Graduate Student Experience Survey 2012

College of Arts and Sciences: Social Sciences

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, Asian Studies and Environmental Sciences, Studies, and Policy (ESSP) were suppressed.

GRADUATE STUDENT EXPERIENCE SURVEY RESPONSE RATE BY DEPARTMENT

CAS Soc Sci	Number of	Number of	Response
	Respondents	Students Surveyed	Rate
Total for all Graduate Programs	1380	2677	51.6
CAS Soc Sci	187	294	63.6
Anthropology	21	31	67.7
Asian Studies	6	7	85.7
Economics	21	45	46.7
Environmental Sciences, Studies and Policy	6	9	66.7
Environmental Studies	12	22	54.5
Geography	28	42	66.7
History	16	29	55.2
International Studies	18	23	78.3
Political Science	31	41	75.6
Sociology	28	45	62.2

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

Program Satisfaction	reitentage of re	spondents who i	atea the johowin	ig jeutures of the	ii program us L	ACEHEIIC.		
	Anthropology (N = 23)	Economics (N = 23)	Environmental Studies (N = 12)	Geography (N = 30)	History (N = 17)	International Studies (N = 18)	Political Science (N = 32)	Sociology (N = 29)
Quality of the faculty	38.1	30.0	45.5	42.9	25.0	27.8	, ,	10.7
Overall Program quality	28.6	35.0	45.5	25.0	6.3	16.7	0.0	7.1
Financial support for graduate students	20.0	40.0	72.7	28.6	31.3	5.9	12.9	7.1
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	33.3	40.0	45.5	28.6	18.8	35.3	9.7	18.5
Quality of academic guidance and advising	23.8	25.0	9.1	10.7	0.0	16.7	9.7	28.6
Intellectual community in Program	28.6	26.3	63.6	57.1	18.8	33.3	0.0	25.0
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	33.3	15.8	0.0	10.7	0.0	11.1	12.9	3.6
Space, facilities and equipment	0.0	10.0	54.5	25.0	18.8	5.6	3.2	10.7
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students	4.8	15.8	63.6	7.1	6.3	16.7	3.2	7.1
Research opportunities in my program	28.6	26.3	18.2	21.4	18.8	16.7	6.5	3.6
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	5.0	25.0	36.4	14.8	18.8	29.4	6.5	14.3
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community	14.3	16.7	45.5	25.0	6.3	38.9	6.7	10.7
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	19.0	5.3	9.1	14.3	12.5	11.1	6.5	3.6
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	9.5	25.0	18.2	3.6	6.3	5.6	3.2	10.7
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	4.8	30.0	27.3	3.7	6.3	16.7	3.2	14.3
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	14.3	10.5	63.6	33.3	18.8	66.7	0.0	7.4
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity	10.0	15.0	10.0	10.7	6.3	22.2	16.1	10.7
33.3% of students or more rated the program as "Excellent".*	3	3	10	3	0	4	0	0
50% of students or more rated the program as "Excellent".**	0	0	5	1	0	1	0	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."

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

Program Satisfaction	rercentage of re	sponaciits wile	acca the johown	ng jeutures of th	en program as	excenent of te	iry doda.	
	Anthropology (N = 23)	Economics (N = 23)	Environmental Studies (N = 12)	Geography (N = 30)	History (N = 17)	International Studies (N = 18)	Political Science (N = 32)	Sociology (N = 29)
Quality of the faculty	71.4	85.0	81.8	82.1	75.0	66.7	61.3	71.4
Overall Program quality	61.9	80.0	72.7	75.0	62.5	72.2	25.8	39.3
Financial support for graduate students	65.0	75.0	81.8	64.3	62.5	58.8	35.5	25.0
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	71.4	65.0	81.8	82.1	62.5	58.8	35.5	63.0
Quality of academic guidance and advising	71.4	70.0	54.5	50.0	43.8	44.4	29.0	53.6
Intellectual community in Program	61.9	57.9	90.9	78.6	56.3	66.7	29.0	39.3
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	47.6	42.1	9.1	39.3	6.3	27.8	38.7	35.7
Space, facilities and equipment	14.3	40.0	81.8	42.9	31.3	44.4	35.5	28.6
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students	33.3	52.6	90.9	35.7	12.5	61.1	6.5	21.4
Research opportunities in my program	47.6	78.9	63.6	60.7	31.3	55.6	12.9	10.7
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	65.0	70.0	63.6	33.3	43.8	70.6	35.5	60.7
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community	57.1	50.0	72.7	50.0	31.3	77.8	23.3	32.1
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	52.4	42.1	45.5	42.9	18.8	44.4	19.4	17.9
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	33.3	65.0	54.5	28.6	12.5	22.2	38.7	39.3
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	42.9	50.0	45.5	25.9	37.5	50.0	22.6	42.9
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	47.6	36.8	81.8	55.6	37.5	88.9	29.0	40.7
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity	30.0	55.0	20.0	46.4	31.3	61.1	32.3	39.3
50% of students or more rated the program as "Excellent" or "Very Good".*	9	13	13	9	5	12	1	4
75% of students or more rated the program as "Excellent" or "Very Good".**	0	4	7	4	1	2	0	0

^{*}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."

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

				 	en program as			
	Anthropology (N = 23)	Economics (N = 23)	Environmental Studies (N = 12)	Geography (N = 30)	History (N = 17)	International Studies (N = 18)	Political Science (N = 32)	Sociology (N = 29)
Quality of the faculty	9.5	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	` '	, ,	
Overall Program quality	14.3	0.0	0.0	3.6	6.3	11.1	38.7	28.6
Financial support for graduate students	20.0	5.0	0.0	14.3	6.3	11.8	45.2	42.9
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	14.3	5.0	9.1	3.6	31.3	5.9	32.3	22.2
Quality of academic guidance and advising	14.3	5.0	0.0	25.0	18.8	11.1	54.8	25.0
Intellectual community in Program	23.8	5.3	0.0	7.1	12.5	22.2	41.9	46.4
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	23.8	26.3	54.5	50.0	68.8	27.8	48.4	35.7
Space, facilities and equipment	33.3	25.0	9.1	28.6	12.5	16.7	32.3	39.3
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students	42.9	21.1	0.0	42.9	62.5	33.3	74.2	53.6
Research opportunities in my program	23.8	10.5	18.2	14.3	25.0	27.8	54.8	60.7
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	15.0	20.0	0.0	18.5	12.5	5.9	32.3	32.1
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community	33.3	22.2	9.1	7.1	31.3	11.1	50.0	50.0
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	9.5	42.1	36.4	42.9	43.8	16.7	48.4	50.0
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	28.6	15.0	18.2	50.0	56.3	22.2	45.2	39.3
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	19.0	20.0	0.0	44.4	25.0	5.6	41.9	28.6
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	19.0	42.1	0.0	7.4	37.5	0.0	41.9	51.9
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity	25.0	10.0	20.0	25.0	43.8	16.7	32.3	28.6
20% of students or more rated the program as "Fair" or "Poor".*	9	8	3	8	10	5	16	16

