

Graduate Student Experience Survey 2015

School of Architecture and Allied Arts

This report includes, in this order:

Response Rate. A list of all programs represented in the report and their survey response rates.

Program Satisfaction. A table that shows the percentage of respondents in each academic program who rated 17 different aspects of their program (e.g., quality of the faculty; financial support for graduate students) as "excellent"; a table that shows the percentage of respondents in each academic program who rated these aspects as "excellent" or "very good;" a table that shows the percentage of respondents in each academic program who rated these aspects as "fair" or "poor."

Advisor Traits. A table that shows the percentage of respondents in each academic program who "strongly agreed" with each of 13 descriptive statements typically associated with academic advisors (e.g., encourages me in my scholarly pursuits; treats my ideas with respect); a table that shows the percentage of respondents in each program who "disagreed" or "strongly disagreed" with each of the 13 descriptive statements.

Departmental Climate. A table that shows the percentage of respondents in each academic program who "strongly agreed" that their program is like each of 10 descriptive statements (e.g., collegial; encouraging; supportive); a table that shows the percentage of respondents in each program who "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that their program is like the description; a table that shows the percentage of respondents in each program who "disagreed" or "strongly disagreed" that their program is like the description.

Historical Comparisons by Program. For each program represented in the school/college or divisional report, shown in alphabetical order, we present a series of eight tables-- three for program satisfaction, two for advisor traits, and three for departmental climate-- that compares the responses from the 2015 survey to those from the 2009 and 2012 surveys.

A Note about Results with Small Respondent Numbers:

In order to preserve confidentiality, programs in which there were 8 or fewer respondents have been grouped with another similar unit, when possible, or suppressed in the program reports that follow. In this report: Digital Arts (MFA), Historic Preservation, Nonprofit Management (Certificate), and Oregon Leadership Sustainability are suppressed for low numbers.

GRADUATE EXPERIENCE SURVEY RESPONSE RATE BY DEPARTMENT

AAA	Number of Respondents	Number of Students Surveyed	Response Rate
Total for all Graduate Programs	1302	2622	49.7
AAA	187	410	45.6
Architecture	64	156	41.0
Art	9	27	33.3
Art History	12	22	54.5
Arts Management	18	39	46.2
Community & Regional Planning	18	31	58.1
Historic Preservation	7	17	41.2
Interior Architecture	9	19	47.4
Landscape Architecture	14	28	50.0
Nonprofit Management (Certificate)	1	2	50.0
Nonprofit Management (Masters)	14	28	50.0
Oregon Leadership Sustainability	4	7	57.1
Public Administration	17	34	50.0

Program Satisfaction

Percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as "Excellent."

	Architecture (N = 57)	Art (N = 8)	Art History (N = 12)	Arts Management (N = 17)	Community & Regional Planning (N = 15)	Interior Architecture (N = 7)	Landscape Architecture (N = 14)	Nonprofit Management (Masters) (N = 14)	Public Administration (N = 15)
Quality of the faculty	15.8%	62.5%	8.3%	11.8%	13.3%	14.3%	42.9%	14.3%	0.0%
Overall Program quality	8.9%	25.0%	0.0%	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%	0.0%
Financial support for graduate students	1.9%	50.0%	25.0%	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%	21.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	15.8%	25.0%	8.3%	23.5%	20.0%	14.3%	7.1%	14.3%	0.0%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	8.8%	0.0%	16.7%	11.8%	6.7%	0.0%	21.4%	35.7%	0.0%
Intellectual community in Program	21.4%	37.5%	16.7%	17.6%	13.3%	14.3%	28.6%	0.0%	6.7%
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	8.9%	12.5%	0.0%	29.4%	46.7%	0.0%	7.1%	42.9%	28.6%
Space, facilities and equipment	10.7%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students	5.4%	12.5%	0.0%	23.5%	0.0%	0.0%	21.4%	14.3%	6.7%
Research opportunities in my program	16.1%	0.0%	8.3%	17.6%	6.7%	0.0%	21.4%	7.1%	0.0%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	16.1%	12.5%	0.0%	11.8%	6.7%	14.3%	35.7%	21.4%	6.7%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community	12.5%	0.0%	8.3%	29.4%	6.7%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	6.7%
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	1.9%	12.5%	0.0%	23.5%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	12.7%	25.0%	8.3%	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%	11.8%	0.0%	14.3%	35.7%	21.4%	0.0%
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	7.1%	25.0%	0.0%	11.8%	13.3%	0.0%	7.1%	21.4%	7.1%
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity	14.0%	12.5%	0.0%	23.5%	6.7%	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%	6.7%
33.3% of students or more rated the program as "Excellent".*	0	3	0	0	1	0	3	2	0
50% of students or more rated the program as "Excellent".**	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

*light green shading indicates that 33.3% or more of respondents rated their program as "Excellent."

**dark green shading indicates that 50% or more of respondents rated their program as "Excellent."

AAA

Program Satisfaction

Percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as "Excellent" or "Very Good."

	Architecture (N = 57)	Art (N = 8)	Art History (N = 12)	Arts Management (N = 17)	Community & Regional Planning (N = 15)	Interior Architecture (N = 7)	Landscape Architecture (N = 14)	Nonprofit Management (Masters) (N = 14)	Public Administration (N = 15)
Quality of the faculty	73.7%	87.5%	58.3%	47.1%	33.3%	57.1%	92.9%	71.4%	26.7%
Overall Program quality	66.1%	100.0%	16.7%	47.1%	33.3%	28.6%	78.6%	57.1%	26.7%
Financial support for graduate students	14.8%	75.0%	50.0%	23.5%	26.7%	0.0%	28.6%	15.4%	14.3%
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	64.9%	75.0%	41.7%	64.7%	60.0%	28.6%	57.1%	64.3%	26.7%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	21.1%	62.5%	41.7%	35.3%	20.0%	14.3%	57.1%	71.4%	13.3%
Intellectual community in Program	73.2%	75.0%	33.3%	64.7%	60.0%	42.9%	78.6%	71.4%	33.3%
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	42.9%	37.5%	0.0%	64.7%	80.0%	28.6%	50.0%	64.3%	42.9%
Space, facilities and equipment	33.9%	62.5%	33.3%	5.9%	0.0%	14.3%	28.6%	7.1%	6.7%
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students	28.6%	25.0%	8.3%	29.4%	20.0%	0.0%	57.1%	50.0%	46.7%
Research opportunities in my program	30.4%	62.5%	16.7%	52.9%	20.0%	14.3%	64.3%	21.4%	0.0%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	41.1%	62.5%	41.7%	35.3%	33.3%	14.3%	78.6%	57.1%	13.3%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community	33.9%	50.0%	8.3%	47.1%	6.7%	28.6%	64.3%	42.9%	26.7%
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	16.7%	25.0%	8.3%	29.4%	33.3%	0.0%	7.1%	35.7%	0.0%
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	49.1%	37.5%	8.3%	17.6%	20.0%	14.3%	35.7%	45.5%	7.1%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	35.1%	50.0%	0.0%	35.3%	53.3%	14.3%	71.4%	50.0%	6.7%
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	30.4%	62.5%	0.0%	35.3%	40.0%	14.3%	42.9%	64.3%	35.7%
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity	42.1%	37.5%	25.0%	47.1%	46.7%	42.9%	35.7%	42.9%	13.3%
50% of students or more rated the program as "Excellent" or "Very Good".*	4	12	2	4	4	1	11	10	0
75% of students or more rated the program as "Excellent" or "Very Good".**	0	5	0	0	1	0	4	0	0

*light green shading indicates that 50% or more of respondents rated their program as "Excellent" or "Very Good."

**dark green shading indicates that 75% or more of respondents rated their program as "Excellent" or "Very Good."

AAA

Program Satisfaction

Percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as "Fair" or "Poor."

