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 compares the responses from the 2009 survey to those from the 2012 survey.

A Note about Results 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, the Master's and Certificate programs in Not-for-Profit Management were grouped, and the Oregon Leadership in Sustainability certificate program was suppressed.

GRADUATE STUDENT EXPERIENCE SURVEY RESPONSE RATE BY DEPARTMENT

AAA	Number of Respondents	Number of Students Surveyed	Response Rate
Total for all Graduate Programs	1380	2677	51.6
AAA	237	514	46.1
Architecture	76	221	34.4
Art	18	23	78.3
Art History	11	26	42.3
Arts Management	28	47	59.6
Community & Regional Planning	25	47	53.2
Historic Preservation	11	26	42.3
Interior Architecture	7	19	36.8
Landscape Architecture	30	51	58.8
Nonprofit Management (Combined)	8	14	57.1
Oregon Leadership in Sustainability (OLIS) Ce	3	4	75.0
Public Administration	20	36	55.6

AAA

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

	Architecture (N = 83)	Art (N = 18)	Art History (N = 12)	Arts Management (N = 29)	Community & Regional Planning (N = 27)	Historic Preservation (N = 11)	Interior Architecture (N = 8)	Landscape Architecture (N = 30)	Nonprofit Management (Combined) (N = 8)	Public Administration (N = 21)
Quality of the faculty	16.0	33.3	45.5	10.7	0.0	27.3	42.9	36.7	25.0	5.0
Overall Program quality	9.3	5.6	27.3	14.3	8.0	0.0	14.3	23.3	14.3	5.3
Financial support for graduate students	5.4	61.1	18.2	7.1	8.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	10.5
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	12.0	22.2	36.4	40.7	20.0	0.0	57.1	20.0	50.0	15.0
Quality of academic guidance and advising	2.7	5.6	36.4	17.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.8	0.0	10.0
Intellectual community in Program	21.3	44.4	54.5	25.0	12.0	9.1	14.3	36.7	14.3	15.8
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	6.7	0.0	9.1	28.6	28.0	0.0	14.3	3.3	12.5	36.8
Space, facilities and equipment	10.8	22.2	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	14.3	5.3
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students	2.7	16.7	10.0	10.7	0.0	0.0	14.3	50.0	0.0	5.3
Research opportunities in my program	8.0	11.1	36.4	17.9	4.0	9.1	0.0	6.7	28.6	5.0
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	8.0	22.2	36.4	7.1	4.0	27.3	0.0	3.3	0.0	15.0
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community	6.7	16.7	27.3	17.9	4.0	9.1	14.3	13.3	28.6	11.1
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	0.0	5.6	18.2	3.6	8.0	0.0	0.0	6.9	0.0	10.5
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	4.2	16.7	54.5	3.8	0.0	0.0	16.7	10.0	33.3	5.0
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	4.0	11.1	9.1	7.1	4.0	20.0	14.3	6.9	0.0	10.0
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	4.0	22.2	9.1	28.6	4.0	18.2	0.0	10.0	0.0	10.0
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity	6.8	11.1	18.2	14.3	0.0	20.0	14.3	10.0	28.6	10.5
33.3% of students or more rated the program as "Excellent".*	0	3	7	1	0	0	2	3	2	1
50% of students or more rated the program as "Excellent".**	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	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."

AAA

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

	Architecture (N = 83)	Art (N = 18)	Art History (N = 12)	Arts Management (N = 29)	Community & Regional Planning (N = 27)	Historic Preservation (N = 11)	Interior Architecture (N = 8)	Landscape Architecture (N = 30)	Nonprofit Management (Combined) (N = 8)	Public Administration (N = 21)
Quality of the faculty	68.0	88.9	81.8	75.0	44.0	63.6	85.7	63.3	100.0	45.0
Overall Program quality	54.7	61.1	63.6	64.3	44.0	54.5	71.4	63.3	71.4	47.4
Financial support for graduate students	18.9	83.3	45.5	25.0	8.0	0.0	14.3	10.0	14.3	15.8
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	45.3	66.7	63.6	74.1	52.0	36.4	57.1	43.3	100.0	60.0
Quality of academic guidance and advising	17.3	38.9	45.5	50.0	24.0	27.3	42.9	41.4	50.0	55.0
Intellectual community in Program	52.0	72.2	63.6	64.3	32.0	54.5	28.6	63.3	57.1	47.4
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	28.0	22.2	36.4	57.1	48.0	54.5	57.1	30.0	62.5	63.2
Space, facilities and equipment	32.4	55.6	36.4	17.9	8.0	0.0	28.6	10.3	28.6	10.5
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students	26.7	50.0	60.0	46.4	12.0	9.1	42.9	73.3	0.0	31.6
Research opportunities in my program	32.0	44.4	63.6	60.7	28.0	45.5	28.6	26.7	28.6	35.0
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	34.7	61.1	54.5	53.6	12.0	54.5	42.9	43.3	57.1	45.0
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community	34.7	38.9	63.6	50.0	16.0	27.3	57.1	46.7	57.1	38.9
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	6.7	27.8	45.5	50.0	20.0	9.1	14.3	10.3	25.0	36.8
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	33.8	55.6	81.8	34.6	29.2	36.4	50.0	33.3	50.0	25.0
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	29.3	38.9	54.5	60.7	16.0	40.0	42.9	37.9	28.6	25.0
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	28.0	44.4	45.5	53.6	32.0	36.4	28.6	43.3	14.3	40.0
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity	32.4	22.2	45.5	46.4	16.0	50.0	42.9	43.3	85.7	47.4
50% of students or more rated the program as "Excellent" or "Very Good".*	3	9	10	12	1	6	6	4	10	3
75% of students or more rated the program as "Excellent" or "Very Good".**	0	2	2	1	0	0	1	0	3	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."

