

Table of Contents

Table 1: Rating Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students: Overall and by School of Graduate Program

Table 2: Library, Place of Residence and Expected Employer from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students: Overall and by School of Graduate Program

Table 3.0: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students: Overall, in School of Natural Sciences, and by Graduate Program

Table 3.1: Overall, in School of Natural Sciences, and in Applied Mathematics

Table 3.2: Overall, in School of Natural Sciences, and in Chemistry and Chemical Biology

Table 3.3: Overall, in School of Natural Sciences, and in Physics

Table 3.4: Overall, in School of Natural Sciences, and in Quantitative and Systems Biology

Table 4.0: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students: Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and by Graduate Program

Table 4.1: Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and in Cognitive and Information Science

Table 4.2: Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and in Political Science

Table 4.3: Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and in Psychological Sciences

Table 4.4: Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and in IGP Social Sciences

Table 4.5: Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and in Interdisciplinary Humanities

Table 5.0: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students: Overall, in School of Engineering, and by Graduate Program

Table 5.1: Overall, in School of Engineering, and in IGP Biological Engineering and Small Scale Technologies

Table 5.2: Overall, in School of Engineering, and in IGP Electrical Engineering and Computer Science

Table 5.3: Overall, in School of Natural Sciences, and in Environmental Systems

Table 5.4: Overall, in School of Engineering, and in IGP Mechanical Engineering

Table 6: Response Rates for the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students

Table 1: Rating Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall and by School of Graduate Program

Category	Item	UCM	Std Dev	Mean SNS	Effect size* > 0.3 Compared to UCM mean				
					Effect size*	Mean SOE	Effect size*	Mean SSHA	Effect size*
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.5	0.52	3.4		3.6		3.5	
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.2	0.54	3.1		3.1		3.3	
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.3	0.46	3.2		3.3		3.3	
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Advice and Feedback Received	3.1	0.67	3.1		3.1		3.2	
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.9	0.57	2.9		3.0		3.0	
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.5	0.39	1.5		1.6		1.5	
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Quality of GTA Training	3.1	0.65	3.1		3.1		3.1	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	0.58	3.6		3.5		3.7	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.4	0.73	3.2		3.4		3.5	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	0.89	3.1		3.2		3.1	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.3	0.74	3.1		3.2		3.4	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Training in research methods	3.3	0.86	3.2		3.3		3.4	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Amount of financial support	3.3	0.78	3.2		3.5		3.4	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Teaching and TA preparation	3.3	0.79	3.3		3.4		3.2	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Availability of courses	2.7	0.92	2.6		2.4	NEG	3.0	POS
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.2	0.80	3.1		3.0		3.3	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Encouragement to take outside courses	2.5	0.98	2.3		2.6		2.7	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Overall quality of course work	3.0	0.80	2.9		2.9		3.2	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.3	0.87	3.3		3.3		3.4	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.5	0.81	3.4		3.6		3.6	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Helpfulness of staff members	3.4	0.79	3.6		3.4		3.3	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty help finding employment	3.1	0.91	3.0		3.2		3.2	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.2	0.78	3.2		3.1		3.3	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.4	0.74	3.3		3.4		3.4	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students treated with respect by faculty	3.5	0.62	3.4		3.5		3.4	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.6	0.55	3.5		3.6		3.7	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.4	0.67	3.3		3.5		3.4	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.6	0.58	3.5		3.6		3.6	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.6	0.88	2.6		2.5		2.7	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Financial support for graduate students	3.2	0.73	3.1		3.1		3.3	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.4	0.64	3.3		3.4		3.4	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Relationships with other students good	3.5	0.56	3.4		3.6		3.6	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Competition among students is excessive (Reversed)	2.9	0.78	3.0		2.7	NEG	3.0	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Staff knowledgeable	3.0	0.79	3.0		3.1		2.9	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Sense of intellectual community	3.2	0.71	3.0		3.2		3.3	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	2.9	0.82	2.8		2.8		3.0	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.1	0.77	3.2		3.0		3.2	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Receive feedback from advisor	3.3	0.80	3.3		3.3		3.4	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Satisfied with advisor time	3.3	0.80	3.2		3.4		3.4	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.5	0.59	3.4		3.5		3.7	POS
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor has interests in mind	3.4	0.73	3.4		3.4		3.5	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.2	0.83	3.1		3.2		3.3	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor keeps track of research progress	3.4	0.76	3.3		3.4		3.5	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall climate	3.4	0.67	3.4		3.5		3.4	
Advice and Feedback Received	Courses workshops on teaching	3.3	0.75	3.4		3.2		3.2	
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	3.1	0.84	3.2		3.2		3.0	
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on publishing your work	3.2	0.85	3.1		3.2		3.2	
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing professional contacts	2.8	0.96	2.8		2.9		2.9	
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options within academia	3.1	0.95	2.8		3.0		3.3	
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options outside academia	2.7	1.01	2.7		2.6		2.9	
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on degree requirements	3.2	0.86	3.3		3.0		3.3	

Table 1: Rating Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall and by School of Graduate Program

Category	Item	UCM	Std Dev	Mean SNS	Effect size* > 0.3 Compared to UCM mean				
					Effect size*	Mean SOE	Effect size*	Mean SSHA	Effect size*
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.1	0.88	3.0		2.9		3.3	
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	0.91	3.0		3.1		3.3	
Advice and Feedback Received	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.2	0.87	3.0		3.2		3.5	POS
Advice and Feedback Received	Feedback on your research	3.4	0.77	3.4		3.4		3.5	
Advice and Feedback Received	Standards for academic writing	3.3	0.87	3.1		3.4		3.5	
Advice and Feedback Received	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	0.72	3.3		3.3		3.5	
University Resources	Admissions processes	3.3	0.76	3.2		3.5		3.3	
University Resources	Fellowships/Awards	3.1	0.90	3.0		3.1		3.1	
University Resources	Appointments (GSR/TA)	3.3	0.84	3.4		3.4		3.3	
University Resources	Academic Services processes	3.2	0.76	3.3		3.3		3.2	
University Resources	Website Information	2.9	0.90	2.9		2.9		3.0	
University Resources	Professional Development Programming	3.2	0.86	3.1		3.2		3.3	
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	0.87	2.8		3.1		3.2	
University Resources	Student Health Center	3.2	0.84	3.1		3.2		3.2	
University Resources	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.1	0.92	2.9		3.1		3.4	
University Resources	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	3.0	0.88	2.9		3.0		3.0	
University Resources	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	0.98	2.9		3.1		3.2	
University Resources	Disability Services	3.0	0.99	3.3	POS	3.1		2.5	NEG
University Resources	On-campus Child Care	3.5	0.66	3.4		3.6		3.6	
University Resources	University Police	3.1	0.91	3.0		3.2		3.0	
University Resources	Parking for students	1.8	0.98	1.8		1.9		1.7	
University Resources	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.6	1.00	2.7		2.7		2.5	
University Resources	Dining Services	2.4	0.99	2.4		2.4		2.5	
University Resources	Bookstore	2.8	0.83	2.9		2.6		2.9	
University Resources	Center for Research on Teaching Excellence (CRTE)	3.3	0.80	3.2		3.4		3.2	
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.7	0.69	1.7		1.7		1.8	
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Family obligations	1.7	0.72	1.7		1.5		1.8	
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Availability of faculty	1.4	0.62	1.4		1.5		1.4	
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.4	0.62	1.5		1.5		1.4	
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	0.72	1.6		1.7		1.5	
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Course scheduling	1.5	0.63	1.5		1.5		1.4	
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	0.62	1.2		1.6	NEG	1.2	
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.8	0.49	3.7		3.9		3.9	
Global Satisfaction	Would select this university	3.2	0.82	3.0		3.3		3.2	
Global Satisfaction	Would select same field	3.6	0.65	3.6		3.5		3.6	
Global Satisfaction	Would recommend this university	3.3	0.81	3.1		3.5		3.4	
Global Satisfaction	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.1	0.82	3.1		3.2		3.0	
Quality of GTA Training	TA Appropriately supervised	2.9	0.87	2.9		3.0		2.9	
Quality of GTA Training	Time expected of TA was right	3.1	0.77	2.9		3.1		3.4	POS
Quality of GTA Training	Prepared for LAB	3.3	0.74	3.3		3.2		3.3	

Effect size expresses the difference between group means in terms of standard deviations (UCM standard deviations here). It is a measure of the strength, magnitude, or importance of the difference as opposed to statistical significance. Unless stated otherwise, the response scales were four points with positive being high (e.g., Very Satisfied [4], Satisfied [3], Dissatisfied [2], Very Dissatisfied [1]; Strongly Agree [4], Agree [3], Disagree [2], Strongly Disagree [1])

Table 2: Library, Place of Residence and Expected Employer from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students: Overall and by School of Graduate Program

	UCM		SNS		SOE		SSHA	
	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Attended a library-sponsored workshop during 2014-15 (Q31)	37		18		7		12	
Have used information from the library sponsored	29	78%	12	67%	6	86%	11	92%
	UCM		SNS		SOE		SSHA	
While attending UC Merced, lived in:								
Merced	150	82%	77	86%	28	93%	45	70%
Excellent or Very Good Place to live	44	29%	20	26%	14	50%	10	22%
Good Place to live	46	31%	22	29%	10	36%	14	31%
Fair or Poor place to live	60	40%	35	45%	4	14%	21	47%
Atwater, Chowchilla, Turlock, Modesto	8		3		0		5	
Bay Area	6		3		1		2	
Other (e.g., Fresno, Stockton)	20		7		1		12	
Type of expected employer:								
Four-year college or university	85	46%	31	34%	11	35%	43	69%
Industry or business	41	22%	24	26%	12	39%	5	26%
National laboratory	14	8%	11	12%	2	6%	1	2%
Community or junior college	6	3%	2	2%	1	3%	3	5%
U.S. (federal government or your home country if not U.S.)	5	3%	4	4%	1	3%	0	0%
Other	10	5%	6	7%	1	3%	3	5%
Unknown	23	13%	13	14%	3	10%	7	11%

Table 3.0: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Natural Sciences, and by Graduate Program

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SNS Mean	Applied Mathematics		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		Physics		Quantitative & Systems Biology	
				Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.5	3.4	3.5	12	3.5	10	3.3	18	3.3	31
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.2	3.1	3.4	13	3.1	10	3.1	20	2.9	34
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.3	3.2	3.5	13	3.2	10	3.3	20	3.1	34
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Advice and Feedback Received	3.1	3.1	3.3	13	3.0	10	3.2	18	3.0	32
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.9	2.9	2.9	13	3.0	10	2.8	18	2.8	32
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.5	1.5	1.4	12	1.4	10	1.7	18	1.5	31
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Quality of GTA Training	3.1	3.1	3.3	12	3.1	10	3.1	18	3.0	31
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.6	4.0	13	3.4	10	3.7	20	3.5	34
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.4	3.2	3.5	13	3.0	10	3.3	20	3.1	33
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.1	3.5	12	3.1	10	3.1	20	2.9	34
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.3	3.1	3.6	13	3.1	10	2.9	19	3.1	33
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Training in research methods	3.3	3.2	3.1	12	3.3	10	3.4	19	3.0	33
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Amount of financial support	3.3	3.2	3.5	12	3.1	10	3.2	20	3.2	34
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Teaching and TA preparation	3.3	3.3	3.8	11	3.4	10	3.3	20	3.1	34
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Availability of courses	3.3	3.3	2.9	13	2.9	10	2.8	19	2.3	32
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.5	3.4	3.6	13	3.2	10	2.9	19	2.9	32
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Encouragement to take outside courses	3.4	3.6	2.7	13	2.8	10	2.5	19	1.9	32
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Overall quality of course work	3.1	3.0	3.4	13	3.3	10	2.7	19	2.8	32
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.2	3.7	12	3.4	10	3.5	19	2.9	34
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.4	3.3	3.8	13	3.4	10	3.8	20	3.1	34
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Helpfulness of staff members	3.5	3.4	3.8	13	3.4	10	3.7	20	3.6	34
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty help finding employment	3.6	3.5	3.6	5	2.9	7	3.0	8	2.9	18
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.4	3.3	3.3	11	3.1	10	3.4	18	3.0	31
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.6	3.5	3.8	13	3.2	10	3.4	20	3.1	34
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students treated with respect by faculty	2.6	2.6	3.6	13	3.5	10	3.4	19	3.4	33
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.2	3.1	3.8	13	3.5	10	3.4	19	3.4	33
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.4	3.3	3.6	13	3.5	10	3.3	19	3.2	33
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.4	3.7	13	3.5	10	3.6	19	3.4	33
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.9	3.0	3.2	13	2.4	10	2.6	19	2.4	33
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.0	3.5	13	2.8	10	3.1	19	3.0	33
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.0	3.4	13	3.4	10	3.3	19	3.2	32
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Relationships with other students good	2.9	2.8	3.5	13	3.5	10	3.5	19	3.3	33
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Competition among students is excessive (Reversed)	3.1	3.2	3.2	13	2.8	10	3.0	19	3.1	33
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Staff knowledgeable	3.3	3.3	3.2	13	3.1	10	3.3	19	2.8	33
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Sense of intellectual community	3.3	3.2	3.5	13	3.2	10	3.1	19	2.8	33
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	3.5	3.4	3.2	13	3.0	10	2.9	19	2.6	33
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.4	3.4	3.4	13	3.1	10	3.2	19	3.1	33
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Receive feedback from advisor	3.2	3.1	3.5	13	3.3	10	3.4	19	3.1	33
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Satisfied with advisor time	3.4	3.3	3.6	13	3.2	10	3.3	19	3.0	33
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.4	3.4	3.4	13	3.4	10	3.3	19	3.4	33
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor has interests in mind	2.7	2.6	3.5	13	3.4	10	3.5	19	3.2	33
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.2	3.1	3.2	13	2.9	10	3.1	19	3.2	33
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor keeps track of research progress	2.5	2.3	3.4	13	3.3	10	3.4	19	3.2	33
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall climate	3.0	2.9	3.6	13	3.4	10	3.3	19	3.3	33
Advice and Feedback Received	Courses workshops on teaching	3.3	3.4	3.5	13	3.3	10	3.5	17	3.3	32
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	3.1	3.2	3.0	8	2.9	10	3.2	13	3.3	30
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on publishing your work	3.2	3.1	3.1	9	3.1	10	3.4	14	3.0	28
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.8	2.9	10	2.7	9	3.1	16	2.6	30
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options within academia	3.1	2.8	3.1	10	2.7	10	3.2	13	2.7	26
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options outside academia	2.7	2.7	3.1	10	2.6	9	2.8	16	2.4	26
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on degree requirements	3.2	3.3	3.7	13	3.2	10	3.4	18	3.0	32
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.1	3.0	3.1	13	3.1	10	3.2	16	2.8	28
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.0	3.3	10	3.0	9	3.1	14	2.8	28
Advice and Feedback Received	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.2	3.0	3.3	11	3.1	9	3.2	16	2.7	24
Advice and Feedback Received	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.4	3.8	11	3.1	10	3.4	17	3.2	30
Advice and Feedback Received	Standards for academic writing	3.3	3.1	3.4	10	2.9	10	3.3	16	2.9	29

