

American University of Armenia

Graduate Student Exit Survey

2010



Prepared by

**Narine Hakobyan
Interim Manager**

**Office for Institutional Research and Assessment
American University of Armenia**

Introduction

During May-June 2010, 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 five years of Exit Surveys, 2006 through 2010.

Methodology

Instrument Design and Timeline

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 May 21, 2010, and survey responses were collected through June 13, 2010.

Sample, Response Rate, Procedures

The 2010 Graduate Student Exit Survey questionnaire was sent to 45 graduating second-year students. The survey population included 13 students from the College of Engineering (CoE), 11 students from the Department of English Programs (DEP), and 21 students from the Department of Law (LAW).

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 44 of 45 graduating students participated in the survey, which comprises a response rate of 97.7 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 Laws (LL.M.)	21	47.7
Master of Science in Computer and Information Science (MS CIS)	13	29.5
Master in Teaching English as Foreign Language (MA TEFL)	10	22.7
TOTAL	44	100.0

Table 1b: Response rate by academic program			
	Total number of students	Number of respondents	Percent
Master of Laws (LL.M.)	21	21	100.0%
Master of Science in Computer and Information Science (MS CIS)	13	13	100.0%
Master in Teaching English as Foreign Language (MA TEFL)	11	10	90.9%
TOTAL	45	44	97.8%

Table 2: Distribution by gender			
	Number of students	Response rate frequency	Response rate percent
Female	31	30	96.8
Male	14	14	100.0
TOTAL	45	44	

Table 3: What was your employment status during most of your graduate education?				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Full time job	15	34.1	34.9	34.9
Part time job	10	22.7	23.3	58.2
Worked occasionally	9	20.5	20.9	79.1
Did not work	9	20.5	20.9	100.0
Missing values	1	2.3	100.0	
TOTAL	44	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	30	68.2	75.0
No	10	22.7	25.0
Missing values	4	9.1	100.0
Total	44	100.0	

Table 5: Where did you learn English before being admitted to AUA?		
<i>(Multiple responses permitted)</i>		
	Frequency	Percent (out of 44)
School	33	75.0
University	23	52.3
Private tutoring	23	52.3
AUA Extension Program	8	18.2
AUA Department of English Programs	5	11.4
Studied myself	4	9.1
Study abroad	4	9.1

Table 6: Which choice was AUA?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
First choice	37	84.1	86.0	86.0
Second choice	5	11.4	11.6	97.7
Third choice or lower	1	2.3	2.3	100.0
Missing values	1	2.3	100.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0		

SATISFACTION WITH THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM**Table 7: Overall and in general, how would you rate your experience in your program?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Excellent	5	11.4	11.6	11.6
Very Good	25	56.8	58.1	69.8
Satisfactory	13	29.5	30.2	100.0
Unsatisfactory	0	0.0	0.0	
Very poor	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	1	2.3	100.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0		
Mean= 2.19 (1=excellent and 5=very poor; missing values excluded)				

Table 8a: The sequence of courses was appropriate

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	6	13.6	13.6
Agree	26	59.1	72.7
Neither agree nor disagree	9	20.5	93.2
Disagree	2	4.5	97.7
Strongly disagree	1	2.3	100.0
TOTAL	44	100.0	
Mean=2.23 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)			

Table 8b: Academic policies and procedures were communicated adequately			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	7	15.9	15.9
Agree	26	59.1	75.0
Neither agree nor disagree	7	15.9	90.9
Disagree	4	9.1	100.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0	
Mean=2.18 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)			

Table 8c: Information about degree requirements was communicated adequately				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	8	18.2	19.0	19.0
Agree	26	59.1	61.9	81.0
Neither agree nor disagree	6	13.6	14.3	95.2
Disagree	2	4.5	4.8	100.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	2	4.5	100.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0		
Mean=2.05 (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	9	20.5	20.9	20.9
Agree	20	45.5	46.5	67.4
Neither agree nor disagree	9	20.5	20.9	88.4
Disagree	5	11.4	11.6	100.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	1	2.3	100.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0		
Mean=2.23 (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	10	22.7	23.3	23.3
Agree	21	47.7	48.8	72.1
Neither agree nor disagree	11	25.0	25.6	97.7
Disagree	0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Strongly disagree	1	2.3	2.3	
Missing values	1	2.3	100.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0		
Mean=2.09 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded)				

