

# 2020 Canadian University Survey Consortium (CUSC) <u>Middle-Year</u> Undergraduate Students

Summary of Results

November 2020

carleton.ca/oirp

# Contents

Table of tablesii
Table of figuresii
Introduction1
Methodology1
Profile of Carleton Respondents2
Results6
Overall Satisfaction with University Experience6
Satisfaction with Teaching8
Perception of Professors
Perception of Staff10
Activities10
Growth and Development11
Contribution to communication skills11
Contribution to analytical and learning skills12
Contribution to working skills13
Contribution to life skills14
Commitment to completion15
Goal Development16
Education goals16
Future Career Goals16
Satisfaction with Services and Facilities17
Conclusion20
Appendix A- CUSC's Protocol for Data Use and data use permissions21
Appendix B- Group 2 and Group 3 Institutions participating in 2020 CUSC survey23
Appendix C- Perceptions of Professors and Staff24
Appendix D- Usage and Satisfaction with Services and Facilities

# Table of tables

Table 1: Proportional Profile of Respondents	3
Table1a: Respondents have self-identified as:	3
Table1b: % Self-identifying as having a disability, including mental health	4
Table 1c: Impact of Work on Academic Performance (Full-Time Students)	5
Table 2: Most Important Aspect of Professors	9
Table 3: Proportion of respondents who strongly agree or agree that most professors 1	.0
Table 4: Student involvement in Activities 1	1
Table 5: Commitment to completion	.6
Table 6: Future Career Goals 1	17

# Table of figures

Figure 1: Has your Experience at this University Met, Exceeded or Fallen Short of your Expectations?	6
Figure 2: Overall Satisfaction of University Experience Carleton vs. Comparable Institutions	7
Figure 3: How likely is it that you would recommend this university?	7
Figure 4: Perceptions of Professors	8
Figure 5: University's Contribution to Communication Skills	. 12
Figure 6: University's Contribution to Analytical and Learning Skills	. 13
Figure 7: University's Contribution to Working Skills	. 14
Figure 8: University's Contribution to Life Skills	15
Figure 9: Satisfaction with Services and Facilities	18

# Introduction

Carleton University regularly participates in a number of surveys in order to better understand its students' characteristics, needs and perceptions. In February 2020, Carleton was one of 29 institutions that participated in the undergraduate survey coordinated by the Canadian University Survey Consortium (CUSC)<sup>1</sup>. This was Carleton's 22nd year participating in a CUSC survey. CUSC operates on a three-year survey cycle. Each year in the cycle a random sample is selected from a different group of undergraduates: first-year, middle-year, or graduating students. In 2020, the survey focused on middle-year undergraduate students which marked the third time that CUSC had offered a middle-year undergraduate survey (the first time it was done was in 2014).

# Methodology

An invitation to complete the online survey was e-mailed to a sample of 3,000 Carleton students who were middle-year undergraduates. 912 Carleton students responded to the survey, resulting in a 30.4% response rate, including partial responses. Carleton's completed response rate is 22.8%<sup>2</sup>, lower than the overall CUSC response rate of 28.5%. This years' response rate was lower than in 2017 (41.9%). Part of it might be due to the fact that Carleton stopped reminders from going out to students who hadn't responded to the survey as soon as classes were cancelled in person as a response to Covid-19. After March 16th, when Carleton University switched from in person classes to on-line classes, there were only 35 students who responded to the survey, so no analysis was performed comparing these students and those who responded before March 16<sup>th</sup>.

This report is meant to highlight results related to student satisfaction with their university experience. Results for Carleton are presented along with a comparison with similar universities. CUSC uses three institutional groupings (Groups 1, 2 and 3) that are based on the type of programs offered, as well as the size of the student population. Group 1 includes universities which have primarily undergraduate programs and they tend to be relatively small. Group 2 institutions are more comprehensive, offering undergraduate and graduate programs, and have a medium-sized student population. The Group 3 institutions have the largest student populations with most offering professional programs in addition to a wide range of undergraduate and graduate programs. For the purpose of this report, the aggregate of Groups 2 and 3, excluding Carleton University, will be used as the comparison

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See Appendix A for CUSC's Protocol for Data Use and data use permissions.

 $<sup>^2</sup>$  The completed response rate is defined as students who have answered roughly 80% of the survey. The analysis in this report also includes partial responses for Carleton University.

**group**<sup>3</sup>. Any differences noted in the text of this report are deemed to be statistically significant, unless otherwise noted.

In order to get a sense of how Carleton is doing over time, the 2020 results have been compared to the results from the 2017 survey throughout this report (the last year that the middle-year CUSC student survey was done). Again, only differences that are statistically significant will be discussed in the text. Please note that totals may not add up to 100 since proportions are rounded. More detailed results for some of the information included in graphs and discussions can be found in the **Appendices**.

# **Profile of Carleton Respondents**

A profile of the Carleton students who responded to the 2020 CUSC student survey is presented in **Table 1**. The profile of respondents at comparable institutions (Groups 2 and 3) can also be found in this table, along with the range of proportions across these universities. Whether there are statistically significant differences or not, it is very useful to consider the range of institutional results in order to understand the variation in student bodies across the participating institutions that constitute Groups 2 and 3. To give a more representative picture of how fairly diverse the student profile is among institutions, the range (lowest and highest proportions) of results across Groups 2 and 3 universities has been included. These institutions are not homogenous, and in cases where Carleton is deemed statistically significantly different than the average, the implication is by no means that it has the highest or lowest proportion of that characteristic.

