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Executive Summary

This report is based on data responses to the biennial University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) administered in 2008, 2010, 2012, and 2014. Students rated their satisfaction with advising by departmental staff, faculty and college advisors. We analyzed upper-division (junior and senior) students’ satisfaction with advising in the division, across majors and over time. Student ratings were on a 6-point scale from “very dissatisfied” to “very satisfied.” For our analyses we grouped responses into two categories “fully satisfied” (including very satisfied and satisfied) and “other responses.” In addition, using the most recent survey data we explored the relationship between satisfaction with advising and other student experiences including satisfaction with program requirements, department rules and policies, availability of courses, opportunities for research, overall academic experience, GPA, as well as equitable and fair treatment by faculty. We also examined the relationship between student satisfaction with advising and the student to departmental staff advisor ratio.

Key Findings

- During 2008-2014 upper-division Social Sciences students’ satisfaction with advising by departmental staff decreased from 60% satisfied in 2008 to 54% in 2014.
- On a program level, student satisfaction with departmental staff advising varied across programs and slightly declined over time. In some programs it was as high as 79% and 90% of students satisfied.
- During 2008-2014 student satisfaction with advising by faculty stayed around 55% (in 2014).
- On a program level, student satisfaction with faculty advising varied across programs and consistently ranged between 54-60% of students. In some programs it was as high as 78% and 90% of students satisfied.
- In 2008-2014 the average satisfaction with the academic advising students received from college staff was consistently around 50% satisfied. Program levels varied from 33% to 66% of students satisfied.
- Over time some of the programs have had significant differences in student experiences with advising related to their transfer status, first generation status, and class level (juniors vs seniors).
- The ratio of students to departmental staff advisor was not a factor in student satisfaction with departmental staff advising.
- Among factors that significantly affected Social Science students’ satisfaction with advising by departmental staff and faculty were student concerns that their program’s requirements were not well-defined and that the department rules and policies were not clearly communicated. Students who did not understand how major requirements combine to produce a coherent understanding of a field of study also expressed less satisfaction with departmental staff and faculty advising.
- Finally, students who were more satisfied with academic advising by departmental staff and faculty were also more satisfied with their overall academic experience.
“Fully satisfied” Metric

This report focuses on upper-division (junior and senior) students’ satisfaction with academic advising provided by faculty, departmental staff, and colleges. We report levels of satisfaction with advising by division and major and by type of advisor based on four UCUES surveys: 2008, 2010, 2012, and 2014. For each program of study, we also compared levels of student satisfaction between juniors and seniors, first generation students and their counterparts, transfer students and students who started at UCSC as frosh.

The goal of this analysis was to provide information useful for program improvement. The analysis:

1. Measures excellence in advising by estimating a proportion of students that were fully satisfied (defined as responding with one of the top two choices on a 6-point scale);
2. Compares advising within different programs relative to this highest/desired level of satisfaction.
3. Offers information that can be used to set standards of excellence based on the observed levels of satisfaction.

Other analytic approaches, such as the use of means (or averages), is less useful for program improvement because they consider “average” levels (that typically fall in the middle category “somewhat satisfied”) and thus provide a limited insight about best practices or improvements over time (2008-2014).

We constructed this “fully satisfied” metric as follows: The UCUES survey questions about advising ask students to report their satisfaction on a 6-point scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td>somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>dissatisfied</td>
<td>very dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{FULLY SATISFIED} \rightarrow \text{i.e., a “best practice”} \] \[ \text{OTHER} \rightarrow \]

Based on our experience with using survey data for program improvement, we grouped student responses in two categories: “fully satisfied,” which included 5=satisfied and 6=very satisfied; and “other,” which included responses from 1 to 4. This metric allows to identify programs that may employ “best practices” and identify the level of satisfaction that could be set as the standard for all programs. This “fully satisfied” metric also enhances our ability to measure excellence in advising and improvement over time.

To provide greater context for the analysis, Table 1 (based on responses to the 2014 UCUES survey) includes both metrics: the proportion of “fully satisfied” and mean scores for each type of advising for UC-wide responses (excluding UCSC) and our campus. Table 1 shows that
across the UC and at UCSC about 50% of students are fully satisfied with academic advising, and that overall student satisfaction with college advising is slightly lower than with the advising provided by faculty and departmental staff. The mean (or average) scores only tell us that both UC-wide and campus-wide students are “somewhat satisfied” with the advising that they are receiving (i.e., a score of 4.20-4.40 on the 6-point scale is equivalent to “somewhat satisfied”).

