



STUDENT PERSPECTIVES ON THE DIVERSITY CREDIT AND ITS FUTURE

November 2021

STUDENT PERSPECTIVES ON THE DIVERSITY CREDIT AND ITS FUTURE

November 2021

This report is made possible by the dedication and collaboration of students at the University of Washington community. Its creation is a student-led effort.

This survey of student opinions on the Diversity Credit, along with the final recommendations and demands, is spearheaded by the Diversity Credit Student Volunteer Team, which primarily hailed from the UW Seattle campus. From winter quarter of 2021, the team has worked in conjunction with the UW Black Student Union and the ASUW Student Senate Committee on Resolution Follow-Up throughout the survey and development of policy recommendations.

The analytic report and key findings on student perspectives are developed by the Polling and Open Data Initiative at the University of Washington (PODUW), a nonpartisan student organization that analyzes data in the public interest.

A more detailed introduction to the Student Volunteer Team, ASUW, and Black Student Union's work on this issue is on pages 4-5



View the digital report at
poddata.org/diversitycredit-asuw

Diversity Credit Student Volunteer Team

Angelique Rodriguez, ASUW Latinx Student Commission Intern

Blake Delisa, ASUW Student Senator

Clara Coyote, ASUW Director of University Affairs 2020-2021

Fabian Villarreal, ASUW Student Senator

Federica Alesaini, ASUW Volunteer

Juan Torres, ASUW Queer Student Commission Director

Kiana Reynolds, UW Black Student Union Vice President of Community Affairs

Lauryn Daniels, ASUW Volunteer

Lillian Williamson, ASUW University Affairs Intern; Queer Student Commission Social Media Intern

Rachel Smithers, ASUW Director of Diversity Efforts 2020-2021

Victoria Ahmad, ASUW Diversity Efforts Intern

ASUW Contributors

Thelonious Goerz, ASUW Volunteer

Vaela'a Lefeiloa'i, ASUW Diversity Efforts Volunteer

Shewit Alemayehu, ASUW Director of Diversity Efforts 2021-2022

Lukas Illa, ASUW Director of University Affairs 2021-2022

Analytic Report Team

(Polling and Open Data Initiative at the University of Washington)

Anson Huang, Director of Outreach (ASUW Senate Committee Chair, Resolution Follow-Up)

Hayoung Jung, Technology Director

Phillip Meng, Executive Director

Faisal Fattani, Senior Data Analyst

Todd Meng, Data Analyst

Melissa Lin, Data Analyst

Abigail Chutnik, Data Analyst

Rachel Kinkley, Director of Visualizations

Corbin Ferrie, Visualizations Specialist

Audrey Qiu, Visualizations Specialist

IN THIS REPORT

BACKGROUND & RECOMMENDATIONS

Executive Summary 2

Background 3

Diversity Credit Creation
Diversity Credit as Defined by Scholastic Regulations
UW Black Student Union Demands 2020
Diversity Credit Student Volunteer Team

Demands & Recommendations 7

ANALYSIS OF STUDENT OPINIONS

Introduction 10

Methodology
Demographics
Limitations

Satisfaction with Current Policies 15

Overall Satisfaction
Satisfaction by Year, Area of Study, and Identity
Satisfaction by Credits Taken

Student Views on the Diversity Credit's Purpose 20

What Students Want Changed 22

Expansion of the Diversity Credit
Supported Policy Changes
Curriculum and Course Gaps

Appendix 31

Appendix A: Demographic Breakdown
Appendix B: Detailed Survey Responses
Appendix C: Latent Dirichlet Allocation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Final Demands & Recommendations

1. Increase the diversity credit requirement from three to more than five credits.
2. Update the definition of “diversity” in the Scholastic Regulations.
3. Provide adequate field-specific diversity courses across disciplines.

Key Analytical Findings

Student Satisfaction with the Current Diversity Credit Requirement

- On a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5 where 1 means “very dissatisfied” and 5 means “very satisfied”, the mean satisfaction was 2.56, meaning that respondents feel somewhere between dissatisfied and neutral with the diversity credit requirement.
- 80.49% of respondents found the diversity credit valuable.

Perceptions of the Diversity Credit's Purpose

- Respondents believe the purpose of the diversity credit should be to teach students to be anti-racist and to recognize and fight against systems of oppression.
- Other respondents believe that diversity classes should expand one’s insight and perspective of the world through the exploration of different cultures and world views.

What Students Want to See Changed

- A majority of respondents (66%) support changing the definition of “diversity” and “diverse course content” to (re)shape the curriculums of courses that fit under this requirement.
- A majority of respondents (65%) support increasing the required credits to graduate from 3 to more than 5.
- A majority of respondents (83%) support requiring all colleges, schools, or majors to offer field-specific diversity credits.

BACKGROUND

This section introduces the Diversity Credit and the ASUW, Black Student Union, and Diversity Credit Volunteer Team's work on the issue.

The ASUW acknowledges the stewards of Coast Salish lands, the lands on which we currently sit and the UW occupies. We acknowledge the original and current caretakers; Duwamish, Suquamish, Tulalip, and Muckleshoot nations and peoples.

Diversity Credit Creation

As early as 2007, expert in equity in education Professor Frances Contreras reported to the Office of Minority Affairs and Diversity on the positive potential of a Diversity Credit. Several years later, in 2012, the ASUW legislated the call for a Diversity Credit Requirement. By 2013, a coalition lead by BIPOC RSOs such as the Black Student Union, Movimiento Estudiantil Chicax de Aztlán, First Nations, Filipino American Student Association, and the Polynesian Student Alliance lead a broader coalition including the UW Students for Diversity Coalition, ASUW Seattle, and the Graduate and Professional Student Senate in a call for the creation of an undergraduate Diversity Credit Requirement. In May of that year, the Faculty Senate passed binding Class B legislation amending scholastic regulations to require a 3 credit Diversity Credit Requirement. The Implementation of the requirement went into effect in the Fall of 2014. It is important to note that in 2012, before the requirement was created, two-thirds of graduating seniors already met the requirement, meaning the creation of the requirement was somewhat symbolic.

Diversity Credit as Defined by Scholastic Regulations

The Diversity Credit Requirement is a graduation requirement defined by Scholastic Regulations that can only be changed by legislation in Faculty Senate. According to the regulations, "It requires 3 credits of coursework that can simultaneously satisfy other Area of Knowledge requirements, thus not adding to general education requirements. It employs a broad definition of diversity." The requirement applies to UW Seattle, Bothell, and Tacoma undergraduates. For transfer students, community college credits can fulfill the requirement though not all transfer students meet such criteria.

The content of diversity credit courses has to meet the definition of diversity laid out in scholastic regulations, thus these definitions play a crucial role in the range of content offered. Officially stated, the purpose of the diversity credit requirement is, "meant to help the student develop an understanding of the complexities of living in increasingly diverse and interconnected societies." This purpose, similar to the following criteria for course subject-matter, is intentionally broad.

