

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

STUDENT SURVEY

2001

A Report

University Assessment

Information Technology

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This first School of Graduate Studies survey was mailed in May 2001 to all 836 graduates of the graduate class of 2001. 181 replies were received and analyzed. The sample was representative of the population in several respects.

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

- 90.1% received Masters degrees; 9.9% PhDs
- Master of Science was the modal degree
- A majority of respondents were from the Colleges of Education and Business
- 44 of 67 graduate degree programs were represented
- 48.1% had not attained a prior degree at USU; 51.9% had USU Bachelors or Masters degrees
- 80.0% had been enrolled as graduate students between 1 and 3 years
- 96.7% had cumulative grade point averages between 3.40 and 4.00
- 51.3% were between 25 and 34 years old
- 58.0% were female; 42% were male
- 88.3% were US citizens
- 73.2% were Utah residents (for tuition purposes)
- 71.3% were married
- 55.6% had between 1 and 3 dependents
- 87.1% were Caucasian
- 70.6% lived in Utah/Idaho before graduate study began

GENERAL FINDINGS

- 30.6% had an assistantship, fellowship, or scholarship during current year (41.5%, any year)
- 71.0% were to begin careers in education, government, or the private sector
- 3.4% changed graduate programs
- 18.5% attended the TA workshop
- 59.8% took all of their courses on the USU campus
- 18.4% took all of their courses via distance education
- 68.2% took no Ed Net courses
- 76.0% took no online courses
- 89.2% thought their degrees improved their career opportunities
- 66.7% used major prof, dept advisor, or other faculty as major planning sources

EDUCATIONAL QUALITY

Satisfaction (very + mostly + somewhat) with:
(Top three)

- Overall quality of graduate training at USU = 97.2%
- Relevance of USU graduate studies to career goals = 97.2%
- Overall quality of graduate courses in the academic department = 96.1%
(Bottom three)
- Range of information/services from Graduate Student Senate = 66.6%
- Availability of assistantship/fellowship support = 66.4%
- Availability of optional health insurance = 52.8%

GRADUATE EXPERIENCES

Agreement (Strongly Agree + Agree) with:

(Top three)

- USU has been a good choice for graduate study = 84.9%
- Academic department provides an intellectually stimulating atmosphere = 82.2%
- Graduate program providing satisfactory preparation for future career = 81.1%

(Bottom two)

- Graduate students able to access resources to support professional activities = 34.7%
- Level of assistantship funding is adequate = 34.2%

THE REPORT

THE SURVEY

In 1997 the Commission on Colleges of the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges recommended that Utah State University begin the assessment of its graduate programs. As one response to this recommendation, Utah State University has begun the annual survey of its graduating, post-baccalaureate students. A survey was developed by an ad hoc committee of Utah State University's Graduate Council in fall of 2000. In coordination with University Assessment, this survey was revised, printed, and then mailed to the recipients of graduate degrees of the class of 2001. For future classes, the survey will be included in the packet of materials sent by the School of Graduate Studies to students who are completing their degrees. The return of the completed survey will be a condition of processing of the student's completion process.

THE SAMPLE

Given the length of the survey development process, it was necessary to mail the survey to students who had graduated on or before May 2001 who were in the class of 2001. 836 surveys were mailed. 181 were returned (21.6 %). Such a return rate, in the absence of follow up, is reasonably decent. However, readers should note that, essentially, the sample is self-selected. That is, it should be assumed that participants were volunteers who either felt an obligation to respond, who felt they had something to say, or both. Generalization of the results to the entire class of 2001 graduate students may not be warranted. In this report, where it is possible, the characteristics of the present sample are compared to available population parameters of the graduate class of 2001 in an effort to determine post hoc the nature of the sample.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THIS SAMPLE OF THE GRADUATE CLASS - 2001

At the time of this writing the population parameters for the graduate class of 2001 were not available. Thus, the survey's sample is compared against the population parameters for the graduate class of 2000 (*Graduation Summary 1999-2000*, Office of Planning & Analysis).

Graduate Degrees of Respondents by Type

Surprisingly, the present sample matches very well with the population data from the prior graduating class in terms of graduate degrees by type. Table 1 shows a comparison of the relative ranking of graduate degrees awarded by type. In the table the ranks from the two data sets match on about half the comparisons. The proportions of graduate degrees by type in the sample match well overall with the proportions of graduate degrees by type in the population. One difference is the Master of Rehabilitation Counseling. This is a recently new degree and there were apparently no graduates in this program last year.

Table 1. Graduate degrees of respondents by type.

<u>Degrees in Sample by Type</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Grad Class 99-00*</u> <u>Percent</u>	<u>Rank*</u>
Master of Accounting (MAcc)	8	4.4	5	4.4	5
Master of Arts (MA)	7	3.9	6.5	3.1	6
Master of Business Administration	24	13.3	3	15.5	2
Master of Computer Science	1**	.6	12.5	0.0	12.5
Master of Education (MEd)	31	17.1	2	11.2	3
Master of Engineering (ME)	3	1.7	10	2.1	7.5
Master of Fine Arts (MFA)	2	1.1	11	1.2	9.5
Master of Landscape Architecture	1	.6	12.5	1.1	9.5
Master of Rehabilitation Counseling (MRC)	7	3.9	6.5	0.0	12.5
Master of Science (MS)	69	38.1	1	48.6	1
Master of Second Language Teaching	4	2.2	9	0.2	11
Master of Social Sciences (MSS)	6	3.3	8	2.2	7.5
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)	18	9.9	4	8.9	4
Total	181	100.0			

* Data extrapolated from *USU Graduation Summary 1999-2000*, Office of Planning and Analysis, September 2000.

**This respondent reported two Masters degrees.

Graduate Degrees by College

While responses were received from 1 in 5 graduates, Table 2 shows that there was a good match between the proportions of students responding from the various colleges and the proportions in the graduating population from the graduate class of 1999-2000. Most respondents were from the Colleges of Education and Business which together constituted a majority of respondents.

Table 2. Respondent participation by college

<u>College</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Grad Class 99-00*</u> <u>Percent</u>	<u>Sample</u> <u>Rank</u>	<u>Grad Class 99-00*</u> <u>Rank</u>
Agriculture	5	2.8	2.2	7.5	8
Business	41	22.7	25.5	2	2
Education	66	36.5	30.8	1	1
Engineering	21	11.6	11.4	4	3
Family Life	5*	2.8	4.5	7.5	6.5
HASS	22	12.2	10.9	3	4
Natural Resources	9	5.0	4.5	6	6.5
Science	12	6.6	8.9	5	5
Total	181	100.0			

*Respondent reporting two Masters degrees not counted here.

Respondents by Degree Program

Tables 3 -10 show the numbers of respondents by degree program. The small numbers in many cases preclude analyses by program due to confidentiality concerns and representativeness.

Table 3. Number of respondents by degree program in the College of Agriculture.

<u>Degree Program</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Animal Science	3	1.7	60.0	60.0
Bioveterinary Science	1	.6	20.0	80.0
Plant Science	1	.6	20.0	100.0
Subtotal	5	2.8	100.0	
Missing	176	97.2		
Total	181	100.0		

Table 4. Number of respondents by degree program in the College of Business.

<u>Degree Program</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Accounting	9	5.0	22.0	22.0
Business Administration	22	12.2	53.7	75.6
BISE	5	2.8	12.2	87.8
Social Sciences	5	2.8	12.2	100.0
Subtotal	41	22.7	100.0	
Missing	140	77.3		
Total	181	100.0		

Table 5. Number of respondents by degree program in the College of Education.

<u>Degree Program</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Communicative Disorders	9	5.0	13.6	13.6
Elementary Education	19	10.5	28.8	42.4
Health, Physical Ed & Rec	3	1.7	4.5	47.0
Instructional Technology	11	6.1	16.7	63.6
Psychology	11	6.1	16.7	80.3
Rehabilitation Counseling	7	3.9	10.6	90.9
Secondary Education	3	1.7	4.5	95.5
Special Education	3	1.7	4.5	100.0
Subtotal	66	36.5	100.0	
Missing	115	63.5		
Total	181	100.0		

Table 6. Number of respondents by degree program in the College of Engineering.

<u>Degree Program</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Biological & Agricultural Engineering	4	2.2	19.0	19.0
Civil & Environmental Engineering	10	5.5	47.6	66.7
Electrical Engineering	3	1.7	14.3	81.0
Industrial Technology	1	.6	4.8	85.7
Irrigation Engineering	1	.6	4.8	90.5
Mechanical Engineering	2	1.1	9.5	100.0
Subtotal	21	11.6	100.0	
Missing	160	88.4		
Total	181	100.0		

Table 7. Number of respondents by degree program in the College of Family Life.

<u>Degree Program</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Family & Human Development	1	.6	16.7	16.7
Human Environments	5*	2.8	83.3	100.0
Subtotal	6	3.3	100.0	
Missing	175	96.7		
Total	181	100.0		

*Contains one respondent who also reported a graduate degree in Computer Science.

Table 8. Number of respondents by degree program in the College of HASS.

<u>Degree Program</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
American Studies	1	.6	4.5	4.5
Art	2	1.1	9.1	13.6
English	7	3.9	31.8	45.5
History	5	2.8	22.7	68.2
Landscape Architecture	1	.6	4.5	72.7
Political Science	1	.6	4.5	77.3
Second Language Teaching	3	1.7	13.6	90.9
Social Sciences	1	.6	4.5	95.5
Sociology	1	.6	4.5	100.0
Subtotal	22	12.2	100.0	
Missing	159	87.8		
Total	181	100.0		

Table 9. Number of respondents by degree program in the College of Natural Resources.