Table 3.0: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Natural Sciences, and by Graduate Program

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SNS Mean	Applied Mathematics		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		Physics		Quantitative & Systems Biology	
				Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency
Advice and Feedback Received	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.3	3.5	13	3.2	10	3.4	14	3.2	29
University Resources	Admissions processes	3.3	3.2	3.2	9	3.4	9	3.2	14	3.0	21
University Resources	Fellowships/Awards	3.1	3.0	3.2	10	3.3	10	2.8	17	2.9	30
University Resources	Appointments (GSR/TA)	3.3	3.4	3.5	13	3.5	10	3.4	18	3.3	31
University Resources	Academic Services processes	3.2	3.3	3.2	9	3.3	7	3.5	11	3.2	24
University Resources	Website Information	2.9	2.9	3.2	12	3.2	9	3.0	16	2.6	31
University Resources	Professional Development Programming	3.2	3.1	3.0	9	3.1	9	3.4	11	2.9	25
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	2.8	2.9	10	3.0	9	2.7	11	2.6	19
University Resources	Student Health Center	3.2	3.1	3.4	8	3.1	7	3.1	15	3.1	24
University Resources	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.1	2.9	3.4	10	3.0	9	2.8	16	2.7	28
University Resources	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	3.0	2.9	2.5	4	3.3	7	3.1	9	2.8	18
University Resources	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	2.9	3.0	1	3.0	6	3.0	5	2.8	12
University Resources	Disability Services	3.0	3.3	0.0	0	3.5	4	3.3	4	3.2	5
University Resources	On-campus Child Care	3.5	3.4	0.0	0	3.3	3	3.4	5	3.4	7
University Resources	University Police	3.1	3.0	2.5	2	3.1	7	3.2	6	3.0	12
University Resources	Parking for students	1.8	1.8	1.6	10	1.6	9	1.5	18	2.1	30
University Resources	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.6	2.7	2.4	12	3.2	9	2.7	13	2.6	21
University Resources	Dining Services	2.4	2.4	2.2	11	2.8	10	2.1	16	2.4	27
University Resources	Bookstore	2.8	2.9	2.7	11	2.8	10	2.6	12	3.1	21
University Resources	Center for Research on Teaching Excellence (CRTE)	3.3	3.2	3.4	8	3.4	9	3.1	11	3.1	18
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.7	1.7	1.5	12	1.5	10	1.9	18	1.8	31
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Family obligations	1.7	1.7	1.7	12	1.4	10	1.7	18	1.8	31
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Availability of faculty	1.4	1.4	1.2	12	1.2	10	1.6	18	1.5	31
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.4	1.5	1.3	12	1.6	10	1.6	18	1.4	31
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.6	1.8	12	1.3	10	1.8	18	1.5	31
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Course scheduling	1.5	1.5	1.3	12	1.3	10	1.6	18	1.5	31
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.2	1.2	12	1.4	10	1.5	18	1.0	31
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.8	3.7	3.8	12	3.7	10	3.6	16	3.7	31
Global Satisfaction	Would select this university	3.2	3.0	3.3	12	3.3	10	2.9	18	2.9	31
Global Satisfaction	Would select same field	3.6	3.6	3.8	12	3.6	10	3.7	18	3.5	31
Global Satisfaction	Would recommend this university	3.3	3.1	3.3	12	3.4	10	2.9	18	3.1	31
Global Satisfaction	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.1	3.1	3.3	12	3.1	9	3.3	18	3.0	30
Quality of GTA Training	TA Appropriately supervised	2.9	2.9	3.1	11	2.7	10	3.2	17	2.8	29
Quality of GTA Training	Time expected of TA was right	3.1	2.9	3.4	12	3.2	10	2.6	17	2.8	31
Quality of GTA Training	Prepared for LAB	3.3	3.3	0.0	0	3.3	10	3.4	17	3.2	25

Effect size expresses the difference between group means in terms of standard deviations (UCM standard deviations here). It is a measure of the strength, magnitude, or importance of the difference as opposed to statistical significance.

Unless stated otherwise, the response scales were four points with positive being high (e.g., Very Satisfied [4], Satisfied [3], Dissatisfied [2], Very Dissatisfied [1]; Strongly Agree [4], Agree [3], Disagree [2], Strongly Disagree [1])

Table 3.1: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Natural Sciences, and in Applied Mathematics

Category	Item	UCM	SNS	Applied Mathematics		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
		Mean	Mean	Mean	Frequency	UCM	SNS	< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.5	3.4	3.5	12			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.2	3.1	3.4	13		POS	
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.3	3.2	3.5	13		POS	
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Advice and Feedback Received	3.1	3.1	3.3	13			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.9	2.9	2.9	13			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.5	1.5	1.4	12			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Quality of GTA Training	3.1	3.1	3.3	12			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.6	4.0	13	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.4	3.2	3.5	13			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.1	3.5	12			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.3	3.1	3.6	13		POS	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Training in research methods	3.3	3.2	3.1	12			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Amount of financial support	3.3	3.2	3.5	12			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Teaching and TA preparation	3.3	3.3	3.8	11	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Availability of courses	3.3	3.3	2.9	13			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.5	3.4	3.6	13			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Encouragement to take outside courses	3.4	3.6	2.7	13	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Overall quality of course work	3.1	3.0	3.4	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.2	3.7	12	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.4	3.3	3.8	13	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Helpfulness of staff members	3.5	3.4	3.8	13	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty help finding employment	3.6	3.5	3.6	5			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.4	3.3	3.3	11			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.6	3.5	3.8	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students treated with respect by faculty	2.6	2.6	3.6	13	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.2	3.1	3.8	13	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.4	3.3	3.6	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.4	3.7	13		POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.9	3.0	3.2	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.0	3.5	13	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.0	3.4	13		POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Relationships with other students good	2.9	2.8	3.5	13	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Competition among students is excessive (Reversed)	3.1	3.2	3.2	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Staff knowledgeable	3.3	3.3	3.2	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Sense of intellectual community	3.3	3.2	3.5	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	3.5	3.4	3.2	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.4	3.4	3.4	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Receive feedback from advisor	3.2	3.1	3.5	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Satisfied with advisor time	3.4	3.3	3.6	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.4	3.4	3.4	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor has interests in mind	2.7	2.6	3.5	13	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.2	3.1	3.2	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor keeps track of research progress	2.5	2.3	3.4	13	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall climate	3.0	2.9	3.6	13	POS	POS	
Advice and Feedback Received	Courses workshops on teaching	3.3	3.4	3.5	13			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	3.1	3.2	3.0	8			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on publishing your work	3.2	3.1	3.1	9			< 10 cases

Table 3.1: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Natural Sciences, and in Applied Mathematics

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SNS Mean	Applied Mathematics		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SNS	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.8	2.9	10			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options within academia	3.1	2.8	3.1	10			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options outside academia	2.7	2.7	3.1	10			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on degree requirements	3.2	3.3	3.7	13	POS	POS	
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.1	3.0	3.1	13			
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.0	3.3	10			
Advice and Feedback Received	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.2	3.0	3.3	11			
Advice and Feedback Received	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.4	3.8	11		POS	
Advice and Feedback Received	Standards for academic writing	3.3	3.1	3.4	10			
Advice and Feedback Received	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.3	3.5	13			
University Resources	Admissions processes	3.3	3.2	3.2	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Fellowships/Awards	3.1	3.0	3.2	10			
University Resources	Appointments (GSR/TA)	3.3	3.4	3.5	13			
University Resources	Academic Services processes	3.2	3.3	3.2	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Website Information	2.9	2.9	3.2	12			
University Resources	Professional Development Programming	3.2	3.1	3.0	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	2.8	2.9	10			
University Resources	Student Health Center	3.2	3.1	3.4	8			< 10 cases
University Resources	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.1	2.9	3.4	10		POS	
University Resources	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	3.0	2.9	2.5	4	NEG		< 10 cases
University Resources	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	2.9	3.0	1			< 10 cases
University Resources	Disability Services	3.0	3.3			NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
University Resources	On-campus Child Care	3.5	3.4			NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
University Resources	University Police	3.1	3.0	2.5	2	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
University Resources	Parking for students	1.8	1.8	1.6	10			
University Resources	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.6	2.7	2.4	12			
University Resources	Dining Services	2.4	2.4	2.2	11			
University Resources	Bookstore	2.8	2.9	2.7	11			
University Resources	Center for Research on Teaching Excellence (CRTE)	3.3	3.2	3.4	8			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.7	1.7	1.5	12			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Family obligations	1.7	1.7	1.7	12			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Availability of faculty	1.4	1.4	1.2	12			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.4	1.5	1.3	12			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.6	1.8	12			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Course scheduling	1.5	1.5	1.3	12			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.2	1.2	12			
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.8	3.7	3.8	12			
Global Satisfaction	Would select this university	3.2	3.0	3.3	12			
Global Satisfaction	Would select same field	3.6	3.6	3.8	12			
Global Satisfaction	Would recommend this university	3.3	3.1	3.3	12			
Global Satisfaction	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.1	3.1	3.3	12			
Quality of GTA Training	TA Appropriately supervised	2.9	2.9	3.1	11			
Quality of GTA Training	Time expected of TA was right	3.1	2.9	3.4	12		POS	
Quality of GTA Training	Prepared for LAB	3.3	3.3			NEG	NEG	< 10 cases

Effect size expresses the difference between group means in terms of standard deviations (UCM standard deviations here). It is a measure of the strength, magnitude, or importance of the difference as opposed to statistical significance. Unless stated otherwise, the response scales were four points with positive being high (e.g., Very Satisfied [4], Satisfied [3], Dissatisfied [2], Very Dissatisfied [1]; Strongly Agree [4], Agree [3], Disagree [2], Strongly Disagree [1])

Table 3.2: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Natural Sciences, and in Chemistry and Chemical Biology

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SNS Mean	Chemistry and Chemical Biology		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SNS	< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.5	3.4	3.5	10			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.2	3.1	3.1	10			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.3	3.2	3.2	10			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Advice and Feedback Received	3.1	3.1	3.0	10			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.9	2.9	3.0	10			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.5	1.5	1.4	10			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Quality of GTA Training	3.1	3.1	3.1	10			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.6	3.4	10			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.4	3.2	3.0	10			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.1	3.1	10			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.3	3.1	3.1	10			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Training in research methods	3.3	3.2	3.3	10			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Amount of financial support	3.3	3.2	3.1	10			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Teaching and TA preparation	3.3	3.3	3.4	10			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Availability of courses	3.3	3.3	2.9	10			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.5	3.4	3.2	10			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Encouragement to take outside courses	3.4	3.6	2.8	10	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Overall quality of course work	3.1	3.0	3.3	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.2	3.4	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.4	3.3	3.4	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Helpfulness of staff members	3.5	3.4	3.4	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty help finding employment	3.6	3.5	2.9	7	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.4	3.3	3.1	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.6	3.5	3.2	10	NEG		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students treated with respect by faculty	2.6	2.6	3.5	10	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.2	3.1	3.5	10	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.4	3.3	3.5	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.4	3.5	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.9	3.0	2.4	10	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.0	2.8	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.0	3.4	10		POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Relationships with other students good	2.9	2.8	3.5	10	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Competition among students is excessive (Reversed)	3.1	3.2	2.8	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Staff knowledgeable	3.3	3.3	3.1	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Sense of intellectual community	3.3	3.2	3.2	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	3.5	3.4	3.0	10	NEG		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.4	3.4	3.1	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Receive feedback from advisor	3.2	3.1	3.3	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Satisfied with advisor time	3.4	3.3	3.2	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.4	3.4	3.4	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor has interests in mind	2.7	2.6	3.4	10	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.2	3.1	2.9	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor keeps track of research progress	2.5	2.3	3.3	10	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall climate	3.0	2.9	3.4	10	POS	POS	
Advice and Feedback Received	Courses workshops on teaching	3.3	3.4	3.3	10			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	3.1	3.2	2.9	10			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on publishing your work	3.2	3.1	3.1	10			

Table 3.2: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Natural Sciences, and in Chemistry and Chemical Biology

