



UNIVERSITY OF LA VERNE

Survey of Graduate Students

Report II: Quality of Programs

Spring 2011

**Prepared by: Office of Institutional Research and Assessment
Aghop Der-Karabetian, Associate VP for University Assessment
Yingxia Cao, Director of Institutional Research**

Research Assistants: Michelle Alfaro and Anissa York, PsyD Students

July 15, 2011

Executive Summary

The purpose of the survey was to gather actionable information from graduate students across the university. The focus of Report II is on the overall quality of programs.

Method and Procedure

The survey items were developed after inspecting a number of graduate student surveys from other universities. Altogether 82-items, including demographic questions, were developed with input from deans and graduate program directors. Additional three open-ended questions were included. Thirteen of the questions dealt with program quality.

The survey was administered online using the SNAP Survey software that protects confidentiality. It was conducted during the months of February and March 2011. Every graduate student who had enrolled in a class during the previous fall term (2010) received an email invitation to log on and complete the survey (N = 3628). Two follow-up reminders went out, and the data was extracted on March 31st, 2011. A total of 615 students responded, a return rate of 17%. The distribution of the respondents on the basic demographic information of gender, ethnicity, college, and degree level were quite comparable to the census population of 3628 students.

Findings

Regardless of degree level or program of study, responses of the total sample are presented here, as well as broken down by status as full or part time, self-reported performance as better or worse than expected, ethnic and racial background, and campus locations. Break down of the data for all the academic areas by college and by program (Not presented here) have been provided to deans and program chairs

Looking only at the responses of the total sample to the “Excellent/Outstanding” and “Very good” response categories combined, on most items about two-thirds of the students endorsed the items, indicating high quality of their programs. The top five program qualities were as follows:

- Relevance of course content (76%)
- Quality of instruction by full-time faculty (75%)
- Level of academic standards (72%)
- Faculty accessibility outside of class (69%)
- Speed of progress through program (69%)

The other items in descending order of endorsement were as follows:

- Overall quality of the program compared to other schools considered (67%)
- Quality of Instruction by part-time faculty (66%)
- Extent of diversity issues addresses in courses (65%)
- Use of technology in delivering courses (64%)
- Faculty providing timely feedback (64%)
- Availability of courses (64%)
- Intellectual quality of fellow students (61%)
- Quality of academic advising (58%)

Summary of Findings

While the top five quality factors generally held across most of the subgroups there were notable variations. Availability of courses was an issue in almost all the subgroups. Quality of academic advising was presented as a concern especially by students who were “Doing worse than expected,” were part-time, and took courses at off campus locations. Relatively more of the international students valued academic advising highly, and relatively fewer Asian/PI and White students appeared to value academic advising highly. Accessibility of faculty outside of class appeared to be an issue at all RCA sites. Quality of instruction by part-time faculty was not endorsed as highly as by full-time faculty, although online students did not show this discrepancy. Timely feedback by faculty and use of technology was an issue in some instance.

Recommendations

1. Increase availability of courses.
2. Provide better academic advising, especially at off campus sites.
3. Improve the quality of teaching by part-time faculty.

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	2
Purpose	5
Method and Procedure	5
Findings	6
Total Sample	6
Full and part-time students	6
Performance levels	7
Ethnic and racial background	8
Main Campus location	9
RCA Campus locations	9
RCA Education	10
On-Line	10
Summary of Findings	10
Recommendations	10
Appendix A: Graduate Survey Form	11
Appendix B: Demographic Information	20
Appendix C: Table 2 – Responses of total sample	26
Appendix D: Table 3 and 4 – Responses of full- and part-time students	28
Appendix E: Table 5 and 6 – Responses by performance level	31
Appendix F: Table 7 – Responses of Main Campus students	34
Appendix G: Table 8 to 11 – Response from RCA campuses	36
Appendix H: Table 12 and 13 – Responses of Education students	41
Appendix I: Table 14 – Responses of On-line students	44

Purpose

The purpose of the survey was to gather actionable information from graduate students attending graduate programs across the University at all locations. This report focuses on the overall quality of the programs.

Method and Procedure

Survey Form

The survey items were developed after inspecting a number of graduate student surveys from a number of other universities. Altogether 82-items, including demographic questions, were developed with input from deans and graduate program directors. Thirteen of the questions dealt with program quality. Additional three open-ended questions were included that asked about the strengths of the programs, changes they would suggest, and additional comments (Appendix A). Besides demographic, location and program status questions the following areas were covered:

1. Factors influencing decision to attend La Verne
- 2. Quality of the different aspects of the program (Focus of this report)**
3. Satisfaction with program and university support services
4. Areas of competence before entering the program, and enhancements of these competencies in the program thus far
5. Satisfaction with the dissertation process (for those who are working on their dissertations)

The stem of the program quality items was, “How would you rate the following aspects of your programs?” The 5-point continuous rating scale was: Poor/Unacceptable, Fair/Somewhat Acceptable, Good/Acceptable, Very Good, and Excellent/Outstanding.

Procedure

The survey was administered online using the SNAP Survey software that protects confidentiality. It was conducted during the months of February and March 2011. Every graduate student who had enrolled in a class during the previous fall term (2010) received an email invitation to log on and complete the survey (N = 3628). Two follow-up reminders went out, and the data was extracted on March 31st, 2011.

Sample Characteristics

A total of 615 students responded, a return rate of 17%. The distribution of the respondents on the basic demographic information of gender, ethnicity, college, and degree level were quite comparable to the census population of 3628 students, as Table 1 in Appendix B shows. The following were some of the salient characteristics of the sample:

- 50% main campus students
- 69% women
- 78% master’s students
- 11% doctoral students
- 6.5% law students

21% had undergraduate degrees from La Verne
 54% worked full-time
 57% were currently working in jobs (Full or part time) related to their program
 22% unemployed
 93% felt doing as well as or better than expected in their course work
 Age: Mean = 34.76 (SD = 3.71).