Student critics have questioned how this broadness and focus on multiculturalism could fail to make students prepared to tackle harmful ideologies and biases in their particular fields and in everyday life. The definition goes on to elaborate that, “Courses focus on cross-cultural analysis and communication; and historical and contemporary inequities such as those associated with race, ethnicity, class, sex and gender, sexual orientation, nationality, ability, religion, creed, age, or socioeconomic status. Course activities should encourage thinking critically on topics such as power, inequality, marginality, and social movements, and effective communication across cultural differences.” This definition is broad and does not require any specific portions of diversity to be addressed. Faculty noted they were uncertain of their definition of diversity. “Previous proposals encountered resistance to a diversity requirement for a variety of reasons, including debate on the definition of diversity”. Student activists have particularly noted that this definition leaves out important requirements for confronting personal bias, practicing anti-racism, aiming to dismantle systems of oppression, or applying the unique histories of oppression in the U.S to modern life. Those who decide how this definition is applied are the faculty of each school, college, and campus who will recommend and approve courses to meet the requirement. Because schools and colleges apply the diversity definition differently, and because the definition is broad, Diversity Credit content can vastly vary.

The timeline of the initial implementation of the Diversity Credit Requirement plays a key role in the current experience of diversity credit courses. Between May of 2013 and Fall of 2014, colleges and schools of UW rushed to approve existing courses to meet the definition of Diversity Credit in time for Fall Quarter. Many existing Diversity Credit courses of today are those quickly approved in 2014. Since 2014, many new courses have been developed and approved as diversity credit courses. Nevertheless, students critique that many courses that seem to cover applicable diversity content fail to be designated as diversity credit courses.

UW Black Student Union Demands 2020

In Summer 2020, with the murder of Black lives at the hands of police, including Breona Taylor, Elijah McClain, George Floyd and countless others, the Black community mourned. While it is not a new issue that institutions fail to protect the lives of Black and Brown people and uphold white supremacy, the issues of systemic racism were brought to national attention. With this momentum, the Black Student Union at the Seattle campus decided to bring this conversation down to the campus level by composing a list of seven demands to address the systemic issues that exist at the University. If this community-led change is implemented, it will create an environment that is more welcoming for Black students on campus. The seven demands are listed as following:

1. Break all ties with SPD
2. Disarm and divest from UWPD

3. Allocate funds to Black RSOs and the American Ethnic Studies department
4. Hire more Black Faculty
5. **Increase the Diversity credit requirement** and make African Studies a major
6. Remove statues of racist figures
7. Fund and expand mental health resources for all UW students

Focusing on the demand to increase the Diversity credit requirement, the Black student Union argued in their petition that “one [3] credit class will not provide students with enough historical background to enter the world an anti-racist. Students must be exposed to the atrocities that have been committed upon Black and brown folks, and how these communities are impacted to this day.” To formally express this demand, the VP of Community of Affairs, Kiana Reynolds, wrote a letter to the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, explaining the demand in more detail. Within this letter Kiana expresses her concern “about the lack of rigor for the Diversity requirement relative to the other required Areas of Knowledge.” She stresses that 3 credits “is not enough to unlearn elitist or racist practice, or to even have an understanding of the full impact of systemic racism globally,” and urges the Faculty Senate to pass legislation in order to meet this demand of increasing and improving the diversity requirement.

Petition: <http://www.change.org/UWDemandsOfBlackStudents>

BSU Email: bsu@uw.edu

BSU Instagram: @uwseattlebsu

Link to Reynolds' Letter:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1PleNzBA9oJj_wr1sShqAeASoJ6Xn9RU0_shmHmuDhb8/edit?usp=sharing

Diversity Credit Student Volunteer Team

The Diversity Credit Student Volunteer Team is an undergraduate team led by students, who are primarily from the UW Seattle campus. Since winter quarter of 2021, the team has frequently worked with the UW Black Student Union and ASUW Student Senate Committee on Resolution Follow Up to guide its efforts.

The Diversity Credit Student Volunteer Team’s work has included outreach, presentations, and dialogue with over 200 student organizations. The team curated an online form to gather student feedback for research and organized two public virtual student forums. They have also remained in contact with several university officials and faculty throughout the 2020-2021 academic year in order to ensure it remained prioritized on an institutional level.

The team’s primary mission was to open dialogue to better understand students’ experiences and perceptions of the current diversity credit requirement. The team is committed to continuing

to build power in collaboration with student leaders in the past, present, and future. They will push the UW to meet the standards desired by students via faculty legislation and scholastic regulation amendments.

The state of the diversity credit requirement in 2020 was reflected in the letter by BSU board member, Kiana Reynolds. These lived experiences and intersectional lenses reveal histories and practices that greatly impact students inside and outside of the classroom. This is specifically a concern that Black students on campus have highlighted and demanded resolution for, across countless hours and years of unpaid labor. The Diversity Credit Student Volunteer Team and contributors extend gratitude, support, and labor to the people and communities most directly impacted by these efforts, who continue to lead efforts to achieve equity and community liberation.

DEMANDS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the feedback we received from UW Students, the *Diversity Credit Student Volunteer Team* is committed to supporting three main demands. These demands are intended to provide a framework for change that aligns with students' needs and lived experiences. We believe that these demands should help ground the faculty taskforce established to provide recommendations for diversity credit change and implementation. We plan to support and maintain student representation at decision-making tables. Most importantly, we believe in building on the legacy of students who came before us and paving the way for student leaders of the future. The UW Black Student Union and the voices of Black students should continue to be centered throughout this movement and policy change. Overall, we want to see accountability to ensure the undergraduate diversity credit requirement is intentionally advancing University-wide goals around equitable education outcomes and institutionalized anti-racism practices.

Final Demands & Recommendations

1. Increase the diversity credit requirement from three to more than five credits.
2. Update the definition of "diversity" in the Scholastic Regulations.
3. Provide adequate field-specific diversity courses across disciplines.

DEMAND #1

We demand that the University of Washington increases the diversity credit requirement from three to more than five credits.

We recommend that all undergraduate students be required to take 10-15 diversity-qualifying credits to graduate from the University of Washington. This should apply to all first-year students no later than the 2025-2026 academic year. Requirements should be fulfilled or partially waived for transfer students on a case-by-case basis through discussion with an academic adviser. We suggest that the diversity credit requirement remain separate from areas of knowledge requirements. For example, students should still be able to simultaneously fulfill a diversity requirement and an area of knowledge requirement with one course, if applicable.

DEMAND #2

We demand that the University of Washington update the definition of "diversity" in the Scholastic Regulations.

We believe this will help shape current and future curriculum that actively connects theoretical discourse with lived experiences of historically excluded and minoritized groups. We highly urge consideration of an action-based component included in a diversity definition. This has the potential to encourage a greater understanding and intentional practice of applying key concepts in experiential and community-based opportunities. Diversity is not just including diverse topics.

DEMAND #3

We demand that the University of Washington provide adequate field-specific diversity courses across disciplines.

