

Texas Lutheran University May 2011 Senior Survey Results

By Jean Constable & Morgan Hale

Introduction

For the past four years, TLU has administered a survey to its graduating seniors. This year's survey asks students to provide the following information:

- contact information
- satisfaction and Importance of TLU services and characteristics
- how likely they would be to recommend TLU to prospective students
- how well they felt TLU prepared them for their career or a graduate school
- post-graduation plans, such as employment information and graduate school plans
- resources students used to make post-graduate plans
- rating various items as strengths or weaknesses for TLU

Each year the survey is revised based on prior years' results. For May 2011 the changes are:

- addition and deletion of satisfaction and importance items
- additional items in the *Post Graduate Plans* section
- a separate *Strengths & Weaknesses* section that asks students to choose if various traits are TLU strengths or weaknesses
- a new item that asks students how many faculty members they know well enough to ask for a letter of recommendation
- deferral of the IGG attainment questions to next year

Satisfaction and importance survey items were changed to both shorten the survey and to narrow the focus to those items that are primarily academic. Kimberly Watts, Director of Career Services, revised the *Post Graduate Plans* section to improve data quality and usefulness. The *Strengths and Weaknesses* section was designed to more clearly show what traits TLU seniors believe we excel at and those that we need to improve. By asking students how many faculty members they know well enough to ask for a letter of recommendation we are able to examine the importance of faculty-student interaction. The Institutional Goals for Graduates (IGGs) will again be a survey item for May 2012.

Results

The 2011 results are described below along with relevant comparisons from the May 2010 and May 2009 survey administrations. The data will be used in TLU's ongoing institutional assessment plans as well as various departmental level assessment plans to guide improvement efforts at all levels and to enhance student learning.

The following tables display summary results for most survey items. Complete results for each question can be found within the appendix along with the survey instrument.

Demographics

The May 2011 senior class had 157 graduates of whom 40 % were male and 60% were female. The survey had an 87% response rate. The responses we received were representative of the graduating class based on gender and ethnicity characteristics of the graduating population.

	May 2011 Survey Respondents	Spring 2011 TLU Graduating Population
Gender		
Male	40%	40%
Female	60%	60%
Ethnicity		
White	74%	74%
Hispanic	9%	16%
African American	15%	9%
Other	2%	1%

As demonstrated in the chart below, Business Administration, Biology, Education, Kinesiology and Psychology have consistently been the top five majors for May graduates for the past three years.

	May 2011 Survey Respondents	May 2010 Survey Respondents	May 2009 Survey Respondents
Business Administration	22%	20%	31%
Biology	17%	13%	11%
Kinesiology	10%	10%	10%
Psychology	9%	13%	7%
Education	7%	10%	7%

Satisfaction and Importance of Student Services

The responses to this section of the survey reveal that the top 5 items the respondents felt were the most important services/characteristics of TLU were also ranked in the top 5 for satisfaction. This indicates that the respondents perceive that TLU is meeting their expectations in opportunities to work with other students, quality of education, academic advising, capstone learning experience, and opportunities to work with faculty outside of class. The top five are summarized below with the full results displayed in the appendix.

Sorted By Satisfaction	Satisfaction % of Positive Responses	Importance % of Positive Responses
	Very Satisfied and Satisfied	Very Important and Important
Opportunities to work with other students	91%	88%
Quality of education	88%	92%
Academic advising	80%	91%
Capstone learning experience	80%	83%
Opportunities to interact with faculty outside of class	78%	81%

Sorted By Importance	Satisfaction % of Positive Responses	Importance % of Positive Responses
	Very Satisfied and Satisfied	Very Important and Important
Quality of education	88%	92%
Academic advising	80%	91%
Opportunities to work with other students	91%	88%
Capstone learning experience	80%	83%
Opportunities to interact with faculty outside of class	78%	81%

Because this section was revised for the May 2011 administration of the survey, a direct comparison of the whole list of last year's results is not appropriate. However, there was some overlap of satisfaction and importance items between the instruments for the last two survey years. Quality of education and academic advising were in the top five for both satisfaction and importance for this year's results as well as last year's.

