

# **EASTERN**

## **MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY**

---

### **INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT**

#### **EMU STUDENT SATISFACTION AND USAGE ASSESSMENTS 2008**

**Graduating Senior Assessment 2008**  
**Sophomore-junior Assessment 2008**

Office of Institutional Assessment  
Division of Academic Affairs

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

September 15, 2008

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>SECTION</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Introduction to Assessments and Report Design	3
Well-Being as EMU Student	9
Quality of Education and Reputation of EMU	15
Satisfaction with Department or School	17
Satisfaction with General Education Courses	23
Satisfaction with Technology-Based Course Delivery	25
Facilities and Services Usage	26
Satisfaction with Facilities and Services	31
Frequency of Engagement in Extracurricular Activities	37
Sample Characteristics	39
Demographics	
Family and Living Arrangements	
Financing Education	
Academic History	
Plans after Graduation	
Identifying Relationships	52
Recommendations	54
Appendices	56

## ***INTRODUCTION TO ASSESSMENTS AND REPORT DESIGN***

The following report resulted from research undertaken to assess the experience of two populations within the Eastern Michigan University student body: undergraduate students who had applied for Winter 2008 graduation and students who had earned enough credits by Winter 2008 to be considered either a sophomore or junior. Separate assessments of each of these populations were conducted, however given the extent to which the methods and findings were similar, it was thought parsimonious to make a joint report.

The tables embedded within the body of this report display data from the Graduating Senior Assessment 2008 (GSA 2008) alongside data from the Sophomore-junior Assessment 2008 (SJA 2008). Comparative findings from the previous Graduating Senior Assessment 2007 (GSA 2007) have been incorporated within the tables, as well. No previous wave of comparative data on the sophomore and junior experience was available, however. Tables specific to each assessment endeavor have been provided as appendices to report more specified data on levels of usage and satisfaction and levels of agreement to statements about the EMU experience and students' sense of well-being.

A mixed-method approach was used to collect the data, relying on both qualitative and quantitative data to inform the analyses. The quantitative data were collected via an online survey delivered to each of the two student groups: the Graduating Senior Survey 2008 (GSA 2008) and the Sophomore-junior Survey 2008 (SJA 2008). The qualitative data were drawn from open-ended questions on those surveys.

## ***SURVEY DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY***

Except for minor modifications, both surveys were duplicates to the survey used for the Graduating Senior 2007 assessment. The surveys 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.

A few modifications to the survey used for the GSA 2007 were devised, however, in response primarily to issues raised within the open-ended sections of the 2007 survey and those raised by members of the EMU community in response to last year's report. For example, a question regarding military service was used so that the needs and well-being of returning or currently serving military personal could be examined. In light of the awareness that even high-achieving students are a retention concern, a question was added to identify students within the Honors College so that their experience could be examined. Given the qualitative remarks in response to open-ended questions on last year's survey, a close-ended question was added to quantifiably assess satisfaction with the SEEUS safety program. Given concern expressed about EMU's reputation, a question was added to assess satisfaction with our newly-implemented brand campaign (Education First and Eagle Nation), as a measure of one attempt to improve EMU's reputation.

Regarding the qualitative data, several questions that were used on the 2007 survey to elicit open-ended responses were repeated: reason for choosing EMU if EMU was not first choice; how educational experience could have been improved; and any other comments about EMU not already addressed. New open-ended questions were added this year to elicit comments specific to satisfaction with Department or School and with general education courses. These qualitative responses were coded into thematic categories, following standard and acceptable procedures for analysis of qualitative data. The qualitative findings have been interwoven into the analysis of quantitative survey data. These data are useful in providing contextual grounding of the survey findings, to be informative in future survey construction, and as suggestive of hypotheses yet to be tested empirically.

The Graduating Senior Assessment 2008 online survey was delivered on April 7<sup>th</sup>, 2008 to emich email addresses of all 1,577 undergraduate students who had applied for Winter 2008 graduation. Forty-nine of these email addresses were over-quota, and therefore undeliverable, leaving a useable sample of 1528 students. A follow-up reminder email was sent on April 14<sup>th</sup>, with a final reminder sent on April 29<sup>th</sup>. Data collection ended on May 5<sup>th</sup>. No incentive was offered for completion of the survey. Six-hundred and one students completed the survey, making for a resultant response rate of 39%.

The Sophomore-junior Assessment 2008 online survey was delivered on April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2008, to a random sample of emich email addresses of 1,263 students who had earned enough credits to be considered either a sophomore or junior. The random sample was comprised of 20% (585) of those classified as sophomores and 20% (678)

of those classified as juniors. Twenty-six of the email addresses were undeliverable, due to being over-quota, leaving a useable sample of 1,237 students. A follow-up reminder email was sent on April 16<sup>th</sup>, with a final reminder sent on April 29<sup>th</sup>. Data collection ended on May 5<sup>th</sup>. No incentive was offered for completion of the survey. One-hundred-ninety-one students completed the survey, making for a resultant response rate of 15%.

The SJA 2008 findings should be read within the context of the very low response rate of 15%. This low response rate when compared to the much higher GSA 2008 response rate (39%) is curious given that it was virtually the same survey, the delivery method was the same, and they were delivered within two days of each other. It could be argued that the higher graduating senior response rate was driven by a greater sense of investment in or responsibility to EMU, but while that may indeed be true, that is not an optimal circumstance.

The low SJA 2008 response rate constitutes another reason why a joint report is being made rather than two separate reports. However, even though the low response rate limits the appropriateness of hypothesis testing, the data do have value in describing 15% of the sophomore-junior sample, and should not be entirely discounted. There is no way of knowing, of course, whether those who did not respond would have responded in the same fashion, but likewise, we cannot guarantee that they would not have. Given the less-than-desirable level of most of the measures that will be reported upon, plus the fact that the scores fairly well mirror those respondents gave to the graduating senior survey, which did have an acceptable response rate, it would perhaps be best to error on the side of caution and not discount the findings.

## ***GUIDE TO READING TABLES***

**Frequency of Use and Engagement Tables:** These variables were measured on a scale of one to five, with one indicating very little usage and five indicating very high usage. An option was also provided for the student who had never used a particular service or facility or had never engaged in a particular extra-curricular activity. The mean score, of course, has been calculated on the five-point scale, and should be read as the average usage or engagement of those who reported any usage or engagement. When reading tables in the body of the report, the “Higher Usage” column represents those who reported high usage (4) plus those who reported very high usage (5). When reading tables in the Appendices wherein the data are reported in fuller detail, the “Lower Usage” column represents those who reported very low usage (1) plus those who reported low usage (2), the “Moderate Usage” represents those who reported moderate usage (3), and the “Higher Usage” column represents those who reported high usage (4) plus those who reported very high usage (5). 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 one to five, which can be interpreted as follows: very low satisfaction (1); low satisfaction (2); moderate satisfaction (3); high satisfaction (4); very high satisfaction (5). As with the levels of usage or engagement measures, 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 (one to five), and indicative of only those who reported having used a particular service or facility. When reading tables in the body of the report, the “Higher Satisfaction” column represents

those who reported high satisfaction (4) plus those who reported very high satisfaction (5). When reading tables in the Appendices wherein the data are reported in fuller detail, the “Lower Satisfaction” column represents those who reported very low (1) plus those who reported low satisfaction (2), the “Moderate Satisfaction” column represents moderate satisfaction (3), and the “Higher Satisfaction” column represents those who reported high (4) plus those who reported very high (5) levels of satisfaction. The “N” column represents the number of respondents who chose to answer each particular question.

**Level of Agreement with Statement Tables:** These variables were measured on a five-point scale ranging from one to five, which can be interpreted as follows: very little agreement (1); little agreement (2); moderate agreement (3); high agreement (4); very high agreement (5). When interpreting the mean score, do so on a five-point scale. The “N” column represents the number of respondents who chose to respond to each particular statement. When reading tables in the body of the report, the “Higher Agreement” column represents those who reported high agreement (4) plus those who reported very high agreement (5). When reading tables in the Appendices wherein the data are reported in fuller detail, the “Lower Agreement” column represents those who reported very little (1) or little (2) agreement, the “Moderate Agreement” column represents those who reported moderate (3) agreement, and the “Higher Agreement” column represents those who reported high agreement (4) plus those who reported very high (5) levels of agreement.

## Well-Being as EMU Student

This report will lead with what is believed to be the most important information to convey: respondents' self-report of well-being, followed by opinions about the quality of education, management, and reputation of EMU. These measures had the strongest relationship to respondents' willingness to recommend EMU to others, which was operationalized as an overall measure of satisfaction with EMU. Measures of well-being have been arranged into three categories: quality of relationships; feelings of safety; and stressors that had a negative impact on academic performance.

### Well-Being: Quality of Relationships: Comparative Percentages of High or Very High Agreement with Statement

<i>Quality of Relationships</i>	<i>GSA 2007</i>	<i>GSA 2008</i>	<i>SJA 2008</i>
I had good relationships with fellow students.	85.9%	75.6%	74.2%
I had good relationships with faculty.	84.5%	73.8%	69.7%
I had positive interactions with the office staff in administrative and support services.	66.6%	49.4%	54.6%
I experienced a sense of belonging at EMU.	58.1%	51.2%	51.9%
Generally speaking, I felt that faculty really cared about my academic performance.	NA	60.7%	58.9%
Generally speaking, I felt that faculty really cared about my personal well-being.	NA	53.7%	48.6%
Generally speaking, I felt that the administration really cared about my academic performance.	NA	35.2%	35.8%
Generally speaking, I felt that the administration really cared about my personal well-being.	NA	30.6%	35.2%

Respondents had very good relationships with fellow students and with their faculty, with 75.6% of the respondents reporting either high or very high agreement with that statement that they did, and 73.8% reporting a similarly positive relationship with faculty. The quality of these relationships, however, did not result in an equally strong sense of belonging, as only 51.2% reported either high or very high agreement with this statement. It is further problematic that even respondents' fairly positive relationship with faculty weakens as it pertains to respondents feeling that faculty really cared about

their academic performance (60.7%), and weakens even more as it pertains to respondents' belief that faculty cared about their personal well-being (53.7%).

Respondents' relationship with those they define as the "administration" was not nearly as positive, with only 35.2% reporting high or very high agreement that the administration cared about their academic performance and an even lower percentage, 30.6%, reporting either high or very high agreement that the administration cared about their personal well-being. Only 49.4% reported high or very high agreement that interactions with office staff in administrative or support services had been positive.

It is important to note here that this measure does not address the "administration" with specificity. As noted in the GSA 2007 report, however, qualitative research conducted in preparation for that assessment revealed that the interviewees categorized within this label all staff other than faculty, those they believed to be responsible for conducting the business of the University, rather than providing the education. This label symbolized individuals ranging from key administrators such as the President, the Provost, Vice-Presidents, Deans, and Department Heads to staff in administrative student support offices.

**Well-Being: Feelings of Safety: Comparative Percentages of High or Very High Agreement with Statement**

<i>Feelings of Safety</i>	<b>GSA 2007</b>	<b>GSA 2008</b>	<b>SJA 2008</b>
I felt safe from physical assault.	54.1%	39.7%	29.5%
I felt safe from personal theft.	44.4%	33.7%	23.4%
I felt safe from relational aggression, such as bullying, taunting, or having my thoughts and opinions disrespected.	83.8%	65.3%	62.1%
I believe that changes in security measures have made the campus safer.	NA	40.0%	32.1%

Unfortunately, a smaller percentage of respondents reported agreement with the statement that they felt safe from physical assault than in 2007: 39.7% compared to 54.1% in 2007. The same was true for feeling safe from personal theft: 33.7% compared to 44.4% in 2007. It is also unfortunate that a smaller percentage of graduating seniors agreed that they felt safe from relational aggression than in 2007: 65.3% verses 83.8%, respectively.

The Annual Security Report (July 2008) filed by Chief Greg O'Dell documented the following improvements to security measures that occurred this past year: "The text messaging emergency alert system is now operational; Increased foot patrols by police officers of classroom buildings and residence halls; Hiring of three additional police officers and one dispatcher; Increased use of private security guards; Increased hours of our SEEUS program; Additional security cameras have been added to campus; Emergency response training with the City of Ypsilanti Police and Fire Departments on campus" (pg. 1; [http://www.emich.edu/publicsafety/current\\_yearly\\_crime\\_stats.pdf](http://www.emich.edu/publicsafety/current_yearly_crime_stats.pdf)).

Despite these significant improvements in security and policing, only 40% of the graduating seniors and 32.1% of the sophomore-junior sample believed that changes in security measures had made the campus safer. Of course, some part of this is based

upon objective reality in that, as evidenced by the crime report, incidence of some types of crime did indeed increase this past academic term, perhaps most notable being four incidents of aggravated assault on campus compared to none in 2006, and incidences of burglary increased in all locations, on campus, dorms/apartments/ and non-campus buildings ([http://www.emich.edu/publicsafety/current\\_yearly\\_crime\\_stats.pdf](http://www.emich.edu/publicsafety/current_yearly_crime_stats.pdf)). To be fair, it should also be noted that there was also a decrease in the incidence of an almost equal number of other types of crime. Aggravated assault and burglary are rather high profile crimes, however, and so, of course, are noticed.

It would be reasonable to assume that the increased concern for safety was influenced by the increased reporting of both on- and off-campus crimes, as required by the Clery Act, which requires timely-warnings be issued, as well as the text-message early-alert system. While the reporting requirements and early-alert procedures may have utility and benefit, they might also have generated an unintended consequence: increased fear of crime.

Of course, it also does not help matters to be required to report crimes that are committed off-campus. In this way, EMU has become a victim of circumstances beyond its control.