Fifty-eight percent of respondents from Carleton were female, this is a higher proportion than the eligible survey population at Carleton (47%). Additionally, the proportion of female middle-year students at Carleton was statistically significantly lower than the proportion of Groups 2 and 3, on average (67%), but comparable to the proportion among 2017 Carleton respondents.

Seventy-three percent of Carleton respondents were between the ages of 19 and 21 at the start of 2020, which was more than the average of the Groups 2 and 3 at 68%, but similar to the proportion of respondents in 2017. Carleton respondents were more likely than the average of Groups 2 and 3 to self-report being an International student (10% vs. 8% respectively). Differences in the proportion of students who self-identified as being members of a visible minority or of an Indigenous background are not statistically significant. Carleton proportions are similar to those in 2017.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Carleton is excluded from the Group 2 and 3 proportions in this report. See Appendix B for a list of Group 2 and 3 universities.

Table 1: Proportional Profile of Respondents					
Attribute	Carleton	Groups 2 and 3 (n=10,414)			
Attribute	(n=912)	Average	Low	High	
Female*	58%	67%	57%	68%	
Between 19 and 21 years*	73%	68%	33%	81%	
International Students*	10%	8%	5%	22%	
Visible minority	41%	42%	20%	72%	
Indigenous	4%	5%	1%	15%	
Students with a disability*	35%	28%	22%	40%	
Disability always limit daily activities*	14%	8%	5%	12%	
Living in rental accommodations*	54%	48%	27%	75%	
Living with parents*	36%	40%	16%	64%	
Living in on-campus housing	6%	5%	1%	11%	
Students who work while studying	55%	53%	41%	68%	
Average number of hours worked per week (all respondents who worked)	16	16	13	25	
Median grade (self-reported) so far at university	В	В	В	В	

\* denotes statistically significant difference between Carleton and the G2 and G3 average

The disaggregated data in **Table 1a** shows some statistically significant differences (marked with an asterisk) between Carleton and the average of Groups 2 and 3.

Table 1a. Respondents have self-identified as:	Carleton	Groups 2 and 3
Arab (e.g., Saudi, Egyptian, etc.)*	7%	3%
Black*	10%	4%
Chinese*	6%	11%
Indigenous	4%	5%
Latin American	3%	3%
South Asian (e.g., East Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan, etc.)	9%	11%
White	64%	60%
Other*	5%	9%
Note: All categories with less than 2% have been included under "Other", ar	nd it includes specif	ic categories such as:

Note: All categories with less than 2% have been included under "Other", and it includes specific categories such as: Filipino, Japanese, Korean, South East Asian (e.g., Cambodian, Indonesian, Laotian, Vietnamese, etc.), West Asian (e.g., Afghan, Iranian, etc.) and Other. Since students could select all that apply, totals add to more than 100%. \* Difference between Carleton and the Group 2 and 3 is statistically significant.

Carleton respondents were more likely than the average of Groups 2 and 3 to report having a disability (35% vs. 28%) and having their daily activities always impacted by it (14% vs. 8%). At Carleton there is a significant increase on those who self-reported having a disability (from 29% in 2017 to 35% in 2020). The increase in respondents reporting having a disability is driven by an increase in respondents

selecting mental health. Mental health was reported as the most common disability, with Carleton respondents more likely to select mental health (22% as compared to 18% in Group 2 and 3). For Carleton this proportion was up from the 2017 survey, where 19% of respondents selected mental health. It is unclear whether the increase in respondents selecting mental health is a result of an increase in mental health disabilities or impairments or a change in awareness and stigma, or some combination of both. **Table 1b** shows the trend of the proportion of respondents who self-identified having a disability, including mental health, since 2014, the first time Carleton participated in the middle-year CUSC survey.



Carleton respondents were more likely than respondents in the comparison group on average, to be living in rental accommodations (54% compared to 48% in Groups 2 and 3), and less likely to be living with parents (36% compared to 40% in Groups 2 and 3). Middle-year respondents at Carleton are more likely to use public transportation (65% compared to 35% of respondents in Group 2 and 3, on average). This could be attributed to the compulsory Universal Transit Pass (U-Pass) for full-time undergraduate students at Carleton.

First-generation respondents (i.e. neither parents nor guardians had any post-secondary education) accounted for 11% of Carleton middle-year respondents which was lower than the 13% in the comparison group. Conversely, 64% of Carleton respondents (unchanged from 2017) indicated that a parent/guardian held at least an undergraduate degree (vs. 58% in Groups 2 and 3). Self-reported

median grade (B) was similar between the respondents at Carleton and those in Groups 2 and 3 as well as among 2017 Carleton respondents.

Fifty-five percent of Carleton respondents reported working while studying for on average 16 hours per week, similar to that of Group 2 and 3, on average. However, this is an increase from 50% at Carleton in 2017. The survey asked respondents if working had an impact on their academic performance. Generally, for full-time students, the reported impact became increasingly negative as the number of hours worked increased (a similar trend for Groups 2 and 3). These results are therefore best interpreted controlling for hours worked (**Table 1c**).

Table 1c. Impact of Work on Academic Performance (Full-Time Students)							
	Car	leton	Groups 2 and 3				
Hours worked	% Hours worked	% Negative impact	% Hours worked	% Negative impact			
10 or less	24%	25%	32%	Similar			
10.5 to 15	34%	46%	33%	Similar			
15.5 to 20	23%	50%	20%	Similar			
20.5+	19%	76%	16%	Similar			

Negative impact includes very negative and somewhat negative (other responses are: no impact, somewhat positive and very positive). Similar indicates no statistically significant difference.

