

Graduate Student Survey at University of Missouri, 2002

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Executive Summary
- III. GSS 2002 and Respondents
- IV. Profile of GSS 2002 Respondents
- V. Response Rate
- VI. Benchmarks
- VII. Benchmarks by Demographic Variables
- VIII. Item Mean and Standard Deviation
- IX. Frequency Distribution
- X. Reference
- XI. Survey Questionnaire

II. Executive Summary (UM)

- ◆

- ◆

III. GSS 2002 and Respondents (UM)

Table 1: Comparison of GSS 2002 Respondents and Population

	<u>GSS 2002</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>GSS 2002</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>GSS 2002</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>GSS 2002</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>GSS 2002</u>	<u>Population</u>
	<u>UMC</u>		<u>UMKC</u>		<u>UMR</u>		<u>UMSL</u>			
<u>Program</u>										
Masters	50%	46%	69%	59%	60%	73%	69%	80%	57%	59%
Doctors	50%	54%	31%	41%	40%	27%	31%	20%	43%	41%
<u>Ethnicity</u>										
Afr.+Am.Ind.	5%	6%	6%	11%	3%	4%	8%	12%	5%	9%
Asian	12%	3%	18%	7%	40%	4%	8%	3%	16%	4%
White	83%	91%	77%	82%	58%	92%	84%	85%	78%	87%
<u>Citizenship</u>										
U.S.&PR	70%	81%	70%	88%	31%	48%	83%	91%	65%	83%
International	30%	19%	30%	12%	69%	52%	17%	9%	35%	17%

Note: GSS 2002 population is defined as all graduate students enrolled in the Fall of 2001.


Source: http://www.system.missouri.edu/planning/exec_ref/1_21.xls

IR&P/MW 08/02

UMC UMKC UMR UMSL UM UMC UMKC UMR UMSL UM

VI. Benchmarks

level of academic
challenge Items:



Student Interactions with Faculty Items:

Opportunity for meaningful interaction with faculty

Opportunity to discuss ideas with faculty members outside of class

The quality of advising that I have received during my thesis/dissertation preparation

Opportunity to work with faculty on research/creative projects

The quality of feedback from faculty on my academic performance

Enriching Learning Experiences items:

Quality of experiences such as practicum/internships in my graduate program

Opportunity to work with diverse groups of people


Opportunity for community/ civic/volunteer service while in graduate school

Opportunity to get involved in professional activities/ disciplinary societies

Opportunity to engage in interdisciplinary work

Opportunity to participate in co-curricular activities (graduate student organizations, graduate student government, etc.)

Supportive Campus Environment: UM & UMC



Supportive Campus Environment items:


Campus environment as it relates to providing the support I need to succeed academically

Campus environment as it relates to providing the support I need to succeed socially

Quality of relationships with administrative personnel and offices

Quality of relationships with other graduate students

Career Preparation: UM & UMC



Career Preparation items:

Advice I have received about career options

Overall quality of my preparation in graduate school for my chosen career

Overall quality of my preparation to conduct research in my field

Overall quality of my preparation to teach in a college or university

Academic and Personal Development Items:

I have learned more in graduate school than I thought possible.

My graduate school experience has enhanced my ability to apply theories/ concepts.

I am comfortable using technology to manage information in my chosen field.

My oral and written skills have improved while in graduate school

My professional skills (such as public speaking, making presentations, interviewing etc.) have improved in graduate school

Working with others is a skill I have improved while in graduate school

Graduate school has contributed to my ability to learn on my own

I am more confident making decisions on professional ethics and responsibilities as a result of graduate school

Satisfaction with university experience items:

It has taken/will take me longer than I expected to complete my graduate degree.