**Well-Being: Stressors Affecting Classroom Performance: Comparative Percentages of High or Very High Agreement**

<b><i>Stressors Affecting Classroom Performance</i></b>	<b>GSA 2007</b>	<b>GSA 2008</b>	<b>SJA 2008</b>
My level of stress at times negatively affected my classroom performance.	42.4%	40.0%	44.1%
My level of depression at times negatively affected my classroom performance.	21.1%	26.4%	30.8%
My level of anxiety at times negatively affected my classroom performance.	26.4%	29.2%	33.1%
My physical health at times negatively affected my classroom performance.	19.3%	25.4%	28.3%
My family responsibilities at times negatively affected my classroom performance.	NA	27.9%	25.5%
My work responsibilities at times negatively affected my classroom performance.	NA	31.6%	32.9%

Responses to measures of stressors that affected respondents' classroom performance are disconcerting. The fact that 40% of graduating senior respondents experienced a level of stress that negatively affected their classroom performance is worrisome, but not totally unexpected, especially given their family and work responsibilities. The rather high percentage of those reporting either high or very high agreement with the statement that their level of depression (26.4% GSA) and anxiety (29.2% GSA) were sufficiently high to negatively affect their classroom performance was even more worrisome. Three of the measures indicated a lower sense of well-being than when measured in 2007 (depression; anxiety; and physical health).

Based on the qualitative reports in response to the open-ended questions on last year's survey, two additional questions were added to assess the impact of family and work responsibilities on classroom performance. Regarding family responsibilities, 27.9% of the GSA respondents reported either high or very high agreement with the statement that family responsibilities negatively affected their classroom performance, and 31.6% reported the same about their work responsibilities.

Interestingly, when tested empirically, none of these measures had more than a weak statistical relationship to any of the other measures. Precisely, stress, anxiety, depression, and poor physical health did not appear to be related to their satisfaction with aspects of their academic program or administrative services. Much further investigation into these matters is warranted to ensure that EMU is doing all that is reasonably can to support our students.

<b>Quality of Education: Comparative Percentages High or Very High Agreement</b>
--

<i>Quality of Education</i>	<b>GSA 2007</b>	<b>GSA 2008</b>	<b>SJA 2008</b>
Courses within major were academically challenging.	NA	71.5%	72.7%
General education courses were academically challenging.	NA	42.3%	44.1%
I received a high quality education from EMU.	76.8%	61.9%	63.7%
Quality of education from EMU is comparable to other universities I could have attended.	71.9%	58.1%	55.4%
EMU prepared me well for my future career.	69.7%	57.2%	59.7%

Opinions regarding the quality of education were assessed. Based upon previous qualitative reports (GSA 2007) indicating a low level of satisfaction with academic rigor, two questions were added to quantify level of satisfaction. This proved to be a fruitful strategy because it made clear that respondents were much more satisfied with the academic rigor of courses within their major than with general education courses. The open-ended responses associated with this question revealed that the greatest complaint was the perception that general education courses were “taught down” to the lowest performer in the class. Respondents assumed that the large class size contributed to this circumstance, but also wondered whether instructors “dumbed down” the classes to reduce the number of complaints from students not interested in the topic. Regardless of the students’ attribution of cause, it is clear that they were not as satisfied with the academic rigor of their general education courses.

What is most striking about responses to the other three measures is that their level of satisfaction is lower than respondents reported in 2007, by more than 10 points.

<b>Quality of Management and Reputation of EMU: Comparative Percentages High or Very High Agreement</b>
---

<i><b>Quality of Management and Reputation of EMU</b></i>	<b>GSA 2007</b>	<b>GSA 2008</b>	<b>SJA 2008</b>
Employers will have a great deal of respect for my degree.	59.6%	57.9%	59.4%
Overall, I think that EMU is well managed.	38.7%	31.8%	39.0%
EMU is managed as well as most universities its size.	47.4%	33.5%	42.6%
EMU has a good reputation within the general public.	47.8%	26.4%	25.4%
I am proud to be associated with EMU.	64.0%	48.2%	49.4%
I would recommend EMU to others.	57.9%	48.8%	53.0%
If I had to do it over again, I would choose to attend EMU.	55.2%	50.0%	52.7%

Opinions regarding the quality of management and the reputation of EMU continue to be lower than desired, and are even lower than they were reported in 2007. Both of these facts are disheartening, but not surprising, given that just prior to data collection, the Vice President for Business and Finance had been placed on administrative leave, and during the data collection period, alleged reasons for dismissal, mismanagement of budgetary funds, were made public. The fact that this occurred virtually simultaneously as data collection, however, should not be used to discount the low level of these measures. Contextualizing responses to deduce an explanation is a different matter than excusing reaction to yet another incidence of administrative misconduct. Students' affective response to the alleged misconduct was real, and should be taken very seriously.

Most distressing, of course, is the fact that students' perception of EMU's reputation within the general public is more than 20 percentage points lower than the previous year: in 2008, only 26.4% of respondents had either a high or very high level of agreement with that statement compare with 47.8% in 2007.

<b>Satisfaction with Department or School: Comparative Percentages of Satisfaction</b>
--

<b><i>Satisfaction with Course Scheduling</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2007</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>SJA 2008</i></b>
Availability of required courses	60.8%	52.1%	41.7%
Availability of elective courses	61.5%	57.7%	53.2%
Amount of advance notice of future course offerings	NA	37.9%	32.2%
Number of evening courses offered	NA	49.6%	48.6%
Number of courses available on Tuesday/Thursday verses Monday/Wednesday/Friday	NA	52.3%	45.9%

By far, the course scheduling issue earning the lowest level of satisfaction pertains to the amount of advance notice of future course offerings: Only 37.9% of the graduating seniors reported any level of satisfaction. The qualitative portion of this assessment revealed that having short notice of course offerings prior to registration was particularly stressful for those students who were also balancing work and family responsibilities. The problem of short notice became particularly stressful toward the end of the students' academic program when, not only were fewer courses needed, resulting in fewer options, but it was further problematic that the remaining courses tended to be upper-level courses, of which generally there was only one section available. The qualitative reports suggest that this is also an important contributing factor in length of time to degree completion.

To put this concern further into context, approximately 20% of the GSA respondents reported also having caregiver responsibilities. Related to this circumstance, 27.9% of the GSA respondents reported either high or very high agreement with the statement that their family responsibilities had negatively affected their academic performance.

Regarding work-related scheduling issues, of the GSA respondents, only 32.5% reported working 20 hours per week or less. Most GSA respondents (58.9%) worked

more than 20 hours per week, and of those, 9.7% of the GSA respondents reported working more than 40 hours per week while a student at EMU. Regarding the impact of these work demands, 31.6% reported either high or very high agreement with the statement that their work-related responsibilities had negatively affected their academic performance.

As supported by the qualitative reports, advance notice of course offerings would allow students more time to arrange various aspects of their life more satisfactorily. The qualitative data inform us that students are particularly interested in advance notice of upper-level, required courses, more so than lower-level courses of which many sections are routinely offered.

As suggested, it would be helpful to majors and minors to have programs post on their webpage a tentative schedule of anticipated future course offerings at least one semester in advance of publication of the course catalog. Even if changes were necessary, it is believed that students would at least appreciate consideration of their need for long-term planning. This type of thoughtfulness would undoubtedly foster a greater sense of feeling cared about by the institution, a feeling that is currently rather low.

The next lowest level of satisfaction pertaining to course scheduling was with the number of evening courses available, with only 49.6% of the GSA respondents reporting either high or very high satisfaction. Given the comparative small number of evening courses offered, we could probably safely assume that students want more evening classes.

Satisfaction with the number of TR verses MWF courses was also low: 52.3%.

For the aggregate, what cannot be known definitively from these measures is the direction of the dissatisfaction, meaning whether they want more classes on TR or more classes on Monday, Wednesday, and Fridays. Even though this question was asked within a section addressing satisfaction with the department or school, given the non-specific nature of this question, we cannot know with a great deal of certainty whether students' dissatisfaction is with the balance of MWF verses TTR courses is within their major or with general education courses.

The qualitative data suggest that students might find two-day courses (either TR or MW) more advantageous than a three-day sequence (MWF). Students have also suggested exploring the idea of classes that meet for a five or six hour block of time on Fridays for a fewer number of weeks, or that are offered in three-hour blocks either Friday mornings or Friday afternoons for the entire term.

Several explanations of the benefits of these alternatives have been given. First, given the fact that 91.4% of the graduating senior respondents reported some level of participation in the paid labor force, having classes on only one or two days would lessen the complexity of combining work and school schedules. In addition, some students whose employers allow them to use flex-time to attend classes during the day prefer to have their employees flex their time on only two days rather than three. Second, attending classes on only two days rather than three would benefit those who have caregiver responsibilities. Third, students reported that transportation costs contribute significantly to the cost of their education. The fact that approximately 44% of the GSA respondents have a commute of at least 30 minutes, and of those, almost one-

quarter have a commute of at least 40 minutes, this consideration should be given some weight.

Regarding availability of required courses, only 52.1% of the GSA reported satisfaction, and scores for availability of elective courses were lower than desired, as well: 57.7%. It is important to note that these scores are lower than when measured on the GSA 2007. While it is important to keep in mind that a difference between only two points in time cannot be considered a true trend, the difference in scores should at least be noted.

<b><i>Satisfaction with Quality of Instruction</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2007</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>SJA 2008</i></b>
Quality of instruction within courses in your major	75.8%	68.0%	71.2%
Degree of difficulty of coursework	NA	63.6%	64.5%
Length of time to receive feedback from faculty on course work	72.6%	64.7%	61.9%
Quality of faculty feedback on course work	72.6%	63.8%	65.2%
Manner in which faculty are evaluated	51.8%	49.0%	53.7%

Even though once again the measures are lower than those reported in 2007, the percentages of those reporting either high or very high satisfaction are relatively high. The exception, of course, is with the manner in which faculty are evaluated. As in 2007, the issue with faculty evaluations is that students were dissatisfied with the fact that the evaluations do not result in outcomes that are apparent to them. As many stated, receiving poor student evaluations does not appear to remove the individual from the classroom or result in improved teaching methods.

<b><i>Satisfaction with Opportunities to Interact within Department/School</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2007</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>SJA 2008</i></b>
Number of opportunities to interact with faculty in the classroom	83.2%	73.1%	69.8%
Number of opportunities to interact with faculty outside the classroom	62.6%	62.9%	61.7%
Number of opportunities created by Department or School to interact with fellow students	NA	54.4%	47.9%
Extent mentored by faculty	NA	50.7%	45.7%
Your Department or School's website	NA	50.1%	56.4%

Clearly, faculty create strong relationships with students in the classroom, but students were not as satisfied with opportunities to interact with faculty outside the classroom. Students were much more dissatisfied with the extent to which they were mentored by faculty, with only half reporting being either highly or very highly satisfied. Students were similarly dissatisfied with the number of opportunities created by their Department/School to interact with fellow students (only 54.4% reported high or very high satisfaction). The greatest level of dissatisfaction was with Department/School websites, with only 50.1% reporting either high or very high satisfaction. According to the qualitative reports, students are most dissatisfied with the fact that many of the websites are not kept up-to-date, and therefore contain inaccurate information.

<b><i>Satisfaction with Quality of Relationships within Department or School</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2007</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>SJA 2008</i></b>
Your sense of belonging within your Department or School	NA	54.9%	54.1%
Level of respect felt from faculty	79.1%	75.9%	72.3%
Level of respect felt from front office staff	69.1%	62.9%	54.4%
General learning environment in the classroom	75.4%	72.2%	68.3%

Even though students generally feel respected by their faculty (75.9% reported high or very high satisfaction) and office staff (62.9% high or very high satisfaction), and are quite satisfied with the general learning environment in the classroom (72.2% high or very high satisfaction), these measures did not translate into a similarly high level of

satisfaction with their sense of belonging within their Department/School. Only 54.9% had either a high or very high level of agreement with that statement.

<b><i>Satisfaction with Advising within Department or School</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2007</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>SJA 2008</i></b>
Clarity of degree requirements	NA	61.6%	53.6%
Availability of faculty for academic advising	NA	61.0%	54.1%
Quality of academic advising from faculty	NA	62.7%	60.0%
Extent of career counseling from faculty	NA	44.9%	50.4%
Quality of career counseling from faculty	NA	48.7%	50.4%

What is most important to note about advising within the Department/School is that students are clearly not very satisfied with either the extent or the quality of career counseling from faculty: only 44.9% reported either high or very high satisfaction with the extent of career counseling received from faculty and, of those who did report receiving career counseling from faculty, only 48.7% reported either high or very high satisfaction. This percentage can be juxtaposed with the finding that only 34.8% of the students who received career counseling from the Career Services Office reported either high or very high satisfaction.

Faculty appear to be performing better when it comes to academic advising, with 62.7% reporting either high or very high satisfaction with the quality of academic advising from faculty. These percentages are much higher than for academic advising received from Pierce Hall advisors (29.1%) or from the College-level advising offices (44.1%).

**Satisfaction with General Education Courses: Comparative Percentages High or Very High Satisfaction**

<b><i>Satisfaction with General Education Courses</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2007</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>SJA 2008</i></b>
Availability of general education courses	81.8%	63.9%	63.4%
Quality of instruction within general education courses	61.4%	51.0%	59.8%
Degree of difficulty of General Education coursework	NA	44.7%	52.5%
Length of time to receive feedback on course work from faculty	66.7%	50.7%	61.8%
Quality of faculty feedback on course work	64.0%	49.2%	55.0%
Level of respect felt from faculty in general education courses	70.8%	59.7%	68.3%
General learning environment in the classroom	64.2%	52.0%	59.2%
Clarity of general education requirements	NA	56.9%	64.8%
Quality of advising regarding general education requirements	NA	47.1%	51.3%

On every measure, students' level of satisfaction with general education courses was lower, and in some cases, much lower, than with satisfaction with courses within the major. Of greatest concern is the differential in the level of respect felt from faculty: 75.9% felt either highly or very highly satisfied with the level of respect they received from faculty in courses related to their major but only 59.7% could say the same about general education courses. Differentials in the degree of difficulty of the coursework were also large (44.7% for general education courses verses 63.6%), as were differentials in satisfaction with quality of instruction (51% for general education courses verses 68% for courses within the major).

