

Table of Contents

Table 1: Rating Results from the 2017 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students: Overall and by School of Graduate Program

Table 2: Library, Place of Residence and Expected Employer from the 2017 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students: Overall and by School of Graduate Program

Table 3.0: Results from the 2017 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 2017 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 Sociology

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

Table 5.0: Results from the 2017 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 2017 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students

Table 7: Rating Results from the 2017 Survey of Spring Graduate Students by Degree Level

Table 8: Rating Results from the 2017 Survey of Spring Graduate Students by URM (Underrepresented Minority)

Table 9: Risk Management Items from the 2017 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students: Overall and by School of Graduate Program

Notes

Scale Scores

Scale scores were computed by averaging the responses of an individual across similar items, usually the items in a section of the questionnaire. The scale scores are similar to but not equivalent to factor scores because the items were clustered based on judgment and items were equally weighted. Scale scores are an effective way to reduce the information load for quick comparison.

Mean Value

To effectively reduce the information to a manageable amount that supports valid comparison, responses to items are reported as mean values where the most positive response is weighted 4 and the most negative response is weighted 1. Items that were negatively worded, were reversed so that a high value is "better." If there were fewer or more than four responses, that is noted in the table.

Structure of Report Worksheets

The tables display results overall, by School, and by program. The program tables include comparison to School and Campus averages. The School tables include comparison of programs within Schools, the School average and the average overall. The campus table includes School comparisons to the overall average.

Structure of Report Tables

Each report page displays the scale scores first and then the individual items that comprise the scales sorted by scale and in the same order.

Effect Size

To help call attention to differences that are of importance, significant effect sizes are flagged. An effect size as used here is a measure of the difference in two means measured in standard deviations. It is often referred to as a noticeable difference instead of a statistically significant difference. The effect size thresholds used here are 0.3 for School to campus comparisons and 0.5 for program to School and campus comparisons.

As an example, in an ordered distribution, 0.3 standard deviations (an effect size of 0.3) is about the 62nd percentile (positive) or 38th percentile (negative).

Table 1: Rating Results from the 2017 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*
Survey Participation		241		77		65		99	
Scale Scores (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.4	0.63	3.5		3.2		3.4	
	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.1	0.56	3.2		2.9	NEG	3.1	
	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.2	0.52	3.3		3.1		3.2	
	Advice and Feedback Received	3.0	0.73	3.1		2.8		3.1	
	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.8	0.66	2.7		2.7		2.9	
	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.6	0.42	1.6		1.6		1.6	
	GSR/TA Training	3.0	0.73	3.1		2.9		2.9	
	Graduate Division Programming	3.0	0.74	3.1		3.0		2.9	
	Food Insecurity	2.1	0.33	2.1		2.1		2.2	
	Environments	2.9	0.34	2.8		2.8		2.9	
	Health	3.6	0.87	3.5		3.7		3.5	
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.7	0.64	3.7		3.7		3.7	
	Would select this university	3.1	0.90	3.2		2.9		3.2	
	Would select same field	3.5	0.71	3.5		3.4		3.6	
	Would recommend this university	3.2	0.93	3.4		3.0		3.1	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	0.68	3.7		3.3	NEG	3.6	
	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.3	0.85	3.5		3.0	NEG	3.4	
	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	0.88	3.2		3.0		3.1	
	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.2	0.90	3.3		2.7	NEG	3.4	
	Training in research methods	3.1	0.86	3.3		2.9		3.1	
	Amount of financial support	3.2	0.85	3.0		3.3		3.2	
	Teaching and TA preparation	3.1	0.88	3.3		3.1		3.0	
	Availability of courses	2.7	1.04	3.1	POS	2.2	NEG	2.9	
	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.1	0.86	3.3		2.7	NEG	3.3	
	Encouragement to take outside courses	2.6	1.03	2.6		2.5		2.8	
	Overall quality of course work	3.0	0.85	3.2		2.6	NEG	3.2	
	GSR/TA appointments in 2016-17	3.3	0.80	3.3		3.2		3.3	
	On track to complete my degree program on time	3.2	0.73	3.1		3.2		3.3	
	Upbeat about my post-graduation career prospects	2.8	0.87	3.0		2.7		2.8	
	Satisfied with the mentorship and advising	3.2	0.88	3.2		2.9	NEG	3.4	
	Satisfied with the career support	2.8	0.95	3.0		2.4	NEG	2.9	
	I have the space and the resources I need	3.1	0.88	3.2		3.1		3.1	
	My graduate prgm keeps hassles to a minimum	2.9	0.85	2.9		2.8		2.8	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	0.94	3.3		3.0		3.3	
	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.5	0.79	3.5		3.3		3.6	
	Helpfulness of staff members	3.2	0.93	3.6	POS	3.1		3.0	
	Faculty help finding employment	3.0	1.04	3.2		2.7		3.0	
	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.1	0.85	3.3		2.9		3.1	
	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.3	0.82	3.4		3.0		3.3	
	Students treated with respect by faculty	3.3	0.73	3.5		3.2		3.2	
	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.4	0.63	3.5		3.3		3.5	
	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.3	0.77	3.5		3.2		3.1	
	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	0.61	3.5		3.4		3.6	
	(NO) Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.5	0.98	2.7		2.3		2.5	
	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	0.80	3.0		3.1		3.0	
	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	0.79	3.4		3.3		3.1	
	Relationships with other students good	3.4	0.68	3.6		3.4		3.4	
	Competition among students (IS NOT) excessive (Reversed)	2.9	0.80	2.9		2.7		3.1	
	Staff knowledgeable	3.0	0.91	3.2		3.0		2.7	

Table 1: Rating Results from the 2017 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	Sense of intellectual community	3.1	0.85	3.3		3.0		2.9	
	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	2.8	0.91	3.1		2.6		2.8	
	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.1	0.82	3.2		2.8	NEG	3.2	
	Receive feedback from advisor	3.3	0.85	3.3		3.2		3.4	
	Satisfied with advisor time	3.3	0.80	3.3		3.2		3.4	
	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.5	0.68	3.4		3.3	NEG	3.6	
	Advisor has interests in mind	3.4	0.76	3.4		3.2	NEG	3.6	
	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.1	0.98	3.1		2.8		3.2	
	Advisor keeps track of research progress	3.4	0.79	3.4		3.3		3.4	
	Overall climate	3.3	0.81	3.5		3.2		3.1	
	My graduate program is (NOT) hostile toward students	3.1	0.88	3.3		3.0		3.1	
	Advice on writing grant proposals	2.8	0.90	2.9		2.8		2.8	
	Advice on publishing your work	3.0	0.93	3.0		2.9		3.1	
Developing professional contacts	2.8	0.98	2.9		2.5		2.8		
Advice on career options within academia	2.9	0.97	3.1		2.5	NEG	3.1		
Advice on career options outside academia	2.5	1.01	2.7		2.1	NEG	2.6		
Advice on degree requirements	3.1	0.94	3.2		3.0		3.1		
Advice on preparing for examinations	3.0	0.95	3.2		2.9		3.0		
Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	0.96	3.1		3.0		3.2		
Process to select a thesis advisor	3.0	1.02	3.0		2.8		3.1		
Feedback on your research	3.4	0.82	3.4		3.2		3.4		
Standards for academic writing	3.2	0.81	3.3		3.1		3.3		
Avoid plagiarism	3.4	0.77	3.4		3.1	NEG	3.5		
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	0.90	2.8		2.8		3.2	
	Student Health Center	3.2	0.90	3.2		3.1		3.2	
	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.3	0.77	3.1		3.2		3.4	
	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	2.7	1.00	2.8		2.6		2.7	
	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	0.98	3.3		3.2		2.9	
	Disability Services	2.8	1.00	3.1		2.9		2.7	
	On-campus Child Care	3.1	1.11	2.9		3.2		3.1	
	University Police	3.1	0.92	3.4	POS	3.1		2.9	
	Parking for students	2.1	1.00	2.0		2.0		2.2	
	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.5	1.02	2.3		2.6		2.6	
	Dining Services	2.2	0.93	2.1		2.1		2.5	
	Bookstore	2.6	0.91	2.6		2.4		2.6	
	Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning (CETL)	3.3	0.79	3.3		3.3		3.2	
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.8	0.79	1.9		1.7		1.8	
	Family obligations	1.8	0.75	1.8		1.6		1.8	
	Availability of faculty	1.5	0.68	1.5		1.6		1.5	
	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.6	0.71	1.5		1.6		1.7	
	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	0.73	1.6		1.8		1.5	
	Course scheduling	1.5	0.63	1.4		1.6		1.5	
	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	0.60	1.3		1.5	POS	1.2	
GSR/TA Training	Courses and workshops on teaching	3.0	0.89	3.2		2.8		3.0	
	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.0	0.89	3.3		3.2		2.8	
	TA Appropriately supervised	3.2	0.87	3.4		3.3		2.7	NEG
	Time expected of TA was right	2.9	0.93	3.0		2.9		2.8	
	Prepared for LAB	3.1	0.85	2.8	NEG	3.1		3.3	

Table 1: Rating Results from the 2017 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*
Graduate Division Programming	Admissions processes	3.3	0.74	3.5		3.1		3.3	
	Fellowships/Awards	3.0	0.92	3.1		3.0		3.0	
	Academic Services processes	3.0	0.94	3.1		3.1		2.8	
	Website Information	2.7	0.93	2.8		2.6		2.8	
	Professional Development Programming	3.1	0.89	3.2		3.0		3.2	
	Financial Services	3.0	0.90	3.1		3.0		3.0	
	Diversity and Inclusion	3.0	0.98	3.3		3.1		2.7	
Food Insecurity (3-Point Scale)	Worried about running out of food	2.2	0.38	2.1		2.2		2.2	
	Food did not last did not have money for more	2.2	0.38	2.1		2.1		2.2	
Environments	Satisfied with living conditions	3.3	0.69	3.2		3.2		3.3	
	My housing situation has (NOT) weighed on me lately	2.7	1.01	2.5		2.6		3.0	
	On campus I feel safe	3.4	0.71	3.5		3.5		3.2	
	I can get by financially without having to cut much	2.9	0.80	2.9		3.0		2.8	
Health (5-Point Scale)	How has your PHYSICAL health been this term?	3.8	0.97	3.7		4.1		3.7	
	How has your MENTAL health been this term?	3.3	1.07	3.3		3.4		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 2017 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 2016-17	36	14%	6	8%	9	12%	21	20%
Have used the information from the library sponsored	31	86%	4	67%	9	100%	18	86%
	UCM		SNS		SOE		SSHA	
While attending UC Merced, lived in:								
Merced	211	88%	62	85%	65	88%	84	87%
Excellent or Very Good Place to live	71	34%	21	34%	22	34%	28	33%
Good Place to live	79	37%	26	42%	26	40%	27	32%
Fair or Poor place to live	61	29%	15	24%	17	26%	29	35%
Atwater, Chowchilla, Turlock, Modesto	17		6		4		7	
Other (e.g., Fresno, Stockton)	13		5		5		6	
Type of expected employer:								
Four-year college or university	100	41%	27	37%	13	18%	60	61%
Community or junior college	15	6%	4	5%	2	3%	9	9%
Elementary, Secondary or Special Focus School	3	1%		0%	3	4%		0%
Industry or business	64	26%	26	36%	35	48%	3	3%
Hospital or Clinic	2	1%	1	1%		0%	1	1%
Nonprofit organization or foundation	4	2%		0%		0%	4	4%
U.S. (federal government or your home country if not U.S.)	4	2%	1	1%	2	3%	1	1%
State or local government	5	2%	1	1%		0%	4	4%
National laboratory	14	6%	4	5%	8	11%	2	2%
Self employed	1	0%	1	1%		0%		0%
Unknown	33	13%	8	11%	10	14%	15	15%

Table 3.0: Results from the 2017 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Natural Sciences, and by Graduate Program

Category	Item	UCM	SNS	Applied Mathematics		Chemistry and Chemical Biology		Physics		Quantitative & Systems Biology	
		Mean	Mean	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency
Scale Scores (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.4	3.5	3.4	11	3.5	15	3.2	16	3.6	28
	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.1	3.2	3.4	11	3.2	16	3.0	19	3.2	31
	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.2	3.3	3.4	11	3.2	16	3.4	19	3.3	31
	Advice and Feedback Received	3.0	3.1	3.3	11	2.9	15	3.2	17	3.1	28
	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.8	2.7	2.8	11	2.6	16	2.5	16	2.8	27
	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.6	1.6	1.6	11	1.5	16	1.5	16	1.6	28
	GSR/TA Training	3.0	3.1	3.2	11	2.9	16	3.1	16	3.2	28
	Graduate Division Programming	3.0	3.1	3.2	11	3.0	15	3.0	15	3.1	28
	Food Insecurity	2.1	2.1	2.0	1	2.2	6	2.0	3	2.1	12
	Environments	2.9	2.8	2.9	11	2.8	15	2.7	15	2.9	28
	Health	3.6	3.5	3.4	11	3.8	15	3.1	15	3.6	28
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.7	3.7	3.5	11	3.8	15	3.6	15	3.9	28
	Would select this university	3.1	3.2	3.1	11	3.2	15	2.9	16	3.4	28
	Would select same field	3.5	3.5	3.5	11	3.4	15	3.3	16	3.7	28
	Would recommend this university	3.2	3.4	3.5	11	3.5	15	2.9	16	3.5	28
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.7	3.8	11	3.8	16	3.6	19	3.7	31
	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.3	3.5	3.5	11	3.6	16	3.4	19	3.4	31
	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.2	3.6	11	3.1	16	2.9	19	3.4	31
	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.2	3.3	3.5	11	3.4	16	2.9	18	3.4	31
	Training in research methods	3.1	3.3	3.6	11	3.1	16	3.2	19	3.3	31
	Amount of financial support	3.2	3.0	3.5	11	3.0	16	2.9	19	2.9	31
	Teaching and TA preparation	3.1	3.3	3.8	11	3.2	16	3.1	18	3.3	30
	Availability of courses	2.7	3.1	3.4	11	3.0	16	3.1	17	3.0	29
	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.1	3.3	3.4	11	3.4	16	3.1	17	3.3	29
	Encouragement to take outside courses	2.6	2.6	3.0	11	2.8	16	2.4	17	2.4	29
	Overall quality of course work	3.0	3.2	3.3	11	3.3	16	2.9	17	3.3	29
	GSR/TA appointments in 2016-17	3.3	3.3	3.5	11	3.3	16	3.1	16	3.4	29
	On track to complete my degree program on time	3.2	3.1	3.3	11	3.1	15	2.9	15	3.2	28
	Upbeat about my post-graduation career prospects	2.8	3.0	2.9	10	3.1	14	2.8	14	3.1	27
	Satisfied with the mentorship and advising	3.2	3.2	3.5	11	3.1	15	3.1	15	3.2	28
	Satisfied with the career support	2.8	3.0	3.0	10	3.0	12	2.8	12	3.1	27
I have the space and the resources I need	3.1	3.2	3.4	11	3.1	15	3.0	15	3.4	28	
My graduate prgm keeps hassles to a minimum	2.9	2.9	3.0	11	2.9	14	2.8	15	3.0	28	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.3	3.6	11	3.1	16	3.3	19	3.4	31
	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.5	3.5	3.6	11	3.4	16	3.5	19	3.5	31
	Helpfulness of staff members	3.2	3.6	3.8	11	3.6	16	3.7	19	3.5	31
	Faculty help finding employment	3.0	3.2	3.3	6	3.0	9	3.0	8	3.4	16
	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.1	3.3	3.4	11	3.2	13	3.4	17	3.4	31
	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.3	3.4	3.4	11	3.4	16	3.4	19	3.5	31
	Students treated with respect by faculty	3.3	3.5	3.4	11	3.5	16	3.6	17	3.5	29
	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.4	3.5	3.6	11	3.5	16	3.5	17	3.4	29
	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.3	3.5	3.5	11	3.5	16	3.6	17	3.4	29
	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.5	3.6	11	3.3	16	3.6	17	3.6	29
	(NO) Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.5	2.7	3.0	11	2.4	16	3.2	17	2.5	29
	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.0	3.3	11	2.8	16	2.9	17	3.0	28
	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.4	3.5	11	3.4	16	3.4	16	3.4	29
	Relationships with other students good	3.4	3.6	3.8	11	3.5	16	3.6	17	3.5	29
	Competition among students (IS NOT) excessive (Reversed)	2.9	2.9	3.3	11	2.7	16	2.9	17	2.9	29
	Staff knowledgeable	3.0	3.2	3.2	11	3.4	16	3.5	17	3.0	29
	Sense of intellectual community	3.1	3.3	3.5	11	3.4	16	3.2	17	3.2	29
	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	2.8	3.1	3.1	11	3.1	16	3.0	17	3.1	29
	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.1	3.2	3.0	11	3.2	16	3.2	17	3.4	29
Receive feedback from advisor	3.3	3.3	3.5	11	3.0	16	3.3	17	3.3	29	
Satisfied with advisor time	3.3	3.3	3.5	11	3.0	16	3.5	17	3.3	29	

Table 3.0: Results from the 2017 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Natural Sciences, and by Graduate Program

Category	Item	UCM	SNS	Applied Mathematics		Chemistry and Chemical Biology		Physics		Quantitative & Systems Biology	
		Mean	Mean	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency
Advice and Feedback Received	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.5	3.4	3.5	11	3.2	16	3.3	17	3.6	29
	Advisor has interests in mind	3.4	3.4	3.5	11	3.4	16	3.5	17	3.4	28
	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.1	3.1	3.1	10	3.1	16	2.9	17	3.2	29
	Advisor keeps track of research progress	3.4	3.4	3.5	11	3.1	16	3.6	17	3.4	29
	Overall climate	3.3	3.5	3.5	11	3.4	16	3.6	17	3.5	29
	My graduate program is (NOT) hostile toward students	3.1	3.3	3.5	11	2.9	14	3.3	14	3.5	26
	Advice on writing grant proposals	2.8	2.9	2.6	7	2.8	12	3.0	11	3.0	26
	Advice on publishing your work	3.0	3.0	3.2	9	2.5	15	3.3	13	3.0	26
	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.9	3.3	9	2.6	14	2.9	14	2.8	26
	Advice on career options within academia	2.9	3.1	3.2	9	2.9	12	3.0	14	3.1	26
	Advice on career options outside academia	2.5	2.7	3.0	9	2.8	14	2.4	12	2.7	23
University Resources	Advice on degree requirements	3.1	3.2	3.4	11	3.2	15	3.5	15	3.1	28
	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.0	3.2	3.6	11	3.0	14	3.1	15	3.1	24
	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.1	3.3	10	3.0	14	3.1	12	3.0	26
	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.0	3.0	3.3	9	2.8	12	3.0	14	3.0	24
	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.4	3.6	11	3.2	15	3.5	17	3.4	28
	Standards for academic writing	3.2	3.3	3.4	10	3.1	15	3.3	15	3.3	26
	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.4	3.5	10	3.2	15	3.6	16	3.4	28
	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	2.8	2.5	6	3.1	10	2.6	11	2.8	17
	Student Health Center	3.2	3.2	3.5	8	3.5	12	2.9	13	3.0	20
	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.3	3.1	3.2	11	3.3	12	2.9	14	3.2	24
	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	2.7	2.8	2.8	5	2.9	8	2.6	5	2.9	12
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	3.3	3.5	6	3.5	6	3.4	5	3.2	19
	Disability Services	2.8	3.1	3.7	3	3.0	1	3.0	2	2.7	3
	On-campus Child Care	3.1	2.9	3.7	3	1.0	2	3.5	2	3.0	4
	University Police	3.1	3.4	3.6	5	3.2	6	3.6	5	3.4	11
	Parking for students	2.1	2.0	2.4	8	1.7	15	1.9	15	2.1	24
	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.5	2.3	2.4	10	2.3	8	1.9	12	2.5	21
	Dining Services	2.2	2.1	2.1	10	2.3	12	1.6	11	2.3	24
	Bookstore	2.6	2.6	2.4	9	2.5	11	2.8	11	2.7	21
	Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning (CETL)	3.3	3.3	3.7	3	3.3	4	3.4	5	3.2	14
	Work/financial commitments	1.8	1.9	1.3	10	2.0	15	1.8	16	2.0	28
	GSR/TA Training	Family obligations	1.8	1.8	1.8	10	1.5	15	1.6	16	2.0
Availability of faculty		1.5	1.5	1.3	10	1.5	16	1.3	16	1.6	28
Graduate program structure or requirements		1.6	1.5	1.4	10	1.5	16	1.5	16	1.5	28
Dissertation topic/research		1.6	1.6	2.0	11	1.7	16	1.7	16	1.3	28
Course scheduling		1.5	1.4	1.3	10	1.4	16	1.4	16	1.4	28
Immigration laws or regulations		1.3	1.3	1.4	10	1.1	16	1.4	16	1.2	28
Courses and workshops on teaching		3.0	3.2	3.4	11	3.0	15	3.1	15	3.3	26
Graduate Division Programing	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.0	3.3	3.5	11	2.9	14	3.6	14	3.3	28
	TA Appropriately supervised	3.2	3.4	3.0	4	3.1	14	3.6	14	3.4	23
	Time expected of TA was right	2.9	3.0	2.8	10	2.9	14	3.2	14	3.0	27
	Prepared for LAB	3.1	2.8	3.2	11	2.8	14	2.1	14	3.0	28
Food Insecurity (3-Point Scale)	Admissions processes	3.3	3.5	3.4	8	3.7	9	3.6	10	3.5	22
	Fellowships/Awards	3.0	3.1	3.1	11	3.0	12	3.1	13	3.2	27
	Academic Services processes	3.0	3.1	3.0	11	3.1	14	3.1	11	3.2	21
	Website Information	2.7	2.8	2.8	11	2.7	15	2.9	15	2.7	27
	Professional Development Programming	3.1	3.2	3.1	7	3.3	9	3.2	9	3.1	23
	Financial Services	3.0	3.1	3.5	11	3.1	12	3.0	12	3.0	27
	Diversity and Inclusion	3.0	3.3	3.5	8	3.2	10	3.1	8	3.4	22
Worried about running out of food	2.2	2.1	2.0	1	2.2	6	2.0	3	2.2	11	

