

# GRADUATE STUDENT EXPERIENCE SURVEY

---

CAS Department Heads  
November 7, 2012

Sandi Morgen  
Vice Provost for Graduate Studies  
Associate Dean of the Graduate School

# Survey Questions and Data Analysis

- 35+ questions covering program satisfaction, program climate, quality of advising/mentor relationships, intended and current career goals, assessments of adequacy and unmet needs for professional and career development, witnessing or experiencing unwanted sexual attention and inequitable treatment by various categories, demographics
- Data analysis and dissemination to-date: Responses to program satisfaction, climate and advisor questions
- Winter 2013: Analysis and dissemination of remaining data, focusing on analysis by various demographic groups, including gender, race/ethnicity, first generation/non first generation student, international and domestic; overall and in some cases college level analysis regarding professional development



# Response Rate

	Students Surveyed	Respondents	Response Rate
Overall	2677	1380	51.6
Allied Arts & Architecture	514	237	46.1
CAS Humanities	352	209	59.4
CAS Natural Sciences	562	320	56.9
CAS Social Sciences	294	187	63.6
Education	486	204	42.0
Business	156	66	42.3
Conflict Res.	51	31	60.8
Journalism	87	39	44.8
Music & Dance	140	52	37.1

Lowest CAS  
Departmental  
Response Rate:  
37.0

Highest CAS  
Departmental  
Response Rate:  
85.7

# Program Satisfaction: “Excellent”

## Natural Sciences

Program Satisfaction	Percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as "Excellent."							
	Biology (N = 54)	Chemistry (N = 55)	Computer & Information Science (N = 27)	Geological Sciences (N = 32)	Human Physiology (N = 25)	Mathematics (N = 32)	Physics (N = 48)	Psychology (N = 59)
Quality of the faculty	51.0	32.1	0.0	43.3	70.8	35.5	34.1	55.4
Overall Program quality	42.0	26.4	3.8	36.7	58.3	32.3	29.5	30.4
Financial support for graduate students	24.5	34.0	23.1	40.0	50.0	74.2	63.6	35.7
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	52.0	26.4	3.8	36.7	52.2	41.9	29.5	46.4
Quality of academic guidance and advising	20.0	13.2	3.8	13.3	52.2	9.7	13.6	26.8
Intellectual community in Program	44.0	26.4	3.8	53.3	47.8	41.9	36.4	48.2
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	10.2	22.6	3.8	0.0	54.2	6.5	11.4	8.9
Space, facilities and equipment	24.0	24.5	15.4	16.7	29.2	41.9	38.6	10.7
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students	18.4	17.0	3.8	50.0	25.0	16.1	20.5	21.4
Research opportunities in my program	46.0	41.5	26.9	63.3	54.2	29.0	43.2	51.8
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	16.0	11.5	4.0	16.7	39.1	22.6	25.0	28.6
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community	12.0	13.2	11.5	10.0	25.0	19.4	27.3	19.6
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	6.0	9.4	3.8	13.8	16.7	6.5	2.3	9.1
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	6.0	11.3	4.0	3.3	37.5	48.4	11.4	3.6
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	10.0	9.4	8.0	6.7	29.2	12.9	6.8	12.5
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	30.0	30.2	11.5	36.7	12.5	0.0	20.5	41.1
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity	18.0	17.0	11.5	13.3	45.8	12.9	4.5	17.9
33.3% of students or more rated the program as "Excellent".*	5	2	0	8	11	6	5	6
50% of students or more rated the program as "Excellent".**	2	0	0	3	7	1	1	2

\*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."

# Advisor Traits: “Strongly Agree”

## Humanities

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

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

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



# 2009 to 2012 Comparison: Program Satisfaction

<i>Program Satisfaction: percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as...</i>						
	<b>Excellent</b>		<b>Excellent or Very Good</b>		<b>Fair or Poor</b>	
	2009 (N = 24)	2012 (N = 23)	2009 (N = 24)	2012 (N = 23)	2009 (N = 24)	2012 (N = 23)
Quality of the faculty	17.6	38.1	68.0	71.4	0.0	9.5
Overall Program quality	3.8	28.6	54.0	61.9	8.4	14.3
Financial support for graduate students	16.9	20.0	29.2	65.0	46.4	20.0
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	22.6	33.3	65.5	71.4	0.0	14.3
Quality of academic guidance and advising	16.1	23.8	53.2	71.4	20.7	14.3
Intellectual community in Program	12.3	28.6	39.8	61.9	8.4	23.8
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	33.3	N/A	47.6	N/A	23.8
Space, facilities and equipment	7.6	0.0	19.9	14.3	56.1	33.3
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	8.0	4.8	20.3	33.3	36.8	42.9
Research opportunities in my program	N/A	28.6	N/A	47.6	N/A	23.8
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	3.9	5.0	42.2	65.0	9.7	15.0
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	3.8	14.3	44.7	57.1	43.1	33.3
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	19.0	N/A	52.4	N/A	9.5
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	7.9	9.5	24.9	33.3	20.7	28.6
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	3.8	4.8	33.8	42.9	25.3	19.0
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	15.6	14.3	57.0	47.6	12.2	19.0
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	8.4	10.0	54.8	30.0	16.9	25.0
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	3 features rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2012, compared to 0 in 2009.		9 features rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2012, compared to 6 in 2009.		9 features rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2012, compared to 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 0 in 2009.			

# How to Use this Data

- **Comparative data within CAS division and 2009-2012 historical comparison:** What does this data suggest about strengths of my program, areas that need attention or improvement?
- **For department heads and Directors of Graduate Studies:** How can I use these data to foster constructive conversations about graduate program among faculty? How do these results echo or differ from other information about my program (other information provided by Graduate School or other assessment data the department already collects from students)?
- **Seeking additional resources or support:** If the department determines there are changes to be made that could benefit from assistance from other UO units, please contact the Graduate School or those units to figure out best way to connect the department with potential institutional resources.
- **Conversations with current graduate students:** Likely winter release to graduate students. Consider best ways to engage students in dialogue about issues. Considerations: recognizing how power differential can make dialogue about graduate program “problems” feel unsafe. Consider most constructive ways to engage students in providing feedback about program ideas for changes.
- **Opportunities for discussion with CAS leadership and Graduate School leadership:** Focused on meeting the institutional challenges of excellence, innovation and inclusion. Meetings in winter and spring 2013.