<u>Degree Program</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Ecology	5	2.8	55.6	55.6
Forestry	1	.6	11.1	66.7
Rec Resources Mgt	1	.6	11.1	77.8
Watershed Science	1	.6	11.1	88.9
Wildlife Biology	1	.6	11.1	100.0
Subtotal	9	5.0	100.0	
Missing	172	95.0		
Total	181	100.0		

Table 10. Number of respondents by degree program in the College of Science.

<u>Degree Program</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Biology	3	1.7	25.0	25.0
Biochemistry	2	1.1	16.7	41.7
Chemistry	1	.6	8.3	50.0
Computer Science	2	1.1	16.7	66.7
Ecology	1	.6	8.3	75.0
Geology	2	1.1	16.7	91.7
Physics	1	.6	8.3	100.0
Subtotal	12	6.6	100.0	
Missing	169	93.4		
Total	181	100.0		

Other Sample Characteristics

Most respondents graduated after May 2000 in May 2001 (Table 11). The 53 who indicated they graduated in 2000, graduated in December of that year, while the remainder graduated in May 2001. The seven respondents who indicated future graduation dates, all graduated from graduate degree programs at USU and had continued into others at the time of the survey. These latter graduation dates reflect the respondents' estimates of their graduation dates for their current degree programs.

Table 11. Years respondents plan to graduate.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
2000	53	29.3	29.4	29.4
2001	120	66.3	66.7	96.1
2002	2	1.1	1.1	97.2
2003	3	1.7	1.7	98.9
2004	2	1.1	1.1	100.0
Subtotal	180	99.4	100.0	
Missing	1	.6		
Total	181	100.0		

Those respondents completing Masters degrees were divided among degree plans with a plurality completing Plan C degrees (Table 12).

Table 12. Master's degree plans.

<u>Masters Degree Plan</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
A	19	27.5	27.5
B	22	31.9	59.4
C	28	40.6	100.0
Total	69		

Crosstabulations of these data by college shows that more Plan A's than expected occurred in the Colleges of Agriculture and Science (Table 13). The College of Education produced more Plan Cs than any other college.

Table 13. College * Master's Degree Plan Crosstabulation

<u>College</u>	<u>Plan A</u>	<u>Plan B</u>	<u>Plan C</u>	<u>Total</u>
Agriculture	2**	0	0	2
Business	4	5	6	15
Education	3	6	15	24
Engineering	4	4	0	8
Family Life	0	1	2	3
HASS	1	4	5	10
Natural Resources	1	1	0	2
Science	4**	1	0	5
Total	19	22	28	69

**More than expected

A substantial majority of respondents carried cumulative grade point averages near 4.0 (Table 14).

Table 14. Cumulative grade point average.

<u>Cumulative GPA</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
4.00 - 3.8	113	62.4	62.4
3.79 - 3.60	44	24.3	86.7
3.59 - 3.40	18	9.9	96.7
3.39 - 3.20	4	2.2	98.9
3.19 - 3.00	2	1.1	100.0
Total	181	100.0	

Table 15 shows that more than 4 in 10 respondents received a baccalaureate degree from USU prior to the degree on which they were currently working. Moreover, a majority received either bachelors or masters degrees. However, a plurality (by single category) of respondents did not receive a prior degree at USU. Whether respondents received a prior degree at USU was independent of the respondents' current colleges.

Table 15. Prior degrees obtained at USU.

<u>Prior USU Degrees</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
None	87	48.1	48.1
Bachelors degree	75	41.4	89.5
Masters Degree	19	10.5	100.0
Total	181	100.0	

Given that most graduate students are in Masters programs, Table 16 shows that a plurality of respondents had been enrolled for 2 years at USU. 8 in 10 had been enrolled at USU for between 1 and 3 years. One in 10 had been enrolled as graduate students for 6 or more years. One of this last group of respondents had completed an MBA, 3 had completed MEds, 2 had completed MEds, 7 had completed MSs, and 5 had completed Ph.Ds.

Table 16. Years enrolled as a graduate student at USU.

<u>Years</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<1	4	2.2	2.2	2.2
1	22	12.2	12.2	14.4
2	70	38.7	38.9	53.3
3	48	26.5	26.7	80.0
4	12	6.6	6.7	86.7
5	6	3.3	3.3	90.0
>=6	18	9.9	10.0	100.0
Subtotal	180	99.4	100.0	
Missing	1	.6		
Total	181	100.0		

A majority of respondents were between 25 and 35 years of age (Table 17).

Table 17. Respondents' current ages.

<u>Age (Yrs.)</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
< 25	18	9.9	9.9	9.9
25 - 29	56	30.9	30.9	40.9
30 - 34	37	20.4	20.4	61.3
35 - 39	22	12.2	12.2	73.5
40 - 49	31	17.1	17.1	90.6
> = 50	17	9.4	9.4	100.0
Total	181	100.0	100.0	

Perhaps as a testament to the fact that respondents were self-selected, more females than males responded to the survey (Table 18). These proportions are the virtual converse of the population parameters for last year's class of graduate students in which there were 57.2 percent males and 42.8 percent females (*Graduation Summary 1999-2000*, USU Office of Planning and Analysis.). The current sample is probably not representative of this year's population of post-baccalaureate graduates in terms of sex.

Table 18. Sex of respondents.

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Male	76	42.0	42.0	42.0
Female	105	58.0	58.0	100.0
Total	181	100.0	100.0	

Most respondents—nearly 9 in 10—were US citizens (Table 19).

Table 19. Citizenship of respondents.

<u>Citizenship</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
U.S.	158	87.3	88.3	88.3
International	21	11.6	11.7	100.0
Subtotal	179	98.9	100.0	
Missing	2	1.1		
Total	181	100.0		

Nearly 3 in 4 respondents were granted Utah residency with respect to their tuitions (Table 20). This proportion compares well with the population parameter (76.1%) from the post-baccalaureate graduating class of 1999-2000 (*Graduation Summary 1999-2000*, Office of Planning and Analysis).

Table 20. Utah residency (for tuition).

<u>Residency</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Yes	131	72.4	73.2	73.2
No	48	26.5	26.8	100.0
Subtotal	179	98.9	100.0	
Missing	2	1.1		
Total	181	100.0		

Table 21 shows that over 7 in 10 respondents were married, a higher proportion than seen in USU's undergraduate population.

Table 21. Marital status.

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Single	39	21.5	21.8	21.8
Married	129	71.3	72.1	93.9
Divorced	11	6.1	6.1	100.0
Subtotal	179	98.9	100.0	
Missing	2	1.1		
Total	181	100.0		

Table 22 shows that a plurality of respondents (25%) claimed one dependent. A majority of respondents (55.6%) claimed 1-3 dependents. In the context of the 3 in 4 respondents who stated they were married, a majority of respondents with several dependents seems reasonable.

Table 22. Number of dependents of respondents.

<u>Dependents</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Zero	30	16.6	16.7	16.7
One	45	24.9	25.0	41.7
Two	36	19.9	20.0	61.7
Three	19	10.5	10.6	72.2
Four	15	8.3	8.3	80.6
Five	16	8.8	8.9	89.4
> = Six	19	10.5	10.6	100.0
Subtotal	180	99.4	100.0	
Missing	1	.6		
Total	181	100.0		

A substantial majority of respondents (87.1%) were caucasian (Table 23). Ethnic population parameters are categorized somewhat differently in other university reports but show that over 8 in 10 students completing masters and doctoral degrees in 1999-2000 were not minority students. Thus, there is some parity between the minority and majority status of the present sample and last year's graduate student population (*Graduation Summary 1999-2000*, Office of Planning and Analysis).

Table 23. Ethnicity of respondents.

<u>Ethnicity</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Asian or Pacific Islander	15	8.3	8.4	8.4
Black (non-Hispanic)	1	.6	.6	9.0
White (non-Hispanic)	155	85.6	87.1	96.1
Hispanic	2	1.1	1.1	97.2
Other	5	2.8	2.8	100.0
Subtotal	178	98.3	100.0	
Missing	3	1.7		
Total	181	100.0		

Interestingly, 7 in 10 respondents lived in Cache Valley, elsewhere in Utah, or in Idaho before they began graduate study (Table 24). This is only 10-12 percent lower than estimates of the home locales of the undergraduate student population at USU. The 1 in 10 proportion of respondents from outside the USA may account for the difference between the two. These results combined with the citizenship results above (Table 19) suggest that this group of graduate students is nearly as parochial as its undergraduate counterpart.

Table 24. Living where before graduate study?

<u>Residence</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
In Cache Valley	58	32.0	32.8	32.8
Elsewhere in Utah	64	35.4	36.2	68.9
Elsewhere in Idaho	3	1.7	1.7	70.6
Elsewhere in the USA	35	19.3	19.8	90.4
Outside the USA	17	9.4	9.6	100.0
Subtotal	177	97.8	100.0	
Missing	4	2.2		
Total	181	100.0		

Table 25 shows that where respondents lived before coming to graduate school at USU relates to their USU colleges. The College of Engineering had fewer respondents from Utah outside Cache Valley, more respondents from Idaho, and more respondents from outside the USA than expected in comparison with the other colleges. The College of Natural Resources also had more respondents from Idaho and from outside the USA than expected. Finally, the College of Science had more respondents from elsewhere in the USA than expected.

Table 25. College * living where before graduate study crosstabulation.