	Architecture (N = 57)	Art (N = 8)	Art History (N = 12)	Arts Management (N = 17)	Community & Regional Planning (N = 15)	Interior Architecture (N = 7)	Landscape Architecture (N = 14)	Nonprofit Management (Masters) (N = 14)	Public Administration (N = 15)
Quality of the faculty	8.8%	0.0%	16.7%	17.6%	0.0%	14.3%	7.1%	14.3%	40.0%
Overall Program quality	8.9%	0.0%	41.7%	35.3%	6.7%	14.3%	7.1%	21.4%	33.3%
Financial support for graduate students	51.9%	0.0%	16.7%	52.9%	53.3%	100.0%	42.9%	46.2%	85.7%
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field	14.0%	12.5%	0.0%	17.6%	13.3%	28.6%	14.3%	21.4%	26.7%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	66.7%	0.0%	41.7%	35.3%	33.3%	57.1%	21.4%	14.3%	86.7%
Intellectual community in Program	10.7%	12.5%	41.7%	23.5%	13.3%	42.9%	7.1%	14.3%	53.3%
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	14.3%	37.5%	75.0%	11.8%	13.3%	14.3%	28.6%	7.1%	21.4%
Space, facilities and equipment	42.9%	25.0%	66.7%	82.4%	80.0%	57.1%	50.0%	78.6%	73.3%
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students	37.5%	50.0%	75.0%	35.3%	60.0%	100.0%	21.4%	21.4%	33.3%
Research opportunities in my program	26.8%	0.0%	41.7%	41.2%	33.3%	71.4%	7.1%	35.7%	78.6%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	21.4%	0.0%	33.3%	35.3%	13.3%	42.9%	21.4%	21.4%	33.3%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community	21.4%	0.0%	58.3%	23.5%	66.7%	28.6%	7.1%	28.6%	46.7%
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	53.7%	37.5%	41.7%	47.1%	46.7%	85.7%	64.3%	21.4%	71.4%
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	20.0%	25.0%	50.0%	41.2%	60.0%	14.3%	21.4%	27.3%	71.4%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	31.6%	12.5%	75.0%	29.4%	20.0%	42.9%	14.3%	28.6%	46.7%
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	48.2%	12.5%	58.3%	35.3%	46.7%	42.9%	14.3%	14.3%	50.0%
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity	19.3%	25.0%	41.7%	41.2%	13.3%	57.1%	21.4%	21.4%	60.0%
20% of students or more rated the program as "Fair" or "Poor".*	11	6	14	14	10	13	9	12	17

*shading indicates that 20% or more of respondents rated their program as "Fair" or "Poor."

Advisor *Percentage of respondents who "Strongly Agreed" with each of the following statements about their advisor.*

	Architecture (N = 57)	Art (N = 8)	Art History (N = 12)	Arts Management (N = 17)	Community & Regional Planning (N = 15)	Interior Architecture (N = 7)	Landscape Architecture (N = 14)	Nonprofit Management (Masters) (N = 14)	Public Administration (N = 15)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	61.5%	71.4%	27.3%	58.8%	33.3%	20.0%	91.7%	63.6%	25.0%
Treats my ideas with respect	56.0%	85.7%	36.4%	64.7%	50.0%	40.0%	91.7%	72.7%	25.0%
Provides constructive feedback on my work	54.2%	85.7%	45.5%	47.1%	16.7%	40.0%	75.0%	36.4%	12.5%
Provides timely feedback on my work	44.0%	57.1%	54.5%	52.9%	33.3%	40.0%	83.3%	54.5%	14.3%
Is available when I need help or advice	42.3%	100.0%	45.5%	47.1%	41.7%	20.0%	91.7%	54.5%	25.0%
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	57.7%	100.0%	36.4%	47.1%	25.0%	20.0%	83.3%	54.5%	28.6%
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds	52.0%	100.0%	63.6%	64.7%	41.7%	20.0%	83.3%	54.5%	25.0%
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field	44.0%	85.7%	18.2%	64.7%	33.3%	20.0%	50.0%	63.6%	12.5%
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work	33.3%	14.3%	9.1%	23.5%	16.7%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	14.3%
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	40.0%	14.3%	9.1%	52.9%	25.0%	0.0%	33.3%	18.2%	14.3%
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	41.7%	14.3%	0.0%	17.6%	8.3%	0.0%	41.7%	10.0%	14.3%
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements	50.0%	57.1%	36.4%	58.8%	25.0%	20.0%	66.7%	18.2%	14.3%
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	56.0%	100.0%	27.3%	58.8%	41.7%	0.0%	75.0%	54.5%	25.0%
50% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" with the above dimensions about their advisor.*	7	10	2	8	1	0	10	8	0
75% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" with the above dimensions about their advisor.**	0	7	0	0	0	0	8	0	0

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

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

AAA

Advisor *Percentage of respondents who "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" with each of the following statements about their advisor.*

	Architecture (N = 57)	Art (N = 8)	Art History (N = 12)	Arts Management (N = 17)	Community & Regional Planning (N = 15)	Interior Architecture (N = 7)	Landscape Architecture (N = 14)	Nonprofit Management (Masters) (N = 14)	Public Administration (N = 15)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	11.5%	0.0%	9.1%	11.8%	8.3%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	50.0%
Treats my ideas with respect	8.0%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	12.5%
Provides constructive feedback on my work	16.7%	0.0%	9.1%	23.5%	8.3%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	37.5%
Provides timely feedback on my work	16.0%	0.0%	18.2%	17.6%	8.3%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	28.6%
Is available when I need help or advice	7.7%	0.0%	18.2%	11.8%	8.3%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	12.5%
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	3.8%	0.0%	18.2%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	9.1%	14.3%
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds	4.0%	0.0%	9.1%	11.8%	8.3%	20.0%	8.3%	0.0%	12.5%
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field	20.0%	0.0%	9.1%	5.9%	8.3%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	50.0%
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work	25.0%	0.0%	27.3%	35.3%	25.0%	60.0%	25.0%	33.3%	57.1%
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	24.0%	14.3%	45.5%	17.6%	25.0%	40.0%	16.7%	36.4%	42.9%
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	25.0%	14.3%	63.6%	29.4%	25.0%	40.0%	16.7%	30.0%	57.1%
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements	20.8%	0.0%	18.2%	5.9%	25.0%	0.0%	8.3%	9.1%	57.1%
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	12.0%	0.0%	36.4%	11.8%	25.0%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	25.0%
20% of students or more "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" with the statements above about their advisor.*	5	0	4	3	5	4	1	3	9
33.3% of students or more "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" with the statements above about their advisor.**	0	0	3	1	0	3	0	2	7

*shading indicates that 20% or more of respondents "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" with the statements above about their advisor.

AAA

Climate *Percentage of respondents who "Strongly Agreed" that their program is like the description.*

	Architecture (N = 57)	Art (N = 8)	Art History (N = 12)	Arts Management (N = 17)	Community & Regional Planning (N = 15)	Interior Architecture (N = 7)	Landscape Architecture (N = 14)	Nonprofit Management (Masters) (N = 14)	Public Administration (N = 15)
Collegial	29.8%	25.0%	8.3%	25.0%	40.0%	14.3%	57.1%	28.6%	14.3%
Encouraging	29.8%	50.0%	0.0%	37.5%	46.7%	0.0%	57.1%	28.6%	21.4%
Supportive	26.8%	50.0%	0.0%	37.5%	46.7%	0.0%	50.0%	35.7%	14.3%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches	28.1%	50.0%	8.3%	37.5%	20.0%	14.3%	50.0%	7.1%	14.3%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	17.9%	50.0%	8.3%	31.3%	33.3%	0.0%	42.9%	28.6%	28.6%
Inclusive of students of color	42.9%	37.5%	25.0%	43.8%	20.0%	14.3%	21.4%	21.4%	14.3%
Inclusive by gender	58.9%	62.5%	25.0%	37.5%	33.3%	14.3%	64.3%	21.4%	35.7%
Inclusive of international students	58.9%	50.0%	33.3%	50.0%	13.3%	28.6%	42.9%	21.4%	21.4%
Inclusive of students with disabilities	51.8%	62.5%	16.7%	31.3%	6.7%	14.3%	21.4%	21.4%	21.4%
Inclusive of first generation students	45.5%	62.5%	16.7%	25.0%	13.3%	0.0%	28.6%	28.6%	21.4%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	57.1%	75.0%	25.0%	56.3%	20.0%	42.9%	57.1%	42.9%	21.4%
33.3% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" that the description fit their program*	6	10	1	7	5	1	8	2	1
50% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" that the description fit their program**	4	9	0	2	0	0	6	0	0

*light green shading indicates that 33.3% or more of respondents "Strongly Agreed" that their program was very much like the description.

**dark green shading indicates that 50% or more of respondents "Strongly Agreed" that their program was very much like the description.

AAA

Climate

Percentage of respondents who "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" that their program is like the description.

