) report being very dissatisfied or dissatisfied with the progress made by the plan.

	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Very Satisfied/Satisfied	35.8% (-)	48.3% (-)	41.1% (-)
Neutral	40.3% (-)	37.3% (-)	39.0% (-)
Very Dissatisfied/Dissatisfied	23.9% (-)	14.4% (-)	19.9% (-)

In Table 64 below, ordinary least-squares regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on individuals' reports of their satisfaction with the progress made with the U-M DEI plan. Table 64 presents estimates of the effects on the average level of satisfaction with the progress made with the U-M DEI plan. The effect estimates are the average change in response categories (in this case varying from "1" = very dissatisfied to "5" = very satisfied) 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 indicated with asterisks, with the levels of significance identified.

The results of the multivariate analysis indicate that faculty from three demographic groups are significantly less satisfied with the progress that has been made with the U-M DEI plan: those who identify as being a woman, who report having a disability, and who are on the tenure track. There are no significant racial/ethnic differences in faculty's satisfaction with the U-M DEI plan progress.

⁷ This is a new question in the 2021 DEI survey, therefore there is no comparison data to the 2016 DEI survey data.

Table 64. Satisfaction with U-M DEI Progress: Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Satisfaction with DEI Plan Progress since 2016	
	Satisfaction with DEI Plan Progress
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	-0.23** (0.07)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	0.09 (0.66)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	-0.17 (-1.95)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	-0.47** (-2.88)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	-0.03 (-0.29)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	0.23** (3.03)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	0.01 (0.10)
African American/Black	-0.05 (-0.42)
Hispanic/Latinx	-0.07 (-0.6)
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.18 (-1.01)
Respondents	802
R-Squared	0.05
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) differences with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. OLS Regression Coefficients with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.001$ two-tailed tests.</i>	

DEI Progress: Plan Progress Compared to Other Institutions

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

Q: How well do you think the U-M is doing in relation to DEI compared to other institutions?⁸

A: Among the very worst; Worse than most; About equal; Better than most; Among the very best

The majority of the faculty (approximately 53%) rate the U-M's DEI efforts as being about equal to those of other universities, while almost 40% view U-M's DEI efforts as being among the best or better than most (Table 65). Only less than 8% of the faculty rate U-M's DEI efforts as being worse than most or the worst.

	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Best/Better than Most	38.6% (-)	40.6% (-)	39.5% (-)
About Equal	51.8% (-)	54.3% (-)	52.9% (-)
Worst/Worse than Most	9.6% (-)	5.0% (-)	7.6% (-)

In Table 66 below, ordinary least-squares regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on individuals' assessments of U-M's DEI efforts compared to other schools. Table 66 presents estimates of the effects on the average assessment of U-M's DEI efforts compared to other schools. The effect estimates are the average change in response categories (in this case varying from "1" = Among the very worst to "5" = Among the very best) 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 indicated with asterisks, with the levels of significance identified.

The results of the multivariate analysis indicate only significant racial differences in faculty's assessment of U-M DEI efforts in relation to other schools. Specifically, African American/Black faculty assess U-M's DEI efforts more positively in relation to other schools in comparison to Asian American/Asian, Hispanic/Latinx and White faculty. No other group differences were found.

⁸ This is a new question in the 2021 DEI survey, therefore there is no comparison data to the 2016 DEI survey data.

Table 66. Comparing U-M DEI Progress: Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Rating of U-M DEI Plan Progress in Comparison to Other Schools	
	DEI Plan Progress Compared to Other Schools
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	-0.08 (-1.23)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	-0.13 (-1.28)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	-0.05 (-0.69)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	-0.27 (-1.83)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	-0.09 (-1.16)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	0.01 (0.17)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	0.05 (0.44) AA
African American/Black	0.20** (2.16) A, H
Hispanic/Latinx	0.06 (0.64) AA
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.20 (-1.24)
Respondents	783
R-Squared	0.03
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) differences with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. OLS Regression Coefficients with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.001$ two-tailed tests.</i>	

H. Well-Being

Physical Health

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

Q: Overall, how would you describe your physical health?⁹

A: Excellent; Very Good; Good; Fair; Poor

Overall, faculty members describe their own physical health in positive terms (Table 67). The overwhelming majority of faculty (approximately 70%) describe their physical health as being “Excellent” (31%) or “Very Good” (39%). Only 7% of the faculty describe their physical health as being “Fair” and less than 1% of the faculty describe their physical health as “Poor”.

	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Excellent	32.7% (-)	28.6% (-)	30.9% (-)
Very Good	37.6% (-)	40.3% (-)	38.8% (-)
Good	21.2% (-)	23.9% (-)	22.4% (-)
Fair	8.1% (-)	6.0% (-)	7.2% (-)
Poor	0.4% (-)	1.2% (-)	0.8% (-)

In Table 68 below, ordinary least-squares regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on individuals’ self-reported physical health. Table 68 presents estimates of the effects on the average assessment of physical health. The effect estimates are the average change in response categories (in this case varying from “1” = Poor to “4” = Excellent/Very Good) 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 indicated with asterisks, with the levels of significance identified.