Table 8f: In general, the courses I took were well taught

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	10	22.7	22.7
Agree	23	52.3	75.0
Neither agree nor disagree	9	20.5	95.5
Disagree	2	4.5	100.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0	
Mean=2.07 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)			

Table 8g: There was good communication between faculty and students regarding student needs, concerns, and suggestions

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	15	34.1	34.1
Agree	18	40.9	75.0
Neither agree nor disagree	6	13.6	88.6
Disagree	5	11.4	100.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0	
Mean=2.02 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)			

Table 8h: Interactions among students and faculty were characterized by mutual respect			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	12	27.3	27.3
Agree	27	61.4	88.6
Neither agree nor disagree	5	11.4	100.0
Disagree	0	0.0	
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0	
Mean=1.84 (<i>1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree</i>)			

Table 8i: Overall, faculty in my department were interested in the professional development of students			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	13	29.5	29.5
Agree	22	50.0	79.5
Neither agree nor disagree	8	18.2	97.7
Disagree	1	2.3	100.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0	
Mean=1.93 (<i>1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree</i>)			

Table 8j: There were many opportunities outside the classroom for interaction between students and faculty			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	10	22.7	22.7
Agree	17	38.6	61.4
Neither agree nor disagree	11	25.0	86.4
Disagree	6	13.6	100.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0	
Mean= 2.30 (<i>1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree</i>)			

Table 8k: The courses I took were valuable for my future career			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	15	34.1	34.1
Agree	19	43.2	77.3
Neither agree nor disagree	9	20.5	97.7
Disagree	1	2.3	100.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0	
Mean= 1.91 (<i>1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree</i>)			

Table 8l: I believe that my program provided me with the skills needed in my field			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	12	27.3	27.3
Agree	23	52.3	79.5
Neither agree nor disagree	8	18.2	97.7
Disagree	1	2.3	100.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0	
Mean=1.95 (<i>1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree</i>)			

Table 8m: My graduate school experiences were relevant to my career goals			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	9	20.5	20.5
Agree	27	61.4	81.8
Neither agree nor disagree	6	13.6	95.5
Disagree	2	4.5	100.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0	
Mean=2.02 (<i>1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree</i>)			

Table 8n: My program was intellectually challenging and stimulating			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	9	20.5	20.5
Agree	29	65.9	86.4
Neither agree nor disagree	5	11.4	97.7
Disagree	1	2.3	100.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0	
Mean=1.95 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)			

Table 8o: I would recommend my graduate program to prospective students			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	14	31.8	31.8
Agree	20	45.5	77.3
Neither agree nor disagree	9	20.5	97.7
Disagree	1	2.3	100.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0	
Mean=1.93 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)			

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	9	20.5	20.9	20.9
Agree	19	43.2	44.2	65.1
Neither agree nor disagree	9	20.5	20.9	86.0
Disagree	5	11.4	11.6	97.7
Strongly disagree	1	2.3	2.3	100.0
Missing values	1	2.3	100.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0		
Mean=2.30 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded)				

Table 8q: I believe that the AUA grading system is fair			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	5	11.4	11.4
Agree	24	54.5	65.9
Neither agree nor disagree	8	18.2	84.1
Disagree	6	13.6	97.7
Strongly disagree	1	2.3	100.0
TOTAL	44	100.0	
Mean=2.41 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)			