Table 1. 2014 UC and UCSC student satisfaction with advising, by advising type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UC WIDE</th>
<th>CAMPUS-WIDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>% Fully Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENTAL STAFF</td>
<td>49,879</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>50,270</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE STAFF</td>
<td>49,872</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*6-point scale: 1 = Very dissatisfied, 2 = Dissatisfied, 3 = Somewhat dissatisfied, 4 = Somewhat satisfied, 5 = Satisfied, 6 = Very satisfied

Table 2 shows the variability of student satisfaction at UCSC by academic division in 2014. The Humanities division has the highest proportion of students fully satisfied with advising provided by all three types of advisors. The observed level of satisfaction is about 70% for departmental staff and faculty advising. During the 2008-2014 period, the levels of satisfaction in the Humanities with faculty and departmental staff advising fluctuated in the range of 65% to 73%. Based on this data, the level of 66% or two–thirds of students being fully satisfied may be considered as the desired standard for all divisions and types of advisors.

Table 2. 2014 UCSC student satisfaction with advising, by type of advising and Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% FULLY SATISFIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENTAL STAFF</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE STAFF</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 See the report on advising for the Humanities Division.
Departmental Comparisons over Time

In 2008-2014 the average satisfaction of upper-division Social Sciences students with the academic advising they received from staff decreased from 60% to 54% (see Table 3 total).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Management Economics</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Science*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics &amp; Global Economics</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVS**</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American and Latino Studies</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Studies</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A sufficient number of respondents was not available until 2014.

**Environmental Studies includes ENVS single major and ENVS combined with Economics, Biology, or Earth Sciences.

In 2008-2014 the average satisfaction of upper-division Social Sciences students with the academic advising they received from faculty was consistently around 55% satisfied (see Table 4 total).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Management Economics</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Science*</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Studies</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics &amp; Global Economics</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVS**</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American and Latino Studies</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Studies</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A sufficient number of respondents was not available until 2014.

**Environmental Studies includes ENVS single major and ENVS combined with Economics, Biology, or Earth Sciences.
In 2008-2014 the average satisfaction of upper-division Social Sciences students with the academic advising they received from college staff was consistently around 50% satisfied (see Table 5 total).

Table 5. Advising by college staff, Upper Division Students in the Social Sciences Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Management Economics</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Science*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Studies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics &amp; Global Economics</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVS**</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American and Latino Studies</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Studies</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A sufficient number of respondents was not available until 2014.

**Environmental Studies includes ENVS single major and ENVS combined with Economics, Biology, or Earth Sciences.
**Satisfaction with Advising Across Programs by Year**

Student satisfaction with different types of advising varied by major, each year. Below we display satisfaction with departmental staff advising (see Figure 1) followed by satisfaction with faculty (see Figure 2) and college advising (see Figure 3) for each year surveyed. The division average is also shown for reference.

**Figure 1. Satisfied with advising by departmental staff, Social Sciences Division (2008-2014)**

![Graph showing satisfaction with advising by departmental staff by year for various programs in Social Sciences Division, 2008-2014. Satisfaction levels are indicated by different colored bars for each year. The division average is also shown for reference.]

*A sufficient number of respondents was not available for Cognitive Science until 2014, so it was omitted.

**Environmental Studies includes ENVS single major and ENVS combined with Economics, Biology, or Earth Sciences.*
Figure 2. Satisfied with faculty advising, Social Sciences Division (2008-2014)*

* A sufficient number of respondents was not available for Cognitive Science until 2014, so it was omitted.

** Environmental Studies includes ENVS single major and ENVS combined with Economics, Biology, or Earth Sciences.
Figure 3. Satisfied with advising by college staff, Social Sciences Division (2008-2014)*

* A sufficient number of respondents was not available for Cognitive Science until 2014, so it was omitted.

** Environmental Studies includes ENVS single major and ENVS combined with Economics, Biology, or Earth Sciences.
Social Sciences Students’ Satisfaction with Advising, 2008-2014

**Satisfaction with Advising by Programs over Time**

Next we look at each program of study and describe the changes in student satisfaction between 2008 and 2014 (as shown in Tables 1-3) as well as significant differences between juniors and seniors, transfer students and those who started UCSC as frosh, and first generation college students and their non-first generation peers.