	Architecture (N = 57)	Art (N = 8)	Art History (N = 12)	Arts Management (N = 17)	Community & Regional Planning (N = 15)	Interior Architecture (N = 7)	Landscape Architecture (N = 14)	Nonprofit Management (Masters) (N = 14)	Public Administration (N = 15)
Collegial	70.2%	50.0%	41.7%	62.5%	93.3%	42.9%	92.9%	57.1%	57.1%
Encouraging	77.2%	87.5%	75.0%	62.5%	93.3%	85.7%	92.9%	64.3%	57.1%
Supportive	67.9%	87.5%	41.7%	62.5%	86.7%	100.0%	85.7%	71.4%	57.1%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches	56.1%	75.0%	66.7%	75.0%	53.3%	57.1%	100.0%	50.0%	35.7%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	62.5%	87.5%	58.3%	75.0%	53.3%	28.6%	85.7%	71.4%	71.4%
Inclusive of students of color	69.6%	87.5%	33.3%	75.0%	46.7%	71.4%	71.4%	50.0%	64.3%
Inclusive by gender	87.5%	87.5%	58.3%	56.3%	66.7%	71.4%	100.0%	78.6%	71.4%
Inclusive of international students	85.7%	87.5%	50.0%	81.3%	33.3%	71.4%	92.9%	57.1%	64.3%
Inclusive of students with disabilities	83.9%	75.0%	33.3%	50.0%	53.3%	85.7%	85.7%	64.3%	57.1%
Inclusive of first generation students	76.4%	62.5%	33.3%	56.3%	53.3%	57.1%	92.9%	64.3%	64.3%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	83.9%	100.0%	50.0%	87.5%	80.0%	85.7%	92.9%	64.3%	57.1%
50% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" that the description fit their program.*	11	11	6	11	9	9	11	11	10
75% of students or more "Strong Agreed" or "Agreed" that the description fit their program.**	6	9	1	5	4	4	10	1	0

*light green shading indicates that 50% or more of respondents "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" that the description fit their program.

**dark green shading indicates that 75% or more of respondents "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" that the description fit their program.

AAA

Climate

Percentage of respondents who "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" that their program is like the description.

	Architecture (N = 57)	Art (N = 8)	Art History (N = 12)	Arts Management (N = 17)	Community & Regional Planning (N = 15)	Interior Architecture (N = 7)	Landscape Architecture (N = 14)	Nonprofit Management (Masters) (N = 14)	Public Administration (N = 15)
Collegial	3.5%	0.0%	8.3%	6.3%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	7.1%	7.1%
Encouraging	7.0%	0.0%	16.7%	12.5%	6.7%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	7.1%
Supportive	10.7%	0.0%	25.0%	12.5%	6.7%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	7.1%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches	14.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	13.3%	28.6%	0.0%	21.4%	28.6%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	16.1%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	13.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%
Inclusive of students of color	5.4%	0.0%	25.0%	6.3%	13.3%	0.0%	14.3%	28.6%	14.3%
Inclusive by gender	1.8%	0.0%	16.7%	25.0%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	7.1%
Inclusive of international students	1.8%	12.5%	16.7%	6.3%	13.3%	0.0%	0.0%	28.6%	7.1%
Inclusive of students with disabilities	5.4%	12.5%	25.0%	12.5%	6.7%	0.0%	7.1%	21.4%	0.0%
Inclusive of first generation students	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	12.5%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	21.4%	7.1%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	1.8%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.4%	7.1%
20% of students or more "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" that the description fit their program.*	0	0	3	1	0	1	0	6	1
33.3% of students or more "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" that the description fit their program.*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

*shading indicates that 20% or more of respondents "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" that the description fit their program.

Architecture

Program Satisfaction: percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as...

	Excellent			Excellent or Very Good			Fair or Poor		
	2009 (N = 95)	2012 (N = 75)	2015 (N = 57)	2009 (N = 95)	2012 (N = 75)	2015 (N = 57)	2009 (N = 95)	2012 (N = 75)	2015 (N = 57)
Quality of the faculty	10.5%	16.0%	15.8%	55.8%	68.0%	73.7%	7.4%	10.7%	8.8%
Overall Program quality	3.1%	9.3%	8.9%	38.1%	54.7%	66.1%	18.6%	12.0%	8.9%
Financial support for graduate students	5.2%	5.5%	1.9%	16.7%	19.2%	14.8%	47.9%	56.2%	51.9%
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field*	16.5%	12.0%	15.8%	47.4%	45.3%	64.9%	18.6%	25.3%	14.0%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	1.0%	2.7%	8.8%	12.4%	17.3%	21.1%	60.8%	60.0%	66.7%
Intellectual community in Program	19.6%	21.3%	21.4%	54.6%	53.3%	73.2%	15.5%	21.3%	10.7%
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	6.7%	8.9%	N/A	28.0%	42.9%	N/A	34.7%	14.3%
Space, facilities and equipment	1.0%	10.8%	10.7%	20.8%	32.4%	33.9%	55.2%	35.1%	42.9%
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	0.0%	2.7%	5.4%	8.2%	26.7%	28.6%	67.0%	33.3%	37.5%
Research opportunities in my program*	7.2%	8.0%	16.1%	37.1%	30.7%	30.4%	30.9%	32.0%	26.8%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	7.2%	8.0%	16.1%	30.9%	34.7%	41.1%	23.7%	21.3%	21.4%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	4.1%	6.7%	12.5%	18.6%	34.7%	33.9%	36.1%	25.3%	21.4%
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	0.0%	1.9%	N/A	6.7%	16.7%	N/A	69.3%	53.7%
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	5.2%	4.2%	12.7%	25.0%	33.8%	49.1%	18.8%	19.7%	20.0%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	4.1%	4.0%	8.8%	20.6%	28.0%	35.1%	38.1%	25.3%	31.6%
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	6.3%	4.0%	7.1%	22.9%	28.0%	30.4%	44.8%	41.3%	48.2%
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	5.2%	6.8%	14.0%	36.5%	32.4%	42.1%	17.7%	28.4%	19.3%
	0 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2015, compared to 0 in 2009 and 0 in 2012.			4 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 2 in 2009 and 3 in 2012.			11 feature(s) rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2015, compared to 9 in 2009 and 14 in 2012.		
	0 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 0 in 2009 and 0 in 2012.			0 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2015, compared to 0 in 2009 and 0 in 2012.					

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

Architecture

Advisor: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed with each of the following statements about their advisor.

	Strongly Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 87)	2012 (N = 53)	2015 (N = 26)	2009 (N = 87)	2012 (N = 53)	2015 (N = 26)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	19.5%	32.1%	61.5%	4.6%	11.3%	11.5%
Treats my ideas with respect	17.2%	43.4%	56.0%	3.4%	11.3%	8.0%
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	9.3%	34.6%	54.2%	8.1%	15.4%	16.7%
Provides timely feedback on my work	8.1%	32.7%	44.0%	12.8%	17.3%	16.0%
Is available when I need help or advice	14.9%	26.4%	42.3%	8.0%	11.3%	7.7%
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	28.3%	57.7%	N/A	7.5%	3.8%
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	17.2%	34.6%	52.0%	5.7%	5.8%	4.0%
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	10.5%	18.9%	44.0%	4.7%	15.1%	20.0%
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	11.6%	13.5%	33.3%	16.3%	34.6%	25.0%
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	9.2%	17.3%	40.0%	17.2%	26.9%	24.0%
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	5.7%	13.5%	41.7%	14.9%	25.0%	25.0%
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	9.4%	17.3%	50.0%	3.5%	11.5%	20.8%
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	19.5%	23.1%	56.0%	9.2%	13.5%	12.0%
<i>* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text</i>	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 7 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 5 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 3 statement(s) in 2012.		
	At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.					