VII. GSS 2002 Benchmarks by Demographic Variables: UM and UMC

		<u>Academic Challenge</u>	<u>Active Learning</u>	<u>Interact w/ Faculty</u>	<u>Enrich Learn</u>	<u>Support</u>	<u>Career Prep</u>	<u>Academic Develop</u>	<u>Personal Develop</u>	<u>Overall Develop</u>	<u>Satis- faction</u>
<u>Program</u>											
_____	UM	3.88	3.29	3.7	3.07	3.39	3.12	3.86	4	3.88	3.49
	UMC	3.98	3.38	3.75	3.14	3.5	3.15	3.9	4.04	3.92	3.5
_____	UM	3.7	3.22	3.43	2.98	3.41	3.01	3.74	3.88	3.77	3.47
	UMC	3.8	3.37	3.52	3.1	3.55	3.09	3.76	3.92	3.81	3.47
<u>Gender</u>											
_____	UM	3.67	3.24	3.58	2.99	3.39	3.06	3.79	3.91	3.81	3.49
	UMC	3.81	3.38	3.64	3.15	3.54	3.14	3.85	3.97	3.87	3.5
_____	UM	3.9	3.29	3.56	3.07	3.41	3.07	3.79	3.94	3.82	3.45
	UMC	3.98	3.38	3.66	3.11	3.53	3.1	3.81	3.98	3.84	3.46
<u>Ethnicity</u>											
_____	UM	3.98	3.46	3.67	3.35	3.43	3.03	3.88	3.98	3.86	3.62
	UMC	4.13	3.56	3.74	3.34	3.53	3.12	3.93	3.93	3.86	3.61
_____	UM	3.42	2.91	3.33	2.71	3.24	2.91	3.7	3.92	3.77	3.42
	UMC	3.47	3.01	3.36	2.86	3.31	2.96	3.69	3.93	3.76	3.4
_____	UM	3.93	3.43	3.61	3.22	3.46	3.09	3.82	3.91	3.82	3.47
	UMC	3.97	3.52	3.65	3.24	3.56	3.11	3.83	3.96	3.86	3.45
<u>Full-Time St.</u>											
_____	UM	3.76	3.25	3.58	3	3.41	3.06	3.79	3.95	3.83	3.45
	UMC	3.88	3.37	3.64	3.1	3.53	3.12	3.83	3.99	3.86	3.46
_____	UM	3.92	3.32	3.51	3.26	3.37	3.06	3.79	3.82	3.76	3.58
	UMC	4.04	3.47	3.71	3.49	3.52	3.14	3.86	3.88	3.83	3.65
<u>Citizenship</u>											
_____	UM	3.94	3.44	3.59	3.2	3.42	3.09	3.81	3.9	3.81	3.46
	UMC	3.98	3.52	3.63	3.23	3.53	3.11	3.81	3.95	3.84	3.45
_____	UM	3.49	2.99	3.54	2.8	3.36	3.02	3.76	3.97	3.83	3.5
	UMC	3.7	3.09	3.7	2.96	3.55	3.14	3.87	4.04	3.91	3.56