Ethnic and racial breakdown:

(several respondents checked multiple ethnic and racial backgrounds, and 21% did not answer this question)

9% African American,
 9% Asian/Pacific Islander
 30% Latino/a
 43% white
 8% international

Findings

The primary focus of the findings here (Report II) is the overall quality of the programs. Regardless of degree level or program of study, responses of the total sample are presented, as well as broken down by status as full or part time, self-reported performance as better or worse than expected, ethnic and racial background, and campus locations.

Break down of the data for all the areas by college and by program (Not presented here) have been provided to deans and program chairs as subgroup sample sizes have allowed, normally over 20 respondents. Also, whenever possible data have been broken down by main campus and off campus subsamples for programs that offer them away from the main campus, or on-line. The “Excellent/Outstanding” and the “Very Good” response categories are combined in the presentation of the findings. The appendices include responses in other response categories where the two middle response categories are combined and label as “Acceptable.”

Total Sample

Table 2 in Appendix C summarizes the response of all respondents (N = 615) to items dealing with program quality. Looking only at the “Excellent/Outstanding” and “Very good” response categories combined, on most items about two-thirds of the students endorsed the items, indicating high quality of their programs. The top five program qualities were as follows:

- Relevance of course content (76%)
- Quality of instruction by full-time faculty (75%)
- Level of academic standards (72%)
- Faculty accessibility outside of class (69%)
- Speed of progress through program (69%)

The other items in descending order of endorsement were as follows:

- Overall quality of the program compared to other schools considered (67%)

- Quality of Instruction by part-time faculty (66%)
- Extent of diversity issues addresses in courses (65%)
- Use of technology in delivering courses (64%)
- Faculty providing timely feedback (64%)
- Availability of courses (64%)
- Intellectual quality of fellow students (61%)
- Quality of academic advising (58%)

While there is room for improvement in a number of these areas, special attention should be provided to improving the quality of academic advising.

Full and Part-time Status

The patterns of responses by full-time (n = 330) and part-time (n = 224) students were generally comparable to the total sample (Tables 3 and 4, Appendix D). However, there were several notable differences between the two groups:

- Quality of academic advising was considered very good or excellent by relatively fewer part-time students (48%) than by full-time students (63%).
- Availability of courses was endorsed by relatively fewer part-time students (57%) than by full-time students (68%).
- No surprisingly, somewhat fewer part-time students (65%) than full-time students (71%) were happy with their speed of progress through the program.

Self-Reported Performance Level

While the top five program qualities endorsed by the **higher performing** (n = 176, “doing far better than expected”) and **lower performing** (n = 38, “doing worse than expected”) students were comparable to the total sample, there were significant differences between the two groups. Significantly fewer percentages of lower performing students endorsed the program quality items across the board (Tables 5 and 6, Appendix E). The following were the especially notable areas:

- Quality of academic advising: Higher performing, 69%; lower performing, 36%
- Overall quality of the program: Higher performing, 71%; lower performing, 39%
- Availability of courses: Higher performing, 71%; lower performing, 46%
- Speed of progress through program: Higher performing, 82%; lower performing, 50%
- Faculty providing timely feedback: Higher performing, 72%; lower performing, 47%

Ethnic and Racial Background

The table below shows the responses (Very Good and Excellent/Outstanding combined) of graduate students from different ethnic and racial background, and international students to items deals with program quality.

	Latino (n = 187)	African American (n = 54)	Asian/PI (n = 55)	White (n = 264)	International (n = 48)
	%	%	%	%	%
1. Relevance of course content to your field	78	90	61	75	78
2. Availability of courses	64	72	57	64	66
3. Speed of progress through program	74	79	63	67	68
4. Level of academic standards	81	82	56	71	73
5. Quality of instruction in courses by full-time faculty	79	79	70	76	72
6. Quality of instruction in courses by part-time faculty	71	78	57	65	66
7. Intellectual quality of fellow students	69	69	51	62	67
8. Faculty accessibility and availability outside of class time	72	65	52	73	63
9. Faculty providing timely feedback about academic work	67	66	63	63	72
10. Extent of diversity issues addressed in course content and assigned work	69	67	61	65	61
11. Use of technology in delivering courses	72	70	55	59	71
12. Quality of academic advising	64	60	51	54	76
13. Overall quality of the program compared to programs in other schools you considered attending	73	70	63	65	76

The top five highest endorsements of program quality by the Latino, African American and White students reflect the total sample. However, the top five endorsements by all five groups include the relevance of course content, and quality of instruction by full-time faculty. Only for the African American group instruction by part-time faculty falls in the top five endorsements. In

all five groups about 2 out of 3 students indicated that they value highly the extent of diversity issues covered in courses, as well as faculty providing timely feedback.

Asian/Pis and international students include in their top five endorsements the overall quality of their program as well as faculty providing feedback about academic work. Relatively more of the international students also value highly the quality of academic advising (72%), higher than any of the other groups, and Asian/PI (51%) and White (54%) students value it least. Asian/PI endorse the level of academic standards least (56%) compared to the other groups. Relatively fewer percentages of Asian/PI students seem to endorse elements of program quality across the board than the other groups.

Overall, it appears that while there are elements of program quality valued by all or most of the groups, there are differences between the groups in how they view the quality of their programs.

Main Campus Location

Table 7 in Appendix F summarizes the responses of main campus graduate students (n = 310) regarding the quality of their programs. All the elements of the programs are endorsed by over 70% of the respondents. The pattern of the top five are comparable to the total sample are endorsed by over 80% of the respondents, including relevance of course content, overall quality of the program, quality of instruction by full-time faculty, level of academic standard, and use of technology in delivering courses. Significantly more of the main campus students (76%) than the overall sample (58%) endorsed the quality of academic advising.

