

GRADUATING SENIOR ASSESSMENT 2007 REPORT

Office of Institutional Assessment
Division of Academic Affairs

Denise Reiling, Ph.D.
Interim Director of Institutional Assessment
Associate Professor of Sociology

January 31, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| SECTION | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Introduction to Study and Report | 3 |
| Guide to Reading Tables | 9 |
| Sample Characteristics | |
| Demographics | 11 |
| Family and Living Arrangements | 14 |
| Financing Education | 16 |
| Academic History | 19 |
| Plans after Graduation | 22 |
| Facilities and Services Usage | 24 |
| Satisfaction with Facilities and Services | 29 |
| Frequency of Engagement in Extracurricular Activities | 36 |
| Satisfaction with Courses within Major | 38 |
| Satisfaction with General Education Courses | 41 |
| Satisfaction with Technology-Based Course Delivery | 43 |
| Well-Being as EMU Student | 44 |
| Opinions Regarding Quality of Education and Reputation of EMU | 49 |
| Predictors of Willingness to Recommend EMU | 55 |
| Recommendations | 66 |

INTRODUCTION TO STUDY AND REPORT

The following report resulted from research undertaken to assess the experience of Eastern Michigan University undergraduate students who graduated in April 2007. A mixed-method approach was used, relying on both qualitative and quantitative data to inform the analysis. The qualitative data were drawn from a set of 25 face-to-face interviews conducted by the Principle Investigator and from open-ended response questions on the online survey that was conducted.

In addition to the dissemination of this report, those departments and Schools for which at least 10 of their students completed the survey have been provided with frequency distribution tables based on the survey data specific to their unit. Deans and Department Heads have also been provided with a copy of an SPSS data file that contains data specific to only their unit, from which student identification numbers have been deleted. Using these tables and data, individual units can compare the report of their students against that of the aggregate.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

A set of 25 face-to-face interviews was conducted by the Principle Investigator prior to completing survey construction so that the qualitative analysis could inform this process. During the interviews, interviewees were asked to comment on a working-draft of the survey, which the former Director of Institutional Assessment had been previously disseminated to Deans and Department Heads for their comments (2006). In this way, the survey came to be modified and refined throughout the interview-collection period.

Interview participants were drawn from a random sample of undergraduate students who had applied for Winter 2007 graduation. Participants were recruited via

an invitation message sent to their emich email accounts. Although use of a random sample is not required for qualitative research and is therefore not standard practice, it was employed to better assure a range of experiences. Each of the five Colleges was equally represented in the interviewee pool; 14 of the interviewees were female and 11 were male. Unfortunately, with one exception, only Caucasian students volunteered for an interview, as did only US-resident students.

All interviews were conducted in the office of the Principle Investigator. Most interviews lasted approximately one hour. Interviewees were not offered an incentive for their participation.

It is important to note that more students offered to be interviewed than time allowed as this demonstrates a desire to share their experience. As the last interview question, interviewees were asked to share the reason for their willingness to participate, and virtually every interviewee remarked that they had been eager to have an opportunity to speak personally with someone about their experience rather than respond to only an anonymous survey. They also appreciated an opportunity to speak with a faculty member, a point that will be elaborated upon further throughout this report.

The qualitative data informed survey construction, as already noted, but was also analyzed and used for its own value. The interview data was coded into thematic categories, following standard and acceptable procedures for analysis of qualitative data. The qualitative findings have been interwoven into the survey data analysis that follows.

It is very important to point out that the qualitative data reported here is different in nature and intended for a different purpose than the survey data. At most, the qualitative findings within this report are intended to be used for contextual grounding of the survey findings, to be informative in future survey construction, and to be read as suggestive of hypotheses yet to be tested empirically, rather than as evidence-based conclusions. Given the relatively small number of interviews conducted vis-à-vis the size of the population of graduating seniors, as well as the homogeneity of the demographic characteristics of the interviewees, the qualitative findings should not be extended beyond their appropriate application.

The resultant online survey consisted of the following subcategories: level of usage of facilities and services; satisfaction with facilities and services; frequency of engagement in extra-curricular activities; satisfaction with courses within major, general education courses, and technology-based course delivery systems; academic history; family and living arrangements; employment while in school; plans after graduation; sense of well-being; opinions regarding the quality of education and reputation of EMU; and a set of demographic questions.

The online survey was delivered on April 17th, 2007 to the email addresses of all 1,571 undergraduate students who had applied for Winter 2007 graduation. As it turns out, of that number, only 1,317 actually received their diploma. There is no way to determine whether any of those 254 students who did not graduate completed the survey, but given that the population was defined as those having applied for graduation, this should not be a significant issue. A follow-up reminder email was sent one week later, with a final reminder sent the following week. No incentive was offered.

Data collection ended on May 5th. The resultant response rate for the aggregate was 39%.

The response rate within each College can also be determined, and arrayed as follows: College of Arts & Sciences, 45% (meaning that 263 of the 587 students who had applied for Winter 2007 graduation completed the survey); College of Business, 39% (80/205); College of Education, 57% (131/231); College of Health and Human Services, 45% (72/161); College of Technology, 42% (47/112).

Furthermore, the following tables array the number of responses and resultant response rate for each Department or School, arranged by their College. For example, within the Department of Art, 12 out of 43 of their students who had applied for Winter 2007 graduation completed the survey, resulting in a response rate of 28%.

College of Arts and Sciences

| <i>Department</i> | <i>Sample/Population</i> | <i>Response Rate</i> |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| African American Studies | 0/1 | 0% |
| Art | 12/43 | 28% |
| Biology | 7/19 | 37% |
| Chemistry | 4/15 | 27% |
| Communication and Theatre Arts | 40/96 | 42% |
| Computer Science | 5/14 | 36% |
| Economics | 3/7 | 43% |
| English Language and Literature | 40/88 | 45% |
| Foreign Language and Bilingual Studies | 11/10 | * |
| Geography and Geology | 8/16 | 50% |
| History and Philosophy | 23/57 | 40% |
| Mathematics | 8/38 | 21% |
| Music and Dance | 10/18 | 55% |
| Physics and Astronomy | 2/10 | 20% |
| Political Science | 24/38 | 63% |
| Psychology | 31/59 | 52% |
| Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology | 34/55 | 62% |
| Women's and Gender Studies | 1/3 | 33% |

*suggests respondent error occurred

College of Business

| <i>Department</i> | <i>Sample/Population</i> | <i>Response Rate</i> |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Accounting and Finance | 36/66 | 54% |
| Computer Information Systems | 7/14 | 50% |
| Management | 23/73 | 32% |
| Marketing | 14/43 | 33% |

College of Education

| <i>Department</i> | <i>Sample/Population</i> | <i>Response Rate</i> |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Leadership and Counseling | 0/0 | 0.0% |
| Special Education | 26/89 | 29% |
| Teacher Education | 105/142 | 74% |

College of Health Sciences and Human Services

| <i>Department</i> | <i>Sample/Population</i> | <i>Response Rate</i> |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| School of Health Promotion and Human Performance | 13/33 | 39% |
| School of Health Sciences | 20/32 | 62% |
| School of Nursing | 19/53 | 36% |
| School of Social Work | 20/43 | 46% |

College of Technology

| <i>Department</i> | <i>Sample/Population</i> | <i>Response Rate</i> |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| School of Engineering Technology | 13/59 | 22% |
| School of Technology Studies | 34/53 | 64% |

Other

| <i>Department</i> | <i>Sample/Population</i> | <i>Response Rate</i> |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| University - General Studies | 5/21 | 24% |

Based on these data, we can determine that College representation in the aggregate was as follows, ordered from highest to lowest: Arts and Sciences (42.9%); College of education (21.4%); College of Business (13%); College of Health and Human Services (11.7%); College of Technology (7.7%); Other (3.3%, no response or General Studies).

GUIDE TO READING TABLES

Frequency of Use and Engagement Tables: These variables were measured on a scale of zero to four, with zero indicating never used and four indicating a very high level of usage. When interpreting the mean score, do so on a five-point scale (zero to four). The “Never Used” column represents a usage level of zero, the “Lower Usage” column represents a low level of usage (1) plus a moderate level of usage (2), and the “Higher Usage” column represents a high usage level (3) plus a very high level of usage (4). The “N” column represents the number of respondents who chose to answer each particular question.

Level of Satisfaction Tables: These variables were measured on a five-point scale ranging from zero to four, which can be interpreted as follows: no satisfaction (0); low satisfaction (1); moderate satisfaction (2); high satisfaction (3); very high level of satisfaction (4). A “never used” answer category was provided but was of course excluded from the computation of the mean. When interpreting the mean score, do so on a five-point scale (zero to four). The “N” column represents the number of respondents who chose to answer each particular question. The “None” column represents those who reported no level of satisfaction, the “Lower” column represents the low (1) plus moderate (2) levels of satisfaction, and the “Higher” column represents the high (3) plus very high (4) levels of satisfaction.

Level of Agreement with Statement Tables: These variables were measured on a five-point scale ranging from zero to four, which can be interpreted as follows: no agreement (0); low agreement (1); moderate agreement (2); high agreement (3); very high level of agreement (4). When interpreting the mean score, do so on a five-point

scale (zero to four). The “N” column represents the number of respondents who chose to respond to each particular statement. The “No Agreement” column represents those who reported no level of agreement, the “Lower” column represents the low (1) plus moderate (2) levels of agreement, and the “Higher” column represents the high (3) plus very high (4) levels of agreement.

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

The sample characteristics arrayed below closely mirror those of the population of graduating seniors. Although not displayed in table form, the average age of the respondents was 27.67, with an age range of 21 to 61 years.

DEMOGRAPHICS: GENDER

Demographics: Aggregate

| <i>Gender</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Percent</i> |
|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Female | 394 | 66.1% |
| Male | 202 | 33.9% |

DEMOGRAPHICS: RESIDENCY

Demographics: Aggregate

| <i>Residency</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Percent</i> |
|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| US resident | 585 | 99.0% |
| International student | 6 | 1.0% |

DEMOGRAPHICS: ETHNIC/RACIAL HERITAGE

Demographics: Aggregate

| <i>Ethnic/Racial Heritage</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Percent</i> |
|--|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Asian-American or Asian | 15 | 2.6% |
| African-American, Black-American, Black | 66 | 11.5% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 9 | 1.6% |
| Mexican-American or Chicano | 2 | 0.3% |
| Middle-Eastern or Arab Ancestry | 6 | 1.0% |
| Native American, American Indian, Alaskan Native | 1 | 0.2% |
| White or Caucasian | 475 | 82.8% |

MARITAL STATUS

Family and Living Arrangements: Aggregate

| <i>Marital Status</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Percent</i> |
|------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Single, never married | 379 | 64.0% |
| Married | 147 | 24.8% |
| Remarried | 5 | 0.8% |
| Living together with partner | 44 | 7.4% |
| Divorced/separated | 17 | 2.9% |

In addition to the standard demographic questions, respondents were asked to report the highest level of education of their parents. The tables have been arrayed below. The mothers of the respondents had a slightly lower level of education than did the fathers. Thirty-seven percent of mothers had only a high school diploma (or GED) or less (3.7%) whereas only 32.7% of fathers were at this level. At the other end of the spectrum, 17.3% of the fathers had a graduate or professional degree compared to 13.3% of the mothers. There was not as much discrepancy at the level of college graduate: 19.3% of the mothers had a completed degree compared to 20.4% of the fathers.

DEMOGRAPHICS: HIGHEST LEVEL OF FATHER'S EDUCATION

Demographics: Aggregate

| <i>Highest Level of Father's Education</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Percent</i> |
|---|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Not high school graduate | 36 | 6.1% |
| High school graduate or GED | 158 | 26.6% |
| Vocational or technical school | 39 | 6.6% |
| Some college | 110 | 18.5% |
| College graduate | 121 | 20.4% |
| Some graduate or professional school | 13 | 2.2% |
| Graduate or professional degree | 103 | 17.3% |
| Do not know/not applicable | 14 | 2.4% |

DEMOGRAPHICS: HIGHEST LEVEL OF MOTHER'S EDUCATION

Demographics: Aggregate

| <i>Highest Level of Mother's Education</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Percent</i> |
|---|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Not high school graduate | 22 | 3.7% |
| High school graduate or GED | 198 | 33.3% |
| Vocational or technical school | 22 | 3.7% |
| Some college | 139 | 23.4% |
| College graduate | 115 | 19.3% |
| Some graduate or professional school | 13 | 2.2% |
| Graduate or professional degree | 79 | 13.3% |
| Do not know/not applicable | 7 | 1.2% |

FAMILY AND LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

The following questions were included on the survey to reflect the fact that many of our students do not fit the mold of traditional student, and in fact, many have fairly heavy employment and family demands that compete with their role as student. The qualitative interviews were highly beneficial in identifying these questions.