<u>College</u>	<u>In Cache Valley</u>	<u>Elsewhere in Utah</u>	<u>Elsewhere in Idaho</u>	<u>Elsewhere in the USA</u>	<u>Outside the USA</u>	<u>Total</u>
Agriculture	2	0	0	2	0	4
Business	15	17	0	6	3	41
Education	18	32	0	12	3	65
Engineering	11	2*	2**	1	5**	21
Family Life	1	3	0	1	0	5
HASS	8	8	0	3	1	20
Natural Resources	1	0	1**	4	3**	9
Science	2	2	0	6**	2	12
Total	58	64	3	35	17	177

*Fewer than expected

**More than expected

Table 26 shows that only 3 in 10 respondents had some sort of financial assistance other than loans, that is to say, had assistantships, fellowships, or scholarships during the current year. Fully 4.5 in 10 reported no financial assistance during the current year.

Among the other forms of assistance identified by respondents were: other scholarships and grants (11), employer assistance (8), Veteran's benefits (1), off and on campus jobs (2), and waivers such as out-of-state tuition (2).

Crosstabulations by college (not shown) revealed what might be expected: a few more research assistantships located in colleges for which research is a principal focus (e.g., Colleges of Engineering and Natural Resources) and a few less in colleges for which research is not a principal focus (e.g., College of Business); and a few more teaching assistantships than expected in colleges where teaching is primary (e.g., College of HASS). The College of Business had quite a few more respondents report being on student loans than any other college.

Table 26. Graduate financial assistance (current year).

<u>Type of Financial Assistance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Research assistantship	21	11.6	12.1	12.1
Teaching assistantship	11	6.1	6.4	18.5
General assistantship	2	1.1	1.2	19.7
Graduate fellowship	1	.6	.6	20.2
Departmental or college fellowship or scholarship	18	9.9	10.4	30.6
Student loan	20	11.0	11.6	42.2
Other (please specify):	19	10.5	11.0	53.2
No graduate financial assistance (current year)	81	44.8	46.8	100.0
Subtotal	173	95.6	100.0	
Missing	8	4.4		
Total	181	100.0		

Slightly more than 4 in 10 respondents reported some sort of financial assistance other than loans at any time in their graduate careers (Table 27). However, one-third of respondents reported no financial assistance at any time during their graduate careers.

In addition to those mentioned above for the current year, financial aid additionally included: foundational support (1), and support from other scholarship sources (1).

Crosstabulations by college (not shown) again revealed what might be expected: fewer Business respondents than expected and more Engineering and Natural Resources respondents had research assistantships; more respondents from Agriculture than expected had teaching assistantships; and again more Business respondents than expected reported the assistance of student loans.

Table 27. Graduate financial assistance (any yr).

<u>Type of Financial Assistance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Research assistantship	28	15.5	15.9	15.9
Teaching assistantship	20	11.0	11.4	27.3
Graduate fellowship	1	.6	.6	27.8
Departmental or college fellowship or scholarship	24	13.3	13.6	41.5
Student loan	25	13.8	14.2	55.7
Other (please specify):	20	11.0	11.4	67.0
No graduate financial assistance	58	32.0	33.0	100.0
Subtotal	176	97.2	100.0	
Missing	5	2.8		
Total	181	100.0		

At the time they received the survey almost 95 percent of respondents had completed their degree requirements. As noted above, the several who reported completion in the future had already completed the requirements for one USU graduate degree and were reflecting on the future completion of another. This division in the interpretation of the meaning of this item should disappear when future students receive the survey prior to, rather than after, graduation.

Table 28. All USU degree program requirements completed when?

<u>Time of Requirement Completion</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Degree requirements have been completed	167	92.3	94.9	94.9
At the end of the current semester	1	.6	.6	95.5
Within one year from now	1	.6	.6	96.0
1-2 years from now	4	2.2	2.3	98.3
3 or more years from now	3	1.7	1.7	100.0
Subtotal	176	97.2	100.0	
Missing	5	2.8		
Total	181	100.0		

More than 7 in 10 respondents planned to begin professional careers when they finished their degree programs (Table 29). Nearly 1 in 10 respondents planned to continue their educations. About 1 in 7 respondents had other plans, including mostly to continue with their current employer (20), or to start anew, e.g., high school teacher (1), or to pursue self-employment, e.g., freelance artist (1).

Table 29. Do what when finished USU degree?

<u>Do What When Finished?</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Pursue additional graduate training at USU	3	1.7	1.7	1.7
Pursue additional graduate training at another institution	12	6.6	6.8	8.5
Begin a professional career in an educational institution	43	23.8	24.4	33.0
Begin a professional career with a government agency	21	11.6	11.9	44.9
Begin a professional career in the private sector or with a non-government organization	61	33.7	34.7	79.5
Other plans (please specify):	25	13.8	14.2	93.8
Uncertain	11	6.1	6.3	100.0
Subtotal	176	97.2	100.0	
Missing	5	2.8		
Total	181	100.0		

Most respondents did not change programs while at USU (Table 30). The five who did cited as reasons: a fellowship, movement from a masters to a doctoral program, movement to a more appropriate curriculum, movement away from a poor program, and changed interests.

Table 30. Changed departments or programs while at USU?

<u>Changed Programs?</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
No	173	95.6	96.6	96.6
Yes	6	3.3	3.4	100.0
Subtotal	179	98.9	100.0	
Missing	2	1.1		
Total	181	100.0		

Four in five respondents did not attend any teaching assistant workshop (Table 31).

Table 31. Attended TA workshop?

<u>TA Workshop?</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
No	145	80.1	81.5	81.5
Yes	33	18.2	18.5	100.0
Subtotal	178	98.3	100.0	
Missing	3	1.7		
Total	181	100.0		

Table 32 shows the crosstabulations of attendance at the TA workshop by college. The data reveal that proportionally the Colleges of Agriculture and Science had more respondents (international students?) who attended the workshop than expected while the College of Business had fewer than expected.

Table 32. College * attended TA workshop? crosstabulation.

<u>College</u>	<u>Attended ?</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	
Agriculture	2	3**	5
Business	40	1*	41
Education	54	9	63
Engineering	20	1	21
Family Life	5	0	5
HASS	14	8	22
Natural Resources	8	1	9
Science	2*	10**	12
Total	145	33	178

Nearly 6 in 10 respondents had courses taught entirely on campus in Logan (Table 33). However, nearly 1 in 5 took their graduate degree courses entirely away from the Logan campus. Together, more than 3 in 10 respondents took most or all of their courses electronically away from the Logan campus. Crosstabulations (not shown) showed, that, as expected, where respondents primarily took their degree work varied by college. That is, more College of Education respondents than expected took their degrees *primarily* in distance education courses, while more College of Business respondents than expected took their degrees *entirely* in distance education courses. Conversely, the College of Engineering had more respondents than expected take their degrees entirely on campus and fewer (0) take their degrees entirely off campus.

Table 33. Instructional formats experienced in graduate courses completed for USU degree.

<u>Instructional Formats</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Entirely on-campus courses taught at the Logan campus	107	59.1	59.8	59.8
Primarily on-campus courses, with some "distance education" classes taught at other locations or via electronic delivery systems	16	8.8	8.9	68.7
Primarily "distance education" courses taught at other locations or via electronic delivery systems, with some on-campus courses	23	12.7	12.8	81.6
Entirely "distance education" courses taught at other locations or via electronic delivery systems (e.g., Uintah Basin Center, etc.)	33	18.2	18.4	100.0
Subtotal	179	98.9	100.0	
Missing	2	1.1		
Total	181	100.0		

About 1 in 4 respondents took 3/4 or more of their course work at locations other than the Logan campus (Table 34). However, a majority took none of their instruction at other locations.

Table 34. Percent of graduate course work comprised by live instruction at other locations.

<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
None	98	54.1	54.1
1 - 10%	16	8.8	63.0
11 - 25%	8	4.4	67.4
26 - 50%	5	2.8	70.2
51 - 75%	8	4.4	74.6
76 - 100%	46	25.4	100.0
Total	181	100.0	

Nearly 7 in 10 respondents took none of their courses via Ed Net (Table 35). About 1 in 10, however, took 3/4 to all of their course work via Ed Net.

Table 35. Percent of graduate course work on Ed Net System.

<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
None	122	67.4	68.2	68.2
1 - 10%	25	13.8	14.0	82.1
11 - 25%	7	3.9	3.9	86.0
26 - 50%	2	1.1	1.1	87.2
51 - 75%	4	2.2	2.2	89.4
76 - 100%	19	10.5	10.6	100.0
Subtotal	179	98.9	100.0	
Missing	2	1.1		
Total	181	100.0		

Three in four respondents received none of their course work via the internet/web (Table 36). A little over 1 in 10 experienced 10 percent or less of their course work via the internet.

Table 36. Percent of graduate course work on internet/web.

<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
None	136	75.1	76.0	76.0
1 - 10%	24	13.3	13.4	89.4
11 - 25%	5	2.8	2.8	92.2
26 - 50%	2	1.1	1.1	93.3
51 - 75%	3	1.7	1.7	95.0
76 - 100%	9	5.0	5.0	100.0
Subtotal	179	98.9	100.0	
Missing	2	1.1		
Total	181	100.0		

Almost 9 in 10 respondents indicated that their graduate degree definitely or probably improved their career opportunities (Table 37). Surprisingly, about 1 in 10 respondents indicated they were uncertain or that their graduate degree probably or definitely would not improve their career opportunities.

Table 37. Career opportunities improved by USU graduate degree?

<u>Improved Opportunities?</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Definitely yes	103	56.9	58.5	58.5
Probably yes	54	29.8	30.7	89.2
Uncertain	11	6.1	6.3	95.5
Probably no	6	3.3	3.4	98.9
Definitely no	2	1.1	1.1	100.0
Subtotal	176	97.2	100.0	
Missing	5	2.8		
Total	181	100.0		

Satisfaction with USU Graduate Experiences

Table 38 shows that overall satisfaction with their graduate experiences among respondents was high with an orderly progression downward. Overall quality of graduate training was the highest. A break in the progression occurs in satisfaction with the Graduate Student Senate, the availability of financial support in the form of assistantships and fellowships, and the availability of optional health care insurance.