RCA Campus Locations

Tables 8 to 11 in Appendix G summarize the responses of students at the following campus locations in respective order: Inland Empire (n = 23), Orange County (n = 28), San Fernando Valley (n = 32), and a Combination group (n = 61) composed of Central Coast (n = 9), High Desert (n = 4), Kern County (n = 7), Ventura (n = 8), Point Mugu (n = 2), Vandenberg (n = 7), and others (Unspecified but excluding Education and on-line students) (n = 24).

The top five endorsements by all four groups include relevance of course content, speed of progress, and quality of instruction by full-time faculty, comparable to the overall sample, even though the actual percentages vary across the groups. The Orange County group has the lowest number that endorse level of academic standard (57%), San Fernando Valley has the lowest number that endorse intellectual quality of fellow students (39%). Orange County and the Combined groups have significantly lower endorsements of quality of academic advising, 46% and 44%, respectively. Noticeably fewer in the Inland Empire and Orange County groups endorse timely feedback from faculty, 47% and 54%, respectively. Relatively more in the San Fernando Group (70%) than the other groups endorse the extent of diversity issues addressed in course content. Accessibility of faculty outside of class does not reach the top five endorsements in any of the groups, ranging from 52% to 65%.

RCA Education

In Appendix H Table 12 summarizes the responses of graduate students in RCA Education programs other than Teacher Education (n = 16), and Table 13 summarizes the combined (n = 18) responses of RCA Teacher Education (n = 8) and Bakersfield Teacher Education (n = 10) programs. Similar to the overall sample, both groups highly endorse in the top five relevance of courses, and speed of progress. However, unlike the overall sample, they also both include availability of courses in the top five qualities, 86% and 94%, respectively. Relatively more of the RCA Teacher Education (81%) than the RCA non-teacher education (69%) students endorse quality of instruction by part-time faculty. About 2 out of 3 in both groups endorse faculty accessibility outside of class. However, less than half the Teacher Education students endorse the quality of academic advising (46%).

On-Line

Table 14 in Appendix I summarizes the responses of exclusively on-line graduate students (n = 19). While across the board the online group endorses all the program quality items more highly than the overall sample, the top five elements in the two groups are comparable except speed of progress; only 45% of the online group versus 69% of the overall sample endorse speed of progress in the program. Not surprisingly, significantly more of the online group (94%) endorse use of technology in delivering of courses than the total sample (64%), and more of the online group endorse the quality of teaching of part-time faculty than the overall sample, 87% and 66%, respectively. About 60% of both the online group and the overall sample endorse quality of academic advising.

Summary of Findings

While the top five quality factors generally held across most of the subgroups there were notable variations. Availability of courses was an issue in almost all the subgroups. Quality of academic advising was presented as a concern especially by students who were “Doing worse than expected,” were part-time, and took courses at off campus locations. Relatively more of the international students valued academic advising highly, and relatively fewer Asian/PI and White students appeared to value academic advising highly. Accessibility of faculty outside of class appeared to be an issue at all RCA sites. Quality of instruction by part-time faculty was not endorsed as highly as by full-time faculty, although online students did not show this discrepancy. Timely feedback by faculty and use of technology was an issue in some instance.

Recommendations

1. Increase availability of courses.
2. Provide better academic advising, especially at off campus sites.
3. Improve the quality of teaching by part-time faculty.

Appendix A
Graduate Survey Form

**University of La Verne
Graduate Student Climate Survey
Draft 1/3/11**

The purpose of this survey is to gather information to improve graduate programs and services. This is a university-wide effort as part of our preparation for the re-affirmation of our accreditation by WASC (Western Association of Schools and Colleges).

While this is a voluntary survey, it is important that we receive the maximum number of responses from all programs and degree levels. The survey is comprehensive and will take about 20-30 minutes to complete. Your input is very important in our efforts for program improvements. It will provide much needed data to build a stronger future for our programs.

Responses are confidential, and will be reported by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment only in aggregate and summary form to departments and programs for action. The summary of the results will also be posted on the Institutional Research web site. Thanks you very much for your time.

If you have questions about the survey please contact Dr. Yingxia Cao, Director of Institutional Research at ycao@laverne.edu, or Dr. Aghop Der-Karabetian, Associate V.P. for University Assessment at ader-karabetian@laverne.edu.

Please click [HERE](#) to access the survey. Doing so will serve as your consent to participate. Please respond by March 1, 2011.

A. Background and Demographic Questions

1. Your current program degree
 - a. Master's degree (with or without credential)
 - b. DPA-Doctor of Public Administration
 - c. EdD-Doctor of Education
 - d. PsyD-Doctor of Psychology
 - e. JD-Juris Doctor
 - f. Credential (only)

2. Your current program title/name
 - College of Arts and Sciences
 - a. Counseling
 - b. Marriage and Family Therapy
 - c. Clinical-Community psychology
 - d. Other
 - College of Business and Public Management
 - e. Business Administration (MBA)
 - f. Gerontology

- g. Health Administration
- h. Leadership and Management
- i. Public Administration-Masters
- j. Public Administration-Doctoral
- k. Other

College of Education

- l. Child Development
- m. Child Life
- n. Educational Counseling
- o. Educational Management
- p. Multiple Subject Credential
- q. School Psychology
- r. Preliminary Administrative Services Credential only
- s. Reading
- t. Single Subject Credential
- u. Special Education
- v. Special Emphasis
- w. Organizational Leadership
- y. Pupil Personnel Credential only (non-degree seeking)
- x. Other