Approximately 54% of the respondents had not lived with their parents for any length of time while they were a student, whereas 45.7% had lived with their parents at least some of the time. Almost 13% had lived with their parents the entire time. Most respondents (66.5%) reported that for more than half of their time as a student, they lived off-campus as a commuter student. Of those, only 37.7% had a commute that was 20 minutes or less; 43% commuted between 21 and 40 minutes; 16.5% commuted between 41 and 60 minutes; and 2.7% commuted for more than one hour.

LENGTH OF TIME LIVING WITH PARENTS

Family and Living Arrangements: Aggregate

| <i>Length of Time Living with Parent/s</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Percent</i> | <i>Cumulative Percent</i> |
|---|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| None of the time | 315 | 54.2% | 54.2% |
| Some of the time | 136 | 23.4% | 77.6% |
| Most of the time | 56 | 9.6% | 87.3% |
| All of the time | 74 | 12.7% | 100.0% |

RESIDENCE LOCATION

Family and Living Arrangements: Aggregate

| <i>Residence Location</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>% More Than 50%</i> |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| Residence Halls | 70 | 14.1% |
| Off-campus, walking distance | 89 | 18.5% |
| Off-campus, commuter | 361 | 66.5% |

LENGTH OF COMMUTE

Family and Living Arrangements: Aggregate

| Length of Commute | N | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------------------|----------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Less than 10 minutes | 73 | 14.2% | 14.2% |
| 10-20 minutes | 121 | 23.5% | 37.7% |
| 21-30 minutes | 127 | 24.7% | 62.5% |
| 31-40 minutes | 94 | 18.3% | 80.7% |
| 41-50 minutes | 57 | 11.1% | 91.8% |
| 51-60 minutes | 28 | 5.4% | 97.3% |
| More than 60 minutes | 14 | 2.7% | 100.0% |

The interviewees suggested that questions be included regarding caregiver responsibilities. Even though 80 to 90% of our respondents were not responsible for care of anyone other than themselves, 19.3% did have responsibility for care of a child at least part of the time, and 10.5% had responsibility for care of a person over the age of 18 for at least part of the time.

CHILDCARE RESPONSIBILITIES WHILE STUDENT

Family and Living Arrangements: Aggregate

| Childcare Responsibilities | N | Percent |
|-----------------------------------|----------|----------------|
| Yes | 107 | 18.0% |
| Sometimes | 8 | 1.3% |
| No | 478 | 80.6% |

CAREGIVER RESPONSIBILITIES WHILE STUDENT (FOR PERSON OVER AGE 18)

Family and Living Arrangements: Aggregate

| Caregiver Responsibilities | N | Percent |
|-----------------------------------|----------|----------------|
| Yes | 32 | 5.4% |
| Sometimes | 30 | 5.1% |
| No | 529 | 89.5% |

FINANCING EDUCATION

CONTRIBUTIONS TO FINANCING EDUCATION

Financing Education: Aggregate

| Contributions to Financing Education | N | None | Very Low-Moderate | High-Very High |
|---|----------|-------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Parents | 589 | 31.9% | 27.0% | 41.1% |
| Spouse/Partner/Significant Other | 578 | 79.2% | 10.4% | 10.3% |
| Other family members | 574 | 85.2% | 9.6% | 5.2% |
| Friends | 571 | 97.7% | 2.0% | 0.4% |
| Employment | 585 | 29.4% | 31.8% | 38.8% |
| Personal savings | 574 | 49.1% | 24.4% | 26.5% |
| Scholarships/grants | 583 | 30.4% | 38.1% | 31.6% |
| Work study | 563 | 86.1% | 7.5% | 6.4% |
| Student loans | 587 | 30.7% | 11.3% | 58.1% |
| Other sources | 189 | 84.1% | 2.1% | 13.7% |

Respondents were asked to report how important each of the above financial resources had been to financing their education. Student loans were the most important source (58.1% either high importance or very high importance), followed by parents (41.1%), personal employment (38.8%), and scholarships and grants (31.6%).

STUDENT LOAN DEBT

Financing Education: Aggregate

| Student Loan Debt | N | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------------------|----------|----------------|---------------------------|
| None | 56 | 12.4% | 12.4% |
| Less than \$5,000 | 12 | 2.7% | 15.0% |
| \$5,000-10,000 | 57 | 12.6% | 27.7% |
| \$10,001-15,000 | 46 | 10.2% | 37.8% |
| \$15,001-20,000 | 69 | 15.3% | 53.1% |
| \$20,001-25,000 | 45 | 10.0% | 63.1% |
| \$25,001-30,000 | 43 | 9.5% | 72.6% |
| \$30,001-35,000 | 32 | 7.1% | 79.6% |
| \$35,001-40,000 | 29 | 6.4% | 86.1% |
| \$40,001-45,000 | 25 | 5.5% | 91.6% |
| More than \$45,000 | 38 | 8.4% | 100.0% |

Only 12.4% of the respondents did not have any student loan debt, and only 2.7% had less than \$5,000 of debt. Thirty-eight percent had between \$5,000 and

\$20,000 (12.6% + 10.2% + 15.3%), and 38.5% (10% + 9.5% + 7.1% + 6.4% + 5.5%) had debt between \$20,000 and \$45,000. Approximately 8% reported student loan debt of more than \$45,000. Only 73% (452/613) of the respondents answered this question, however.

CREDIT CARD DEBT

Financing Education: Aggregate

| <i>Credit Card Debt</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Percent</i> | <i>Cumulative Percent</i> |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| None | 174 | 40.5% | 40.5% |
| Less than \$1,000 | 58 | 13.5% | 54.0% |
| \$1,000-2,000 | 45 | 10.5% | 64.4% |
| \$2,001-3,000 | 37 | 8.6% | 73.0% |
| \$3,001-4,000 | 24 | 5.6% | 78.6% |
| \$4,001-5,000 | 22 | 5.1% | 83.7% |
| \$5,001-6,000 | 12 | 2.8% | 86.5% |
| \$6,001-7,000 | 10 | 2.3% | 88.8% |
| \$7,001-8,000 | 5 | 1.2% | 90.0% |
| \$8,001-9,000 | 9 | 2.1% | 92.1% |
| \$9,001-10,000 | 11 | 2.6% | 94.7% |
| More than \$10,000 | 23 | 5.3% | 100.0% |

Interviewees suggested that it would be good to ask about credit card debt in addition to student loan debt as these function as an important resource. Credit card debt did not seem unreasonably high for most, although it is important to note that only 70% (430/613) of the respondents chose to answer this question. Of those who did, however, 40.5% reported no credit card debt, 43.3% reported less than \$5,000 in credit card debt, 11% reported between \$5,000 and \$10,000 in debt, and 5.3% reported more than \$10,000 in credit card debt.

HOURS EMPLOYED WHILE STUDENT

Family and Living Arrangements: Aggregate

| <i>Hours Employed While Student, per Week</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Percent</i> |
|--|-----------------|-----------------------|
| None | 53 | 8.9% |
| Less than 10 hours | 45 | 7.6% |
| 10-20 hours | 138 | 23.3% |
| 21-30 hours | 177 | 29.8% |
| 31-40 hours | 120 | 20.2% |
| More than 40 hours | 60 | 10.1% |

EMPLOYMENT WHILE IN SCHOOL RELATED TO FIELD OF STUDY

Family and Living Arrangements: Aggregate

| <i>Employment Related to Major Field of Study</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Percent</i> |
|--|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Yes | 157 | 27.4% |
| No | 417 | 72.6% |

Only 8.9% of the respondents reported having not been employed at all during their time as a student. Approximately 30% reported being employed for 20 hours or less, 50% reported being employed between 20 and 40 hours, and 10.1% reported being employed for more than 40 hours while a student. Only 27.4% reported being employed in a field related to their major.

ACADEMIC HISTORY

ANTICIPATED GRADE POINT AVERAGE

Academic History: Aggregate

| <i>Anticipated Grade Point Average</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Percentage</i> | <i>Cumulative Percentage</i> |
|---|-----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2.0-2.4 | 8 | 1.3% | 1.3% |
| 2.5-2.9 | 102 | 17.1% | 18.4% |
| 3.0-3.4 | 198 | 33.1% | 51.5% |
| 3.5-4.0 | 290 | 48.5% | 100.0% |

The survey respondents matched the interviewees in that both anticipated fairly high grade point averages upon graduation. In fact, 81.6% anticipated a GPA of at least 3.0, with almost half of the respondents (48.5%) anticipating a GPA of 3.5 or higher. Only 18.4% anticipated a GPA below 3.0. This circumstance is considered to be a limitation of this study as it weakens the ability to generalize the findings beyond those with a GPA below a 3.0, which was only 18.4% of the sample.

PACE OF ATTENDANCE

Academic History: Aggregate

| <i>Pace of Attendance</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Percentage</i> |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Attended mostly part-time | 58 | 9.6% |
| Attended mostly full-time | 458 | 76.0% |
| Combination of both | 87 | 14.4% |

Seventy-six percent of the respondents had attended EMU on a mostly full-time basis, with an additional 14.4% having attended EMU on both a full-time and part-time basis. Only 9.6% attended mostly part-time.

YEARS PURSUING DEGREE

Academic History: Aggregate

| <i>Years Actively Pursuing Degree</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Percentage</i> | <i>Cumulative Percentage</i> |
|--|-----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1-2 years | 13 | 2.3% | 2.3% |
| 3-4 years | 161 | 28.0% | 30.3% |
| 5-6 years | 252 | 43.9% | 74.2% |
| 7-8 years | 86 | 14.9% | 89.2% |
| More than 8 years | 62 | 10.8% | 100.0% |

Despite the fact that most respondents reported having pursued their degree mostly full-time, the most common length of time needed to complete their degree was five to six years, with 43.9% of the respondents needing this length of time. Only 30.3% needed four years or less, and 25.7% needed more than seven years to complete their degree.

TRANSFER CREDIT

Academic History: Aggregate

| <i>Transfer Credit</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Percentage</i> |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| No transfer | 266 | 45.2% |
| Transferred from 4-year university | 85 | 14.5% |
| Transferred from community college | 185 | 31.5% |
| Transferred from both | 52 | 8.8% |

Forty-five percent of the sample did not have any transfer credit. Thirty-one percent had transfer credit from a community college, 14.5% had transfer credit from a four-year university, and 8.8% had transfer credit from both a four-year college and a community college. During the interviews, those who had transfer credit from a community college reported that the decision to attend a community college was purely financial as they were able to take advantage of a lower tuition rate, rather than for academic reasons.

CHOOSING EMU

Academic History: Aggregate

| <i>Choosing EMU</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Percentage</i> |
|--|-----------------|--------------------------|
| EMU was first choice | 356 | 58.1% |
| No, not accepted elsewhere | 44 | 7.2% |
| No, could not afford first choice school | 126 | 20.6% |
| No, needed stay in geographic region | 114 | 18.6% |

For 58.1% of the respondents, EMU was their first choice. Respondents were given the opportunity to list their reasons for choosing EMU as an open-ended response. The most common reason was the geographic location, either proximate to their home or their place of employment. The second most common reason was the cost, although many noted that tuition increases had diminished this benefit. Explanations for choosing EMU included having not been accepted elsewhere (7.2%), not being able to afford their first choice school (20.6%), or needing to stay in the geographic region (18.6%).

PLANS AFTER GRADUATION

EMPLOYMENT AFTER GRADUATION

Plans After Graduation: Aggregate

| Plans for Employment After Graduation | N | Percentage |
|---|----------|-------------------|
| Already have job closely related to major | 189 | 31.1% |
| Already have job but not closely related to major | 104 | 17.1% |
| Not employed but will be looking for employment | 273 | 44.9% |
| Not employed but will not be looking for employment | 42 | 6.9% |

Only 48.2% had secured employment after graduation, and within that group, only 31.1% had secured employment that was closely related to their major. Of the 51.8% that did not have employment, 44.9% would be looking for employment.

PLANS FOR FURTHER FORMAL STUDY AFTER GRADUATION

Plans After Graduation: Aggregate

| Plans for Further Formal Study After Graduation | N | Percentage |
|--|----------|-------------------|
| No further study planned | 61 | 10.0% |
| Pursue second Bachelor degree | 51 | 8.3% |
| Pursue certificate or professional license | 65 | 10.6% |
| Pursue Master's degree (MA, MS, MBA) | 483 | 78.8% |
| Pursue law degree | 48 | 7.8% |
| Pursue medical degree (MD, OD, DDS, etc.) | 12 | 2.0% |
| Pursue doctorate (Ph.D., Ed.D., etc.) | 106 | 17.3% |

Respondents were asked to report whether they planned further formal study after graduation, a question for which they could choose more than one answer. Only ten percent reported that they did not plan further study, and 78.8% reported that they planned to pursue a Master's degree. This finding, along with the percentages of those considering a second Bachelor's degree (8.3%) or a certificate or professional license (10.6%), bodes well for EMU's graduate programs when considering the high percentage that plan to remain in this geographic location.