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

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

Advisor	Tercentage of re	sponaciits wiio	Strongly Agreed	with cach of th	c jonowing state	ments about the	ii uuvisoi.	
	Anthropology (N = 23)	Economics (N = 23)	Environmental Studies (N = 12)	Geography (N = 30)	History (N = 17)	International Studies (N = 18)	Political Science (N = 32)	Sociology (N = 29)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	57.1	58.3	60.0	69.2	68.8	72.2	71.4	65.4
Treats my ideas with respect	61.9	58.3	60.0	69.2	75.0	88.9	76.2	80.8
Provides constructive feedback on my work	52.4	58.3	60.0	46.2	56.3	55.6	52.4	57.7
Provides timely feedback on my work	52.4	66.7	40.0	38.5	56.3	44.4	47.6	42.3
Is available when I need help or advice	52.4	58.3	10.0	53.8	43.8	33.3	52.4	57.7
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	47.6	41.7	40.0	56.0	56.3	72.2	71.4	61.5
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds	61.9	66.7	70.0	61.5	81.3	77.8	90.5	65.4
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field	81.0	41.7	40.0	52.0	50.0	61.1	25.0	36.0
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work	45.0	50.0	44.4	50.0	31.3	38.9	14.3	38.5
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	50.0	50.0	20.0	30.8	31.3	22.2	28.6	15.4
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	50.0	66.7	40.0	30.8	25.0	22.2	28.6	38.5
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements	33.3	41.7	40.0	38.5	56.3	50.0	52.4	44.0
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	57.1	50.0	40.0	42.3	37.5	61.1	57.1	69.2
50% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" with the above dimensions about their advisor.*	10	10.0	4.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0
75% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" with the above dimensions about their advisor.**	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0

^{*}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.

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

AUVISUI	rereentage of re	esponaciies wiio	Disagreea or s	ociongly bisagice	d With Cach of	the johowing stu	tements about th	ich davison.
	Anthropology (N = 23)	Economics (N = 23)	Environmental Studies (N = 12)	Geography (N = 30)	History (N = 17)	International Studies (N = 18)	Political Science (N = 32)	Sociology (N = 29)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Treats my ideas with respect	0.0	8.3	0.0	7.7	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Provides constructive feedback on my work	0.0	0.0	10.0	11.5	12.5	0.0	4.8	3.8
Provides timely feedback on my work	4.8	0.0	20.0	19.2	12.5	16.7	4.8	11.5
Is available when I need help or advice	0.0	0.0	10.0	11.5	12.5	22.2	0.0	7.7
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.0	6.3	0.0	4.8	3.8
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.0	25.0	0.0	5.0	8.0
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work	0.0	8.3	0.0	15.4	25.0	0.0	14.3	15.4
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	10.0	0.0	10.0	19.2	12.5	5.6	14.3	30.8
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	5.0	0.0	10.0	19.2	18.8	16.7	19.0	15.4
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements	4.8	0.0	0.0	19.2	6.3	11.1	0.0	8.0
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	9.5	0.0	0.0	15.4	18.8	0.0	0.0	7.7
20% of students or more "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" with the statements above about their advisor.*	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	1
33.3% of students or more "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" with the statements above about their advisor.**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

							1	
	Anthropology (N = 23)	Economics (N = 23)	Environmental Studies (N = 12)	Geography (N = 30)	History (N = 17)	International Studies (N = 18)	Political Science (N = 32)	Sociology (N = 29)
Collegial	19.0	15.0	63.6	66.7	50.0	44.4	12.9	16.0
Encouraging	28.6	25.0	63.6	51.9	31.3	38.9	9.7	14.8
Supportive	28.6	36.8	63.6	44.4	37.5	50.0	9.7	14.8
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches	19.0	30.0	81.8	50.0	18.8	66.7	16.1	14.8
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	23.8	20.0	90.9	50.0	18.8	77.8	6.5	11.1
Inclusive of students of color	19.0	30.0	45.5	40.7	18.8	77.8	6.5	18.5
Inclusive by gender	47.6	30.0	90.9	59.3	18.8	72.2	22.6	33.3
Inclusive of international students	23.8	30.0	63.6	55.6	31.3	83.3	22.6	18.5
Inclusive of students with disabilities	25.0	26.3	40.0	33.3	12.5	61.1	6.7	18.5
Inclusive of first generation students	30.0	26.3	50.0	37.5	12.5	61.1	6.7	23.1
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	47.6	26.3	90.9	42.3	50.0	88.9	23.3	53.8
33.3% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" that the description fit their program*	2	1	11	11	3	11	0	2
50% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" that the description fit their program**	0	0	9	6	2	9	0	1

^{*}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.

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

Cimate	Tercentage of re	spenaents tine	ourongly rigited	0. 1.g. 000. t	at the program	is like the deseri		
	Anthropology (N = 23)	Economics (N = 23)	Environmental Studies (N = 12)	Geography (N = 30)	History (N = 17)	International Studies (N = 18)	Political Science (N = 32)	Sociology (N = 29)
Collegial	61.9	90.0	100.0	88.9	93.8	83.3	51.6	60.0
Encouraging	66.7	75.0	90.9	85.2	81.3	83.3	32.3	51.9
Supportive	66.7	73.7	90.9	85.2	75.0	83.3	35.5	55.6
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches	66.7	90.0	90.9	85.7	68.8	94.4	51.6	59.3
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	71.4	50.0	100.0	92.9	56.3	100.0	54.8	40.7
Inclusive of students of color	57.1	75.0	72.7	66.7	50.0	88.9	38.7	40.7
Inclusive by gender	81.0	85.0	100.0	92.6	56.3	88.9	48.4	66.7
Inclusive of international students	52.4	80.0	72.7	81.5	43.8	88.9	64.5	51.9
Inclusive of students with disabilities	55.0	78.9	70.0	62.5	31.3	83.3	40.0	40.7
Inclusive of first generation students	60.0	73.7	80.0	75.0	43.8	94.4	40.0	53.8
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	76.2	84.2	90.9	76.9	81.3	94.4	63.3	80.8
50% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" that the description fit their program.*	11	11	11	11	8	11	5	8
75% of students or more "Strong Agreed" or "Agreed" that the description fit their program.**	2	8	8	9	4	11	0	1

^{*}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.