3. Program Location-Campus where you attend classes

- a. Main Campus
- b. Exclusively On-line
- c. RC Education other than Teacher Education (Away from the Main Campus)
- d. RC Teacher Education (Away from the Main Campus other than Bakersfield)
- e. Bakersfield-Teacher Education
- f. Central Coast
- g. High Desert
- h. Inland Empire
- i. Kern County
- j. Orange County
- k. San Fernando Valley
- l. Ventura County
- m. Point Mugu
- n. Vandenberg
- o. Other

4. When did you start your program? Semester/term: _____ Year: _____

5. When do you expect to graduate? Semester/term: _____ Year: _____

6. Your Ethnic/Racial background: _____

7a. Gender:

- a. Female

b. Male
 7b. Age: _____

7c. Marital status:
 a. Currently married
 b. Currently single

8. Are you an international student?
 a. Yes
 b. No

9. When you first entered graduate school at La Verne, did you already have a graduate degree from another institution?
 a. No
 b. Yes, a master’s degree in the same field that I am now studying
 c. Yes, a master’s degree in a different field than I am now studying
 d. Yes, a doctoral degree in a different field than the one I am now studying

10. Is your undergraduate (Bachelor’s) degree from La Verne?
 a. Yes
 b. No

11. Are you currently attending La Verne as a
 a. Full-time student?
 b. Part-time student?

12. You are currently
 a. Employed full-time in a job that is related to your graduate program
 b. Employed part-time in a job that is related to your graduate program
 c. Employed full-time but not in a job related to your graduate program
 d. Employed part-time but not in a job related to your graduate program
 e. Not employed in a job at this time

B. How much did the following factors influenced your DECISION to ENROLL in your program at La Verne?

	Very	Somewhat	A Little	Not At All	Not Applicable
13. Reputation of your Program	-	-	-	-	-
14. La Verne’s overall reputation	-	-	-	-	-
15. Area of specialization matched your interest	-	-	-	-	-
16. Location where the program was offered	-	-	-	-	-
17. Recommendation of a friend, acquaintance or colleague	-	-	-	-	-

18. Affordability compared to other private not-for-profit universities	-	-	-	-	-
19. Opportunity to work with a specific faculty member	-	-	-	-	-
20. Encouragement of a La Verne faculty member while deciding	-	-	-	-	-
21. Care and attention given to you by program administrator or advisor	-	-	-	-	-
22. The information available on the University and program webpage	-	-	-	-	-
23. Being near family or other significant individuals in your life	-	-	-	-	-
24. The Mission and Values of La Verne	-	-	-	-	-
26. Diversity of the student body	-	-	-	-	-

C. How would you rate the following aspects of your program?

Poor/ Unaccep- table Fair/ Some- what Acceptable Good/ Accep- table Very Good Excellent/ Outstanding N/A

27. Relevance of course content to your field	-	-	-	-	-
28. Availability of courses	-	-	-	-	-
29. Speed of progress through program	-	-	-	-	-
30. Level of Academic standards	-	-	-	-	-
31. Quality of instruction in courses by full-time faculty	-	-	-	-	-
32. Quality of instruction in courses by part-time faculty	-	-	-	-	-
33. Intellectual quality of fellow students	-	-	-	-	-
34. Faculty accessibility and availability outside of class time	-	-	-	-	-
35. Faculty providing timely feedback about academic work	-	-	-	-	-
36. Extent of diversity issues addressed in course content and	-	-	-	-	-

assigned work	-	-	-	-	-	-
37. Use of technology in delivering courses	-	-	-	-	-	-
38. Quality of academic advising	-	-	-	-	-	-
39. Overall quality of the program compared to programs in other schools you considered attending	-	-	-	-	-	-

D. How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your program and University Services, if they are applicable to you?

	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Not Applicable
Program issues						
40. Classroom facilities	-	-	-	-	-	-
41. Rapport between students and faculty in the program	-	-	-	-	-	-
42. Collegiality of students in the program	-	-	-	-	-	-
43. Opportunities for teamwork and collaboration	-	-	-	-	-	-
44. Opportunities to apply what you learn in the classroom	-	-	-	-	-	-
45. Feeling comfortable and supported in the program as a member of a national, ethnic, religious or racial group	-	-	-	-	-	-
Services						
46. Library access and support	-	-	-	-	-	-
47. Career advice from faculty	-	-	-	-	-	-
48. Assistance from Office of Career Services	-	-	-	-	-	-
49. Computer and technology facilities and services	-	-	-	-	-	-
50. Services of the Financial Aid Office	-	-	-	-	-	-
51. Writing assistance from the Learning Enhancement Center	-	-	-	-	-	-
52. Application process	-	-	-	-	-	-
53. Registration process	-	-	-	-	-	-
54. Office of the Graduate Academic Services	-	-	-	-	-	-
55. Parking	-	-	-	-	-	-
56. Food services	-	-	-	-	-	-
57. Break areas	-	-	-	-	-	-
58. Study spaces	-	-	-	-	-	-
59. How important is it to have services such as the Registrar, Financial Aid						

or Learning Enhancement Center available at night
or on weekends?

Very important Somewhat important Minimally important Not at all important

E. How would you rate

a. Your following competencies BEFORE you started the program? and

b. How well coursework and experiences IN THE PROGRAM SO FAR have enhanced these competencies?

