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 2015 survey to those from the 2009 and 2012 surveys.

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: Applied Physics is suppressed for low numbers.

GRADUATE EXPERIENCE SURVEY RESPONSE RATE BY DEPARTMENT

CAS NatSci	Number of Respondents	Number of Students Surveyed	Response Rate
Total for all Graduate Programs	1302	2622	49.7
CAS NatSci	347	646	53.7
Applied Physics	7	21	33.3
Biology	47	95	49.5
Chemistry	73	142	51.4
Computer & Information Science	33	64	51.6
Geological Sciences	21	32	65.6
Human Physiology	28	40	70.0
Mathematics	32	65	49.2
Physics	50	91	54.9
Psychology	56	96	58.3

CAS Natural Sciences

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

	Biology (N = 45)	Chemistry (N = 68)	Computer & Information Science (N = 27)	Geological Sciences (N = 21)	Human Physiology (N = 28)	Mathematics (N = 30)	Physics (N = 46)	Psychology (N = 55)
Quality of the faculty	35.6%	33.8%	14.8%	52.4%	53.6%	33.3%	26.1%	38.2%
Overall Program quality	23.3%	14.7%	7.4%	52.4%	57.1%	28.6%	22.2%	27.3%
Financial support for graduate students	16.3%	33.3%	44.4%	47.6%	57.1%	65.5%	54.3%	30.9%
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	35.6%	26.5%	11.1%	42.9%	60.7%	41.4%	32.6%	35.2%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	25.0%	19.4%	11.1%	28.6%	50.0%	3.4%	8.7%	20.0%
Intellectual community in Program	32.6%	26.5%	18.5%	47.6%	32.1%	44.8%	42.2%	27.3%
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	14.0%	16.2%	3.7%	0.0%	46.4%	0.0%	4.3%	10.9%
Space, facilities and equipment	23.3%	25.0%	29.6%	47.6%	46.4%	20.7%	30.4%	40.0%
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students	4.7%	16.2%	7.4%	38.1%	28.6%	10.7%	19.6%	20.0%
Research opportunities in my program	50.0%	29.9%	14.8%	42.9%	64.3%	41.4%	37.0%	50.9%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	22.7%	10.3%	7.4%	19.0%	46.4%	17.2%	6.5%	21.8%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community	20.9%	19.1%	18.5%	4.8%	39.3%	14.3%	13.6%	16.4%
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	9.3%	10.3%	3.7%	4.8%	17.9%	0.0%	2.2%	14.5%
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	4.5%	10.4%	7.4%	0.0%	53.6%	41.4%	4.3%	13.0%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	20.5%	8.8%	11.1%	14.3%	25.0%	6.9%	4.3%	10.9%
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	27.3%	28.4%	18.5%	23.8%	28.6%	3.7%	13.0%	21.8%
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity	4.7%	29.4%	14.8%	4.8%	50.0%	3.4%	2.2%	9.1%
33.3% of students or more rated the program as "Excellent".*	3	2	1	8	12	6	3	4
50% of students or more rated the program as "Excellent".**	1	0	0	2	8	1	1	1

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

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

CAS Natural Sciences

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

	Biology (N = 45)	Chemistry (N = 68)	Computer & Information Science (N = 27)	Geological Sciences (N = 21)	Human Physiology (N = 28)	Mathematics (N = 30)	Physics (N = 46)	Psychology (N = 55)
Quality of the faculty	82.2%	70.6%	51.9%	90.5%	85.7%	76.7%	76.1%	78.2%
Overall Program quality	76.7%	61.8%	48.1%	85.7%	85.7%	78.6%	71.1%	65.5%
Financial support for graduate students	58.1%	74.2%	66.7%	95.2%	85.7%	86.2%	73.9%	63.6%
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	82.2%	72.1%	44.4%	95.2%	89.3%	82.8%	76.1%	77.8%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	47.7%	47.8%	51.9%	76.2%	75.0%	27.6%	37.0%	47.3%
Intellectual community in Program	72.1%	66.2%	55.6%	85.7%	71.4%	89.7%	82.2%	63.6%
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	39.5%	45.6%	14.8%	20.0%	71.4%	35.7%	45.7%	23.6%
Space, facilities and equipment	58.1%	63.2%	63.0%	76.2%	60.7%	58.6%	76.1%	78.2%
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students	46.5%	35.3%	33.3%	76.2%	57.1%	46.4%	45.7%	47.3%
Research opportunities in my program	93.2%	73.1%	55.6%	85.7%	96.4%	93.1%	56.5%	87.3%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	59.1%	32.4%	40.7%	47.6%	71.4%	44.8%	32.6%	61.8%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community	44.2%	50.0%	51.9%	42.9%	67.9%	32.1%	40.9%	43.6%
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	32.6%	33.8%	29.6%	14.3%	32.1%	22.2%	17.8%	41.8%
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	27.3%	38.8%	51.9%	30.0%	85.7%	72.4%	26.1%	33.3%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	40.9%	26.5%	29.6%	38.1%	67.9%	31.0%	19.6%	50.9%
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	47.7%	47.8%	37.0%	52.4%	64.3%	11.1%	54.3%	43.6%
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity	44.2%	57.4%	33.3%	38.1%	82.1%	31.0%	21.7%	45.5%
50% of students or more rated the program as "Excellent" or "Very Good".*	8	9	8	10	16	8	8	9
75% of students or more rated the program as "Excellent" or "Very Good".**	4	0	0	9	8	6	4	4

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

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

CAS Natural Sciences

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

	Biology (N = 45)	Chemistry (N = 68)	Computer & Information Science (N = 27)	Geological Sciences (N = 21)	Human Physiology (N = 28)	Mathematics (N = 30)	Physics (N = 46)	Psychology (N = 55)
Quality of the faculty	0.0%	5.9%	3.7%	4.8%	3.6%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Overall Program quality	0.0%	10.3%	3.7%	4.8%	3.6%	7.1%	6.7%	3.6%
Financial support for graduate students	11.6%	13.6%	14.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	6.5%	12.7%
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	6.7%	5.9%	29.6%	0.0%	3.6%	6.9%	2.2%	3.7%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	18.2%	23.9%	29.6%	14.3%	10.7%	37.9%	30.4%	21.8%
Intellectual community in Program	11.6%	10.3%	18.5%	0.0%	17.9%	3.4%	8.9%	14.5%
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	27.9%	25.0%	55.6%	40.0%	10.7%	42.9%	32.6%	45.5%
Space, facilities and equipment	7.0%	10.3%	11.1%	4.8%	32.1%	24.1%	6.5%	7.3%
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students	20.9%	33.8%	29.6%	0.0%	17.9%	21.4%	17.4%	20.0%
Research opportunities in my program	0.0%	6.0%	29.6%	4.8%	0.0%	3.4%	13.0%	0.0%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	15.9%	42.6%	33.3%	4.8%	17.9%	41.4%	37.0%	9.1%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community	20.9%	16.2%	22.2%	19.0%	7.1%	10.7%	34.1%	21.8%
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	39.5%	33.8%	37.0%	33.3%	21.4%	48.1%	53.3%	25.5%
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	38.6%	32.8%	33.3%	35.0%	3.6%	13.8%	34.8%	46.3%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	27.3%	51.5%	40.7%	19.0%	17.9%	37.9%	41.3%	14.5%
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	15.9%	28.4%	51.9%	19.0%	14.3%	63.0%	21.7%	20.0%
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity	18.6%	14.7%	48.1%	19.0%	10.7%	44.8%	45.7%	23.6%
20% of students or more rated the program as "Fair" or "Poor".*	6	8	12	3	2	9	9	8