Table 38. Summary of respondents' satisfaction with graduate experiences at USU. The table is arrayed from highest satisfaction levels to lowest satisfaction levels.

<u>USU Graduate Experiences</u>	Opinion (%) (Very Satisfied + Mostly Satisfied + Somewhat Satisfied)
The overall quality of the graduate training that you have received at USU.	97.2
The relevance of your USU graduate studies to your career goals.	97.2
The overall quality of graduate courses that you have taken inside your department.	96.1
The availability of and access to e-mail and internet services for graduate students at USU.	95.1
How would you rate your satisfaction with the overall quality of your graduate academic program at USU?	95.0
The admissions process when you first entered graduate school at USU.	93.4
The helpfulness of USU library/learning resource staff in helping you locate and access resource materials.	92.9
The helpfulness of faculty members in your academic department in responding to your concerns and questions.	92.2
The level of interaction with and feedback provided by your major professor.	92.2
The availability of library facilities that provide an environment that is appealing and conducive to study.	91.2
The helpfulness of non-faculty staff members in your academic department in responding to your concerns and questions.	90.6
The overall quality of graduate courses that you have taken outside your department.	89.7

The information you received from the School of Graduate Studies regarding degree requirements and how to meet them.	89.5
The information you received from your department regarding degree requirements and how to meet them.	89.0
The helpfulness of School of Graduate Studies staff in responding to your concerns or questions.	88.8
The ability to obtain library resource materials through interlibrary loan when those materials were not available in the USU library collection.	88.8
The availability of faculty in your department to meet with you and provide feedback regarding your graduate studies or your research.	88.3
The helpfulness of your major professor in responding to your concerns and questions.	87.8
The availability through USU's library facilities of electronic databases that you need for graduate course work or research purposes.	87.6
The availability of library collections (books and journals) in your fields of study at USU.	84.3
The availability of research resources (facilities, equipment, computers, etc.) in your academic department to meet your needs as a graduate student.	81.6
The range of information and services provided by the USU Graduate Students Senate (GSS).	66.6
The availability of assistantship or fellowship support to help cover the costs of your graduate education at USU.	66.4
The availability of optional health care insurance for graduate students that is adequate to meet your needs.	52.8

For all items in this section, crosstabulations (which are not shown), were run for colleges with categories collapsed into satisfied, dissatisfied, and not applicable. Where the crosstabulations analysis is not mentioned for a particular item it means that there was no relationship between the respondents' college and responses to that particular item. In Tables 39 - 62, respondents' satisfaction is portrayed for the individual items in this section.

Table 39 shows that over 9 in 10 respondents were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied with the admissions process.

Table 39. The admissions process.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	51	28.2	28.2
Mostly Satisfied	102	56.4	84.5
Somewhat Satisfied	16	8.8	93.4
Somewhat Dissatisfied	8	4.4	97.8
Mostly Dissatisfied	4	2.2	100.0
Total	181	100.0	

Close to 9 in 10 respondents were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied with the information they had received from the School of Graduate Studies informing them of degree requirements and how to meet them (Table 40).

Table 40. Information from School of Graduate Studies regarding degree requirements.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	45	24.9	24.9
Mostly Satisfied	81	44.8	69.6
Somewhat Satisfied	36	19.9	89.5
Somewhat Dissatisfied	10	5.5	95.0
Mostly Dissatisfied	3	1.7	96.7
Very Dissatisfied	5	2.8	99.4
Not Applicable	1	.6	100.0
Total	181	100.0	

Almost 9 in 10 respondents were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied with the information they received from their departments regarding degree requirements and how to meet them (Table 41).

Table 41. Information from department regarding degree requirements.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	59	32.6	32.6
Mostly Satisfied	77	42.5	75.1
Somewhat Satisfied	25	13.8	89.0
Somewhat Dissatisfied	12	6.6	95.6
Mostly Dissatisfied	5	2.8	98.3
Very Dissatisfied	3	1.7	100.0
Total	181	100.0	

Almost 9 in 10 respondents (88.8%) reported they were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied with the helpfulness of the School of Graduate Studies staff in responding to their concerns and questions (Table 42). For this item crosstabulations showed that more respondents from HASS and from Family Life than expected were dissatisfied with the helpfulness of the School of Graduate Studies staff.

Table 42. Helpfulness of School of Graduate Studies staff in responding to students' concerns and questions.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	56	30.9	31.3	31.3
Mostly Satisfied	71	39.2	39.7	70.9
Somewhat Satisfied	32	17.7	17.9	88.8
Somewhat Dissatisfied	9	5.0	5.0	93.9
Mostly Dissatisfied	6	3.3	3.4	97.2
Very Dissatisfied	4	2.2	2.2	99.4
Not Applicable	1	.6	.6	100.0
Subtotal	179	98.9	100.0	
Missing	2	1.1		
Total	181	100.0		

Nine in ten respondents were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied with the helpfulness of non faculty staff members in their academic departments in response to their concerns and questions (Table 43). More respondents than expected from Science were dissatisfied.

Table 43. Helpfulness of non faculty staff members in the student's academic department.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	76	42.0	42.2	42.2
Mostly Satisfied	61	33.7	33.9	76.1
Somewhat Satisfied	26	14.4	14.4	90.6
Somewhat Dissatisfied	2	1.1	1.1	91.7
Mostly Dissatisfied	2	1.1	1.1	92.8
Very Dissatisfied	4	2.2	2.2	95.0
Not Applicable	9	5.0	5.0	100.0
Subtotal	180	99.4	100.0	
Missing	1	.6		
Total	181	100.0		

Over 9 in 10 respondents were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied with the helpfulness of faculty in academic departments in response to students' concerns and questions (Table 44).

Table 44. Helpfulness of faculty in academic department in response to student's concerns and questions.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	79	43.6	44.1	44.1
Mostly Satisfied	65	35.9	36.3	80.4
Somewhat Satisfied	21	11.6	11.7	92.2
Somewhat Dissatisfied	9	5.0	5.0	97.2
Mostly Dissatisfied	2	1.1	1.1	98.3
Very Dissatisfied	3	1.7	1.7	100.0
Subtotal	179	98.9	100.0	
Missing	2	1.1		
Total	181	100.0		

Somewhat surprisingly, not quite 9 in 10 respondents were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied with the helpfulness of their major professors in response to their concerns and questions (Table 45). While still a substantial majority of respondents noted their satisfaction with the subject of this item, the overall satisfaction level is somewhat lower than satisfaction ratings with other items in this section. On the other hand, respondents who claimed they were very satisfied with the helpfulness of their major professors constituted a simple majority, the only item in this section where this is the case. The crosstabulations analysis showed that more Business respondents than expected indicated that this item was not applicable to them.

Table 45. Helpfulness of major professor in response to students' concerns and questions.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	95	52.5	52.8	52.8
Mostly Satisfied	44	24.3	24.4	77.2
Somewhat Satisfied	19	10.5	10.6	87.8
Somewhat Dissatisfied	8	4.4	4.4	92.2
Mostly Dissatisfied	2	1.1	1.1	93.3
Very Dissatisfied	2	1.1	1.1	94.4
Not Applicable	10	5.5	5.6	100.0
Subtotal	180	99.4	100.0	
Missing	1	.6		
Total	181	100.0		

With 5 exceptions, all other respondents were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied with the overall quality of their graduate training at USU (Table 46).

Table 46. Overall quality of graduate training at USU.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	61	33.7	33.9	33.9
Mostly Satisfied	88	48.6	48.9	82.8
Somewhat Satisfied	26	14.4	14.4	97.2
Somewhat Dissatisfied	3	1.7	1.7	98.9
Mostly Dissatisfied	1	.6	.6	99.4
Very Dissatisfied	1	.6	.6	100.0
Subtotal	180	99.4	100.0	
Missing	1	.6		
Total	181	100.0		

Well over 9 in 10 respondents (96.1%) were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied with the overall quality of courses in their academic departments (Table 47). A simple majority (55.2%) were mostly satisfied. More respondents than expected in the College of Science were dissatisfied.

Table 47. Overall quality of courses in academic department.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	53	29.3	29.3
Mostly Satisfied	100	55.2	84.5
Somewhat Satisfied	21	11.6	96.1
Somewhat Dissatisfied	4	2.2	98.3
Mostly Dissatisfied	1	.6	98.9
Very Dissatisfied	1	.6	99.4
Not Applicable	1	.6	100.0
Total	181	100.0	

Almost 3 in 10 respondents (54/181) answered this item as Not Applicable, suggesting that they took no courses outside their academic departments. These cases were removed before satisfaction was computed. Of the remaining respondents almost 9 in 10 were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied with the overall quality of courses taken outside their academic departments (Table 48). Fewer College of Education respondents than expected indicated they were satisfied, while more than expected indicated this item was not applicable to them. More respondents than expected in the College of Science were dissatisfied.

Table 48. Overall quality of courses outside the academic department.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	26	20.4	20.4
Mostly Satisfied	58	45.7	66.1
Somewhat Satisfied	30	23.6	89.7
Somewhat Dissatisfied	7	5.5	95.2
Mostly Dissatisfied	3	2.4	97.6
Very Dissatisfied	3	2.4	100.0
Total	127	100.0	

Eighteen respondents indicated that this item was not applicable to them. We can speculate that these were individuals who were not taking courses on the Logan campus. They were removed from the sample before satisfaction ratings were computed. Well over 9 in 10 respondents to this item were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied with the availability of or access to e-mail and internet services (Table 49).