AAA

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

	Architecture (N = 83)	Art (N = 18)	Art History (N = 12)	Arts Management (N = 29)	Community & Regional Planning (N = 27)	Historic Preservation (N = 11)	Interior Architecture (N = 8)	Landscape Architecture (N = 30)	Nonprofit Management (Combined) (N = 8)	Public Administration (N = 21)
Quality of the faculty	10.7	0.0	0.0	3.6	12.0	18.2	0.0	6.7	0.0	20.0
Overall Program quality	12.0	11.1	9.1	10.7	16.0	27.3	0.0	10.0	0.0	15.8
Financial support for graduate students	55.4	0.0	36.4	50.0	64.0	63.6	57.1	66.7	42.9	52.6
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	26.7	11.1	9.1	3.7	20.0	27.3	14.3	26.7	0.0	10.0
Quality of academic guidance and advising	58.7	33.3	36.4	7.1	36.0	54.5	42.9	27.6	25.0	10.0
Intellectual community in Program	21.3	11.1	18.2	17.9	16.0	36.4	14.3	6.7	0.0	26.3
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	33.3	38.9	45.5	7.1	20.0	36.4	0.0	30.0	12.5	15.8
Space, facilities and equipment	35.1	22.2	18.2	35.7	80.0	100.0	14.3	51.7	14.3	73.7
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students	34.7	33.3	20.0	28.6	44.0	54.5	14.3	16.7	28.6	36.8
Research opportunities in my program	32.0	33.3	9.1	14.3	20.0	27.3	28.6	46.7	42.9	50.0
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	21.3	5.6	9.1	14.3	28.0	27.3	42.9	10.0	0.0	15.0
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community	25.3	27.8	9.1	28.6	44.0	45.5	14.3	16.7	0.0	22.2
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	69.3	44.4	36.4	32.1	48.0	45.5	42.9	55.2	12.5	42.1
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	21.1	27.8	9.1	23.1	29.2	27.3	33.3	30.0	0.0	50.0
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	25.3	16.7	18.2	21.4	28.0	50.0	42.9	24.1	0.0	15.0
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	41.3	33.3	18.2	10.7	20.0	27.3	14.3	30.0	14.3	20.0
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity	29.7	33.3	9.1	28.6	16.0	30.0	0.0	23.3	14.3	42.1
20% of students or more rated the program as "Fair" or "Poor".*	15	10	5	8	13	16	7	11	4	11

*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.*									
	Architecture (N = 83)	Art (N = 18)	Art History (N = 12)	Arts Management (N = 29)	Community & Regional Planning (N = 27)	Historic Preservation (N = 11)	Interior Architecture (N = 8)	Landscape Architecture (N = 30)	Nonprofit Management (N = 8)	Public Administration (N = 21)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	32.1	70.6	70.0	55.6	31.6	25.0	71.4	59.3	16.7	25.0
Treats my ideas with respect	43.4	76.5	70.0	66.7	47.4	25.0	85.7	63.0	33.3	50.0
Provides constructive feedback on my work	34.6	76.5	60.0	55.6	36.8	0.0	85.7	59.3	16.7	40.0
Provides timely feedback on my work	32.7	64.7	50.0	59.3	31.6	25.0	42.9	48.1	0.0	30.0
Is available when I need help or advice	26.4	76.5	50.0	57.7	21.1	37.5	71.4	44.4	16.7	30.0
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	28.3	82.4	30.0	77.8	42.1	25.0	71.4	44.4	33.3	50.0
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds	34.6	76.5	60.0	81.5	36.8	25.0	71.4	59.3	66.7	55.0
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field	18.9	52.9	40.0	66.7	42.1	25.0	71.4	48.1	33.3	20.0
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work	13.5	47.1	50.0	33.3	27.8	25.0	57.1	7.4	0.0	5.3
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	17.3	17.6	33.3	44.4	15.8	37.5	14.3	7.4	16.7	5.3
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	13.5	17.6	30.0	29.6	11.1	25.0	50.0	3.7	0.0	5.6
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements	17.3	76.5	30.0	51.9	15.8	25.0	57.1	29.6	33.3	15.8
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	23.1	64.7	40.0	59.3	21.1	12.5	57.1	22.2	33.3	31.6
50% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" with the above dimensions about their advisor.*	0	10.0	7.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	11.0	4.0	1.0	3.0
75% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" with the above dimensions about their advisor.**	0	6.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	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.