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SNS Mean	Chemistry and Chemical Biology		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SNS	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.8	2.7	9			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options within academia	3.1	2.8	2.7	10			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options outside academia	2.7	2.7	2.6	9			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on degree requirements	3.2	3.3	3.2	10			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.1	3.0	3.1	10			
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.0	3.0	9			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.2	3.0	3.1	9			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.4	3.1	10			
Advice and Feedback Received	Standards for academic writing	3.3	3.1	2.9	10			
Advice and Feedback Received	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.3	3.2	10			
University Resources	Admissions processes	3.3	3.2	3.4	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Fellowships/Awards	3.1	3.0	3.3	10			
University Resources	Appointments (GSR/TA)	3.3	3.4	3.5	10			
University Resources	Academic Services processes	3.2	3.3	3.3	7			< 10 cases
University Resources	Website Information	2.9	2.9	3.2	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Professional Development Programming	3.2	3.1	3.1	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	2.8	3.0	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Student Health Center	3.2	3.1	3.1	7			< 10 cases
University Resources	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.1	2.9	3.0	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	3.0	2.9	3.3	7			< 10 cases
University Resources	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	2.9	3.0	6			< 10 cases
University Resources	Disability Services	3.0	3.3	3.5	4	POS		< 10 cases
University Resources	On-campus Child Care	3.5	3.4	3.3	3			< 10 cases
University Resources	University Police	3.1	3.0	3.1	7			< 10 cases
University Resources	Parking for students	1.8	1.8	1.6	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.6	2.7	3.2	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
University Resources	Dining Services	2.4	2.4	2.8	10			
University Resources	Bookstore	2.8	2.9	2.8	10			
University Resources	Center for Research on Teaching Excellence (CRTE)	3.3	3.2	3.4	9			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.7	1.7	1.5	10			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Family obligations	1.7	1.7	1.4	10			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Availability of faculty	1.4	1.4	1.2	10			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.4	1.5	1.6	10			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.6	1.3	10			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Course scheduling	1.5	1.5	1.3	10			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.2	1.4	10			
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.8	3.7	3.7	10			
Global Satisfaction	Would select this university	3.2	3.0	3.3	10			
Global Satisfaction	Would select same field	3.6	3.6	3.6	10			
Global Satisfaction	Would recommend this university	3.3	3.1	3.4	10			
Global Satisfaction	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.1	3.1	3.1	9			< 10 cases
Quality of GTA Training	TA Appropriately supervised	2.9	2.9	2.7	10			
Quality of GTA Training	Time expected of TA was right	3.1	2.9	3.2	10			
Quality of GTA Training	Prepared for LAB	3.3	3.3	3.3	10			

Effect size expresses the difference between group means in terms of standard deviations (UCM standard deviations here). It is a measure of the strength, magnitude, or importance of the difference as opposed to statistical significance. Unless stated otherwise, the response scales were four points with positive being high (e.g., Very Satisfied [4], Satisfied [3], Dissatisfied [2], Very Dissatisfied [1]; Strongly Agree [4], Agree [3], Disagree [2], Strongly Disagree [1])

Table 3.3: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Natural Sciences, and in Physics

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SNS Mean	Physics		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SNS	< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.5	3.4	3.3	18			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.2	3.1	3.1	20			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.3	3.2	3.3	20			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Advice and Feedback Received	3.1	3.1	3.2	18			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.9	2.9	2.8	18			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.5	1.5	1.7	18			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Quality of GTA Training	3.1	3.1	3.1	18			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.6	3.7	20			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.4	3.2	3.3	20			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.1	3.1	20			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.3	3.1	2.9	19			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Training in research methods	3.3	3.2	3.4	19			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Amount of financial support	3.3	3.2	3.2	20			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Teaching and TA preparation	3.3	3.3	3.3	20			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Availability of courses	3.3	3.3	2.8	19	NEG		
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.5	3.4	2.9	19	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Encouragement to take outside courses	3.4	3.6	2.5	19	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Overall quality of course work	3.1	3.0	2.7	19			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.2	3.5	19			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.4	3.3	3.8	20		POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Helpfulness of staff members	3.5	3.4	3.7	20			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty help finding employment	3.6	3.5	3.0	8	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.4	3.3	3.4	18			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.6	3.5	3.4	20			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students treated with respect by faculty	2.6	2.6	3.4	19	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.2	3.1	3.4	19		POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.4	3.3	3.3	19			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.4	3.6	19			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.9	3.0	2.6	19		NEG	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.0	3.1	19			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.0	3.3	19			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Relationships with other students good	2.9	2.8	3.5	19	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Competition among students is excessive (Reversed)	3.1	3.2	3.0	19			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Staff knowledgeable	3.3	3.3	3.3	19			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Sense of intellectual community	3.3	3.2	3.1	19			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	3.5	3.4	2.9	19	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.4	3.4	3.2	19			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Receive feedback from advisor	3.2	3.1	3.4	19			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Satisfied with advisor time	3.4	3.3	3.3	19			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.4	3.4	3.3	19			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor has interests in mind	2.7	2.6	3.5	19	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.2	3.1	3.1	19			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor keeps track of research progress	2.5	2.3	3.4	19	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall climate	3.0	2.9	3.3	19			
Advice and Feedback Received	Courses workshops on teaching	3.3	3.4	3.5	17			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	3.1	3.2	3.2	13			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on publishing your work	3.2	3.1	3.4	14			

Table 3.3: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Natural Sciences, and in Physics

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SNS Mean	Physics		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SNS	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.8	3.1	16			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options within academia	3.1	2.8	3.2	13			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options outside academia	2.7	2.7	2.8	16			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on degree requirements	3.2	3.3	3.4	18			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.1	3.0	3.2	16			
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.0	3.1	14			
Advice and Feedback Received	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.2	3.0	3.2	16			
Advice and Feedback Received	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.4	3.4	17			
Advice and Feedback Received	Standards for academic writing	3.3	3.1	3.3	16			
Advice and Feedback Received	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.3	3.4	14			
University Resources	Admissions processes	3.3	3.2	3.2	14			
University Resources	Fellowships/Awards	3.1	3.0	2.8	17			
University Resources	Appointments (GSR/TA)	3.3	3.4	3.4	18			
University Resources	Academic Services processes	3.2	3.3	3.5	11			
University Resources	Website Information	2.9	2.9	3.0	16			
University Resources	Professional Development Programming	3.2	3.1	3.4	11			
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	2.8	2.7	11			
University Resources	Student Health Center	3.2	3.1	3.1	15			
University Resources	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.1	2.9	2.8	16			
University Resources	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	3.0	2.9	3.1	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	2.9	3.0	5			< 10 cases
University Resources	Disability Services	3.0	3.3	3.3	4			< 10 cases
University Resources	On-campus Child Care	3.5	3.4	3.4	5			< 10 cases
University Resources	University Police	3.1	3.0	3.2	6			< 10 cases
University Resources	Parking for students	1.8	1.8	1.5	18			
University Resources	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.6	2.7	2.7	13			
University Resources	Dining Services	2.4	2.4	2.1	16			
University Resources	Bookstore	2.8	2.9	2.6	12			
University Resources	Center for Research on Teaching Excellence (CRTE)	3.3	3.2	3.1	11			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.7	1.7	1.9	18			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Family obligations	1.7	1.7	1.7	18			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Availability of faculty	1.4	1.4	1.6	18			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.4	1.5	1.6	18			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.6	1.8	18			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Course scheduling	1.5	1.5	1.6	18			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.2	1.5	18			
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.8	3.7	3.6	16			
Global Satisfaction	Would select this university	3.2	3.0	2.9	18			
Global Satisfaction	Would select same field	3.6	3.6	3.7	18			
Global Satisfaction	Would recommend this university	3.3	3.1	2.9	18	NEG		
Global Satisfaction	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.1	3.1	3.3	18			
Quality of GTA Training	TA Appropriately supervised	2.9	2.9	3.2	17			
Quality of GTA Training	Time expected of TA was right	3.1	2.9	2.6	17	NEG		
Quality of GTA Training	Prepared for LAB	3.3	3.3	3.4	17			

Effect size expresses the difference between group means in terms of standard deviations (UCM standard deviations here). It is a measure of the strength, magnitude, or importance of the difference as opposed to statistical significance. Unless stated otherwise, the response scales were four points with positive being high (e.g., Very Satisfied [4], Satisfied [3], Dissatisfied [2], Very Dissatisfied [1]; Strongly Agree [4], Agree [3], Disagree [2], Strongly Disagree [1])

Table 3.4: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Natural Sciences, and in Quantitative and Systems Biology

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SNS Mean	Quantitative & Systems Biology		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SNS	< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.5	3.4	3.3	31			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.2	3.1	2.9	34			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.3	3.2	3.1	34			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Advice and Feedback Received	3.1	3.1	3.0	32			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.9	2.9	2.8	32			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.5	1.5	1.5	31			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Quality of GTA Training	3.1	3.1	3.0	31			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.6	3.5	34			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.4	3.2	3.1	33			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.1	2.9	34			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.3	3.1	3.1	33			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Training in research methods	3.3	3.2	3.0	33			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Amount of financial support	3.3	3.2	3.2	34			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Teaching and TA preparation	3.3	3.3	3.1	34			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Availability of courses	3.3	3.3	2.3	32	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.5	3.4	2.9	32	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Encouragement to take outside courses	3.4	3.6	1.9	32	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Overall quality of course work	3.1	3.0	2.8	32			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.2	2.9	34			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.4	3.3	3.1	34			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Helpfulness of staff members	3.5	3.4	3.6	34			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty help finding employment	3.6	3.5	2.9	18	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.4	3.3	3.0	31			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.6	3.5	3.1	34	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students treated with respect by faculty	2.6	2.6	3.4	33	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.2	3.1	3.4	33			POS
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.4	3.3	3.2	33			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.4	3.4	33			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.9	3.0	2.4	33	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.0	3.0	33			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.0	3.2	32			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Relationships with other students good	2.9	2.8	3.3	33	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Competition among students is excessive (Reversed)	3.1	3.2	3.1	33			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Staff knowledgeable	3.3	3.3	2.8	33	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Sense of intellectual community	3.3	3.2	2.8	33	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	3.5	3.4	2.6	33	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.4	3.4	3.1	33			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Receive feedback from advisor	3.2	3.1	3.1	33			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Satisfied with advisor time	3.4	3.3	3.0	33			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.4	3.4	3.4	33			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor has interests in mind	2.7	2.6	3.2	33	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.2	3.1	3.2	33			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor keeps track of research progress	2.5	2.3	3.2	33	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall climate	3.0	2.9	3.3	33			POS
Advice and Feedback Received	Courses workshops on teaching	3.3	3.4	3.3	32			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	3.1	3.2	3.3	30			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on publishing your work	3.2	3.1	3.0	28			

Table 3.4: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Natural Sciences, and in Quantitative and Systems Biology

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SNS Mean	Quantitative & Systems Biology		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SNS	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.8	2.6	30			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options within academia	3.1	2.8	2.7	26			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options outside academia	2.7	2.7	2.4	26			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on degree requirements	3.2	3.3	3.0	32			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.1	3.0	2.8	28			
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.0	2.8	28			
Advice and Feedback Received	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.2	3.0	2.7	24	NEG		
Advice and Feedback Received	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.4	3.2	30			
Advice and Feedback Received	Standards for academic writing	3.3	3.1	2.9	29			
Advice and Feedback Received	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.3	3.2	29			
University Resources	Admissions processes	3.3	3.2	3.0	21			
University Resources	Fellowships/Awards	3.1	3.0	2.9	30			
University Resources	Appointments (GSR/TA)	3.3	3.4	3.3	31			
University Resources	Academic Services processes	3.2	3.3	3.2	24			
University Resources	Website Information	2.9	2.9	2.6	31			
University Resources	Professional Development Programming	3.2	3.1	2.9	25			
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	2.8	2.6	19			
University Resources	Student Health Center	3.2	3.1	3.1	24			
University Resources	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.1	2.9	2.7	28			
University Resources	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	3.0	2.9	2.8	18			
University Resources	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	2.9	2.8	12			
University Resources	Disability Services	3.0	3.3	3.2	5			< 10 cases
University Resources	On-campus Child Care	3.5	3.4	3.4	7			< 10 cases
University Resources	University Police	3.1	3.0	3.0	12			
University Resources	Parking for students	1.8	1.8	2.1	30			
University Resources	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.6	2.7	2.6	21			
University Resources	Dining Services	2.4	2.4	2.4	27			
University Resources	Bookstore	2.8	2.9	3.1	21			
University Resources	Center for Research on Teaching Excellence (CRTE)	3.3	3.2	3.1	18			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.7	1.7	1.8	31			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Family obligations	1.7	1.7	1.8	31			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Availability of faculty	1.4	1.4	1.5	31			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.4	1.5	1.4	31			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.6	1.5	31			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Course scheduling	1.5	1.5	1.5	31			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.2	1.0	31			
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.8	3.7	3.7	31			
Global Satisfaction	Would select this university	3.2	3.0	2.9	31			
Global Satisfaction	Would select same field	3.6	3.6	3.5	31			
Global Satisfaction	Would recommend this university	3.3	3.1	3.1	31			
Global Satisfaction	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.1	3.1	3.0	30			
Quality of GTA Training	TA Appropriately supervised	2.9	2.9	2.8	29			
Quality of GTA Training	Time expected of TA was right	3.1	2.9	2.8	31			
Quality of GTA Training	Prepared for LAB	3.3	3.3	3.2	25			

Effect size expresses the difference between group means in terms of standard deviations (UCM standard deviations here). It is a measure of the strength, magnitude, or importance of the difference as opposed to statistical significance. Unless stated otherwise, the response scales were four points with positive being high (e.g., Very Satisfied [4], Satisfied [3], Dissatisfied [2], Very Dissatisfied [1]; Strongly Agree [4], Agree [3], Disagree [2], Strongly Disagree [1])

Table 4.0: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and by Graduate Program