As noted in the GSA 2007, several factors contribute to these differences. First, it could be argued that students are, of course, going to be more satisfied with courses that have greater pertinence to their major. Second, students expressed feeling as though the general education courses were "dumbed down" to the "lowest common denominator, in part to control for the large class size, as well as students who were not

particularly interested in the course topics. Third, students reported that instructors of general education courses did not seem as interested in the topic as courses within their major.

**Satisfaction with Technology-Based Course Delivery: Comparative Percentages High or Very High Satisfaction**

<i>Satisfaction with Technology-Based Course Delivery</i>	<i>GSA 2007</i>	<i>GSA 2008</i>	<i>SJA 2008</i>
WebCT	68.4%	51.3%	66.7%
Web Caucus	60.8%	44.3%	54.2%
Electronic reserves	78.7%	67.6%	72.2%
Lectures presented via Power Point presentations	76.8%	67.0%	66.2%
Online course delivery	76.1%	62.9%	71.3%
my.emich course homepages	73.6%	64.3%	66.5%
Faculty's ability to operate classroom instructional equipment	NA	56.8%	56.0%

Once again, we see that, for those reporting usage of technology-based course delivery systems, levels of satisfaction were lower than when measured in 2007. The decline was particularly sharp for satisfaction with the web-caucus system. Based upon qualitative reports on the 2007 survey of dissatisfaction with faculty's ability to operate classroom instructional equipment, a question was added to quantify this experience. As the rather low level of satisfaction indicates (only 56.8% reported either high or very high satisfaction), the dissatisfaction with faculty performance in this area is fairly widespread. Of course, what is not known from this measure is where the fault lies: with the technology itself or with the faculty member's ability to comprehend its usage. Whatever the cause, this is clearly an area that should be targeted for improvement.

**Frequency of Use of Facilities and Services: Comparative Percentages of Those Reporting Having Never Used**

<i>Facilities</i>	<b>GSA 2007</b>	<b>GSA 2008</b>	<b>SJA 2008</b>
Halle Library	1.3%	2.6%	6.5%
Computer Labs	3.8%	4.6%	12.9%
REC-IM facilities	33.7%	29.8%	34.9%
EMU Student Center	19.2%	8.7%	5.4%
EMU's website	NA	0.3%	1.1%
Parking facility and lots	NA	5.0%	9.2%

The table above reports comparative data on respondents who never used a particular academic support facility or service. A very small percentage of GSA respondents report never having used the Halle Library (2.6%) or the computer labs (4.6%), although the 2008 percentages are higher than reported in 2007. Usage of the Student Center has increased since 2007 (only 8.7% having never used as opposed to 19.2% previously).

**Frequency of Use of Facilities: Comparative Percentages High or Very High Level of Usage**

<i>Facilities</i>	<b>GSA 2007</b>	<b>GSA 2008</b>	<b>SJA 2008</b>
Halle Library	60.9%	51.3%	44.3%
Computer Labs	67.3%	60.6%	55.6%
REC-IM facilities	26.9%	41.7%	43.8%
EMU Student Center	25.1%	44.1%	49.7%
EMU's website	NA	78.2%	77.2%
Parking facility and lots	NA	74.6%	68.4%

The table above provides data regarding the frequency of use by those who reported any level of usage of a particular facility. As evidence, EMU's website receives very heavy usage, with 78.2% reporting either high or very high usage, and of course, given the high percentage of commuters, the parking facilities received a similarly high level of usage (74.6%). Computer labs and the Halle Library received the next highest levels of usage (60.6% and 51.3%, respectively). Less than half reported using either

the EMU Student Center or the REC-IM facilities with either a high or very high frequency (44.1% and 41.7%, respectively).

**Frequency of Use of Academic Services: Comparative Percentages of Those Reporting Having Never Used**

<b>Academic Services</b>	<b>GSA 2007</b>	<b>GSA 2008</b>	<b>SJA 2008</b>
Holman Learning Center	82.5%	71.6%	75.8%
The Writing Center	80.3%	75.3%	77.8%
Academic advising from Department or School	12.7%	6.5%	15.1%
Academic advising from College advising office	27.6%	20.4%	29.7%
Academic advising from Pierce Hall advisors	40.9%	34.9%	40.0%

This year's GSA respondents reported a lower percentage than in 2007 of having never used either the Holman Learning Center or the Writing Center (71.6% and 75.3%, respectively), which means that a higher percentage of the 2008 graduates sought these services. The same can be said for advising services from the three locations listed.

**Frequency of Use of Academic Services: Comparative Percentages High or Very High Level of Usage**

<b>Academic Services</b>	<b>GSA 2007</b>	<b>GSA 2008</b>	<b>SJA 2008</b>
Holman Learning Center	5.0%	15.6%	22.2%
The Writing Center	2.8%	12.4%	9.8%
Academic advising from Department or School	31.4%	37.1%	36.8%
Academic advising from College advising office	18.8%	28.0%	22.6%
Academic advising from Pierce Hall advisors	7.6%	16.2%	7.2%

Of those who reported using academic services, there was a notably large increase in those reporting either high or very high level of usage of the Holman Learning Center and the Writing Center: For Holman, up from 5% in 2007 to 15.6% in 2008, and for the Writing Center, up from 2.8% in 2007 to 12.4% in 2008. There were also notable increases in usage of academic advising from the College advising offices and from Pierce Hall advisors.

### Frequency of Use of Administrative Services: Comparative Percentages of Those Reporting Having Never Used

<i>Administrative Services</i>	<i>GSA 2007</i>	<i>GSA 2008</i>	<i>SJA 2008</i>
Financial Aid Office	28.1%	27.4%	26.6%

About the same percentage of 2008 respondents as 2007 respondents reported never having used the Financial Aid Office.

### Frequency of Use of Administrative Services: Comparative Percentages High or Very High Level of Usage

<i>Administrative Services</i>	<i>GSA 2007</i>	<i>GSA 2008</i>	<i>SJA 2008</i>
Financial Aid Office	23.4%	35.2%	26.7%

Of those who did report usage of the Financial Aid Office, the frequency of those reporting either high or very high usage increased from 23.4% to 35.2% in 2008.

### Frequency of Use of Student Support Services: Comparative Percentages of Those Reporting Having Never Used

<i>Student Support Services</i>	<i>GSA 2007</i>	<i>GSA 2008</i>	<i>SJA 2008</i>
Career Services Office	59.5%	55.2%	76.2%
Food Services (Student Center food court, Eastern Eateries, etc)	NA	10.9%	6.5%
Snow Health Center for physical health care	57.6%	56.7%	69.7%
Snow Health Center for mental health counseling	86.1%	83.5%	82.8%
SEEUS	NA	57.6%	57.5%

The percentage of those who reported never having used the Career Services Office (55.2%) was higher than would be expected, given the high percentage of graduating seniors who report not having employment after graduation within their major. While the level of reported non-usage may be higher than desired, it is important to note that many students may have, indeed, benefited from events and services without awareness that they were supported by Career Services. For example,

students may have attended a career fair without realizing that it had been organized by Career Services.

Frequency of use of food services was not assessed in 2007, but for the 2008 respondents, only 10.9% reported having never used on-campus food services.

Regarding mental health services, 83.5% reported having never used the services of Snow Health Center. While this may seem to be a high level of non-usage, the opposite is that about 16% of these respondents did make use of mental health services.

Regarding physical health, 56.7% reported having never used Snow Health Center.

Usage of the SEEUS program was assessed for the first time this year: 57.6% reporting having never used these services. While this may seem a high level of non-usage, when looked at it the other way, 42.4% did report some level of usage.

#### **Frequency of Use of Student Support Services: Comparative Percentages High or Very High Level of Usage**

<b><i>Student Support Services</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2007</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>SJA 2008</i></b>
Career Services Office	8.1%	22.4%	11.3%
Food Services (Student Center food court, Eastern Eateries, etc)	NA	43.9%	50.6%
Snow Health Center for physical health care	7.8%	19.4%	16.1%
Snow Health Center for mental health counseling	2.7%	19.8%	15.7%
SEEUS	NA	24.1%	20.3%

Of those who did report usage of Career Services, a much larger percentage reported either a high or very high level of usage over 2007, 22.4% and 8.1%, respectively. There could be at least two explanations for this increase in reported usage: students who reported usage could have simply been more aware that the services these used were provided by the Career Services office (for example,

connecting up a career fair with Career Services office); or, there could have been a true increase in the amount of use. If it were the latter, the increase use of services could possibly be related to the dramatic improvement in the facility that houses Career Services. The current location, in McKenny Union, certainly instills much greater confidence in the services than the former location.

Among those who reported any usage of on-campus food services (almost 90%), 43.9% reported either a high or very high usage of those services.

Of those reporting usage of Snow Mental Health Services, 19.8% reported either high or very high usage, which is a significant increase from the 2.7% that reported high or very high usage in 2007. Of those reporting usage of Snow Health Center for physical health concerns, a similarly dramatic increase was evidenced: 19.4% reported either high or very high usage, compared to 7.8% in 2007.

Use of the SEEUS program was not assessed in 2007, but of the 42.4% that reported usage, 24.1% of the graduating seniors reported either high or very high usage of this security program.

**Satisfaction with Facilities and Services: Comparative Percentages of High or Very High Satisfaction**

<i>Facility</i>	<i>GSA 2007</i>	<i>GSA 2008</i>	<i>SJA 2008</i>
Halle Library services	87.3%	69.3%	70.0%
Halle Library holdings	83.6%	69.9%	65.4%
Computer services/technical support	70.0%	49.7%	60.8%
Computer availability	61.8%	54.7%	62.3%
REC-IM equipment	57.5%	52.7%	59.8%
REC-IM hours	53.6%	50.7%	51.7%
EMU Student Center	69.9%	69.9%	73.7%
Parking facility and lots	14.6%	23.8%	22.6%
Classroom buildings (physical appearance)	30.1%	25.3%	31.3%
Grounds (physical appearance)	63.0%	53.2%	50.0%
EMU's website	NA	69.5%	66.5%

With the exception of satisfaction with the parking facility/parking lots (which showed a 9.2 percentage point increase and the Student Center (satisfaction stayed the same), satisfaction with all other facilities was lower than when measured in 2007. Satisfaction with parking facilities/lots, however, remains quite low, with only 23.8% reporting any level of satisfaction. Satisfaction with the Student Center remains quite high, with almost 70% reporting either a high or very high level of satisfaction.

Some measures were much lower than others. Although levels of satisfaction with Halle Library services and holdings were still impressively high (69.3% and 69.9%, respectively), it is notable that the percentages dropped by a considerable amount (18 and 13.7%, respectively). Levels of satisfaction with computer services/technical support dropped even more so, by 20.3 percentage point, with satisfaction with computer availability dropping by 7.1 percentage points. Currently, satisfaction with these two measures is around 50%. Similar levels of mid-range satisfaction were reported for REC-IM equipment and REC-IM hours of service.

Satisfaction with the physical appearance of the classroom buildings and the grounds remained lower than desired, too, with satisfaction with the buildings much lower than with the grounds (25.3% and 53.2%, respectively).

Satisfaction with EMU's main website was fairly high, with almost 70% reporting either high or very high satisfaction. It is important to note, however, that satisfaction with Department/School websites was much lower, only 50.1%. It is further important to note that level of satisfaction with Department/School website varied greatly by individual Department/School.

### **Satisfaction with Academic Services: Comparative Percentages of High or Very High Satisfaction**

<b><i>Academic Service</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2007</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>SJA 2008</i></b>
Academic advising from faculty within your Department or School		58.2%	56.0%
Academic advising from College advising office	58.9%	44.1%	50.4%
Academic advising from Pierce Hall advisors	25.3%	29.1%	27.6%
Academic support through Holman Learning Center	39.8%	42.3%	46.4%
Academic support through Writing Center	38.8%	38.7%	56.7%

Across the board, levels of satisfaction with academic advising were much lower than desired, with advising from faculty earning the highest level of satisfaction (58.2%), followed by advising from the College advising offices (44.1%), with the lowest satisfaction reported for advising from Pierce Hall advisors (29.1%). The ordering of this ranking could possibly be influenced by the fact that many years would have passed since the respondents had received their initial advising from Pierce; in addition, we could reasonably expect that the first few contacts with an advising office might not be remembered fondly, given the confusion and uncertainty surrounding a student's

initial foray into university life. It is also important to note that students might feel more satisfied with advising from faculty as they have more frequent and closer contact with their faculty than advisors in administrative offices, with whom they have very infrequent contact, and no relationship outside of advising.

This is not to say that the problems with advising are only relational. Indeed, given the complexities stemming from a large number of programs with diverse requirements and with the recently implemented General Education requirements, undoubtedly, mistakes are made, some potentially quite costly. It is important to note here, however, that, since the time of the 2007 assessment, the Advising Center has undertaken significant improvements in the advising system. Most importantly, a “note-keeping” system has been implemented that allows academic advisors to document advising sessions. This system should prove to significantly improve satisfaction with advising as it will allow for a study of advising errors and illuminate areas in need of clarification.

A final point regarding dissatisfaction with advising is that sometimes errors have occurred in the student’s program of study as a consequence of students attempting to manage their program without formal advising, as we know anecdotally many students do. Understanding the extent to which students forego formal advising and the reasons for that would be a worthy area of investigation.

Satisfaction with academic support provided through the Holman Learning Center improved over that reported in 2007: 42.3% and 39.8%, respectively. Satisfaction with academic support provided by The Writing Center remained virtually the same, 38.7% and 38.8%, respectively. Each of these remains lower than desired.

It is recommended that a study be undertaken to understand how satisfaction with these academic support services could be improved.

