

Graduate Student Experience Survey 2012

College of Arts and Sciences: Humanities

This report includes, in this order:

Response Rate. A list of all programs represented in the report and their survey response rates.

Program Satisfaction. A table that shows the percentage of respondents in each academic program who rated 17 different aspects of their program (e.g., quality of the faculty; financial support for graduate students) as "excellent"; a table that shows the percentage of respondents in each academic program who rated these aspects as "excellent" or "very good;" a table that shows the percentage of respondents in each academic program who rated these aspects as "fair" or "poor."

Advisor Traits. A table that shows the percentage of respondents in each academic program who "strongly agreed" with each of 13 descriptive statements typically associated with academic advisors (e.g., encourages me in my scholarly pursuits; treats my ideas with respect); a table that shows the percentage of respondents in each program who "disagreed" or "strongly disagreed" with each of the 13 descriptive statements.

Departmental Climate. A table that shows the percentage of respondents in each academic program who "strongly agreed" that their program is like each of 10 descriptive statements (e.g., collegial; encouraging; supportive); a table that shows the percentage of respondents in each program who "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that their program is like the description; a table that shows the percentage of respondents in each program who "disagreed" or "strongly disagreed" that their program is like the description.

Historical Comparisons by Program. For each program represented in the school/college or divisional report, shown in alphabetical order, we present a series of eight tables-- three for program satisfaction, two for advisor traits, and three for departmental climate-- that compare the responses from the 2009 survey to those from the 2012 survey.

A Note about Departments and Programs with Small Respondent Numbers:

In order to preserve confidentiality, programs in which there were 8 or fewer respondents have been grouped with another similar unit, when possible, or suppressed in the program reports that follow. In this report, French, Italian, and Spanish were grouped with Romance Languages; Classics and Russian, East European and Eurasian Studies were suppressed.

GRADUATE STUDENT EXPERIENCE SURVEY RESPONSE RATE BY DEPARTMENT

CAS Hum	Number of Respondents	Number of Students Surveyed	Response Rate
Total for all Graduate Programs	1380	2677	51.6
CAS Hum	209	352	59.4
Classics	3	5	60.0
Comparative Literature	11	17	64.7
Creative Writing	10	27	37.0
East Asian Languages & Literatures	14	25	56.0
English	66	95	69.5
Folklore	10	14	71.4
German	8	10	80.0
Linguistics	26	51	51.0
Philosophy	23	34	67.6
Romance Languages	27	52	51.9
Russian and East European Studies	4	7	57.1
Theater Arts	7	15	46.7

CAS Humanities
Program Satisfaction
Percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as "Excellent."

	Comparative Literature (N = 11)	Creative Writing (N = 10)	East Asian Languages & Literatures (N = 16)	English (N = 69)	Folklore (N = 11)	German (N = 9)	Linguistics (N = 27)	Philosophy (N = 23)	Romance Languages (N = 30)	Theater Arts (N = 8)
Quality of the faculty	63.6	60.0	21.4	40.9	20.0	50.0	50.0	34.8	40.7	14.3
Overall Program quality	36.4	60.0	35.7	16.9	33.3	25.0	38.5	13.0	14.8	14.3
Financial support for graduate students	45.5	40.0	35.7	10.8	50.0	0.0	19.2	0.0	40.7	14.3
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	9.1	40.0	21.4	15.4	40.0	50.0	42.3	34.8	37.0	0.0
Quality of academic guidance and advising	45.5	20.0	35.7	25.8	40.0	37.5	30.8	8.7	22.2	14.3
Intellectual community in Program	72.7	40.0	35.7	40.9	66.7	37.5	57.7	21.7	26.9	0.0
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	9.1	0.0	21.4	13.6	0.0	12.5	3.8	8.7	7.7	0.0
Space, facilities and equipment	18.2	0.0	7.1	4.5	11.1	12.5	3.8	0.0	3.7	28.6
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students	27.3	10.0	14.3	10.6	50.0	25.0	20.0	34.8	11.1	14.3
Research opportunities in my program	9.1	11.1	14.3	4.6	30.0	12.5	15.4	13.0	14.8	14.3
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	18.2	0.0	35.7	6.1	11.1	25.0	24.0	8.7	7.7	0.0
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community	45.5	0.0	21.4	9.1	77.8	37.5	34.6	34.8	44.4	14.3
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	9.1	0.0	21.4	4.5	11.1	0.0	0.0	4.3	7.4	0.0
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	81.8	20.0	35.7	48.5	11.1	37.5	19.2	17.4	51.9	14.3
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	18.2	0.0	7.1	3.1	0.0	37.5	19.2	8.7	3.7	0.0
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	81.8	0.0	14.3	13.6	80.0	37.5	24.0	26.1	22.2	28.6
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity	36.4	20.0	21.4	12.1	66.7	25.0	23.1	4.5	11.1	14.3
33.3% of students or more rated the program as "Excellent". *	9	5	6	3	9	8	5	4	5	0
50% of students or more rated the program as "Excellent". **	4	2	0	0	6	2	2	0	1	0

*light green shading indicates that 33.3% or more of respondents rated their program as "Excellent."

**dark green shading indicates that 50% or more of respondents rated their program as "Excellent."

CAS Humanities

Program Satisfaction

Percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as "Excellent" or "Very Good."

	Comparative Literature (N = 11)	Creative Writing (N = 10)	East Asian Languages & Literatures (N = 16)	English (N = 69)	Folklore (N = 11)	German (N = 9)	Linguistics (N = 27)	Philosophy (N = 23)	Romance Languages (N = 30)	Theater Arts (N = 8)
Quality of the faculty	100.0	70.0	92.9	87.9	90.0	100.0	88.5	73.9	81.5	57.1
Overall Program quality	81.8	80.0	64.3	72.3	88.9	87.5	76.9	60.9	70.4	42.9
Financial support for graduate students	81.8	60.0	64.3	43.1	50.0	12.5	50.0	8.7	59.3	85.7
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	90.9	70.0	64.3	50.8	80.0	87.5	80.8	60.9	74.1	14.3
Quality of academic guidance and advising	72.7	60.0	57.1	57.6	80.0	37.5	73.1	43.5	44.4	28.6
Intellectual community in Program	81.8	80.0	50.0	75.8	100.0	75.0	76.9	43.5	61.5	14.3
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	45.5	20.0	50.0	47.0	42.9	87.5	69.2	21.7	34.6	0.0
Space, facilities and equipment	54.5	50.0	35.7	22.7	44.4	37.5	23.1	13.0	7.4	71.4
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students	54.5	50.0	28.6	45.5	50.0	62.5	48.0	56.5	40.7	14.3
Research opportunities in my program	63.6	33.3	57.1	41.5	60.0	50.0	61.5	34.8	44.4	14.3
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	63.6	50.0	71.4	45.5	77.8	50.0	68.0	47.8	50.0	28.6
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community	90.9	60.0	50.0	47.0	88.9	75.0	69.2	52.2	66.7	14.3
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	45.5	20.0	35.7	13.6	44.4	37.5	30.8	13.0	25.9	14.3
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	90.9	80.0	57.1	78.8	44.4	50.0	57.7	52.2	74.1	42.9
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	54.5	40.0	50.0	29.2	66.7	62.5	57.7	26.1	33.3	42.9
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	90.9	11.1	71.4	37.9	90.0	50.0	48.0	47.8	44.4	42.9
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity	81.8	40.0	57.1	37.9	88.9	62.5	73.1	27.3	51.9	14.3
50% of students or more rated the program as "Excellent" or "Very Good".*	15	11	14	6	13	13	13	6	9	3
75% of students or more rated the program as "Excellent" or "Very Good".**	9	3	1	3	9	6	4	0	1	1