Architecture

Climate: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed that their program is like the description

	Strongly Agreed			Strongly Agreed or Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 97)	2012 (N = 76)	2015 (N = 57)	2009 (N = 97)	2012 (N = 76)	2015 (N = 57)	2009 (N = 97)	2012 (N = 76)	2015 (N = 57)
Collegial	N/A	25.0%	29.8%	N/A	69.7%	70.2%	N/A	3.9%	3.5%
Encouraging	26.8%	26.3%	29.8%	68.0%	73.7%	77.2%	9.3%	10.5%	7.0%
Supportive	24.7%	19.7%	26.8%	62.9%	68.4%	67.9%	9.3%	15.8%	10.7%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	15.5%	22.4%	28.1%	54.6%	67.1%	56.1%	14.4%	11.8%	14.0%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	15.5%	19.7%	17.9%	48.5%	57.9%	62.5%	22.7%	15.8%	16.1%
Inclusive of students of color*	15.6%	26.3%	42.9%	52.1%	55.3%	69.6%	14.6%	21.1%	5.4%
Inclusive by gender*	40.2%	39.5%	58.9%	81.4%	82.9%	87.5%	7.2%	6.6%	1.8%
Inclusive of international students	N/A	33.3%	58.9%	N/A	73.3%	85.7%	N/A	9.3%	1.8%
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	17.0%	14.5%	51.8%	54.3%	56.6%	83.9%	13.8%	15.8%	5.4%
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	21.3%	45.5%	N/A	58.7%	76.4%	N/A	9.3%	0.0%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	38.3%	36.0%	57.1%	79.8%	78.7%	83.9%	1.1%	2.7%	1.8%
<i>* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text</i>	At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 6 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 2 statement(s) in 2009 and 3 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 11 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 7 statement(s) in 2009 and 11 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 1 statement(s) in 2009 and 1 statement(s) in 2012.		
	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 4 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 6 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 2 statement(s) in 2009 and 2 statement(s) in 2012.					

Art

Program Satisfaction: percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as...

	Excellent		
	2009 (N = 16)	2012 (N = 18)	2015 (N = 8)
Quality of the faculty	37.5%	33.3%	62.5%
Overall Program quality	35.3%	5.6%	25.0%
Financial support for graduate students	47.1%	61.1%	50.0%
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field*	35.3%	22.2%	25.0%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	23.5%	5.6%	0.0%
Intellectual community in Program	41.2%	44.4%	37.5%
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	0.0%	12.5%
Space, facilities and equipment	5.9%	22.2%	0.0%
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	11.8%	16.7%	12.5%
Research opportunities in my program*	29.4%	11.1%	0.0%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	5.9%	22.2%	12.5%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	29.4%	16.7%	0.0%
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	5.6%	12.5%
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	11.8%	16.7%	25.0%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	11.8%	11.1%	0.0%
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	29.4%	22.2%	25.0%
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	5.9%	11.1%	12.5%
	3 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2015, compared to 5 in 2009 and 3 in 2012.		
	2 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 0 in 2009 and 1 in 2012.		

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

Excellent or Very Good		
2009 (N = 16)	2012 (N = 18)	2015 (N = 8)
75.0%	88.9%	87.5%
58.8%	61.1%	100.0%
70.6%	83.3%	75.0%
58.8%	66.7%	75.0%
47.1%	38.9%	62.5%
47.1%	72.2%	75.0%
N/A	22.2%	37.5%
35.3%	55.6%	62.5%
23.5%	50.0%	25.0%
47.1%	44.4%	62.5%
17.6%	61.1%	62.5%
35.3%	38.9%	50.0%
N/A	27.8%	25.0%
47.1%	55.6%	37.5%
17.6%	38.9%	50.0%
52.9%	44.4%	62.5%
41.2%	22.2%	37.5%
12 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 5 in 2009 and 9 in 2012.		
5 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2015, compared to 1 in 2009 and 2 in 2012.		

Fair or Poor		
2009 (N = 16)	2012 (N = 18)	2015 (N = 8)
12.5%	0.0%	0.0%
23.5%	11.1%	0.0%
5.9%	0.0%	0.0%
29.4%	11.1%	12.5%
35.3%	33.3%	0.0%
17.6%	11.1%	12.5%
N/A	38.9%	37.5%
41.2%	22.2%	25.0%
58.8%	33.3%	50.0%
35.3%	33.3%	0.0%
23.5%	5.6%	0.0%
35.3%	27.8%	0.0%
N/A	44.4%	37.5%
29.4%	27.8%	25.0%
52.9%	16.7%	12.5%
29.4%	33.3%	12.5%
35.3%	33.3%	25.0%
6 feature(s) rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2015, compared to 12 in 2009 and 10 in 2012.		

Art

Advisor: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed with each of the following statements about their advisor.

	Strongly Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 17)	2012 (N = 17)	2015 (N = 7)	2009 (N = 17)	2012 (N = 17)	2015 (N = 7)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	58.8%	70.6%	71.4%	5.9%	5.9%	0.0%
Treats my ideas with respect	70.6%	76.5%	85.7%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	52.9%	76.5%	85.7%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Provides timely feedback on my work	58.8%	64.7%	57.1%	11.8%	5.9%	0.0%
Is available when I need help or advice	58.8%	76.5%	100.0%	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	82.4%	100.0%	N/A	0.0%	0.0%
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	58.8%	76.5%	100.0%	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	47.1%	52.9%	85.7%	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	52.9%	47.1%	14.3%	23.5%	5.9%	0.0%
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	23.5%	17.6%	14.3%	35.3%	11.8%	14.3%
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	29.4%	17.6%	14.3%	17.6%	11.8%	14.3%
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	58.8%	76.5%	57.1%	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	64.7%	64.7%	100.0%	11.8%	5.9%	0.0%
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 10 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 9 statement(s) in 2009 and 10 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 2 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.		
	At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 7 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 6 statement(s) in 2012.					

Art

Climate: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed that their program is like the description

	Strongly Agreed			Strongly Agreed or Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 17)	2012 (N = 18)	2015 (N = 8)	2009 (N = 17)	2012 (N = 18)	2015 (N = 8)	2009 (N = 17)	2012 (N = 18)	2015 (N = 8)
Collegial	N/A	33.3%	25.0%	N/A	83.3%	50.0%	N/A	0.0%	0.0%
Encouraging	23.5%	33.3%	50.0%	76.5%	72.2%	87.5%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Supportive	23.5%	27.8%	50.0%	70.6%	66.7%	87.5%	11.8%	5.6%	0.0%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	11.8%	38.9%	50.0%	64.7%	77.8%	75.0%	17.6%	11.1%	0.0%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	41.2%	50.0%	50.0%	76.5%	72.2%	87.5%	17.6%	11.1%	0.0%
Inclusive of students of color*	29.4%	52.9%	37.5%	64.7%	64.7%	87.5%	17.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Inclusive by gender*	47.1%	44.4%	62.5%	70.6%	66.7%	87.5%	11.8%	5.6%	0.0%
Inclusive of international students	N/A	35.3%	50.0%	N/A	64.7%	87.5%	N/A	0.0%	12.5%
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	29.4%	52.9%	62.5%	70.6%	76.5%	75.0%	5.9%	0.0%	12.5%
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	41.2%	62.5%	N/A	76.5%	62.5%	N/A	5.9%	0.0%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	52.9%	77.8%	75.0%	88.2%	94.4%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text</i>	At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 10 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 3 statement(s) in 2009 and 10 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 11 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 8 statement(s) in 2009 and 11 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.		
	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 9 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 1 statement(s) in 2009 and 4 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 9 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 3 statement(s) in 2009 and 5 statement(s) in 2012.					

Art History

Program Satisfaction: percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as...

	Excellent			Excellent or Very Good			Fair or Poor		
	2009 (N = 18)	2012 (N = 11)	2015 (N = 12)	2009 (N = 18)	2012 (N = 11)	2015 (N = 12)	2009 (N = 18)	2012 (N = 11)	2015 (N = 12)
Quality of the faculty	38.9%	45.5%	8.3%	66.7%	81.8%	58.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%
Overall Program quality	11.1%	27.3%	0.0%	72.2%	63.6%	16.7%	16.7%	9.1%	41.7%
Financial support for graduate students	55.6%	18.2%	25.0%	88.9%	45.5%	50.0%	5.6%	36.4%	16.7%
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field*	27.8%	36.4%	8.3%	66.7%	63.6%	41.7%	11.1%	9.1%	0.0%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	27.8%	36.4%	16.7%	50.0%	45.5%	41.7%	11.1%	36.4%	41.7%
Intellectual community in Program	22.2%	54.5%	16.7%	77.8%	63.6%	33.3%	5.6%	18.2%	41.7%
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	9.1%	0.0%	N/A	36.4%	0.0%	N/A	45.5%	75.0%
Space, facilities and equipment	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	38.9%	36.4%	33.3%	5.6%	18.2%	66.7%
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	44.4%	10.0%	0.0%	66.7%	60.0%	8.3%	11.1%	20.0%	75.0%
Research opportunities in my program*	27.8%	36.4%	8.3%	44.4%	63.6%	16.7%	16.7%	9.1%	41.7%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	22.2%	36.4%	0.0%	61.1%	54.5%	41.7%	27.8%	9.1%	33.3%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	33.3%	27.3%	8.3%	61.1%	63.6%	8.3%	22.2%	9.1%	58.3%
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	18.2%	0.0%	N/A	45.5%	8.3%	N/A	36.4%	41.7%
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	22.2%	54.5%	8.3%	72.2%	81.8%	8.3%	11.1%	9.1%	50.0%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	16.7%	9.1%	0.0%	55.6%	54.5%	0.0%	33.3%	18.2%	75.0%
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	22.2%	9.1%	0.0%	55.6%	45.5%	0.0%	5.6%	18.2%	58.3%
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	22.2%	18.2%	0.0%	55.6%	45.5%	25.0%	11.1%	9.1%	41.7%
	0 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2015, compared to 4 in 2009 and 7 in 2012.			2 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 13 in 2009 and 10 in 2012.			14 feature(s) rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2015, compared to 3 in 2009 and 5 in 2012.		
	0 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 1 in 2009 and 2 in 2012.			0 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2015, compared to 2 in 2009 and 2 in 2012.					

