School of Social Work

Faculty

DIVERSITY, EQUITY & INCLUSION
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

2021

Unit Census Report

**Campus Climate Survey
on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion**

February 2022   Prepared by: ◉ SOUNDROCKET™

Table of Contents

Introduction & Background

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.

The U-M Campus Climate Survey on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) was designed as both a scientific sample (designed to provide institution level estimates), as well as a census of students, faculty, and staff at the U-M Ann Arbor campus. While some questions included in the survey related to the overall U-M community, the main study objective was to provide respondents with the opportunity to share their perspectives, opinions, and experiences associated with DEI topics as they relate to U-M overall, as well as the units where the community spend most of their time. The unit level varied by population, where faculty, special faculty, staff, and graduate students were generally asked about their department; and undergraduate students were generally asked about either their school/college or about U-M overall.

Defining the Population: For the purposes of the U-M DEI survey, the faculty category includes those who are tenured, and tenure-, research-, and clinical-track.

The study was initially conducted as a scientific sample survey in 2016, followed by a census in 2017. From the sample survey, an overall institution level report with statistics were generated in early 2018. Using the census data collection, unit level reports generated for schools/colleges and departments in 2017-2018 to provide a baseline for their climate near the beginning of a five-year DEI Strategic Plan.

U-M has seen substantial efforts and progress during a time of formidable challenges. Chief among those challenges: an unrelenting global pandemic, a racial reckoning expressed through massive protests and violent counter-protests, and the most divisive political climate in recent memory. As a community, the University of Michigan weathered these historic events, utilizing DEI principles to move through the process.

Closing out the initial five-year plan brings us to a point to revisit the data. The 1st follow-up survey was conducted during the Fall 2021 term among students, staff, special faculty, and faculty. Different from the efforts in 2016-2017, where the sample survey and census efforts were separated by time, in 2021 both the sample and census efforts took place at the same time. The questionnaire and data collection design were implemented with the intent to provide the University and its units a snapshot of where things are at today.

This report and the data used to generate it come from the census survey and are being applied at the local unit level. It is the intent of this report to help unit and school/college leaders to report on progress made, while also identifying areas for future DEI growth.

This report summarizes the study results for the FACULTY population in:
School of Social Work

Use of Results & Next Steps

The results of this survey underscore the importance of regularly collecting data to apprise U-M Ann Arbor campus leadership and the broader community about respondent experiences surrounding diversity, equity, and inclusion. Further analyses of survey results may be conducted to inform the work of U-M Ann Arbor schools, colleges, and units in developing enhanced education and programming efforts, to ensure that ample support is available for individuals who experience discriminatory events, and to bridge gaps in knowledge and/or understanding of all policies and resources regarding DEI across the University.

We expect that units will share the survey results with members of their community. This also will be an opportunity to secure more granular insights from community members regarding their lived experiences with DEI. Further, the results should be used to help inform the development of the unit-level plans for DEI 2.0. Units will begin developing DEI 2.0 plans in Fall, 2022, with the process spanning the academic year. The formal launch of DEI 2.0 will be in Fall, 2023.

Methods

The U-M Campus Climate Survey on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion was conducted in the Fall 2021 term as a complex designed study with three primary goals:

1. Give all U-M enrolled students and permanently employed staff, special faculty, and faculty a voice to communicate their experiences related to DEI at the U-M Ann Arbor campus.
2. Provide the U-M administration and campus community with scientifically defensible institution level estimates of the campus climate.
3. Provide U-M units with data to evaluate local unit level efforts and outcomes.

To accomplish these goals, a complex study design was developed to include a short-form survey administered as a census to **all students, staff, special faculty, and faculty**, coupled with a long-form survey administered to **a scientifically selected sample of students, staff, and faculty**, using protocols designed to increase participation and maximize the quality of the data collected (such as incentives, calling, and paper versions of the survey). The census (short-form) effort was designed to meet the first and third goals. The sample (long-form) effort was designed to meet the second goal.

This report includes data from the census data collection. The results are intended for consumption by individual units at the U-M Ann Arbor. **Because the study was conducted as a census, statistical comparisons designed for use with sample survey data were not conducted and are not included for these unit level results.**

Within the census effort, there were no sample design or data collection method differences between the student, staff, special faculty, and faculty data collections. There were minor questionnaire design differences between the four populations, which as described in the Questionnaire section below.

Sample Design

SoundRocket and the Office of Diversity, Equity & Inclusion (ODEI) collaborated with the relevant units on campus to acquire up to date and accurate lists of students, staff, special faculty, and faculty at the U-M Ann Arbor.

For the student population, the collaboration included the U-M Registrar, who generated a list of all students (undergraduate and graduate/professional) who were enrolled at the U-M Ann Arbor. There was no limit set for the number of current credit hours, whether enrollment was in a traditional or primarily online program, or any other criteria except that they must have been enrolled on the specified date. The file was generated and provided to SoundRocket to represent all eligible enrolled students as of September 20, 2021.

For the staff, special faculty, and faculty populations, the collaboration was with the Human Resources department, who generated a list of all permanent staff, special faculty, and faculty at the U-M Ann Arbor campus. The file was generated and provided to SoundRocket to represent all eligible employees as of September 20, 2021.

It was determined that employees of U-M affiliated units (such as alumni associations) would not be included in this effort. Temporary employees were also not included in this effort. Both of these exceptions were consistent with exceptions made in the 2017 data collection.

Where duplicates were identified between the employee and student files, the participant was included in this effort as a student.

All school/college or department/unit designations used in this effort for framing the "unit" were completed using institutional records that identified each student and employee's primary unit.

Questionnaire (Short-Form/Census Version)

The 2021 U-M DEI Survey was based on the 2016/2017 questionnaire. The instrument was modified with a few key goals in mind:

- Maintain some ability to compare between 2016/2017 and 2021, especially at the institutional level.
- Reduce the burden on responders, excluding questions that were not useful from the previous data collection.
- Introduction of new items to capture community experiences and opinions on DEI progress.
- Introduction of new items related to health, wellness, and understanding the impact of COVID-19 on the community.

The following is a description of the contents of the overall questionnaire, ordered by topical area as it is in this report. All survey participants were initially provided with a brief description of the survey, a confidentiality statement, and contact information to learn more from SoundRocket or the U-M DEI teams. All participants were required to read an informed consent statement, where they clicked "Next" if they agreed to participate.

Within the questionnaire, all unit specific questions were tailored for specific populations in the same way that they were in the 2017 survey. **Undergraduate students were asked to share their experiences either about their school/college or U-M overall. Graduate/professional students and staff/faculty/special faculty were asked to share their experiences with their department/unit.** A few minor exceptions in the questionnaire are noted in the data tables included in this report where undergraduate students may have been asked to refer to the U-M overall in lieu of their school/college. These diversions were intentional to capture the most relevant student experience relating to DEI.

Part I: Demographics

- Questions to capture participant demographics, including gender identity, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, religious affiliation, political orientation, disability status, military service, citizenship, generation status, housing status, and employment status.

Part II: Perceptions of Satisfaction & Climate Aspects

- Satisfaction with current climate overall and within the unit.
- Experiences with a variety of dimensions related to campus climate within the unit.
- DEI specific perceptions and experiences within the unit.
- Students Only:
  - Feelings of being listening to in classroom settings.
  - Feelings of being valued outside of the classroom.

Part III: Discrimination Perceptions & Experiences

- Feelings of being discriminated against within the past 12 months.
- Specific discriminatory events experienced in the past 12 months.

Part IV: DEI Progress & Engagement

- Experiences over the past 5 years with DEI-related activities and events.
- Satisfaction with and rating of overall U-M DEI progress and within unit DEI progress.
- Comparing DEI progress at U-M with other institutions, and in the unit with other U-M units.

Part V: Wellbeing & COVID Experiences

- Questions about overall physical and mental health, sleep, and wellbeing.
- Questions about the adverse effects of COVID-19 in a variety of areas.

Comparing Baseline Data to 2021

While the 2021 survey questionnaire and data collection designs were similar to the 2016-2017 efforts, they were not designed to compare the population longitudinally between the two efforts. Only the institutional sample and study design (which used the long-form sample survey) was optimized to allow for limited direct 2016/2017 to 2021 comparisons. As such, **direct comparisons between 2016/2017 and 2021 are not recommended.**

Where comparable measures were asked both in 2017 and 2021, we do provide unit level change metrics. Wherever similar statistics are presented, we have identified a + / - with numeric change of the comparable statistic from baseline. These should be considered only as a guide for each evaluation of changes since 2017. Due to the design differences in the study, any difference (or non-difference) identified should be considered carefully.

The following should be considered when evaluating these data:

- The questionnaires did change some, potentially introducing order and context effects.
- There were many structural changes within U-M, as such, in many circumstances comparing units between the two times may not be appropriate.
- Data collection in 2017 took place over the course of a full year with different sub-populations being surveyed at different times between the Winter/Spring and Fall of 2017—where all populations were surveyed in 2021 during the Fall.
- Data collection in 2021 included both census and sample designs in one administration. In 2016-2017, the sample study was conducted in the Fall of 2016, while the Census study was conducted throughout 2017.
- Environmental influences of the U.S. Presidential Elections and the COVID-19 pandemic should be considered when evaluating differences between the two data collections.
- Unit level estimates in 2017 and in 2021 include no adjustments for nonresponse. No weights were used in the creation of either set of unit level estimates for the census study.
- Units experienced a variety of response rates, where some units have very low potential for nonresponse bias and some may have high potential for nonresponse bias. Different patterns of nonresponse could have an impact on differences between data collections.

Accessibility & the 2021 Instrument

As in 2017, the study design included efforts to increase the reach of this questionnaire to all eligible participants. This included an effort to develop a web-based survey that was inclusive of all, including those with disabilities, such that an equitable level of participation was possible.

The web-based survey was developed using guidelines identified in the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG). While limited to the capabilities of the DatStat Illume web-based survey system in some areas, the programming used was as compliant as possible with the WCAG guidelines.

