

STUDENT CAMPUS CLIMATE ASSESSMENT TRACKING STUDY

(April, 2006)

Executive Summary

1. **Overview and Methodology** – The following is a summary of the key findings from the on-line University of Arizona Student Climate Assessment Tracking Study conducted for The Office of the Dean of Students. The primary objective of this project was to evaluate major issues facing students and determine their feeling of comfort on the University of Arizona campus. In addition, the study evaluated degree of satisfaction and performance measures with respect to the faculty, computing resources, on-campus activities and the social environment. The results of this study were analyzed by a variety of key student classifications and demographics, and in comparison to the 2001 and 1996 telephone-based surveys conducted with University students.

The results summarized in this report reflect a class-weighted in-tab sample of 713 student respondents. The project was fielded between April 12th and 27th, 2006. The randomly-selected database of student e-mail addresses was supplied by the University of Arizona. Students were told that their participation was “completely voluntary” and “the information you provide will be collected confidentially, and stored anonymously in the database.” As an incentive, survey respondents were offered an opportunity to provide their e-mail address for a drawing of five \$100 gift certificates from the Memorial Union Bookstore (with one certificate awarded per class).

Of the 7,000 database students sent an invitation, there were 1,059 students in the FMR research database by the April 27th deadline date who clicked the link in their e-mail invitation or reminder to arrive at the first screen of the survey. Of these, 1,024 clicked the “opt-in” box to authorize use of their data and 993 continued at least through the first question – 713 of which were usable surveys with a significant amount of data. **This represents a response rate of 10.1%.** Of the 713 students who completed the survey, 578 chose to provide their e-mail address and participate in the prize drawing.

The final in-tab sample is representative in terms of age, part-time/full-time student status, residency status, transfer student status, fraternity/sorority membership, employment status, marital/parental status and first generation college attendance.

The on-line self-administered questionnaire took students an average of 18 minutes to complete.

2. **Student Respondent Profile** – The 2006 web-based student sample is highly consistent with the 2001 and 1996 baseline surveys. This includes ethnicity –which was highly consistent with the UA Factbook breakout of student demographics. The key characteristics of the 713 student-respondents that participated in this tracking survey are as follows:

	<u>In 2001</u>	<u>In 1996</u>
• 78% live off-campus (70% live within five miles of campus – 72% in 2001)	(70%)	(94%)
• 90% are full-time students	(88%)	(82%)
• 69% are “in-state” students (for tuition purposes)	(66%)	(74%)
• 68% have attended the University for at least three semesters	(67%)	(69%)
• 24% are transfer students from another institution	(24%)	(37%)
• 10% are members of fraternities or sororities	(11%)	(7%)
• 64% work in addition to attending school (36% who work 20 hours or more/week – up from 30% in 2001)	(58%)	(68%)
• 47% of employed students work off-campus; 44% work on-campus (up from 36%); the remaining 9% work both on- and off-campus (same as '01)	(54%)	(N/A)
• 84% are single; 91% do <i>not</i> have children under 17 living with them	(84%/92%)	(72%/86%)
• 23% are in the first generation of their family to attend college	(21%)	(N/A)
• 84% are between the ages of 18 to 29	(88%)	(84%)

Additional 2006 Student Characteristics – For the first time, students were asked a variety of other lifestyle and personal characteristic questions. The highlights include:

- Among “out-of-state” students, **14%** say that they are international students; and **13%** say that they are “Second Language” Learners.
- **1%** of all students say that they are members of an intercollegiate athletic team.
- **7%** claim to have a learning disability (3%), a physical disability (3%) or both (1%).
- **6%** describe themselves as Bisexual (4%), Gay (1%) or Lesbian (1%).
- **One-third** say that they typically communicate with their parents daily (some several times/day); **54%** communicate weekly; while 8% say that they communicate no more often than monthly with their parents.
- Nearly one-half (**45%**) – including a majority of freshmen and sophomores – say that they intend on being involved with the UA Alumni Association after graduation. This is less likely to be true among juniors and seniors; and true among only one-third of graduate students.

3. **Top-of-Mind Descriptions of the University “Student Climate”** – Perhaps a function of the self-administered nature of this year’s study, students were much more likely to offer “no answer” to the “open-ended” question of “describing the overall student climate” (42% versus 3%-5% in the past two studies). Still, the most common description was the same as in the 2001 and 1996 telephone-based surveys: “friendly/social” (10%, 17% among those providing any answer – compared to 26% in 1996 and 33% in 2001). Other, more general “positive” descriptions were also common but less frequent (16% – among those providing an answer, down from 26% in 2001). As we’ve seen in the past, freshmen are particularly apt to characterize the student climate as “friendly.” This year, this is also true among juniors. There continues to be secondary references to the “relaxed,” “comfortable” and/or “fun” campus atmosphere.

Importantly, “diversity” imaging among the student body is still strong – 12% (among those providing any answer, about the same as 2001 [14%] and up from 1996 [7%]). Unlike the 2001 study, Whites are as likely as Hispanics to refer to the “cultural diversity” of the University. There is a progressively lower number of students who describe the campus climate in positive “academic” terms. There are clearly less positive “climate” descriptions among graduate students – many of

whom perceive a “disconnect” between graduate and undergraduate students. Some are critical of the “treatment” of grad students as being “overworked, underpaid and not valued.” Others are “nervous” about budget cutbacks.