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

Art History

Advisor: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed with each of the following statements about their advisor.

	Strongly Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 17)	2012 (N = 10)	2015 (N = 11)	2009 (N = 17)	2012 (N = 10)	2015 (N = 11)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	64.7%	70.0%	27.3%	0.0%	30.0%	9.1%
Treats my ideas with respect	64.7%	70.0%	36.4%	0.0%	20.0%	9.1%
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	70.6%	60.0%	45.5%	5.9%	10.0%	9.1%
Provides timely feedback on my work	35.3%	50.0%	54.5%	11.8%	40.0%	18.2%
Is available when I need help or advice	41.2%	50.0%	45.5%	5.9%	20.0%	18.2%
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	30.0%	36.4%	N/A	20.0%	18.2%
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	58.8%	60.0%	63.6%	0.0%	20.0%	9.1%
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	47.1%	40.0%	18.2%	0.0%	30.0%	9.1%
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	35.3%	50.0%	9.1%	17.6%	30.0%	27.3%
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	35.3%	33.3%	9.1%	23.5%	33.3%	45.5%
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	17.6%	30.0%	0.0%	29.4%	40.0%	63.6%
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	47.1%	30.0%	36.4%	5.9%	20.0%	18.2%
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	52.9%	40.0%	27.3%	17.6%	30.0%	36.4%
<i>* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text</i>	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 2 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 5 statement(s) in 2009 and 7 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 4 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 2 statement(s) in 2009 and 12 statement(s) in 2012.		
	At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.					

Art History

Climate: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed that their program is like the description

	Strongly Agreed			Strongly Agreed or Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 18)	2012 (N = 11)	2015 (N = 12)	2009 (N = 18)	2012 (N = 11)	2015 (N = 12)	2009 (N = 18)	2012 (N = 11)	2015 (N = 12)
Collegial	N/A	45.5%	8.3%	N/A	81.8%	41.7%	N/A	9.1%	8.3%
Encouraging	44.4%	27.3%	0.0%	83.3%	63.6%	75.0%	11.1%	9.1%	16.7%
Supportive	41.2%	27.3%	0.0%	76.5%	63.6%	41.7%	5.9%	9.1%	25.0%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	50.0%	36.4%	8.3%	83.3%	72.7%	66.7%	5.6%	0.0%	16.7%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	44.4%	36.4%	8.3%	88.9%	72.7%	58.3%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%
Inclusive of students of color*	38.9%	63.6%	25.0%	66.7%	81.8%	33.3%	11.1%	9.1%	25.0%
Inclusive by gender*	61.1%	63.6%	25.0%	77.8%	81.8%	58.3%	11.1%	0.0%	16.7%
Inclusive of international students	N/A	90.9%	33.3%	N/A	90.9%	50.0%	N/A	0.0%	16.7%
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	44.4%	45.5%	16.7%	83.3%	81.8%	33.3%	0.0%	9.1%	25.0%
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	54.5%	16.7%	N/A	90.9%	33.3%	N/A	0.0%	16.7%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	58.8%	81.8%	25.0%	88.2%	100.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%
<i>* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text</i>	At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 1 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 8 statement(s) in 2009 and 9 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 6 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 8 statement(s) in 2009 and 11 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 3 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.		
	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 3 statement(s) in 2009 and 5 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 1 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 7 statement(s) in 2009 and 7 statement(s) in 2012.					

Arts Management

Program Satisfaction: percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as...

	Excellent			Excellent or Very Good			Fair or Poor		
	2009 (N = 25)	2012 (N = 28)	2015 (N = 17)	2009 (N = 25)	2012 (N = 28)	2015 (N = 17)	2009 (N = 25)	2012 (N = 28)	2015 (N = 17)
Quality of the faculty	24.0%	10.7%	11.8%	64.0%	75.0%	47.1%	8.0%	3.6%	17.6%
Overall Program quality	12.0%	14.3%	11.8%	64.0%	64.3%	47.1%	8.0%	10.7%	35.3%
Financial support for graduate students	11.5%	7.1%	11.8%	23.1%	25.0%	23.5%	50.0%	50.0%	52.9%
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field*	38.5%	40.7%	23.5%	69.2%	74.1%	64.7%	3.8%	3.7%	17.6%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	7.7%	17.9%	11.8%	38.5%	50.0%	35.3%	34.6%	7.1%	35.3%
Intellectual community in Program	34.6%	25.0%	17.6%	73.1%	64.3%	64.7%	7.7%	17.9%	23.5%
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	28.6%	29.4%	N/A	57.1%	64.7%	N/A	7.1%	11.8%
Space, facilities and equipment	7.7%	3.6%	5.9%	7.7%	17.9%	5.9%	30.8%	35.7%	82.4%
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	15.4%	10.7%	23.5%	23.1%	46.4%	29.4%	23.1%	28.6%	35.3%
Research opportunities in my program*	34.6%	17.9%	17.6%	65.4%	60.7%	52.9%	7.7%	14.3%	41.2%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	20.0%	7.1%	11.8%	60.0%	53.6%	35.3%	8.0%	14.3%	35.3%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	38.5%	17.9%	29.4%	69.2%	50.0%	47.1%	11.5%	28.6%	23.5%
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	3.6%	23.5%	N/A	50.0%	29.4%	N/A	32.1%	47.1%
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	7.7%	3.8%	11.8%	26.9%	34.6%	17.6%	3.8%	23.1%	41.2%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	11.5%	7.1%	11.8%	57.7%	60.7%	35.3%	23.1%	21.4%	29.4%
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	23.1%	28.6%	11.8%	46.2%	53.6%	35.3%	23.1%	10.7%	35.3%
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	30.8%	14.3%	23.5%	65.4%	46.4%	47.1%	11.5%	28.6%	41.2%
	0 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2015, compared to 4 in 2009 and 1 in 2012.			4 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 9 in 2009 and 12 in 2012.			14 feature(s) rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2015, compared to 6 in 2009 and 8 in 2012.		
	0 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 0 in 2009 and 0 in 2012.			0 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2015, compared to 0 in 2009 and 1 in 2012.					

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

Arts Management

Advisor: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed with each of the following statements about their advisor.

	Strongly Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 26)	2012 (N = 27)	2015 (N = 17)	2009 (N = 26)	2012 (N = 27)	2015 (N = 17)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	38.5%	55.6%	58.8%	15.4%	3.7%	11.8%
Treats my ideas with respect	42.3%	66.7%	64.7%	11.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	38.5%	55.6%	47.1%	38.5%	3.7%	23.5%
Provides timely feedback on my work	34.6%	59.3%	52.9%	26.9%	3.7%	17.6%
Is available when I need help or advice	30.8%	57.7%	47.1%	38.5%	7.7%	11.8%
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	77.8%	47.1%	N/A	0.0%	5.9%
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	38.5%	81.5%	64.7%	11.5%	11.1%	11.8%
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	50.0%	66.7%	64.7%	3.8%	7.4%	5.9%
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	15.4%	33.3%	23.5%	38.5%	33.3%	35.3%
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	23.1%	44.4%	52.9%	23.1%	18.5%	17.6%
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	15.4%	29.6%	17.6%	34.6%	25.9%	29.4%
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	26.9%	51.9%	58.8%	23.1%	14.8%	5.9%
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	30.8%	59.3%	58.8%	34.6%	14.8%	11.8%
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 8 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 1 statement(s) in 2009 and 10 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 3 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 8 statement(s) in 2009 and 2 statement(s) in 2012.		
	At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 2 statement(s) in 2012.					