Table 3.0: Results from the 2017 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Natural Sciences, and by Graduate Program

Category	Item	UCM	SNS	Applied Mathematics		Chemistry and Chemical Biology		Physics		Quantitative & Systems Biology	
		Mean	Mean	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency
Environments	Food did not last did not have money for more	2.2	2.1	1.0	1	2.3	3	2.0	3	2.1	8
	Satisfied with living conditions	3.3	3.2	3.4	11	3.2	15	3.1	15	3.3	28
	My housing situation has (NOT) weighed on me lately	2.7	2.5	3.2	10	2.3	13	2.4	15	2.4	26
	On campus I feel safe	3.4	3.5	3.3	11	3.4	15	3.3	15	3.6	27
Health (5-Point Scale)	I can get by financially without having to cut much	2.9	2.9	3.2	11	3.1	14	3.1	14	2.6	28
	How has your PHYSICAL health been this term?	3.8	3.7	3.5	11	3.9	15	3.3	15	3.9	28
	How has your MENTAL health been this term?	3.3	3.3	3.2	11	3.7	15	2.8	15	3.4	28

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 2017 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 Scores (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.4	3.5	3.4	11			
	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.1	3.2	3.4	11	POS		
	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.2	3.3	3.4	11			
	Advice and Feedback Received	3.0	3.1	3.3	11			
	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.8	2.7	2.8	11			
	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.6	1.6	1.6	11			
	GSR/TA Training	3.0	3.1	3.2	11			
	Graduate Division Programming	3.0	3.1	3.2	11			
	Food Insecurity	2.1	2.1	2.0	1			< 10 cases
	Environments	2.9	2.8	2.9	11			
	Health	3.6	3.5	3.4	11			
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.7	3.7	3.5	11			
	Would select this university	3.1	3.2	3.1	11			
	Would select same field	3.5	3.5	3.5	11			
	Would recommend this university	3.2	3.4	3.5	11			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.7	3.8	11			
	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.3	3.5	3.5	11			
	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.2	3.6	11	POS		
	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.2	3.3	3.5	11			
	Training in research methods	3.1	3.3	3.6	11	POS		
	Amount of financial support	3.2	3.0	3.5	11		POS	
	Teaching and TA preparation	3.1	3.3	3.8	11	POS	POS	
	Availability of courses	2.7	3.1	3.4	11	POS		
	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.1	3.3	3.4	11			
	Encouragement to take outside courses	2.6	2.6	3.0	11			
	Overall quality of course work	3.0	3.2	3.3	11			
	GSR/TA appointments in 2016-17	3.3	3.3	3.5	11			
	On track to complete my degree program on time	3.2	3.1	3.3	11			
	Upbeat about my post-graduation career prospects	2.8	3.0	2.9	10			
	Satisfied with the mentorship and advising	3.2	3.2	3.5	11			
	Satisfied with the career support	2.8	3.0	3.0	10			
	I have the space and the resources I need	3.1	3.2	3.4	11			
My graduate prgm keeps hassles to a minimum	2.9	2.9	3.0	11				
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.3	3.6	11			
	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.5	3.5	3.6	11			
	Helpfulness of staff members	3.2	3.6	3.8	11	POS		
	Faculty help finding employment	3.0	3.2	3.3	6			< 10 cases
	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.1	3.3	3.4	11			
	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.3	3.4	3.4	11			
	Students treated with respect by faculty	3.3	3.5	3.4	11			
	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.4	3.5	3.6	11			
	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.3	3.5	3.5	11			
	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.5	3.6	11			
	(NO) Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.5	2.7	3.0	11			
	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.0	3.3	11			

Table 3.1: Results from the 2017 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
	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.4	3.5	11			
	Relationships with other students good	3.4	3.6	3.8	11	POS		
	Competition among students (IS NOT) excessive (Reversed)	2.9	2.9	3.3	11			
	Staff knowledgeable	3.0	3.2	3.2	11			
	Sense of intellectual community	3.1	3.3	3.5	11			
	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	2.8	3.1	3.1	11			
	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.1	3.2	3.0	11			
	Receive feedback from advisor	3.3	3.3	3.5	11			
	Satisfied with advisor time	3.3	3.3	3.5	11			
	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.5	3.4	3.5	11			
	Advisor has interests in mind	3.4	3.4	3.5	11			
	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.1	3.1	3.1	10			
	Advisor keeps track of research progress	3.4	3.4	3.5	11			
	Overall climate	3.3	3.5	3.5	11			
	My graduate program is (NOT) hostile toward students	3.1	3.3	3.5	11			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	2.8	2.9	2.6	7			< 10 cases
	Advice on publishing your work	3.0	3.0	3.2	9			< 10 cases
	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.9	3.3	9	POS		< 10 cases
	Advice on career options within academia	2.9	3.1	3.2	9			< 10 cases
	Advice on career options outside academia	2.5	2.7	3.0	9	POS		< 10 cases
	Advice on degree requirements	3.1	3.2	3.4	11			
	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.0	3.2	3.6	11	POS		
	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.1	3.3	10			
	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.0	3.0	3.3	9			< 10 cases
	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.4	3.6	11			
	Standards for academic writing	3.2	3.3	3.4	10			
	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.4	3.5	10			
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	2.8	2.5	6	NEG		< 10 cases
	Student Health Center	3.2	3.2	3.5	8			< 10 cases
	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.3	3.1	3.2	11			
	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	2.7	2.8	2.8	5			< 10 cases
	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	3.3	3.5	6			< 10 cases
	Disability Services	2.8	3.1	3.7	3	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	On-campus Child Care	3.1	2.9	3.7	3	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	University Police	3.1	3.4	3.6	5	POS		< 10 cases
	Parking for students	2.1	2.0	2.4	8			< 10 cases
	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.5	2.3	2.4	10			
	Dining Services	2.2	2.1	2.1	10			
	Bookstore	2.6	2.6	2.4	9			< 10 cases
	Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning (CETL)	3.3	3.3	3.7	3	POS		< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.8	1.9	1.3	10	NEG	NEG	
	Family obligations	1.8	1.8	1.8	10			
	Availability of faculty	1.5	1.5	1.3	10			
	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.6	1.5	1.4	10			
	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.6	2.0	11	POS	POS	

Table 3.1: Results from the 2017 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
	Course scheduling	1.5	1.4	1.3	10			
	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.3	1.4	10			
GSR/TA Training	Courses and workshops on teaching	3.0	3.2	3.4	11	POS		
	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.0	3.3	3.5	11			
	TA Appropriately supervised	3.2	3.4	3.0	4			< 10 cases
	Time expected of TA was right	2.9	3.0	2.8	10			
	Prepared for LAB	3.1	2.8	3.2	11			
Graduate Division Programing	Admissions processes	3.3	3.5	3.4	8			< 10 cases
	Fellowships/Awards	3.0	3.1	3.1	11			
	Academic Services processes	3.0	3.1	3.0	11			
	Website Information	2.7	2.8	2.8	11			
	Professional Development Programming	3.1	3.2	3.1	7			< 10 cases
	Financial Services	3.0	3.1	3.5	11			
	Diversity and Inclusion	3.0	3.3	3.5	8			< 10 cases
Food Insecurity (3-Point Scale)	Worried about running out of food	2.2	2.1	2.0	1	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
	Food did not last did not have money for more	2.2	2.1	1.0	1			< 10 cases
Environments	Satisfied with living conditions	3.3	3.2	3.4	11	POS		
	My housing situation has (NOT) weighed on me lately	2.7	2.5	3.2	10			
	On campus I feel safe	3.4	3.5	3.3	11			
	I can get by financially without having to cut much	2.9	2.9	3.2	11			
Health (5-Point Scale)	How has your PHYSICAL health been this term?	3.8	3.7	3.5	11			
	How has your MENTAL health been this term?	3.3	3.3	3.2	11			

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 2017 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 Scores (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.4	3.5	3.5	15			
	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.1	3.2	3.2	16			
	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.2	3.3	3.2	16			
	Advice and Feedback Received	3.0	3.1	2.9	15			
	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.8	2.7	2.6	16			
	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.6	1.6	1.5	16			
	GSR/TA Training	3.0	3.1	2.9	16			
	Graduate Division Programming	3.0	3.1	3.0	15			
	Food Insecurity	2.1	2.1	2.2	6			< 10 cases
	Environments	2.9	2.8	2.8	15			
Health	3.6	3.5	3.8	15				
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.7	3.7	3.8	15			
	Would select this university	3.1	3.2	3.2	15			
	Would select same field	3.5	3.5	3.4	15			
	Would recommend this university	3.2	3.4	3.5	15			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.7	3.8	16			
	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.3	3.5	3.6	16			
	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.2	3.1	16			
	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.2	3.3	3.4	16			
	Training in research methods	3.1	3.3	3.1	16			
	Amount of financial support	3.2	3.0	3.0	16			
	Teaching and TA preparation	3.1	3.3	3.2	16			
	Availability of courses	2.7	3.1	3.0	16			
	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.1	3.3	3.4	16			
	Encouragement to take outside courses	2.6	2.6	2.8	16			
	Overall quality of course work	3.0	3.2	3.3	16			
	GSR/TA appointments in 2016-17	3.3	3.3	3.3	16			
	On track to complete my degree program on time	3.2	3.1	3.1	15			
	Upbeat about my post-graduation career prospects	2.8	3.0	3.1	14			
	Satisfied with the mentorship and advising	3.2	3.2	3.1	15			
	Satisfied with the career support	2.8	3.0	3.0	12			
	I have the space and the resources I need	3.1	3.2	3.1	15			
My graduate prgm keeps hassles to a minimum	2.9	2.9	2.9	14				
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.3	3.1	16			
	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.5	3.5	3.4	16			
	Helpfulness of staff members	3.2	3.6	3.6	16			
	Faculty help finding employment	3.0	3.2	3.0	9			< 10 cases
	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.1	3.3	3.2	13			
	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.3	3.4	3.4	16			
	Students treated with respect by faculty	3.3	3.5	3.5	16			
	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.4	3.5	3.5	16			
	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.3	3.5	3.5	16			
	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.5	3.3	16			
	(NO) Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.5	2.7	2.4	16			
	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.0	2.8	16			

Table 3.2: Results from the 2017 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
	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.4	3.4	16			
	Relationships with other students good	3.4	3.6	3.5	16			
	Competition among students (IS NOT) excessive (Reversed)	2.9	2.9	2.7	16			
	Staff knowledgeable	3.0	3.2	3.4	16			
	Sense of intellectual community	3.1	3.3	3.4	16			
	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	2.8	3.1	3.1	16			
	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.1	3.2	3.2	16			
	Receive feedback from advisor	3.3	3.3	3.0	16			
	Satisfied with advisor time	3.3	3.3	3.0	16			
	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.5	3.4	3.2	16			
	Advisor has interests in mind	3.4	3.4	3.4	16			
	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.1	3.1	3.1	16			
	Advisor keeps track of research progress	3.4	3.4	3.1	16			
	Overall climate	3.3	3.5	3.4	16			
	My graduate program is (NOT) hostile toward students	3.1	3.3	2.9	14			NEG
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	2.8	2.9	2.8	12			
	Advice on publishing your work	3.0	3.0	2.5	15	NEG		NEG
	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.9	2.6	14			
	Advice on career options within academia	2.9	3.1	2.9	12			
	Advice on career options outside academia	2.5	2.7	2.8	14			
	Advice on degree requirements	3.1	3.2	3.2	15			
	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.0	3.2	3.0	14			
	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.1	3.0	14			
	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.0	3.0	2.8	12			
	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.4	3.2	15			
	Standards for academic writing	3.2	3.3	3.1	15			
	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.4	3.2	15			
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	2.8	3.1	10			
	Student Health Center	3.2	3.2	3.5	12			
	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.3	3.1	3.3	12			
	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	2.7	2.8	2.9	8			< 10 cases
	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	3.3	3.5	6			< 10 cases
	Disability Services	2.8	3.1	3.0	1			< 10 cases
	On-campus Child Care	3.1	2.9	1.0	2	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
	University Police	3.1	3.4	3.2	6			< 10 cases
	Parking for students	2.1	2.0	1.7	15			
	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.5	2.3	2.3	8			< 10 cases
	Dining Services	2.2	2.1	2.3	12			
	Bookstore	2.6	2.6	2.5	11			
	Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning (CETL)	3.3	3.3	3.3	4			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.8	1.9	2.0	15			
	Family obligations	1.8	1.8	1.5	15			
	Availability of faculty	1.5	1.5	1.5	16			
	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.6	1.5	1.5	16			
	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.6	1.7	16			

Table 3.2: Results from the 2017 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
	Course scheduling	1.5	1.4	1.4	16			
	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.3	1.1	16			
GSR/TA Training	Courses and workshops on teaching	3.0	3.2	3.0	15			
	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.0	3.3	2.9	14			
	TA Appropriately supervised	3.2	3.4	3.1	14			
	Time expected of TA was right	2.9	3.0	2.9	14			
	Prepared for LAB	3.1	2.8	2.8	14			
Graduate Division Programing	Admissions processes	3.3	3.5	3.7	9			< 10 cases
	Fellowships/Awards	3.0	3.1	3.0	12			
	Academic Services processes	3.0	3.1	3.1	14			
	Website Information	2.7	2.8	2.7	15			
	Professional Development Programming	3.1	3.2	3.3	9			< 10 cases
	Financial Services	3.0	3.1	3.1	12			
	Diversity and Inclusion	3.0	3.3	3.2	10			
Food Insecurity (3-Point Scale)	Worried about running out of food	2.2	2.1	2.2	6			< 10 cases
	Food did not last did not have money for more	2.2	2.1	2.3	3			< 10 cases
Environments	Satisfied with living conditions	3.3	3.2	3.2	15			
	My housing situation has (NOT) weighed on me lately	2.7	2.5	2.3	13			
	On campus I feel safe	3.4	3.5	3.4	15			
	I can get by financially without having to cut much	2.9	2.9	3.1	14			
Health (5-Point Scale)	How has your PHYSICAL health been this term?	3.8	3.7	3.9	15			
	How has your MENTAL health been this term?	3.3	3.3	3.7	15			

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 2017 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 Scores (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.4	3.5	3.2	16			
	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.1	3.2	3.0	19			
	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.2	3.3	3.4	19			
	Advice and Feedback Received	3.0	3.1	3.2	17			
	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.8	2.7	2.5	16			
	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.6	1.6	1.5	16			
	GSR/TA Training	3.0	3.1	3.1	16			
	Graduate Division Programming	3.0	3.1	3.0	15			
	Food Insecurity	2.1	2.1	2.0	3			< 10 cases
	Environments	2.9	2.8	2.7	15	NEG		
	Health	3.6	3.5	3.1	15	NEG	NEG	
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.7	3.7	3.6	15			
	Would select this university	3.1	3.2	2.9	16			
	Would select same field	3.5	3.5	3.3	16			
	Would recommend this university	3.2	3.4	2.9	16			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.7	3.6	19			
	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.3	3.5	3.4	19			
	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.2	2.9	19			
	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.2	3.3	2.9	18			
	Training in research methods	3.1	3.3	3.2	19			
	Amount of financial support	3.2	3.0	2.9	19			
	Teaching and TA preparation	3.1	3.3	3.1	18			
	Availability of courses	2.7	3.1	3.1	17			
	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.1	3.3	3.1	17			
	Encouragement to take outside courses	2.6	2.6	2.4	17			
	Overall quality of course work	3.0	3.2	2.9	17			
	GSR/TA appointments in 2016-17	3.3	3.3	3.1	16			
	On track to complete my degree program on time	3.2	3.1	2.9	15			
	Upbeat about my post-graduation career prospects	2.8	3.0	2.8	14			
	Satisfied with the mentorship and advising	3.2	3.2	3.1	15			
	Satisfied with the career support	2.8	3.0	2.8	12			
	I have the space and the resources I need	3.1	3.2	3.0	15			
My graduate prgm keeps hassles to a minimum	2.9	2.9	2.8	15				
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.3	3.3	19			
	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.5	3.5	3.5	19			
	Helpfulness of staff members	3.2	3.6	3.7	19	POS		
	Faculty help finding employment	3.0	3.2	3.0	8			< 10 cases
	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.1	3.3	3.4	17			
	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.3	3.4	3.4	19			
	Students treated with respect by faculty	3.3	3.5	3.6	17			
	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.4	3.5	3.5	17			
	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.3	3.5	3.6	17			
	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.5	3.6	17			
	(NO) Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.5	2.7	3.2	17	POS	POS	
	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.0	2.9	17			

Table 3.3: Results from the 2017 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Natural Sciences, and in Physics

Category	Item	UCM	SNS	Physics		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
		Mean	Mean	Mean	Frequency	UCM	SNS	< 10 cases
	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.4	3.4	16			
	Relationships with other students good	3.4	3.6	3.6	17			
	Competition among students (IS NOT) excessive (Reversed)	2.9	2.9	2.9	17			
	Staff knowledgeable	3.0	3.2	3.5	17	POS		
	Sense of intellectual community	3.1	3.3	3.2	17			
	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	2.8	3.1	3.0	17			
	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.1	3.2	3.2	17			
	Receive feedback from advisor	3.3	3.3	3.3	17			
	Satisfied with advisor time	3.3	3.3	3.5	17			
	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.5	3.4	3.3	17			
	Advisor has interests in mind	3.4	3.4	3.5	17			
	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.1	3.1	2.9	17			
	Advisor keeps track of research progress	3.4	3.4	3.6	17			
	Overall climate	3.3	3.5	3.6	17			
	My graduate program is (NOT) hostile toward students	3.1	3.3	3.3	14			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	2.8	2.9	3.0	11			
	Advice on publishing your work	3.0	3.0	3.3	13			
	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.9	2.9	14			
	Advice on career options within academia	2.9	3.1	3.0	14			
	Advice on career options outside academia	2.5	2.7	2.4	12			
	Advice on degree requirements	3.1	3.2	3.5	15			
	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.0	3.2	3.1	15			
	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.1	3.1	12			
	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.0	3.0	3.0	14			
	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.4	3.5	17			
	Standards for academic writing	3.2	3.3	3.3	15			
	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.4	3.6	16			
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	2.8	2.6	11			
	Student Health Center	3.2	3.2	2.9	13			
	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.3	3.1	2.9	14			
	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	2.7	2.8	2.6	5			< 10 cases
	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	3.3	3.4	5			< 10 cases
	Disability Services	2.8	3.1	3.0	2			< 10 cases
	On-campus Child Care	3.1	2.9	3.5	2		POS	< 10 cases
	University Police	3.1	3.4	3.6	5	POS		< 10 cases
	Parking for students	2.1	2.0	1.9	15			
	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.5	2.3	1.9	12	NEG		
	Dining Services	2.2	2.1	1.6	11	NEG	NEG	
	Bookstore	2.6	2.6	2.8	11			
	Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning (CETL)	3.3	3.3	3.4	5			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.8	1.9	1.8	16			
	Family obligations	1.8	1.8	1.6	16			
	Availability of faculty	1.5	1.5	1.3	16			
	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.6	1.5	1.5	16			
	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.6	1.7	16			