PLANS FOR GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION AFTER GRADUATION

Plans After Graduation: Aggregate

| <i>Plans for Geographic Location</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>No Likelihood</i> | <i>Lower Likelihood</i> | <i>Higher Likelihood</i> |
|---|-----------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Southeast Michigan | 590 | 19.0% | 13.3% | 67.8% |
| Michigan, but outside of Southeast Michigan | 550 | 51.5% | 29.6% | 18.9% |
| Another state within the United States | 552 | 33.0% | 27.4% | 39.7% |
| Country other than the United States | 538 | 81.8% | 13.4% | 4.8% |

Approximately 87% of the respondents reported either a high or very high likelihood that they would remain in Michigan after graduation. Of those, 67.8% reported a high or very high likelihood that they would remain in the vicinity of southeast Michigan.

FACILITIES AND SERVICE USAGE

Frequency of Use of Facilities and Services: Aggregate

| Facility or Service | N | Mean | Std. | Never Used | Low Usage | High Usage |
|--------------------------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Halle Library | 606 | 2.80 | 1.08 | 1.3% | 37.8% | 60.9% |
| Computer Labs | 605 | 2.89 | 1.15 | 3.8% | 28.9% | 67.3% |
| REC-IM Facilities | 603 | 1.52 | 1.42 | 33.7% | 39.5% | 26.9% |
| McKenny Union Student Center | 606 | 2.19 | 1.23 | 8.7% | 49.8% | 41.4% |
| New EMU Student Center | 605 | 1.63 | 1.26 | 19.2% | 55.7% | 25.1% |
| Academic Advising within Department | 604 | 1.89 | 1.22 | 12.7% | 55.8% | 31.4% |
| Academic Advising/College Office | 602 | 1.37 | 1.21 | 27.6% | 53.7% | 18.8% |
| Academic Advising/Pierce Hall Office | 606 | 0.85 | 0.95 | 40.9% | 51.5% | 7.6% |
| Financial Aid Office | 606 | 1.50 | 1.30 | 28.1% | 48.5% | 23.4% |
| Career Services Office | 605 | 0.69 | 1.05 | 59.5% | 32.4% | 8.1% |
| Snow Health Center/Physical Health | 602 | 0.68 | 0.99 | 57.6% | 34.5% | 7.8% |
| Snow Health Center/Mental Health | 606 | 0.23 | 0.67 | 86.1% | 11.2% | 2.7% |
| Holman Learning Center | 605 | 0.33 | 0.85 | 82.5% | 12.5% | 5.0% |
| The Writing Center | 603 | 0.31 | 0.74 | 80.3% | 16.9% | 2.8% |

Frequency of use of facilities and services was measured on a scale of zero to four, with zero indicating never used and four indicating a very high level of usage. Given that it was frequency of use that was being measured by the “never used” column (as opposed to level of satisfaction), zero represents a valid response, and as such, was included in the computation of the mean. Therefore, when interpreting the mean score, do so on a five-point scale (zero to four). In the table above, the “Never Used” column represents a usage level of zero, the “Low Usage” column represents a low level of usage (1) plus a moderate level of usage (2), and the “High Usage” column represents a high usage level (3) plus a very high level of usage (4). The “N” column represents the number of respondents who chose to answer each particular question.

When interpreting these data it is important to note that the respondents gave a retrospective account of an experience that for most covered a span of more than four years, rather than an objective report of actual number of visits.

Frequency of Use of Facilities and Services

| <i>Facility or Service</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std.</i> | <i>Never Used</i> | <i>Low Usage</i> | <i>High Usage</i> |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Halle Library | 606 | 2.80 | 1.08 | 1.3% | 37.8% | 60.9% |
| Computer Labs | 605 | 2.89 | 1.15 | 3.8% | 28.9% | 67.3% |
| Holman Learning Center | 605 | .33 | .85 | 82.5% | 12.5% | 5.0% |
| The Writing Center | 603 | .31 | .74 | 80.3% | 16.9% | 2.8% |

Of the four academic-support facilities assessed, respondents reported the highest mean score (2.89) and highest percentage of either high or very high usage of the computer labs (67.3%). Frequency of usage was similar for the Halle Library (2.80; 60.9%). For each of these support facilities, the percent reporting “never used” was very low (1.3% and 3.8%). Conversely, fairly high percentages of respondents reported having never used the Holman Learning Center (82.5%) and the Writing Center (80.3%). These low levels of usage should not be taken as a reflection on the importance of these Centers for the retention of those who are in need of their services, of course, which, if the sample is reflective of the population, would be approximately 20% of the student body.

Frequency of Use of Facilities and Services

| <i>Facility or Service</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std.</i> | <i>Never Used</i> | <i>Low Usage</i> | <i>High Usage</i> |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Academic Advising within Department | 604 | 1.89 | 1.22 | 12.7% | 55.8% | 31.4% |
| Academic Advising/College Office | 602 | 1.37 | 1.21 | 27.6% | 53.7% | 18.8% |
| Academic Advising/Pierce Hall Office | 606 | .85 | .95 | 40.9% | 51.5% | 7.6% |

Usage of advising services were fairly low, with advising within the department reporting the highest mean level of usage (1.89) and the highest level of any usage 87.2% (55.8% lower usage and 31.4% higher usage), and the lowest percentage of never having been used (12.7%). The College level advising offices were the next most frequently used locations, with Pierce Hall services drawing the lowest level of usage.

Frequency of Use of Facilities and Services

| <i>Facility or Service</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std.</i> | <i>Never Used</i> | <i>Low Usage</i> | <i>High Usage</i> |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Financial Aid Office | 606 | 1.50 | 1.30 | 28.1% | 48.5% | 23.4% |
| Career Services Office | 605 | .69 | 1.05 | 59.5% | 32.4% | 8.1% |

The fact that 71.9% reported some level of usage of the Financial Aid Office is copasetic with the fact that approximately 70% reported having relied on students loans to finance their education. The finding that almost 60% of the respondents reported never having used the Office of Career Services, however, was unexpected, for three reasons: when asked about plans after graduation, only 31.1% reported that they had already secured employment that was closely related to their major, 44.9% reported that they would be looking for employment, and 72.6% of those who reported being employed while attending classes reported that their employment had not been related to their degree.

When asked during the interviews about career services, several barriers to seeking these services were named. For some, it was simply the matter that they were not aware that these services existed. Others, however, reported that they did not believe that it would be worth their time, even though they reported that they had never taken the time to discover first-hand what services were available.

Two factors appeared to be at play here. First, some reported having heard from others that they had not been satisfied with the services they had received. Findings reported in the following section (Levels of Satisfaction) lend credence to these reports: 67.7% of those who did access Career Services reported either no level of satisfaction (27%) or low to moderate satisfaction (40.7%) with the career counseling they had

received; 58.35% reported either no level of satisfaction (17.8%) or low to moderate satisfaction (40.55%) with the information they had received.

The second barrier to seeking the assistance of Career Services that emerged qualitatively was that the respondents expected that the most credible career advice would come, and they preferred that it come, from their own department or School. Those expressing this opinion, however, expressed an equivalent lament about the lack of career information provided by their department or School. Respondents did recognize that faculty holding a Ph.D.-level academic position within their particular discipline might not be well-versed in entry-level positions, but they at least desired to converse with their faculty about career possibilities. Evidence of this desire to interact with faculty presented itself elsewhere in the assessment. This desire should not be taken as a rejection of other providers, per se, but simply a desire for greater faculty involvement to facilitate their professional socialization.

Frequency of Use of Facilities and Services

| <i>Facility or Service</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std.</i> | <i>Never Used</i> | <i>Low Usage</i> | <i>High Usage</i> |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| REC-IM Facilities | 603 | 1.52 | 1.42 | 33.7% | 39.5% | 26.9% |
| Snow Health Center/Physical Health | 602 | .68 | .99 | 57.6% | 34.5% | 7.8% |
| Snow Health Center/Mental Health | 606 | .23 | .67 | 86.1% | 11.2% | 2.7% |

Only 33.7% of the sample reported having never used the REC-IM facilities, with 66.4% reporting some level of usage (39.5% very low or low usage and 26.9% high or very high usage). For physical health care, 57.6% of the respondents reported having never used the services of Snow Health Center for physical care, but 42.3% did seek care. This level of usage is not surprising given the fact that most students either have never lived on campus or have lived on campus for only a very short time, in addition to the fact that college-age students are typically a healthy population.

The level of usage of Snow Health Center for mental health care was much lower (86.1% reported having never used), with only approximately 14% of the sample having sought mental health care on campus. To put this statistic in perspective, however, the National Institute of Mental Health estimates that only 15% of the adult general population seeks mental health treatment each year.

(<http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/library/mentalhealth/chapter2/sec7.html#overall>).

Frequency of Use of Facilities and Services

| <i>Facility or Service</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std.</i> | <i>Never Used</i> | <i>Low Usage</i> | <i>High Usage</i> |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| McKenny Union Student Center | 606 | 2,19 | 1.23 | 8.7% | 49.8% | 41.4% |
| New EMU Student Center | 605 | 1,63 | 1.26 | 19.2% | 55.7% | 25.1% |

As the data demonstrate, the former student center located in the McKenny Union was an important place for students, with only 8.7% of the respondents reporting never having visited this location, and 41.4% reporting either high usage or very high usage. The data for the new Student Center demonstrate much lower usage, which is not surprising given that at the time of data collection, the Center had been open only a few months (November 6, 2006).

SATISFACTION WITH FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Levels of Satisfaction with Facilities and Services: Aggregate

| Facility or Service | N | Never Used | Mean | Std. | None | Lower | Higher |
|-----------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|
| Academic Advising through College | 604 | 12.6% | 2.59 | 1.21 | 7.2% | 33.9% | 58.9% |
| Academic Advising through Pierce | 603 | 29.2% | 1.61 | 1.26 | 23.4% | 51.3% | 25.3% |
| Graduation Audit Processing Time | 603 | 1.3% | 2.46 | 1.22 | 7.9% | 37.4% | 54.6% |
| Graduation Audit Information | 601 | 1.2% | 2.49 | 1.22 | 7.1% | 37.5% | 55.4% |
| Clarity of Degree Requirements | 604 | 0.2% | 2.69 | 1.13 | 4.3% | 34.6% | 61.0% |
| Financial Aid Office Services | 600 | 26.3% | 2.35 | 1.22 | 8.4% | 42.3% | 49.3% |
| Career Services Information | 605 | 55.5% | 2.05 | 1.35 | 17.8% | 40.6% | 41.6% |
| Career Services Career Counseling | 603 | 66.2% | 1.76 | 1.43 | 27.0% | 40.7% | 32.4% |
| Snow Health Services (physical) | 602 | 58.3% | 2.38 | 1.35 | 13.5% | 30.6% | 55.8% |
| Snow Health Services (mental) | 603 | 79.4% | 1.68 | 1.56 | 35.5% | 29.0% | 35.6% |
| REC-IM Equipment | 605 | 35.0% | 2.48 | 1.17 | 8.1% | 34.4% | 57.5% |
| REC-IM Hours | 602 | 37.0% | 2.40 | 1.25 | 10.0% | 36.4% | 53.6% |
| Holman Learning Center Services | 596 | 76.8% | 1.94 | 1.43 | 23.2% | 37.0% | 39.8% |
| Writing Center Services | 604 | 74.8% | 1.91 | 1.41 | 23.0% | 38.2% | 38.8% |
| Halle Library Services | 600 | 7.2% | 3.33 | 0.76 | 0.2% | 12.6% | 87.3% |
| Halle Library Holdings | 602 | 12.5% | 3.27 | 0.84 | 0.6% | 15.7% | 83.6% |
| Computer Technical Support | 602 | 13.1% | 2.92 | 1.00 | 1.7% | 28.3% | 70.0% |
| Computer Availability | 602 | 4.8% | 2.71 | 1.12 | 3.5% | 34.7% | 61.8% |
| Parking Availability | 603 | 5.6% | 1.14 | 1.18 | 38.3% | 47.1% | 14.6% |
| EMU Student Center | 604 | 18.4% | 2.89 | 1.19 | 6.5% | 23.5% | 69.9% |
| Physical Appearance (Classrooms) | 604 | 1.0% | 1.86 | 1.11 | 12.7% | 57.2% | 30.1% |
| Physical Appearance (Grounds) | 604 | 1.3% | 2.65 | 0.98 | 3.5% | 33.6% | 63.0% |

Level of satisfaction with facilities and services was measured on a five-point scale ranging from zero to four, which can be interpreted as follows: no satisfaction (0); low satisfaction (1); moderate satisfaction (2); high satisfaction (3); and very high satisfaction (4). A “never used” answer category was provided. The computation of the mean was based on the responses of only those who reported experience. When interpreting the mean score, do so on a five-point scale (zero to four). In the table below, the “N” column represents the number of respondents who chose to answer each particular question. The “None” column represents those who reported no level of satisfaction, the “Lower” column represents the low (1) and moderate (2) levels of

satisfaction, and the “Higher” column represents the high (3) and very high (4) levels of satisfaction.