AAA

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

	Architecture (N = 83)	Art (N = 18)	Art History (N = 12)	Arts Management (N = 29)	Community & Regional Planning (N = 27)	Historic Preservation (N = 11)	Interior Architecture (N = 8)	Landscape Architecture (N = 30)	Nonprofit Management (Combined) (N = 8)	Public Administration (N = 21)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	11.3	5.9	30.0	3.7	5.3	12.5	0.0	7.4	0.0	10.0
Treats my ideas with respect	11.3	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	3.7	0.0	5.0
Provides constructive feedback on my work	15.4	0.0	10.0	3.7	0.0	25.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	5.0
Provides timely feedback on my work	17.3	5.9	40.0	3.7	15.8	12.5	0.0	11.1	0.0	15.0
Is available when I need help or advice	11.3	5.9	20.0	7.7	15.8	12.5	14.3	11.1	0.0	20.0
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	7.5	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	11.1	0.0	5.0
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds	5.8	0.0	20.0	11.1	10.5	12.5	0.0	7.4	0.0	5.0
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field	15.1	5.9	30.0	7.4	10.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work	36.5	5.9	30.0	33.3	16.7	37.5	14.3	37.0	0.0	52.6
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	28.8	11.8	33.3	18.5	26.3	0.0	14.3	22.2	33.3	47.4
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	25.0	11.8	40.0	25.9	33.3	12.5	16.7	29.6	16.7	50.0
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements	11.5	0.0	20.0	14.8	5.3	25.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	21.1
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	13.5	5.9	30.0	14.8	5.3	37.5	14.3	18.5	0.0	26.3
20% of students or more "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" with the statements above about their advisor.*	3	0	12	2	2	4	0	3	1	6
33.3% of students or more "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" with the statements above about their advisor.**	1	0	3	1	1	2	0	1	1	3

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

AAA

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

	Architecture (N = 83)	Art (N = 18)	Art History (N = 12)	Arts Management (N = 29)	Community & Regional Planning (N = 27)	Historic Preservation (N = 11)	Interior Architecture (N = 8)	Landscape Architecture (N = 30)	Nonprofit Management (Combined) (N = 8)	Public Administration (N = 21)
Collegial	25.0	33.3	45.5	25.9	12.5	18.2	57.1	48.3	14.3	35.0
Encouraging	26.3	33.3	27.3	37.0	12.0	27.3	42.9	41.4	14.3	31.6
Supportive	19.7	27.8	27.3	37.0	8.0	18.2	28.6	34.5	28.6	35.0
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches	22.4	38.9	36.4	48.1	20.0	18.2	28.6	34.5	14.3	25.0
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	19.7	50.0	36.4	37.0	28.0	27.3	14.3	34.5	14.3	21.1
Inclusive of students of color	26.3	52.9	63.6	40.7	20.0	36.4	57.1	42.9	42.9	31.6
Inclusive by gender	39.5	44.4	63.6	29.6	32.0	36.4	57.1	62.1	42.9	55.0
Inclusive of international students	33.3	35.3	90.9	44.4	16.0	36.4	57.1	51.7	28.6	26.3
Inclusive of students with disabilities	14.5	52.9	45.5	37.0	12.0	27.3	28.6	31.0	14.3	21.1
Inclusive of first generation students	21.3	41.2	54.5	34.6	12.0	27.3	28.6	37.9	14.3	31.6
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	36.0	77.8	81.8	40.7	24.0	36.4	42.9	65.5	14.3	45.0
33.3% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" that the description fit their program*	3	10	9	9	0	4	6	10	2	4
50% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" that the description fit their program**	0	4	5	0	0	0	4	3	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.

AAA

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

	Architecture (N = 83)	Art (N = 18)	Art History (N = 12)	Arts Management (N = 29)	Community & Regional Planning (N = 27)	Historic Preservation (N = 11)	Interior Architecture (N = 8)	Landscape Architecture (N = 30)	Nonprofit Management (Combined) (N = 8)	Public Administration (N = 21)
Collegial	71.1	83.3	81.8	70.4	87.5	81.8	85.7	93.1	85.7	85.0
Encouraging	73.7	72.2	63.6	70.4	72.0	72.7	100.0	82.8	85.7	89.5
Supportive	68.4	66.7	63.6	77.8	64.0	72.7	100.0	75.9	85.7	90.0
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches	65.8	77.8	72.7	81.5	72.0	45.5	71.4	82.8	57.1	65.0
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	57.9	72.2	72.7	74.1	64.0	72.7	42.9	72.4	57.1	68.4
Inclusive of students of color	55.3	64.7	81.8	74.1	44.0	63.6	71.4	67.9	57.1	63.2
Inclusive by gender	82.9	66.7	81.8	63.0	80.0	63.6	71.4	86.2	100.0	80.0
Inclusive of international students	73.3	64.7	90.9	77.8	60.0	54.5	57.1	82.8	85.7	63.2
Inclusive of students with disabilities	56.6	76.5	81.8	59.3	44.0	54.5	28.6	72.4	71.4	52.6
Inclusive of first generation students	58.7	76.5	90.9	65.4	36.0	63.6	71.4	82.8	71.4	52.6
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	78.7	94.4	100.0	85.2	60.0	81.8	85.7	86.2	57.1	70.0
50% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" that the description fit their program.*	11	11	11	11	8	10	9	11	11	11
75% of students or more "Strong Agreed" or "Agreed" that the description fit their program.**	2	5	7	4	2	2	4	8	5	4

*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.

AAA

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

	Architecture (N = 83)	Art (N = 18)	Art History (N = 12)	Arts Management (N = 29)	Community & Regional Planning (N = 27)	Historic Preservation (N = 11)	Interior Architecture (N = 8)	Landscape Architecture (N = 30)	Nonprofit Management (Combined) (N = 8)	Public Administration (N = 21)
Collegial	3.9	0.0	9.1	11.1	0.0	9.1	0.0	6.9	0.0	10.0
Encouraging	10.5	0.0	9.1	3.7	4.0	18.2	0.0	6.9	0.0	5.3
Supportive	15.8	5.6	9.1	14.8	8.0	18.2	0.0	10.3	0.0	10.0
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches	11.8	11.1	0.0	7.4	8.0	9.1	0.0	6.9	0.0	20.0
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	15.8	11.1	9.1	3.7	8.0	0.0	14.3	6.9	0.0	21.1
Inclusive of students of color	21.1	0.0	9.1	7.4	16.0	9.1	28.6	10.7	0.0	15.8
Inclusive by gender	6.6	5.6	0.0	22.2	0.0	0.0	14.3	3.4	0.0	15.0
Inclusive of international students	9.3	0.0	0.0	7.4	4.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	15.8
Inclusive of students with disabilities	15.8	0.0	9.1	11.1	4.0	9.1	0.0	10.3	0.0	26.3
Inclusive of first generation students	9.3	5.9	0.0	7.7	12.0	18.2	0.0	10.3	0.0	26.3
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	2.7	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.0
20% of students or more "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" that the description fit their program.*	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3
33.3% of students or more "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" that the description fit their program.*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Architecture