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

CAS Natural Sciences

Advisor	*Percentage of respondents who "Strongly Agreed" with each of the following statements about their advisor.*							
	Biology (N = 45)	Chemistry (N = 68)	Computer & Information Science (N = 27)	Geological Sciences (N = 21)	Human Physiology (N = 28)	Mathematics (N = 30)	Physics (N = 46)	Psychology (N = 55)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	63.9%	59.3%	52.2%	85.0%	88.9%	62.5%	70.5%	64.8%
Treats my ideas with respect	61.1%	50.8%	56.5%	70.0%	92.6%	70.8%	56.8%	59.3%
Provides constructive feedback on my work	61.1%	44.8%	47.8%	75.0%	88.9%	54.2%	47.7%	48.1%
Provides timely feedback on my work	33.3%	44.1%	43.5%	65.0%	63.0%	54.2%	43.2%	35.2%
Is available when I need help or advice	44.4%	55.9%	56.5%	68.4%	70.4%	62.5%	52.3%	44.4%
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	50.0%	64.4%	52.2%	80.0%	81.5%	45.8%	52.3%	46.3%
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds	72.2%	60.3%	60.9%	90.0%	88.9%	58.3%	72.7%	61.1%
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field	38.9%	50.0%	47.8%	65.0%	85.2%	22.7%	47.7%	42.6%
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work	52.8%	56.1%	60.9%	75.0%	70.4%	47.6%	56.8%	38.9%
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	44.4%	43.1%	50.0%	65.0%	63.0%	40.9%	40.9%	24.1%
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	61.1%	48.3%	52.2%	75.0%	74.1%	55.0%	54.5%	40.7%
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements	55.6%	43.1%	39.1%	50.0%	74.1%	47.8%	47.7%	37.0%
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	50.0%	39.7%	47.8%	55.0%	81.5%	45.8%	43.2%	33.3%
50% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" with the above dimensions about their advisor.*	9	7	8	13	13	7	7	3
75% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" with the above dimensions about their advisor.**	0	0	0	6	7	0	0	0

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

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

CAS Natural Sciences

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

	Biology (N = 45)	Chemistry (N = 68)	Computer & Information Science (N = 27)	Geological Sciences (N = 21)	Human Physiology (N = 28)	Mathematics (N = 30)	Physics (N = 46)	Psychology (N = 55)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	0.0%	1.7%	13.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	4.5%	5.6%
Treats my ideas with respect	8.3%	8.5%	8.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	7.4%
Provides constructive feedback on my work	8.3%	8.6%	17.4%	5.0%	3.7%	8.3%	4.5%	13.0%
Provides timely feedback on my work	25.0%	6.8%	13.0%	0.0%	3.7%	12.5%	11.4%	14.8%
Is available when I need help or advice	8.3%	5.1%	8.7%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	9.1%	13.0%
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	11.1%	3.4%	17.4%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	13.0%
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds	8.3%	5.2%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	1.9%
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field	11.1%	5.2%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	11.4%	5.6%
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work	2.8%	3.5%	13.0%	0.0%	3.7%	9.5%	11.4%	14.8%
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	5.6%	10.3%	13.6%	10.0%	3.7%	4.5%	11.4%	16.7%
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	5.6%	1.7%	13.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%	16.7%
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements	19.4%	10.3%	17.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.8%	13.0%
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	16.7%	20.7%	13.0%	5.0%	0.0%	16.7%	13.6%	24.1%
20% of students or more "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" with the statements above about their advisor.*	1	1	0	0	0	0	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

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

CAS Natural Sciences

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

	Biology (N = 45)	Chemistry (N = 68)	Computer & Information Science (N = 27)	Geological Sciences (N = 21)	Human Physiology (N = 28)	Mathematics (N = 30)	Physics (N = 46)	Psychology (N = 55)
Collegial	29.3%	25.0%	20.0%	66.7%	42.9%	56.7%	39.1%	43.6%
Encouraging	31.7%	32.4%	26.9%	61.9%	64.3%	13.3%	26.1%	36.4%
Supportive	36.6%	32.4%	38.5%	57.1%	60.7%	17.2%	30.4%	34.5%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches	36.6%	35.3%	32.0%	81.0%	53.6%	36.7%	35.6%	38.2%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	36.6%	33.8%	19.2%	42.9%	53.6%	3.3%	45.7%	47.3%
Inclusive of students of color	46.3%	35.3%	65.4%	42.9%	75.0%	23.1%	39.1%	30.9%
Inclusive by gender	63.4%	42.6%	50.0%	57.1%	85.7%	23.3%	33.3%	49.1%
Inclusive of international students	39.0%	32.4%	69.2%	28.6%	75.0%	37.9%	54.5%	34.5%
Inclusive of students with disabilities	36.6%	19.4%	53.8%	33.3%	60.7%	33.3%	22.7%	25.5%
Inclusive of first generation students	46.3%	35.3%	48.0%	57.1%	71.4%	34.6%	32.6%	27.3%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	58.5%	46.3%	42.3%	50.0%	75.0%	58.6%	46.5%	49.1%
33.3% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" that the description fit their program*	9	6	7	10	11	6	7	8
50% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" that the description fit their program**	2	0	4	7	10	2	1	0

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

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

CAS Natural Sciences

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

	Biology (N = 45)	Chemistry (N = 68)	Computer & Information Science (N = 27)	Geological Sciences (N = 21)	Human Physiology (N = 28)	Mathematics (N = 30)	Physics (N = 46)	Psychology (N = 55)
Collegial	92.7%	80.9%	68.0%	90.5%	82.1%	90.0%	73.9%	85.5%
Encouraging	73.2%	69.1%	73.1%	95.2%	89.3%	60.0%	67.4%	83.6%
Supportive	75.6%	69.1%	69.2%	85.7%	92.9%	62.1%	69.6%	76.4%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches	87.8%	79.4%	68.0%	95.2%	82.1%	76.7%	82.2%	78.2%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	82.9%	76.5%	46.2%	85.7%	85.7%	33.3%	80.4%	83.6%
Inclusive of students of color	73.2%	72.1%	88.5%	76.2%	85.7%	53.8%	58.7%	61.8%
Inclusive by gender	80.5%	85.3%	73.1%	85.7%	100.0%	63.3%	64.4%	85.5%
Inclusive of international students	73.2%	70.6%	88.5%	66.7%	89.3%	75.9%	68.2%	70.9%
Inclusive of students with disabilities	61.0%	55.2%	84.6%	61.9%	78.6%	63.0%	34.1%	54.5%
Inclusive of first generation students	68.3%	73.5%	80.0%	81.0%	89.3%	80.8%	41.9%	50.9%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	82.9%	79.1%	76.9%	85.0%	89.3%	79.3%	69.8%	85.5%
50% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" that the description fit their program.*	11	11	10	11	11	10	9	11
75% of students or more "Strong Agreed" or "Agreed" that the description fit their program.**	6	5	5	9	11	5	2	7

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

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

CAS Natural Sciences

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

	Biology (N = 45)	Chemistry (N = 68)	Computer & Information Science (N = 27)	Geological Sciences (N = 21)	Human Physiology (N = 28)	Mathematics (N = 30)	Physics (N = 46)	Psychology (N = 55)
Collegial	2.4%	2.9%	12.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	6.5%	1.8%
Encouraging	7.3%	10.3%	15.4%	4.8%	3.6%	16.7%	15.2%	7.3%
Supportive	4.9%	8.8%	15.4%	4.8%	3.6%	13.8%	10.9%	7.3%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches	2.4%	7.4%	12.0%	4.8%	7.1%	3.3%	6.7%	9.1%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	4.9%	4.4%	19.2%	9.5%	10.7%	36.7%	2.2%	0.0%
Inclusive of students of color	7.3%	11.8%	0.0%	14.3%	3.6%	23.1%	17.4%	12.7%
Inclusive by gender	4.9%	7.4%	7.7%	9.5%	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%	3.6%
Inclusive of international students	7.3%	11.8%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	6.9%	13.6%	5.5%
Inclusive of students with disabilities	17.1%	14.9%	7.7%	19.0%	7.1%	7.4%	18.2%	18.2%
Inclusive of first generation students	4.9%	5.9%	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	14.0%	20.0%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	4.9%	4.5%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%	4.7%	3.6%
20% of students or more "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" that the description fit their program.*	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1
33.3% of students or more "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" that the description fit their program.*	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0