Table 3.3: Results from the 2017 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Natural Sciences, and in Physics

Category	Item	UCM	SNS	Physics		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
		Mean	Mean	Mean	Frequency	UCM	SNS	< 10 cases
	Course scheduling	1.5	1.4	1.4	16			
	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.3	1.4	16			
GSR/TA Training	Courses and workshops on teaching	3.0	3.2	3.1	15			
	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.0	3.3	3.6	14	POS		
	TA Appropriately supervised	3.2	3.4	3.6	14	POS		
	Time expected of TA was right	2.9	3.0	3.2	14			
	Prepared for LAB	3.1	2.8	2.1	14	NEG	NEG	
Graduate Division Programing	Admissions processes	3.3	3.5	3.6	10			
	Fellowships/Awards	3.0	3.1	3.1	13			
	Academic Services processes	3.0	3.1	3.1	11			
	Website Information	2.7	2.8	2.9	15			
	Professional Development Programming	3.1	3.2	3.2	9			< 10 cases
	Financial Services	3.0	3.1	3.0	12			
	Diversity and Inclusion	3.0	3.3	3.1	8			< 10 cases
Food Insecurity (3-Point Scale)	Worried about running out of food	2.2	2.1	2.0	3			< 10 cases
	Food did not last did not have money for more	2.2	2.1	2.0	3			< 10 cases
Environments	Satisfied with living conditions	3.3	3.2	3.1	15			
	My housing situation has (NOT) weighed on me lately	2.7	2.5	2.4	15			
	On campus I feel safe	3.4	3.5	3.3	15			
	I can get by financially without having to cut much	2.9	2.9	3.1	14			
Health (5-Point Scale)	How has your PHYSICAL health been this term?	3.8	3.7	3.3	15	NEG		
	How has your MENTAL health been this term?	3.3	3.3	2.8	15			

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 2017 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 Scores (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.4	3.5	3.6	28			
	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.1	3.2	3.2	31			
	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.2	3.3	3.3	31			
	Advice and Feedback Received	3.0	3.1	3.1	28			
	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.8	2.7	2.8	27			
	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.6	1.6	1.6	28			
	GSR/TA Training	3.0	3.1	3.2	28			
	Graduate Division Programming	3.0	3.1	3.1	28			
	Food Insecurity	2.1	2.1	2.1	12			
	Environments	2.9	2.8	2.9	28			
	Health	3.6	3.5	3.6	28			
	Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.7	3.7	3.9	28		
Would select this university		3.1	3.2	3.4	28			
Would select same field		3.5	3.5	3.7	28			
Would recommend this university		3.2	3.4	3.5	28			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.7	3.7	31			
	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.3	3.5	3.4	31			
	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.2	3.4	31			
	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.2	3.3	3.4	31			
	Training in research methods	3.1	3.3	3.3	31			
	Amount of financial support	3.2	3.0	2.9	31			
	Teaching and TA preparation	3.1	3.3	3.3	30			
	Availability of courses	2.7	3.1	3.0	29			
	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.1	3.3	3.3	29			
	Encouragement to take outside courses	2.6	2.6	2.4	29			
	Overall quality of course work	3.0	3.2	3.3	29			
	GSR/TA appointments in 2016-17	3.3	3.3	3.4	29			
	On track to complete my degree program on time	3.2	3.1	3.2	28			
	Upbeat about my post-graduation career prospects	2.8	3.0	3.1	27			
	Satisfied with the mentorship and advising	3.2	3.2	3.2	28			
	Satisfied with the career support	2.8	3.0	3.1	27			
	I have the space and the resources I need	3.1	3.2	3.4	28			
My graduate prgm keeps hassles to a minimum	2.9	2.9	3.0	28				
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.3	3.4	31			
	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.5	3.5	3.5	31			
	Helpfulness of staff members	3.2	3.6	3.5	31			
	Faculty help finding employment	3.0	3.2	3.4	16			
	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.1	3.3	3.4	31			
	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.3	3.4	3.5	31			
	Students treated with respect by faculty	3.3	3.5	3.5	29			
	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.4	3.5	3.4	29			
	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.3	3.5	3.4	29			
	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.5	3.6	29			
	(NO) Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.5	2.7	2.5	29			
	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.0	3.0	28			

Table 3.4: Results from the 2017 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
	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.4	3.4	29			
	Relationships with other students good	3.4	3.6	3.5	29			
	Competition among students (IS NOT) excessive (Reversed)	2.9	2.9	2.9	29			
	Staff knowledgeable	3.0	3.2	3.0	29			
	Sense of intellectual community	3.1	3.3	3.2	29			
	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	2.8	3.1	3.1	29			
	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.1	3.2	3.4	29			
	Receive feedback from advisor	3.3	3.3	3.3	29			
	Satisfied with advisor time	3.3	3.3	3.3	29			
	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.5	3.4	3.6	29			
	Advisor has interests in mind	3.4	3.4	3.4	28			
	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.1	3.1	3.2	29			
	Advisor keeps track of research progress	3.4	3.4	3.4	29			
	Overall climate	3.3	3.5	3.5	29			
	My graduate program is (NOT) hostile toward students	3.1	3.3	3.5	26			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	2.8	2.9	3.0	26			
	Advice on publishing your work	3.0	3.0	3.0	26			
	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.9	2.8	26			
	Advice on career options within academia	2.9	3.1	3.1	26			
	Advice on career options outside academia	2.5	2.7	2.7	23			
	Advice on degree requirements	3.1	3.2	3.1	28			
	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.0	3.2	3.1	24			
	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.1	3.0	26			
	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.0	3.0	3.0	24			
	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.4	3.4	28			
	Standards for academic writing	3.2	3.3	3.3	26			
	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.4	3.4	28			
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	2.8	2.8	17			
	Student Health Center	3.2	3.2	3.0	20			
	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.3	3.1	3.2	24			
	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	2.7	2.8	2.9	12			
	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	3.3	3.2	19			
	Disability Services	2.8	3.1	2.7	3			< 10 cases
	On-campus Child Care	3.1	2.9	3.0	4			< 10 cases
	University Police	3.1	3.4	3.4	11			
	Parking for students	2.1	2.0	2.1	24			
	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.5	2.3	2.5	21			
	Dining Services	2.2	2.1	2.3	24			
	Bookstore	2.6	2.6	2.7	21			
	Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning (CETL)	3.3	3.3	3.2	14			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.8	1.9	2.0	28			
	Family obligations	1.8	1.8	2.0	28			
	Availability of faculty	1.5	1.5	1.6	28			
	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.6	1.5	1.5	28			
	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.6	1.3	28			

Table 3.4: Results from the 2017 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
	Course scheduling	1.5	1.4	1.4	28			
	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.3	1.2	28			
GSR/TA Training	Courses and workshops on teaching	3.0	3.2	3.3	26			
	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.0	3.3	3.3	28			
	TA Appropriately supervised	3.2	3.4	3.4	23			
	Time expected of TA was right	2.9	3.0	3.0	27			
	Prepared for LAB	3.1	2.8	3.0	28			
Graduate Division Programing	Admissions processes	3.3	3.5	3.5	22			
	Fellowships/Awards	3.0	3.1	3.2	27			
	Academic Services processes	3.0	3.1	3.2	21			
	Website Information	2.7	2.8	2.7	27			
	Professional Development Programming	3.1	3.2	3.1	23			
	Financial Services	3.0	3.1	3.0	27			
	Diversity and Inclusion	3.0	3.3	3.4	22			
Food Insecurity (3-Point Scale)	Worried about running out of food	2.2	2.1	2.2	11			
	Food did not last did not have money for more	2.2	2.1	2.1	8			< 10 cases
Environments	Satisfied with living conditions	3.3	3.2	3.3	28			
	My housing situation has (NOT) weighed on me lately	2.7	2.5	2.4	26			
	On campus I feel safe	3.4	3.5	3.6	27			
	I can get by financially without having to cut much	2.9	2.9	2.6	28			
Health (5-Point Scale)	How has your PHYSICAL health been this term?	3.8	3.7	3.9	28			
	How has your MENTAL health been this term?	3.3	3.3	3.4	28			

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 2017 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and by Graduate Program

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SSHA Mean	Cognitive & Information Sciences		Political Science		Psychological Sciences		Sociology		Interdisciplinary Humanities		
				Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	
Scale Scores (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.4	3.4	3.8	9	3.6	7	3.5	29	3.6	27	2.7	21	
	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.1	3.1	3.4	10	3.5	8	3.3	31	3.2	28	2.6	22	
	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.2	3.2	3.6	10	3.5	8	3.3	31	3.3	28	2.7	22	
	Advice and Feedback Received	3.0	3.1	3.6	9	3.6	7	3.1	30	3.2	27	2.5	21	
	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.8	2.9	2.9	9	3.4	7	3.0	29	2.9	27	2.5	21	
	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.6	1.6	1.3	9	1.3	7	1.6	28	1.5	27	1.7	21	
	GSR/TA Training	3.0	2.9	3.2	8	3.0	7	3.0	30	3.0	27	2.5	21	
	Graduate Division Programming	3.0	2.9	3.1	9	2.8	7	3.2	29	3.0	27	2.6	21	
	Food Insecurity	2.1	2.2	2.2	3	2.0	1	2.1	13	2.0	5	2.6	5	
	Environments	2.9	2.9	2.9	9	3.0	6	2.9	29	2.9	27	2.9	20	
	Health	3.6	3.5	3.7	9	3.7	6	3.5	29	3.6	27	3.3	21	
	Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.7	3.7	3.9	8	4.0	7	3.8	28	3.8	26	3.1	20
		Would select this university	3.1	3.2	3.4	9	3.4	7	3.3	29	3.4	27	2.5	21
Would select same field		3.5	3.6	4.0	9	3.4	7	3.7	29	3.8	27	3.2	20	
Would recommend this university		3.2	3.1	3.8	9	3.7	7	3.2	29	3.5	27	2.1	21	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.6	4.0	10	4.0	8	3.7	31	3.6	28	3.1	22	
	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.3	3.4	4.0	10	4.0	8	3.6	31	3.6	28	2.5	22	
	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.1	3.2	10	3.9	7	3.0	31	3.2	28	2.8	22	
	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.2	3.4	3.6	10	3.9	8	3.6	31	3.5	28	2.8	22	
	Training in research methods	3.1	3.1	3.2	10	3.4	8	3.4	31	3.3	28	2.4	22	
	Amount of financial support	3.2	3.2	3.4	10	3.5	8	3.1	31	3.3	27	3.3	22	
	Teaching and TA preparation	3.1	3.0	3.6	9	3.3	7	3.1	30	3.0	27	2.5	22	
	Availability of courses	2.7	2.9	2.8	9	3.4	7	3.1	30	2.8	27	2.4	21	
	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.1	3.3	3.7	9	3.9	7	3.6	30	3.1	27	2.6	21	
	Encouragement to take outside courses	2.6	2.8	2.7	9	3.0	7	2.7	30	3.1	27	2.2	21	
	Overall quality of course work	3.0	3.2	3.3	9	3.7	7	3.4	30	3.4	25	2.4	21	
	GSR/TA appointments in 2016-17	3.3	3.3	3.8	9	3.0	7	3.5	28	3.4	25	2.9	21	
	On track to complete my degree program on time	3.2	3.3	3.1	9	3.3	6	3.3	29	3.5	27	3.2	21	
	Upbeat about my post-graduation career prospects	2.8	2.8	2.9	9	2.0	6	3.1	29	2.9	25	2.3	20	
	Satisfied with the mentorship and advising	3.2	3.4	3.7	9	3.7	6	3.4	29	3.5	26	2.9	20	
	Satisfied with the career support	2.8	2.9	3.5	8	3.0	6	2.9	27	3.1	27	2.2	21	
	I have the space and the resources I need	3.1	3.1	3.6	9	3.3	6	3.2	28	3.3	27	2.5	21	
My graduate prgm keeps hassles to a minimum	2.9	2.8	3.1	8	3.5	6	2.9	28	3.1	25	2.2	21		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.3	3.8	10	3.8	8	3.4	31	3.6	28	2.5	21	
	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.5	3.6	3.9	10	3.9	7	3.6	30	3.7	28	3.4	22	
	Helpfulness of staff members	3.2	3.0	2.9	10	2.6	7	3.1	30	3.1	27	2.9	22	
	Faculty help finding employment	3.0	3.0	3.4	5	3.8	4	3.1	19	3.4	13	1.9	11	
	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.1	3.1	3.5	10	3.4	7	2.9	27	3.2	26	2.8	21	
	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.3	3.3	3.7	10	3.8	8	3.5	31	3.4	27	2.6	22	
	Students treated with respect by faculty	3.3	3.2	3.6	9	3.6	7	3.3	30	3.4	28	2.7	21	
	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.4	3.5	3.8	9	3.6	7	3.5	30	3.6	28	3.0	21	
	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.3	3.1	3.6	9	3.4	7	3.2	30	3.4	28	2.2	21	
	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.6	3.9	9	3.9	7	3.7	30	3.5	28	3.3	21	
	(NO) Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.5	2.5	3.0	9	2.7	7	2.4	30	2.9	27	2.0	21	
	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.0	3.6	9	3.4	7	3.0	30	3.1	27	2.5	21	
	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.1	3.4	9	4.0	7	3.4	30	3.2	28	2.0	21	
	Relationships with other students good	3.4	3.4	3.6	9	4.0	7	3.6	30	3.4	28	2.7	21	
	Competition among students (IS NOT) excessive (Reversed)	2.9	3.1	3.3	9	3.0	7	3.1	30	3.1	28	2.8	21	
	Staff knowledgeable	3.0	2.7	3.4	9	3.0	7	2.9	30	2.7	27	2.0	21	
	Sense of intellectual community	3.1	2.9	3.6	9	3.4	7	3.2	30	3.0	28	1.9	21	
	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	2.8	2.8	3.1	9	3.7	7	3.0	30	3.1	28	1.8	21	
	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.1	3.2	3.7	9	3.3	7	3.3	30	3.4	28	2.8	21	
	Receive feedback from advisor	3.3	3.4	4.0	9	3.4	7	3.5	30	3.5	28	2.8	21	
	Satisfied with advisor time	3.3	3.4	3.9	9	3.6	7	3.3	30	3.4	27	3.1	21	
	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.5	3.6	3.9	9	3.7	7	3.6	30	3.7	27	3.5	21	
	Advisor has interests in mind	3.4	3.6	3.9	9	3.6	7	3.6	30	3.6	27	3.4	21	
	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.1	3.2	3.2	9	2.6	7	3.4	29	3.4	27	2.8	21	
	Advisor keeps track of research progress	3.4	3.4	3.9	9	3.6	7	3.4	30	3.6	27	3.0	21	
	Overall climate	3.3	3.1	3.7	9	3.4	7	3.4	30	3.4	27	2.0	21	
	My graduate program is (NOT) hostile toward students	3.1	3.1	3.9	8	3.3	6	3.1	28	3.3	26	2.6	20	

Table 4.0: Results from the 2017 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		Political Science		Psychological Sciences		Sociology		Interdisciplinary Humanities	
		Mean	Mean	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	2.8	2.8	3.1	8	3.2	5	2.9	26	2.8	24	2.4	21
	Advice on publishing your work	3.0	3.1	3.7	9	3.6	7	3.1	28	3.4	27	2.1	21
	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.8	3.3	9	3.7	7	2.8	30	3.0	27	2.2	21
	Advice on career options within academia	2.9	3.1	3.6	9	3.9	7	3.2	30	3.2	26	2.4	21
	Advice on career options outside academia	2.5	2.6	3.2	9	2.7	7	2.2	29	3.0	27	2.2	21
	Advice on degree requirements	3.1	3.1	3.8	9	3.7	7	3.1	30	3.2	27	2.2	20
	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.0	3.0	3.8	8	3.6	7	3.2	23	3.1	25	2.2	19
	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.2	3.9	7	3.7	7	3.1	27	3.4	27	2.7	21
	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.0	3.1	3.7	7	3.9	7	3.2	19	3.4	25	2.2	19
	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.4	4.0	9	3.7	7	3.4	30	3.6	27	2.9	21
	Standards for academic writing	3.2	3.3	3.8	9	3.7	7	3.3	30	3.4	26	2.8	20
	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.5	3.7	9	3.9	7	3.5	27	3.4	27	3.2	17
	University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	3.2	3.1	7	3.8	4	3.2	25	3.2	19	2.9
Student Health Center		3.2	3.2	3.6	9	3.7	6	3.2	26	3.4	22	2.7	15
Health Insurance (USHIP)		3.3	3.4	3.4	9	3.7	6	3.4	29	3.3	23	3.3	18
Center for Career and Prof Advancement		2.7	2.7	3.3	3	3.5	2	2.6	11	3.1	7	1.9	8
Counseling and Psychological Services		3.1	2.9	3.3	7	3.8	5	3.2	16	2.9	15	2.0	10
Disability Services		2.8	2.7	0.0	0	4.0	1	3.0	8	3.0	4	2.0	8
On-campus Child Care		3.1	3.1	4.0	1	4.0	1	3.3	4	3.3	4	2.5	6
University Police		3.1	2.9	3.3	3	3.0	4	3.3	12	3.0	9	2.1	10
Parking for students		2.1	2.2	2.1	8	2.4	5	2.3	26	2.1	24	2.1	18
Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)		2.5	2.6	2.5	4	3.2	5	2.2	18	3.1	12	2.4	14
Dining Services		2.2	2.5	2.0	7	3.0	4	2.6	19	2.7	21	2.3	15
Bookstore		2.6	2.6	2.4	9	3.2	6	2.9	23	2.7	23	2.1	16
Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning (CETL)		3.3	3.2	3.5	2	3.8	4	3.3	15	3.2	12	2.8	11
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.8	1.8	1.3	9	1.7	7	2.0	28	1.6	27	1.8	21
	Family obligations	1.8	1.8	1.3	9	1.7	7	2.0	28	1.9	27	1.6	21
	Availability of faculty	1.5	1.5	1.2	9	1.0	7	1.5	28	1.3	27	1.8	21
	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.6	1.7	1.2	9	1.0	7	1.6	27	1.6	26	2.2	21
	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.5	1.2	9	1.4	7	1.5	28	1.5	26	1.5	21
	Course scheduling	1.5	1.5	1.6	9	1.1	7	1.4	28	1.5	26	2.0	21
	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.2	1.1	9	1.0	7	1.2	27	1.2	26	1.3	21
GSR/TA Training	Courses and workshops on teaching	3.0	3.0	3.3	6	3.2	6	3.1	28	2.9	26	2.6	21
	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.0	2.8	3.1	8	3.0	7	3.0	28	2.7	23	2.3	21
	TA Appropriately supervised	3.2	2.7	3.0	4	2.7	3	3.0	11	2.9	9	2.3	12
	Time expected of TA was right	2.9	2.8	3.1	8	2.7	7	2.9	28	3.0	21	2.2	20
	Prepared for LAB	3.1	3.3	3.5	8	3.4	7	3.3	28	3.5	22	3.0	21
Graduate Division Programing	Admissions processes	3.3	3.3	3.6	5	3.5	2	3.5	17	3.3	17	2.8	12
	Fellowships/Awards	3.0	3.0	3.1	8	2.8	6	3.2	27	3.0	24	2.6	20
	Academic Services processes	3.0	2.8	3.2	5	2.6	5	2.9	20	2.9	20	2.5	17
	Website Information	2.7	2.8	3.1	8	3.2	6	2.9	27	3.0	24	2.3	19
	Professional Development Programming	3.1	3.2	3.8	6	3.5	4	3.4	19	3.3	22	2.7	20
	Financial Services	3.0	3.0	2.9	9	3.2	6	3.3	22	2.8	24	2.8	16
	Diversity and Inclusion	3.0	2.7	3.4	7	2.8	5	3.0	19	2.8	23	2.1	17
Food Insecurity (3-Point Scale)	Worried about running out of food	2.2	2.2	2.3	3	2.0	1	2.1	13	2.0	5	2.6	5
	Food did not last did not have money for more	2.2	2.2	2.0	2	2.0	1	2.1	9	2.0	2	2.8	4
Environments	Satisfied with living conditions	3.3	3.3	3.1	9	3.5	6	3.3	29	3.2	27	3.4	20
	My housing situation has (NOT) weighed on me lately	2.7	3.0	2.9	8	3.2	6	2.9	29	3.0	22	3.1	20
	On campus I feel safe	3.4	3.2	3.3	9	3.3	6	3.5	29	3.4	27	2.7	20
	I can get by financially without having to cut much	2.9	2.8	2.6	9	3.0	6	2.9	29	3.0	25	2.6	20
Health (5-Point Scale)	How has your PHYSICAL health been this term?	3.8	3.7	3.8	9	3.8	6	3.9	28	3.9	27	3.3	21
	How has your MENTAL health been this term?	3.3	3.3	3.6	9	3.5	6	3.2	29	3.4	27	3.2	21