4. **Graduate Student Perceptions** – The following is a summary of the perceptions among graduate students regarding their experiences at the University of Arizona:

- **Financial cutbacks in graduate departments have put a hardship on your workload and financial status.** Two-thirds agree – the largest share “strongly” (44%). Only 15% disagree to any degree. Strong agreement is highest among progressively older students, non-Hispanic minorities and members of the College of Humanities, Fine Arts or Agriculture & Life Sciences.
- **New graduate student orientation to campus (and your department) was very helpful to you.** Seven of ten agree – more often female students, non-Hispanic minorities and College of Medicine students. Less than two of ten disagree with this statement.
- **There are many professional development opportunities for graduate students.** The majority agree (53%). Still, less than two of ten “agree strongly” (16%) and more disagree (24%) – most often Eller College of Management students. Agreement tends to be higher among 22 to 24 year-olds, non-Hispanic minorities and students of the College of Education or Humanities.
- **There are tutoring, careers and academic advising services for graduate students.** Overall, more agree (44%) than disagree (31%). Hispanics, students who work progressively fewer hours and College of Medicine or Graduate College students are more likely to agree. Meanwhile, Eller College of Management and Fine Arts students are more apt to disagree with this statement.
- **There is ample, safe affordable housing for graduate students in the neighborhoods surrounding the campus.** Nearly one-half agree (46%). These tend to be Whites, single students and students of the College of Education or Fine Arts. On the other hand, 37% disagree with this statement – particularly progressively older students, married students and College of Agriculture & Life Sciences students.

5. **Student Service/Resource Usage** – The services or resources with the greatest degree of usage by students in the past semester include:

- **The University Bookstore** (98% usage – not measured in 2001.)
- **The Library** (92% usage – about the same as 2001 [94%.])
- **Student Union Food Services** (86% usage – not previously measured.)
- **The Campus Recreation Center** (58%, down significantly from 2001 [75%]; however, still remains high with men and Greek life students.)
- **The Campus Health Center** (53% usage, up from 49% in 2001 and 46% in 1996.)
- **The Financial Aid Office** (51% usage, up from 46% – especially high use among non-White students, upperclassmen, transfer students and those only part-time or not employed.)
- **Academic Advising Center** (51%, down from 70% in 2001- when it was referred to as “advising services.”)
- **Career Services** (33% usage, consistent with 32% in 2001 – and up from only 25% in 1996.)
- **The University Learning Center** (27% usage, up dramatically from 6% in 2001 – which was a decline from 10% in 1996.)
- **ASUA Saferide Program** (21%, up from 16% in 2001.)
- **Greek Life** (19% usage. This compares to 10% who say that they currently belong to a sorority or fraternity. Those most “Greek life” active are men, sophomores and Eller College of Management students.)
- **Student Leadership Programs** (16% usage, off slightly from 18% five years ago – when referred to as “Student Programs/Activity Services.”)
- **UA Facilitators** (15% usage, up significantly from 5% in 2001. This is especially true among freshmen and sophomores. One-fourth are still unfamiliar with this program.)
- **The Dean of Students Office** (13%, almost identical to 14% in 2001.)

- **Multi-Cultural Programs/Cultural Centers** (12%, up slightly from 11% in 2001.)
- **Commuter Student Affairs** (14% usage, a major increase from 5% in 2001.)
- **The Faculty Fellows Program** (11% usage, up from 8% five years ago. One of four are unfamiliar with the program.)

In 2001, eight student services had been used by less than one of ten students. This is true of only four programs now – all of which also have had marked increased usage. These include:

- **Disabled Resource Center** (8%, up from 3%.)
 - **Oasis Center** (4%, usage up from 3% in 2001 and only 1% in 1996. One of four are unfamiliar with this program.)
 - **Center for Learning Disabilities (SALT Center)** (4%, up slightly from 3% in the past two studies. Importantly, 12% say they are unaware of this program – up from only 6% five years ago.)
 - **University Childcare Program or Services** (4% usage, up significantly from only 1% in 2001.)
6. **Satisfaction with Student Services/Resources** – As we found in 2001, students who have used the resources/services evaluated in this study are typically satisfied with them. In most cases, the satisfaction evaluation of services used has improved since the 2001 and 1996 studies.

The Areas of Greatest Improvement – Compared to the 2001 and 1996 baseline surveys, user satisfaction scores (on the “1-to-5” evaluation scale) have increased the most and/or have the highest overall satisfaction levels are as follows:

- **The Library** (4.3, up from 4.0 – including 86% satisfaction and 92% usage.)
- **The Campus Health Center** (4.2 up from 4.0, with 83% satisfaction and 53% usage – indicating increased use as well.)
- **The Saferide Program** (4.1, up from a 3.9 for the ASUA Escort Service. Usage is up from 16% to 21% and overall satisfaction is now 78% – up from 70%.)