VII. GSS 2002 Benchmarks by Demographic Variables: UM and UMC

		<u>Academic Challenge</u>	<u>Active Learning</u>	<u>Interact w/ Faculty</u>	<u>Enrich Learn</u>	<u>Support</u>	<u>Career Prep</u>	<u>Academic Develop</u>	<u>Personal Develop</u>	<u>Overall Develop</u>	<u>Satis- faction</u>
<u>Career Aspiration</u>											
	UM	3.91	3.21	3.61	3	3.44	3.07	3.88	3.94	3.86	3.49
	UMC	3.91	3.19	3.64	3.02	3.47	3.01	3.91	3.99	3.89	3.52
	UM	3.91	3.4	3.48	3.13	3.43	2.96	3.82	3.94	3.83	3.62
	UMC	3.93	3.54	3.58	3.13	3.52	2.95	3.79	3.89	3.76	3.6
	UM	3.96	3.32	3.75	3.14	3.41	3.09	3.87	4.01	3.89	3.47
	UMC	4.02	3.41	3.77	3.2	3.48	3.1	3.88	4.06	3.92	3.47
	UM	3.58	3.15	3.48	2.87	3.33	3.04	3.77	3.91	3.81	3.49
	UMC	3.73	3.35	3.62	2.97	3.56	3.17	3.86	3.98	3.89	3.48
	UM	3.76	3.18	3.59	2.89	3.34	3.18	3.81	3.96	3.83	3.48
	UMC	3.93	3.2	3.64	2.89	3.48	3.23	3.9	4.02	3.92	3.55
<u>Status in Program</u>											
	UM	3.78	3.23	3.52	3.01	3.41	3.06	3.77	3.88	3.78	3.47
	UMC	3.9	3.36	3.63	3.15	3.54	3.14	3.8	3.93	3.81	3.48
	UM	3.72	3.3	3.53	2.97	3.4	3.08	3.76	3.9	3.79	3.48
	UMC	3.87	3.54	3.59	3.01	3.59	3.15	3.81	3.92	3.84	3.47
	UM	3.78	3.23	3.56	3.01	3.35	3.06	3.8	3.97	3.83	3.46
	UMC	3.89	3.3	3.65	3.1	3.5	3.1	3.84	4.01	3.87	3.45
	UM	3.86	3.37	3.71	3.15	3.43	3.07	3.9	4.08	3.94	3.49
	UMC	3.93	3.43	3.73	3.22	3.52	3.08	3.94	4.11	3.9	3.5

	Mean	Std	Mean	Std	Mean	Std	Mean	Std
1 Level of aca. challenge	3.98	0.90	3.89	0.90	3.82	0.91	3.74	0.90
2 Keep pace with new dev.	3.92	0.94	3.82	0.97	3.75	0.98	3.62	1.00
3 Use thinking skills	4.15	0.91	4.03	0.95	3.92	0.96	3.80	0.97
4 Overall quality	3.90	0.92	3.80	0.93	3.71	0.94	3.62	0.94
5 Work w/ other students	3.59	1.11	3.52	1.11	3.66	1.09	3.56	1.07
6 Work w/ students outside class	3.36	1.23	3.23	1.20	3.32	1.19	3.14	1.20
7 Tutor other students	3.01	1.19	2.95	1.16	2.89	1.14	2.79	1.13
8 Interaction w/ faculty	3.84	1.06	3.78	1.09	3.70	1.05	3.62	1.05
9 Discuss w/ faculty outside class	3.79	1.11	3.73	1.11	3.59	1.08	3.50	1.10
10 Quality of advising/thesis	3.81	1.20	3.74	1.21	3.45	1.22	3.38	1.23
11 Work w/ faculty on research	3.65	1.22	3.58	1.21	3.20	1.21	3.13	1.21
12 Feedback on aca. Performance	3.57	1.15	3.55	1.11	3.39	1.07	3.33	1.06
13 Quality of practicums/internships	3.27	1.30	3.15	1.27	3.34	1.33	3.06	1.41
14 Interact w/ ind. From different backgrounds	3.16	1.26	3.18	1.23	3.34	1.21	3.30	1.21
15 Community/civic/volunteer services	2.71	1.24	2.67	1.17	2.83	1.18	2.70	1.18
16 Professional activities/societies	3.41	1.19	3.30	1.16	3.21	1.16	3.06	1.16
17 Engage in interdisciplinary work	3.02	1.22	3.01	1.19	2.86	1.15	2.86	1.13
18 Co-curricular activities	3.30	1.14	3.17	1.12	3.06	1.13	2.94	1.13
19 Support academically	3.50	1.02	3.36	1.05	3.55	0.96	3.39	1.01
20 Support socially	3.13	1.07	2.96	1.08	3.31	1.00	3.02	1.07
21 Relationship w/ admin. Personnel	3.51	1.07	3.42	1.07	3.46	1.06	3.40	1.05
22 Relationship w/ students	3.87	0.95	3.82	0.92	3.88	0.91	3.81	0.90