Table 9: What are the three most important differences between AUA and other universities and colleges?	Frequency	Percent
<i>(Open-ended question; Responses recoded)</i>		
Western style of education and teaching style	19	20.0
Fair grading system/Fairness/Equity	8	8.4
English-speaking environment	8	8.4
Given knowledge/skills and its application into the practice	8	8.4
AUA atmosphere and culture	7	7.4
Student-centered approach to learning	7	7.4
Higher level of education	7	7.4
Attitude of students toward study	5	5.3
Different relations between faculty and students	5	5.3
Faculty/Professionals	4	4.2
Resources (access to Internet, e-mail, student server, new technologies, library)	4	4.2
Team work	4	4.2
Corruption-free environment	2	2.1
New opportunities for research, jobs, etc.	2	2.1
Discipline and strict policies	2	2.1
Flexible schedule	2	2.1
Higher tuition	1	1.1
Total comments	95	100.0

Table 10: What are the three things you liked most about AUA?	Frequency	Percent
<i>(Open-ended question; Responses recoded)</i>		
Quality of education/Western teaching style/Academic process	14	14.0
Relationship with faculty/Student-centered approach	13	13.0
Facilities/Resources/Library	10	10.0
Professors/Professionals/Experts in the field	9	9.0
AUA atmosphere and culture	7	7.0
Teamwork	7	7.0
My Department/School/Courses	7	7.0
Community/Friends	5	5.0
Paramaz Avedisian Building	5	5.0
Discipline/policies	5	5.0
Academic freedom/Ability to choose and criticize	3	3.0
Analytical thinking	3	3.0
Students attitude toward the study	3	3.0
New opportunities for jobs, conferences, etc.	2	2.0
English-speaking environment	2	2.0
Fairness/Honesty/Equity	1	1.0
Practicability of received knowledge	1	1.0
Financial programs	1	1.0
Security	1	1.0
Graduation Ceremony	1	1.0
Total comments	100	100.0

Table 11: What are the three most important things AUA could do to improve the quality of the graduate experience?

(Open-ended question; Responses recoded)

	Frequency	Percent
Improve the quality of instructors	18	24.0
Increase admission criteria	6	8.0
More practical emphasis on study	5	6.7
Improve computer resources	5	6.7
Improve grading system	5	6.7
Have student exchange program	4	5.3
More focus on research/more research facilities	4	5.3
Improve relationships between faculty, students and alumni	4	5.3
Focus on problem solving	3	4.0
Increase internships/workshops	2	2.7
Academic program and courses improvements	2	2.7
More effective management of classes	2	2.7
Increase the number of elective courses	2	2.7
Have sport and entertainment activities	2	2.7
More strict approach to students performance	2	2.7
Add English speaking classes	2	2.7
Respect and consider student opinion	1	1.3
Less e-learning	1	1.3
Add specializations in LLM	1	1.3
Improve the service of Room 19	1	1.3
Control over the syllabuses and materials instructors use	1	1.3
Add minor in business	1	1.3
No suggestions	1	1.3
Total comments	75	100.0

ATTITUDES ON STUDENT LEARNING

Table 12a: Which of the following WAS emphasized in your program?		
<i>(Multiple responses permitted)</i>		
	Frequency	Percent of total respondents (n=43)
Theoretical knowledge	29	67.4
Problem solving	28	65.1
Research	28	65.1
Connections between ideas and practices	25	58.1
Applied Research	10	23.3

Table 12b: Which of the following SHOULD BE more emphasized in your program?		
<i>(Multiple responses permitted)</i>		
	Frequency	Percent of total respondents (n=42)
Problem solving	23	54.8
Connections between ideas and practices	22	52.4
Applied Research	14	33.3
Research	12	28.6
Theoretical knowledge	10	23.8