Arts Management

Climate: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed that their program is like the description

	Strongly Agreed			Strongly Agreed or Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 26)	2012 (N = 27)	2015 (N = 16)	2009 (N = 26)	2012 (N = 27)	2015 (N = 16)	2009 (N = 26)	2012 (N = 27)	2015 (N = 16)
Collegial	N/A	25.9%	25.0%	N/A	70.4%	62.5%	N/A	11.1%	6.3%
Encouraging	42.3%	37.0%	37.5%	80.8%	70.4%	62.5%	7.7%	3.7%	12.5%
Supportive	42.3%	37.0%	37.5%	84.6%	77.8%	62.5%	3.8%	14.8%	12.5%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	34.6%	48.1%	37.5%	80.8%	81.5%	75.0%	3.8%	7.4%	0.0%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	48.0%	37.0%	31.3%	84.0%	74.1%	75.0%	0.0%	3.7%	6.3%
Inclusive of students of color*	44.0%	40.7%	43.8%	76.0%	74.1%	75.0%	0.0%	7.4%	6.3%
Inclusive by gender*	34.6%	29.6%	37.5%	61.5%	63.0%	56.3%	15.4%	22.2%	25.0%
Inclusive of international students	N/A	44.4%	50.0%	N/A	77.8%	81.3%	N/A	7.4%	6.3%
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	44.0%	37.0%	31.3%	80.0%	59.3%	50.0%	0.0%	11.1%	12.5%
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	34.6%	25.0%	N/A	65.4%	56.3%	N/A	7.7%	12.5%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	56.0%	40.7%	56.3%	92.0%	85.2%	87.5%	0.0%	3.7%	0.0%
<i>* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text</i>	At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 7 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 8 statement(s) in 2009 and 9 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 11 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 8 statement(s) in 2009 and 11 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 1 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 1 statement(s) in 2012.		
	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 2 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 1 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 5 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 7 statement(s) in 2009 and 4 statement(s) in 2012.					

Community & Regional Planning

Program Satisfaction: percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as...

	Excellent		
	2009 (N = 25)	2012 (N = 25)	2015 (N = 15)
Quality of the faculty	4.0%	0.0%	13.3%
Overall Program quality	0.0%	8.0%	0.0%
Financial support for graduate students	4.0%	8.0%	0.0%
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field*	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%
Intellectual community in Program	8.0%	12.0%	13.3%
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	24.0%	46.7%
Space, facilities and equipment	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Research opportunities in my program*	12.0%	4.0%	6.7%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	12.0%	4.0%	6.7%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	8.3%	4.0%	6.7%
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	8.0%	6.7%
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	12.0%	4.0%	13.3%
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	8.0%	0.0%	6.7%
	1 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2015, compared to 0 in 2009 and 0 in 2012.		
	0 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 0 in 2009 and 0 in 2012.		

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

Excellent or Very Good		
2009 (N = 25)	2012 (N = 25)	2015 (N = 15)
24.0%	44.0%	33.3%
32.0%	44.0%	33.3%
12.0%	8.0%	26.7%
36.0%	52.0%	60.0%
8.0%	28.0%	20.0%
52.0%	36.0%	60.0%
N/A	48.0%	80.0%
12.0%	12.0%	0.0%
48.0%	16.0%	20.0%
52.0%	28.0%	20.0%
44.0%	16.0%	33.3%
33.3%	16.0%	6.7%
N/A	20.0%	33.3%
8.3%	29.2%	20.0%
32.0%	20.0%	53.3%
40.0%	32.0%	40.0%
40.0%	20.0%	46.7%
4 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 2 in 2009 and 1 in 2012.		
1 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2015, compared to 0 in 2009 and 0 in 2012.		

Fair or Poor		
2009 (N = 25)	2012 (N = 25)	2015 (N = 15)
28.0%	12.0%	0.0%
32.0%	16.0%	6.7%
64.0%	64.0%	53.3%
24.0%	20.0%	13.3%
40.0%	36.0%	33.3%
24.0%	16.0%	13.3%
N/A	20.0%	13.3%
72.0%	76.0%	80.0%
36.0%	40.0%	60.0%
20.0%	20.0%	33.3%
16.0%	28.0%	13.3%
37.5%	44.0%	66.7%
N/A	48.0%	46.7%
29.2%	29.2%	60.0%
36.0%	28.0%	20.0%
12.0%	20.0%	46.7%
12.0%	16.0%	13.3%
10 feature(s) rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2015, compared to 12 in 2009 and 13 in 2012.		

Community & Regional Planning

Advisor: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed with each of the following statements about their advisor.

	Strongly Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 25)	2012 (N = 20)	2015 (N = 12)	2009 (N = 25)	2012 (N = 20)	2015 (N = 12)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	28.0%	30.0%	33.3%	4.0%	5.0%	8.3%
Treats my ideas with respect	28.0%	45.0%	50.0%	4.0%	0.0%	16.7%
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	12.0%	35.0%	16.7%	4.0%	0.0%	8.3%
Provides timely feedback on my work	8.0%	30.0%	33.3%	16.0%	15.0%	8.3%
Is available when I need help or advice	20.0%	20.0%	41.7%	8.0%	15.0%	8.3%
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	40.0%	25.0%	N/A	0.0%	0.0%
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	8.0%	35.0%	41.7%	16.0%	10.0%	8.3%
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	8.3%	40.0%	33.3%	4.2%	10.0%	8.3%
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	12.0%	26.3%	16.7%	32.0%	15.8%	25.0%
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	20.0%	15.0%	25.0%	24.0%	25.0%	25.0%
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	16.0%	10.5%	8.3%	20.0%	31.6%	25.0%
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	12.0%	15.0%	25.0%	8.0%	5.0%	25.0%
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	12.0%	20.0%	41.7%	24.0%	5.0%	25.0%
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 1 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 5 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 4 statement(s) in 2009 and 2 statement(s) in 2012.		
	At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.					

Community & Regional Planning

Climate: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed that their program is like the description

	Strongly Agreed			Strongly Agreed or Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 24)	2012 (N = 24)	2015 (N = 15)	2009 (N = 24)	2012 (N = 24)	2015 (N = 15)	2009 (N = 24)	2012 (N = 24)	2015 (N = 15)
Collegial	N/A	12.5%	40.0%	N/A	87.5%	93.3%	N/A	0.0%	0.0%
Encouraging	16.7%	12.0%	46.7%	50.0%	72.0%	93.3%	8.3%	4.0%	6.7%
Supportive	24.0%	8.0%	46.7%	56.0%	64.0%	86.7%	8.0%	8.0%	6.7%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	4.0%	16.0%	20.0%	48.0%	72.0%	53.3%	8.0%	8.0%	13.3%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	33.3%	28.0%	33.3%	70.8%	68.0%	53.3%	4.2%	8.0%	13.3%
Inclusive of students of color*	4.0%	20.0%	20.0%	32.0%	48.0%	46.7%	24.0%	16.0%	13.3%
Inclusive by gender*	28.0%	32.0%	33.3%	80.0%	84.0%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%
Inclusive of international students	N/A	16.0%	13.3%	N/A	64.0%	33.3%	N/A	4.0%	13.3%
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	13.6%	12.0%	6.7%	36.4%	48.0%	53.3%	4.5%	4.0%	6.7%
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	12.0%	13.3%	N/A	40.0%	53.3%	N/A	12.0%	6.7%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	25.0%	24.0%	20.0%	66.7%	64.0%	80.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text</i>	At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 5 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 1 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 9 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 5 statement(s) in 2009 and 8 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 1 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.		
	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 4 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 1 statement(s) in 2009 and 2 statement(s) in 2012.					

Interior Architecture

Program Satisfaction: percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as...