VIII: GSS 2002 Mean and Standard Deviation

	Doctoral Students				Master's Students			
	UMC		UM		UMC		UM	
	Mean	Std	Mean	Std	Mean	Std	Mean	Std
28 Learned more than I thought	3.30	0.77	3.30	0.78	3.17	0.85	3.17	0.84
29 Enhanced ability to apply theories	4.25	0.67	4.18	0.73	3.98	0.82	3.98	0.81
30 Comfortable using tech in my field	4.16	0.79	4.14	0.79	4.15	0.80	4.14	0.78
31 Oral and written skills improved	4.20	0.79	4.14	0.81	3.97	0.93	3.91	0.92
32 Teaching to be my career	4.07	0.98	3.99	0.99	3.33	1.19	3.37	1.16
33 Teaching is requirement of my program	3.32	1.28	3.29	1.24	2.68	1.23	2.74	1.19
34 Professional skills improved	4.19	0.78	4.12	0.80	3.95	0.88	3.87	0.89
35 Working w/ others	3.78	0.89	3.75	0.87	3.81	0.89	3.75	0.90
36 Ability of learn on my own	4.24	0.78	4.21	0.79	4.03	0.88	4.05	0.86
37 Making decisions on ethics	3.95	0.90	3.90	0.89	3.90	0.87	3.85	0.91
38 Take longer to complete degree	3.33	1.21	3.35	1.17	2.76	1.30	2.82	1.23
39 Computing support is adequate	3.55	1.13	3.58	1.09	3.57	1.02	3.54	1.04
40 Deadlines are clearly communicated	3.51	1.08	3.54	1.07	3.62	1.06	3.66	1.02
41 Support resources are adequate	3.11	1.22	3.18	1.20	3.21	1.11	3.23	

IX: GSS 2002 Frequency Distributions

			Doctoral Students				Master's Students			
			UMC		UM		UMC		UM	
			Count	Col%	Count	Count	47	7%	85	8%
1	Level of aca. challenge	poor	6	1%	15	1%	13	2%	33	2%
			653	100%	1,030	100%	638	100%	1,349	100%
		excellent	283	43%	384	37%	203	32%	360	27%
		very good	228	35%	374	36%	244	38%	506	38%
		good	106	16%	199	19%	141	22%	351	26%
		fair	Total	31	5%	61	6%	43	7%	115
2	Keep pace with new dev.	poor	5	1%	11	1%	8	1%	17	1%
			653	100%	1,029	100%	639	100%	1,349	100%
		excellent	178	27%	242	24%	123	19%	225	17%
		very good	282	43%	436	43%	291	46%	583	43%
		good	142	22%	259	25%	150	23%	365	27%
		fair	Total	40	6%	73	7%	67	10%	159
3	Use thinking skills	poor	8	1%	14	1%	8	1%	17	1%
			650	100%	1,024	100%	639	100%	1,349	100%
		excellent	154	24%	217	21%	166	26%	288	21%
		very good	215	33%	333	33%	202	32%	443	33%
		good	173	27%	288	28%	176	28%	405	30%
		fair	Total	74	11%	136	13%	70	11%	157
4	Overall quality	poor	32	5%	49	5%	23	4%	54	4%
			648	100%	1,023	100%	637	100%	1,347	100%
		excellent	145	22%	182	18%	115	18%	194	14%
		very good	166	26%	257	25%	192	30%	372	28%
		good	165	25%	283	28%	161	25%	348	26%
		fair	Total	126	19%	222	22%	120	19%	301
5	Work w/other students	poor	48	7%	82	8%	49	8%	133	10%
			650	100%	1,026	100%	637	100%	1,348	100%
		excellent	66	13%	85	11%	41	10%	66	8%
		very good	106	21%	163	21%	74	18%	159	18%
		good	154	30%	259	33%	141	34%	291	33%
		fair	Total	125	25%	192	24%	107	26%	230
6	Work w/students outside clas	poor	54	11%	90	11%	47	11%	124	14%
			505	100%	789	100%	410	100%	870	100%
		excellent	220	34%	324	31%	159	25%	311	23%
		very good	200	31%	318	31%	232	36%	464	34%
		good	150	23%	249	24%	157	25%	367	27%
		fair	Total	71	11%	109	11%	74	12%	171
7	Tutor other students	poor	11	2%	29	3%	16	3%	36	3%
			652	100%	1,029	100%	638	100%	1,349	100%
			Total							
8	Interaction w/faculty									
			Total							

