

2009 AUA Graduate Student Exit Survey

Introduction

During November-December 2009, the American University of Armenia conducted its annual University-wide Graduate Student Exit Survey. The survey was carried out by the AUA Office of Institutional Research (IRO) with the support of the Provost and Vice President and the academic departments.

The major objectives of the survey were to obtain information from students on the degree of student satisfaction with AUA graduate programs and to identify areas where improvements may be necessary.

This report describes the methodology used for the survey and presents the findings in tables. At the end of this report, an Addendum is attached that includes tables with data from four years of Exit Surveys, 2006 through 2009.

Methodology

Instrument Design and Timeline

The survey instrument used in 2008 was updated based on comments received from the Deans of academic programs. The instrument includes questions on academic program and curriculum evaluation, educational experiences, and general satisfaction with academic program and University services to students. Demographic questions were asked for analysis purposes. Students were informed about the anonymity of their responses in an accompanying cover letter that provided instructions on how to complete the questionnaire.

Survey questionnaires were distributed on November 13, 2009, and survey responses were collected through December 30, 2009.

Sample, Response Rate, Procedures

The 2009 Graduate Student Exit Survey questionnaire was sent to 114 graduating second-year students. The survey population included 36 students from the College of Engineering (CoE), 19 students from the Department of English Programs (DEP), 17 students from the College of Health Sciences (CHS), 31 students from the School of Business Management (SBM), and 11 students from the School of Political Science and International Affairs (PSIA).

In order to obtain an adequate response rate, the following procedures were followed:

- A letter from the Institutional Research Office was sent to each graduating student with a request to complete the survey and an explanation of its importance.
- Self-administered questionnaires together with instructions were distributed by each academic program. A special box for collecting completed questionnaires was placed in each departmental office to assure the anonymity of responses.

- A reminder email message was sent by the IRO.

A total of 100 of 114 graduating students participated in the survey, which comprises a response rate of 87.7 percent.

Upon completion of data collection, data was entered into an SPSS file and statistical analyses such as frequencies, cross-tabulations, and mean averages of the responses were performed.

RESPONSE RATES AND BACKGROUND PROFILES

Table 1a: Distribution of respondents by degree		
	Frequency	Percent
Master of Engineering in Industrial Engineering and Systems (M. Eng.)	18	18.0
Master of Science in Computer and Information Science (MS CIS)	12	12.0
Master of Business Administration (MBA)	28	28.0
Master of Political Science and International Affairs (MPSIA)	10	10.0
Master of Laws (LL.M.)	-	-
Master in Public Health (MPH)	15	15.0
Master in Teaching English as Foreign Language (MA TEFL)	13	13.0
Certificate in Teaching English as Foreign Language (CTEFL)	4	4.0
TOTAL	100	100.0

Table 1b: Response rate by academic program			
	Total number of students	Number of respondents	Percent
Master of Engineering in Industrial Engineering and Systems (M. Eng.)	21	18	85.7%
Master of Science in Computer and Information Science (MS CIS)	15	12	80.0%
Master of Business Administration (MBA)	31	28	90.3%
Master of Political Science and International Affairs (MPSIA)	11	10	90.9%
Master of Public Health (MPH)	17	15	88.2%
Master in Teaching English as Foreign Language (MA TEFL)	14	13	92.9%
Certificate in Teaching English as Foreign Language (CTEFL)	5	4	80.0%
TOTAL	114	100	87.7%

Table 2: Distribution by gender			
	Number of students	Response rate frequency	Response rate percent
Female	71	66	93.0
Male	43	34	79.1
TOTAL	114	100	

Table 3: What was your employment status during most of your graduate education?			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Full time job	23	23.0	23.0
Part time job	19	19.0	42.0
Worked occasionally	19	19.0	61.0
Did not work	39	39.0	100.0
TOTAL	100	100.0	

Table 4: Do you or your family own a personal desktop or notebook computer that you use for AUA work?			
	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent
Yes	63	63.0	63.6
No	36	36.0	36.4
Missing values	1	1.0	100.0
Total	100	100.0	

Table 5: Where did you learn English before being admitted to AUA?		
<i>(Multiple responses permitted)</i>		
	Frequency	Percent
School	55	55.6
University	45	45.5
Private tutoring	49	49.5
AUA Extension Program	11	11.1
Studied myself	10	10.1
Foreign language centers	3	3.0