	Minimal (or None At All In Program)	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Not Applicable
60. Team work						
Before starting	-	-	-	-	-	-
Program so far	-	-	-	-	-	-
61. Leadership skills						
Before starting	-	-	-	-	-	-
Program so far	-	-	-	-	-	-
62. Competence in working with ethnically and racially diverse individuals and groups						
Before starting	-	-	-	-	-	-
Program so far	-	-	-	-	-	-
63. Thinking critically and analytically						
Before starting	-	-	-	-	-	-
Program so far	-	-	-	-	-	-
64. Quantitative research skills						
Before starting	-	-	-	-	-	-
Program so far	-	-	-	-	-	-
65. Qualitative research skills						
Before starting	-	-	-	-	-	-
Program so far	-	-	-	-	-	-
66. Critically evaluating the scholarly literature in your field						
Before starting	-	-	-	-	-	-
Program so far	-	-	-	-	-	-
67. Examining my values and ethics in relations to your field						
Before starting	-	-	-	-	-	-
Program so far	-	-	-	-	-	-
68. Writing skills						
Before starting	-	-	-	-	-	-
Program so far	-	-	-	-	-	-

69. Oral and public speaking skills						
Before starting	-	-	-	-	-	-
Program so far	-	-	-	-	-	-
70. Analyzing quantitative problems involving statistics, math, etc.						
Before starting	-	-	-	-	-	-
Program so far	-	-	-	-	-	-
71. Computer and Internet skills						
Before starting	-	-	-	-	-	-
Program so far	-	-	-	-	-	-
72. Solving complex real-world problems						
Before starting	-	-	-	-	-	-
Program so far	-	-	-	-	-	-
73. Contributing to the welfare of your community						
Before starting	-	-	-	-	-	-
Program so far	-	-	-	-	-	-

F. Please respond to these questions if you are working with a dissertation committee at this time (At least Form 1 is completed)

(Please skip to SECTION G if you are NOT a doctoral student, or have NOT started working on a dissertation)

74. Helpfulness of the dissertation guidebook your program provides.

Not At All	A Little	Somewhat	Very
Satisfied	Satisfied	Satisfied	Satisfied

75. Helpfulness of your dissertation advisor in finding and formulating a dissertation topic.

Not At All	A Little	Somewhat	Very
Satisfied	Satisfied	Satisfied	Satisfied

76. Availability of your dissertation advisor to you for consultation.

Not At All	A Little	Somewhat	Very
Satisfied	Satisfied	Satisfied	Satisfied

77. Helpfulness of your advisor's feedback about your work

Not At All	A Little	Somewhat	Very
Satisfied	Satisfied	Satisfied	Satisfied

78. Advisor returning your work within a reasonable timeline.

Not At All	A Little	Somewhat	Very
Satisfied	Satisfied	Satisfied	Satisfied

79. Your confidence about conducting dissertation research when you started the process.

Not At All	A Little	Somewhat	Very
------------	----------	----------	------

Satisfied Satisfied Satisfied Satisfied

80. Dissertation preparatory workshop/seminar/course your program provides.

Not At All	A Little	Somewhat	Very
Satisfied	Satisfied	Satisfied	Satisfied

81. Dissertation related services provided by the office of Graduate Academic Services.

Not At All	A Little	Somewhat	Very
Satisfied	Satisfied	Satisfied	Satisfied

82. What would you change about the dissertation process of your program?

G. General Comments

83. What do you think are the greatest strengths of your program?

84. What would you change in your program to make it better?

85. Other comments or suggestions:

Appendix B

Table 1: Demographic Information

Table 1

Graduate Student Survey, spring 2011: Demographic Information (N = 615)

Item	Sample %	Census % (N = 3628)	Sample N
Your current/last program degree (N =612):			
1. Master's degree (with or without credentials)	78%		478
2. DPA-Doctor of Public Administration	3%		19
3. EdD-Doctor of Education	6%		38
4. PsyD-Doctor of Psychology	2%		13
5. JD-Juris Doctor	7%		40
Missing data			3
Your current/last college (N =607)			
1. College of Arts and Sciences	9%	5%	57
2. College of Business and Public Management	48%	49%	296
3. College of Education and Organizational Leadership	35%	34%	214
4. College of Law	7%	12%	40
Missing data			8
Program of study (N =514)			
1. Counseling	1%		4
2. Marriage and Family Therapy	2%		15
3. Clinical-Community Psychology	2%		14
4. Business Administration (MBA)	25%		155
5. Gerontology	1%		6
6. Health Administration	2%		15
7. Leadership and Management (MSLM)	12%		71
8. Public Administration-Masters	4%		22
9. Public Administration-Doctoral	3%		18
10. Child Development	1%		8
11. Child Life	1%		5
12. Educational Counseling	10%		62
13. Educational Management	1%		6
14. Multiple Subject Credential	4%		23
15. School Psychology	1%		4
16. Reading	1%		7
17. Single Subject Credential	2%		11
18. Special Education	1%		7
19. Special Emphasis	3%		17
20. Organizational Leadership (Doctoral)	6%		38
21. Preliminary Administrative Services			

Credential Only	0%	0
22. Pupil Personal Credential Only	.5%	1
23. Other	5%	32
Missing data		74

Campus attended (N =507)

1. Main Campus	50%	310
2. Exclusively Online	3%	19
3. RCA Education other than Teacher Educations (away from the main campus)	3%	16
4. RCA Teacher Education (away from the main campus other than Bakersfield)	1%	8
5. Bakersfield-Teacher Education	2%	10
6. Central Coast	2%	9
7. High Desert	1%	4
8. Inland Empire	4%	23
9. Kern County	1%	7
10. Orange County	5%	28
11. San Fernando Valley	5%	32
12. Ventura County	1%	8
13. Point Mugu	.5%	2
14. Vandenberg	1%	7
15. Other	4%	24
Missing data		108

Term/semester started program (N =609)

1. Fall	62%	378
2. Winter	14%	86
3. Spring	15%	91
4. Summer	9%	54
Missing data		6

Year started program (N =609)

1. 2001	.5%	1
2. 2002	.5%	1
3. 2004	.5%	2
4. 2005	.5%	2
5. 2006	.5%	3
6. 2007	5%	30
7. 2008	18%	11
8. 2009	31%	190
9. 2010	43%	266
10. Other	1%	4
Missing data		6

Term expected to graduate (N =589)

1. Fall	18%		112
2. Winter	17%		103
3. Spring	52%		318
4. Summer	9%		56
Missing data			26

Year expected to graduate (N =605)