- **The University Learning Center** (4.0, up from 3.8 and dramatically greater usage – 27%, up from 6%. Satisfaction is now 74%, up from 60%.)
- **The Faculty Fellows Program** (4.0, up from 3.9; along with 11% usage, up from 8%.)
- **Commuter Student Affairs** (3.9, up from 3.7; and 14% usage, up from 5%. Satisfaction has grown from 56% to 72%.)
- **Academic Advising Center** (3.8, up from 3.6; although usage has dropped from 70% [when referred to as Advising Services] to 51%. Importantly, satisfaction has grown from 57% to 70 %.)
- **Career Services** (3.8, identical to 2001 and up from a 3.5 in 1996; along with 33% usage, up from 32%. Satisfaction is at 71%, up from 67%.)
- **UA Facilitators** (3.8, identical to 2001, with satisfaction down only slightly – from 71% to 64%; with usage nearly tripling from 5% to 15%. Usage has grown most significantly among freshmen and sophomores.)

First Time Evaluations – The services/resources evaluated for the first time in this tracking survey that generate a high degree of satisfaction among users include:

- **The University Bookstores** (3.9, with 98% usage and 75% satisfaction – especially high with freshmen [83%.])
- **Student Union Food Services** (3.6, with 86% usage and 66% satisfaction.)
- **Greek Life** (3.1, with 19% “usage” [involvement] and 47% satisfaction – which is especially strong with freshmen [3.8].)

Services That Have Declined – The remaining services/resources post a decline in high user satisfaction:

- **The Campus Recreation Center** (3.9, down from 4.4; with satisfaction down to 76% from 88% in 2001; and usage down to 58% from 75%.)
- **The Financial Aid Office** (3.6. down from 3.7; but with increased usage – 51%, up from 46%. Dissatisfaction has grown from 16% to 25%.)

- **Student Leadership Programs** (3.9, down from 4.0 [when referred to as Student Programs/Activities]. Participation is down from 18% to 16% and satisfaction has declined from 77% to 67%.)
 - **Disabled Resource Center** (3.9, down from 4.4 [when referred to as Disabled Student Services]. While satisfaction is down dramatically – from 92% to 59% – usage is up from 5% to 8%.)
 - **Multi-Cultural Programs and Services/Cultural Centers** (3.8, down from 4.2 in 2001 and 4.5 in 1996. Usage is about the same – 12%, up from 11% in 2001 and 13% in 1996. Satisfaction is down to 64% from 82% in 2001 and 92% in 1996.)
 - **The Center for Learning Disabilities (SALT Center)** (3.7, down from 4.6 in 2001 and 3.9 in 1996. Usage is up from 3% to 4%. Satisfaction is way down from 87% in 2001 and 71% in 1996 to only 47% now. Those most dissatisfied are graduate students [25%.])
 - **The Dean of Students Office** (3.5, down from 3.7; with almost identical satisfaction [58% versus 60% in 2001] and usage [13% compared to 14% in 2001]. Graduate students indicate the lowest level of satisfaction, with 27% saying that they are “dissatisfied.”)
 - **Oasis Center** (3.5, down from 4.4 in 2001 and 3.9 in 1996. Usage is up to 4% from 3%. Satisfaction, however, is down dramatically – from 93% to 41%. Freshmen indicate high satisfaction [4.0]; while graduate students are the most dissatisfied [3.3].)
 - **University Childcare Program or Services** (3.0, down from 3.6; with only 33% satisfaction, down from 60%. Graduate students are most likely to use these services and are most dissatisfied – by far [1.9]. Overall usage is up from 1% to 4%. Among graduate students, usage is up from 3% to 6%.)
7. **Evaluation of University Characteristics** – The following is a summary of student evaluations (including relevant tracking data), broken out by category:

University Facility/Resource Evaluations –

- **The quality of most University facilities you use are very good** (82% agree, up from 77%.)

- **Overall, the University's facilities accommodate disabled students well** (65% agree, down from 81%.)
- **The equipment you use in your classes is generally inadequate or outdated** (Six of ten disagree, similar to 2001 findings. Two of ten agree now, compared to 14% in 2001.)

Campus Safety Evaluations –

- **You feel safe on campus during the day** (Almost identical to the 2001 survey, the overwhelming majority agree [96%.])
- **You feel safe off campus during the day** (Only 80% agree. Strong agreement, however, is lower among female students.)
- **You don't feel safe off campus after dark** (54% agree with this statement. Females are twice as likely to agree [65%] as are men [32%.])
- **You don't feel safe on campus after dark** (Four of ten agree, up from only two of ten in 2001. One-half of females agree, compared to only 18% of male students.)

Administration and Policy Evaluations –

- **You would like to see students be more involved with large university-wide decisions** (80% agree, especially Greek Life students [90%.])
- **You feel powerless to change University policies** (66% agree, up from 51% in 2001 – a significant change in attitude.)
- **You believe students can impact University policy** (45% agree, virtually the same as we found in 2001 – but down from 55% agreement in 1996.)
- **University policies seem to have the students' best interest in mind** (39% agree, down slightly from 44% in 2001 and one-half in the baseline survey.)

Class Availability/Size Evaluations –

- **You feel less involved in classes with a larger number of students** (75% agree, up from 68% in 2001.)