Table 49. Availability/Access of e-mail/internet services.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	83	50.9	50.9
Mostly Satisfied	57	35.0	85.9
Somewhat Satisfied	15	9.2	95.1
Somewhat Dissatisfied	4	2.5	97.6
Mostly Dissatisfied	2	1.2	98.8
Very Dissatisfied	2	1.2	100.0
Total	163	100.0	

Fifteen respondents considered library collections in their fields not applicable to them. More respondents than expected were in the College of Business. They were removed from the sample before satisfaction ratings were computed for the remaining respondents. Over 8 in 10 respondents were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied with the availability of library collections in their fields (Table 50).. This is about a 10 percent lower satisfaction rating than comparable satisfaction ratings in this section.

Table 50. Availability of library collections in your field.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	47	28.3	28.3
Mostly Satisfied	53	31.9	60.2
Somewhat Satisfied	40	24.1	84.3
Somewhat Dissatisfied	11	6.7	91.0
Mostly Dissatisfied	9	5.4	96.4
Very Dissatisfied	6	3.6	100.0
Total	166	100.0	

Over one in three respondents (65/181) considered inter-library loan resources not to be applicable to them. More than expected were in the College of Business. Satisfaction ratings were computed after these respondents were removed from the sample. Almost 9 in 10 of the remaining respondents were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied with their ability to obtain needed resources through inter-library loan when those resources were not locally available (Table 51). Fewer than expected were from the College of Business.

Table 51. Ability to obtain library resources through inter-library loan.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	34	29.3	29.3
Mostly Satisfied	44	37.9	67.2
Somewhat Satisfied	25	21.6	88.8
Somewhat Dissatisfied	7	6.0	94.8
Mostly Dissatisfied	2	1.7	96.5
Very Dissatisfied	4	3.5	100.0
Total	116	100.0	

Twenty-eight respondents indicated that the availability of electronic data bases was not applicable to them. They were removed from the sample before satisfaction ratings were computed. Of the remaining respondents, 87.6 percent were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied with the availability of electronic data bases through the libraries (Table 52).

Table 52. Availability of electronic data bases through library.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	45	29.4	29.4
Mostly Satisfied	56	36.6	66.0
Somewhat Satisfied	33	21.6	87.6
Somewhat Dissatisfied	13	8.5	96.1
Mostly Dissatisfied	4	2.6	98.7
Very Dissatisfied	2	1.3	100.0
Total	153	100.0	

Forty-two respondents (23.2%) indicated that the helpfulness of library resource staff was not applicable to them. More of these respondents than expected were from the College of Business. They were removed from the sample before satisfaction ratings were computed. Over 9 in 10 of the remaining respondents were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied with the helpfulness of library resource staff in helping them to locate and access resource materials (Table 53).

Table 53. Helpfulness of library resource staff.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	45	32.5	32.5
Mostly Satisfied	52	37.4	69.9
Somewhat Satisfied	32	23.0	92.9
Somewhat Dissatisfied	7	5.0	97.9
Mostly Dissatisfied	1	0.7	98.6
Very Dissatisfied	2	1.4	100.0
Total	139	100.0	

Thirty-three respondents (18.2%) indicated that having library facilities conducive to study was not applicable to them. They were removed from the sample before satisfaction ratings were computed. Of the remaining respondents about 9 in 10 were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied that the library facilities were appealing and conducive to study (Table 54).

Table 54. Availability of library facilities conducive to study.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	41	27.7	27.7
Mostly Satisfied	65	43.9	71.6
Somewhat Satisfied	29	19.6	91.2
Somewhat Dissatisfied	8	5.4	96.6
Mostly Dissatisfied	2	1.3	97.9
Very Dissatisfied	3	2.1	100.0
Total	148	100.0	

Thirty-one respondents (17.1%) indicated that the availability of research resources in their academic departments was not applicable to them. More of these respondents than expected were from the College of Business. They were removed from the sample before satisfaction ratings were computed. Of the remaining respondents around 8 in 10 were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied with the availability of research resources in their academic departments (Table 55). While this is a significant majority, the satisfaction ratings for this item are relatively lower than for other items in this section.

Table 55. Availability of research resources in academic department.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	34	23.1	23.1
Mostly Satisfied	58	39.5	62.6
Somewhat Satisfied	28	19.0	81.6
Somewhat Dissatisfied	17	11.6	93.2
Mostly Dissatisfied	5	3.4	96.6
Very Dissatisfied	5	3.4	100.0
Total	147	100.0	

Given few missing or non applicable responses, the entire sample was used on the item in Table 56. Nearly 9 in 10 respondents (88.3%) were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied with the availability of faculty in their academic departments who could meet with them and provide them with feedback regarding their graduate studies and their research.

Table 56. Availability of faculty in academic department.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	65	35.9	36.3	36.3
Mostly Satisfied	60	33.1	33.5	69.8
Somewhat Satisfied	33	18.2	18.4	88.3
Somewhat Dissatisfied	10	5.5	5.6	93.9
Mostly Dissatisfied	7	3.9	3.9	97.8
Very Dissatisfied	1	.6	.6	98.3
Not Applicable	3	1.7	1.7	100.0
Subtotal	179	98.9	100.0	
Missing	2	1.1		
Total	181	100.0		

There were 14 respondents who considered the level of interaction and feedback provided by a major professor were not applicable to them. More than expected of these respondents were from the College of Business while fewer were from the College of Education. These respondents were removed from the sample before satisfaction ratings were computed. Of the remaining respondents over 9 in 10 were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied with the level of interaction with, and feedback provided by, their major professors (Table 57).

Table 57. Level of interaction and feedback provided by major professor.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	80	47.9	47.9
Mostly Satisfied	52	31.1	79.0
Somewhat Satisfied	22	13.2	92.2
Somewhat Dissatisfied	8	4.8	97.0
Mostly Dissatisfied	1	0.6	97.6
Very Dissatisfied	4	2.4	100.0
Total	167	100.0	

Only 5 respondents of the 181 in the sample (2.8%) were somewhat, mostly, or very dissatisfied with the relevance of their graduate studies at USU to their career goals (Table 58). All remaining respondents (97.2%) were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied with the relevance of their graduate studies at USU to their career goals.

Table 58. Relevance of USU graduate studies to career goals.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	86	47.5	47.5
Mostly Satisfied	61	33.7	81.2
Somewhat Satisfied	29	16.0	97.2
Somewhat Dissatisfied	2	1.1	98.3
Mostly Dissatisfied	1	.6	98.9
Very Dissatisfied	2	1.1	100.0
Total	181	100.0	

Quite a number of respondents (82/181) either did not answer or indicated that the range of information/services provided by the Graduate Students Senate was not applicable to them. With these respondents removed satisfaction ratings were computed. Satisfaction on this item was relatively lower than on other items in this section. Only 66.6 percent indicated they were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied with the range of information and services provided by the Graduate Student Senate (Table 59).

Table 59. Range of information/services provided by Graduate Students Senate.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	10	10.1	10.1
Mostly Satisfied	24	24.2	34.3
Somewhat Satisfied	32	32.3	66.6
Somewhat Dissatisfied	14	14.1	80.7
Mostly Dissatisfied	6	6.1	86.8
Very Dissatisfied	13	13.2	100.0
Total	99	100.0	

Fifty-three respondents indicated that availability of assistantships or fellowships was not applicable to them. Perhaps these were respondents who were employed while attending graduate school. These respondents were removed from the sample before satisfaction ratings were computed. Of the remaining respondents only 2 in 3 were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied with the availability of assistantships and fellowships to cover educational costs (Table 60). Again this is a proportion lower than others in this section. The remaining 1 in 3 respondents were somewhat, mostly, or very dissatisfied with the availability of assistantships and fellowships.

Table 60. Availability of assistantship/fellowship support to help cover educational costs.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	38	29.7	29.7
Mostly Satisfied	28	21.9	51.6
Somewhat Satisfied	19	14.8	66.4
Somewhat Dissatisfied	16	12.5	78.9
Mostly Dissatisfied	8	6.3	85.2
Very Dissatisfied	19	14.8	100.0
Total	128	100.0	

A considerable number of respondents (109/181) indicated that the availability of optional health care insurance was not applicable to them. These respondents were removed from the sample before satisfaction ratings were computed. Of the remaining respondents a bare majority (52.8%) were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied with the availability of optional health care (Table 61). This outcome is lower than many in this section. Fully 1 in 5 respondents (22.2%) were very dissatisfied. More than expected, dissatisfied respondents were from the College of Science.

Table 61. Availability of optional health care insurance that is adequate to meet needs.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	10	13.9	13.9
Mostly Satisfied	18	25.0	38.9
Somewhat Satisfied	10	13.9	52.8
Somewhat Dissatisfied	13	18.1	70.9
Mostly Dissatisfied	5	6.9	77.8
Very Dissatisfied	16	22.2	100.0
Total	72	100.0	

Well over 9 in 10 respondents (95.0%) were very, mostly, or somewhat satisfied with the overall quality of their graduate programs at USU (Table 62). More than expected, dissatisfied respondents were from the College of Science.

Table 62. Satisfaction with overall quality of graduate program at USU.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	51	28.2	28.5	28.5
Mostly Satisfied	96	53.0	53.6	82.1
Somewhat Satisfied	23	12.7	12.8	95.0
Somewhat Dissatisfied	5	2.8	2.8	97.8
Mostly Dissatisfied	2	1.1	1.1	98.9
Very Dissatisfied	2	1.1	1.1	100.0
Subtotal	179	98.9	100.0	
Missing	2	1.1		
Total	181	100.0		

There is an interesting difference between the responses to this survey and those who answer a similar item on the equivalent undergraduate survey. Two in three respondents to this survey indicate that human resources—the major professor, the departmental graduate advisor, or other faculty—are the major sources of information for the graduate student (Table 63). Paper sources count for much less. For undergraduate students, paper sources, e.g., departmental requirement sheets, frequently account for a plurality of responses to this item.