**Anthropology**

- In Anthropology, satisfaction with advising varied across years and by the type of advisor.
- Satisfaction with advising by departmental staff increased in 2010 and 2012 and then dropped in 2014.
- Despite some fluctuations, satisfaction with advising by faculty consistently ranged between 57% and 73% and was lower in 2014 than in 2008.
- Satisfaction with college staff advising increased from 45% in 2008 to 58% in 2014.
- No statistically significant differences were found between juniors’ and seniors’ satisfaction with each of the three types of advisors.
- No statistically significant differences were found between first generation students and their peers’ satisfaction with each of the three types of advisors (see Figure 4).
- In 2008 transfer students were significantly less satisfied with advising by departmental staff than students who started UCSC as frosh (see Figure 5). Importantly, both transfer students and their peers’ satisfaction sharply declined after 2012 thus reducing previously found group differences. At the same time, transfer students and their peers reported similar levels of satisfaction with faculty advising and college advisors during this time period.
Business Management Economics

- In Business Management Economics (BME), satisfaction with advising varied slightly since 2008. Satisfaction with advising by departmental staff was consistently within range of 50%-58%, by faculty consistently ranged of 45%-56%, and by college staff ranged within 44%-50% in 2008-2014.
- In 2010 juniors in BME were significantly less satisfied than seniors with college staff advising. No significant differences were found between juniors’ and seniors’ satisfaction with college staff advising in subsequent years as well as with other types of advisors.
- There were no significant differences in satisfaction with either type of advisor between first generation and non-first generation students.
- Transfer students were significantly more satisfied with advising by departmental staff and faculty in 2008 and 2010 (see Figures 6 and 7). However, this gap closed in subsequent years, in part because transfer students’ satisfaction decreased. Transfer students were significantly more satisfied with advising by college staff than their peers’ in 2010 and 2014 (Figure 8).

*Indicates a group difference based on Chi-Square tests at $p < .05$
Figure 6. Satisfied with departmental staff advising in BME by transfer status

Figure 7. Satisfied with faculty advising in BME by transfer status

Figure 8. Satisfied with college advising in BME by transfer status

*Indicates a group difference based on Chi-Square tests at $p < .05$. 
Economics

- Average levels of satisfaction with advising by departmental staff and faculty was consistently around 50% satisfied during 2008-2014. Satisfaction with college advisors dropped from 50% satisfied in 2008 to 40% satisfied in 2014.
- No significant differences were found between juniors’ and seniors’ satisfaction with various types of advisors except in 2012, when juniors were significantly less satisfied than seniors with college staff advising.
- There were no significant differences in satisfaction with either kind of advisor between first generation and non-first generation students in 2008-2014.
- No significant differences were found between transfer students and their peers’ with faculty advising.
- In 2008 transfer students were significantly less satisfied with advising by departmental staff than students who started UCSC as frosh (see Figure 9). However, this trend reversed in subsequent years due to increase in transfer students’ satisfaction and them becoming more satisfied than their peers. Transfer students were significantly less satisfied in 2008 and significantly more satisfied in 2010 and 2014 with advising by college staff than their peers’ (see Figure 10).

Figure 9. Satisfied with departmental staff advising in Economics by transfer status

Figure 10. Satisfied with college staff advising in Economics by transfer status

*Indicates a group difference based on Chi-Square tests at $p < .05$
Community Studies

- In Community Studies, satisfaction with advising by departmental staff, faculty and college staff increased considerably since 2008.
- Satisfaction with advising by departmental staff increased from 80% in 2008 to 91% in 2014 and satisfaction with advising by faculty increased from 73% in 2008 to 91% in 2014.
- In 2008, seniors were significantly less satisfied than juniors with faculty advising (see Figure 11). However, this gap closed in subsequent years, in part because seniors’ satisfaction increased in subsequent years. No significant differences were found between juniors’ and seniors’ satisfaction with departmental staff or college advisors.
- No significant differences were found between first generation students and their peers’ satisfaction with departmental staff or faculty advising.
- In 2012, first generation students were significantly less satisfied than non-first generation students with advising by college staff. However, this trend reversed with all first generation students reporting being satisfied in 2014 (see Figure 12).
- There were no significant differences in satisfaction between transfer students and their peers’ with either type of advisor.

*Indicates a group difference based on Chi-Square tests at $p .05$
Environmental Studies (includes ENVS single and ENVS combined majors)

- Overall, satisfaction with departmental staff advising fell dramatically between 2008 and 2010 and then began to increase in 2012 and 2014, reaching 52% satisfied.
- Satisfaction with advising by faculty was consistently within the range of 50%-54% between 2008 and 2014.
- Student satisfaction with college staff consistently ranged between 42%-48%.
- In 2008, juniors were significantly less satisfied than seniors with advising by departmental staff. In both 2008 and 2010, juniors were significantly less satisfied than seniors with advising by faculty (see Figure 13). However, this gap closed in subsequent years because juniors’ satisfaction increased while seniors’ satisfaction decreased.
- No significant differences were found between juniors’ and seniors’ satisfaction with college advisors.
- There were no significant differences in satisfaction with any of the advisors between first generation and non-first generation students in 2008-2014.
- In 2014 transfer students were significantly more satisfied than their peers’ with departmental staff advising, advising by faculty and by college staff. Figure 14 shows the changes in satisfaction with faculty advising; while transfer students’ satisfaction increased in 2014, satisfaction among students who started as frosh declined.