Table 13: 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
LLM	<i>Was done</i>	10 (47.6%)	14 (66.7%)	15 (71.4%)	12 (57.1%)	3 (14.3%)	21
	<i>Should be more</i>	12 (57.1%)	5 (23.8%)	14 (66.7%)	4 (19.0%)	4 (19.0%)	
CIS	<i>Was done</i>	7 (53.8%)	8 (61.5%)	9 (69.2%)	9 (69.2%)	3 (23.1%)	13
	<i>Should be more</i>	7 (53.8%)	3 (23.1%)	6 (46.2%)	3 (23.1%)	5 (38.5%)	
MATEFL	<i>Was done</i>	8 (80.0%)	7 (70.0%)	4 (40.0%)	7 (70.0%)	4 (40.0%)	10
	<i>Should be more</i>	3 (30.0%)	2 (20.0%)	3 (30.0%)	5 (50.0%)	5 (50.0%)	

Table 14: 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
	LLM	CIS	MATEFL	
Applying theories or concepts to practical problems/situations	5.43	5.50	6.11	5.60
Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods	5.52	5.54	5.56	5.53
Analyzing cases or situations in-depth	5.62	5.00	5.11	5.33
Synthesizing ideas and/or information into new more complex interpretations and relationships	5.19	5.00	5.22	5.14
Memorizing facts and ideas from lectures and readings	5.43	5.00	2.33	4.64

Table 15: 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
Speaking skills	5.77
Ability to critically analyze ideas and information	5.70
Writing skills	5.66
Ability to plan and carry out projects independently	5.59
Ability to solve analytical problems	5.53
Ability to function as part of a team	5.41
Applying scientific methods of inquiry	5.28
Presenting papers at conferences/seminars	5.16
Ability to lead and guide others	4.88
Network with others in the field	4.76
Computer skills	4.44
Submitting papers for publication	4.07

SATISFACTION WITH DEGREE PROGRAM SERVICES

Table 16a: Student advising (e.g., guidance on academic requirements, thesis/essay)			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	6	13.6	13.6
Satisfied	26	59.1	72.7
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	8	18.2	90.9
Unsatisfied	4	9.1	100.0
Very unsatisfied	0	0.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0	
Mean= 2.23 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)			

Table 16b: Adequacy of support for research (e.g., research facilities such as labs and centers)			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	7	15.9	15.9
Satisfied	27	61.4	77.3
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	8	18.2	95.5
Unsatisfied	2	4.5	100.0
Very unsatisfied	0	0.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0	
Mean= 2.11 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)			

Table 16c: Opportunity for research experience or practical skills application			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	8	18.2	18.2
Satisfied	22	50.0	68.2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	11	25.0	93.2
Unsatisfied	3	6.8	100.0
Very unsatisfied	0	0.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0	
Mean= 2.20 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)			

Table 16d: Communications about academic policies and procedures

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	5	11.4	11.6	11.6
Satisfied	29	65.9	67.4	79.1
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	8	18.2	18.6	97.7
Unsatisfied	1	2.3	2.3	100.0
Very unsatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	1	2.3	100.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0		
Mean= 2.12 (<i>1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded</i>)				

Table 16e: Opportunities for formal student evaluations of instruction

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	5	11.4	11.6	11.6
Satisfied	26	59.1	60.5	72.1
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	9	20.5	20.9	93.0
Unsatisfied	3	6.8	7.0	100.0
Very unsatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	1	2.3	100.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0		
Mean= 2.23 (<i>1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded</i>)				

Table 16f: Staff support in the degree program

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	11	25.0	25.0
Satisfied	27	61.4	86.4
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	6	13.6	100.0
Unsatisfied	0	0.0	100.0
Very unsatisfied	0	0.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0	
Mean= 1.89 (<i>1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded</i>)			

SATISFACTION WITH UNIVERSITY SERVICES

Table 17a: Classroom facilities and equipment			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	27	61.4	61.4
Satisfied	17	38.6	100.0
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	0	0.0	
Unsatisfied	0	0.0	
Very unsatisfied	0	0.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0	
Mean= 1.39 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)			

Table 17b: Services provided by Student Academic Affairs office (Room 19)				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	18	40.9	41.9	41.9
Satisfied	22	50.0	51.2	93.0
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2	4.5	4.7	97.7
Unsatisfied	1	2.3	2.3	100.0
Very unsatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	1	2.3	100.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0		
Mean=1.67 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)				