Levels of Satisfaction with Facilities and Services

| <i>Facility or Service</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std.</i> | <i>Never Used</i> | <i>None</i> | <i>Lower</i> | <i>Higher</i> |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Holman Learning Center Services | 596 | 1.94 | 1.43 | 76.8% | 23.2% | 37.0% | 39.8% |
| Writing Center Services | 604 | 1.91 | 1.41 | 74.8% | 23.0% | 38.2% | 38.8% |
| Halle Library Services | 600 | 3.33 | .76 | 7.2% | .2% | 12.6% | 87.3% |
| Halle Library Holdings | 602 | 3.27 | .84 | 12.5% | .6% | 15.7% | 83.6% |
| Computer Technical Support | 602 | 2.92 | 1.00 | 13.1% | 1.7% | 28.3% | 70.0% |
| Computer Availability | 602 | 2.71 | 1.12 | 4.8% | 3.5% | 34.7% | 61.8% |

Among those who responded to this question, the small percentage who reported using the services of the Holman Learning Center (23.2%) and the Writing Center (25.2%) reported fairly low levels of satisfaction with their services, with means of only 1.94 and 1.91, respectively. In each case, nearly one-quarter (23%) of those who used the services reported absolutely no satisfaction, with additionally high percentages reporting only either a low or moderate level of satisfaction (37% and 38.2%, respectively). Unfortunately, none of the interviewees reported having used either of these services so no insight into the low levels of satisfaction could be gleaned.

Conversely, satisfaction with both Halle Library services and holdings was quite high, with mean scores of 3.33 for services and 3.27 for holdings, and more than 80% reporting either high or very high levels of satisfaction with each (87.3% with services and 83.6% with holdings).

Computer technical support and availability had more moderate levels of satisfaction, although still fairly high, especially given what appears to be a high demand for each, with only 1.7% reporting never having used technical support and only 3.5% reporting never having used the computer labs. To have 70% of respondents report

either a high or a very high level of satisfaction with computer technical support is noteworthy.

Levels of Satisfaction with Facilities and Services

| <i>Facility or Service</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std.</i> | <i>Never Used</i> | <i>None</i> | <i>Lower</i> | <i>Higher</i> |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Academic Advising through College | 604 | 2.59 | 1.21 | 12.6% | 7.2% | 33.9% | 58.9% |
| Academic Advising through Pierce | 603 | 1.61 | 1.26 | 29.2% | 23.4% | 51.3% | 25.3% |

Academic advising through the respondents' College received much higher marks than did that provided through the advising office in Pierce Hall, with the percentage of those reporting either a high or very high level of satisfaction nearly twice as high for the Colleges. It is also noteworthy that 23.4% reported absolutely no satisfaction with advising through Pierce verses only 7.2% reporting no satisfaction with advising through their College. The most common complaint to emerge from the interviews about Pierce Hall advising was misinformation, with the second most common complaint being impersonal service. The interviews suggest that the same desire to be closer to faculty could be at play here, too, as with career counseling, in that the interviewees reported being more likely to "trust" that more accurate information would come from within their College rather than what they viewed to be a more impersonal administrative unit.

Levels of Satisfaction with Facilities and Services

| <i>Facility or Service</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std.</i> | <i>Never Used</i> | <i>None</i> | <i>Lower</i> | <i>Higher</i> |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Graduation Audit Processing Time | 603 | 2.46 | 1.22 | 1.3% | 7.9% | 37.4% | 54.6% |
| Graduation Audit Information | 601 | 2.49 | 1.22 | 1.2% | 7.1% | 37.5% | 55.4% |
| Clarity of Degree Requirements | 604 | 2.69 | 1.13 | .2% | 4.3% | 34.6% | 61.0% |

Reported levels of satisfaction with the graduation audit processing time, audit information, and the clarity of degree requirements were split. In each case,

approximately half of the respondents reported having either a high or a very high level of satisfaction and half reported either no satisfaction at all or a low to moderate level of satisfaction. The qualitative data revealed that the most common dissatisfaction with the audit process and information was misinformation, primarily due to what was believed to be faulty advising or confusion regarding transfer credit.

Levels of Satisfaction with Facilities and Services

| <i>Facility or Service</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std.</i> | <i>Never Used</i> | <i>None</i> | <i>Lower</i> | <i>Higher</i> |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Financial Aid Office Services | 600 | 2.35 | 1.22 | 26.3% | 8.4% | 42.3% | 49.3% |
| Career Services Information | 605 | 2.05 | 1.35 | 55.5% | 17.8% | 40.55 | 41.6% |
| Career Services Career Counseling | 603 | 1.76 | 1.43 | 66.2% | 27.0% | 40.7% | 32.4% |

Financial Aid and Career Services earned a similarly mixed review as the graduation audit process. Of these three items, satisfaction with information from career services and career counseling earned the lowest ratings, with 27% reporting no satisfaction with the counseling service.

Levels of Satisfaction with Facilities and Services

| <i>Facility or Service</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std.</i> | <i>Never Used</i> | <i>None</i> | <i>Lower</i> | <i>Higher</i> |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Snow Health Services (physical) | 602 | 2.38 | 1.35 | 58.3% | 13.5% | 30.6% | 55.8% |
| Snow Health Services (mental) | 603 | 1.68 | 1.56 | 79.4% | 35.5% | 29.0% | 35.55 |
| REC-IM Equipment | 605 | 2.48 | 1.17 | 35.0% | 8.1% | 34.4% | 57.5% |
| REC-IM Hours | 602 | 2.40 | 1.25 | 37.0% | 10.0% | 36.4% | 53.6% |

The levels of satisfaction with both REC-IM equipment and hours of operation received mixed reviews, with about half being either highly or very highly satisfied and the other half being either dissatisfied or moderately satisfied. The percentage of those never having used the facilities is noteworthy, however, in that it reflects that about two-thirds of the sample did make use of this service.

Physical health services provided by Snow earned higher marks than did mental health services, for which 35.5% reported no satisfaction at all versus only 13.5%

reporting no satisfaction with services for physical health matters. It is important to note that this finding is not surprising, given the uncomfortable nature of counseling and the high likelihood that an individual's problems will not be easily or quickly resolved. Two of the twenty-five interviewees had reported experience with mental health services, with their greatest dissatisfaction resulting from the length of time before being seen. A review of the service utilization literature would contextualize this finding and provide support for the assertion that what appears to be a low level of satisfaction with these services is not an unexpected circumstance. This finding certainly suggests a need for further research into service utilization on campus.

Levels of Satisfaction with Facilities and Services

| <i>Facility or Service</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std.</i> | <i>Never Used</i> | <i>None</i> | <i>Lower</i> | <i>Higher</i> |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Parking Availability | 603 | 1.14 | 1.18 | 5.6% | 38.3% | 47.1% | 14.6% |
| EMU Student Center | 604 | 2.89 | 1.19 | 18.4% | 6.5% | 23.5% | 69.9% |
| Physical Appearance (Classrooms) | 604 | 1.86 | 1.11 | 1.0% | 12.7% | 57.2% | 30.1% |
| Physical Appearance (Grounds) | 604 | 2.65 | .98 | 1.3% | 3.5% | 33.6% | 63.0% |

Among the various facilities and services assessed, parking availability earned the highest percentage of those reporting absolutely no satisfaction (38.3%) and the lowest percentage of those reporting either high or very high satisfaction (14.6%). The qualitative data revealed that, among students who were employed, inadequacy of parking was a leading reason for not attending class.

This was most likely to be true for those whose employer allowed them to use "flex-time" to take classes during their regularly scheduled work hours but did not allow sufficient time to find a parking place or to walk in from a more remote parking area. It was also noted that for some who travel in some distance from their workplace, a

lengthy commute adds to the length of time away from work, so finding parking readily was quite important.

A second issue with parking that emerged from the interviews pertained to feeling unsafe in the parking garage or when parked in the more remote parking areas. Every interviewee who reported feeling unsafe in these areas asked for greater police patrol. An increase in staffing of the SEEUS program was also mentioned, but increased police patrol was more strongly supported.

When probed as to their reluctance to use the SEEUS program, two responses emerged: for men, it was a matter of masculinity, feeling uncomfortable admitting to at least two other people that they were concerned for their safety. This was not such a significant barrier for women, however, although they did express feeling uncomfortable asking more than one person to walk with them, and to have the fact that they were being assisted so noticeable. For these reasons, the students did not believe that the SEEUS program was as beneficial as intended. They were very clear, however, that the SEEUS program should not be reduced, and in fact, they felt strongly that it should be increased. Their rationale was that even if not walking with students, having SEEUS available for surveillance was effective in-and-of itself, and therefore was appreciated.

Level of satisfaction with the new Student Center earned the highest marks of any facility, with almost 70% reporting either a high or a very high level of satisfaction. Given that the McKenny Union was no longer in operation at the time of data collection, satisfaction with its services was not assessed.

Respondents were much more satisfied the physical appearance of the grounds than that of the classroom buildings. The grounds earned a mean of 2.65

verses a mean of 1.86 for the classrooms. Sixty-three percent reported either a high or a very high level of satisfaction with the physical appearance of the grounds. The most common complaint against the physical appearance of the grounds pertained to the upkeep. Cigarette remains were deemed to be the most objectionable, by far.

Only 31.1% reported being similarly satisfied with the appearance of the classroom buildings. The qualitative data revealed Pray-Harrold and Mark Jefferson to be the most problematic buildings. While the interviewees expressed wanting improvements in the furnishings and interior and exterior appointments, they expressed the greatest level of intolerance toward of the cleanliness of the buildings. They expressed understanding budget restrictions that prevented remodeling, but could not understand why our current facilities could not at least be kept clean and in working order.

FREQUENCY OF ENGAGEMENT WITH EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

Frequency of Engagement: Aggregate

| <i>Frequency of Engagement in Extra-Curricular Activities</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std.</i> | <i>None</i> | <i>Lower</i> | <i>Higher</i> |
|--|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Student organization activities | 599 | 1.18 | 1.32 | 44.7% | 36.8% | 18.6% |
| Student government activities | 601 | 0.54 | 0.90 | 66.6% | 29.1% | 4.4% |
| Departmental activities | 599 | 1.36 | 1.34 | 36.2% | 41.9% | 21.8% |
| Athletic competitions | 601 | 0.86 | 1.15 | 54.4% | 33.5% | 12.2% |
| Intramural sports | 602 | 0.49 | 1.07 | 78.7% | 12.4% | 8.9% |
| Classroom service learning projects | 599 | 0.80 | 1.12 | 57.6% | 32.3% | 10.2% |
| Volunteering with campus organizations | 599 | 0.88 | 1.34 | 62.9% | 20.9% | 16.2% |
| Volunteering with off-campus organizations | 600 | 0.91 | 1.34 | 61.0% | 23.3% | 15.7% |
| Performances (music, theater, dance, etc.) | 601 | 0.73 | 1.19 | 63.7% | 25.2% | 11.1% |
| Greek membership | 602 | 0.46 | 1.18 | 84.7% | 4.9% | 10.5% |

Frequency of engagement in extra-curricular activities was measured on a five-point scale, ranging from zero to four, as follows: no engagement (0) low level of engagement (1); a moderate level of engagement (2); a high level of engagement (3); and a very high level of engagement (4). Given that it was level of engagement that was being measured, the zero response has numeric value, and as such, was included in the computation of the mean. Therefore, when interpreting the mean score, do so on a five-point scale (zero to four). In the table above, the “None” column represents an engagement level of zero, the “Lower” column represents a low level of engagement (1) plus a moderate level of engagement (2), and the “Higher” column represents a high level of engagement (3) plus a very high level of engagement (4). The “N” column represents the number of respondents who chose to answer each particular question.

When interpreting these data it is important to note that the respondents were being asked to provide a retrospective account of experiences that for most covered a span of more than four years, rather than an objective report based on an actual number of experiences.

Based upon the percentage of those reporting having never engaged in each activity, the rank order was as follows, ranked from highest to lowest level of non-engagement: Greek membership (84.7%); intramural sports (78.7%); activities sponsored by student government (66.6%); performances (63.7%); volunteering through campus organizations (62.9%); volunteering through off-campus organizations (61%); classroom service learning projects (57.6%); athletic competitions (54.4%); activities sponsored by student organizations (44.7%); and activities sponsored by their department (36.2%).