Category	Item	UCM		SSHA		Cognitive & Information Sciences		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		Psychological Sciences		Social Sciences		Interdisciplinary Humanities	
		Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.5	3.5	3.5	13	3.5	5	3.6	23	3.6	9	3.5	14		
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.2	3.3	3.3	15	3.3	6	3.3	28	3.3	10	3.1	18		
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.3	3.3	3.5	15	3.3	6	3.4	28	3.5	10	3.1	18		
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Advice and Feedback Received	3.1	3.2	3.0	13	3.2	5	3.3	26	3.4	10	3.1	15		
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.9	3.0	3.0	14	3.1	5	3.1	26	2.9	10	2.9	15		
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.5	1.5	1.3	13	1.5	5	1.5	24	1.6	9	1.6	14		
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Quality of GTA Training	3.1	3.1	3.0	12	2.6	5	3.4	21	2.5	7	3.2	12		
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.7	3.8	15	3.8	6	3.8	28	3.8	10	3.6	18		
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.4	3.5	3.7	15	3.8	6	3.6	28	3.6	10	3.1	17		
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.1	3.5	15	3.5	6	2.9	28	2.9	10	2.9	17		
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.3	3.4	3.2	15	3.3	6	3.6	27	3.6	10	3.4	18		
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Training in research methods	3.3	3.4	3.1	15	3.3	6	3.8	28	3.5	10	2.8	17		
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Amount of financial support	3.3	3.4	3.4	15	3.8	6	3.3	28	3.4	10	3.3	17		
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Teaching and TA preparation	3.3	3.2	3.4	14	3.2	5	3.2	28	3.4	9	2.9	17		
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Availability of courses	3.3	3.4	3.4	13	3.0	6	3.1	27	2.7	10	2.8	16		
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.5	3.6	3.3	13	3.0	6	3.5	27	3.2	10	3.2	16		
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Encouragement to take outside courses	3.4	3.3	3.0	13	2.0	6	2.6	27	2.7	10	2.9	16		
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Overall quality of course work	3.1	3.2	3.0	13	3.0	6	3.5	27	3.4	10	2.9	16		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.3	3.4	15	3.3	6	3.6	27	3.4	10	3.3	18		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.4	3.4	3.6	15	3.8	6	3.6	28	3.9	10	3.6	18		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Helpfulness of staff members	3.5	3.4	3.5	13	3.7	6	3.3	28	3.3	8	2.9	18		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty help finding employment	3.6	3.7	3.2	9	4.0	1	3.3	14	4.0	2	2.8	11		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.4	3.4	3.5	15	2.7	6	3.2	27	3.5	8	3.5	17		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.6	3.6	3.5	15	3.3	6	3.5	28	3.5	10	3.0	17		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students treated with respect by faculty	2.6	2.7	3.6	13	3.0	6	3.4	27	3.6	10	3.3	16		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.2	3.3	3.8	13	3.7	6	3.7	27	3.7	10	3.6	16		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.4	3.4	3.5	13	3.2	6	3.4	27	3.8	10	3.1	15		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.6	3.7	13	3.3	6	3.6	27	3.7	10	3.6	16		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.9	3.0	2.8	13	3.3	6	2.6	27	3.1	10	2.3	16		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	2.9	3.3	13	3.5	6	3.3	27	3.5	10	3.1	16		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.3	3.6	13	3.8	6	3.5	27	3.6	10	2.9	16		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Relationships with other students good	2.9	3.0	3.7	13	3.7	6	3.7	27	3.6	10	3.3	16		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Competition among students is excessive (Reversed)	3.1	3.2	3.2	13	3.3	6	3.1	27	3.1	10	2.7	16		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Staff knowledgeable	3.3	3.4	3.3	13	3.0	6	2.8	27	2.5	8	2.7	16		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Sense of intellectual community	3.3	3.4	3.4	13	3.2	5	3.5	27	3.4	10	2.8	15		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	3.5	3.7	3.3	13	3.2	6	3.0	27	3.3	10	2.5	15		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.4	3.5	3.1	13	3.0	6	3.2	26	3.2	10	3.3	16		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Receive feedback from advisor	3.2	3.3	3.4	13	3.0	6	3.5	26	3.6	10	3.3	16		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Satisfied with advisor time	3.4	3.5	3.3	13	3.3	6	3.6	27	3.4	10	3.3	16		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.4	3.4	3.9	13	3.5	6	3.7	27	3.7	10	3.6	16		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor has interests in mind	2.7	3.0	3.6	13	3.3	6	3.5	27	3.7	10	3.6	16		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.2	3.3	3.6	13	3.0	6	3.3	26	3.0	10	3.1	16		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor keeps track of research progress	2.5	2.7	3.5	13	2.8	6	3.6	27	3.7	10	3.4	16		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall climate	3.0	3.2	3.5	13	3.0	6	3.6	27	3.7	10	3.3	16		
Advice and Feedback Received	Courses workshops on teaching	3.3	3.2	3.2	10	2.8	4	3.3	24	3.3	7	3.2	14		
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	3.1	3.0	3.0	12	2.8	4	3.1	24	3.1	10	2.9	15		
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on publishing your work	3.2	3.2	3.1	12	3.0	5	3.4	26	3.3	10	2.8	13		
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.9	2.8	12	2.6	5	2.8	26	3.3	10	2.8	14		
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options within academia	3.1	3.3	3.3	12	3.2	5	3.5	26	3.6	10	2.9	14		
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options outside academia	2.7	2.9	2.8	13	2.6	5	2.6	25	3.4	10	2.9	14		
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on degree requirements	3.2	3.3	3.2	13	3.8	5	3.4	25	3.2	10	2.9	15		
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.1	3.3	3.0	8	3.2	5	3.5	22	3.4	8	3.1	15		
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.3	2.7	9	3.3	4	3.6	22	3.6	10	3.2	15		
Advice and Feedback Received	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.2	3.5	3.7	7	3.2	5	3.4	18	3.9	9	3.3	13		
Advice and Feedback Received	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.5	3.1	13	3.6	5	3.7	26	3.4	10	3.7	15		
Advice and Feedback Received	Standards for academic writing	3.3	3.5	3.0	13	3.6	5	3.7	26	3.5	10	3.3	14		
Advice and Feedback Received	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.5	3.5	11	3.6	5	3.5	23	3.4	9	3.5	14		
University Resources	Admissions processes	3.3	3.3	3.5	8	3.0	2	3.6	14	2.8	8	3.3	10		
University Resources	Fellowships/Awards	3.1	3.1	3.2	13	3.4	5	3.1	25	3.1	9	3.0	13		
University Resources	Appointments (GSR/TA)	3.3	3.3	3.3	13	3.4	5	3.3	25	3.3	9	3.1	13		
University Resources	Academic Services processes	3.2	3.2	3.4	7	2.8	4	3.3	19	2.8	8	3.3	13		
University Resources	Website Information	2.9	3.0	3.4	11	3.2	5	3.0	24	2.9	9	2.6	14		

Table 4.0: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and by Graduate Program

Category	Item	UCM	SSHA	Cognitive & Information Sciences		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		Psychological Sciences		Social Sciences		Interdisciplinary Humanities	
		Mean	Mean	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency
University Resources	Professional Development Programming	3.2	3.3	3.7	10	3.5	4	3.3	21	3.2	9	3.0	13
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	3.2	3.2	10	3.3	4	3.3	23	3.3	10	2.9	11
University Resources	Student Health Center	3.2	3.2	2.8	11	3.3	3	3.5	21	3.4	8	3.0	12
University Resources	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.1	3.4	3.2	12	4.0	3	3.5	24	3.4	9	3.1	14
University Resources	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	3.0	3.0	3.0	2	0.0	0	2.8	10	3.4	5	2.9	7
University Resources	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	3.2	0.0	0	4.0	1	3.6	9	3.1	7	2.8	9
University Resources	Disability Services	3.0	2.5	0.0	0	0.0	0	3.3	4	2.5	2	2.0	6
University Resources	On-campus Child Care	3.5	3.6	0.0	0	0.0	0	4.0	3	3.5	2	3.3	4
University Resources	University Police	3.1	3.0	4.0	1	3.5	2	3.3	10	2.8	4	2.2	6
University Resources	Parking for students	1.8	1.7	1.7	10	2.6	5	1.6	23	1.4	10	1.8	11
University Resources	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.6	2.5	2.3	7	2.5	2	2.6	17	2.6	7	2.7	9
University Resources	Dining Services	2.4	2.5	2.0	9	2.8	4	2.6	22	2.6	5	2.5	10
University Resources	Bookstore	2.8	2.9	2.7	11	2.8	5	3.0	23	2.9	8	2.7	11
University Resources	Center for Research on Teaching Excellence (CRTE)	3.3	3.2	3.3	6	2.7	3	3.5	19	2.5	8	3.3	9
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.7	1.8	1.5	13	1.6	5	1.8	24	2.0	9	1.9	14
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Family obligations	1.7	1.8	1.6	13	2.0	5	2.0	24	1.8	9	1.8	14
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Availability of faculty	1.4	1.4	1.6	13	1.0	5	1.4	24	1.2	9	1.4	14
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.4	1.4	1.0	13	1.4	5	1.3	23	1.8	9	1.6	14
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.5	1.2	13	1.8	5	1.5	24	1.6	9	1.5	14
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Course scheduling	1.5	1.4	1.0	13	1.4	5	1.3	23	1.8	9	1.7	14
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.2	1.0	13	1.0	5	1.2	24	1.1	9	1.3	14
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.8	3.9	4.0	13	3.8	4	4.0	23	4.0	9	3.8	14
Global Satisfaction	Would select this university	3.2	3.2	3.2	13	3.2	5	3.3	23	3.3	9	3.1	14
Global Satisfaction	Would select same field	3.6	3.6	3.6	13	3.2	5	3.7	23	3.6	9	3.6	14
Global Satisfaction	Would recommend this university	3.3	3.4	3.2	13	3.8	5	3.4	22	3.3	9	3.4	14
Global Satisfaction	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.1	3.0	3.0	11	2.0	4	3.2	21	2.4	7	3.1	12
Quality of GTA Training	TA Appropriately supervised	2.9	2.9	2.6	11	2.3	4	3.4	20	2.4	7	2.9	12
Quality of GTA Training	Time expected of TA was right	3.1	3.4	3.4	12	3.2	5	3.6	21	2.7	7	3.3	12
Quality of GTA Training	Prepared for LAB	3.3	3.3	3.3	4	2.5	2	3.7	9	2.5	4	3.8	4

Effect size expresses the difference between group means in terms of standard deviations (UCM standard deviations here). It is a measure of the strength, magnitude, or importance of the difference as opposed to statistical significance.

Unless stated otherwise, the response scales were four points with positive being high (e.g., Very Satisfied [4], Satisfied [3], Dissatisfied [2], Very Dissatisfied [1]; Strongly Agree [4], Agree [3], Disagree [2], Strongly Disagree [1])

Table 4.1: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and in Cognitive and Information
Science

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SSHA Mean	Cognitive & Information Sciences		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SSHA	< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.5	3.5	3.5	13			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.2	3.3	3.3	15			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.3	3.3	3.5	15			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Advice and Feedback Received	3.1	3.2	3.0	13			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.9	3.0	3.0	14			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.5	1.5	1.3	13	POS	POS	
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Quality of GTA Training	3.1	3.1	3.0	12			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.7	3.8	15			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.4	3.5	3.7	15			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.1	3.5	15			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.3	3.4	3.2	15			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Training in research methods	3.3	3.4	3.1	15			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Amount of financial support	3.3	3.4	3.4	15			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Teaching and TA preparation	3.3	3.2	3.4	14			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Availability of courses	3.3	3.4	3.4	13			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.5	3.6	3.3	13			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Encouragement to take outside courses	3.4	3.3	3.0	13			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Overall quality of course work	3.1	3.2	3.0	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.3	3.4	15			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.4	3.4	3.6	15			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Helpfulness of staff members	3.5	3.4	3.5	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty help finding employment	3.6	3.7	3.2	9		NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.4	3.4	3.5	15			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.6	3.6	3.5	15			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students treated with respect by faculty	2.6	2.7	3.6	13	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.2	3.3	3.8	13	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.4	3.4	3.5	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.6	3.7	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.9	3.0	2.8	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	2.9	3.3	13		POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.3	3.6	13	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Relationships with other students good	2.9	3.0	3.7	13	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Competition among students is excessive (Reversed)	3.1	3.2	3.2	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Staff knowledgeable	3.3	3.4	3.3	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Sense of intellectual community	3.3	3.4	3.4	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	3.5	3.7	3.3	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.4	3.5	3.1	13		NEG	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Receive feedback from advisor	3.2	3.3	3.4	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Satisfied with advisor time	3.4	3.5	3.3	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.4	3.4	3.9	13	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor has interests in mind	2.7	3.0	3.6	13	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.2	3.3	3.6	13	POS		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor keeps track of research progress	2.5	2.7	3.5	13	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall climate	3.0	3.2	3.5	13	POS		
Advice and Feedback Received	Courses workshops on teaching	3.3	3.2	3.2	10			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	3.1	3.0	3.0	12			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on publishing your work	3.2	3.2	3.1	12			

Table 4.1: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and in Cognitive and Information
Science

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SSHA Mean	Cognitive & Information Sciences		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SSHA	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.9	2.8	12			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options within academia	3.1	3.3	3.3	12			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options outside academia	2.7	2.9	2.8	13			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on degree requirements	3.2	3.3	3.2	13			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.1	3.3	3.0	8			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.3	2.7	9	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.2	3.5	3.7	7	POS		< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.5	3.1	13		NEG	
Advice and Feedback Received	Standards for academic writing	3.3	3.5	3.0	13		NEG	
Advice and Feedback Received	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.5	3.5	11			
University Resources	Admissions processes	3.3	3.3	3.5	8			< 10 cases
University Resources	Fellowships/Awards	3.1	3.1	3.2	13			
University Resources	Appointments (GSR/TA)	3.3	3.3	3.3	13			
University Resources	Academic Services processes	3.2	3.2	3.4	7			< 10 cases
University Resources	Website Information	2.9	3.0	3.4	11			
University Resources	Professional Development Programming	3.2	3.3	3.7	10	POS		
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	3.2	3.2	10			
University Resources	Student Health Center	3.2	3.2	2.8	11			
University Resources	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.1	3.4	3.2	12			
University Resources	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	3.0	3.0	3.0	2			< 10 cases
University Resources	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	3.2			NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
University Resources	Disability Services	3.0	2.5			NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
University Resources	On-campus Child Care	3.5	3.6			NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
University Resources	University Police	3.1	3.0	4.0	1	POS	POS	< 10 cases
University Resources	Parking for students	1.8	1.7	1.7	10			
University Resources	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.6	2.5	2.3	7			< 10 cases
University Resources	Dining Services	2.4	2.5	2.0	9		NEG	< 10 cases
University Resources	Bookstore	2.8	2.9	2.7	11			
University Resources	Center for Research on Teaching Excellence (CRTE)	3.3	3.2	3.3	6			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.7	1.8	1.5	13			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Family obligations	1.7	1.8	1.6	13			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Availability of faculty	1.4	1.4	1.6	13			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.4	1.4	1.0	13	POS	POS	
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.5	1.2	13	POS		
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Course scheduling	1.5	1.4	1.0	13	POS	POS	
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.2	1.0	13			
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.8	3.9	4.0	13			
Global Satisfaction	Would select this university	3.2	3.2	3.2	13			
Global Satisfaction	Would select same field	3.6	3.6	3.6	13			
Global Satisfaction	Would recommend this university	3.3	3.4	3.2	13			
Global Satisfaction	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.1	3.0	3.0	11			
Quality of GTA Training	TA Appropriately supervised	2.9	2.9	2.6	11			
Quality of GTA Training	Time expected of TA was right	3.1	3.4	3.4	12			
Quality of GTA Training	Prepared for LAB	3.3	3.3	3.3	4			< 10 cases