- **Generally, you are satisfied with the size of your classes** (72% agree, up from 69% in 2001 but down from 83% in 1996.)
- **You have been unable to get some of the classes you need** (59% agree, up significantly from 37% in 2001 – compared to 53% in 1996.)
- **The size of most of your classes is way too large** (Nearly one-third agree, compared with only 18% in 2001 and 35% in 1996. The vast majority of graduate students disagree [75%.].)

Faculty/Teaching Assistant (TA) Evaluations –

- **You've had no problems with Teaching Assistants (TA's) in your class** (Only 56% now agree, compared to 64% in 2001 and 60% in 1996. Disagreement with this statement is highest with sophomores and Hispanic students. Two-thirds of freshmen agree that they've had no problems.)
- **Most faculty members seem to place more importance on research than teaching** (39% agree, up from 31% in 2001 – but still down from 52% in 1996.)
- **You are dissatisfied with most of the Teaching Assistants (TA's) you've had in your classes** (23% agree, up from only 15% in 2001 and 19% in 1996. Still, most disagree with this statement.)

Academic Advising Evaluations –

- **The quality of the academic advising you've received is good** (63% agree, up from 52% in 2001. Those most satisfied are freshmen and Greek Life members, as well as students in Education or Agriculture & Life Sciences.)
- **You've been unable to get the academic advising you need** (Three of ten agree, up from 23% in 2001. This is particularly true among Education or Social & Behavioral Sciences students.)

8. **Computer/Internet Usage and Evaluations** – More than nine of ten students have a desktop or laptop computer for their personal use (94%), up from 91% in 2001. Eight of ten students (up from 75%) use the computers and other resources in the campus computer labs. Campus computer usage tends to be greater among sophomores and upperclassmen – as well as non-White students and those enrolled in the College of Engineering, Humanities, Medicine or Social & Behavioral Sciences. As we found in 2001, freshmen are more apt to be non-users of campus computer resources (although the vast majority do use them).

Frequency of Campus Computer Usage – While usage has increased (from 75% to 81% overall), slightly fewer indicate that they utilize campus computers on a daily basis (from 26% to 22%). Weekly usage is basically unchanged at 38%, while a few more report using campus computers “a few times a month” (from 22% to 26%). The rest (14%) continue to indicate monthly (8%) or less frequent (6%) usage.

Hours Per Week Spent on the Internet Related to Academic Support – Six of ten students indicate that they spend 5 to 14 hours per week connected to the Internet related to academic support (communicating with faculty, research, coursework, etc.). Among the rest, nearly as many spend 15+ hours (17%) as less than four hours (24%) per week connected to the Internet for academic support. These 15+ hour per week users tend to be graduate students, non-Whites and male students. The largest share of undergraduates spend 5 to 9 hours on the Internet related to academic support.

Hours Per Week Spent on the Internet Related to Social Use – Students spend fewer hours connected to the Internet for social purposes (e-mails, Facebook, Myspace, instant messaging, etc.). More than six of ten students spend 9 or fewer hours per week connected to the Internet related to social use (63%). This includes one-third who spend less than four hours on-line each week. Usage in excess of 20 hours is inversely related to class and employment status. Married and Hispanic students are also more likely to indicate “light” social use of the Internet.

Quality of Communication Through Technology Compared to Face-to-Face Contact – One-half of students agree at least “somewhat” that the quality of communication through technology (such as e-mail, D2L, blackboard, listserv) is equally effective as face-to-face contact. However, only one of ten “agree strongly.” Among the rest, four of ten disagree with this statement – while one of ten neither agree nor disagree. The majority of undergraduates think communication through technology is equal to personal interaction. This also tends to be true among female students, Hispanics and College of Education or Engineering Students. Most graduate students disagree (54%).

Overall Rating of Computing Resources Availability – Similar to the 2001 survey, three of four students offer a positive evaluation of the availability of computing resources at the University of Arizona. Among the rest, and in line with 2001 findings, more offer a neutral (18%) than a negative (“not available”) (9%) evaluation. Graduate students offer the most positive evaluations. Positive evaluations are also higher among students enrolled in the Graduate College and College of Humanities, Medicine or Agriculture & Life Sciences.

Overall Satisfaction With Computing Resources – Students were also asked to rate their overall satisfaction with the computing resources provided by the University. More than three of four are satisfied with these resources (77%), up from 73% in 2001. Satisfaction scores are consistent regardless of class status, but marginally higher among seniors and graduate students (especially those enrolled in the Graduate College). Medicine, Humanities and Agriculture & Life Sciences students also indicate a higher degree of overall satisfaction with computing resources.

Regular Use of Various Types of Technology – New to the current survey, students were also probed for their regular usage of various types of technology. Nearly all students regularly use a **cell phone** (97%). Cell phone usage is nearly universal among undergraduates, and only slightly lower among graduate students (93%).

Most also regularly use an **iPod or MP3 player** (56%), especially freshmen, fraternity/sorority members and students who are not employed – as well as College of Medicine and Eller College of Management students. MP3 player usage is inversely related to employment status and is higher among male students (61%) as compared to females (54%). Meanwhile, the majority of juniors, non-Hispanic minorities and transfer students do not regularly use an MP3 player.