# Results

#### **Overall Satisfaction with University Experience**

In the 2020 CUSC survey for middle year students, respondents were asked about their overall experience at their university and how it compared to their expectations. As **Figure 1** illustrates, a higher proportion of respondents at Carleton reported that the university had either met or exceeded their expectations (85% compared to 80% of respondents in Groups 2 and 3). This was comparable to Carleton respondents in 2017.



Respondents were asked to rate how satisfied they were with the concern shown by the university for them as an individual, as well as their decision to attend this university. **Figure 2** shows that a higher proportion of Carleton respondents reported satisfaction with their decision to attend this university (91% vs. 85% at comparable institutions). There was not statistically significant difference between Carleton and the average of Groups 2 and 3 with their satisfaction with the concern shown by the university for them as an individual. Carleton results were similar from 2017 to 2020 for both questions.



Figure 2: Overall Satisfaction of University Experience Carleton vs. Comparable Institutions

Students were asked to rate the likelihood they would recommend their university to a friend or family member on a scale from 0 (not at all likely) to 10 (extremely likely). Carleton respondents are more likely to recommend their university to a friend or family member than the average of Groups 2 and 3 (**Figure 3**). Comparison over time is not possible since this question changed from "Would you recommend Carleton to others?" with answers of yes or no.



# Figure 3: How likely is it that you would recommend this university to a friend or family member?

# Satisfaction with Teaching

#### Perception of Professors

The survey explored the perceptions that respondents had towards their professors through their response ratings of a range of statements. Eighty-two percent of Carleton respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they were generally satisfied with the quality of teaching they received (similar to 2017), however, this is lower than the 85%, on average, in Groups 2 and 3. Additionally, specific questions were asked about perceptions of professors with respect to teaching and teaching-related interactions. For Carleton, the 16 statements as related to students' level of agreement is illustrated in **Figure 4**. The figure shows that, on a whole, Carleton respondents have very positive perceptions of their professors with all but one measure being above 70% agreement.



#### Figure 4: Perceptions of Professors

Students were asked to select the top three aspects that they believe are most important for professors to focus on. The most selected aspect was communicate well in their teaching, with 40% selecting it their top three. Table 2 shows results for Carleton only since differences between Carleton and the average of Groups 2 and 3 are not statistically significant. Comparisons over time are not possible since that question was not asked in 2017.

Table 2: Most important aspect of Professors	Carleton
Communicate well in their teaching	40%
Are fair in their grading	34%
Are intellectually stimulating in their teaching	33%
Seem knowledgeable in their fields	29%
Are well organized in their teaching	26%
Provide useful feedback on my academic work	21%
Treat students as individuals, not just numbers	21%
Are consistent in their grading	17%
Treat students the same regardless of race	15%
Treat students the same regardless of gender	12%
Look out for students' interests	12%
Take a personal interest in my academic progress	11%
Are reasonably accessible outside of class	10%
Provide prompt feedback on my academic work	10%
Encourage students to participate in class discussions	9%

Note: Respondents provided top three choices. Therefore, columns will not sum to 100%

The 16 statements that were evaluated to assess perceptions of professors are listed in **Table 3.** It can be seen that Carleton respondents reported lower levels of agreement compared to the average of Groups 2 and 3 for all items that are statistically significantly different. Compared to 2017, the only measure that 2020 Carleton respondents were more likely to agree was on the measure that "Most of my professors provide prompt feedback on my academic work" (70% in 2020 vs. 64% in 2017). There are a couple of items where there's a difference between Carleton respondents in 2020 and in 2017, however, since we are showing the proportion of those who selected 'strongly agree' or 'agree', the difference is not clearly visible. For both items: "Most of my professors encourage students to participate in class discussions", and … "seem knowledgeable in their fields", Carleton's 2020 respondents are less likely to strongly agree but more likely to agree compared to 2017.

**Appendix C** gives a more detailed summary of satisfaction results for teaching among Carleton respondents, compared to the average of Groups 2 and 3, as well as Carleton respondents in 2017.

Table 3: Proportion of respondents who Strongly Agreed or      Agreed that		Carleton	
		2020	2020
Most of my professors are reasonably accessible outside of class	Similar	89%	Similar
Most of my professors take a personal interest in my academic progress	58%	48%	54%
Most of my professors treat students as individuals, not just numbers	Similar	72%	80%
Most of my professors encourage students to participate in class discussions	85%	85%	Similar
Most of my professors are well organized in their teaching	84%	82%	Similar
Most of my professors seem knowledgeable in their fields	96%	96%	Similar
Most of my professors communicate well in their teaching	82%	80%	Similar
Most of my professors are intellectually stimulating in their teaching	Similar	73%	79%
Most of my professors provide useful feedback on my academic work	Similar	71%	Similar
Most of my professors provide prompt feedback on my academic work	64%	70%	Similar
Most of my professors are fair in their grading	86%	82%	86%
Most of my professors are consistent in their grading	82%	79%	Similar
Most of my professors treat students the same regardless of gender	Similar	95%	Similar
Most of my professors treat students the same regardless of race	Similar	95%	Similar
Most of my professors look out for students' interests	80%	76%	82%
Generally, I am satisfied with the quality of teaching I have received	Similar	82%	85%

Note: Results for the average of Groups 2 and 3 and Carleton's 2017 shown when statistically significantly different from Carleton's 2020 results.