Effect size expresses the difference between group means in terms of standard deviations (UCM standard deviations here). It is a measure of the strength, magnitude, or importance of the difference as opposed to statistical significance. Unless stated otherwise, the response scales were four points with positive being high (e.g., Very Satisfied [4], Satisfied [3], Dissatisfied [2], Very Dissatisfied [1]; Strongly Agree [4], Agree [3], Disagree [2], Strongly Disagree [1])

Table 4.2: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and in Political Science

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SSHA Mean	Political Science		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SSHA	< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.5	3.5	3.5	5			< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.2	3.3	3.3	6			< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.3	3.3	3.3	6			< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Advice and Feedback Received	3.1	3.2	3.2	5			< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.9	3.0	3.1	5			< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.5	1.5	1.5	5			< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Quality of GTA Training	3.1	3.1	2.6	5	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.7	3.8	6			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.4	3.5	3.8	6	POS		< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.1	3.5	6			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.3	3.4	3.3	6			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Training in research methods	3.3	3.4	3.3	6			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Amount of financial support	3.3	3.4	3.8	6	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Teaching and TA preparation	3.3	3.2	3.2	5			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Availability of courses	3.3	3.4	3.0	6			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.5	3.6	3.0	6	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Encouragement to take outside courses	3.4	3.3	2.0	6	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Overall quality of course work	3.1	3.2	3.0	6			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.3	3.3	6			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.4	3.4	3.8	6	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Helpfulness of staff members	3.5	3.4	3.7	6			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty help finding employment	3.6	3.7	4.0	1			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.4	3.4	2.7	6	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.6	3.6	3.3	6			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students treated with respect by faculty	2.6	2.7	3.0	6	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.2	3.3	3.7	6	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.4	3.4	3.2	6			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.6	3.3	6			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.9	3.0	3.3	6			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	2.9	3.5	6	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.3	3.8	6	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Relationships with other students good	2.9	3.0	3.7	6	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Competition among students is excessive (Reversed)	3.1	3.2	3.3	6			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Staff knowledgeable	3.3	3.4	3.0	6		NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Sense of intellectual community	3.3	3.4	3.2	5			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	3.5	3.7	3.2	6		NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.4	3.5	3.0	6	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Receive feedback from advisor	3.2	3.3	3.0	6			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Satisfied with advisor time	3.4	3.5	3.3	6			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.4	3.4	3.5	6			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor has interests in mind	2.7	3.0	3.3	6	POS		< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.2	3.3	3.0	6			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor keeps track of research progress	2.5	2.7	2.8	6			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall climate	3.0	3.2	3.0	6			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Courses workshops on teaching	3.3	3.2	2.8	4	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	3.1	3.0	2.8	4			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on publishing your work	3.2	3.2	3.0	5			< 10 cases

Table 4.2: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and in Political Science

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SSHA Mean	Political Science		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SSHA	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.9	2.6	5			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options within academia	3.1	3.3	3.2	5			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options outside academia	2.7	2.9	2.6	5			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on degree requirements	3.2	3.3	3.8	5	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.1	3.3	3.2	5			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.3	3.3	4			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.2	3.5	3.2	5			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.5	3.6	5			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Standards for academic writing	3.3	3.5	3.6	5			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.5	3.6	5			< 10 cases
University Resources	Admissions processes	3.3	3.3	3.0	2			< 10 cases
University Resources	Fellowships/Awards	3.1	3.1	3.4	5			< 10 cases
University Resources	Appointments (GSR/TA)	3.3	3.3	3.4	5			< 10 cases
University Resources	Academic Services processes	3.2	3.2	2.8	4	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
University Resources	Website Information	2.9	3.0	3.2	5			< 10 cases
University Resources	Professional Development Programming	3.2	3.3	3.5	4			< 10 cases
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	3.2	3.3	4			< 10 cases
University Resources	Student Health Center	3.2	3.2	3.3	3			< 10 cases
University Resources	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.1	3.4	4.0	3	POS	POS	< 10 cases
University Resources	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	3.0	3.0			NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
University Resources	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	3.2	4.0	1	POS	POS	< 10 cases
University Resources	Disability Services	3.0	2.5			NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
University Resources	On-campus Child Care	3.5	3.6			NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
University Resources	University Police	3.1	3.0	3.5	2		POS	< 10 cases
University Resources	Parking for students	1.8	1.7	2.6	5	POS	POS	< 10 cases
University Resources	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.6	2.5	2.5	2			< 10 cases
University Resources	Dining Services	2.4	2.5	2.8	4			< 10 cases
University Resources	Bookstore	2.8	2.9	2.8	5			< 10 cases
University Resources	Center for Research on Teaching Excellence (CRTE)	3.3	3.2	2.7	3	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.7	1.8	1.6	5			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Family obligations	1.7	1.8	2.0	5			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Availability of faculty	1.4	1.4	1.0	5	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.4	1.4	1.4	5			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.5	1.8	5			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Course scheduling	1.5	1.4	1.4	5			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.2	1.0	5			< 10 cases
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.8	3.9	3.8	4			< 10 cases
Global Satisfaction	Would select this university	3.2	3.2	3.2	5			< 10 cases
Global Satisfaction	Would select same field	3.6	3.6	3.2	5	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Global Satisfaction	Would recommend this university	3.3	3.4	3.8	5	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Global Satisfaction	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.1	3.0	2.0	4	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Quality of GTA Training	TA Appropriately supervised	2.9	2.9	2.3	4	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Quality of GTA Training	Time expected of TA was right	3.1	3.4	3.2	5			< 10 cases
Quality of GTA Training	Prepared for LAB	3.3	3.3	2.5	2	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases

Effect size expresses the difference between group means in terms of standard deviations (UCM standard deviations here). It is a measure of the strength, magnitude, or importance of the difference as opposed to statistical significance. Unless stated otherwise, the response scales were four points with positive being high (e.g., Very Satisfied [4], Satisfied [3], Dissatisfied [2], Very Dissatisfied [1]; Strongly Agree [4], Agree [3], Disagree [2], Strongly Disagree [1])

Table 4.3: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and in Psychological Sciences

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SSHA Mean	Psychological Sciences		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SSHA	< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.5	3.5	3.6	23			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.2	3.3	3.3	28			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.3	3.3	3.4	28			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Advice and Feedback Received	3.1	3.2	3.3	26			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.9	3.0	3.1	26			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.5	1.5	1.5	24			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Quality of GTA Training	3.1	3.1	3.4	21			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.7	3.8	28			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.4	3.5	3.6	28			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.1	2.9	28			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.3	3.4	3.6	27			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Training in research methods	3.3	3.4	3.8	28	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Amount of financial support	3.3	3.4	3.3	28			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Teaching and TA preparation	3.3	3.2	3.2	28			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Availability of courses	3.3	3.4	3.1	27			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.5	3.6	3.5	27			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Encouragement to take outside courses	3.4	3.3	2.6	27	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Overall quality of course work	3.1	3.2	3.5	27			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.3	3.6	27			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.4	3.4	3.6	28			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Helpfulness of staff members	3.5	3.4	3.3	28			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty help finding employment	3.6	3.7	3.3	14			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.4	3.4	3.2	27			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.6	3.6	3.5	28			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students treated with respect by faculty	2.6	2.7	3.4	27	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.2	3.3	3.7	27	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.4	3.4	3.4	27			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.6	3.6	27			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.9	3.0	2.6	27			NEG
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	2.9	3.3	27			POS
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.3	3.5	27	POS		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Relationships with other students good	2.9	3.0	3.7	27	POS		POS
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Competition among students is excessive (Reversed)	3.1	3.2	3.1	27			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Staff knowledgeable	3.3	3.4	2.8	27	NEG		NEG
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Sense of intellectual community	3.3	3.4	3.5	27			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	3.5	3.7	3.0	27	NEG		NEG
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.4	3.5	3.2	26			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Receive feedback from advisor	3.2	3.3	3.5	26			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Satisfied with advisor time	3.4	3.5	3.6	27			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.4	3.4	3.7	27			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor has interests in mind	2.7	3.0	3.5	27	POS		POS
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.2	3.3	3.3	26			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor keeps track of research progress	2.5	2.7	3.6	27	POS		POS
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall climate	3.0	3.2	3.6	27	POS		
Advice and Feedback Received	Courses workshops on teaching	3.3	3.2	3.3	24			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	3.1	3.0	3.1	24			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on publishing your work	3.2	3.2	3.4	26			

Table 4.3: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and in Psychological Sciences

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SSHA Mean	Psychological Sciences		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SSHA	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.9	2.8	26			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options within academia	3.1	3.3	3.5	26			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options outside academia	2.7	2.9	2.6	25			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on degree requirements	3.2	3.3	3.4	25			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.1	3.3	3.5	22			
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.3	3.6	22			
Advice and Feedback Received	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.2	3.5	3.4	18			
Advice and Feedback Received	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.5	3.7	26			
Advice and Feedback Received	Standards for academic writing	3.3	3.5	3.7	26			
Advice and Feedback Received	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.5	3.5	23			
University Resources	Admissions processes	3.3	3.3	3.6	14			
University Resources	Fellowships/Awards	3.1	3.1	3.1	25			
University Resources	Appointments (GSR/TA)	3.3	3.3	3.3	25			
University Resources	Academic Services processes	3.2	3.2	3.3	19			
University Resources	Website Information	2.9	3.0	3.0	24			
University Resources	Professional Development Programming	3.2	3.3	3.3	21			
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	3.2	3.3	23			
University Resources	Student Health Center	3.2	3.2	3.5	21			
University Resources	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.1	3.4	3.5	24			
University Resources	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	3.0	3.0	2.8	10			
University Resources	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	3.2	3.6	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Disability Services	3.0	2.5	3.3	4		POS	< 10 cases
University Resources	On-campus Child Care	3.5	3.6	4.0	3	POS	POS	< 10 cases
University Resources	University Police	3.1	3.0	3.3	10			
University Resources	Parking for students	1.8	1.7	1.6	23			
University Resources	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.6	2.5	2.6	17			
University Resources	Dining Services	2.4	2.5	2.6	22			
University Resources	Bookstore	2.8	2.9	3.0	23			
University Resources	Center for Research on Teaching Excellence (CRTE)	3.3	3.2	3.5	19			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.7	1.8	1.8	24			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Family obligations	1.7	1.8	2.0	24			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Availability of faculty	1.4	1.4	1.4	24			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.4	1.4	1.3	23			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.5	1.5	24			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Course scheduling	1.5	1.4	1.3	23			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.2	1.2	24			
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.8	3.9	4.0	23			
Global Satisfaction	Would select this university	3.2	3.2	3.3	23			
Global Satisfaction	Would select same field	3.6	3.6	3.7	23			
Global Satisfaction	Would recommend this university	3.3	3.4	3.4	22			
Global Satisfaction	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.1	3.0	3.2	21			
Quality of GTA Training	TA Appropriately supervised	2.9	2.9	3.4	20	POS	POS	
Quality of GTA Training	Time expected of TA was right	3.1	3.4	3.6	21	POS		
Quality of GTA Training	Prepared for LAB	3.3	3.3	3.7	9	POS		< 10 cases

Effect size expresses the difference between group means in terms of standard deviations (UCM standard deviations here). It is a measure of the strength, magnitude, or importance of the difference as opposed to statistical significance. Unless stated otherwise, the response scales were four points with positive being high (e.g., Very Satisfied [4], Satisfied [3], Dissatisfied [2], Very Dissatisfied [1]; Strongly Agree [4], Agree [3], Disagree [2], Strongly Disagree [1])

Table 4.4: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and in IGP Social Sciences

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SSHA Mean	Social Sciences		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SSHA	< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.5	3.5	3.6	9			< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.2	3.3	3.3	10			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.3	3.3	3.5	10			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Advice and Feedback Received	3.1	3.2	3.4	10			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.9	3.0	2.9	10			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.5	1.5	1.6	9			< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Quality of GTA Training	3.1	3.1	2.5	7	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.7	3.8	10			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.4	3.5	3.6	10			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.1	2.9	10			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.3	3.4	3.6	10			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Training in research methods	3.3	3.4	3.5	10			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Amount of financial support	3.3	3.4	3.4	10			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Teaching and TA preparation	3.3	3.2	3.4	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Availability of courses	3.3	3.4	2.7	10	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.5	3.6	3.2	10		NEG	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Encouragement to take outside courses	3.4	3.3	2.7	10	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Overall quality of course work	3.1	3.2	3.4	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.3	3.4	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.4	3.4	3.9	10	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Helpfulness of staff members	3.5	3.4	3.3	8			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty help finding employment	3.6	3.7	4.0	2			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.4	3.4	3.5	8			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.6	3.6	3.5	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students treated with respect by faculty	2.6	2.7	3.6	10	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.2	3.3	3.7	10	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.4	3.4	3.8	10	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.6	3.7	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.9	3.0	3.1	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	2.9	3.5	10	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.3	3.6	10	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Relationships with other students good	2.9	3.0	3.6	10	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Competition among students is excessive (Reversed)	3.1	3.2	3.1	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Staff knowledgeable	3.3	3.4	2.5	8	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Sense of intellectual community	3.3	3.4	3.4	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	3.5	3.7	3.3	10		NEG	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.4	3.5	3.2	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Receive feedback from advisor	3.2	3.3	3.6	10	POS		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Satisfied with advisor time	3.4	3.5	3.4	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.4	3.4	3.7	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor has interests in mind	2.7	3.0	3.7	10	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.2	3.3	3.0	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor keeps track of research progress	2.5	2.7	3.7	10	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall climate	3.0	3.2	3.7	10	POS	POS	
Advice and Feedback Received	Courses workshops on teaching	3.3	3.2	3.3	7			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	3.1	3.0	3.1	10			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on publishing your work	3.2	3.2	3.3	10			

Table 4.4: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and in IGP Social Sciences