Because some of the standard designs employed by the questionnaire were not easily translated into compliant formats without significant changes to the questionnaire itself, SoundRocket used an "Accessible Survey" feature selection on the first page of the questionnaire. This feature allowed the user to identify that they were using assistive technologies to complete the survey. On selection, the web-based survey would adjust to a design that was more friendly to assistive technologies.

The efforts implemented in the 2021 survey were comparable to those that were implemented in 2017. SoundRocket engaged with on-campus resources to evaluate and confirm that the web-based survey was functioning appropriately.

During data collection, a total of 1010 participants (3.8% of the overall total taking the survey) used the accessible survey selector to adapt the questionnaire to their screen reading technology.

Data Collection

The 2021 U-M DEI Survey census was administered as an online web survey. The survey was optimized so that it could be completed successfully on mobile devices and tablets, as well as on desktop or laptop computers. Mobile optimization was implemented dynamically during the survey—if the system detected that a mobile-sized screen was in use, it automatically adjusted the view to accommodate the device.

All participants were invited to participate directly with email communications sent from SoundRocket to the U-M provided email address. SoundRocket coordinated with U-M IT personnel to ensure that all emails were delivered and not captured/blocked by U-M cyber security protocols. SoundRocket complied with all required security protocols in establishing secure connections to U-M servers for email delivery.

The protocol for the census survey included:

- An email invitation to participate in the survey.
- A reminder sent approximately 4 days following the invitation.
- A second reminder sent approximately 3 days following the first reminder.
- A third reminder sent approximately 4 days following the second reminder.
- A fourth reminder sent approximately 3 days following the third reminder.
- A fifth reminder sent approximately 8 days following the fourth reminder.

Participants who had been randomly selected to participate in the sample survey (long-form) effort may have also received additional notifications/reminders including mailed letters, telephone prompts, mailed questionnaires, and additional email communications.

Only participants who had not yet responded or who had partially responded (but hadn't completed the survey) were sent reminders at each of these steps.

Data collection formally launched on October 28, 2021, and was closed on January 3, 2022. All outbound contacts associated with the census survey were completed as of approximately November 19, 2021. However, the survey remained open for late responders and for those who were part of the sample (long-form) survey effort to complete the more robust sample communication protocol.

Participant Incentives

To encourage participation, all eligible participants – regardless of whether they participated in the survey, to ensure consistency with Michigan law — were entered into a random drawing to win one of ten $100 gift cards. Prizes were awarded in January 2022.

Final Dispositions & Response Rates

Disposition codes, response rates, and completion rates described in this report are based on Standard Definitions as described by The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) in their 2011 publication: Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys, 7th edition.

Final Study Dispositions

Survey dispositions were defined as follows:

- **Login:** an individual who clicked to open the survey but did not consent to participate; these cases were treated as equal to any other nonresponse.
- **Partial:** an individual who logged in, consented, and responded to at least one question, but quit the survey before reaching the end.
- **Complete:** an individual who consented to participate and who clicked through the entire survey (answering all or some questions) and clicked "Submit."
- **Ineligible:** an individual initially thought eligible to participate, but determined to not be eligible (e.g., due to not being employed on the eligibility date); ineligible cases were removed from the denominator of all response rate calculations.

Response Rates

Response rates for the U-M DEI survey were calculated as follows:

- **Response Rate:** Number of completes (c) plus the number of partials (p) divided by the eligible (e) sample size; this calculation follows AAPOR response rate calculation #2: $((c+p)/e)$.
- **Completion Rate:** Number of completes (c) divided by the sum of completes (c) plus partials (p): $(c/(c+p))$.
- **Refusals (r):** Count of individuals who said that they did not want to participate in the survey.
- **Refusal %:** Count of refusals (r) divided by the total sample size: (r/n).

A participant is considered to have responded to the survey if their submission met the stated criteria to be considered a complete or a partial. Data from all such cases is included in this report. Response and completion rates are shown for the total number of participants across all schools and colleges who responded to the survey, and for units within U-M where applicable.

With respect to final dispositions, it is important to emphasize that "complete" does not require that the respondent answer every question in the survey; "complete" indicates that a person navigated through the entire survey and then – at the end – clicked "Submit." A "partial" disposition denotes records in which a respondent progressed beyond the consent page but did not click "Submit" at the end of the survey.

During preparation for, and during, data collection individuals who were not eligible to participate in the study were identified. This may be the result of duplicates (same individual included twice) or individuals who were not 18 years of age as of the eligibility date (September 20, 2021). When ineligible cases are identified, they are recorded as such and are not included in further data collection. Table A shows the total counts of faculty who were ***invited and eligible*** to participate, along with rates of response and completion for U-M overall and for your unit.

Table A: U-M All Faculty DEI Response & Completion Rates (Short-Form Census Survey Effort)

2021 Data	Invited & Eligible	Partial Responses	Completed Response	Response Rate	Completion Rate
U-M Faculty					
Total	5391	217	2254	45.8%	91.2%
School of Social Work Faculty					
Total	58	2	39	70.7%	95.1%

Confidentiality

To ensure the success of this survey, given the sensitive nature of several of the questions, a key element of the study design was to limit direct access between U-M Ann Arbor administration and students, staff, special faculty, and faculty who were being surveyed. Integral to this effort was the use of an independent contractor (SoundRocket) for data collection efforts, which provided a firewall between respondents' identity and their survey responses. Consistent with standard practices for large data collections such as this, SoundRocket was required to use encryption technologies (including SSL for all web-based interfaces) and adhere to strict guidelines to maintain data security and confidentiality. SoundRocket has been collecting sensitive data from university populations for over 17 years. Their communications, staff training, processes and quality processes all focus on minimizing disclosure risk. SoundRocket also engaged with their own IRB to review the study protocol and oversee respondent protections during this study.

After the participant list was provided to SoundRocket, no U-M Ann Arbor employee ever had access to any identifying information on any potential survey respondent in a way that would allow them to link survey response to any individual identity. All survey staff 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 completed, SoundRocket followed contract terms for data archiving.

These protections and policies did not prohibit individuals who chose to engage with U-M personnel concerning the survey on their own. Some participants connected with U-M DEI office staff during the course of the data collection effort about this survey on their own, sometimes self-disclosing their participation (or non-participation) in the survey. However, these disclosures cannot be tied back to survey data or reporting provided to the U-M for analysis and interpretation.

How to Read this Report

The following section provides some guidance on how to read and interpret the tables presented in this report.

Data Types (%, Means, and Change)

The following rules apply to how data types are presented in the tables:

1. Data presented in the tables in this report are primarily displayed as percentages (%), rounded to the nearest single decimal place. Where presented, means were also rounded to the nearest single decimal place. Measures of change (see #3 below) are rounded to the nearest whole number.
2. Where no % is indicated (such as in Table I-1a under the Age demographic), the values represent a mean statistic.
3. Data presented in the parenthesis within a cell represents a ***change metric***, meaning it shows the absolute change in % since the 2017 survey (where a comparable item was asked). For example, a data cell that indicates **5.6%** *(+1)* suggests that the current 2021 value of 5.6% represents an increase of 1% (from approx. 4.6%) since the 2017 survey. A negative change value, such as **37.0%** *(-3)* indicates that the current 2021 value of 37.0% represents a decrease of 3% (from approx. 40.0%) since the 2017 survey. A data cell that indicates a (0) for change means that there was no measurable change.

The data shown in tables throughout this report are population level data (parameters). Statistical testing is not appropriate in a census because all elements that could be studied are included in the study design. Additionally, this study was not conducted with the intent of measuring longitudinal change over time. Lastly, unit level data has not been weighted in any way.

Sample Size & Item Missing Data

This survey was optional for all invited participants. Each participant was asked to read and accept terms in an introductory consent statement. Those who chose not to proceed after reading the consent were not included in these analyses and were considered non-responders to the study. Any participant who consented to participate and engaged in the survey were allowed to skip any item that they did not wish to respond to. As such, the number of participants responding to each item varied from item to item. This pattern may have been different between units as well. As such, we do not present sample size in these tables. However, please *look at Table A (on page 9)* to identify the total number of participants who partially or completely responded within your unit. The total completed responses and partial responses combined will represent the maximum number of cases represented for each unit level statistic.

Self-Reported Data

With few exceptions (unit designation and student type designation), all data presented in these reports used self-reported survey responses. If an individual respondent chose not to respond to the gender or race/ethnicity survey question (which is key to most of the tables in this report), then their data is not included in the tables.

Data Suppression Rules

To preserve confidentiality of individuals who participated (or who decided not to participate), data suppression rules were applied to all reports to reduce the likelihood of actual or perceived disclosure. **It should be noted that any attempt at individually disclosing participation status, or any responses provided by any individual in this survey is not appropriate and is a breach of confidentiality.** Data suppression will show up as a long dash (—) in the data cells, such as what we see in the table example below.

The following suppression rules were followed for this report:

Unit Level Suppression A unit report has not been generated for any unit with fewer than 10 completed responses.	**Demographic Data (Part I) Suppression** Any cell within the demographic tables (all tables in Part I of this report) representing fewer than 15 responses was suppressed.
General Cell Suppression (Parts II, III, IV, and V) Any cell in the remainder of the report (Parts II through V) where the data represents fewer than 5 responses was suppressed.	**2017 to 2021 Comparison Suppression** If 2017 data qualifies for suppression, then the comparison statistic was suppressed. This remains true even if 2021 data is not suppressed. Additionally, if 2021 data is suppressed, then the comparison statistic is also suppressed regardless of the number of cases in 2017.

Overall Table Structure

Each table will indicate if the data used to generate the table includes 2021 only, or 2021 and 2017 comparison data.

The primary measures will be presented in rows. In this case, each measure includes several response options.

Cell values show the % of faculty who selected the specific response (as defined in the row). This example tells us that 24.2% of faculty in this department/unit reported that they identify as "Agnostic/Atheist".

The value in parenthesis identifies that there was a change (since 2017) of +5. See page 6 for more details on how to interpret the change metric.

Tables will sometimes share data from different levels within the U-M. This table includes data from All U-M Faculty and from the local Unit Faculty.

This is what a suppression looks like. See above for more details.