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 2017 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 Scores (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.4	3.4	3.8	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.1	3.1	3.4	10	POS		
	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.2	3.2	3.6	10	POS	POS	
	Advice and Feedback Received	3.0	3.1	3.6	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.8	2.9	2.9	9			< 10 cases
	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.6	1.6	1.3	9	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
	GSR/TA Training	3.0	2.9	3.2	8			< 10 cases
	Graduate Division Programming	3.0	2.9	3.1	9			< 10 cases
	Food Insecurity	2.1	2.2	2.2	3			< 10 cases
	Environments	2.9	2.9	2.9	9			< 10 cases
	Health	3.6	3.5	3.7	9			< 10 cases
	Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.7	3.7	3.9	8		
Would select this university		3.1	3.2	3.4	9			< 10 cases
Would select same field		3.5	3.6	4.0	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Would recommend this university		3.2	3.1	3.8	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.6	4.0	10	POS	POS	
	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.3	3.4	4.0	10	POS	POS	
	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.1	3.2	10			
	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.2	3.4	3.6	10			
	Training in research methods	3.1	3.1	3.2	10			
	Amount of financial support	3.2	3.2	3.4	10			
	Teaching and TA preparation	3.1	3.0	3.6	9		POS	< 10 cases
	Availability of courses	2.7	2.9	2.8	9			< 10 cases
	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.1	3.3	3.7	9	POS		< 10 cases
	Encouragement to take outside courses	2.6	2.8	2.7	9			< 10 cases
	Overall quality of course work	3.0	3.2	3.3	9			< 10 cases
	GSR/TA appointments in 2016-17	3.3	3.3	3.8	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	On track to complete my degree program on time	3.2	3.3	3.1	9			< 10 cases
	Upbeat about my post-graduation career prospects	2.8	2.8	2.9	9			< 10 cases
	Satisfied with the mentorship and advising	3.2	3.4	3.7	9	POS		< 10 cases
	Satisfied with the career support	2.8	2.9	3.5	8	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	I have the space and the resources I need	3.1	3.1	3.6	9		POS	< 10 cases
My graduate prgm keeps hassles to a minimum	2.9	2.8	3.1	8			< 10 cases	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.3	3.8	10	POS	POS	
	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.5	3.6	3.9	10			
	Helpfulness of staff members	3.2	3.0	2.9	10			
	Faculty help finding employment	3.0	3.0	3.4	5			< 10 cases
	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.1	3.1	3.5	10			
	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.3	3.3	3.7	10	POS		
	Students treated with respect by faculty	3.3	3.2	3.6	9			< 10 cases
	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.4	3.5	3.8	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.3	3.1	3.6	9		POS	< 10 cases
	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.6	3.9	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	(NO) Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.5	2.5	3.0	9		POS	< 10 cases
	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.0	3.6	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases

Table 4.1: Results from the 2017 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
	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.1	3.4	9			< 10 cases
	Relationships with other students good	3.4	3.4	3.6	9			< 10 cases
	Competition among students (IS NOT) excessive (Reversed)	2.9	3.1	3.3	9	POS		< 10 cases
	Staff knowledgeable	3.0	2.7	3.4	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Sense of intellectual community	3.1	2.9	3.6	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	2.8	2.8	3.1	9			< 10 cases
	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.1	3.2	3.7	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Receive feedback from advisor	3.3	3.4	4.0	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Satisfied with advisor time	3.3	3.4	3.9	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.5	3.6	3.9	9	POS		< 10 cases
	Advisor has interests in mind	3.4	3.6	3.9	9	POS		< 10 cases
	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.1	3.2	3.2	9			< 10 cases
	Advisor keeps track of research progress	3.4	3.4	3.9	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Overall climate	3.3	3.1	3.7	9		POS	< 10 cases
	My graduate program is (NOT) hostile toward students	3.1	3.1	3.9	8	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	2.8	2.8	3.1	8			< 10 cases
	Advice on publishing your work	3.0	3.1	3.7	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.8	3.3	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Advice on career options within academia	2.9	3.1	3.6	9	POS		< 10 cases
	Advice on career options outside academia	2.5	2.6	3.2	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Advice on degree requirements	3.1	3.1	3.8	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.0	3.0	3.8	8	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.2	3.9	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.0	3.1	3.7	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.4	4.0	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Standards for academic writing	3.2	3.3	3.8	9	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.5	3.7	9			< 10 cases
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	3.2	3.1	7			< 10 cases
	Student Health Center	3.2	3.2	3.6	9			< 10 cases
	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.3	3.4	3.4	9			< 10 cases
	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	2.7	2.7	3.3	3	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	2.9	3.3	7			< 10 cases
	Disability Services	2.8	2.7		0	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
	On-campus Child Care	3.1	3.1	4.0	1	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	University Police	3.1	2.9	3.3	3		POS	< 10 cases
	Parking for students	2.1	2.2	2.1	8			< 10 cases
	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.5	2.6	2.5	4			< 10 cases
	Dining Services	2.2	2.5	2.0	7		NEG	< 10 cases
	Bookstore	2.6	2.6	2.4	9			< 10 cases
	Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning (CETL)	3.3	3.2	3.5	2			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.8	1.8	1.3	9	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
	Family obligations	1.8	1.8	1.3	9	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
	Availability of faculty	1.5	1.5	1.2	9			< 10 cases
	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.6	1.7	1.2	9	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.5	1.2	9	NEG		< 10 cases

Table 4.1: Results from the 2017 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
	Course scheduling	1.5	1.5	1.6	9			< 10 cases
	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.2	1.1	9			< 10 cases
GSR/TA Training	Courses and workshops on teaching	3.0	3.0	3.3	6			< 10 cases
	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.0	2.8	3.1	8			< 10 cases
	TA Appropriately supervised	3.2	2.7	3.0	4			< 10 cases
	Time expected of TA was right	2.9	2.8	3.1	8			< 10 cases
	Prepared for LAB	3.1	3.3	3.5	8			< 10 cases
Graduate Division Programming	Admissions processes	3.3	3.3	3.6	5			< 10 cases
	Fellowships/Awards	3.0	3.0	3.1	8			< 10 cases
	Academic Services processes	3.0	2.8	3.2	5			< 10 cases
	Website Information	2.7	2.8	3.1	8			< 10 cases
	Professional Development Programming	3.1	3.2	3.8	6	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Financial Services	3.0	3.0	2.9	9			< 10 cases
	Diversity and Inclusion	3.0	2.7	3.4	7		POS	< 10 cases
Food Insecurity (3-Point Scale)	Worried about running out of food	2.2	2.2	2.3	3			< 10 cases
	Food did not last did not have money for more	2.2	2.2	2.0	2		NEG	< 10 cases
Environments	Satisfied with living conditions	3.3	3.3	3.1	9			< 10 cases
	My housing situation has (NOT) weighed on me lately	2.7	3.0	2.9	8			< 10 cases
	On campus I feel safe	3.4	3.2	3.3	9			< 10 cases
	I can get by financially without having to cut much	2.9	2.8	2.6	9			< 10 cases
Health (5-Point Scale)	How has your PHYSICAL health been this term?	3.8	3.7	3.8	9			< 10 cases
	How has your MENTAL health been this term?	3.3	3.3	3.6	9			< 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 2017 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 Scores (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.4	3.4	2.7	21	NEG	NEG	
	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.1	3.1	2.6	22	NEG	NEG	
	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.2	3.2	2.7	22	NEG	NEG	
	Advice and Feedback Received	3.0	3.1	2.5	21	NEG	NEG	
	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.8	2.9	2.5	21		NEG	
	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.6	1.6	1.7	21			
	GSR/TA Training	3.0	2.9	2.5	21	NEG	NEG	
	Graduate Division Programming	3.0	2.9	2.6	21	NEG		
	Food Insecurity	2.1	2.2	2.6	5	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Environments	2.9	2.9	2.9	20			
Health	3.6	3.5	3.3	21				
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.7	3.7	3.1	20	NEG	NEG	
	Would select this university	3.1	3.2	2.5	21	NEG	NEG	
	Would select same field	3.5	3.6	3.2	20	NEG	NEG	
	Would recommend this university	3.2	3.1	2.1	21	NEG	NEG	
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.6	3.1	22	NEG	NEG	
	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.3	3.4	2.5	22	NEG	NEG	
	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.1	2.8	22			
	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.2	3.4	2.8	22		NEG	
	Training in research methods	3.1	3.1	2.4	22	NEG	NEG	
	Amount of financial support	3.2	3.2	3.3	22			
	Teaching and TA preparation	3.1	3.0	2.5	22	NEG	NEG	
	Availability of courses	2.7	2.9	2.4	21			
	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.1	3.3	2.6	21	NEG	NEG	
	Encouragement to take outside courses	2.6	2.8	2.2	21		NEG	
	Overall quality of course work	3.0	3.2	2.4	21	NEG	NEG	
	GSR/TA appointments in 2016-17	3.3	3.3	2.9	21	NEG	NEG	
	On track to complete my degree program on time	3.2	3.3	3.2	21			
	Upbeat about my post-graduation career prospects	2.8	2.8	2.3	20	NEG	NEG	
	Satisfied with the mentorship and advising	3.2	3.4	2.9	20		NEG	
	Satisfied with the career support	2.8	2.9	2.2	21	NEG	NEG	
	I have the space and the resources I need	3.1	3.1	2.5	21	NEG	NEG	
My graduate prgm keeps hassles to a minimum	2.9	2.8	2.2	21	NEG	NEG		
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.3	2.5	21	NEG	NEG	
	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.5	3.6	3.4	22			
	Helpfulness of staff members	3.2	3.0	2.9	22			
	Faculty help finding employment	3.0	3.0	1.9	11	NEG	NEG	
	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.1	3.1	2.8	21			
	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.3	3.3	2.6	22	NEG	NEG	
	Students treated with respect by faculty	3.3	3.2	2.7	21	NEG	NEG	
	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.4	3.5	3.0	21	NEG	NEG	
	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.3	3.1	2.2	21	NEG	NEG	
	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.6	3.3	21			
	(NO) Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.5	2.5	2.0	21	NEG	NEG	
	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.0	2.5	21	NEG	NEG	

Table 4.5: Results from the 2017 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
	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.1	2.0	21	NEG	NEG	
	Relationships with other students good	3.4	3.4	2.7	21	NEG	NEG	
	Competition among students (IS NOT) excessive (Reversed)	2.9	3.1	2.8	21			
	Staff knowledgeable	3.0	2.7	2.0	21	NEG	NEG	
	Sense of intellectual community	3.1	2.9	1.9	21	NEG	NEG	
	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	2.8	2.8	1.8	21	NEG	NEG	
	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.1	3.2	2.8	21		NEG	
	Receive feedback from advisor	3.3	3.4	2.8	21	NEG	NEG	
	Satisfied with advisor time	3.3	3.4	3.1	21			
	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.5	3.6	3.5	21			
	Advisor has interests in mind	3.4	3.6	3.4	21			
	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.1	3.2	2.8	21			
	Advisor keeps track of research progress	3.4	3.4	3.0	21		NEG	
	Overall climate	3.3	3.1	2.0	21	NEG	NEG	
	My graduate program is (NOT) hostile toward students	3.1	3.1	2.6	20	NEG	NEG	
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	2.8	2.8	2.4	21			
	Advice on publishing your work	3.0	3.1	2.1	21	NEG	NEG	
	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.8	2.2	21	NEG	NEG	
	Advice on career options within academia	2.9	3.1	2.4	21	NEG	NEG	
	Advice on career options outside academia	2.5	2.6	2.2	21			
	Advice on degree requirements	3.1	3.1	2.2	20	NEG	NEG	
	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.0	3.0	2.2	19	NEG	NEG	
	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.2	2.7	21		NEG	
	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.0	3.1	2.2	19	NEG	NEG	
	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.4	2.9	21	NEG	NEG	
	Standards for academic writing	3.2	3.3	2.8	20	NEG	NEG	
	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.5	3.2	17			
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	3.2	2.9	18			
	Student Health Center	3.2	3.2	2.7	15		NEG	
	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.3	3.4	3.3	18			
	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	2.7	2.7	1.9	8	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	2.9	2.0	10	NEG	NEG	
	Disability Services	2.8	2.7	2.0	8	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
	On-campus Child Care	3.1	3.1	2.5	6	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
	University Police	3.1	2.9	2.1	10	NEG	NEG	
	Parking for students	2.1	2.2	2.1	18			
	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.5	2.6	2.4	14			
	Dining Services	2.2	2.5	2.3	15			
	Bookstore	2.6	2.6	2.1	16		NEG	
	Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning (CETL)	3.3	3.2	2.8	11	NEG		
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.8	1.8	1.8	21			
	Family obligations	1.8	1.8	1.6	21			
	Availability of faculty	1.5	1.5	1.8	21		POS	
	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.6	1.7	2.2	21	POS	POS	
	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.5	1.5	21			

Table 4.5: Results from the 2017 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
	Course scheduling	1.5	1.5	2.0	21	POS	POS	
	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.2	1.3	21			
GSR/TA Training	Courses and workshops on teaching	3.0	3.0	2.6	21			
	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.0	2.8	2.3	21	NEG	NEG	
	TA Appropriately supervised	3.2	2.7	2.3	12	NEG	NEG	
	Time expected of TA was right	2.9	2.8	2.2	20	NEG	NEG	
	Prepared for LAB	3.1	3.3	3.0	21			
Graduate Division Programing	Admissions processes	3.3	3.3	2.8	12	NEG	NEG	
	Fellowships/Awards	3.0	3.0	2.6	20			
	Academic Services processes	3.0	2.8	2.5	17			
	Website Information	2.7	2.8	2.3	19			NEG
	Professional Development Programming	3.1	3.2	2.7	20	NEG	NEG	
	Financial Services	3.0	3.0	2.8	16			
	Diversity and Inclusion	3.0	2.7	2.1	17	NEG	NEG	
Food Insecurity (3-Point Scale)	Worried about running out of food	2.2	2.2	2.6	5	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Food did not last did not have money for more	2.2	2.2	2.8	4	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Environments	Satisfied with living conditions	3.3	3.3	3.4	20			
	My housing situation has (NOT) weighed on me lately	2.7	3.0	3.1	20			
	On campus I feel safe	3.4	3.2	2.7	20	NEG	NEG	
	I can get by financially without having to cut much	2.9	2.8	2.6	20			
Health (5-Point Scale)	How has your PHYSICAL health been this term?	3.8	3.7	3.3	21	NEG		
	How has your MENTAL health been this term?	3.3	3.3	3.2	21			

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 2017 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and in Political Science

Category	Item	UCM	SSHA	Political Science		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
		Mean	Mean	Mean	Frequency	UCM	SSHA	< 10 cases
Scale Scores (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.4	3.4	3.6	7			< 10 cases
	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.1	3.1	3.5	8	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.2	3.2	3.5	8	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Advice and Feedback Received	3.0	3.1	3.6	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.8	2.9	3.4	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.6	1.6	1.3	7	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
	GSR/TA Training	3.0	2.9	3.0	7			< 10 cases
	Graduate Division Programming	3.0	2.9	2.8	7			< 10 cases
	Food Insecurity	2.1	2.2	2.0	1		NEG	< 10 cases
	Environments	2.9	2.9	3.0	6			< 10 cases
	Health	3.6	3.5	3.7	6			< 10 cases
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.7	3.7	4.0	7		POS	< 10 cases
	Would select this university	3.1	3.2	3.4	7			< 10 cases
	Would select same field	3.5	3.6	3.4	7			< 10 cases
	Would recommend this university	3.2	3.1	3.7	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.6	4.0	8	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.3	3.4	4.0	8	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.1	3.9	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.2	3.4	3.9	8	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Training in research methods	3.1	3.1	3.4	8			< 10 cases
	Amount of financial support	3.2	3.2	3.5	8			< 10 cases
	Teaching and TA preparation	3.1	3.0	3.3	7			< 10 cases
	Availability of courses	2.7	2.9	3.4	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.1	3.3	3.9	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Encouragement to take outside courses	2.6	2.8	3.0	7			< 10 cases
	Overall quality of course work	3.0	3.2	3.7	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	GSR/TA appointments in 2016-17	3.3	3.3	3.0	7			< 10 cases
	On track to complete my degree program on time	3.2	3.3	3.3	6			< 10 cases
	Upbeat about my post-graduation career prospects	2.8	2.8	2.0	6	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
	Satisfied with the mentorship and advising	3.2	3.4	3.7	6	POS		< 10 cases
	Satisfied with the career support	2.8	2.9	3.0	6			< 10 cases
	I have the space and the resources I need	3.1	3.1	3.3	6			< 10 cases
My graduate prgm keeps hassles to a minimum	2.9	2.8	3.5	6	POS	POS	< 10 cases	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.3	3.8	8	POS		< 10 cases
	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.5	3.6	3.9	7			< 10 cases
	Helpfulness of staff members	3.2	3.0	2.6	7	NEG		< 10 cases
	Faculty help finding employment	3.0	3.0	3.8	4	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.1	3.1	3.4	7			< 10 cases
	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.3	3.3	3.8	8	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Students treated with respect by faculty	3.3	3.2	3.6	7			< 10 cases
	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.4	3.5	3.6	7			< 10 cases
	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.3	3.1	3.4	7			< 10 cases
	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.6	3.9	7	POS		< 10 cases
	(NO) Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.5	2.5	2.7	7			< 10 cases
	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.0	3.4	7		POS	< 10 cases

Table 4.2: Results from the 2017 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and in Political Science