Explanations for such low levels of engagement were given in the qualitative portions of the assessment. The primary reason for non-engagement was not having sufficient time in their schedule, almost exclusively due to their need for employment. In fact, most of the interviewees expressed great disappointment to be graduating without having engaged more, and saw this as a great loss.

SATISFACTION WITH COURSES IN MAJOR

Levels of Satisfaction with Courses within Major: Aggregate

| Satisfaction with Courses within Major | N | Mean | Std. | No Satisfaction | Lower Satisfaction | Higher Satisfaction |
|---|----------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Availability of required courses | 602 | 2.61 | 1.02 | 3.0% | 36.2% | 60.8% |
| Availability of elective courses | 601 | 2.67 | 1.03 | 3.5% | 35.0% | 61.5% |
| Quality of instruction | 599 | 3.00 | 0.88 | 0.8% | 23.4% | 75.8% |
| Length of time to receive feedback | 601 | 2.93 | 0.91 | 0.8% | 26.6% | 72.6% |
| Quality of feedback | 602 | 2.92 | 0.93 | 1.0% | 26.4% | 72.6% |
| Opportunities interact with faculty in class | 601 | 3.24 | 0.82 | 0.3% | 16.4% | 83.2% |
| Opportunities interact with faculty outside class | 602 | 2.74 | 1.11 | 3.7% | 33.8% | 62.6% |
| Process for evaluating faculty | 602 | 2.41 | 1.19 | 8.3% | 39.8% | 51.8% |
| Academic advising from faculty | 601 | 2.69 | 1.22 | 7.5% | 29.5% | 63.0% |
| Level of respect from faculty | 602 | 3.14 | 0.94 | 2.0% | 19.0% | 79.1% |
| Level of respect from front office staff | 602 | 2.87 | 1.03 | 3.3% | 27.6% | 69.1% |
| Learning environment in classroom | 601 | 2.96 | 0.87 | 1.3% | 23.3% | 75.4% |

Level of satisfaction with facilities and services was measured on a five-point scale ranging from zero to four, which can be interpreted as follows: no satisfaction (0); low satisfaction (1); moderate satisfaction (2); high satisfaction (3); and very high satisfaction (4). In the table above, the “N” column represents the number of respondents who chose to answer each particular question. The “No Satisfaction” column represents those who reported no level of satisfaction, the “Lower” column represents those reporting low satisfaction (1) plus those reporting moderate satisfaction (2), and the “Higher” column represents those reporting high satisfaction (3) or very high satisfaction (4).

The survey data resonates quite well with the interviewees’ reports: most respondents were quite satisfied with the quality of course instruction within their major (3.00; 75.0% reported either a high or very high satisfaction), most felt respected by faculty within their major (3.14; 79.1% high or very high satisfaction), and most were

satisfied with the number of opportunities they had to interact with faculty in the classroom (3.24; 83.2% high or very high satisfaction).

The next highest means and percentages of those satisfied were earned for the overall learning environment in the classroom (2.96; 75.4% high or very high), the length of time to receive feedback on their work from faculty (2.93; 72.6% high or very high), the quality of that feedback (2.92; 72.6% high or very high). It should be noted that front office staff were not quite as highly evaluated, with only 69.1% reporting either a high or very high level of satisfaction. Questions on the well-being section of the survey inform this discussion, as well, and have been discussed in that section of this report.

Respondents were not as satisfied, however, with the number of opportunities to interact with faculty outside of the classroom (2.74; 62.6% high or very high satisfaction). Most of the interviewees expressed this desire, as well, but really could not create a vision of how this would occur, primarily given time constraints and tight schedules of their own. When probed as to exactly what was needed, what the interviewees expected would result from increased interactions with faculty outside the classroom, three unmet needs emerged: 1) the need to learn about their major in a deeper way; 2) the need to feel greater integration into not only their major, but also better integrated into EMU and their future profession, and 3) the need for faculty to know them well enough to serve as professional references for their future employment or graduate school applications.

Advising received from faculty was also not as highly regarded, with only 63% reporting either a high or very high level of satisfaction. The most common complaint to emerge from the interview was a lack of advising regarding careers.

Respondents were also not very satisfied with the availability of required and elective courses (60.8% reporting high or very high satisfaction and 61.5%, respectively). Only two complaints emerged during the interviews to illuminate this finding. First, interviewees expressed frustration that they did not have sufficient advance notice of when required courses would be offered. Second, they expressed unhappiness with insufficient courses offered at night and with courses offered on three days (MWF) rather than two days (MW), particularly given the work demands of most of our students.

The process used to evaluate faculty received the lowest mark: only 51.8% reported either a high or very high level of satisfaction. The complaint to emerge qualitatively was the feeling that the evaluations were useless because there was no accountability built into the system. Precisely, they questioned the value of the evaluation if no change resulted.

SATISFACTION WITH GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES

Levels of Satisfaction with General Education Courses: Aggregate

| Satisfaction with General Education Courses | N | Mean | Std. | Never Used | No Satisfaction | Lower Satisfaction | Higher Satisfaction |
|--|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Availability of General Education courses | 553 | 3.12 | 0.86 | 8.0% | 1.1% | 17.2% | 81.8% |
| Quality of instruction | 555 | 2.67 | 0.88 | 7.7% | 1.3% | 37.3% | 61.4% |
| Length of time to receive feedback | 547 | 2.76 | 0.86 | 8.1% | 1.1% | 32.2% | 66.7% |
| Quality of feedback | 547 | 2.73 | 0.91 | 8.5% | 1.3% | 34.7% | 64.0% |
| Level of respect from faculty | 551 | 2.92 | 0.90 | 7.9% | 0.9% | 28.3% | 70.8% |
| Learning environment in classroom | 553 | 2.73 | 0.93 | 7.7% | 2.0% | 33.8% | 64.2% |

With the exception of availability of courses, on every measure, respondents were more satisfied with courses within their major than with their general education courses. It is important to note, however, that as with courses within the major, the percentages of those with no satisfaction were negligible.

Three possible explanations for the differential in levels of satisfaction emerged through the qualitative data. First, respondents liked the smaller size of classes within their major as opposed to the larger general education classes. Second, they expressed greater interest in the content of courses within their major. There is a relationship between these two factors that is important to note, however, as they expressed a very strong opinion that smaller class size in general education courses would have facilitated greater interest in the course content. For both general education and courses within their major, respondents believed that most of their classes had been too large.

Third, respondents believed that general education courses were more likely to be taught by lecturers than by faculty. Many respondents believed that some lecturers were not as qualified to teach as faculty, although they acknowledged that they had received some excellent course instruction from lecturers. When probed about this

equivocation, it seemed to be that they were not so much rejecting of lecturers and as they were desirous of greater contact with faculty, a theme that resonated throughout the interviews.

SATISFACTION WITH TECHNOLOGY-BASED COURSE DELIVERY

Levels of Satisfaction with Technology-Based Course Delivery: Aggregate

| <i>Satisfaction with Technology-Based Course Delivery</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Never Used</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std.</i> | <i>No Satisfaction</i> | <i>Lower Satisfaction</i> | <i>Higher Satisfaction</i> |
|--|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| WebCT | 598 | 22.2% | 2.75 | 1.06 | 4.5% | 27.1% | 68.4% |
| Web Caucus | 599 | 33.2% | 2.56 | 1.18 | 7.8% | 31.6% | 60.8% |
| Electronic Reserves | 600 | 16.3% | 3.15 | 0.93 | 1.4% | 19.9% | 78.7% |
| Power Point Lecturers | 600 | 16.2% | 3.03 | 1.01 | 2.6% | 20.7% | 76.8% |
| Online Courses | 600 | 30.5% | 3.01 | 1.08 | 4.3% | 19.6% | 76.1% |
| my.emich course homepages | 598 | 6.7% | 3.00 | 1.00 | 1.8% | 24.5% | 73.6% |

Web Caucus and online courses were the least used technologies, with 33.2% and 30.5%, respectively, reporting having never used, following by WebCT, at 22.2%. Of those who did use these technologies, however, reported levels of satisfaction were fairly high. The electronic reserve system received the highest rating, looking at both the mean (3.15) and the percentage of high or very high satisfaction (78.7%).

During the interviews, respondents reported greatly appreciating these technologies. They did, however, express a concern about Power Point lectures as they had been used in the lower-level, general education courses, but not so much in upper-level courses within their major. The reported difference was that many faculty or lecturers in lower-level courses tended to present only the slides, with very little to no instruction beyond the content of the slide. The respondents recognized that this presentation style probably emerged in response to the need to reach large numbers of students from many different disciplines, but they were unhappy with it, nonetheless. In fact, several expressed believing that it was exactly in these large, lower-level, general education courses that faculty and lecturers needed to be the most engaging.

WELL-BEING AS EMU STUDENT: QUALITY OF RELATIONSHIPS

Sense of Well-Being: Aggregate

| Quality of Relationships | N | Mean | Std. | No Agreement | Lower Agreement | Higher Agreement |
|--|----------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| I had good relationships with fellow students. | 603 | 3.33 | 0.78 | 0.2% | 13.9% | 85.9% |
| I had good relationships with faculty. | 600 | 3.26 | 0.81 | 0.5% | 15.0% | 84.5% |
| I had positive interactions with office staff. | 601 | 2.78 | 1.05 | 3.8% | 29.7% | 66.6% |
| I have a sense of belonging at EMU. | 602 | 2.63 | 1.21 | 6.5% | 35.4% | 58.1% |
| I felt the faculty really cared about me. | 603 | 2.86 | 1.03 | 2.5% | 29.6% | 68.0% |
| I felt the administration really cared about me. | 602 | 1.88 | 1.24 | 16.3% | 51.5% | 32.3% |

Clearly, respondents' quality of relationships with fellow students and faculty was quite high (means of 3.33 and 3.26, respectively). Approximately 85% reported either a high or a very high level of agreement with statements asserting "good relationships" with these groups. Interaction with office staff, however, was not as positive, as the mean score was 2.78, with only 66.6% reporting a high or very high level of agreement.

The good relationships with faculty, however, did not translate into an equally high feeling that faculty "really cared" about them, as the mean score dipped to 2.86, and only 68% had either a high or a very high level of agreement with that statement. A gap between having a good relationship with faculty and feeling that the faculty cared about them was evident during the interviews, too. When this question was probed during the interviews, it was explained that the extent to which they felt faculty cared about them was limited to the classroom, and to only their particular classroom, at that. The most common feeling was that faculty did not care to hear that the student's personal problems, financial problems, or workplace demands were interfering with their classroom performance.

Conversely, only 32.3% had a high or very high level of agreement with the statement of belief that the "administration really cared" about them. In this case, the

mean was only 1.88, and 16.8% had absolutely no agreement with the statement.

Given the cultural climate at the time of data collection and the unfortunate events that contributed to that, this low mean score is not surprising. The issue of cultural climate has been more fully discussed in the last section of this report.

The reliability and validity of this statement can be called into question, however, as what, exactly, did the term “administration” represent to the student? It would have been ideal to break down this query into specific categories (such as President, Provost, etc.) but concern for respondent burden, specifically length of the survey, was already high. Plus, during the interviews that were conducted prior to completion of survey construction, every student interviewed gave the same response when asked for their interpretation of this term: anyone who wasn’t a faculty member or a lecturer, or as one interviewee put it: “...those on the business end of a college degree.” The greatest level of responsibility assigned during the interviews, however, was to the office of the President as a reflection of the power of that office and a belief that the “buck stops” there.

WELL-BEING AS EMU STUDENT: FEELINGS OF SAFETY

Sense of Well-Being: Aggregate

| <i>Feeling of Safety</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std.</i> | <i>No Agreement</i> | <i>Lower Agreement</i> | <i>Higher Agreement</i> |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| While on campus, I felt safe from physical assault. | 599 | 2.45 | 1.17 | 6.3% | 39.6% | 54.1% |
| While on campus, I felt safe from personal theft. | 601 | 2.18 | 1.23 | 11.8% | 43.8% | 44.4% |
| While in class, I felt safe from relational aggression. | 601 | 3.26 | 0.93 | 2.3% | 13.8% | 83.8% |

The high mean (3.26) and percentage of those having either a high or very high level of agreement with the statement that they felt safe from relational aggression (83.8%) resonates well with the finding reported earlier regarding the generally positive

learning environment in the classrooms, as well as the positive feelings expressed toward faculty.

Respondents did not feel nearly as safe while “on campus,” however. Of greatest concern for students was safety from personal theft, which had a low mean score of only 2.18, with 11.8% reporting absolutely no level of agreement with the statement that they felt safe from personal theft while on campus. Only 44.4% had either a high or very high level of agreement with that statement, and a similar percentage (43.8%) had either a low or moderate level of agreement with the statement.

