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

Table of Contents

I.   Executive Summary

In the fall of 2021, the University of Michigan (U-M) conducted a random-sample survey of 3,500 students that was designed to adequately represent the approximately 50,260 students enrolled as of September 27, 2021. The survey used a special two-phase design to best represent the full diversity of students, and it produced an impressive overall response rate of 49%.

The data collected in this study is designed to provide a representative snapshot of U-M students 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 students has changed between the two reports.

In addition, new questions have been asked to directly assess student perceptions of the progress that has been made as a result of the U-M DEI strategic plan as well as student self-reports of their own health and well-being. Bivariate and multivariate analyses were used to provide an overview of the student 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 student body. 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 student community 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 fewer individuals who identify as heterosexual students (76%) compared to the 2016 sample (87%).

- The 2021 sample included significantly fewer students who identify as White (48%) compared to the 2016 sample (58%).

- The percent of students in the 2021 sample who reported having a disability (9%) nearly doubled from the 2016 sample (5%).

A new item was introduced into the 2021 survey that asked students to report their political beliefs ranging from very liberal to very conservative. Overall, 68% of students described their political beliefs as being very liberal, liberal or slightly liberal; 13% described their political beliefs as moderate/middle of the road; and 10% characterized their political beliefs as slightly conservative, conservative or very conservative. Approximately 9% reported that they had not thought about it or did not know.

Institutional Climate

Overall, students in the 2021 sample reported moderately positive general climate experiences at U-M. Those experiences, however, were significantly less positive than the experiences reported in the 2016 sample. In general, students in less privileged groups reported less positive overall 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 students (61%) were satisfied with the overall climate at U-M in the previous 12 months, that percentage represented a significant decrease from the responses of students in the 2016 sample (72%). Specifically, students who report having a disability and underrepresented minority students felt less satisfied with the climate than did their majority counterparts.

Regarding individual attributes that make up the general climate and the DEI climate, overall, the students in the 2021 sample reported experiencing the climate in moderately positive ways. African American/Black students and persons with disabilities rate the general climate less positively.

Considering attributes in the campus climate related to DEI, students also tended to report experiencing the climate in moderately positive ways, with no differences between the 2016 and 2021 samples. Women students and members of the LGBTQ+ community rated the DEI climate less positively. Likewise, African American/Black students rated the DEI climate as less positive than did their White, Asian American/Asian, Hispanic/Latinx, and Other Race/Ethnicity peers.

Individuals' Assessment of Being Valued at U-M

Overall, students 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 students, LBGTQ+ students and individuals with disabilities, as well as minoritized students were less likely to report feelings of being valued, belonging, personal growth and thriving.

Intergroup Interactions

Overall, students 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 students reported engaging often or very often in meaningful ways with others who differed from them ranged from 37% (political opinions) to 78% (race/ethnicity).

For the most part, student reports of such interactions were lower in the 2021 sample compared to the 2016 sample. An exception was interactions with persons who differed in sexual orientation; there was significantly more interaction in the 2021 sample.

Discrimination[1]

Overall, significant numbers of students reported experiencing discrimination at U-M. Approximately 12% of the 2021 sample reported feeling that, in general, over the previous 12 months they had been discriminated against at U-M, a decrease of about 5 percentage points from the 2016 sample. With respect to discrimination based on specific social identities, the most frequent reports of students experiencing at least one discriminatory event were based on race/ethnicity (18%), sex (18) and social class (16%). None of these results, however, significantly differed from the 2016 sample. Out of the eight social identities assessed, only three identities yielded discrimination outcomes that differed significantly from the 2016 sample: sexual orientation (significantly higher for undergraduates), religion (significantly lower for graduate/professional students, and political orientation (significantly lower for both undergraduates and graduate students).

One especially noteworthy finding is that while only 8.5% of the total student group reported having a disability, 5.6% of the total student group 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, students self-reported limited engagement in DEI-related activities. On average, students engaged in the past 12 months in 1.6 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 students reported engaging in more DEI-related activities than men students, while students born outside the US and undergraduate students engaged in fewer DEI activities than did their counterparts. It should be noted that African American/Black students reported engaging in significantly more DEI-related activity than all other ethnic group identities.

Assessment of DEI 1.0

Although they reported being less satisfied with the overall climate at U-M than the 2016 sample, in general, students in the 2021 sample reported positive assessments of the impact that DEI 1.0 has had at U-M. Specifically, 57% of the students 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 6% rated the DEI climate as being somewhat or much worse. In addition, 40% of the students were satisfied or very satisfied with the progress that was made via the DEI plan since its implementation compared to 11% 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, 50% of the students reported that they think that U-M is doing better than most or among the very best, while only 6% 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 student 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 the student body 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 student perspectives and experiences related to their time 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 students 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 student perceptions of the progress that has been made as a result of the U-M DEI strategic plan as well as the students' 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 student population at the University of Michigan, this study used a sample survey approach rather than a census of all students. A carefully selected sample, with randomization, allows researchers to make scientifically 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 students.

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 students could seek assistance if they had questions or if they experienced issues relating to diversity, equity and/or inclusion while studying at U-M Ann Arbor.

Demographics—Survey Part I

- Questions were asked to capture the demographics of each participant, including gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, religious affiliation, disability, military status, and citizenship.

- Students were also asked in what school/college they are enrolled and how long they have been 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 student 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 eligible population for this survey included all graduate and undergraduate students (part- and full-time) at the U-M Ann Arbor campus who were enrolled as of September 27, 2021. The University of Michigan Registrar provided the sample frame (approximately 50,257 students).

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

Data Collection

The overall data collection design protocol for students was:

- Phase I: A USPS mailed pre-notification letter sent to each selected student, inviting them to participate in a web-based survey. Any student who lacked an adequate USPS mailing address received an email pre-notification letter.

    - An email invitation to participate in the web-based survey.

    - A series of four email reminders to participate in the web-based survey.

- Phase II: A second phase sample selection of n=525 students designed to compensate for trends in nonresponse.

    - A second phase interviewer telephone prompt to compete the survey.

- All participating students 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 student nonresponders were selected to be included in a "Phase II" responsive design. For the Phase II design, student nonresponders were contacted via telephone by professionally trained interviewers to encourage their participation. To preserve confidentiality, if the participant agreed to participate in the study as a result of the telephone call, the interviewer resent the email invitation to the individual so the student could complete the survey on their own. For respondents who could not be contacted, as a courtesy, interviewers also emailed a new survey link to potential participants after leaving a voice mail message about the survey.

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 rates[2] 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)	48.8%
Mean Time to Complete Survey (Web Survey Responses Only)	14 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 students. 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 two-phase sampling introduced differential weights for some students. Those sampled for the second phase of recruitment received an adjustment weight, equal to the inverse of the rate at which they were selected. These weights allowed this second-phase sample to represent the sample members who were not selected for the second phase.

---

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, gender, race/ethnicity, academic level, citizenship status, and credits taken), 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 students 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 was 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 students based upon responses to the survey itself. **Each section of this report displays percentages of the student 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 students are based on a sample of the students, 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

Undergraduate vs. Graduate/Professional

In this report, students are divided into Undergraduate and Graduate/Professional segments in an attempt to account for some of the variation in experiences between these two groups.