Experience

The results gathered from the May 2011 survey show that 82% of the respondents were either "likely" or "very likely" to recommend TLU to a prospective student. This data is consistent with what we have seen in previous years as shown in the comparison chart below.

How likely are you to recommend TLU to a prospective student?

		May 2011	May 2010	May 2009
Very Likely	Count	72	63	75
	% of Responses	52%	50%	56%
Likely	Count	41	41	37
	% of Responses	30%	32%	28%
Neutral	Count	12	14	13
	% of Responses	9%	11%	10%
Unlikely	Count	11	2	3
	% of Responses	8%	20%	20%
Very Unlikely	Count	1	2	2
	% of Responses	1%	20%	10%
No Response	Count	1	4	4
	% of Responses	1%	40%	30%

Seventy-three percent (73%) of the respondents believed that TLU had done either “well” or “very well” at preparing them for future employment or graduate school programs.

How well did TLU prepare you for your upcoming job/schooling?

		May 2011
Very Well	Count	54
	% of Responses	39%
Well	Count	47
	% of Responses	34%
Adequately	Count	31
	% of Responses	22%
Not Well	Count	3
	% of Responses	2%
Not Well At All	Count	2
	% of Responses	1%
No Response	Count	1
	% of Responses	1%

The table below shows the cross tabulation of the “recommend TLU” and “prepared” survey item responses. This type of chart illustrates the relationship of the responses to each other. As you can see, students who feel well prepared for graduate school and their career are also more likely to recommend TLU to prospective students.

Cross tabulation of recommending TLU and prepared by TLU

		TLU Prepared					
		Very Well	Well	Adequately	Not Well	Not Well at All	Total
Recommend TLU	Very Likely	45	22	5	0	0	72
	Likely	8	21	12	0	0	41
	Neutral	0	3	7	1	1	12
	Unlikely	1	1	7	2	0	11
	Very Unlikely	0	0	0	0	1	1
	Total	54	47	31	3	2	

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was run to examine whether or not how well respondents felt like TLU had prepared them for future jobs affected how likely they would be to recommend TLU to prospective students. The results revealed a significant difference in how likely the respondents were to recommend TLU based on how well they felt TLU had prepared them. The better prepared the students felt TLU had made them, the more likely they would be to recommend TLU.

How many of your instructors do you know well enough to ask for a letter of recommendation?

	Count	Percent
None	2	1%
1 to 3	8	6%
4 to 6	58	42%
7 to 10	66	48%
10+	3	2%
No Response	1	1%

This question was added to the survey this year as an experimental item to see if it would give us quantitative evidence of the importance of the student and instructor connection. 90% of the respondents felt that they knew 4-10 instructors well enough that they could ask them for a letter of recommendation. This clustering of responses in only two of the five options precludes us from finding statistical importance. However, there is a statistically significant positive relationship between the number of instructors a student knows well enough to ask for a letter of recommendation and how likely they would be to recommend TLU to prospective students and to their TLU GPA. We believe that this question has great potential for the May 2012 survey after revising the response categories to shorten the ranges in the number of instructors a student might know well enough to ask for a letter of recommendation.

Correlations

		GPA	How likely are you to recommend TLU to a prospective student?	How many of your instructors do you know well enough to ask for a letter of recommendation?
How many of your instructors do you know well enough to ask for a letter of recommendation?	Pearson Correlation	.377**	.283**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	
	N	137	137	137

We also performed an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) using the letter of recommendation as the independent variable and GPA as the dependent variable to determine if mean GPA in the various response categories was significantly different. As stated above and as shown by the descriptive statistics, the response categories were too broad to reach any conclusions.

It would be interesting to see if students who feel comfortable asking several faculty members for letters of recommendation also retain at higher rates than those who do not. Another follow up study that would be of interest is to pair TLU GPA data with similar survey items from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

Below are the results from the discussed analysis.