*light green shading indicates that 50% or more of respondents rated their program as "Excellent" or "Very Good."

**dark green shading indicates that 75% or more of respondents rated their program as "Excellent" or "Very Good."

CAS Humanities

Program Satisfaction

Percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as "Fair" or "Poor."

	Comparative Literature (N = 11)	Creative Writing (N = 10)	East Asian Languages & Literatures (N = 16)	English (N = 69)	Folklore (N = 11)	German (N = 9)	Linguistics (N = 27)	Philosophy (N = 23)	Romance Languages (N = 30)	Theater Arts (N = 8)
Quality of the faculty	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	3.8	8.7	7.4	28.6
Overall Program quality	0.0	10.0	0.0	7.7	11.1	0.0	11.5	17.4	11.1	28.6
Financial support for graduate students	0.0	10.0	14.3	27.7	12.5	37.5	19.2	87.0	25.9	14.3
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	0.0	10.0	7.1	12.3	0.0	12.5	7.7	13.0	11.1	42.9
Quality of academic guidance and advising	18.2	10.0	14.3	15.2	20.0	25.0	7.7	26.1	29.6	57.1
Intellectual community in Program	9.1	10.0	21.4	4.5	0.0	12.5	3.8	34.8	15.4	0.0
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	9.1	60.0	14.3	16.7	28.6	0.0	15.4	39.1	34.6	71.4
Space, facilities and equipment	27.3	20.0	35.7	40.9	33.3	12.5	34.6	47.8	74.1	0.0
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students	18.2	20.0	50.0	21.2	12.5	12.5	12.0	34.8	37.0	71.4
Research opportunities in my program	9.1	33.3	7.1	27.7	20.0	0.0	11.5	39.1	25.9	57.1
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	9.1	30.0	7.1	27.3	11.1	12.5	8.0	17.4	26.9	28.6
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community	9.1	20.0	21.4	21.2	0.0	12.5	15.4	26.1	7.4	42.9
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	18.2	60.0	21.4	62.1	22.2	25.0	34.6	69.6	51.9	71.4
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	9.1	0.0	0.0	6.1	22.2	25.0	7.7	8.7	3.7	28.6
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	9.1	30.0	21.4	33.8	11.1	25.0	7.7	21.7	33.3	28.6
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	0.0	77.8	21.4	28.8	0.0	12.5	20.0	26.1	18.5	28.6
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity	0.0	40.0	0.0	15.2	0.0	0.0	11.5	31.8	18.5	28.6
20% of students or more rated the program as "Fair" or "Poor".*	1	10	7	9	6	5	3	12	9	14

*orange shading indicates that 20% or more of respondents rated their program as "Fair" or "Poor."

CAS Humanities

Advisor *Percentage of respondents who "Strongly Agreed" with each of the following statements about their advisor.*

	Comparative Literature (N = 11)	Creative Writing (N = 10)	East Asian Languages & Literatures (N = 16)	English (N = 69)	Folklore (N = 11)	German (N = 9)	Linguistics (N = 27)	Philosophy (N = 23)	Romance Languages (N = 30)	Theater Arts (N = 8)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	77.8	66.7	81.8	72.7	77.8	85.7	45.8	81.0	52.0	66.7
Treats my ideas with respect	77.8	66.7	80.0	85.5	88.9	85.7	62.5	76.2	76.0	66.7
Provides constructive feedback on my work	44.4	55.6	81.8	69.1	66.7	57.1	56.5	61.9	52.0	50.0
Provides timely feedback on my work	55.6	55.6	72.7	65.5	55.6	42.9	47.8	66.7	48.0	50.0
Is available when I need help or advice	44.4	55.6	72.7	70.9	66.7	57.1	43.5	66.7	60.0	50.0
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	33.3	55.6	81.8	61.8	77.8	57.1	43.5	61.9	52.0	50.0
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds	55.6	66.7	90.9	81.8	88.9	71.4	65.2	76.2	80.0	66.7
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field	44.4	33.3	63.6	54.5	88.9	57.1	54.5	66.7	44.0	66.7
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work	22.2	33.3	54.5	14.5	50.0	42.9	36.4	38.1	24.0	16.7
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	44.4	22.2	54.5	25.5	75.0	57.1	54.5	33.3	12.0	50.0
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	55.6	33.3	54.5	32.7	55.6	57.1	47.8	42.9	12.5	50.0
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements	55.6	22.2	81.8	65.5	75.0	57.1	56.5	42.9	44.0	66.7
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	55.6	55.6	81.8	61.8	77.8	71.4	39.1	47.6	48.0	66.7
50% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" with the above dimensions about their advisor.*	7	8.0	13.0	10.0	13.0	11.0	6.0	8.0	6.0	12.0
75% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" with the above dimensions about their advisor.**	2	0.0	7.0	2.0	8.0	2.0	0.0	3.0	2.0	0.0

*light green shading indicates that 50% or more of respondents "Strongly Agreed" with the above dimensions about their advisor.

**dark green shading indicates that 75% or more of respondents "Strongly Agreed" with the above dimensions about their advisor.

CAS Humanities

Advisor *Percentage of respondents who "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" with each of the following statements about their advisor.*

	Comparative Literature (N = 11)	Creative Writing (N = 10)	East Asian Languages & Literatures (N = 16)	English (N = 69)	Folklore (N = 11)	German (N = 9)	Linguistics (N = 27)	Philosophy (N = 23)	Romance Languages (N = 30)	Theater Arts (N = 8)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	4.0	16.7
Treats my ideas with respect	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	16.7
Provides constructive feedback on my work	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.0	16.7
Provides timely feedback on my work	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.9	0.0	0.0	4.3	4.8	8.0	16.7
Is available when I need help or advice	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	4.3	4.8	8.0	0.0
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	11.1	0.0	4.3	0.0	4.0	16.7
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	33.3
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field	0.0	11.1	0.0	5.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	16.7
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work	0.0	44.4	9.1	30.9	0.0	0.0	22.7	14.3	16.0	33.3
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	11.1	55.6	9.1	18.2	0.0	0.0	13.6	9.5	20.0	33.3
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	11.1	44.4	0.0	14.5	11.1	0.0	8.7	9.5	20.8	33.3
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements	11.1	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.7	0.0	12.0	16.7
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	0.0	11.1	0.0	7.3	11.1	0.0	8.7	9.5	4.0	33.3
20% of students or more "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" with the statements above about their advisor.*	0	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	5
33.3% of students or more "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" with the statements above about their advisor.**	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

*red shading indicates that 20% or more of respondents "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" with the statements above about their advisor.