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

Cililate	restessinge of se	spondents who	Disagreeu or s	trongly Disagree	u that then pro	grain is like the	acsemption.	
	Anthropology (N = 23)	Economics (N = 23)	Environmental Studies (N = 12)	Geography (N = 30)	History (N = 17)	International Studies (N = 18)	Political Science (N = 32)	Sociology (N = 29)
Collegial	4.8	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.9	12.0
Encouraging	4.8	5.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	45.2	25.9
Supportive	9.5	0.0	0.0	3.7	6.3	0.0	41.9	25.9
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches	14.3	5.0	0.0	3.6	12.5	0.0	9.7	29.6
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	9.5	25.0	0.0	3.6	6.3	0.0	12.9	25.9
Inclusive of students of color	14.3	0.0	9.1	3.7	31.3	0.0	41.9	40.7
Inclusive by gender	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.8	0.0	32.3	14.8
Inclusive of international students	9.5	0.0	0.0	3.7	25.0	5.6	19.4	22.2
Inclusive of students with disabilities	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.3	0.0	26.7	14.8
Inclusive of first generation students	15.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	12.5	0.0	26.7	23.1
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	7.7
20% of students or more "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" that the description fit their program.*	0	1	0	0	3	0	6	7
33.3% of students or more "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" that the description fit their program.*	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1

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

Anthropology

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

Excellent Figure 1 Figure 1 Figure 1 Figure 2 Figur

	Program Satis	faction: percenta
	Exce	llent
	2009	2012
	(N = 24)	(N = 23)
Quality of the faculty	17.6	38.1
Overall Program quality	3.8	28.6
Financial support for graduate students	16.9	20.0
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent	22.6	22.2
developments in my field	22.6	33.3
Quality of academic guidance and advising	16.1	23.8
Intellectual community in Program	12.3	28.6
Training/ assistance about career and professional	N/A	33.3
development	IN/A	33.3
Space, facilities and equipment	7.6	0.0
Process for involving students in Program decisions	8.0	4.8
that affect graduate students*	0.0	4.0
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	28.6
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess	3.8	5.0
graduate students	3.0	3.0
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive	3.8	14.3
community*		
Training/assistance about grants and other external	N/A	19.0
funding Adequacy of preparation for teaching	7.6	9.5
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess	7.0	9.5
graduate students	3.8	4.8
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	15.6	14.3
	0.4	10.0
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	8.4	10.0
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	3 features rated as	'Excellent' by at
	least 33.3% of stude	•
	compared to 0 in 20	· ·
	0 features rated as	'Excellent' by at
	least 50% of studen	its in 2012,
	compared to 0 in 20	009.

Excellent of	Excellent or very Good						
2009	2012						
(N = 24)	(N = 23)						
68.0	71.4						
54.0	61.9						
29.2	65.0						
65.5	71.4						
53.2	71.4						
39.8	61.9						
N/A	47.6						
19.9	14.3						
20.3	33.3						
N/A	47.6						
40.6	65.0						
44.7	57.1						
N/A	52.4						
24.0	33.3						
33.8	42.9						
57.0	47.6						
54.8	30.0						
9 features rated as	•						

9 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 6 in 2009.

0 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2012, compared to 0 in 2009.

jeanance of them program asm							
Fair or Poor							
2009	2012						
(N = 24)	(N = 23)						
0.0	9.5						
8.4	14.3						
46.4	20.0						
0.0	14.3						
20.7	14.3						
8.4	23.8						
N/A	23.8						
56.1	33.3						
36.8	42.9						
N/A	23.8						
9.3	15.0						
43.1	33.3						
N/A	9.5						
19.9	28.6						
25.3	19.0						
12.2	19.0						
16.9	25.0						

9 features rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2012, compared to 6 in 2009.

Anthropology

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

	9 7 1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Strongly Agreed	
	2009	2012
	(N = 24)	(N = 23)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	66.2	57.1
Treats my ideas with respect	61.6	61.9
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	36.3	52.4
Provides timely feedback on my work	54.0	52.4
Is available when I need help or advice	49.3	52.4
Would support me in any career path I choose	N/A	47.6
(academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	47.0
Treats students in the department equitably	49.3	61.9
regardless of their backgrounds*	.0.0	
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics	58.6	81.0
in our field*		
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my	57.8	45.0
graduate studies, research or creative work*	37.8	15.0
Helps me develop professional relationships with	54.0	50.0
others in the field		
Advises me about how to get my work published,	45.5	50.0
performed or shown		
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences	47.8	33.3
or disagreements*	17.10	33.3
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am	57.8	57.1
facing in graduate school		
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly	

^{* 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 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 1 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.

Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
2009	2012	
(N = 24)	(N = 23)	
0.0	0.0	
0.0	0.0	
4.6	0.0	
16.8	4.8	
16.0	0.0	
N/A	0.0	
3.8	0.0	
13.1	0.0	
3.8	0.0	
13.1	10.0	
16.9	5.0	
0.0	4.8	
13.0	9.5	
At least 20% of rest	ondents	

At least 20% of respondents
'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed'
with 0 statements about their advisors
in 2012, compared to 0 statements in
2009.

Anthropology

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

	Strongly Agreed	
	2009	2012
	(N = 24)	(N = 23)
Collegial	N/A	19.0
Encouraging	16.9	28.6
Supportive	11.4	28.6
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical,	20.7	19.0
methodological or creative approaches*		
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	16.1	23.8
Inclusive of students of color*	13.9	19.0
Inclusive by gender*	24.5	47.6
Inclusive of international students	N/A	23.8
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	22.1	25.0
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	30.0
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	40.6	47.6

^{* 2012} survey included minor edits to question text

At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 2 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 1 statements in 2009.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.

Strongly Agreed or Agreed		
2009	2012	
(N = 24)	(N = 23)	
N/A	61.9	
70.9	66.7	
59.1	66.7	
66.7	66.7	
83.2	71.4	
54.5	57.1	
83.1	81.0	
N/A	52.4	
55.8	55.0	
N/A	60.0	
66.7	76.2	

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 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 2 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 2 statements in 2009.

Simple of Charles Simple of			
Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed			
2009	2012		
(N = 24)	(N = 23)		
N/A	4.8		
4.6	4.8		
8.4	9.5		
8.8	14.3		
0.0	9.5		
36.8	14.3		
3.8	4.8		
N/A	9.5		
4.9	10.0		
N/A	15.0		
3.8	0.0		
At least 200/ of room	andonts		

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.