Less than one of ten students regularly use a **P.D.A. (Personal Digital Assistant)** (9%) – more often male students, graduate students and College of Engineering students.

9. **Primary Source of Learning about On-Campus Activities** – Three of ten University of Arizona students indicate that their primary source of learning about on-campus activities is *The Daily Wildcat*. This is particularly true among upperclassmen, male students, transfer students and College of Medicine or Agriculture & Life Sciences students. One of four report that listservs are their primary source. Nearly as many rely on friends as their primary information resource (22%). Another 14% primarily rely on the University website. Few utilize a Facebook (4%) or text-messaging (1%) as their primary resource.

Types of On-Campus Events Attended Most Often – When asked to identify the 2-3 types of on-campus events they attend most often, one of ten each report attending athletic or sports events, concerts or music performances and academic-oriented activities (such as seminars or brown bag meetings). Sports event attendance is more common among freshmen and juniors, while upperclassmen are more likely to go to a music concert. Graduate students (and, relatedly, progressively older or Graduate College students) are most likely to indicate attending an academic-related activity.

Another 7% regularly attend club-related activities, more often seniors and College of Engineering students. Other regularly attended on-campus events include cultural related activities (such as an art show or play) (6%), events on the mall (6%), fraternity/sorority events (5%) and guest lectures (5%). Overall, more than 60 different events are mentioned by students.

Overall, four of ten do not identify any specific events (32%) or indicate they attend no such events (8%). Those who do not attend any on-campus events tend to be older (30+) students, graduate students, married students and those employed for 20+ hours each week (in addition to classes).

10. **Faculty Evaluations** – Consistent with prior tracking surveys, student respondents were asked to rate the performance of the University’s faculty. *Overall, faculty evaluations are generally less highly positive than we found in 2001 – but still higher than the 1996 baseline survey.*

Two-thirds or more of students indicate a positive (“excellent” or “good”) rating of the faculty with respect to these seven characteristics:

- **The faculty’s sensitivity to students with physical disabilities** (Three of four offer a positive rating [3.9 average score], off slightly from eight of ten [4.2] in 2001 [when this characteristic included “physical or learning disabilities”].)
- **The accessibility of faculty members by e-mail** (Two-thirds indicate a favorable rating, down from 86% in 2001. Graduate students indicate the highest marks [4.1 versus 3.7-3.9 among undergraduates].)
- **The faculty’s sensitivity to students with learning disabilities** (Overall, two-thirds are favorable – down from eight of ten in 2001 who responded positively to a statement regarding “physical or learning disabilities.”)
- **The respect faculty members show students** (Compared to 2001, positive evaluations have declined [from 77% to 66%] and a few more indicate a “poor” grade [from 4% to 11%]. “Good” ratings are elevated among freshmen and graduate students.)
- **The faculty’s sensitivity to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender students** (Among those with an opinion, two-thirds specify a favorable rating – compared to only 12% who are negative. Freshmen and graduate students indicate the most favorable scores.)

- **The *sensitivity* of faculty members to diverse ethnic groups or cultures** (Two-thirds are favorable, down from 73% in 2001 – although “poor” grades remain low [10%]. Positive evaluations are highest among seniors and graduate students, as well as Whites. Hispanics are reflective of overall evaluations. On the other hand, less than one-half of non-Hispanic minority students offer an “excellent” or “good” evaluation [48%] – while two of ten are negative.)
- **The *quality* of faculty members** (64% report a positive evaluation, down from 77% in the 2001 survey. Similar to the last study, graduate students offer the most favorable grades. Among undergraduates, seniors are more highly positive than juniors or underclassmen. With respect to college, Humanities and Agriculture & Life Sciences students are most favorable.)

The majority of students also indicate positive evaluations of the following faculty characteristics:

- **The faculty’s use of technology in the classroom** (58% indicate a favorable score, down from 73% in 2001 [when simply tested as “faculty members’ use of technology”]. Positive evaluations are elevated among freshmen and seniors, as well as fraternity/sorority members and College of Agriculture & Life Sciences students.)
- **The availability of faculty members for office hours** (Compared to 2001, fewer are favorable [from 70% to 58%]. Graduate students again offer the most positive evaluations – as do White students [especially compared to non-Whites] and Humanities students.)
- **The level of *support* faculty members give students** (Positive scores have declined from 67% to 58%, while negative evaluations have increased somewhat [from 8% to 14%]. Graduate students and Graduate College or Agriculture & Life Sciences students indicate the most favorable evaluations.)
- **The faculty’s *flexibility* to individual student’s needs such as religious holidays or child care considerations** (There has been a dip in positive evaluations [from 63% to 52%], although negative scores remain basically unchanged at 19%. Graduate students offer the most favorable opinions. About one of four Hispanics and non-Hispanic minorities rate the faculty as “not so good” or “poor” – while White students are generally reflective of overall patterns. Married students are more highly positive than are singles.)