CAS Humanities

Climate *Percentage of respondents who "Strongly Agreed" that their program is like the description.*

	Comparative Literature (N = 11)	Creative Writing (N = 10)	East Asian Languages & Literatures (N = 16)	English (N = 69)	Folklore (N = 11)	German (N = 9)	Linguistics (N = 27)	Philosophy (N = 23)	Romance Languages (N = 30)	Theater Arts (N = 8)
Collegial	81.8	50.0	30.8	56.3	50.0	62.5	57.7	8.7	42.3	0.0
Encouraging	80.0	20.0	69.2	45.3	77.8	50.0	50.0	13.0	38.5	28.6
Supportive	81.8	40.0	53.8	43.8	66.7	62.5	50.0	8.7	38.5	28.6
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches	63.6	30.0	38.5	29.7	77.8	37.5	30.8	34.8	42.3	14.3
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	100.0	11.1	38.5	20.3	88.9	37.5	23.1	30.4	30.8	14.3
Inclusive of students of color	81.8	77.8	46.2	26.6	55.6	75.0	53.8	56.5	76.9	14.3
Inclusive by gender	72.7	60.0	69.2	53.1	66.7	75.0	60.0	69.6	69.2	28.6
Inclusive of international students	90.9	55.6	84.6	26.6	66.7	100.0	80.8	34.8	76.9	0.0
Inclusive of students with disabilities	63.6	44.4	53.8	40.6	55.6	62.5	44.0	26.1	46.2	14.3
Inclusive of first generation students	72.7	50.0	53.8	30.2	55.6	75.0	52.0	43.5	50.0	14.3
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	100.0	70.0	84.6	64.1	66.7	100.0	61.5	69.6	69.2	42.9
33.3% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" that the description fit their program*	11	8	10	6	11	11	9	6	10	1
50% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" that the description fit their program**	11	6	7	3	11	9	8	3	5	0

*light green shading indicates that 33.3% or more of respondents "Strongly Agreed" that their program was very much like the description.

**dark green shading indicates that 50% or more of respondents "Strongly Agreed" that their program was very much like the description.

CAS Humanities

Climate

Percentage of respondents who "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" that their program is like the description.

	Comparative Literature (N = 11)	Creative Writing (N = 10)	East Asian Languages & Literatures (N = 16)	English (N = 69)	Folklore (N = 11)	German (N = 9)	Linguistics (N = 27)	Philosophy (N = 23)	Romance Languages (N = 30)	Theater Arts (N = 8)
Collegial	90.9	80.0	76.9	90.6	75.0	87.5	76.9	52.2	73.1	28.6
Encouraging	100.0	60.0	92.3	82.8	100.0	87.5	96.2	56.5	73.1	42.9
Supportive	100.0	70.0	92.3	84.4	100.0	87.5	88.5	47.8	61.5	42.9
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches	90.9	50.0	84.6	71.9	100.0	87.5	76.9	65.2	73.1	57.1
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	100.0	22.2	76.9	53.1	100.0	87.5	65.4	65.2	65.4	42.9
Inclusive of students of color	100.0	88.9	84.6	54.7	66.7	100.0	84.6	65.2	88.5	42.9
Inclusive by gender	100.0	80.0	84.6	85.9	88.9	100.0	96.0	91.3	88.5	57.1
Inclusive of international students	100.0	88.9	92.3	53.1	77.8	100.0	92.3	60.9	88.5	14.3
Inclusive of students with disabilities	81.8	66.7	84.6	76.6	66.7	87.5	84.0	60.9	76.9	28.6
Inclusive of first generation students	90.9	70.0	84.6	54.0	77.8	100.0	84.0	65.2	92.3	28.6
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	100.0	90.0	92.3	93.8	88.9	100.0	80.8	87.0	96.2	57.1
50% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" that the description fit their program.*	11	10	11	11	11	11	11	10	11	3
75% of students or more "Strong Agreed" or "Agreed" that the description fit their program.**	11	5	11	6	9	11	10	2	6	0

*light green shading indicates that 50% or more of respondents "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" that the description fit their program.

**dark green shading indicates that 75% or more of respondents "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" that the description fit their program.

CAS Humanities

Climate *Percentage of respondents who "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" that their program is like the description.*

	Comparative Literature (N = 11)	Creative Writing (N = 10)	East Asian Languages & Literatures (N = 16)	English (N = 69)	Folklore (N = 11)	German (N = 9)	Linguistics (N = 27)	Philosophy (N = 23)	Romance Languages (N = 30)	Theater Arts (N = 8)
Collegial	0.0	10.0	7.7	1.6	0.0	12.5	3.8	17.4	7.7	42.9
Encouraging	0.0	30.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	12.5	3.8	17.4	11.5	28.6
Supportive	0.0	20.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	3.8	21.7	11.5	42.9
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches	0.0	20.0	0.0	7.8	0.0	0.0	11.5	17.4	11.5	28.6
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	0.0	55.6	0.0	17.2	0.0	0.0	11.5	8.7	15.4	28.6
Inclusive of students of color	0.0	0.0	7.7	18.8	11.1	0.0	7.7	8.7	11.5	42.9
Inclusive by gender	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.5	28.6
Inclusive of international students	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.2	11.1	0.0	3.8	13.0	7.7	28.6
Inclusive of students with disabilities	0.0	0.0	15.4	6.3	11.1	0.0	4.0	13.0	0.0	28.6
Inclusive of first generation students	0.0	10.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	4.0	13.0	3.8	28.6
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	14.3
20% of students or more "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" that the description fit their program.*	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	10
33.3% of students or more "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" that the description fit their program.*	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

*red shading indicates that 20% or more of respondents "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" that the description fit their program.

Comparative Literature

Program Satisfaction: percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as...