#### Perception of Staff

Carleton respondents were less likely to indicate that "most teaching assistants in my academic program are helpful" compared to Groups 2 and 3, on average (72% 'strongly agree' and 'agree' vs. 77% respectively), as well as compared to Carleton respondents in 2017. Eighty-eight percent of Carleton respondents perceived university support staff (e.g. clerks, secretaries etc.) as being helpful which is a similar proportion to respondents in Groups 2 and 3 on average and to Carleton respondents in 2017.

# Activities

When assessed on student involvement in campus activities, compared to the average of Groups 2 and 3, Carleton middle-year respondents were more likely (very often or often) to participate in student government (excluding voting in student elections) (10% vs. 7% for Groups 2 and 3 on average). Conversely, they were less likely to attend public lectures and guest speakers on campus (8% vs. 9% for Groups 2 and 3 on average) and participate in student clubs (18% vs. 25%). With regards to engaging in community service or volunteer activities, Carleton middle-year respondents were less

likely to do so, either on or off campus, compared to their counterparts, and when they did, 20% of Carleton respondents reported spending 3 or more hours per week in the activity, compared to 28% of respondents in Groups 2 and 3 on average.

Compared to 2017, Carleton respondents in 2020 were less likely (very often or often) to participate in student government (10% vs. 15% in 2017); student clubs (18% vs. 23%); and attending home games of university athletic teams (8% vs. 13%). **Table 4** gives a breakdown of the activities where there was a statistically significant difference between Carleton and Groups 2 and 3, on average.

Table 4: Student Involvement in Activities				
Since last September, how o	Since last September, how often have you (% very often or often)			
	attended public lectures and guest speakers on campus?	8%	9%	
Campus Activities	participated in student government (excluding voting in student elections)?	10%	7%	
	participated in student clubs?	18%	25%	
Community service and	participated in on-campus community service/volunteer activities?	13%	14%	
volunteer activities	participated in off-campus community service/volunteer activities?	13%	18%	

Forty-four percent of Carleton respondents reported spending in excess of 31 hours a week on academic work in total (in and out of class), this was comparable to the average of Groups 2 and 3, but lower than the 52% of Carleton respondents in 2017.

# Growth and Development

Respondents were asked how much their university experience contributed to their growth and development in 29 areas. These areas could be categorized into four themes: (*i*) communication skills; (*ii*) analytical and learning skills; (*iii*) working skills; and (*iv*) life skills.

# Contribution to communication skills

Among the four communication skills rated, Carleton university contributed *most* to students' growth and development in writing clearly and correctly (52% very much or much), which is similar to Groups 2 and 3 on average, and *least* to second or third language skills (21% very much or much), which is more than the 14% in Groups 2 and 3 on average. In the other two areas that were assessed, Carleton respondents were less likely than the peer group to indicate that the university contributed to speaking to small groups (41% vs. 50% in Groups 2 and 3) and speaking to a class or audience (28% vs. 38%).

Compared to 2017, Carleton respondents in 2020 we less likely to indicate that the university contributed to speaking to small groups (41% very much or much vs. 49% in 2017) and speaking to a class or audience (28% vs. 37% in 2017).



# Contribution to analytical and learning skills

In the eight areas assessed, Carleton respondents rated the university as contributing the *most* to thinking logically and analytically (65% very much or much, similar to Groups 2 and 3) and contributing the *least* to mathematical skills (34%, similar to Groups 2 and 3). Fifty percent of respondents at Carleton indicated that the university experience contributed very much or much to listening to others to absorb information accurately, this is lower than the 54% in Groups 2 and 3. Note that these results do not control for the variation in program mix between Carleton and Group 2 and 3 institutions.

Compared to 2017, there were 5 areas out of 8 where 2020 Carleton respondents were less likely to report that Carleton contributed very much or much to their development.

Mathematical skills (36% very much or much in 2017 vs. 34% in 2020) Thinking creatively to find ways to achieve an objective (53% vs. 44%) Understanding abstract concepts (60% vs. 52%) Reading to absorb information accurately (53% vs. 48%) Listening to others to absorb information accurately (57% vs. 50%)



# FIGURE 6: UNIVERSITY'S CONTRIBUTION TO ANALYTICAL AND LEARNING SKILLS

# Contribution to working skills

Carleton respondents, when asked to assess the university's contribution to their development and growth in 7 working skills areas, rated the university as contributing the *most* (very much and much) to their ability to work independently (69%, similar to Groups 2 and 3, on average) and the *least* to their entrepreneurial skills (12%, lower than the 18% in Groups 2 and 3, on average).

Carleton respondents were less likely to indicate that the university contributed (very much or much) to growth and development in the following working skills compared to respondents in Groups 2 and 3, on average: knowledge of career options (34% vs. 38%); and cooperative interaction in groups (41% vs. 51%). Compared to 2017, they were less likely to indicate that the university contributed to their computer literacy skills (40% in 2017 vs. 33% in 2020); and cooperative interaction in groups (46% in 2017 vs. 41% in 2020).



# Contribution to life skills

When asked to assess the university's contribution to the development and growth of life skills, Carleton respondents rated the university as contributing (very much or much) the *most* to their ability to interact with people from backgrounds different from their own (53%, similar to Groups 2 and 3, on average) and the *least* to their spirituality (10%, lower than the 14% in Groups 2 and 3, on average).