Just less than one-half of students offer a positive evaluation of the faculty with respect to the following qualities:

- **The faculty's *responsiveness to students' input*** (Positive scores have dipped to 1996 levels [48%, down from 61% in 2001] and negative evaluations have increased [from 9% in 2001 to 17% now]. More likely to indicate a negative score are juniors, non-Hispanic minorities and Engineering students. Graduate students and College of Humanities or Medicine students are more likely to be positive.)
- **The *involvement of the faculty with students*** (Just less than one-half indicate a positive evaluation [48%], down slightly from 54% in 2001. At the same time, unfavorable mentions have increased somewhat [from 13% to 19%]. Graduate students are most likely to score the faculty as "good" or "excellent" – while seniors are most favorable among undergraduates. Nearly as many Hispanic students are negative [33%] as positive [39%]. This is also the case among sophomores.)
- **The *clarity of the expectations the faculty gives to students*** (Only 46% offer a positive "grade," down from 64% in 2001 – while negative evaluations have grown from 7% to 17%. Negative scores are more apparent among non-Hispanic minorities, juniors and Fine Arts majors. Seniors and graduate students are most likely to indicate a positive evaluation.)
- **The faculty's *availability to interact with students outside the classroom*** (New to the current survey, only 45% report a positive "grade" – compared to 19% who are negative. As many Hispanic students offer a negative as positive evaluation [35% each]. Again, graduate students indicate the most favorable evaluations.)

There is a more of a "neutral" evaluation overall with respect to **the faculty's responsiveness to diverse learning styles**, with three of ten each offering a positive or negative score. While this is generally the case regardless of class status, slightly more sophomores and juniors are negative than positive.

11. **“Social Environment” Evaluations** – Students were asked to rate their personal importance of specific areas of student life at the University of Arizona.

These four aspects of student life are “very important” to a majority of students:

- **The academic experience** (76% “very important,” up from 64% in 2001. The degree of high importance is marginally lower only among sophomores [66% versus 75%-81% in the other classifications]. The oldest students, Hispanics and College of Humanities students are especially apt to highly value the academic experience.)
- **Safety** (64% “very important,” up from 60%/4.4 in 2001. There are few differences in strong importance among undergraduates [66%-68%], although it is lower among graduate students [53%]. Women, the youngest students and Hispanics place the most importance on this aspect of student life.)
- **Faculty support** (59% “very important,” up from 48% in 2001. Three of four graduate students – as well as two-thirds of non-White students – place a high degree of importance on faculty support. Only sophomores are less likely to rate this aspect “very important” [40% versus 55%-60% among other undergraduates].)
- **Access to faculty and administration** (51% “very important,” up from 44% in 2001. Seniors and graduate students are especially apt to indicate strong importance. This is also the case among Hispanics, Engineering, Fine Arts and Graduate College students.)

Two-thirds or more indicate that the following factors are “important” or “very important” to them, including:

- **The quality of facilities and equipment** (89% importance, 42% “very important.” This is highly consistent with the 2001 survey. Strong importance is highest among graduate students, Hispanics and College of Medicine or Engineering students.)
- **The overall social climate or atmosphere** (73% importance, 29% “very important.” This reflects an increase from two-thirds importance in 2001. The importance of the social climate is inversely related to class status and higher also among Hispanics and College of Humanities students. As we found in 2001, Greek system members [91%] place a higher degree of importance on this factor than non-members [72%].)

- **The diversity of the student population** (67% importance, 32% “very important.” These findings are consistent with the 2001 survey. Also similar to the last study, non-White students [53%] – especially Hispanics [59%] – consider student diversity “very important.” This compares to 24% of White students [although 62% place some degree of importance on this factor]. Freshmen, female students and College of Humanities or Graduate College students are also more likely to value student diversity.)
- **Feeling part of the University “community”** (65% importance, 23% “very important.” This is up from 58% importance in 2001. Freshmen, Hispanics and fraternity/sorority members – along with Eller College of Management, Medicine and Humanities students – place the most importance on being part of the University “community.”)

Compared to 2001, more place importance on **involvement in the University beyond the classroom** – both overall (from 49% to 63%) and in terms of strong importance (from 17% to 26%). Importance is higher among undergraduates (especially freshmen) as compared to graduate students. Non-White students (more often Hispanics), fraternity/sorority members and Engineering or Medical students are also more likely to place elevated importance on this factor.

Degree of Involvement in Student Organizations or Activities – The majority of students indicate they are at least “somewhat involved” with student organizations or activities outside of the classroom (55%), including 16% who say they are “very involved.” This is highly consistent with the 2001 survey (57% and 17%, respectively). Similar to prior surveys, those 25 and older are less apt to be involved in student organizations, as are Hispanics and those who work 20 or more hours per week. Fraternity/sorority members continue to be particularly apt to be at least “somewhat” involved (93% versus 51% of non-Greeks). Sophomores and College of Medicine or Agriculture & Life Sciences students are also more apt to be at least “somewhat involved” in student organizations.

Degree of Involvement in Non-University Organizations or Activities – Slightly less indicate they are at least “somewhat involved” in non-University organizations or activities (59%, down from 62% in 2001), although a few more say they are “very involved” (19%, up from 16%). Consistent with 2001 findings, women, 20 to 21 year-olds and seniors are more apt to be involved in a non-University organization, as are non-Hispanic minorities and College of Medicine students. Three of four fraternity/sorority members also report involvement in a non-University activity, including 44% who are “very involved” (versus 57%/16% for non-Greeks).