Descriptive Statistics

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
GPA	More than 10	3	2.454	0.504	0.291
	7 - 10	66	3.075	0.557	0.069
	4 - 6	58	3.388	0.389	0.051
	1 - 3	8	3.578	0.392	0.139
	None	2	3.507	0.337	0.238
	Total	137	3.229	0.517	0.044
How likely are you to recommend TLU to a prospective student?	More than 10	3	3.00	2.000	1.155
	7 - 10	66	4.06	.943	.116
	4 - 6	58	4.47	.863	.113
	1 - 3	8	4.63	1.061	.375
	None	2	5.00	.000	.000
	Total	137	4.26	.970	.083

Post Graduate Plans

Upon graduating, what will you be doing?

Employment		
	Count	Percent
Seeking Employment	64	46%
Employed Part Time	28	20%
Employed Full Time	45	33%
No Response	1	1%
Total	138	100%

Comparison with May 2010 results

	May 2011 Count	Survey Percent	May 2010 Count	Survey Percent
Not Employed	64	46%	85	67%
Employed	73	53%	42	33%

Fifty-three percent (53%) of the respondents to the May 2011 survey reported they were employed either part or full time. Of the 53% of the respondents, 33% reported they were employed full time and 20% reported they were employed part time. It should be noted that the May 2010 survey did not ask respondents whether they were employed full time or part time.

Graduate School		
	Count	Percent
Attending	59	43%
Not Attending	78	57%
No Response	1	1%
Total	138	100%

Comparison with May 2010 Results

	May 2011 Survey		May 2010 Survey	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Attending	59	43%	33	26%
Not Attending	78	57%	94	74%

Forty-three percent (43%) of the survey respondents reported they will be attending a graduate program of some type (law school, medical school, MBA program, or doctoral program). This is an increase from the May 2010 results which showed 26% of the respondents attending a graduate program.

	Military Service		Volunteering		Travelling	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Yes	3	2%	17	12%	26	19%
No	134	97%	120	87%	111	80%
No Response	1	1%	1	1%	1	1%
Total	138	100%	138	100%	138	100%

Two percent (2%) of the respondents reported that they will be involved in military service after graduation. Additionally, 12% of the respondents indicated that they intend to volunteer their time, and 19% intend to travel after graduation.

What resources did you use to plan your next steps after graduation?

Respondents identified *faculty members* and *internship opportunities* as the most commonly used resources for them in planning what to do after graduation. This illustrates the perceived importance of participation in internships and of working and interacting with faculty outside of class. Having more opportunities for students to network with potential employers and more opportunities for students to participate in internships would give students a higher chance of being employed upon graduation.

Resources Used

	Count	Percent
Career Counseling	38	12%
Faculty Members	81	25%
Career Workshops	14	4%
Internships	47	15%
Jobs4Bulldogs	21	6%
Career Development Event/Fair	22	7%
Career Handouts	13	4%
Assessment Tools	8	2%
Alumni	33	10%
Other	39	12%
No Response	8	2%
Total	324	100%

If employed, how was your current job found?

	Count	Percent
Networking	25	16%
Internship/Student Teaching	12	8%
Online Ads	3	2%
Company Websites	3	2%
Newspaper Ads	0	0%
Jobs4Bulldogs	3	2%
TLU Career Event/Fair	1	1%
Other	27	18%
No Response	80	52%
Total	154	100%

If employed, how related is your current job to your major?

	Count	Percent
Highly Related	21	15%
Moderately Related	8	6%
Slightly Related	9	7%
Not At All Related	17	12%
No Response	83	60%
Total	138	100%

In future surveys it would be helpful to include a space for respondents to input text when they select “other” for the questions above dealing with resources used in planning what to do after graduation and with how the respondent’s current job was found.

Additionally, 19 of the 83 (23%) respondents who did not respond to the question of how related their current job was to their major said that they were employed. This may mean that the students taking this survey may not understand how to answer the question. This is a question that we may need to consider revising in future iterations of the survey.

If employed, what will your salary be?