Carleton respondents were less likely to indicate that the university contributed (very much or much) to growth and development in the following life skills areas compared to respondents in Groups 2 and 3, on average: Dealing successfully with obstacles to achieve an objective (45% vs. 50%, in Groups 2 and 3); ability to lead a group to achieve an objective (34% vs. 43%); self-confidence (33% vs. 37%) and moral and ethical judgment (38% vs. 44%).

Compared to 2017, 2020 Carleton respondents were less likely to indicate that the university contributed (very much or much) to growth and development in dealing successfully with obstacles to achieve an objective (54% in 2017 vs. 45% in 2020); self-confidence (40% vs. 33%) and spirituality (16% vs. 10%).



# Commitment to completion

The middle-year CUSC survey asks a series of questions that collect information on students' commitment to completing their programs. The vast majority of respondents agree or strongly agree that they plan to complete their degree at their current university (which is similar to the average of respondents from Groups 2 and 3), however, Carleton respondents are more likely to plan to come back to their university next year (97% agree or strongly agree at Carleton vs. 95% in Groups 2 and 3).

At Carleton, most respondents agree or strongly agree that they are willing to put a lot of effort into being successful at university (95%, similar to comparable institutions), yet when asked questions that reflect their effort into being successful like attending all of their classes, or having good study habits, the proportion of respondents that agree or strongly agree decreases to 82% and 68% respectively, both of these proportions are lower than those of Groups 2 and 3 (90% and 74%, respectively).

Table 5: Commitment to completion					
% Agree or Strongly agree	Carleton 2017	Carleton 2020	Groups 2 and 3		
I plan to complete my degree at this university	Similar	98%	Similar		
I plan to come back to this university next year	Similar	97%	95%		
I am willing to put a lot of effort into being successful at university	Similar	95%	Similar		
I am in the right program for me	Similar	91%	Similar		
Most of my courses are interesting	84%	82%	Similar		
I normally go to all of my classes	86%	82%	90%		
My course load is manageable	Similar	78%	Similar		
I can deal with stress	78%	73%	78%		
I have the financial resources to complete my program	Similar	72%	Similar		
I had adequate information about my program from the university before I enrolled	Similar	70%	Similar		
I have good study habits	Similar	68%	74%		
A university degree is worth the cost	Similar	62%	Similar		
I plan to go to college/CEGEP next year	Similar	8%	15%		
I plan to transfer to another university next year	Similar	5%	8%		

"Don't know" responses are not included in the calculations. Response options are: Strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree, and don't know.

# **Goal Development**

# Education goals

Middle-year students from Carleton University were more likely than their counterparts to have chosen their major or discipline, 95% vs. 92% of Groups 2 and 3, on average. However, this is lower than the 97% of Carleton respondents in 2017.

After completion of their undergraduate program, 23% of Carleton middle-year respondents (similar to 2017 survey results) indicated that they intended to apply to a professional program (e.g., Medicine, Law, etc.), this is a lower proportion compared to 30% of respondents in the Groups 2 and 3. And 36% of respondents at Carleton intend to apply to graduate school, similar proportion for respondents in Groups 2 and 3, on average and to 2017 Carleton respondents.

#### Future Career Goals

Overall, 22% of middle-year students have a specific career in mind while another 36% have several possible careers in mind. About 6 in 10 respondents say they know their career options at least fairly well, with 17% saying they know their options very well. Almost all middle-year respondents have

Table 6: Future Career Goa	Table 6: Future Career Goals					
Which of the following best describes your career plans?	Carleton 2017	Carleton 2020	Groups 2 and 3			
I have a specific career in mind	30%	22%	32%			
I have several possible careers in mind	31%	36%	36%			
I have some general ideas but I need to clarify them	23%	26%	22%			
I am unsure, but I want to develop a career plan	13%	12%	9%			
I am not thinking about a career at this stage of my studies	2%	3%	1%			
How well do you know the career options your program or intended program could open for you?	Carleton 2017	Carleton 2020	Groups 2 and 3			
Very well		17%	20%			
Fairly well	0. 1	46%	49%			
Only a little	Similar	33%	28%			
Not at all		4%	4%			
Steps taken to prepare for employment/career after graduation. Choose all that apply	Carleton 2017	Carleton 2020	Groups 2 and 3			
Talked with parents/family about employment/career	Similar	78%	Similar			
Talked with friends about employment/career	Similar	77%	Similar			
Created resume or curriculum vitae (CV)	Similar	69%	61%			
Talked with professors about employment/career	33%	38%	Similar			
Attended an employment fair	29%	34%	Similar			
Worked in my chosen field of employment	Similar	29%	Similar			
Volunteered in my chosen field of employment	Similar	24%	33%			
Met with a career counsellor	Similar	22%	Similar			
Created an e-portfolio (an inventory of skills, abilities and experience maintained on the web)	Similar	20%	Similar			
None of the above	Similar	7%	5%			
I have a career mentor	Similar	4%	8%			

taken at least one step to prepare them for employment or their career after graduation, mostly casual steps like talking with parents, family or friends about employment.

Note: Results for the average of Groups 2 and 3 and Carleton's 2017 shown when statistically significantly different from Carleton's 2020 results.

# Satisfaction with Services and Facilities

Respondents were asked if they had used 26 services and facilities, and those who had used them were able to rate their satisfaction with the services and facilities.

As seen in **Figure 9**, the percentage of users is shown in parentheses besides each item (e.g. 63% of Carleton respondents indicated that they had used the library's electronic resources). The chart further

shows the satisfaction ratings provided by those respondents who indicated they used the service or facilities. Services or facilities are sorted in descending order based on the proportion of respondents that were very satisfied or satisfied.