Table 6: Which choice was AUA?			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
First choice	88	88.0	88.0
Second choice	9	9.0	97.0
Third choice or lower	3	3.0	100.0
TOTAL	100	100.0	

SATISFACTION WITH THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM

Table 7: Overall and in general, how would you rate your experience in your program?			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Excellent	23	23.0	23.0
Very Good	58	58.0	81.0
Satisfactory	19	19.0	100.0
Unsatisfactory	0	0.0	
Very poor	0	0.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0	
Mean= 2.00 (1=excellent and 5=very poor)			

Table 8a: The sequence of courses was appropriate				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	12	12.0	12.2	12.2
Agree	53	53.0	54.1	66.3
Neither agree nor disagree	17	17.0	17.3	83.7
Disagree	16	16.0	16.3	100.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing value	2	2.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean=2.38 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded)				

Table 8b: Academic policies and procedures were communicated adequately

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	19	19.0	19.2	19.2
Agree	60	60.0	60.6	79.8
Neither agree nor disagree	13	13.0	13.1	92.9
Disagree	7	7.0	7.1	100.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	1	1.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		

Mean=2.08 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded)

Table 8c: Information about degree requirements was communicated adequately

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	20	20.0	20.6	20.6
Agree	61	61.0	62.9	83.5
Neither agree nor disagree	10	10.0	10.3	93.8
Disagree	6	6.0	6.2	100.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	3	3.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		

Mean=2.02 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded)

Table 8d: On the whole, faculty members were well qualified to teach their courses

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	19	19.0	19.8	19.8
Agree	52	52.0	54.2	74.0
Neither agree nor disagree	18	18.0	18.8	92.7
Disagree	6	6.0	6.2	99.0
Strongly disagree	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
Missing values	4	4.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		

Mean=2.15 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded)

Table 8e: In general, faculty members prepared carefully for their courses				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	22	22.0	22.2	22.2
Agree	55	55.0	55.6	77.8
Neither agree nor disagree	19	19.0	19.2	97.0
Disagree	3	3.0	3.0	100.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	1	1.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean=2.03 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded)				

Table 8f: In general, the courses I took were well taught				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	17	17.0	17.2	17.2
Agree	58	58.0	58.6	75.8
Neither agree nor disagree	21	21.0	21.2	97.0
Disagree	3	3.0	3.0	100.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	1	1.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean=2.10 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded)				

Table 8g: There was good communication between faculty and students regarding student needs, concerns, and suggestions				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	37	37.0	37.4	37.4
Agree	43	43.0	43.4	80.8
Neither agree nor disagree	12	12.0	12.1	92.9
Disagree	4	4.0	4.0	97.0
Strongly disagree	3	3.0	3.0	100.0
Missing values	1	1.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean=1.92 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded)				

Table 8h: Interactions among students and faculty were characterized by mutual respect				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	45	45.0	45.5	45.5
Agree	46	46.0	46.5	91.9
Neither agree nor disagree	6	6.0	6.1	98.0
Disagree	1	1.0	1.0	99.0
Strongly disagree	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
Missing values	1	1.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean=1.66 (<i>1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded</i>)				

Table 8i: Overall, faculty in my department were interested in the professional development of students				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	31	31.0	31.3	31.3
Agree	48	48.0	48.5	79.8
Neither agree nor disagree	17	17.0	17.2	97.0
Disagree	3	3.0	3.0	100.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	1	1.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean=1.92 (<i>1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded</i>)				

Table 8j: There were many opportunities outside the classroom for interaction between students and faculty				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	30	30.0	30.6	30.6
Agree	46	46.0	46.9	77.6
Neither agree nor disagree	12	12.0	12.2	89.8
Disagree	9	9.0	9.2	99.0
Strongly disagree	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
Missing values	2	2.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean= 2.03 (<i>1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded</i>)				

Table 8k: The courses I took were valuable for my future career				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	27	27.0	27.6	27.6
Agree	59	59.0	60.2	87.8
Neither agree nor disagree	11	11.0	11.2	99.0
Disagree	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	2	2.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean= 1.86 (<i>1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded</i>)				

Table 8l: I believe that my program provided me with the skills needed in my field				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	33	33.0	33.3	33.3
Agree	56	56.0	56.6	89.9
Neither agree nor disagree	10	10.0	10.1	100.0
Disagree	0	0.0	0.0	
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	1	1.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean=1.77 (<i>1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded</i>)				