	Full Time		Part Time	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
\$55,000 or more	1	2%	1	4%
\$45,000 – 54,999	5	11%	0	0%
\$35,000 – 44,999	4	9%	1	4%
\$25,000 – 34,999	3	7%	1	4%
\$15,000 - 24,999	7	16%	3	11%
\$14,999 or less	3	7%	8	29%
No Response	22	49%	14	50%
Total	45	100%	28	100%

Forty-nine percent (49%) of the respondents who said that they were employed did not reveal their income level. This may be because many graduates really have no idea how much their salary will be if they have not yet started. This idea is also supported by a respondent who stated that he/she was employed part time but claims that he/she will make \$55,000 or more in a year. That seems like a very unlikely scenario.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Small classes and the quality of the teaching at TLU were seen as the two biggest strengths, with 98% and 87% of respondents viewing them as strengths respectively. The respondents felt that TLU's biggest weaknesses were the quality of social activities and the number of social activities with 38% and 31% of respondents respectively viewing them as weaknesses.

	Strength		Weakness		Neither		No Response		Total	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Small classes	135	98%	0	0%	2	1%	1	1%	138	100%
Quality of teaching	120	87%	5	4%	12	9%	1	1%	138	100%
Hands-on learning experiences	107	78%	10	7%	24	17%	1	1%	138	100%
Quality educational programs	104	75%	9	7%	24	17%	1	1%	138	100%
Number of social activities	52	38%	43	31%	42	30%	1	1%	138	100%
Quality of social activities	44	32%	52	38%	20	14%	2	1%	138	100%

Additional Analysis

We repeated two of the analyses that we ran for the May 2010 survey to determine if the results from last year were an isolated phenomenon or had continuing relevance. The first such analysis is a comparison of mean GPAs within the response choices for recommending TLU. The statistical testing revealed that mean GPA is not a significant factor for determining how likely a student will be to recommend TLU to a prospective student. Thus, a high GPA is not a prerequisite for a student to recommend TLU to prospective students. This finding was consistent with the results of the May 2010 survey results. We repeated this analysis with the how well TLU prepared you survey item which yielded the same results. There was no statistically significant difference in mean GPAs between the response categories.

Additionally, we created a correlation matrix of student satisfaction with cultural events on campus, quality of education, their first year experience course, and likelihood of recommending TLU. The results showed a statistically significant positive relationship between the first three variables to how likely they were to recommend TLU. This data is also consistent with the results of the May 2010 survey as well as the results reported in higher education literature in regards to the link between student engagement and attainment of educational goals (Adelman, 2006).

Conclusions

The majority of the findings for the May 2011 senior survey are consistent with past years' results. TLU continues to provide positive educational and co-curricular experiences for our students with a dedicated and engaged faculty, small classes, and many opportunities to participate in high impact activities. The data are consistent across the years for these areas.

Two of the new survey items yielded interesting and significant findings. The first of these items asked students how well TLU prepared them for careers and graduate school. Using an analysis of variance (ANOVA) that compared responses to this question to how likely students were to recommend TLU, we found that the students who believed that TLU had done a good job of preparing them were more likely to recommend TLU to prospective students. This finding is especially interesting in light of the comparison of mean GPA between response categories discussed in the Additional Analysis section above.

The survey question asking how many instructors students knew well enough to ask for a letter of recommendation has great potential for future analysis. We learned that we must revise the response categories to make analysis meaningful. However, because there was a positive significant correlation between the number of instructors that a student knew well enough to ask for a letter of recommendation with how likely they were to recommend TLU and with GPA, we will continue to include it in the survey.

Works Cited

Adelman, C. (2006). *The Toolbox Revisited: Paths to Degree Completion From High School Through College*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Appendix

Major

	May 2011 Survey Respondents	May 2010 Survey Respondents	May 2009 Survey Respondents
Business Administration	22%	20%	31%
Biology	17%	13%	11%
Kinesiology	10%	10%	10%
Psychology	9%	13%	70%
Multidisciplinary Studies (Education)	10%	10%	7%
Communication Studies	6%	2%	4%
Computer Science	5%	1%	1%
Political Science	4%	2%	3%
English Studies	3%	2%	2%
History	3%	2%	3%
Mathematics	2%	6%	1%
Dramatic Media	2%	2%	1%
Athletic Training	2%	3%	1%
Art	2%	2%	1%
Theology	1%	5%	0.05
Sociology	1%	2%	3%
Vocal Performance	1%	0%	0%
Spanish Studies	1%	0%	0%
Applied Science	1%	0%	0%
Music	1%	2%	1%
Chemistry	1%	2%	1%
Physics	1%	2%	4%