	Excellent		Excellent or Very Good		Fair or Poor	
	2009 (N = 10)	2012 (N = 11)	2009 (N = 10)	2012 (N = 11)	2009 (N = 10)	2012 (N = 11)
Quality of the faculty	20.5	63.6	66.0	100.0	11.2	0.0
Overall Program quality	9.3	36.4	50.6	81.8	21.5	0.0
Financial support for graduate students	9.3	45.5	48.6	81.8	30.8	0.0
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	20.6	9.1	59.9	90.9	30.8	0.0
Quality of academic guidance and advising	20.6	45.5	52.6	72.7	19.5	18.2
Intellectual community in Program	20.6	72.7	39.2	81.8	40.1	9.1
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	9.1	N/A	45.5	N/A	9.1
Space, facilities and equipment	20.6	18.2	57.8	54.5	42.1	27.3
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	9.3	27.3	59.9	54.5	30.8	18.2
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	9.1	N/A	63.6	N/A	9.1
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	20.6	18.2	50.5	63.6	10.2	9.1
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	39.3	45.5	50.6	90.9	21.5	9.1
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	9.1	N/A	45.5	N/A	18.2
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	18.6	81.8	41.2	90.9	21.5	9.1
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	20.6	18.2	59.9	54.5	21.5	9.1
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	80.5	81.8	80.5	90.9	10.2	0.0
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	29.9	36.4	59.8	81.8	28.8	0.0
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	9 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2012, compared to 2 in 2009.		15 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 11 in 2009.		1 features rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2012, compared to 10 in 2009.	
	4 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 1 in 2009.		9 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2012, compared to 1 in 2009.			

Comparative Literature

Advisor: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed with each of the following statements about their advisor.

	Strongly Agreed		Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 10)	2012 (N = 11)	2009 (N = 10)	2012 (N = 11)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	70.1	77.8	0.0	0.0
Treats my ideas with respect	58.7	77.8	0.0	0.0
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	59.9	44.4	9.3	0.0
Provides timely feedback on my work	59.9	55.6	0.0	0.0
Is available when I need help or advice	48.6	44.4	0.0	0.0
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	33.3	N/A	0.0
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	70.1	55.6	0.0	0.0
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	48.6	44.4	0.0	0.0
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	44.3	22.2	10.5	0.0
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	55.7	44.4	10.5	11.1
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	38.1	55.6	0.0	11.1
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	67.0	55.6	0.0	11.1
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	70.1	55.6	0.0	0.0
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 7 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 8 statements in 2009.		At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.	
	At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 2 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.			

Comparative Literature

Climate: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed that their program is like the description

	Strongly Agreed		Strongly Agreed or Agreed		Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 10)	2012 (N = 11)	2009 (N = 10)	2012 (N = 11)	2009 (N = 10)	2012 (N = 11)
Collegial	N/A	81.8	N/A	90.9	N/A	0.0
Encouraging	54.8	80.0	65.3	100.0	11.5	0.0
Supportive	39.3	81.8	69.2	100.0	10.2	0.0
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	37.2	63.6	69.2	90.9	10.2	0.0
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	69.2	100.0	80.5	100.0	10.2	0.0
Inclusive of students of color*	27.9	81.8	59.9	100.0	21.5	0.0
Inclusive by gender*	48.6	72.7	69.2	100.0	10.2	0.0
Inclusive of international students	N/A	90.9	N/A	100.0	N/A	0.0
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	46.9	63.6	87.2	81.8	12.8	0.0
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	72.7	N/A	90.9	N/A	0.0
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	66.0	100.0	76.3	100.0	11.2	0.0
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 11 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 7 statements in 2009.		At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 11 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 8 statements in 2009.		At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 1 statements in 2009.	
	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 11 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 3 statements in 2009.		At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 11 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 3 statements in 2009.			

Creative Writing

Program Satisfaction: percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as...

	Excellent		Excellent or Very Good		Fair or Poor	
	2009 (N = 14)	2012 (N = 10)	2009 (N = 14)	2012 (N = 10)	2009 (N = 14)	2012 (N = 10)
Quality of the faculty	30.9	60.0	83.8	70.0	7.3	0.0
Overall Program quality	30.9	60.0	61.8	80.0	0.0	10.0
Financial support for graduate students	41.4	40.0	78.0	60.0	7.3	10.0
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	23.6	40.0	54.5	70.0	7.3	10.0
Quality of academic guidance and advising	30.9	20.0	61.8	60.0	23.6	10.0
Intellectual community in Program	50.9	40.0	74.6	80.0	0.0	10.0
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	0.0	N/A	20.0	N/A	60.0
Space, facilities and equipment	39.8	0.0	61.8	50.0	14.6	20.0
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	23.6	10.0	47.2	50.0	22.0	20.0
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	11.1	N/A	33.3	N/A	33.3
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	16.2	0.0	47.1	50.0	22.0	30.0
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	25.1	0.0	47.1	60.0	38.2	20.0
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	0.0	N/A	20.0	N/A	60.0
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	16.2	20.0	39.8	80.0	30.9	0.0
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	16.2	0.0	61.7	40.0	30.9	30.0
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	16.2	0.0	39.8	11.1	29.3	77.8
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	8.9	20.0	39.8	40.0	22.0	40.0
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	5 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2012, compared to 3 in 2009.		11 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 8 in 2009.		10 features rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2012, compared to 8 in 2009.	
	2 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 1 in 2009.		3 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2012, compared to 2 in 2009.			

Creative Writing

Advisor: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed with each of the following statements about their advisor.

	Strongly Agreed		Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 14)	2012 (N = 10)	2009 (N = 14)	2012 (N = 10)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	76.4	66.7	0.0	0.0
Treats my ideas with respect	70.7	66.7	0.0	0.0
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	61.8	55.6	0.0	0.0
Provides timely feedback on my work	61.8	55.6	0.0	0.0
Is available when I need help or advice	48.3	55.6	0.0	0.0
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	55.6	N/A	0.0
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	47.1	66.7	14.7	0.0
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	41.4	33.3	7.3	11.1
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	23.6	33.3	7.3	44.4
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	30.9	22.2	30.9	55.6
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	30.9	33.3	23.6	44.4
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	47.1	22.2	7.3	11.1
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	39.8	55.6	7.3	11.1
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 8 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 4 statements in 2009.		At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 3 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 2 statements in 2009.	
	At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 1 statements in 2009.			

Creative Writing

Climate: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed that their program is like the description

	Strongly Agreed			Strongly Agreed or Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 14)	2012 (N = 10)		2009 (N = 14)	2012 (N = 10)		2009 (N = 14)	2012 (N = 10)
Collegial	N/A	50.0		N/A	80.0		N/A	10.0
Encouraging	8.9	20.0		54.4	60.0		38.2	30.0
Supportive	16.2	40.0		54.4	70.0		30.9	20.0
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	16.2	30.0		61.7	50.0		16.2	20.0
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	16.2	11.1		54.4	22.2		16.2	55.6
Inclusive of students of color*	9.6	77.8		33.3	88.9		33.3	0.0
Inclusive by gender*	14.7	60.0		54.5	80.0		23.6	0.0
Inclusive of international students	N/A	55.6		N/A	88.9		N/A	0.0
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	17.5	44.4		66.6	66.7		7.9	0.0
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	50.0		N/A	70.0		N/A	10.0
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	47.1	70.0		78.0	90.0		0.0	0.0
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 8 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 1 statements in 2009.			At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 10 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 7 statements in 2009.			At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 4 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 4 statements in 2009.	
	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 6 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.			At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 5 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 1 statements in 2009.				