Table I-1b: Selected Faculty Demographics

2021 Data (with 2017 Comparison)	Totals
All U-M Faculty	
Religious Affiliation	
Agnostic/Atheist	27.8% *(+1)*
Buddhist	2.6% *(+1)*
Christian	36.0% *(+9)*
Jewish	8.9% *(+3)*
Muslim	2.0% *(−9)*
Other Religious Affiliation	5.8% *(+4)*
None	16.9% *(+7)*
Political Orientation	
Conservative	6.9% *(−1)*
Moderate	12.8% *(+4)*
Liberal	80.3% *(−3)*
Not thought about it/Don't know	— *(−)*
Sexual Orientation	
Heterosexual	89.4% *(−)*
LGBQA+[3]	10.6% *(−)*
Example Unit Faculty	
Religious Affiliation	
Agnostic/Atheist	24.2% *(+1)*
Buddhist	1.8% *(+0)*
Christian	43.8% *(+2)*
Jewish	9.7% *(+3)*
Muslim	2.9% *(−3)*
Other Religious Affiliation	6.3% *(+5)*
None	11.3% *(+2)*
Political Orientation	
Conservative	9.2% *(−2)*
Moderate	15.3% *(+3)*
Liberal	75.5% *(−1)*
Not thought about it/Don't know	— *(−)*
Sexual Orientation	
Heterosexual	95.4% *(−)*
LGBQA+[3]	4.6% *(−)*

[3]Includes the survey categories of Bisexual, Gay/Lesbian, Queer, Questioning, Asexual, and Preferred response not listed.

Additional Common Table Column Structures

The following header formats showcase the structures used to present most of the tables in this report.

Basic Data Table: These tables include one column for the variable labels, and one column for the data itself.

2021 Data Only	Totals

All Faculty Gender and Collapsed Race/Ethnicity Table: These tables include a column for U-M All Faculty and Unit Faculty Totals. Additionally, it presents Unit Faculty data broken out by gender identity and a collapsed race/ethnicity White and BIPOC (see Table I-2 on page 16 for more about the BIPOC category).

2021 Data (with 2017 Comparison)	U-M All Faculty Totals	Unit Faculty Totals	Unit Faculty			
			Gender		Race/Ethnicity	
			Woman	Man	White	BIPOC

Detailed Race/Ethnicity Table: Due to the number of categories, these tables have a slightly different structure, with a focus on the detailed race/ethnicity categories as columns in the table.

2021 Data (with 2017 Comparison)	White	African Amer/ Black	Asian Amer/ Asian	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Native Amer/ Alaskan Native	Middle Eastern/ North African	More Than One	Other Race/ Ethnicity

Part I: Demographics

To best understand the survey results, it is important to get an understanding of who completed the survey. This first section of the report details several key demographics collected from study participants. These are intended to give you a sense for who responded to the survey, but it can also give insights into the diversity of your population, as well as an indication for whether that diversity is changing. Each table in this section (Part I: Demographics) includes data from all U-M faculty to provide some context to your unit results.

Table I-1a: Selected Faculty Demographics

2021 Data (with 2017 Comparison)	Totals
All U-M Faculty	
Age	
Average (Years)	**50.3** *(+0)*
Gender Identity	
Woman	**46.1%** *(+1)*
Man	**52.0%** *(−2)*
Transgender/Gender Non-Conforming/Other[1]	**2.0%** *(−)*
Race/Ethnicity	
White	**66.8%** *(−5)*
African American/Black	**4.8%** *(+1)*
Asian American/Asian/Pacific Islander	**14.6%** *(+2)*
Hispanic/Latino/a	**3.3%** *(+0)*
Native American/Alaskan Native	**−** *(−)*
Middle Eastern/North African	**1.7%** *(+0)*
Other Race/Ethnicity	**2.4%** *(+0)*
More Than One Race/Ethnicity[2]	**6.0%** *(+1)*
School of Social Work Faculty	
Age	
Average (Years)	**51.0** *(−1)*
Gender Identity	
Woman	**62.5%** *(−)*
Man	**−** *(−)*
Transgender/Gender Non-Conforming/Other[1]	**−** *(−)*
Race/Ethnicity	
White	**57.5%** *(−)*
African American/Black	**−** *(−)*
Asian American/Asian/Pacific Islander	**−** *(−)*
Hispanic/Latino/a	**−** *(−)*
Native American/Alaskan Native	**−** *(−)*
Middle Eastern/North African	**−** *(−)*
Other Race/Ethnicity	**−** *(−)*
More Than One Race/Ethnicity[2]	**−** *(−)*

[1]Due to the small sample size, which would result in these data being suppressed for most units, this category for gender included participants who identified as Transgender/Gender Non-Conforming, participants who indicated that their preferred response was not listed, and participants who selected multiple gender categories. Additional details for U-M overall are included in Tables I-3a and b.

[2]Race/Ethnicity was asked as a select all that apply question. Responders who selected multiple categories are represented here as "More Than One Race/Ethnicity".

Table I-1b: Selected Faculty Demographics

2021 Data (with 2017 Comparison)	Totals
All U-M Faculty	
Religious Affiliation	
Agnostic/Atheist	**27.8%** *(−2)*
Buddhist	**2.6%** *(+0)*
Christian	**36.0%** *(−5)*
Jewish	**8.9%** *(+0)*
Muslim	**2.0%** *(+1)*
Other Religious Affiliation	**5.8%** *(+0)*
None	**16.9%** *(+6)*
Political Orientation	
Conservative	**6.9%** *(−1)*
Moderate	**12.8%** *(+4)*
Liberal	**80.3%** *(−3)*
Not thought about it/Don't know	**—** *(−)*
Sexual Orientation	
Heterosexual	**89.4%** *(−)*
LGBQA+[3]	**10.6%** *(−)*
School of Social Work Faculty	
Religious Affiliation	
Agnostic/Atheist	**—** *(−)*
Buddhist	**—** *(−)*
Christian	**42.5%** *(−)*
Jewish	**—** *(−)*
Muslim	**—** *(−)*
Other Religious Affiliation	**—** *(−)*
None	**—** *(−)*
Political Orientation	
Conservative	**—** *(−)*
Moderate	**—** *(−)*
Liberal	**85.0%** *(+0)*
Not thought about it/Don't know	**—** *(−)*
Sexual Orientation	
Heterosexual	**80.5%** *(−)*
LGBQA+[3]	**—** *(−)*

[3]Includes the survey categories of Bisexual, Gay/Lesbian, Queer, Questioning, Asexual, and Preferred response not listed.

Table I-1c: Selected Faculty Demographics

2021 Data *(with 2017 Comparison)*	Totals
All U-M Faculty	
Disability[4]	
Yes	**7.6%** *(+2)*
U.S. Citizen[5]	
Yes	**62.9%** *(-9)*
Education	
High School/GED	—
Associate's	—
Bachelor's	—
Post-Graduate	**97.6%**
Other	**2.0%**
School of Social Work Faculty	
Disability[4]	
Yes	**—** *(—)*
U.S. Citizen[5]	
Yes	**67.5%** *(-22)*
Education	
High School/GED	—
Associate's	—
Bachelor's	—
Post-Graduate	**100.0%**
Other	—

[4]Response of "Yes, I have a disability" to the question, "Do you have a disability?"

[5]Response of "Yes" to the question, "Were you born in the United States, Puerto Rico, a U.S. Island area, or born abroad of U.S. citizen parents?"

Black, Indigenous, & People of Color (BIPOC) Reporting

In many places within this report breakouts of individual race/ethnicity categories will result in cell sizes that are too small to report. As such, we will also present a collapsed version of race/ethnicity, which is abbreviated in report columns as BIPOC (meaning "Black, Indigenous, and People of Color"). This category will include any participant who identified as being African American/Black, Asian American/Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic/Latino/a, Middle Eastern/North African, Native American/Alaskan Native, Other Race/Ethnicity, or More Than One Race/Ethnicity. The comparable statistic from the 2017 report is "Non-white".

The following data represents the distribution of the BIPOC categories for all U-M and for your department/unit.

Table I-2: Collapsed Race (BIPOC) Demographic Distribution of Faculty

2021 Data *(with 2017 Comparison)*	Totals
All U-M Faculty	
White	**66.8%** *(−5)*
BIPOC	**33.2%** *(+5)*
School of Social Work Faculty	
White	**57.5%** *(−)*
BIPOC	**42.5%** *(−)*

Transgender/Gender Non-Conforming Population Details

A unique opportunity offered by a full campus census is to collect data on sub-groups that may not have adequate numbers for detailed analyses when identified during a sample study design. The transgender/gender non-conforming population at the U-M is such a population.

To allow for a better understanding of the characteristics of this group at U-M overall, we have included some data tables for U-M faculty overall. This will allow the campus community overall to have a general understanding for how gender identity is currently being expressed at U-M.

Table I-3a: All U-M Faculty Detailed Breakout of Response to the Main Gender Identity Question

2021 Data Only	Totals
Man	51.8%
Woman	45.9%
Transgender/Gender Non-Conforming	–
Preferred response not listed	1.4%

Note: This question was asked as multiple response, therefore it is possible that the sum of the values may be greater than 100%. Additionally, these percentages may differ from the values in Table I-1a above.

Those who identified as Transgender/Gender Non-Conforming were then asked for further detail about their gender identity.

Table I-3b: All U-M Faculty Transgender/Gender Non-Conforming Follow-up Detail

2021 Data Only	Totals
Transgender man	–
Transgender woman	–
Gender Non-Conforming	–
Genderqueer	–
Preferred response not listed	–

Note: This question was asked as multiple response, therefore it is possible that the sum of the values may be greater than 100%

Part II: Perceptions of Satisfaction & Climate Aspects

Satisfaction with Campus Climate at U-M Campus Overall

Understanding satisfaction with the overall U-M campus climate that each participant has experienced within the past 12 months is key to understanding current climate. We asked faculty to provide their level of satisfaction (from "Very Dissatisfied" to "Very Satisfied" using a 5-point scale) with the **U-M campus overall** (Table II-1 series).