We recommend that the UW prioritize increasing diversity credit course options in STEAM (science, technology, engineering, arts, and mathematics) areas of study and other fields where minoritized communities are underrepresented. Course instructors that incorporate diversity-qualifying topics in their research or teaching should be supported and prioritized in employment processes, such as hiring and tenure.

Recommendations for Further Research

In order to successfully implement institutional change that incorporates tri-campus student desires, considers the interests of other stakeholders, and understands the nuances of implementation, we recommend that further research be conducted to transform these student-informed demands into a reality. We urge the faculty diversity credit taskforce to center the voices and demands of students and their representatives. Taskforce student representation needs to include liaisons from all three UW campuses. It should also include direct insight from a representative of each RSO that has been at the forefront of these efforts at UW. This includes, but isn't limited to, the **Black Student Union, Latinx Student Union, First Nations, Filipino American Student Association, and Polynesian Student Alliance.**

Furthermore, we recommend that resources be allocated to review current course content and syllabi. This would help highlight areas that can fulfill, or be adapted to fulfill, new diversity credit guidelines. An increase in diversity course offerings would help meet the demand from an increased diversity credit load. Unit-level reviewers could serve as collaborators for guidelines to help with implementation. They will be more familiar with course offerings and content in their unit. Most units also have diversity-specific positions that liaison to the *UW Diversity Council*, which discusses high-level goals detailed in [the UW Diversity Blueprint](#), including the diversity credit. This council has potential to serve as a key resource in the further research and implementation of the diversity credit requirement improvements.

ANALYSIS OF STUDENT PERSPECTIVES ON THE DIVERSITY CREDIT

For questions or comments on the methodology used in the analysis, please visit poddata.org/feedback.

INTRODUCTION

METHODOLOGY

Survey Questions

The survey questions were designed to address three main areas: student demographics, personal experiences, and potential impact. For the section on student demographics, respondents were asked participants important information such as which current University about the University of Washington campus they attend, their class year, their area of study, and any marginalized identity they hold. Additionally in this section, respondents could express interest in participating in the Faculty Senate Task Force on expanding the Diversity Credit.

In the section on respondents' personal experiences with the current diversity credit system, respondents were asked about how many diversity credits they had taken at UW, their value of the diversity credit, and their satisfaction with the current diversity credit offerings. Respondents were also asked for their perception on the purpose of the Diversity Credit.

Finally in the potential impact section, seven proposals to changing the diversity credit policies were outlayed to the respondents – their feedback was requested on what they thought needed to change. Many qualitative questions were asked in this section: 1) how the UW definition of diverse subject matter could better serve the purpose of the Diversity Credit Requirement, 2) how diversity credit policy could be improved to cover curriculum gaps with diversity credit, and 3) what classes they thought should or shouldn't be diversity credit and why.

Analytical Approach

This analysis aims to achieve three primary goals. First, it aims to present a general picture of how satisfied UW students are with the current diversity credit requirement. To understand the differences in satisfaction across year, area of study, and identity, data from each group was isolated. One-way ANOVA significance tests (significance level of 0.05) -- which test for significant differences between three or more groups -- were performed to understand differences in satisfaction of the current requirement between the various demographic groups.

Second, the analysis aims to understand student perceptions of the purpose of the diversity credit. To identify trends within the the qualitative data, top keywords were recognized by parsing through the responses. Furthermore, data analysts subjectively identified representative quotes based on common themes and keywords.

Third, the analysis aims to provide an overview of potential changes to the diversity credit requirement supported by students. To understand the differences in the support for the changes to the diversity credit requirement across identity, year, and area of study, One-way ANOVA significance test (significance level of 0.05) was performed to understand differences in support for the proposed changes to the current diversity credit requirement between the demographic groups. In addition, there was a large amount of qualitative data that contained valuable information on student opinions of curriculum, class gaps, and redefining the definition of the diversity credits. Latent Dirichlet

Allocation (LDA), which is a Natural Language Processing (NLP) model, was employed to analyze responses for the most important changes to the diversity credit requirement and generate clusters of similar words in order to identify top keywords. Lastly, an analyst also subjectively identified representative quotes based on common themes and keywords.

DEMOGRAPHICS

246 students responded to the ASUW Diversity Credit Expansion Survey. Most outreach was conducted by students and groups at the University's Seattle campus. Accordingly, nearly all respondents (n=238) currently study at the UW Seattle campus, while 2 and 5 of the respondents, respectively, study at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma.

TABLE 1 *Responses by Campus*

	Seattle	Bothell	Tacoma	No Response	Total
Percentage of Respondents	96.7% (238)	0.8% (2)	2.0% (5)	0.4% (1)	100% (246)

*Percentages rounded to one decimal place

In terms of percentage of respondents by grade level, there was a roughly even distribution of freshman, sophomores, juniors, and senior undergraduate students.

TABLE 1 *Responses by Class Year*


	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Other*
Percentage of Respondents	20.7% (51)	24.4% (60)	28.9% (71)	22.8% (56)	3.25% (8)

*Fifth+ year, post-undergraduate, and graduate students.

Additionally, the most commonly selected area of study among respondents was Social Sciences with 45.53% of respondents (112) reporting that they are majoring in a field within that discipline. Meanwhile, more than half of the respondents (141 or 57%) reported they are in a STEM-related major (Biological and Environmental Sciences, Computing, Math, Engineering, Physical Sciences, and Health Sciences). According to the University of Washington's Office of Planning and Budgeting, 40% of UW students are in STEM fields. This means that STEM students are slightly overrepresented in this survey.

Percentage of Respondents Based on Areas of Study

Among the respondents (n=246), there were eleven unique areas of study. The most common area of study was "Social Sciences," with 45.53% of the respondents selecting this category.



Each respondent was allowed to select more than one area of study. It is for this reason that the above percentages do not sum to 100%. The size of each category are as follows: Social Sciences (n=112), Biological and Environmental Sciences (n=63), Health Sciences (n=59), The Arts (n=30), Language and Literature (n=23), Business (n=22), Computing (n=20), Engineering (n=20), Physical Sciences (n=15), Math (n=10), Molecular, Cellular & Developmental Biology (n=1).

The survey asked respondents whether they identified with a marginalized group – defined as womxn, Black, Indigenous, Person of Color, Queer, Immigrant, Disabled, and International Student. They were also given an option to self-report any identity not mentioned. In the sample, 88% of respondents identified with at least one marginalized identity; The three most common marginalized identities were womxn (58%), person of color (45%), and queer (32%).

Respondents by Participation in Diversity Courses

Respondents were asked for the number of diversity credits they took, and whether they considered them valuable or not. Out of 246 responses, five of them were given as qualitative responses stating that they 'graduated before diversity credits were a requirement' or provided responses that provided unclear information of the number of diversity credits they took. Thus, the following data includes only the 241 quantitative responses.


Out of 241 responses, the largest response was from those who took more than 5 credits, which was 46.89% of respondents. Additionally, 12.45% respondents took no diversity credit, 0.41% respondents took 1 diversity credit, 6.64% respondents took 3 diversity credits, 0.83% of the respondents took 4 diversity credits, and 32.78% of the respondents took 5 diversity credits.

