Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Review of the minutes from January 9, 2020
3. Announcements
4. Final Reading: Distance learning Class B legislation – Lynn Dietrich
5. Final Reading: Zoom pro license Class C resolution
6. Update on SERU survey questions – Judith Howard and Katie Malcom
7. Good of the order
8. Adjourn

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 10:32 a.m.

2. Review of the minutes from January 9, 2020

The minutes from January 9, 2020, were approved as written.

3. Announcements

There were no announcements.

4. Final Reading: Distance learning Class B legislation – Lynn Dietrich

Lynn Dietrich gave an overview of the Class B legislation (Exhibits 1 and 2).

Penelope Moon, Assistant Director of Digital Learning, provided feedback on the Class B legislation and stressed the importance valuing all students equally.

The council gave suggestions for the language in the background and rationale.

Both pieces of Class B legislation were approved.

5. Final Reading: Zoom pro license Class C resolution

Chair Halverson introduced the updated Class C resolution (Exhibit 3).
There were concerns that even a Zoom Pro license might not be sufficient for accommodating all students and faculty for certain classes. The Class C is the first step towards a better system, but the technology needs to improve more before everyone can be accommodated.

Amendments were made for clarity.

The Class C resolution was approved as amended.

6. Update on SERU survey questions – Judith Howard and Katie Malcom

Judith Howard, the UWRA representative on the council, and Katie Malcolm from the Center for Teaching and Learning gave an update on the SERU survey (Exhibit 4).

There were positive responses from students that showed that classes regarding diversity are having an impact.

7. Good of the order

Fred Bookstein, a faculty member on the council, gave an update on Class A legislation regarding lecturer titles that passed the January 23, 2020 Faculty Senate meeting. The legislation brings the teaching, tenure, and research tracks more into balance.

8. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 p.m.

Minutes by Jordan Smith, jjsmith4@uw.edu, assistant to the chair

Present: Faculty Code Section 21-61 A: Thomas Halverson (chair), Timea Tihanyi, Fred Bookstein, Kristin Gustafson, Lynn Dietrich, Kathleen Peterson
Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: Judith Howard, Deepa Banerjee, Alece Stancin
President’s designee: LeAnne Jones Wiles
Guests: Katie Malcolm, Sean Gehrke, Penelope Moon

Absent: Faculty Code Section 21-61 A: Kimberlee Gillis-Bridges, Sri Devi Duvvuri
Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: Brady Rainey

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – Class B 101
Exhibit 2 – Class B 115
Exhibit 3 – Class C on Zoom Pro
Exhibit 4 – SERU Survey
Class B Legislation
Student Governance and Policies
Scholastic Regulations
Chapter 101, Section 1 (Preliminary Statements and Definitions, Program-Specific Students)

Background and Rationale

The Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning, with the support of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards and the Office of the University Registrar, recommends amending Scholastic Regulations Chapter 101 (Admissions) based on the following findings:

- Lack of access to state-funded courses at the UW forces students admitted to fee-based programs to seek general education and elective course options at other institutions, inside and outside Washington State. This runs counter to our university’s commitment to providing students with a “uniquely Washington” experience as members of our academic community.

- While there are over 900 online courses currently offered at UW, undergraduate online students completing their degrees in fee-based programs have access to only a small number of online courses they need to complete their degree.

- The university is losing considerable tuition revenue (SCH) by denying students access to these UW courses. In addition, there is a financial impact on the students who may have to pay higher fees as non-matriculated students at other institutions. If the student is receiving financial aid, they must submit a Consortium Agreement to the Office of Student Financial Aid (OSFA) to be approved, which places a burden on the office’s limited resources. This process can be complicated if the transfer institution is on a different academic calendar. If the transfer course is not completed, it can cause a delay in the subsequent quarter’s financial aid being released.

- The university’s strategic plan to improve the Husky Experience prioritizes supporting students as they navigate their way through the university experience. Forcing fee-based students to complete coursework at other institutions runs counter to this goal, and can delay students’ graduation because of the complicated process of getting transfer courses approved in time to post their degrees.