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

	Excellent		Excellent or Very Good		Fair or Poor	
	2009 (N = 104)	2012 (N = 83)	2009 (N = 104)	2012 (N = 83)	2009 (N = 104)	2012 (N = 83)
Quality of the faculty	11.6	16.0	57.5	68.0	6.9	10.7
Overall Program quality	3.0	9.3	37.6	54.7	19.2	12.0
Financial support for graduate students	5.5	5.4	17.0	18.9	47.6	55.4
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	16.2	12.0	47.3	45.3	18.7	26.7
Quality of academic guidance and advising	0.9	2.7	12.1	17.3	61.7	58.7
Intellectual community in Program	19.2	21.3	53.8	52.0	15.8	21.3
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	6.7	N/A	28.0	N/A	33.3
Space, facilities and equipment	1.1	10.8	20.9	32.4	55.4	35.1
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	0.0	2.7	7.4	26.7	67.8	34.7
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	8.0	N/A	32.0	N/A	32.0
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	7.0	8.0	30.7	34.7	24.2	21.3
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	4.1	6.7	19.0	34.7	36.3	25.3
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	0.0	N/A	6.7	N/A	69.3
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	5.3	4.2	24.5	33.8	18.9	21.1
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	3.9	4.0	19.9	29.3	37.9	25.3
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	6.1	4.0	22.7	28.0	44.5	41.3
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	5.1	6.8	35.5	32.4	18.7	29.7

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

0 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2012, compared to 0 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 50% of students in 2012, compared to 2 in 2009.

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

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

Architecture

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

	Strongly Agreed		Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 104)	2012 (N = 83)	2009 (N = 104)	2012 (N = 83)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	19.9	32.1	4.8	11.3
Treats my ideas with respect	17.6	43.4	3.8	11.3
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	9.7	34.6	7.9	15.4
Provides timely feedback on my work	8.4	32.7	12.3	17.3
Is available when I need help or advice	15.8	26.4	7.6	11.3
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	28.3	N/A	7.5
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	17.2	34.6	5.6	5.8
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	10.9	18.9	4.6	15.1
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	12.2	13.5	15.9	36.5
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	9.8	17.3	16.8	28.8
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	6.0	13.5	14.5	25.0
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	9.8	17.3	3.4	11.5
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	19.9	23.1	9.1	13.5

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 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 0 statements in 2009.

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 3 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.

Architecture

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 = 104)	2012 (N = 83)	2009 (N = 104)	2012 (N = 83)	2009 (N = 104)	2012 (N = 83)
Collegial	N/A	25.0	N/A	71.1	N/A	3.9
Encouraging	26.2	26.3	67.3	73.7	9.1	10.5
Supportive	25.2	19.7	62.3	68.4	9.8	15.8
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	15.3	22.4	52.9	65.8	15.1	11.8
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	14.7	19.7	47.5	57.9	24.3	15.8
Inclusive of students of color*	14.7	26.3	51.2	55.3	15.4	21.1
Inclusive by gender*	40.0	39.5	81.3	82.9	7.1	6.6
Inclusive of international students	N/A	33.3	N/A	73.3	N/A	9.3
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	17.2	14.5	53.3	56.6	14.8	15.8
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	21.3	N/A	58.7	N/A	9.3
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	39.1	36.0	79.0	78.7	1.2	2.7

* 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 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.

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 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 2 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 2 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 1 statements in 2009.

Art History

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

	Excellent		Excellent or Very Good		Fair or Poor	
	2009 (N = 18)	2012 (N = 12)	2009 (N = 18)	2012 (N = 12)	2009 (N = 18)	2012 (N = 12)
Quality of the faculty	35.6	45.5	65.6	81.8	0.0	0.0
Overall Program quality	12.3	27.3	71.2	63.6	17.8	9.1
Financial support for graduate students	53.4	18.2	89.0	45.5	5.5	36.4
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	24.5	36.4	64.4	63.6	12.3	9.1
Quality of academic guidance and advising	24.5	36.4	47.8	45.5	11.0	36.4
Intellectual community in Program	23.3	54.5	76.7	63.6	6.7	18.2
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	9.1	N/A	36.4	N/A	45.5
Space, facilities and equipment	0.0	0.0	38.0	36.4	5.5	18.2
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	46.6	10.0	64.4	60.0	12.3	20.0
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	36.4	N/A	63.6	N/A	9.1
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	25.7	36.4	60.1	54.5	28.9	9.1
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	35.6	27.3	58.9	63.6	23.4	9.1
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	18.2	N/A	45.5	N/A	36.4
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	17.8	54.5	71.2	81.8	11.1	9.1
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	17.8	9.1	53.4	54.5	34.3	18.2
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	23.3	9.1	53.3	45.5	5.5	18.2
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	24.5	18.2	52.2	45.5	12.2	9.1

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

7 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2012, compared to 4 in 2009.