Economics

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

Excellent Excellent or Very Good Fair or Poor

	Program Satis	faction: percenta
	Excellent	
	2009	2012
	(N = 22)	(N = 23)
Quality of the faculty	13.3	30.0
Overall Program quality	0.0	35.0
Financial support for graduate students	20.0	40.0
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent	20.6	40.0
developments in my field	20.6	40.0
Quality of academic guidance and advising	21.0	25.0
Intellectual community in Program	19.5	26.3
Training/ assistance about career and professional	N/A	15.8
development	·	10.0
Space, facilities and equipment	4.5	10.0
Process for involving students in Program decisions	26.9	15.8
that affect graduate students*	N/A	26.3
Research opportunities in my program Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess	N/A	20.3
graduate students	15.9	25.0
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive		
community*	16.9	16.7
Training/assistance about grants and other external	N1/A	5.3
funding	N/A	5.3
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	15.0	25.0
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess	5.5	30.0
graduate students	гэ	10.5
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	5.2	10.5
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	15.9	15.0
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	3 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2012, compared to 0 in 2009.	
	0 features rated as least 50% of studen compared to 0 in 20	ts in 2012,

2009	2012	
(N = 22)	(N = 23)	
74.3	85.0	
59.3	80.0	
45.5	75.0	
73.0	65.0	
46.0	70.0	
67.0	57.9	
N/A	42.1	
35.9	40.0	
57.0	52.6	
N/A	78.9	
52.4	70.0	
42.9	50.0	
N/A	42.1	
30.5	65.0	
31.4	50.0	
31.9	36.8	
41.4	55.0	
13 features rated as 'Excellent' or		

13 features rated as 'Excellent' or
'Very Good' by at least 50% of
students in 2012, compared to 6 in
2009.

⁴ features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2012, compared to 0 in 2009.

Fair or Poor		
2009	2012	
(N = 22)	(N = 23)	
0.0	0.0	
5.8	0.0	
15.9	5.0	
5.5	5.0	
22.0	5.0	
16.5	5.3	
N/A	26.3	
34.6	25.0	
11.0	21.1	
N/A	10.5	
21.0	20.0	
29.1	22.2	
N/A	42.1	
42.0	15.0	
31.0	20.0	
40.3	42.1	
37.5	10.0	

8 features rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2012, compared to 8 in 2009.

Economics

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

	Strongly Agreed	
	2009	2012
	(N = 22)	(N = 23)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	57.0	58.3
Treats my ideas with respect	45.8	58.3
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	52.0	58.3
Provides timely feedback on my work	39.7	66.7
Is available when I need help or advice	45.8	58.3
Would support me in any career path I choose	N/A	41.7
(academic or a career outside the academy)	14/74	71.7
Treats students in the department equitably	57.0	66.7
regardless of their backgrounds*	57.0	
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics	39.7	41.7
in our field*		
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my	44.8	50.0
graduate studies, research or creative work*		
Helps me develop professional relationships with	45.8	50.0
others in the field		
Advises me about how to get my work published,	44.8	66.7
performed or shown		
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences	39.7	41.7
or disagreements*	33	,
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am	57.0	50.0
facing in graduate school		
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 50% of rest	ondents 'Strongly

^{* 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 4 statements in 2009.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.

Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
2009	2012	
(N = 22)	(N = 23)	
0.0	0.0	
6.1	8.3	
6.1	0.0	
12.3	0.0	
0.0	0.0	
N/A	0.0	
6.1	0.0	
6.1	0.0	
12.3	8.3	
12.2	0.0	
0.0	0.0	
12.3	0.0	
0.0	0.0	
A+ + 200/ -f		

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.

Economics

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

	Strongly Agreed	
	2009	2012
	(N = 22)	(N = 23)
Collegial	N/A	15.0
Encouraging	31.0	25.0
Supportive	25.5	36.8
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical,	20.0	30.0
methodological or creative approaches*	20.0	30.0
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	20.5	20.0
Inclusive of students of color*	25.9	30.0
Inclusive by gender*	40.5	30.0
Inclusive of international students	N/A	30.0
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	31.4	26.3
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	26.3
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	40.5	26.3

^{* 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 2 statements in 2009.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.

Strongly Agreed or Agreed		
2009	2012	
(N = 22)	(N = 23)	
N/A	90.0	
73.0	75.0	
78.0	73.7	
67.0	90.0	
50.6	50.0	
56.9	75.0	
72.5	85.0	
N/A	80.0	
67.9	78.9	
N/A	73.7	
61.5	84.2	

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 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 8 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 1 statements in 2009.

- g p		
Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
2009	2012	
(N = 22)	(N = 23)	
N/A	10.0	
5.5	5.0	
5.5	0.0	
5.5	5.0	
11.0	25.0	
11.0	0.0	
11.0	0.0	
N/A	0.0	
5.5	0.0	
N/A	0.0	
0.0	0.0	
A+ I+ 200/ -f		

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.

Environmental Studies

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

Excellent Figure 1 Figure 1 Figure 1 Figure 2 Figur

	Program Satis	faction: percenta
	Excellent	
	2009	2012
	(N = 7)	(N = 12)
Quality of the faculty	26.9	45.5
Overall Program quality	40.4	45.5
Financial support for graduate students	53.8	72.7
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent	40.4	45.5
developments in my field	40.4	45.5
Quality of academic guidance and advising	29.8	9.1
Intellectual community in Program	56.7	63.6
Training/ assistance about career and professional	N/A	0.0
development		
Space, facilities and equipment	0.0	54.5
Process for involving students in Program decisions	53.8	63.6
that affect graduate students*	21/2	40.0
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	18.2
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess	13.5	36.4
graduate students Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive		
community*	53.8	45.5
Training/assistance about grants and other external		
funding	N/A	9.1
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	13.5	18.2
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess	0.0	27.3
graduate students	0.0	27.5
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	53.8	63.6
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	0.0	10.0
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	10 features rated as least 33.3% of stude compared to 7 in 20	ents in 2012,
	5 features rated as least 50% of studen compared to 5 in 20	ts in 2012,

Excellent or very Good		
2009	2012	
(N = 7)	(N = 12)	
86.5	81.8	
86.6	72.7	
83.6	81.8	
73.1	81.8	
43.3	54.5	
86.5	90.9	
N/A	9.1	
26.9	81.8	
100.0	90.9	
N/A 63.6		
73.1	63.6	
100.0	72.7	
N/A 45.5		
59.7 54.5		
56.7 45.5		
86.5	81.8	
59.6	20.0	
13 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of		

'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 12 in 2009.

7 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2012, compared to 7 in 2009.

Fair or Poor		
2009	2012	
(N = 7)	(N = 12)	
0.0	0.0	
0.0	0.0	
16.4	0.0	
0.0	9.1	
13.5	0.0	
0.0	0.0	
N/A	54.5	
34.6	9.1	
0.0	0.0	
N/A	18.2	
0.0	0.0	
0.0	9.1	
N/A	36.4	
26.9	18.2	
0.0	0.0	
0.0	0.0	
0.0	20.0	

3 features rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2012, compared to 2 in 2009.