- Home units can maintain control of their enrollment requirements and procedures for their courses, so the impact of expanded access should be di minimis. For example, a home unit could limit the total number of fee-based students that could enroll in a course, or limit the period in which fee-based students could enroll.
Admission

1. Preliminary Statements and Definitions

   1.E.2 Program-Specific Student

A program-specific undergraduate student is one who has been competitively admitted to a specific degree program and must choose from a limited number of courses specifically identified in his or her program. Admission is restricted to this program and does not qualify the student for admission to other degree programs of the University of Washington. To be admitted to other degree programs, the students must separately apply. The student shall be informed by the program of any additional restrictions related to his or her enrollment.
Class B Legislation
Student Governance and Policies
Scholastic Regulations
Chapter 115, Section 1 (Course-Numbering System) and Chapter 114, Section 1 (Depth Requirements) and Section 2 (Requirements for the Bachelor’s Degree)

Background and Rationale

The Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning, with the support of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards and the Office of the University Registrar, recommends amending several regulations related to distance learning: Scholastic Regulations Chapter 115 (Courses), Chapter 114 (Degrees, Graduation, and Commencement) and Chapter 107 (Academic Probation and Dismissal for Low Scholarship) based on the following findings:

Chapter 115:
- DL courses are required to undergo an extensive review in the third year by the University Curriculum Committee, a process that is not required for courses taught on campus and puts an undue administrative burden on units offering online courses. This statute was developed in 2001 at a time when the university was just beginning to explore distance learning. We now offer over 900 online courses and the additional effort does not reflect what we now know about the risks and challenges of this mode of instruction, nor does it align with the levels of review and evaluation we require of courses taught on campus. We have two undergraduate degree completion programs and a number of successful master’s degree programs with rigorous curricula and faculty and staff that now have years of online pedagogical expertise, rendering this additional scrutiny unnecessary.
- Additional course review at the university level is expensive, labor-intensive, discriminatory, and unnecessary. Home units may develop their own systems and processes of monitoring online courses based on evidence-based practices, as they do for courses taught on campus, DL courses offered by the University of Washington should be recognized as residence credits. Currently, undergraduate UW students who complete more than 15 credits of UW DL courses during their final 60 credits must complete a graduation petition and request a waiver of the senior residency requirement, which may delay graduation. Recognizing these UW credits as residence credit will significantly diminish the Colleges’ and Registrars’ administrative burden of adjudicating these waiver requests and smooth the path toward degree.

Chapter 114:
- If DL courses are recognized as residence credits, it will no longer be necessary for a distance-learning degree programs to petition for a waiver of the 45-credit resident requirement.

Chapter 107:
- If DL courses are recognized as residence credits, it will no longer be necessary to call them out specifically to calculate the cumulative grade-point average.
Chapter 115
Courses

1. Course-Numbering System

   I. DL Courses

   8) In addition to the initial review, DL courses must be reviewed in the third year by the appropriate curriculum review committees of the school or college. It is the responsibility of the home school or college to determine the necessity of and procedure for additional review of DL courses after the courses have been approved at the university level.

   10) DL courses offered by the student’s home campus are considered residence credits at that campus.


Chapter 114
Degrees, Graduation, and Commencement

1. Depth Requirements

   B. Residence Requirement

   To be recommended for a first or subsequent Bachelor’s degree, a student must complete 45 of his or her final 60 credits as a matriculated student in residence at the University of Washington campus where the degree is to be earned. Exceptions to this rule are as follows:

   1) Of the 45 resident credits required for a UW undergraduate degree, no more than 10 credits may be waived by the dean of the college or school awarding the degree and only on a case-by-case basis.
2) A unit desiring to develop a provisional undergraduate distance-learning degree may petition the college or school and the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, appropriate campus undergraduate program governance body, for a waiver of the 45-credit resident requirement and/or the 90-credit course limit. Such petitions should identify the reasons why the offering needs to waive the requirement, based on audience, access, or unit academic mission, describe the relationship of the new program to existing degrees, justify the methods of content delivery, and describe the goals and oversight needed to meet institutional standards. If the petition is approved, the degree may be implemented with a repetition of the above mentioned review required in the sixth year for continuance.


Chapter 107
Academic Probation and Dismissal for Low Scholarship

1. Cumulative Grade-Point Average

Cumulative grade-point average includes only credits granted for courses taken in residence at the University of Washington and DL courses. This specifically excludes transfer and extension credits, and credits earned by examination.

