### 2013 College Senior Survey

#### liberals 21.1% 32.5% 28.1%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>UND 2013</th>
<th>National 2013</th>
<th>UND 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far left</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-of-the-road</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far right</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### views on a diverse world

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability to see the world from someone else’s perspective</th>
<th>UND 2013</th>
<th>Nat 2013</th>
<th>UND 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest 10%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest 10%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2013 Senior Student Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>UND 2013</th>
<th>Nat 2013</th>
<th>UND 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stable, secure future</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to pay off debt</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/life balance</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of jobs</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership potential</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High income potential</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for innovation</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and initiative</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of personal values</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Student Self Assessment Percentage rating high or above average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability to discuss and negotiate controversial issues</th>
<th>UND 2013</th>
<th>Nat 2013</th>
<th>UND 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest 10%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest 10%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### if you could make your college choice over, would you still choose to enroll at your current college? 88% of 2013 UND seniors, 87% of 2013 national seniors, and 92% of 2009 UND seniors said YES.

Green indicates UND data is greater than the National.

Red indicates UND data is lower than the National.

Blue indicates that UND 2009 data is greater than 2013 data.
Executive Summary

The Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California at Los Angeles sponsors the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP). CIRP is a national, longitudinal study of the American higher education system, consisting of a series of three surveys: The Freshman Survey (TFS), Your First College Year (YFCY), and the College Senior Survey (CSS). UND has intermittently used the CSS, with the spring 2013 administration following a spring 2009 administration. UND also uses TFS and administers this survey to incoming freshmen of odd-numbered years. In the spring of 2013, UND invited 1000 seniors to complete the CSS. 172 students completed the survey for a response rate of 17%. Of those surveyed, 119 indicated they were graduating. The following summary data is based on that graduating senior sample.

CIRP summarizes scores from select survey questions into fifteen constructs, where the individual items are summed into a construct score to allow institutions to compare themselves against all public universities in these broad categories. UND seniors score significantly better than seniors at public universities in four of the fifteen construct categories:

- **Satisfaction with Coursework** – With a mean of 51, UND scores higher than public universities who score a mean of 50.6. UND senior respondents report high satisfaction with the relevance of coursework, both relevance to everyday life (74% very satisfied or satisfied) and relevance to future career plans (79% very satisfied or satisfied). Yet this should be grounded in a loss of satisfaction in General Studies and the Humanities which saw large losses in satisfaction.

- **Habits of Mind** - In conjunction with coursework, UND (57%) students found the content of coursework in terms of logical argumentation, problem solving, and information analysis quantitative and qualitative, higher than their public peers (54%). These skills associated with lifelong learning success such as supporting your opinion with a logical argument are demonstrated by UND seniors (99%) answering frequently or occasionally and public seniors answering at 97%. UND students also show a demonstrable advantage in working with others to problem solve, answering positively 100% compared with public peers at 98%.

- **Leadership** - In this new construct UND presents a unified measure about their leadership development. 56% of UND seniors noted they had been a leader in an organization during their academic career compared to peer 54%.

- **Academic Disengagement** – While the numbers are low, UND respondents are less likely to frequently miss class for reasons other than employment (3% at UND versus 5% at public universities). More concerning is that UND respondents are also less likely to report falling asleep in class, with 27% reporting this occurs occasionally or frequently compared to 31% at public universities.
The ground appears to be shifting in that in 2009 UND scored higher in four of the nine constructs, but by 2013 UND scored significantly lower in five of the fifteen constructs. In many cases this is a matter of UND peers rising to a greater level of performance versus a drop in UND overall scores. In other words, our peer institutions are improving at rates that have overtaken UND high performances in the past.

- **Student-Faculty Interaction: Mentorship** – UND senior respondents score a mean of 49 compared to 50 for public university seniors. While in 2009 UND showed higher scores in this construct each of the areas saw significant increases by peers. For example, peer institutions previously were rated at 47 and UND dropped from 50.

- **Positive Cross-racial Interaction** - UND respondents score a mean of 48 on this construct compared to public universities where the mean is 51. While UND respondents are significantly less likely to experience each of the 5 components making up the construct our peers have succeeded in moving even farther ahead in terms of positive engagements. Yet, even falling below our public peers, UND’s scores indicate positive progress when compared with longitudinal data.

- **Negative Cross-Racial Interaction** – In this particular construct, a lower score is positive in that it indicates lower levels of negative interaction with persons of differing racial or ethnic groups. UND scores a mean of 50 compared to 51 at public universities. Yet, this represents a 2 increase in the mean since 2009.

- **Overall Satisfaction** – UND respondents report higher levels of satisfaction with the quality of instruction received (91% satisfied at UND compared to 85% at public universities). Most UND respondents (90%) would again come to UND if given the chance to start over.

- **Social Agency** - Although in the overall construct UND falls below its peers, UND respondents rate *Helping others who are in difficulty* as being most important - 80% state essential or very important, an increase of the mean by 1%. In addition students indicating becoming a community leader as essential or important rose to 44% in 2013 (41% in 2009) in comparison with to peers at 42% in 2013 (38% in 2009).

The six constructs where UND scores are not significantly different than public university norms include:

- **Academic Self-Concept**
- **Social Self-Concept**
- **Pluralistic Orientation**
- **Sense of Belonging**
- **Civic Awareness.**
- **Civic Engagement**
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Introduction

2012-2013 CIRP: The Freshman Survey and the College Senior Survey

The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) at the Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California in Los Angeles conducts national, longitudinal studies of the American higher education system. One of the goals of CIRP research is to assist institutions with their need for assessment by conducting surveys to help measure student outcomes. This is accomplished through administration of three CIRP surveys: The Freshman Survey (TFS), Your First College Year (YFCY) and the College Senior Survey (CSS). UND has utilized the TFS for over thirty years, and conducted the CSS in 1995, 2000, 2004, 2009, and 2013.

TFS is administered to incoming first-year students before they start classes, and it is intended to gauge their expectations of the college experience. The survey asks about high school behaviors, academic preparedness, student values and goals, admission decisions, and expectations of college. UND has most recently been administering the survey approximately every-other year to incoming freshmen.