Category	Item	UCM	SSHA	Political Science		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
		Mean	Mean	Mean	Frequency	UCM	SSHA	< 10 cases
	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.1	4.0	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Relationships with other students good	3.4	3.4	4.0	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Competition among students (IS NOT) excessive (Reversed)	2.9	3.1	3.0	7			< 10 cases
	Staff knowledgeable	3.0	2.7	3.0	7			< 10 cases
	Sense of intellectual community	3.1	2.9	3.4	7		POS	< 10 cases
	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	2.8	2.8	3.7	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.1	3.2	3.3	7			< 10 cases
	Receive feedback from advisor	3.3	3.4	3.4	7			< 10 cases
	Satisfied with advisor time	3.3	3.4	3.6	7			< 10 cases
	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.5	3.6	3.7	7			< 10 cases
	Advisor has interests in mind	3.4	3.6	3.6	7			< 10 cases
	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.1	3.2	2.6	7		NEG	< 10 cases
	Advisor keeps track of research progress	3.4	3.4	3.6	7			< 10 cases
	Overall climate	3.3	3.1	3.4	7			< 10 cases
	My graduate program is (NOT) hostile toward students	3.1	3.1	3.3	6			< 10 cases
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	2.8	2.8	3.2	5			< 10 cases
	Advice on publishing your work	3.0	3.1	3.6	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.8	3.7	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Advice on career options within academia	2.9	3.1	3.9	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Advice on career options outside academia	2.5	2.6	2.7	7			< 10 cases
	Advice on degree requirements	3.1	3.1	3.7	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.0	3.0	3.6	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.2	3.7	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.0	3.1	3.9	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.4	3.7	7			< 10 cases
	Standards for academic writing	3.2	3.3	3.7	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.5	3.9	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	3.2	3.8	4	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Student Health Center	3.2	3.2	3.7	6	POS		< 10 cases
	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.3	3.4	3.7	6	POS		< 10 cases
	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	2.7	2.7	3.5	2	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	2.9	3.8	5	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Disability Services	2.8	2.7	4.0	1	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	On-campus Child Care	3.1	3.1	4.0	1	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	University Police	3.1	2.9	3.0	4			< 10 cases
	Parking for students	2.1	2.2	2.4	5			< 10 cases
	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.5	2.6	3.2	5	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Dining Services	2.2	2.5	3.0	4	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Bookstore	2.6	2.6	3.2	6	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning (CETL)	3.3	3.2	3.8	4	POS	POS	< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.8	1.8	1.7	7			< 10 cases
	Family obligations	1.8	1.8	1.7	7			< 10 cases
	Availability of faculty	1.5	1.5	1.0	7	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.6	1.7	1.0	7	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.5	1.4	7			< 10 cases

Table 4.2: Results from the 2017 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and in Political Science

Category	Item	UCM	SSHA	Political Science		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
		Mean	Mean	Mean	Frequency	UCM	SSHA	< 10 cases
	Course scheduling	1.5	1.5	1.1	7	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.2	1.0	7			< 10 cases
GSR/TA Training	Courses and workshops on teaching	3.0	3.0	3.2	6			< 10 cases
	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.0	2.8	3.0	7			< 10 cases
	TA Appropriately supervised	3.2	2.7	2.7	3	NEG		< 10 cases
	Time expected of TA was right	2.9	2.8	2.7	7			< 10 cases
	Prepared for LAB	3.1	3.3	3.4	7			< 10 cases
Graduate Division Programming	Admissions processes	3.3	3.3	3.5	2			< 10 cases
	Fellowships/Awards	3.0	3.0	2.8	6			< 10 cases
	Academic Services processes	3.0	2.8	2.6	5			< 10 cases
	Website Information	2.7	2.8	3.2	6			< 10 cases
	Professional Development Programming	3.1	3.2	3.5	4			< 10 cases
	Financial Services	3.0	3.0	3.2	6			< 10 cases
	Diversity and Inclusion	3.0	2.7	2.8	5			< 10 cases
Food Insecurity (3-Point Scale)	Worried about running out of food	2.2	2.2	2.0	1			< 10 cases
	Food did not last did not have money for more	2.2	2.2	2.0	1		NEG	< 10 cases
Environments	Satisfied with living conditions	3.3	3.3	3.5	6			< 10 cases
	My housing situation has (NOT) weighed on me lately	2.7	3.0	3.2	6			< 10 cases
	On campus I feel safe	3.4	3.2	3.3	6			< 10 cases
	I can get by financially without having to cut much	2.9	2.8	3.0	6			< 10 cases
Health (5-Point Scale)	How has your PHYSICAL health been this term?	3.8	3.7	3.8	6			< 10 cases
	How has your MENTAL health been this term?	3.3	3.3	3.5	6			< 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 2017 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 Scores (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.4	3.4	3.5	29			
	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.1	3.1	3.3	31			
	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.2	3.2	3.3	31			
	Advice and Feedback Received	3.0	3.1	3.1	30			
	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.8	2.9	3.0	29			
	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.6	1.6	1.6	28			
	GSR/TA Training	3.0	2.9	3.0	30			
	Graduate Division Programming	3.0	2.9	3.2	29			
	Food Insecurity	2.1	2.2	2.1	13			
	Environments	2.9	2.9	2.9	29			
	Health	3.6	3.5	3.5	29			
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.7	3.7	3.8	28			
	Would select this university	3.1	3.2	3.3	29			
	Would select same field	3.5	3.6	3.7	29			
	Would recommend this university	3.2	3.1	3.2	29			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.6	3.7	31			
	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.3	3.4	3.6	31			
	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.1	3.0	31			
	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.2	3.4	3.6	31			
	Training in research methods	3.1	3.1	3.4	31			
	Amount of financial support	3.2	3.2	3.1	31			
	Teaching and TA preparation	3.1	3.0	3.1	30			
	Availability of courses	2.7	2.9	3.1	30			
	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.1	3.3	3.6	30	POS		
	Encouragement to take outside courses	2.6	2.8	2.7	30			
	Overall quality of course work	3.0	3.2	3.4	30			
	GSR/TA appointments in 2016-17	3.3	3.3	3.5	28			
	On track to complete my degree program on time	3.2	3.3	3.3	29			
	Upbeat about my post-graduation career prospects	2.8	2.8	3.1	29			
	Satisfied with the mentorship and advising	3.2	3.4	3.4	29			
	Satisfied with the career support	2.8	2.9	2.9	27			
	I have the space and the resources I need	3.1	3.1	3.2	28			
My graduate prgm keeps hassles to a minimum	2.9	2.8	2.9	28				
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.3	3.4	31			
	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.5	3.6	3.6	30			
	Helpfulness of staff members	3.2	3.0	3.1	30			
	Faculty help finding employment	3.0	3.0	3.1	19			
	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.1	3.1	2.9	27			
	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.3	3.3	3.5	31			
	Students treated with respect by faculty	3.3	3.2	3.3	30			
	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.4	3.5	3.5	30			
	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.3	3.1	3.2	30			
	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.6	3.7	30			
	(NO) Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.5	2.5	2.4	30			
	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.0	3.0	30			

Table 4.3: Results from the 2017 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
	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.1	3.4	30			
	Relationships with other students good	3.4	3.4	3.6	30			
	Competition among students (IS NOT) excessive (Reversed)	2.9	3.1	3.1	30			
	Staff knowledgeable	3.0	2.7	2.9	30			
	Sense of intellectual community	3.1	2.9	3.2	30			
	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	2.8	2.8	3.0	30			
	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.1	3.2	3.3	30			
	Receive feedback from advisor	3.3	3.4	3.5	30			
	Satisfied with advisor time	3.3	3.4	3.3	30			
	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.5	3.6	3.6	30			
	Advisor has interests in mind	3.4	3.6	3.6	30			
	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.1	3.2	3.4	29			
	Advisor keeps track of research progress	3.4	3.4	3.4	30			
	Overall climate	3.3	3.1	3.4	30			
	My graduate program is (NOT) hostile toward students	3.1	3.1	3.1	28			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	2.8	2.8	2.9	26			
	Advice on publishing your work	3.0	3.1	3.1	28			
	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.8	2.8	30			
	Advice on career options within academia	2.9	3.1	3.2	30			
	Advice on career options outside academia	2.5	2.6	2.2	29			
	Advice on degree requirements	3.1	3.1	3.1	30			
	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.0	3.0	3.2	23			
	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.2	3.1	27			
	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.0	3.1	3.2	19			
	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.4	3.4	30			
	Standards for academic writing	3.2	3.3	3.3	30			
	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.5	3.5	27			
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	3.2	3.2	25			
	Student Health Center	3.2	3.2	3.2	26			
	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.3	3.4	3.4	29			
	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	2.7	2.7	2.6	11			
	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	2.9	3.2	16			
	Disability Services	2.8	2.7	3.0	8			< 10 cases
	On-campus Child Care	3.1	3.1	3.3	4			< 10 cases
	University Police	3.1	2.9	3.3	12			
	Parking for students	2.1	2.2	2.3	26			
	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.5	2.6	2.2	18			
	Dining Services	2.2	2.5	2.6	19			
	Bookstore	2.6	2.6	2.9	23			
	Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning (CETL)	3.3	3.2	3.3	15			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.8	1.8	2.0	28			
	Family obligations	1.8	1.8	2.0	28			
	Availability of faculty	1.5	1.5	1.5	28			
	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.6	1.7	1.6	27			
	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.5	1.5	28			

Table 4.3: Results from the 2017 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
	Course scheduling	1.5	1.5	1.4	28			
	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.2	1.2	27			
GSR/TA Training	Courses and workshops on teaching	3.0	3.0	3.1	28			
	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.0	2.8	3.0	28			
	TA Appropriately supervised	3.2	2.7	3.0	11			
	Time expected of TA was right	2.9	2.8	2.9	28			
	Prepared for LAB	3.1	3.3	3.3	28			
Graduate Division Programing	Admissions processes	3.3	3.3	3.5	17			
	Fellowships/Awards	3.0	3.0	3.2	27			
	Academic Services processes	3.0	2.8	2.9	20			
	Website Information	2.7	2.8	2.9	27			
	Professional Development Programming	3.1	3.2	3.4	19			
	Financial Services	3.0	3.0	3.3	22			
	Diversity and Inclusion	3.0	2.7	3.0	19			
Food Insecurity (3-Point Scale)	Worried about running out of food	2.2	2.2	2.1	13			
	Food did not last did not have money for more	2.2	2.2	2.1	9			< 10 cases
Environments	Satisfied with living conditions	3.3	3.3	3.3	29			
	My housing situation has (NOT) weighed on me lately	2.7	3.0	2.9	29			
	On campus I feel safe	3.4	3.2	3.5	29			
	I can get by financially without having to cut much	2.9	2.8	2.9	29			
Health (5-Point Scale)	How has your PHYSICAL health been this term?	3.8	3.7	3.9	28			
	How has your MENTAL health been this term?	3.3	3.3	3.2	29			

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 2017 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and in Sociology

Category	Item	UCM	SSHA	Sociology		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
		Mean	Mean	Mean	Frequency	UCM	SSHA	< 10 cases
Scale Scores (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.4	3.4	3.6	27			
	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.1	3.1	3.2	28			
	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.2	3.2	3.3	28			
	Advice and Feedback Received	3.0	3.1	3.2	27			
	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.8	2.9	2.9	27			
	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.6	1.6	1.5	27			
	GSR/TA Training	3.0	2.9	3.0	27			
	Graduate Division Programming	3.0	2.9	3.0	27			
	Food Insecurity	2.1	2.2	2.0	5		NEG	< 10 cases
	Environments	2.9	2.9	2.9	27			
Health	3.6	3.5	3.6	27				
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.7	3.7	3.8	26			
	Would select this university	3.1	3.2	3.4	27			
	Would select same field	3.5	3.6	3.8	27			
	Would recommend this university	3.2	3.1	3.5	27			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.6	3.6	28			
	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.3	3.4	3.6	28			
	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.1	3.2	28			
	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.2	3.4	3.5	28			
	Training in research methods	3.1	3.1	3.3	28			
	Amount of financial support	3.2	3.2	3.3	27			
	Teaching and TA preparation	3.1	3.0	3.0	27			
	Availability of courses	2.7	2.9	2.8	27			
	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.1	3.3	3.1	27			
	Encouragement to take outside courses	2.6	2.8	3.1	27		POS	
	Overall quality of course work	3.0	3.2	3.4	25			
	GSR/TA appointments in 2016-17	3.3	3.3	3.4	25			
	On track to complete my degree program on time	3.2	3.3	3.5	27			
	Upbeat about my post-graduation career prospects	2.8	2.8	2.9	25			
	Satisfied with the mentorship and advising	3.2	3.4	3.5	26			
	Satisfied with the career support	2.8	2.9	3.1	27			
	I have the space and the resources I need	3.1	3.1	3.3	27			
My graduate prgm keeps hassles to a minimum	2.9	2.8	3.1	25				
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.3	3.6	28			
	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.5	3.6	3.7	28			
	Helpfulness of staff members	3.2	3.0	3.1	27			
	Faculty help finding employment	3.0	3.0	3.4	13			
	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.1	3.1	3.2	26			
	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.3	3.3	3.4	27			
	Students treated with respect by faculty	3.3	3.2	3.4	28			
	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.4	3.5	3.6	28			
	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.3	3.1	3.4	28			
	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.6	3.5	28			
	(NO) Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.5	2.5	2.9	27			
	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.0	3.1	27			

Table 4.4: Results from the 2017 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and in Sociology

Category	Item	UCM	SSHA	Sociology		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
		Mean	Mean	Mean	Frequency	UCM	SSHA	< 10 cases
	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.1	3.2	28			
	Relationships with other students good	3.4	3.4	3.4	28			
	Competition among students (IS NOT) excessive (Reversed)	2.9	3.1	3.1	28			
	Staff knowledgeable	3.0	2.7	2.7	27			
	Sense of intellectual community	3.1	2.9	3.0	28			
	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	2.8	2.8	3.1	28			
	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.1	3.2	3.4	28			
	Receive feedback from advisor	3.3	3.4	3.5	28			
	Satisfied with advisor time	3.3	3.4	3.4	27			
	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.5	3.6	3.7	27			
	Advisor has interests in mind	3.4	3.6	3.6	27			
	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.1	3.2	3.4	27			
	Advisor keeps track of research progress	3.4	3.4	3.6	27			
	Overall climate	3.3	3.1	3.4	27			
	My graduate program is (NOT) hostile toward students	3.1	3.1	3.3	26			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	2.8	2.8	2.8	24			
	Advice on publishing your work	3.0	3.1	3.4	27			
	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.8	3.0	27			
	Advice on career options within academia	2.9	3.1	3.2	26			
	Advice on career options outside academia	2.5	2.6	3.0	27			
	Advice on degree requirements	3.1	3.1	3.2	27			
	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.0	3.0	3.1	25			
	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.2	3.4	27			
	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.0	3.1	3.4	25			
	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.4	3.6	27			
	Standards for academic writing	3.2	3.3	3.4	26			
	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.5	3.4	27			
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	3.2	3.2	19			
	Student Health Center	3.2	3.2	3.4	22			
	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.3	3.4	3.3	23			
	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	2.7	2.7	3.1	7			< 10 cases
	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	2.9	2.9	15			
	Disability Services	2.8	2.7	3.0	4			< 10 cases
	On-campus Child Care	3.1	3.1	3.3	4			< 10 cases
	University Police	3.1	2.9	3.0	9			< 10 cases
	Parking for students	2.1	2.2	2.1	24			
	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.5	2.6	3.1	12	POS		
	Dining Services	2.2	2.5	2.7	21			
	Bookstore	2.6	2.6	2.7	23			
	Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning (CETL)	3.3	3.2	3.2	12			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.8	1.8	1.6	27			
	Family obligations	1.8	1.8	1.9	27			
	Availability of faculty	1.5	1.5	1.3	27			
	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.6	1.7	1.6	26			
	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.5	1.5	26			

Table 4.4: Results from the 2017 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students:
Overall, in School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, and in Sociology

Category	Item	UCM	SSHA	Sociology		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
		Mean	Mean	Mean	Frequency	UCM	SSHA	< 10 cases
	Course scheduling	1.5	1.5	1.5	26			
	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.2	1.2	26			
GSR/TA Training	Courses and workshops on teaching	3.0	3.0	2.9	26			
	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.0	2.8	2.7	23			
	TA Appropriately supervised	3.2	2.7	2.9	9			< 10 cases
	Time expected of TA was right	2.9	2.8	3.0	21			
	Prepared for LAB	3.1	3.3	3.5	22			
Graduate Division Programing	Admissions processes	3.3	3.3	3.3	17			
	Fellowships/Awards	3.0	3.0	3.0	24			
	Academic Services processes	3.0	2.8	2.9	20			
	Website Information	2.7	2.8	3.0	24			
	Professional Development Programming	3.1	3.2	3.3	22			
	Financial Services	3.0	3.0	2.8	24			
	Diversity and Inclusion	3.0	2.7	2.8	23			
Food Insecurity (3-Point Scale)	Worried about running out of food	2.2	2.2	2.0	5			< 10 cases
	Food did not last did not have money for more	2.2	2.2	2.0	2		NEG	< 10 cases
Environments	Satisfied with living conditions	3.3	3.3	3.2	27			
	My housing situation has (NOT) weighed on me lately	2.7	3.0	3.0	22			
	On campus I feel safe	3.4	3.2	3.4	27			
	I can get by financially without having to cut much	2.9	2.8	3.0	25			
Health (5-Point Scale)	How has your PHYSICAL health been this term?	3.8	3.7	3.9	27			
	How has your MENTAL health been this term?	3.3	3.3	3.4	27			

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 2017 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		Electrical Engineering & Computer Science		Environmental Systems		Mechanical Engineering	
				Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency
Scale Scores (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.4	3.2	3.3	13	3.1	12	3.3	21	3.3	17
	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.1	2.9	2.9	13	2.7	13	3.0	21	2.9	18
	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.2	3.1	3.0	13	2.9	13	3.2	21	3.0	18
	Advice and Feedback Received	3.0	2.8	2.9	13	2.7	12	2.9	21	2.8	17
	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.8	2.7	2.9	13	2.7	12	2.7	21	2.5	17
	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.6	1.6	1.5	13	1.8	12	1.6	21	1.6	16
	GSR/TA Training	3.0	2.9	3.0	13	2.8	12	2.8	20	2.9	17
	Graduate Division Programming	3.0	3.0	3.1	13	3.0	11	2.9	21	3.0	18
	Food Insecurity	2.1	2.1	2.0	2	2.3	2	2.3	4	2.0	4
	Environments	2.9	2.8	3.0	13	2.7	12	2.8	20	2.8	17
Health	3.6	3.7	3.5	13	3.7	12	3.7	21	3.9	17	
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.7	3.7	3.8	12	3.5	10	3.9	20	3.7	17
	Would select this university	3.1	2.9	3.2	13	2.5	11	3.0	21	2.8	17
	Would select same field	3.5	3.4	3.0	13	3.5	11	3.4	21	3.6	17
	Would recommend this university	3.2	3.0	3.2	13	2.9	12	3.0	21	2.9	17
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.3	3.1	13	2.8	13	3.8	21	3.3	18
	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.3	3.0	2.9	13	2.5	13	3.4	21	2.9	18
	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.0	2.9	13	3.2	13	3.1	21	2.9	18
	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.2	2.7	2.9	13	2.2	13	2.9	21	2.8	17
	Training in research methods	3.1	2.9	3.0	13	2.8	13	2.9	21	2.9	18
	Amount of financial support	3.2	3.3	3.1	12	3.3	13	3.4	21	3.3	18
	Teaching and TA preparation	3.1	3.1	3.0	13	3.1	10	3.2	18	3.0	17
	Availability of courses	2.7	2.2	2.6	13	1.7	12	2.3	21	2.0	18
	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.1	2.7	3.1	13	2.3	12	2.8	21	2.7	18
	Encouragement to take outside courses	2.6	2.5	2.9	13	1.8	12	2.4	21	2.9	18
	Overall quality of course work	3.0	2.6	2.9	13	2.3	12	2.5	21	2.8	18
	GSR/TA appointments in 2016-17	3.3	3.2	3.0	13	3.4	12	3.1	21	3.3	18
	On track to complete my degree program on time	3.2	3.2	3.2	13	3.2	10	3.1	20	3.4	17
	Upbeat about my post-graduation career prospects	2.8	2.7	2.6	13	2.9	9	2.9	21	2.6	16
	Satisfied with the mentorship and advising	3.2	2.9	2.8	13	2.8	12	3.1	21	2.9	17
	Satisfied with the career support	2.8	2.4	2.5	11	2.2	10	2.8	20	2.2	17
	I have the space and the resources I need	3.1	3.1	3.3	13	2.8	12	3.1	20	3.2	17
My graduate prgm keeps hassles to a minimum	2.9	2.8	3.2	13	2.8	11	2.7	21	2.8	17	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.0	2.9	13	2.7	13	3.1	21	3.1	18
	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.5	3.3	3.4	13	3.2	12	3.6	21	3.1	18
	Helpfulness of staff members	3.2	3.1	3.3	13	3.0	13	3.2	21	2.9	18
	Faculty help finding employment	3.0	2.7	3.0	7	2.3	10	3.4	11	2.3	13
	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.1	2.9	2.9	13	2.3	12	3.3	20	3.0	17
	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.3	3.0	3.1	13	2.8	13	3.2	21	3.0	18
	Students treated with respect by faculty	3.3	3.2	3.1	13	3.0	12	3.5	21	3.0	18
	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.4	3.3	3.2	13	3.1	12	3.6	21	3.2	18
	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.3	3.2	3.1	13	3.0	12	3.5	21	3.2	17
	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.4	3.4	13	3.2	12	3.7	21	3.4	18
	(NO) Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.5	2.3	2.1	13	2.0	12	2.6	21	2.3	18
	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.1	2.8	12	3.6	11	3.0	21	3.2	17
	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.3	3.2	13	3.1	12	3.5	21	3.2	16
	Relationships with other students good	3.4	3.4	3.3	13	3.2	12	3.6	21	3.4	18
	Competition among students (IS NOT) excessive (Reversed)	2.9	2.7	2.6	13	2.8	12	2.7	21	2.7	18
	Staff knowledgeable	3.0	3.0	3.0	13	2.8	12	3.1	21	3.2	18
	Sense of intellectual community	3.1	3.0	2.9	13	3.0	12	3.2	21	2.9	18
	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	2.8	2.6	2.6	13	2.5	12	2.7	21	2.4	18
	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.1	2.8	2.8	13	2.6	12	2.5	21	3.2	18
Receive feedback from advisor	3.3	3.2	3.0	13	3.3	11	3.3	21	3.1	18	
Satisfied with advisor time	3.3	3.2	3.2	13	3.2	12	3.2	21	3.4	18	