1. 2010	4%		27
2. 2011	42%		261
3. 2012	33%		205
4. 2013	14%		83
5. 2014	3%		19
6. 2015	1%		7
7. Other	.5%		3
Missing data			10

Non-resident alien (N =610)

1. Yes	9%		54
2. No	90%		556
Missing data			5

Are you Hispanic/Latino? (N =552)

1. Yes	30%		187
2. No	59%		365
Missing data			90

Race/Ethnicity (N =485)

1. American Indian/Alaska Native	.5%	1%	3
2. Black/African American	9%	9%	54
3. White/Caucasian	43%	30%	264
4. Asian/Pacific Islander	9%	16%	55
5. Other	18%		109
Missing data			130

Gender (N =608)

1. Male	30%	36%	186
2. Female	69%	63%	422
Missing data			7

Marital status (N =607)

1. Currently married	42%		256
2. Currently single (never married)	32%		198
3. In a committed relationship	15%		90
4. Other (divorced, separated, etc.)	10%		63
Missing data			8

International student (N =608)

1. Yes	8%	48
2. No	91%	560
Missing data		7

Already possess a graduate degree? (N =608)

1. No	86%	526
2. Yes, a master's degree in the same field that I am now studying	5%	28
3. Yes, a master's degree in a different field than I am now studying	8%	49
4. Yes, a doctoral degree in a different field than the one I am now studying	1%	5
Missing data		7

Undergraduate degree from the University of La Verne (N =610)

1. Yes	21%	129
2. No	78%	481
Missing data		5

Current attendance status (N =607)

1. Full-Time	54%	330
2. Part-Time	36%	224
3. Have graduated	9%	53
Missing data		8

Current enrollment status (N =610)

1. Employed full-time in a job that is related to your graduate program	44%	270
2. Employed part-time in a job that is related to your graduate program	13%	77
3. Employed full-time but not in a job related to your graduate program	14%	84
4. Employed part-time but not in a job related to your graduate program	7%	41
5. Not employed in a job at this time	22%	138
Missing data		5

Academic achievement (N =608)

1. Far better than expected	29%	176
2. As well as expected	64%	394
3. Somewhat worse than expected	4%	27
4. Far worse than expected	2%	11
Missing data		7

Descriptive information: Mean and Standard Deviation

1. Age	34.76	10.28	n = 589
2. Current GPA	3.71	.41	n = 546

Appendix C

Table 2: Responses to item on program quality by total sample

Table 2

Graduate student survey responses (2011): Program of Study (N/A responses were excluded)

Item	<i>n</i>	Poor/ Unacceptable	Acceptable	Very Good/ Excellent/ Outstanding	N/A
1. Relevance of course content to your field	592	.2%	24%	76%	0
2. Availability of courses	590	4%	32%	64%	2
3. Speed of progress through program	590	1%	30%	69%	3
4. Level of academic standards	590	2%	26%	72%	1
5. Quality of instruction in courses by full-time faculty	565	2%	24%	75%	26
6. Quality of instruction in courses by part-time faculty	556	2%	32%	66%	35
7. Intellectual quality of fellow students	585	3%	36%	61%	4
8. Faculty accessibility and availability outside of class time	578	2%	29%	69%	13
9. Faculty providing timely feedback about academic work	588	4%	32%	64%	6
10. Extent of diversity issues addressed in course content and assigned work	559	3%	33%	65%	32
11. Use of technology in delivering courses	578	4%	32%	64%	13
12. Quality of academic advising	563	6%	36%	58%	26
13. Overall quality of the program compared to programs in other schools you considered attending	533	4%	29%	67%	59

Appendix D

Tables 3 and 4: Quality of program by full-time and part-time students

Table 3
Graduate student survey responses (2011): Program of Study (N/A responses were excluded)
Student status: Full-time

Item	<i>n</i>	Poor/ Unacceptable	Acceptable %	Excellent/ Outstanding	N/A
1. Relevance of course content to your field	318	0	22	78	12
2. Availability of courses	316	4	28	68	14
3. Speed of progress through program	315	2	27	71	15
4. Level of academic standards	318	2	26	72	12
5. Quality of instruction in courses by full-time faculty	307	2	22	76	13
6. Quality of instruction in courses by part-time faculty	290	3	31	66	40
7. Intellectual quality of fellow students	313	4	32	64	17
8. Faculty accessibility and availability outside of class time	309	3	29	68	21
9. Faculty providing timely feedback about academic work	315	5	31	64	15
10. Extent of diversity issues addressed in course content and assigned work	302	4	33	63	28
11. Use of technology in delivering courses	311	5	29	66	19
12. Quality of academic advising	299	8	29	63	31
13. Overall quality of the program compared to programs in other schools you considered attending	285	5	27	68	45

Table 4
Graduate student survey responses (2011): Program of Study (N/A responses were excluded)
Student Status: Part Time

Item	<i>n</i>	Poor/ Unacceptable	Acceptable %	Excellent/ Outstanding	N/A
1. Relevance of course content to your field	220	0	26	74	4
2. Availability of courses	219	4	39	57	5
3. Speed of progress through program	219	1	34	65	5
4. Level of academic standards	217	3	26	71	7
5. Quality of instruction in courses by full-time faculty	204	2	25	73	20
6. Quality of instruction in courses by part-time faculty	213	1	33	66	11
7. Intellectual quality of fellow students	217	2	40	58	7
8. Faculty accessibility and availability outside of class time	213	2	29	69	11
9. Faculty providing timely feedback about academic work	217	3	31	66	7
10. Extent of diversity issues addressed in course content and assigned work	205	2	31	67	19
11. Use of technology in delivering courses	212	5	35	60	12
12. Quality of academic advising	209	4	48	48	15
13. Overall quality of the program compared to programs in other schools you considered attending	195	2	32	66	29