The CSS is intended to be used as a follow-up to TFS and/or YFCY, measuring attitudes of graduating seniors on topics similar to what they were asked as incoming students. This survey allows institutions to measure cognitive and affective growth during the entire 4-year college experience. UND has intermittently used the CSS. In 2013, the CSS was emailed to 1000 seniors. 172 Students completed the survey for a response rate of 17%. Of these 172 students, UND is able to match 49 of them to their responses provided on TFS as freshmen. This report will focus on the 2013 CSS administration, comparing UND senior responses to those of seniors at public universities. When applicable, the report will also look at the subset of 49 students for which both CSS and TFS scores are available in an attempt to measure growth and attitude changes in this group of seniors as compared to their responses on TFS they took as freshmen.

CIRP Constructs and Themes

Using CSS data, CIRP developed fifteen constructs designed to capture the experiences and outcomes institutions are often interested in understanding. The constructs represent areas that are typically difficult to assess because of their complex and multifaceted nature. The constructs include the following areas: Habits of Mind, Academic Disengagement,
Constructs

Habits of Mind
This new construct brings together those learning behaviors and traits that have become associated with academic success. As a foundation for lifelong learning skill, these highly transferable skills are beneficial not only in academic settings but provide the basis for success in the larger job market. Highlighting areas such as supporting logical arguments, seeking and explaining solutions among peers, and evaluating the reliability of information builds on analytic achievements. Other items such as risk taking, exploring topics on your own, and accepting mistakes as a part of the learning process, gauge not only self-development skills but a healthy relationship with the learning process and leading to self-confidence in and out of the classroom. See Figure 1.

Behind the Data
Behind each of the constructs are sets of questions which attempt to gauge the many facets of the general construct. In Habits of the Mind we find the responses to the following:

- Support your opinions with a logical argument
- Seek solutions to problems and explain them to others
❖ Seek alternative solutions to a problem
❖ Evaluate the quality or reliability of information you received
❖ Ask questions in class
❖ Take a risk because you felt you had more to gain
❖ Seek feedback on your academic work
❖ Explore topics on your own, even though it was not required for a class
❖ Revise your papers to improve your writing
❖ Look up scientific research articles and resources
❖ Accept mistakes as a part of the learning process

Figure 1: Mean and Percentile: Habits of the Mind

Freshman to Senior Changes
In terms of the Habits of the Mind, a high scoring group for both freshmen and seniors indicates a strong growth in the skills tracked.

Longitudinal Significance
The construct Habits of the Mind is new thus no previous data is available for comparison.

Interaction with Faculty
CIRP developed a construct related to student-faculty interaction based on items pertaining to how often professors provide students with nine items tied to the faculty role. These nine items include:

❖ Help in achieving professional goals,
❖ Advice and guidance about the educational program,
- Emotional support and encouragement,
- Feedback on academic work outside of grades,
- Opportunities to discuss coursework outside of class,
- Encouragement to pursue graduate study, help improving study skills,
- Letters of recommendation,
- Opportunities to work on research projects.

Respondents indicate whether they experience these items frequently, occasionally, or not at all. A summary of this construct is seen in Figure 2. UND scores a mean of 49, which is significantly lower than the mean of 50 from public universities (p < 0.01). See Figure 2.

Figure 2: Mean and Percentile: Faculty Interaction: Mentorship

Behind the Data
Of the nine items making up the student–faculty interaction score, UND respondents score means lower or significantly lower than their national counterparts at public universities in all of the nine component items. This is a significant change from 2009 where UND scored higher in the four areas indicated with an arrow.

- Advice and guidance about your educational program - UND scores 2.21 compared to 2.29 at public universities.
- Help to improve your study skills - UND scores 2.01 compared to 2.09 at public universities.
- Feedback on your academic work outside of grades - UND scores 2.21 versus 2.25 at public universities.
- Help in achieving your professional goals - UND scores 2.15 compared to 2.22 at public universities.
- An opportunity to work on a research project – UND scores 1.79 to 1.87 at public universities.
- Encouragement to pursue graduate/professional study – UND scores 2.18 to 2.27 at public universities.
- Emotional Support and encouragement – UND scores 1.95 to 2.06 at public universities.
- Letters of recommendation – UND scores 2.08 to 2.09 at public universities.
- Opportunity to discuss coursework outside class – UND scores 2.29 to 2.38 at public universities.

**Freshman to Senior Changes**

In an interesting shift from the 2009 survey senior respondents are less likely to have asked questions in class than they were as incoming freshmen asking high school teachers. Nearly all incoming freshmen reported asking questions in class while 8% of seniors indicated that did not ask questions in the classroom. UND’s responses mirror those at a national level, where incoming freshmen are more likely to ask questions frequently (60%) than senior respondents (34%).

**Longitudinal Significance**

In reviewing the longitudinal data beginning in 2000 it would seem that after a significant increase in students’ indications of frequent feedback from faculty from 2004 to 2009, UND fell in 2013. This turn would be less disconcerting if we were consistent with other public institutions. For example, in *advice and guidance about your educational program* UND’s percentage answering frequent took a steep downturn between 2009 and 2013. See Figure 3.

*Figure 3: Comparison of Faculty Guidance Frequency by Survey Population*

---

**Percent of students indicating faculty "frequently" give educational guidance**

![Graph showing the percentage of students indicating faculty frequently give educational guidance from 2000 to 2013. The graph compares UND, Public, and Peer institutions.](Image)
**Academic Disengagement**

CIRP measures academic disengagement in terms of the extent to which students frequently engage in behaviors that are inconsistent with academic success. These behaviors include four items: coming late to class, missing class for reasons other than employment, failing to complete homework on time, and falling asleep in class. Respondents are able to report these behaviors occurring frequently, occasionally, or not at all. This means that the lower the mean, the better. As noted, UND’s mean and percentile score are not significantly different from public universities on this particular construct. See Figure 4.

*Figure 4: Mean and Percentile: Academic Disengagement*

**Behind the Data**

UND scores significantly better than their public institution peers on two of the four items making up the academic disengagement construct:

- Missing class for reasons other than employment – just 3% of UND respondents report frequently missing class compared to 5% of public university respondents. 72% report occasionally missing class at UND compared to 75% at public universities.
- Falling asleep in class - UND respondents are less likely to report this occurring, with none reporting this frequently and merely 27% reporting occasionally. At the national level, 4% of seniors report falling asleep in class frequently with an additional 27% reporting occasionally.
- Most notably UND students reported frequently late 4% of the time and occasionally 46% with national comparisons at 6% and 52% respectively.
Freshman to Senior Changes
On items related to academic disengagement, there are no significant differences between responses seen as incoming freshmen and outgoing seniors.