East Asian Languages & Literatures

Program Satisfaction: percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as...

	Excellent		Excellent or Very Good		Fair or Poor	
	2009 (N = 12)	2012 (N = 16)	2009 (N = 12)	2012 (N = 16)	2009 (N = 12)	2012 (N = 16)
Quality of the faculty	36.2	21.4	62.7	92.9	17.7	0.0
Overall Program quality	31.8	35.7	54.0	64.3	14.8	0.0
Financial support for graduate students	17.1	35.7	39.3	64.3	46.0	14.3
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	31.8	21.4	61.4	64.3	14.8	7.1
Quality of academic guidance and advising	46.6	35.7	54.0	57.1	22.2	14.3
Intellectual community in Program	39.2	35.7	54.0	50.0	31.2	21.4
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	21.4	N/A	50.0	N/A	14.3
Space, facilities and equipment	17.1	7.1	39.3	35.7	53.4	35.7
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	24.5	14.3	39.3	28.6	38.6	50.0
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	14.3	N/A	57.1	N/A	7.1
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	31.8	35.7	61.4	71.4	22.2	7.1
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	26.4	21.4	50.4	50.0	33.7	21.4
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	21.4	N/A	35.7	N/A	21.4
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	39.2	35.7	63.0	57.1	29.6	0.0
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	22.9	7.1	46.7	50.0	22.2	21.4
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	39.2	14.3	54.0	71.4	38.6	21.4
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	31.8	21.4	54.0	57.1	14.8	0.0
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	6 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2012, compared to 5 in 2009.		14 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 10 in 2009.		7 features rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2012, compared to 10 in 2009.	
	0 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 0 in 2009.		1 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2012, compared to 0 in 2009.			

East Asian Languages & Literatures

Advisor: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed with each of the following statements about their advisor.

	Strongly Agreed		Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 12)	2012 (N = 16)	2009 (N = 12)	2012 (N = 16)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	61.4	81.8	0.0	0.0
Treats my ideas with respect	76.2	80.0	0.0	0.0
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	61.4	81.8	0.0	0.0
Provides timely feedback on my work	61.4	72.7	0.0	0.0
Is available when I need help or advice	68.8	72.7	7.4	0.0
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	81.8	N/A	0.0
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	68.8	90.9	0.0	0.0
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	68.8	63.6	0.0	0.0
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	54.0	54.5	7.4	9.1
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	37.6	54.5	7.4	9.1
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	37.6	54.5	7.4	0.0
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	61.4	81.8	7.4	0.0
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	68.8	81.8	7.4	0.0
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 13 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 10 statements in 2009.		At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statements about their advisor in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.	
	At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 7 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 1 statements in 2009.			

East Asian Languages & Literatures

Climate: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed that their program is like the description

	Strongly Agreed			Strongly Agreed or Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 12)	2012 (N = 16)		2009 (N = 12)	2012 (N = 16)		2009 (N = 12)	2012 (N = 16)
Collegial	N/A	30.8		N/A	76.9		N/A	7.7
Encouraging	39.2	69.2		61.4	92.3		7.4	0.0
Supportive	48.2	53.8		77.8	92.3		7.4	0.0
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	37.6	38.5		68.8	84.6		7.4	0.0
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	39.2	38.5		54.0	76.9		16.4	0.0
Inclusive of students of color*	39.2	46.2		61.4	84.6		9.0	7.7
Inclusive by gender*	39.2	69.2		77.8	84.6		0.0	0.0
Inclusive of international students	N/A	84.6		N/A	92.3		N/A	0.0
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	39.2	53.8		77.8	84.6		0.0	15.4
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	53.8		N/A	84.6		N/A	0.0
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	63.0	84.6		92.6	92.3		0.0	0.0
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 10 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 8 statements in 2009.			At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 11 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 8 statements in 2009.			At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.	
	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 7 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 1 statements in 2009.			At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 11 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 4 statements in 2009.				

Program Satisfaction: percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as...

	Excellent		Excellent or Very Good		Fair or Poor	
	2009 (N = 47)	2012 (N = 69)	2009 (N = 47)	2012 (N = 69)	2009 (N = 47)	2012 (N = 69)
Quality of the faculty	30.1	40.9	89.2	87.9	2.0	1.5
Overall Program quality	12.5	16.9	61.3	72.3	9.2	7.7
Financial support for graduate students	6.4	10.8	36.1	43.1	42.3	27.7
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	16.0	15.4	61.7	50.8	8.8	12.3
Quality of academic guidance and advising	16.7	25.8	63.7	57.6	10.8	15.2
Intellectual community in Program	46.6	40.9	80.9	75.8	8.8	4.5
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	13.6	N/A	47.0	N/A	16.7
Space, facilities and equipment	8.4	4.5	29.7	22.7	43.1	40.9
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	14.3	10.6	44.1	45.5	24.0	21.2
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	4.6	N/A	41.5	N/A	27.7
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	10.3	6.1	28.3	45.5	17.6	27.3
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	8.4	9.1	40.5	47.0	24.0	21.2
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	4.5	N/A	13.6	N/A	62.1
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	41.7	48.5	70.1	78.8	12.7	6.1
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	8.8	3.1	25.5	29.2	34.2	33.8
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	11.9	13.6	33.9	37.9	30.1	28.8
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	11.9	12.1	40.3	37.9	15.4	15.2
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	3 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2012, compared to 2 in 2009.		6 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 6 in 2009.		9 features rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2012, compared to 6 in 2009.	
	0 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 0 in 2009.		3 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2012, compared to 2 in 2009.			

Advisor: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed with each of the following statements about their advisor.

	Strongly Agreed		Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 47)	2012 (N = 69)	2009 (N = 47)	2012 (N = 69)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	69.1	72.7	0.0	0.0
Treats my ideas with respect	62.7	85.5	0.0	0.0
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	54.5	69.1	0.0	1.8
Provides timely feedback on my work	48.0	65.5	6.1	10.9
Is available when I need help or advice	56.5	70.9	2.0	1.8
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	61.8	N/A	1.8
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	60.9	81.8	0.0	0.0
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	54.5	54.5	2.0	5.5
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	27.6	14.5	18.4	30.9
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	32.5	25.5	9.0	18.2
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	35.2	32.7	13.7	14.5
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	46.4	65.5	0.0	0.0
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	56.5	61.8	4.0	7.3
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 10 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 7 statements in 2009.		At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 1 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.	
	At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 2 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.			