	Excellent			Excellent or Very Good			Fair or Poor		
	2009 (N = 8)	2012 (N = 8)	2015 (N = 7)	2009 (N = 8)	2012 (N = 8)	2015 (N = 7)	2009 (N = 8)	2012 (N = 8)	2015 (N = 7)
Quality of the faculty	0.0%	37.5%	14.3%	50.0%	87.5%	57.1%	12.5%	0.0%	14.3%
Overall Program quality	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	12.5%	62.5%	28.6%	25.0%	0.0%	14.3%
Financial support for graduate students	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	87.5%	50.0%	100.0%
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field*	0.0%	50.0%	14.3%	50.0%	50.0%	28.6%	0.0%	25.0%	28.6%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	37.5%	14.3%	62.5%	37.5%	57.1%
Intellectual community in Program	0.0%	12.5%	14.3%	12.5%	25.0%	42.9%	12.5%	12.5%	42.9%
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	12.5%	0.0%	N/A	50.0%	28.6%	N/A	0.0%	14.3%
Space, facilities and equipment	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	14.3%	50.0%	25.0%	57.1%
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	37.5%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Research opportunities in my program*	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.5%	37.5%	14.3%	25.0%	25.0%	71.4%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	37.5%	14.3%	25.0%	37.5%	42.9%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	12.5%	50.0%	28.6%	37.5%	12.5%	28.6%
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	0.0%	0.0%	N/A	12.5%	0.0%	N/A	50.0%	85.7%
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	25.0%	42.9%	14.3%	0.0%	42.9%	14.3%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	0.0%	12.5%	14.3%	25.0%	50.0%	14.3%	25.0%	37.5%	42.9%
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	25.0%	14.3%	75.0%	12.5%	42.9%
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	25.0%	37.5%	42.9%	25.0%	12.5%	57.1%
	0 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2015, compared to 0 in 2009 and 2 in 2012.			1 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 2 in 2009 and 6 in 2012.			13 feature(s) rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2015, compared to 11 in 2009 and 10 in 2012.		
	0 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 0 in 2009 and 1 in 2012.			0 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2015, compared to 0 in 2009 and 1 in 2012.					

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

Interior Architecture

Advisor: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed with each of the following statements about their advisor.

	Strongly Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 8)	2012 (N = 8)	2015 (N = 5)	2009 (N = 8)	2012 (N = 8)	2015 (N = 5)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	12.5%	62.5%	20.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Treats my ideas with respect	0.0%	75.0%	40.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	0.0%	75.0%	40.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Provides timely feedback on my work	0.0%	37.5%	40.0%	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Is available when I need help or advice	25.0%	62.5%	20.0%	50.0%	12.5%	0.0%
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	62.5%	20.0%	N/A	0.0%	0.0%
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	25.0%	62.5%	20.0%	12.5%	0.0%	20.0%
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	25.0%	62.5%	20.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	62.5%	25.0%	60.0%
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	37.5%	25.0%	40.0%
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	0.0%	42.9%	0.0%	50.0%	14.3%	40.0%
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	12.5%	50.0%	20.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	37.5%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	12.5%	0.0%
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 10 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 4 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 9 statement(s) in 2009 and 2 statement(s) in 2012.		
	At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 2 statement(s) in 2012.					

Interior Architecture

Climate: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed that their program is like the description

	Strongly Agreed			Strongly Agreed or Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 8)	2012 (N = 8)	2015 (N = 7)	2009 (N = 8)	2012 (N = 8)	2015 (N = 7)	2009 (N = 8)	2012 (N = 8)	2015 (N = 7)
Collegial	N/A	50.0%	14.3%	N/A	87.5%	42.9%	N/A	0.0%	14.3%
Encouraging	25.0%	37.5%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%	85.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Supportive	12.5%	25.0%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	12.5%	25.0%	14.3%	50.0%	62.5%	57.1%	0.0%	0.0%	28.6%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	12.5%	50.0%	28.6%	50.0%	12.5%	0.0%
Inclusive of students of color*	12.5%	50.0%	14.3%	25.0%	75.0%	71.4%	50.0%	25.0%	0.0%
Inclusive by gender*	12.5%	50.0%	14.3%	62.5%	75.0%	71.4%	25.0%	12.5%	0.0%
Inclusive of international students	N/A	50.0%	28.6%	N/A	62.5%	71.4%	N/A	0.0%	0.0%
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	12.5%	25.0%	14.3%	50.0%	37.5%	85.7%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	25.0%	0.0%	N/A	75.0%	57.1%	N/A	0.0%	0.0%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	25.0%	37.5%	42.9%	87.5%	87.5%	85.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text</i>	At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 1 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 6 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 9 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 6 statement(s) in 2009 and 10 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 1 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 3 statement(s) in 2009 and 1 statement(s) in 2012.		
	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 4 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 4 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 1 statement(s) in 2009 and 7 statement(s) in 2012.					

Landscape Architecture

Program Satisfaction: percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as...

	Excellent		
	2009 (N = 19)	2012 (N = 30)	2015 (N = 14)
Quality of the faculty	36.8%	36.7%	42.9%
Overall Program quality	21.1%	23.3%	14.3%
Financial support for graduate students	5.3%	3.3%	21.4%
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field*	31.6%	20.0%	7.1%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	15.8%	13.8%	21.4%
Intellectual community in Program	26.3%	36.7%	28.6%
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	3.3%	7.1%
Space, facilities and equipment	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	10.5%	50.0%	21.4%
Research opportunities in my program*	10.5%	6.7%	21.4%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	26.3%	3.3%	35.7%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	15.8%	13.3%	14.3%
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	6.9%	0.0%
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	5.3%	10.0%	0.0%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	15.8%	6.9%	35.7%
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	10.5%	10.0%	7.1%
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	15.8%	10.0%	14.3%
	3 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2015, compared to 1 in 2009 and 3 in 2012.		
	0 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 0 in 2009 and 1 in 2012.		

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

Excellent or Very Good		
2009 (N = 19)	2012 (N = 30)	2015 (N = 14)
78.9%	63.3%	92.9%
63.2%	63.3%	78.6%
47.4%	10.0%	28.6%
63.2%	43.3%	57.1%
31.6%	41.4%	57.1%
63.2%	63.3%	78.6%
N/A	30.0%	50.0%
10.5%	10.3%	28.6%
42.1%	73.3%	57.1%
42.1%	26.7%	64.3%
47.4%	43.3%	78.6%
52.6%	46.7%	64.3%
N/A	10.3%	7.1%
31.6%	33.3%	35.7%
31.6%	37.9%	71.4%
31.6%	43.3%	42.9%
63.2%	43.3%	35.7%
11 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 6 in 2009 and 4 in 2012.		
4 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2015, compared to 1 in 2009 and 0 in 2012.		

Fair or Poor		
2009 (N = 19)	2012 (N = 30)	2015 (N = 14)
5.3%	6.7%	7.1%
10.5%	10.0%	7.1%
31.6%	66.7%	42.9%
15.8%	26.7%	14.3%
42.1%	27.6%	21.4%
10.5%	6.7%	7.1%
N/A	30.0%	28.6%
57.9%	51.7%	50.0%
52.6%	16.7%	21.4%
26.3%	46.7%	7.1%
21.1%	10.0%	21.4%
31.6%	16.7%	7.1%
N/A	55.2%	64.3%
15.8%	30.0%	21.4%
31.6%	24.1%	14.3%
21.1%	30.0%	14.3%
10.5%	23.3%	21.4%
9 feature(s) rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2015, compared to 9 in 2009 and 11 in 2012.		

Landscape Architecture

Advisor: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed with each of the following statements about their advisor.

	Strongly Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 19)	2012 (N = 27)	2015 (N = 12)	2009 (N = 19)	2012 (N = 27)	2015 (N = 12)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	52.6%	59.3%	91.7%	0.0%	7.4%	8.3%
Treats my ideas with respect	63.2%	63.0%	91.7%	0.0%	3.7%	8.3%
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	31.6%	59.3%	75.0%	10.5%	3.7%	8.3%
Provides timely feedback on my work	42.1%	48.1%	83.3%	21.1%	11.1%	8.3%
Is available when I need help or advice	47.4%	44.4%	91.7%	26.3%	11.1%	8.3%
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	44.4%	83.3%	N/A	11.1%	8.3%
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	63.2%	59.3%	83.3%	0.0%	7.4%	8.3%
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	36.8%	48.1%	50.0%	5.3%	0.0%	8.3%
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	10.5%	7.4%	33.3%	31.6%	37.0%	25.0%
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	15.8%	7.4%	33.3%	31.6%	22.2%	16.7%
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	10.5%	3.7%	41.7%	31.6%	29.6%	16.7%
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	31.6%	29.6%	66.7%	5.3%	11.1%	8.3%
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	42.1%	22.2%	75.0%	15.8%	18.5%	8.3%
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 10 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 3 statement(s) in 2009 and 4 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 1 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 5 statement(s) in 2009 and 3 statement(s) in 2012.		
	At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 8 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.					