Table 63. Major source of program planning information.

<u>Sources</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Major professor	75	41.4	41.7	41.7
Departmental graduate advisor	40	22.1	22.2	63.9
Other faculty	5	2.8	2.8	66.7
Department graduate requirement sheet/handbook	35	19.3	19.4	86.1
Graduate Catalog	8	4.4	4.4	90.6
School of Graduate Studies staff	2	1.1	1.1	91.7
Other students	11	6.1	6.1	97.8
Other	4	2.2	2.2	100.0
Subtotal	180	99.4	100.0	
Missing	1	.6		
Total	181	100.0		

Agreement on Graduate Experiences

Table 64 summarizes respondents' agreement with various statements descriptive of their graduate experiences at USU. The table is arrayed to show statements first for which there is greatest agreement. Most agreement occurred when students were asked about USU being a good choice for graduate study. Least agreement occurred on thesis/dissertation guidelines, arguably, in the minds of graduate students, as bad as parking services is for undergraduates in the undergraduate survey.

Table 64. Summary of respondents' agreement with various statements about their graduate experiences.

<u>Statements</u>	<u>Agreement (%) (Strongly Agree + Agree)</u>
For me, USU has been a good choice for graduate study.	84.9
My department provides an intellectually stimulating atmosphere.	82.2
I believe that my graduate program is providing me with satisfactory preparation for my future career.	81.1
My advisor/major professor can be relied upon to review and provide constructive criticism of my work.	79.0
My department has a humane environment characterized by mutual respect between students and professors.	76.0
My advisor/major professor is an effective mentor who provides effective and supportive guidance in terms of my academic pursuits and professional development.	75.7
I would recommend my department and graduate program to prospective graduate students.	75.1
There is satisfactory communication between faculty and graduate students in my department.	72.8
Faculty members in my department are interested in the welfare and professional development of graduate students.	71.5
My department provides satisfactory advising and program counseling to graduate students.	66.9
During my first year of graduate studies at USU my department did a good job of helping me understand program requirements, expectations and procedures.	65.6
I am satisfied with the computer facilities available to graduate students.	65.3
The USU School of Graduate Studies provides the information I need to adhere to things like filing candidacy and program of study forms, meeting deadlines, etc.	64.8
My department has done a good job of providing me with opportunities for professional development through things like attending professional meetings, presenting papers at conferences, or networking with professionals in my field.	60.1

The procedures and criteria used by my department when decisions are made regarding the allocation of assistantships or other types of graduate funding are fair and equitable.	51.4
I am satisfied with the University library holdings for my field.	50.7
My department is helpful and supportive in graduates' search for professional employment.	50.0
I am satisfied with the thesis/dissertation review guidelines and procedures that are conducted by the USU School of Graduate Studies.	44.8
The Teaching Assistants Workshop that is offered by the School of Graduate Studies provides the content that is needed to help graduate students be effective as teaching assistants or course instructors.	43.1
I would like to receive more feedback on my academic progress.	41.7
Students in my department are able to access the resources needed to help support professional activities such as travel for attendance at professional meetings and conferences.	34.7
The level of assistantship funding in my department is adequate to meet the needs of graduate students who receive funding.	34.2

For all items in this section, crosstabulations (which are not shown), were run for colleges with categories collapsed into agree, disagree, and neutral/not applicable. Where the crosstabulations analysis is not mentioned for a particular item it means that there was no relationship between the respondents' college and responses to that particular item.

Tables 65 - 86 document agreement with the individual statements shown above in specific detail for each statement.

A number of respondents (30/181) considered more feedback on their academic progress not applicable to them. They were removed from the sample before agreement was computed. Of the remainder, a plurality were neutral (41.1%) (Table 65). Only about 4 in 10 respondents strongly agreed or agreed with this item.

Table 65. More feedback desired on academic progress.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	16	10.6	10.6
Agree	47	31.1	41.7
Neutral	62	41.1	82.8
Disagree	21	13.9	96.7
Strongly Disagree	5	3.3	100.0
Total	151	100.0	

About 8 in 10 respondents considered that their graduate programs provided them with satisfactory preparation for a future career (Table 66). More HASS respondents than expected indicated they were neutral or the item was not applicable to them. More Science respondents than expected were dissatisfied.

Table 66. Graduate program provides satisfactory preparation for career.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	55	30.4	30.6	30.6
Agree	91	50.3	50.6	81.1
Neutral	24	13.3	13.3	94.4
Disagree	7	3.9	3.9	98.3
Strongly Disagree	1	.6	.6	98.9
Not Applicable	2	1.1	1.1	100.0
Subtotal	180	99.4	100.0	
Missing	1	.6		
Total	181	100.0		

Well over 7 in 10 respondents strongly agreed or agreed that their academic departments were humane environments while about 1 in 16 were neutral (Table 67).

Table 67. Academic department has a humane environment characterized by mutual respect.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	62	34.3	34.6	34.6
Agree	74	40.9	41.3	76.0
Neutral	27	14.9	15.1	91.1
Disagree	8	4.4	4.5	95.5
Strongly Disagree	3	1.7	1.7	97.2
Not Applicable	5	2.8	2.8	100.0
Subtotal	179	98.9	100.0	
Missing	2	1.1		
Total	181	100.0		

Over 8 in 10 respondents strongly agreed or agreed that their academic departments provided intellectually stimulating atmospheres (Table 68). More Engineering respondents than expected disagreed with this statement.

Table 68. Academic department provides an intellectually stimulating atmosphere.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	63	34.8	35.0	35.0
Agree	85	47.0	47.2	82.2
Neutral	21	11.6	11.7	93.9
Disagree	7	3.9	3.9	97.8
Strongly Disagree	1	.6	.6	98.3
Not Applicable	3	1.7	1.7	100.0
Subtotal	180	99.4	100.0	
Missing	1	.6		
Total	181	100.0		

Eighteen respondents (9.9%) either did not respond to this item or indicated the item was not applicable to them. Their records were removed before agreement was computed. Of the remaining respondents, 6 in 10 strongly agreed or agreed that their academic departments provided opportunities for professional development (Table 69). Between 1 in 5 and 1 in 6 respondents were neutral and about 1 in 5 either disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Table 69. Academic department provides opportunities for professional development.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	44	27.0	27.0
Agree	54	33.1	60.1
Neutral	29	17.8	77.9
Disagree	23	14.1	92.0
Strongly Disagree	13	8.0	100.0
Total	163	100.0	

Over 6 in 10 respondents strongly agreed or agreed that their academic departments did a good job of helping them understand program requirements, expectations, and procedures during the first year of graduate study (Table 70). About 1 in 6 were neutral, while nearly 1 in 5 disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Table 70. During first year, academic department helped to understand program requirements.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	46	25.4	25.6	25.6
Agree	72	39.8	40.0	65.6
Neutral	28	15.5	15.6	81.1
Disagree	24	13.3	13.3	94.4
Strongly Disagree	9	5.0	5.0	99.4
Not Applicable	1	.6	.6	100.0
Subtotal	180	99.4	100.0	
Missing	1	.6		
Total	181	100.0		

Over 7 in 10 respondents strongly agreed or agreed that satisfactory communication existed in their academic departments between faculty and graduate students (Table 71). About 1 in 7 were neutral on this item, while over 1 in 10 disagreed or strongly disagreed. More Science respondents than expected were neutral or stated the item was not applicable to them.

Table 71. Satisfactory communication exists between faculty and graduate students in academic department.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	58	32.0	32.2	32.2
Agree	73	40.3	40.6	72.8
Neutral	25	13.8	13.9	86.7
Disagree	19	10.5	10.6	97.2
Strongly Disagree	4	2.2	2.2	99.4
Not Applicable	1	.6	.6	100.0
Subtotal	180	99.4	100.0	
Missing	1	.6		
Total	181	100.0		

Two of three respondents strongly agreed or agreed that their academic departments provided satisfactory advising and program counseling to them (Table 72). One in five were neutral and 1 in 10 disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Table 72. Academic department provides satisfactory advising/program counseling.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	44	24.3	24.7	24.7
Agree	75	41.4	42.1	66.9
Neutral	36	19.9	20.2	87.1
Disagree	12	6.6	6.7	93.8
Strongly Disagree	8	4.4	4.5	98.3
Not Applicable	3	1.7	1.7	100.0
Subtotal	178	98.3	100.0	
Missing	3	1.7		
Total	181	100.0		

Fifteen respondents indicated this item was not applicable to them. These cases were removed before agreements were computed. Of the remaining respondents almost 8 in 10 strongly agreed or agreed that their advisors/major professors could be relied on to review and provide constructive criticism of their work (Table 73). Nearly 1 in 6 were neutral. More Business respondents than expected indicated they were neutral or the item was not applicable to them.

Table 73. Advisor/Major professor provides constructive criticism of work.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	82	49.4	49.4
Agree	49	29.6	79.0
Neutral	24	14.4	93.4
Disagree	6	3.6	97.0
Strongly Disagree	5	3.0	100.0
Total	166	100.0	

Twelve respondents indicated that mentorship by their major professor was not applicable to them. These cases were removed before agreement was computed. Of the remaining respondents well over 7 in 10 strongly agreed or agreed that their major professors were effective mentors who provided them with effective and supportive guidance in their academic pursuits and professional development (Table 74). About 1 in 7 were neutral. Fewer Business respondents agreed with this item and more Business respondents than expected were neutral or indicated the item was not applicable to them.