Table II-1a: Faculty Satisfaction with U-M Campus Climate Overall, by Gender, and by Collapsed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data *(with 2017 Comparison)*	U-M All Faculty Totals	Unit Faculty Totals	Unit Faculty			
			Gender		Race/Ethnicity	
			Woman	Man	White	BIPOC
Very Dissatisfied/Dissatisfied	28.2% *(+15)*	31.7% *(+5)*	28.0% *(—)*	41.7% *(—)*	26.1% *(—)*	35.3% *(—)*
Neutral	25.2% *(+7)*	26.8% *(−10)*	28.0% *(−14)*	— *(—)*	34.8% *(—)*	— *(—)*
Satisfied/Very Satisfied	46.6% *(−22)*	41.5% *(+5)*	44.0% *(—)*	— *(—)*	39.1% *(—)*	47.1% *(—)*

Table II-1b: Faculty Satisfaction with U-M Campus Climate Overall, by Detailed Race

2021 Data *(with 2017 Comparison)*	White	African Amer/ Black	Asian Amer/ Asian	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Native Amer/ Alaskan Native	Middle Eastern/ North African	More Than One	Other Race/ Ethnicity
Very Dissatisfied/Dissatisfied	26.1% *(—)*	— *(—)*	— *(—)*	— *(—)*	— *(—)*	— *(—)*	— *(—)*	— *(—)*
Neutral	34.8% *(—)*	— *(—)*	— *(—)*	— *(—)*	— *(—)*	— *(—)*	— *(—)*	— *(—)*
Satisfied/Very Satisfied	39.1% *(—)*	75.0% *(—)*	— *(—)*	— *(—)*	— *(—)*	— *(—)*	— *(—)*	— *(—)*

Satisfaction with Campus Climate at Your Department/Unit

Understanding satisfaction with the department/unit climate that each participant has experienced within the past 12 months is key to understanding current climate. We asked faculty to provide their level of satisfaction (from "Very Dissatisfied" to "Very Satisfied" using a 5-point scale) **of their department/unit** (Table II-2 series).

Table II-2a: Faculty Satisfaction with School of Social Work Climate Overall, by Gender, and by Collapsed Race/Ethnicity

| 2021 Data *(with 2017 Comparison)* | U-M All Faculty Totals | Unit Faculty Totals | Unit Faculty | | | |
| | | | Gender | | Race/Ethnicity | |
			Woman	Man	White	BIPOC
Very Dissatisfied/Dissatisfied	24.7% *(+3)*	29.3% *(−1)*	24.0% *(−)*	— *(−)*	34.8% *(−)*	— *(−)*
Neutral	17.6% *(+0)*	29.3% *(+3)*	28.0% *(−)*	— *(−)*	34.8% *(−)*	— *(−)*
Satisfied/Very Satisfied	57.7% *(−3)*	41.5% *(−2)*	48.0% *(+6)*	41.7% *(−)*	30.4% *(−20)*	58.8% *(−)*

Table II-2b: Faculty Satisfaction with School of Social Work Climate by Detailed Race

2021 Data *(with 2017 Comparison)*	White	African Amer/ Black	Asian Amer/ Asian	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Native Amer/ Alaskan Native	Middle Eastern/ North African	More Than One	Other Race/ Ethnicity
Very Dissatisfied/Dissatisfied	34.8% *(−)*	— *(−)*	— *(−)*	— *(−)*	— *(−)*	— *(−)*	— *(−)*	— *(−)*
Neutral	34.8% *(−)*	— *(−)*	— *(−)*	— *(−)*	— *(−)*	— *(−)*	— *(−)*	— *(−)*
Satisfied/Very Satisfied	30.4% *(−20)*	75.0% *(−)*	— *(−)*	— *(−)*	— *(−)*	— *(−)*	— *(−)*	— *(−)*

Dimensions of Campus Climate Within Your Department/Unit

Study participants were asked to reflect on several sets of opposing climate-related dimensions using a scale called a semantic differential. Pairs of adjectives are shown which can serve as endpoints on a scale, and survey participants select a rating between each adjective that they feel best represents their perception of the entity being studied. The scale allows for up to five (5) points between each pair of adjectives.

Faculty were asked about their experiences in their department/unit.

In Table II-3a and b, we present the individual scores reported by all faculty. Each score is identified by the value to the left of the symbol as identified in the legend. The amount of change observed since the 2017 survey is identified in the "Change Since 2017" column. The change may indicate a positive (+) or negative (-) change since 2017. For example, a score of 3.3 with a change flagged as +0.3 means that the change from 2017 to 2021 was an increase of 0.3 on the measure. Because the design is not intended for direct comparison of 2017 to 2021 results, no significance testing or effect size has been calculated.

Individual Dimension Scores

Table II-3a: Faculty Dimensions of Climate (Mean Score)

Legend:
☐ U-M Faculty
🟨 Unit Faculty

	1	2	3	4	5	Change Since 2017	
Hostile			3.9 ☐			(−0.1)	**Friendly**
			3.6 🟨			(−0.3)	
Disrespectful			3.9 ☐			(−0.1)	**Respectful**
			3.6 🟨			(−0.2)	
Contentious			3.7 ☐			(−0.2)	**Collegial**
			3.4 🟨			(−0.4)	
Individualistic			3.2 ☐			(−0.1)	**Collaborative**
		2.7 🟨				(+0.1)	
Competitive			3.3 ☐			(−0.2)	**Cooperative**
		2.7 🟨				(−0.3)	
Unsupportive			3.8 ☐			(+0.0)	**Supportive**
			3.6 🟨			(+0.0)	
Unwelcoming			3.8 ☐			(−0.1)	**Welcoming**
			3.5 🟨			(+0.1)	

20

Table II-3b: Faculty Dimensions of Climate (Mean Score) *(Continued)*

	1	2	3	4	5	Change Since 2017	
Racist				3.9 ☐		*(-0.3)*	**Non-Racist**
			3.4 🟨			*(-0.1)*	
Homogenous			3.1 ☐			*(-0.2)*	**Diverse**
			3.7 🟨			*(+0.4)*	
Sexist			3.6 ☐			*(-0.2)*	**Non-Sexist**
			3.4 🟨			*(+0.0)*	
Homophobic				4.3 ☐		*(-0.1)*	**Non-Homophobic**
			3.8 🟨			*(-0.3)*	
Transphobic				4.0 ☐		*(+0.3)*	**Non-Transphobic**
			3.8 🟨			*(+0.3)*	
Ageist			3.6 ☐			*(-0.2)*	**Non-Ageist**
			3.3 🟨			*(-0.6)*	

General & DEI Climate Factors

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) is a statistical technique that condenses data by grouping variables into factors (sets of variables) based on shared variance, the statistical index of the degree to which variables are associated (shared variance is indicated by correlation coefficients). The EFA was run on these items back in 2017, where we identified two primary factors for these analyses. Using the 2021 data, we re-ran the EFA to ensure that the same factors remain associated—and it confirmed that they do remain associated as they were in 2017[5]. Thus, the two factors we will use for 2021 remain the same as in 2017: (1) General Climate Elements, and (2) DEI Climate Elements. The variables that make up each of the factors are:

Factor 1 General Climate Elements Factor	Factor 2 DEI Climate Elements Factor
Hostile/Friendly Disrespectful/Respectful Contentious/Collegial Individualistic/Collaborative Competitive/Cooperative Unsupportive/Supportive Unwelcoming/Welcoming	Racist/Non-Racist Homogenous/Diverse Sexist/Non-Sexist Homophobic/Non-Homophobic Transphobic/Non-Transphobic Ageist/Non-Ageist

[5]*In 2017 the staff, faculty, and special faculty factors did not include the "Transphobic/Non-Transphobic" dimension. It was included for the student survey and was found to hold true as part of the factor when it was included. The 2017 factors were re-run in 2021 to evaluate whether this changed the calculation, and it was found to have no effect.*

In the following two tables, we present the collapsed Factors as an analytic unit. Factors are created by calculating the mean score for all responses provided for each item within each factor. Only individuals who responded to all included items were included in these analyses.

Table II-4a: Faculty Dimensions of Factors Overall, by Gender, and by Collapsed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data (with 2017 Comparison)	U-M All Faculty Totals	Unit Faculty Totals	Gender		Race/Ethnicity	
			Woman	Man	White	BIPOC
Factor 1: General Climate	3.6 (−0.1)	3.3 (−0.1)	3.3 (−0.3)	3.6 (+0.2)	3.3 (−0.2)	3.4 (−0.4)
Factor 2: DEI Climate Elements	3.8 (−0.2)	3.6 (−0.1)	3.5 (−0.3)	3.9 (+0.1)	3.5 (−0.4)	3.7 (+0.1)

Table II-4b: Faculty Dimensions of Factors by Detailed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data (with 2017 Comparison)	White	African Amer/ Black	Asian Amer/ Asian	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Native Amer/ Alaskan Native	Middle Eastern/ North African	More Than One	Other Race/ Ethnicity
Factor 1: General Climate	3.3 (−0.2)	3.8 (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	3.5 (−)	— (−)
Factor 2: DEI Climate Elements	3.5 (−0.4)	4.1 (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	3.4 (−)	— (−)

DEI Experiences & Perceptions

Faculty were asked to respond to two separate series of questions regarding their experiences and perceptions around several DEI-related concepts.

DEI Specific Department/Unit Perceptions

First, they were asked about some specific DEI-related aspects related to their department/unit. They were asked how much they agree or disagree (using a 5-point scale from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree) with a series of statements on this topic. Their responses were collapsed into a % of those who reported that they Strongly Agree or Agree with the statement.

Faculty were all asked to consider their experiences within the past 12 months. Those who had less than 12 months experience were asked to consider the full duration of the time they have been on campus.