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

Biology

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

	Excellent			Excellent or Very Good			Fair or Poor		
	2009 (N = 54)	2012 (N = 49)	2015 (N = 45)	2009 (N = 54)	2012 (N = 49)	2015 (N = 45)	2009 (N = 54)	2012 (N = 49)	2015 (N = 45)
Quality of the faculty	38.9%	51.0%	35.6%	87.0%	89.8%	82.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Overall Program quality	16.7%	42.0%	23.3%	83.3%	82.0%	76.7%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Financial support for graduate students	25.9%	24.5%	16.3%	61.1%	73.5%	58.1%	9.3%	6.1%	11.6%
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field*	38.9%	52.0%	35.6%	79.6%	82.0%	82.2%	3.7%	2.0%	6.7%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	16.7%	20.0%	25.0%	55.6%	52.0%	47.7%	20.4%	12.0%	18.2%
Intellectual community in Program	48.1%	44.0%	32.6%	88.9%	74.0%	72.1%	3.7%	4.0%	11.6%
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	10.2%	14.0%	N/A	30.6%	39.5%	N/A	34.7%	27.9%
Space, facilities and equipment	18.5%	24.0%	23.3%	61.1%	58.0%	58.1%	9.3%	22.0%	7.0%
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	9.4%	18.4%	4.7%	32.1%	36.7%	46.5%	34.0%	28.6%	20.9%
Research opportunities in my program*	33.3%	46.0%	50.0%	74.1%	80.0%	93.2%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	17.0%	16.0%	22.7%	54.7%	50.0%	59.1%	22.6%	14.0%	15.9%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	13.0%	12.0%	20.9%	44.4%	36.0%	44.2%	13.0%	24.0%	20.9%
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	6.0%	9.3%	N/A	20.0%	32.6%	N/A	34.0%	39.5%
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	13.2%	6.0%	4.5%	39.6%	26.0%	27.3%	22.6%	36.0%	38.6%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	13.2%	10.0%	20.5%	39.6%	42.0%	40.9%	24.5%	38.0%	27.3%
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	27.8%	30.0%	27.3%	57.4%	64.0%	47.7%	14.8%	16.0%	15.9%
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	13.2%	18.0%	4.7%	45.3%	40.0%	44.2%	15.1%	22.0%	18.6%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

3 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2015, compared to 4 in 2009 and 5 in 2012.	8 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 10 in 2009 and 10 in 2012.	6 feature(s) rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2015, compared to 5 in 2009 and 8 in 2012.
1 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 0 in 2009 and 2 in 2012.	4 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2015, compared to 4 in 2009 and 4 in 2012.	

Biology

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

	Strongly Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 49)	2012 (N = 40)	2015 (N = 36)	2009 (N = 49)	2012 (N = 40)	2015 (N = 36)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	55.1%	62.5%	63.9%	6.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Treats my ideas with respect	44.9%	60.0%	61.1%	8.2%	5.0%	8.3%
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	44.9%	50.0%	61.1%	6.1%	5.0%	8.3%
Provides timely feedback on my work	38.8%	45.0%	33.3%	6.1%	7.5%	25.0%
Is available when I need help or advice	44.9%	50.0%	44.4%	4.1%	2.5%	8.3%
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	43.6%	50.0%	N/A	15.4%	11.1%
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	36.7%	66.7%	72.2%	4.1%	5.1%	8.3%
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	28.6%	41.0%	38.9%	10.2%	12.8%	11.1%
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	57.1%	50.0%	52.8%	8.2%	2.5%	2.8%
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	40.8%	35.0%	44.4%	18.4%	15.0%	5.6%
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	42.9%	45.0%	61.1%	16.3%	5.0%	5.6%
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	28.6%	37.5%	55.6%	12.2%	15.0%	19.4%
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	38.8%	32.5%	50.0%	22.4%	20.0%	16.7%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 9 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 2 statement(s) in 2009 and 6 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 1 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 1 statement(s) in 2009 and 1 statement(s) in 2012.

Biology

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 = 50)	2012 (N = 48)	2015 (N = 41)	2009 (N = 50)	2012 (N = 48)	2015 (N = 41)	2009 (N = 50)	2012 (N = 48)	2015 (N = 41)
Collegial	N/A	45.8%	29.3%	N/A	89.6%	92.7%	N/A	2.1%	2.4%
Encouraging	48.0%	43.8%	31.7%	82.0%	85.4%	73.2%	0.0%	2.1%	7.3%
Supportive	40.0%	50.0%	36.6%	90.0%	87.5%	75.6%	0.0%	2.1%	4.9%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	44.0%	43.8%	36.6%	82.0%	83.3%	87.8%	2.0%	8.3%	2.4%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	42.0%	47.9%	36.6%	84.0%	75.0%	82.9%	2.0%	4.2%	4.9%
Inclusive of students of color*	32.0%	34.0%	46.3%	64.0%	55.3%	73.2%	8.0%	23.4%	7.3%
Inclusive by gender*	54.0%	64.6%	63.4%	92.0%	83.3%	80.5%	0.0%	2.1%	4.9%
Inclusive of international students	N/A	45.8%	39.0%	N/A	79.2%	73.2%	N/A	6.3%	7.3%
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	25.0%	31.9%	36.6%	64.6%	53.2%	61.0%	8.3%	17.0%	17.1%
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	48.9%	46.3%	N/A	74.5%	68.3%	N/A	6.4%	4.9%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	48.0%	61.7%	58.5%	88.0%	83.0%	82.9%	0.0%	4.3%	4.9%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 9 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 6 statement(s) in 2009 and 10 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 2 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 1 statement(s) in 2009 and 3 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 11 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 8 statement(s) in 2009 and 11 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 6 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 6 statement(s) in 2009 and 8 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 1 statement(s) in 2012.

Chemistry

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

	Excellent			Excellent or Very Good			Fair or Poor		
	2009 (N = 61)	2012 (N = 54)	2015 (N = 68)	2009 (N = 61)	2012 (N = 54)	2015 (N = 68)	2009 (N = 61)	2012 (N = 54)	2015 (N = 68)
Quality of the faculty	27.9%	31.5%	33.8%	82.0%	75.9%	70.6%	3.3%	5.6%	5.9%
Overall Program quality	24.6%	25.9%	14.7%	73.8%	72.2%	61.8%	1.6%	5.6%	10.3%
Financial support for graduate students	39.3%	33.3%	33.3%	65.6%	61.1%	74.2%	13.1%	13.0%	13.6%
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field*	34.4%	25.9%	26.5%	85.2%	81.5%	72.1%	4.9%	0.0%	5.9%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	19.7%	13.0%	19.4%	52.5%	44.4%	47.8%	14.8%	13.0%	23.9%
Intellectual community in Program	47.5%	25.9%	26.5%	82.0%	70.4%	66.2%	4.9%	5.6%	10.3%
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	22.2%	16.2%	N/A	46.3%	45.6%	N/A	18.5%	25.0%
Space, facilities and equipment	26.2%	25.9%	25.0%	57.4%	64.8%	63.2%	9.8%	9.3%	10.3%
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	11.7%	16.7%	16.2%	35.0%	33.3%	35.3%	26.7%	25.9%	33.8%
Research opportunities in my program*	36.1%	40.7%	29.9%	80.3%	68.5%	73.1%	3.3%	5.6%	6.0%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	16.4%	11.3%	10.3%	54.1%	37.7%	32.4%	11.5%	18.9%	42.6%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	18.3%	13.0%	19.1%	46.7%	48.1%	50.0%	15.0%	20.4%	16.2%
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	9.3%	10.3%	N/A	24.1%	33.8%	N/A	38.9%	33.8%
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	16.4%	11.1%	10.4%	37.7%	35.2%	38.8%	16.4%	25.9%	32.8%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	10.0%	9.3%	8.8%	43.3%	31.5%	26.5%	16.7%	24.1%	51.5%
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	32.8%	30.2%	28.4%	68.9%	56.6%	47.8%	11.5%	15.1%	28.4%
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	16.4%	16.7%	29.4%	37.7%	46.3%	57.4%	19.7%	20.4%	14.7%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

2 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2015, compared to 4 in 2009 and 2 in 2012.