S-B 95, December 10, 1964; S-B 173, April 6, 2007: both with Presidential approval.
Class C Resolution: Support for purchasing and maintaining a real-time, online interaction license suitable for all UW faculty and students

WHEREAS the University of Washington has experienced repeated weather-related emergencies leading to closures in recent years and commuting challenges; and
WHEREAS the University of Washington currently has no plan in place that provides access for all faculty and students to communicate via video/audio conferencing during emergencies (weather-related, pandemics, earthquakes, or similar); and
WHEREAS the University of Washington provides only a real-time, online interaction service (Zoom Basic) for video/audio conferencing that does not meet the faculty and student needs for emergencies or other university functions (the current contract restricts meetings to 40 minutes), but allows faculty to purchase an upgraded license to a service (Zoom Pro) which is adequate (it will record for up to 24 hours); and
WHEREAS the University of Washington could provide required accommodation for student learning needs, particularly for students with disabilities who may experience significant challenges getting to campus and students with religious needs, via better access to course activities and better interaction with instructors related to course work; and
WHEREAS Erik Hofer, AVP for Academic Services & Deputy CIO, reported that the University’s Zoom usage is approaching a level of individual users (most often using personal or departmental funds) that would justify obtaining an enterprise license for all faculty and students; and
WHEREAS the Faculty Council on Teaching & Learning, the Faculty Council on Student Affairs, the Associated Students of the University of Washington, and the Office of Disability Resource Services (DRS) all agree in their support the University of Washington’s purchasing and maintaining a real-time, online interaction license suitable for all UW faculty and students; therefore
BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the University of Washington supports UW Information Technology purchasing and maintaining a real-time, online interaction license for all UW faculty and students.
Assessing Student Learning Experiences in Undergraduate Diversity Requirement Courses Using SERU 2019 Survey Data

Jillian Morn, Research Scientist
December 2019

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes the results of 4 new questions on student learning experiences in Diversity requirement courses from the Student Experience in the Research University (SERU) 2019 survey of undergraduates at the University of Washington. 15.6% of undergraduates gave a partial or complete survey response. 2,719 to 2,738 students responded to the 4 questions identified. Overall, undergraduate students reported that their understanding of issues of diversity and inequality improved from when they started on this campus compared to now. 57% of respondents said their proficiency understanding issues of diversity and inequality was good to excellent when they started at UW, compared to 88% now. Among respondents who indicated they had taken courses that met the UW Diversity requirement, 84% somewhat to strongly agreed that the courses helped foster a climate where all students could learn and participate and 81% somewhat to strongly agreed that the courses had a positive effect on the quality of their education at UW.

Responses varied by student level, entrance type, gender, and race/ethnicity of respondents. Seniors reported the highest average difference in their proficiency levels from when they started compared to now for understanding issues of diversity and inequality. Seniors were also less likely than other levels of students to agree with the statements that courses that met the UW Diversity requirement fostered inclusive climates or had a positive effect on their education quality. 25% of transfer student respondents indicated they had not yet taken courses that meet the UW Diversity requirement, compared to 12% of first-time first year students. Women respondents reported higher levels of proficiency understanding issues of diversity and inequality when they started at UW and now relative to men. A higher percentage of women respondents reported having taken courses that met the UW Diversity requirement, and overall women were more likely than men respondents to agree with the statements that courses that met the UW Diversity requirement had a positive impact on climate and their education quality. Hispanic and white students reported the highest average increase in proficiency understanding issues of diversity and inequality from when they started at UW. International students were more likely than students of other races or ethnicities to agree with the statements that courses that met the UW Diversity requirement had a positive impact on climate and their education quality.

INTRODUCTION

This report provides results of the SERU 2019 survey of University of Washington. Specifically, this report summarizes the results of 4 SERU questions written by the Faculty Council on Teaching & Learning subcommittee on Equity and Diversity Pedagogy and the Office of Educational Assessment to address student learning experiences of undergraduate students in diversity requirement courses.

Prior to survey launch, OEA and the FCTL subcommittee wrote 4 new custom questions for the Wildcard Module of the SERU survey instrument. One set of questions asked respondents to rate their level of
proficiency in understanding issues of sociocultural, political and/or economic diversity and inequality when they started at this campus and to rate their level of proficiency now. Respondents were asked to evaluate their level of proficiency on a 6-point Likert scale from “Very Poor” to “Excellent.” The questions as they appear in the survey instrument can be seen below in Figure 1.

Figure 1. SERU 2019 Understanding Issues Questions in Survey Instrument

Two additional custom questions were written and added to the Wildcard Module to collect data on the perception of the impact of courses that meet the UW Diversity requirement. Respondents were asked to select their level of agreement with the statement on a 6-point Likert scale. A seventh response option of “No courses taken” was provided as well. The questions as they appear in the survey instrument can be seen below in Figure 2.
METHOD

Population

The original population selected for the survey sample included all undergraduate students enrolled at the Seattle campus on the tenth day of winter quarter 2019. Students under the age of 18 at the start of the survey, visiting and exchange students, university employees enrolled using a faculty or staff exemption, and those with no email address on file were excluded from the population. The final population included N=29,688 students.