TABLE 5 *Number of Diversity Credits Taken by Respondents*

Number of credits	0	1	2	3	4	5	More than 5	Total
Number of respondents	30	1	0	16	2	79	113	241

Percentage of Respondents Who Identify With Each Marginalized Identity

Among the respondents (n=246), 58.54% of the respondents identified as a Womxn, and 45.12% of the respondents identified as a Person of Color.



Each respondent was allowed to select more than one marginalized identity. It is for this reason that the above percentages do not sum to 100%. The size of each category are as follows: Womxn (n=144), Person of Color (n=111), Queer (n=78), Immigrant (n=17), Black (n=15), Disabled (n=14), International Student (n=8), Indigenous (n=7), Mexican-American (n=1), Southeast Asian (n=1), Mixed Racial Culture (n=1), Jewish (n=1), Hispanic (n=1), Bisexual (n=1), Low-Income (n=1).

ANALYSIS LIMITATIONS

The sampling and analytical methodologies are intended to provide the most accurate representation of student voices. Nonetheless, we note the following limitations to our analysis:

- Students without digital access may not have had the same access to the survey
- Respondents in this survey may have held certain opinions that rendered them more likely to respond (participation bias, non-response bias)
- While the expansion of the Diversity Credit will affect all three campuses, the survey was distributed to mainly UW Seattle students, resulting in few responses/perspectives from the other two campuses
- Since the survey was completely voluntary, the sample may not be perfectly random or fully representative of UW Seattle students as a whole (self-selection bias)

We present the analysis of this report as correlations but that does not imply causation. As the samples were not drawn randomly and were small (n = 246) compared to the student population as a whole, the Central Limit Theorem does not apply here and, thus, our sample most likely does not

follow a normal distribution. This may affect the result of our two-tailed t-test, which relies on a normally distributed sample. Since much of the data is qualitative, the report does not weigh the responses. With that in mind, responses to qualitative questions may represent only a fraction of respondents, that is, not all respondents responded to every open-ended question.

SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT POLICIES

Students' satisfaction of diversity courses

Survey respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with the existing diversity credit requirement at the University of Washington on a scale from 1 to 5, 1 meaning “very dissatisfied” and 5 meaning “very satisfied.” Out of the 245 responses¹ for this question, the mean satisfaction was 2.5633, the standard deviation was 1.2808, and the median was 2. Thus, the median response was “dissatisfied”. The mean satisfaction suggests a neutral to dissatisfied attitude toward the current system. Only 24% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the credit system while 60% of respondents were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied.

TABLE 2 *Student Satisfaction with Diversity Courses*

Rating	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Total
Number of respondents	50	96	41	27	31	245

Mean = 2.5633 (between *dissatisfied* and *neither dissatisfied nor satisfied*)

Standard Deviation = 1.2808

Median = 2 (*dissatisfied*)

Satisfaction of the Current Requirement by Year, Area of Study, and Identity

We performed one-way ANOVA significance test (significance level of 0.05) to determine if responses differed between class year, areas of study, and marginalized identity. The resulting p-values from the data suggest that there is not a significant difference in satisfaction levels between individuals from different areas of study or between individuals from different class years (First Year, Second Year, Third Year, Fourth Year, Fifth+ Year). However, the data does suggest a significant difference in the mean satisfaction levels between individuals of different identities.

TABLE 3 *One-way ANOVA Significance Test across Identity, Area of Study, and Year*


	Identity	Area of study	Class year
P-value from ANOVA*	0.0019	0.5947	0.7992

*Significance level of 0.05

¹ A response was taken out due to ambiguity, resulting in a sample size of 245 for this question

Mean Satisfaction with the Diversity Credit Does Not Vary Significantly by Class Year


The mean satisfaction across all class years is within one standard deviation (1.28) of the sample mean of 2.56. Fourth-year students have the highest average satisfaction (2.73) and fifth-year+ students have the lowest average satisfaction (2.25).



Fifth Year+ refers to 5th year+ students (n=5), graduate students (n=2), and a recent grad (n=1).

Mean Satisfaction with the Diversity Credit Does Not Vary Significantly by Area of Study

The respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with the diversity credit requirement on a scale of 1-5, where 1 represented "very dissatisfied" and 5 represented "very satisfied." The average satisfaction rating among the entire survey respondents was 2.56 with a standard deviation of 1.28. Some STEM fields such as Physical Sciences and Biological and Environmental Sciences indicated the highest levels of satisfaction; however, others such as Computing, Engineering, and Math indicated the lowest levels of satisfaction.



The Areas of Study included in the survey were Business (n=22), Physical Sciences (n=15), Biological and Environmental Sciences (n= 63), Health Sciences (n=59), The Arts (n=30), Social Sciences(n=112), Engineering (n=20), Language and Literature (n=23), Computing (n=20), Math (n=10), and Molecular, Cellular & Developmental Biology (n=1) – Molecular, Cellular, & Developmental Biology was not included as a category due to the small sample size. Note that respondents could hold more than one area of study.


With respect to table 3, the ANOVA test analyzing identity was performed with 9 groups based on the survey -- Black, Indigenous, Person of Color, Queer, Womxn, Disabled, Immigrant, International Student, and Blanks (meaning the respondent did not select any of the given 8 categories in the survey). Respondents were also able to self-identify; however, the identities were not included due to a small sample size. The p-value of 0.0019 suggests there exists at least two groups that have significantly different satisfaction levels.

Upon further analysis, a two-tailed t-test with a significance level of 0.05 was conducted to compare satisfaction between respondents who indicated that they held no marginalized identities and respondents who indicated they held at least one marginalized identity. As listed in the analytical limitations, we advise caution in interpreting this finding, as two-tailed t-test relies on a normally distributed sample that may not be exactly replicated here. The results of the test, a p-value of 0.0002 as shown in table 3, suggest a significant difference in satisfaction level between individuals from

marginalized groups and individuals who don't belong to marginalized groups, with those who self-identify with at least one marginalized group indicating lower satisfaction with the diversity system.

Black Respondents Reported the Lowest Satisfaction With the Current Diversity Credit Requirement

The respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with the diversity credit requirement on a scale of 1-5, where 1 represented "very dissatisfied" and 5 represented "very satisfied." The average satisfaction rating among the entire survey respondents was 2.56 with a standard deviation of 1.28. Black respondents reported the lowest level of satisfaction with an average rating of 1.86, while students with no marginalized identity reported the highest level of satisfaction with an average rating of 3.38.



Marginalized Identities included in the survey were Black (n=15), Indigenous (n=7), Person of Color (n=111), Queer (n=78), Womxn (n=144), Disabled (n=14), Immigrant (n=17), and International Student (n=8). Respondents were also able to self identify which included other marginalized identities such as Mexican-American (n=1), Southeast Asian (n=1), Mixed racial culture (n=1), Jewish (n=1), Hispanic (n=1), Mixed Person (n=1), bisexual (n=1), Low-Income (n=1) – these identities were not included as a category due to the small sample size, but were included in the total average and standard deviation calculation. Students could also choose not to identify with any marginalized identities (n=24). Note that respondents could hold more than one marginalized identity.