On-Line Interest Groups Compared to Face-to-Face Groups – One-half disagree that on-line interest groups (i.e., Facebook or Myspace) are as meaningful as those groups that are based on face-to-face interaction between individual students. Just 27% agree to any degree (with only 6% who “agree strongly”) – while nearly as many “disagree strongly” (26%). The level of agreement is similar regardless of class status or other demographic sub-group.

12. **Student Body Diversity/Tolerance Evaluations** – The following is a summary of student evaluations of various aspects of student body diversity and tolerance:

- **Students are generally *tolerant* of ethnic or racial differences** (72% agree –off slightly from 2001 – including twice as many who disagree [from 5% to 12%]. As we found in 2001, the majority agree regardless of ethnicity – although Hispanic [56%] and other minority [62%] students are less likely to agree than Whites [77%.])
- **Students are generally *tolerant* of religious belief differences** (Two-thirds agree, only slightly lower than 2001 [70%]. Underclassmen and Greek life members are more likely to agree with this statement. While agreement is similar between White and Hispanic students [71% each], it is much lower among non-Hispanic minorities [56%] – including two of ten who disagree.)
- **The student body diversity has a positive impact on the overall University environment** (Agreement – both strong and overall – has continued to incrementally decline since the 1996 baseline study. Six of ten agree with this statement, including 23% who do so “strongly.” This is down from 69% in 2001. Strong agreement is similar regardless of ethnicity, although Hispanic students are most likely agree to some extent [70% versus 59% of Whites and 54% of non-Hispanic minorities].)
- **The “diversity” of events at the University helps create better understanding among students** (New to the current survey, 57% agree with this statement [16% “strongly”] versus 13% who disagree. Agreement is higher among non-White students [63%] as compared to Whites [55%]. Freshmen and Fine Arts students are also more likely to agree with this statement.)

- **Students are generally tolerant of sexual orientation differences** (Highly consistent with 2001 findings, 56% agree [15% “strongly”] and 11% disagree. On average, agreement is similar regardless of class status and higher among College of Fine Arts or Science students.)
- **Racial and ethnic tensions are a serious problem on campus** (Seven of ten disagree [down from 81% in 2001], and just 8% agree to any degree. Similar to overall patterns, seven of ten Hispanic and White students disagree. More than six of ten non-Hispanic students also disagree [63%] – although 18% “agree somewhat.”)

13. **Student Conduct/Personal Behavior Evaluations** – The following is a summary of student agreement with various statements regarding student conduct and personal behavior:

- **Students often feel overwhelmed and frustrated** (Compared to 2001, more agree – both overall [from 54% to 68%] and “strongly” [from 16% to 25%]. Still this is short of 1996 totals [81% and 36%, respectively]. Agreement in the current study is inversely related to class status and higher among non-Hispanic minorities and College of Science, Humanities or Fine Arts students.)
- **Students are generally civil or polite, rather than rude** (While agreement is generally consistent with the 2001 survey [69%], the percentage who disagree has inched higher [from 8% to 14%]. Agreement is highest among graduate students, while lower only among sophomores.)
- **It’s easy to make friends with other students** (64% agree, representing a progressive decline since the 2001 [73%] and 1996 [84%] surveys. Compared to 2001, twice as many disagree [from 10% to 21%] – more often non-White students, sophomores and upperclassmen. Still, the majority of students regardless of class status [including 74% of freshmen] or ethnicity agree with this statement.)
- **Students are more interested in getting their degree than the overall student experience** (Compared to 2001, more students agree with this statement [from 36% to 43%] – while one-third continue to disagree. Agreement continues to be directly related to class status and is higher among non-Hispanic minority students and transfer students. More Greek life students disagree [44%] than agree [29%]. This is also the case among freshmen.)

14. **University Administration/Policy Evaluations –**

- **Students are cynical about their ability to impact University policy** (Similar to the 2001 survey, six of ten students agree – 18% “strongly.” However, just 7% now disagree with this statement, down from 12%. As we found in the previous study, seniors and graduate students are more likely to agree. This is also the case among male students and those enrolled in the College of Humanities or the Graduate College.)
- **Most students feel alienated and not part of “the system”** (In a reversal from the 2001 survey, slightly more now agree [33%] than disagree [29%]. This is the case among all but freshmen [24% versus 28%, respectively]. One-half of Hispanic students agree with this statement. This is also the case among four of ten Science, Humanities, Medicine and Graduate College students.)

15. **Student Climate/Social Environment Evaluations –**

- **School *spirit* is strong** (While the vast majority continues to agree, it is down from 2001 levels – both overall [from 77% to 66%] and “strongly” [from 39% to 25%]. In addition, disagreement has increased from 6% to 13%. Similar to the previous study, agreement is highest among underclassmen – including nine of ten freshmen. This compares to one-half of graduate students. Hispanics, female students and College of Agriculture & Life Sciences students are more likely to agree with this statement.)
- **The student academic climate is very competitive** (53% agree, up slightly from the 2001 survey [51%]. However, disagreement has increased from 16% to 23%. Nearly as many graduate students disagree [35%] as agree [40%]. Most undergraduates agree to some degree, particularly freshmen and juniors – as well as female students, Hispanics, transfer students, fraternity/sorority members and College of Medicine students.)
- **There is a feeling of “community” among students** (Just less than one-half agree [48%], off slightly from 52% in 2001. However, disagreement has increased from 16% to 29%. More apt to disagree are juniors, non-White students, married students and those who work 20+ hours per week. Underclassmen – particularly freshmen – are most apt to agree. Agreement also skews female and is elevated among Whites, fraternity/sorority members and Eller College of Management, Humanities and Fine Arts students.)