Agreement with the statement that they felt safe from physical assault while on campus was also well below a desirable level, with a mean of only 2.45, and 6.3% having absolutely no agreement with that statement. Only 54.1% had either a high or very high level of agreement with the statement, and 39.6% had either a low or moderate level of agreement with the statement.

Even though concern for theft was higher than concern for physical assault, the interviewees did express high levels of concern about physical assault. They were particularly concerned about physical assaults that could potentially occur in the classrooms, isolated areas of the Library, or the parking lots, and expressed hope that the administration had taken those areas into consideration when designing safety measures. Most of the interviewees expressed concern that the residence halls appeared to be receiving more attention than other areas of the campus. In fact, a major complaint that emerged throughout the qualitative data was that EMU operated as though it were a residential campus, when in fact, the numbers would argue otherwise.

WELL-BEING AS EMU STUDENT: PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH

Sense of Well-Being: Aggregate

| <i>Physical and Mental Health</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std.</i> | <i>No Agreement</i> | <i>Lower Agreement</i> | <i>Higher Agreement</i> |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Stress has negatively affected my performance. | 597 | 2.03 | 1.40 | 18.6% | 39.0% | 42.4% |
| Depression has negatively affected my performance. | 597 | 1.16 | 1.36 | 47.2% | 31.6% | 21.1% |
| Anxiety has negatively affected my performance. | 598 | 1.47 | 1.39 | 34.6% | 39.0% | 26.4% |
| Physical health has negatively affected my performance. | 599 | 1.23 | 1.29 | 39.7% | 40.9% | 19.3% |

To those outside the health field, these numbers may not seem problematic, but they should not be read over too quickly. The fact that 81.4% reported some level of agreement with the statement that stress had negatively affected their performance and of that, 42.4% reported either a high or very high level of agreement with that statement is troubling because stress can have serious consequences for both physical and mental health, not to mention academic performance and retention. It is also noteworthy that approximately 52.7% reported some level of agreement with the statement that depression had negatively affected their academic performance (31.6% lower level of agreement and 21.1% higher level of agreement), and 65.4% reported some level of agreement with the statement that anxiety had negatively affected their academic performance (39% lower level of agreement and 26.4% higher level of agreement).

These mental health experiences have real consequences that should not be disregarded. A follow-up study should be undertaken into the root causes of the stress, depression, and anxiety that were reported. At a minimum, the numbers should at least be read for their value in decision-making regarding provision of health services, particularly mental health services.

The interviewees reported that their negative affective states, whether stress, depression, or anxiety, most generally resulted from worry about their ability to find employment after graduation, their level of student loan debt, on which they would soon be required to make payment, and the stress of balancing work with education. Many of the interviewees expressed feeling a sense of futility when considering their future, given the current economic climate in Michigan.

OPINIONS REGARDING QUALITY OF EDUCATION AND REPUTATION OF EMU

Opinions Regarding Quality of Education and Reputation of EMU: Aggregate

| Quality of Education and Reputation of EMU | N | Mean | Std. | No Agreement | Lower Agreement | Higher Agreement |
|---|----------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| I received a high quality education from EMU. | 602 | 2.97 | 0.90 | 2.3% | 21.0% | 76.8% |
| Quality of education is comparable to other universities. | 602 | 2.88 | 1.06 | 4.0% | 24.1% | 71.9% |
| EMU prepared me well for future career. | 604 | 2.87 | 1.05 | 3.1% | 27.1% | 69.7% |
| Employers will have great deal respect for EMU degree. | 601 | 2.66 | 1.10 | 4.2% | 36.3% | 59.6% |
| EMU has good reputation within general public. | 602 | 2.34 | 1.16 | 8.5% | 43.7% | 47.8% |
| I am proud to be associated with EMU. | 599 | 2.76 | 1.11 | 4.0% | 32.0% | 64.0% |
| Overall, EMU is well managed. | 600 | 2.03 | 1.22 | 14.5% | 46.9% | 38.7% |
| EMU managed as well as other universities its size. | 601 | 2.24 | 1.23 | 10.8% | 41.7% | 47.4% |
| I would recommend EMU to others. | 601 | 2.57 | 1.20 | 7.2% | 34.9% | 57.9% |
| If I had to do it over again, I would attend EMU. | 596 | 2.49 | 1.29 | 9.7% | 35.1% | 55.2% |

The level of agreement with the statements listed above was measured on a five-point scale ranging from zero to four. The “N” column represents the number of respondents who answered each particular question. The “No Agreement” column represents those who reported no agreement; “Lower Agreement” represents those reporting low (1) plus those reporting moderate agreement (2); “Higher Agreement” represents those reporting high (3) or very high agreement (4).

Opinions Regarding Quality of Education and Reputation of EMU

| Quality of Education and Reputation of EMU | N | Mean | Std. | No Agreement | Lower Agreement | Higher Agreement |
|---|----------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| I received a high quality education from EMU. | 602 | 2.97 | 0.90 | 2.3% | 21.0% | 76.8% |
| Quality of education is comparable to other universities. | 602 | 2.88 | 1.06 | 4.0% | 24.1% | 71.9% |
| EMU prepared me well for future career. | 604 | 2.87 | 1.05 | 3.1% | 27.1% | 69.7% |

Overall, most would consider the percentage of those with a higher level of agreement with these statements (inclusive of both a high level and a very high level of agreement) to be fairly high. Almost 77% reported either a high or very high level of agreement with the belief statement that they had received a high quality education from EMU. When asked to compare their education to that received at other

universities, approximately 72% had either a high or very high level of belief that the quality of education they received was comparable.

A smaller percentage (69.7%), had either a high or very high level of belief that their EMU education had prepared them well for their future career. This finding appears unexpectedly high in light of the following related findings: only 31.1% of the respondents reported having secured employment within their field of study; 66.2% reported having never taken advantage of career counseling through Career Services, and among those who did, 67.7% either reported no satisfaction with the services (27%) or a low level of satisfaction (40.7%); 55.5% reported having never accessed career information from Career Services, and among those who had, 58.3% reported either no level of satisfaction with the information they received (17.8%) or a low level of satisfaction with the information (40.5%).

Taken together, there does appear to be a discrepancy between a fairly high level of belief in the quality of their education and its value in preparation for a future career and outcomes based on that perceived value: only 31.1% already have employment within their field of study. Of course, the general economy itself would have a bearing on this outcome, but that circumstance alone should have resulted in a higher percentage of respondents having accessed Career Services. Further research is needed to explore whether these discrepancies reflect the same sense of futility that emerged during the interviews.

Opinions Regarding Quality of Education and Reputation of EMU

| <i>Quality of Education and Reputation of EMU</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std.</i> | <i>No Agreement</i> | <i>Lower Agreement</i> | <i>Higher Agreement</i> |
|--|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Employers will have great deal respect for EMU degree. | 601 | 2.66 | 1.10 | 4.2% | 36.3% | 59.6% |
| EMU has good reputation within general public. | 602 | 2.34 | 1.16 | 8.5% | 43.7% | 47.8% |
| I am proud to be associated with EMU. | 599 | 2.76 | 1.11 | 4.0% | 32.0% | 64.0% |

Sixty-four percent of the respondents reported either a high or very high level of agreement with the statement that they were proud to be associated with EMU. A similar percentage (59.6%) reported either a high or very high level of agreement with the statement that employers would have a great deal of respect for their EMU degree. A much lower percentage, however, 47.8%, had a high belief that EMU has a good reputation within the general public. During the interviews, the interviewees became rather defensive of EMU on this matter, citing what they believed to be excessive news reporting about the “falls from grace” that occurred at EMU, and the lack a of balanced perspective.

They also noted, that, to be fair, it would be difficult for most institutions to be seen in a positive light given close proximity to the much higher status University of Michigan. They suggested that the academic dominance and symbolic importance of the University of Michigan possibly dimmed the reputation of EMU more than EMU's past problems. The fact that 40.5% of the respondents had either no level of agreement (4.2%) or only a low to moderate level of agreement (36.3%) with the statement that employers would have a great deal of respect for their EMU degree is troubling. It is particularly so in light of the fact that 67.8% indicated there was a high or very high likelihood that they would remain in southeast Michigan, a geographic region that, as

one interviewee described, is in “the shadow of the place where everyone wants to be from (U of M) rather than settled for” (EMU).

The qualitative data is instructive here in helping more fully understand the factors that might be involved in their perception of the level of respect employers would hold for their degree from EMU. One interviewee explained that, if she were to secure employment within her profession, she would be somewhat reluctant to display her diploma if working with graduates from the University of Michigan. While she recognized working alongside UM graduates could be read as a sign of her competence and achievement, she believed that awareness of her EMU education would cause the quality of her work to be not as highly regarded. In other words, her work would have to be a great deal better to be considered as good as that of the U of M graduates.

Opinions Regarding Quality of Education and Reputation of EMU

| <i>Quality of Education and Reputation of EMU</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std.</i> | <i>No Agreement</i> | <i>Lower Agreement</i> | <i>Higher Agreement</i> |
|--|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Overall, EMU is well managed. | 600 | 2.03 | 1.22 | 14.5% | 46.9% | 38.7% |
| EMU managed as well as other universities its size. | 601 | 2.24 | 1.23 | 10.8% | 41.7% | 47.4% |

Clearly respondents were not well-satisfied with the management of EMU. Only 38.7% had a high or very high level of agreement with the statement that EMU was well managed, and only 47.4% had a high or very high level of agreement with the statement that EMU was managed as well as other universities its size.

The most common complaint against the management of EMU was the handling of the investigation and reporting of the murder that occurred on campus, and spoke at length about the betrayal of trust on so many levels. Of course, the interviewees were also very upset and angered over the construction of the former President’s house, as even years later, much anger and resentment was expressed. The respondents saw

these incidents as indicative of a systemic problem rather than the failing of only one or two individuals.

Sociologically speaking, given the closer relationship and greater number of opportunities for face-to-face interaction students have with faculty, the differential in response to faculty vis-à-vis the administration is not surprising. Additionally, it stands to reason that students would hold more responsible the party that they viewed as accountable for spending their tuition dollars. Clearly, as already evidenced by the fairly high level of belief that they had a good relationship with their faculty (3.26), the fairly high level of satisfaction with quality of instruction (3.0), feelings of being respected by faculty (3.14), and feeling that faculty “really cared” about them (2.86 verses 1.88 for administration) faculty loyalty within this sample of students was fairly high.

It is important to keep in mind that qualitative data is different in nature and intended for a different purpose than survey data. At most, the qualitative findings within this report are intended to be used for elucidation, to enlighten future survey construction, and to be read as suggestive of hypotheses yet to be tested empirically, rather than as evidence-based conclusions. The feelings of students vis-à-vis the administration and the management of EMU necessitates much further study.

Opinions Regarding Quality of Education and Reputation of EMU

| <i>Quality of Education and Reputation of EMU</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std.</i> | <i>No Agreement</i> | <i>Lower Agreement</i> | <i>Higher Agreement</i> |
|--|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| I would recommend EMU to others. | 601 | 2.57 | 1.20 | 7.2% | 34.9% | 57.9% |
| If I had to do it over again, I would attend EMU. | 596 | 2.49 | 1.29 | 9.7% | 35.1% | 55.2% |

These two questions were considered to be the best overall measures of satisfaction with the functioning of EMU as an institution. Although the numbers are lower than most would agree desirable, with only 57.9% reporting either a high or very

high level of willingness to recommend EMU to others and only 55.2% similarly willing to attend EMU again, it is important to embed the findings in the cultural climate within which the data were collected (April 2007). This graduating class had experienced very public accusations of misconduct brought against one former President regarding the construction of the President's house; it had experienced the murder of one of its peers on campus and the arrest of a fellow student as a suspect in that murder (December 2006); only weeks before the data were collected, it had experienced very public accusations of misconduct in the investigation and reporting of the murder brought against various high-level administrators. These are difficult circumstances, to be sure, and it would be sociologically ill-conceived to consider that the cultural climate did not influence the responses.

Of course, this is not meant to say that the findings should be disregarded as reflective of only a peculiar set of circumstances not likely to ever occur again rather than also suggestive of some deeper-seated, more enduring institutional problems. The tragedies that occurred most certainly influenced levels of well-being and opinions regarding the administration of EMU much more than they influenced satisfaction with facilities and services or course delivery. These latter experiences, however, certainly would have influenced students' sense of well-being and opinions regarding the quality of their education and the reputation of EMU, particularly their willingness to recommend EMU to others and their hypothetical willingness to choose EMU again, based upon their past experience.

