# 5-10-15 Year Alumni Survey — Summary of Disaggregation of Satisfaction with Pedagogical Aspects at Evergreen

#### Class of 2002

Female alumni have significantly *higher* satisfaction with respect shown for different or opposing viewpoints than male alumni.

#### Class of 2007

Female alumni have significantly *lower* satisfaction with Respect shown to persons of differing ethnicities/religions/sexual or gender orientations than male alumni.

Alumni who were at some point in their education Below Poverty have significantly *higher* satisfaction with the education they were able to construct as an Evergreen student than alumni who were not Below Poverty Level.

Non-Traditional Age alumni have significantly *higher* satisfaction with academic planning/advising by faculty and Linking theory and practice than Traditional Age alumni.

Alumni of color have significantly *higher* satisfaction with Academic planning/advising by faculty and Quality of learning interactions with other students.

#### Class of 2012

Female alumni have significantly *higher* satisfaction with respect shown for different or opposing viewpoints and quality of interactions with other students.

LGBTQQ alumni have significantly *lower* satisfaction with Academic Planning by Faculty, Interdisciplinary approach to education, and Respect shown to persons of differing ethnicities, religions, sexual or gender orientations.

Alumni of color have significantly *higher* satisfaction with Quality of learning interaction with other students than White, Non-Hispanic/Unknown alumni.

(1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Satisfied, 4=Very Satisfied)

	2002				2007				2012		
Gender											
	Gender	N	Mean		Gender	N	Mean		Gender	N	Mean
a Academic planning/advising	F	110	3.15	a Academic planning/advising	F	130	3.05	a Academic planning/advising	F	156	3.1
by faculty	M	69	3.14	by faculty	М	93	3.17	by faculty	M	102	3.09
b Interdisciplinary approach	F	112	3.66	b Interdisciplinary approach	F	128	3.67	b Interdisciplinary approach	F	156	3.66
to education	M	69	3.64	to education	М	93	3.63	to education	M	101	3.58
c Linking theory and practice	F	110	3.49	C Linking theory and practice	F	130	3.34	C Linking theory and practice	F	152	3.43
ziming theory and practice	M	69	3.45	zg theory and proceed	М	92	3.41	2g cheory and produce	M	101	3.34
d Narrative evaluations by	F	111	3.45	d Narrative evaluations by	F	130	3.3	d Narrative evaluations by	F	156	3.43
faculty	M	69	3.42	faculty	М	93	3.4	faculty	M	101	3.41
e The practice of self-	F	112	3.38	e The practice of self-	F	128	3.3	e The practice of self-	F	156	3.22
evaluation	M	69	3.42	evaluation	М	93	3.24	evaluation	M	101	3.12
f Overall quality of instruction	F	110	3.58	f Overall quality of instruction	F	127	3.42	f Overall quality of instruction	F	155	3.45
over an quanty or monaction	M	68	3.5	Overall quality of motifaction	M	91	3.54	everan quanty or motivation	M	101	3.38
g Quality of learning interaction with other	F	112	3.43	g Quality of learning interaction with other	F	130	3.2	g Quality of learning interaction with other	F	156	3.29
students	M	69	3.29	students	M	91	3.31	students	M	102	3.09
h The education you were able to construct as an	F	113	3.48	h The education you were able to construct as an	F	128	3.38	h The education you were able to construct as an	F	154	3.44
Evergreen student	M	68	3.44	Evergreen student	M	93	3.45	Evergreen student	М	102	3.4
i Respect shown for different	F	113	3.33	i Respect shown for different	F	129	3.14	i Respect shown for different	F	154	3.19
or opposing viewpoints	M	68	2.97	or opposing viewpoints	М	93	3.23	or opposing viewpoints	M	102	2.76
j Respect shown to persons of differing ethnicities,	F	110	3.46	Respect shown to persons of differing ethnicities,	F	130	3.25	j Respect shown to persons of differing ethnicities,	F	155	3.33
religions, sexual or gender orientations	М	69	3.33	religions, sexual or gender orientations	M	90	3.59	religions, sexual or gender orientations	M	102	3.19
Females significantly higher satisfaction with respect shown for different or opposing viewpoints				Females have significantly lower satisfaction with Respect shown to persons of differing ethnicities/religions/sexual or gender orientations				Females significantly higher for different or opposing vie interactions with other stud	wpoints and	•	