Students were recruited to participate through targeted emails, physical ads displayed on campus, and digital ads in online spaces like MyUW.

Response Rate

The survey went out on April 1, 2019. The survey closed on May 10, 2019 with 5,349 interactions. Of the 5,349 interactions, 679 individuals reached the consent page and did not consent or decline to participate, 14 respondents formally declined to participate, 1,864 respondents consented and provided a partial survey response, and 2,792 respondents consented and provided a complete survey response.
Of the 4,656 partial and complete responses, 4 were graduate students and 8 were students who were under the age of 18 who must be excluded from analysis. Thus, the qualified total response rate for SERU 2019 was 4,644/29,688, or 15.6%. The table below shows the response counts and rates for each of the diversity requirement questions.

Table 1. SERU 2019 Responses Rates for Diversity Requirement Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Count of Responses</th>
<th>Question Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding issues when started</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding issues now</td>
<td>2,731</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity requirement courses fostered climate</td>
<td>2,719</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity requirement positive effect on quality of education</td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 4 new questions appear in the very last section of the survey in the Wildcard Module. Question location in the survey may explain the low and declining response rates among respondents.

RESULTS

“Understanding issues of sociocultural, political and/or economic diversity and inequality”

On a 6-point Likert scale, with 1 being “Very Poor” and 6 being “Excellent”, respondents gave an average rating of 3.66 when they started compared to an average rating of 4.55 now for their proficiency in understanding issues of sociocultural, political and/or economic diversity and inequality. 57% of respondents rated their proficiency level at good to excellent when they started at UW. 88% of respondents rated their proficiency level at good to excellent now.

2,729 respondents provided a rating for both questions. A paired t-test shows that the average difference in the rating for understanding issues of diversity and inequality when they started and now was significantly different at p<0.001, with a mean difference of 0.89.

60% of those who provided a rating for both when they started and now indicated their proficiency understanding issues of diversity and inequality increased overtime (N=1,624). 39% indicated there was no change in their proficiency (N=1,073). And 1% indicated their proficiency understanding issues of diversity and inequality decreased over time (N=32).
Figure 3.

Mean ratings of proficiency understanding issues of diversity and inequality when they started and now varied by student level, entrance type, gender, and race/ethnicity.

Table 3. SERU 2019 Understanding issues of sociocultural, political and/or economic diversity and inequality, Mean ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Class</th>
<th>Mean Rating When you started</th>
<th>Mean Rating Now</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Total who answered both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-year</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.57 ***</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.60 ***</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.72 ***</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.26 ***</td>
<td>1079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Entry Type</th>
<th>Mean Rating When you started</th>
<th>Mean Rating Now</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Total who answered both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTFY</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.92 ***</td>
<td>2,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.75 ***</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Gender</th>
<th>Mean Rating When you started</th>
<th>Mean Rating Now</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Total who answered both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.80 ***</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.95 ***</td>
<td>1,737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Ethnicity</th>
<th>Mean Rating When you started</th>
<th>Mean Rating Now</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Total who answered both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.71 ***</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>0.94 ***</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>0.95 ***</td>
<td>1,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0.98 ***</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.88 ***</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>0.94 ***</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.71 ***</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>2,738</th>
<th>2,731</th>
<th>2,729</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.89 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 3 alphas for statistical significance of paired t-tests are denoted in this table: * p<0.05, **p<0.01 *** p<0.001.
The difference of mean ratings between when they started compared to now was significantly different for all groups at $p<0.001$ except other/unknown race respondents with no significant difference in self-evaluation of proficiency understanding issues of diversity and inequality over time.

Seniors had the highest mean rating of their proficiency understanding issues of diversity and inequality now (4.70), and the highest mean difference from when they started (1.26). Interestingly, seniors also gave the lowest mean rating of proficiency understanding issues of diversity and inequality when they started (3.44).

Transfer students rate their proficiency understanding issues of diversity and inequality when they started at UW and now higher than students who entered as first-time first years. First-time first year students reported a higher average difference in proficiency now compared to when they first started. This is likely because respondents are asked to evaluate their skills when they started the UW, therefore first-time first year students are looking back to their ability as freshmen, while transfer students may be looking back to their ability as a sophomore or junior class standing compared to now.

Women reported a higher mean rating of their proficiency understanding issues of diversity and inequality when they started (3.68), and now (4.63), as well as a higher average difference in proficiency over time (0.95) relative to men.

Hispanic students reported the largest difference in proficiency understanding issues of diversity and inequality when they started compared to now (0.98 mean difference), followed by White students (0.95) and Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students and American Indian/Alaska Native students tied at 0.94. Race unknown students and African American students reported the highest proficiency understanding issues of diversity and inequality when they started, and the lowest mean difference in their proficiency over time.