IX: GSS 2002 Frequency Distributions

	Doctoral Students				Master's Students			
	UMC		UM		UMC		UM	
	Count	Col%	Count	Col%	Count	Col%	Count	Col%
excellent	218	33%	306	30%	146	23%	285	21%
very good	192	29%	326	32%	212	33%	421	31%

IX: GSS 2002 Frequency Distributions

				Doctoral Students				Master's Students			
				UMC		UM		UMC		UM	
				Count	Col%	Count	Col%	Count	Col%	Count	Col%

IX: GSS 2002 Frequency Distributions

	Doctoral Students				Master's Students			
	UMC		UM		UMC		UM	
	Count	Col%	Count	Col%	Count	Col%	Count	Col%
str. agree	145	22%	199	19%	63	10%	127	10%
agree	172	26%	289	28%	99	16%	219	16%
neutral	146	22%	247	24%	159	25%	384	29%
disagree	124	19%	195	19%	193	31%	387	29%
str. Disagree	66	10%	99	10%	117	19%	219	16%
	653	100%	1,029	100%	631	100%	1,336	100%
str. agree	247	38%	349	34%	162	26%	303	23%
agree	312	48%	503	49%	334	53%	695	52%
neutral	73	11%	136	13%	85	13%	221	17%
disagree	21	3%	39	4%	42	7%	96	7%
str. Disagree	2	0%	3	0%	8	1%	20	1%
	655	100%	1,030	100%	631	100%	1,335	100%
str. agree	132	20%	184	18%	132	21%	249	19%
agree	306	47%	501	49%	304	48%	648	49%
neutral	164	25%	263	26%	145	23%	306	23%
disagree	43	7%	66	6%	42	7%	118	9%
str. Disagree	9	1%	15	1%	8	1%	14	1%
	654	100%	1,029	100%	631	100%	1,335	100%
str. agree	272	42%	407	40%	198	31%	421	32%
agree	289	44%	471	46%	300	48%	650	49%
neutral	75	11%	118	11%	94	15%	187	14%
disagree	17	3%	29	3%	32	5%	63	5%
str. Disagree	2	0%	5	0%	7	1%	14	1%
	655	100%	1,030	100%	631	100%	1,335	100%
str. agree	190	29%	267	26%	156	25%	310	23%
agree	292	45%	468	46%	305	48%	642	48%
neutral	128	20%	222	22%	128	20%	268	20%
disagree	37	6%	57	6%	36	6%	91	7%
str. Disagree	7	1%	12	1%	6	1%	20	2%
	654	100%	1,026	100%	631	100%	1,331	100%
str. agree	142	22%	212	21%	72	11%	145	11%
agree	154	24%	262	25%	136	22%	289	22%
neutral	179	27%	293	28%	107	17%	276	21%
disagree	136	21%	207	20%	197	31%	435	33%
str. Disagree	44	7%	58	6%	118	19%	190	14%
	655	100%	1,032	100%	630	100%	1,335	100%
str. agree	118	18%	177	17%	89	14%	191	14%
agree	298	45%	493	48%	316	50%	646	48%
neutral	104	16%	168	16%	117	19%	264	20%
disagree	93	14%	134	13 agree				