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

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

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

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

Art History

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

	Strongly Agreed		Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 18)	2012 (N = 12)	2009 (N = 18)	2012 (N = 12)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	64.4	70.0	0.0	30.0
Treats my ideas with respect	64.4	70.0	0.0	20.0
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	70.0	60.0	5.5	10.0
Provides timely feedback on my work	34.4	50.0	11.1	40.0
Is available when I need help or advice	39.9	50.0	5.5	20.0
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	30.0	N/A	20.0
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	57.7	60.0	0.0	20.0
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	47.8	40.0	0.0	30.0
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	36.8	50.0	17.8	30.0
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	35.6	33.3	23.3	33.3
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	19.0	30.0	28.8	40.0
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	47.8	30.0	5.5	20.0
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	54.6	40.0	16.6	30.0

* 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 5 statements in 2009.

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

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 12 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 2 statements in 2009.

Art History

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 = 18)	2012 (N = 12)	2009 (N = 18)	2012 (N = 12)	2009 (N = 18)	2012 (N = 12)
Collegial	N/A	45.5	N/A	81.8	N/A	9.1
Encouraging	41.1	27.3	82.2	63.6	12.3	9.1
Supportive	36.9	27.3	75.0	63.6	5.9	9.1
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	47.8	36.4	83.4	72.7	5.5	0.0
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	41.1	36.4	87.7	72.7	0.0	9.1
Inclusive of students of color*	39.9	63.6	64.4	81.8	11.1	9.1
Inclusive by gender*	58.9	63.6	76.7	81.8	11.1	0.0
Inclusive of international students	N/A	90.9	N/A	90.9	N/A	0.0
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	41.1	45.5	82.2	81.8	0.0	9.1
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	54.5	N/A	90.9	N/A	0.0
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	55.9	81.8	86.8	100.0	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 8 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 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 7 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.

Art

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

	Excellent		Excellent or Very Good		Fair or Poor	
	2009 (N = 20)	2012 (N = 18)	2009 (N = 20)	2012 (N = 18)	2009 (N = 20)	2012 (N = 18)
Quality of the faculty	30.0	33.3	65.9	88.9	11.7	0.0
Overall Program quality	28.3	5.6	47.5	61.1	21.1	11.1
Financial support for graduate students	43.0	61.1	68.7	83.3	10.1	0.0
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	23.8	22.2	43.0	66.7	36.8	11.1
Quality of academic guidance and advising	19.2	5.6	38.4	38.9	36.8	33.3
Intellectual community in Program	32.9	44.4	44.0	72.2	14.6	11.1
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	0.0	N/A	22.2	N/A	38.9
Space, facilities and equipment	4.6	22.2	46.0	55.6	35.8	22.2
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	9.1	16.7	23.8	50.0	56.1	33.3
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	11.1	N/A	44.4	N/A	33.3
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	4.6	22.2	14.7	61.1	20.2	5.6
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	23.8	16.7	28.4	38.9	30.3	27.8
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	5.6	N/A	27.8	N/A	44.4
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	10.1	16.7	37.4	55.6	36.8	27.8
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	9.1	11.1	14.6	38.9	51.5	16.7
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	29.3	22.2	54.1	44.4	25.7	33.3
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	5.5	11.1	32.8	22.2	42.3	33.3

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

3 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2012, compared to 1 in 2009.	9 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 3 in 2009.	10 features rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2012, compared to 11 in 2009.
1 features rated as 'Excellent' 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.	

Art

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

	Strongly Agreed		Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 20)	2012 (N = 18)	2009 (N = 20)	2012 (N = 18)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	47.5	70.6	11.1	5.9
Treats my ideas with respect	57.6	76.5	5.5	0.0
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	43.0	76.5	11.0	0.0
Provides timely feedback on my work	47.5	64.7	15.6	5.9
Is available when I need help or advice	48.5	76.5	11.1	5.9
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	82.4	N/A	0.0
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	48.5	76.5	16.6	0.0
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	32.9	52.9	0.0	5.9
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	39.6	47.1	40.1	5.9
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	20.3	17.6	43.8	11.8
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	25.2	17.6	27.3	11.8
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	49.3	76.5	17.6	0.0
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	55.2	64.7	23.5	5.9

* 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 2 statements in 2009.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 6 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 4 statements in 2009.

Art

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 = 20)	2012 (N = 18)	2009 (N = 20)	2012 (N = 18)	2009 (N = 20)	2012 (N = 18)
Collegial	N/A	33.3	N/A	83.3	N/A	0.0
Encouraging	18.2	33.3	73.2	72.2	5.5	0.0
Supportive	18.2	27.8	74.2	66.7	5.5	5.6
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	14.7	38.9	71.7	77.8	14.7	11.1
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	44.0	50.0	84.4	72.2	15.6	11.1
Inclusive of students of color*	23.8	52.9	59.6	64.7	20.2	0.0
Inclusive by gender*	39.4	44.4	75.2	66.7	15.6	5.6
Inclusive of international students	N/A	35.3	N/A	64.7	N/A	0.0
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	25.2	52.9	73.8	76.5	4.8	0.0
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	41.2	N/A	76.5	N/A	5.9
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	55.0	77.8	89.9	94.4	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 3 statements in 2009.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 4 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 8 statements in 2009.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 5 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 3 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.