Table II-5a: Faculty Agreement with Statements About DEI Specific Climate Overall, by Gender, and by Collapsed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data *(with 2017 Comparison)*	U-M All Faculty Totals	Unit Faculty				
		Unit Faculty Totals	Gender		Race/Ethnicity	
			Woman	Man	White	BIPOC
I feel valued as an individual in my department/unit.	64.0% *(−2)*	56.1% *(−15)*	52.0% *(−19)*	75.0% *(—)*	52.2% *(−6)*	64.7% *(−24)*
I feel I belong in my department/unit.	63.7% *(−4)*	53.7% *(−8)*	52.0% *(−5)*	66.7% *(—)*	47.8% *(−2)*	64.7% *(−13)*
My department/unit has a strong commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion.	72.3% *(+1)*	85.4% *(−10)*	96.0% *(−4)*	75.0% *(−8)*	91.3% *(+0)*	82.4% *(−18)*
I have considered leaving my department/unit because I felt isolated or unwelcomed.	25.5% *(+4)*	29.3% *(—)*	32.0% *(—)*	— *(—)*	34.8% *(—)*	— *(—)*
I am treated with respect in my department/unit.	71.1% *(−4)*	60.0% *(−26)*	60.0% *(−26)*	81.8% *(−2)*	63.6% *(−20)*	58.8% *(−30)*
I feel others don't value my opinions in my department/unit.	23.2% *(+6)*	30.0% *(+6)*	28.0% *(—)*	— *(—)*	27.3% *(—)*	29.4% *(—)*
My department/unit is a place where I am able to perform up to my full potential.	58.7% *(−4)*	55.0% *(−12)*	60.0% *(+3)*	63.6% *(−20)*	63.6% *(+5)*	47.1% *(−31)*
I have opportunities in my department/unit for professional success that are similar to those of my colleagues.	64.6% *(−2)*	52.5% *(−5)*	52.0% *(+2)*	63.6% *(—)*	50.0% *(+0)*	58.8% *(−8)*
I have found one or more communities or groups where I feel I belong in my department/unit.	62.3% *(+0)*	59.0% *(−12)*	62.5% *(−2)*	45.5% *(−38)*	57.1% *(−10)*	64.7% *(−13)*
There is too much emphasis put on issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion here in my department/unit.	19.4% *(+11)*	15.4% *(—)*	— *(—)*	— *(—)*	23.8% *(—)*	— *(—)*
My department/unit provides sufficient programs and resources to foster the success of a diverse group of scholars.	56.1% *(+4)*	51.3% *(−30)*	50.0% *(−29)*	54.5% *(−29)*	52.4% *(−31)*	52.9% *(−25)*
I have to work harder than others to be valued equally in my department/unit.	34.8% *(+9)*	59.0% *(+21)*	62.5% *(+20)*	— *(—)*	42.9% *(—)*	76.5% *(+21)*
My experience in my department/unit has had a positive influence on my professional growth.	64.9% *(−5)*	69.2% *(−16)*	75.0% *(−11)*	63.6% *(−20)*	66.7% *(−25)*	76.5% *(−1)*

Table II-5b: Faculty Agreement with Statements About DEI Specific Climate by Detailed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data (with 2017 Comparison)	White	African Amer/ Black	Asian Amer/ Asian	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Native Amer/ Alaskan Native	Middle Eastern/ North African	More Than One	Other Race/ Ethnicity
I feel valued as an individual in my department/unit.	52.2% (−6)	75.0% (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
I feel I belong in my department/unit.	47.8% (−2)	75.0% (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
My department/unit has a strong commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion.	91.3% (+0)	100.0% (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	100.0% (−)	— (−)
I have considered leaving my department/unit because I felt isolated or unwelcomed.	34.8% (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
I am treated with respect in my department/unit.	63.6% (−20)	75.0% (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
I feel others don't value my opinions in my department/unit.	27.3% (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
My department/unit is a place where I am able to perform up to my full potential.	63.6% (+5)	75.0% (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
I have opportunities in my department/unit for professional success that are similar to those of my colleagues.	50.0% (+0)	62.5% (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
I have found one or more communities or groups where I feel I belong in my department/unit.	57.1% (−10)	87.5% (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
There is too much emphasis put on issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion here in my department/unit.	23.8% (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
My department/unit provides sufficient programs and resources to foster the success of a diverse group of scholars.	52.4% (−31)	75.0% (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
I have to work harder than others to be valued equally in my department/unit.	42.9% (−)	75.0% (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
My experience in my department/unit has had a positive influence on my professional growth.	66.7% (−25)	87.5% (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	100.0% (−)	— (−)

Feeling Valued in the Department/Unit

We also hope that our community can feel valued for specific contributions in their department/unit. We measured this with a similar set of question that asked faculty to identify how strongly they agree (on a 5-point scale from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree) with a statement about how valued they felt for the following contributions.

Faculty were able to indicate Not Applicable to this item if they felt the item was not relevant for their job responsibilities. The data presented in these tables excluded any Not Applicable response.

Responses were collapsed into those who indicated they Strongly Agree or Agree that they felt valued by each of the following groups.

Table II-6a: Faculty Strongly Agree to Agree with Feeling Valued Overall, by Gender, and by Collapsed Race/Ethnicity

| | | Unit Faculty | | | | | |
| | | | Gender | | Race/Ethnicity | | |
2021 Data *(with 2017 Comparison)*	**U-M All Faculty Totals**	**Unit Faculty Totals**	**Woman**	**Man**	**White**	**BIPOC**
Teaching	62.0% (−3)	79.5% (+21)	79.2% (+29)	72.7% (−)	71.4% (+17)	88.2% (−)
Research, scholarship, and/or creativity	65.3% (−2)	61.5% (−4)	50.0% (−7)	90.9% (+8)	47.6% (−11)	82.4% (+5)
Service contributions	63.9% (−1)	71.8% (+16)	70.8% (+21)	90.9% (−)	66.7% (+25)	82.4% (+5)
Mentoring of students	57.8% (+1)	74.4% (+2)	66.7% (−5)	81.8% (−2)	66.7% (+0)	88.2% (−1)
Mentoring of faculty	36.9% (−5)	35.9% (+8)	37.5% (−)	45.5% (−)	33.3% (−)	41.2% (−)
Clinical practice	25.2% (−43)	20.5% (−)	20.8% (−)	— (−)	— (−)	29.4% (−)

Table II-6b: Faculty Strongly Agree to Agree with Feeling Valued by Detailed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data *(with 2017 Comparison)*	**White**	**African Amer/ Black**	**Asian Amer/ Asian**	**Hispanic/ Latino/a**	**Native Amer/ Alaskan Native**	**Middle Eastern/ North African**	**More Than One**	**Other Race/ Ethnicity**
Teaching	71.4% (+17)	87.5% (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	100.0% (−)	— (−)
Research, scholarship, and/or creativity	47.6% (−11)	87.5% (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
Service contributions	66.7% (+25)	87.5% (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
Mentoring of students	66.7% (+0)	87.5% (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
Mentoring of faculty	33.3% (−)	62.5% (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
Clinical practice	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)

Equity in the Department/Unit

A feeling of fairness and equity is a key element of DEI. We asked faculty to identify how strongly they agree (on a 5-point scale from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree) with a series of statements about how fair and equitable they felt their department climate has been.

Responses were collapsed into those who indicated they Strongly Agree or Agree with the following statements.

Table II-7a: Faculty Agreement with Equity in the Department/Unit Overall, by Gender, and by Collapsed Race/Ethnicity

| | | | Unit Faculty | | | |
| | | | Gender | | Race/Ethnicity | |
2021 Data *(with 2017 Comparison)*	**U-M All Faculty Totals**	**Unit Faculty Totals**	**Woman**	**Man**	**White**	**BIPOC**
I have a voice in the decision-making that affects the direction of my department/unit.	52.6% (−1)	43.6% (−33)	41.7% (−37)	54.5% (−)	33.3% (−33)	58.8% (−30)
The teaching workload is fairly and equitably distributed in my department/unit.	47.8% (−8)	43.6% (−28)	41.7% (−30)	63.6% (−)	33.3% (−25)	58.8% (−30)
There are fair and equitable expectations regarding research in my department/unit.	54.1% (−9)	56.4% (−9)	50.0% (−19)	81.8% (−)	57.1% (−6)	58.8% (−8)
There are fair and equitable expectations regarding service in my department/unit.	46.5% (−8)	43.6% (−14)	33.3% (−17)	81.8% (−)	42.9% (−15)	47.1% (−8)
There are fair and equitable processes for determining compensation in my department/unit.	41.1% (−1)	43.6% (−23)	37.5% (−27)	63.6% (−)	38.1% (−12)	52.9% (−36)
Support is provided fairly and equitably in my department/unit.	48.6% (−2)	38.5% (−23)	37.5% (−20)	54.5% (−)	42.9% (−24)	35.3% (−20)
Rewards for work performance are fairly and equitably distributed in my department/unit.	42.1% (−3)	48.7% (+6)	41.7% (−)	72.7% (−)	47.6% (−)	52.9% (−3)
DEI work is valued in my department/unit.	71.5%	82.1%	83.3%	81.8%	85.7%	82.4%

Table II-7b: Faculty Agreement with Equity in the Department/Unit by Detailed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data *(with 2017 Comparison)*	**White**	**African Amer/ Black**	**Asian Amer/ Asian**	**Hispanic/ Latino/a**	**Native Amer/ Alaskan Native**	**Middle Eastern/ North African**	**More Than One**	**Other Race/ Ethnicity**
I have a voice in the decision-making that affects the direction of my department/unit.	33.3% (−33)	62.5% (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)
The teaching workload is fairly and equitably distributed in my department/unit.	33.3% (−25)	75.0% (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)
There are fair and equitable expectations regarding research in my department/unit.	57.1% (−6)	87.5% (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)
There are fair and equitable expectations regarding service in my department/unit.	42.9% (−15)	75.0% (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)
There are fair and equitable processes for determining compensation in my department/unit.	38.1% (−12)	62.5% (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)
Support is provided fairly and equitably in my department/unit.	42.9% (−24)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)
Rewards for work performance are fairly and equitably distributed in my department/unit.	47.6% (−)	75.0% (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)	− (−)
DEI work is valued in my department/unit.	85.7%	87.5%	−	−	−	−	100.0%	−

Part III: Discrimination Perceptions & Experiences

Felt Discrimination in Past 12 Months

Faculty were asked to report if anytime over the past 12 months they had felt discriminated against within their department/unit.