Distribution of Majors among Degree Types

Major	BA	BBA	BM	BS	BA/BS	BS/BBA	Totals
ACCT						2%	2%
APPL	1%						1%
ATHL				2%			2%
BIOL	5%			11%			16%
BUSI		14%				2%	16%
CHEM				1%			1%
COMM	6%						6%
CSCI	1%			4%			5%
DRAM	2%				1%		2%
EDEL				1%	1%		2%
EDSS				1%			1%
ENGL	3%						3%
HIST	3%						3%
KINS	1%			9%			9%
MATH	2%				1%		2%
MDST		7%			1%		7%
MUSI	1%						1%
PHYS	1%				1%		1%
POLS	4%						4%
PSYC	6%			3%			9%
SOCI	1%						1%
SPAN	1%				1%		1%
THEO	1%						1%
VART	2%						2%
VPER			1%				1%
Totals	39%	20%	1%	32%	4%	2%	

All Satisfaction Responses

Services		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Not at all Satisfied	No Response
Cultural events on campus	Count	17	66	50	2	1	2
	Percent	12%	48%	36%	1%	1%	1%
Academic support services	Count	54	51	26	4	1	2
	Percent	39%	37%	19%	3%	1%	1%
Academic advising	Count	66	44	13	1	1	4
	Percent	48%	32%	9%	1%	1%	3%
Quality of education	Count	69	52	9	1	1	6
	Percent	50%	38%	7%	1%	1%	4%
Opportunity to do research	Count	40	56	33	6	1	2
	Percent	29%	29%	29%	29%	29%	29%
Capstone learning experience	Count	56	54	17	6	2	3
	Percent	41%	39%	12%	4%	1%	2%
Study abroad opportunities	Count	43	24	60	7	0	4
	Percent	31%	17%	43%	5%	0%	3%
Opportunities for internships	Count	33	37	47	13	3	5
	Percent	24%	27%	34%	9%	2%	4%
Opportunities for service learning	Count	26	42	57	5	1	7
	Percent	19%	30%	41%	4%	1%	5%
Opportunities for community service	Count	39	57	35	3	1	3
	Percent	28%	41%	25%	2%	1%	2%
Opportunities for community service on course related items	Count	15	42	61	11	5	4
	Percent	11%	30%	44%	8%	4%	3%
Opportunities to interact with faculty outside of class	Count	63	45	23	4	0	3
	Percent	46%	33%	17%	3%	0%	2%
Opportunities to work with other students	Count	63	62	8	2	0	3
	Percent	46%	45%	6%	1%	0%	2%
First Year Experience course	Count	41	42	43	4	4	4
	Percent	30%	30%	31%	3%	3%	3%

All Importance Responses

Services		Very Important	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Not at all Important	No Response
Cultural events on campus	Count	31	48	49	5	2	0
	Percent	22%	35%	36%	4%	1%	0%
Academic support services	Count	73	38	24	0	1	0
	Percent	53%	28%	17%	0%	1%	0%
Academic advising	Count	99	26	8	0	1	0
	Percent	72%	19%	6%	0%	1%	0%
Quality of education	Count	116	11	4	0	0	0
	Percent	84%	8%	3%	0%	0%	0%
Opportunity to do research	Count	52	56	24	2	1	0
	Percent	38%	41%	17%	1%	1%	0%
Capstone learning experience	Count	73	41	15	5	1	0
	Percent	53%	30%	11%	4%	1%	0%
Study abroad opportunities	Count	40	28	59	5	2	0
	Percent	29%	20%	43%	4%	1%	0%
Opportunities for internships	Count	68	39	22	1	2	0
	Percent	49%	28%	16%	1%	1%	0%
Opportunities for service learning	Count	27	47	50	6	2	0
	Percent	20%	34%	36%	4%	1%	0%
Opportunities for community service	Count	42	48	37	7	1	0
	Percent	30%	35%	27%	5%	1%	0%
Opportunities for community service on course related items	Count	20	49	58	4	3	0
	Percent	14%	36%	42%	3%	2%	0%
Opportunities to interact with faculty outside of class	Count	68	44	18	3	1	0
	Percent	49%	32%	13%	2%	1%	0%
Opportunities to work with other students	Count	63	58	9	5	0	0
	Percent	46%	42%	7%	4%	0%	0%
First Year Experience course	Count	45	37	32	15	5	0
	Percent	33%	27%	23%	11%	4%	0%