Table 17c: Advising for students on policies and rights and responsibilities				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	4	9.1	9.5	9.5
Satisfied	23	52.3	54.8	64.3
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	13	29.5	31.0	95.2
Unsatisfied	2	4.5	4.8	100.0
Very unsatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	2	4.5	100.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0		
Mean= 2.31 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)				

Table 17d: Financial aid services; scholarships, loans, work study

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	9	20.5	22.5	22.5
Satisfied	15	34.1	37.5	60.0
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	12	27.3	30.0	90.0
Unsatisfied	4	9.1	10.0	100.0
Very unsatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	4	9.1	100.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0		
Mean=2.28 (<i>1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded</i>)				

Table 17e: Library resources in the field of study

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	12	27.3	27.9	27.9
Satisfied	24	54.5	55.8	83.7
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	6	13.6	14.0	97.7
Unsatisfied	1	2.3	2.3	100.0
Very unsatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	
Missing values	1	2.3	100.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0		
Mean= 1.91 (<i>1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded</i>)				

Table 17f: Computer resources

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	9	20.5	20.5
Satisfied	21	47.7	68.2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	12	27.3	95.5
Unsatisfied	2	4.5	100.0
Very unsatisfied	0	0.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0	
Mean= 2.16 (<i>1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded</i>)			

Table 17g: Food services				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	3	6.8	7.1	7.1
Satisfied	18	40.9	42.9	50.0
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	15	34.1	35.7	85.7
Unsatisfied	4	9.1	9.5	95.2
Very unsatisfied	2	4.5	4.8	100.0
Missing values	2	4.5	100.0	
TOTAL	44	100.0		
Mean=2.62 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)				

EMPLOYMENT PLANS

Table 18: What are your immediate employment plans?		
	Frequency	Percent
I am seeking employment	13	29.5
I am already employed in a position that I think is appropriate for my degree	11	25.0
I am already employed but not in a position that I think is appropriate for my degree	7	15.9
I will continue my graduate education	6	13.6
I am not seeking employment right now	3	6.8
I don't know yet	2	4.5
Other	2	4.5
TOTAL	44	100.0

Table 19: If you are seeking employment, which BEST describes your potential employer?		
	Frequency	Percent
Embassies and international organizations	5	11.4
Foreign-funded development projects and companies	4	9.1
Educational and research institutions	2	4.5
Businesses and enterprises	1	2.3
Don't know	1	2.3
TOTAL	13	100.0

Table 20: Have you ever used the services offered at the AUA Alumni and Career Development Office?			
	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent
Yes	13	29.5	32.5
No	27	61.4	67.5
Missing values	4	9.1	100.0
Total	44	100.0	

Table 20a: List of the services used and satisfaction level	
	Frequency
ACDO- Beeline, 3rd generation program	1
E-mails are very useful, lectures are well organized	1
Found emails useful	1
Helped us to write good resumes and cover letters	1
I have applied to several job positions that ACDO has suggested	1
I have received samples of CV and resume writings	1
I have the samples of resume and cover letter sent to me by ACDO and tried to use them. It was very useful for me	1
I receive e-mails from ACDO office and found them very useful, I am very satisfied	1
I think ACDO people are friendly and do their best for students	1
Some good scholarships and informative e-mails	1

CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Table 21: Have you ever participated in AUA Extension Program courses?			
	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent
Yes	10	22.7	23.3
No	33	75.0	76.7
Missing values	1	2.3	100.0
Total	44	100.0	

Table 21a: Courses taken at AUA Extension	
Name of the course	Number of responses
English courses	4
TOEFL Preparation course	2
Business communications, tourism translation	1
Microsoft access	1
Passage I	1