Arts Management

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 = 29)	2009 (N = 23)	2012 (N = 29)	2009 (N = 23)	2012 (N = 29)
Quality of the faculty	25.3	10.7	63.3	75.0	8.2	3.6
Overall Program quality	17.6	14.3	62.5	64.3	8.2	10.7
Financial support for graduate students	12.6	7.1	28.6	25.0	44.0	50.0
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	36.5	40.7	67.8	74.1	3.9	3.7
Quality of academic guidance and advising	13.0	17.9	40.4	50.0	32.2	7.1
Intellectual community in Program	32.5	25.0	71.7	64.3	8.7	17.9
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	28.6	N/A	57.1	N/A	7.1
Space, facilities and equipment	7.8	3.6	7.8	17.9	32.2	35.7
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	19.9	10.7	23.8	46.4	23.5	28.6
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	17.9	N/A	60.7	N/A	14.3
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	26.6	7.1	59.2	53.6	8.2	14.3
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	41.2	17.9	68.6	50.0	11.7	28.6
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	3.6	N/A	50.0	N/A	32.1
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	13.0	3.8	25.6	34.6	3.9	23.1
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	16.9	7.1	56.9	60.7	23.5	21.4
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	20.8	28.6	44.3	53.6	23.5	10.7
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	32.2	14.3	63.9	46.4	11.7	28.6

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

1 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2012, compared to 2 in 2009.

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

12 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 8 in 2009.

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

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

Arts Management

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 = 29)	2009 (N = 23)	2012 (N = 29)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	40.4	55.6	15.7	3.7
Treats my ideas with respect	45.1	66.7	11.8	0.0
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	44.3	55.6	36.2	3.7
Provides timely feedback on my work	40.4	59.3	23.6	3.7
Is available when I need help or advice	36.5	57.7	36.2	7.7
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	77.8	N/A	0.0
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	41.2	81.5	11.7	11.1
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	47.9	66.7	0.0	7.4
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	15.7	33.3	35.3	33.3
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	28.6	44.4	20.5	18.5
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	20.8	29.6	36.1	25.9
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	28.6	51.9	24.4	14.8
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	32.5	59.3	36.1	14.8

* 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 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.

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 2 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 8 statements in 2009.

Arts Management

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 = 29)	2009 (N = 23)	2012 (N = 29)	2009 (N = 23)	2012 (N = 29)
Collegial	N/A	25.9	N/A	70.4	N/A	11.1
Encouraging	40.4	37.0	80.4	70.4	7.8	3.7
Supportive	40.4	37.0	84.3	77.8	3.9	14.8
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	36.5	48.1	79.6	81.5	3.9	7.4
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	46.1	37.0	83.7	74.1	0.0	3.7
Inclusive of students of color*	42.9	40.7	75.5	74.1	0.0	7.4
Inclusive by gender*	32.5	29.6	59.9	63.0	16.6	22.2
Inclusive of international students	N/A	44.4	N/A	77.8	N/A	7.4
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	42.0	37.0	78.7	59.3	0.0	11.1
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	34.6	N/A	65.4	N/A	7.7
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	54.3	40.7	91.9	85.2	0.0	3.7

* 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 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 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.

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.

Community & Regional Planning

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

	Excellent		Excellent or Very Good		Fair or Poor	
	2009 (N = 27)	2012 (N = 27)	2009 (N = 27)	2012 (N = 27)	2009 (N = 27)	2012 (N = 27)
Quality of the faculty	4.3	0.0	26.0	44.0	26.6	12.0
Overall Program quality	0.0	8.0	33.9	44.0	30.1	16.0
Financial support for graduate students	4.3	8.0	11.4	8.0	64.1	64.0
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	0.0	20.0	37.5	52.0	22.2	20.0
Quality of academic guidance and advising	0.0	0.0	7.9	24.0	38.7	36.0
Intellectual community in Program	8.7	12.0	54.1	32.0	23.0	16.0
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	28.0	N/A	48.0	N/A	20.0
Space, facilities and equipment	3.6	0.0	12.3	8.0	72.7	80.0
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	3.6	0.0	49.0	12.0	35.2	44.0
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	4.0	N/A	28.0	N/A	20.0
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	13.0	4.0	44.6	12.0	15.8	28.0
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	8.2	4.0	32.8	16.0	37.3	44.0
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	8.0	N/A	20.0	N/A	48.0
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	0.0	0.0	8.2	29.2	26.7	29.2
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	0.0	4.0	33.2	16.0	36.0	28.0
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	12.2	4.0	41.0	32.0	12.2	20.0
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	7.1	0.0	39.5	16.0	12.3	16.0

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

0 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2012, compared to 0 in 2009.

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

13 features rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2012, compared to 11 in 2009.

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

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

Community & Regional Planning

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

	Strongly Agreed		Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 27)	2012 (N = 27)	2009 (N = 27)	2012 (N = 27)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	26.5	31.6	3.6	5.3
Treats my ideas with respect	26.5	47.4	3.6	0.0
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	10.7	36.8	3.6	0.0
Provides timely feedback on my work	7.1	31.6	15.0	15.8
Is available when I need help or advice	19.4	21.1	7.9	15.8
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	42.1	N/A	0.0
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	7.1	36.8	16.5	10.5
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	7.4	42.1	3.7	10.5
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	11.5	27.8	30.9	16.7
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	18.6	15.8	23.7	26.3
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	15.0	11.1	19.3	33.3
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	10.7	15.8	7.9	5.3
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	10.7	21.1	23.7	5.3

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 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 0 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.