0 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 0 in 2009 and 0 in 2012.

9 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 10 in 2009 and 8 in 2012.

0 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2015, compared to 4 in 2009 and 2 in 2012.

8 feature(s) rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2015, compared to 1 in 2009 and 6 in 2012.

Chemistry

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

	Strongly Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 54)	2012 (N = 36)	2015 (N = 59)	2009 (N = 54)	2012 (N = 36)	2015 (N = 59)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	55.6%	44.4%	59.3%	1.9%	0.0%	1.7%
Treats my ideas with respect	44.4%	34.3%	50.8%	3.7%	8.6%	8.5%
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	48.1%	41.7%	44.8%	5.6%	5.6%	8.6%
Provides timely feedback on my work	40.7%	33.3%	44.1%	14.8%	8.3%	6.8%
Is available when I need help or advice	37.0%	36.1%	55.9%	13.0%	11.1%	5.1%
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	47.2%	64.4%	N/A	8.3%	3.4%
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	44.4%	52.8%	60.3%	9.3%	5.6%	5.2%
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	46.3%	47.2%	50.0%	5.6%	5.6%	5.2%
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	55.6%	55.6%	56.1%	9.3%	2.8%	3.5%
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	40.7%	38.9%	43.1%	7.4%	8.3%	10.3%
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	45.3%	50.0%	48.3%	5.7%	2.8%	1.7%
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	33.3%	41.7%	43.1%	3.7%	13.9%	10.3%
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	37.0%	36.1%	39.7%	7.4%	19.4%	20.7%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 7 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 2 statement(s) in 2009 and 3 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 1 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.

Chemistry

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 = 57)	2012 (N = 52)	2015 (N = 68)	2009 (N = 57)	2012 (N = 52)	2015 (N = 68)	2009 (N = 57)	2012 (N = 52)	2015 (N = 68)
Collegial	N/A	40.4%	25.0%	N/A	82.7%	80.9%	N/A	3.8%	2.9%
Encouraging	42.1%	30.8%	32.4%	78.9%	84.6%	69.1%	1.8%	7.7%	10.3%
Supportive	48.3%	32.7%	32.4%	86.7%	84.6%	69.1%	0.0%	5.8%	8.8%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	38.3%	30.8%	35.3%	83.3%	75.0%	79.4%	3.3%	7.7%	7.4%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	45.8%	36.5%	33.8%	89.8%	76.9%	76.5%	0.0%	5.8%	4.4%
Inclusive of students of color*	32.2%	42.3%	35.3%	64.4%	73.1%	72.1%	13.6%	5.8%	11.8%
Inclusive by gender*	50.8%	51.9%	42.6%	81.4%	88.5%	85.3%	3.4%	3.8%	7.4%
Inclusive of international students	N/A	39.2%	32.4%	N/A	68.6%	70.6%	N/A	3.9%	11.8%
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	22.8%	30.8%	19.4%	66.7%	55.8%	55.2%	1.8%	7.7%	14.9%
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	44.2%	35.3%	N/A	73.1%	73.5%	N/A	3.8%	5.9%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	47.5%	57.7%	46.3%	86.4%	90.4%	79.1%	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 6 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 6 statement(s) in 2009 and 7 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 1 statement(s) in 2009 and 2 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 11 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 8 statement(s) in 2009 and 11 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 5 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 6 statement(s) in 2009 and 7 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.

Computer & Information Science

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 = 26)	2015 (N = 27)	2009 (N = 20)	2012 (N = 26)	2015 (N = 27)	2009 (N = 20)	2012 (N = 26)	2015 (N = 27)
Quality of the faculty	20.0%	0.0%	14.8%	70.0%	23.1%	51.9%	15.0%	26.9%	3.7%
Overall Program quality	5.3%	3.8%	7.4%	52.6%	30.8%	48.1%	21.1%	19.2%	3.7%
Financial support for graduate students	9.5%	23.1%	44.4%	38.1%	61.5%	66.7%	28.6%	7.7%	14.8%
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field*	9.5%	3.8%	11.1%	47.6%	26.9%	44.4%	19.0%	34.6%	29.6%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	9.5%	3.8%	11.1%	61.9%	34.6%	51.9%	19.0%	34.6%	29.6%
Intellectual community in Program	0.0%	3.8%	18.5%	61.9%	53.8%	55.6%	14.3%	15.4%	18.5%
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	3.8%	3.7%	N/A	23.1%	14.8%	N/A	38.5%	55.6%
Space, facilities and equipment	19.0%	15.4%	29.6%	57.1%	50.0%	63.0%	14.3%	19.2%	11.1%
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	9.5%	3.8%	7.4%	42.9%	34.6%	33.3%	19.0%	23.1%	29.6%
Research opportunities in my program*	9.5%	26.9%	14.8%	66.7%	57.7%	55.6%	14.3%	11.5%	29.6%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	0.0%	4.0%	7.4%	52.4%	32.0%	40.7%	14.3%	28.0%	33.3%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	5.3%	11.5%	18.5%	42.1%	50.0%	51.9%	15.8%	11.5%	22.2%
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	3.8%	3.7%	N/A	26.9%	29.6%	N/A	30.8%	37.0%
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	4.8%	4.0%	7.4%	47.6%	32.0%	51.9%	9.5%	36.0%	33.3%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	0.0%	8.0%	11.1%	33.3%	28.0%	29.6%	19.0%	36.0%	40.7%
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	0.0%	11.5%	18.5%	38.1%	34.6%	37.0%	23.8%	19.2%	51.9%
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	9.5%	11.5%	14.8%	57.1%	42.3%	33.3%	23.8%	26.9%	48.1%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

1 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2015, compared to 0 in 2009 and 0 in 2012.	8 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 8 in 2009 and 5 in 2012.
0 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 0 in 2009 and 0 in 2012.	0 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2015, compared to 0 in 2009 and 0 in 2012.

12 feature(s) rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2015, compared to 4 in 2009 and 10 in 2012.