It must be taken into consideration that the smaller the proportion of respondents who reported using a service or facility, the less reliable the results may be for the satisfaction ratings of the service or facility.



#### Figure 9: Satisfaction with Services and Facilities

Carleton respondents reported a *higher* usage of the following services compared to Groups 2 and 3: Services for students with disabilities (14% vs. 7%); University libraries (physical books, magazines, stacks) (46% vs. 41%); University libraries (electronic resources) (63% vs. 57%); Employment services (13% vs. 9%); Study skills and learning supports (14% vs. 11%); University residences (15% vs. 11%); Campus medical services (26% vs. 20%); Co-op offices and supports (20% vs. 14%); and Food services (60% vs. 55%). Carleton respondents reported *lower* usage of the following services compared to Groups 2 and 3: Academic advising (38% vs. 48%); Other recreational facilities (13% vs. 17%); University bookstores (online inventory check, ordering, etc.) (41% vs. 49%); and Parking (35% vs. 42%).

Regarding satisfaction with the services used, Carleton respondents reported *higher* levels of satisfaction (satisfied and very satisfied), compared to Groups 2 and 3, on average, on 2 services: Food services (86% vs. 75%) and Parking (51% vs. 40%). Carleton respondents reported *lower* levels of satisfaction than Groups 2 and 3, on Campus medical services (77% vs. 88%).

Among Carleton respondents, in comparing the use of services and facilities from 2017 to 2020 there was an *increase* in usage for the University bookstore (online inventory check, ordering, etc.) (41% in 2020 up from 31% in 2017); Services for students with disabilities (14% vs. 10%); and a *decrease* in the use of Services for international students (4% in 2020 down from 7% in 2017); University library (physical books, magazines, stacks) (46% vs. 51%); University libraries (electronic resources) (63% vs. 70%); Tutoring (6% vs. 8%); Athletic facilities (43% vs. 51%); University bookstores (physical stores) (64% vs. 71%); and Food services (60% vs. 71%).

When compared to 2017, 2020 Carleton respondents reported *higher* levels of satisfaction (satisfied and very satisfied) with Food services (86% in 2020 vs. 75% in 2017), and *lower* levels of satisfaction with University libraries (physical books, magazines, stacks) (95% vs. 96); and University libraries (electronic resources) (95% vs. 96%), for both proportions, most of the decrease is on "very satisfied".

Appendix D gives a more detailed summary of services and facilities satisfaction results for 2020 Carleton respondents and the comparison with Groups 2 and 3, on average; and 2017 Carleton respondents.

# Conclusion

The 2020 CUSC survey offers valuable insight into student's perceptions of their experiential learning and development as they progress through their academic program. Furthermore, survey results provide useful feedback that will aid in Carleton University's ongoing effort for continued improvements in the educational experience for current and future students.

Carleton respondents were more likely than the average of Groups 2 and 3 to report having a disability (35% vs. 28%) and having their daily activities always impacted by it (14% vs. 8%). This proportion also increased at Carleton from 29% in 2017. Mental health was reported as the most common disability, with Carleton having a higher proportion than Groups 2 and 3 (22% vs. 18%), and a higher proportion than in 2017 (19%).

Fifty-five percent of Carleton respondents reported working while studying for on average 16 hours per week, similar to that of Group 2 and 3, on average. However, this is an increase from 50% at Carleton in 2017.

Overall, Carleton middle-year respondents indicated a positive experience at the university. A higher proportion of respondents at Carleton reported that the university had either met or exceeded their expectations (85% compared to 80% of respondents in Groups 2 and 3); reported satisfaction with their decision to attend this university (91% vs. 85%); and are more likely to recommend their university to a friend or family member than their peers in Groups 2 and 3.

Despite their overall satisfaction being higher than the comparison group, there were many areas where Carleton respondents had lower levels of agreement or satisfaction. For instance, the level of agreement was lower when it comes to their professors taking a personal interest in their academic progress with 48% (strongly agree or agree), which is lower than the comparison group (54%), and than Carleton in 2017 (58%); also, when it comes to teaching assistants in their academic program being helpful (72% strongly agree or agree vs. 77% in the comparison group and in 2017).

Carleton respondents reported lower usage of Academic Advising, compared to Groups 2 and 3 (38% vs. 48%), however, their satisfaction with this service is similar.

The next CUSC survey will be for Graduating undergraduate students and is scheduled for February 2021. For further information on the results of the surveys in which Carleton participates, go to <a href="https://oirp.carleton.ca/main/surveys/">https://oirp.carleton.ca/main/surveys/</a>

# Appendix A- CUSC's Protocol for Data Use and data use permissions

# DATA LICENSING & MEMBERSHIP AGREEMENT BETWEEN CARLETON UNIVERSITY AND THE CANADIAN UNIVERSITY SURVEY CONSORTIUM (CUSC)/CONSORTIUM CANADIEN DE RECHERCHE SUR LES ÉTUDIANTS UNIVERSITAIRES (CCREU)

#### OWNERSHIP OF SURVEY DATA

The data collected in surveys of students attending a member institution is the property of that institution.

#### EXCHANGE OF SURVEY DATA AMONG MEMBERS

Each member will make its survey data available to the other members for the general purposes as outlined in the Preamble herein. Each member is bound by restrictions on the use and disclosure of data belonging to other members.