Environmental Studies

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

	Strongly	Agreed
	2009	2012
	(N = 7)	(N = 12)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	51.7	60.0
Treats my ideas with respect	51.7	60.0
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	35.6	60.0
Provides timely feedback on my work	35.6	40.0
Is available when I need help or advice	51.7	10.0
Would support me in any career path I choose	N/A	40.0
(academic or a career outside the academy)	14/71	40.0
Treats students in the department equitably	35.6	70.0
regardless of their backgrounds*		
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics	35.6	40.0
in our field*		
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my	35.6	44.4
graduate studies, research or creative work*	55.5	
Helps me develop professional relationships with	35.6	20.0
others in the field		
Advises me about how to get my work published,	35.6	40.0
performed or shown		
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences	19.6	40.0
or disagreements*	20.0	
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am	51.7	40.0
facing in graduate school		
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 50% of rest	ondents 'Strongly

^{* 2012} survey included minor edits to question text

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 4 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 4 statements in 2009.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.

Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
2009	2012	
(N = 7)	(N = 12)	
0.0	0.0	
0.0	0.0	
0.0	10.0	
16.1	20.0	
16.1	10.0	
N/A	0.0	
0.0	0.0	
0.0	0.0	
32.2	0.0	
16.1	10.0	
16.1	10.0	
0.0	0.0	
16.1	0.0	
At least 20% of respondents		

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 1 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 1 statements in 2009.

Environmental Studies

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

2009 2012 (N = 7) (N = 12)		Strongly	/ Agreed
Collegial N/A 63.6 Encouraging 81.1 63.6 Supportive 83.6 63.6 Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches* Open to interdisciplinary inquiry 83.6 90.9 Inclusive of students of color* 40.4 45.5 Inclusive by gender* 83.6 90.9 Inclusive of international students N/A 63.6		2009	2012
Encouraging 81.1 63.6 Supportive 83.6 63.6 Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches* Open to interdisciplinary inquiry 83.6 90.9 Inclusive of students of color* 40.4 45.5 Inclusive by gender* 83.6 90.9 Inclusive of international students N/A 63.6		(N = 7)	(N = 12)
Supportive 83.6 63.6 Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches* Open to interdisciplinary inquiry 83.6 90.9 Inclusive of students of color* 40.4 45.5 Inclusive by gender* 83.6 90.9 Inclusive of international students N/A 63.6	Collegial	N/A	63.6
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches* Open to interdisciplinary inquiry Inclusive of students of color* Inclusive by gender* Inclusive of international students N/A 81.8 90.9 81.8 90.9 81.8 90.9 83.6 90.9 83.6 90.9 83.6 90.9	Encouraging	81.1	63.6
methodological or creative approaches* Open to interdisciplinary inquiry Inclusive of students of color* Inclusive by gender* Inclusive of international students N/A 81.8 90.9 N/A 63.6	Supportive	83.6	63.6
methodological or creative approaches* Open to interdisciplinary inquiry Inclusive of students of color* Inclusive by gender* Inclusive of international students N/A 63.6		70.2	81.8
Inclusive of students of color* 40.4 45.5 Inclusive by gender* 83.6 90.9 Inclusive of international students N/A 63.6	methodological or creative approaches*	70.2	01.0
Inclusive by gender* 83.6 90.9 Inclusive of international students N/A 63.6	Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	83.6	90.9
Inclusive of international students N/A 63.6	Inclusive of students of color*	40.4	45.5
· ·	Inclusive by gender*	83.6	90.9
Inclusive of students with disabilities* 26.9 40.0	Inclusive of international students	N/A	63.6
	Inclusive of students with disabilities*	26.9	40.0
Inclusive of first generation students N/A 50.0	Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	50.0
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations 83.6 90.9	Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	83.6	90.9

^{* 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 9 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 6 statements in 2009.

Strongly Agreed or Agreed	
2012	
(N = 12)	
100.0	
90.9	
90.9	
90.9	
100.0	
72.7	
100.0	
72.7	
70.0	
80.0	
90.9	

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 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 8 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 8 statements in 2009.

Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
2009	2012	
(N = 7)	(N = 12)	
N/A	0.0	
0.0	0.0	
0.0	0.0	
0.0	0.0	
0.0	0.0	
0.0	9.1	
0.0	0.0	
N/A	0.0	
0.0	0.0	
N/A	0.0	
0.0	0.0	

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.

Geography

	Program Satis	faction: percenta
	Excellent	
	2009	2012
	(N = 21)	(N = 30)
Quality of the faculty	56.6	42.9
Overall Program quality	43.8	25.0
Financial support for graduate students	19.5	28.6
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent	CF 4	30 C
developments in my field	65.4	28.6
Quality of academic guidance and advising	39.0	10.7
Intellectual community in Program	71.7	57.1
Training/ assistance about career and professional	N/A	10.7
development	IN/A	10.7
Space, facilities and equipment	19.5	25.0
Process for involving students in Program decisions	23.9	7.1
that affect graduate students*		7.1
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	21.4
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess	18.5	14.8
graduate students	-5.5	
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive	43.4	25.0
community* Training/assistance about grants and other external		
funding	N/A	14.3
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	22.9	3.6
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess		
graduate students	9.8	3.7
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	32.7	33.3
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	36.1	10.7
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	3 features rated as least 33.3% of stude compared to 7 in 20	ents in 2012,
	1 features rated as least 50% of studen compared to 3 in 20	its in 2012,

Execution very dood		
2009	2012	
(N = 21)	(N = 30)	
90.3	82.1	
85.0	75.0	
58.5	64.3	
84.9	82.1	
67.3	50.0	
95.6	78.6	
N/A	39.3	
46.8	42.9	
47.8	35.7	
N/A	60.7	
51.2	33.3	
62.9	50.0	
N/A	42.9	
45.8	28.6	
32.7	25.9	
61.0	55.6	
75.1	46.4	
9 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very		

9 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 10 in 2009.

4 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2012, compared to 5 in 2009.

Fair or Poor		
2009	2012	
(N = 21)	(N = 30)	
0.0	3.6	
0.0	3.6	
23.9	14.3	
0.0	3.6	
5.4	25.0	
0.0	7.1	
N/A	50.0	
49.7	28.6	
24.9	42. 9	
N/A	14.3	
4.4	18.5	
14.2	7.1	
N/A	42.9	
4.4	50.0	
13.2	44.4	
19.5	7.4	
9.8	25.0	

8 features rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2012, compared to 3 in 2009.

Geography

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

| Strongly Agreed | Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed |

The state of the s			
	Strongly Agreed		
	2009	2012	
	(N = 21)	(N = 30)	
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	70.7	69.2	
Treats my ideas with respect	66.3	69.2	
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	71.7	46.2	
Provides timely feedback on my work	49.7	38.5	
Is available when I need help or advice	53.2	53.8	
Would support me in any career path I choose	N/A	56.0	
(academic or a career outside the academy)	14/74	30.0	
Treats students in the department equitably	57.6	61.5	
regardless of their backgrounds*		33.0	
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics	75.1	52.0	
in our field*			
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my	46.8	50.0	
graduate studies, research or creative work*		55.5	
Helps me develop professional relationships with	56.6	30.8	
others in the field			
Advises me about how to get my work published,	51.2	30.8	
performed or shown			
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences	53.2	38.5	
or disagreements*			
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am	50.5	42.3	
facing in graduate school			
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 50% of resp	ondents 'Strongly	

^{* 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 10 statements in 2009.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 1 statements in 2009.

Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
2009	2012	
(N = 21)	(N = 30)	
0.0	7.7	
0.0	7.7	
4.4	11.5	
14.1	19.2	
9.8	11.5	
N/A	16.0	
4.4	3.8	
0.0	12.0	
8.8	15.4	
9.8	19.2	
8.8	19.2	
14.1	19.2	
13.9	15.4	
At least 20% of room	ondonts	

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.

Geography

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

	Strongly Agreed	
	2009	2012
	(N = 21)	(N = 30)
Collegial	N/A	66.7
Encouraging	70.7	51.9
Supportive	56.6	44.4
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical,	51.2	50.0
methodological or creative approaches*	31.2	
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	46.8	50.0
Inclusive of students of color*	28.3	40.7
Inclusive by gender*	67.3	59.3
Inclusive of international students	N/A	55.6
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	28.3	33.3
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	37.5
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	65.4	42.3

^{* 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 6 statements in 2009.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 6 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 5 statements in 2009.

Strongly Agreed or Agreed		
2009	2012	
(N = 21)	(N = 30)	
N/A	88.9	
89.2	85.2	
94.6	85.2	
80.5	85.7	
74.1	92.9	
70.7	66.7	
94.6	92.6	
N/A	81.5	
66.3	62.5	
N/A	75.0	
94.7	76.9	

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 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 9 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 5 statements in 2009.

Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
2009	2012	
(N = 21)	(N = 30)	
N/A	0.0	
0.0	3.7	
0.0	3.7	
0.0	3.6	
0.0	3.6	
19.5	3.7	
0.0	0.0	
N/A	3.7	
4.4	0.0	
N/A	4.2	
5.4	0.0	
A+1+ 200/ -f	1 1	

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.

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

	Program Satis	faction: percenta
	Excellent	
	2009	2012
	(N = 20)	(N = 17)
Quality of the faculty	72.1	25.0
Overall Program quality	38.7	6.3
Financial support for graduate students	38.1	31.3
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent	39.3	18.8
developments in my field	39.3	18.8
Quality of academic guidance and advising	56.4	0.0
Intellectual community in Program	54.3	18.8
Training/ assistance about career and professional	N/A	0.0
development	IN/A	0.0
Space, facilities and equipment	27.9	18.8
Process for involving students in Program decisions	27.9	6.3
that affect graduate students*	21.5	0.5
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	18.8
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess	49.9	18.8
graduate students	13.3	10.0
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive	32.8	6.3
community*		
Training/assistance about grants and other external	N/A	12.5
funding	20.0	6.2
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	29.0	6.3
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	28.5	6.3
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	44.6	18.8
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	51.1	6.3
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	0 features rated as least 33.3% of stude compared to 9 in 20	ents in 2012,
	0 features rated as	'Excellent' by at

0 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 4 in 2009.

Excellent or Very Good		
2009 2012		
(N = 20)	(N = 17)	
100.0	75.0	
76.3	62.5	
48.9	62.5	
88.2	62.5	
88.1	43.8	
77.4	56.3	
N/A	6.3	
71.0	31.3	
54.3	12.5	
N/A	31.3	
82.2	43.8	
55.4	31.3	
N/A	18.8	
61.3	12.5	
60.7	37.5	
66.2	37.5	
66.7	31.3	
5 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very		

5 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 13 in 2009.

1 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2012, compared to 6 in 2009.

, , , ,		
Fair or Poor		
2009	2012	
(N = 20)	(N = 17)	
0.0	0.0	
5.9	6.3	
39.3	6.3	
0.0	31.3	
5.9	18.8	
0.0	12.5	
N/A	68.8	
17.7	12.5	
17.7	62.5	
N/A	25.0	
5.9	12.5	
10.8	31.3	
N/A	43.8	
16.7	56.3	
17.7	25.0	
17.1	37.5	
11.2	43.8	

10 features rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2012, compared to 1 in 2009.

History

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

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Strongly Agreed	
	2009	2012
	(N = 20)	(N = 17)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	83.3	68.8
Treats my ideas with respect	77.4	75.0
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	77.4	56.3
Provides timely feedback on my work	71.5	56.3
Is available when I need help or advice	77.4	43.8
Would support me in any career path I choose	N/A	56.3
(academic or a career outside the academy)	14/71	30.3
Treats students in the department equitably	77.4	81.3
regardless of their backgrounds*	7711	02.0
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics	60.9	50.0
in our field*	00.5	33.0
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my	32.3	31.3
graduate studies, research or creative work*	32.3	31.5
Helps me develop professional relationships with	43.6	31.3
others in the field	45.0	51.5
Advises me about how to get my work published,	54.3	25.0
performed or shown	54.5	25.0
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences	66.2	56.3
or disagreements*	00.2	50.5
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am	65.1	37.5
facing in graduate school		
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 50% of resp	ondents 'Strongly

²⁰¹² survey included minor edits to question text

Agreed' with 8 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 10 statements in 2009.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 2 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 5 statements in 2009.

Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
2009	2012	
(N = 20)	(N = 17)	
0.0	6.3	
0.0	12.5	
0.0	12.5	
5.9	12.5	
0.0	12.5	
N/A	6.3	
0.0	0.0	
0.0	25.0	
11.8	25.0	
5.9	12.5	
5.9	18.8	
0.0	6.3	
11.8	18.8	
At least 20% of rest	ondents	

'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 2 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.

History

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

	Strongly Agreed	
	2009	2012
	(N = 20)	(N = 17)
Collegial	N/A	50.0
Encouraging	71.5	31.3
Supportive	54.3	37.5
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical,	47.8	18.8
methodological or creative approaches*	.,,,,	20.0
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	49.5	18.8
Inclusive of students of color*	39.7	18.8
Inclusive by gender*	61.7	18.8
Inclusive of international students	N/A	31.3
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	53.1	12.5
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	12.5
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	60.9	50.0

^{* 2012} survey included minor edits to question text

At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 3 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 8 statements in 2009.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 2 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 5 statements in 2009.

Strongly Agreed or Agreed	
2009	2012
(N = 20)	(N = 17)
N/A	93.8
94.1	81.3
88.1	75.0
94.1	68.8
77.0	56.3
72.5	50.0
77.3	56.3
N/A	43.8
83.1	31.3
N/A	43.8
78.6	81.3

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 8 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 8 statements in 2009.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 4 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 7 statements in 2009.

Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
2009	2012	
(N = 20)	(N = 17)	
N/A	0.0	
0.0	0.0	
5.9	6.3	
0.0	12.5	
0.0	6.3	
21.6	31.3	
4.9	18.8	
N/A	25.0	
0.0	31.3	
N/A	12.5	
5.3	0.0	
At least 200/ of respondents		

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 3 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 1 statements in 2009.