Computer & Information Science

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

	Strongly Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 19)	2012 (N = 22)	2015 (N = 23)	2009 (N = 19)	2012 (N = 22)	2015 (N = 23)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	42.1%	50.0%	52.2%	15.8%	0.0%	13.0%
Treats my ideas with respect	36.8%	40.9%	56.5%	5.3%	0.0%	8.7%
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	42.1%	36.4%	47.8%	21.1%	9.1%	17.4%
Provides timely feedback on my work	36.8%	36.4%	43.5%	31.6%	22.7%	13.0%
Is available when I need help or advice	42.1%	31.8%	56.5%	21.1%	9.1%	8.7%
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	27.3%	52.2%	N/A	4.5%	17.4%
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	52.6%	40.9%	60.9%	0.0%	13.6%	4.3%
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	52.6%	27.3%	47.8%	5.3%	0.0%	4.3%
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	31.6%	36.4%	60.9%	21.1%	13.6%	13.0%
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	42.1%	36.4%	50.0%	21.1%	18.2%	13.6%
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	42.1%	40.9%	52.2%	15.8%	4.5%	13.0%
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	36.8%	40.9%	39.1%	10.5%	4.5%	17.4%
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	47.4%	36.4%	47.8%	21.1%	13.6%	13.0%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 8 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 2 statement(s) in 2009 and 1 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 6 statement(s) in 2009 and 1 statement(s) in 2012.

Computer & Information Science

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 = 21)	2012 (N = 24)	2015 (N = 25)	2009 (N = 21)	2012 (N = 24)	2015 (N = 25)	2009 (N = 21)	2012 (N = 24)	2015 (N = 25)
Collegial	N/A	16.7%	20.0%	N/A	62.5%	68.0%	N/A	8.3%	12.0%
Encouraging	42.9%	20.8%	26.9%	61.9%	66.7%	73.1%	9.5%	12.5%	15.4%
Supportive	35.0%	25.0%	38.5%	70.0%	70.8%	69.2%	5.0%	8.3%	15.4%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	23.8%	25.0%	32.0%	85.7%	62.5%	68.0%	0.0%	25.0%	12.0%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	25.0%	16.7%	19.2%	70.0%	54.2%	46.2%	0.0%	8.3%	19.2%
Inclusive of students of color*	42.9%	37.5%	65.4%	90.5%	75.0%	88.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Inclusive by gender*	38.1%	45.8%	50.0%	76.2%	62.5%	73.1%	9.5%	20.8%	7.7%
Inclusive of international students	N/A	62.5%	69.2%	N/A	83.3%	88.5%	N/A	0.0%	0.0%
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	47.4%	37.5%	53.8%	73.7%	62.5%	84.6%	0.0%	8.3%	7.7%
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	37.5%	48.0%	N/A	66.7%	80.0%	N/A	0.0%	0.0%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	36.8%	41.7%	42.3%	84.2%	79.2%	76.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 7 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 6 statement(s) in 2009 and 6 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 4 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 1 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 10 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 8 statement(s) in 2009 and 11 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 5 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 4 statement(s) in 2009 and 3 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 2 statement(s) in 2012.

Geological Sciences

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

	Excellent			Excellent or Very Good			Fair or Poor		
	2009 (N = 15)	2012 (N = 30)	2015 (N = 21)	2009 (N = 15)	2012 (N = 30)	2015 (N = 21)	2009 (N = 15)	2012 (N = 30)	2015 (N = 21)
Quality of the faculty	40.0%	43.3%	52.4%	100.0%	90.0%	90.5%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%
Overall Program quality	18.8%	36.7%	52.4%	93.8%	86.7%	85.7%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%
Financial support for graduate students	25.0%	40.0%	47.6%	75.0%	73.3%	95.2%	18.8%	3.3%	0.0%
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field*	37.5%	36.7%	42.9%	87.5%	86.7%	95.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	12.5%	13.3%	28.6%	56.3%	53.3%	76.2%	6.3%	13.3%	14.3%
Intellectual community in Program	50.0%	53.3%	47.6%	81.3%	83.3%	85.7%	6.3%	3.3%	0.0%
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	0.0%	0.0%	N/A	23.3%	20.0%	N/A	50.0%	40.0%
Space, facilities and equipment	43.8%	16.7%	47.6%	81.3%	80.0%	76.2%	0.0%	10.0%	4.8%
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	12.5%	50.0%	38.1%	43.8%	83.3%	76.2%	18.8%	3.3%	0.0%
Research opportunities in my program*	25.0%	63.3%	42.9%	87.5%	90.0%	85.7%	0.0%	3.3%	4.8%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	6.3%	16.7%	19.0%	43.8%	50.0%	47.6%	12.5%	20.0%	4.8%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	0.0%	10.0%	4.8%	50.0%	50.0%	42.9%	12.5%	10.0%	19.0%
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	13.8%	4.8%	N/A	24.1%	14.3%	N/A	51.7%	33.3%
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	75.0%	23.3%	30.0%	12.5%	33.3%	35.0%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	0.0%	6.7%	14.3%	18.8%	40.0%	38.1%	37.5%	26.7%	19.0%
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	25.0%	36.7%	23.8%	75.0%	60.0%	52.4%	18.8%	10.0%	19.0%
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	6.7%	13.3%	4.8%	33.3%	33.3%	38.1%	26.7%	33.3%	19.0%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

8 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2015, compared to 4 in 2009 and 8 in 2012.

2 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 1 in 2009 and 3 in 2012.

10 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 11 in 2009 and 12 in 2012.

9 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2015, compared to 9 in 2009 and 7 in 2012.

3 feature(s) rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2015, compared to 2 in 2009 and 6 in 2012.

Geological Sciences

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

	Strongly Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 16)	2012 (N = 29)	2015 (N = 20)	2009 (N = 16)	2012 (N = 29)	2015 (N = 20)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	68.8%	69.0%	85.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Treats my ideas with respect	50.0%	79.3%	70.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	75.0%	69.0%	75.0%	0.0%	6.9%	5.0%
Provides timely feedback on my work	56.3%	58.6%	65.0%	0.0%	10.3%	0.0%
Is available when I need help or advice	62.5%	41.4%	68.4%	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	64.3%	80.0%	N/A	3.6%	5.0%
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	62.5%	69.0%	90.0%	6.3%	6.9%	0.0%
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	25.0%	31.0%	65.0%	6.3%	10.3%	0.0%
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	75.0%	48.3%	75.0%	12.5%	13.8%	0.0%
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	50.0%	41.4%	65.0%	31.3%	17.2%	10.0%
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	62.5%	53.6%	75.0%	18.8%	17.9%	0.0%
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	37.5%	55.2%	50.0%	12.5%	6.9%	0.0%
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	31.3%	31.0%	55.0%	18.8%	10.3%	5.0%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 13 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 9 statement(s) in 2009 and 8 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 6 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 2 statement(s) in 2009 and 1 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 1 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.

Geological Sciences

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 = 16)	2012 (N = 29)	2015 (N = 21)	2009 (N = 16)	2012 (N = 29)	2015 (N = 21)	2009 (N = 16)	2012 (N = 29)	2015 (N = 21)
Collegial	N/A	55.2%	66.7%	N/A	89.7%	90.5%	N/A	0.0%	0.0%
Encouraging	50.0%	55.2%	61.9%	87.5%	82.8%	95.2%	0.0%	3.4%	4.8%
Supportive	37.5%	48.3%	57.1%	81.3%	82.8%	85.7%	6.3%	0.0%	4.8%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	37.5%	58.6%	81.0%	87.5%	86.2%	95.2%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	31.3%	58.6%	42.9%	93.8%	82.8%	85.7%	6.3%	3.4%	9.5%
Inclusive of students of color*	37.5%	20.7%	42.9%	68.8%	55.2%	76.2%	6.3%	6.9%	14.3%
Inclusive by gender*	75.0%	55.2%	57.1%	87.5%	89.7%	85.7%	0.0%	3.4%	9.5%
Inclusive of international students	N/A	27.6%	28.6%	N/A	62.1%	66.7%	N/A	0.0%	14.3%
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	6.7%	14.8%	33.3%	46.7%	44.4%	61.9%	6.7%	11.1%	19.0%
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	25.9%	57.1%	N/A	59.3%	81.0%	N/A	7.4%	4.8%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	46.7%	42.9%	50.0%	80.0%	85.7%	85.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 10 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 6 statement(s) in 2009 and 7 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 7 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 2 statement(s) in 2009 and 5 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 11 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 7 statement(s) in 2009 and 10 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 9 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 6 statement(s) in 2009 and 7 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.