Climate: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed that their program is like the description

	Strongly Agreed			Strongly Agreed or Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 47)	2012 (N = 69)		2009 (N = 47)	2012 (N = 69)		2009 (N = 47)	2012 (N = 69)
Collegial	N/A	56.3		N/A	90.6		N/A	1.6
Encouraging	28.3	45.3		73.7	82.8		8.8	3.1
Supportive	32.2	43.8		73.7	84.4		6.8	3.1
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	24.8	29.7		66.9	71.9		15.1	7.8
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	14.3	20.3		59.3	53.1		15.6	17.2
Inclusive of students of color*	16.7	26.6		45.9	54.7		19.1	18.8
Inclusive by gender*	39.0	53.1		80.9	85.9		6.8	0.0
Inclusive of international students	N/A	26.6		N/A	53.1		N/A	17.2
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	25.1	40.6		71.2	76.6		8.9	6.3
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	30.2		N/A	54.0		N/A	11.1
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	55.3	64.1		85.3	93.8		4.4	0.0
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 6 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 2 statements in 2009.			At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 11 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 7 statements in 2009.			At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.	
	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 3 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 1 statements in 2009.			At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 6 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 2 statements in 2009.				

Folklore

Program Satisfaction: percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as...

	Excellent		Excellent or Very Good		Fair or Poor	
	2009 (N = 10)	2012 (N = 11)	2009 (N = 10)	2012 (N = 11)	2009 (N = 10)	2012 (N = 11)
Quality of the faculty	55.0	20.0	72.7	90.0	0.0	0.0
Overall Program quality	17.7	33.3	46.1	88.9	0.0	11.1
Financial support for graduate students	0.0	50.0	8.8	50.0	82.3	12.5
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	37.3	40.0	63.8	80.0	0.0	0.0
Quality of academic guidance and advising	37.3	40.0	72.7	80.0	0.0	20.0
Intellectual community in Program	26.5	66.7	44.2	100.0	10.8	0.0
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	0.0	N/A	42.9	N/A	28.6
Space, facilities and equipment	8.8	11.1	17.6	44.4	73.4	33.3
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	0.0	50.0	8.8	50.0	53.0	12.5
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	30.0	N/A	60.0	N/A	20.0
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	27.3	11.1	53.8	77.8	0.0	11.1
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	18.5	77.8	45.0	88.9	8.8	0.0
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	11.1	N/A	44.4	N/A	22.2
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	8.8	11.1	26.5	44.4	17.7	22.2
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	8.8	0.0	44.2	66.7	17.7	11.1
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	91.2	80.0	91.2	90.0	8.8	0.0
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	46.1	66.7	100.0	88.9	0.0	0.0
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	9 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2012, compared to 5 in 2009.		13 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 6 in 2009.		6 features rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2012, compared to 3 in 2009.	
	6 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 2 in 2009.		9 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2012, compared to 2 in 2009.			

Folklore

Advisor: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed with each of the following statements about their advisor.

	Strongly Agreed		Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 10)	2012 (N = 11)	2009 (N = 10)	2012 (N = 11)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	82.3	77.8	0.0	0.0
Treats my ideas with respect	64.6	88.9	0.0	0.0
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	46.1	66.7	9.6	0.0
Provides timely feedback on my work	55.0	55.6	0.0	0.0
Is available when I need help or advice	35.4	66.7	0.0	0.0
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	77.8	N/A	11.1
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	72.7	88.9	0.0	11.1
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	90.4	88.9	0.0	0.0
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	17.7	50.0	26.5	0.0
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	27.3	75.0	28.4	0.0
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	8.8	55.6	55.0	11.1
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	19.6	75.0	8.8	0.0
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	63.8	77.8	8.8	11.1
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 13 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 6 statements in 2009.		At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 3 statements in 2009.	
	At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 8 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 2 statements in 2009.			

Folklore

Climate: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed that their program is like the description

	Strongly Agreed		Strongly Agreed or Agreed		Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 10)	2012 (N = 11)	2009 (N = 10)	2012 (N = 11)	2009 (N = 10)	2012 (N = 11)
Collegial	N/A	50.0	N/A	75.0	N/A	0.0
Encouraging	45.0	77.8	91.1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Supportive	46.1	66.7	82.3	100.0	0.0	0.0
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	46.1	77.8	72.6	100.0	0.0	0.0
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	82.3	88.9	91.1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Inclusive of students of color*	35.4	55.6	63.8	66.7	8.8	11.1
Inclusive by gender*	61.9	66.7	91.1	88.9	0.0	0.0
Inclusive of international students	N/A	66.7	N/A	77.8	N/A	11.1
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	66.8	55.6	88.3	66.7	0.0	11.1
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	55.6	N/A	77.8	N/A	0.0
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	100.0	66.7	100.0	88.9	0.0	0.0
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 11 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 8 statements in 2009.		At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 11 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 8 statements in 2009.		At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.	
	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 11 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 4 statements in 2009.		At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 9 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 6 statements in 2009.			

Linguistics

Program Satisfaction: percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as...

	Excellent			Excellent or Very Good			Fair or Poor	
	2009 (N = 23)	2012 (N = 27)		2009 (N = 23)	2012 (N = 27)		2009 (N = 23)	2012 (N = 27)
Quality of the faculty	52.1	50.0		91.8	88.5		4.1	3.8
Overall Program quality	34.2	38.5		76.3	76.9		0.0	11.5
Financial support for graduate students	8.8	19.2		39.0	50.0		32.5	19.2
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	34.2	42.3		70.6	80.8		4.0	7.7
Quality of academic guidance and advising	35.0	30.8		79.3	73.1		0.0	7.7
Intellectual community in Program	29.4	57.7		88.2	76.9		0.0	3.8
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	3.8		N/A	69.2		N/A	15.4
Space, facilities and equipment	8.8	3.8		17.6	23.1		40.4	34.6
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	21.5	20.0		67.1	48.0		8.2	12.0
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	15.4		N/A	61.5		N/A	11.5
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	26.3	24.0		76.3	68.0		0.0	8.0
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	48.8	34.6		74.4	69.2		8.2	15.4
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	0.0		N/A	30.8		N/A	34.6
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	24.6	19.2		76.3	57.7		4.0	7.7
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	30.2	19.2		79.3	57.7		4.0	7.7
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	16.7	24.0		50.9	48.0		11.9	20.0
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	28.5	23.1		79.4	73.1		7.9	11.5
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	5 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2012, compared to 5 in 2009.			13 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 12 in 2009.			3 features rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2012, compared to 2 in 2009.	
	2 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 1 in 2009.			4 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2012, compared to 8 in 2009.				

Linguistics

Advisor: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed with each of the following statements about their advisor.