A majority of the students (62%) in the 2021 sample are undergraduates (Table 2). There is no significant difference from the 2016 sample.

Table 2. Respondent's Student Status	
	Percentage of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016
Undergraduate	62.3% (+1.0)
Graduate/Professional	37.7% (-1.0)

Age

The mean age of the student population in the 2021 sample is 22.6 years of age, which does not differ significantly from the 2016 sample (Table 3).

Table 3. What is your current age (in years)?, by Student Status	
	Mean Age and Amount of Change since 2016
Total Students	22.6 (-0.1)
Undergraduate	19.8 (-0.2)
Graduate/Professional	27.2 (+0.2)

Gender

Of the total student group in the 2021 sample, roughly 48% identify as man, 50% 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 Student Status			
	Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016		
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
Man	46.5% (-2.3)	50.7% (-3.2)	48.1% (-2.7)
Woman	51.3% (+1.1)	47.6% (+2.2)	49.9% (+1.5)
Transgender/Gender Nonconforming	1.2% (+0.5)	0.3% (0)	0.8% (+0.3)
Preferred Response Not Listed	1.1% (+0.7)	1.3% (+1.0)	1.2% (+0.8)

Sexual Orientation

With respect to the sexual orientation of the students in the 2021 sample, roughly 76% of the total student group report being heterosexual, followed by approximately 9% reporting being bisexual and approximately 5% reporting being gay/lesbian (Table 5). There are significant differences between the 2016 and 2021 samples. Overall, 11 percentage points fewer students in the 2021 sample identify as heterosexual and approximately 5 percentage points more students indicate that they are bisexual. There also is a significant increase (4 percentage points) in the 2021 sample for student who reported more than one selection. There are no other significant differences across the two samples.

Table 5. What is your sexual orientation?, by Student Status			
	Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016		
	Undergraduate	Graduate/Professional	Total
Heterosexual	77.2% (-9.9)*	74.2% (-12.9)*	76.1% (-11.0)*
Bisexual	8.9% (+4.0)*	8.1% (+5.4)*	8.6% (+4.6)*
Gay/Lesbian	4.0% (+0.1)	5.8% (+2.0)	4.7% (+0.9)
Queer	1.1% (+0.7)	1.1% (-0.3)	1.1% (+0.3)
Questioning	0.2% (+0.6)	0.6% (+0.4)	1.0% (+0.5)
Asexual	0.7% (-0.3)	0.5% (+0.3)	0.6% (-0.1)
Preferred Response Not Listed	0.9% (-0.3)	2.6% (+1.7)	1.5% (+0.5)
More Than One Selection	6.2% (+5.0)*	7.0% (+3.4)	6.5% (+4.4)*

Race and Ethnicity

Racially, approximately 48% of the total student group in the 2021 sample identify as White, 26% as Asian American/Asian[3], 7% as Hispanic/Latinx, 5% as African American/Black, 5% as Middle Eastern/North African, 2% as Other Race/Ethnicity, 6% as more than one selection and 0.2% as Native American/Alaskan Native (Table 6). There were significant differences across the samples for Middle Eastern/North African students, who increased by over 3 percentage points in the 2021 sample, and White students, who decreased from 57.9% of the sample in 2016 to 48.1% of the 2021 sample.

Table 6. Please indicate the racial or ethnic group(s) with which you identify (select all that apply), by Student Status			
	Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016		
	Undergraduate	Graduate/Professional	Total
African American/Black	5.3% (+0.8)	5.0% (+1.1)	5.2% (+0.9)
Asian American/Asian[3]	20.5% (-0.2)	36.1% (+6.2)	26.4% (+2.2)
Hispanic/Latinx	7.1% (+1.8)	7.8% (+0.1)	7.4% (+1.1)
Middle Eastern/North African	7.3% (+5.6)*	1.1% (-0.6)	4.9% (+3.3)*
Native American/Alaskan Native	0.1% (0)	0.4% (+0.2)	0.2% (+0.1)
White	52.3% (-10.4)*	41.3% (-8.9)*	48.1% (-9.8)*
Other Race/Ethnicity	1.4% (+0.9)	2.4% (+0.8)	1.8% (+0.8)
More Than One Selection	6.1% (+1.6)	6.0% (+1.2)	6.1% (+1.5)

---

[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 students are divided into three segments: White, Asian/Asian American, and Underrepresented (Table 7). The Underrepresented category includes all other categories. There are significant differences in the total student population for White and Underrepresented students across the 2016 and 2021 samples, with White students decreasing by 9.8 percentage points and Underrepresented students increasing by 7.6 percentage points.

Table 7. Please indicate the racial or ethnic group(s) with which you identify (select all that apply), Condensed Categorization by Student Status			
	Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016		
	Undergraduate	Graduate/Professional	Total
White	52.3% (-10.4)*	41.3% (-8.9)*	48.1% (-9.8)*
Asian American/Asian	20.5% (-0.2)	36.1% (+6.2)	26.4% (+2.2)
Underrepresented	27.3% (+10.6)*	22.7% (+2.7)	25.5% (+7.6)*

Country of Origin

Approximately 65% of the 2021 total student sample report being born in the United States, which is 10 percentage points fewer students than in the 2016 sample (Table 8).

Table 8. Were you born in the United States, Puerto Rico, a US island area, or born abroad of US citizen parents?, by Student Status			
	Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016		
	Undergraduate	Graduate/Professional	Total
No	25.6% (+9.0)*	50.6% (+12.3)*	35.0% (+10.1)*
Yes	74.4% (-9.0)*	49.4% (-12.3)*	65.0% (-10.1)*

Religious Identity

While the students 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 both student segments as well as the total student population's reports of religious beliefs. The total 2021 sample, compared to the 2016, was more likely to identify as Agnostic and with no religion, and less likely to identify as Catholic, Jewish, Lutheran, Methodist, and Baptist.

Table 9. With what religious affiliation, if any, do you most strongly identify?, by Student Status			
	Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016		
	Undergraduate	Graduate/Professional	Total
Agnostic	18.2% (+5.1)	16.7% (+5.7)	17.6% (+5.4)*
Atheist	10.0% (-0.7)	14.0% (+1.2)	11.5% (0)
Baptist	0.8% (-1.0)*	0.6% (-0.4)	0.7% (-0.8)*
Buddhist	2.2% (+1.1)	4.1% (+2.2)	2.9% (+1.6)
Catholic	17.5% (-4.9)	11.6% (-2.8)	15.3% (-4.0)*
Christian: Nondenominational	10.5% (+0.2)	8.8% (-1.8)	9.8% (-0.5)
Eastern Orthodox	0.4% (-0.8)	1.8% (+1.0)	1.0% (-0.1)
Episcopalian	0.5% (-0.2)	1.6% (+1.0)	0.9% (+0.2)
Hindu	3.9% (0)	3.9% (-2.0)	3.9% (-0.7)
Muslim	5.1% (+2.6)	3.0% (+0.1)	4.3% (+1.6)
Jewish	3.3% (-5.6)*	1.9% (-4.7)*	2.8% (-5.2)*
Lutheran	1.2% (-1.2)	0.6% (-1.0)	1.0% (-1.1)*
Methodist	1.2% (-1.5)	0.1% (-1.6)*	0.8% (-1.5)*
Presbyterian	0.5% (-1.1)*	3.0% (+1.3)	1.5% (-0.2)
Protestant: Nondenominational	0.2% (-0.9)*	0.9% (+0.1)	0.5% (-0.5)
Unitarian Universalist	1.2% (+0.9)	0.2% (-1.1)	0.8% (+0.2)
None	16.9% (+4.4)	22.8% (+4.8)	19.1% (+4.5)*
Other Christian	3.5% (+3.0)	0.4% (-0.7)	2.3% (+1.6)
Other	3.0% (+0.8)	4.1% (+0.6)	3.4% (+0.7)