Longitudinal Significance
UND shows progress on measures within this construct and significant decline in student lateness for class, and falling asleep in class. Along with failure to complete homework and class absences for other than work UND students reported fewer of these types of behaviors. The item for which the most long term data is available, homework completion, shows a healthy decline and steady maintenance at UND and public institutions overall. See Figure 5.

Figure 5: Frequency of students with on time homework by student populations

Percent of students who indicate failing to complete homework "frequently/occasionally" on-time

Academic Self-Concept
As a new construct, academic self-concept attempts to gauge and engage with student beliefs about their academic abilities. This construct includes measures on student’s self confidence in academic environments. The survey asks each student to rank themselves in academic ability, self-confidence (intellectual), drive to achieve, and mathematical ability. Students rank themselves on a 5 point scale. Lowest 10%, Below Average, Average, Above Average, and Highest 10%. This new construct provides for some interesting data points. See Figure 6.
Behind the Data
Academic Ability, as with the other questions, begins with “Rate yourself on each of the following traits as compared with the average person your age.” The results for UND and other public universities are quite consistent. See Figure 7. What is equally consistent and more interesting than the total is that men and women rank themselves significantly differently overall. See Figure 8, and Figure 9. Women across the board appear to hesitate to self-identify in the highest 10%, while men assert they are in this bracket across the board 10% or higher. Moreover, this gender divide continues with mathematical ability and self-confidence. In drive to achieve those gender distinctions disappear and women take just a slight lead in this confidence evaluation.

Figure 6: Mean and Percentile: Academic Self Concept

25th, Mean, and 75th Percentile
Academic Self-Concept

Figure 7: Academic Ability Frequency Distribution (Total Students)
Freshman to Senior Changes

Unfortunately this pattern is reflected in the comparison from freshman to seniors. First year women come to UND with lower scores in the high construct area at 27% and leave as seniors with 30%. On the other hand men enter with 53% and leave as seniors with a high construct frequency at 73%. That being said both men and women leave their university experiences with higher confidence levels than their peers, women by 3% and men by 20%. In the end, it may be best to paraphrase, Garrison Keillor, “UND where all the women are strong, all the men are good-looking, and all the children are above average.” As this survey bears out in the long term, he just might be right.
Longitudinal Significance

This is a new construct.

Satisfaction with Coursework

The CSS construct looking at satisfaction with coursework measures the extent to which students see their coursework as relevant, useful, and applicable to their academic success and future plans.

Figure 10: Mean and Percentile: Satisfaction with Coursework

Respondents are asked to rate their satisfaction on a 5-point scale (1 = very dissatisfied through 5 = very satisfied) on four items: the relevance of coursework to future career plans, the relevance of coursework to everyday life, the courses in your major field, and the general education or core curriculum courses.

UND scores are on par with public universities on this particular construct, with a mean of 51.0 for UND and 50.6 for Public Universities. See Figure 10.

Behind the Data

UND respondents are significantly more likely to be satisfied with the relevance of their coursework:

- Satisfaction with relevance of coursework to everyday life – nearly three-quarters of UND respondents are satisfied with the relevance of coursework to everyday life (75%) as compared to 73% of seniors at public universities. Four percent of UND respondents are dissatisfied with coursework relevance to everyday life.
• Satisfaction with relevance to future career plans – more UND seniors (79%) report satisfaction with the relevance of coursework to future career plans, while 76% of seniors from public universities report such satisfaction.

• Satisfaction with coursework in major field areas remain strong but is beginning to lag behind the public universities and shows a drop from the 2009 survey.

• Both UND and Public Universities have seen a drop in satisfaction with General Education or Core curriculum courses. UND who scored ‘Very Satisfied’ or ‘Satisfied’ decrease to 68% while public institutions dropped to 74%

**Freshman to Senior Changes**

There are no comparable questions between the TFS and CSS surveys on this item.

**Longitudinal Significance**

As noted earlier students rate coursework in their major has increased in “very satisfied”, moving from 39% in 2009 to 44% in 2013. Moreover, the same holds true for coursework relevant to everyday life where in 2009 “very satisfied” was selected by 25% and in 2013 29%. Yet there was a downward shift in “satisfied” that moved to “dissatisfied.” As noted, 49% in 2009 to 45% in 2013 “satisfied” and ‘dissatisfied” 4% in 2009 to 8% in 2013 in coursework for future career plans the distribution of responses is broadening, covering all categories. The most significant changes occurred in core or general education requirements. See Figure 11, which saw a large drop from 2009 to 2013.

**Figure 11: Satisfaction with Core Curriculum / General Studies**

**Satisfaction with General Education Coursework Overtime**

![Satisfaction with Core Curriculum / General Studies](image-url)
Positive Cross-Racial Interaction
This particular construct is a unified measure of students’ level of positive interaction with diverse peers. Six items asking the frequency with which various interactions occur between the survey taker and a fellow student from a different racial or ethnic group. With UND’s lack of diverse student body when compared to national institutions, it is not surprising that UND scores significantly lower than the national norms. See Figure 12.

Figure 12: Mean and Percentile: Positive Cross Racial Interaction

Behind the Data
Six survey items combine to make up the positive cross-racial interaction construct. The items evaluate the frequency with which interactions occur between students of different racial/ethnic groups. The interactions include having intellectual discussions outside of class, sharing personal feelings and problems, dining or sharing a meal, having meaningful and honest discussions about race/ethnic relations outside of class, studying or preparing for class, and socializing and partying. They are marked on a 5-point scale (1=Never to 5 = Very Often.)

UND scores significantly lower than respondents from public universities on all 6 items in this construct. Even so UND answered positively to having dined or shared a meal “very often” or “often” 33%. See Figure 13. UND is at 31% with the public university at 36%. While still lower, the numbers are not bad given the limited diversity at UND. UND students are least likely to report having had shared personal feelings about race relations. In a positive turn, the activity UND respondents say is most likely to occur is dining or having a meal with fellow students from a different race/ethnic group.
**Figure 13:** Mean Frequency of interaction by survey populations where 1 = seldom to 5 = Very Often

**Positive Cross-Racial Interaction Mean Scores for Component Items**

![Graph showing mean scores for component items](image)

**Freshman to Senior**

This item was not included in this year’s assessment.

**Longitudinal Significance**

UND in the long run appears to be making progress with building positive cross-racial environments. On each of the measures within the construct the trend on the positive selections are a growing overtime and the negative selections are decreasing. For example for studied or prepared for class shifted upward in “very often”, and “often” from 26 % in 2009 to 35% in 2013. Likewise dining or sharing a meal declined in the “never” or “seldom” choice groups from 42% in 2009 to 31% in 2013, indicating an encouraging change.