Table III-1a: Faculty Felt Discriminated Against in the Past 12 Months in Their Department/Unit Overall, by Gender, and by Race/Ethnicity

| 2021 Data (with 2017 Comparison) | U-M All Faculty Totals | Unit Faculty Totals | Unit Faculty | | | |
| | | | Gender | | Race/Ethnicity | |
			Woman	Man	White	BIPOC
Felt Discriminated Against in the Past 12 Months	20.4% (+3)	23.1% (−)	25.0% (−)	– (−)	– (−)	29.4% (−)

Table III-1b: Faculty Felt Discriminated Against in the Past 12 Months in Their Department/Unit by Detailed Race

2021 Data (with 2017 Comparison)	White	African Amer/ Black	Asian Amer/ Asian	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Native Amer/ Alaskan Native	Middle Eastern/ North African	More Than One	Other Race/ Ethnicity
Felt Discriminated Against in the Past 12 Months	– (−)	– (−)	– (−)	– (−)	– (−)	– (−)	– (−)	– (−)

Specific Discriminatory Events Experienced

Faculty were then asked to identify one or more specific discriminatory events they personally have experienced over the past 12 months within their department/unit.

Table series III-2 identifies the proportion of faculty at U-M overall and within the department/unit who reported feeling some discrimination and who identified one or more specific discriminatory events. The remaining tables in the Table III-2 series detail the breakout by gender and race/ethnicity of those who have felt discriminated against and who identified one or more specific discriminatory events among department/unit faculty. Faculty were asked to indicate if they had experienced events "Never", "1-2 times", or "3 or more times". For this report, we have collapsed all reports of "1-2 times" and "3 or more times" into a reported discriminatory event.

Table III-2a: Faculty Type of Discriminatory Event Experienced In Their Department/Unit, by Gender, and by Race/Ethnicity

| | | Unit Faculty | | | | |
| | | | Gender | | Race/Ethnicity | |
2021 Data *(with 2017 Comparison)*	**U-M All Faculty Totals**	**Unit Faculty Totals**	**Woman**	**Man**	**White**	**BIPOC**
Ability or disability status	4.0% (+1)	12.8% (—)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)
Racial or ethnic identity	14.0% (+7)	20.5% (—)	25.0% (—)	— (—)	— (—)	41.2% (—)
Sex	19.8% (+3)	23.7% (—)	34.8% (—)	— (—)	23.8% (—)	— (—)
Sexual orientation	3.2% (+1)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)
Gender identity or gender expression	6.2% (+2)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)
Veteran status	0.4% (+0)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)
Relationship status	5.5% (−1)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)
National origin	8.5% (+3)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)
Age	14.3% (+0)	30.8% (—)	37.5% (—)	— (—)	23.8% (—)	35.3% (—)
Religion	4.5% (−2)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)
Height or weight	4.3% (+1)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)
Political orientation	8.1% (+1)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)
Social class	7.5% (+2)	15.8% (—)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)	29.4% (—)
Mental health status[6]	5.3%	—	—	—	—	—

[6]This item does not include a change metric because the 2017 survey did not include mental health status as a dimension of discriminatory experiences.

Table III-2b: Faculty Type of Discriminatory Event Experienced In Their Department/Unit by Gender, and Collapsed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data (with 2017 Comparison)	White	African Amer/ Black	Asian Amer/ Asian	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Native Amer/ Alaskan Native	Middle Eastern/ North African	More Than One	Other Race/ Ethnicity
Ability or disability status	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
Racial or ethnic identity	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
Sex	23.8% (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
Sexual orientation	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
Gender identity or gender expression	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
Veteran status	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
Relationship status	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
National origin	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
Age	23.8% (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
Religion	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
Height or weight	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
Political orientation	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
Social class	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)	— (−)
Mental health status[6]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

[6]This item does not include a change metric because the 2017 survey did not include mental health status as a dimension of discriminatory experiences.

Part IV: DEI Progress & Engagement

DEI Activities & Events

Over the past five years, there have been numerous DEI activities on the U-M Campus. While some of these activities can be tracked with attendance records, many are self-initiated and cannot be tracked. To understand how engaged the community is in DEI-related activities, we asked each participant to identify whether they have participated, and if they have, how often they have participated in a series of DEI-related events. Participants were asked to consider events within the past 12 months. In the Table IV-1 series, we present the proportion of faculty who reported any activity.

Table IV-1a: Faculty Participation in One or More U-M Campus DEI Activity or Event in the Past 12 Months Overall, by Gender, and by Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	U-M All Faculty Totals	Unit Faculty Totals	Unit Faculty			
			Gender		Race/Ethnicity	
			Woman	Man	White	BIPOC
Attended a DEI-related training/workshop session	80.7%	90.0%	100.0%	83.3%	91.3%	87.5%
Attended a DEI-related talk or seminar	84.7%	92.3%	95.8%	81.8%	90.5%	94.1%
Listened to a DEI-related podcast	38.2%	65.0%	75.0%	66.7%	68.2%	64.7%
Attended a DEI-related film series	26.6%	28.9%	40.9%	—	—	41.2%
Attended a DEI-related meeting or retreat in my unit	69.2%	87.5%	100.0%	66.7%	86.4%	88.2%
Read a book on a DEI-related topic	62.6%	97.6%	100.0%	91.7%	95.7%	100.0%
Attended a DEI-related event in my unit	72.9%	95.0%	100.0%	91.7%	90.9%	100.0%
Attended a DEI-related event at the U-M level	59.4%	75.0%	66.7%	83.3%	63.6%	88.2%
Served on a DEI-related committee or taskforce	45.6%	68.3%	68.0%	75.0%	56.5%	82.4%
Had a DEI-related conversation with a colleague/peer	91.5%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table IV-1b: Faculty Participation in One or More U-M Campus DEI Activity or Event in the Past 12 Months by Detailed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	White	African Amer/ Black	Asian Amer/ Asian	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Native Amer/ Alaskan Native	Middle Eastern/ North African	More Than One	Other Race/ Ethnicity
Attended a DEI-related training/workshop session	91.3%	87.5%	—	—	—	—	—	—
Attended a DEI-related talk or seminar	90.5%	87.5%	—	—	—	—	100.0%	—
Listened to a DEI-related podcast	68.2%	62.5%	—	—	—	—	—	—
Attended a DEI-related film series	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Attended a DEI-related meeting or retreat in my unit	86.4%	87.5%	—	—	—	—	100.0%	—
Read a book on a DEI-related topic	95.7%	100.0%	—	—	—	—	100.0%	—
Attended a DEI-related event in my unit	90.9%	100.0%	—	—	—	—	100.0%	—
Attended a DEI-related event at the U-M level	63.6%	100.0%	—	—	—	—	—	—
Served on a DEI-related committee or taskforce	56.5%	87.5%	—	—	—	—	—	—
Had a DEI-related conversation with a colleague/peer	100.0%	100.0%	—	—	—	—	100.0%	—

Satisfaction with DEI Progress

Satisfaction With U-M DEI Efforts Overall

Measuring satisfaction with progress made on issues related to the DEI initiative also helps identify whether the direction, pace, and scope of change is what the campus community has expected from this effort. Participants were asked to identify their satisfaction on a 5-point scale (Very Dissatisfied to Very Satisfied) including any time they have spent at U-M over the past 5 years.

Table IV-2a: Faculty Satisfaction with Overall U-M Campus Climate DEI Progress, by Gender, and by Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	U-M All Faculty Totals	Unit Faculty Totals	Unit Faculty			
			Gender		Race/Ethnicity	
			Woman	Man	White	BIPOC
Very Dissatisfied/Dissatisfied	21.4%	29.3%	24.0%	–	26.1%	29.4%
Neutral	39.2%	39.0%	44.0%	41.7%	47.8%	29.4%
Satisfied/Very Satisfied	39.4%	31.7%	32.0%	–	26.1%	41.2%

Table IV-2b: Faculty Satisfaction with Overall U-M Campus Climate DEI Progress by Detailed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	White	African Amer/ Black	Asian Amer/ Asian	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Native Amer/ Alaskan Native	Middle Eastern/ North African	More Than One	Other Race/ Ethnicity
Very Dissatisfied/Dissatisfied	26.1%	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Neutral	47.8%	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Satisfied/Very Satisfied	26.1%	62.5%	–	–	–	–	–	–

Satisfaction with DEI Progress Within the Department/Unit

While overall progress at U-M is certainly desirable, it is also important to see what is happening at the local department/unit level. Participants were asked to identify their satisfaction on a 5-point scale (Very Dissatisfied to Very Satisfied), and were asked to consider up to the past 5 years.

Table IV-3a: Faculty Satisfaction with Department/Unit DEI Progress Overall, by Gender, and by Race/Ethnicity

| | | Unit Faculty | | | | | |
| | | | | Gender | | Race/Ethnicity | |
2021 Data Only	**U-M All Faculty Totals**	**Unit Faculty Totals**	**Woman**	**Man**	**White**	**BIPOC**
Very Dissatisfied/Dissatisfied	20.7%	14.6%	—	—	—	—
Neutral	27.3%	34.1%	32.0%	41.7%	34.8%	35.3%
Satisfied/Very Satisfied	52.0%	51.2%	56.0%	41.7%	52.2%	52.9%

Table IV-3b: Faculty Satisfaction with Department/Unit DEI Progress by Detailed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	**White**	**African Amer/ Black**	**Asian Amer/ Asian**	**Hispanic/ Latino/a**	**Native Amer/ Alaskan Native**	**Middle Eastern/ North African**	**More Than One**	**Other Race/ Ethnicity**
Very Dissatisfied/Dissatisfied	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Neutral	34.8%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Satisfied/Very Satisfied	52.2%	62.5%	—	—	—	—	—	—

Rating DEI Progress

Rating DEI Progress at UM Overall Compared to Before DEI Strategic Plan (2016)

While satisfaction with the progress is one way to measure progress, we also looked at participants' assessment about the direction of and amount of change that is taking place. Participants who indicated that they have been at U-M long enough to evaluate the progress were asked to compare the DEI climate at the start of the DEI strategic plan (in 2016) to the current DEI climate at U-M.