IX: GSS 2002 Frequency Distributions

			Doctoral Students				Master's Students			
			UMC		UM		UMC		UM	
			Count	Col%	Count	Col%	Count	Col%	Count	Col%
48a	Teaching assistantship as:	largest source	137	29%	239	14%	104	31%	226	11%
		2nd largest src.	120	26%	183	10%	69	21%	136	7%
		3rd largest src.	93	20%	142	8%	51	15%	80	4%
		4th largest src.	42	9%	56	3%	23	7%	42	2%
		5th largest src.	31	7%	44	3%	11	3%	33	2%
		6th largest src.	45	10%	72	4%	76	23%	173	9%
	Total	468	100%	1,748	100%	334	100%	2,018	100%	
48b	Research assistantship as:	largest source	187	40%	287	12%	135	37%	288	10%
		2nd largest src.	111	24%	178	7%	82	22%	155	6%
		3rd largest src.	62	13%	94	4%	43	12%	77	3%
		4th largest src.	38	8%	58	2%	21	6%	41	1%
		5th largest src.	29	6%	39	2%	16	4%	34	1%
		6th largest src.	40	9%	64	3%	68	19%	156	6%
	Total	467	100%	2,468	100%	365	100%	2,769	100%	
48c	Resident assistant/tutor as:	largest source	12	7%	24	1%	17	9%	35	1%
		2nd largest src.	14	8%	21	1%	14	8%	41	1%
		3rd largest src.	21	12%	36	1%	19	10%	53	2%
		4th largest src.	20	12%	33	1%	17	9%	40	1%
		5th largest src.	20	12%	29	1%	14	8%	25	1%
		6th largest src.	82	49%	150	5%	100	55%	229	7%
	Total	169	100%	2,761	100%	181	100%	3,192	100%	
48d	Tuition waivers as:	largest source	200	37%	275	8%	179	43%	306	8%
		2nd largest src.	155	29%	239	7%	107	26%	195	5%
		3rd largest src.	103	19%	163	5%	45	11%	103	3%
		4th largest src.	51	9%	76	2%	14	3%	41	1%
		5th largest src.	15	3%	26	1%	14	3%	26	1%
		6th largest src.	16	3%	44	1%	56	13%	134	3%
	Total	540	100%	3,584	100%	415	100%	3,997	100%	
48e	Univ. grant as:	largest source	88	28%	139	3%	37	17%	94	2%
		2nd largest src.	43	14%	75	2%	28	13%	54	1%
		3rd largest src.	40	13%	68	2%	21	10%	51	1%
		4th largest src.	41	13%	59	1%	26	12%	56	1%
		5th largest src.	38	12%	55	1%	20	9%	41	1%
		6th largest src.	59	19%	101	2%	84	39%	196	4%
	Total	309	100%	4,081	100%	216	100%	4,489	100%	
48f	Government support as:	largest source	61	31%	94	2%	36	18%	69	1%
		2nd largest src.	17	9%	26	1%	16	8%	31	1%
		3rd largest src.	19	10%	29	1%	14	7%	31	1%
		4th largest src.	16	8%	26	1%	20	10%	36	1%
		5th largest src.	15	8%	23	1%	22	11%	47	1%
		6th largest src.	70	35%	123	3%	90	45%	226	5%
	Total	198	100%	4,402	100%	198	100%	4,929	100%	
48g	Independent grants as:	largest source	25	12%	49	1%	18	9%	44	1%
		2nd largest src.	14	7%	31	1%	15	7%	33	1%
		3rd largest src.	26	12%	36	1%	32	16%	61	1%
		4th largest src.	34	16%	49	1%	30	15%	45	1%
		5th largest src.	36	17%	45	1%	25	12%	50	1%
		6th largest src.	75	36%	128	3%	81	40%	215	4%
	Total	210	100%	4,740	100%	201	100%	5,377	100%	

X. Reference

Astin, A. W. (1991). Assessment for excellence: The philosophy and practice of assessment and evaluation in higher education. New York: American Council on education/Macmillan.

Bowen, W. G., & Rudenstine, N. L., (1992), In pursuit of the PhD. Princeton University Press, New Jersey.

Education Commission of the States. (1995). Making quality count in undergraduate education. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Kuh, G. D., (2001). The national survey of student engagement: conceptual framework and overview of psychometric properties. Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research & Planning, IN: Bloomington.