**Negative Diversity Interaction**

Negative cross-racial interaction is a measure of students’ level of negative interaction with diverse peers. Negative interactions include having tense or hostile interactions, feeling insulted or threatened because of your race or having guarded interactions with students from a differing racial or ethnic group.
Unlike the Positive Cross Racial Interaction Construct, UND has reached equity with its public university peers in this category. While an indication of larger issues nationally, this decrease in negative interactions is in a positive direction for UND.

**Figure 14: Mean and Percentile: Negative Cross Racial Interaction**

The difference between UND and the score for public universities is statistically significant for each of the three component items. Mean scores can be seen in Figure 14.

- Although 65% UND students reported never having tense or hostile interactions with racial or ethnic others which is a decrease from previous years, the responses for “seldom”, showed a solid increase to 25%. In other words 90% of students encounter race/ethnicity with limited hostility.
- 75 percent of UND respondents have never felt insulted or threatened because of their race or ethnicity. This compares to 71% of respondents from public universities reporting this never occurs.
- More than half (65%) of UND respondents report they have never had guarded interactions with students from racial/ethnic groups other than their own. See Figure 15.
**Freshman to Senior**
This item was not included in this year’s assessment

**Longitudinal Significance**
In looking at the data between 2009, the year racial questions were added, and 2013, UND has undergone significant changes and the impact of those changes appear to be bearing fruit. *Reduction in racial tension, guarded interactions, and feelings defined as threats or insults* have lessened. More positive influences which come with diversity are seeing a stronger presence at UND.

**Pluralistic Orientation**
The new pluralistic orientation construct continues where the racial/ethnic questions leave off by expanding and further developing notions of openness and environments for living and working in a diverse society. This construct measures include tolerance of others with different beliefs, ability to work cooperatively with diverse people, openness to having my views challenged, ability to see the world from someone else’s perspective, and the ability to discuss and negotiate controversial issues. These questions ask students to be self-reflective about their own openness and own orientation to others. These measures use a point scale with asking students to compare themselves with the average person your age with ratings: highest 10%, above average, average, below average, and lowest 10%.
Behind the data
Of the five measures within this construct, UND is on par with other public institutions in ability to see the world from someone else’s perspective. See Figure 16. UND rises above its peers in openness to having my own views challenged with ratings for “highest 10%” and “above average” at 67% and 65% respectively. It also rises above in ability to discuss controversial issues with UND at 70% and public institutions at 68%. UND students fall below its peer students in “tolerance of others with different beliefs.” There is a difference of -2% when “Highest 10%” and “above average” are combined. In ability to work cooperatively with diverse people the difference is -3.2%.

Freshman to Senior
This item was not included in this year’s assessment

Longitudinal Significance
Initial year of the question

Social Agency
The social agency construct measures the extent to which student’s value political and social involvement as a personal goal. This is accomplished by looking at responses to questions asking seniors to indicate the importance to them personally of items such as participating in a community action program, helping to promote racial understanding, becoming a community leader, influencing social values, keeping up to date with political affairs, and helping others who are in difficulty.
UND scores closely replicate the national norms when it comes to student dedication to social involvement. See Figure 17.

**Behind the data**

Students are asked to indicate the importance to them personally of the social agency items on a 4-point scale (1 = Not Important to 4 = Essential) of the six component items, UND does not score appreciably different than public universities on any of the items. See Figure 18.

For UND respondents, the greatest importance is placed on helping others who are in difficulty; 79% of UND respondents state this is essential or very important. The least amount of importance is placed on helping to promote racial understanding; just 32% of UND respondents feel this is essential or very important while 25% feel this is not important at all.
Freshman to Senior Changes
Seniors are significantly more likely to feel the importance of social agency. In fact, the sample mean in the senior year increased by 3 over freshmen. Nationwide concern with social agency is on the increase as well. 37% of freshmen say it is essential or very important, to keep up with political affairs compared to 33% of seniors. Seniors are also significantly more likely to say it is important to become a community leader – 51% in 2013 compared to 35% in 2009.

Longitudinal Significance
Since 2000 students sense of social agency and their part in bringing about social change has grown considerably across all measures. In 2000 24% of students rated community action “essential” or “very important” rising to 38% in 2009 and slightly dropping to 36% in 2013. Keeping up with politics has also become more important, rising from 24% in 2000 to 41% in 2013. Moreover, a commitment to community leadership is continuing to find importance in student lives, climbing from 30% in 2000, 34% in 2004, 41% in 2009, and 43% in 2013. See Figure 19.

Figure 19: UND Student Frequency Response Community Leadership

Sense of Belonging
Four items are combined to develop a construct related to sense of belonging – a measure of the extent to which students feel a sense of academic and social integration on campus. It looks at the agreement with statements that include:
- I feel I am a member of this college.
- I feel I have a sense of belonging to this college.
- I see myself as part of the campus community.
- If asked, I would recommend this college to others.

**Figure 20: Mean and Percentile: Sense of Belonging**

**25th, Mean, and 75th Percentile**

**Sense of Belonging**

In this construct UND matches its peers in students’ perceptions of belonging. While UND in previous years outranked its peers, the addition of another measure could easily account for the difference. See Figure 20.

**Behind the Data**

UND senior respondents’ scores fall in line with national norms for their sense of belonging:

- I feel I am a member of this college - 91% of UND senior respondents feel they have a sense of belonging on this campus. This compares to the 89% of seniors at public universities.
- I see myself as part of the campus community - 80% of UND senior respondents’ report they agree or strongly agree, compared to 81% of seniors from public.
- 85% of UND students agree have a sense of belonging to this campus while nationally 83% report agreement.

**Freshman to Senior Changes**

This item was not included in this year’s assessment
Longitudinal Significance

As a construct, sense of belonging has been tracked since 2009. In the 2009 survey students sense of belonging was high. With the UND mean for I feel I am a member of this college, at 3.4 which was significant with p>.05 when compared with public institutions. In 2013 the mean dropped in this measure to 3.20 and the public institution mean was 3.17. For the measure sense of belonging to this campus the decline is also large. From a mean of 3.23 in 2009, to 3.03

Civic Awareness

Civic awareness measures changes in students’ understanding of the issues facing their community, nation, and the world. In this construct, students are asked to judge the depth of their understanding and/or ability to participate in the body politic in which they live and study. The measure incorporate notions of understanding in and around community, national, and global issues; UND does not score significantly different from its public university peers, scoring a mean of 49 for both.