(1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Satisfied, 4=Very Satisfied)

	2002		2007		2012						
Below Poverty											
		N	Mean			N	Mean			N	Mean
a Academic planning/advising	B-Pov	68	3.26	a Academic planning/advising	B-Pov	104	3.20	a Academic planning/advising	B-Pov	124	3.1
by faculty	Not B-Pov	111	3.08	by faculty	Not B-Pov	119	3.01	by faculty	Not B-Pov	134	3.09
b Interdisciplinary approach	B-Pov	71	3.7	b Interdisciplinary approach	B-Pov	103	3.73	b Interdisciplinary approach	B-Pov	123	3.63
to education	Not B-Pov	110	3.62	to education	Not B-Pov	118	3.59	to education	Not B-Pov	134	3.63
c Linking theory and practice	B-Pov	69	3.46	C Linking theory and practice	B-Pov	103	3.43	c Linking theory and practice	B-Pov	123	3.32
Linking theory and practice	Not B-Pov	110	3.48	Linking theory and practice	Not B-Pov	119	3.32	Linking theory and practice	Not B-Pov	130	3.47
d Narrative evaluations by	B-Pov	70	3.47	d Narrative evaluations by	B-Pov	104	3.36	d Narrative evaluations by	B-Pov	124	3.37
faculty	Not B-Pov	110	3.42	faculty	Not B-Pov	119	3.33	faculty	Not B-Pov	133	3.47
e The practice of self-	B-Pov	71	3.44	e The practice of self-	B-Pov	102	3.32	e The practice of self-	B-Pov	123	3.17
evaluation	Not B-Pov	110	3.36	evaluation	Not B-Pov	119	3.24	evaluation	Not B-Pov	134	3.19
f Overall quality of instruction	B-Pov	70	3.61	f Overall quality of instruction	B-Pov	102	3.47	f Overall quality of instruction	B-Pov	124	3.41
Overall quality of instruction	Not B-Pov	108	3.51		Not B-Pov	116	3.47		Not B-Pov	132	3.42
g Quality of learning interaction with other	B-Pov	71	3.38	g Quality of learning interaction with other	B-Pov	104	3.23	g Quality of learning interaction with other	B-Pov	124	3.23
students	Not B-Pov	110	3.37	students	Not B-Pov	117	3.26	students	Not B-Pov	134	3.19
h The education you were able to construct as an	B-Pov	71	3.49	h The education you were able to construct as an	B-Pov	102	3.55	h The education you were able to construct as an	B-Pov	123	3.4
Evergreen student	Not B-Pov	110	3.45	Evergreen student	Not B-Pov	119	3.29	Evergreen student	Not B-Pov	133	3.45
i Respect shown for different	B-Pov	70	3.14	i Respect shown for different	B-Pov	103	3.17	i Respect shown for different	B-Pov	123	3.01
or opposing viewpoints	Not B-Pov	111	3.23	or opposing viewpoints	Not B-Pov	119	3.18	or opposing viewpoints	Not B-Pov	133	3.03
Respect shown to persons of differing ethnicities,	B-Pov	68	3.32	Respect shown to persons of differing ethnicities,	B-Pov	102	3.40	Respect shown to persons of differing ethnicities,	B-Pov	123	3.28
religions, sexual or gender orientations	Not B-Pov	111	3.47	religions, sexual or gender orientations	Not B-Pov	118	3.38	religions, sexual or gender orientations	Not B-Pov	134	3.26
No significant differences				Below Poverty Students had education you were able to	,			No significant differences			

(1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Satisfied, 4=Very Satisfied)