PREDICTORS OF WILLINGNESS TO RECOMMEND EMU TO OTHERS

To examine predictors of willingness to recommend EMU to others, correlation matrices were constructed to analyze its relationship to the following sets of measures: satisfaction with facilities and services; satisfaction with courses within major; satisfaction with general education courses; satisfaction with technology-based course delivery; sense of well-being; opinions regarding quality of education and reputation of EMU.

Although a good measure of the strength of the relationship between two variables, correlation does not prove causation. As such, correlation should not be interpreted as the degree to which one measure is causing another, but rather, as signifying only the degree to which one measure is being influenced in the same way as another measure.

When interpreting correlation matrices, the strength of the relationship is measured on a scale of zero to one: the closer to one, the stronger the relationship. Generally, a score between zero and .3 is considered to be a weak relationship; a score between .4 and .6 would be considered a moderate relationship; and a score between .7 and one would be considered a strong relationship.

Correlations allow the “direction” of the relationship to be analyzed, too. To have a positive relationship means that an increase in the value of one variable coincides with an increase in the value of another variable with which it is correlated, or conversely, both decrease. To have a negative relationship means that an increase in the value of one variable coincides with a decrease in the value of another variable with

which it is correlated. These inverse relationships are signified by a negative integer preceding the correlation value.

Correlation Matrix: Measures of Satisfaction with Facilities and Services by "I Would Recommend EMU to Others"

| Measure | N | Correlation | Sig. |
|-----------------------------------|----------|--------------------|-------------|
| Academic Advising through College | 521 | 0.288 | 0.000 |
| Academic Advising through Pierce | 421 | 0.293 | 0.000 |
| Graduation Audit Processing Time | 589 | 0.264 | 0.000 |
| Graduation Audit Information | 587 | 0.293 | 0.000 |
| Clarity of Degree Requirements | 597 | 0.301 | 0.000 |
| Financial Aid Office Services | 439 | 0.335 | 0.000 |
| Career Services Information | 267 | 0.232 | 0.000 |
| Career Services Career Counseling | 203 | 0.261 | 0.000 |
| Snow Health Services (physical) | 249 | 0.101 | 0.113 |
| Snow Health Services (mental) | 122 | 0.052 | 0.567 |
| REC-IM Equipment | 391 | 0.164 | 0.001 |
| REC-IM Hours | 377 | 0.224 | 0.000 |
| Holman Learning Center Services | 137 | 0.212 | 0.013 |
| Writing Center Services | 150 | 0.165 | 0.044 |
| Halle Library Services | 552 | 0.174 | 0.000 |
| Halle Library Holdings | 522 | 0.197 | 0.000 |
| Computer Technical Support | 519 | 0.268 | 0.000 |
| Computer Availability | 568 | 0.217 | 0.000 |
| Parking Availability | 563 | 0.303 | 0.000 |
| EMU Student Center | 487 | 0.297 | 0.000 |
| Physical Appearance (Classrooms) | 592 | 0.390 | 0.000 |
| Physical Appearance (Grounds) | 590 | 0.348 | 0.000 |

None of the measures of satisfaction with facilities and services had more than a weak relationship to willingness to recommend EMU to others (all were below .4). Of these, the five strongest relationships to willingness to recommend EMU to others were as follows: the physical appearance of the classroom buildings (.390); the physical appearance of the grounds (.348); financial aid services (.335); parking availability (.303); and clarity of degree requirements (.301). The direction of each of these relationships was positive, meaning that the higher the satisfaction on each of these measures, the higher the willingness to recommend EMU to others, or conversely, the lower the value, the lower the willingness to recommend EMU.

Correlation Matrix: Measures of Satisfaction with Courses within Major by "I Would Recommend EMU to Others"

| Measure | N | Correlation | Sig. |
|---|----------|--------------------|-------------|
| Availability of required courses | 597 | 0.278 | 0.000 |
| Availability of elective courses | 596 | 0.304 | 0.000 |
| Quality of instruction | 595 | 0.346 | 0.000 |
| Length of time to receive feedback | 597 | 0.330 | 0.000 |
| Quality of feedback | 598 | 0.368 | 0.000 |
| Opportunities interact with faculty in class | 597 | 0.301 | 0.000 |
| Opportunities interact with faculty outside class | 598 | 0.253 | 0.000 |
| Process for evaluating faculty | 598 | 0.360 | 0.000 |
| Academic advising from faculty | 597 | 0.305 | 0.000 |
| Level of respect from faculty | 598 | 0.350 | 0.000 |
| Level of respect from front office staff | 598 | 0.339 | 0.000 |
| Learning environment in classroom | 597 | 0.469 | 0.000 |

None of the measures of satisfaction with courses within the major had more than a weak relationship to willingness to recommend EMU to others, with one exception: Satisfaction with the learning environment in the classroom had a moderate, positive relationship (.469).

Correlation Matrix: Measures of Satisfaction with General Education Courses by "I Would Recommend EMU to Others"

| Measure | N | Correlation | Sig. |
|---|----------|--------------------|-------------|
| Availability of General Education courses | 550 | 0.265 | 0.000 |
| Quality of instruction | 552 | 0.357 | 0.000 |
| Length of time to receive feedback | 546 | 0.353 | 0.000 |
| Quality of feedback | 546 | 0.367 | 0.000 |
| Level of respect from faculty | 550 | 0.374 | 0.000 |
| Learning environment in classroom | 552 | 0.442 | 0.000 |

The same circumstance was found to be true regarding general education courses. Only satisfaction with the learning environment in the classroom had more than a weak relationship to willingness to recommend EMU to others, which was moderate (.442).

***Correlation Matrix: Measures of Satisfaction with Technology-Based Course Delivery
by "I Would Recommend EMU to Others"***

| Measure | N | Correlation | Sig. |
|---------------------------|----------|--------------------|-------------|
| WebCT | 463 | 0.302 | 0.000 |
| Web Caucus | 398 | 0.342 | 0.000 |
| Electronic Reserves | 500 | 0.229 | 0.000 |
| Power Point Lecturers | 500 | 0.290 | 0.000 |
| Online Courses | 415 | 0.337 | 0.000 |
| my.emich course homepages | 555 | 0.353 | 0.000 |

None of the measures of satisfaction with technology-based course delivery proved to have more than a weak relationship to willingness to recommend EMU to others.

Correlation Matrix: Measures of Well-Being by "I Would Recommend EMU to Others"

| Measure | N | Correlation | Sig. |
|--|----------|--------------------|-------------|
| I had good relationships with fellow students | 600 | 0.309 | 0.000 |
| I had good relationships with faculty | 597 | 0.387 | 0.000 |
| I had positive interactions with office staff | 598 | 0.491 | 0.000 |
| I have a sense of belonging at EMU | 600 | 0.602 | 0.000 |
| I felt the faculty really cared about me | 600 | 0.498 | 0.000 |
| I felt the administration really cared about me | 600 | 0.531 | 0.000 |
| While on campus, I felt safe from physical assault | 596 | 0.392 | 0.000 |
| While on campus, I felt safe from personal theft | 598 | 0.402 | 0.000 |
| While in class, I felt safe from relational aggression | 598 | 0.276 | 0.000 |
| Stress has negatively affected my performance | 594 | - 0.164 | 0.000 |
| Depression has negatively affected my performance | 594 | - 0.062 | 0.134 |
| Anxiety has negatively affected my performance | 594 | - 0.091 | 0.027 |
| Physical health has negatively affected my performance | 596 | - 0.036 | 0.378 |

None of the measures of well-being proved to have a strong relationship to willingness to recommend EMU to others. Five of the measures, however, were moderately associated, listed in order of strength of the relationship: "I have a sense of belonging at EMU" (.602); "I felt the administration really cared about me" (.531); "I felt the faculty really cared about me" (.498); "I had positive interactions with office staff" (.491); and "While on campus, I felt safe from personal theft" (.402).

Correlation Matrix: Measures of Quality of Education by "I Would Recommend EMU to Others"

| <i>Measure</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Correlation</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| I received a high quality education from EMU | 599 | 0.695 | 0.000 |
| Quality of education is comparable to other universities | 599 | 0.673 | 0.000 |
| EMU prepared me well for future career | 601 | 0.698 | 0.000 |
| Employers will have great deal respect for EMU degree | 599 | 0.696 | 0.000 |
| EMU has good reputation within general public | 600 | 0.634 | 0.000 |
| I am proud to be associated with EMU | 598 | 0.820 | 0.000 |
| Overall, EMU is well managed | 599 | 0.736 | 0.000 |
| EMU managed as well as other universities its size | 598 | 0.736 | 0.000 |
| If I had to do it over again, I would attend EMU | 595 | 0.823 | 0.000 |

Clearly, measures of opinions regarding the quality of education and EMU's reputation had more important relationships to willingness to recommend EMU to others than any of the other sets of measures. As arrayed in the table above, the first five measures had fairly high, although still moderate, positive relationships. Four had strong relationships to willingness to recommend. The strongest relationships were as follows: "If I had it to do over again, I would attend EMU (.823); "I am proud to be associated with EMU" (.820); "Overall, EMU is well managed" (.736); and "EMU is managed as well as other universities its size" (.736).

To test these relationships, a multiple-regression model was constructed, using "willingness to recommend EMU to others" as the dependent variable. Independent variables were selected from each of the above correlation tables. Only those with at least a moderate correlation with willingness to recommend EMU (.4 or above) were selected. Age and gender (as dummied variables) were included in the model as demographic variables.

The resultant model had an R value of .908. R values range from zero to one, with one reflecting a model that explains all variance in the dependent variable, so an R

value of .908 would be considered quite high in predictive value. As illustrated in the table that follows, neither age nor gender were predictors of willingness to recommend EMU to others. The strongest predictor (based on the size of the B value) was “If I had to do it over again, I would choose to attend EMU” (.345), followed closely by “I am proud to be associated with EMU” (.3.25).

Only three other variables were statistically significant predictors of willingness to recommend, as follows: “I think that EMU is managed as well as most universities its size” (.238); “I received a high quality education from EMU” (.137); and “While on campus, I felt safe from personal theft” (.049).

Coefficients(a)

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | T | Sig. |
|---|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 5 (Constant) | -.236 | .077 | | -3.049 | .002 |
| If I had to do it over again, I would choose to attend EMU | .345 | .025 | .377 | 13.665 | .000 |
| I am proud to be associated with EMU | .325 | .034 | .299 | 9.642 | .000 |
| I think that EMU is managed as well as most universities its size | .238 | .024 | .243 | 9.748 | .000 |
| I received a high quality education from EMU | .137 | .035 | .102 | 3.855 | .000 |
| While on campus, I felt safe from personal theft | .049 | .019 | .051 | 2.545 | .011 |

a Dependent Variable: I would recommend EMU to others

It is understandable that the leading predictor of willingness to recommend EMU to others would depend most heavily upon their own willingness to choose EMU again, but what determines pride in EMU? When examined during the qualitative interviews, the overwhelming response was reputation, reputation, reputation, among employers and within the general public. Interviewees reported various levels of shame to be

associated with EMU because of its negative publicity. As already discussed, interviewees were concerned about the impact these very public problems would have on their ability to secure employment.

Interviewees made the point that the “bad news just keeps coming” and had not been balanced by good news getting equal press coverage. They had mixed feelings about EMU in this regard: on one hand, they were very angry with the “administration” over the handling of the murder on campus and the construction of the President’s house, and yet on the other hand, they were still sufficiently connected to EMU to be defensive of it. Consequently, they did not hold EMU completely responsible for its spoiled identity.

The second most common response to the question of pride in EMU had to do with the quality of their education. Every single interviewee expressed believing that the general public, and to a lesser extent employers, did not believe a degree from EMU was comparable to that of the University of Michigan, which most strongly believed was the dominant comparison, even though unfair competition. One interviewee explained: “It’s all about Michigan, and in Michigan, nothing else really matters as much. Just look at how many of our own students you see wearing UM shirts rather than EMU. If I didn’t know better, I would think I was in Ann Arbor.”

When probed for their opinions on how EMU could change this situation, the interviewees acknowledged that much of the public perception was out of our control and simply a function of the dominance of U of M. Almost every interviewee, however, believed that there was one thing EMU could do to change public perception of the quality of their degree vis-à-vis one from U of M: increase performance standards and

the rigor of the coursework. They believed very strongly that EMU has the reputation of being an “easy” school with much lower standards for both admission and performance of students.

To examine this question quantitatively, when the same model was tested with “I am proud to be associated with EMU” as the dependent variable, the following results emerged that strongly support the qualitative interviews. The R value for this model was .863.