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SSHA Mean	Social Sciences		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SSHA	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.9	3.3	10			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options within academia	3.1	3.3	3.6	10	POS		
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options outside academia	2.7	2.9	3.4	10	POS	POS	
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on degree requirements	3.2	3.3	3.2	10			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.1	3.3	3.4	8			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.3	3.6	10			
Advice and Feedback Received	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.2	3.5	3.9	9	POS		< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.5	3.4	10			
Advice and Feedback Received	Standards for academic writing	3.3	3.5	3.5	10			
Advice and Feedback Received	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.5	3.4	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Admissions processes	3.3	3.3	2.8	8	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
University Resources	Fellowships/Awards	3.1	3.1	3.1	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Appointments (GSR/TA)	3.3	3.3	3.3	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Academic Services processes	3.2	3.2	2.8	8	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
University Resources	Website Information	2.9	3.0	2.9	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Professional Development Programming	3.2	3.3	3.2	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	3.2	3.3	10			
University Resources	Student Health Center	3.2	3.2	3.4	8			< 10 cases
University Resources	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.1	3.4	3.4	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	3.0	3.0	3.4	5	POS	POS	< 10 cases
University Resources	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	3.2	3.1	7			< 10 cases
University Resources	Disability Services	3.0	2.5	2.5	2			< 10 cases
University Resources	On-campus Child Care	3.5	3.6	3.5	2			< 10 cases
University Resources	University Police	3.1	3.0	2.8	4			< 10 cases
University Resources	Parking for students	1.8	1.7	1.4	10			
University Resources	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.6	2.5	2.6	7			< 10 cases
University Resources	Dining Services	2.4	2.5	2.6	5			< 10 cases
University Resources	Bookstore	2.8	2.9	2.9	8			< 10 cases
University Resources	Center for Research on Teaching Excellence (CRTE)	3.3	3.2	2.5	8	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.7	1.8	2.0	9			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Family obligations	1.7	1.8	1.8	9			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Availability of faculty	1.4	1.4	1.2	9			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.4	1.4	1.8	9	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.5	1.6	9			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Course scheduling	1.5	1.4	1.8	9		NEG	< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.2	1.1	9			< 10 cases
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.8	3.9	4.0	9			< 10 cases
Global Satisfaction	Would select this university	3.2	3.2	3.3	9			< 10 cases
Global Satisfaction	Would select same field	3.6	3.6	3.6	9			< 10 cases
Global Satisfaction	Would recommend this university	3.3	3.4	3.3	9			< 10 cases
Global Satisfaction	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.1	3.0	2.4	7	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Quality of GTA Training	TA Appropriately supervised	2.9	2.9	2.4	7	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Quality of GTA Training	Time expected of TA was right	3.1	3.4	2.7	7	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Quality of GTA Training	Prepared for LAB	3.3	3.3	2.5	4	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases

Effect size expresses the difference between group means in terms of standard deviations (UCM standard deviations here). It is a measure of the strength, magnitude, or importance of the difference as opposed to statistical significance. Unless stated otherwise, the response scales were four points with positive being high (e.g., Very Satisfied [4], Satisfied [3], Dissatisfied [2], Very Dissatisfied [1]; Strongly Agree [4], Agree [3], Disagree [2], Strongly Disagree [1])

Table 4.5: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and in Interdisciplinary Humanities

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SSHA Mean	Interdisciplinary Humanities		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SSHA	< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.5	3.5	3.5	14			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.2	3.3	3.1	18			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.3	3.3	3.1	18			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Advice and Feedback Received	3.1	3.2	3.1	15			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.9	3.0	2.9	15			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.5	1.5	1.6	14			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Quality of GTA Training	3.1	3.1	3.2	12			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.7	3.6	18			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.4	3.5	3.1	17			NEG
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.1	2.9	17			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.3	3.4	3.4	18			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Training in research methods	3.3	3.4	2.8	17	NEG		NEG
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Amount of financial support	3.3	3.4	3.3	17			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Teaching and TA preparation	3.3	3.2	2.9	17	NEG		
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Availability of courses	3.3	3.4	2.8	16	NEG		NEG
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.5	3.6	3.2	16			NEG
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Encouragement to take outside courses	3.4	3.3	2.9	16	NEG		
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Overall quality of course work	3.1	3.2	2.9	16			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.3	3.3	18			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.4	3.4	3.6	18			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Helpfulness of staff members	3.5	3.4	2.9	18	NEG		NEG
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty help finding employment	3.6	3.7	2.8	11	NEG		NEG
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.4	3.4	3.5	17			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.6	3.6	3.0	17	NEG		NEG
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students treated with respect by faculty	2.6	2.7	3.3	16	POS		POS
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.2	3.3	3.6	16	POS		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.4	3.4	3.1	15			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.6	3.6	16			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.9	3.0	2.3	16	NEG		NEG
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	2.9	3.1	16			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.3	2.9	16			NEG
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Relationships with other students good	2.9	3.0	3.3	16	POS		POS
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Competition among students is excessive (Reversed)	3.1	3.2	2.7	16	NEG		NEG
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Staff knowledgeable	3.3	3.4	2.7	16	NEG		NEG
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Sense of intellectual community	3.3	3.4	2.8	15	NEG		NEG
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	3.5	3.7	2.5	15	NEG		NEG
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.4	3.5	3.3	16			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Receive feedback from advisor	3.2	3.3	3.3	16			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Satisfied with advisor time	3.4	3.5	3.3	16			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.4	3.4	3.6	16			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor has interests in mind	2.7	3.0	3.6	16	POS		POS
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.2	3.3	3.1	16			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor keeps track of research progress	2.5	2.7	3.4	16	POS		POS
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall climate	3.0	3.2	3.3	16			
Advice and Feedback Received	Courses workshops on teaching	3.3	3.2	3.2	14			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	3.1	3.0	2.9	15			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on publishing your work	3.2	3.2	2.8	13			

Table 4.5: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and in Interdisciplinary Humanities

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SSHA Mean	Interdisciplinary Humanities		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SSHA	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.9	2.8	14			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options within academia	3.1	3.3	2.9	14			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options outside academia	2.7	2.9	2.9	14			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on degree requirements	3.2	3.3	2.9	15			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.1	3.3	3.1	15			
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.3	3.2	15			
Advice and Feedback Received	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.2	3.5	3.3	13			
Advice and Feedback Received	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.5	3.7	15			
Advice and Feedback Received	Standards for academic writing	3.3	3.5	3.3	14			
Advice and Feedback Received	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.5	3.5	14			
University Resources	Admissions processes	3.3	3.3	3.3	10			
University Resources	Fellowships/Awards	3.1	3.1	3.0	13			
University Resources	Appointments (GSR/TA)	3.3	3.3	3.1	13			
University Resources	Academic Services processes	3.2	3.2	3.3	13			
University Resources	Website Information	2.9	3.0	2.6	14			
University Resources	Professional Development Programming	3.2	3.3	3.0	13			
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	3.2	2.9	11			
University Resources	Student Health Center	3.2	3.2	3.0	12			
University Resources	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.1	3.4	3.1	14			
University Resources	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	3.0	3.0	2.9	7			< 10 cases
University Resources	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	3.2	2.8	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Disability Services	3.0	2.5	2.0	6	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
University Resources	On-campus Child Care	3.5	3.6	3.3	4			< 10 cases
University Resources	University Police	3.1	3.0	2.2	6	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
University Resources	Parking for students	1.8	1.7	1.8	11			
University Resources	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.6	2.5	2.7	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Dining Services	2.4	2.5	2.5	10			
University Resources	Bookstore	2.8	2.9	2.7	11			
University Resources	Center for Research on Teaching Excellence (CRTE)	3.3	3.2	3.3	9			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.7	1.8	1.9	14			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Family obligations	1.7	1.8	1.8	14			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Availability of faculty	1.4	1.4	1.4	14			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.4	1.4	1.6	14			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.5	1.5	14			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Course scheduling	1.5	1.4	1.7	14			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.2	1.3	14			
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.8	3.9	3.8	14			
Global Satisfaction	Would select this university	3.2	3.2	3.1	14			
Global Satisfaction	Would select same field	3.6	3.6	3.6	14			
Global Satisfaction	Would recommend this university	3.3	3.4	3.4	14			
Global Satisfaction	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.1	3.0	3.1	12			
Quality of GTA Training	TA Appropriately supervised	2.9	2.9	2.9	12			
Quality of GTA Training	Time expected of TA was right	3.1	3.4	3.3	12			
Quality of GTA Training	Prepared for LAB	3.3	3.3	3.8	4	POS	POS	< 10 cases

Effect size expresses the difference between group means in terms of standard deviations (UCM standard deviations here). It is a measure of the strength, magnitude, or importance of the difference as opposed to statistical significance. Unless stated otherwise, the response scales were four points with positive being high (e.g., Very Satisfied [4], Satisfied [3], Dissatisfied [2], Very Dissatisfied [1]; Strongly Agree [4], Agree [3], Disagree [2], Strongly Disagree [1])

Table 5.0: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Engineering, and by Graduate Program

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SOE Mean	Biological Engineering & Small Scale Technologies		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		Environmental Systems		Mechanical Engineering	
				Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.5	3.6	3.4	9	3.8	9	3.6	20	3.5	13
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.2	3.1	3.2	11	3.2	9	3.0	23	3.3	15
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.3	3.3	3.2	11	3.4	9	3.2	23	3.4	15
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Advice and Feedback Received	3.1	3.1	2.9	9	3.5	9	2.9	22	3.2	13
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.9	3.0	3.0	9	3.2	9	2.8	20	3.0	13
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.5	1.6	1.5	9	1.4	9	1.7	20	1.6	13
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Quality of GTA Training	3.1	3.1	3.0	9	3.4	8	2.8	17	3.3	12
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.5	3.1	11	3.4	9	3.6	23	3.8	15
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.4	3.4	3.3	11	3.3	9	3.3	23	3.6	15
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.2	2.8	11	3.4	9	3.3	23	3.3	15
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.3	3.2	3.3	11	3.1	9	3.1	23	3.3	15
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Training in research methods	3.3	3.3	3.2	11	3.6	9	3.0	23	3.5	14
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Amount of financial support	3.3	3.5	3.5	10	3.6	9	3.4	23	3.6	15
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Teaching and TA preparation	3.3	3.4	3.3	10	3.5	8	3.3	20	3.6	15
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Availability of courses	3.3	3.3	2.9	9	2.1	9	2.1	22	2.6	14
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.5	3.6	3.1	9	3.2	9	2.8	22	3.1	14
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Encouragement to take outside courses	3.4	3.4	3.0	9	2.8	8	2.1	22	2.9	14
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Overall quality of course work	3.1	3.2	3.0	9	2.9	9	2.6	22	3.1	14
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.1	3.1	11	3.6	9	3.2	23	3.7	15
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.4	3.4	3.4	11	3.7	9	3.6	23	3.6	15
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Helpfulness of staff members	3.5	3.5	3.3	10	3.3	9	3.4	23	3.6	14
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty help finding employment	3.6	3.6	2.8	5	3.4	7	3.2	13	3.2	12
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.4	3.5	2.9	11	2.8	9	3.2	22	3.4	15
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.6	3.6	3.1	11	3.7	9	3.3	23	3.5	15
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students treated with respect by faculty	2.6	2.5	3.3	9	3.6	9	3.6	21	3.6	14
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.2	3.1	3.4	9	3.6	9	3.5	22	3.8	14
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.4	3.4	3.3	9	3.4	9	3.6	22	3.4	14
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.6	3.4	9	3.6	9	3.6	22	3.8	14
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.9	2.7	2.1	9	2.0	9	2.6	22	2.7	14
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.1	3.0	9	3.4	9	3.0	22	3.1	14
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.2	3.4	9	3.6	9	3.5	22	3.3	14
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Relationships with other students good	2.9	2.8	3.7	9	3.7	9	3.6	22	3.5	14
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Competition among students is excessive (Reversed)	3.1	3.0	2.8	9	2.1	9	3.0	22	2.4	14
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Staff knowledgeable	3.3	3.3	3.2	9	3.2	9	3.0	22	3.1	14
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Sense of intellectual community	3.3	3.4	3.0	9	3.2	9	3.1	22	3.4	14
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	3.5	3.5	2.6	9	2.8	9	2.8	22	3.1	14
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.4	3.4	3.0	9	3.7	9	2.5	22	3.3	14
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Receive feedback from advisor	3.2	3.2	3.0	9	3.6	9	3.2	22	3.5	14
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Satisfied with advisor time	3.4	3.4	3.0	9	3.8	9	3.3	22	3.5	14
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.4	3.5	3.3	9	3.8	9	3.4	22	3.4	14
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor has interests in mind	2.7	2.4	3.2	9	3.8	9	3.4	22	3.4	14
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.2	3.0	3.1	9	3.2	9	3.1	22	3.3	14
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor keeps track of research progress	2.5	2.6	3.1	9	3.8	9	3.3	22	3.6	14
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall climate	3.0	2.9	3.2	9	3.7	9	3.5	22	3.5	14
Advice and Feedback Received	Courses workshops on teaching	3.3	3.2	3.3	9	3.6	9	2.9	20	3.5	13
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	3.1	3.2	3.3	7	3.4	9	3.0	21	3.3	12
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on publishing your work	3.2	3.2	3.1	7	3.7	9	3.0	21	3.3	13
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.9	2.6	9	2.9	8	3.0	20	3.1	12
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options within academia	3.1	3.0	2.9	7	3.1	9	2.8	19	3.3	12
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options outside academia	2.7	2.6	2.3	8	3.1	9	2.3	19	2.8	13
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on degree requirements	3.2	3.0	3.0	9	3.3	9	2.8	22	3.0	13
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.1	2.9	2.8	9	3.4	8	2.7	20	3.1	12
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.1	3.0	7	3.6	8	3.0	22	3.2	12
Advice and Feedback Received	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.2	3.2	3.0	7	3.7	6	3.0	12	3.3	12
Advice and Feedback Received	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.4	3.1	8	3.9	9	3.3	22	3.5	13

Table 5.0: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Engineering, and by Graduate Program