Human Physiology

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

	Excellent			Excellent or Very Good			Fair or Poor		
	2009 (N = 31)	2012 (N = 24)	2015 (N = 28)	2009 (N = 31)	2012 (N = 24)	2015 (N = 28)	2009 (N = 31)	2012 (N = 24)	2015 (N = 28)
Quality of the faculty	58.1%	70.8%	53.6%	80.6%	87.5%	85.7%	3.2%	4.2%	3.6%
Overall Program quality	38.7%	58.3%	57.1%	83.9%	83.3%	85.7%	6.5%	4.2%	3.6%
Financial support for graduate students	25.8%	50.0%	57.1%	54.8%	66.7%	85.7%	25.8%	4.2%	0.0%
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field*	54.8%	52.2%	60.7%	93.5%	78.3%	89.3%	3.2%	4.3%	3.6%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	38.7%	52.2%	50.0%	87.1%	78.3%	75.0%	3.2%	13.0%	10.7%
Intellectual community in Program	35.5%	47.8%	32.1%	77.4%	82.6%	71.4%	6.5%	4.3%	17.9%
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	54.2%	46.4%	N/A	91.7%	71.4%	N/A	4.2%	10.7%
Space, facilities and equipment	32.3%	29.2%	46.4%	58.1%	45.8%	60.7%	6.5%	20.8%	32.1%
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	25.8%	25.0%	28.6%	51.6%	66.7%	57.1%	6.5%	8.3%	17.9%
Research opportunities in my program*	61.3%	54.2%	64.3%	87.1%	79.2%	96.4%	6.5%	8.3%	0.0%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	22.6%	39.1%	46.4%	67.7%	73.9%	71.4%	6.5%	13.0%	17.9%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	32.3%	25.0%	39.3%	61.3%	54.2%	67.9%	9.7%	8.3%	7.1%
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	16.7%	17.9%	N/A	58.3%	32.1%	N/A	12.5%	21.4%
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	25.8%	37.5%	53.6%	54.8%	70.8%	85.7%	6.5%	12.5%	3.6%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	16.1%	29.2%	25.0%	58.1%	62.5%	67.9%	16.1%	12.5%	17.9%
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	16.1%	12.5%	28.6%	61.3%	41.7%	64.3%	12.9%	12.5%	14.3%
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	29.0%	45.8%	50.0%	77.4%	83.3%	82.1%	6.5%	4.2%	10.7%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

12 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2015, compared to 6 in 2009 and 11 in 2012.

8 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 3 in 2009 and 7 in 2012.

16 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 15 in 2009 and 15 in 2012.

8 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2015, compared to 7 in 2009 and 8 in 2012.

2 feature(s) rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2015, compared to 1 in 2009 and 1 in 2012.

Human Physiology

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

	Strongly Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 31)	2012 (N = 24)	2015 (N = 27)	2009 (N = 31)	2012 (N = 24)	2015 (N = 27)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	83.9%	79.2%	88.9%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%
Treats my ideas with respect	77.4%	82.6%	92.6%	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	80.6%	70.8%	88.9%	0.0%	4.2%	3.7%
Provides timely feedback on my work	67.7%	73.9%	63.0%	3.2%	4.3%	3.7%
Is available when I need help or advice	64.5%	83.3%	70.4%	6.5%	4.2%	0.0%
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	70.8%	81.5%	N/A	0.0%	0.0%
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	61.3%	75.0%	88.9%	9.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	67.7%	66.7%	85.2%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	48.4%	87.5%	70.4%	6.5%	4.2%	3.7%
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	67.7%	70.8%	63.0%	3.2%	0.0%	3.7%
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	63.3%	79.2%	74.1%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	63.3%	70.8%	74.1%	3.3%	4.2%	0.0%
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	64.5%	66.7%	81.5%	12.9%	4.2%	0.0%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 13 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 11 statement(s) in 2009 and 13 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 7 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 3 statement(s) in 2009 and 6 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.

Human Physiology

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 = 31)	2012 (N = 24)	2015 (N = 28)	2009 (N = 31)	2012 (N = 24)	2015 (N = 28)	2009 (N = 31)	2012 (N = 24)	2015 (N = 28)
Collegial	N/A	33.3%	42.9%	N/A	83.3%	82.1%	N/A	4.2%	3.6%
Encouraging	64.5%	54.2%	64.3%	83.9%	91.7%	89.3%	3.2%	4.2%	3.6%
Supportive	50.0%	65.2%	60.7%	86.7%	91.3%	92.9%	3.3%	4.3%	3.6%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	51.6%	58.3%	53.6%	80.6%	79.2%	82.1%	3.2%	8.3%	7.1%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	38.7%	33.3%	53.6%	80.6%	70.8%	85.7%	6.5%	8.3%	10.7%
Inclusive of students of color*	61.3%	37.5%	75.0%	87.1%	62.5%	85.7%	9.7%	4.2%	3.6%
Inclusive by gender*	54.8%	66.7%	85.7%	83.9%	79.2%	100.0%	3.2%	4.2%	0.0%
Inclusive of international students	N/A	66.7%	75.0%	N/A	75.0%	89.3%	N/A	4.2%	0.0%
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	32.3%	25.0%	60.7%	64.5%	50.0%	78.6%	6.5%	8.3%	7.1%
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	45.8%	71.4%	N/A	62.5%	89.3%	N/A	4.2%	0.0%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	48.4%	45.8%	75.0%	71.0%	75.0%	89.3%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 11 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 7 statement(s) in 2009 and 10 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 10 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 5 statement(s) in 2009 and 5 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 11 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 8 statement(s) in 2009 and 11 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 11 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 6 statement(s) in 2009 and 7 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.

Mathematics

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

	Excellent			Excellent or Very Good			Fair or Poor		
	2009 (N = 33)	2012 (N = 31)	2015 (N = 30)	2009 (N = 33)	2012 (N = 31)	2015 (N = 30)	2009 (N = 33)	2012 (N = 31)	2015 (N = 30)
Quality of the faculty	51.5%	35.5%	33.3%	72.7%	90.3%	76.7%	6.1%	3.2%	6.7%
Overall Program quality	42.4%	32.3%	28.6%	81.8%	90.3%	78.6%	9.1%	6.5%	7.1%
Financial support for graduate students	45.5%	74.2%	65.5%	87.9%	90.3%	86.2%	6.1%	6.5%	3.4%
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field*	51.5%	41.9%	41.4%	78.8%	96.8%	82.8%	9.1%	0.0%	6.9%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	18.2%	9.7%	3.4%	48.5%	35.5%	27.6%	21.2%	12.9%	37.9%
Intellectual community in Program	66.7%	41.9%	44.8%	84.8%	93.5%	89.7%	9.1%	6.5%	3.4%
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	6.5%	0.0%	N/A	22.6%	35.7%	N/A	22.6%	42.9%
Space, facilities and equipment	27.3%	41.9%	20.7%	48.5%	74.2%	58.6%	21.2%	6.5%	24.1%
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	9.4%	16.1%	10.7%	62.5%	61.3%	46.4%	18.8%	16.1%	21.4%
Research opportunities in my program*	48.5%	29.0%	41.4%	75.8%	80.6%	93.1%	9.1%	3.2%	3.4%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	18.2%	22.6%	17.2%	57.6%	54.8%	44.8%	15.2%	9.7%	41.4%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	22.6%	19.4%	14.3%	45.2%	51.6%	32.1%	6.5%	19.4%	10.7%
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	6.5%	0.0%	N/A	19.4%	22.2%	N/A	35.5%	48.1%
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	45.5%	48.4%	41.4%	84.8%	83.9%	72.4%	12.1%	12.9%	13.8%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	21.2%	12.9%	6.9%	51.5%	38.7%	31.0%	18.2%	29.0%	37.9%
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	19.4%	6.5%	11.1%	9.7%	58.1%	63.0%
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	24.2%	12.9%	3.4%	54.5%	38.7%	31.0%	18.2%	29.0%	44.8%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

6 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2015, compared to 7 in 2009 and 6 in 2012.