TABLE 4 *Satisfaction across Marginalized and Non-Marginalized Identities*

	No marginalized identities	At least one marginalized identity
Sample size (n)	29	217
Mean (M)	3.38	2.45
Sum of squares (SS)	62.83	315.54
t-value*		3.7507
p-value		0.0002

*Two-tailed t-test with a significance level (alpha) of 0.05

Satisfaction of the Current Requirement by the Number of Diversity Credits Taken

Analyzing the number of diversity credit taken by respondents and the satisfaction of the current diversity credit system, a one-way ANOVA test was performed to compare the satisfaction of the current diversity credit requirement based on the number of diversity credits taken. The respondents were partitioned into four groups on the number of diversity credits taken: "None", "1-3 Credits", "4-5 Credits", and "More than 5 Credits." The resulting p-value of 0.4345 does not suggest a significant difference in satisfaction based on the number of diversity credits taken.

As the table below shows, nearly half of respondents (46.5%) have taken more than 5 diversity credits. This group also indicated the lowest satisfaction of the system while respondents who took 1-3 credits had the highest satisfaction, although this group only contained 18 people so we recommend caution in interpreting satisfaction based on number of credits taken. As a whole, there wasn't a large difference between groups based on the number of credits taken; the averages for all groups were below 3, which suggests a neutral to slight dissatisfaction with the current requirement.


TABLE 6 *Satisfaction with the Diversity Credits Requirement across the Number of Credits Taken*

Number of credits taken	Sample Size (n)	Average Satisfaction of the Current Diversity Credit Requirement
"None"	30	2.58
"1-3"	17	2.94
"4-5"	81	2.63
"More than 5"	113	2.47

In addition, the number of diversity credits taken based on satisfaction with the diversity credit requirement was visualized in the chart below. As shown, a majority of the respondents who were very satisfied, dissatisfied, and very dissatisfied with the current diversity credit requirement took more than 5 diversity credits.

Majority of the Respondents Who Were Either Very Satisfied or (Very) Dissatisfied With the Current Diversity Credit Requirement Took More Than 5 Diversity Credits

This chart shows the proportion of respondents who took each range of diversity credits based on their satisfaction with the diversity credit requirement. The proportion of students who took 4-5 diversity credits reported progressively larger as the satisfaction level increased from 1 to 4. However, the majority of the students who are "very satisfied" or "very dissatisfied" tend to take more than 5 diversity credits.



The respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with the diversity credit requirement on a scale of 1-5, where 1 represented "very dissatisfied" and 5 represented "very satisfied." The following were the sample sizes for each level of satisfaction: 1 (n=49), 2 (n=94), 3 (n=40), 4 (n=27), and 5 (n=31), giving us a total sample size of n=241. Five responses were excluded as their responses were ambiguous or unanswered.

Value of the Diversity Credits by the Number of Diversity Credits Taken

Given the 241 responses on the number of diversity credits taken, the value of the diversity credit was analyzed. The vast majority of respondents found the diversity credit useful, no matter how many credits they took. Among respondents who took over 5 diversity credits, 109 (96.46%) of them found the diversity credits to be useful. Additionally, for the 81 respondents who took 4 to 5 diversity credits, 70 (86.42%) of them found the diversity credits to be useful. Understandably, for the 30 respondents who didn't take anycredits, 26 (86.66%) of them answered that they 'have not taken diversity credits at UW'.

TABLE 7 Value of the Diversity Credit Based on the Number of Diversity Credits Taken²

Number of credits taken	None	1-3	4-5	More than 5	Total
Found diversity credits useful	4	13	70	109	196
Did not find diversity credits useful	0	4	11	4	19
Did not take diversity credits at the University of Washington	26	0	0	0	26

² Note: This table only represents 241 responses as 5 responses were excluded for ambiguously indicating the number of credits taken. However, all 246 responses indicated the usefulness of the diversity credit. Overall, with all 246 responses, 80.49% of the respondents found their diversity credits valuable, while 7.72% did not find their diversity credits valuable. The remaining 11.79% answered that they did not take a diversity course at the University of Washington.

Many respondents believe that the diversity credit's purpose is to **teach students to be anti-racist** and to **recognize and fight against systems of oppression**:

- *To expand students' perspectives and aim to have students that leave UW be anti-racist, and able to recognize systems of oppression and ways to fight against them*
- *To educate students about experiences of oppressed and marginalized peoples that they may not have had themselves and teach them how to fight against oppression and discrimination in their chosen fields*
- *teaching anti-racism and anti-oppression frameworks; giving students applicable/real world skills and experience in combatting racism and oppression globally;*

Other representative responses mentioned that diversity classes **expand one's insight and perspective of the world** through the exploration of different cultures and world views:

- *A diversity credit course serves to broaden the minds of what is taught in mainstream education; what is taught in a Diversity Credit course is what is often missing in White education. It is making space to speak on and explore identity, privilege and power.*
- *For students to learn about others and themselves to get a better understanding of our world and ways they can help fix it.*
- *It's supposed to allow you to peer into the life of someone else and recognize your own privileges within that sphere. I believe classes like race studies does not only allow you to learn about other people, but learn about yourself and how we uphold racism, the patriarchy, etc. because that is what we have been taught.*

Beyond learning about marginalized groups and systems of oppression, some respondents believe that through taking a diversity credit, we can ultimately **create a more equitable society**:

- *To expand ones perception and appreciation for those unlike themselves in an effort to promote greater awareness, appreciation, and allyship for the diverse world we live in.*
- *To provide UW students with the tools to preserve diversity and encourage equity in their post education (and really, educational) lives*
- *I think that the best diversity courses actively work to educate individuals on how they can help create a more equitable and accepting society for all, regardless of where they go in life.*

WHAT STUDENTS WANT CHANGED

Overall Expansion of the Diversity Credit

Subsequently, respondents were presented with a selection of proposed changes to the diversity credit requirement and were prompted to select the changes that they support. Across all respondents (n=246), there was majority support for changing the definition of diversity and diverse course content, increasing the required credits to graduate from 3 to more than 5, and requiring all areas of study to offer field-specific diversity credit classes.

TABLE 8 *Respondent Opinion on the Proposed Changes to the Diversity Credit*


	Change the definition of "diversity" and "diverse course content"*	Change the approval process of diversity courses	Increasing the required credits to graduate from 3 to 5	Increasing the required credits to graduate from 3 to more than 5	Require all colleges, schools, or majors to offer field-specific diversity credits	Rather than change diversity credits, create a new type of credit for putting equity into action	Require an experiential learning component to Diversity Credit coursework	Other (please elaborate below)
What needs to change?	65.85% (n=162)	43.50% (n=107)	40.65% (n=100)	64.63% (n=159)	82.93% (n=204)	30.49% (n=75)	37.40% (n=92)	10.16% (n=25)

* "Change the definition of "diversity" and "diverse course content" to (re)shape the curriculums of courses that fit under this requirement"

Three of the Seven Proposed Changes to the Diversity Credit Requirement Received Support From a Vast Majority of Respondents

Among all respondents (n=246), A significant majority (83%) believe that there should be field-specific diversity credits. In addition, 66% believe the definition of "diversity" and "diverse course content" should be changed and 65% believe that the diversity credit requirement should be raised from 3 to more than 5.

■ Agree ■ Disagree



"All respondents" include first-year students (n=51), second-year students (n=60), third-year students (n=71), fourth-year students (n=56), fifth-year+ students (n=5), graduate students (n=2), and recent graduates (n=1).

Correlations between marginalized identities and change categories

Series of ANOVA tests (significance level of 0.05) were performed to compare the responses between respondents from different groups on the proposed changes to the diversity credit requirement. The three most popular changes to the diversity credit requirement were considered – these changes were noted in the table below along with the calculated p-value for each category based on each grouping (marginalized identity, area of study, and class year) – each response was encoded to 1 if they supported the proposed change and encoded to 0 otherwise. The p-values for all three changes proposed that there was no significant difference in the support of the changes between respondents from the 8 different marginalized groups in the survey. For the third-best supported change, "increasing the required credits to graduate from 3 to more than 5", our significance tests suggest that support for this change differ between at least two areas of study and between at least two class years. However, ANOVA tests are intended to be used when comparing groups of similar sample size, and the sample demographics of this survey do not show even distribution across areas of study nor for class years. For this reason, we caution against drawing conclusions about the differences in support for this change category.

TABLE 8 *One-way ANOVA Significance Tests across Proposed Diversity Credit Changes*

	Require all colleges, schools, or majors to offer field-specific diversity credits	Change the definition of "diversity" and "diverse course content" to (re)shape the curriculums of courses that fit under this requirement	Increasing the required credits to graduate from 3 to more than 5
Marginalized identity*	0.58392	0.77991	0.60286
Area of study*	0.45048	0.16654	0.00161
Class year*	0.76444	0.03458	0.00001

*Significance level of 0.05


Changes supported by Marginalized identities and non-Marginalized identities

There was a stark contrast in support for proposed changes between respondents with no marginalized identity and students with at least one marginalized identity. While there was majority support for three of the seven proposed changes among respondents with at least one marginalized identity, only one proposed change received majority support among respondents with none.

Three of the Seven Proposed Changes to the Diversity Credit Requirement Received Support From a Vast Majority of Respondents With at Least One Marginalized Identity

Among the respondents who held at least 1 marginalized identity (n=217), a significant majority (86%) believed that all colleges, schools, or majors should be required to offer field-specific diversity credit courses. In addition, 69% believed the definition of "diversity" and "diverse course content" should be changed and 68% believed that the diversity credit requirement should be raised from 3 to more than 5.

■ Agree ■ Disagree




Marginalized Identities included in the survey were Black (n=15), Indigenous (n=7), Person of Color (n=111), Queer (n=78), Womxn (n=144), Disabled (n=14), Immigrant (n=17), and International Student (n=8). Respondents were also able to self identify which included other marginalized identities such as Mexican-American (n=1), Southeast Asian (n=1), Mixed racial culture (n=1), Jewish (n=1), Hispanic (n=1), Mixed Person (n=1), bisexual (n=1), Low-Income (n=1). Note that respondents could hold more than one marginalized identity.

Six of the Seven Proposed Changes to the Diversity Credit Requirement Were Opposed by a Majority of Respondents Who Do Not Identify With a Marginalized Identity

Among the respondents who did not identify with any marginalized identity (n=29), 59% believed that all colleges, schools, or majors should offer field-specific diversity credits. In regards to the proposed changes to the diversity credit requirement, the responses of students with no marginalized identities are in stark contrast to those of students with at least one marginalized identity. A majority of respondents who did not identify with any marginalized identity did not support changing the definitions of "diversity" and "diversity course content" or increasing the required diversity credits to more than 5.

■ Agree ■ Disagree



Significance tests were also performed to compare responses of these two populations: p_1 (n = 217) being respondents who identify with one or more marginalized groups and p_2 (n = 29) being respondents who identify with no marginalized groups. We looked at the proportion of each sample that selected the top three most commonly chosen changes as something that needs to be changed. The results are discussed below.

TABLE 9 One-way ANOVA Significance Test across Proposed Diversity Credit Changes (Marginalized and Non-Marginalized Identities)

	Require all colleges, schools, or majors to offer field-specific diversity credits	Change the definition of "diversity" and "diverse course content" to (re)shape the curriculums of courses that fit under this requirement	Increasing the required credits to graduate from 3 to more than 5
p-value*	0.0001	0.002	0.003

*Significance level of 0.05

Require all colleges, schools, or majors to offer field-specific diversity credits

86.18% of respondents from p_1 supported this change while 58.62% of respondents from p_2 supported the change. The resulting p-value was 0.0001 which suggests that respondents who identify with at least one marginalized identities are more likely to indicate that requiring all colleges, schools, or majors to offer field-specific diversity credits would be an improvement to the current diversity credit system.

Change the definition of "diversity" and "diverse course content" to (re)shape the curriculums of courses that fit under this requirement

69.12% of respondents from p_1 supported the proposed change while 41.38% of respondents from p_2 supported the change. The resulting p-value of 0.002 indicates that respondents who identify with at least one marginalized identities are more likely to indicate that changing the definition of "diversity" and "diverse course content" to (re)shape the curriculums of courses that fit under this requirement would be an improvement to the current system.

Increasing the required credits to graduate from 3 to more than 5


67.74% of respondents from p_1 supported this change while 41.38% of respondents from p_2 supported the change. The resulting p-value of 0.003 suggests that respondents who identify with at least one marginalized identities are more likely to indicate that increasing the number of required diversity credits from 3 to more than 5 would improve the system.

Changes Supported by Respondents from Various Areas of Study

We see varying support for each of the proposed change categories when we disaggregate the responses by area of study. Overall, Engineering, Math, Social Sciences, the Arts, and Language and Literature displayed the most support for each of the proposed changes while Computing, Business, and Physical sciences displayed the least support.

Support for Each Proposed Change to the Diversity Credit Requirement by the Areas of Study

The following chart depicts the percentage of respondents who support each of the seven proposed modifications to the current diversity credit requirement, based on areas of study. Three of the proposals (Changing definitions of "diversity" and "diverse course content", Increase required credits from 3 to more than 5, Require field-specific diversity credits) received support from a majority of respondents (65.85%, 64.63%, and 82.93% respectively). Across all categories, the Engineering and Social Science categories displayed a consistently high degree of support for each of the proposed changes.



Each respondent was allowed to choose more than one area of study. It is for this reason that the percentages for each proposed change exceed 100%. In addition, this visualization does not include responses from the Molecular, Cellular & Developmental Biology area of study as there was only one respondent in this category; however, this data was included in the total calculation.

Most Important Changes

Which of the above options is most important to you?

Respondents were asked the question, "Which of the [proposed changes to the diversity credit requirement] is most important to you?" To analyze the responses, an NLP model called "Latent Dirichlet Allocation" (LDA) was utilized. We recommend caution in the interpretation of the chart because the model isn't optimal when given small number of data inputs and inconsistent sentence structures. With a survey sample size of 246, not everyone responded to the qualitative question, and other respondents had varied length in their responses.

Based on the LDA, we can see that the biggest cluster contains the word stem "field-specif-" "field" and "specif-". This indicates that field-specific diversity courses are the most important issue to the respondents. The third cluster contains, "credit", "increase", "require", "5", "3", indicating that increasing the credit requirement is another important issue. The fourth cluster contains "chang-" "definit-", "cours-", indicating that changing the definition is slightly behind the previous responses.

Please refer to Appendix C of the report for the chart and further details on the implementation of LDA.

Curriculum and Class Gaps

Respondents were presented with three open response questions relating to curriculum and class gaps where they provided their thoughts on the current diversity credit requirement:

Have you ever encountered a class you thought should or shouldn't be a Diversity Credit? Why?

44.72% of respondents answered this question (n=110). Commonly used terms include "history" (n=7), "psych 210" (n=8), "racis-" (n=10), and "systems of oppression" (n=4). About 35.45% of respondents who answered this question (n=39) said that they have not encountered a class that they thought should/shouldn't be a diversity credit.

Several respondents thought that **PSYCH 210 should not be a diversity class**, arguing that it was a "cop out" of the diversity credit requirement as it **doesn't dwell deep enough into reflections of identity, and biases**:

- *Psych 210, it's often used as a cop out and people just see it as the "sex" class rather than reflect on the different sexual identities and ideas from the course.*
- *PSYCH 210 is borderline... it does discuss the LGBTQ community a bit but barely touches on other biases and how to avoid them*
- *Psych 210 is walking a line I think. I loved the class and found it to be very informative, and you will learn about marginalized sexual and gender identities, but it seems like the easy cop out for a lot of people so they don't have to take a diversity credit that more deeply explores inequality in America.*

Some respondents also opposed **classes in the Environmental Science department** being considered diversity classes:

- *Yes, this is the case for many classes in environmental sciences, but in the sense that I think classes should go more in depth about the work of BIPOC scientists, the history of racism in*

science, and should teach indigenous perspectives, not because I think they go deep enough to warrant actual diversity education as it stands

- *Some environmental science classes are considered DIV credits when they're not focusing on the people most harmed by the environment. Otherwise, Political Science, LSJ and History seem to do a good job.*

There was a range of classes respondents believe should be considered diversity classes though there are no classes under this category that received more than one mention. Some of the classes mentioned include **JSIS 436, DIS ST 332, Salsa and Latin Dance** (among other dance classes), **Feminism in the Borderlands, and Art History courses** that focused on Indigenous art:

- *Right now I am taking JSIS 436 (Ethnic Politics in Multi-cultural Societies) and we have fascinating discussions about racial/class dynamics in regions across the globe, how race/racism is perceived by different ethnic groups, and we talk discuss the importance of being an ally/ anti-racist.*
- *I think DIS ST 332 should be a diversity credit but currently it is not listed as one. This class studies disabilities using the framework of rights, identities, values, and medicine. Diversity credits should include classes that make people more aware and inclusive towards people with disabilities*
- *I took salsa and Latin dance recently. For the amount of time we spent on the cultural context and history of salsa(1/3 of the class), I'm surprised it doesn't give a diversity credit, especially when similar classes in the dance department do.*
- *Feminism in the Borderlands- this class was an amazing space to explore compounding oppression faced by Chicanas and tied together a lot of intersectional feminist ideas and practices and how they connect to other womxn and WOC specifically. Super valuable class that changed the way I think about a lot topics surrounding oppression today and in the past.*
- *Art History courses focused on Indigenous art don't count for DIV, I think they should because the School of Art is LACKING in diversity (in faculty representation and course offerings) and it would encourage more people to take them*

Where are the gaps in curriculum of Diversity Credits offered to respondents?

32.11% of respondents answered this question (n=79). Of those that answered, "STEM" was a common mention (n=12).

One common theme was the need for **STEM** to have **course-related diversity content to combat discrimination in the field and at UW:**

- *As someone who started off on the STEM path at UW, there was noticeable problems with respect and equity. There were a lot of microaggressions, racism, homophobia, ableism, etc.*
- *Too often Diversity credits are only offered in a limited subset of humanities classes, it would be great if more STEM professors stepped up to the challenge of exposing racism in our own fields.*
- *When I look for DIV credits, I usually find classes in social sciences and not STEM ones. It makes it seem like equity and social justice are abstract from stem disciplines, when in reality that is not the case at all. There should be more diversity classes/content in stem education.*
- *Students should be required to take a diversity course in their field of study. Right now people may just take a diversity course because it is simply an easy course and they walk out without*

applying it to their lives. Therefore students should be required to take a class that will be directly applicable to their career fields

Others noted the **lack of opportunities to apply course material** from diversity courses to real life:

- *the absence of "action" programs that would let students have hands on experience. I think this is important because students would be proactive and understand how to tackle down the issues that divide us.*
- *Maybe group work, student fieldwork where student use their platform to share their knowledge to others, and (if applies) create a community to understand differences that we see how the coursework apply to our own lives somehow.*
- *Probably actual application of anti racism in the world and specific fields (also how to combat racism in yourself)*

Some students highlighted the importance of **representation** and the need for **professors who come from marginalized groups** to be teaching courses relating to diversity:

- *It would involve hiring faculty who are qualified talk on these topics (preferably, if we are going to talk about minority groups, it would be nice to hire minority professors)*
- *What classes are considered to be "diverse" and who is teaching them? Who is it marketed to?*

How could the UW definition of diverse subject matter better serve the purpose of the Diversity Credit Requirement?

26.42% of respondents answered this question (n=65). Of those that answered the question, common words were "marginal-" (n=10), "oppress-" (n=6), and "systems" (n=5). Additionally, "specific" (n=6) was mentioned.