Behind the Data

Of the three items that make up the civic awareness construct, UND does not score significantly different from their public institution peers on any of them. Not surprisingly, large percentages of students report their abilities as being stronger now at the end of their college career when compared to when they first entered college. See Figure 21.

50 percent of UND respondents state they are strong in understanding the problems facing their community, 42% state they are strong in understanding social problems facing our nation, and 37% report they are strong at understanding global issues. Nationally, public university seniors reporting strong levels of ability are 79%, 88%, and 84% respectively.

Freshman to Senior Changes

This item was not included in this year’s assessment

Longitudinal Significance

For longitudinal purposes it is important to note the change in this particular construct. In past iterations students were asked to think about and compare their awareness of community, national and global issues with what they were at the time they entered college. For 2013, the questions have been reworded and removed any reference to past awareness. The question now asks students to “Think about your Current Abilities and tell us how strong or weak you believe you are in each of these areas: Understanding the problems facing your community, Understanding National Issues, and Understanding global issues. See Figure 22.
Civic Engagement

Not to be confused with previous survey themes, Civic Engagement as a construct brings together measures that evaluate student depth and commitment to engaging in civic, electoral, and political activities. As a new construct, engagement is differentiated from
Civic Awareness by active participation and involvement in civic activities. Like the historical civic engagement theme it includes notions of community and social action with its definition of community and civil society. The measures within this construct form a core set of values and actions which define and in many ways proscribe what counts as civic activity. See Figure 23. They are:

- I am interested in seeking information about current social and political issues.
- Publicly communicated your opinion about a cause (e.g., blog, email, petition)
- Worked on a local, state, or national campaign
- Demonstrated for a cause (e.g., boycott, rally, protest)
- Goal: Keeping up to date with political affairs.
- Goal: Influencing social values
- Helped raise money for a cause or campaign
- Performed volunteer or community service work.

**Figure 23: Mean and Percentile: Civic Engagement**

Beyond the Data
As a new construct this data will serve as base line for future but as it stands reveals interesting insight into student endeavors and desires. These measures can be further delineated into four groups: political interest, political involvement, community values, and community activism. See Figure 24.

**Freshman to Senior Changes**
This item was not included in this year’s assessment.

**Longitudinal Significance**
This is a new item.
Like the civic engagement construct, the leadership construct was formerly classified as a theme. The transition from leadership theme to leadership construct is more straightforward. The construct duplicates the theme with a couple of small additions. What differs is a more formal structure with an emphasis not only on desire to lead, or perceptions of the self as a leader but the participation in organizations and leadership program available at the college level. The Measures within this construct are as follows:

- Self-rated ability in leadership abilities
- Self-rating in leadership ability
- I have effectively led a group to a common purpose
- Been a leader in an organization
- Participated in leadership training.

In general, UND scores quite closely to other public universities with regard to the leadership attitudes of the responding seniors. Of the seven items included in this particular theme, there are no significant differences between UND scores and the scores for public universities even though UND numbers tend to be slightly higher than those scored by public universities. See Figure 25. Eighty-six percent of UND senior respondents are satisfied with the leadership opportunities available.
**Behind the Data**

UND mean and 25th percentile are slightly higher than other public universities as noted in Figure 25 above. Over 56% of UND indicate that they have been a leader in an organization compared to publics at 54%. In terms of self-assessment UND students rank themselves in the leadership category as a major strength or somewhat strong by 87% whereas public universities compare at 83%. In leadership ability public universities respond they rank in the highest 10% or above average in ability at 72%, UND students respond at 75%. Finally, in terms of actual engagement UND students at 79% are higher than public universities by 4% in having effectively led a group to a common purpose.

**Freshman to Senior Changes**

This item was not included in this year’s assessment

**Longitudinal Significance**

This is a new item

**Social Self-Concept**

Social Self-concept is also a new baseline construct. In terms of its measures, it overlaps with measure used in other constructs and themes. The measure itself attempts to provide a matrix to gauge students’ beliefs about their abilities and confidence in social situations. See Figure 26. This matrix uses the following measures some of which have been discussed in earlier constructs:

- Public Speaking
- Leadership Ability
- Social Self-Confidence
Figure 26: Self-Concept (Social)

Behind the Data

As seen in the figure above UND is on par with public universities in this measure. It remains to be seen the significance of this construct in overall view of student life.

Freshman to Senior Changes

In terms of changes which occurred between freshmen and seniors is that those freshman who indicated the highest 10% in public speaking (15%) shifted downward to 13% as seniors. The most significant shift in public speaking comes in a shift from average to above average. See Figure 27, 28 and 29.

Figure 26: Frequency Distribution: Public Speaking: First Year/Senior

Social Self-Concept Mean Scores for Public Speaking
Overall Satisfaction

CSS asks three items to gauge overall satisfaction of college seniors: satisfaction with overall college experience, satisfaction with overall quality of instruction, and whether the student would definitely choose to enroll at their current college. UND’s mean score is slightly lower than the national norms with regard to overall satisfaction. See Figure 29.

Behind the Data

UND scores satisfaction ratings are significantly lower than national norms in overall quality of instruction. Nearly of the respondents (78%) report satisfaction in the quality of instruction received, compared to 86% of CSS respondents from public universities. UND students’ dissatisfaction grew 10% while public universities were lower at 4%.
Approximately 2% of UND respondents are very dissatisfied with the quality of instruction.

Figure 29: Mean and Percentile: Overall Satisfaction

![Graph showing 25th, Mean, and 75th Percentile Overall Satisfaction for UND and Public Universities.]

Though not statistically significant, UND students’ overall college experience fell behind public universities with means of 4.3 and 4.25 respectively. See Figure 31. The good news is that given the choice to rethink their college choice, UND students chose definitely and probably yes 89% almost 2 percentage points over other public universities. See Figure 29.

Freshman to Senior Changes
This item was not included in this year’s assessment

Figure 30: Frequency Comparison: Overall College Experience 09/13

Longitudinal Significance

![Graph showing Historical Distribution of Overall College Experience for UND.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CSS asks seniors to report the level to which they feel they have strengthened or weakened in a knowledge area throughout their college experience. Not surprisingly, nearly all respondents state they have much stronger knowledge in all areas now as compared to when they first entered UND. 87 percent of UND respondents report they have stronger general knowledge and 93% report stronger knowledge of a particular field or discipline. Ninety percent (90%) report having stronger analytical and problem solving skills, while 92% report having stronger problem solving skills. UND results are similar to those for seniors from public universities.
When looking at student rankings for mathematical ability, UND seniors again score similar levels of confidence in their skill level as seniors at public universities.