### **Satisfaction with Administrative Services: Comparative Percentages of High or Very High Satisfaction**

<b><i>Administrative Service</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2007</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>SJA 2008</i></b>
Graduation audit processing time	54.6%	43.6%	NA
Clarity of graduation audit results	54.6%	52.3%	NA
Financial Aid Office services	49.3%	40.4%	48.6%
EMU's brand marketing campaign: "Education First" and "Eagle Nation"	NA	35.1%	41.8%
SEEUS	NA	55.1%	65.1%
Registration process	NA	56.8%	60.5%

Satisfaction with the graduation audit processing time and clarity of graduation audit results remains lowered than desired (43.6% and 52.3%, respectively).

Satisfaction with audit processing time dropped by 11 points over 2007. It is reasonable to assume that some of the dissatisfaction with the graduation audit process is a consequence of problems related to faulty advising.

Satisfaction with the Financial Aid Office services dropped by a large percentage, too (8.9 percentage points), down to only 40.4% reporting any level of satisfaction.

Three administrative services were assessed for the first time. EMU's brand marketing campaign, "Education First" and "Eagle Nation" had a much lower than desired level of satisfaction, only 35.1%. Of the 42.4% of respondents reporting using the SEEUS program, satisfaction with the program was only 55.1%. The most common dissatisfaction with the SEEUS program was the limited number or hours the service was available. Satisfaction with the registration process was only 56.8%, with the most common complaint being insufficient notification of future course offerings.

### **Satisfaction with Student Support Services: Comparative Percentages High or Very High Satisfaction**

<b><i>Satisfaction with Student Support Services</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2007</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>SJA 2008</i></b>
Career information provided through the Career Services Office	41.6%	41.1%	47.8%
Career advising provided through Career Services Office	32.4%	34.8%	46.9%
Quality of physical health services through Snow Health Center	55.8%	48.6%	54.3%
Length of wait to be seen for physical health services	NA	61.2%	62.5%
Quality of mental health counseling through Snow Health Center	35.6%	60.7%	51.6%
Length of wait to be seen for mental health counseling services	NA	65.8%	53.2%
Variety of food available through on-campus food services	NA	42.5%	39.7%
Nutritional value of food available through on-campus food services	NA	23.0%	24.1%

Satisfaction with career information and career advising provided through Career Services Office were virtually the same as last year: 41.1% reported either high or very high satisfaction with career information and 34.8% reported either high or very high satisfaction with career advising. As noted in a previous section, however, it is not surprising that these percentages are not higher, given students desire to receive career advising from their faculty.

What is most notable in the table above is the large increase in satisfaction with the quality of mental health counseling services provided through Snow Health Center: up to 60.7% in 2008 from 35.6% in 2007. Although satisfaction with the length of wait to be seen for mental health counseling services was not assessed in 2007, in 2008, 65.8% of the respondents who reported any use of these services reported being either highly or very highly satisfied.

Length of wait to be seen for physical health care was similarly high (61.2% either highly or very highly satisfied). Satisfaction with quality of physical health services was down a bit from 2007: 48.6% and 55.8%, respectively.

For the first time, satisfaction with on-campus food services was evaluated. Regarding the variety of food choices, 42.5% reported either high or very high satisfaction. Satisfaction with the nutritional value of food offerings was much lower, however, with only 23% reporting either high or very high satisfaction.

## Frequency of Engagement in Extracurricular Activities

### Frequency of Engagement in Extracurricular Activities: No Engagement

<i>Frequency of Engagement in Co-Curricular Activities</i>	<i>GSA 2007</i>	<i>GSA 2008</i>	<i>SJA 2008</i>
Activities sponsored by student organizations	44.7%	40.9%	42.5%
Activities sponsored by Student government	66.6%	66.0%	69.4%
Activities sponsored by your Department or School	36.2%	38.1%	49.5%
Varsity athletic competitions	54.4%	56.8%	57.5%
Intramural sports	78.7%	75.6%	78.4%
Classroom service learning projects	57.6%	52.8%	63.6%
Volunteer work through a campus organizations	62.9%	65.5%	68.3%
Volunteer work through off-campus organizations	61.0%	65.3%	67.8%
On-campus artistic performances	63.7%	53.8%	52.2%
Fraternity or sorority membership	84.7%	85.6%	86.9%

The table above lists percentage of those respondents reporting no level of engagement with the particular extracurricular activity. Levels of non-engagement remained fairly stable between 2007 and 2008, except for a slight increase in the level of non-engagement with on-campus artistic performances (up 10%). Activities sponsored by respondents' Department or School and by student organizations drew the lowest levels of non-participation: only 38.1% and 40.9%, respectively, reported having never participated in these activities.

Fraternity or sorority membership drew the highest level of non-participation, which is not surprising given the exclusionary nature of these organizations. As illustrated in the table below, however, of those who did report membership, 58.1% reported to be either highly or very highly engaged. This was the highest level of engagement reported for any category.

### Frequency of Engagement in Extracurricular Activities: Comparative Percentages High or Very High Engagement

<i>Frequency of Engagement in Co-Curricular Activities</i>	<i>GSA 2007</i>	<i>GSA 2008</i>	<i>SJA 2008</i>
Activities sponsored by student organizations	18.6%	37.0%	43.0%
Activities sponsored by Student government	4.4%	19.2%	31.5%
Activities sponsored by your Department or School	21.8%	38.3%	38.7%
Varsity athletic competitions	12.2%	31.8%	38.0%
Intramural sports	8.9%	40.9%	47.5%
Classroom service learning projects	10.2%	32.4%	47.8%
Volunteer work through a campus organizations	16.2%	45.6%	44.9%
Volunteer work through off-campus organizations	15.7%	45.8%	50.8%
On-campus artistic performances	11.1%	34.7%	43.8%
Fraternity or sorority membership	10.5%	58.1%	54.2%

Across the board, for those who reported any level of engagement, the level of engagement increased dramatically between 2007 and 2008. Aside for the increase in participation in Greek activities, as noted above, the greatest increases in engagement were as follows: volunteer work through a campus organization (29.4% increase in either high or very high engagement); volunteer work through off-campus organization (30.1% increase in either high or very high engagement); and intramural sports (30.1% increase in high or very high engagement).

## Sample Characteristics

Sample characteristics provide contextual grounding for the more substantive assessment of usage, satisfaction, well-being, and perception of EMU's reputation and quality of education. A description of the respondents' demographic characteristics opens this section, followed by descriptive information about respondents' family and living arrangements, financing of their education, their academic history, and, in the case of the graduating seniors, after-graduation plans for employment and geographic location.

### Gender: Comparative Percentages

<i>Gender</i>	<i>GSA 2007</i>	<i>GSA 2008</i>	<i>SJA 2008</i>
Female	66.1%	67.5%	74.0%
Male	33.9%	32.0%	26.0%
Trans-gendered	NA	0.5%	0.0%

Gender composition of Graduating Senior survey respondents fairly well reflects the population of those who applied for Winter 2008 graduation (62% female and 38% male), as did the GSA 2007 assessment. Although not shown in table form, the average age of GSA 2008 was 27.6 years, ranging between 19 and 65 years.

### Student Residency Status: Comparative Percentages

<i>Student Residency Status</i>	<i>GSA 2007</i>	<i>GSA 2008</i>	<i>SJA 2008</i>
US resident	99.0%	98.1%	96.7%
International student	1.0%	1.9%	3.3%

There was almost a full point increase from 2007 in the percentage of GSA 2008 respondents who reported to be international students.

### Racial/Ethnic Heritage: Comparative Percentages

<i><b>Ethnic/Racial Heritage</b></i>	<i><b>GSA 2007</b></i>	<i><b>2008 GSA</b></i>	<i><b>SJA 2008</b></i>
Asian-American or Asian	2.6%	2.8%	1.8%
African-American, Black-American, Black	11.5%	8.2%	14.2%
Hispanic or Latino	1.6%	1.1%	1.2%
Mexican-American or Chicano	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%
Middle-Eastern or Arab Ancestry	1.0%	0.9%	1.8%
Native American, American Indian, Alaskan Native	0.2%	0.2%	0.6%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	NA	0.2%	0.0%
White or Caucasian	82.8%	86.5%	80.5%

As illustrated in the table above, there continues to be an over-representation of students who report “white or Caucasian” as their racial/ethnic heritage and an equally large under-representation of minorities: of those who reported their ethnic/racial heritage, 75.6% percent of those who applied for graduation identified as white, compared to 86.5% of the survey respondents, whereas 13% of those who applied for graduation identified as African-American, compared to only 8.2% of the survey respondents.

### Father’s Level of Education: Comparative Percentages

<i><b>Highest Level of Father's Education</b></i>	<i><b>GSA 2007</b></i>	<i><b>GSA 2008</b></i>	<i><b>SJA 2008</b></i>
Not high school graduate	6.1%	6.3%	3.9%
High school graduate or GED	26.6%	28.5%	34.1%
Vocational or technical school	6.6%	8.2%	9.5%
Some college	18.5%	19.7%	16.2%
College graduate	20.4%	21.8%	19.6%
Some graduate or professional school	2.2%	1.5%	2.2%
Graduate or professional degree	17.3%	12.5%	12.8%
Do not know/not applicable	2.4%	1.4%	1.7%

### Mother's Level of Education: Comparative Percentages

<i>Highest Level of Mother's Education</i>	<b>GSA 2007</b>	<b>GSA 2008</b>	<b>SJA 2008</b>
Not high school graduate	3.7%	3.8%	2.2%
High school graduate or GED	33.3%	31.4%	31.8%
Vocational or technical school	3.7%	7.4%	3.4%
Some college	23.4%	24.9%	27.4%
College graduate	19.3%	18.4%	20.7%
Some graduate or professional school	2.2%	2.4%	2.2%
Graduate or professional degree	13.3%	11.3%	11.2%
Do not know/not applicable	1.2%	0.5%	1.1%

As illustrated in the tables below, for graduating seniors, parents' level of education in the 2008 wave was fairly consistent with that reported in 2007.

### Residence Location: Comparative Percentages of More Than 50% Time as Residence Location While EMU Student

<i>Residence Location</i>	<b>GSA 2007</b>	<b>GSA 2008</b>	<b>SJA 2008</b>
Residence Halls	14.1%	10.3%	27.9%
Off-campus, walking distance	18.5%	14.0%	10.4%
Off-campus, commuter	66.5%	59.6%	64.5%

The data in the table above once again support the notion that EMU students are commuters rather than campus residents. When asked to report percentage of time lived in residence halls, living off-campus but within walking distance, or living as an off-campus commuter, 59.6% of the GSA 2008 respondents reported that they had spent more than 50% of that time as an off-campus commuter.

### Length of Commute: Comparative Percentages

<i>Length of Commute</i>	<b>GSA 2007</b>	<b>GSA 2008</b>	<b>SJA 2008</b>
Less than 10 minutes	14.2%	13.9%	17.4%
10-20 minutes	23.5%	20.7%	29.7%
21-30 minutes	24.7%	22.3%	18.8%
31-40 minutes	18.3%	18.4%	11.6%
41-50 minutes	11.1%	14.5%	16.7%
51-60 minutes	5.4%	6.6%	5.1%
More than 60 minutes	2.7%	3.5%	0.7%

For the non-resident students, the commute was generally time-consuming, with only 13.9% of the GSA 2008 respondents having a commute of less than 10 minutes. Forty three percent of the GSA 08 respondents commuted between 10 and 30 minutes, and an additional 43% commuted more than 30 minutes. These findings put into context the high levels of dissatisfaction with parking that was discussed in an earlier section. Parking is important to EMU students because the lack of available parking that is in close proximity to classroom buildings seriously disadvantages students who may have been traveling much longer than the average resident- or within-walking-distance student would have spent walking or biking to class.

#### **Length of Time Living with Parents While EMU Student: Comparative Percentages**

<b><i>Length of Time Living with Parent/s</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2007</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>SJA 2008</i></b>
None of the time	54.2%	52.2%	58.5%
Some of the time	23.4%	24.0%	14.0%
Most of the time	9.6%	9.0%	4.3%
All of the time	12.7%	14.9%	23.2%

A little more than half (52.2%) of the GSA 2008 respondents reported never having lived with their parents while a student at EMU, which is a somewhat smaller percentage than reported in 2007. The same approximate 2% difference appears in the difference between those who reported living with their parents for the entire time (12.7% in 2007 verses 14.9% in 2008).

#### **Marital Status: Comparative Percentages**

<b><i>Marital Status</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2007</i></b>	<b><i>2008 GSA</i></b>	<b><i>SJA 2008</i></b>
Single, never married	64%	67.3%	77.9%
Married	24.8%	20.6%	12.7%
Living together with partner	7.4%	9.7%	7.2%
Divorced/separated	2.9%	2.4%	2.2%
Widowed	NA	0.0%	0.0%

### Childcare Responsibilities While EMU Student: Comparative Percentages

<i>Childcare Responsibilities</i>	<b>GSA 2007</b>	<b>GSA 2008</b>	<b>SJA 2008</b>
Yes	18.0%	17.3%	13.1%
Sometimes	1.3%	1.0%	0.5%
No	80.6%	81.7%	86.3%

### Adult Caregiver Responsibilities While EMU Student: Comparative Percentages

<i>Adult Caregiver Responsibilities</i>	<b>GSA 2007</b>	<b>2008 GSA</b>	<b>SJA 2008</b>
Yes	5.4%	4.3%	3.3%
Sometimes	5.1%	5.0%	8.8%
No	89.5%	90.7%	87.9%

Most 2008 GSA respondents had never been married (67.3%). As for caregiver responsibilities, 17.3% reported having childcare responsibilities while a student at EMU and 4.3% reported having responsibility for the care of a dependent adult. As already noted in the section regarding well-being, caregiver responsibilities are important to note as they have a significant impact of students' academic performance.