*Figure 13. Satisfied with faculty advising in Environmental Studies by class level

*Figure 14. Satisfied with faculty advising in Environmental Studies by transfer status

*Indicates a group difference based on Chi-Square tests at $p < .05$
Latin American and Latino Studies

- In Latin American and Latino Studies (LALS), satisfaction with advising fluctuated significantly since 2008. Satisfaction with advising by departmental staff decreased significantly from 75% satisfied in 2012 to 35% in 2014. Similarly for faculty and college staff advising, there was a large decrease in their satisfaction between 2012 and 2014.
- No significant differences were found between juniors’ and seniors’ satisfaction with departmental, faculty or college staff advising.
- In 2008, 2012 and 2014, first generation students were significantly more satisfied with advising by departmental staff than their peers (see Figure 15). Also in 2014, first generation students were significantly more satisfied than non-first generation students with advising by college staff.
- Regarding faculty advising on academic matters, no significant differences were found between first generation and their peers as well as between transfer students and students who started as frosh.
- In 2014, transfer students were significantly less satisfied with advising by departmental (Figure 16) and college staff (Figure 17) than those who started UCSC as frosh.

*Figure 15. Satisfied with departmental staff advising in LALS by first generation status

*Figure 16. Satisfied with departmental staff advising in LALS by transfer status

*Indicates a group difference based on Chi-Square tests at p .05
Legal Studies

- In Legal Studies, satisfaction with advising increased considerably since 2008. Satisfaction with advising by departmental staff had a narrow range with minimal variation, while satisfaction with faculty advising increased from 38% in 2008 to 59% in 2014. Students also became more satisfied with college staff advising by 2014.
- No significant differences were found between juniors’ and seniors’ with departmental and college staff advising except in 2010 when juniors were significantly less satisfied than seniors.
- No significant differences were found between first generation and their peers’ with college staff advising except in 2012 when first generation students were significantly more satisfied with advising by college staff.
- Similar levels of satisfaction with faculty advisors were reported by juniors and seniors, transfer students and students who started as frosh, and by first generation students and their peers.
- No significant differences were found between transfer students and their peers’ with college staff advising except in 2012 when transfer students were significantly more satisfied with advising by college staff than those who started UCSC as frosh.

Politics
In Politics, satisfaction with advising has increased since 2008. The largest increase in satisfaction with all three types of advisors was from 2010 to 2012.

No significant differences were found between first generation and their peers’ with departmental and college staff advising except in 2012 when first generation students were significantly less satisfied with advising by departmental and college staff.

There were no significant differences in satisfaction with departmental staff and college advisors between juniors/seniors or transfer students/those who started UCSC as frosh.

Similar levels of satisfaction with faculty advisors were reported by juniors and seniors, transfer students and students who started as frosh, and by first generation students and their peers.

Psychology

Student satisfaction with advising was unchanged between 2008 and 2014 except for some decline in satisfaction with departmental staff advising from 63% in 2008 to 52% in 2014.

No significant differences were found in juniors’ and seniors’ satisfaction with departmental staff advisors and college advisors.

No significant differences were found between juniors’ and seniors’ satisfaction with faculty advisors except in 2014 when juniors were significantly less satisfied than seniors with advising by faculty.

In 2014, first generation students were significantly less satisfied with advising by both departmental staff and faculty advisors. Figure 18 shows declining satisfaction with departmental advisors among first generation students.

While in 2010 first generation students were significantly more satisfied than their peers’ with advising by college staff (see Figure 19). However, this gap closed in subsequent years.

Transfer students were significantly more satisfied with advising by departmental staff than those who started UCSC as frosh in 2010.

In 2014, transfer students were significantly more satisfied with advising by faculty and college staff.
Sociology

- In Sociology, satisfaction with advising is increasing since 2008. For example, satisfaction with advising by departmental staff increased by 11% (from 58% in 2008 to 69% in 2014).
- In both 2008 and 2010, juniors were significantly less satisfied than seniors with advising by departmental staff and faculty. Junior students’ satisfaction improved and the difference disappeared in subsequent years. Figure 20 shows the changes in satisfaction with departmental staff.
- Juniors and seniors were similarly satisfied with their college advisors during 2008-2014.
- There were no significant differences in satisfaction with all three types of advisors between first generation and non-first generation students.
- Transfer students and students who started as frosh were similarly satisfied with departmental staff, faculty advisors and college advisors during 2008-2014.
Figure 20. Satisfied with departmental staff advising in Sociology by class level

*Indicates a group difference based on Chi-Square tests at \( p < .05 \).