Disability

Approximately 9% of the total student population in the 2021 sample identify as having a disability (Table 10). The number of students who reported having a disability in the 2021 sample increased by 3.4 percentage points, compared to the 2016 sample.

Table 10. Do you have a disability?, by Student Status			
	Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016		
	Undergraduate	Graduate/Professional	Total
Yes, I have a disability	8.8% (+3.7)	7.9% (+2.9)	8.5% (+3.4)*
No, I do not have a disability	91.2% (-3.7)	92.1% (-2.9)	91.5% (-3.4)*

Military Service

Overall, 1.4% of the students 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 Student Status			
	Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016		
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
Ever or currently serving	1.4% (+0.9)	1.4% (-0.9)	1.4% (+0.2)
Never served	98.6% (-0.9)	98.6% (+0.9)	98.6% (-0.2)

Political Views

Overall, the students in the 2021 sample lean heavily liberal in their reported political views (Table 12). Exactly 68% of the students report that their political views can best be categorized as liberal while only about 10% 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 Student Status			
	Percent of U-M Students		
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
Very Liberal/Liberal/Slightly Liberal	67.4% (-)	69.1% (-)	68.0% (-)
Moderate/Middle of the Road	13.0% (-)	12.6% (-)	12.8% (-)
Slightly Conservative/Conservative/ Very Conservative	11.6% (-)	7.8% (-)	10.2% (-)
Not Thought About It/Don't Know	8.0% (-)	10.5% (-)	9.0% (-)

V.   Survey Responses

A.   Satisfaction with Overall Campus Climate/Environment

The tables below describe U-M student 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 61% of the 2021 sample, compared to 72% of the 2016 sample, report being satisfied or very satisfied with the overall climate within the prior 12 months.

Table 13. U-M Climate Satisfaction with Overall Campus Climate: Estimated Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
Very Satisfied/Satisfied	61% (-10.8)*	61.3% (-10.6)*	61.1% (-10.7)*

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 students 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 disability status and racial groups. Specifically, students who report having a disability are 69% less likely to report this satisfaction than students who do not report having a disability. With regard to race, African American/Black students are 66% less likely than White students to report satisfaction with the overall climate and Hispanic/Latinx students are 48% less likely than White students to report this satisfaction. Additionally, Asian American/Asian and Other Race/Ethnicity students are each more likely to report satisfaction with the overall climate when compared to African American/Black students.

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, from Multivariate Logistic Regression Analysis	
	Satisfaction "Very Satisfied/Satisfied" vs. Other Response
Women Students (Relative to Men Students)	1.13 (0.39)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	0.89 (0.30)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	1.61 (3.17)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	0.31*** (11.58)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	1.11 (0.27)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	0.89 (4.97) AA
African American/Black	0.34*** (14.57) A, O
Hispanic/Latinx	0.52* (5.88)
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.94 (0.03) AA
Respondents	1,214
-2 Log-likelihood	63,006.84
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	

B. Perceptions of the General Climate and the DEI Climate

The tables below describe U-M student 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. Note: The 2021-report version of this second factor ("DEI Climate Elements") now adds a new item measuring transphobic vs. non-transphobic.

We constructed an index (a formula) for each factor and calculated its value; 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, students in the 2021 sample report experiencing general elements of the campus climate in moderately positive ways (mean of 3.6 out of 5, Table 15). There is no statistically significant difference between the 2016 and 2021 samples.

Table 15. U-M General Climate Elements: Estimated Mean for U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
General Climate Elements	3.6 (0)	3.7 (-0.1)	3.6 (-0.1)

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 students who report having a disability report less positive general climate elements after accounting for the other identities. Conversely, students who report not being born in the US report a more positive assessment of general climate elements.

There are also significant race differences such that African American/Black students are less likely to view the general climate elements in positive terms compared to Asian American/Asian and Other Race/Ethnicity students.

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 Students (Relative to Men Students)	-0.08 (-1.25)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	-0.09 (-1.26)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	0.17* (2.18)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	-0.31*** (-3.40)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	-0.12 (-1.66)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	0.12 (1.36) AA
African American/Black	-0.19* (-2.11) A, O
Hispanic/Latinx	-0.03 (-0.33)
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.16 (1.51) AA
Respondents	1,194
R-Squared	0.08
*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.*	

DEI Climate Elements

Students in the 2021 sample report experiencing the DEI elements of the climate in positive ways (mean of 3.8 out of 5, Table 17). There is no statistically significant difference between the 2016 and 2021 samples for either undergraduates or graduate/professional students.

Table 17. U-M DEI Climate Elements: Estimated Mean of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
DEI Climate Elements	3.8 (0)	3.7 (0)	3.8 (0)

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 students who identify as being a woman or who identify as LGBTQ+ relative to their majority comparison group. There are significant race/ethnicity differences in the perception of DEI climate elements such that African American/Black students report less positive DEI climate elements than do White, Asian American/Asian, Hispanic/Latinx, and Other Race/Ethnicity students.

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 Students (Relative to Men Students)	-0.30*** (-4.60)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	-0.24** (-3.11)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	0.15 (1.71)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	-0.21 (-1.88)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	0.06 (0.84)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	-0.01 (-0.15) AA
African American/Black	-0.52*** (-4.93) A, H, O
Hispanic/Latinx	-0.16 (-1.68) AA
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.07 (0.65) AA
Respondents	1,194
R-Squared	0.11

*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.*

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

The tables below describe U-M student 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 student body.

Factor 2: Valued and Belonging

- I feel valued as an individual at U-M.
- I feel I belong at U-M.
- I have considered leaving U-M because I felt isolated or unwelcomed.
- 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 academic success that are similar to those of my peers.
- 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 academic 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, students 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 is a significant difference between the 2021 and 2016 overall samples in their assessment of U-M's institutional commitment to DEI, with the 2016 sample rating the institutional commitment more positively. There also is a statistically significant difference for undergraduate students in which the 2016 sample reported a higher belief that U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI.

Table 19. U-M Institutional Commitment to DEI: Estimated Mean for Students and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
Institutional Commitment	3.3 (-0.2)*	3.3 (0)	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 students who identify as women or who identify as LGBTQ+ are less likely to agree with the idea that U-M has an institutional commitment to DEI relative to men or to heterosexual students, respectively.