The results of the multivariate analysis indicate that the faculty who identify as being a woman, who report not having a disability, and who are older report significantly more positive physical health.

There are significant racial differences in faculty’s assessment of their physical health such that African American/Black and Other Race/Ethnicity faculty report significantly poorer physical health than White faculty.

⁹ This is a new question in the 2021 DEI survey, therefore there is no comparison data to the 2016 DEI survey data.

Table 68. Well-Being (Physical Health): Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Physical Health	
	Physical Health
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	0.20** (2.67)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	-0.11 (-0.75)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	-0.02 (-0.25)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	-0.72*** (-4.46)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	0.18* (2.13)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	-0.10 (-1.25)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	-0.23 (-1.87)
African American/Black	-0.22* (-2.02)
Hispanic/Latinx	-0.06 (-0.64)
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.46* (-2.31)
Respondents	773
R-Squared	0.08
<p><i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) differences with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. OLS Regression Coefficients with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.001$ two-tailed tests.</i></p>	

Mental Health

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

Q: Overall, how would you describe your mental health?¹⁰

A: Excellent; Very Good; Good; Fair; Poor

Similar to physical health, the faculty generally describe their own mental health in a positive manner (Table 69). The majority of the faculty (55%) describe their mental health as being “Excellent” (23%) or “Very Good” (32%). Only 17% of the faculty describe their mental health as being “Fair” and fewer than 3% describe it as “Poor”.

Table 69. Well-Being (Mental Health): Estimated Percent of U-M Faculty, by Tenure Track Status			
	Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Excellent	24.4% (-)	21.4% (-)	23.1% (-)
Very Good	30.2% (-)	34.9% (-)	32.3% (-)
Good	26.2% (-)	24.9% (-)	25.6% (-)
Fair	16.6% (-)	16.5% (-)	16.5% (-)
Poor	2.6% (-)	2.4% (-)	2.5% (-)

In Table 70 below, ordinary least-squares regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on individuals’ self-reported mental health. Table 70 presents estimates of the effects on the average assessment of mental health. The effect estimates are the average change in response categories (in this case varying from “1” = Poor to “4” = Excellent/Very Good) 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 indicated with asterisks, with the levels of significance identified.

The results of the multivariate analysis indicate that two groups report significantly more positive mental health than their relevant counterparts: faculty who do not report having a disability and faculty who are older.

There are no significant racial/ethnic differences in faculty’s assessment of their mental health.

¹⁰ This is a new question in the 2021 DEI survey, therefore there is no comparison data to the 2016 DEI survey data.

Table 70. Well-Being (Mental Health): Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Mental Health	
	Mental Health
Women Faculty (Relative to Men Faculty)	-0.06 (-0.70)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)	-0.26 (-1.55)
Not Born in US (Relative to Faculty Born in the US)	-0.06 (-0.61)
Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)	-0.71*** (-3.56)
Age 41 and Older (Relative to Faculty Age 40 and Younger)	0.44*** (4.39)
Non-Tenure Track (Relative to Tenure Track)	-0.05 (-0.57)
Race (Relative to White Faculty)	
Asian American/Asian	0.11 (0.79)
African American/Black	-0.02 (-0.18)
Hispanic/Latinx	0.02 (0.18)
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.04 (-0.27)
Respondents	773
R-Squared	0.07
<i>Letter symbols indicate statistically significant (p<0.05) differences with other race/ethnic categories where A=Asian American/Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, AA=African American/Black, H=Hispanic/Latinx, and O=Other Race/Ethnicity. OLS Regression Coefficients with t-statistics shown in parentheses. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 two-tailed tests.</i>	

VI. Conclusion

The current report utilizes high-quality data from a campus-wide climate survey to obtain an empirical assessment of faculty's perceptions of the University of Michigan Ann Arbor campus and their experiences on it. These data provide several benefits to the U-M community. First, the data provide improved estimates of the composition of faculty on several variables, including by religion, disability status, political identity, and Middle Eastern/North African (MENA) racial/ethnic group membership. The data also provide a snapshot of our current context that can be compared with our original survey in 2016. Further, this data will serve as an important baseline for the beginning of the DEI 2.0 strategic planning process.

Finally, as with the 2016 data, the plan is to report to the entire U-M community the findings of this report. We will also provide broad access to the public to a de-identified version of the dataset to allow members of the community to explore the data on their own. By doing this, we are planning to model inclusion and transparency with the goal of fostering new and better ideas that will aid our efforts to make the U-M more diverse, equitable, and inclusive.