Community & Regional Planning

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 = 27)	2012 (N = 27)	2009 (N = 27)	2012 (N = 27)	2009 (N = 27)	2012 (N = 27)
Collegial	N/A	12.5	N/A	87.5	N/A	0.0
Encouraging	16.4	12.0	51.6	72.0	7.4	4.0
Supportive	23.7	8.0	56.9	64.0	7.1	8.0
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	3.6	20.0	50.6	72.0	7.9	8.0
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	33.6	28.0	70.9	64.0	3.7	8.0
Inclusive of students of color*	3.6	20.0	32.4	44.0	23.7	16.0
Inclusive by gender*	27.3	32.0	80.6	80.0	0.0	0.0
Inclusive of international students	N/A	16.0	N/A	60.0	N/A	4.0
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	13.7	12.0	37.1	44.0	4.0	4.0
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	12.0	N/A	36.0	N/A	12.0
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	25.4	24.0	68.0	60.0	0.0	0.0

* 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 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.

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 2 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 1 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.

Historic Preservation

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 = 11)	2009 (N = 13)	2012 (N = 11)	2009 (N = 13)	2012 (N = 11)
Quality of the faculty	14.1	27.3	71.9	63.6	7.0	18.2
Overall Program quality	7.0	0.0	49.2	54.5	15.6	27.3
Financial support for graduate students	0.0	0.0	14.1	0.0	78.9	63.6
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	28.1	0.0	71.8	36.4	0.0	27.3
Quality of academic guidance and advising	7.0	0.0	42.2	27.3	36.7	54.5
Intellectual community in Program	14.1	9.1	77.4	54.5	0.0	36.4
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	0.0	N/A	54.5	N/A	36.4
Space, facilities and equipment	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	93.0	100.0
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	14.1	0.0	36.7	9.1	56.3	54.5
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	9.1	N/A	45.5	N/A	27.3
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	7.0	27.3	28.1	54.5	36.7	27.3
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	14.1	9.1	57.8	27.3	14.1	45.5
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	0.0	N/A	9.1	N/A	45.5
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	7.6	0.0	37.9	36.4	7.6	27.3
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	7.0	20.0	21.1	40.0	36.7	50.0
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	36.7	18.2	71.9	36.4	21.1	27.3
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	28.1	20.0	70.3	50.0	0.0	30.0

* 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.	6 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 6 in 2009.	16 features rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2012, compared to 7 in 2009.
0 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 0 in 2009.	0 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2012, compared to 1 in 2009.	

Historic Preservation

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 = 11)	2009 (N = 13)	2012 (N = 11)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	39.5	25.0	15.1	12.5
Treats my ideas with respect	31.9	25.0	7.6	12.5
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	30.3	0.0	31.9	25.0
Provides timely feedback on my work	30.3	25.0	16.8	12.5
Is available when I need help or advice	31.9	37.5	15.1	12.5
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	25.0	N/A	12.5
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	31.9	25.0	15.1	12.5
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	30.3	25.0	7.6	0.0
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	7.6	25.0	30.3	37.5
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	30.3	37.5	22.7	0.0
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	30.3	25.0	15.2	12.5
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	22.7	25.0	37.8	25.0
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	22.7	12.5	30.3	37.5

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.	At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 4 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 5 statements in 2009.
At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.	

Historic Preservation

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 = 11)	2009 (N = 13)	2012 (N = 11)	2009 (N = 13)	2012 (N = 11)
Collegial	N/A	18.2	N/A	81.8	N/A	9.1
Encouraging	42.2	27.3	71.9	72.7	0.0	18.2
Supportive	28.1	18.2	77.3	72.7	7.0	18.2
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	28.1	18.2	78.9	45.5	7.0	9.1
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	43.7	27.3	92.9	72.7	7.0	0.0
Inclusive of students of color*	49.2	36.4	92.9	63.6	0.0	9.1
Inclusive by gender*	49.2	36.4	85.9	63.6	0.0	0.0
Inclusive of international students	N/A	36.4	N/A	54.5	N/A	0.0
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	30.3	27.3	62.2	54.5	0.0	9.1
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	27.3	N/A	63.6	N/A	18.2
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	70.3	36.4	85.9	81.8	0.0	0.0

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 4 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 5 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 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 10 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 6 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.

Landscape Architecture

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

	Excellent		Excellent or Very Good		Fair or Poor	
	2009 (N = 20)	2012 (N = 30)	2009 (N = 20)	2012 (N = 30)	2009 (N = 20)	2012 (N = 30)
Quality of the faculty	40.2	36.7	80.4	63.3	4.6	6.7
Overall Program quality	20.6	23.3	65.4	63.3	9.3	10.0
Financial support for graduate students	4.6	3.3	50.5	10.0	28.8	66.7
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	31.9	20.0	65.4	43.3	13.9	26.7
Quality of academic guidance and advising	16.0	13.8	29.9	41.4	39.2	27.6
Intellectual community in Program	25.3	36.7	65.5	63.3	10.3	6.7
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	3.3	N/A	30.0	N/A	30.0
Space, facilities and equipment	0.0	0.0	10.3	10.3	59.8	51.7
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	14.9	50.0	45.8	73.3	48.4	16.7
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	6.7	N/A	26.7	N/A	46.7
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	27.3	3.3	52.6	43.3	18.6	10.0
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	14.9	13.3	56.1	46.7	29.9	16.7
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	6.9	N/A	10.3	N/A	55.2
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	5.7	10.0	29.9	33.3	13.9	30.0
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	16.0	6.9	36.6	37.9	28.9	24.1
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	11.3	10.0	32.9	43.3	19.5	30.0
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	16.0	10.0	66.5	43.3	10.3	23.3

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

3 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2012, compared to 1 in 2009.	4 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 8 in 2009.	11 features rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2012, compared to 6 in 2009.
1 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 0 in 2009.	0 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2012, compared to 1 in 2009.	