Employers Cited

Allen Independent School District
Bath and Body Works
Chili's
Deer Oaks Behavioral Organization
DOE
Dynamo Cycle
Energy Waste
Ernst & Young
Fidelity National Home Warranty
Fisher, Herbst, & Kemble P.C.
Golf Club of Seguin
Guadalupe Family Health
Guadalupe Regional Medical Center
Harris County
HEB
Institutional Research Department
Intown Properties
Kohls
Life Time Fitness
Lifetouch Portrait Studios
Lowes
Matt Brown Insurance
Mcdonalds
Padgett Stratemann & Co.

Paseo Homes
Possibly- Alvin ISD
PricewaterhouseCoopers
Professional physical service
Professional Golf
Rent House
Seguin Cigar
Sodexo/TLU Dining Services
State Farm
TaLK Program
Tek Systems or Brunel
Texas A&M University
Texas Lutheran University
Texas Lutheran University IT Department
TFC Design Shoppe
Thirsty Camel
TLU
TLU
TLU-Student Worker
United States Army
USMC
UTHSCSA
YNN

Net Promoter Score Comparison of Mean GPA within Response Categories

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error of Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Sig.
No Response	1	2.330000	.	.	2.3300	2.3300	
Very Unlikely	1	3.019000	.	.	3.0190	3.0190	
Unlikely	11	3.322182	.6931179	.2089829	1.9670	4.0000	
Neutral	12	2.894917	.5031469	.1452460	2.0470	3.9190	
Likely	41	3.232878	.5656220	.0883353	2.0120	4.0000	
Very Likely	72	3.272056	.4503961	.0530797	2.1210	4.0000	
Total	138	3.222957	.5211232	.0443609	1.9670	4.0000	
Between Groups							.111

Analysis of Variance Recommending TLU vs. Prepared by TLU

How well did TLU prepare you for your upcoming job/schooling?	Mean	Std. Deviation	N	Sig.
Not Well at All	2.00	1.414	2	
Not Well	2.33	.577	3	
Adequately	3.48	1.029	31	
Well	4.36	.705	47	
Very Well	4.80	.528	54	
Total	4.26	.970	137	
				.000

Correlation between Recommending TLU and Letters of Recommendation

		How many of your instructors do you know well enough to ask for a letter of recommendation?
How likely are you to recommend TLU to a prospective student?	Pearson Correlation	.283**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001
	N	137

Correlation of Net Promoter Score to Selected Factors

		How likely are you to recommend TLU to a prospective student?
Pearson Correlation	How likely are you to recommend TLU to a prospective student?	1.000
	GPA	0.129
	Cultural events on campus S	0.354
	Quality of education S	0.552
	First Year Experience course S	0.149
Sig. (1-tailed)	How likely are you to recommend TLU to a prospective student?	
	GPA	.067
	Cultural events on campus S	.000
	Quality of education S	.000
	First Year Experience course S	.043

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Predicting Net Promoter Score Response

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	44.883	4	11.221	17.375	.000
	Residual	80.724	125	.646		
	Total	125.608	129			

Linear Regression Coefficients for Net Promoter Score

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	.092	.626		.147	.883	-1.147	1.331
	GPA	.104	.140	.054	.740	.461	-.174	.382
	Cultural events on campus S	.246	.110	.184	2.233	.027	.028	.464
	Quality of education S	.702	.110	.508	6.405	.000	.485	.919
	First Year Experience course S	-.054	.077	-.056	-.711	.479	-.206	.097

TLU GRADUATION SURVEY 2011
All responses will be kept confidential.

Congratulations on your approaching graduation! Please help us improve the TLU experience by providing your responses to the questions below. Thank you!