The analysis also indicates significant race differences. African American/Black and Hispanic/Latinx students each report less agreement with the idea that U-M is committed to DEI than do White students. African American students report less agreement with this idea compared to Other Race/Ethnicity students as well. Additionally, Asian American/Asian students report stronger agreement with the idea that U-M is committed to DEI than do African American/Black or Hispanic/Latinx students.

Table 20. U-M Institutional Commitment to DEI: Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Feelings on Institutional Commitment to DEI Goals	
	Institutional Commitment
Women Students (Relative to Men Students)	-0.31*** (-4.79)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	-0.38*** (-4.88)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	0.17 (1.76)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	-0.03 (-0.37)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	0.08 (1.17)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	0.08 (0.86) AA, H
African American/Black	-0.44*** (-4.47) A, O
Hispanic/Latinx	-0.31*** (-3.44) A
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.08 (-0.74) AA
Respondents	1,187
R-Squared	0.16
*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.*	

Valued and Belonging

Overall, students in the 2021 sample report agreement with the idea that they are valued and feel that they belong at U-M (3.8 out of 5, Table 21). The 2021 sample is significantly less likely to report that they feel valued and belong than the 2016 sample. This sample difference is significant for the total student body and both groups of students.

Table 21. U-M Key Dimensions: Estimated Mean Valued/Belonging and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
Valued and Belonging	3.8 (-0.2)*	3.8 (-0.1)*	3.8 (-0.2)*

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 students who identify as being LGBTQ+ or who report having a disability are significantly less likely to report feeling like they are valued or feel they belong at U-M compared to their relevant majority group. There also are significant race differences such that African American/Black students are less likely than White, than Asian American/Asian and than Other Race/Ethnicity students to report feeling like they are valued or feel like they belong at U-M.

Table 22. U-M Key Dimensions: Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Feelings of Being Valued and Belonging at U-M	
	Valued/Belonging
Women Students (Relative to Men Students)	-0.02 (0.25)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	-0.28*** (-4.34)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	0.12 (1.70)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	-0.33** (-3.05)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	0.02 (0.37)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	0.005 (0.0) AA
African American/Black	-0.34*** (-3.68) A, O
Hispanic/Latinx	-0.14 (-1.41)
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.03 (0.32) AA
Respondents	1,189
R-Squared	0.07
*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.*	

Thriving and Growth

Overall, the students in the 2021 sample report agreement with the idea that they are thriving and growing at U-M (3.8 out of 5, Table 23). While the 2021 total sample as well as the two student subgroups is each less likely to report that they feel that they are thriving and growing at U-M than the 2016 sample, there are significant sample differences only for the total student body.

Table 23. U-M Key Dimensions: Estimated Mean Thriving/Growth of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
Thriving and Growth	3.8 (-0.1)	3.8 (-0.1)	3.8 (-0.1)*

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: students who identify as a woman, who are LGBTQ+ or who report having a disability.

The analysis also indicates significant race differences. White students are more likely than Asian American/Asian, than African American/Black and than Hispanic/Latinx students to report feelings of thriving and growth at U-M. Additionally, African American/Black students are less likely than Asian American/Asian, than Hispanic/Latinx and than Other Race/Ethnicity students to report feelings of thriving and growth; and Hispanic/Latinx students are less likely than Other Race/Ethnicity students to report the same sentiment.

	Thriving/Growth
Table 24. U-M Key Dimensions: Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Feelings of Thriving and Growth at U-M	
Women Students (Relative to Men Students)	-0.11* (-2.07)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	-0.22*** (-3.55)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	-0.02 (-0.35)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	-0.25* (-2.58)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	-0.05 (-0.82)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	-0.21** (-2.76) AA
African American/Black	-0.57*** (-7.00) A, H, O
Hispanic/Latinx	-0.27** (-2.88) AA, O
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.03 (-0.30) AA, H
Respondents	1,188
R-Squared	0.09

*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.*

D.   Fair and Equitable Treatment at U-M

Fair and Equitable Treatment at U-M

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

> Q: How much do you agree/disagree with the following statement: I am treated fairly and equitably on campus in general.

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

On average, a large majority (84%) of students in the 2021 sample report that they feel they are treated fairly and equitably on campus in general (Table 25). There are no significant differences between the 2021 and 2016 responses to this question concerning fair treatment.

Table 25. Fair Treatment Survey Question: Estimated Mean of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
Strongly Agree/Agree	85.7% (-2.0)	81.4% (-5.9)	84.1% (-3.5)

In Table 26 below, the model estimates the effects on the student responses to the question regarding the fairness of treatment. The effect estimates represent the estimated average change in the 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 students who report having a disability are 51% less likely to report fair and equitable treatment on campus in general.

There also are significant race differences. African American/Black students are 78% less likely than White students to report fair and equitable treatment on campus in general. African American/Black students are also more likely to report that they are not treated fairly and equitably when compared to Asian American/Asian, Hispanic/Latinx, and Other Race/Ethnicity students. Additionally, Hispanic/Latinx students are 58% less likely to report fair and equitable treatment on campus in general compared to White students. They are also less likely to report fair and equitable treatment when compared to Other Race/Ethnicity students.

Table 26. Estimated Odds Ratios (Wald Chi-Square) for Key Social Identity Variables Predicting the Probability of Reporting Agreement with Fair Treatment at U-M, from Multivariate Logistic Regression Analysis	
	Fair and Equitable Treatment
Women Students (Relative to Men Students)	0.71 (-1.24)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	.070 (-1.27)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	0.96 (-0.12)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	0.49* (-2.18)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	1.35 (1.07)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	0.72 (-0.80) AA
African American/Black	0.22*** (-4.41) A, H, O
Hispanic/Latinx	0.42* (-2.51) O
Other Race/Ethnicity	1.15 (0.34) H
Respondents	1,177
-2 Log-likelihood	37,239.77
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	

E.   Intergroup Interactions in the Prior 12 Months

Political Opinions

The tables below describe U-M student 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 37% of students 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 27). Overall, significantly fewer students (by 11 percentage points) in the 2021 sample than in the 2016 sample report having this type of interaction. Additionally, there are significant differences between the two samples for both undergraduate and graduate/professional student groups of 14 and 8 percentage points, respectively.

Table 27. U-M Meaningful Interaction with Others of Different Political Opinions: Estimated Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
Very Often/Often	40.6% (-14.4)*	30.1% (-8.2)*	36.6% (-11.4)*

In Table 28 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 28 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 students who identify as a woman and those who identify as LGBTQ+ are less likely to report having meaningful interactions in the prior 12 months with people whose political opinions differ from their own (compared to men students and heterosexuals, respectively). Additionally, undergraduate students are more likely to report having such interactions compared to graduate/professional students.

Significant racial differences are present such that Asian American/Asian students are less likely to report having meaningful interactions with people whose political opinions differ from their own compared to White students.