Table 74. Advisor/Major professor is an effective mentor.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	81	47.9	47.9
Agree	47	27.8	75.7
Neutral	24	14.2	89.9
Disagree	11	6.5	96.4
Strongly Disagree	6	3.6	100.0
Total	169	100.0	

Over 7 in 10 respondents strongly agreed or agreed that faculty members in their academic departments were interested in the welfare and professional development of graduate students (Table 75). About 1 in 6 were neutral while about 1 in 10 disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Table 75. Faculty in academic department are interested in welfare and professional development of students.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	61	33.7	34.1	34.1
Agree	67	37.0	37.4	71.5
Neutral	31	17.1	17.3	88.8
Disagree	15	8.3	8.4	97.2
Strongly Disagree	4	2.2	2.2	99.4
Not Applicable	1	.6	.6	100.0
Subtotal	179	98.9	100.0	
Missing	2	1.1		
Total	181	100.0		

Thirty-five respondents indicated that the support of their academic departments in their job searches was not applicable to them so their records were removed before agreement was computed. Of the remaining respondents only 50 percent agreed or strongly agreed that their academic departments were supportive in their search for professional employment (Table 76). This is relatively lower agreement than is seen in responses to other items in this section. Over 3 in 10 were neutral while nearly 1 in 5 respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Table 76. Academic department is supportive in search for professional employment.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	32	21.9	21.9
Agree	41	28.1	50.0
Neutral	46	31.5	81.5
Disagree	20	13.7	95.2
Strongly Disagree	7	4.8	100.0
Total	146	100.0	

Thirty-one respondents indicated that the availability of computer facilities was not applicable to them. Their records were removed before agreement was computed. Of the remaining respondents well over 6 in 10 strongly agreed or agreed that they were satisfied with the computer facilities available to graduate students (Table 77). Nearly 1 in 5 were neutral while about 1 in 6 disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Table 77. Satisfaction with computer facilities available to graduate students.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	38	25.3	25.3
Agree	60	40.0	65.3
Neutral	28	18.7	84.0
Disagree	15	10.0	94.0
Strongly Disagree	9	6.0	100.0
Total	150	100.0	

Twenty-nine respondents indicated that library holdings in their fields was not applicable to them. Of the remaining respondents a bare majority (50.7%) strongly agreed or agreed that they were satisfied with the university library holdings in their fields (Table 78). This amount of agreement is relatively lower than agreement with most other items in this section. Nearly 3 in 10 respondents were neutral while about 1 in 5 disagreed or strongly disagreed. More Science respondents than expected disagreed with this statement.

Table 78. Satisfaction with university library holdings in student's field.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	29	19.1	19.1
Agree	48	31.6	50.7
Neutral	42	27.6	78.3
Disagree	22	14.4	92.7
Strongly Disagree	11	7.3	100.0
Total	152	100.0	

Sixty-five respondents (35.9%) indicated that thesis/dissertation guidelines were not applicable to them. Their records were removed before agreement was computed. Less than half of the remaining respondents (44.8%) strongly agreed or agreed that they were satisfied with the thesis/dissertation guidelines and procedures of the School of Graduate Studies (Table 79). This is the lowest agreement of any item in this section. Fully 3 in 10 respondents were neutral, while over 1 in 5 disagreed or strongly disagreed that they were satisfied with these guidelines and procedures. More Business and fewer Science respondents than expected indicated they were neutral or that this item did not apply to them. More Natural Resources and more Science respondents than expected disagreed with this statement.

Table 79. Satisfied with thesis/dissertation review guidelines/procedures of School of Graduate Studies.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	13	11.2	11.2
Agree	39	33.6	44.8
Neutral	37	31.9	76.7
Disagree	13	11.2	87.9
Strongly Disagree	14	12.1	100.0
Total	116	100.0	

Eleven respondents indicated that provision of information by the School of Graduate Studies was not applicable to them. Of the remaining respondents nearly 2 in 3 strongly agreed or agreed that the School of Graduate Studies provided them with the necessary information for filing candidacy and program of study forms and for meeting deadlines (Table 80). Nearly 1 in 5 were neutral, while about 1 in 6 disagreed or strongly disagreed. Fewer Education respondents than expected were neutral or indicated that the item was not applicable to them.

Table 80. School of Graduate Studies provides necessary information for filing candidacy and program of study forms and for meeting deadlines.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	27	15.9	15.9
Agree	83	48.9	64.8
Neutral	31	18.2	83.0
Disagree	19	11.1	94.1
Strongly Disagree	10	5.9	100.0
Total	170	100.0	

Many respondents (123/181) either indicated that the effectiveness of the TA workshop was not applicable to them or did not respond to this item. This is probably because so few of them took the workshop (see Table 31 above). Their responses were removed before agreement was computed. Of the remaining respondents (58), only 43.1 percent strongly agreed or agreed that the TA workshop sponsored by the School of Graduate Studies provided them the content needed to help them be effective as teaching assistants or course instructors. A plurality (44.8%) were neutral on this item. A bit more than 1 in 10 disagreed or strongly disagreed with it. More Science respondents than expected agreed with this item, but also more Science students than expected disagreed with it.

Table 81. TA workshop provides content needed to be effective TAs or course instructors.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	8	13.8	13.8
Agree	17	29.3	43.1
Neutral	26	44.8	87.9
Disagree	3	5.2	93.1
Strongly Disagree	4	6.9	100.0
Total	58	100.0	

Seventy-six respondents considered assistantship allocations in their academic departments to not be applicable to them. Of the remaining respondents 5 in 10 strongly agreed or agreed that assistantship allocations in their departments were fair and equitable (Table 82). Over 1 in 3 respondents was neutral while 1 in 8 disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Table 82. Allocations of assistantships in academic department are fair/equitable.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	16	15.2	15.2
Agree	38	36.2	51.4
Neutral	38	36.2	87.6
Disagree	5	4.8	92.4
Strongly Disagree	8	7.6	100.0
Total	105	100.0	

Sixty-one respondents, ostensibly those who did not receive assistantships, indicated that the level of assistantship funding in their departments was not applicable to them. These cases were removed before agreement was computed. Of the remaining respondents only 1 in 3 strongly agreed or agreed that assistantship funding in their academic departments was adequate to meet the needs of graduate students who received them (Table 83). Over 1 in 3 strongly disagreed or disagreed with this item.

Table 83. Level of assistantship funding in academic department is adequate for those who receive them.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	16	13.4	13.4
Agree	25	20.8	34.2
Neutral	34	28.3	62.5
Disagree	28	23.3	85.8
Strongly Disagree	17	14.2	100.0
Total	120	100.0	

Fifty-seven respondents indicated that accessing resources in their academic departments in support of their professional activities was not applicable to them. These cases were removed before agreement was computed. Of the remaining respondents only somewhat more than 4 in 10 strongly agreed or agreed (Table 84). Over 1 in 3 were neutral. More than 1 in 4 strongly disagreed or disagreed.

Table 84. Students can access resources in academic department to support professional activities.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	12	9.7	9.7
Agree	31	25.0	34.7
Neutral	46	37.1	71.8
Disagree	22	17.7	89.5
Strongly Disagree	13	10.5	100.0
Total	124	100.0	

Over 8 in 10 respondents (84.9%) strongly agreed or agreed that USU was a good choice for them for graduate study (Table 85). One in 10 was neutral.

Table 85. USU is a good choice for graduate study.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	81	44.8	45.3	45.3
Agree	71	39.2	39.7	84.9
Neutral	18	9.9	10.1	95.0
Disagree	8	4.4	4.5	99.4
Strongly Disagree	1	.6	.6	100.0
Subtotal	179	98.9	100.0	
Missing	2	1.1		
Total	181	100.0		

Three of four respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they would recommend their department and graduate programs to prospective graduate students (Table 86). However, 1 in 6 were neutral while 1 in 13 strongly disagreed or disagreed. More Natural Resources respondents than expected were neutral or indicated that this statement was not applicable to them. More Family Life respondents than expected disagreed with it.

Table 86. Respondent would recommend department/graduate program to prospective graduate students.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	74	40.9	41.8	41.8
Agree	59	32.6	33.3	75.1
Neutral	29	16.0	16.4	91.5
Disagree	9	5.0	5.1	96.6
Strongly Disagree	5	2.8	2.8	99.4
Not Applicable	1	.6	.6	100.0
Subtotal	177	97.8	100.0	
Missing	4	2.2		
Total	181	100.0		

APPENDIX A

A list of respondent comments in response to the item, "What do you think that USU should do better to meet the needs of graduate students?" (Note: Where respondent comment appeared to be destructive or personal department/unit/program names have been deleted. This was done to maintain student confidentiality.) 71 respondents had no comment. The remaining comments, one per individual, follow.