Appendix E

Tables 5 and 6: Quality of program by students doing better than expected and worse than expected

Table 5
Graduate student survey responses (2011): Program of Study (N/A responses were excluded)
Academic Performance: Doing Far Better than Expected

Item	<i>n</i>	Poor/ Unacceptable	Acceptable %	Excellent/ Outstanding/ Very Good	N/A
1. Relevance of course content to your field	172	0	17	83	4
2. Availability of courses	172	2	27	71	4
3. Speed of progress through program	171	0	18	82	5
4. Level of academic standards	172	2	16	82	4
5. Quality of instruction in courses by full-time faculty	167	0	18	82	9
6. Quality of instruction in courses by part-time faculty	160	1	24	75	16
7. Intellectual quality of fellow students	171	2	31	67	5
8. Faculty accessibility and availability outside of class time	170	1	25	74	6
9. Faculty providing timely feedback about academic work	171	2	26	72	5
10. Extent of diversity issues addressed in course content and assigned work	169	2	25	73	7
11. Use of technology in delivering courses	169	1	27	72	7
12. Quality of academic advising	169	2	29	69	7
13. Overall quality of the program compared to programs in other schools you considered attending	164	2	27	71	12

Table 6

Graduate student survey responses (2011): Quality of Program of Study (N/A responses were excluded) Academic Performance: Doing Worse than Expected

Item	<i>n</i>	Poor/ Unacceptable	Acceptable	Excellent/ Outstanding/ Very Good	N/A
			%		
1. Relevance of course content to your field	35	0	31	69	3
2. Availability of courses	35	11	43	46	3
3. Speed of progress through program	34	3	47	50	4
4. Level of academic standards	35	11	36	53	3
5. Quality of instruction in courses by full-time faculty	32	3	38	59	6
6. Quality of instruction in courses by part-time faculty	32	0	41	59	6
7. Intellectual quality of fellow students	34	3	38	59	4
8. Faculty accessibility and availability outside of class time	32	9	38	53	6
9. Faculty providing timely feedback about academic work	34	12	41	47	4
10. Extent of diversity issues addressed in course content and assigned work	31	13	38	49	7
11. Use of technology in delivering courses	33	24	30	46	5
12. Quality of academic advising	32	25	38	36	6
13. Overall quality of the program compared to programs in other schools you considered attending	29	17	44	39	9

Appendix F
Table 7: Quality of Program of Study

Table 1

Graduate student survey responses (2011): Quality of Program of Study (N/A responses were excluded) Program Location: Main Campus

Item	<i>n</i>	Poor/ Unacceptable	Acceptable	Very Good/ Excellent/ Outstanding	N/A
1. Relevance of course content to your field	300	0	16	84	10
2. Availability of courses	300	4	20	76	10
3. Speed of progress through program	300	1	24	75	10
4. Level of academic standards	299	2	18	80	11
5. Quality of instruction in courses by full-time faculty	294	1	17	82	16
6. Quality of instruction in courses by part-time faculty	283	3	23	74	27
7. Intellectual quality of fellow students	296	4	23	73	14
8. Faculty accessibility and availability outside of class time	292	2	20	78	18
9. Faculty providing timely feedback about academic work	299	4	21	75	11
10. Extent of diversity issues addressed in course content and assigned work	285	2	24	74	25
11. Use of technology in delivering courses	291	1	22	77	19
12. Quality of academic advising	282	4	20	76	28
13. Overall quality of the program compared to programs in other schools you considered attending	271	2	15	83	39

Appendix G

Tables 8-11: Responses from Off campus RCA sites to program quality

Table 8

Graduate student survey responses (2011): Quality of Program of Study (N/A responses were excluded) Program Location: Inland Empire

Item	<i>n</i>	Poor/ Unacceptable	Acceptable %	Very Good Excellent/ Outstanding	N/A
1. Relevance of course content to your field	23	0	22	78	0
2. Availability of courses	23	0	35	65	0
3. Speed of progress through program	22	0	27	73	1
4. Level of academic standards	23	0	22	78	0
5. Quality of instruction in courses by full-time faculty	21	5	24	71	2
6. Quality of instruction in courses by part-time faculty	20	0	30	70	3
7. Intellectual quality of fellow students	23	0	30	70	0
8. Faculty accessibility and availability outside of class time	23	4	35	61	0
9. Faculty providing timely feedback about academic work	23	9	44	47	0
10. Extent of diversity issues addressed in course content and assigned work	21	0	48	52	2
11. Use of technology in delivering courses	23	4	35	61	0
12. Quality of academic advising	23	4	26	70	0
13. Overall quality of the program compared to programs in other schools you considered attending	20	0	30	70	3

Table 9

Graduate student survey responses (2011): Quality of Program of Study (N/A responses were excluded) Program Location: Orange County

Item	<i>n</i>	Poor/ Unacceptable	Acceptable	Very Good/ Excellent/ Outstanding	N/A
1. Relevance of course content to your field	26	0	35	65	2
2. Availability of courses	26	8	34	58	2
3. Speed of progress through program	26	4	27	69	2
4. Level of academic standards	26	0	43	57	2
5. Quality of instruction in courses by full-time faculty	25	0	36	64	3
6. Quality of instruction in courses by part-time faculty	26	0	39	61	2
7. Intellectual quality of fellow students	25	4	36	60	3
8. Faculty accessibility and availability outside of class time	25	0	48	52	3
9. Faculty providing timely feedback about academic work	26	0	46	54	2
10. Extent of diversity issues addressed in course content and assigned work	25	0	40	60	3
11. Use of technology in delivering courses	26	4	43	53	2
12. Quality of academic advising	26	4	50	46	2
13. Overall quality of the program compared to programs in other schools you considered attending	23	0	39	61	5