Table 5.0: Results from the 2017 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		Electrical Engineering & Computer Science		Environmental Systems		Mechanical Engineering	
				Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency
Advice and Feedback Received	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.5	3.3	3.0	13	2.9	11	3.6	21	3.3	18
	Advisor has interests in mind	3.4	3.2	3.2	13	2.8	12	3.6	21	3.1	18
	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.1	2.8	2.9	13	2.5	11	3.3	21	2.3	18
	Advisor keeps track of research progress	3.4	3.3	3.3	13	3.4	11	3.2	21	3.3	18
	Overall climate	3.3	3.2	3.2	13	3.0	12	3.4	21	3.2	18
	My graduate program is (NOT) hostile toward students	3.1	3.0	2.8	13	3.2	10	3.1	19	2.9	16
	Advice on writing grant proposals	2.8	2.8	2.7	10	2.7	7	3.0	20	2.5	13
	Advice on publishing your work	3.0	2.9	2.8	12	2.9	11	3.1	20	2.9	15
	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.5	2.5	12	2.3	12	2.8	20	2.2	13
	Advice on career options within academia	2.9	2.5	2.6	11	2.3	11	2.7	21	2.1	14
	Advice on career options outside academia	2.5	2.1	2.2	11	2.2	12	2.3	21	1.9	14
	Advice on degree requirements	3.1	3.0	2.9	13	2.8	12	3.0	21	3.2	16
	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.0	2.9	2.9	12	2.6	11	3.0	20	3.0	15
Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.0	3.0	12	2.8	10	3.1	21	3.1	15	
Process to select a thesis advisor	3.0	2.8	2.8	11	2.7	10	2.9	15	2.8	13	
Feedback on your research	3.4	3.2	3.2	13	3.2	10	3.2	21	3.1	16	
Standards for academic writing	3.2	3.1	3.1	13	3.2	10	3.2	20	3.1	14	
Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.1	3.3	12	2.8	10	3.3	18	2.9	13	
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	2.8	3.0	10	2.9	12	2.7	16	2.8	14
	Student Health Center	3.2	3.1	3.3	12	2.8	12	3.3	19	2.9	16
	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.3	3.2	3.5	12	3.0	12	3.3	19	3.1	14
	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	2.7	2.6	2.8	11	2.8	8	2.5	11	2.4	13
	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	3.2	3.4	7	3.0	4	3.4	11	2.8	9
	Disability Services	2.8	2.9	3.4	5	3.0	2	2.4	5	3.0	2
	On-campus Child Care	3.1	3.2	3.5	4	4.0	1	2.7	3	3.0	1
	University Police	3.1	3.1	3.6	10	3.0	7	3.0	9	2.9	8
	Parking for students	2.1	2.0	2.4	13	1.7	10	1.9	18	2.0	17
	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.5	2.6	2.8	8	2.7	11	2.5	14	2.5	15
	Dining Services	2.2	2.1	2.3	13	1.8	10	2.2	20	1.9	16
	Bookstore	2.6	2.4	2.3	11	2.8	10	2.4	17	2.2	12
	Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning (CETL)	3.3	3.3	3.4	7	3.5	6	3.4	13	2.9	8
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.8	1.7	1.6	13	1.9	11	1.8	21	1.6	16
	Family obligations	1.8	1.6	1.6	13	1.6	11	1.7	21	1.6	16
	Availability of faculty	1.5	1.6	1.6	13	1.6	11	1.8	21	1.3	16
	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.6	1.6	1.5	13	1.8	12	1.6	21	1.7	16
	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.8	1.7	13	2.0	10	1.9	21	1.5	15
	Course scheduling	1.5	1.6	1.5	13	1.5	12	1.6	21	1.7	16
	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.5	1.2	13	1.9	12	1.1	21	1.8	16
GSR/TA Training	Courses and workshops on teaching	3.0	2.8	3.0	12	2.5	11	2.9	20	2.9	15
	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.0	3.2	3.1	12	3.4	9	3.1	15	3.1	14
	TA Appropriately supervised	3.2	3.3	3.4	10	3.4	9	3.2	13	3.2	15
	Time expected of TA was right	2.9	2.9	2.9	12	2.9	8	3.3	14	2.5	14
	Prepared for LAB	3.1	3.1	3.0	12	3.4	10	3.1	15	2.9	14
Graduate Division Programing	Admissions processes	3.3	3.1	3.0	7	3.4	8	2.9	9	3.1	15
	Fellowships/Awards	3.0	3.0	3.0	12	3.0	10	3.1	20	3.0	17
	Academic Services processes	3.0	3.1	2.9	9	3.4	9	3.0	21	3.0	14
	Website Information	2.7	2.6	2.9	11	2.9	10	2.5	20	2.4	17
	Professional Development Programming	3.1	3.0	3.3	11	3.0	8	3.2	17	2.6	14
	Financial Services	3.0	3.0	3.0	8	3.6	7	2.8	19	3.1	14
Diversity and Inclusion	3.0	3.1	3.2	11	3.1	9	3.2	15	3.1	13	
Food Insecurity (3-Point Scale)	Worried about running out of food	2.2	2.2	2.0	2	2.5	2	2.3	4	2.0	4

Table 5.0: Results from the 2017 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		Electrical Engineering & Computer Science		Environmental Systems		Mechanical Engineering	
				Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency
Environments	Food did not last did not have money for more	2.2	2.1	1.0	1	2.0	2	2.3	3	2.0	3
	Satisfied with living conditions	3.3	3.2	3.5	13	3.3	12	3.3	20	3.1	17
	My housing situation has (NOT) weighed on me lately	2.7	2.6	3.2	13	2.6	11	2.4	18	2.4	16
	On campus I feel safe	3.4	3.5	3.5	13	3.5	11	3.5	19	3.5	17
	I can get by financially without having to cut much	2.9	3.0	3.1	13	3.4	11	3.0	20	2.8	16
Health (5-Point Scale)	How has your PHYSICAL health been this term?	3.8	4.1	3.8	13	4.2	11	4.1	21	4.2	17
	How has your MENTAL health been this term?	3.3	3.4	3.2	13	3.3	12	3.3	21	3.7	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])

Electrical Engineering & Computer Science had the lowest response rate (35%). The program was also lowest in 2015 (33%).

Table 5.1: Results from the 2017 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		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SOE	< 10 cases
Scale Scores (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.4	3.2	3.3	13			
	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.1	2.9	2.9	13			
	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.2	3.1	3.0	13			
	Advice and Feedback Received	3.0	2.8	2.9	13			
	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.8	2.7	2.9	13			
	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.6	1.6	1.5	13			
	GSR/TA Training	3.0	2.9	3.0	13			
	Graduate Division Programming	3.0	3.0	3.1	13			
	Food Insecurity	2.1	2.1	2.0	2			< 10 cases
	Environments	2.9	2.8	3.0	13		POS	
Health	3.6	3.7	3.5	13				
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.7	3.7	3.8	12			
	Would select this university	3.1	2.9	3.2	13			
	Would select same field	3.5	3.4	3.0	13	NEG	NEG	
	Would recommend this university	3.2	3.0	3.2	13			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.3	3.1	13	NEG		
	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.3	3.0	2.9	13			
	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.0	2.9	13			
	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.2	2.7	2.9	13			
	Training in research methods	3.1	2.9	3.0	13			
	Amount of financial support	3.2	3.3	3.1	12			
	Teaching and TA preparation	3.1	3.1	3.0	13			
	Availability of courses	2.7	2.2	2.6	13			
	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.1	2.7	3.1	13			
	Encouragement to take outside courses	2.6	2.5	2.9	13			
	Overall quality of course work	3.0	2.6	2.9	13			
	GSR/TA appointments in 2016-17	3.3	3.2	3.0	13			
	On track to complete my degree program on time	3.2	3.2	3.2	13			
	Upbeat about my post-graduation career prospects	2.8	2.7	2.6	13			
	Satisfied with the mentorship and advising	3.2	2.9	2.8	13			
	Satisfied with the career support	2.8	2.4	2.5	11			
	I have the space and the resources I need	3.1	3.1	3.3	13			
My graduate prgm keeps hassles to a minimum	2.9	2.8	3.2	13				
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.0	2.9	13			
	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.5	3.3	3.4	13			
	Helpfulness of staff members	3.2	3.1	3.3	13			
	Faculty help finding employment	3.0	2.7	3.0	7			< 10 cases
	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.1	2.9	2.9	13			
	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.3	3.0	3.1	13			
	Students treated with respect by faculty	3.3	3.2	3.1	13			
	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.4	3.3	3.2	13			
	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.3	3.2	3.1	13			
	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.4	3.4	13			
	(NO) Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.5	2.3	2.1	13			
	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.1	2.8	12			

Table 5.1: Results from the 2017 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		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SOE	< 10 cases
	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.3	3.2	13			
	Relationships with other students good	3.4	3.4	3.3	13			
	Competition among students (IS NOT) excessive (Reversed)	2.9	2.7	2.6	13			
	Staff knowledgeable	3.0	3.0	3.0	13			
	Sense of intellectual community	3.1	3.0	2.9	13			
	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	2.8	2.6	2.6	13			
	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.1	2.8	2.8	13			
	Receive feedback from advisor	3.3	3.2	3.0	13			
	Satisfied with advisor time	3.3	3.2	3.2	13			
	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.5	3.3	3.0	13	NEG		
	Advisor has interests in mind	3.4	3.2	3.2	13			
	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.1	2.8	2.9	13			
	Advisor keeps track of research progress	3.4	3.3	3.3	13			
	Overall climate	3.3	3.2	3.2	13			
	My graduate program is (NOT) hostile toward students	3.1	3.0	2.8	13			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	2.8	2.8	2.7	10			
	Advice on publishing your work	3.0	2.9	2.8	12			
	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.5	2.5	12			
	Advice on career options within academia	2.9	2.5	2.6	11			
	Advice on career options outside academia	2.5	2.1	2.2	11			
	Advice on degree requirements	3.1	3.0	2.9	13			
	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.0	2.9	2.9	12			
	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.0	3.0	12			
	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.0	2.8	2.8	11			
	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.2	3.2	13			
	Standards for academic writing	3.2	3.1	3.1	13			
	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.1	3.3	12			
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	2.8	3.0	10			
	Student Health Center	3.2	3.1	3.3	12			
	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.3	3.2	3.5	12			
	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	2.7	2.6	2.8	11			
	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	3.2	3.4	7			< 10 cases
	Disability Services	2.8	2.9	3.4	5	POS		< 10 cases
	On-campus Child Care	3.1	3.2	3.5	4			< 10 cases
	University Police	3.1	3.1	3.6	10	POS		
	Parking for students	2.1	2.0	2.4	13			
	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.5	2.6	2.8	8			< 10 cases
	Dining Services	2.2	2.1	2.3	13			
	Bookstore	2.6	2.4	2.3	11			
	Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning (CETL)	3.3	3.3	3.4	7			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.8	1.7	1.6	13			
	Family obligations	1.8	1.6	1.6	13			
	Availability of faculty	1.5	1.6	1.6	13			
	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.6	1.6	1.5	13			
	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.8	1.7	13			

Table 5.1: Results from the 2017 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		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SOE	< 10 cases
	Course scheduling	1.5	1.6	1.5	13			
	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.5	1.2	13			
GSR/TA Training	Courses and workshops on teaching	3.0	2.8	3.0	12			
	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.0	3.2	3.1	12			
	TA Appropriately supervised	3.2	3.3	3.4	10			
	Time expected of TA was right	2.9	2.9	2.9	12			
	Prepared for LAB	3.1	3.1	3.0	12			
Graduate Division Programing	Admissions processes	3.3	3.1	3.0	7			< 10 cases
	Fellowships/Awards	3.0	3.0	3.0	12			
	Academic Services processes	3.0	3.1	2.9	9			< 10 cases
	Website Information	2.7	2.6	2.9	11			
	Professional Development Programming	3.1	3.0	3.3	11			
	Financial Services	3.0	3.0	3.0	8			< 10 cases
	Diversity and Inclusion	3.0	3.1	3.2	11			
Food Insecurity (3-Point Scale)	Worried about running out of food	2.2	2.2	2.0	2			< 10 cases
	Food did not last did not have money for more	2.2	2.1	1.0	1	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
Environments	Satisfied with living conditions	3.3	3.2	3.5	13			
	My housing situation has (NOT) weighed on me lately	2.7	2.6	3.2	13		POS	
	On campus I feel safe	3.4	3.5	3.5	13			
	I can get by financially without having to cut much	2.9	3.0	3.1	13			
Health (5-Point Scale)	How has your PHYSICAL health been this term?	3.8	4.1	3.8	13			
	How has your MENTAL health been this term?	3.3	3.4	3.2	13			

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 2017 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students: Overall, in School of Engineering, and in IGP Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (Response Rate was Lowest 35%)

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SOE Mean	Electrical Engineering & Computer Science		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SOE	< 10 cases
Scale Scores (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.4	3.2	3.1	12			
	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.1	2.9	2.7	13	NEG		
	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.2	3.1	2.9	13	NEG		
	Advice and Feedback Received	3.0	2.8	2.7	12	NEG		
	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.8	2.7	2.7	12			
	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.6	1.6	1.8	12	POS		
	GSR/TA Training	3.0	2.9	2.8	12			
	Graduate Division Programming	3.0	3.0	3.0	11			
	Food Insecurity	2.1	2.1	2.3	2			< 10 cases
	Environments	2.9	2.8	2.7	12			
	Health	3.6	3.7	3.7	12			
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.7	3.7	3.5	10			
	Would select this university	3.1	2.9	2.5	11	NEG		
	Would select same field	3.5	3.4	3.5	11			
	Would recommend this university	3.2	3.0	2.9	12			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.3	2.8	13	NEG	NEG	
	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.3	3.0	2.5	13	NEG	NEG	
	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.0	3.2	13			
	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.2	2.7	2.2	13	NEG	NEG	
	Training in research methods	3.1	2.9	2.8	13			
	Amount of financial support	3.2	3.3	3.3	13			
	Teaching and TA preparation	3.1	3.1	3.1	10			
	Availability of courses	2.7	2.2	1.7	12	NEG		
	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.1	2.7	2.3	12	NEG	NEG	
	Encouragement to take outside courses	2.6	2.5	1.8	12	NEG	NEG	
	Overall quality of course work	3.0	2.6	2.3	12	NEG		
	GSR/TA appointments in 2016-17	3.3	3.2	3.4	12			
	On track to complete my degree program on time	3.2	3.2	3.2	10			
	Upbeat about my post-graduation career prospects	2.8	2.7	2.9	9			< 10 cases
	Satisfied with the mentorship and advising	3.2	2.9	2.8	12			
	Satisfied with the career support	2.8	2.4	2.2	10	NEG		
	I have the space and the resources I need	3.1	3.1	2.8	12			
My graduate prgm keeps hassles to a minimum	2.9	2.8	2.8	11				
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.0	2.7	13	NEG		
	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.5	3.3	3.2	12			
	Helpfulness of staff members	3.2	3.1	3.0	13			
	Faculty help finding employment	3.0	2.7	2.3	10	NEG		
	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.1	2.9	2.3	12	NEG	NEG	
	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.3	3.0	2.8	13	NEG		
	Students treated with respect by faculty	3.3	3.2	3.0	12			
	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.4	3.3	3.1	12	NEG		
	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.3	3.2	3.0	12			
	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.4	3.2	12	NEG		
	(NO) Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.5	2.3	2.0	12	NEG		
	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.1	3.6	11	POS	POS	

Table 5.2: Results from the 2017 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students: Overall, in School of Engineering, and in IGP Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (Response Rate was Lowest 35%)

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SOE Mean	Electrical Engineering & Computer Science		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SOE	< 10 cases
	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.3	3.1	12			
	Relationships with other students good	3.4	3.4	3.2	12			
	Competition among students (IS NOT) excessive (Reversed)	2.9	2.7	2.8	12			
	Staff knowledgeable	3.0	3.0	2.8	12			
	Sense of intellectual community	3.1	3.0	3.0	12			
	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	2.8	2.6	2.5	12			
	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.1	2.8	2.6	12	NEG		
	Receive feedback from advisor	3.3	3.2	3.3	11			
	Satisfied with advisor time	3.3	3.2	3.2	12			
	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.5	3.3	2.9	11	NEG	NEG	
	Advisor has interests in mind	3.4	3.2	2.8	12	NEG	NEG	
	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.1	2.8	2.5	11	NEG		
	Advisor keeps track of research progress	3.4	3.3	3.4	11			
	Overall climate	3.3	3.2	3.0	12			
	My graduate program is (NOT) hostile toward students	3.1	3.0	3.2	10			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	2.8	2.8	2.7	7			< 10 cases
	Advice on publishing your work	3.0	2.9	2.9	11			
	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.5	2.3	12			
	Advice on career options within academia	2.9	2.5	2.3	11	NEG		
	Advice on career options outside academia	2.5	2.1	2.2	12			
	Advice on degree requirements	3.1	3.0	2.8	12			
	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.0	2.9	2.6	11			
	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.0	2.8	10			
	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.0	2.8	2.7	10			
	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.2	3.2	10			
	Standards for academic writing	3.2	3.1	3.2	10			
	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.1	2.8	10	NEG		
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	2.8	2.9	12			
	Student Health Center	3.2	3.1	2.8	12			
	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.3	3.2	3.0	12			
	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	2.7	2.6	2.8	8			< 10 cases
	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	3.2	3.0	4			< 10 cases
	Disability Services	2.8	2.9	3.0	2			< 10 cases
	On-campus Child Care	3.1	3.2	4.0	1	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	University Police	3.1	3.1	3.0	7			< 10 cases
	Parking for students	2.1	2.0	1.7	10			
	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.5	2.6	2.7	11			
	Dining Services	2.2	2.1	1.8	10			
	Bookstore	2.6	2.4	2.8	10			
	Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning (CETL)	3.3	3.3	3.5	6			< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.8	1.7	1.9	11			
	Family obligations	1.8	1.6	1.6	11			
	Availability of faculty	1.5	1.6	1.6	11			
	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.6	1.6	1.8	12			
	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.8	2.0	10	POS		