**Figure 4.**
“Courses that met the UW Diversity requirement fostered a climate where all students could learn and participate”

On a 6-point Likert scale, with 1 being “Strongly Disagree” and 6 being “Strongly Agree”, respondents gave an average rating of 4.42 of their agreement that courses that met the UW Diversity requirement fostered a climate where all students could learn and participate. Among the 2,341 respondents who indicated they had taken a course that met the UW Diversity requirement, 84% somewhat to strongly agreed that the courses fostered a climate where all students could learn and participate.

Levels of agreement varied by student level, entrance type, gender, and race/ethnicity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5. SERU 2019 Diversity requirement course climate, Mean ratings</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>No Courses Taken</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Entry Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTFY</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sophomores had the highest mean rating of agreement (4.54), while seniors had the lowest mean rating or agreement (4.37). 17% of first-years, sophomores, and juniors indicated they had not yet taken courses that met the UW Diversity requirement. Among those who had taken the courses, 88% of first-years, 88% of sophomores, 83% of juniors, and 83% of seniors somewhat to strongly agree that they fostered a climate where all students could learn and participate.
Mean rating of agreement did not vary by entrance type; transfer students had a mean rating of agreement of 4.43 while students who entered as first-time first years had a mean rating of agreement of 4.42. However, a greater percentage of transfer students had not yet taken courses that meet the UW Diversity requirement. Among those who had taken the courses, 85% of first-time first year and 83% of transfer students somewhat to strongly agree that they fostered a climate where all students could learn and participate.

Agreement varied significantly by gender. Women had a higher mean rating of agreement with 4.50 compared to 4.26 for men. A higher percentage of men indicated that have not yet taken courses that meet the UW Diversity requirement relative to women. Among those who had taken the courses, 80% of men and 87% of women somewhat to strongly agree that they fostered a climate where all students could learn and participate.
Students with other/unknown race had the lowest mean rating of agreement with 3.94. American Indian/Alaska Native students had the highest mean rating of 4.65. Among those who had taken the courses, 87% of American Indian/Alaska Native, 87% of International, 86% of Hispanic, 86% of Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, 85% of White, 83% of Asian, 82% of African American, and 69% of Other/Unknown students somewhat to strongly agree they fostered a climate where all students could learn and participate.
“The UW Diversity requirement has had a positive effect on the quality of my education at UW”

On a 6-point Likert scale, with 1 being “Strongly Disagree” and 6 being “Strongly Agree”, respondents gave an average rating of 4.35 on their agreement that the UW Diversity requirement has had a positive effect on the quality of their education at UW. Among the 2,337 respondents who indicated they had taken a course that met the UW Diversity requirement, 81% somewhat to strongly agreed that the requirement had a positive effect on the quality of their education.

Levels of agreement varied by student level, entrance type, gender, and race/ethnicity.

Sophomores had the highest mean rating of agreement (4.51), while juniors had the lowest mean rating or agreement (4.28). 18% of first-years and sophomores, 16% of juniors, and 10% of seniors indicated they had not yet taken courses that met the UW Diversity requirement. Among those who had taken courses that met the UW Diversity requirement, 84% of first-years, 86% of sophomores, 80% of juniors, and 78% of seniors somewhat to strongly agree that they had a positive effect on the quality of their education at UW.
Mean rating of agreement varied slightly by entrance type; transfer students had a mean rating of agreement of 4.30 while students who entered as first-time first years had a mean rating of agreement of 4.35. As mentioned above, a greater percentage of transfer students had not yet taken courses that met the UW Diversity requirement. Among those who had taken the courses, 81% of first-time first year and 78% of transfer students somewhat to strongly agree that they had a positive effect on the quality of their education at UW.

Agreement varied significantly by gender. Women had a higher mean rating of agreement of 4.53 compared to 4.01 for men. A higher percentage of men indicated that have not yet taken courses that meet the UW Diversity requirement relative to women. Among those who had taken the courses, 72% of men and 85% of women somewhat to strongly agree that they had a positive effect on the quality of their education at UW.
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Students with other/unknown race had the lowest mean rating of agreement of 3.94. American Indian/Alaska Native students had the highest mean rating of 4.66. Among those who had taken the courses, 87% of International, 86% of Hispanic, 85% of African American, 84% of American Indian/Alaska Native, 82% of Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, 80% of Asian, 77% of White, and 76% of Other/Unknown students somewhat to strongly agree that they had a positive effect on the quality of their education at UW.
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