### Contributions to Financing Education: Comparative Percentages of High or Very High Contribution

<i>Contributions to Financing Education</i>	<b>GSA 2007</b>	<b>GSA 2008</b>	<b>SJA 2008</b>
Parents	41.1%	39.5%	38.8%
Spouse/Partner/Significant Other	10.3%	8.4%	7.8%
Other family members	5.2%	6.5%	9.4%
Friends	0.4%	1.4%	1.6%
Employment	38.8%	34.1%	26.1%
Personal savings	26.5%	27.5%	23.5%
Scholarships/grants	31.6%	37.1%	37.2%
Work study	6.4%	4.8%	6.3%
Student loans	58.1%	57.3%	50.8%
Other sources	13.7%	9.5%	3.1%

By far, the most important source of financing the respondents' education was student loans (57.3% reported this source as either high or very highly important). The next most important sources of funding were parents (39.5% reported high or very high

importance), scholarships/grants (37.1% reported high or very high importance), followed by employment (34.1% reported high or very high importance).

### **Student Loan Debt: Comparative Percentages**

<i><b>Student Loan Debt</b></i>	<i><b>GSA 2007</b></i>	<i><b>GSA 2008</b></i>	<i><b>SJA 2008</b></i>
None	12.4%	11.7%	20.1%
Less than \$5,000	2.7%	4.9%	9.4%
\$5,000-10,000	12.6%	8.5%	18.8%
\$10,001-15,000	10.2%	11.5%	17.4%
\$15,001-20,000	15.3%	11.0%	12.1%
\$20,001-25,000	10.0%	8.8%	8.1%
\$25,001-30,000	9.5%	10.1%	4.7%
\$30,001-35,000	7.1%	9.2%	4.7%
\$35,001-40,000	6.4%	4.7%	2.0%
\$40,001-45,000	5.5%	6.1%	2.0%
More than \$45,000	8.4%	13.5%	0.7%

Not surprisingly, only 11.7% of the GSA respondents reported no student loan debt. Of greatest concern is the fact that 19.6% of the GSA respondents have more than \$40,000 in student loan debt. It should be noted that the response rate to this question was only 74%, which is much lower than the response rate to other questions. Students could have felt this information to be too personal, but the qualitative data suggest other reasons for non-response. For example, some students did not know the amount of their debt because they choose to ignore their student loan statements rather than face the reality of the amount owed.

### Credit Card Debt: Comparative Percentages

<i>Credit Card Debt</i>	<i>GSA 2007</i>	<i>GSA 2008</i>	<i>SJA 2008</i>
None	40.5%	34.8%	54.4%
Less than \$1,000	13.5%	14.3%	19.2%
\$1,000-2,000	10.5%	10.2%	6.4%
\$2,001-3,000	8.6%	9.3%	8.0%
\$3,001-4,000	5.6%	6.0%	3.2%
\$4,001-5,000	5.1%	6.9%	0.8%
\$5,001-6,000	2.8%	2.9%	2.4%
\$6,001-7,000	2.3%	2.4%	0.0%
\$7,001-8,000	1.2%	1.9%	2.4%
\$8,001-9,000	2.1%	1.7%	0.0%
\$9,001-10,000	2.6%	3.6%	0.0%
More than \$10,000	5.3%	6.2%	3.2%

Respondents were also asked to report credit card debt they believed was associated with completion of their degree. The level of debt is arrayed in the table above, but again, it should be noted that the response rate to this question was fairly low, too, approximately 70%. A full 25.6% reported more than \$5,000 of credit card debt, with 6.2% reporting debt of more than \$10,000. Based on the qualitative reports, the 34.8% of students reporting no credit card debt should be interpreted with caution and should not necessarily be read as a signifier of financial health: for some respondents, their credit score would not permit them a credit card.

### Hours Employed While EMU Student: Comparative Percentages

<i>Hours Employed While Student</i>	<i>GSA 2007</i>	<i>GSA 2008</i>	<i>SJA 2008</i>
None	8.9%	8.5%	18.3%
Less than 10 hours	7.6%	7.8%	8.3%
10-20 hours	23.3%	24.7%	31.1%
21-30 hours	29.8%	25.9%	19.4%
31-40 hours	20.2%	23.3%	17.2%
More than 40 hours	10.1%	9.7%	5.6%

Only 8.5% of the GSA respondents reported having not been employed while a student at EMU. Of the GSA respondents, 32.5% reported working 20 hours per week or less. Most GSA respondents (58.9%) worked more than 20 hours per week. Of those, 9.7% of the GSA respondents reported working more than 40 hours per week while a student at EMU.

When disaggregating the GSA 2008 data to examine hours employed by pace of attendance, we see that, as would be expected, the group most likely to have been employed more than 20 hours per week was those who reported having attended on a mostly part-time basis, followed by those who reported mixed-pace attendance. The qualitative data provided two explanations for this: the student was either taking classes as they could afford to, or the student could not otherwise afford to have less than full-time employment. Most noteworthy is the fact that almost 51.6% of those who reported attending mostly full-time reported working more than 20 hours while doing so.

#### **Whether Employment While Student Related to Field of Study**

<b><i>Employment Related to Field of Study</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2007</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>SJA 2008</i></b>
Yes, all of the time	27.4%	12.4%	29.3%
Yes, most of the time	0%	26.2%	0%
No, none of the time	72.6%	61.5%	70.7%

Almost 62% of the GSA respondents reported that their employment while a student had not been related to their field of study. The remainder reported that their employment had been related to their field of study (12.4%) or had been related most of the time (26.2%). Further study is needed to explore the manner in which this circumstance may be merely a reflection of employment opportunities (such as a lack of available of part-time or flexible employment within professions related to field of study),

the result of students' choice, or whether EMU could do more to place our students into their chosen career path as they approach graduation.

### **Military Participation: Comparative Percentages**

<b><i>Member of U.S. Military</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2007</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>SJA 2008</i></b>
Yes, currently serving	NA	2.1%	1.1%
Yes, but no longer active duty	NA	NA	1.7%
No	NA	97.9%	97.2%

Members of the US military, a small but important population, were identified for the first time within this assessment. Twelve of the GSA respondents (2.1%) reported having been a member of the US military while a student at EMU. Given their comparatively small sample size vis-à-vis the aggregate, their experience was compared against that of a sub-sample of non-military respondents (randomly selected from those who matched demographically). In general, the respondents with military experience reported higher levels of satisfaction and well-being, with two exceptions: those with military experience reported a lower sense of belonging at EMU and a lower quality of relationships with fellow students.

When tested against the non-military sub-sample (using ANOVA difference of means test), however, the differences approached, but did not achieve, standard acceptable levels of significance (.05 or lower). These findings mean that more was involved in causing the difference in mean scores than military service. It does not follow, however, that failing to achieve statistical significance means that the differences in mean scores are not important substantively; those in position to offer support services to students with military service should be made aware of these findings and

further study should be undertaken (if not already in progress) to explore the needs of our students who are also or who have been members of the US military.

### **Anticipated Grade Point Average: Comparative Percentages**

<b><i>Anticipated Grade Point Average</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2007</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>SJA 2008</i></b>
Below 2.0	NA	NA	1.6%
2.0-2.4	1.3%	1.2%	10.9%
2.5-2.9	17.1%	17.5%	22.4%
3.0-3.4	33.1%	35.8%	29.5%
3.5-4.0	48.5%	45.5%	35.5%

The GPA of the population of students who applied for Winter 2008 graduation was 3.26. Eighty-one percent of the GSA respondents reported an anticipated GPA of at least 3.0, which was higher than the percentage of SJA respondents who anticipated a GPA of at least 3.0 (65%). This large difference suggests that GPA may be one factor involved in failure to complete the degree.

### **Pace of Attendance: Comparative Percentages**

<b><i>Pace of Attendance</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2007</i></b>	<b><i>GSA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>SJA 2008</i></b>
Attending mostly part-time	9.6%	10.6%	9.7%
Attending mostly full-time	76.0%	76.0%	77.3%
Combination of both	14.4%	13.4%	13.0%

More than three-quarters of the GSA 2008 respondents attended mostly full-time. Unfortunately, general surveys cannot explain pace of attendance, nor can they even adequately describe the pace of attendance. Given the importance of pace of attendance as a retention issue, further study is warranted. Three factors did emerge from the qualitative data that could influence full- or part-time attendance: whether courses were available; whether the student could afford tuition; and whether the

student with a low GPA “stopped out” from EMU to attempt to raise their GPA at a community college.

### Years Actively Pursuing EMU Degree

<i>Years Actively Pursuing Degree</i>	<i>GSA 2007</i>	<i>GSA 2008</i>	<i>SJA 2008</i>
1-2 years	2.3%	2.0%	29.1%
3-4 years	28.0%	25.1%	56.4%
5-6 years	43.9%	43.9%	7.9%
7-8 years	14.9%	16.6%	3.4%
More than 8 years	10.8%	12.4%	3.4%

Only 25.1% of the GSA respondents reported having earned their degree with a four-year period. Despite the fact that 76% of these respondents reported having attended EMU mostly full-time, 43.9% needed at least five to six years to complete their degree, and 28% needed more than seven years. Length of time pursuing their degree is certainly a retention issue that deserves further study.

### Transfer Credit: Comparative Percentages

<i>Transfer Credit</i>	<i>GSA 2007</i>	<i>GSA 2008</i>	<i>SJA 2008</i>
No transfer credit	45.2%	45.3%	49.7%
Transfer credit from 4-year university	14.5%	14.2%	10.8%
Transfer credit from community college	31.5%	31.8%	34.6%
Transfer credit from both	8.8%	8.7%	4.9%

Approximately half of the GSA 2008 respondents did not have any transfer credit. Of those who did report transfer credit, approximately one-third had earned credits from a community college rather than a four-year institution.

### Honors College Student Participation: Comparative Percentages

<i>Honors College Student</i>	<i>GSA 2007</i>	<i>GSA 2008</i>	<i>SJA 2008</i>
Yes	NA	14.6%	12.4%
No	NA	85.4%	87.6%

In recognition of the fact that the satisfaction of students with high grade point averages is also a retention concern, a survey question was included to identify students within the Honors College. Of the GSA respondents, 14.6% were Honors students, which was an over-representation of the 5% of those who applied for Winter 2008 graduation.

### Choosing EMU: Comparative Percentages

<i>Choosing EMU</i>	<i>GSA 2007</i>	<i>GSA 2008</i>	<i>SJA 2008</i>
EMU was first choice	58.1%	61.1%	49.7%
No, not accepted elsewhere	7.2%	6.7%	7.9%
No, could not afford first choice school	20.6%	13.1%	18.8%
No, needed stay in geographic region	18.6%	17.5%	27.7%

EMU was reportedly the first choice for only 61.1% of the GSA respondents. In both cases, the most common explanation for choosing EMU even though it was not their first choice school was that they needed to stay within the geographic region (17.5%). It appears that EMU has a niche market, if you will, being those with geographic constraints. Further study of this population is warranted to ascertain why, given the other schools within the geographic region, EMU was their first choice. Was it the reputation of EMU as a good school or were other schools simply not available to them, either because of a low GPA that disqualified them or because of financial constraints, etc.?

### Plans for Employment after Graduation: Comparative Percentages

<i>Plans for Employment After Graduation</i>	<b>GSA 2007</b>	<b>GSA 2008</b>	<b>SJA 2008</b>
Already have job closely related to major	31.1%	29.0%	NA
Already have job but not closely related to major	17.1%	16.8%	NA
Not employed but will be looking for employment	44.9%	48.4%	NA
Not employed but will not be looking for employment	6.9%	5.8%	NA

As was the case for the GSA 2007 respondents, a very low percentage of the graduating seniors had secured employment related to their field of study: only 29%. Of the remainder, 48.4% did not consider themselves to be employed but would be seeking employment. As noted in the GSA 2007 report, these percentages, coupled with the very low level of reported usage of Career Services, are unexplainable with the data collected on general surveys such as this. The problem simply must be given more in-depth, focused study.

### Plans for Further Formal Study after Graduation: Comparative Percentages

<i>Plans for Further Formal Study After Graduation</i>	<b>GSA 2007</b>	<b>GSA 2008</b>	<b>SJA 2008</b>
No further study intended	10.0%	7.7%	13.1%
Pursue second Bachelor degree	8.3%	9.8%	6.3%
Pursue certificate or professional license	10.6%	9.7%	10.5%
Pursue Master's degree (MA, MS, MBA)	78.8%	77.9%	73.8%
Pursue law degree	7.8%	3.5%	2.6%
Pursue medical degree (MD, OD, DDS, etc.)	2.0%	1.5%	3.1%
Pursue doctorate (Ph.D., Ed.D., etc.)	17.3%	15.3%	17.3%

Responses to the question of whether further study after completion of their Bachelor's degree was planned echoed the GSA 2007. The most noteworthy statistic, in terms of EMU's offerings, is that more than 70% (77.9% of GSA respondents and 73.8% of SJA respondents) reported intent to pursue a Master's degree of some sort.

### Plans for Geographic Location after Graduation: Comparative Percentages of High or Very High Likelihood

<i>Plans for Geographic Location</i>	<i>GSA 2007</i>	<i>GSA 2008</i>	<i>SJA 2008</i>
Southeast Michigan	67.8%	61.9%	49.7%
Michigan, but outside of Southeast Michigan	18.9%	21.8%	27.3%
Another state within the United States	39.7%	44.4%	56.9%
Country other than the United States	4.8%	10.4%	10.5%

It also bodes well for EMU's graduate programs that such high percentages reported either a high or very high likelihood that they would stay within Southeast Michigan after graduation: 61.9% of GSA respondents. Furthermore, the high percentages of high or very high likelihood of staying within Michigan, generally, 83.7%, provides strong evidence that EMU graduates stay and contribute to the Michigan economy.

### IDENTIFYING RELATIONSHIPS

Statistical analyses relevant to the level of measurement were conducted to examine the relationship between willingness to recommend EMU to others, which was conceptualized as a measure of overall satisfaction, and the measures of satisfaction, well-being, and opinions about the quality of education, the quality of management, and EMU's reputation within the general public. Examinations began with correlation analyses, which revealed the following measures to have the strongest relationships to willingness to recommend EMU, listed in descending order. The values given represent the strength of the relationship, on a continuum of increasing strength, with the values of .4-.6 representing moderate strength and values of .7 or higher representing a strong relationship to willingness to recommend EMU to others.

