Introduction and Important Caveats

In the spring of 2006, the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) was administered electronically with an internet-based questionnaire to all 153,000 undergraduates at the nine general campuses of the University, including 22,000 undergraduate students at UC Davis. The response rate across the University of California was about 38% but varied widely by campus. About 7,000 UC Davis students participated in the survey, for a campus response rate of about 33%. Actual response rates varied by item. As in 2004, female students responded to UCUES at a higher rate than males. Otherwise, UCUES respondents in 2006 were very representative of the UC Davis population.† Demographics of the survey population and the respondents for 2006 are shown in the Appendix.

The questionnaire was delivered using a modular approach by which all respondents received a common set of “core” questions. Respondents were then randomly assigned to receive one of five survey “modules” each of which focused on a specific aspect of the student experience. This report focuses on responses to items in the Student Services module. This module was presented to about 40% of UC Davis UCUES respondents, and about 2,500 responded to items in the module.

In the Student Services module, UC Davis students were presented with a block of questions related to each of the following services:

- Advising Services
- Campus Recreation
- Childcare & Family Services
- Counseling & Psychological Services (CAPS)
- Cowell Student Health Center
- Cross-Cultural Center
- Educational Opportunity Program Information Office
- Financial Aid Office
- Internship & Career Center
- Learning Skills Center (LSC)
- Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Transgender Resource Center
- Office of the University Registrar
- Reentry Student Services
- Residence Hall Programs
- Services for International Students & Scholars
- Student Disability Center
- Student Housing
- Transfer Student Services
- Women's Resources & Research Center

† UCUES respondents in 2006 were even more representative of the campus population than in 2004. In 2004, White students and seniors were somewhat over-represented while freshmen were somewhat under-represented in the UCUES data.
Students who indicated they had used the service were asked to rate their satisfaction with the service (excellent, good, fair, or poor) and also to rate the importance of the service (extremely important, very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not at all important). Results are summarized as the percentage of users who rated the service excellent or good and the percentage of users who rated the service extremely important, very important, or somewhat important.

The percentage of respondents who indicated they had needed the service but not used it is reported for each service. These “unserved” students were also asked to rate the importance of the service, with the same scale as users. These two measures taken in combination provide a measure of unmet need. In addition, the unserved were asked to identify reasons for not using the service. These reasons are shown in order of frequency for each service. Due to limitations of the survey tool used in 2006, the same list of reasons for non-use was presented for each service, even though not all reasons were logically applicable to all services. Those responses are included here for completeness.

Finally, both users and unserved students were asked how the service could better meet their needs. Those text responses are not included here, but are available to directors and staff of the individual services. It should be noted that those comments reveal that some respondents were confused about the identity and purpose of the services they evaluated.

It is also important to note that 1) students frequently skipped the entire block of survey items related to a particular service so the number of respondents for a service cannot be used to estimate the size of the population served, 2) for each service, the numbers of users and unserved included in analysis differ substantially and 3) although system-wide comparison data are presented and may offer useful context, the precise scope and delivery of services varies markedly between UC campuses.

\[\text{\footnotesize\ref{footnote}}\] Unfortunately, due to some miscommunication during development of the survey tool, students who did not need a particular service were explicitly directed to skip that entire block of questions (even though “didn’t need this service” was available as a response option). Thus, students who did not need the service cannot be separated from other non-respondents, which confounds analysis. In particular, this means that the survey provides no reliable measure of the size of the population needing a specific service. All results reported here are based only on respondents who reported either needing and using the service or needing but not using the service. Nothing should be inferred about the number who did not need the service.