# COMPARISONS LIMITED TO AGGREGATE DATA

The only interuniversity comparisons permitted for publication or circulation beyond a member's senior administrators are those that are based on the aggregate data for all members or the aggregate data for the groups of members identified by CUSC-CCREU.

A member may prepare and circulate reports based on aggregated data from selected groups of member institutions for internal use only to senior administrators of its institution.

#### LIMITATIONS ON THE USE OF DATA

A member may not publish statistical measures or analysis of its own data for purposes of institutional promotion in a manner that would harm the reputation of another member institution.

Members may not publish statistical measures or analysis of data collected at another member institution with the name of the institution disclosed. Members may publish statistical measures and analysis of their own data.

A member may not publish statistical measures or analysis of data collected at another member institution that would allow an informed reader to identify the institution by reference to location, uncommon programs or other information contained in the published material.

#### REQUIREMENTS FOR CONFIDENTIALITY

A member may make available to its senior administrators statistical measures and analysis of data from another member, with the identity of the member disclosed, for the purposes outlined in the Preamble above. The member disclosing the identity of another member in these circumstances must ensure that those to whom the information is made available are aware of its confidential nature and restricted audience.

A member institution may be requested to disclose data or statistical measures under freedom of information legislation or other requirements for accountability. In these circumstances members may disclose their own data in order to fulfill the request. Members shall not disclose data that belongs to other member institutions unless the request explicitly demands it and legal counsel advises that the request must be fulfilled. If it must be fulfilled the member institution shall notify immediately the other member institution(s). If it does not have to be fulfilled the requester should be referred to the other member institution(s) which should be notified immediately.

# Appendix B- Group 2 and Group 3 Institutions participating in 2020 CUSC survey

#### Group 2

Carleton University Lakehead University Simon Fraser University Thompson Rivers University University of Regina University of Victoria Wilfrid Laurier University

# Group 3

McMaster University University of Calgary University of Saskatchewan

Most of my professors		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
	Carleton 2020	1%	9%	72%	18%
Are reasonably accessible outside of class	Groups 2 and 3		Simil	ar	
	Carleton 2017		Simil	ar	
	Carleton 2020	13%	39%	42%	6%
Take a personal interest in my academic	Groups 2 and 3	9%	36%	45%	10%
progress	Carleton 2017	9%	33%	50%	8%
	Carleton 2020	4%	24%	55%	17%
Treat students as individuals, not just numbers	Groups 2 and 3	4%	16%	59%	21%
numbers	Carleton 2017		Simil	ar	
	Carleton 2020	2%	13%	64%	20%
Encourage students to participate in class discussions	Groups 2 and 3		Simil	ar	
uiscussions	Carleton 2017	2%	13%	59%	26%
	Carleton 2020	3%	15%	70%	11%
Are well organized in their teaching	Groups 2 and 3		Simil	ar	
	Carleton 2017	3%	13%	67%	17%
	Carleton 2020	1%	3%	60%	37%
Seem knowledgeable in their fields	Groups 2 and 3		Simil	ar	
	Carleton 2017	1%	3%	54%	42%
	Carleton 2020	2%	18%	67%	13%
Communicate well in their teaching	Groups 2 and 3		Simil	ar	
	Carleton 2017	3%	16%	65%	17%
	Carleton 2020	5%	23%	59%	14%
Are intellectually stimulating in their teaching	Groups 2 and 3	3%	18%	64%	15%
teaching	Carleton 2017		Simil	ar	
	Carleton 2020	4%	25%	61%	11%
Provide useful feedback on my academic work	Groups 2 and 3		Simil	ar	
WOIK	Carleton 2017		Simil	ar	
	Carleton 2020	4%	26%	62%	8%
Provide prompt feedback on my academic work	Groups 2 and 3		Simil	ar	
work	Carleton 2017	7%	29%	54%	10%
	Carleton 2020	2%	15%	70%	12%
Are fair in their grading	Groups 2 and 3	2%	12%	75%	12%
	Carleton 2017	3%	12%	71%	14%
	Carleton 2020	3%	19%	66%	13%
Are consistent in their grading	Groups 2 and 3		Simil	ar	
	Carleton 2017	4%	14%	67%	15%

# Appendix C- Perceptions of Professors and Staff

Most of my professors		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	
	Carleton 2020	2%	3%	44%	51%	
Treat students the same regardless of gender	Groups 2 and 3	Similar				
	Carleton 2017		Similar			
	Carleton 2020	2%	3%	44%	51%	
Treat students the same regardless of race	Groups 2 and 3		Similar			
	Carleton 2017		Similar			
Look out for students' interests	Carleton 2020	4%	20%	56%	20%	
	Groups 2 and 3	3%	16%	56%	25%	
	Carleton 2017	3%	17%	54%	26%	
Generally, I am satisfied with the quality of teaching I have received	Carleton 2020	3%	16%	70%	12%	
	Groups 2 and 3	2%	12%	72%	14%	
	Carleton 2017		Similar			
Most teaching assistants in my academic program are helpful.	Carleton 2020	5%	23%	57%	16%	
	Groups 2 and 3	5%	19%	57%	20%	
	Carleton 2017	4%	19%	58%	19%	
	Carleton 2020	3%	10%	62%	26%	
Most university support staff (e.g., clerks, secretaries, etc.) are helpful.	Groups 2 and 3	Similar				
secretaries, etc.) are neiprui.	Carleton 2017	Similar				

Note: Results for the average of Groups 2 and 3 and Carleton's 2017 shown when statistically significantly different from Carleton's 2020 results.