Kuh, G. D., Schuh, J.S., Whitt, E.J., & Associates. (1991). Involving colleges:

XI. Survey Questionnaire:

University of Missouri Graduate Student Survey Winter 2002

Please complete by April 19, 2002

Learning Environment

*Directions: In this first part of the survey, we want to ask about the **learning environment** in your graduate program. When you answer, please consider your complete experience as a University of Missouri graduate student, rather than only a particular semester or year. Please read each item and select the one response, which best describes your graduate program.*

Level of Academic Challenge

Student Interactions with Faculty

- 8. Opportunity for meaningful interaction with faculty
 - excellent
 - very good
 - good
 - fair
 - poor
- 9. Opportunity to discuss ideas with faculty members outside of class
 - excellent
 - very good
 - good
 - fair
 - poor
- 10. The quality of advising that I have received during my thesis/dissertation preparation
 - excellent
 - very good
 - good
 - fair
 - poor
 - N/A
- 11. Opportunity to work with faculty on research/creative projects
 - excellent
 - very good
 - good
 - fair
 - poor
- 12. The quality of feedback from faculty on my academic performance
 - excellent
 - very good
 - good
 - fair
 - poor

Enriching Learning Experiences

- 13. Quality of exps42(n)-5.7(i)-1.2(ng)-5.7(Expe)-7.9(r)5.2(i)-1.2(en)-5.7(ces)JJJET74.88 404.22 122.22 -0.9 refBT7.9999 0 0 7.9999 197.1 405.12 Tm0

18. Opportunity to participate in co-curricular activities (graduate student organizations, graduate student government, etc.)
- excellent
 - very good
 - good
 - fair
 - poor
 - N/A

Supportive Campus Environment

19. Campus environment as it relates to providing the support I need to succeed academically
- excellent
 - very good
 - good
 - fair
 - poor
20. Campus environment as it relates to providing the support I need to succeed socially
- excellent
 - very good
 - good
 - fair
 - poor
21. Quality of relationships with administrative personnel and offices
- excellent
 - very good
 - good
 - fair
 - poor
22. Quality of relationships with other graduate students
- excellent
 - very good
 - good
 - fair
 - poor

Career Preparation

Directions: In this part of the survey, we want to ask about career preparation in your entire University of Missouri graduate program experience rather than one particular semester or year. Please read each statement and select the one response which best describes your program.

23. Advice I have received about career options in higher education
- excellent
 - very good
 - good
 - fair
 - poor
 - N/A
24. Advice I have received about career options outside higher education
- excellent
 - very good
 - good
 - fair
 - poor
 - N/A
25. Overall quality of my preparation in graduate school for my chosen career
- excellent
 - very good
 - good
 - fair
 - poor
26. Overall quality of my preparation to conduct research in my field
- excellent
 - very good
 - good
 - fair
 - poor
 - N/A

27. Overall quality of my preparation to teach in a college or university
- excellent
 - very good
 - good
 - fair
 - poor
 - N/A

Academic and Personal Development

Directions: In this part of the survey, we want to ask about academic and personal development over the entire length of your University of Missouri graduate program rather than one particular semester or year. Please read each statement and select the one response which best describes your

36. Graduate school has contributed to my ability to learn on my own.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
37. I am more confident making decisions on professional ethics and responsibilities as a result of graduate school.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

Satisfaction with University Experience

Directions: In this part of the survey, we want to ask about your university experience in your entire University of Missouri graduate program rather than one particular semester or year. Please read each statement and select one response, which best describes your agreement with the statement.

38. It has taken/will take me longer than I expected to complete my graduate degree.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
39. Computing support is adequate.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
40. Program requirements/deadlines are clearly communicated.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
41. Support resources (such as office space, equipment and supplies) are adequate.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
42. Library and information sources/support are adequate.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
43. If I ever perceive abuse or misconduct in my program, I know where to go to address the issue.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
44. I would recommend this program to a friend.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
45. If I were going to do it again, I would pursue graduate studies at this university.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

Financial

55. What is your racial or ethnic identification? (Mark all that apply)

Black or African American

Asian American or Pacific Islander

White

American Indian or other Native American

Other:

56. Citizenship status:

U.S. citizen

U.S. permanent resident