Table 8m: My graduate school experiences were relevant to my career goals				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	26	26.0	26.5	26.5
Agree	58	58.0	59.2	85.7
Neither agree nor disagree	14	14.0	14.3	100.0
Disagree	0	0.0	0.0	
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	2	2.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean=1.88 (<i>1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded</i>)				

Table 8n: My program was intellectually challenging and stimulating				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	28	28.0	28.6	28.6
Agree	56	56.0	57.1	85.7
Neither agree nor disagree	13	13.0	13.3	99.0
Disagree	0	0.0	0.0	99.0
Strongly disagree	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
Missing values	2	2.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean=1.88 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded)				

Table 8o: I would recommend my graduate program to prospective students				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	35	35.0	35.4	35.4
Agree	48	48.0	48.5	83.8
Neither agree nor disagree	15	15.0	15.2	99.0
Disagree	0	0.0	0.0	99.0
Strongly disagree	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
Missing values	1	1.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean=1.83 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded)				

Table 8p: If I had the opportunity to make the choice again, I would enroll in this program again				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	33	33.0	33.3	33.3
Agree	40	40.0	40.4	73.7
Neither agree nor disagree	16	16.0	16.2	89.9
Disagree	6	6.0	6.1	96.0
Strongly disagree	4	4.0	4.0	100.0
Missing values	1	1.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean=2.07 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded)				

Table 8q: I believe that the AUA grading system is fair				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	31	31.0	31.6	31.6
Agree	47	47.0	48.0	79.6
Neither agree nor disagree	15	15.0	15.3	94.9
Disagree	5	5.0	5.1	100.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	2	2.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean=1.94 (<i>1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded</i>)				

ATTITUDES ON STUDENT LEARNING

Table 9a: Which of the following WAS emphasized in your program?		
<i>(Multiple responses permitted)</i>		
	Frequency	Percent of total respondents (n=100)
Connections between ideas and practices	69	69.0
Problem solving	68	68.0
Theoretical knowledge	60	60.0
Research	58	58.0
Applied Research	26	26.0

Table 9b: Which of the following SHOULD BE more emphasized in your program?		
<i>(Multiple responses permitted)</i>		
	Frequency	Percent of total respondents (n=100)
Connections between ideas and practices	51	51.0
Problem solving	48	48.0
Applied Research	40	40.0
Research	37	37.0
Theoretical knowledge	25	25.0

Table 10: Distribution of responses by degree and percentage of total number for each degree*(Multiple responses permitted; Missing values and comments from 'other' category excluded)*

Degree		Connections between ideas and practices	Theoretical knowledge	Problem solving	Research	Applied Research	Total responses
IESM	<i>Was done</i>	12 (66.7%)	11 (61.1%)	12 (66.7%)	7 (38.9%)	3 (16.6%)	18
	<i>Should be more</i>	9 (50.0%)	4 (22.2%)	10 (55.6%)	8 (44.4%)	8 (44.4%)	
CIS	<i>Was done</i>	10 (83.3%)	7 (58.3%)	11 (91.7%)	6 (50.0%)	3 (25.0%)	12
	<i>Should be more</i>	4 (33.3%)	3 (25.0%)	4 (33.3%)	2 (16.6%)	7 (58.3%)	
SBM	<i>Was done</i>	18 (64.3%)	17 (60.7%)	20 (71.4%)	12 (42.9%)	3 (10.7%)	28
	<i>Should be more</i>	22 (78.6%)	7 (25.0%)	12 (42.9%)	11 (39.3%)	11 (39.3%)	
PSIA	<i>Was done</i>	6 (60.0%)	7 (70.0%)	2 (20.0%)	8 (80.0%)	1 (10.0%)	10
	<i>Should be more</i>	4 (40.0%)	1 (10.0%)	9 (90.0%)	-	3 (30.0%)	
CHS	<i>Was done</i>	9 (64.3%)	7 (42.9%)	11 (78.6%)	12 (85.7%)	7 (50.0%)	15
	<i>Should be more</i>	4 (26.7%)	4 (26.7%)	3 (20.0%)	7 (46.7%)	7 (46.7%)	
MATEFL	<i>Was done</i>	9 (75.0%)	8 (66.6%)	7 (58.3%)	11 (91.7%)	7 (58.3%)	13
	<i>Should be more</i>	5 (38.5%)	3 (23.1%)	6 (46.2%)	7 (53.8%)	2 (15.4%)	
CTEFL	<i>Was done</i>	4 (100.0%)	2 (50.0%)	4 (100.0%)	2 (50.0%)	2 (50.0%)	4
	<i>Should be more</i>	3 (75.0%)	3 (75.0%)	4 (100.0%)	2 (50.0%)	2 (50.0%)	