	Strongly Agreed		Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 23)	2012 (N = 27)	2009 (N = 23)	2012 (N = 27)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	72.3	45.8	0.0	4.2
Treats my ideas with respect	68.4	62.5	4.0	8.3
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	68.4	56.5	0.0	0.0
Provides timely feedback on my work	55.7	47.8	11.9	4.3
Is available when I need help or advice	59.6	43.5	4.0	4.3
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	43.5	N/A	4.3
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	76.3	65.2	7.9	4.3
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	67.5	54.5	0.0	0.0
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	38.1	36.4	7.9	22.7
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	41.2	54.5	0.0	13.6
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	46.9	47.8	7.9	8.7
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	54.0	56.5	4.0	8.7
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	63.6	39.1	7.9	8.7
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 6 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 9 statements in 2009.		At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 1 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.	
	At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 1 statements in 2009.			

Linguistics

Climate: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed that their program is like the description

	Strongly Agreed		Strongly Agreed or Agreed		Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 23)	2012 (N = 27)	2009 (N = 23)	2012 (N = 27)	2009 (N = 23)	2012 (N = 27)
Collegial	N/A	57.7	N/A	76.9	N/A	3.8
Encouraging	68.4	50.0	92.1	96.2	0.0	3.8
Supportive	71.5	50.0	92.1	88.5	0.0	3.8
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	33.3	30.8	92.1	76.9	0.0	11.5
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	37.3	23.1	92.1	65.4	0.0	11.5
Inclusive of students of color*	71.5	53.8	88.2	84.6	0.0	7.7
Inclusive by gender*	71.5	60.0	92.1	96.0	4.0	0.0
Inclusive of international students	N/A	80.8	N/A	92.3	N/A	3.8
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	61.2	44.0	91.8	84.0	0.0	4.0
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	52.0	N/A	84.0	N/A	4.0
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	67.5	61.5	88.1	80.8	0.0	0.0
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 9 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 7 statements in 2009.		At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 11 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 8 statements in 2009.		At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.	
	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 8 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 6 statements in 2009.		At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 10 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 8 statements in 2009.			

Philosophy

Program Satisfaction: percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as...

	Excellent		Excellent or Very Good		Fair or Poor	
	2009 (N = 11)	2012 (N = 23)	2009 (N = 11)	2012 (N = 23)	2009 (N = 11)	2012 (N = 23)
Quality of the faculty	52.5	34.8	80.2	73.9	0.0	8.7
Overall Program quality	44.3	13.0	61.4	60.9	9.9	17.4
Financial support for graduate students	18.1	0.0	36.2	8.7	54.0	87.0
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	35.1	34.8	71.2	60.9	0.0	13.0
Quality of academic guidance and advising	36.9	8.7	53.2	43.5	19.8	26.1
Intellectual community in Program	53.2	21.7	80.2	43.5	9.9	34.8
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	8.7	N/A	21.7	N/A	39.1
Space, facilities and equipment	19.8	0.0	36.1	13.0	55.7	47.8
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	36.9	34.8	55.0	56.5	17.1	34.8
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	13.0	N/A	34.8	N/A	39.1
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	36.1	8.7	62.0	47.8	19.8	17.4
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	53.2	34.8	71.3	52.2	8.9	26.1
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	4.3	N/A	13.0	N/A	69.6
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	45.0	17.4	72.0	52.2	9.9	8.7
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	19.8	8.7	28.0	26.1	38.6	21.7
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	28.7	26.1	71.2	47.8	18.8	26.1
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	36.1	4.5	54.2	27.3	9.9	31.8
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	4 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2012, compared to 10 in 2009.		6 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 11 in 2009.		12 features rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2012, compared to 3 in 2009.	
	0 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 3 in 2009.		0 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2012, compared to 2 in 2009.			

Philosophy

Advisor: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed with each of the following statements about their advisor.

	Strongly Agreed		Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 11)	2012 (N = 23)	2009 (N = 11)	2012 (N = 23)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	52.5	81.0	0.0	0.0
Treats my ideas with respect	52.5	76.2	0.0	0.0
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	54.2	61.9	9.9	0.0
Provides timely feedback on my work	28.0	66.7	9.9	4.8
Is available when I need help or advice	34.4	66.7	19.8	4.8
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	61.9	N/A	0.0
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	52.5	76.2	9.9	0.0
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	62.4	66.7	9.9	0.0
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	36.1	38.1	9.9	14.3
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	36.1	33.3	9.9	9.5
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	44.3	42.9	9.9	9.5
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	62.4	42.9	0.0	0.0
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	54.2	47.6	8.2	9.5
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 8 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 7 statements in 2009.		At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statements about their advisor in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.	
	At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 3 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.			

Philosophy

Climate: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed that their program is like the description

	Strongly Agreed		Strongly Agreed or Agreed		Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 11)	2012 (N = 23)	2009 (N = 11)	2012 (N = 23)	2009 (N = 11)	2012 (N = 23)
Collegial	N/A	8.7	N/A	52.2	N/A	17.4
Encouraging	45.8	13.0	80.2	56.5	0.0	17.4
Supportive	62.1	8.7	70.3	47.8	0.0	21.7
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	36.9	34.8	61.4	65.2	0.0	17.4
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	45.0	30.4	81.9	65.2	0.0	8.7
Inclusive of students of color*	62.1	56.5	80.2	65.2	0.0	8.7
Inclusive by gender*	61.4	69.6	90.1	91.3	0.0	0.0
Inclusive of international students	N/A	34.8	N/A	60.9	N/A	13.0
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	62.1	26.1	90.1	60.9	0.0	13.0
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	43.5	N/A	65.2	N/A	13.0
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	70.2	69.6	90.0	87.0	0.0	0.0
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 6 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 8 statements in 2009.		At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 10 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 8 statements in 2009.		At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 1 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.	
	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 3 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 5 statements in 2009.		At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 2 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 6 statements in 2009.			

Romance Languages

Program Satisfaction: percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as...

	Excellent		Excellent or Very Good		Fair or Poor	
	2009 (N = 28)	2012 (N = 30)	2009 (N = 28)	2012 (N = 30)	2009 (N = 28)	2012 (N = 30)
Quality of the faculty	25.7	40.7	77.1	81.5	4.2	7.4
Overall Program quality	7.6	14.8	51.0	70.4	11.8	11.1
Financial support for graduate students	6.6	40.7	46.7	59.3	22.0	25.9
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	20.6	37.0	69.9	74.1	8.1	11.1
Quality of academic guidance and advising	28.0	22.2	56.7	44.4	8.1	29.6
Intellectual community in Program	25.4	26.9	50.0	61.5	19.4	15.4
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	7.7	N/A	34.6	N/A	34.6
Space, facilities and equipment	3.3	3.7	49.3	7.4	25.3	74.1
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	3.3	11.1	14.0	40.7	50.7	37.0
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	14.8	N/A	44.4	N/A	25.9
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	9.9	7.7	52.6	50.0	26.1	26.9
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	14.0	44.4	52.6	66.7	22.0	7.4
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	7.4	N/A	25.9	N/A	51.9
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	24.6	51.9	74.6	74.1	4.0	3.7
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	9.9	3.7	37.9	33.3	30.1	33.3
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	3.4	22.2	44.1	44.4	27.7	18.5
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	9.9	11.1	39.3	51.9	15.4	18.5
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	5 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2012, compared to 0 in 2009.		9 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 8 in 2009.		9 features rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2012, compared to 7 in 2009.	
	1 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 0 in 2009.		1 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2012, compared to 1 in 2009.			