Table 28. 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 Students (Relative to Men Students)	-0.44*** (-4.33)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	-0.42*** (-3.76)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	-0.03 (-0.26)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	-0.002 (-0.01)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	0.23* (2.43)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	-0.23* (-2.01)
African American/Black	-0.25 (-1.77)
Hispanic/Latinx	-0.04 (-0.29)
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.18 (-0.87)
Respondents	1,169
R-Squared	0.09

*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.*

Religious Beliefs

The tables below describe student 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 69% of students 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 29). Overall, significantly fewer students in the 2021 sample report having this type of interaction than in the 2016 sample. Although both groups are trending in the same direction, the sample difference is statistically significant only with the undergraduate students.

Table 29. U-M Meaningful Interaction with Others of Different Religious Beliefs: Estimated Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
Very Often/Often	70.3% (-10.9)*	66.1% (-7.6)	68.7% (-9.3)*

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 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 there are significant race differences such that Asian American/Asian students are less likely than White students to report having meaningful interactions in the past 12 months with people whose religion differs from their own. Other Race/Ethnicity students are more likely than Asian American/Asian students to report having these meaningful interactions. There are no other significant differences.

Table 30. U-M 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 Students (Relative to Men Students)	-0.01 (-0.07)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	-0.16 (-1.40)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	-0.10 (-0.86)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	0.05 (0.32)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	-0.01 (-0.13)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	-0.35** (-2.72) O
African American/Black	-0.24 (-1.48)
Hispanic/Latinx	-0.10 (-0.82)
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.08 (0.67) A
Respondents	1,166
R-Squared	0.04
*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.*	

National Origin

The tables below describe student 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 72% of students 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 31). The 2021 sample did not differ significantly from the 2016 sample.

Table 31. U-M Meaningful Interaction with Others of Different National Origin: Estimated Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
Very Often/Often	68.9% (-4.9)	76.4% (-4.3)	71.7% (-5.0)

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 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 Other Race/Ethnicity students are more likely than White students to report having meaningful interactions in the past 12 months with people whose nationality differs from their own. There are no other significant differences.

Table 32. 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 Students (Relative to Men Students)	-0.04 (-0.44)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	-0.04 (-0.37)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	0.15 (1.42)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	0.14 (0.81)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	-0.16 (-1.72)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	0.005 (0.03)
African American/Black	-0.05 (-0.30)
Hispanic/Latinx	0.21 (1.89)
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.25* (2.20)
Respondents	1,169
R-Squared	0.03

*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.*

Race/Ethnicity

The tables below describe student 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 78% of the 2021 student 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 33). The 2021 sample did not differ significantly from the 2016 sample.

Table 33. U-M Meaningful Interaction with Others of Different Race/Ethnicity: Estimated Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
Very Often/Often	77.2% (-3.4)	79.9% (-2.5)	78.2% (-3.1)

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 different characteristics. The model in Table 34 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 there are statistically significant racial differences. Specifically, Other Race/Ethnicity students are more likely than White, than Asian American/Asian, than African American/Black, and than Hispanic/Latinx students to report having meaningful interactions with people whose racial/ethnic identity differs from their own. There are no other significant differences.

Table 34. 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 Students (Relative to Men Students)	0.02 (0.21)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	0.09 (0.85)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	-0.04 (-0.38)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	0.04 (0.22)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	-0.10 (-1.18)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	-0.02 (-0.13) O
African American/Black	0.07 (0.41) O
Hispanic/Latinx	0.13 (1.06) O
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.45*** (4.26) A, AA, H
Respondents	1,173
R-Squared	0.03
*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.*	

Sexual Orientation

The tables below describe student 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, approximately 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 35). Overall, significantly more students 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 undergraduate students.

Table 35. U-M Meaningful Interaction with Others of Different Sexual Orientation: Estimated Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
Very Often/Often	59.8% (+10.3)*	59.7% (+2.9)	59.8% (+7.2)*

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 differing characteristics. The model in Table 36 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 students who identify as LGBTQ+ are more likely than heterosexual students to report having meaningful interactions in the prior 12 months with people whose sexual orientation differs from their own. There are also significant racial differences. Specifically, Asian American/Asian students are less likely to report having meaningful interactions with people whose sexual orientation differs from their own when compared to African American/Black, to Hispanic/Latinx and to White students.

Table 36. 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 Students (Relative to Men Students)	0.15 (1.37)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	0.83*** (8.16)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	-0.09 (-0.71)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	0.13 (0.63)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	-0.12 (-1.20)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	-0.56*** (-3.47) AA, H
African American/Black	-0.19 (-1.43) A
Hispanic/Latinx	-0.11 (-0.79) A
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.12 (-0.57)
Respondents	1,166
R-Squared	0.15

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.

41

Social Class

The tables below describe student 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 58% 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 37). The 2021 sample did not differ significantly from the 2016 sample.

Table 37. U-M Meaningful Interaction with Others of Different Social Class: Estimated Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
Very Often/Often	63.0% (-5.3)	50.5% (-0.2)	58.3% (-2.5)

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 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 there are no significant differences among the various identities examined.

Table 38. 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 Students (Relative to Men Students)	0.07 (0.66)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	0.11 (1.01)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	-0.23 (-1.66)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	0.21 (1.39)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	0.14 (1.38)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	-0.15 (-0.94)
African American/Black	0.06 (0.34)
Hispanic/Latinx	0.04 (0.32)
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.03 (0.19)
Respondents	1,165
R-Squared	0.04
*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.*	

F.   Discrimination

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

Felt Discriminated Against

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

> Q: In general, over the past 12 months, **have you <u>felt</u> 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 12% of the 2021 sample report feeling that in general over the prior 12 months they have been discriminated against at the U-M (Table 39). Compared to the 2016 sample, students in the 2021 sample were less likely to report feeling that they had been discriminated against, by a decrease of 5 percentage points. Although both student subgroups are trending in the same direction, the sample difference is statistically significant only with the undergraduate students.

Table 39. Felt Discriminated Against at U-M: Estimated Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
Yes	11.8% (-5.3)*	11.9% (-3.4)	11.8% (-4.6)*

The model in Table 40 estimates the risk of students 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 students report feeling that they have been discriminated against at U-M in the past year. Specifically, students who identify as LGBTQ+ are 108% more likely than students who identify as heterosexual to report that they have been discriminated against. Also, students who report having a disability are 291% more likely than students 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. Asian American/Asian students are 123% more likely, African American/Black students are 316% more likely and Hispanic/Latinx students are 325% more likely than White students to report feeling that they have been discriminated against at U-M in the past year. Additionally, Other Race/Ethnicity students are less likely than Hispanic/Latinx students to report this feeling of discrimination.

Table 40. 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 Students (Relative to Men Students)	1.52 (2.28)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	2.08** (7.67)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	0.87 (0.29)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	3.91*** (15.80)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	0.95 (0.06)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	2.23* (5.06)
African American/Black	4.16*** (11.08)
Hispanic/Latinx	4.25*** (16.38) O
Other Race/Ethnicity	1.87 (2.28) H
Respondents	1,178
-2 Log-likelihood	29,499.02
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.	

Discrimination Experienced: Disability

The tables below describe U-M student 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 6% of all students 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 41). It should be noted, however, that only about 9% of the students in the 2021 sample report having a disability. Overall, there are no significant differences between the 2021 and 2016 samples in terms of experiencing a discriminatory event as a result of their ability.

Table 41. Experienced Discrimination at U-M Based on Ability or Disability Status: Estimated Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
1 or more times	6.2% (+1.8)	4.6% (+0.8)	5.6% (+1.4)

The model in Table 42 estimates the risk of students 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 students report feeling that they have been discriminated against at U-M in the past year as a result of their ability status. Specifically, students who report having a disability are 2,356% more likely than students who do not report having a disability to report that they experienced a discriminatory event as a result of their ability status. Also, students who identify as LGBTQ+ are 216% more likely than students who identify as heterosexual to report that they have been discriminated against in this manner. Students not born in the U.S. are 79% less likely to report discrimination due to ability status.

There are a number of significant race differences after accounting for other identities. Specifically, Asian American/Asian students are 1,172% more likely and African American/Black students are 723% more likely than White students to report that they experienced a discriminatory event as a result of their ability status. Additionally, Hispanic/Latinx students and Other Race/Ethnicity students are both less likely to report discrimination in this manner compared to Asian American/Asian and to African American/Black students.

Table 42. 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 Students (Relative to Men Students)	1.41 (0.48)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	3.16** (7.34)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	0.21** (6.99)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	24.56*** (56.53)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	1.07 (0.03)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	12.72*** (5.84) H, O
African American/Black	8.23** (10.76) H, O
Hispanic/Latinx	1.04 (<0.01) A, AA
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.89 (0.02) A, AA
Respondents	1,169
-2 Log-likelihood	12,553.74

*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.*

Discrimination Experienced: Racial Identity

The tables below describe U-M student 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 students 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 43). Overall, there are no significant differences between the 2021 and 2016 samples in terms of experiencing a discriminatory event as a result of their race/ethnicity.

Table 43. Experienced Discrimination at U-M Based on Racial or Ethnic Identity: Estimated Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
1 or more times	18.1% (-1.1)	18.8% (-1.1)	18.4% (-1.1)

The model in Table 44 estimates the risk of students 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 students report feeling they have been discriminated against at U-M in the past year because of their race/ethnic identity. Specifically, students who report having a disability are 111% more likely than students with no disability to report that they have been discriminated against due to their race/ethnicity.

There are also significant race differences. African American/Black students are 2,252% more likely, Asian American/Asian students are 1,301% more likely, and Hispanic/Latinx students are 1,566% more likely than White students to report experiencing racial discrimination in the prior year. Other Race/Ethnicity students are significantly less likely than African American/Black and than Hispanic/Latinx students to report such discrimination.

Table 44. 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 Students (Relative to Men Students)	1.04 (0.02)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	1.57 (2.62)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	1.02 (0.01)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	2.11* (4.22)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	1.31 (1.30)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	14.01*** (15.55)
African American/Black	23.52*** (55.77) O
Hispanic/Latinx	16.66*** (40.96) O
Other Race/Ethnicity	5.81 (11.22) AA, H
Respondents	1,170
-2 Log-likelihood	42,758.45
*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*	

Discrimination Experienced: Sex

The tables below describe U-M students 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 18% of students 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 45). Overall, there are no significant differences between the 2021 and 2016 samples in terms of experiencing a discriminatory event as a result of their sex.

Table 45. Experienced Discrimination at U-M Based on Sex: Estimated Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
1 or more times	21.6% (-1.4)	11.5% (-3.8)	17.8% (-2.2)

The model in Table 46 estimates the risk of students 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 students report feeling that they have been discriminated against at U-M in the past year because of their sex. Specifically, students who identify as a woman are 492% more likely than students who identify as a man to report that they experienced a discriminatory event as a result of their sex. LGBTQ+ students are 79% more likely than heterosexual students to report discrimination in this manner, and undergraduate students are 118% more likely than graduate/professional students to report experiencing discrimination due to their sex.

There are also significant race differences. Other Race/Ethnicity students are 74% less likely than White students to report experiencing sex discrimination in the past year. They also are less likely than African American/Black and than Hispanic/Latinx students to report discrimination in this manner.

Table 46. 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 Students (Relative to Men Students)	5.92*** (26.66)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	1.79* (3.87)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	1.06 (0.03)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	1.04 (<0.01)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	2.18** (9.33)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	0.50 (2.52)
African American/Black	0.80 (0.34) O
Hispanic/Latinx	0.74 (0.84) O
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.26** (9.44) AA, H
Respondents	1,168
-2 Log-likelihood	36,044.33

*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.*

Discrimination Experienced: Sexual Orientation

The tables below describe U-M student 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 7% of students 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 47). There is a significant difference between the undergraduate sample in 2021 and in 2016 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.

Table 47. Experienced Discrimination at U-M Based on Sexual Orientation: Estimated Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
1 or more	9.1% (+3.9)*	3.1% (-2.0)	6.8% (+1.7)

The model in Table 48 estimates the risk of students 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 students report experiencing discrimination at U-M in the past year because of their sexual orientation. Specifically, students who identify as LGBTQ+ are 1,018% more likely than students who identify as heterosexual to report that they experienced a discriminatory event as a result of their sexual orientation. Students not born in the US are 78% less likely to report experiencing this discrimination, and undergraduate students are 219% more likely than graduate/professional students to report experiencing discrimination at U-M in the past year because of their sexual orientation.

There are no significant race differences observed.

Table 48. 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 Students (Relative to Men Students)	0.80 (0.25)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	11.18*** (22.89)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	0.22** (7.89)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	1.26 (0.23)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	3.19** (9.67)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	2.70 (0.66)
African American/Black	1.25 (0.11)
Hispanic/Latinx	1.34 (0.30)
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.89 (0.03)
Respondents	1,167
-2 Log-likelihood	16,842.59
*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.*	

Discrimination Experienced: National Origin

The tables below describe U-M student 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 11% of students 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 49). Overall, there are no significant differences between the 2021 and 2016 samples in terms of experiencing a discriminatory event as a result of their national origin.

Table 49. Experienced Discrimination at U-M Based on National Origin: Estimated Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
1 or more times	9.6% (+0.2)	12.6% (-0.8)	10.8% (-0.2)

The model in Table 50 estimates the risk of students 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 race differences in the extent to which students report experiencing discrimination at U-M because of their national origin in the past year. Specifically, Asian American/Asian students are 2,680% more likely, African American/Black students are 1,815% more likely, Hispanic/Latinx students are 3,059 more likely, and Other Race/Ethnicity students are 461% more likely than White students to report that they experienced a discriminatory event as a result of their national origin. Also, Other Race/Ethnicity students are significantly less likely to report such discrimination compared to Asian American/Asian, to African American/Black and to Hispanic/Latinx students.

Table 50. 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 Students (Relative to Men Students)	0.78 (0.63)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	1.17 (0.20)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	1.27 (0.55)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	1.84 (0.89)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	1.36 (1.31)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	27.80*** (14.00) O
African American/Black	19.15*** (19.48) O
Hispanic/Latinx	31.59*** (46.41) O
Other Race/Ethnicity	5.61*** (9.51) A, AA, H
Respondents	1,173
-2 Log-likelihood	24,426.24
*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.*	

Discrimination Experienced: Religion

The tables below describe U-M student 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 10% of students 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 51). There is a significant difference between the graduate/professional student sample in 2021 and the 2016 sample such that the former is significantly less likely to report experiencing at least one discriminatory event as a result of their religion at U-M in the past 12 months.