	2002				2007				2012		
First-Generation Alun	nni										
	F: .0	N	Mean		F:	N	Mean		F: .0	N	Mean
a Academic planning/advising by faculty	FirstGen	47	3.3	a Academic planning/advising by faculty	FirstGen	64	3.13	a Academic planning/advising by faculty	FirstGen	98	3.14
	Non FG	132	3.1		Non FG	159	3.09	, ,	Non FG	160	3.07
b Interdisciplinary approach	FirstGen	48	3.73	b Interdisciplinary approach	FirstGen	63	3.78	b Interdisciplinary approach	FirstGen	97	3.62
to education	Non FG	133	3.62	to education	Non FG	158	3.61	to education	Non FG	160	3.64
C Linking theory and practice	FirstGen	49	3.53	C Linking theory and practice	FirstGen	64	3.48	C Linking theory and practice	FirstGen	96	3.41
	Non FG	130	3.45		Non FG	158	3.32		Non FG	157	3.39
d Narrative evaluations by	FirstGen	49	3.39	d Narrative evaluations by	FirstGen	64	3.44	d Narrative evaluations by	FirstGen	98	3.44
faculty	Non FG	131	3.46	faculty	Non FG	159	3.3	faculty	Non FG	159	3.41
e The practice of self-	FirstGen	49	3.43	e The practice of self-	FirstGen	64	3.39	e The practice of self- evaluation	FirstGen	98	3.15
evaluation	Non FG	132	3.38	evaluation	Non FG	157	3.23		Non FG	159	3.2
f Overall quality of instruction	FirstGen	49	3.51	f Overall quality of instruction	FirstGen	61	3.51	f Overall quality of instruction	FirstGen	97	3.47
Overall quality of instruction	Non FG	129	3.57	Overall quality of matraction	Non FG	157	3.45	Overall quality of motivation	Non FG	159	3.38
g Quality of learning interaction with other	FirstGen	50	3.44	g Quality of learning interaction with other	FirstGen	64	3.22	g Quality of learning interaction with other	FirstGen	98	3.28
students	Non FG	131	3.35	students	Non FG	157	3.25	students	Non FG	160	3.18
h The education you were able to construct as an	FirstGen	49	3.53	h The education you were able to construct as an	FirstGen	62	3.5	h The education you were able to construct as an	FirstGen	98	3.46
Evergreen student	Non FG	132	3.44	Evergreen student	Non FG	159	3.37	Evergreen student	Non FG	158	3.41
i Respect shown for different	FirstGen	50	3.28	i Respect shown for different	FirstGen	64	3.19	i Respect shown for different	FirstGen	98	3.13
or opposing viewpoints	Non FG	131	3.16	or opposing viewpoints	Non FG	158	3.17	or opposing viewpoints	Non FG	158	2.95
j Respect shown to persons of differing ethnicities,	FirstGen	48	3.44	j Respect shown to persons of differing ethnicities,	FirstGen	61	3.34	j Respect shown to persons of differing ethnicities,	FirstGen	98	3.33
religions, sexual or gender orientations	Non FG	131	3.4	religions, sexual or gender orientations	Non FG	159	3.41	religions, sexual or gender orientations	Non FG	159	3.24
No significant differences				No significant differences				No significant differences			

(1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Satisfied, 4=Very Satisfied)

		2007		2012							
Do you identify as gay	y, lesbian, b	isexual, t	ransgender	, or queer? (Questioning	alumni incl	uded)					
		N	Mean			N	Mean			N	Mean
a Academic planning/advising	LGBTQQ	25	2.92	a Academic planning/advising	LGBTQQ	58	3	a Academic planning/advising by	LGBTQQ	71	2.92
by faculty	Not	140	3.22	by faculty	Not	145	3.12	faculty	Not	161	3.18
b Interdisciplinary approach	LGBTQQ	27	3.67	b Interdisciplinary approach	LGBTQQ	57	3.63	b Interdisciplinary approach	LGBTQQ	71	3.55
to education	Not	140	3.67	to education	Not	144	3.66	to education	Not	160	3.69
C Linking theory and practice	LGBTQQ	27	3.37	C Linking theory and practice	LGBTQQ	58	3.28	C Linking theory and practice	LGBTQQ	69	3.33
Linking theory and practice	Not	139	3.5	Linking theory and practice	Not	144	3.41	Elliking theory and practice	Not	159	3.44
d Narrative evaluations by	LGBTQQ	27	3.44	d Narrative evaluations by	LGBTQQ	58	3.38	d Narrative evaluations by	LGBTQQ	70	3.39
faculty	Not	139	3.47	faculty	Not	145	3.32	faculty	Not	161	3.48
e The practice of self-	LGBTQQ	28	3.5	e The practice of self-	LGBTQQ	58	3.26	e The practice of self-	LGBTQQ	71	3.2
evaluation	Not	139	3.4	evaluation	Not	144	3.28	evaluation	Not	160	3.24
f Overall quality of instruction	LGBTQQ	26	3.5	f Overall quality of instruction	LGBTQQ	58	3.34	f Overall quality of instruction	LGBTQQ	70	3.34
Over all quality of illistruction	Not	138	3.57		Not	140	3.52		Not	160	3.46
g Quality of learning interaction with other	LGBTQQ	26	3.23	g Quality of learning interaction with other	LGBTQQ	58	3.14	g Quality of learning interaction with other	LGBTQQ	71	3.13
students	Not	140	3.43	students	Not	143	3.28	students	Not	161	3.26
h The education you were able to construct as an	LGBTQQ	27	3.37	h The education you were able to construct as an	LGBTQQ	56	3.38	h The education you were able to construct as an	LGBTQQ	70	3.36
Evergreen student	Not	140	3.5	Evergreen student	Not	145	3.43	Evergreen student	Not	160	3.48
i Respect shown for different	LGBTQQ	26	3.12	i Respect shown for different	LGBTQQ	58	3.03	i Respect shown for different	LGBTQQ	69	3
or opposing viewpoints	Not	140	3.21	or opposing viewpoints	Not	144	3.22	or opposing viewpoints	Not	161	3.09
j Respect shown to persons of differing ethnicities,	LGBTQQ	26	3.42	j Respect shown to persons of differing ethnicities,	LGBTQQ	58	3.22	Respect shown to persons of differing ethnicities,	LGBTQQ	70	3.1
religions, sexual or gender orientations	Not	139	3.42	religions, sexual or gender orientations	Not	142	3.46	religions, sexual or gender orientations	Not	161	3.39
No significant differences				No significant differences  No significant differences  Ro significant differences  No significant differences  Planning by Faculty, Interdisciplinary approach to education, and Respect shown to persons of differing ethnicities, religions, sexual or gender orientations.							

(1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Satisfied, 4=Very Satisfied)

	2002				2007				2012		
Non Traditional Age											
		N	Mean			N	Mean			N	Mean
a Academic planning/advising	NonTrad	94	3.21	a Academic planning/advising by	NonTrad	133	3.18	a Academic planning/advising	NonTrad	122	3.13
by faculty	Trad Age	85	3.08	faculty	Trad Age	90	2.98	by faculty	Trad Age	136	3.07
b Interdisciplinary approach	NonTrad	93	3.69	b Interdisciplinary approach	NonTrad	131	3.67	b Interdisciplinary approach	NonTrad	121	3.59
to education	Trad Age	88	3.61	to education	Trad Age	90	3.63	to education	Trad Age	136	3.67
c Linking theory and practice	NonTrad	92	3.48	C Linking theory and practice	NonTrad	132	3.45	c Linking theory and practice	NonTrad	121	3.37
	Trad Age	87	3.47		Trad Age	90	3.26		Trad Age	132	3.42
d Narrative evaluations by	NonTrad	94	3.47	d Narrative evaluations by	NonTrad	133	3.37	d Narrative evaluations by	NonTrad	122	3.37
faculty	Trad Age	86	3.41	faculty Tra	Trad Age	90	3.3	faculty	Trad Age	135	3.47
e The practice of self-	NonTrad	94	3.46	e The practice of self-	NonTrad	131	3.31	e The practice of self-	NonTrad	121	3.13
evaluation	Trad Age	87	3.32	evaluation	Trad Age	90	3.22	evaluation	Trad Age	136	3.23
f Overall quality of instruction	NonTrad	93	3.61	f Overall quality of instruction	Overall quality of instruction NonTrad 129 3.51   f Overall quality of instruction	NonTrad	121	3.43			
	Trad Age	85	3.48		Trad Age	89	3.4	, ,	Trad Age	135	3.41
g Quality of learning interaction with other	NonTrad	95	3.41	g Quality of learning interaction with other	NonTrad	133	3.25	g Quality of learning interaction with other	NonTrad	122	3.2
students	Trad Age	86	3.34	students	Trad Age	88	3.24	students	Trad Age	136	3.23
h The education you were able to construct as an	NonTrad	94	3.51	h The education you were able to construct as an	NonTrad	132	3.45	h The education you were able to construct as an	NonTrad	121	3.45
Evergreen student	Trad Age	87	3.41	Evergreen student	Trad Age	89	3.34	Evergreen student	Trad Age	135	3.41
i Respect shown for different	NonTrad	94	3.18	i Respect shown for different	NonTrad	133	3.17	i Respect shown for different	NonTrad	121	3.05
or opposing viewpoints	Trad Age	87	3.21	or opposing viewpoints	Trad Age	89	3.19	or opposing viewpoints	Trad Age	135	2.99
Respect shown to persons of differing ethnicities,	NonTrad	93	3.33	Respect shown to persons of differing ethnicities,	NonTrad	131	3.37	j Respect shown to persons of differing ethnicities,	NonTrad	121	3.28
religions, sexual or gender orientations	Trad Age	86	3.5	religions, sexual or gender orientations	Trad Age	89	3.43	religions, sexual or gender orientations	Trad Age	136	3.26
No significant differences				Non-Traditional Age studen with academic planning/aa theory and practice.	,	•	,	No significant differences			