- “I am proud to be associated with EMU.” (.859)
- “If I had it to do over again, I would choose to attend EMU.” (.834)
- “I believe that the quality of education I received from EMU is comparable to that from other universities that I could have attended.” (.689)
- “Overall, I think that EMU is well managed.” (.689)
- “I think that EMU is managed as well as most universities its size.” (.687)
- “I received a high quality education from EMU.” (.674)
- “EMU prepared me well for my future career.” (.648)
- “I believe that EMU has a good reputation within the general public.” (.633)
- “I believe that employers will have a great deal of respect for my degree.” (.608)
- “I experienced a sense of belonging at EMU.” (.577)
- “Generally speaking, I felt that the administration really cared about my academic performance.” (.524)
- “Generally speaking, I felt that the administration really cared about my personal well-being.” (.521)
- “Generally speaking, I felt that the faculty really cared about my academic performance.” (.502)
- Satisfaction with general learning environment in the classroom (.471)
- “Generally speaking, I felt that the faculty really cared about my personal well-being.” (.460)
- “I felt safe from physical assault.” (.452)
- “I felt safe from personal theft.” (.442)
- Satisfaction with quality of career counseling from faculty (.442)
- Satisfaction with quality of instruction (courses within major) (.440)
- “I had positive interactions with the office staff in administrative and support services.” (.426)
- Satisfaction with level of respect felt from faculty (.425)
- Satisfaction with level of respect felt from front office staff (Department/School) (.421)
- Satisfaction with extent of career counseling from faculty (.419)
- Satisfaction with quality of feedback on coursework (courses within major) (.415)
- Satisfaction with sense of belonging within Department/School (.413)
- “I felt safe from relational aggression, such as bullying, taunting, or having my thoughts and opinions disrespected.” (.405)
- Satisfaction with degree of difficulty of coursework (.404)

An examination was also made into the relationship between whether EMU had been the respondent's first choice school (true of 61.1% of the respondents) and various measures of satisfaction. Indeed, employing independent sample t-tests of differences in means revealed that being the first choice school was predictive of high or very high satisfaction on almost every measure.

While it may be true that being respondents' first-choice school was important, this measure lost its predictive value when tested against other variables within a multiple regression model. Regression analysis revealed that the following variables were predictive of students' willingness to recommend EMU to others, listed in order of influence: level of pride in EMU; level of willingness to choose EMU again; level of belief that EMU has a good reputation within the general public; and level of sense of belonging within EMU.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- Clearly, as noted in the 2007 GSA report, the administration must continue its efforts to rebuild students' trust and restore its reputation as a well-managed institution. The importance of restoring trust in management cannot be overstated.
- All members of the EMU community must continue efforts to create an environment where our students feel safe from physical harm, and where students feel they belong and are cared about by faculty and the administration, both academically and personally. For faculty, the strongest correlations with feeling cared about are with measures of quality of instruction and feeling respected; for administrators, the strongest correlations are with quality of management and reputation of EMU.
- An assessment of mental health service needs and utilization should be conducted under the auspices of the Office of Institutional Assessment. Included in this study should be an examination of the factors that contribute to students' experience of stress and anxiety as none of the measures associated with their education had more than a very weak relationship, if any, to levels of stress, anxiety, and depression. Given the moderately strong relationships, however, between mental health states (stress, anxiety, and depression), family and work responsibilities, and physical health, this study should also examine ways in which EMU might be able to support students with these challenges.
- The fact that only 29% of the GSA respondents had employment related to their field of study and 48% were seeking employment underscores the importance of career counseling, from both faculty and the Career Services Office. Efforts should be made to support both sources.
- Continued effort must be directed toward creating a cultural climate that encourages student participation in EMU's assessment endeavors, particularly from minority students. Future data collection efforts should enlist the support of Department Heads and School Directors to encourage student participation.

Students might be more willing to respond to a request for participation from their Department Head or School Director rather than someone farther removed, such as the Director of Institutional Assessment. While a 39% response rate (GSA 08) may be considered acceptable, certainly a much higher rate is preferable. Most would not, however, view as acceptable the 15% response rate to the Sophomore\_Junior survey. This very low response rate is regrettable given that understanding the experience of this population is critical to our retention efforts.

- It is recommended that the Office of Institutional Assessment establish an electronic newsletter through which results of student surveys such as these could be disseminated. Establishing a line of communication such as this would signal to students the administration's commitment to the recently articulated key values: accountability; integrity, management; and service to students (President Martin's remarks to Regents, September 16, 2008). The electronic newsletter would also demonstrate that their voices are heard, and would call attention to the importance of student participation in the surveys.

## APPENDIX A: WELL-BEING

### WELL-BEING: QUALITY OF RELATIONSHIPS

#### Graduating Senior Assessment 2008: Quality of Relationships

<i>Quality of Relationships: GSA 2008</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Lower Agreement</i>	<i>Moderate Agreement</i>	<i>Higher Agreement</i>
I had good relationships with fellow students.	587	4.06	7.5%	16.9%	75.6%
I had good relationships with faculty.	587	3.98	9.0%	17.2%	73.8%
I had positive interactions with the office staff in administrative and support services.	585	3.39	22.4%	28.2%	49.4%
I experienced a sense of belonging at EMU.	586	3.41	24.1%	24.7%	51.2%
Generally speaking, I felt that faculty really cared about my academic performance.	584	3.62	19.3%	20.0%	60.7%
Generally speaking, I felt that faculty really cared about my personal well-being.	588	3.50	21.9%	24.3%	53.7%
Generally speaking, I felt that the administration really cared about my academic performance.	584	2.96	36.3%	28.4%	35.2%
Generally speaking, I felt that administration really cared about my personal well-being.	588	2.78	43.4%	26.0%	30.6%

#### Sophomore-junior Assessment 2008: Quality of Relationships

<i>Quality of Relationships: SJA 2008</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Lower Agreement</i>	<i>Moderate Agreement</i>	<i>Higher Agreement</i>
I have good relationships with fellow students.	186	3.95	11.3%	14.5%	74.2%
I have good relationships with faculty.	185	3.90	12.4%	17.8%	69.7%
I have positive interactions with the office staff in administrative and support services.	185	3.50	22.7%	22.7%	54.6%
I experience a sense of belonging at EMU.	183	3.40	26.8%	21.3%	51.9%
Generally speaking, I feel that faculty really care about my academic performance.	185	3.58	19.5%	21.6%	58.9%
Generally speaking, I feel that faculty really care about my personal well-being.	185	3.43	22.2%	29.2%	48.6%
Generally speaking, I feel that the administration really cares about my academic performance.	184	3.02	32.6%	31.5%	35.8%
Generally speaking, I feel that administration really cares about my personal well-being.	185	2.88	41.6%	23.2%	35.2%

## WELL-BEING: FEELINGS OF SAFETY

### Graduating Senior Assessment 2008: Feelings of Safety

<i>Feelings of Safety: GSA 2008</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Lower Agreement</i>	<i>Moderate Agreement</i>	<i>Higher Agreement</i>
I felt safe from physical assault	587	3.00	38.7%	21.6%	39.7%
I felt safe from personal theft	587	2.79	46.5%	19.8%	33.7%
I felt safe from relational aggression, such as bullying, taunting, or having my thoughts and opinions disrespected	585	3.74	14.9%	19.8%	65.3%

### Sophomore-junior Assessment 2008: Feelings of Safety

<i>Feelings of Safety: SJA 2008</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Lower Agreement</i>	<i>Moderate Agreement</i>	<i>Higher Agreement</i>
I feel safe from physical assault	183	2.73	47.0%	23.5%	29.5%
I feel safe from personal theft	184	2.48	53.8%	22.8%	23.4%
I feel safe from relational aggression, such as bullying, taunting, or having my thoughts and opinions disrespected	185	3.56	22.7%	15.1%	62.1%
I believe that changes in security measures have made the campus safer	184	2.92	36.4%	31.5%	32.1%

## WELL-BEING: STRESSORS

### Graduating Senior Assessment 2008: Stressors

<b><i>Stressors: GSA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>N</i></b>	<b><i>Mean</i></b>	<b><i>Lower Agreement</i></b>	<b><i>Moderate Agreement</i></b>	<b><i>Higher Agreement</i></b>
My level of stress at times negatively affected my classroom performance	585	3.01	33.3%	26.7%	40.0%
My level of depression at times negatively affected my classroom performance	584	2.37	57.9%	15.8%	26.4%
My level of anxiety at times negatively affected my classroom performance	583	2.58	50.3%	20.6%	29.2%
My physical health at times negatively affected my classroom performance	583	2.41	56.1%	18.5%	25.4%
My family responsibilities at times negatively affected my classroom performance	583	2.55	52.1%	19.9%	27.9%
My work responsibilities at times negatively affected my classroom performance	584	2.73	45.0%	23.3%	31.6%

### Sophomore-junior Assessment 2008: Stressors

<b><i>Stressors: SJA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>N</i></b>	<b><i>Mean</i></b>	<b><i>Lower Agreement</i></b>	<b><i>Moderate Agreement</i></b>	<b><i>Higher Agreement</i></b>
My level of stress at times negatively affects my classroom performance	184	3.23	28.3%	27.7%	44.1%
My level of depression at times negatively affects my classroom performance	185	2.64	48.6%	20.5%	30.8%
My level of anxiety at times negatively affects my classroom performance	184	2.85	37.5%	29.3%	33.1%
My physical health at times negatively affects my classroom performance	184	2.54	54.3%	17.4%	28.3%
My family responsibilities at times negatively affects my classroom performance	184	2.61	49.5%	25.0%	25.5%
My work responsibilities at times negatively affects my classroom performance	185	2.81	42.7%	24.3%	32.9%

## APPENDIX B: QUALITY OF EDUCATION: COURSES WITHIN MAJOR

### Graduating Senior Assessment 2008: Quality of Education

<i>Quality of Education</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Lower Agreement</i>	<i>Moderate Agreement</i>	<i>Higher Agreement</i>
Courses within major were academically challenging.	585	3.88	10.6%	17.9%	71.5%
General education courses were academically challenging.	578	3.20	27.0%	30.6%	42.3%
I received a high quality education from EMU.	583	3.70	12.7%	25.4%	61.9%
Quality of education from EMU is comparable to other universities I could have attended.	583	3.58	19.6%	22.3%	58.1%
EMU prepared me well for my future career	583	3.55	20.2%	22.6%	57.2%

### Sophomore-junior Assessment 2008: Quality of Education

<i>Quality of Education</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Lower Agreement</i>	<i>Moderate Agreement</i>	<i>Higher Agreement</i>
Courses major are academically challenging.	187	3.92	10.2%	17.1%	72.7%
General education courses are academically challenging.	186	3.21	25.8%	30.1%	44.1%
I am receiving a high quality education from EMU.	187	3.67	16.6%	19.8%	63.7%
Quality of education from EMU is comparable to other universities I could have attended.	184	3.55	19.0%	25.5%	55.4%
EMU is preparing me well for my future career.	186	3.58	18.3%	22.0%	59.7%

## APPENDIX C: OPINIONS REGARDING QUALITY OF MANAGEMENT AND REPUTATION

### Graduating Senior Assessment 2008: Quality of Management and Reputation

<i>Quality of Management and Reputation of EMU:GSA 2008</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Lower Agreement</i>	<i>Moderate Agreement</i>	<i>Higher Agreement</i>
Employers will have a great deal of respect for my degree.	582	3.61	19.1%	23.0%	57.9%
Overall, I think that EMU is well managed.	584	2.76	44.2%	24.0%	31.8%
EMU is managed as well as most universities its size.	584	2.85	39.9%	26.5%	33.5%
EMU has a good reputation within the general public.	584	2.58	50.5%	23.1%	26.4%
I am proud to be associated with EMU.	581	3.41	21.7%	30.1%	48.2%
I would recommend EMU to others.	584	3.32	27.6%	23.6%	48.8%
If I had to do it over again, I would choose to attend EMU.	583	3.30	30.4%	19.6%	50.0%

### Sophomore-junior Assessment 2008: Quality of Management and Reputation

<i>Quality of Management and Reputation of EMU</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Lower Agreement</i>	<i>Moderate Agreement</i>	<i>Higher Agreement</i>
Employers will have a great deal of respect for my degree.	185	3.63	16.2%	24.3%	59.4%
Overall, I think that EMU is well managed.	187	2.95	35.3%	25.7%	39.0%
EMU is managed as well as most universities its size.	183	3.03	37.2%	20.2%	42.6%
I believe that EMU has a good reputation within the general public	185	2.52	54.1%	20.5%	25.4%
I am proud to be associated with EMU.	186	3.40	22.6%	28.0%	49.4%
I would recommend EMU to others.	185	3.43	22.7%	24.3%	53.0%
If I had to do it over again, I would choose to attend EMU.	184	3.26	32.6%	14.7%	52.7%

## APPENDIX D: SATISFACTION WITH COURSE SCHEDULING

### Graduating Senior Assessment 2008: Satisfaction with Course Scheduling

<b><i>Satisfaction with Course Scheduling: GSA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>N</i></b>	<b><i>Never Used</i></b>	<b><i>Mean</i></b>	<b><i>Lower Satisfaction</i></b>	<b><i>Moderate Satisfaction</i></b>	<b><i>Higher Satisfaction</i></b>
Availability of required courses	586	0.5%	3.41	22.3%	25.6%	52.1%
Availability of elective courses	585	3.4%	3.56	17.0%	25.3%	57.7%
Amount of advance notice of future course offerings	584	6.5%	2.99	38.1%	24.0%	37.9%
Number of evening courses offered	585	9.1%	3.36	23.1%	27.3%	49.6%
Number of courses available on Tuesday/Thursday verses Monday/Wednesday/Friday	586	6.0%	3.48	19.6%	28.1%	52.3%