Landscape Architecture

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

	Strongly Agreed		Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 20)	2012 (N = 30)	2009 (N = 20)	2012 (N = 30)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	53.1	59.3	0.0	7.4
Treats my ideas with respect	63.4	63.0	0.0	3.7
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	33.5	59.3	10.3	3.7
Provides timely feedback on my work	39.2	48.1	21.6	11.1
Is available when I need help or advice	49.5	44.4	25.2	11.1
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	44.4	N/A	11.1
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	64.4	59.3	0.0	7.4
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	40.2	48.1	4.6	0.0
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	10.3	7.4	29.9	37.0
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	20.6	7.4	28.9	22.2
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	16.0	3.7	29.9	29.6
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	34.5	29.6	4.6	11.1
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	44.8	22.2	14.9	18.5

* 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 3 statements in 2009.

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

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 3 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 5 statements in 2009.

Landscape Architecture

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 = 20)	2012 (N = 30)	2009 (N = 20)	2012 (N = 30)	2009 (N = 20)	2012 (N = 30)
Collegial	N/A	48.3	N/A	93.1	N/A	6.9
Encouraging	41.2	41.4	80.4	82.8	0.0	6.9
Supportive	49.5	34.5	89.7	75.9	4.6	10.3
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	44.8	34.5	74.7	82.8	0.0	6.9
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	44.8	34.5	71.1	72.4	4.6	6.9
Inclusive of students of color*	30.9	42.9	49.5	67.9	19.6	10.7
Inclusive by gender*	60.8	62.1	80.4	86.2	4.6	3.4
Inclusive of international students	N/A	51.7	N/A	82.8	N/A	3.4
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	30.9	31.0	75.7	72.4	4.6	10.3
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	37.9	N/A	82.8	N/A	10.3
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	60.8	65.5	94.3	86.2	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 6 statements in 2009.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 3 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 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 8 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 5 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.

Public Administration

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

	Excellent		Excellent or Very Good		Fair or Poor	
	2009 (N = 22)	2012 (N = 21)	2009 (N = 22)	2012 (N = 21)	2009 (N = 22)	2012 (N = 21)
Quality of the faculty	26.0	5.0	73.2	45.0	0.0	20.0
Overall Program quality	4.3	5.3	59.9	47.4	10.0	15.8
Financial support for graduate students	5.3	10.5	19.2	15.8	56.4	52.6
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	13.0	15.0	76.1	60.0	10.0	10.0
Quality of academic guidance and advising	4.3	10.0	42.6	55.0	9.0	10.0
Intellectual community in Program	19.2	15.8	79.5	47.4	15.2	26.3
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	36.8	N/A	63.2	N/A	15.8
Space, facilities and equipment	4.3	5.3	13.9	10.5	57.9	73.7
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	28.2	5.3	65.6	31.6	10.0	36.8
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	5.0	N/A	35.0	N/A	50.0
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	13.9	15.0	62.2	45.0	8.6	15.0
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	13.9	11.1	60.3	38.9	9.6	22.2
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	10.5	N/A	36.8	N/A	42.1
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	5.3	5.0	33.1	25.0	5.3	50.0
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	8.6	10.0	52.6	25.0	13.9	15.0
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	27.8	10.0	56.5	40.0	4.3	20.0
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	13.9	10.5	62.2	47.4	19.6	42.1

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

1 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2012, compared to 0 in 2009.	3 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% 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.	0 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2012, compared to 2 in 2009.

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

Public Administration

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

	Strongly Agreed		Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed	
	2009 (N = 22)	2012 (N = 21)	2009 (N = 22)	2012 (N = 21)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	52.2	25.0	13.3	10.0
Treats my ideas with respect	61.8	50.0	0.0	5.0
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	51.3	40.0	9.4	5.0
Provides timely feedback on my work	57.5	30.0	14.7	15.0
Is available when I need help or advice	47.9	30.0	4.3	20.0
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	50.0	N/A	5.0
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	42.7	55.0	0.0	5.0
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	47.9	20.0	0.0	5.0
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	9.0	5.3	18.6	52.6
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	18.2	5.3	19.9	47.4
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	13.0	5.6	19.5	50.0
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	42.7	15.8	10.0	21.1
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	44.8	31.6	15.0	26.3

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 3 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.

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 6 statements about their advisors in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.

Public Administration

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 = 22)	2012 (N = 21)	2009 (N = 22)	2012 (N = 21)	2009 (N = 22)	2012 (N = 21)
Collegial	N/A	35.0	N/A	85.0	N/A	10.0
Encouraging	47.4	31.6	84.8	89.5	4.7	5.3
Supportive	47.4	35.0	94.8	90.0	5.3	10.0
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	23.9	25.0	85.7	65.0	9.0	20.0
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	47.8	21.1	90.5	68.4	0.0	21.1
Inclusive of students of color*	34.9	31.6	80.4	63.2	9.6	15.8
Inclusive by gender*	53.0	55.0	95.7	80.0	0.0	15.0
Inclusive of international students	N/A	26.3	N/A	63.2	N/A	15.8
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	35.0	21.1	84.5	52.6	0.0	26.3
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	31.6	N/A	52.6	N/A	26.3
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	46.0	45.0	95.5	70.0	0.0	15.0

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 4 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 7 statements in 2009.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 1 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 8 statements in 2009.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 4 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 4 statements about the climate of their program in 2012, compared to 0 statements in 2009.