(1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Satisfied, 4=Very Satisfied)

	2002				2007				2012		
Student of Color											
		N	Mean			N	Mean			N	Mean
a Academic planning/advising	SOC	26	3.38	a Academic planning/advising by	SOC	31	3.32	a Academic planning/advising	SOC	38	3.21
by faculty	WNH/U	153	3.11	faculty	WNH/U	192	3.06	by faculty	WNH/U	220	3.08
b Interdisciplinary approach	SOC	26	3.77	b Interdisciplinary approach	SOC	31	3.68	b Interdisciplinary approach	SOC	38	3.76
to education	WNH/U	155	3.63	to education	WNH/U	190	3.65	to education	WNH/U	219	3.61
C Linking theory and practice	SOC	26	3.58	C Linking theory and practice	SOC	31	3.52	C Linking theory and practice	SOC	38	3.53
Linking theory and practice	WNH/U	153	3.46	Linking theory and practice	WNH/U	191	3.35	Linking theory and practice	WNH/U	215	3.37
d Narrative evaluations by	SOC	26	3.46	d Narrative evaluations by	SOC	31	3.32	d Narrative evaluations by	SOC	37	3.38
faculty	WNH/U	154	3.44	faculty	WNH/U	192	3.34	faculty	WNH/U	220	3.43
e The practice of self-	SOC	26	3.5	e The practice of self-	SOC	31	3.45	e The practice of self-	SOC	37	3.3
evaluation	WNH/U	155	3.37	evaluation	WNH/U	190	3.25	evaluation	WNH/U	220	3.16
f Overall quality of instruction	SOC	25	3.76	f Overall quality of instruction	SOC	29	3.52	3.52 f Overall quality of instruction	SOC	38	3.47
Overall quality of instruction	WNH/U	153	3.52	Overall quality of instruction	WNH/U	189	3.46		WNH/U	218	3.41
g Quality of learning interaction with other	SOC	26	3.54	g Quality of learning interaction with other	soc	31	3.45	g Quality of learning interaction with other	soc	38	3.45
students	WNH/U	155	3.35	students	WNH/U	190	3.21	students	WNH/U	220	3.17
h The education you were able to construct as an	SOC	26	3.65	h The education you were able to construct as an	SOC	31	3.55	h The education you were able to construct as an	SOC	38	3.42
Evergreen student	WNH/U	155	3.43	Evergreen student	WNH/U	190	3.38	Evergreen student	WNH/U	218	3.43
i Respect shown for different	SOC	26	3.23	i Respect shown for different	SOC	31	3.39	i Respect shown for different	SOC	38	3.13
or opposing viewpoints	WNH/U	155	3.19	or opposing viewpoints	WNH/U	191	3.14	or opposing viewpoints	WNH/U	218	3
j Respect shown to persons of differing ethnicities,	SOC	26	3.38	j Respect shown to persons of differing ethnicities,	SOC	30	3.57	j Respect shown to persons of differing ethnicities,	SOC	38	3.29
religions, sexual or gender orientations	WNH/U	153	3.42	religions, sexual or gender orientations	WNH/U	190	3.36	religions, sexual or gender orientations	WNH/U	219	3.27
No significant differences				Students of color are significantly more satisfied with Academic planning/advising by faculty and Quality of learning interaction with other students  Students of color are significantly more satisfied with Cooperation of the color are significantly more satisfied with Cooperation							ith Quality