International Studies

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

Excellent Excellent or Very Good Fair or Poor

	Program Satis	faction: percenta
	Excellent	
	2009	2012
	#N/A	(N = 18)
Quality of the faculty	#N/A	27.8
Overall Program quality	#N/A	16.7
Financial support for graduate students	#N/A	5.9
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent	#N/A	35.3
developments in my field	#IN/A	33.3
Quality of academic guidance and advising	#N/A	16.7
Intellectual community in Program	#N/A	33.3
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	11.1
Space, facilities and equipment	#N/A	5.6
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	#N/A	16.7
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	16.7
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess	, #N/A	29.4
graduate students	,	
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	#N/A	38.9
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	11.1
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	#N/A	5.6
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	#N/A	16.7
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	#N/A	66.7
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	#N/A	22.2
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	4 features rated as least 33.3% of stude compared to 0 in 20 1 features rated as least 50% of studen	ents in 2012, 009. 'Excellent' by at

compared to 0 in 2009.

zacement or very coou	
2009	2012
#N/A	(N = 18)
#N/A	66.7
#N/A	72.2
#N/A	58.8
#N/A	58.8
#N/A	44.4
#N/A	66.7
N/A	27.8
#N/A	44.4
#N/A	61.1
N/A	55.6
#N/A	70.6
#N/A	77.8
N/A	44.4
#N/A	22.2
#N/A	50.0
#N/A	88.9
#N/A	61.1
12 features rated as 'Excellent' or	

12 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 0 in 2009.

2 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2012, compared to 0 in 2009.

, , , ,		
Fair or Poor		
2009	2012	
#N/A	(N = 18)	
#N/A	5.6	
#N/A	11.1	
#N/A	11.8	
#N/A	5.9	
#N/A	11.1	
#N/A	22.2	
N/A	27.8	
#N/A	16.7	
#N/A	33.3	
N/A	27.8	
#N/A	5.9	
#N/A	11.1	
N/A	16.7	
#N/A	22.2	
#N/A	5.6	
#N/A	0.0	
#N/A	16.7	

5 features rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2012, compared to 0 in 2009.

International Studies

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

	Strongly Agreed	
	2009	2012
	#N/A	(N = 18)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	#N/A	72.2
Treats my ideas with respect	#N/A	88.9
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	#N/A	55.6
Provides timely feedback on my work	#N/A	44.4
Is available when I need help or advice	#N/A	33.3
Would support me in any career path I choose	N/A	72.2
(academic or a career outside the academy)	,	
Treats students in the department equitably	#N/A	77.8
regardless of their backgrounds*	-	
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics	#N/A	61.1
in our field*	,	
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my	#N/A	38.9
graduate studies, research or creative work*	<i></i>	30.3
Helps me develop professional relationships with	#N/A	22.2
others in the field	HIV/A	22.2
Advises me about how to get my work published,	#N/A	22.2
performed or shown	πιν/ Δ	22.2
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences	#N/A	50.0
or disagreements*	#11/14	30.0
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am	#N/A	61.1
facing in graduate school	-	
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 50% of resp	ondents 'Strongly

^{* 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 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.

Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
2009	2012	
#N/A	(N = 18)	
#N/A	0.0	
#N/A	0.0	
#N/A	0.0	
#N/A	16.7	
#N/A	22.2	
N/A	0.0	
#N/A	5.6	
#N/A	16.7	
#N/A	11.1	
#N/A	0.0	
A+ + 200/ -f	and a second	

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 1 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.

International Studies

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

	Strongly Agreed	
	2009	2012
	#N/A	(N = 18)
Collegial	N/A	44.4
Encouraging	#N/A	38.9
Supportive	#N/A	50.0
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	#N/A	66.7
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	#N/A	77.8
Inclusive of students of color*	#N/A	77.8
Inclusive by gender*	#N/A	72.2
Inclusive of international students	N/A	83.3
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	#N/A	61.1
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	61.1
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	#N/A	88.9

^{* 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 0 statements in 2009.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 9 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.

Strongly Agreed or Agreed	
2012	
(N = 18)	
83.3	
83.3	
83.3	
94.4	
100.0	
88.9	
88.9	
88.9	
83.3	
94.4	
94.4	

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 11 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 11 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.

<u> </u>		
Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
2009	2012	
#N/A	(N = 18)	
N/A	0.0	
#N/A	0.0	
N/A	5.6	
#N/A	0.0	
N/A	0.0	
#N/A	0.0	
A		

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.

Political Science

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

	Program Satis	faction: percenta
	Excellent	
	2009	2012
	(N = 31)	(N = 32)
Quality of the faculty	10.2	12.9
Overall Program quality	10.2	0.0
Financial support for graduate students	21.1	12.9
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent	10.2	9.7
developments in my field	10.2	9.7
Quality of academic guidance and advising	21.1	9.7
Intellectual community in Program	10.2	0.0
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	12.9
Space, facilities and equipment	7.3	3.2
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	7.3	3.2
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	6.5
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess		
graduate students	9.9	6.5
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	14.5	6.7
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	6.5
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	13.2	3.2
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	6.6	3.2
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	18.1	0.0
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	23.5	16.1
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	0 features rated as least 33.3% of stude compared to 0 in 20	ents in 2012,
	0 features rated as least 50% of studen compared to 0 in 20	its in 2012,

Excellent or Very Good	
2009	2012
(N = 31)	(N = 32)
74.5	61.3
40.8	25.8
32.0	35.5
47.8	35.5
41.2	29.0
36.3	29.0
N/A	38.7
28.1	35.5
17.5	6.5
N/A	12.9
34.3	35.5
30.7	23.3
N/A	19.4
47.6	38.7
23.7	22.6
28.3	29.0
40.6	32.3
1 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very	

1 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very
Good' by at least 50% of students in
2012, compared to 1 in 2009.

O features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2012, compared to 0 in 2009.

Fair or Poor		
2009	2012	
(N = 31)	(N = 32)	
0.0	3.2	
19.8	38.7	
38.3	45.2	
14.1	32.3	
30.3	54.8	
29.0	41.9	
N/A	48.4	
51.1	32.3	
61.3	74.2	
N/A	54.8	
41.0	32.3	
23.8	50.0	
N/A	48.4	
32.0	45.2	
58.5	41.9	
21.1	41.9	
17.5	32.3	

16 features rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2012, compared to 10 in 2009.