Table 11: Means of how often during coursework students used the following activities on a scale of 1 to 7 by degree and University-wide (1=never and 7=always)

	By departments							University-wide
	IESM	SBM	PSIA	CHS	CIS	MATEFL	CTEFL	
Applying theories or concepts to practical problems/situations	5.33	5.25	5.10	5.87	5.25	5.77	6.75	5.47
Analyzing cases or situations in-depth	5.50	5.64	4.40	5.60	5.00	5.46	5.75	5.39
Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods	5.50	4.57	4.70	5.93	4.75	5.54	6.25	5.17
Synthesizing ideas and/or information into new more complex interpretations and relationships	5.11	4.71	4.20	5.80	4.75	5.38	5.00	5.00
Memorizing facts and ideas from lectures and readings	5.11	4.04	4.60	4.93	4.42	2.15	3.25	4.19

Table 12: Means of how much graduate education at AUA contributed to development of the following areas on scale of 1 to 7 (1=no contribution and 7=very significant contribution)

	Mean
Ability to function as part of a team	6.11
Presenting papers at conferences/seminars	5.92
Ability to plan and carry out projects independently	5.86
Ability to critically analyze ideas and information	5.67
Ability to solve analytical problems	5.59
Writing skills	5.53
Speaking skills	5.41
Ability to lead and guide others	5.41
Applying scientific methods of inquiry	5.31
Network with others in the field	5.29
Computer skills	5.01
Submitting papers for publication	4.64

SATISFACTION WITH DEGREE PROGRAM SERVICES

Table 13a: Student advising (e.g., guidance on academic requirements, thesis/essay)				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	24	24.0	24.5	24.5
Satisfied	63	63.0	64.3	88.8
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	10	10.0	10.2	99.0
Unsatisfied	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
Very unsatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	2	2.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean= 1.88 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)				

Table 13b: Adequacy of support for research (e.g., research facilities such as labs and centers)				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	23	23.0	24.2	24.2
Satisfied	49	49.0	51.6	75.8
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	15	15.0	15.8	91.6
Unsatisfied	8	8.0	8.4	100.0
Very unsatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	5	5.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean= 2.08 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)				

Table 13c: Opportunity for research experience or practical skills application				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	8	8.0	8.5	8.5
Satisfied	41	41.0	43.6	52.1
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	36	36.0	38.3	90.4
Unsatisfied	8	8.0	8.5	98.9
Very unsatisfied	1	1.0	1.1	100.0
Missing values	6	6.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean= 2.50 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)				

Table 13d: Communications about academic policies and procedures				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	15	15.0	16.1	16.1
Satisfied	44	44.0	47.3	63.4
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	32	32.0	34.4	97.8
Unsatisfied	2	2.0	2.2	100.0
Very unsatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	6	6.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean= 2.23 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)				

Table 13e: Opportunities for formal student evaluations of instruction				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	18	18.0	19.1	19.1
Satisfied	56	56.0	59.6	78.7
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	16	16.0	17.0	95.7
Unsatisfied	4	4.0	4.3	100.0
Very unsatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	6	6.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean= 2.06 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)				

Table 13f: Staff support in the degree program				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	29	29.0	30.9	30.9
Satisfied	56	56.0	59.6	90.4
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	6	6.0	6.4	96.8
Unsatisfied	3	3.0	3.2	100.0
Very unsatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	6	6.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean= 1.82 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)				

SATISFACTION WITH UNIVERSITY SERVICES

Table 14a: Classroom facilities and equipment				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	49	49.0	49.5	49.5
Satisfied	45	45.0	45.5	94.9
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2	2.0	2.0	97.0
Unsatisfied	2	2.0	2.0	99.0
Very unsatisfied	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
Missing values	1	1.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean= 1.60 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)				

Table 14b: Services provided by Student Academic Affairs office (Room 19)				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	24	24.0	24.2	24.2
Satisfied	49	49.0	49.5	73.7
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	20	20.0	20.2	93.9
Unsatisfied	5	5.0	5.1	99.0
Very unsatisfied	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
Missing values	1	1.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean=2.09 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)				