One area with a significant difference is in the area of revision of written work. UND's mean is .12 over public universities and .26 over peer institutions. This represents a significance of p<.01 and an area of overall success for UND. Though not statistically significant, UND also rises above its peers in evaluating the quality or reliability of information received, and in supporting opinions with logical arguments. Seniors are also asked to compare themselves to the average person their age on intellectual traits including academic ability, mathematical ability, and writing ability. UND students compare well along all of these matrices. See Figure 32.

As a general rule, UND seniors rate themselves similarly to seniors at public universities, with over three-quarters (78% for UND, 81% for public universities) reporting they have above average academic ability. This particular group of students from UND report similar levels of academic ability as seniors as they did when they were freshmen.

**Academic Enhancement Experiences**

Several items on CSS revolve around the theme of academic enhancement. These items gauge participation in programs and initiatives related to student learning, such as working on research, independent study, and participating in study abroad and internships.

Some highlights on this theme include:

- 84% of students have participated in a culminating or capstone experience. 85% have worked on independent studies.
• UND seniors report similar levels of frequency for working on a professor’s research projects, with 35% reporting frequently or occasionally. Nationally, this number runs at 34%.

• One area where UND seniors report significantly more of is working with other students. While UND compares positively other public universities in group work, UND students far out rank other schools in tutoring other students. At 60% to 46% on this question.

• UND seniors fall behind in the area of study abroad, with just 6% of UND respondents stating they have participated compared to 17% of respondents from public universities.

• Fewer UND students report participating in an internship program. Under half (46%) of UND respondents report, they have participated in an internship compared with the 49% of seniors at public universities who have participated. Although the gap appears to be closing as UND numbers rise and peers participation appears to be dropping.

**Written and Oral Communication**

This theme illustrates the extent which communication skills change during college and how student assess their skills against their peers. In this area UND students excel in comparison to their peers. UND students score themselves as high as or higher than their peers on three of the seven measures and on par with the rest.

**Active and Collaborative Learning**

This particular theme illustrates the extent to which students are furthering their knowledge of course material through interaction both with faculty and with other students. UND students rank well in this thematic area when it comes to student interaction with faculty.

Of the ten items included in the active and collaborative learning theme, UND significantly exceeds the national norm set at public universities in just one category: professors providing an opportunity to apply classroom learning to “real life” issues. Nearly all UND respondents (99%) state that this occurs frequently or occasionally, compared to 87% of public university respondents.

UND scores significantly higher than the national norms in nine of the seventeen items, all of which apply to student interaction with classmates and positive student interactions in and outside of the classroom. Where UND students fall behind is in expressing their opinions. Students are reticent to challenge professors, classmates, and colleagues in their beliefs particularly in terms of race or ethnicity.
**Interaction with Faculty**

**Student Interaction with Faculty Theme**

An additional 29 CSS items are looked at in explicating faculty interaction. They relate to the amount of time students spend with faculty and their perceptions of faculty support as well as the quality of those interactions. Included in the theme are items such as amount of time spent talking with faculty during class and outside of the classroom. These and the frequency of items such as working on a professor’s research project, challenging a professor’s idea in class, feeling intimidated by professors, communicating regularly with professors, being a guest in a professor's home, and asking professors for advice after class. Seniors also report their level of agreement with faculty engagement on issues such as faculty being interested in student academic problems and personal problems, their satisfaction with the amount of faculty contact, and the frequency with which faculty show respect for students.

UND scores significantly higher than public universities on five of twenty-nine items, these five items include:

- 35% of students responded that they had worked on a professor’s research project, where as 34% of public university students did so.
- UND students asked a professor for advice after class – 97% report this occurs frequently or occasionally compared to 90% of seniors at public universities.
- Faculty is more likely to give students honest feedback on student abilities and skills. This includes feedback outside of grades.
- Real life learning, that is course work and instruction that is applied to real-world problems is experienced by UND students “Frequently/Occasionally” at a frequency of 95%. Public university students experience this at 92%.
- Most promising are UND students appearing to put skills to work in that almost 40% have had an opportunity to publish in their undergraduate career.

UND is on par with its peers on the majority of the items in this theme which include:

- Challenging a professor's ideas in class,
- Communicating regularly with your professors,
- Amount of contact with faculty,
- Ability to find a faculty or staff mentor,
- Felt that faculty provided me with feedback that helped me assess my progress in class
- Felt my contributions were valued in class,
- Felt that faculty encouraged me to ask questions and participate in discussions,
Faculty provided a letter of recommendation.

**Satisfaction with Academic Support and Courses Theme**

CIRP pulls together various items to gauge the use of and satisfaction with campus academic support structures and types of coursework typically required in general education. Eighteen items are evaluated, varying from satisfaction with overall instruction, discipline-based instruction (such as mathematics, humanities, social sciences, etc.), availability of faculty, and advising. UND senior respondents report lower levels of satisfaction from previous surveys. This is most notable in general education and humanities where these survey results indicate a nadir since 2000. Other areas fell from a high in 2009 to 2004 levels or just above 2004. See Figure 33.

UND scores significantly lower than their public university peers on eleven of the eighteen items. Graduating seniors report high satisfaction in overall instruction, class size, faculty contact, and relevancy of coursework to everyday life and to future career plans. Yet, overall while still good overall satisfaction with instruction is down with a decline of the mean by .28.

**Figure 33: Longitudinal Comparison of Satisfaction with Coursework**

- **Overall quality of instruction** – 78% of UND respondents report satisfaction compared to 85% of respondents from public universities. Just 1% of UND respondents are dissatisfied with the overall quality of instruction.
- Class size – 91% of UND respondents are satisfied with their class size. Nationally, 88% report satisfaction.
- Amount of contact with faculty – 83% of UND respondents are satisfied with their contact with faculty, compared to just fewer than 84% nationally.
- Ability to find a faculty or staff member – 77% of UND respondents are satisfied with their ability to find faculty and staff when needed; nationally, 75% report satisfaction in this area.
- Qualities of computer training/assistance – 62% of UND respondents are satisfied with the training and computer assistance compared to 64% nationally. See Figure 34 below.
- Academic advising – 66% of UND students report they are satisfied compared to 65% for public universities.