Cognitive Sciences

- We were only able to analyze the survey data for 2014. There were no significant differences between juniors/seniors, transfer students/those who started UCSC as frosh, or first generation college students/their peers with either kind of advisor in Cognitive Sciences in 2014.
**Possible Relationships between Student Dissatisfaction with Advising in Social Sciences**

We explored possible explanations for student dissatisfaction with advising in Social Sciences and their experiences with other aspects of the program using the 2014 UCUES survey results. We tested the relationship between satisfaction with advising types and satisfaction with program requirements and policies, research opportunities, overall academic experience, and their actual GPA by conducting correlation analysis.\(^2\) We found the following:

1. Students who were less satisfied with the *availability of courses needed for graduation* were also less satisfied with advising by both departmental staff and faculty.
2. Similarly, students who thought their *program’s requirements were not well-defined* tended to be less satisfied with advising by both departmental staff and faculty.
3. Students who thought that *department rules and policies were not clearly communicated* tended to be less satisfied with advising by both types of advisors. Their dissatisfaction was stronger for departmental staff advising.
4. Students who did not understand how major requirements combine to produce a coherent understanding of a field of study also expressed less satisfaction with departmental staff and faculty advising.
5. Student satisfaction with *opportunities for research experience or to produce creative projects* was unrelated to satisfaction with advising by departmental staff or faculty.
6. Students who had not worked with faculty on research or creative projects tended to express less satisfaction with advising by faculty.
7. Satisfaction with advising by faculty and departmental staff was unrelated to whether or not students believe that the *faculty treats students equitably and fairly*.
8. Of note, a student’s *overall GPA* was not related to their satisfaction with either type of advisor.
9. The ratio of students to departmental staff advisor was not a factor to student satisfaction with departmental staff advising.

---

\(^2\) The satisfaction questions in their original 6-point scale were used for correlation analysis. We reported those relationships that were “significant” at \(p < .05\) in Pearson r analysis.
10. Finally, students who were more satisfied with academic advising by departmental staff and faculty were also more satisfied with their *overall academic experience*. 
APPENDIX

UCUES 2014 CORE Survey Questions
Academic Engagement Part I: Overall Satisfaction and Agreement
Q42 How satisfied are you with each of the following aspects of your educational experience overall?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very dissatisfied (1)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat dissatisfied (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied (4)</th>
<th>Satisfied (5)</th>
<th>Very satisfied (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advising by faculty on academic matters (1)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising by school or college staff on academic matters (2)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising by departmental staff on academic matters (3)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions used in correlation Analysis:³

Q42 How satisfied are you with each of the following aspects of your educational experience overall?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very dissatisfied (1)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat dissatisfied (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied (4)</th>
<th>Satisfied (5)</th>
<th>Very satisfied (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of courses needed for graduation (7)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for research experience or to produce creative products (11)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q48 Please answer the following questions about your major.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes (1)</th>
<th>No (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you understand how the requirements of your major combine to produce a coherent understanding of a field of study? (4)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the program requirements well defined? (5)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are department rules and policies clearly communicated? (6)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ Student to faculty ratio data was provided by Undergraduate Advising Offices and was not a questions asked in the UCUES survey.
Q27 Indicate the following scholarship, research, and creative activities that you are currently doing or have completed as an (University Name) University student. **NOTE: If participant responded to one of the 6 questions below, their response was used in the correlation analysis.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes, doing now or have done (1)</th>
<th>No (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assist faculty in research with course credit (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist faculty in research for pay without course credit (5)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist faculty in research as a volunteer without course credit (6)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on creative projects under the direction of faculty with course credit (8)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on creative projects under the direction of faculty for pay without course credit (9)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on creative projects under the direction of faculty as a volunteer without course credit (10)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q40 How often have you experienced the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>Rarely (2)</th>
<th>Occasionally (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat often (4)</th>
<th>Often (5)</th>
<th>Very often (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students treated equitably and fairly by the faculty (5)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q29 How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your campus experiences/education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied (1)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat dissatisfied (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied (4)</th>
<th>Satisfied (5)</th>
<th>Very satisfied (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My (University Name) grade point average (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall academic experience (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>