Table IV-4a: Faculty Rating of Overall U-M Campus Climate DEI Compared to Before DEI Strategic Plan (2016) Overall, by Gender, and by Race/Ethnicity

| | | Unit Faculty | | | | | |
| | | | Gender | | Race/Ethnicity | | |
2021 Data Only	**U-M All Faculty Totals**	**Unit Faculty Totals**	**Woman**	**Man**	**White**	**BIPOC**
Much Worse/Somewhat Worse	15.2%	–	–	–	–	–
About the Same	28.1%	45.5%	36.8%	54.5%	50.0%	–
Much Better/Somewhat Better	56.7%	48.5%	52.6%	45.5%	45.0%	58.3%

Table IV-4b: Faculty Rating of Overall U-M Campus Climate DEI Compared to Before DEI Strategic Plan (2016) by Detailed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	**White**	**African Amer/ Black**	**Asian Amer/ Asian**	**Hispanic/ Latino/a**	**Native Amer/ Alaskan Native**	**Middle Eastern/ North African**	**More Than One**	**Other Race/ Ethnicity**
Much Worse/Somewhat Worse	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
About the Same	50.0%	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Much Better/Somewhat Better	45.0%	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

Rating DEI Progress in Department/Unit Compared to Before DEI Strategic Plan (2016)

Participants who indicated that they have been at U-M long enough to evaluate the progress were also asked to compare the DEI climate within their department/unit at the start of the DEI strategic plan (in 2016) to the current DEI climate within their department/unit.

Table IV-5a: Faculty Rating of Own Department/Unit Climate DEI Progress Compared to Before DEI Strategic Plan (2016) Overall, by Gender, and by Race/Ethnicity

| 2021 Data Only | U-M All Faculty Totals | Unit Faculty Totals | Gender | | Race/Ethnicity | |
			Woman	Man	White	BIPOC
Much Worse/Somewhat Worse	13.0%	—	—	—	—	—
About the Same	30.1%	39.4%	—	54.5%	45.0%	—
Much Better/Somewhat Better	56.9%	57.6%	73.7%	45.5%	55.0%	66.7%

Table IV-5b: Faculty Rating of Own Department/Unit Climate DEI Progress Compared to Before DEI Strategic Plan (2016) by Detailed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	White	African Amer/ Black	Asian Amer/ Asian	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Native Amer/ Alaskan Native	Middle Eastern/ North African	More Than One	Other Race/ Ethnicity
Much Worse/Somewhat Worse	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
About the Same	45.0%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Much Better/Somewhat Better	55.0%	83.3%	—	—	—	—	—	—

Comparing DEI Progress

UM DEI Progress Compared to Other Institutions

A point of reference for community members assessment for how U-M is performing with regards to DEI is how they perceive of what is happening at other institutions. We can learn from experiences that our community members have with other institutions.

Participants were asked how well they thought the U-M is doing in relation to DEI compared to other institutions. Response categories were provided on a 5-point scale, ranging from "Among the very worst" to "Among the very best".

Table IV-6a: Faculty Comparing U-M DEI Progress to Other Institutions Overall, by Gender, and by Race/Ethnicity

| 2021 Data Only | U-M All Faculty Totals | Unit Faculty Totals | Unit Faculty | | | |
| | | | Gender | | Race/Ethnicity | |
			Woman	Man	White	BIPOC
Among the Very Worst/Worse Than Most	9.4%	–	–	–	–	–
About Equal	52.9%	40.6%	26.3%	70.0%	47.4%	–
Among the Very Best/Better Than Most	37.6%	46.9%	52.6%	–	47.4%	50.0%

Table IV-6b: Faculty Comparing U-M DEI Progress to Other Institutions by Detailed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	White	African Amer/ Black	Asian Amer/ Asian	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Native Amer/ Alaskan Native	Middle Eastern/ North African	More Than One	Other Race/ Ethnicity
Among the Very Worst/Worse Than Most	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
About Equal	47.4%	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Among the Very Best/Better Than Most	47.4%	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

Department/Unit DEI Progress Compared to Other Departments/Units

Participants were also asked how well they thought their department/unit is doing in relation to DEI compared to other departments/units at U-M. Response categories were provided on a 5-point scale, ranging from "Among the very worst" to "Among the very best".

Table IV-7a: Faculty Comparing Department/Unit DEI Progress to Other Departments/Units Overall, by Gender, and by Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	U-M All Faculty Totals	Unit Faculty Totals	Gender		Race/Ethnicity	
			Woman	**Man**	**White**	**BIPOC**
Among the Very Worst/Worse Than Most	11.9%	—	—	—	—	—
About Equal	42.7%	28.1%	—	—	26.3%	—
Among the Very Best/Better Than Most	45.4%	71.9%	78.9%	70.0%	73.7%	75.0%

Table IV-7b: Faculty Comparing Department/Unit DEI Progress to Other Departments/Units by Detailed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	White	African Amer/ Black	Asian Amer/ Asian	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Native Amer/ Alaskan Native	Middle Eastern/ North African	More Than One	Other Race/ Ethnicity
Among the Very Worst/Worse Than Most	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
About Equal	26.3%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Among the Very Best/Better Than Most	73.7%	83.3%	—	—	—	—	—	—

Part V: Wellbeing & COVID-19

Wellbeing of Faculty

Overall faculty wellbeing can be correlated with being in a supportive and strong DEI climate. Questions were added to the 2021 survey to capture overall physical health, mental health, and sleep health for our faculty. Faculty were asked to reflect on their life satisfaction. The specific questions and question wording is presented before each series of data tables.

Overall Physical Health

Faculty were asked to indicate whether they felt their overall physical health was excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor.

Table V-1a: Faculty Report of Overall Physical Health Overall, by Gender, and by Race/Ethnicity

| 2021 Data Only | U-M All Faculty Totals | Unit Faculty Totals | Unit Faculty | | | |
| | | | Gender | | Race/Ethnicity | |
			Woman	Man	White	BIPOC
Poor	0.8%	–	–	–	–	–
Fair	5.6%	–	–	–	–	–
Good	21.9%	23.1%	20.8%	–	–	29.4%
Excellent/Very Good	71.6%	69.2%	70.8%	72.7%	81.0%	58.8%

Table V-1b: Faculty Report of Overall Physical Health by Detailed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	White	African Amer/ Black	Asian Amer/ Asian	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Native Amer/ Alaskan Native	Middle Eastern/ North African	More Than One	Other Race/ Ethnicity
Poor	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Fair	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Good	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Excellent/Very Good	81.0%	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

Overall Mental Health

Faculty were asked to indicate whether they felt their overall mental health was excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor.

Table V-2a: Faculty Report of Overall Mental Health, by Gender, and by Race/Ethnicity

| | | Unit Faculty | | | | |
| | | | Gender | | Race/Ethnicity | |
2021 Data Only	**U-M All Faculty Totals**	**Unit Faculty Totals**	**Woman**	**Man**	**White**	**BIPOC**
Poor	2.6%	–	–	–	–	–
Fair	14.3%	–	–	–	–	–
Good	26.6%	28.2%	33.3%	–	33.3%	–
Excellent/Very Good	56.5%	64.1%	58.3%	90.9%	57.1%	70.6%

Table V-2b: Faculty Report of Overall Mental Health by Detailed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	**White**	**African Amer/ Black**	**Asian Amer/ Asian**	**Hispanic/ Latino/a**	**Native Amer/ Alaskan Native**	**Middle Eastern/ North African**	**More Than One**	**Other Race/ Ethnicity**
Poor	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Fair	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Good	33.3%	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Excellent/Very Good	57.1%	62.5%	–	–	–	–	–	–

Overall Sleep in the Past Month

Faculty were asked to indicate whether they felt their quality of sleep in the past month was excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor.

Table V-3a: Faculty Report of Sleep Health Overall, by Gender, and by Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	U-M All Faculty Totals	Unit Faculty Totals	Gender		Race/Ethnicity	
			Woman	Man	White	BIPOC
Poor	12.9%	—	—	—	—	—
Fair	25.7%	17.9%	—	—	—	—
Good	29.3%	46.2%	41.7%	63.6%	52.4%	41.2%
Excellent/Very Good	32.2%	28.2%	33.3%	—	28.6%	—

Table V-3b: Faculty Report of Sleep Health by Detailed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	White	African Amer/ Black	Asian Amer/ Asian	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Native Amer/ Alaskan Native	Middle Eastern/ North African	More Than One	Other Race/ Ethnicity
Poor	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fair	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Good	52.4%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Excellent/Very Good	28.6%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Overall Life Satisfaction

Faculty were asked to indicate how much they agree (using a 5-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree) with two statements relating to their life satisfaction.

Table V-4a: Faculty Report of Agreement (those indicating Strongly Agree or Agree) to the Statement Overall, by Gender, and by Race/Ethnicity

| 2021 Data Only | U-M All Faculty Totals | Unit Faculty Totals | Unit Faculty | | | |
| | | | Gender | | Race/Ethnicity | |
			Woman	Man	White	BIPOC
I am satisfied with my life.	76.6%	84.6%	87.5%	81.8%	81.0%	88.2%
What I do in my life is worthwhile.	86.8%	87.2%	87.5%	90.9%	81.0%	94.1%

Table V-4b: Faculty Report of Agreement (those indicating Strongly Agree or Agree) to the Statement by Detailed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	White	African Amer/ Black	Asian Amer/ Asian	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Native Amer/ Alaskan Native	Middle Eastern/ North African	More Than One	Other Race/ Ethnicity
I am satisfied with my life.	81.0%	87.5%	—	—	—	—	100.0%	—
What I do in my life is worthwhile.	81.0%	87.5%	—	—	—	—	100.0%	—

Adverse Effects of COVID Among Faculty

Part of living in 2021 is the shared experience of COVID-19. While the experience is shared, there are significant differences with how the pandemic has and is impacting our community members. We included a series of questions designed to understand how much our faculty have been adversely affected by COVID-19 in a variety of ways. Participants were asked to indicate if each of these areas were affected "Not at all", "Somewhat", or "A great deal".