**Figure 34: Longitudinal Comparison: Satisfaction of Facilities and Assistance**

![Frequency of very satisfied/satisfied](image)

- **Satisfaction Services and Community**
  UND respondents give equivalent or high remarks to nearly all areas related to campus services, scoring higher satisfaction mean scores in nine of twelve items included in this particular CIRP theme. The two areas with lower satisfaction include the diversity of the student body, which scores significantly lower than national public university norms, and student housing office/services.
On the positive side of things, seven items score means that are significantly higher than the national norms. These seven items are:

- Availability of Campus Social Activities – Two thirds (67%) UND respondents are satisfied on par with 68% at public universities.
- Financial Aid Packages – Most seniors (51%) report satisfaction with the packages provided which once again is on par with other public universities at 50% satisfaction.
- Respect for Student Belief - 74% of UND senior respondents report they are very satisfied or satisfied with the respect for the expression of diverse compared to 75% at public universities.
- Career counseling and advising – Satisfaction for career counseling is comparable to that of job placement services, with 63% of UND respondents reporting satisfaction. At public institutions, 57% report satisfaction.

Health and Wellness

The CIRP theme of health and wellness gauges student behaviors, attitudes, and experiences related to health and wellness issues, and their use of and satisfaction with related campus services. Clustered under this theme are three general areas: access and use of health and psychological services, behavioral habits related to health, and alcohol and tobacco consumption.

In one area students rated UND far above the national group. Student health had a satisfaction level of 76%, with public universities lagging far behind at 47%. Both men and women were equally satisfied with the services offered. Psychological services were rated almost absolutely the same across all survey populations, with means at 3.64 and 3.64.

UND students’ emotional health appears to present some issues. While not out of line with our peers, feelings of depression and being overwhelmed are on the rise, particularly with men. In the 2009 survey with regard to feeling depressed, just 3% of UND respondents state they frequently feel depressed compared to 9% of respondents at public universities frequently feeling depressed. In 2013, 8% of UND respondents say they feel depressed frequently and 52% occasionally. What is most striking is that men at UND indicated that they were depressed 63% while the frequency at the national level men noted they were depressed 51%. This spike in male depression at UND is well worthy of notice.
While the differences are not statistically significant, more UND students report feeling overwhelmed by all they have to do, with 35% saying this occurs frequently and 61% saying this occurs occasionally. Nationally, 31% report they frequently feel overwhelmed and 65% are occasionally overwhelmed by all they have to do.

Approximately one in five (21%) UND respondents frequently drink beer compared to 35% of respondents from public universities. On the other hand, approximately one in four (27%) UND respondents report they never drink beer which compares to 24% at public universities. When it comes to drinking wine or liquor, UND and public universities both have roughly 1-in five respondents state this never occurs (17% for UND and 16% for public universities.). See Figure 35.

UND respondents are catching up to their peers and report they frequently drink liquor, with 23% reporting consumption as opposed to 24% at public universities. While in 2009 UND students reported binge drinking frequencies in 2009 lower than peers, now UND students outstrip their peers by 6% for once in two weeks and 1 percent for 6-9 times in two weeks. See Figure 36.
Religiosity and Spirituality
A higher percentage of UND students report a religious preference. Just 27% of UND respondents state “none” as their current religious preference compared to 29% of respondents from public universities. The only non-Christian population who noted their religious preference was Buddhism. While UND has a visible Jewish and Muslim community the lack of identification is of note. Particularly as Jewish represent 3% and Muslims represent 1% of the sample at other public institutions. See Figure 37.

UND respondents are significantly more likely to attend a religious service and attend them more frequently than respondents from public universities. Nearly 65% of UND respondents frequently/occasionally attend a religious service compared to 52% nationally. Just over one-third (36%) of UND respondents state they never attend a religious service, where nationally, under one-half (48%) report they never attend a religious service.

UND respondents like their peers find integrating spirituality into their life important. Sixty-three percent of UND CSS completers say this is essential or very important compared to 47% of CSS takers from public universities.
Diversity Theme

Interesting findings appear when looking at the twenty five items CIRP uses to define the theme of diversity. Since UND has a limited population representing minority racial and ethnic groups, responses to these particular items can vary quite differently from typical public universities, yet the manner specific questions are asked leads to some surprising results.

The lack of persons of minority race or ethnicity is represented in the responses stating they have had a roommate of different race (24% at UND versus 44% at public universities) and the number of respondents saying they have frequently dined with someone of another racial group (33% at UND compared to 51% at public universities.) UND students are as equally satisfied and are as confident in their ability to work cooperative with diverse people as their public university counterparts (81% at UND compared to 84% at public universities) and with their level of satisfaction. In addition UND students are confident in their ability to discuss and negotiate controversial issues better than their peers (70% rating highest 10%/Above Average compared to 68% at public universities.)

UND tends to score significantly better than public universities with regard to discriminatory activities. Fewer UND students report they have been singled out because of their race/ethnicity, gender, religious affiliation, or sexual orientation (10% versus 13% at public universities.) Surprisingly more report they have heard faculty express racial
stereotypes in 2013 (23% versus 24% at public universities.) than in 2009 (18% versus 24% at public universities).

**Civic Engagement: Participation, Awareness, and Values**

This theme is a conglomeration of many themes and attempts to relate to the levels of engagement and satisfaction with community and volunteer work during college, as well as items that reflect future orientation toward volunteer community service. This new theme as whole works more as a holistic construct which incorporates elements of the following constructs: Civic Engagement, Civic Awareness, Pluralistic Orientation, and Social Agency. While there is benefit to looking at these items more closely in relation to one another please see these social constructs listed above for the highlights in those areas.

**Career Planning**

When asked about plans after graduation, 23% of UND respondents have accepted an offer of employment, while 33% are looking but have no offers and 13% are not actively looking for employment. Nationally, 25% of respondents have accepted employment while 42% are still looking and just 11% are not actively looking for employment.

When the survey taker plans to attend graduate school, it appears UND respondents are less likely to have their plans formulated. For students planning on attending graduate school, 22% of UND respondents have accepted and plan on attending graduate school the coming fall, compared to 18% for respondents from public universities. 7% of UND respondents have applied and are still waiting responses compared to 3% of public university respondents.

UND respondents are significantly more likely to have had frequent help from their professors in achieving their professional goals, with 87% of respondents stating they have had frequent or at least occasional help from professors, compared to 86% of public university respondents.