1. Additional financial resources.
2. Also include questions about specific college faculty, not just departmental staff. My greatest challenge was with the college politics, not my department. Data needs to be collected on the dean & associate deans support.
3. An excellent experience overall-I cannot think of any area in need of improvement. Kudos for an outstanding distance program in (dept omitted)!
4. As an international student, I hope we do not have an out-of-state tuition waiver cap once we have an assistantship.
5. Better communication to departments concerning degree requirements. Better communication concerning program theses, and change the thesis review protocols!!!
6. Better electrical equipment. Have intermediate advisors take personal relation course.
7. Better explain the thesis process (From start to finish)
8. Better library services support services and distance ed options
9. Better library, better financial aid for grad. students
10. Better sources of money for graduate students so they don't have to work off-campus throughout the year. This is the biggest single problem @ USU.
11. Better train staff as to USU policies and requirements. Provide more funding to engineering dept. Inform students of graduation and grading requirements.
12. Can't help you 'improve' at this time, because I loved my experience-And I don't say that lightly. The (dept omitted) was just wonderful!
13. Change the process to check thesis at Graduate School office. It took surprisingly long. Clearly determine what is required at the help of professors to reach that. Students should not be responsible for everything.
14. Computers on location are needed for some Distance Ed. classes.
15. Continue Distance education program and add more major studies for masters.
16. Continue helping international students to obtain clearance to attend USU & offering financial support.
17. Continue to expand the distance education and web based courses. Provide more on-line classes in the summer.
18. Counseling needs to be accurate and content specific with all options pertaining to a field of study explained.
19. Cut red tape, reduce cost to students, establish more interaction with industry. Adapt university conditions and opportunities for older students with families.
20. Departments should meet regularly w/ students to ensure that educational goals are being met in terms of course availability, program of study, career path, etc.
21. Education classes are outdated and have little application in the real world. Very few professors are "real teachers" & have little knowledge of teaching. Subject matter is ancient & non-applicable.
22. Eliminate graduate tuition- Follow the lead of the other top tier universities in this country.
23. Employ secretarial staff in every department who are kind and helpful. Everyone should learn a lesson in kindness from the (dept omitted) staff. Yea for them.
24. End your tenure system to improve the quality of all your teachers!
25. Engineers are forced to take courses which have no bearing on our desired field, the courses don't help us and they restrict us from taking applicable courses.

School of Graduate Studies
Student Survey - 2001
Page 41

26. For grad students thesis option: a detailed schedule of form deadlines, where to get forms, where to take forms/papers etc. It was very confusing.
27. Get more qualified people in the records office! My transcript was held up this winter because someone charged me almost double for a summer workshop.
28. Get rid of (person deleted). She doesn't know how to do her job. A PhD in (field deleted) in NO WAY qualifies her for the position she occupies in the (field deleted) office. She was the most awful person/part of my entire education at USU.
29. Have better coordination between the career placement center and the various departments with helping graduate students get together with potential employers and get job interviews.
30. Have classes in the (program deleted) be taught w/in our department. Get staff & dept. chair in the (dept deleted) who actually care about the graduate students!! The 3 yrs. I was in graduate school not one conference, lecture, party, or training was planned for graduate students
31. Have computers at off campus sites available for students to use.
32. Have new professors or more professors
33. I can't think of a thing. It is a great program.
34. I can only speak for the (department deleted)-overall it is not a teacher-friendly graduate program and the electronic out-reach was extremely limited.
35. I experienced several changes of graduate school deans. Requirements were changed by each one making my degree work last much longer than needed-Graduate school deans were rigid and inflexible.
36. I have nothing but praise for my department relevant to my experience at USU.
37. I never felt there was any concern or interest from the graduate office in my progress. I felt very isolated and the departmental feedback was often very negative. I needed more support and it would have been nice to have a graduate school advisor outside my department, who was concerned about my success. The departments have too much control & no check/balance system.
38. I really enjoyed the program and the professors were great!
39. I would like to have had the chance to apply for TA's.
40. Improve availability of classes...in my dept.(deleted), some classes were only offered in the 4-week summer sessions. I felt they were ineffective. Also, advertise grad. student senate more. It seemed that few students were aware of the organization.
41. Improve communication between the departmental & graduate school thesis reviewers so no conflicting information is given.
42. Improve the financial assistance and its availability for all international graduate students.
43. In this program, offer more TAs or ways for students to acquire teaching experience.
44. Intake conference with dept. chairman & new graduate students to outline the graduate program, processes, time lines, field questions, etc.
45. Interdepartmental recognition of credits should be more open and less restricted. A more helpful financial aid should be available to international students by its own department.
46. International study assignment as a class to complete MBA program.
47. It is difficult to do research projects so far from a library.
48. It is difficult to get feedback in the ed-net system.
49. It would be helpful if departments held orientations for new graduate students to meet faculty and discuss programs.
50. It would be helpful if major professors were more available, helpful and informed concerning requirements and options in the grad. programs.
51. It would have been great to have information on financial help. Quicker response to e-mails and quicker feedback on assignments.
52. Keep those in distance education courses more aware of when top firms will be interviewing. I never knew unless someone in my class perhaps found out. It would also be nice to be able to interview elsewhere.
53. Keep us informed about policy changes.
54. Library online for Distance students. (Journals, etc.) Better connections for employment opportunities, especially for distance students

School of Graduate Studies
Student Survey - 2001
Page 42

55. List of required paperwork & deadlines given at beginning of program
56. Look at the financial aid department and simplify the process of getting funding. As a non-citizen I went through a lot of hassle every year.
57. Make sure departments & grad school are aware & following the same regulations & guidelines. Sometimes there was disagreement about procedure, process etc.
58. Make sure that departments give complete and all-inclusive checklists of everything that needs done to be called "graduated". With dates of needing to be completed listed. My department needs help there!! Especially during the graduates(or undergraduates) last year and especially last semester.
59. Make sure the faculty are assisting the students of their education but not just using them for their own benefits or playing political games.
60. Make the transition from undergrad to grad flow smoothly so there are no problems for class registration.
61. Make tuition more reasonable (in other words, make them more affordable and not penalize intl. student with astronomical tuition).
62. Many professors are too hard to get a hold of and phone tag gets old.
63. Merrill Library needs to do a better job of checking in books-tired of finding large fines on account-they always find the books I turned in months earlier. Hire an illustration instructor in art dept!!
64. More comprehensive guidelines about research rotations, teaching, courses, how to solve conflicts constructively, & thesis/dissertation consistency. The (position deleted) FAR oversteps his bounds.
65. More computers, more internet access!
66. More courtesy among the graduate office staff when dealing with grad students in the (dept deleted); not my experience one of my classmates
67. More financial aid-Not in the form of loans (jobs, grants, TA's, etc.)
68. More info early on with time frame checklist.
69. More library resources - journals, texts, databases, etc.
70. More printouts allocated to graduate students.
71. More projects and more teamwork.
72. More relevant courses in field of study. Being able to understand the educational system that international students belong to & thereby helping them to adapt to the US educational system
73. More research funding so more students can focus on research instead of teaching and other work for finances.
74. More research journals in the libraries! Better parking & health insurance benefits for TAs/RAs
75. More scholarship opportunities.
76. My experience at USU was enhanced by an extraordinary mentor, (Name deleted). He smoothed over any potential problems. My biggest headache was working with other departments to get things done. More responsibility for graduates as a whole rather than looking out for students in a particular department would be appreciated
77. My major complaints are the libraries (getting better online) and the poor quality, relative to price, of the health insurance.
78. Need to more closely benchmark our program w/ peer group. I would also like to know what percent I graduated in (i.e. top 25%, etc.)
79. None
80. Nothing - I had a great experience!
81. Number of hours the library is open is too few, department is not current in teaching about new technologies, department should offer greater computer access to grad students, offer software thesis/dissertation format.
82. Obtain better advisors
83. Offer more funding for in-state students. Offer a wider range of classes.
84. Outline set requirements for the Plan B option.
85. Professors should be more available to off-site or distance education.

School of Graduate Studies
Student Survey - 2001
Page 43

86. Provide better service for distance students who also have to travel to the main campus for occasional classes. More internet and telephone services. A 1-800 toll free line so student can conduct business with the main campus w/o racking up huge phone bills
87. Provide clear information early on regarding ALL graduation requirements, deadlines, and fees.
88. Provide clear information on what paperwork needs to be received at what time.
89. Provide information that addresses graduate students and their opportunities. Provide financial assistance.
90. Provide more doctoral programs over EdNet.
91. Provide more real world application of the things the graduates are learning.
92. Required courses should be offered, so they don't overlap each other on times or days.
93. Revamp required courses and make them more applicable.
94. Send information on registration each semester during registration to off campus graduate students. (Email would be fine)
95. Set up a mentor program with a second/third year grad. student mentoring a first year grad student. It would be best to stay within their dept. and if possible with major professor.
96. Should have letter to remind students of their requirements.
97. Tell us how to get our diplomas after we move away.
98. The assist. director for the program (program name and person's name deleted) seemed to create more obstacles than she removed.
99. The chairs in the business building 1st floor in the computer rooms need to be replaced. Rooms 113 & 115.
100. The Com DE Department needs to give the graduate students information regarding course requirements.
101. The ECE dept. needs more profs. in a variety of subjects and more financial aid.
102. The graduate school's requirements for formatting of theses are ridiculous. More time is spent on formatting changes than is spent on committee members corrections. Where should our priorities lie? Maybe grad students should focus on technical aspects of research & people in the grad school should on formatting things like this survey. There is also a need for more workshops or classes for first year grad students to know what is expected of them.
103. The graduate school and (program deleted) were very unorganized regarding graduation requirements. Please, get organized! Also, graduate instructors absolutely deserve better pay and better health care options.
104. The (program name deleted) program needs professors or other professionals to act as mentors for their students. I felt like there was a significant gap between professors and students. Some really cared but many were rather indifferent.
105. The staff at the school of Grad Studies are cold and abrasive. They don't treat students like customers. Get customer oriented staff.
106. Try to discourage students who have already completed a bachelor's degree from staying at USU for a graduate program & try to admit more students from other universities to diversify the student population.
107. University coverage of graduate health insurance, adequate assistantship stipends to cover tuition & cost of living in Logan, greater visibility of GSS, graduate student orientation for student who start besides fall semester.
108. You did an awesome job; thank you!
109. You should make sure that the people in the extension office communicate better with the graduate school.