COVID-19 Impact: My Own Physical Health

Table V-5a: Faculty COVID-19 Adverse Effect (My Own Physical Health) Overall, by Gender, and by Race/Ethnicity

| 2021 Data Only | U-M All Faculty Totals | Unit Faculty Totals | Unit Faculty | | | |
| | | | Gender | | Race/Ethnicity | |
			Woman	Man	White	BIPOC
Not at all affected	51.5%	51.3%	45.8%	54.5%	57.1%	47.1%
Somewhat affected	38.8%	41.0%	41.7%	45.5%	38.1%	41.2%
Affected a great deal	9.7%	—	—	—	—	—

Table V-5b: Faculty COVID-19 Adverse Effect (My Own Physical Health) by Detailed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	White	African Amer/ Black	Asian Amer/ Asian	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Native Amer/ Alaskan Native	Middle Eastern/ North African	More Than One	Other Race/ Ethnicity
Not at all affected	57.1%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Somewhat affected	38.1%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Affected a great deal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

COVID-19 Impact: My Own Mental Health

Table V-6a: Faculty COVID-19 Adverse Effect (My Own Mental Health) Overall, by Gender, and by Race/Ethnicity

		Unit Faculty				
			Gender		Race/Ethnicity	
2021 Data Only	**U-M All Faculty Totals**	**Unit Faculty Totals**	**Woman**	**Man**	**White**	**BIPOC**
Not at all affected	19.5%	18.4%	—	—	23.8%	—
Somewhat affected	56.7%	60.5%	60.9%	72.7%	52.4%	70.6%
Affected a great deal	23.9%	21.1%	26.1%	—	23.8%	—

Table V-6b: Faculty COVID-19 Adverse Effect (My Own Mental Health) by Detailed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	**White**	**African Amer/ Black**	**Asian Amer/ Asian**	**Hispanic/ Latino/a**	**Native Amer/ Alaskan Native**	**Middle Eastern/ North African**	**More Than One**	**Other Race/ Ethnicity**
Not at all affected	23.8%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Somewhat affected	52.4%	75.0%	—	—	—	—	—	—
Affected a great deal	23.8%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

COVID-19 Impact: The Health of a Loved One

Table V-7a: Faculty COVID-19 Adverse Effect (Health of a Loved One) Overall, by Gender, and by Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	U-M All Faculty Totals	Unit Faculty Totals	Unit Faculty			
			Gender		Race/Ethnicity	
			Woman	Man	White	BIPOC
Not at all affected	41.0%	35.9%	33.3%	54.5%	47.6%	—
Somewhat affected	39.3%	38.5%	41.7%	—	33.3%	41.2%
Affected a great deal	19.8%	25.6%	25.0%	—	—	35.3%

Table V-7b: Faculty COVID-19 Adverse Effect (Health of a Loved One) by Detailed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	White	African Amer/ Black	Asian Amer/ Asian	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Native Amer/ Alaskan Native	Middle Eastern/ North African	More Than One	Other Race/ Ethnicity
Not at all affected	47.6%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Somewhat affected	33.3%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Affected a great deal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

COVID-19 Impact: My Ability to Maintain Social Relationships

Table V-8a: Faculty COVID-19 Adverse Effect (Ability to Maintain Social Relationships) Overall, by Gender, and by Race/Ethnicity

| | | | Unit Faculty | | | |
| | | | Gender | | Race/Ethnicity | |
2021 Data Only	**U-M All Faculty Totals**	**Unit Faculty Totals**	**Woman**	**Man**	**White**	**BIPOC**
Not at all affected	12.8%	23.1%	—	—	—	29.4%
Somewhat affected	49.8%	38.5%	33.3%	—	47.6%	29.4%
Affected a great deal	37.4%	38.5%	50.0%	—	33.3%	41.2%

Table V-8b: Faculty COVID-19 Adverse Effect (Ability to Maintain Social Relationships) by Detailed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	**White**	**African Amer/ Black**	**Asian Amer/ Asian**	**Hispanic/ Latino/a**	**Native Amer/ Alaskan Native**	**Middle Eastern/ North African**	**More Than One**	**Other Race/ Ethnicity**
Not at all affected	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Somewhat affected	47.6%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Affected a great deal	33.3%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

COVID-19 Impact: My Financial Situation

Table V-9a: Faculty COVID-19 Adverse Effect (Financial Situation) Overall, by Gender, and by Race/Ethnicity

| | | Unit Faculty | | | | |
| | | | Gender | | Race/Ethnicity | |
2021 Data Only	**U-M All Faculty Totals**	**Unit Faculty Totals**	**Woman**	**Man**	**White**	**BIPOC**
Not at all affected	74.4%	74.4%	79.2%	63.6%	76.2%	70.6%
Somewhat affected	20.9%	20.5%	—	—	23.8%	—
Affected a great deal	4.6%	—	—	—	—	—

Table V-9b: Faculty COVID-19 Adverse Effect (Financial Situation) by Detailed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	**White**	**African Amer/ Black**	**Asian Amer/ Asian**	**Hispanic/ Latino/a**	**Native Amer/ Alaskan Native**	**Middle Eastern/ North African**	**More Than One**	**Other Race/ Ethnicity**
Not at all affected	76.2%	75.0%	—	—	—	—	—	—
Somewhat affected	23.8%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Affected a great deal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

COVID-19 Impact: My Housing Situation

Table V-10a: Faculty COVID-19 Adverse Effect (Housing Situation) Overall, by Gender, and by Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	U-M All Faculty Totals	Unit Faculty				
			Gender		**Race/Ethnicity**	
		Unit Faculty Totals	Woman	Man	White	BIPOC
Not at all affected	89.9%	92.1%	91.3%	100.0%	95.2%	88.2%
Somewhat affected	7.0%	–	–	–	–	–
Affected a great deal	3.1%	–	–	–	–	–

Table V-10b: Faculty COVID-19 Adverse Effect (Housing Situation) by Detailed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	White	African Amer/ Black	Asian Amer/ Asian	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Native Amer/ Alaskan Native	Middle Eastern/ North African	More Than One	Other Race/ Ethnicity
Not at all affected	95.2%	87.5%	–	–	–	–	–	–
Somewhat affected	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Affected a great deal	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

COVID-19 Impact: My Work or Academic Performance

Table V-11a: Faculty COVID-19 Adverse Effect (Work or Academic Performance) Overall, by Gender, and by Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	U-M All Faculty Totals	Unit Faculty Totals	Unit Faculty			
			Gender		Race/Ethnicity	
			Woman	Man	White	BIPOC
Not at all affected	19.4%	25.6%	20.8%	–	23.8%	29.4%
Somewhat affected	52.4%	43.6%	41.7%	54.5%	52.4%	35.3%
Affected a great deal	28.3%	30.8%	37.5%	–	23.8%	35.3%

Table V-11b: Faculty COVID-19 Adverse Effect (Work or Academic Performance) by Detailed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	White	African Amer/ Black	Asian Amer/ Asian	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Native Amer/ Alaskan Native	Middle Eastern/ North African	More Than One	Other Race/ Ethnicity
Not at all affected	23.8%	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Somewhat affected	52.4%	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Affected a great deal	23.8%	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

COVID-19 Impact: My Experience of Discrimination Related to One or More of My Identities

Table V-12a: Faculty COVID-19 Adverse Effect (Discrimination Related to One or More of My Identities) Overall, by Gender, and by Race/Ethnicity

| | | Unit Faculty | | | | | |
| | | | Gender | | Race/Ethnicity | |
2021 Data Only	**U-M All Faculty Totals**	**Unit Faculty Totals**	**Woman**	**Man**	**White**	**BIPOC**
Not at all affected	82.3%	73.7%	69.6%	90.9%	76.2%	70.6%
Somewhat affected	12.0%	15.8%	21.7%	–	–	–
Affected a great deal	5.7%	–	–	–	–	–

Table V-12b: Faculty COVID-19 Adverse Effect (Discrimination Related to One or More of My Identities) by Detailed Race/Ethnicity

2021 Data Only	**White**	**African Amer/ Black**	**Asian Amer/ Asian**	**Hispanic/ Latino/a**	**Native Amer/ Alaskan Native**	**Middle Eastern/ North African**	**More Than One**	**Other Race/ Ethnicity**
Not at all affected	76.2%	62.5%	–	–	–	–	–	–
Somewhat affected	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Affected a great deal	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

DEI Resources & Additional Reporting

The U-M Campus Climate Survey on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) is one component of the campus wide plan to foster and strengthen diversity, equity, and inclusion at the U-M Ann Arbor. The information included in this report may be used to help shape DEI plans within units and subunits. For questions about interpreting study results and analyses of data collected in the 2021 U-M DEI Campus Climate Survey, please contact the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion via email at umdeiplan@umich.edu. For questions about the study methodology, to engage in an independent data collection effort to add context to this report, to generate more custom reporting, or to further explore other survey topics of interest to your specific group, please contact SoundRocket via email at info@soundrocket.com, or by phone at 734-213-4600. You may also reach out to Scott Crawford, who served as the Data Collection Director for this (and the 2017) effort at scott@soundrocket.com or 734-527-2150; or connect with Josh Patterson, Ph.D., Research Director of Higher Education Research at SoundRocket at jpatterson@soundrocket.com or 734-234-5015.

Additional Standard Sub-unit Level Reporting

What is available?
SoundRocket will begin taking orders for Supplemental Unit Reports starting Monday, February 21, 2022. This will give an opportunity for departments or other sub-units to order a unit report of their own, structured after this report. These supplemental reports will look the same as the primary unit reports being generated, only they will be filtered for the specified departments or sub-units. Reports will only be available where a minimum of 10 responses have been received from any requested group (i.e. students, staff, special faculty, or faculty). Due to structural changes within the U-M, some restrictions on 2017 to 2021 comparisons within the report may apply.

What is the cost?
The U-M Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion has negotiated a discounted rate of $400 per report ordered using standard defined U-M department names before June 1, 2022. SoundRocket may also be available for units to assist with other custom reporting or related needs (additional fees may apply).

How do I order?
To order a Supplemental Unit Report **after Monday, February 21,** please go to https://srsrv.com/UM-DEI-REPORTS/