Coefficients(a)

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|---|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| (Constant) | .093 | .085 | | 1.094 | .274 |
| I believe that employers will have a great deal of respect for my degree from Eastern | .123 | .040 | .122 | 3.076 | .002 |
| If I had to do it over again, I would choose to attend EMU | .161 | .027 | .191 | 5.869 | .000 |
| I have a sense of belonging to EMU | .179 | .025 | .194 | 7.026 | .000 |
| I believe that EMU has a good reputation within the general public | .186 | .032 | .197 | 5.804 | .000 |
| I received a high quality education from EMU | .163 | .049 | .133 | 3.329 | .001 |
| Overall, I think that EMU is well managed | .140 | .029 | .155 | 4.809 | .000 |
| I believe that the quality of education I received from EMU is comparable to that from other universities | .094 | .040 | .090 | 2.367 | .018 |

a. Dependent Variable: I am proud to be associated with EMU

The leading predictors of being proud to be associated with EMU were “I believe that EMU has a good reputation within the general public” (.186); “I have a sense of belonging to EMU” (.179); “I received a high quality education from EMU” (.163); “If I

had to do it over again, I would choose to attend EMU" (.161); "Overall, I think that EMU is well managed" (.140); "I believe that employers will have a great deal of respect for my degree from Eastern" (.123); and "I believe that the quality of education I received from EMU is comparable to that from other universities" (.094).

Clearly, reputation of EMU was important for these respondents. Management of the institution and quality of education were two key reputation-related components that emerged through both the survey and the qualitative data. Given that these were key predictors of feeling proud of EMU, willingness to choose EMU again, and willingness to recommend EMU to others, addressing EMU's reputation in these two areas will be of vital importance to better outcomes.

When designing goals to improve the students' experience, it would be remiss to dismiss these findings only as the result of isolated events that affected only those who were students during this time period. In fact, some indirect evidence from a national survey of incoming, first-year students suggests that the Fall 2006 incoming student body had a similarly low opinion of EMU's reputation. The 2006 CIRP Peer Group Report is the source of this evidence (<http://www.emich.edu/irim/>).

For example, when the 2006 incoming, first-year students were asked to report the level of importance of various factors influencing their decision to attend EMU, two of their responses were noteworthy: "This college has a very good academic reputation," only 38.9% of EMU incoming-student respondents reported that this was a "very important" factor, compared to 49% of respondents from all other public, four-year colleges, and 70.8% of respondents from our peer institutions. Additionally, in response to the statement that "This college's graduates get good jobs," only 35.5% reported this

factor to be very important compared to 44.1% from all other public, four-year colleges, and 59.2% of respondents from our peer institutions.

Granted, these are indirect measures of reputation, but certainly the lower level of importance of these factors must be examined as the data suggest that our incoming students might enter with some aspects of their academic self-esteem lower than those attending other institutions. Other findings from the 2006 CIRP also suggest the same about academic self-esteem and the expectation states of our incoming students. In addition to this Graduating Senior Assessment 2007 Report, the CIRP findings should be considered when defining goals and objectives to improve the academic journey, including the following.

- When asked to estimate the likelihood that there would be a “very good” chance of doing each of the following:
 - Be satisfied with their College: EMU 42.3% verses Peer 59.7%.
 - Communicate regularly with their professors: EMU 23.3% verses Peer 34.4%.
 - Participate in student clubs/groups: EMU 29.7% verses Peer 43.1%.
 - Transfer to another college before graduating: EMU 11.4% verses Peer 6.3%.
 - Work full-time while attending college: EMU 13.4% verses Peer 5.7%.
- A higher percentage of EMU students than Peers reported “major concern” that they would not have enough funds to complete college (18.8% verses 9.2%)

- A lower percentage of EMU students than Peers reported a “very good” chance that they would be able to study abroad (17.5% verses 24.4%).
- When our 2006 incoming, first-year students were asked to rate their self as “above average” compared with the average person his/her age in terms of the following, the following percentages of agreement emerged:
 - Academic ability: EMU 58.7% verses Peer 79%.
 - Mathematical ability: EMU 33.3% verses Peer 54.3%.
 - Drive to achieve: EMU 66.2% verses Peer 77.9%.
 - Emotional health: EMU 52.5% verses Peer 59.5%.
 - Physical health: EMU 52% verses Peer 58.6%.

Ending this report by introducing CIRP data on incoming first-year students is not intended to dismiss the fact that real things do or do not happen during the course of an academic career that influence students’ level of reported satisfaction at the end. Data on incoming first-year students do have legitimate value at the end of a graduating senior report, however, in suggesting to the institution the baseline from which our students’ experience begins. For example, knowing that only 58.7% of the 2006 EMU incoming students would rate themselves as “above average” in academic ability compared to 79% of students at EMU’s peer institutions possibly sets their expectation about the quality of education they “deserve” to receive. It is vitally important, therefore, to use all available resources to make ourselves aware of the areas in which our students’ needs may be different or greater than those of students at other universities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations that follow have emerged from the quantitative survey findings. Qualitative data gleaned from the open-ended survey responses and the 25 interviews that were conducted were used for their value in suggesting solutions to the problem areas that were identified. The recommendations themselves, however, were not based upon the qualitative data, given the small sample size vis-à-vis the population and the homogeneity of the interviewees.

A prerequisite to drawing forth recommendations, of course, is the establishment of a performance baseline, which is certainly a subjective decision. What exactly constitutes an “acceptable” level of satisfaction most often is influenced by multiple factors. To ground the recommendations contextually, each of the recommendations below begins with the Principle Investigator’s data-driven rationale.

1. First and foremost, the results of the regression analysis used to predict respondents’ willingness to recommend EMU to others must be addressed (on the assumption that this is the most appropriate measure of overall level of satisfaction with EMU). The recommendations that follow emerged from the five predictor variables: willingness to choose EMU again; being proud to be associated with EMU; belief that EMU is managed as well as others its size; belief that they received a high quality education; and feeling safe from personal theft while on campus:
 - a. Two key reputation-related factors must be addressed: quality of education and quality of institutional management.

- b. To a very large extent, the reputation of EMU among the students must first be restored. Repairing students' belief and confidence in EMU must emerge primarily from healing the relationship between students and the administration.
- c. The qualitative reports that academic rigor and standards were too low needs to be further explored as this might be influencing students' perception in the quality of their education. To begin this exploration, the following measures will be added to the next survey: "The courses within my major were sufficiently academically challenging;" and "The general education courses were sufficiently academically challenging."
- d. Campus safety must be addressed. Of the two safety-related measures, only feeling safe from personal theft predicted willingness to recommend EMU to others. Feeling safe from physical assault should not be dismissed as unimportant, however, given that 45.9% of the respondents had either no agreement (6.3%) or a low or moderate level of agreement (39.6%) with the statement that "While on campus, I felt safe from physical assault." The qualitative data highlighted three areas where students felt vulnerable: parking areas, the Library, and classrooms.
- e. To address the matter of pride in EMU, given the issues raised in the section regarding its reputation, attention must be given to restoring student confidence in their degree and to increasing the stature of EMU in the eyes of our students. Given the sociological importance of a strong identity around which group members can coalesce, the brand campaign

- (“Education First”), in particular the symbolism of “Eagle Nation” may have strong potential. Even among those who might have chosen a different brand, the mere existence of a clearly-stated identity might be effective.
- f. The low level of satisfaction with the physical appearance of the classrooms must be addressed given the importance of the quality of one’s physical environment as a reflection on one’s worth. Only 31% of respondents reported either a high or very high level of satisfaction.
 - g. The low level of satisfaction with parking availability quite probably affects each of the following: satisfaction with management; academic performance (and therefore retention); feelings of safety; and a sense of belonging to EMU. As one interviewee stated, “It just feels like if EMU really wanted me to be here, it would find a suitable place for me to park. After all, most of us don’t live here. That’s what the administration doesn’t seem to get.”
2. The issue of quality of academic advising must be addressed. Pierce Hall received particularly low marks compared to advising from College and faculty advisors, with a low mean level of satisfaction of 1.61 and only 25.3% reporting either a high or very high level of satisfaction with Pierce services. Conversely, academic advising from the College earned a mean score of 2.59, with 58.9% reporting either a high or very high level of satisfaction; faculty advising earned a mean score of 2.69, with 63% reporting either a high or very high level of satisfaction. The interviewees suggested that quality of advising is a key retention issue given that poor advising almost

- always results in a need for additional courses, accompanied by the following:
stress; disappointment in EMU management; increased student loan debt;
increased time away from current employment; a delay in graduation; and
therefore a delay in entering more gainful employment.
3. The graduation audit processing time and audit information also warrants further investigation. In each case, about half reported either no satisfaction, low satisfaction, or only moderate satisfaction.
 4. REC-IM and the Office of Financial Aide received mixed reviews, as well. Efforts should be made to better understand dissatisfaction.
 5. Efforts should be made by departments and Schools to connect with students as soon as possible after declaring their major. Doing so should increase a sense of belonging, and should allow for greater contact with faculty. A suggestion made frequently during the interviews was to have a faculty mentor assigned to each student as soon as the student enters the major, and to have that faculty mentor remain with the student throughout their program. The interviewees explained that in this way, both continuity and accountability would be possible, and more importantly, the student would more likely feel integrated into their major. Mentor/mentee relationships would also increase students' satisfaction with opportunities to interact with faculty outside the classroom, which was considerably lower than satisfaction with opportunities to interact with faculty in class (62.6% verses 83.2%, respectively).

6. The fact that 66.2% of the respondents reported never having accessed career counseling through Career Services demands a study into barriers to accessing these services. Given that only 31.1% reported having a job closely related to their major upon graduation and 44.9% were not employed but would be looking for employment after graduation, the low level of usage of this service center is counterintuitive.
7. Understanding the low level of satisfaction with Career Services reported by those who did use these services must be given high priority. In addition to the obvious problems associated with such a low level of satisfaction, this circumstance is very likely affecting its reputation, and therefore usage of Career Services. The qualitative reports suggested very strongly that students want faculty to be more involved in career advising because for various reasons, they view faculty as having greater authority in this area. Given this, perhaps stronger linkages should be made between Career Services and the various academic units.
8. Given that 48.1% of the respondents reported either no satisfaction (8.3%) or a low or moderate level of satisfaction (39.8%) with the system used to evaluate faculty, this system should be studied to further understand students' relatively low level of satisfaction with the current system.
9. Length of time to complete the degree warrants investigation as 78.6% reported needing at least five to six years to complete their degree (43% between five and six years; 14.9% between seven and eight years; and 10.8% more than eight years), despite the fact that 76% attended mostly full-

- time. A statistical analysis of these two variables failed to find a statistically significant causal relationship between length of time necessary to complete the degree and frequency of attendance so clearly other contributing factors are unknown.
10. Given that around 40% of the respondents reported either no satisfaction or a low to moderate level of satisfaction with availability of required and elective courses within their major, a study of course scheduling should be undertaken. The qualitative data would suggest an assessment of the desirability of an increased number of night classes and a Monday-Wednesday course schedule (as opposed to MWF). Particularly for upper-level courses, interviewees reported a desire for late afternoon or night classes. They also reported that when having only MWF courses available to them, they most likely attended class on only two of those days (MW). Another related issue that emerged qualitatively was the need to have greater advance notice of course offerings so that students could better plan their schedules.
11. Given the very high percentage of those reporting intent to pursue a graduate program (78.8% Master's degree, 8.3% second Bachelor's degree, 10.6% a certificate or professional license), bodes well for EMU's graduate programs, particularly in light of the fact that 67.8% plan to remain in this geographic region (southeast Michigan). Given the increased enrollment these data suggest, an assessment of the experience of our current graduate students seems warranted.

12. The high percentage of those reporting absolutely no satisfaction with the services of Holman Learning Center (23.2%) and the Writing Center (23%) and the relatively low mean level of satisfaction (1.94 and 1.91) warrant further research. It may be logical and therefore tempting to assume that the remedial nature of these services would influence the level of reported satisfaction, but research is needed to determine the degree of that influence, as well as other factors that contribute to dissatisfaction.
13. There is a need to conduct a targeted study of lower-performing graduating seniors, given the problem of those with lower graduating GPAs having chosen to not participate in this research.
14. Consideration should be given to increasing mental health services on-campus, given what could be argued to be a relatively high level of usage of on-campus services (as well as CIRP 2006 data suggesting the incoming, first-year students believe themselves to have a lower quality of mental health than students at EMU's peer institutions).
15. Given the rather low level of those who reported that EMU had been their first choice, it is imperative to better understand what would make EMU students' first choice. The qualitative data suggested that one way of doing so would be to get a better sense of who our students are: overwhelmingly, the qualitative data suggest that the student who is a commuter and who is working while a student feels unseen.
16. It will be important to conduct ongoing assessments of our students' experience long before they apply for graduation. To address this need, as

well as the increased needs for data for program review and accreditation, plans are underway for the Office of Institutional Assessment to conduct routine assessments of the Junior-Sophomore experience, in addition to continuation of the Graduating Senior Assessment.