Political Science

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

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Strongly	Agreed
	2009	2012
	(N = 31)	(N = 32)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	54.6	71.4
Treats my ideas with respect	53.9	76.2
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	59.2	52.4
Provides timely feedback on my work	51.8	47.6
Is available when I need help or advice	54.6	52.4
Would support me in any career path I choose	N/A	71.4
(academic or a career outside the academy)	11771	7 1.4
Treats students in the department equitably	43.6	90.5
regardless of their backgrounds*		00.0
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics	36.9	25.0
in our field*		
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my	19.5	14.3
graduate studies, research or creative work*		
Helps me develop professional relationships with	23.9	28.6
others in the field		
Advises me about how to get my work published,	23.4	28.6
performed or shown		
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences	40.8	52.4
or disagreements*	10.0	J211
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am	40.4	57.1
facing in graduate school	-	
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 50% of resp	ondents 'Strongly

^{* 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 5 statements in 2009.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 2 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.

Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
2009	2012	
(N = 31)	(N = 32)	
7.1	0.0	
3.9	0.0	
0.0	4.8	
18.8	4.8	
0.0	0.0	
N/A	4.8	
3.9	0.0	
0.0	5.0	
14.9	14.3	
11.4	14.3	
10.3	19.0	
11.7	0.0	
3.9	0.0	
A+ + 200/ -f		

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.

Political Science

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

	Strongly Agreed	
	2009	2012
	(N = 31)	(N = 32)
Collegial	N/A	12.9
Encouraging	21.3	9.7
Supportive	16.9	9.7
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	13.9	16.1
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	18.1	6.5
Inclusive of students of color*	31.6	6.5
Inclusive by gender*	28.0	22.6
Inclusive of international students	N/A	22.6
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	37.1	6.7
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	6.7
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	44.5	23.3

^{* 2012} survey included minor edits to question text

At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' 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 0 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.

Strongly Agreed or Agreed		
2009	2012	
(N = 31)	(N = 32)	
N/A	51.6	
52.8	32.3	
50.5	35.5	
51.1	51.6	
62.3	54.8	
66.0	38.7	
69.0	48.4	
N/A	64.5	
85.2	40.0	
N/A	40.0	
89.8	63.3	
	_	

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 5 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 8 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.

Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
2009	2012	
(N = 31)	(N = 32)	
N/A	12.9	
25.7	45.2	
13.8	41.9	
17.5	9.7	
20.5	12.9	
13.9	41.9	
6.6	32.3	
N/A	19.4	
0.0	26.7	
N/A	26.7	
0.0	16.7	

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 6 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 2 statements in 2009.

Sociology

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

	Program Satis	faction: percenta
	Excellent	
	2009	2012
	(N = 29)	(N = 29)
Quality of the faculty	18.8	10.7
Overall Program quality	7.4	7.1
Financial support for graduate students	0.0	7.1
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	23.6	18.5
Quality of academic guidance and advising	14.7	28.6
Intellectual community in Program	18.8	25.0
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	3.6
Space, facilities and equipment	11.7	10.7
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	0.0	7.1
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	3.6
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	8.1	14.3
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	4.0	10.7
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	3.6
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	15.0	10.7
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	8.1	14.3
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	14.7	7.4
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	14.3	10.7
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	0 features rated as least 33.3% of stude compared to 0 in 20	ents in 2012,
		te u itt i

O features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 0 in 2009.

<i>yy y</i>		
Excellent or Very Good		
2009	2012	
(N = 29)	(N = 29)	
76.3	71.4	
36.8	39.3	
22.1	25.0	
58.3	63.0	
40.1	53.6	
40.2	39.3	
N/A	35.7	
34.5	28.6	
15.4	21.4	
N/A	10.7	
19.5	60.7	
14.7	32.1	
N/A	17.9	
30.4	39.3	
15.5	42.9	
25.4	40.7	
51.8	39.3	
4 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very		

4 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' 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 1 in 2009.

jeutures of their program us		
Fair or Poor		
2009	2012	
(N = 29)	(N = 29)	
8.4	7.1	
8.0	28.6	
51.9	42.9	
16.0	22.2	
34.5	25.0	
38.6	46.4	
N/A	35.7	
42.0	39.3	
52.5	53.6	
N/A	60.7	
29.7	32.1	
51.1	50.0	
N/A	50.0	
18.0	39.3	
43.1	28.6	
57.3	51.9	
18.8	28.6	

16 features rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2012, compared to 9 in 2009.

Sociology

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

Advisor. percentage of respondents who Agree		
	Strongly Agreed	
	2009	2012
	(N = 29)	(N = 29)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	78.9	65.4
Treats my ideas with respect	83.5	80.8
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	78.9	57.7
Provides timely feedback on my work	63.0	42.3
Is available when I need help or advice	63.0	57.7
Would support me in any career path I choose	N/A	61.5
(academic or a career outside the academy)	14771	01.5
Treats students in the department equitably	62.2	65.4
regardless of their backgrounds*	02.2	03.1
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics	52.2	36.0
in our field*	0=:=	55.5
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my	26.7	38.5
graduate studies, research or creative work*		55.5
Helps me develop professional relationships with	45.0	15.4
others in the field		
Advises me about how to get my work published,	61.7	38.5
performed or shown		
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences	53.0	44.0
or disagreements*		-
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am	59.4	69.2
facing in graduate school		
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 50% of resp	
	Agreed' with 7 state	
	advisors in 2012 so	mnared to 10

advisors in 2012, compared to 10 statements in 2009.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 1 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 3 statements in 2009.

Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
2009	2012	
(N = 29)	(N = 29)	
8.0	0.0	
8.3	0.0	
8.0	3.8	
8.7	11.5	
12.4	7.7	
N/A	3.8	
7.2	3.8	
8.0	8.0	
33.4	15.4	
23.9	30.8	
16.7	15.4	
23.9	8.0	
20.3	7.7	
At least 20% of room	andonto	

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 1 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 4 statements in 2009.

Sociology

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

	Strongly Agreed	
	2009	2012
	(N = 29)	(N = 29)
Collegial	N/A	16.0
Encouraging	11.4	14.8
Supportive	15.2	14.8
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	10.7	14.8
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	11.8	11.1
Inclusive of students of color*	7.7	18.5
Inclusive by gender*	12.1	33.3
Inclusive of international students	N/A	18.5
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	9.1	18.5
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	23.1
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	37.5	53.8

^{* 2012} survey included minor edits to question text

At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 2 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 1 statements in 2009.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 1 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.

Strongly Agreed or Agreed		
2009	2012	
(N = 29)	(N = 29)	
N/A	60.0	
43.4	51.9	
33.9	55.6	
25.4	59.3	
37.3	40.7	
39.1	40.7	
38.2	66.7	
N/A	51.9	
12.9	40.7	
N/A	53.8	
70.6	80.8	

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 8 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 1 statements in 2009.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 1 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.

Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
2009	2012	
(N = 29)	(N = 29)	
N/A	12.0	
26.8	25.9	
16.0	25.9	
36.4	29.6	
26.5	25.9	
42.9	40.7	
24.6	14.8	
N/A	22.2	
17.4	14.8	
N/A	23.1	
8.1	7.7	
A+ 1+ 200/ -f	1 1	

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 7 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 5 statements in 2009.