16. **Overall Rating of the University Social Environment** – Six of ten rate the University social environment as “excellent” or “good” (down slightly from 62% in 2001), while 8% say it is “not so good” or “poor” (up from 4%). Younger students (21 and under) continue to rate the University social environment higher. Fraternity/sorority members also remain more apt to offer a higher rating than their non-Greek counterparts. There is little difference in ratings among undergraduates, while graduate students offer a somewhat lower rating. While there was no real difference based on gender in 2001, women now give a higher rating for the University social environment than do men.

Reasons for Rating the University Social Environment as “Excellent” or “Good” – Students who indicate a positive evaluation of the University social environment are most likely to say that “most of the people you meet on campus are very nice, with very few exceptions” (21%, down from 31% in 2001). Several refer to high tolerance among students. Others say that they “have been able to make friends with a lot of really neat people from diverse backgrounds” (10%). Others appreciate opportunities to get involved, as well as social events, clubs and other organizations encouraged and supported by the University. Others refer to the sense of openness on campus that promotes diversity or that students get along with each other.

Reasons for Rating the University Social Environment as “Not So Good” or “Poor” – While most do not offer a specific criticism, several say “there is too much emphasis on the Greek life and their social activities” (18%, up from 4% in 2001). Relative to the 2001 survey, fewer specifically mention student cliques – although some refer to “stuck-up and cocky” students who “socialize over a beer bong.” Other say there is “lack of real diversity” among students – including some who note a “strong distinction between racial groups on campus.” More generally, some “feel disconnected from the majority of the student body” and/or indicate that “many students feel unable to communicate or make friends on campus.”

17. **Goals for Gains From Academic Experience** – New to the current survey, student respondents were asked to explain what they hope to have gained from the University at the end of their academic experience. Three of ten – particularly sophomores and College of Science students – simply say “**earning my degree**” is a primary goal. More generally, two of ten desire “**knowledge about my field**” – more often male students, non-Hispanic minorities and seniors or graduate students. Others seek “**a strong education**” (14%) and/or practical knowledge concerning their field of study (11%).

In addition to their academic goals, several students desire “**lifelong friends**” (16%) – along with “**memories.**” Others would like to gain “**real-world experience to prepare me for the rest of my life,**” as well as “**a sense of self**” or “**to know who I am**” (5%-6%). Some hope to improve their “**social skills**” or “**social aptitude.**”

One of ten (more often seniors and College of Engineering students) would like to gain “a great education that will leave me **marketable** in the real world” (“preparation for my **career,**” “a degree that will get me a **good paying job**”). In addition, some graduate students seek “**a network of contacts**” in their chosen field.

18. **Favorite Activities or Pastimes** – “Hanging out with friends” continues to a primary spare time activity (31%, up slightly from 29% in 2001). There has also been a slight increase in the share who “watch movies” (from 16% to 19%) – along with “family time” (7%), “going to parties” (6%), “dancing” (5%), “shopping” (5%), “eating out” (4%) and/or “bars or clubs” (4%). While there are fewer specific references to the Student Recreation Center, one of ten say they “exercise” or “go to they gym” – while others pursue individual (hiking, cycling, running or swimming) (17%) or team oriented (16%) sports. One of ten attend sporting events. Two of ten enjoy “reading.” Compared to 2001, there are fewer specific references to the Internet – although some “chat on-line” (5%) and/or “play video games” (6%).
19. **Ways Student Would Feel Safer on Campus During the Day** – Three of four students indicate they “already feel safe” (37%) or have no specific suggestion (38%). Those who say they “feel safe during the day” tend to be female students, Whites and undergraduates. Another 7% report “if there are **a lot of people** on campus, I feel safe.”

Among the rest, one of ten recommend that “**seeing more campus security**” would make them feel safer on campus during the day (“**police on bikes,**” “**more security in the parking garages,**” “**more patrols and cops on campus**”). Others indicate that “**keeping homeless people off campus** would make many feel safer,” while some focus on “**less traffic**” or “campus police to **enforce riding laws to bicycle riders and skate boarders.**”

20. **Ways Student Would Feel Safer on Campus at Night** – The two primary suggestions made by students to improve nighttime campus security include:

- **“More lighting” or “more blue light towers”** (33%) (These are twice as likely to be female students [39% versus 21% of males]. Relatedly, a few women also suggest additional “blue phones” or “emergency call phones.”)
- **“A more visible security personnel presence” or “more police officers on patrol at night”** (29%) (Again, these are much more likely to be female [35%] than male [17%] students.)

In lesser numbers, others suggest that **“more people on campus”** at night would make them feel safer. Some recommend **the extension of Safe-Ride program hours or the number of stops it makes**. As with daytime safety preferences, a few add **“keep bums away from campus”** at night.