Table 5.2: Results from the 2017 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students: Overall, in School of Engineering, and in IGP Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (Response Rate was Lowest 35%)

Category	Item	UCM Mean	SOE Mean	Electrical Engineering & Computer Science		Effect size* > 0.5 Compared to ...		
				Mean	Frequency	UCM	SOE	< 10 cases
	Course scheduling	1.5	1.6	1.5	12			
	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.5	1.9	12	POS	POS	
GSR/TA Training	Courses and workshops on teaching	3.0	2.8	2.5	11	NEG		
	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.0	3.2	3.4	9			< 10 cases
	TA Appropriately supervised	3.2	3.3	3.4	9			< 10 cases
	Time expected of TA was right	2.9	2.9	2.9	8			< 10 cases
	Prepared for LAB	3.1	3.1	3.4	10			
Graduate Division Programming	Admissions processes	3.3	3.1	3.4	8			< 10 cases
	Fellowships/Awards	3.0	3.0	3.0	10			
	Academic Services processes	3.0	3.1	3.4	9	POS		< 10 cases
	Website Information	2.7	2.6	2.9	10			
	Professional Development Programming	3.1	3.0	3.0	8			< 10 cases
	Financial Services	3.0	3.0	3.6	7	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Diversity and Inclusion	3.0	3.1	3.1	9			< 10 cases
Food Insecurity (3-Point Scale)	Worried about running out of food	2.2	2.2	2.5	2	POS	POS	< 10 cases
	Food did not last did not have money for more	2.2	2.1	2.0	2			< 10 cases
Environments	Satisfied with living conditions	3.3	3.2	3.3	12			
	My housing situation has (NOT) weighed on me lately	2.7	2.6	2.6	11			
	On campus I feel safe	3.4	3.5	3.5	11			
	I can get by financially without having to cut much	2.9	3.0	3.4	11	POS		
Health (5-Point Scale)	How has your PHYSICAL health been this term?	3.8	4.1	4.2	11			
	How has your MENTAL health been this term?	3.3	3.4	3.3	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 5.3: Results from the 2017 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	SOE	< 10 cases
Scale Scores (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.4	3.5	3.3	21			
	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.1	3.2	3.0	21			
	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.2	3.3	3.2	21			
	Advice and Feedback Received	3.0	3.1	2.9	21			
	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.8	2.7	2.7	21			
	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.6	1.6	1.6	21			
	GSR/TA Training	3.0	3.1	2.8	20			
	Graduate Division Programming	3.0	3.1	2.9	21			
	Food Insecurity	2.1	2.1	2.3	4			< 10 cases
	Environments	2.9	2.8	2.8	20			
Health	3.6	3.5	3.7	21				
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.7	3.7	3.9	20			
	Would select this university	3.1	3.2	3.0	21			
	Would select same field	3.5	3.5	3.4	21			
	Would recommend this university	3.2	3.4	3.0	21			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.7	3.8	21			
	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.3	3.5	3.4	21			
	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.2	3.1	21			
	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.2	3.3	2.9	21			
	Training in research methods	3.1	3.3	2.9	21			
	Amount of financial support	3.2	3.0	3.4	21			
	Teaching and TA preparation	3.1	3.3	3.2	18			
	Availability of courses	2.7	3.1	2.3	21			NEG
	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.1	3.3	2.8	21			NEG
	Encouragement to take outside courses	2.6	2.6	2.4	21			
	Overall quality of course work	3.0	3.2	2.5	21	NEG		NEG
	GSR/TA appointments in 2016-17	3.3	3.3	3.1	21			
	On track to complete my degree program on time	3.2	3.1	3.1	20			
	Upbeat about my post-graduation career prospects	2.8	3.0	2.9	21			
	Satisfied with the mentorship and advising	3.2	3.2	3.1	21			
	Satisfied with the career support	2.8	3.0	2.8	20			
	I have the space and the resources I need	3.1	3.2	3.1	20			
My graduate prgm keeps hassles to a minimum	2.9	2.9	2.7	21				
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.3	3.1	21			
	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.5	3.5	3.6	21			
	Helpfulness of staff members	3.2	3.6	3.2	21			
	Faculty help finding employment	3.0	3.2	3.4	11			
	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.1	3.3	3.3	20			
	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.3	3.4	3.2	21			
	Students treated with respect by faculty	3.3	3.5	3.5	21			
	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.4	3.5	3.6	21			
	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.3	3.5	3.5	21			
	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.5	3.7	21			
	(NO) Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.5	2.7	2.6	21			
	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.0	3.0	21			

Table 5.3: Results from the 2017 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	SOE	< 10 cases
	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.4	3.5	21			
	Relationships with other students good	3.4	3.6	3.6	21			
	Competition among students (IS NOT) excessive (Reversed)	2.9	2.9	2.7	21			
	Staff knowledgeable	3.0	3.2	3.1	21			
	Sense of intellectual community	3.1	3.3	3.2	21			
	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	2.8	3.1	2.7	21			
	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.1	3.2	2.5	21	NEG	NEG	
	Receive feedback from advisor	3.3	3.3	3.3	21			
	Satisfied with advisor time	3.3	3.3	3.2	21			
	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.5	3.4	3.6	21			
	Advisor has interests in mind	3.4	3.4	3.6	21			
	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.1	3.1	3.3	21			
	Advisor keeps track of research progress	3.4	3.4	3.2	21			
	Overall climate	3.3	3.5	3.4	21			
	My graduate program is (NOT) hostile toward students	3.1	3.3	3.1	19			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	2.8	2.9	3.0	20			
	Advice on publishing your work	3.0	3.0	3.1	20			
	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.9	2.8	20			
	Advice on career options within academia	2.9	3.1	2.7	21			
	Advice on career options outside academia	2.5	2.7	2.3	21			
	Advice on degree requirements	3.1	3.2	3.0	21			
	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.0	3.2	3.0	20			
	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.1	3.1	21			
	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.0	3.0	2.9	15			
	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.4	3.2	21			
	Standards for academic writing	3.2	3.3	3.2	20			
	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.4	3.3	18			
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	2.8	2.7	16			
	Student Health Center	3.2	3.2	3.3	19			
	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.3	3.1	3.3	19			
	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	2.7	2.8	2.5	11			
	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	3.3	3.4	11			
	Disability Services	2.8	3.1	2.4	5		NEG	< 10 cases
	On-campus Child Care	3.1	2.9	2.7	3			< 10 cases
	University Police	3.1	3.4	3.0	9			< 10 cases
	Parking for students	2.1	2.0	1.9	18			
	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.5	2.3	2.5	14			
	Dining Services	2.2	2.1	2.2	20			
	Bookstore	2.6	2.6	2.4	17			
	Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning (CETL)	3.3	3.3	3.4	13			
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.8	1.9	1.8	21			
	Family obligations	1.8	1.8	1.7	21			
	Availability of faculty	1.5	1.5	1.8	21			
	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.6	1.5	1.6	21			
	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.6	1.9	21			

Table 5.3: Results from the 2017 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	SOE	< 10 cases
	Course scheduling	1.5	1.4	1.6	21			
	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.3	1.1	21			
GSR/TA Training	Courses and workshops on teaching	3.0	3.2	2.9	20			
	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.0	3.3	3.1	15			
	TA Appropriately supervised	3.2	3.4	3.2	13			
	Time expected of TA was right	2.9	3.0	3.3	14			
	Prepared for LAB	3.1	2.8	3.1	15			
Graduate Division Programing	Admissions processes	3.3	3.5	2.9	9	NEG	NEG	< 10 cases
	Fellowships/Awards	3.0	3.1	3.1	20			
	Academic Services processes	3.0	3.1	3.0	21			
	Website Information	2.7	2.8	2.5	20			
	Professional Development Programming	3.1	3.2	3.2	17			
	Financial Services	3.0	3.1	2.8	19			
	Diversity and Inclusion	3.0	3.3	3.2	15			
Food Insecurity (3-Point Scale)	Worried about running out of food	2.2	2.1	2.3	4			< 10 cases
	Food did not last did not have money for more	2.2	2.1	2.3	3			< 10 cases
Environments	Satisfied with living conditions	3.3	3.2	3.3	20			
	My housing situation has (NOT) weighed on me lately	2.7	2.5	2.4	18			
	On campus I feel safe	3.4	3.5	3.5	19			
	I can get by financially without having to cut much	2.9	2.9	3.0	20			
Health (5-Point Scale)	How has your PHYSICAL health been this term?	3.8	3.7	4.1	21			
	How has your MENTAL health been this term?	3.3	3.3	3.3	21			

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 2017 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 Scores (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.4	3.2	3.3	17			
	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.1	2.9	2.9	18			
	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.2	3.1	3.0	18			
	Advice and Feedback Received	3.0	2.8	2.8	17			
	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.8	2.7	2.5	17			
	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.6	1.6	1.6	16			
	GSR/TA Training	3.0	2.9	2.9	17			
	Graduate Division Programming	3.0	3.0	3.0	18			
	Food Insecurity	2.1	2.1	2.0	4			< 10 cases
	Environments	2.9	2.8	2.8	17			
	Health	3.6	3.7	3.9	17			
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.7	3.7	3.7	17			
	Would select this university	3.1	2.9	2.8	17			
	Would select same field	3.5	3.4	3.6	17			
	Would recommend this university	3.2	3.0	2.9	17			
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	3.3	3.3	18			
	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.3	3.0	2.9	18			
	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	3.0	2.9	18			
	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.2	2.7	2.8	17			
	Training in research methods	3.1	2.9	2.9	18			
	Amount of financial support	3.2	3.3	3.3	18			
	Teaching and TA preparation	3.1	3.1	3.0	17			
	Availability of courses	2.7	2.2	2.0	18	NEG		
	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.1	2.7	2.7	18			
	Encouragement to take outside courses	2.6	2.5	2.9	18			
	Overall quality of course work	3.0	2.6	2.8	18			
	GSR/TA appointments in 2016-17	3.3	3.2	3.3	18			
	On track to complete my degree program on time	3.2	3.2	3.4	17			
	Upbeat about my post-graduation career prospects	2.8	2.7	2.6	16			
	Satisfied with the mentorship and advising	3.2	2.9	2.9	17			
	Satisfied with the career support	2.8	2.4	2.2	17	NEG		
	I have the space and the resources I need	3.1	3.1	3.2	17			
My graduate prgm keeps hassles to a minimum	2.9	2.8	2.8	17				
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	3.0	3.1	18			
	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.5	3.3	3.1	18	NEG		
	Helpfulness of staff members	3.2	3.1	2.9	18			
	Faculty help finding employment	3.0	2.7	2.3	13	NEG		
	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.1	2.9	3.0	17			
	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.3	3.0	3.0	18			
	Students treated with respect by faculty	3.3	3.2	3.0	18			
	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.4	3.3	3.2	18			
	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.3	3.2	3.2	17			
	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	3.4	3.4	18			
	(NO) Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.5	2.3	2.3	18			
	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	3.1	3.2	17			

Table 5.4: Results from the 2017 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
	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	3.3	3.2	16			
	Relationships with other students good	3.4	3.4	3.4	18			
	Competition among students (IS NOT) excessive (Reversed)	2.9	2.7	2.7	18			
	Staff knowledgeable	3.0	3.0	3.2	18			
	Sense of intellectual community	3.1	3.0	2.9	18			
	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	2.8	2.6	2.4	18			
	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.1	2.8	3.2	18			
	Receive feedback from advisor	3.3	3.2	3.1	18			
	Satisfied with advisor time	3.3	3.2	3.4	18			
	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.5	3.3	3.3	18			
	Advisor has interests in mind	3.4	3.2	3.1	18	NEG		
	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.1	2.8	2.3	18	NEG	NEG	
	Advisor keeps track of research progress	3.4	3.3	3.3	18			
	Overall climate	3.3	3.2	3.2	18			
	My graduate program is (NOT) hostile toward students	3.1	3.0	2.9	16			
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	2.8	2.8	2.5	13			
	Advice on publishing your work	3.0	2.9	2.9	15			
	Developing professional contacts	2.8	2.5	2.2	13	NEG		
	Advice on career options within academia	2.9	2.5	2.1	14	NEG		
	Advice on career options outside academia	2.5	2.1	1.9	14	NEG		
	Advice on degree requirements	3.1	3.0	3.2	16			
	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.0	2.9	3.0	15			
	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	3.0	3.1	15			
	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.0	2.8	2.8	13			
	Feedback on your research	3.4	3.2	3.1	16			
	Standards for academic writing	3.2	3.1	3.1	14			
	Avoid plagiarism	3.4	3.1	2.9	13	NEG		
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	2.8	2.8	14			
	Student Health Center	3.2	3.1	2.9	16			
	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.3	3.2	3.1	14			
	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	2.7	2.6	2.4	13			
	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	3.2	2.8	9			< 10 cases
	Disability Services	2.8	2.9	3.0	2			< 10 cases
	On-campus Child Care	3.1	3.2	3.0	1			< 10 cases
	University Police	3.1	3.1	2.9	8			< 10 cases
	Parking for students	2.1	2.0	2.0	17			
	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.5	2.6	2.5	15			
	Dining Services	2.2	2.1	1.9	16			
	Bookstore	2.6	2.4	2.2	12			
	Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning (CETL)	3.3	3.3	2.9	8		NEG	< 10 cases
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.8	1.7	1.6	16			
	Family obligations	1.8	1.6	1.6	16			
	Availability of faculty	1.5	1.6	1.3	16			
	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.6	1.6	1.7	16			
	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	1.8	1.5	15			

Table 5.4: Results from the 2017 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
	Course scheduling	1.5	1.6	1.7	16			
	Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	1.5	1.8	16	POS	POS	
GSR/TA Training	Courses and workshops on teaching	3.0	2.8	2.9	15			
	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.0	3.2	3.1	14			
	TA Appropriately supervised	3.2	3.3	3.2	15			
	Time expected of TA was right	2.9	2.9	2.5	14			
	Prepared for LAB	3.1	3.1	2.9	14			
Graduate Division Programming	Admissions processes	3.3	3.1	3.1	15			
	Fellowships/Awards	3.0	3.0	3.0	17			
	Academic Services processes	3.0	3.1	3.0	14			
	Website Information	2.7	2.6	2.4	17			
	Professional Development Programming	3.1	3.0	2.6	14	NEG		
	Financial Services	3.0	3.0	3.1	14			
	Diversity and Inclusion	3.0	3.1	3.1	13			
Food Insecurity (3-Point Scale)	Worried about running out of food	2.2	2.2	2.0	4			< 10 cases
	Food did not last did not have money for more	2.2	2.1	2.0	3			< 10 cases
Environments	Satisfied with living conditions	3.3	3.2	3.1	17			
	My housing situation has (NOT) weighed on me lately	2.7	2.6	2.4	16			
	On campus I feel safe	3.4	3.5	3.5	17			
	I can get by financially without having to cut much	2.9	3.0	2.8	16			
Health (5-Point Scale)	How has your PHYSICAL health been this term?	3.8	4.1	4.2	17			
	How has your MENTAL health been this term?	3.3	3.4	3.7	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 6: Response Rates for the 2017 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students

Underrepresented Minorities

	Not URM	URM	Total
Did not respond	204	39	243
	50%	42%	48%
Responded	208	53	261
	50%	58%	52%
<hr/>			
	412	92	504
	82%	18%	

Gender

	Female	Male	Total
Did not respond	81	160	241
	36%	57%	48%
Responded	141	119	260
	64%	43%	52%
<hr/>			
	222	279	501
	44%	56%	

Degree

	MA	MS	PHD	Total
Did not respond	7	23	213	243
	50%	64%	47%	48%
Responded	7	13	241	261
	50%	36%	53%	52%
<hr/>				
	14	36	454	504
	3%	7%	90%	

School

	SNS	SOE	SSHA	Total
Did not respond	90	89	64	243
	53%	54%	38%	48%
Responded	80	75	106	261
	47%	46%	62%	52%
<hr/>				
	170	164	170	504
	34%	33%	34%	

Table 6: Response Rates for the 2017 Survey of Spring Ph.D. Students

Major	AMAT	CCB	CIS	ESYS	IGBT	IGEC	IGMN	SOC	IH	PHYI	POLS	PSYS	QSB	Total
Did not respond	8	12	16	20	11	35	23	15	18	28	5	10	42	243
	42%	41%	62%	47%	46%	65%	53%	35%	38%	60%	38%	24%	56%	48%
Responded	11	17	10	23	13	19	20	28	29	19	8	31	33	261
	58%	59%	38%	53%	54%	35%	47%	65%	62%	40%	62%	76%	44%	52%
	19	29	26	43	24	54	43	43	47	47	13	41	75	504
	4%	6%	5%	9%	5%	11%	9%	9%	9%	9%	3%	8%	15%	

- 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
- SOC** Sociology
- IH** Interdisciplinary Humanities
- PHYI** Physics
- POLS** Political Science
- PSYS** Psychology
- QSB** Quantitative & Systems Biology

Table 7: Rating Results from the 2017 Survey of Spring Graduate Students by Degree Level

Category	Item	Doctoral		Masters		Difference (Doctoral - Masters)	Effect Size of More than 0.3 (DOC)	Common SD
		Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency			
Scale Scores (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.4	226	2.9	19	0.5	POS	0.63
	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.1	241	2.8	20	0.3	POS	0.56
	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.2	241	3.0	20	0.2	POS	0.52
	Advice and Feedback Received	3.0	228	2.6	19	0.4	POS	0.73
	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.8	226	2.4	19	0.3	POS	0.66
	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.6	225	1.9	18	-0.3	NEG	0.42
	GSR/TA Training	3.0	226	2.5	18	0.5	POS	0.73
	Graduate Division Programming	3.0	225	2.5	19	0.5	POS	0.74
	Food Insecurity	1.3	206	1.6	16	-0.3	NEG	0.33
	Environments	2.9	222	2.8	19	0.1		0.34
	Health	3.6	224	3.3	19	0.3		0.87
	Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.7	217	3.5	19	0.2	POS
Would select this university		3.1	225	2.4	19	0.8	POS	0.90
Would select same field		3.5	224	3.4	19	0.2		0.71
Would recommend this university		3.2	226	2.4	19	0.8	POS	0.93
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	241	3.4	20	0.2		0.68
	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.3	241	3.1	19	0.2		0.85
	Adequacy of facilities	3.1	240	3.1	20	0.1		0.88
	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.2	239	2.7	18	0.5	POS	0.90
	Training in research methods	3.1	241	2.7	19	0.4	POS	0.86
	Amount of financial support	3.2	239	3.0	19	0.2		0.85
	Teaching and TA preparation	3.1	228	2.7	19	0.4	POS	0.88
	Availability of courses	2.7	231	2.1	19	0.6	POS	1.04
	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.1	231	3.0	19	0.1		0.86
	Encouragement to take outside courses	2.6	231	2.1	19	0.5	POS	1.03
	Overall quality of course work	3.0	229	2.6	19	0.5	POS	0.85
	GSR/TA appointments in 2016-17	3.3	226	2.9	19	0.4	POS	0.80
	On track to complete my degree program on time	3.2	221	3.0	19	0.2	POS	0.73
	Upbeat about my post-graduation career prospects	2.8	213	2.5	17	0.4	POS	0.87
	Satisfied with the mentorship and advising	3.2	222	2.7	19	0.5	POS	0.88
	Satisfied with the career support	2.8	208	2.3	18	0.5	POS	0.95
I have the space and the resources I need	3.1	222	2.6	18	0.6	POS	0.88	
My graduate prgm keeps hassles to a minimum	2.9	218	2.4	18	0.4	POS	0.85	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	240	2.9	20	0.4	POS	0.94
	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.5	238	3.2	20	0.3	POS	0.79
	Helpfulness of staff members	3.2	238	3.0	20	0.3		0.93
	Faculty help finding employment	3.0	132	3.0	10	0.0		1.04
	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.1	225	3.0	20	0.2		0.85
	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.3	240	2.8	20	0.5	POS	0.82
	Students treated with respect by faculty	3.3	232	3.3	19	0.0		0.73
	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.4	232	3.3	19	0.2		0.63
	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.3	231	3.4	19	-0.1		0.77
	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	232	3.6	19	-0.1		0.61
	(NO) Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.5	231	2.4	19	0.1		0.98
	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	227	2.7	19	0.4	POS	0.80
	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	229	2.8	19	0.4	POS	0.79
	Relationships with other students good	3.4	232	2.9	19	0.5	POS	0.68
	Competition among students (IS NOT) excessive (Reversed)	2.9	232	2.5	18	0.4	POS	0.80
	Staff knowledgeable	3.0	231	2.6	19	0.3	POS	0.91
	Sense of intellectual community	3.1	232	2.5	19	0.6	POS	0.85
	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	2.8	232	2.6	19	0.3		0.91
	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.1	232	2.8	19	0.3	POS	0.82