UND respondents also feel they have made greater progress toward being prepared for both employments after college or graduate school. Nearly all UND respondents – 72% - report they are stronger or much stronger with regard to preparedness for their career now on par with the 72% of seniors at public universities. When asked if they are prepared for graduate school, 68% of UND respondents feel more prepared now than they were when they entered college as compared to 69% of public university respondents.

UND respondents report spending significantly less time on career planning, which includes things such as job searches, internships, etc., but this number is increasing from just 5% of UND respondents in 2009 to just under 13% in 2013 have spent 6 or more hours on career planning. On the other hand, UND respondents are significantly less likely than
in 2009 to have met with an advisor about career plans, the rate decreasing to 88% from 93% of respondents stating this occurred frequently or occasionally.

UND respondents are also significantly more satisfied with career planning services and UND senior respondents (79%) say they are satisfied with the relevance of coursework to future career plans, as compared to 71% nationally. With regard to services, 63% of UND respondents are satisfied with career counseling and planning, and 49% of UND respondents are satisfied with job placement services for students. Nationally, 57% of respondents are satisfied with career counseling and 41% are satisfied with job placement services.

UND seniors are reaching farther and higher in their aspirations as a long term look at their plans for further education reflects the national norm where graduate and professional degrees have become as important for life long career success. See Figure 38.

Figure 38: Longitudinal Number of student’s long range degree plans

Student Educational Aspirations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bachelor's degree (B.A., B.S., etc.)</th>
<th>Master's degree (M.A., M.S., etc.)</th>
<th>Ph.D. or Ed.D.</th>
<th>M.D., D.O., D.D.S., D.V.M.</th>
<th>LL.B or J.D. (Law)</th>
<th>Total % Student seeking Graduate Degree or Higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Miscellaneous

Financial Funding
With the high cost of education funding has become a watch word along with student retention. CSS track some basic self-reported information of the ways in which students fund their educational goals at the undergraduate level. This is the second year that CSS has asked about student debt and the types of support available to students. UND Students report consistently and significantly that receive no resources from their families for educational expenses. 31% reported no support in 2013 and 29% in 2009. Student debt is climbing for UND students as well. For the 52% of students reporting that they borrowed money UND students mean self-reported debt is $35,699 and the median debt is 27,500. 87% of UND Students are using their own resources and at higher levels by working and other sources of self-generated income up from 84% in 2009. They are taking on more debt and taking on more debt, 69% now taking loans up from 59% in 2009. On the positive side UND students are receiving more grants and scholarships over all in 2013 82% of students than the 59% in 2009.

Specific Current Events and Issues
Each CSS survey asks several questions about current political or social issues. Some questions have a short shelf life, others have been carried over since 2000 in some form or another. These questions are interesting insights into changing norms in college students lives, this years questions center on political dissent and free speech, preferential treatment, service in the armed forces and three specific social issues, same sex marriage, racial discrimination and abortion. The latter have been tracked longitudinal and are interesting in and of themselves in the changing evolution of public/civic values. The questions are as follows: On the scale Agree Strongly, Agree Somewhat, Disagree Somewhat, and Disagree Strongly, lease indicate your agreement with each of the following statements:

- Realistically, an individual can do little to bring about changes in our society
- Colleges should prohibit racist/sexist speech
- Dissent is a critical component of the political process
- Colleges have a right to ban extreme speakers from campus
- Students from disadvantaged social backgrounds should be given preferential treatment in college admissions
- Only volunteers should serve in the armed forces
- Same-sex couples should have the right to legal marital status
- Racial discrimination is no longer a major problem in America
- Abortion should be legal

The individual activism question has been tracked longitudinally and indicates that UND students are as hopefully or not that individual actions can have an impact on their world as their peers and in remains at the one in five or four level over time. Figure 39: Realistically, an individual can do little to bring about changes in our society. This is interesting when compared with the longitudinal attitudes toward banning racist /sexist speech. While it would seem that while
individual speech is not powerful, most UND students agree that this type of individual action could require institutional intervention. See Figure 43: Longitudinal: Colleges should prohibit racist/sexist speech on campus. Two questions pertaining to protest have been carried over from 2009 to 2013. Each of these questions reveals UND students are just like their peers struggle with both notions of civic discourse in theory and practice. See Figures 40 and 41.

Figure 39: Realistically, an individual can do little to bring about changes in our society

**Percentage comparison of individual ability to change by survey population over time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 40: Longitudinal and Populations Comparisons on Abortion

**Percentage comparison by survey population over time on legalizing abortion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 41: Longitudinal and Population Comparison Racist/Sexist Speech

**Percentage Colleges should prohibit racist/sexist speech on campus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 42: Longitudinal and Population Comparisons on Gay Marriage

**Same-sex couples should have the right to legal marital status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UND Responses to Issues**

Figure 43: Longitudinal: Colleges should prohibit racist/sexist speech on campus

**UND Responses to two questions about freedom of speech**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Dissent is a critical component of the political process</th>
<th>Colleges have a right to ban extreme speakers from campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissent is a critical component of the political process</td>
<td>Disagree Strongly</td>
<td>Disagree Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree Somewhat</td>
<td>Disagree Somewhat</td>
<td>Agree Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 44: Voluntary Military

**UND Responses to An All Volunteer Military?**

![Bar chart showing responses to whether only volunteers should serve in the armed forces.](chart)

- **Disagree Strongly**: 11
- **Disagree Somewhat**: 33.9
- **Agree Somewhat**: 33.1
- **Agree Strongly**: 22

Only Volunteers should serve in the armed forces

Disagree Strongly, Disagree Somewhat, Agree Somewhat, Agree Strongly

Figure 45: UND Responses 2013 Racism and Affirmative Actions

**UND Responses to two questions Racism and Affirmative Action**

![Bar chart showing responses to two questions.](chart)

- **Students from disadvantaged social backgrounds should be given preferential treatment in college admissions**
  - **Disagree Strongly**: 31.9
  - **Disagree Somewhat**: 47.1
  - **Agree Somewhat**: 21
  - **Agree Strongly**: 0

- **Racial discrimination is no longer a major problem in America**
  - **Disagree Strongly**: 31.1
  - **Disagree Somewhat**: 44.5
  - **Agree Somewhat**: 22.7
  - **Agree Strongly**: 1.7

Students from disadvantaged social backgrounds should be given preferential treatment in college admissions

Racial discrimination is no longer a major problem in America

Disagree Strongly, Disagree Somewhat, Agree Somewhat, Agree Strongly