### Sophomore-junior Assessment 2008: Satisfaction with Course Scheduling

<b><i>Satisfaction with Course Scheduling: SJA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>N</i></b>	<b><i>Never Used</i></b>	<b><i>Mean</i></b>	<b><i>Lower Satisfaction</i></b>	<b><i>Moderate Satisfaction</i></b>	<b><i>Higher Satisfaction</i></b>
Availability of required courses	188	0.5%	3.10	29.9%	28.3%	41.7%
Availability of elective courses	186	8.1%	3.48	19.3%	27.5%	53.2%
Amount of advance notice of future course offerings	185	5.9%	2.90	39.7%	28.2%	32.2%
Number of evening courses offered	185	24.3%	3.34	22.9%	28.6%	48.6%
Number of courses available on Tuesday/Thursday schedule verses Monday/Wednesday/Friday schedule	187	4.3%	3.29	24.6%	29.6%	45.9%

## APPENDIX E: SATISFACTION WITH QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION

### Graduating Senior Assessment 2008: Satisfaction with Quality of Instruction

<b><i>Satisfaction with Quality of Instruction: GSA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>N</i></b>	<b><i>Never Used</i></b>	<b><i>Mean</i></b>	<b><i>Lower Satisfaction</i></b>	<b><i>Moderate Satisfaction</i></b>	<b><i>Higher Satisfaction</i></b>
Quality of instruction within courses in your major	585	0.5%	3.86	11.7%	20.3%	68.0%
Degree of difficulty of coursework	585	0.9%	3.70	11.9%	24.5%	63.6%
Length of time to receive feedback on course work from faculty	585	0.9%	3.72	12.4%	22.9%	64.7%
Quality of faculty feedback on course work	587	0.7%	3.73	11.3%	24.9%	63.8%
Manner in which faculty are evaluated	585	1.2%	3.32	27.3%	23.7%	49.0%

<b><i>Satisfaction with Quality of Instruction: SJA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>N</i></b>	<b><i>Never Used</i></b>	<b><i>Mean</i></b>	<b><i>Lower Satisfaction</i></b>	<b><i>Moderate Satisfaction</i></b>	<b><i>Higher Satisfaction</i></b>
Quality of instruction within courses in your major	188	2.1%	3.90	12.5%	16.3%	71.2%
Degree of difficulty of coursework	186	1.6%	3.78	8.2%	27.3%	64.5%
Length of time to receive feedback on course work from faculty	187	3.2%	3.69	15.5%	22.7%	61.9%
Quality of faculty feedback on course work	187	3.2%	3.75	12.2%	22.7%	65.2%
Manner in which faculty are evaluated	187	5.3%	3.47	22.0%	24.3%	53.7%

<b>APPENDIX F: SATISFACTION WITH OPPORTUNITIES TO INTERACT WITHIN DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL</b>
---

**Graduating Senior Assessment 2008: Satisfaction with Opportunities to Interact within Department/School**

<i><b>Satisfaction with Opportunities to Interact within Department or School: GSA 2008</b></i>	<i><b>N</b></i>	<i><b>Never Used</b></i>	<i><b>Mean</b></i>	<i><b>Lower Satisfaction</b></i>	<i><b>Moderate Satisfaction</b></i>	<i><b>Higher Satisfaction</b></i>
Number of opportunities to interact with faculty in the classroom	586	1.4%	4.00	8.8%	18.0%	73.1%
Number of opportunities to interact with faculty outside the classroom	586	4.3%	3.71	15.0%	22.1%	62.9%
Number of opportunities created by Department or School to interact with fellow students	586	8.4%	3.52	20.3%	25.3%	54.4%
Extent mentored by faculty	585	8.4%	3.35	27.1%	22.2%	50.7%
Your Department or School's website	584	9.1%	3.36	24.7%	25.2%	50.1%

**Sophomore-junior Assessment 2008: Satisfaction with Opportunities to Interact within Department/School**

<i><b>Satisfaction with Opportunities to Interact within Department or School: SJA 2008</b></i>	<i><b>N</b></i>	<i><b>Never Used</b></i>	<i><b>Mean</b></i>	<i><b>Lower Satisfaction</b></i>	<i><b>Moderate Satisfaction</b></i>	<i><b>Higher Satisfaction</b></i>
Number of opportunities to interact with faculty in the classroom	187	2.7%	3.91	10.4%	19.8%	69.8%
Number of opportunities to interact with faculty outside the classroom	187	6.4%	3.70	15.4%	22.9%	61.7%
Number of opportunities created by Department or School to interact with fellow students	187	13.9%	3.30	28.0%	24.2%	47.9%
Extent mentored by faculty	184	17.9%	3.29	29.8%	24.5%	45.7%
Your Department or School's website	187	16.6%	3.49	21.2%	22.4%	56.4%

**APPENDIX G: SATISFACTION WITH QUALITY OF RELATIONSHIPS WITHIN DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL**

**Graduating Senior Assessment 2008: Satisfaction with Quality of Relationships within Department/School**

<i>Satisfaction with Quality of Relationships within Department or School:GSA 2008</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Never Used</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Lower Satisfaction</i>	<i>Moderate Satisfaction</i>	<i>Higher Satisfaction</i>
Your sense of belonging within your Department of School	586	2.7%	3.50	24.9%	20.2%	54.9%
Level of respect felt from faculty	585	0.9%	4.01	10.7%	13.4%	75.9%
Level of respect felt from front office staff	583	7.0%	3.69	17.9%	19.2%	62.9%
General learning environment in the classroom	586	0.7%	3.87	9.1%	18.7%	72.2%

**Sophomore-junior Assessment 2008: Satisfaction with Quality of Relationships within Department/School**

<i>Satisfaction with Quality of Relationships within Department or School:SJA 2008</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Never Used</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Lower Satisfaction</i>	<i>Moderate Satisfaction</i>	<i>Higher Satisfaction</i>
Your sense of belonging within your Department of School	184	6.5%	3.46	23.8%	22.1%	54.1%
Level of respect felt from faculty	187	1.6%	4.01	9.8%	17.9%	72.3%
Level of respect felt from front office staff	184	13.0%	3.63	15.6%	30.0%	54.4%
General learning environment in the classroom	187	2.1%	3.80	10.4%	21.3%	68.3%

## APPENDIX H: SATISFACTION WITH ADVISING WITHIN DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL

### Graduating Senior Assessment 2008: Satisfaction with Advising within Department/School

<i>Satisfaction with Department or School: GSA 2008</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Never Used</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Lower Satisfaction</i>	<i>Moderate Satisfaction</i>	<i>Higher Satisfaction</i>
Clarity of degree requirements	585	0.3%	3.58	20.9%	17.5%	61.6%
Availability of faculty for academic advising	583	3.1%	3.68	15.0%	23.9%	61.0%
Quality of academic advising from faculty	582	5.0%	3.64	19.5%	17.7%	62.7%
Extent of career counseling from faculty	585	20.3%	3.17	32.4%	22.7%	44.9%
Quality of career counseling from faculty	582	23.0%	3.28	28.3%	23.0%	48.7%

### Sophomore-junior Assessment 2008: Satisfaction with Advising within Department/School

<i>Satisfaction with Department or School: SJA 2008</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Never Used</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Lower Satisfaction</i>	<i>Moderate Satisfaction</i>	<i>Higher Satisfaction</i>
Clarity of degree requirements	187	1.1%	3.45	20.0%	26.5%	53.6%
Availability of faculty for academic advising	185	8.1%	3.52	17.6%	28.2%	54.1%
Quality of academic advising from faculty	187	11.8%	3.58	21.2%	18.8%	60.0%
Extent of career counseling from faculty	186	40.3%	3.38	26.1%	23.4%	50.4%
Quality of career counseling from faculty	186	40.3%	3.43	22.5%	27.0%	50.4%

## APPENDIX I: SATISFACTION WITH GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES

### Satisfaction with General Education Courses: Graduating Senior Assessment 2008

<i>Satisfaction with General Education Courses</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Never Used</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Lower Satisfaction</i>	<i>Moderate Satisfaction</i>	<i>Higher Satisfaction</i>
Availability of general education courses	579	6.0%	3.74	10.5%	25.6%	63.9%
Quality of instruction within general education courses	576	5.7%	3.43	18.6%	30.4%	51.0%
Degree of difficulty of General Education coursework	579	6.0%	3.34	18.8%	36.6%	44.7%
Length of time to receive feedback on course work from faculty	579	6.2%	3.48	14.2%	35.2%	50.7%
Quality of faculty feedback on course work	578	6.2%	3.45	16.1%	34.7%	49.2%
Level of respect felt from faculty in general education courses	578	6.1%	3.62	14.7%	25.6%	59.7%
General learning environment in the classroom	577	5.9%	3.47	16.0%	32.0%	52.0%
Clarity of general education requirements	575	5.6%	3.53	19.0%	24.1%	56.9%
Quality of advising regarding general education requirements	575	11.0%	3.23	28.5%	24.4%	47.1%

### Satisfaction with General Education Courses: Sophomore-junior Assessment 2008

<i>Satisfaction with General Education Courses</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Never Used</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Lower Satisfaction</i>	<i>Moderate Satisfaction</i>	<i>Higher Satisfaction</i>
Availability of general education courses	181	9.4%	3.76	12.8%	23.8%	63.4%
Quality of instruction within general education courses	182	9.9%	3.57	18.3%	22.0%	59.8%
Degree of difficulty of General Education coursework	180	10.0%	3.43	18.5%	29.0%	52.5%
Length of time to receive feedback on course work from faculty	181	10.5%	3.63	13.6%	24.7%	61.8%
Quality of faculty feedback on course work	181	10.5%	3.54	15.4%	29.6%	55.0%
Level of respect felt from faculty in general education courses	180	10.6%	3.81	11.8%	19.9%	68.3%
General learning environment in the classroom	182	11.0%	3.57	14.8%	25.9%	59.2%
Clarity of general education requirements	181	10.5%	3.71	13.6%	21.6%	64.8%
Quality of advising regarding general education requirements	180	13.3%	3.37	22.4%	26.3%	51.3%

## APPENDIX J: SATISFACTION WITH TECHNOLOGY-BASED COURSE DELIVERY

### Satisfaction with Technology-Based Course Delivery: Graduating Senior Assessment 2008

<i>Satisfaction with Technology-Based Course Delivery</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Never Used</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Lower Satisfaction</i>	<i>Moderate Satisfaction</i>	<i>Higher Satisfaction</i>
WebCT	580	21.7%	3.41	22.2%	26.4%	51.3%
Web Caucus	580	39.7%	3.21	26.9%	28.9%	44.3%
Electronic reserves	578	14.0%	3.85	14.5%	17.9%	67.6%
Lectures presented via Power Point	579	14.5%	3.81	13.1%	19.8%	67.0%
Online course delivery	578	21.1%	3.72	17.8%	19.3%	62.9%
my.emich course homepages	581	4.1%	3.73	17.1%	18.7%	64.3%
Faculty's ability to operate classroom instructional equipment	581	3.6%	3.54	19.1%	24.1%	56.8%

### Satisfaction with Technology-Based Course Delivery: Sophomore-junior Assessment 2008

<i>Satisfaction with Technology-Based Course Delivery</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Never Used</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Lower Satisfaction</i>	<i>Moderate Satisfaction</i>	<i>Higher Satisfaction</i>
WebCT	182	40.7%	3.72	16.7%	16.7%	66.7%
Web Caucus	182	73.6%	3.56	20.8%	25.0%	54.2%
Electronic reserves	181	16.6%	3.99	10.6%	17.2%	72.2%
Lectures presented via Power Point	183	20.8%	3.76	16.6%	17.2%	66.2%
Online course delivery	183	52.5%	3.89	13.8%	14.9%	71.3%
my.emich course homepages	183	8.7%	3.84	18.0%	15.6%	66.5%
Faculty's ability to operate classroom instructional equipment	181	9.4%	3.56	19.5%	24.4%	56.0%

## APPENDIX K: FREQUENCY OF USE OF FACILITIES

### Frequency of Use of Facilities: Graduating Senior Assessment 2008

<i>Frequency of Use: Facilities</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Never Used</i>	<i>Lower Usage</i>	<i>Moderate Usage</i>	<i>Higher Usage</i>
Halle Library	588	3.39	2.6%	24.1%	24.6%	51.3%
Computer Labs	588	3.65	4.6%	20.9%	18.5%	60.6%
REC-IM facilities	587	3.07	29.8%	36.2%	22.1%	41.7%
EMU Student Center	588	3.20	8.7%	33.3%	22.5%	44.1%
EMU's website	585	4.17	0.3%	14.1%	7.7%	78.2%
Parking facility and lots	585	4.08	5.0%	18.3%	7.0%	74.6%

### Frequency of Use of Facilities: Sophomore-junior Assessment 2008

<i>Frequency of Use of Facilities: Sophomore-junior 2008</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Never Used</i>	<i>Lower Usage</i>	<i>Moderate Usage</i>	<i>Higher Usage</i>
Halle Library	186	3.25	6.5%	27.6%	28.2%	44.3%
Computer Labs	186	3.45	12.9%	27.8%	16.7%	55.6%
REC-IM facilities	186	3.11	34.9%	34.7%	21.5%	43.8%
EMU Student Center	185	3.49	5.4%	22.9%	27.4%	49.7%
EMU's website	186	4.21	1.1%	12.5%	10.3%	77.2%
Parking facility and lots	185	3.95	9.2%	22.0%	9.5%	68.4%

## APPENDIX L: FREQUENCY OF USE OF ACADEMIC SERVICES

### Frequency of Use of Academic Services: Graduating Senior Assessment 2008

<i>Frequency of Use: Academic Services</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Never Used</i>	<i>Lower Usage</i>	<i>Moderate Usage</i>	<i>Higher Usage</i>
Holman Learning Center	588	2.24	71.6%	64.7%	19.8%	15.6%
The Writing Center	586	1.93	75.3%	74.5%	13.1%	12.4%
Academic advising from Department or School	584	3.04	6.5%	35.3%	27.5%	37.1%
Academic advising from College advising office	588	2.67	20.4%	47.4%	24.6%	28.0%
Academic advising from Pierce Hall advisors	587	2.02	34.9%	71.2%	12.6%	16.2%