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SOE Mean	Biological Engineering & Small Scale Technologies		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		Environmental Systems		Mechanical Engineering	
				Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency
Advice and Feedback Received	Standards for academic writing	3.3	3.4	3.3	8	3.9	9	3.2	21	3.4	13
Advice and Feedback Received	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.3	3.4	8	3.6	9	3.1	20	3.3	13
University Resources	Admissions processes	3.3	3.5	3.9	7	3.7	7	3.0	11	3.6	8
University Resources	Fellowships/Awards	3.1	3.1	3.1	8	3.4	8	2.9	17	3.2	11
University Resources	Appointments (GSR/TA)	3.3	3.4	3.3	9	3.7	9	3.1	19	3.5	11
University Resources	Academic Services processes	3.2	3.3	3.3	6	3.7	7	3.0	17	3.6	9
University Resources	Website Information	2.9	2.9	3.0	9	3.2	9	2.5	18	3.4	11
University Resources	Professional Development Programming	3.2	3.2	3.7	7	3.1	8	3.0	17	3.1	11
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	3.1	3.1	9	3.4	9	2.8	15	3.2	11
University Resources	Student Health Center	3.2	3.2	3.3	8	3.0	8	3.1	17	3.4	11
University Resources	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.1	3.1	3.3	9	2.6	8	2.9	19	3.5	11
University Resources	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	3.0	3.0	3.3	4	3.1	8	2.7	12	3.2	10
University Resources	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	3.1	4.0	1	3.0	7	3.1	9	3.2	5
University Resources	Disability Services	3.0	3.1	3.5	2	3.7	3	2.4	7	3.5	4
University Resources	On-campus Child Care	3.5	3.6	4.0	1	3.7	3	3.5	4	3.7	3
University Resources	University Police	3.1	3.2	3.5	2	3.3	6	3.0	11	3.4	5
University Resources	Parking for students	1.8	1.9	1.3	7	3.0	6	1.9	14	1.9	12
University Resources	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.6	2.7	2.3	9	3.2	9	2.6	15	2.6	11
University Resources	Dining Services	2.4	2.4	2.3	9	2.7	9	2.1	17	2.6	13
University Resources	Bookstore	2.8	2.6	2.6	8	2.9	9	2.4	17	2.9	9
University Resources	Center for Research on Teaching Excellence (CRTE)	3.3	3.4	3.6	8	3.3	7	3.5	13	3.2	9
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.7	1.7	1.6	9	1.2	9	1.9	20	2.0	13
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Family obligations	1.7	1.5	1.3	9	1.2	9	1.7	20	1.5	13
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Availability of faculty	1.4	1.5	1.3	9	1.6	9	1.6	20	1.4	13
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.4	1.5	1.3	9	1.4	9	1.7	20	1.4	13
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.7	2.2	9	1.0	9	1.9	20	1.7	13
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Course scheduling	1.5	1.5	1.3	9	1.6	9	1.8	20	1.4	13
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.6	1.6	9	1.8	9	1.2	20	2.0	13
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.8	3.9	3.7	9	4.0	9	3.9	20	4.0	13
Global Satisfaction	Would select this university	3.2	3.3	3.2	9	3.6	9	3.4	20	3.2	13
Global Satisfaction	Would select same field	3.6	3.5	3.4	9	3.8	9	3.6	20	3.4	13
Global Satisfaction	Would recommend this university	3.3	3.5	3.2	9	3.8	9	3.4	20	3.5	13
Global Satisfaction	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.1	3.2	3.1	7	3.6	7	2.9	17	3.4	11
Quality of GTA Training	TA Appropriately supervised	2.9	3.0	2.9	9	3.4	8	2.6	15	3.3	12
Quality of GTA Training	Time expected of TA was right	3.1	3.1	3.0	9	3.5	8	2.8	17	3.2	12
Quality of GTA Training	Prepared for LAB	3.3	3.2	3.1	7	3.4	8	2.9	13	3.4	12

Effect size expresses the difference between group means in terms of standard deviations (UCM standard deviations here). It is a measure of the strength, magnitude, or importance of the difference as opposed to statistical significance.

Unless stated otherwise, the response scales were four points with positive being high (e.g., Very Satisfied [4], Satisfied [3], Dissatisfied [2], Very Dissatisfied [1]; Strongly Agree [4], Agree [3], Disagree [2], Strongly Disagree [1])

Electrical Engineering & Computer Science had the lowest response rate by far (33%).

Table 5.1: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Engineering, and in IGP Biological Engineering and Small Scale Technologies

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SOE Mean	Biological Engineering & Small Scale Technologies Mean		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SOE	< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.5	3.6	3.4	9			< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.2	3.1	3.2	11			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.3	3.3	3.2	11			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Advice and Feedback Received	3.1	3.1	2.9	9			< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.9	3.0	3.0	9			< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.5	1.6	1.5	9			< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Quality of GTA Training	3.1	3.1	3.0	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.5	3.1	11	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.4	3.4	3.3	11			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.2	2.8	11			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.3	3.2	3.3	11			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Training in research methods	3.3	3.3	3.2	11			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Amount of financial support	3.3	3.5	3.5	10			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Teaching and TA preparation	3.3	3.4	3.3	10			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Availability of courses	3.3	3.3	2.9	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.5	3.6	3.1	9	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Encouragement to take outside courses	3.4	3.4	3.0	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Overall quality of course work	3.1	3.2	3.0	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.1	3.1	11			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.4	3.4	3.4	11			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Helpfulness of staff members	3.5	3.5	3.3	10			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty help finding employment	3.6	3.6	2.8	5	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.4	3.5	2.9	11	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.6	3.6	3.1	11	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students treated with respect by faculty	2.6	2.5	3.3	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.2	3.1	3.4	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.4	3.4	3.3	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.6	3.4	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.9	2.7	2.1	9	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.1	3.0	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.2	3.4	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Relationships with other students good	2.9	2.8	3.7	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Competition among students is excessive (Reversed)	3.1	3.0	2.8	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Staff knowledgeable	3.3	3.3	3.2	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Sense of intellectual community	3.3	3.4	3.0	9		NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	3.5	3.5	2.6	9	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.4	3.4	3.0	9	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Receive feedback from advisor	3.2	3.2	3.0	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Satisfied with advisor time	3.4	3.4	3.0	9		NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.4	3.5	3.3	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor has interests in mind	2.7	2.4	3.2	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.2	3.0	3.1	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor keeps track of research progress	2.5	2.6	3.1	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall climate	3.0	2.9	3.2	9		POS	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Courses workshops on teaching	3.3	3.2	3.3	9			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	3.1	3.2	3.3	7			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on publishing your work	3.2	3.2	3.1	7			< 10 cases

Table 5.1: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Engineering, and in IGP Biological Engineering and Small Scale Technologies

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SOE Mean	Biological Engineering & Small Scale Technologies Mean		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SOE	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.9	2.6	9			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options within academia	3.1	3.0	2.9	7			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options outside academia	2.7	2.6	2.3	8			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on degree requirements	3.2	3.0	3.0	9			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.1	2.9	2.8	9			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.1	3.0	7			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.2	3.2	3.0	7			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.4	3.1	8			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Standards for academic writing	3.3	3.4	3.3	8			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.3	3.4	8			< 10 cases
University Resources	Admissions processes	3.3	3.5	3.9	7	POS		< 10 cases
University Resources	Fellowships/Awards	3.1	3.1	3.1	8			< 10 cases
University Resources	Appointments (GSR/TA)	3.3	3.4	3.3	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Academic Services processes	3.2	3.3	3.3	6			< 10 cases
University Resources	Website Information	2.9	2.9	3.0	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Professional Development Programming	3.2	3.2	3.7	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	3.1	3.1	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Student Health Center	3.2	3.2	3.3	8			< 10 cases
University Resources	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.1	3.1	3.3	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	3.0	3.0	3.3	4			< 10 cases
University Resources	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	3.1	4.0	1	POS	POS	< 10 cases
University Resources	Disability Services	3.0	3.1	3.5	2	POS		< 10 cases
University Resources	On-campus Child Care	3.5	3.6	4.0	1	POS	POS	< 10 cases
University Resources	University Police	3.1	3.2	3.5	2			< 10 cases
University Resources	Parking for students	1.8	1.9	1.3	7	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
University Resources	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.6	2.7	2.3	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Dining Services	2.4	2.4	2.3	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Bookstore	2.8	2.6	2.6	8			< 10 cases
University Resources	Center for Research on Teaching Excellence (CRTE)	3.3	3.4	3.6	8			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.7	1.7	1.6	9			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Family obligations	1.7	1.5	1.3	9	POS		< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Availability of faculty	1.4	1.5	1.3	9			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.4	1.5	1.3	9			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.7	2.2	9	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Course scheduling	1.5	1.5	1.3	9			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.6	1.6	9			< 10 cases
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.8	3.9	3.7	9			< 10 cases
Global Satisfaction	Would select this university	3.2	3.3	3.2	9			< 10 cases
Global Satisfaction	Would select same field	3.6	3.5	3.4	9			< 10 cases
Global Satisfaction	Would recommend this university	3.3	3.5	3.2	9			< 10 cases
Global Satisfaction	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.1	3.2	3.1	7			< 10 cases
Quality of GTA Training	TA Appropriately supervised	2.9	3.0	2.9	9			< 10 cases
Quality of GTA Training	Time expected of TA was right	3.1	3.1	3.0	9			< 10 cases
Quality of GTA Training	Prepared for LAB	3.3	3.2	3.1	7			< 10 cases

Effect size expresses the difference between group means in terms of standard deviations (UCM standard deviations here). It is a measure of the strength, magnitude, or importance of the difference as opposed to statistical significance. Unless stated otherwise, the response scales were four points with positive being high (e.g., Very Satisfied [4], Satisfied [3], Dissatisfied [2], Very Dissatisfied [1]; Strongly Agree [4], Agree [3], Disagree [2], Strongly Disagree [1])

**Table 5.2: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Engineering, and in IGP Electrical Engineering and Computer Science**
Note: ONLY ONE-THIRD OF GRADUATE STUDENTS COMPLETED THE SURVEY -- 30% BELOW THE AVERAGE

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SOE Mean	Electrical Engineering & Computer Science		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SOE	< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.5	3.6	3.8	9			< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.2	3.1	3.2	9			< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.3	3.3	3.4	9			< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Advice and Feedback Received	3.1	3.1	3.5	9		POS	< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.9	3.0	3.2	9			< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.5	1.6	1.4	9			< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Quality of GTA Training	3.1	3.1	3.4	8		POS	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.5	3.4	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.4	3.4	3.3	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.2	3.4	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.3	3.2	3.1	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Training in research methods	3.3	3.3	3.6	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Amount of financial support	3.3	3.5	3.6	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Teaching and TA preparation	3.3	3.4	3.5	8			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Availability of courses	3.3	3.3	2.1	9	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.5	3.6	3.2	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Encouragement to take outside courses	3.4	3.4	2.8	8	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Overall quality of course work	3.1	3.2	2.9	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.1	3.6	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.4	3.4	3.7	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Helpfulness of staff members	3.5	3.5	3.3	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty help finding employment	3.6	3.6	3.4	7			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.4	3.5	2.8	9	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.6	3.6	3.7	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students treated with respect by faculty	2.6	2.5	3.6	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.2	3.1	3.6	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.4	3.4	3.4	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.6	3.6	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.9	2.7	2.0	9	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.1	3.4	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.2	3.6	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Relationships with other students good	2.9	2.8	3.7	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Competition among students is excessive (Reversed)	3.1	3.0	2.1	9	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Staff knowledgeable	3.3	3.3	3.2	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Sense of intellectual community	3.3	3.4	3.2	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	3.5	3.5	2.8	9	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.4	3.4	3.7	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Receive feedback from advisor	3.2	3.2	3.6	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Satisfied with advisor time	3.4	3.4	3.8	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.4	3.5	3.8	9	POS		< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor has interests in mind	2.7	2.4	3.8	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.2	3.0	3.2	9			< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor keeps track of research progress	2.5	2.6	3.8	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall climate	3.0	2.9	3.7	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Courses workshops on teaching	3.3	3.2	3.6	9			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	3.1	3.2	3.4	9			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on publishing your work	3.2	3.2	3.7	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases

**Table 5.2: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Engineering, and in IGP Electrical Engineering and Computer Science**
Note: ONLY ONE-THIRD OF GRADUATE STUDENTS COMPLETED THE SURVEY -- 30% BELOW THE AVERAGE

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SOE Mean	Electrical Engineering & Computer Science		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SOE	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.9	2.9	8			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options within academia	3.1	3.0	3.1	9			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options outside academia	2.7	2.6	3.1	9		POS	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on degree requirements	3.2	3.0	3.3	9			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.1	2.9	3.4	8		POS	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.1	3.6	8	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.2	3.2	3.7	6	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.4	3.9	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Standards for academic writing	3.3	3.4	3.9	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.3	3.6	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Admissions processes	3.3	3.5	3.7	7	POS		< 10 cases
University Resources	Fellowships/Awards	3.1	3.1	3.4	8			< 10 cases
University Resources	Appointments (GSR/TA)	3.3	3.4	3.7	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Academic Services processes	3.2	3.3	3.7	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
University Resources	Website Information	2.9	2.9	3.2	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Professional Development Programming	3.2	3.2	3.1	8			< 10 cases
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	3.1	3.4	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Student Health Center	3.2	3.2	3.0	8			< 10 cases
University Resources	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.1	3.1	2.6	8	NEG		< 10 cases
University Resources	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	3.0	3.0	3.1	8			< 10 cases
University Resources	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	3.1	3.0	7			< 10 cases
University Resources	Disability Services	3.0	3.1	3.7	3	POS	POS	< 10 cases
University Resources	On-campus Child Care	3.5	3.6	3.7	3			< 10 cases
University Resources	University Police	3.1	3.2	3.3	6			< 10 cases
University Resources	Parking for students	1.8	1.9	3.0	6	POS	POS	< 10 cases
University Resources	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.6	2.7	3.2	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
University Resources	Dining Services	2.4	2.4	2.7	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Bookstore	2.8	2.6	2.9	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Center for Research on Teaching Excellence (CRTE)	3.3	3.4	3.3	7			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.7	1.7	1.2	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Family obligations	1.7	1.5	1.2	9	POS		< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Availability of faculty	1.4	1.5	1.6	9			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.4	1.5	1.4	9			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.7	1.0	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Course scheduling	1.5	1.5	1.6	9			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.6	1.8	9	NEG		< 10 cases
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.8	3.9	4.0	9			< 10 cases
Global Satisfaction	Would select this university	3.2	3.3	3.6	9			< 10 cases
Global Satisfaction	Would select same field	3.6	3.5	3.8	9			< 10 cases
Global Satisfaction	Would recommend this university	3.3	3.5	3.8	9	POS		< 10 cases
Global Satisfaction	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.1	3.2	3.6	7	POS		< 10 cases
Quality of GTA Training	TA Appropriately supervised	2.9	3.0	3.4	8			< 10 cases
Quality of GTA Training	Time expected of TA was right	3.1	3.1	3.5	8	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Quality of GTA Training	Prepared for LAB	3.3	3.2	3.4	8			< 10 cases