Table 10

Graduate student survey responses (2011): Quality of Program of Study (N/A responses were excluded) Campus Location: San Fernando Valley

Item	<i>n</i>	Poor/ Unacceptable	Acceptable	Very Good Excellent/ Outstanding	N/A
1. Relevance of course content to your field	32	0	19	81	0
2. Availability of courses	32	3	34	63	0
3. Speed of progress through program	32	0	25	75	0
4. Level of academic standards	32	0	34	66	0
5. Quality of instruction in courses by full-time faculty	29	0	31	69	3
6. Quality of instruction in courses by part-time faculty	30	0	30	70	2
7. Intellectual quality of fellow students	32	6	55	39	0
8. Faculty accessibility and availability outside of class time	31	0	35	65	1
9. Faculty providing timely feedback about academic work	31	0	35	65	1
10. Extent of diversity issues addressed in course content and assigned work	30	0	30	70	2
11. Use of technology in delivering courses	31	0	49	51	1
12. Quality of academic advising	30	3	33	64	2
13. Overall quality of the program compared to programs in other schools you considered attending	30	0	43	57	2

Table 11

Graduate student survey responses (2011): Quality of Program of Study (N/A responses were excluded) Program Location: Central coast + High Desert + Kern county + Ventura + Point Mugu + Vandenberg + Other

Item	<i>n</i>	Poor/ Unacceptable	Acceptable	Very Good/ Excellent/ Outstanding	N/A
1. Relevance of course content to your field	60	2	32	66	1
2. Availability of courses	60	2	34	64	1
3. Speed of progress through program	59	2	27	71	2
4. Level of academic standards	60	3	25	72	1
5. Quality of instruction in courses by full-time faculty	51	4	29	67	10
6. Quality of instruction in courses by part-time faculty	54	4	36	60	7
7. Intellectual quality of fellow students	59	2	39	59	2
8. Faculty accessibility and availability outside of class time	59	2	38	60	2
9. Faculty providing timely feedback about academic work	59	2	36	62	2
10. Extent of diversity issues addressed in course content and assigned work	54	4	37	59	7
11. Use of technology in delivering courses	57	14	28	58	4
12. Quality of academic advising	55	9	47	44	6
13. Overall quality of the program compared to programs in other schools you considered attending	52	6	36	58	9

Appendix H

Tables 12 and 13: Responses by RCA Education other than Teacher Education and Combined programs of RCA Teacher Education and Bakersfield Teacher Education

Table 12

Graduate student survey responses (2011): Quality of Program of Study (N/A responses were excluded) Program Location: RCA Ed other than teacher Ed

Item	<i>n</i>	Poor/ Unacceptable	Acceptable	Very Good Excellent/ Outstanding	N/A
1. Relevance of course content to your field	16	0	18	82	0
2. Availability of courses	14	0	14	86	0
3. Speed of progress through program	16	0	12	88	0
4. Level of academic standards	15	0	26	74	1
5. Quality of instruction in courses by full-time faculty	13	0	31	69	3
6. Quality of instruction in courses by part-time faculty	16	0	31	69	0
7. Intellectual quality of fellow students	16	0	31	69	0
8. Faculty accessibility and availability outside of class time	16	0	31	69	0
9. Faculty providing timely feedback about academic work	16	0	43	57	0
10. Extent of diversity issues addressed in course content and assigned work	15	0	20	80	1
11. Use of technology in delivering courses	16	0	25	75	0
12. Quality of academic advising	16	0	37	63	0
13. Overall quality of the program compared to programs in other schools you considered attending	14	0	43	57	2

Table 13

Graduate student survey responses (2011): Quality of Program of Study (N/A responses were excluded) Program Location: RCA Teacher Ed + Bakersfield Ed

Item	<i>n</i>	Poor/ Unacceptable	Acceptable	Very Good/ Excellent/ Outstanding	N/A
1. Relevance of course content to your field	16	0	24	76	2
2. Availability of courses	16	6	0	94	2
3. Speed of progress through program	17	0	0	100	1
4. Level of academic standards	16	0	13	87	2
5. Quality of instruction in courses by full-time faculty	16	13	19	68	2
6. Quality of instruction in courses by part-time faculty	16	0	19	81	2
7. Intellectual quality of fellow students	17	0	24	76	1
8. Faculty accessibility and availability outside of class time	17	12	24	64	1
9. Faculty providing timely feedback about academic work	17	6	18	76	1
10. Extent of diversity issues addressed in course content and assigned work	17	0	24	76	1
11. Use of technology in delivering courses	17	6	18	76	1
12. Quality of academic advising	17	18	36	46	1
13. Overall quality of the program compared to programs in other schools you considered attending	14	14	21	65	4

Appendix I

Table 14: Responses of Exclusively On-line students

Table 14

Graduate student survey responses (2011): Quality of Program of Study (N/A responses were excluded) Campus Location: Exclusively On-Line

Item	<i>n</i>	Poor/ Unacceptable	Acceptable	Very Good/ Excellent/ Outstanding	N/A
1. Relevance of course content to your field	18	0	22	78	1
2. Availability of courses	18	0	38	62	1
3. Speed of progress through program	18	0	55	45	1
4. Level of academic standards	18	0	17	83	1
5. Quality of instruction in courses by full-time faculty	17	0	6	94	2
6. Quality of instruction in courses by part-time faculty	16	0	13	87	3
7. Intellectual quality of fellow students	16	0	18	82	3
8. Faculty accessibility and availability outside of class time	15	0	26	84	4
9. Faculty providing timely feedback about academic work	18	0	16	84	1
10. Extent of diversity issues addressed in course content and assigned work	18	6	17	77	1
11. Use of technology in delivering courses	18	0	6	94	1
12. Quality of academic advising	18	0	38	62	1
13. Overall quality of the program compared to programs in other schools you considered attending	16	0	6	94	3