### Frequency of Use of Academic Services: Sophomore-junior Assessment 2008

<i>Frequency of Use of Academic Services: Sophomore-junior 2008</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Never Used</i>	<i>Lower Usage</i>	<i>Moderate Usage</i>	<i>Higher Usage</i>
Holman Learning Center	186	2.29	75.8%	57.8%	20.0%	22.2%
The Writing Center	185	1.98	77.8%	65.9%	24.4%	9.8%
Academic advising from Department or School	186	2.96	15.1%	41.1%	22.2%	36.8%
Academic advising from College advising office	182	2.49	29.7%	50.8%	26.6%	22.6%
Academic advising from Pierce Hall advisors	185	1.77	40.0%	80.2%	12.6%	7.2%

<b>APPENDIX M: FREQUENCY OF USE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES</b>
--

**Frequency of Use of Administrative Services: Graduating Senior Assessment 2008**

<i>Frequency of Use: Administrative Services</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Never Used</i>	<i>Lower Usage</i>	<i>Moderate Usage</i>	<i>Higher Usage</i>
Financial Aid Office	584	2.88	27.4%	41.3%	23.6%	35.2%

**Frequency of Use of Administrative Service: Sophomore-junior Assessment 2008**

<i>Frequency of Use of Administrative Service: Sophomore-junior 2008</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Never Used</i>	<i>Lower Usage</i>	<i>Moderate Usage</i>	<i>Higher Usage</i>
Financial Aid Office	184	2.73	26.6%	43.0%	30.4%	26.7%

## APPENDIX N: FREQUENCY OF USE OF STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

### Frequency of Use of Student Support Services: Graduating Senior Assessment 2008

<i>Frequency of Use: Student Support Services</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Never Used</i>	<i>Lower Usage</i>	<i>Moderate Usage</i>	<i>Higher Usage</i>
Career Services Office	587	2.38	55.2%	58.9%	18.6%	22.4%
Food Services (Student Center food court, Eastern Eateries, etc)	588	3.18	10.9%	33.4%	22.7%	43.9%
Snow Health Center for physical health care	584	2.32	56.7%	58.9%	21.7%	19.4%
Snow Health Center for mental health counseling	583	2.40	83.5%	53.1%	27.1%	19.8%
SEEUS	587	2.39	57.6%	58.6%	17.3%	24.1%

### Frequency of Use of Student Support Services: Sophomore-junior Assessment 2008

<i>Frequency of Use of Student Support Services: Sophomore-junior 2008</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Never Used</i>	<i>Lower Usage</i>	<i>Moderate Usage</i>	<i>Higher Usage</i>
Career Services Office	185	2.02	76.2%	68.2%	20.5%	11.3%
Food Services (Student Center food court, Eastern Eateries, etc)	184	3.37	6.5%	33.1%	16.3%	50.6%
Snow Health Center for physical health care	185	2.32	69.7%	58.9%	25.0%	16.1%
Snow Health Center for mental health counseling	186	2.22	82.8%	59.4%	25.0%	15.7%
SEEUS	186	2.41	57.5%	55.7%	24.1%	20.3%

## APPENDIX O: SATISFACTION WITH FACILITIES

### Satisfaction with Facilities: Graduating Senior Assessment 2008

<i>Satisfaction with Facilities</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Never Used</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Lower Satisfaction</i>	<i>Moderate Satisfaction</i>	<i>Higher Satisfaction</i>
Halle Library services	587	12.9%	3.89	10.6%	20.2%	69.3%
Halle Library holdings	589	17.1%	3.83	12.9%	17.2%	69.9%
Computer services/technical support	588	13.6%	3.43	21.9%	28.5%	49.7%
Computer availability	586	4.3%	3.53	20.0%	25.3%	54.7%
REC-IM equipment	587	34.4%	3.46	22.3%	24.9%	52.7%
REC-IM hours	587	33.6%	3.36	24.9%	24.4%	50.7%
EMU Student Center	588	8.5%	3.86	15.1%	15.1%	69.9%
Parking facility and lots	584	5.0%	2.46	56.0%	20.2%	23.8%
Classroom buildings (physical appearance)	588	1.0%	2.74	43.6%	31.1%	25.3%
Grounds (physical appearance)	586	1.2%	3.44	19.7%	27.1%	53.2%
EMU's website	589	0.2%	3.78	13.3%	17.2%	69.5%

### Satisfaction with Facilities: Sophomore-junior Assessment 2008

<i>Facility</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Never Used</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Lower Satisfaction</i>	<i>Moderate Satisfaction</i>	<i>Higher Satisfaction</i>
Halle Library services	186	19.4%	3.89	12.7%	17.3%	70.0%
Halle Library holdings	186	25.3%	3.76	15.1%	19.4%	65.4%
Computer services/technical support	187	27.8%	3.70	11.1%	28.1%	60.8%
Computer availability	187	13.4%	3.64	18.5%	19.1%	62.3%
REC-IM equipment	186	39.8%	3.61	19.6%	20.5%	59.8%
REC-IM hours	187	36.9%	3.29	26.3%	22.0%	51.7%
EMU Student Center	187	6.4%	4.06	10.3%	16.0%	73.7%
Parking facility and lots	186	7.5%	2.47	53.5%	23.8%	22.6%
Classroom buildings (physical appearance)	186	0.5%	2.86	38.9%	29.7%	31.3%
Grounds (physical appearance)	186	1.1%	3.30	27.7%	22.3%	50.0%
EMU's website	186	0.5%	3.82	14.1%	19.5%	66.5%

## APPENDIX P: SATISFACTION WITH ACADEMIC SERVICES

### Satisfaction with Academic Services: Graduating Senior Assessment 2008

<b><i>Satisfaction with Academic Service: GSA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>N</i></b>	<b><i>Never Used</i></b>	<b><i>Mean</i></b>	<b><i>Lower Satisfaction</i></b>	<b><i>Moderate Satisfaction</i></b>	<b><i>Higher Satisfaction</i></b>
Academic advising from faculty within Department or School	584	5.0%	3.57	20.2%	21.6%	58.2%
Academic advising from College advising office	583	18.4%	3.15	32.8%	23.1%	44.1%
Academic advising from Pierce Hall advisors	582	36.8%	2.67	45.7%	25.3%	29.1%
Academic support through Holman Learning Center	585	81.0%	3.22	27.0%	30.6%	42.3%
Academic support through Writing Center	586	81.1%	2.94	37.8%	23.4%	38.7%

### Satisfaction with Academic Services: Sophomore-junior Assessment 2008

<b><i>Satisfaction with Academic Services: SJA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>N</i></b>	<b><i>Never Used</i></b>	<b><i>Mean</i></b>	<b><i>Lower Satisfaction</i></b>	<b><i>Moderate Satisfaction</i></b>	<b><i>Higher Satisfaction</i></b>
Academic advising from faculty within Department or School	184	14.7%	3.47	26.8%	17.2%	56.0%
Academic advising from College advising office	183	31.7%	3.37	24.8%	24.8%	50.4%
Academic advising from Pierce Hall advisors	184	37.0%	2.64	45.7%	26.7%	27.6%
Academic support through Holman Learning Center	184	77.7%	3.24	29.3%	24.4%	46.4%
Academic support through Writing Center	181	79.6%	3.43	27.0%	16.2%	56.7%

## APPENDIX Q: SATISFACTION WITH ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

### Satisfaction with Administrative Services: Graduating Senior Assessment 2008

<i>Satisfaction with Administrative Services: GSA 2008</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Never Used</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Lower Satisfaction</i>	<i>Moderate Satisfaction</i>	<i>Higher Satisfaction</i>
Graduation audit processing time	589	0.7%	3.17	32.5%	23.9%	43.6%
Clarity of graduation audit results	589	0.7%	3.35	29.6%	18.1%	52.3%
Financial Aid Office services	588	25.2%	3.11	29.8%	29.8%	40.4%
EMU's brand marketing campaign: "Education First" and "Eagle Nation"	583	35.5%	2.86	40.2%	24.7%	35.1%
SEEUS	587	54.9%	3.50	20.0%	24.9%	55.1%
Registration process	589	0.2%	3.54	17.0%	26.2%	56.8%

### Satisfaction with Administrative Services: Sophomore-junior Assessment 2008

<i>Satisfaction with Administrative Services: SJA 2008</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Never Used</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Lower Satisfaction</i>	<i>Moderate Satisfaction</i>	<i>Higher Satisfaction</i>
Financial Aid Office services	186	23.7%	3.35	24.6%	26.8%	48.6%
EMU's brand marketing campaign: "Education First" and "Eagle Nation"	186	44.6%	2.94	37.9%	20.4%	41.8%
SEEUS	185	53.5%	3.73	17.4%	17.4%	65.1%
Registration process	183	0.5%	3.56	17.6%	22.0%	60.5%

## APPENDIX R: SATISFACTION WITH STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

### Satisfaction with Student Support Services: Graduating Senior Assessment 2008

<b><i>Satisfaction with Student Support Services: GSA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>N</i></b>	<b><i>Never Used</i></b>	<b><i>Mean</i></b>	<b><i>Lower Satisfaction</i></b>	<b><i>Moderate Satisfaction</i></b>	<b><i>Higher Satisfaction</i></b>
Career information provided through Career Services Office	586	60.6%	3.10	32.5%	26.5%	41.1%
Career advising provided through Career Services Office	586	67.6%	2.92	37.9%	27.4%	34.8%
Quality of physical health services provided through Snow Health Center	582	63.9%	3.38	21.0%	30.5%	48.6%
Length of wait to be seen for physical health services	584	65.6%	3.66	18.4%	20.4%	61.2%
Quality of mental health counseling services provided through Snow Health Center	580	86.4%	3.57	17.7%	21.5%	60.7%
Length of wait to be seen for mental health counseling services	582	86.9%	3.72	15.8%	18.4%	65.8%
Variety of food available through on-campus food services	586	14.0%	3.19	27.6%	30.0%	42.5%
Nutritional value of food available through on-campus food services	586	14.8%	2.61	47.5%	29.5%	23.0%

### Satisfaction with Student Support Services: Sophomore-junior Assessment 2008

<b><i>Satisfaction with Student Support Services: SJA 2008</i></b>	<b><i>N</i></b>	<b><i>Never Used</i></b>	<b><i>Mean</i></b>	<b><i>Lower Satisfaction</i></b>	<b><i>Moderate Satisfaction</i></b>	<b><i>Higher Satisfaction</i></b>
Career information provided through Career Services Office	185	75.1%	3.33	19.6%	32.6%	47.8%
Career advising provided through Career Services Office	184	82.6%	3.22	25.0%	28.1%	46.9%
Quality of physical health services provided through Snow Health Center	184	75.0%	3.43	26.1%	19.6%	54.3%
Length of wait to be seen for physical health services	182	73.6%	3.69	18.8%	18.8%	62.5%
Quality of mental health counseling services provided through Snow Health Center	183	83.1%	3.29	25.8%	22.6%	51.6%
Length of wait to be seen for mental health counseling services	184	82.6%	3.16	34.4%	12.5%	53.2%
Variety of food available through on-campus food services	185	7.6%	3.10	29.8%	30.4%	39.7%
Nutritional value of food available through on-campus food services	185	8.1%	2.62	48.8%	27.1%	24.1%

## APPENDIX S: FREQUENCY OF ENGAGEMENT IN EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

### Frequency of Engagement in Extracurricular Activities: Graduating Senior Assessment 2008

<i>Frequency of Engagement in Co-Curricular Activities</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Lower</i>	<i>Moderate</i>	<i>Higher</i>
Activities sponsored by student organizations	585	2.98	40.9%	38.2%	24.9%	37.0%
Activities sponsored by Student Government	582	2.38	66.0%	57.1%	23.7%	19.2%
Activities sponsored by Department or School	582	2.94	38.1%	39.7%	21.9%	38.3%
Varsity athletic competitions	584	2.80	56.8%	43.7%	24.6%	31.8%
Intramural sports	582	2.91	75.6%	40.1%	19.0%	40.9%
Classroom service learning projects	583	2.91	52.8%	39.3%	28.4%	32.4%
Volunteer work through campus organizations	585	3.21	65.5%	34.2%	20.3%	45.6%
Volunteer work through off-campus organizations	580	3.27	65.3%	31.3%	22.9%	45.8%
On-campus artistic performances	586	2.99	53.8%	38.7%	26.6%	34.7%
Fraternity or sorority membership	584	3.54	85.6%	31.0%	10.7%	58.1%

### Frequency of Engagement in Extracurricular Activities: Sophomore-junior Assessment 2008

<i>Frequency of Engagement in Co-Curricular Activities</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Lower</i>	<i>Moderate</i>	<i>Higher</i>
Activities sponsored by student organizations	186	3.22	42.5%	27.1%	29.9%	43.0%
Activities sponsored by Student Government	186	2.75	69.4%	43.9%	24.6%	31.5%
Activities sponsored by Department or School	184	3.12	49.5%	28.0%	33.3%	38.7%
Varsity athletic competitions	186	3.03	57.5%	32.9%	29.1%	38.0%
Intramural sports	185	3.23	78.4%	32.5%	20.0%	47.5%
Classroom service learning projects	184	3.25	63.6%	31.3%	20.9%	47.8%
Volunteer work through a campus organizations	183	3.21	68.3%	36.2%	19.0%	44.9%
Volunteer work through off-campus organizations	183	3.34	67.8%	27.1%	22.0%	50.8%
On-campus artistic performances	186	3.18	52.2%	37.1%	19.1%	43.8%
Fraternity or sorority membership	183	3.46	86.9%	33.3%	12.5%	54.2%