Effect size expresses the difference between group means in terms of standard deviations (UCM standard deviations here). It is a measure of the strength, magnitude, or importance of the difference as opposed to statistical significance. Unless stated otherwise, the response scales were four points with positive being high (e.g., Very Satisfied [4], Satisfied [3], Dissatisfied [2], Very Dissatisfied [1]; Strongly Agree [4], Agree [3], Disagree [2], Strongly Disagree [1])

Table 5.3: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Natural Sciences, and in Environmental Systems

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SNS Mean	Environmental Systems		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SNS	< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.5	3.4	3.6	20			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.2	3.1	3.0	23			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.3	3.2	3.2	23			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Advice and Feedback Received	3.1	3.1	2.9	22			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.9	2.9	2.8	20			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.5	1.5	1.7	20			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Quality of GTA Training	3.1	3.1	2.8	17			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.6	3.6	23			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.4	3.2	3.3	23			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.1	3.3	23			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.3	3.1	3.1	23			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Training in research methods	3.3	3.2	3.0	23			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Amount of financial support	3.3	3.2	3.4	23			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Teaching and TA preparation	3.3	3.3	3.3	20			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Availability of courses	3.3	3.3	2.1	22	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.5	3.4	2.8	22	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Encouragement to take outside courses	3.4	3.6	2.1	22	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Overall quality of course work	3.1	3.0	2.6	22	NEG		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.2	3.2	23			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.4	3.3	3.6	23			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Helpfulness of staff members	3.5	3.4	3.4	23			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty help finding employment	3.6	3.5	3.2	13			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.4	3.3	3.2	22			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.6	3.5	3.3	23			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students treated with respect by faculty	2.6	2.6	3.6	21	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.2	3.1	3.5	22	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.4	3.3	3.6	22			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.4	3.6	22			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.9	3.0	2.6	22			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.0	3.0	22			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.0	3.5	22			POS
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Relationships with other students good	2.9	2.8	3.6	22	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Competition among students is excessive (Reversed)	3.1	3.2	3.0	22			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Staff knowledgeable	3.3	3.3	3.0	22			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Sense of intellectual community	3.3	3.2	3.1	22			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	3.5	3.4	2.8	22	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.4	3.4	2.5	22	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Receive feedback from advisor	3.2	3.1	3.2	22			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Satisfied with advisor time	3.4	3.3	3.3	22			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.4	3.4	3.4	22			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor has interests in mind	2.7	2.6	3.4	22	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.2	3.1	3.1	22			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor keeps track of research progress	2.5	2.3	3.3	22	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall climate	3.0	2.9	3.5	22	POS	POS	
Advice and Feedback Received	Courses workshops on teaching	3.3	3.4	2.9	20	NEG	NEG	
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	3.1	3.2	3.0	21			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on publishing your work	3.2	3.1	3.0	21			

Table 5.3: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Natural Sciences, and in Environmental Systems

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SNS Mean	Environmental Systems		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SNS	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.8	3.0	20			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options within academia	3.1	2.8	2.8	19			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options outside academia	2.7	2.7	2.3	19			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on degree requirements	3.2	3.3	2.8	22		NEG	
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.1	3.0	2.7	20			
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.0	3.0	22			
Advice and Feedback Received	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.2	3.0	3.0	12			
Advice and Feedback Received	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.4	3.3	22			
Advice and Feedback Received	Standards for academic writing	3.3	3.1	3.2	21			
Advice and Feedback Received	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.3	3.1	20			
University Resources	Admissions processes	3.3	3.2	3.0	11			
University Resources	Fellowships/Awards	3.1	3.0	2.9	17			
University Resources	Appointments (GSR/TA)	3.3	3.4	3.1	19			
University Resources	Academic Services processes	3.2	3.3	3.0	17			
University Resources	Website Information	2.9	2.9	2.5	18			
University Resources	Professional Development Programming	3.2	3.1	3.0	17			
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	2.8	2.8	15			
University Resources	Student Health Center	3.2	3.1	3.1	17			
University Resources	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.1	2.9	2.9	19			
University Resources	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	3.0	2.9	2.7	12			
University Resources	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	2.9	3.1	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Disability Services	3.0	3.3	2.4	7	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
University Resources	On-campus Child Care	3.5	3.4	3.5	4			< 10 cases
University Resources	University Police	3.1	3.0	3.0	11			
University Resources	Parking for students	1.8	1.8	1.9	14			
University Resources	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.6	2.7	2.6	15			
University Resources	Dining Services	2.4	2.4	2.1	17			
University Resources	Bookstore	2.8	2.9	2.4	17	NEG	NEG	
University Resources	Center for Research on Teaching Excellence (CRTE)	3.3	3.2	3.5	13			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.7	1.7	1.9	20			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Family obligations	1.7	1.7	1.7	20			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Availability of faculty	1.4	1.4	1.6	20			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.4	1.5	1.7	20			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.6	1.9	20			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Course scheduling	1.5	1.5	1.8	20			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.2	1.2	20			
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.8	3.7	3.9	20			
Global Satisfaction	Would select this university	3.2	3.0	3.4	20			
Global Satisfaction	Would select same field	3.6	3.6	3.6	20			
Global Satisfaction	Would recommend this university	3.3	3.1	3.4	20			
Global Satisfaction	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.1	3.1	2.9	17			
Quality of GTA Training	TA Appropriately supervised	2.9	2.9	2.6	15			
Quality of GTA Training	Time expected of TA was right	3.1	2.9	2.8	17			
Quality of GTA Training	Prepared for LAB	3.3	3.3	2.9	13		NEG	

Effect size expresses the difference between group means in terms of standard deviations (UCM standard deviations here). It is a measure of the strength, magnitude, or importance of the difference as opposed to statistical significance. Unless stated otherwise, the response scales were four points with positive being high (e.g., Very Satisfied [4], Satisfied [3], Dissatisfied [2], Very Dissatisfied [1]; Strongly Agree [4], Agree [3], Disagree [2], Strongly Disagree [1])

Table 5.4: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Engineering, and in IGP Mechanical Engineering

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SOE Mean	Mechanical Engineering		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SOE	< 10 cases
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.5	3.6	3.5	13			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.2	3.1	3.3	15			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.3	3.3	3.4	15			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Advice and Feedback Received	3.1	3.1	3.2	13			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.9	3.0	3.0	13			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.5	1.6	1.6	13			
Scale Score (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Quality of GTA Training	3.1	3.1	3.3	12			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.5	3.8	15			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.4	3.4	3.6	15			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.2	3.3	15			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.3	3.2	3.3	15			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Training in research methods	3.3	3.3	3.5	14			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Amount of financial support	3.3	3.5	3.6	15			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Teaching and TA preparation	3.3	3.4	3.6	15			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Availability of courses	3.3	3.3	2.6	14	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.5	3.6	3.1	14	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Encouragement to take outside courses	3.4	3.4	2.9	14	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and	Overall quality of course work	3.1	3.2	3.1	14			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.1	3.7	15	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.4	3.4	3.6	15			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Helpfulness of staff members	3.5	3.5	3.6	14			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty help finding employment	3.6	3.6	3.2	12			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.4	3.5	3.4	15			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.6	3.6	3.5	15			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students treated with respect by faculty	2.6	2.5	3.6	14	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.2	3.1	3.8	14	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.4	3.4	3.4	14			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.6	3.8	14			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.9	2.7	2.7	14			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.1	3.1	14			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.2	3.3	14			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Relationships with other students good	2.9	2.8	3.5	14	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Competition among students is excessive (Reversed)	3.1	3.0	2.4	14	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Staff knowledgeable	3.3	3.3	3.1	14			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Sense of intellectual community	3.3	3.4	3.4	14			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	3.5	3.5	3.1	14	NEG		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.4	3.4	3.3	14			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Receive feedback from advisor	3.2	3.2	3.5	14			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Satisfied with advisor time	3.4	3.4	3.5	14			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.4	3.5	3.4	14			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor has interests in mind	2.7	2.4	3.4	14	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.2	3.0	3.3	14			
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Advisor keeps track of research progress	2.5	2.6	3.6	14	POS	POS	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Overall climate	3.0	2.9	3.5	14	POS	POS	
Advice and Feedback Received	Courses workshops on teaching	3.3	3.2	3.5	13			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	3.1	3.2	3.3	12			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on publishing your work	3.2	3.2	3.3	13			

Table 5.4: Results from the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Engineering, and in IGP Mechanical Engineering

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SOE Mean	Mechanical Engineering		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SOE	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.9	3.1	12			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options within academia	3.1	3.0	3.3	12			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on career options outside academia	2.7	2.6	2.8	13			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on degree requirements	3.2	3.0	3.0	13			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.1	2.9	3.1	12			
Advice and Feedback Received	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.1	3.2	12			
Advice and Feedback Received	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.2	3.2	3.3	12			
Advice and Feedback Received	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.4	3.5	13			
Advice and Feedback Received	Standards for academic writing	3.3	3.4	3.4	13			
Advice and Feedback Received	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.3	3.3	13			
University Resources	Admissions processes	3.3	3.5	3.6	8			< 10 cases
University Resources	Fellowships/Awards	3.1	3.1	3.2	11			
University Resources	Appointments (GSR/TA)	3.3	3.4	3.5	11			
University Resources	Academic Services processes	3.2	3.3	3.6	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Website Information	2.9	2.9	3.4	11			
University Resources	Professional Development Programming	3.2	3.2	3.1	11			
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	3.1	3.2	11			
University Resources	Student Health Center	3.2	3.2	3.4	11			
University Resources	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.1	3.1	3.5	11			
University Resources	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	3.0	3.0	3.2	10			
University Resources	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	3.1	3.2	5			< 10 cases
University Resources	Disability Services	3.0	3.1	3.5	4	POS		< 10 cases
University Resources	On-campus Child Care	3.5	3.6	3.7	3			< 10 cases
University Resources	University Police	3.1	3.2	3.4	5			< 10 cases
University Resources	Parking for students	1.8	1.9	1.9	12			
University Resources	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.6	2.7	2.6	11			
University Resources	Dining Services	2.4	2.4	2.6	13			
University Resources	Bookstore	2.8	2.6	2.9	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	Center for Research on Teaching Excellence (CRTE)	3.3	3.4	3.2	9			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.7	1.7	2.0	13			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Family obligations	1.7	1.5	1.5	13			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Availability of faculty	1.4	1.5	1.4	13			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.4	1.5	1.4	13			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.7	1.7	13			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Course scheduling	1.5	1.5	1.4	13			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.6	2.0	13	NEG	NEG	
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.8	3.9	4.0	13			
Global Satisfaction	Would select this university	3.2	3.3	3.2	13			
Global Satisfaction	Would select same field	3.6	3.5	3.4	13			
Global Satisfaction	Would recommend this university	3.3	3.5	3.5	13			
Global Satisfaction	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.1	3.2	3.4	11			
Quality of GTA Training	TA Appropriately supervised	2.9	3.0	3.3	12			
Quality of GTA Training	Time expected of TA was right	3.1	3.1	3.2	12			
Quality of GTA Training	Prepared for LAB	3.3	3.2	3.4	12			

Effect size expresses the difference between group means in terms of standard deviations (UCM standard deviations here). It is a measure of the strength, magnitude, or importance of the difference as opposed to statistical significance. Unless stated otherwise, the response scales were four points with positive being high (e.g., Very Satisfied [4], Satisfied [3], Dissatisfied [2], Very Dissatisfied [1]; Strongly Agree [4], Agree [3], Disagree [2], Strongly Disagree [1])

Table 6: Response Rates for the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students

Survey Participants

Gender

	Female	Male	Total
Did not respond	39	99	138
	24%	47%	37%
Responded	121	110	231
	76%	53%	63%
	160	209	369
	43%	57%	

California Resident*

	AB 540	Not a CA Resident	CA Resident	Total
Did not respond	1	51	86	138
	17%	41%	36%	37%
Responded	5	73	153	231
	83%	59%	64%	63%
	6	124	239	369
	2%	34%	65%	

Degree

	MA	MS	PHD	Total
Did not respond	5	12	121	138
	56%	46%	36%	37%
Responded	4	14	213	231
	44%	54%	64%	63%
	9	26	334	369
	2%	7%	91%	

Table 6: Response Rates for the 2015 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students

		Survey Participants														Total
Major		AMAT	CCB	CIS	ESYS	IGBT	IGEC	IGMN	IGSS	IGWC	IH	PHYI	POLS	PSYS	QSB	
Did not respond		9	11	9	14	10	24	9	4	6	0	17	3	7	15	138
		39%	52%	36%	34%	48%	67%	32%	29%	30%	0%	46%	33%	20%	29%	37%
Responded		14	10	16	27	11	12	19	10	14	8	20	6	28	36	231
		61%	48%	64%	66%	52%	33%	68%	71%	70%	100%	54%	67%	80%	71%	63%
		23	21	25	41	21	36	28	14	20	8	37	9	35	51	369
		6%	6%	7%	11%	6%	10%	8%	4%	5%	2%	10%	2%	9%	14%	

AMAT	Applied Mathematics
CCB	Chemistry & Chemical Biology
CIS	Cognitive and Information Sciences
ESYS	Environmental Systems
IGBT	Biological Engineering & Small Scale Technologies
IGEC	Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences
IGMN	Mechanical Engineering
IGSS	Social Sciences
IGWC	World Cultures
IH	Interdisciplinary Humanities
PHYI	Physics
POLS	Political Science
PSYS	Psychology
QSB	Quantitative & Systems Biology

* Resident for fee purposes.