Romance Languages

Advisor: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed with each of the following statements about their advisor.

	Strongly Agreed		Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 28)	2012 (N = 30)	2009 (N = 28)	2012 (N = 30)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	52.6	52.0	19.4	4.0
Treats my ideas with respect	59.9	76.0	12.1	0.0
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	37.9	52.0	16.2	16.0
Provides timely feedback on my work	38.6	48.0	19.4	8.0
Is available when I need help or advice	49.3	60.0	8.1	8.0
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	52.0	N/A	4.0
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	66.6	80.0	12.1	0.0
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	49.3	44.0	4.0	8.0
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	43.4	24.0	11.4	16.0
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	32.3	12.0	20.1	20.0
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	28.2	12.5	24.2	20.8
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	44.5	44.0	12.1	12.0
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	45.3	48.0	22.8	4.0
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 6 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 3 statements in 2009.		At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 2 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 3 statements in 2009.	
	At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 2 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.			

Romance Languages

Climate: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed that their program is like the description

	Strongly Agreed		Strongly Agreed or Agreed		Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 28)	2012 (N = 30)	2009 (N = 28)	2012 (N = 30)	2009 (N = 28)	2012 (N = 30)
Collegial	N/A	42.3	N/A	73.1	N/A	7.7
Encouraging	38.6	38.5	69.2	73.1	20.2	11.5
Supportive	45.3	38.5	65.9	61.5	23.4	11.5
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	13.3	42.3	63.3	73.1	18.8	11.5
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	27.2	30.8	69.9	65.4	18.7	15.4
Inclusive of students of color*	49.3	76.9	81.3	88.5	7.3	11.5
Inclusive by gender*	59.2	69.2	76.5	88.5	3.3	11.5
Inclusive of international students	N/A	76.9	N/A	88.5	N/A	7.7
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	32.0	46.2	78.0	76.9	11.4	0.0
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	50.0	N/A	92.3	N/A	3.8
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	68.3	69.2	91.3	96.2	0.0	3.8
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 10 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 5 statements in 2009.		At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 11 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 8 statements in 2009.		At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 2 statements in 2009.	
	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 5 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 2 statements in 2009.		At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 6 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 4 statements in 2009.			

Theater Arts

Program Satisfaction: percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as...

	Excellent		Excellent or Very Good		Fair or Poor	
	2009 (N = 13)	2012 (N = 8)	2009 (N = 13)	2012 (N = 8)	2009 (N = 13)	2012 (N = 8)
Quality of the faculty	26.2	14.3	84.7	57.1	7.6	28.6
Overall Program quality	8.6	14.3	61.4	42.9	0.0	28.6
Financial support for graduate students	26.2	14.3	60.1	85.7	32.2	14.3
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	8.6	0.0	57.3	14.3	7.1	42.9
Quality of academic guidance and advising	8.6	14.3	47.2	28.6	15.7	57.1
Intellectual community in Program	40.1	0.0	61.4	14.3	15.7	0.0
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	0.0	N/A	0.0	N/A	71.4
Space, facilities and equipment	14.2	28.6	70.1	71.4	8.6	0.0
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	7.1	14.3	38.6	14.3	40.1	71.4
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	14.3	N/A	14.3	N/A	57.1
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	15.7	0.0	52.7	28.6	31.5	28.6
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	14.2	14.3	35.5	14.3	40.1	42.9
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	0.0	N/A	14.3	N/A	71.4
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	33.0	14.3	70.0	42.9	15.7	28.6
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	14.2	0.0	38.6	42.9	38.5	28.6
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	15.7	28.6	40.1	42.9	38.5	28.6
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	21.3	14.3	70.0	14.3	7.1	28.6
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	0 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2012, compared to 1 in 2009.		3 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 9 in 2009.		14 features rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2012, compared to 6 in 2009.	
	0 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 0 in 2009.		1 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2012, compared to 1 in 2009.			

Theater Arts

Advisor: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed with each of the following statements about their advisor.

	Strongly Agreed		Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 13)	2012 (N = 8)	2009 (N = 13)	2012 (N = 8)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	77.2	66.7	0.0	16.7
Treats my ideas with respect	70.1	66.7	0.0	16.7
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	85.8	50.0	0.0	16.7
Provides timely feedback on my work	70.1	50.0	0.0	16.7
Is available when I need help or advice	73.8	50.0	0.0	0.0
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	50.0	N/A	16.7
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	47.2	66.7	7.1	33.3
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	92.9	66.7	0.0	16.7
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	31.5	16.7	7.1	33.3
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	17.3	50.0	29.9	33.3
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	33.0	50.0	37.0	33.3
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	71.6	66.7	0.0	16.7
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	70.1	66.7	7.1	33.3
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 12 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 8 statements in 2009.		At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 5 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 2 statements in 2009.	
	At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 3 statements in 2009.			

Theater Arts

Climate: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed that their program is like the description

	Strongly Agreed			Strongly Agreed or Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 13)	2012 (N = 8)		2009 (N = 13)	2012 (N = 8)		2009 (N = 13)	2012 (N = 8)
Collegial	N/A	0.0		N/A	28.6		N/A	42.9
Encouraging	38.6	28.6		67.0	42.9		24.3	28.6
Supportive	31.5	28.6		82.8	42.9		0.0	42.9
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	40.1	14.3		68.5	57.1		7.1	28.6
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	22.8	14.3		47.2	42.9		17.3	28.6
Inclusive of students of color*	15.7	14.3		47.2	42.9		29.9	42.9
Inclusive by gender*	31.5	28.6		70.1	57.1		15.7	28.6
Inclusive of international students	N/A	0.0		N/A	14.3		N/A	28.6
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	15.7	14.3		55.8	28.6		0.0	28.6
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	14.3		N/A	28.6		N/A	28.6
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	75.6	42.9		82.7	57.1		8.6	14.3
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 1 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 3 statements in 2009.			At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 3 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 6 statements in 2009.			At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 10 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 2 statements in 2009.	
	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 1 statements in 2009.			At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 2 statements in 2009.				