Landscape Architecture

Climate: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed that their program is like the description

	Strongly Agreed			Strongly Agreed or Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 19)	2012 (N = 29)	2015 (N = 14)	2009 (N = 19)	2012 (N = 29)	2015 (N = 14)	2009 (N = 19)	2012 (N = 29)	2015 (N = 14)
Collegial	N/A	48.3%	57.1%	N/A	93.1%	92.9%	N/A	6.9%	0.0%
Encouraging	42.1%	41.4%	57.1%	78.9%	82.8%	92.9%	0.0%	6.9%	7.1%
Supportive	52.6%	34.5%	50.0%	89.5%	75.9%	85.7%	5.3%	10.3%	7.1%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	47.4%	34.5%	50.0%	78.9%	82.8%	100.0%	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	47.4%	34.5%	42.9%	68.4%	72.4%	85.7%	5.3%	6.9%	0.0%
Inclusive of students of color*	26.3%	42.9%	21.4%	47.4%	67.9%	71.4%	21.1%	10.7%	14.3%
Inclusive by gender*	57.9%	62.1%	64.3%	78.9%	86.2%	100.0%	5.3%	3.4%	0.0%
Inclusive of international students	N/A	51.7%	42.9%	N/A	82.8%	92.9%	N/A	3.4%	0.0%
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	31.6%	31.0%	21.4%	73.7%	72.4%	85.7%	5.3%	10.3%	7.1%
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	37.9%	28.6%	N/A	82.8%	92.9%	N/A	10.3%	0.0%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	57.9%	65.5%	57.1%	94.7%	86.2%	92.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text</i>	At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 8 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 6 statement(s) in 2009 and 10 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 11 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 7 statement(s) in 2009 and 11 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 1 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.		
	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 6 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 3 statement(s) in 2009 and 3 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 10 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 5 statement(s) in 2009 and 8 statement(s) in 2012.					

Public Administration

Program Satisfaction: percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as...

	Excellent		
	2009 (N = 20)	2012 (N = 21)	2015 (N = 15)
Quality of the faculty	25.0%	4.8%	0.0%
Overall Program quality	4.5%	5.0%	0.0%
Financial support for graduate students	4.5%	10.0%	0.0%
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field*	13.6%	14.3%	0.0%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	4.5%	9.5%	0.0%
Intellectual community in Program	18.2%	20.0%	6.7%
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	35.0%	28.6%
Space, facilities and equipment	4.5%	5.0%	0.0%
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	27.3%	5.0%	6.7%
Research opportunities in my program*	9.1%	4.8%	0.0%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	13.6%	14.3%	6.7%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	13.6%	15.8%	6.7%
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	10.0%	0.0%
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	4.5%	4.8%	0.0%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	9.1%	9.5%	0.0%
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	27.3%	14.3%	7.1%
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	13.6%	10.0%	6.7%
	0 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2015, compared to 0 in 2009 and 1 in 2012.		
	0 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 0 in 2009 and 0 in 2012.		

* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text

Excellent or Very Good		
2009 (N = 20)	2012 (N = 21)	2015 (N = 15)
75.0%	47.6%	26.7%
59.1%	50.0%	26.7%
18.2%	15.0%	14.3%
72.7%	61.9%	26.7%
45.5%	57.1%	13.3%
77.3%	50.0%	33.3%
N/A	65.0%	42.9%
13.6%	15.0%	6.7%
68.2%	35.0%	46.7%
54.5%	38.1%	0.0%
63.6%	47.6%	13.3%
59.1%	42.1%	26.7%
N/A	40.0%	0.0%
31.8%	28.6%	7.1%
50.0%	28.6%	6.7%
59.1%	42.9%	35.7%
63.6%	50.0%	13.3%
0 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 11 in 2009 and 6 in 2012.		
0 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2015, compared to 2 in 2009 and 0 in 2012.		

Fair or Poor		
2009 (N = 20)	2012 (N = 21)	2015 (N = 15)
0.0%	19.0%	40.0%
9.1%	15.0%	33.3%
59.1%	50.0%	85.7%
13.6%	9.5%	26.7%
9.1%	9.5%	86.7%
18.2%	25.0%	53.3%
N/A	15.0%	21.4%
59.1%	70.0%	73.3%
9.1%	35.0%	33.3%
9.1%	47.6%	78.6%
9.1%	14.3%	33.3%
9.1%	21.1%	46.7%
N/A	40.0%	71.4%
4.5%	47.6%	71.4%
13.6%	14.3%	46.7%
4.5%	19.0%	50.0%
18.2%	40.0%	60.0%
17 feature(s) rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2015, compared to 2 in 2009 and 9 in 2012.		

Public Administration

Advisor: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed with each of the following statements about their advisor.

	Strongly Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 21)	2012 (N = 21)	2015 (N = 8)	2009 (N = 21)	2012 (N = 21)	2015 (N = 8)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	52.4%	28.6%	25.0%	14.3%	9.5%	50.0%
Treats my ideas with respect	61.9%	52.4%	25.0%	0.0%	4.8%	12.5%
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	52.4%	42.9%	12.5%	9.5%	4.8%	37.5%
Provides timely feedback on my work	57.1%	33.3%	14.3%	14.3%	14.3%	28.6%
Is available when I need help or advice	47.6%	33.3%	25.0%	4.8%	19.0%	12.5%
Would support me in any career path I choose (academic or a career outside the academy)	N/A	52.4%	28.6%	N/A	4.8%	14.3%
Treats students in the department equitably regardless of their backgrounds*	42.9%	57.1%	25.0%	0.0%	4.8%	12.5%
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	47.6%	23.8%	12.5%	0.0%	4.8%	50.0%
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work*	9.5%	10.0%	14.3%	19.0%	50.0%	57.1%
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	19.0%	5.0%	14.3%	19.0%	45.0%	42.9%
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	14.3%	5.3%	14.3%	19.0%	47.4%	57.1%
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements*	42.9%	20.0%	14.3%	9.5%	20.0%	57.1%
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	45.0%	35.0%	25.0%	15.0%	25.0%	25.0%
<i>* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text</i>	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 4 statement(s) in 2009 and 3 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 9 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 5 statement(s) in 2012.		
	At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012.					

Public Administration

Climate: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed that their program is like the description

	Strongly Agreed			Strongly Agreed or Agreed			Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed		
	2009 (N = 21)	2012 (N = 21)	2015 (N = 14)	2009 (N = 21)	2012 (N = 21)	2015 (N = 14)	2009 (N = 21)	2012 (N = 21)	2015 (N = 14)
Collegial	N/A	33.3%	14.3%	N/A	85.7%	57.1%	N/A	9.5%	7.1%
Encouraging	47.6%	35.0%	21.4%	85.7%	90.0%	57.1%	4.8%	5.0%	7.1%
Supportive	47.6%	38.1%	14.3%	95.2%	90.5%	57.1%	4.8%	9.5%	7.1%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	23.8%	28.6%	14.3%	85.7%	66.7%	35.7%	9.5%	19.0%	28.6%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	47.6%	25.0%	28.6%	90.5%	70.0%	71.4%	0.0%	20.0%	14.3%
Inclusive of students of color*	33.3%	35.0%	14.3%	81.0%	65.0%	64.3%	9.5%	15.0%	14.3%
Inclusive by gender*	52.4%	57.1%	35.7%	95.2%	81.0%	71.4%	0.0%	14.3%	7.1%
Inclusive of international students	N/A	30.0%	21.4%	N/A	65.0%	64.3%	N/A	15.0%	7.1%
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	35.0%	20.0%	21.4%	85.0%	55.0%	57.1%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	30.0%	21.4%	N/A	55.0%	64.3%	N/A	25.0%	7.1%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	45.0%	47.6%	21.4%	95.0%	71.4%	57.1%	0.0%	14.3%	7.1%
<i>* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text</i>	At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 1 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 7 statement(s) in 2009 and 6 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 10 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 8 statement(s) in 2009 and 11 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 1 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 3 statement(s) in 2012.		
	At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 1 statement(s) in 2009 and 1 statement(s) in 2012.			At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 0 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 8 statement(s) in 2009 and 4 statement(s) in 2012.					