Table 7: Rating Results from the 2017 Survey of Spring Graduate Students by Degree Level

Category	Item	Doctoral		Masters		Difference (Doctoral - Masters)	Effect Size of More than 0.3 (DOC)	Common SD
		Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency			
Advice and Feedback Received	Receive feedback from advisor	3.3	231	2.9	18	0.4	POS	0.85
	Satisfied with advisor time	3.3	231	3.1	19	0.2		0.80
	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.5	230	3.5	19	-0.1		0.68
	Advisor has interests in mind	3.4	230	3.4	19	0.0		0.76
	Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.1	228	3.1	19	0.0		0.98
	Advisor keeps track of research progress	3.4	230	3.3	19	0.1		0.79
	Overall climate	3.3	231	2.7	19	0.5	POS	0.81
	My graduate program is (NOT) hostile toward students	3.1	211	2.8	17	0.3	POS	0.88
	Advice on writing grant proposals	2.8	190	2.2	16	0.6	POS	0.90
	Advice on publishing your work	3.0	213	2.1	15	0.9	POS	0.93
	Developing professional contacts	2.8	214	2.1	17	0.6	POS	0.98
	Advice on career options within academia	2.9	211	2.6	16	0.4	POS	0.97
	Advice on career options outside academia	2.5	209	2.1	17	0.4	POS	1.01
	Advice on degree requirements	3.1	224	2.8	19	0.3	POS	0.94
Advice on preparing for examinations	3.0	204	2.9	16	0.1		0.95	
Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	209	2.9	18	0.2		0.96	
Process to select a thesis advisor	3.0	185	2.8	18	0.2		1.02	
Feedback on your research	3.4	225	2.9	19	0.5	POS	0.82	
Standards for academic writing	3.2	215	2.8	18	0.5	POS	0.81	
Avoid plagiarism	3.4	209	3.1	19	0.3	POS	0.77	
University Resources	On-campus computer facilities	3.0	169	2.6	18	0.4	POS	0.90
	Student Health Center	3.2	190	2.7	17	0.5	POS	0.90
	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.3	203	2.9	16	0.4	POS	0.77
	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	2.7	104	3.0	11	-0.3	NEG	1.00
	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	120	3.0	13	0.1		0.98
	Disability Services	3.1	35	3.3	3	-0.3		1.11
	On-campus Child Care	2.8	43	3.4	5	-0.6	NEG	1.00
	University Police	3.1	99	3.1	11	0.0		0.92
	Parking for students	2.1	201	1.8	16	0.3		1.00
	Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.5	152	2.4	17	0.1		1.02
	Dining Services	2.2	182	1.7	18	0.5	POS	0.93
	Bookstore	2.6	179	2.1	17	0.5	POS	0.91
Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning (CETL)	3.3	104	3.0	9	0.3	POS	0.79	
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.8	222	2.3	18	-0.6	NEG	0.79
	Family obligations	1.8	222	1.8	18	0.0		0.75
	Availability of faculty	1.5	223	1.9	18	-0.4	NEG	0.68
	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.6	222	2.1	18	-0.5	NEG	0.71
	Dissertation topic/research	1.6	221	1.8	18	-0.2		0.73
	Course scheduling	1.5	223	1.9	18	-0.4	NEG	0.63
Immigration laws or regulations	1.3	222	1.4	18	-0.1		0.60	
GSR/TA Training	Courses and workshops on teaching	3.0	212	2.5	17	0.5	POS	0.89
	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	3.0	204	2.2	16	0.9	POS	0.89
	TA Appropriately supervised	3.2	141	3.1	10	0.1		0.87
	Time expected of TA was right	2.9	197	2.4	17	0.5	POS	0.93
	Prepared for LAB	3.1	204	2.6	17	0.5	POS	0.85
Graduate Division Programing	Admissions processes	3.3	141	3.0	16	0.3	POS	0.74
	Fellowships/Awards	3.0	207	2.3	19	0.8	POS	0.92
	Academic Services processes	3.0	177	2.6	18	0.4	POS	0.94
	Website Information	2.7	210	2.2	19	0.6	POS	0.93
	Professional Development Programming	3.1	169	2.6	16	0.6	POS	0.89

Table 7: Rating Results from the 2017 Survey of Spring Graduate Students by Degree Level

Category	Item	Doctoral		Masters		Difference (Doctoral - Masters)	Effect Size of More than 0.3 (DOC)	Common SD
		Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency			
Food Insecurity	Financial Services	3.0	187	2.5	16	0.5	POS	0.90
	Diversity and Inclusion	3.0	167	2.7	17	0.3	POS	0.98
	Worried about running out of food	1.3	206	1.7	16	-0.3	NEG	0.38
	Food did not last did not have money for more	1.2	205	1.6	16	-0.3	NEG	0.38
Environments	Satisfied with living conditions	3.3	222	2.9	19	0.4	POS	0.69
	My housing situation has (NOT) weighed on me lately	2.7	207	2.6	18	0.2		1.01
	On campus I feel safe	3.4	219	3.2	19	0.2		0.71
	I can get by financially without having to cut much	2.9	216	2.4	18	0.5	POS	0.80
Health	How has your PHYSICAL health been this term?	3.8	222	3.6	19	0.2		0.97
	How has your MENTAL health been this term?	3.3	224	3.0	19	0.3	POS	1.07

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 8: Rating Results from the 2017 Survey of All (Masters and Doctoral) Spring Graduate Students by URM (Underrepresented Minority)

Category	Item	Domestic Not URM		Domestic URM		Difference (Domestic URM - Not Domestic URM)	Size of More than 0.3	International		Difference (International - Domestic Not URM)	Size of More than 0.3	Common SD
		Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency			Mean	Frequency			
Scale Scores (Mean of items constituting the scale)	Global Satisfaction	3.4	115	3.2	51	-0.2		3.3	79	-0.1		0.63
	Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	3.1	125	3.0	53	-0.1		3.1	83	0.0		0.56
	Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	3.2	125	3.2	53	0.0		3.2	83	0.0		0.52
	Advice and Feedback Received	3.0	116	2.9	52	-0.2		3.0	79	0.0		0.73
	Satisfaction with University Resources	2.8	116	2.6	50	-0.2		2.7	79	-0.1		0.66
	Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious Obstacle)	1.6	116	1.7	50	0.1		1.6	77	0.0		0.42
	GSR/TA Training	2.9	114	2.8	52	0.0		3.1	78	0.2	POS	0.73
	Graduate Division Programming	3.0	114	2.8	51	-0.2	NEG	3.0	79	0.1		0.74
	Food Insecurity	1.3	106	1.5	48	0.2	POS	1.2	68	0.0		0.33
	Environments	2.9	114	2.9	51	0.0		2.8	76	-0.1	NEG	0.34
	Health	3.5	115	3.4	51	-0.1		3.7	77	0.2		0.87
Global Satisfaction	Will stay in grad program	3.7	114	3.6	49	-0.1		3.7	73	-0.1		0.64
	Would select this university	3.1	115	3.0	51	-0.2		3.0	78	-0.1		0.90
	Would select same field	3.6	114	3.5	51	-0.1		3.4	78	-0.2		0.71
	Would recommend this university	3.1	115	2.9	51	-0.2		3.2	79	0.1		0.93
Satisfaction with Academic Program and Experience	Intellectual caliber of the faculty	3.6	125	3.6	53	0.0		3.4	83	-0.2		0.68
	Ability to keep pace with developments	3.4	125	3.2	52	-0.2		3.2	83	-0.2		0.85
	Adequacy of facilities	3.2	124	2.8	53	-0.3	NEG	3.2	83	0.0		0.88
	Quality of graduate level teaching	3.3	124	3.1	53	-0.1		3.0	80	-0.2		0.90
	Training in research methods	3.1	125	3.1	53	-0.1		3.0	82	-0.1		0.86
	Amount of financial support	3.2	124	3.2	52	0.0		3.1	82	-0.1		0.85
	Teaching and TA preparation	3.1	119	2.8	52	-0.3	NEG	3.3	76	0.2		0.88
	Availability of courses	2.9	117	2.5	52	-0.4	NEG	2.5	81	-0.4	NEG	1.04
	Quality of instruction in your courses	3.2	117	3.0	52	-0.2		3.1	81	-0.1		0.86
	Encouragement to take outside courses	2.5	117	2.6	52	0.0		2.7	81	0.1		1.03
	Overall quality of course work	3.1	116	2.9	52	-0.2		3.0	80	-0.1		0.85
	GSR/TA appointments in 2016-17	3.2	115	3.3	50	0.1		3.3	80	0.1		0.80
	On track to complete my degree program on time	3.2	114	3.2	51	0.0		3.3	75	0.1		0.73
	Upbeat about my post-graduation career prospects	2.8	113	2.8	48	0.0		2.9	69	0.1		0.87
	Satisfied with the mentorship and advising	3.2	115	3.2	49	0.0		3.2	77	0.0		0.88
	Satisfied with the career support	2.8	107	2.8	48	0.0		2.6	71	-0.2		0.95
	I have the space and the resources I need	3.2	113	2.8	51	-0.3	NEG	3.2	76	0.0		0.88
My graduate prgm keeps hassles to a minimum	2.8	115	2.8	47	0.0		2.9	74	0.2		0.85	
Satisfaction with Climate in the Program	Quality of academic advising	3.2	124	3.3	53	0.1		3.2	83	0.0		0.94
	Professional relationship with your advisor	3.5	124	3.6	53	0.1		3.4	81	-0.1		0.79
	Helpfulness of staff members	3.2	123	3.0	52	-0.2		3.3	83	0.1		0.93
	Faculty help finding employment	3.1	63	3.1	23	0.0		2.8	56	-0.3		1.04
	The opportunity to interact across disciplines	3.1	118	3.0	49	-0.1		3.2	78	0.0		0.85
	Overall satisfaction with grad program	3.2	124	3.2	53	-0.1		3.3	83	0.0		0.82
	Students treated with respect by faculty	3.3	118	3.3	52	0.0		3.3	81	0.1		0.73
	Faculty members are willing to work with students	3.4	118	3.4	52	0.0		3.4	81	0.0		0.63
	Rapport faculty and graduate students is good	3.2	118	3.3	52	0.1		3.4	80	0.2		0.77
	Your relationships with faculty are good	3.5	118	3.6	52	0.1		3.5	81	-0.1		0.61
	(NO) Tensions among faculty that affect students (Reversed)	2.5	117	2.6	52	0.1		2.5	81	0.0		0.98
	Financial support for graduate students	3.0	116	2.9	52	0.0		3.1	78	0.2		0.80
	Students in your grad program are collegial	3.2	118	3.0	52	-0.2		3.3	78	0.1		0.79
	Relationships with other students good	3.4	118	3.4	52	-0.1		3.4	81	0.0		0.68
	Competition among students (IS NOT) excessive (Reversed)	3.1	118	3.0	52	-0.1		2.6	80	-0.5	NEG	0.80
	Staff knowledgeable	2.8	117	2.8	52	-0.1		3.2	81	0.3	POS	0.91
	Sense of intellectual community	2.9	118	3.0	52	0.1		3.1	81	0.2		0.85
	Graduate prgm encourages collaboration	2.8	118	2.8	52	0.0		2.9	81	0.2		0.91
	Amount coursework seems appropriate	3.2	118	3.0	52	-0.2		3.0	81	-0.1		0.82
	Receive feedback from advisor	3.2	118	3.4	51	0.2		3.4	80	0.2		0.85
	Satisfied with advisor time	3.3	117	3.3	52	0.1		3.3	81	0.1		0.80
	Research interests incorporated into thesis	3.5	117	3.7	52	0.2		3.4	80	-0.1		0.68
	Advisor has interests in mind	3.4	117	3.5	52	0.1		3.4	80	-0.1		0.76
Person or office you trust to report abuse or misconduct	3.1	115	3.1	52	0.0		2.9	80	-0.2		0.98	
Advisor keeps track of research progress	3.3	117	3.4	52	0.1		3.5	80	0.2		0.79	
Overall climate	3.2	117	3.1	52	-0.1		3.3	81	0.1		0.81	
My graduate program is (NOT) hostile toward students	3.2	110	3.2	47	0.0		2.9	71	-0.3	NEG	0.88	
Advice and Feedback Received	Advice on writing grant proposals	2.9	101	2.5	45	-0.4	NEG	2.8	60	-0.1		0.90
	Advice on publishing your work	3.0	110	2.7	47	-0.3	NEG	3.0	71	0.0		0.93
	Developing professional contacts	2.8	109	2.5	50	-0.3		2.6	72	-0.2		0.98

Table 8: Rating Results from the 2017 Survey of All (Masters and Doctoral) Spring Graduate Students by URM (Underrepresented Minority)

Category	Item	Domestic Not URM		Domestic URM		Difference (Domestic URM - Not Domestic URM)	Size of More than 0.3	International		Difference (International - Domestic Not URM)	Size of More than 0.3	Common SD
		Mean	Frequency	Mean	Frequency			Mean	Frequency			
University Resources	Advice on career options within academia	3.0	108	2.8	50	-0.2		2.8	69	-0.2		0.97
	Advice on career options outside academia	2.5	106	2.4	49	-0.1		2.4	71	-0.1		1.01
	Advice on degree requirements	3.1	115	2.9	51	-0.1		3.1	77	0.0		0.94
	Advice on preparing for examinations	3.0	104	2.9	47	-0.1		3.1	69	0.1		0.95
	Developing your thesis or dissertation	3.1	107	3.0	47	-0.1		3.2	73	0.1		0.96
	Process to select a thesis advisor	3.0	93	3.0	45	0.0		3.0	65	0.1		1.02
	Feedback on your research	3.3	116	3.4	52	0.1		3.3	76	0.0		0.82
	Standards for academic writing	3.2	112	3.1	49	0.0		3.3	72	0.1		0.81
	Avoid plagiarism	3.5	107	3.2	49	-0.3	NEG	3.2	72	-0.3	NEG	0.77
	On-campus computer facilities	2.9	75	3.0	39	0.0		2.9	73	0.0		0.90
	Student Health Center	3.3	92	2.9	43	-0.4	NEG	3.1	72	-0.2		0.90
	Health Insurance (USHIP)	3.4	101	3.1	44	-0.3	NEG	3.2	74	-0.2		0.77
	Center for Career and Prof Advancement	2.6	41	2.8	18	0.2		2.8	56	0.2		1.00
	Counseling and Psychological Services	3.1	61	3.0	29	-0.1		3.2	43	0.1		0.98
Disability Services	3.1	17	2.8	8	-0.4	NEG	3.2	13	0.1		1.11	
On-campus Child Care	2.8	19	2.7	15	-0.1		3.3	14	0.5	POS	1.00	
University Police	3.2	46	2.8	24	-0.5	NEG	3.2	40	0.0		0.92	
Parking for students	2.1	105	1.9	47	-0.2		2.1	65	0.0		1.00	
Campus shuttle bus service (Cat Tracks)	2.4	67	2.4	32	0.0		2.6	70	0.2		1.02	
Dining Services	2.4	92	2.1	39	-0.3		2.0	69	-0.3	NEG	0.93	
Bookstore	2.7	93	2.3	39	-0.4	NEG	2.5	64	-0.2		0.91	
Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning (CETL)	3.3	52	2.9	22	-0.4	NEG	3.3	39	0.0		0.79	
Obstacles (3-Point Scale & Higher is More Serious)	Work/financial commitments	1.8	115	1.9	50	0.1		1.7	75	-0.1		0.79
	Family obligations	1.8	115	1.8	50	0.0		1.6	75	-0.2		0.75
	Availability of faculty	1.6	115	1.6	50	0.1		1.4	76	-0.1		0.68
	Graduate program structure or requirements	1.6	113	1.8	50	0.2		1.5	77	-0.1		0.71
	Dissertation topic/research	1.7	115	1.5	50	-0.1		1.6	74	-0.1		0.73
	Course scheduling	1.5	114	1.6	50	0.1		1.5	77	0.0		0.63
	Immigration laws or regulations	1.1	114	1.2	49	0.2		1.7	77	0.7	POS	0.60
GSR/TA Training	Courses and workshops on teaching	3.0	106	2.9	47	-0.1		3.1	76	0.1		0.89
	Appropriately prepared for CLASSROOM	2.8	107	2.8	48	0.0		3.3	65	0.5	POS	0.89
	TA Appropriately supervised	2.9	68	3.3	25	0.4	POS	3.4	58	0.5	POS	0.87
	Time expected of TA was right	2.7	104	2.7	45	0.0		3.1	65	0.3	POS	0.93
	Prepared for LAB	3.0	106	3.0	48	0.0		3.1	67	0.0		0.85
Graduate Division Programing	Admissions processes	3.3	63	3.2	34	-0.1		3.4	60	0.1		0.74
	Fellowships/Awards	3.0	107	2.7	46	-0.3	NEG	3.0	73	0.0		0.92
	Academic Services processes	2.9	90	2.5	39	-0.4	NEG	3.2	66	0.3	POS	0.94
	Website Information	2.7	103	2.6	49	-0.1		2.8	77	0.1		0.93
	Professional Development Programming	3.2	89	2.9	36	-0.3	NEG	3.0	60	-0.2		0.89
	Financial Services	3.0	97	2.9	44	-0.1		3.1	62	0.1		0.90
Diversity and Inclusion	2.9	77	2.8	41	-0.1		3.2	66	0.3	POS	0.98	
Food Insecurity	Worried about running out of food	1.3	106	1.5	48	0.2	POS	1.3	68	0.0		0.38
	Food did not last did not have money for more	1.2	106	1.4	47	0.2	POS	1.2	68	0.0		0.38
Environments	Satisfied with living conditions	3.3	114	3.2	51	-0.2		3.1	76	-0.2		0.69
	My housing situation has (NOT) weighed on me lately	2.9	109	2.8	46	-0.1		2.5	70	-0.4	NEG	1.01
	On campus I feel safe	3.4	113	3.2	51	-0.2		3.4	74	0.0		0.71
	I can get by financially without having to cut much	3.0	113	2.6	49	-0.4	NEG	2.9	72	0.0		0.80
Health	How has your PHYSICAL health been this term?	3.8	114	3.6	51	-0.2		4.0	76	0.2		0.97
	How has your MENTAL health been this term?	3.3	115	3.1	51	-0.1		3.5	77	0.2		1.07

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 9: Risk Management Items from the 2017 Survey of Spring Ph.D. and Masters Students:

	UCM	SNS	SOE	SSHA				
Number of respondents to these items	247	74	73	100				
	%	%	%	%				
Would be able to determine how to report U damaging activity	Yes	75	78	4	73	-2	73	-1
	No	25	22		27		27	
Effect size* > 0.3 Compared to UCM mean								
		Std Dev	Mean	Mean	Mean			
Comfortable reporting the damaging activity (4-point scale)	3.1	0.81	3.1	3.1	3.1			
Percentage uncomfortable or very uncomfortable		19 %	15 %	19 %	22 %			
Confidence that U would respond appropriately (5-point scale)	3.5	1.14	3.7	3.7	3.3			
Percentage unsure, doubtful or having little or no confidence		47 %	40 %	45 %	54 %			
Percentage unsure		33 %	32 %	36 %	33 %			
Percentage doubtful or having little or no confidence		14 %	8 %	10 %	21 %			

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.

The response scale for the four-point scale was: Very comfortable [4], Comfortable [3], Uncomfortable [2], Very uncomfortable [1]