8 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 11 in 2009 and 11 in 2012.

9 feature(s) rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2015, compared to 2 in 2009 and 5 in 2012.

1 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 3 in 2009 and 1 in 2012.

6 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2015, compared to 6 in 2009 and 7 in 2012.

Mathematics

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

	Strongly Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 31)	2012 (N = 23)	2015 (N = 24)	2009 (N = 31)	2012 (N = 23)	2015 (N = 24)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	54.8%	43.5%	62.5%	3.2%	0.0%	4.2%
Treats my ideas with respect	51.6%	39.1%	70.8%	3.2%	8.7%	0.0%
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	45.2%	43.5%	54.2%	3.2%	8.7%	8.3%
Provides timely feedback on my work	32.3%	39.1%	54.2%	3.2%	4.3%	12.5%
Is available when I need help or advice	54.8%	47.8%	62.5%	6.5%	4.3%	4.2%
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	47.8%	45.8%	N/A	0.0%	0.0%
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	51.6%	52.2%	58.3%	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	38.7%	26.1%	22.7%	3.2%	8.7%	9.1%
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	29.0%	13.0%	47.6%	3.2%	17.4%	9.5%
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	35.5%	26.1%	40.9%	12.9%	8.7%	4.5%
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	38.7%	52.2%	55.0%	6.5%	4.3%	0.0%
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	38.7%	30.4%	47.8%	6.5%	8.7%	0.0%
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	41.9%	30.4%	45.8%	0.0%	13.0%	16.7%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 7 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 4 statement(s) in 2009 and 2 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.

Mathematics

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 = 33)	2012 (N = 30)	2015 (N = 30)	2009 (N = 33)	2012 (N = 30)	2015 (N = 30)	2009 (N = 33)	2012 (N = 30)	2015 (N = 30)
Collegial	N/A	40.0%	56.7%	N/A	90.0%	90.0%	N/A	3.3%	0.0%
Encouraging	45.5%	33.3%	13.3%	78.8%	73.3%	60.0%	21.2%	0.0%	16.7%
Supportive	34.4%	30.0%	17.2%	78.1%	76.7%	62.1%	12.5%	10.0%	13.8%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	27.3%	34.5%	36.7%	69.7%	79.3%	76.7%	12.1%	3.4%	3.3%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	9.4%	10.0%	3.3%	46.9%	20.0%	33.3%	12.5%	40.0%	36.7%
Inclusive of students of color*	41.9%	27.6%	23.1%	64.5%	58.6%	53.8%	6.5%	13.8%	23.1%
Inclusive by gender*	31.3%	33.3%	23.3%	43.8%	66.7%	63.3%	12.5%	13.3%	20.0%
Inclusive of international students	N/A	50.0%	37.9%	N/A	86.7%	75.9%	N/A	6.7%	6.9%
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	38.7%	30.0%	33.3%	71.0%	53.3%	63.0%	9.7%	10.0%	7.4%
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	34.5%	34.6%	N/A	69.0%	80.8%	N/A	6.9%	0.0%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	35.5%	40.0%	58.6%	74.2%	83.3%	79.3%	3.2%	0.0%	6.9%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 6 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 5 statement(s) in 2009 and 7 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 2 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 1 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 10 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 6 statement(s) in 2009 and 10 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 5 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 2 statement(s) in 2009 and 5 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 3 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 1 statement(s) in 2009 and 1 statement(s) in 2012.

Physics

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

	Excellent			Excellent or Very Good			Fair or Poor		
	2009 (N = 31)	2012 (N = 45)	2015 (N = 46)	2009 (N = 31)	2012 (N = 45)	2015 (N = 46)	2009 (N = 31)	2012 (N = 45)	2015 (N = 46)
Quality of the faculty	6.5%	31.1%	26.1%	83.9%	86.7%	76.1%	3.2%	2.2%	0.0%
Overall Program quality	6.5%	28.9%	22.2%	67.7%	80.0%	71.1%	0.0%	2.2%	6.7%
Financial support for graduate students	35.5%	62.2%	54.3%	74.2%	84.4%	73.9%	3.2%	2.2%	6.5%
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field*	9.7%	28.9%	32.6%	64.5%	73.3%	76.1%	6.5%	4.4%	2.2%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	6.5%	13.3%	8.7%	32.3%	44.4%	37.0%	25.8%	26.7%	30.4%
Intellectual community in Program	25.8%	37.8%	42.2%	83.9%	77.8%	82.2%	6.5%	11.1%	8.9%
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	8.9%	4.3%	N/A	31.1%	45.7%	N/A	46.7%	32.6%
Space, facilities and equipment	29.0%	37.8%	30.4%	83.9%	82.2%	76.1%	0.0%	2.2%	6.5%
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	12.9%	22.2%	19.6%	45.2%	64.4%	45.7%	19.4%	20.0%	17.4%
Research opportunities in my program*	6.5%	44.4%	37.0%	61.3%	75.6%	56.5%	12.9%	8.9%	13.0%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	13.3%	22.2%	6.5%	40.0%	57.8%	32.6%	36.7%	15.6%	37.0%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	10.0%	28.9%	13.6%	36.7%	51.1%	40.9%	36.7%	17.8%	34.1%
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	2.2%	2.2%	N/A	31.1%	17.8%	N/A	40.0%	53.3%
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	0.0%	11.1%	4.3%	23.3%	37.8%	26.1%	33.3%	26.7%	34.8%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	9.7%	4.4%	4.3%	32.3%	44.4%	19.6%	38.7%	11.1%	41.3%
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	9.7%	22.2%	13.0%	32.3%	60.0%	54.3%	22.6%	20.0%	21.7%
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	6.5%	4.4%	2.2%	22.6%	20.0%	21.7%	35.5%	48.9%	45.7%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

3 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2015, compared to 1 in 2009 and 4 in 2012.

1 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 0 in 2009 and 1 in 2012.

8 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 7 in 2009 and 11 in 2012.

4 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2015, compared to 3 in 2009 and 6 in 2012.

9 feature(s) rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2015, compared to 7 in 2009 and 7 in 2012.

Physics

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

	Strongly Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 30)	2012 (N = 41)	2015 (N = 44)	2009 (N = 30)	2012 (N = 41)	2015 (N = 44)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	53.3%	56.1%	70.5%	0.0%	7.3%	4.5%
Treats my ideas with respect	60.0%	51.2%	56.8%	3.3%	2.4%	2.3%
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	40.0%	43.9%	47.7%	3.3%	4.9%	4.5%
Provides timely feedback on my work	41.4%	43.9%	43.2%	6.9%	12.2%	11.4%
Is available when I need help or advice	50.0%	46.3%	52.3%	3.3%	0.0%	9.1%
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	51.2%	52.3%	N/A	7.3%	2.3%
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	51.7%	57.5%	72.7%	6.9%	5.0%	2.3%
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	32.1%	36.6%	47.7%	7.1%	9.8%	11.4%
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	51.7%	53.7%	56.8%	0.0%	0.0%	11.4%
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	32.1%	34.1%	40.9%	7.1%	9.8%	11.4%
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	42.9%	36.6%	54.5%	3.6%	4.9%	4.5%
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	28.6%	41.0%	47.7%	14.3%	10.3%	6.8%
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	24.1%	36.6%	43.2%	13.8%	14.6%	13.6%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 7 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 5 statement(s) in 2009 and 5 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.