Services and facilities used ar	nd satisfaction	(%) Used	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfie	d Satisfied	Very satisfied
	Carleton 2020	2%		18%	64%	18%
Services for Indigenous students	Groups 2 and 3	Similar		Simi	lar	
	Carleton 2017	Similar		Simi	lar	
Services for international students	Carleton 2020	4%	4%	7%	64%	25%
	Groups 2 and 3	Similar		Simi	lar	
	Carleton 2017	7%		Simi	lar	
	Carleton 2020	14%	2%	6%	56%	36%
Services for students with	Groups 2 and 3	7%		Simi	lar	
disabilities	Carleton 2017	10%		Simi	lar	
	Carleton 2020	46%	1%	5%	68%	26%
University libraries (physical	Groups 2 and 3	41%		Simi	lar	
books, magazines, stacks)	Carleton 2017	51%	1%	3%	61%	35%
	Carleton 2020	63%	1%	4%	67%	28%
University libraries (electronic	Groups 2 and 3	57%		Simi	lar	
resources)	Carleton 2017	70%	1%	3%	58%	38%
	Carleton 2020	13%	2%	15%	66%	16%
Employment services	Groups 2 and 3	9%		Simi	lar	
	Carleton 2017	Similar		Simi	lar	
	Carleton 2020	13%		13%	68%	19%
Career counselling	Groups 2 and 3	Similar		Simi	lar	
-	Carleton 2017	Similar		Simi	lar	
	Carleton 2020	14%	8%	15%	50%	27%
Personal counselling	Groups 2 and 3	Similar		Simi	lar	
	Carleton 2017	Similar		Simi	lar	
	Carleton 2020	38%	4%	12%	58%	26%
Academic advising	Groups 2 and 3	48%		Simi	lar	
	Carleton 2017	Similar		Simi	lar	
Tutoring	Carleton 2020	6%		10%	73%	18%
	Groups 2 and 3	Similar		Simi	lar	
	Carleton 2017	8%		Simi	lar	
o 1 199 1	Carleton 2020	14%	1%	7%	76%	15%
Study skills and learning	Groups 2 and 3	11%		Simi	lar	
supports	Carleton 2017	Similar		Simi	lar	
	Carleton 2020	11%	4%	15%	64%	17%
Writing skills	Groups 2 and 3	Similar		Simi	lar	
~	Carleton 2017	Similar		Simi	lar	

# Appendix D- Usage and Satisfaction with Services and Facilities

Services and facilities used and	d satisfaction	(%) Used	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfie	d Satisfied	Very satisfied
	Carleton 2020	15%	2%	13%	71%	14%
University residences	Groups 2 and 3	11%		Sim	ilar	
	Carleton 2017	Similar		Sim	ilar	
Advising for students who need financial aid	Carleton 2020	7%	2%	17%	67%	13%
	Groups 2 and 3	Similar		Sim	ilar	
	Carleton 2017	Similar		Sim	ilar	
	Carleton 2020	28%	4%	15%	67%	14%
Financial aid	Groups 2 and 3	Similar		Sim	ilar	
	Carleton 2017	Similar		Sim	ilar	
	Carleton 2020	43%	3%	9%	61%	28%
Athletic facilities	Groups 2 and 3	Similar		Sim	ilar	
	Carleton 2017	51%		Sim	ilar	
	Carleton 2020	13%	1%	6%	74%	19%
Other recreational facilities	Groups 2 and 3	17%		Sim	ilar	
	Carleton 2017	Similar		Sim	ilar	
University bookstores (physical stores)	Carleton 2020	64%	2%	9%	70%	18%
	Groups 2 and 3	Similar		Sim	ilar	
	Carleton 2017	71%		Sim	ilar	
University bookstores (online	Carleton 2020	41%	1%	7%	74%	18%
	Groups 2 and 3	49%		Sim	ilar	
inventory check, ordering, etc.)	Carleton 2017	31%		Sim	ilar	
	Carleton 2020	26%	7%	16%	56%	21%
Campus medical services	Groups 2 and 3	20%	3%	9%	61%	27%
I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	Carleton 2017	Similar		Sim	ilar	
	Carleton 2020	20%	6%	18%	53%	23%
Co-op offices and supports	Groups 2 and 3	14%		Sim	ilar	
	Carleton 2017	Similar		Sim	ilar	
	Carleton 2020	15%	1%	3%	81%	15%
Facilities for university-based social activities	Groups 2 and 3	Similar		Sim	ilar	
	Carleton 2017	Similar		Sim	ilar	
Facilities for student associations	Carleton 2020	12%	2%	10%	71%	16%
	Groups 2 and 3	Similar		Sim	ilar	
	Carleton 2017	Similar		Sim	ilar	
Computing services help desk	Carleton 2020	9%	1%	12%	66%	21%
	Groups 2 and 3	Similar		Sim	ilar	
	Carleton 2017	Similar		Sim		
	Carleton 2020	60%	3%	11%	70%	17%
Food services	Groups 2 and 3	55%	5%	20%	65%	10%
	Carleton 2017	71%	5%	20%	60%	14%

Services and facilities us	ed and satisfaction	(%) Used	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied
Parking	Carleton 2020	35%	21%	27%	41%	10%
	Groups 2 and 3	42%	26%	35%	35%	4%
	Carleton 2017	Similar		Similar		

Note: Results for the average of Groups 2 and 3 and Carleton's 2017 shown when statistically significantly different from Carleton's 2020 results.