Section 1: Contact Information

1. First Name:

2. Last Name:

3. Email where you can be reached after graduation: Format [x@x.xx](#)

Address where you will be living after graduation

4. Permanent address line 1

5. Permanent City

6. Permanent State

7. Permanent Zip Code

Address where you can ALWAYS be reached after graduation (If Different)

8. Mailing address line 1

9. Mailing address City

10. Mailing address State

11. Mailing address Zip

Section 2: Please indicate your level of satisfaction and importance for the items listed using the following scale:

Satisfaction:

Importance:

5 = Very satisfied

5 = Very important

4 = Satisfied

4 = Important

3 = Neutral

3 = Neutral

2 = Dissatisfied

2 = Unimportant

1 = Very dissatisfied 1 = Very unimportant

1. Cultural events on campus	Satisfaction	Importance
2. Academic support services	Satisfaction	Importance
3. Academic advising	Satisfaction	Importance
4. Quality of education	Satisfaction	Importance
5. Opportunity to do research	Satisfaction	Importance
6. Capstone learning experience	Satisfaction	Importance
7. Study abroad opportunities	Satisfaction	Importance
8. Opportunities for internships	Satisfaction	Importance
9. Opportunities for service learning	Satisfaction	Importance
10. Opportunities for community service	Satisfaction	Importance

11. Opportunities to work with faculty on course related items	Satisfaction	Importance
12. Opportunities to interact with faculty outside of class	Satisfaction	Importance
13. Opportunities to work with other students	Satisfaction	Importance
14. First Year Experience course	Satisfaction	Importance

Section 3: Experience

- How likely are you to recommend TLU to a prospective student? Select one.
☐ Very likely ☐ Likely ☐ Neutral ☐ Unlikely ☐ Very unlikely
- How well did TLU prepare you for your upcoming job/schooling? Select one.
☐ Very well ☐ Well ☐ Adequately ☐ Not well ☐ Not well at all
- How many of your instructors do you know well enough to ask for a letter of recommendation?
☐ None ☐ 1 – 3 ☐ 4 – 6 ☐ 7 – 10 ☐ More than 10

Section 4: Post Graduation Plans

- Upon graduation, what will you be doing? (Select all that apply)
Employed full-time
Employed part-time
Military Service
Volunteering
Traveling
Seeking employment
Graduate school (Law)
Graduate school (Medical)
Graduate school (MBA)
Graduate school (PhD)
Other education: Please explain
- What resources did you use to plan your next steps after graduation? (Select all that apply)
Career counseling
Faculty members
Career workshops
Internships
Jobs4Bulldogs
Career Development Event/Fair
Career handouts
Assessment tools
Alumni
Other
- If employed, how was your current job found? (Select all that apply)
Networking
Internship/Student teaching
Online ads
Company website

Newspaper ads
Jobs4Bulldogs
TLU Career event/fair
Other

4. If employed, how related is your current job to your major? (Select one)

☐ Highly related ☐ Moderately related ☐ Slightly related ☐ Not at all related

5. If employed, what is the name of your company/employer?

6. If employed, what will your annual salary be? (Select one)

\$14,999 or less
\$15,000 – 24,999
\$25,000 – 34,999
\$35,000 – 44,999
\$45,000 – 54,999
\$55,000 or more

Section 5: Strengths and Weaknesses

For each item below, choose whether it is a strength of TLU, a weakness of TLU, or neither a strength or weakness.

1. Small classes	<input type="checkbox"/> Strength	<input type="checkbox"/> Weakness	<input type="checkbox"/> Neither
2. Quality of teaching	<input type="checkbox"/> Strength	<input type="checkbox"/> Weakness	<input type="checkbox"/> Neither
3. Quality educational programs	<input type="checkbox"/> Strength	<input type="checkbox"/> Weakness	<input type="checkbox"/> Neither
4. Number of social activities	<input type="checkbox"/> Strength	<input type="checkbox"/> Weakness	<input type="checkbox"/> Neither
5. Quality of social activities	<input type="checkbox"/> Strength	<input type="checkbox"/> Weakness	<input type="checkbox"/> Neither
6. Hands-on learning experiences	<input type="checkbox"/> Strength	<input type="checkbox"/> Weakness	<input type="checkbox"/> Neither

Section 6: Comments: