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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the results of the Undergraduate Exit Survey. The survey was designed by the Office of the Provost and administered to 377 potential graduating students (undergraduate level) at Nazarbayev University (NU) between May 14 and June 18, 2015.

## Purpose of the Survey

The purpose of the Undergraduate Exit Survey is to promote a data-driven understanding of the educational experiences of NU's graduating students (Bachelor's level) and of their post-graduation plans. Data collected through this survey will help shed light on the level/quality of academic support that NU provided to its first cohort of undergraduate students (class of 2015) and support institutional self-assessment/self-reflection.

## Survey Response Rate

Overall, 246 graduating students participated in the survey for a response rate of $65.3 \%$. Response rates differed across groups and were slightly higher for (1) female compared to male students, (2) students with higher academic performance compare to those with lower academic performance, (3) students from the School of Science and Technology and School of Humanities and Social Sciences compared to those from the School of Engineering. Analytical steps were taken to ensure that survey results did not suffer from non-response bias.

## Summary of Key Findings

## Perception of NU experiences (institutional level)

Graduating students had a positive perception of their NU experiences. For instance:

- $68.5 \%$ of the respondents "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that they were satisfied with the overall education they received at NU ( $20.7 \%$ were neutral and $10.8 \%$ disagreed).
- $73.3 \%$ would recommend NU to other potential students and $83.6 \%$ felt their NU experience has motivated them to achieve something in life.

However, students were less positive about how effectively student feedback was used to improve learning at NU ( $44 \%$ of the students agreed with the statement, $31.5 \%$ were neutral, and $24.5 \%$ disagreed).

## Satisfaction with various aspects of major/program

Graduating students had a highly positive perception of their experiences within their major/program, except for areas related to course availability/variety. For instance:

- $77.9 \%$ of the respondents were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the overall experience in their major/program.
- $80.5 \%$ of the respondents were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the quality of teaching within their major/program, and $93 \%$ with their instructors' availability out of class.
- Only $37.2 \%$ of the respondents, however, were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the variety and $42.4 \%$ with the availability of courses in their major/program.


## Skills and competencies

Graduating students had a highly positive perception of NU's contribution to skill/competency development. For instance, the ability to work independently or in team; written or oral communication; and research, problem-solving, information retrieval and processing, presentation skills received very high ratings (with $80 \%$ to more than $90 \%$ of the respondents rating NU's contribution as "good" or "excellent").

Of the 14 skills that students were asked to rate, application of knowledge and skills in real-world settings had the lowest rating: $62 \%$ of the respondents rated NU's contribution as "good" or "excellent" and $32 \%$ as fair.

## Post-graduation plans

- The majority of the respondents ( $52 \%$ ) expected to pursue graduate or professional degree programs in Fall 2015, whereas $37 \%$ expected to enter the workforce (and $11 \%$ to engage in other activities).
- Among the 84 students who expected to enter the workforce, 28 reported that they had received a job offer-with 13 of them having already accepted an offer (as of mid-May to mid-June 2015).
- Key highlights for the 117 students who planned to attend graduate or professional school include:
- Top destinations: UK (29\%), USA (22\%), and Kazakhstan (20\%)
- Institutions most frequently mentioned: Nazarbayev University (20\%) and University College London (11\%)
- Most popular fields: Engineering (36\%) and Science and Technology (22\%)


## Individual development

Graduating students had a positive perception of NU's ability to meet their needs for intellectual and personal growth. For instance:

- $77 \%$ of the respondents indicated that NU met their needs for intellectual growth "very well" or "well." The corresponding percentage for personal growth was $71 \%$.
Perception of career preparation, however, was less positive: $35 \%$ of the respondents indicated that NU met their career preparation needs "well" or "very well" ( $45 \%$ rated NU's performance as "adequate" and $20 \%$ "inadequate" or "very inadequate"). Perception of career preparation was less positive among students who planned to work compared to those who planned to pursue graduate or professional studies.


## Satisfaction with campus services

In general, graduating students expressed high levels of satisfaction with campus services: $62 \%$ to $95 \%$ of the respondents indicated that they were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with particular campus services.

## Meaningful interactions with faculty, advice to new students, and suggestions for NU

Students were asked to provide open-ended comments on different aspects of their experiences at NU. Analyses of these qualitative comments revealed the following:

- Working with faculty members on projects emerged as the top theme in students' description of a positive, meaningful interaction with faculty members.
- Improving time management skills emerged as the top advice given to new NU students.
- Increasing course variety and availability emerged as the top theme in descriptions of what NU could have done to better support students during their undergraduate study.


## Conclusion

Results from the 2015 Undergraduate Exit Survey suggest that, overall, graduating students had a positive perception of their undergraduate experience at Nazarbayev University. This positive perception extended to institutional-level experiences, experiences within the major, skill/competency development, individual development, as well as experiences with campus services/facilities. Students, however, tended to be less satisfied with course variety and availability within their major/program and less positive about the use of student feedback to improve learning. In fact, increasing course variety/availability and using student feedback to improve learning were among the top suggestions to NU. Also, their perception of career preparation was, substantially, less positive compared to perceptions of personal and intellectual growth. These (less positive) perceptions may be due, at least in part, to problems related to NU's early development phase inevitably experienced by this first cohort. These issues should be addressed as NU expands its student (and also indeed faculty) body. It is expected that the implementation of the NU quality system will address some of the issues raised by students (particularly the use of student feedback). Nevertheless, students' concerns with course variety and availability, use of student feedback, and career preparation-as low ratings on these aspects seem to suggest-warrant close attention at institutional, school, and program levels.
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## INTRODUCTION

## About the Undergraduate Exit Survey

The Undergraduate Exit Survey aims to promote a data-driven understanding of the educational experiences of NU's graduating students (Bachelor's level) and of their post-graduation plans. The survey measures different aspects of graduating students' undergraduate experiences and post-graduation plans. Students were asked to share their views on the following aspects:

- Perception of experiences at NU (institutional level)
- Satisfaction with different aspect of the student's major/program
- NU's contribution to the development of skills and competencies
- Post-graduation plans
- Other experiences (individual development, experiences with services/facilities, positive interactions with faculty, advice to new students, recommendations for NU etc.)

This survey was developed by the Office of the Provost, with input from undergraduate schools and from relevant support units. Some questions on the survey were adapted from existing instruments.

The survey was administered electronically, through Qualtrics, between May 14 and June 18, 2015. Reminders were sent to students once or twice a week.

## Target Population and Response Rates

The Undergraduate Exit Survey targets undergraduate students who are eligible to complete their Bachelor's degree program at the end of the academic year. In spring 2015, The Office of the Registrar provided the Office of the Provost with a list of 377 potential graduates. These students were invited to participate in the survey. Overall, 246 students participated, for a response rate of $65.3 \%$.

Tables 1 and 2 provide response rates (as well as the distribution of students in the population and in the sample of respondents) by school and gender.

Table 1. Survey Response Rate by School

| School | Graduating <br> Students | Survey <br> Respondents | Response Rate <br> $(\%)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| School of Engineering | 119 | 67 | 56.3 |
| School of Humanities and Social Sciences | 132 | 85 | 64.4 |
| School of Science and Technology | 126 | 94 | 74.6 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 . 3}$ |

Table 2. Survey Response Rate by Gender

| Gender | Graduating <br> Students | Survey <br> Respondents | Response Rate <br> $(\%)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Male | 191 | 115 | 60.2 |
| Female | 186 | 131 | 70.4 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 . 3}$ |

## Distribution of Survey Respondents

Figure 1. Percent Distribution of Respondents by School


Figure 2. Percent Distribution of Respondents by Gender


## Data Analysis

We computed means and standard deviations for close-ended questions that involved a rating scale. For items (on the same scale) that measured the same construct, we also computed a composite score that captured the student's attitude or perception relative to that construct (e.g., perception of experience at NU, satisfaction with aspects of the major/program, development of skills and competencies, individual development, and satisfaction with services and facilities). These scores were on a scale from 0 to 100 . For more information on how composite scores were created, see Appendix A. For all close-ended questions (with or without a rating scale), we computed the frequency of each response category.

The survey included four open-ended questions that asked students to comment on different aspects of their experience. We received around 350 open-ended comments, which we coded in order to identify emerging themes.

## Non-Response Error

Differences in response rates across sub-groups can lead to non-response bias, particularly if these subgroups also differ on survey variables (Kalton, 1983; Pike, 2008). Weighting adjustments have been recommended as a solution to non-response bias. In this analysis, we used weights to adjust for nonresponse because, as our analyses revealed, there were gender and school differences both in the response rate and in the level of satisfaction with aspects of the student's major. However, we also found that this adjustment was not necessary because the difference between weighted and unweighted statistics was negligible. Therefore, we retained and reported unweighted statistics. For more information on this analysis, see Appendix B.

## Limitations

Information collected through surveys is almost always prone to error. Different sources of survey error have been documented in the literature (e.g., Biemer et al., 1991; Braverman, 1996; Dillman, 2007; Fowler, 2009; Groves 1983; Groves et al., 2009; Krosnick, 1991; Krosnick et al., 1996), including sampling error, coverage error, non-response error, and measurement error.

The first two sources of error, sampling and coverage, were not particularly of concern in this study because (1) the survey was administered to all graduating seniors (not to a sample of students) and (2) all members of the graduating student population had equal chance of being and were in fact included in the study. We addressed the third source of error, non-response, by using weighting adjustment, and found only negligible differences between weighted and unweighted results (See Appendix B).

The last source of error (measurement) may be attributed to the instrument (e.g., unclearly formulated questions) or to the respondent (e.g. simply choosing a response option that appears to be "reasonable" or "satisfactory"). We tried to minimize instrument-related error by paying close attention to the survey design process (e.g., we adapted some questions from existing instruments and solicited feedback on the instrument from multiple stakeholders). Respondent-related error, however, is more difficult to deal with since we have no direct control over the respondent's behavior. For a more detailed discussion of errorrelated issues, see Appendix C.

Another limitation is that not all survey participants responded to every question on the survey. Item nonresponse rate, that is the percentage of individuals who did not respond to a specific survey question, ranged from $5 \%$ to $11 \%$ for close-ended questions. It is possible, though unlikely, that item nonresponse rates affected the precision of survey estimates.

## Organization of the Report

This report is organized into three main parts. Part 1 provides relevant descriptive statistics overall and by school. Part 2 provides descriptive statistics on composite scores created for each scale. Part 3 provides results of the analysis of open-ended comments.

The report includes a series of appendices that provide more detailed information on composite scores (Appendix A), non-response bias (Appendix B), and limitations related to the precision of survey results (Appendix C). Appendix D provides detailed frequency distributions of responses.

## PART 1. ITEM DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS (OVERALL AND BY SCHOOL)

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics on Perception of NU Experiences (Institutional Level)

|  | All Schools |  |  |  | School of Engineering |  |  |  | School of Humanities \& Social Sciences |  |  |  | School of Science \& Technology |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Please indicate the extent to which you Agree or Disagree with each of the following statements.(Scale: 1-5)* | Mean | SD |  | $N$ | Mean | SD |  | $N$ | Mean | SD |  | $N$ | Mean | SD |  | $N$ |
| NU has helped me meet the goals I came here to achieve. | 3.77 | 0.87 | 69.8\% | 232 | 3.68 | 0.74 | 65.1\% | 63 | 3.88 | 0.95 | 75.3\% | 81 | 3.73 | 0.88 | 68.2\% | 88 |
| My experiences here have helped motivate me to make something of my life. | 4.07 | 0.81 | 83.6\% | 232 | 4.24 | 0.67 | 90.5\% | 63 | 4.06 | 0.91 | 81.5\% | 81 | 3.97 | 0.79 | 80.7\% | 88 |
| I am proud of my accomplishments at NU. | 3.88 | 0.90 | 69.8\% | 232 | 3.98 | 0.83 | 74.6\% | 63 | 3.78 | 0.99 | 65.4\% | 81 | 3.89 | 0.86 | 70.5\% | 88 |
| I believe that student feedback is used effectively in order to improve student learning at NU. | 3.26 | 1.09 | 44.0\% | 232 | 2.90 | 1.09 | 28.6\% | 63 | 3.46 | 1.08 | 54.3\% | 81 | 3.33 | 1.04 | 45.5\% | 88 |
| If I had to start over again, I would still choose to come to NU. | 3.54 | 1.18 | 59.9\% | 232 | 3.46 | 1.10 | 57.1\% | 63 | 3.65 | 1.18 | 65.4\% | 81 | 3.49 | 1.23 | 56.8\% | 88 |
| I would recommend NU to other potential students. | 3.91 | 0.95 | 73.3\% | 232 | 3.92 | 0.85 | 73.0\% | 63 | 3.96 | 1.04 | 76.5\% | 81 | 3.85 | 0.93 | 70.5\% | 88 |
| I am satisfied with the overall education I received at NU. | 3.71 | 0.91 | 68.5\% | 232 | 3.37 | 0.79 | 54.0\% | 63 | 3.90 | 0.93 | 75.3\% | 81 | 3.78 | 0.90 | 72.7\% | 88 |

[^0]Table 4. Descriptive Statistics on Satisfaction with Various Aspects of the Student's Major/Program

| Please rate your satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your major / program. (Scale: $1-4)^{*}$ | All Schools |  |  |  | School of Engineering |  |  |  | School of Humanities \& Social Sciences |  |  |  | School of Science \& Technology |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean | SD | \% <br> Satisfied/ Very Satisfied | $N$ | Mean | SD | \% <br> Satisfied/ Very Satisfied | $N$ | Mean | SD | \% <br> Satisfied/ Very Satisfied | $N$ | Mean | SD | \% <br> Satisfied/ Very Satisfied | $N$ |
| Quality of teaching | 2.97 | 0.62 | 80.5\% | 231 | 2.60 | 0.55 | 57.1\% | 63 | 3.16 | 0.66 | 87.5\% | 80 | 3.05 | 0.52 | 90.9\% | 88 |
| Testing/grading system | 2.92 | 0.59 | 81.8\% | 231 | 2.63 | 0.60 | 63.5\% | 63 | 3.05 | 0.63 | 87.5\% | 80 | 3.01 | 0.47 | 89.8\% | 88 |
| Quality of academic advising | 2.83 | 0.75 | 70.4\% | 230 | 2.58 | 0.62 | 58.1\% | 62 | 2.96 | 0.86 | 76.3\% | 80 | 2.89 | 0.70 | 73.9\% | 88 |
| Availability of courses you wanted to take | 2.33 | 0.81 | 42.4\% | 231 | 2.00 | 0.70 | 23.8\% | 63 | 2.40 | 0.82 | 48.8\% | 80 | 2.51 | 0.80 | 50.0\% | 88 |
| Variety of courses offered | 2.32 | 0.78 | 37.2\% | 231 | 2.13 | 0.71 | 25.4\% | 63 | 2.30 | 0.86 | 38.8\% | 80 | 2.47 | 0.73 | 44.3\% | 88 |
| Availability of your instructors out of class | 3.19 | 0.57 | 93.0\% | 230 | 3.17 | 0.52 | 93.7\% | 63 | 3.15 | 0.66 | 89.9\% | 79 | 3.24 | 0.53 | 95.5\% | 88 |
| Faculty concern for your academic progress | 2.93 | 0.75 | 76.6\% | 231 | 2.71 | 0.68 | 68.3\% | 63 | 3.00 | 0.86 | 78.8\% | 80 | 3.01 | 0.67 | 80.7\% | 88 |
| Your overall experience in your major/program | 2.92 | 0.69 | 77.9\% | 231 | 2.73 | 0.57 | 69.8\% | 63 | 3.00 | 0.84 | 77.5\% | 80 | 2.98 | 0.59 | 84.1\% | 88 |

[^1]Table 5. Descriptive Statistics on Perception of NU's Contribution to Development of Skills and Competencies

|  | All Schools |  |  |  | School of Engineering |  |  |  | School of Humanities \& Social Sciences |  |  |  | School of Science \& Technology |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Please rate NU's contribution to enabling you to develop or strengthen each of the following. (Scale: $1-4)^{*}$ | Mean | SD | \% <br> Good/ Excellent | $N$ | Mean | SD | \% <br> Good/ Excellent | $N$ | Mean | SD | \% <br> Good/ Excellent | $N$ | Mean | SD | \% <br> Good/ Excellent | $N$ |
| Ability to apply knowledge and skills in real-world settings | 2.67 | 0.77 | 61.6\% | 229 | 2.68 | 0.65 | 61.3\% | 62 | 2.50 | 0.90 | 50.0\% | 80 | 2.83 | 0.70 | 72.4\% | 87 |
| Ability to search and retrieve information using technology | 3.27 | 0.69 | 89.1\% | 229 | 3.31 | 0.59 | 93.5\% | 62 | 3.26 | 0.78 | 85.0\% | 80 | 3.25 | 0.67 | 89.7\% | 87 |
| Ability to critically evaluate information for decision-making | 3.25 | 0.66 | 88.6\% | 229 | 3.18 | 0.61 | 88.7\% | 62 | 3.48 | 0.67 | 92.5\% | 80 | 3.10 | 0.63 | 85.1\% | 87 |
| Time management skills | 2.81 | 0.77 | 68.1\% | 229 | 2.85 | 0.62 | 75.8\% | 62 | 2.93 | 0.85 | 72.5\% | 80 | 2.68 | 0.77 | 58.6\% | 87 |
| Written communication skills | 3.08 | 0.70 | 82.5\% | 229 | 2.95 | 0.53 | 83.9\% | 62 | 3.24 | 0.72 | 86.3\% | 80 | 3.02 | 0.78 | 78.2\% | 87 |
| Oral communication skills | 3.07 | 0.69 | 83.4\% | 229 | 3.00 | 0.63 | 80.6\% | 62 | 3.20 | 0.70 | 86.3\% | 80 | 3.01 | 0.71 | 82.8\% | 87 |
| Research skills | 3.20 | 0.68 | 89.5\% | 229 | 3.05 | 0.66 | 87.1\% | 62 | 3.35 | 0.68 | 91.3\% | 80 | 3.17 | 0.67 | 89.7\% | 87 |
| Presentation skills | 3.33 | 0.64 | 91.7\% | 229 | 3.32 | 0.57 | 95.2\% | 62 | 3.43 | 0.69 | 91.3\% | 80 | 3.24 | 0.63 | 89.7\% | 87 |
| Leadership skills | 2.93 | 0.81 | 72.8\% | 228 | 2.94 | 0.70 | 75.8\% | 62 | 3.04 | 0.90 | 77.2\% | 79 | 2.82 | 0.80 | 66.7\% | 87 |
| Problem-solving skills | 3.12 | 0.65 | 86.0\% | 229 | 3.16 | 0.55 | 91.9\% | 62 | 3.13 | 0.75 | 82.5\% | 80 | 3.08 | 0.61 | 85.1\% | 87 |
| Self-management skills (e.g., ability to express emotions, manage stress, cope with life challenges) | 2.84 | 0.85 | 69.0\% | 229 | 3.00 | 0.75 | 79.0\% | 62 | 2.81 | 0.97 | 67.5\% | 80 | 2.76 | 0.79 | 63.2\% | 87 |
| Ability to work in a team or group | 3.17 | 0.76 | 83.8\% | 228 | 3.44 | 0.65 | 95.1\% | 61 | 3.06 | 0.80 | 81.3\% | 80 | 3.07 | 0.74 | 78.2\% | 87 |
| Ability to work independently | 3.28 | 0.69 | 90.0\% | 229 | 3.24 | 0.64 | 91.9\% | 62 | 3.39 | 0.72 | 91.3\% | 80 | 3.21 | 0.68 | 87.4\% | 87 |
| Ability to use the techniques, skills, and modern tools needed to be successful in your profession | 3.03 | 0.77 | 79.9\% | 229 | 2.97 | 0.68 | 82.3\% | 62 | 2.98 | 0.91 | 72.5\% | 80 | 3.11 | 0.67 | 85.1\% | 87 |

*Scale: 1= Poor, 2= Fair, 3=Good, 4=Excellent; SD = Standard Deviation; "\% Good/Excellent" = Percent of respondents who answered "Good" or "Excellent"; N = Number of students who answered the question

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics on Perception of Individual Development

|  | All Schools |  |  |  | School of Engineering |  |  |  | School of Humanities \& Social Sciences |  |  |  | School of Science \& Technology |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| How well has NU met your needs in each of the following areas. (Scale: 1-5)* | Mean | SD | \% <br> Well/ <br> Very <br> Well | $N$ | Mean | SD | \% <br> Well/ <br> Very <br> Well | $N$ | Mean | SD | \% <br> Well/ <br> Very <br> Well | $N$ | Mean | SD | \% <br> Well/ <br> Very <br> Well | $N$ |
| Career preparation | 3.19 | 0.93 | 35.0\% | 220 | 3.29 | 0.89 | 35.6\% | 59 | 3.09 | 1.09 | 33.8\% | 77 | 3.20 | 0.79 | 35.7\% | 84 |
| Intellectual growth | 4.00 | 0.79 | 77.3\% | 220 | 3.81 | 0.68 | 72.9\% | 59 | 4.21 | 0.83 | 83.1\% | 77 | 3.93 | 0.79 | 75.0\% | 84 |
| Personal growth | 3.91 | 0.87 | 70.8\% | 219 | 3.85 | 0.96 | 67.8\% | 59 | 4.00 | 0.86 | 72.7\% | 77 | 3.87 | 0.82 | 71.1\% | 83 |

*Scale: 1=Very Inadequately, 2=Inadequately, 3=Adequately, 4=Well, 5=Very Well; SD = Standard Deviation; "\% Well/Very Well" = Percent of respondents who answered "Well" or "Very Well"; $\mathrm{N}=$ Number of students who answered the question

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics on Satisfaction with Campus Services and Facilities ${ }^{1}$

| How satisfied are you with each of the following University services or facilities? If you did not use any of these services or facilities, please select "Not Applicable." (Scale: 1 to 4)* | All Schools |  |  |  | School of Engineering |  |  |  | School of Humanities \& Social Sciences |  |  |  | School of Science \& Technology |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean | SD | $\%$ Satisfied/ Very Satisfied | $N$ | Mean | SD | $\%$ Satisfied/ Very Satisfied | $N$ | Mean | SD | $\%$ Satisfied/ Very Satisfied | $N$ | Mean | SD |  | $N$ |
| Library resources and services | 3.37 | 0.59 | 95.4\% | 218 | 3.41 | 0.56 | 96.6\% | 58 | 3.44 | 0.62 | 93.5\% | 77 | 3.28 | 0.57 | 96.4\% | 83 |
| Career and advising services | 3.00 | 0.70 | 82.8\% | 209 | 3.10 | 0.71 | 86.4\% | 59 | 2.97 | 0.79 | 78.4\% | 74 | 2.96 | 0.58 | 84.2\% | 76 |
| Student housing facilities | 3.25 | 0.75 | 88.6\% | 210 | 3.45 | 0.54 | 98.3\% | 58 | 3.20 | 0.84 | 81.1\% | 74 | 3.14 | 0.78 | 88.5\% | 78 |
| Psychological counseling services | 2.95 | 0.72 | 81.5\% | 119 | 3.03 | 0.71 | 83.9\% | 31 | 3.04 | 0.67 | 84.4\% | 45 | 2.79 | 0.77 | 76.7\% | 43 |
| Student health services | 2.83 | 0.85 | 71.2\% | 205 | 2.89 | 0.75 | 73.7\% | 57 | 2.66 | 1.01 | 60.6\% | 71 | 2.94 | 0.75 | 79.2\% | 77 |
| Student disability services | 2.72 | 0.80 | 65.6\% | 93 | 2.81 | 0.63 | 69.2\% | 26 | 2.75 | 0.98 | 62.5\% | 32 | 2.63 | 0.73 | 65.7\% | 35 |
| Food services | 2.60 | 0.75 | 61.7\% | 209 | 2.68 | 0.68 | 66.1\% | 59 | 2.49 | 0.86 | 53.5\% | 71 | 2.63 | 0.70 | 65.8\% | 79 |
| Sports Center services | 2.82 | 0.67 | 75.6\% | 176 | 2.90 | 0.62 | 83.7\% | 49 | 2.84 | 0.65 | 76.2\% | 63 | 2.75 | 0.71 | 68.8\% | 64 |
| IT services | 2.74 | 0.74 | 70.1\% | 201 | 2.88 | 0.60 | 78.6\% | 56 | 2.75 | 0.80 | 67.2\% | 67 | 2.64 | 0.77 | 66.7\% | 78 |

*Scale: 1= Very Dissatisfied, 2= Dissatisfied, 3= Satisfied, 4=Very Satisfied; SD = Standard Deviation; "\% Satisfied/Very Satisfied" = Percent of respondents who answered "Satisfied" or "Very Satisfied"; $\mathrm{N}=$ Number of students who answered the question

[^2]Figure 3. Students' Primary Activity after Graduation ${ }^{1}(\mathbf{N}=225)$


Note: The "other" category included students who planned to start their own business/company, join the military, engage in voluntary activities, prepare for graduate admission tests, and those who were unsure of their future plans.

Figure 4. Number of Students Receiving and Accepting Offers of Employment


* As of the time of survey administration (May 14 to June 18, 2015)


## Information on Offers of Employment Accepted ${ }^{5}$

- Types of positions: Audit Assistant, Junior Researcher, Field Engineer, Programmer, Lab Assistant, Intern, etc.
- Companies/Organizations: KPMG, National Laboratory Astana, NURIS, Open Technologies, Schlumberger, KVL Consulting, P\&G, etc.
- Locations: Astana (10 students), Almaty, foreign country.
- Relationship between employment and major/program: 12 students (out of 13) indicated that their prospective employment is related to their major/program or is in the same field as their major/program.
- Job search tools: previously worked for employer (6 students); job fair and announcements by NU Career and Advising Center; personal contacts.

Note: This information is based on 13 students who indicated that they had accepted an offer of employment.

[^3]
## PART 2. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON COMPOSITE SCORES

Composite scores were computed to capture students' overall perception on each dimension. These scores range from 0 to 100 . For more information on how they were computed, see Appendix A.

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics on Composite Scores

|  | All Schools |  |  |  | School of Engineering |  |  |  | School of Humanities \& Social Sciences |  |  |  | School of Science \& Technology |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean | SD | Median | $N$ | Mean | SD | Median | $N$ | Mean | SD | Median | $N$ | Mean | SD | Median | $N$ |
| Perception of NU experiences | 68.43 | 18.64 | 70.83 | 232 | 67.46 | 15.77 | 70.83 | 63 | 69.96 | 21.47 | 70.83 | 81 | 67.71 | 17.83 | 68.75 | 88 |
| Satisfaction with program/major | 61.97 | 15.73 | 61.11 | 231 | 54.69 | 11.63 | 55.56 | 63 | 64.61 | 18.59 | 63.89 | 80 | 64.77 | 13.81 | 61.11 | 88 |
| Development of skills and competencies | 69.17 | 16.89 | 69.05 | 229 | 69.24 | 13.53 | 66.67 | 62 | 70.91 | 18.55 | 71.43 | 80 | 67.52 | 17.47 | 66.67 | 87 |
| Individual development | 67.42 | 18.02 | 66.67 | 220 | 66.24 | 17.33 | 66.67 | 59 | 69.16 | 19.50 | 75.00 | 77 | 66.67 | 17.16 | 66.67 | 84 |
| Satisfaction with campus services | 65.17 | 15.04 | 66.67 | 213 | 68.37 | 12.91 | 66.67 | 58 | 64.37 | 16.88 | 62.50 | 75 | 63.61 | 14.45 | 62.50 | 80 |

[^4]Figure 5. Distribution of Composite Scores on each Dimension

## Composite Scores



Note: Blue bars depict a histogram (percent) and the red line the kernel density curve.

Histograms were constructed by classifying grades into equally-spaced bins (sub-intervals). Each bar shows the percentage of students whose grade fell into a particular bin. The kernel density plot may be thought of as a smoothed histogram that displays the shape of the distribution. It is an estimate of the probability density function. The area under the curve is equal to 1 . For instance, the probability that a student score was between 60 and 70 is simply the area under the curve between these two points.

## PART 3. OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS: TOP THEMES

Description of a positive, meaningful interaction with a faculty member
Top 5 Themes


Note: Percentages are based on 78 usable comments.

## Advice to new Nazarbayev University students

## Top 5 Themes



Note: Percentages are based on 224 usable comments.

Opinions on what NU could have done to better support students during their undergraduate study Top 5 Themes


Note: Percentages are based on 127 usable comments.

Opinions on other aspects the undergraduate experience
Top 4 Themes


Note: Percentages are based on 54 usable comments.
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## APPENDICES

## Appendix A. Computing Composite Scores for Rating Scales

Computation of composite scores for each scale involved two main steps. First, we use reliability analysis (Cronbach's alpha) to ascertain the internal reliability (consistency) of items on a given scale (dimension). All reliability coefficients obtained were high and exceeded the 0.70 level suggested by Nunnaly (1978). The table below lists all items included in each reliability analysis, along with the corresponding reliability coefficient.

Second, we computed composite scores on a given dimension, by averaging individual's scores on items that measured that dimension, provided that the participant responded to at least half of the items. Before creating composite scores, we used linear transformations to convert items from their original scale ( $1-5$ or $1-4$ ) to a scale from 0 to 100 . Thus, composite scores were on a scale from 0 to $100 .{ }^{1}$ This procedure ensured that composite scores were on the same scale (across the dimensions measured), more meaningful, and easier to interpret.

| Dimension measured | Scale reliability (Cronbach's alpha) | Items included in the analysis |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Perception of NU experiences * | 0.86 |  |
|  |  | NU has helped me meet the goals I came here to achieve. <br> My experiences here have helped motivate me to make something of my life. <br> I am proud of my accomplishments at NU . <br> I believe that student feedback is used effectively in order to improve student learning at NU. <br> If I had to start over again, I would still choose to come to NU . <br> I would recommend NU to other potential students. NU has helped me meet the goals I came here to achieve. |
| Satisfaction with major /program** | 0.78 |  |
|  |  | Quality of teaching <br> Testing/grading system <br> Quality of academic advising <br> Variety of courses offered <br> Availability of your instructors out of class <br> Faculty concern for your academic progress |
| Development of skills and competencies** | 0.92 |  |
|  |  | Ability to apply knowledge and skills in real-world settings <br> Ability to search and retrieve information using technology <br> Ability to critically evaluate information for decisionmaking <br> Time management skills <br> Written communication skills <br> Oral communication skills <br> Research skills <br> Presentation skills <br> Leadership skills <br> Problem-solving skills <br> Self-management skills (e.g., ability to express emotions, manage stress, cope with life challenges) <br> Ability to work in a team or group <br> Ability to work independently |

[^5]| Individual development* | 0.78 | Ability to use the techniques, skills, and modern tools needed to be successful in your profession |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | Career preparation |
|  |  | Intellectual growth |
|  |  | Personal growth |
| Satisfaction with campus services** | 0.75 |  |
|  |  | brary resources and services |
|  |  | Career and advising services |
|  |  | Student housing facilities |
|  |  | Psychological counseling services |
|  |  | Student health services |
|  |  | Student disability services |
|  |  | Food services |
|  |  | Sports Center services |
|  |  | IT services |

[^6]
## Appendix B. Dealing with Non-Response Bias

Differences in response rates across sub-groups can lead to non-response bias, particularly if these subgroups also differ on survey variables (Kalton, 1983; Pike, 2008). We used the following procedure to determine whether or not we needed to adjust for non-response bias.

Firstly, we examined response rates across sub-groups. We conducted these analyses based on students' school, gender, and academic performance (as measured by whether or not the student's Fall 2014 cumulative GPA was above the median). The result of this analysis was that response rates differed across sub-groups. For instance, $56 \%$ of graduating students in the School of Engineering participated in the survey, compared to $64 \%$ in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences and $75 \%$ in the School of Science and Technology. Likewise, $70 \%$ of female students participated in the survey compared to $60 \%$ of male students. Finally, $72 \%$ of high-achieving students (i.e., those with a cumulative GPA above the median) participated in the survey, compared to $59 \%$ of the students with low-to-median academic performance. We also compared the distribution of students who participated in the survey to the distribution in the graduation student population and found some differences across subgroups. For instance, Engineering students accounted for about $32 \%$ of the graduating students but only $27 \%$ of survey respondents. Science and technology students accounted for about $33 \%$ of the graduating students but $38 \%$ of the survey respondents. Female students accounted for about $49 \%$ of the graduating students but $53 \%$ of survey respondents.

Secondly, we examine whether there were group differences (based on school, gender, and academic performance) in students' responses to survey items. This analysis was based on the composite score created for each dimensions (see Appendix A). We used composite scores for this analysis because these scores captured students' attitudes/perceptions on each of the main dimensions of students' undergraduate experiences. We found that Engineering students' level of satisfaction with different aspects of their major was lower compared to that of students from each of the other two schools. In addition, male students rated their satisfaction with different aspects of their major lower than female students did. There were no group differences relative to the other dimensions (perception of NU experiences, development of skills and competencies, individual development, and satisfaction with services/facilities).

Because of the potential for non-response bias (due to the differences highlighted above), we computed weights to adjust for non-response (examples of studies covering this issue in detail include: Kalton, 1983; Bethlehem, 2002; Pike, 2008). We computed weights based on the student's school and gender, used these weights to compute summary statistics, and compared weighted and unweighted results. In this particular case, we found that weighted and unweighted means only resulted in negligible differences. Consequently, we retained unweighted summary statistics as final results (as non-response adjustment was deemed unnecessary).

## Appendix C. Limitations: Precision of Survey Results

Information collected through surveys is almost always prone to error. There are different sources of survey error, including sampling error, coverage error, non-response error, measurement error (e.g., Biemer et al., 1991; Braverman, 1996; Dillman, 2007; Fowler, 2009; Groves 1983; Groves et al., 2009; Krosnick, 1991; Krosnick et al., 1996).

Sampling error was not a concern in this study because the Graduating Student Survey was administered to all graduating seniors and not to a sample of students. Likewise, coverage error was not a concern because all members of the graduating student population had equal chance of being-and were in factincluded in the study. Results of our analyses also suggest non-response error is not likely to be a major concern in this study. Although we found differences in survey response rates and in survey-variable means (particularly on satisfaction with different aspects of the student's major), we determined that adjusting for non-response bias seemed unnecessary given that summary statistics did not change substantially before and after non-response adjustment (see Appendix B).

Measurement error however, is always a threat in survey research. This error "occurs when a respondent's answer to a survey question is inaccurate, imprecise, or cannot be compared in any useful way to other respondents' answers" (Dillman, 2007, p. 9). Measurement error can result from different sources: the wording or organization of the survey instrument, the respondent, the mode of survey administration, and the interviewer (Braverman, 1996). This last source (interviewer) does not apply to the Graduating Student Survey because this survey is self-administered. It is, however, important to recognize that students' responses may have been affected by the survey instrument itself or from respondents' inherent characteristics. With respect to the survey instrument, it is possible for a response to be inaccurate or imprecise because the question was unclear to the respondent or because of issues related to the structure or sequence of the questions (Braverman, 1996). We attempted to minimize this type of error by paying closer attention to the survey design stage (e.g., we adapted some of the questions from existing survey instruments and solicited feedback from multiple stakeholders). With respect to the respondent errors, it is possible that some students misreported perceptions and/or facts. For example, a respondent may agree with an assertion in a survey item without regard to content-a phenomenon described as acquiescence (Krosnick et al., 1996) and which can be due, among other things, to a tendency to be "polite and agreeable" (Krosnick, 2000). The respondent may also select the response option that appears to be reasonable or acceptable, instead of producing the mental effort necessary to provide an optimal response-a phenomenon called satisficing (Krosnick, 1991; Krosnick et al., 1996). Therefore, the precision of the results of this survey may be limited by some of the sources of measurement error discussed here.

Finally, the precision of survey estimates may be affected by item non-response. Not all survey participants responded to every question on the survey. Item non-response rate, that is the percentage of individuals who did not respond to a specific survey question, ranged from $5 \%$ to $11 \%$ for close-ended questions. The weight adjustments used to deal with non-response bias do not address bias due to item non-response. Therefore, it is possible, though not very likely (because item non response was no a major issue), that the precision of survey estimates on a given question was affected by item non-responsewhich would be the case if individuals who responded to the item differed systematically from those who did not provide a response on that item.

## Appendix D. Detailed Frequency Distributions of Survey Responses

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

| \# | Item | Strongly Agree (\%) | Agree (\%) | Neither Agree nor Disagree (\%) | Disagree (\%) | Strongly Disagree (\%) | Number of Responses |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | NU has helped me meet the goals I came here to achieve. | 17.2 | 52.6 | 21.1 | 7.8 | 1.3 | 232 |
| 2 | My experiences here have helped motivate me to make something of my life. | 29.7 | 53.9 | 11.2 | 4.3 | 0.9 | 232 |
| 3 | I am proud of my accomplishments at NU. | 25.9 | 44.0 | 22.8 | 6.5 | 0.9 | 232 |
| 4 | I believe that student feedback is used effectively in order to improve student learning at NU. | 12.5 | 31.5 | 31.5 | 18.5 | 6.0 | 232 |
| 5 | If I had to start over again, I would still choose to come to NU. | 22.4 | 37.5 | 17.7 | 16.4 | 6.0 | 232 |
| 6 | I would recommend NU to other potential students. | 28.4 | 44.8 | 17.2 | 8.2 | 1.3 | 232 |
| 7 | I am satisfied with the overall education I received at NU. | 15.5 | 53.0 | 20.7 | 8.6 | 2.2 | 232 |

Please rate your satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your major/program.

| $\#$ | Item | Very <br> Satisfied <br> $(\%)$ | Satisfied <br> $(\%)$ | Dissatisfied <br> $(\%)$ | Very <br> Dissatisfied <br> $(\%)$ | Number of <br> Responses |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Quality of teaching | 16.9 | 63.6 | 18.6 | 0.9 | 231 |
| 2 | Testing/grading system | 12.1 | 69.7 | 16.5 | 1.7 | 231 |
| 3 | Quality of academic advising | 17.0 | 53.5 | 25.2 | 4.3 | 230 |
| 4 | Availability of courses you <br> wanted to take | 6.1 | 36.4 | 42.4 | 15.2 | 231 |
| 5 | Variety of courses offered | 6.9 | 30.3 | 50.2 | 12.6 | 231 |
| 6 | Availability of your instructors <br> out of class | 27.0 | 66.1 | 6.1 | 0.9 | 230 |
| 7 | Faculty concern for your <br> academic progress | 20.3 | 56.3 | 19.0 | 4.3 | 231 |
| 8 | Your overall experience in your <br> major/program | 16.9 | 61.0 | 19.0 | 3.0 | 231 |

## Please rate NU's contribution to enabling you to develop or strengthen each of the following:

| \# | Item | Excellent (\%) | Good (\%) | Fair (\%) | Poor (\%) | Number of Responses |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Ability to apply knowledge and skills in real-world settings | 12.2 | 49.3 | 31.9 | 6.6 | 229 |
| 2 | Ability to search and retrieve information using technology | 39.3 | 49.8 | 9.6 | 1.3 | 229 |
| 3 | Ability to critically evaluate information for decision-making | 37.1 | 51.5 | 10.9 | 0.4 | 229 |
| 4 | Time management skills | 17.5 | 50.7 | 27.5 | 4.4 | 229 |
| 5 | Written communication skills | 27.1 | 55.5 | 15.7 | 1.7 | 229 |
| 6 | Oral communication skills | 25.8 | 57.6 | 14.8 | 1.7 | 229 |
| 7 | Research skills | 32.8 | 56.8 | 8.3 | 2.2 | 229 |
| 8 | Presentation skills | 41.5 | 50.2 | 7.9 | 0.4 | 229 |
| 9 | Leadership skills | 24.6 | 48.2 | 22.4 | 4.8 | 228 |
| 10 | Problem-solving skills | 26.6 | 59.4 | 13.1 | 0.9 | 229 |
| 11 | Self-management skills (e.g., ability to express emotions, manage stress, cope with life challenges) | 22.3 | 46.7 | 24.0 | 7.0 | 229 |
| 12 | Ability to work in a team or group | 35.5 | 48.2 | 13.6 | 2.6 | 228 |
| 13 | Ability to work independently | 39.7 | 50.2 | 8.3 | 1.7 | 229 |
| 14 | Ability to use the techniques, skills, and modern tools needed to be successful in your profession | 26.6 | 53.3 | 16.2 | 3.9 | 229 |


| Distribution of Graduating Students who Plan to Pursue Graduate or Professional Studies, by Prospective Field of Study, Destination, and Degree Level |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prospective Field of Study | Counts | \% |
| Engineering | 37 | 35.9 |
| Science and Technology | 23 | 22.3 |
| Humanities and Social Sciences | 17 | 16.5 |
| Business | 14 | 13.6 |
| Medicine | 12 | 11.7 |
| Total ${ }^{1}$ | 103 | 100 |
| Prospective Institution | Counts ${ }^{2}$ | \% |
| Nazarbayev University | 19 | 20.4 |
| University College London | 10 | 10.8 |
| University of Manchester |  |  |
| Boston University |  |  |
| Imperial College London |  |  |
| King's College London |  |  |
| The George Washington University |  |  |
| Tulane University |  |  |
| University of Freiburg |  |  |
| Central European University |  |  |
| Columbia University |  |  |
| Delft University of Technology |  |  |
| Georgia State University |  |  |
| King Abdullah University of Science and Technology |  |  |
| Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology |  |  |
| McGill University |  |  |
| McMaster University |  |  |
| Nanyang Technological University |  |  |
| National University of Singapore |  |  |
| School of High Studies in Engineering in Lille |  |  |
| Stanford University |  |  |
| Stockholm University |  |  |
| The Pennsylvania State University |  |  |
| The Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration |  |  |
| Tokyo Institute of Technology |  |  |
| Toulouse School of Economics |  |  |
| University of Arizona |  |  |
| University of Birmingham |  |  |
| University of California |  |  |
| University of Edinburgh |  |  |
| University of Illinois |  |  |
| University of Madrid |  |  |
| University of Massachusetts |  |  |
| University of Nevada |  |  |

[^7]| University of Nottingham |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| University of Wisconsin-Madison |  |  |
| University of York |  |  |
| Vanderbilt University |  |  |
| Institution not yet known or student undecided | $\mathbf{9 3}$ | 16.1 |
| Total $^{\text { }}$ | Counts |  |

[^8]How well has NU met your needs in each of the following areas?

| $\#$ | Item | Very <br> well <br> $(\%)$ | Well <br> $(\%)$ | Adequately <br> $(\%)$ | Inadequately <br> $(\%)$ | Very <br> Inadequately <br> $(\%)$ | Number of <br> Responses |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Career preparation | 7.7 | 27.3 | 44.5 | 16.8 | 3.6 | 220 |
| 2 | Intellectual growth | 26.4 | 50.9 | 19.1 | 3.2 | 0.5 | 220 |
| 3 | Personal growth | 26.5 | 44.3 | 23.7 | 4.6 | 0.9 | 219 |

How satisfied are you with each of the following University services or facilities? If you did not use any of these services or facilities, please select "Not applicable".

| $\#$ | Item <br> Satisy <br> $(\%)$ | Satisfied <br> $(\%)$ | Dissatisfied <br> $(\%)$ | Very <br> Dissatisfied <br> $(\%)$ | Not <br> Applicable <br> $(\%)$ | Number of <br> Responses |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Library resources <br> and services | 42.0 | 53.0 | 4.1 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 219 |
| 2 | Career and <br> advising services | 20.1 | 58.9 | 13.2 | 3.2 | 4.6 | 219 |
| 3 | Student housing <br> facilities | 38.4 | 46.6 | 7.3 | 3.7 | 4.1 | 219 |
|  | Psychological <br> counselling <br> services | 10.0 | 34.2 | 7.3 | 2.7 | 45.7 | 219 |
| 5 | Student health | 19.2 | 47.5 | 18.7 | 8.2 | 6.4 | 219 |
|  | services | Student disability | 6.0 | 22.1 | 11.5 | 3.2 | 57.1 |
| services | 6.8 | 52.1 | 27.9 | 8.7 | 4.6 | 217 |  |
| 7 | Food services | Sports Center <br> services | 8.7 | 52.1 | 16.4 | 3.2 | 19.6 |
| 9 | IT services | 10.0 | 54.3 | 21.0 | 6.4 | 8.2 | 219 |


[^0]:    *Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree; SD = Standard Deviation; "\% Agree/Strongly Agree" = Percent of respondents who answered "Agree" or "Strongly Agree"; $\mathrm{N}=$ Number of students who answered the question

[^1]:    *Scale: 1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Satisfied, 4=Very Satisfied; SD = Standard Deviation; "\% Satisfied/Very Satisfied" = Percent of respondents who answered
    "Satisfied" or "Very Satisfied"; N = Number of students who answered the question

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ Response categories included a "Not Applicable" option. For the purpose of this analysis, individuals who selected this option were excluded from frequency distributions and from the computation of means and standard deviations. Detailed frequency distributions, including the number of students who selected "Not Applicable" are provided in Appendix D.

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ This is based on what students believed would be their primary activity in Fall 2015.
    ${ }^{2} 37.3 \%$ of 225 responses
    ${ }_{4}^{3} 33.3 \%$ of 84 students who responded that they plan to work (full-time or part-time)
    ${ }^{4} 46.4 \%$ of 28 students who reported that they had received an offer of employment
    ${ }^{5}$ Students' responses are listed. However, for confidentiality purposes, response counts are reported (in parentheses) only if greater than or equal to five.

[^4]:    Scale: 0 to 100; SD = Standard Deviation; Median: Middle value (half of the score fall below this value and half above it); $\mathrm{N}=$ Number of students included in the analysis

[^5]:    ${ }^{1} 0$ corresponded to responses such as: Very Dissatisfied, Strongly Disagree, Very Inadequate, or Poor. In contrast, 100 corresponded to responses such as Very Satisfied, Strongly Agree, Very Well, or Excellent.

[^6]:    * Items on this dimension were, originally, on a five-point scale.
    ** Items on this dimension were, originally, on a four-point scale.

[^7]:    ${ }^{1} 14$ students did not provide information on prospective field of study
    ${ }^{2}$ For confidentiality purposes, counts (and percentages) are displayed only when five or more students reported a particular institution as their prospective destination for graduate or professional studies.

[^8]:    ${ }^{1} 24$ respondents did not provide information on institution.
    ${ }^{2}$ For confidentiality purposes, counts (and percentages) are displayed only when five or more students reported a particular country as their prospective destination for graduate or professional studies.
    ${ }^{3} 24$ respondents did not provide information on country of study.
    ${ }^{4} 16$ respondents did not provide information on degree level.