Table 51. Experienced Discrimination at U-M Based on Religion: Estimated Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
1 or more times	13.8% (-0.9)	4.6% (-5.0)*	10.3% (-2.4)

The model in Table 52 estimates the risk of students 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 differences in the extent to which students report experiencing discrimination at U-M in the past year because of their religion. Students who were not born in the US are 69% less likely than those born in the US to report experiencing discrimination due to religion. Students who report having a disability are 163% more likely to report experiencing religious discrimination than students not reporting a disability, and undergraduate students are 173% more likely to report such discrimination compared to graduate/professional students.

There also are several racial differences observed. Specifically, Other Race/Ethnicity students are 160% more likely than White students to report discrimination based on religion. Hispanic/Latinx students are significantly less likely to report experiencing discrimination based on religion compared to their Asian American/Asian, to their African American/Black, and to their Other Race/Ethnicity peers.

Table 52. 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 Students (Relative to Men Students)	1.06 (0.03)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	0.95 (0.02)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	0.31** (10.32)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	2.63* (4.68)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	2.73*** (11.52)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	2.20 (2.56) H
African American/Black	2.37 (2.12) H
Hispanic/Latinx	0.55 (1.19) A, AA, O
Other Race/Ethnicity	2.60* (4.55) H
Respondents	1,173
-2 Log-likelihood	30,050.11
*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.*	

Discrimination Experienced: Political Orientation

The tables below describe U-M student 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 14% of students reported experiencing at least one discriminatory event at U-M in the past 12 months as a result of their political orientation (Table 53). Student reports of discrimination as a result of their political orientation decreased significantly across the 2021 and 2016 samples for the total sample as well as the undergraduate and graduate/professional student groups.

Table 53. Experienced Discrimination at U-M Based on Political Orientation: Estimated Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
1 or more times	17.9% (-7.6)*	6.9% (-5.8)*	13.7% (-6.8)*

The model in Table 54 estimates the risk of students 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 significant differences in the extent to which students report experiencing discrimination at U-M in the past year because of their political orientation when accounting for other aspects of identity. Specifically, women students are 50% less likely than men students to report experiencing discrimination based on political orientation. Students who report having a disability are 135% more likely to report experiencing such discrimination compared to students who report having no disability, and undergraduate students are 183% more likely to report experiencing discrimination based on political orientation compared to graduate/professional students.

There are no significant race differences observed.

Table 54. 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 Students (Relative to Men Students)	0.50* (5.74)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	0.62 (1.52)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	0.71 (0.62)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	2.35* (3.94)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	2.83** (13.57)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	0.85 (1.02)
African American/Black	0.37 (3.33)
Hispanic/Latinx	0.66 (1.14)
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.69 (0.62)
Respondents	1,172
-2 Log-likelihood	36,303.09
*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.*	

Discrimination Experienced: Social Class

The tables below describe U-M student 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 16% of students reported experiencing at least one discriminatory event at U-M in the past 12 months as a result of their social class (Table 55). Student reports of discrimination based on their social class did not differ significantly across the 2021 and 2016 samples.

Table 55. Experienced Discrimination at U-M Based on Social Class: Estimated Percent of U-M Students and Amount of Change Since 2016, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
1 or more times	18.2% (+2.0)	11.4% (+1.5)	15.6% (+1.9)

The model in Table 56 estimates the risk of students 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 students report experiencing discrimination at U-M in the past year as a result of their social class. Specifically, students who report having a disability are 203% more likely than students 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 students are 112% more likely and Hispanic/Latinx students are 121% more likely than White students to report that they experienced a discriminatory event as a result of their social class. Asian American/Asian students are significantly less likely to report experiencing such discrimination compared to their African American/Black and Hispanic/Latinx peers.

Table 56. 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 Students (Relative to Men Students)	1.31 (0.81)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	1.16 (0.23)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	1.15 (0.12)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	3.03** (7.38)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	1.71 (2.88)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	0.81 (2.64) AA, H
African American/Black	2.12* (4.10) A
Hispanic/Latinx	2.21* (5.48) A
Other Race/Ethnicity	1.19 (0.11)
Respondents	1,172
-2 Log-likelihood	36,955.73
*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.*	

G.   DEI Participation and Progress with DEI Initiatives

DEI Actions Index

The tables below describe U-M student 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 student 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, students self-report engaging in fewer than two of the five DEI actions (Table 57). Specifically, the mean number of events that students report participating in at least once in the prior 12 months is 1.6 out of 5.

Table 57. DEI Action Index: Mean Rating of U-M Students, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
DEI Action Index	1.39 (-)	1.92 (-)	1.59 (-)

In Table 58 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 58 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 students who identify as being a woman self-report engaging in more DEI activities than those who identify as a man, while students

---

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

who were not born in the US and undergraduate students report engaging in fewer DEI activities compared to their counterparts, respectively.

There are also significant racial differences. Specifically, African American students self-report engaging in more DEI activities than Asian American/Asian, Hispanic/Latinx, Other Race/Ethnicity, and White students.

Table 58. DEI Action Index: Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Five DEI Actions	
	DEI Actions (Five-Variable Index)
Women Students (Relative to Men Students)	0.44** (3.04)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	0.01 (0.57)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	-0.53** (-3.89)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	0.40 (1.43)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	-0.72*** (-4.98)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	-0.15 (-0.72) AA
African American/Black	1.18*** (3.46) A, H, O
Hispanic/Latinx	0.23 (1.20) AA
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.03 (0.14) AA
Respondents	1,183
R-Squared	0.11
*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.* ***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.*	

DEI Progress: DEI Climate Now vs. 2016

The tables below describe U-M student 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 students report seeing progress being made with the DEI climate at U-M since the start of the DEI strategic plan (Table 59). Overall, 57% of the students report that the DEI climate is much better or somewhat better than at the start of the DEI plan. At the same time, roughly 37% report that things are about the same, and only approximately 6% report feeling that things have gotten worse.

Table 59. U-M DEI Climate vs 2016: Estimated Percent of U-M Students, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	Graduate/Professional	Total
Much/Somewhat Better	58.7% (-)	53.0% (-)	56.5% (-)
About the Same	35.1% (-)	40.3% (-)	37.1% (-)
Much/Somewhat Worse	6.2% (-)	6.7% (-)	6.4% (-)

In Table 60 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 60 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 there are significant racial differences in the student assessment of U-M DEI plan progress. African American/Black students report that less progress has been made by the U-M DEI plan since 2016 compared to White students. Additionally, Hispanic/Latinx and Other Race/Ethnicity students report more progress being made when compared with African American/Black students.

There are no other significant differences observed.

---

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

Table 60. 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 Students (Relative to Men Students)	-0.07 (-0.78)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	-0.16 (-1.38)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	-0.13 (-1.31)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	-0.17 (-1.25)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	<0.01 (0.04)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	-0.12 (-1.06)
African American/Black	-0.43** (-3.01) H, O
Hispanic/Latinx	-0.03 (-0.32) AA
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.24 (1.33) AA
Respondents	631
R-Squared	0.06
*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.*	

DEI Progress: Satisfaction with Plan Progress

The tables below describe U-M student 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

Approximately 40% of the students report being very satisfied or satisfied with the U-M's DEI plan progress and only roughly 1 in 10 (11%) report being very dissatisfied or dissatisfied with the progress made by the plan.

Table 61. Satisfaction with U-M DEI Progress: Estimated Percent of U-M Students, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
Very Satisfied/Satisfied	39.8% (-)	40.1% (-)	39.9% (-)
Neutral	49.5% (-)	48.7% (-)	49.2% (-)
Very Dissatisfied/Dissatisfied	10.7% (-)	11.2% (-)	10.9% (-)

In Table 62 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 62 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 there are significant racial differences in the student assessment of satisfaction with the DEI plan progress. Asian American/Asian students report being more satisfied than White students with DEI plan progress, while African American students report being less satisfied than White students. Both African American/Black students and Hispanic/Latinx students are significantly less satisfied with DEI plan progress than are Asian American/Asian students. Other Race/Ethnicity students are more satisfied with DEI plan progress than African American/Black students.

There are no other significant differences observed.

---

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

Table 62. 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 Students (Relative to Men Students)	-0.05 (-0.62)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	-0.05 (-0.59)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	0.02 (0.24)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	-0.11 (-0.86)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	0.01 (0.16)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	0.24* (2.25) AA, H
African American/Black	-0.35** (-2.90) A, O
Hispanic/Latinx	-0.19 (-1.58) A
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.12 (0.86) AA
Respondents	1,205
R-Squared	0.04

*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.*

DEI Progress: Plan Progress Compared to Other Institutions

The tables below describe U-M student 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

Half of the students (approximately 50%) rate the U-M's DEI efforts as being among the best or better than most, while 44% view U-M's DEI efforts as being about equal to those of other universities (Table 63). Only about 6% of students rate U-M's DEI efforts as being worse than most or the worst.

Table 63. Comparing U-M DEI Progress: Estimated Percent of U-M Students, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
Best/Better than Most	51.6% (-)	46.3% (-)	49.6% (-)
About Equal	42.5% (-)	47.0% (-)	44.2% (-)
Worst/Worse than Most	5.8% (-)	6.8% (-)	6.2% (-)

In Table 64 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 64 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 significant differences in the student assessment of U-M DEI efforts in relation to other schools. Students who were not born in the US rate U-M's DEI plan progress more positively than students who were born in the US.

There also were significant racial differences in the student assessment of U-M DEI efforts in relation to other schools. Specifically, African American/Black students assess U-M's DEI efforts less positively in relation to other schools in comparison to Asian American/Asian, Hispanic/Latinx, Other Race/Ethnicity, and White students.

---

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

Table 64. 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 Students (Relative to Men Students)	-0.08 (-1.04)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	-0.13 (-1.39)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	0.17* (2.12)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	-0.04 (-0.31)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	0.05 (0.66)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	<0.01 (<0.01) AA
African American/Black	-0.31* (-2.54) A, H, O
Hispanic/Latinx	-0.06 (-0.73) AA
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.12 (1.10) AA
Respondents	1,192
R-Squared	0.03
*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.*	

H.   Well-Being

Physical Health

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

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

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

The majority of students (approximately 51%) describe their physical health as being "Excellent" (18%) or "Very Good" (33%). Only 12% of the students describe their physical health as being "Fair", and 3% of the students describe their physical health as "Poor".

Table 65. Well-Being (Physical Health): Estimated Percent of U-M Students, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
Excellent	16.5% (-)	19.7% (-)	17.7% (-)
Very Good	31.5% (-)	35.9% (-)	33.2% (-)
Good	35.9% (-)	32.0% (-)	34.4% (-)
Fair	12.5% (-)	10.4% (-)	11.7% (-)
Poor	3.6% (-)	2.0% (-)	3.0% (-)

In Table 66 below, ordinary least-squares regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on individuals' self-reported physical health. Table 66 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 heterosexual students report significantly more positive physical health than students who identify as LGBTQ+.

There are significant racial differences in the student assessment of their physical health such that Hispanic/Latinx students report significantly poorer physical health than White students, while Other Race/Ethnicity students report significantly better physical health than Hispanic/Latinx students.

---

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

Table 66. Well-Being (Physical Health): Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Physical Health	
	Physical Health
Women Students (Relative to Men Students)	-0.09 (-0.93)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	-0.29* (-2.55)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	0.02 (0.20)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	-0.20 (-1.01)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	-0.17 (-1.81)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	-0.02 (-0.18)
African American/Black	-0.19 (-1.29)
Hispanic/Latinx	-0.29* (-2.27) O
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.22 (1.11) H
Respondents	1,162
R-Squared	0.05
*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.*	

Mental Health

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

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

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

When it comes to mental health, students generally describe their own mental health in a less positive manner (Table 67). Fewer than 1 in 10 (8%) students describe their mental health as being "Excellent". Only 16% of students describe their mental health as being "Very Good", while 29% describe their mental health as "Fair", and 13% describe it as "Poor".

Table 67. Well-Being (Mental Health): Estimated Percent of U-M Students, by Student Status			
	Undergraduate	**Graduate/Professional**	**Total**
Excellent	6.9% (-)	10.4% (-)	8.3% (-)
Very Good	14.8% (-)	18.8% (-)	16.3% (-)
Good	32.8% (-)	34.6% (-)	33.5% (-)
Fair	29.3% (-)	28.0% (-)	28.8% (-)
Poor	16.2% (-)	8.1% (-)	13.1% (-)

In Table 68 below, ordinary least-squares regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on individuals' self-reported mental health. Table 68 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 three groups report significantly less positive mental health than their relevant counterparts: students who identify as being a woman, LGBTQ+ students, and those students who report having a disability.

There are also significant racial/ethnic differences in the student assessment of their mental health, with Asian American/Asian students reporting more positive mental health compared to Hispanic/Latinx students.

---

[10] 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 (Mental Health): Results from OLS Regression Estimates of Multivariate Models of Demographic Associations with Mental Health	
	Mental Health
Women Students (Relative to Men Students)	-0.21* (-2.00)
LGBTQ+ (Relative to Heterosexual Students)	-0.59*** (-5.34)
Not Born in the US (Relative to Students Born in the US)	0.20 (1.57)
Disability (Relative to Students with no Disability)	-0.49*** (-3.88)
Undergraduate (Relative to Graduate Students)	-0.18 (-1.86)
Race (Relative to White Students)	
Asian American/Asian	0.25 (1.66) H
African American/Black	0.11 (0.84)
Hispanic/Latinx	-0.07 (-0.51) A
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.03 (0.16)
Respondents	1,160
R-Squared	0.13
*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.*	

VI.   Conclusion

The current report utilizes high-quality data from a campus-wide climate survey to obtain an empirical assessment of student 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 students 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.