Physics

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 = 31)	2012 (N = 44)	2015 (N = 46)	2009 (N = 31)	2012 (N = 44)	2015 (N = 46)	2009 (N = 31)	2012 (N = 44)	2015 (N = 46)
Collegial	N/A	56.8%	39.1%	N/A	77.3%	73.9%	N/A	2.3%	6.5%
Encouraging	9.7%	35.6%	26.1%	80.6%	66.7%	67.4%	3.2%	15.6%	15.2%
Supportive	16.1%	42.2%	30.4%	74.2%	75.6%	69.6%	6.5%	8.9%	10.9%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	24.1%	28.9%	35.6%	62.1%	75.6%	82.2%	10.3%	6.7%	6.7%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	30.0%	28.9%	45.7%	66.7%	73.3%	80.4%	10.0%	0.0%	2.2%
Inclusive of students of color*	16.1%	42.2%	39.1%	61.3%	71.1%	58.7%	19.4%	2.2%	17.4%
Inclusive by gender*	12.9%	48.9%	33.3%	58.1%	68.9%	64.4%	19.4%	15.6%	20.0%
Inclusive of international students	N/A	51.1%	54.5%	N/A	91.1%	68.2%	N/A	2.2%	13.6%
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	17.9%	29.5%	22.7%	60.7%	54.5%	34.1%	7.1%	9.1%	18.2%
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	33.3%	32.6%	N/A	64.4%	41.9%	N/A	6.7%	14.0%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	29.6%	46.7%	46.5%	70.4%	86.7%	69.8%	0.0%	2.2%	4.7%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 7 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 8 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 1 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 2 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 9 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 8 statement(s) in 2009 and 11 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 2 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 1 statement(s) in 2009 and 5 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 1 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.

Psychology

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

	Excellent			Excellent or Very Good			Fair or Poor		
	2009 (N = 42)	2012 (N = 57)	2015 (N = 55)	2009 (N = 42)	2012 (N = 57)	2015 (N = 55)	2009 (N = 42)	2012 (N = 57)	2015 (N = 55)
Quality of the faculty	28.6%	52.6%	38.2%	90.5%	87.7%	78.2%	4.8%	3.5%	0.0%
Overall Program quality	22.0%	29.8%	27.3%	85.4%	78.9%	65.5%	4.9%	8.8%	3.6%
Financial support for graduate students	11.6%	36.8%	30.9%	32.6%	66.7%	63.6%	32.6%	15.8%	12.7%
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field*	25.6%	45.6%	35.2%	74.4%	75.4%	77.8%	9.3%	5.3%	3.7%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	32.6%	26.3%	20.0%	74.4%	63.2%	47.3%	14.0%	14.0%	21.8%
Intellectual community in Program	39.5%	47.4%	27.3%	88.4%	73.7%	63.6%	2.3%	5.3%	14.5%
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	8.8%	10.9%	N/A	31.6%	23.6%	N/A	28.1%	45.5%
Space, facilities and equipment	11.6%	10.5%	40.0%	34.9%	35.1%	78.2%	27.9%	26.3%	7.3%
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	16.7%	22.8%	20.0%	61.9%	54.4%	47.3%	7.1%	19.3%	20.0%
Research opportunities in my program*	30.2%	52.6%	50.9%	76.7%	89.5%	87.3%	2.3%	3.5%	0.0%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	18.6%	29.8%	21.8%	60.5%	64.9%	61.8%	9.3%	14.0%	9.1%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	23.3%	19.3%	16.4%	58.1%	47.4%	43.6%	16.3%	22.8%	21.8%
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	8.9%	14.5%	N/A	32.1%	41.8%	N/A	33.9%	25.5%
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	14.0%	3.5%	13.0%	30.2%	26.3%	33.3%	25.6%	52.6%	46.3%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	11.6%	14.0%	10.9%	55.8%	40.4%	50.9%	9.3%	17.5%	14.5%
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	16.3%	40.4%	21.8%	51.2%	64.9%	43.6%	14.0%	7.0%	20.0%
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	16.3%	19.3%	9.1%	58.1%	52.6%	45.5%	11.6%	19.3%	23.6%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

4 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2015, compared to 1 in 2009 and 6 in 2012.

9 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 12 in 2009 and 11 in 2012.

8 feature(s) rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2015, compared to 3 in 2009 and 5 in 2012.

1 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 0 in 2009 and 2 in 2012.

4 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2015, compared to 4 in 2009 and 4 in 2012.

Psychology

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

	Strongly Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 43)	2012 (N = 57)	2015 (N = 54)	2009 (N = 43)	2012 (N = 57)	2015 (N = 54)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	74.4%	68.4%	64.8%	2.3%	5.3%	5.6%
Treats my ideas with respect	72.1%	71.9%	59.3%	0.0%	5.3%	7.4%
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	65.1%	59.6%	48.1%	2.3%	7.0%	13.0%
Provides timely feedback on my work	32.6%	47.4%	35.2%	14.0%	17.5%	14.8%
Is available when I need help or advice	48.8%	54.4%	44.4%	9.3%	12.3%	13.0%
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	66.7%	46.3%	N/A	1.8%	13.0%
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	60.5%	80.7%	61.1%	7.0%	3.5%	1.9%
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	48.8%	52.6%	42.6%	9.3%	7.0%	5.6%
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	48.8%	43.9%	38.9%	9.3%	19.3%	14.8%
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	44.2%	49.1%	24.1%	9.3%	17.5%	16.7%
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	62.8%	50.0%	40.7%	9.3%	14.3%	16.7%
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	48.8%	50.9%	37.0%	7.0%	10.5%	13.0%
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	53.5%	57.9%	33.3%	14.0%	14.0%	24.1%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 3 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 6 statement(s) in 2009 and 10 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 1 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 1 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.

Psychology

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 = 43)	2012 (N = 55)	2015 (N = 55)	2009 (N = 43)	2012 (N = 55)	2015 (N = 55)	2009 (N = 43)	2012 (N = 55)	2015 (N = 55)
Collegial	N/A	61.8%	43.6%	N/A	90.9%	85.5%	N/A	3.6%	1.8%
Encouraging	53.5%	55.4%	36.4%	93.0%	83.9%	83.6%	4.7%	3.6%	7.3%
Supportive	53.5%	54.4%	34.5%	95.3%	77.2%	76.4%	4.7%	7.0%	7.3%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	27.9%	56.1%	38.2%	76.7%	84.2%	78.2%	7.0%	5.3%	9.1%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	34.9%	50.9%	47.3%	88.4%	87.7%	83.6%	7.0%	3.5%	0.0%
Inclusive of students of color*	34.9%	43.9%	30.9%	67.4%	71.9%	61.8%	9.3%	10.5%	12.7%
Inclusive by gender*	46.5%	57.9%	49.1%	79.1%	91.2%	85.5%	7.0%	1.8%	3.6%
Inclusive of international students	N/A	42.1%	34.5%	N/A	68.4%	70.9%	N/A	3.5%	5.5%
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	30.2%	28.6%	25.5%	62.8%	50.0%	54.5%	9.3%	10.7%	18.2%
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	31.6%	27.3%	N/A	63.2%	50.9%	N/A	8.8%	20.0%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	48.8%	64.9%	49.1%	86.0%	87.7%	85.5%	2.3%	5.3%	3.6%

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 8 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 6 statement(s) in 2009 and 9 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 2 statement(s) in 2009 and 7 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 11 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 8 statement(s) in 2009 and 11 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 7 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 6 statement(s) in 2009 and 7 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 1 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.