Common complaints about the current diversity credit requirement centered around needing a **more specific definition of diversity**, arguing that classes need to **dive deeper into topics about systems of oppression** and **how they affect marginalized groups**:

- *The UW definition of diverse subject matter should explicitly support implementing anti-oppressive and anti-racist curriculum. Additionally, there should be a focus on understanding systems of oppression, not just outcomes. A majority of rhetoric surrounding marginalization of students in STEM (what I major in) focus on the statistics but not the causes. Students from marginalized populations and students from historically oppressive populations would both benefit tremendously from better understanding the underlying causes of oppression and inequity.*
- *sociocultural, political, and economic diversity of human experience" is academic jargon at its worst - each of these terms should be broken down and further defined. "political diversity" should mean explicitly radical/revolutionary, like Black Radical and Feminist traditions. "economic diversity" should focus specifically on critiques of the capitalist system- its no good to learn that people live in poverty without giving students the tools to materially change the conditions of the world*
- *It could get a whole lot more specific, with the current definition, I could get 1/2 my classes at UW to count for "Diversity Credit" and I am a STEM major...*

Respondents also thought that there needs to be a **clearly defined outcome and objective** of the diversity credit:

- *I think UW needs to be more specific - not in the subject of Diversity Credit courses, but in what the course should accomplish in order to be considered a Diversity Credit course. For example, I've taken some classes about feminism where I didn't learn anything new at all. Although I am a woman on campus, that definitely doesn't mean I know everything about feminism; in fact, I would say I know relatively little! As a woman I would still like to learn when I take a Diversity Credit course about feminism.*
- *If UW can define diversity in a way that ensures students will leave the class more tolerant and understanding of marginalized groups, I think that is key.*

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

Detailed Sample Demographics

This section describes the sample size and distribution of the responses for the survey demographic questions.

Appendix Table A1. Sample Demographics

Characteristic	Subgroup	n	% of Sample
Campus	UW Seattle	238	96.75%
	UW Tacoma	4	1.63%
	UW Bothell	2	0.81%
	No Response	2	0.81%
Graduation Year	First Year Freshman	49	19.92%
	First Year Transfer Student	2	0.81%
	First Year Total (Both Freshman and Transfer)	51	20.73%
	Second Year	54	21.95%
	Second Year Transfer Student	6	2.44%

Second Year Total (Both Freshman and Transfer)	60	24.39%
Third Year	71	28.86%
Fourth Year	56	22.76%
Fifth Year, Graduate Student, Recent Graduates	8	3.25%

Note: Respondents could choose multiple identities and write-in their identities. The percentages indicate the percentage of respondents (n = 246) who chose the corresponding identity -- thus, the sum of all the percentages is greater than 1.

Marginalized Identities	Black	15	6.10%
	Indigenous	7	2.85%
	Person of Color	111	45.12%
	Queer	78	31.71%
	Womxn	144	58.54%
	Disabled	14	5.69%
	Immigrant	17	6.91%
	International Student	8	3.25%
	Mexican-American	1	0.41%

Southeast Asian	1	0.41%
Mixed racial culture	1	0.41%
Jewish	1	0.41%
Hispanic	1	0.41%
Mixed Person	1	0.41%
Bisexual	1	0.41%
Low Income	1	0.41%
No Response	29	11.79%

Note: Like above, respondents could choose multiple areas of study. The percentages indicate the percentage of respondents (n = 246) who chose the corresponding area of study -- thus, the sum of all the percentages is greater than 1.

Area of Study	The Arts	30	12.20%
	Biological and Environmental Sciences	63	25.61%
	Business	22	8.94%
	Computing	20	8.13%
	Engineering	20	8.13%

STUDENT VOICES ON THE DIVERSITY CREDIT AND ITS FUTURE

Health Sciences	59	23.98%
Language and Literature	23	9.35%
Math	10	4.07%
Physical Science	15	6.10%
Social Science	112	45.53%
Molecular, Cellular & Developmental Biology	1	0.41%

APPENDIX B

Detailed Survey Responses

This section covers student opinions on the changes to current requirement, values, and satisfaction with the current diversity credit requirement.

Appendix Table B1. Survey Questions – Values of the Diversity Credit Requirement (Proportions)

Question	Answer Choices	n	% of sample
Are you interested in participating in the Faculty Senate Task Force on expanding the Diversity Credit?	Yes	42	17.14%
	No	124	50.61%
	Maybe	74	30.20%
	Write in: Interested but has graduated/will be graduating this year	2	0.82%
	Write in: Interested but is too busy	2	0.82%
	Write in: Not sure what obligations the task force has	1	0.41%
Did you find your diversity credits to be valuable?	Yes	198	80.49%
	I haven't taken diversity credits at UW	29	11.79%

No	19	7.72%
----	----	-------

Note: As this question allowed respondents to choose multiple answers, the percentages indicate the percentage of respondents (n = 246) who chose the corresponding area of study -- thus, the sum of all the percentages is greater than 1.

What needs to change? Check all that apply.	Change the approval process of diversity courses	107	43.50%
	Increasing the required credits to graduate from 3 to 5	100	40.65%
	Increasing the required credits to graduate from 3 to more than 5	159	64.63%
	Require all colleges, schools, or majors to offer field-specific diversity credits	204	82.93%
	Rather than change diversity credits, create a new type of credit for putting equity into action	75	30.49%
	Change the definition of "diversity" and "diverse course content" to (re)shape the curriculums of courses that fit under this requirement	162	65.85%
	Require an experiential learning component to Diversity Credit coursework	92	37.40%
	Other (please elaborate below)	25	10.16%

Appendix Table B2. Survey Questions – Diversity Credits and Student Satisfaction

Question	Answer Choices	n	% of sample
How many diversity credits at UW have you taken so far?	0	30	12.45%
	1	1	0.41%
	2	0	0.00%
	3	16	6.64%
	4	2	0.82%
	5	79	32.78%
	> 5	113	46.89%
How satisfied are you with the existing Diversity Credit requirement?	5	31	12.65%
(5 = Very Satisfied, 1 = Very Dissatisfied)	4	27	11.02%
	3	41	16.73%
	2	96	39.18%
	1	50	20.41%

Appendix Table B3. Survey Questions – Diversity Credits and Student Satisfaction (Numerical)


Question	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation
How satisfied are you with the existing Diversity Credit requirement?	2.563265	2	1.2808

APPENDIX C

Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA)

To examine the responses to the qualitative question “Which of the [proposed change to the diversity credit requirement is most important to you?”, a Natural-Language Processing model called “Latent Dirichlet Allocation” (LDA) was utilized. It was found that the hyperparameter $k = 6$ (i.e. 6 cluster groups) had the clearest result.

In the following LDA chart, each panel represents a cluster of word stems, where beta represents the probability of a term appearing in a cluster. Clusters are ranked by size. We recommend caution in the interpretation of the chart because the model isn't optimal when given small number of data inputs and inconsistent sentence structures. Even with a survey sample size of 246, not everyone responded to the qualitative question, and other respondents had varied length in their responses.



Based on the LDA, we can see that the biggest cluster contains the word stem “field-specif-” “field” and “specif-”. This indicates that field-specific diversity courses are the most important change to the requirement to the respondents. The third cluster contains, “credit”, “increase”, “require”, “5”, “3”, indicating that increasing the credit requirement is another important change. The fourth cluster contains “changing “definition”, “course”, indicating that changing the definition is slightly behind the previous responses.

Back cover design: *Mahak Saxena (ASUW)*



NOVEMBER 2021

STUDENT VOICES ON THE DIVERSITY CREDIT AND ITS FUTURE

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE
ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF WASHINGTON (ASUW)'S DIVERSITY
CREDIT EXPANSION SURVEY

ASUW | ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

PODUW | Polling and Open Data Initiative
at the University of Washington