Table 14c: Advising for students on policies and rights and responsibilities				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	17	17.0	17.2	17.2
Satisfied	50	50.0	50.5	67.7
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	27	27.0	27.3	94.9
Unsatisfied	5	5.0	5.1	100.0
Very unsatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	1	1.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean= 2.20 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)				

Table 14d: Financial aid services; scholarships, loans, work study

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	38	38.0	38.8	38.8
Satisfied	31	31.0	31.6	70.4
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	21	21.0	21.4	91.8
Unsatisfied	7	7.0	7.1	99.0
Very unsatisfied	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
Missing values	1	1.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean=2.00 (<i>1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded</i>)				

Table 14e: Library resources in the field of study

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	30	30.0	30.3	30.3
Satisfied	58	58.0	58.6	88.9
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	9	9.0	9.1	98.0
Unsatisfied	2	2.0	2.0	100.0
Very unsatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	1	1.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean= 1.83 (<i>1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded</i>)				

Table 14f: Computer resources

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	31	31.0	31.3	31.3
Satisfied	46	46.0	46.5	77.8
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	15	15.0	15.2	92.9
Unsatisfied	7	7.0	7.1	100.0
Very unsatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	1	1.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean= 1.98 (<i>1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded</i>)				

Table 14g: Food services				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	15	15.0	15.3	15.3
Satisfied	38	38.0	38.8	54.1
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	36	36.0	36.7	90.8
Unsatisfied	7	7.0	7.1	98.0
Very unsatisfied	2	2.0	2.0	100.0
Missing values	2	2.0	100.0	
TOTAL	100	100.0		
Mean=2.00 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)				

EMPLOYMENT PLANS

Table 15: What are your immediate employment plans?		
	Frequency	Percent
I am already employed in a position that I think is appropriate for my degree	23	23.0
I am already employed but not in a position that I think is appropriate for my degree	26	26.0
I am seeking employment	32	32.0
I am not seeking employment right now	4	4.0
I will continue my graduate education	4	4.0
I don't know yet	7	7.0
Other	4	4.0
TOTAL	100	100.0

Table 16: If you are seeking employment, which BEST describes your potential employer?		
	Frequency	Percent
Foreign-funded development projects and companies	12	37.5
Businesses and enterprises	11	34.4
Embassies and international organizations	6	18.8
Armenian government and agencies	2	6.2
Armenian non-governmental organizations	1	3.1
TOTAL	32	100.0

Table 17: Have you ever used the services offered at the AUA Alumni and Career Development Office?			
	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent
Yes	16	16.0	16.5
No	81	81.0	83.5
Missing values	3	3.0	100.0
Total	100	100.0	

Table 17a: List of the services used and satisfaction level	
	Frequency
I am not satisfied because they always offer jobs for MBA.	1
I found a job through ACDO.	1
I got my previous job from mail sent by ACDO, I am satisfied with the work they do.	1
I used its e-mails on job opportunities and got several interviews. I am satisfied with this service of the AUA Alumni and Career Development Office.	1
Job announcement- I already applied for one of the vacancies.	1
Job opportunities sent by ACDO are really helpful, I have used them many times. Special thanks!!	1
Sometimes I get interesting e-mails from ACDO and they help us to find appropriate jobs.	1
Sometimes I used the job opportunities announcements I received from ACDO.	1
The job opportunities they send are quite useful.	1
The job vacancies and trainings announcement that we get through our email are very useful.	1
The job vacancies that we get through our e-mail are very good.	3

CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Table 18: Have you ever participated in AUA Extension Program courses?			
	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent
Yes	10	10.0	10.2
No	88	88.0	89.8
Missing values	2	2.0	100.0
Total	100	100.0	

Table 18a: Courses taken at AUA Extension	
Name of the course	Number of responses
English courses	7
TOEFL Preparation course	2
Strategic HR management	1

Table 19: Courses that AUA Extension can provide to support lifelong learning needs?	
Name of the course	Number of responses
Biostatistics	1
Engineering statistics	1
Business English	1
Foreign languages	1
English oral communication	1
Report and research paper writing	1
CAD/CAM	1
Advanced Mat lab	1
Mathematics for engineering students	1
Database administration	2
Unix systems	1
Computer courses	1
Project management	2
Entrepreneurship	1
Advanced finance	1
Advanced marketing	1
Public Relations	2