Table 22: Courses that AUA Extension can provide to support lifelong learning needs	
Name of the course	Number of responses
AJAX	2
WEB development	2
FLEX	1
JQuery	1
Java certification program	1
PHP	1
Programming courses	1
Advanced database courses	1
Course in contemporary technologies	1
English pronunciation	1
Speaking courses and writing courses	2
Leadership	1
Legal writing	2
TOEFL IBT	1

ADDENDUM A

2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010 EXIT SURVEY DATA: COMPARATIVE TABLES

Table A: Student opinions about their graduate programs			
	Year	Mean*	Combined Percentage Strongly Agree and Agree
The sequence of courses was appropriate.	2006	2.31	73.6
	2007	2.32	73.0
	2008	2.21	71.3
	2009	2.38	66.3
	2010	2.23	72.7
Academic policies and procedures were communicated adequately.	2006	2.30	70.6
	2007	2.37	64.3
	2008	2.11	73.8
	2009	2.08	79.8
	2010	2.18	75.0
Information about degree requirements was communicated adequately.	2006	2.13	74.8
	2007	2.12	79.7
	2008	2.03	75.5
	2009	2.02	83.5
	2010	2.05	81.0
There was good communication between faculty and students regarding student needs, concerns, and suggestions.	2006	2.17	70.9
	2007	2.33	63.6
	2008	2.04	76.9
	2009	1.92	80.8
	2010	2.02	75.0
Interactions among students and faculty were characterized by mutual respect.	2006	1.83	88.0
	2007	2.01	79.1
	2008	1.71	91.7
	2009	1.66	91.9
	2010	1.84	88.6
On the whole, faculty members were well qualified to teach their courses.	2006	2.17	69.7
	2007	2.36	63.8
	2008	2.18	72.0
	2009	2.15	74.0
	2010	2.23	67.4
There were many opportunities outside the classroom for interaction between students and faculty.	2006	2.44	57.7
	2007	2.30	63.6
	2008	1.97	77.8
	2009	2.03	77.6
	2010	2.30	61.4

In general, faculty members prepared carefully for their courses	2006	2.06	78.7
	2007	2.18	75.2
	2008	1.91	85.2
	2009	2.03	77.8
	2010	2.09	72.1
Overall, faculty in my department were interested in the professional development of students.	2006	2.25	68.2
	2007	2.09	72.9
	2008	1.87	83.3
	2009	1.92	79.8
	2010	1.93	79.5
In general, the courses I took were well taught.	2006	2.20	72.7
	2007	2.24	73.6
	2008	2.09	76.9
	2009	2.10	75.8
	2010	2.07	75.0
The courses I took were valuable for my future career.	2006	1.97	78.2
	2007	2.02	79.1
	2008	1.95	83.3
	2009	1.86	87.8
	2010	1.91	77.3
My program was intellectually challenging and stimulating.	2006	1.90	85.5
	2007	1.99	79.8
	2008	1.97	82.4
	2009	1.88	85.7
	2010	1.95	86.4
My graduate school experiences were relevant to my career goals.	2006	2.05	76.6
	2007	2.00	73.4
	2008	2.00	81.3
	2009	1.88	85.7
	2010	2.02	81.8
I would recommend my graduate program to prospective students.	2006	2.01	77.3
	2007	2.07	76.0
	2008	1.84	84.1
	2009	1.83	83.8
	2010	1.93	77.3
If I had the opportunity to make the choice again, I would enroll in this program again.	2006	2.33	62.7
	2007	2.47	55.0
	2008	2.15	69.4
	2009	2.07	73.7
	2010	2.30	65.1
I believe that my program provided me with the skills needed in my field.	2006	1.94	84.5
	2007	2.05	79.1
	2008	1.96	79.4
	2009	1.77	89.9
	2010	1.95	79.5

I believe that the AUA grading system is fair.	2006	2.48	59.5
	2007	2.55	55.5
	2008	1.96	79.4
	2009	1.94	79.6
	2010	2.41	65.9
<i>(1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded)</i>			

Table B: Overall and in general, how would you rate your experience in your program?		
Year	Mean*	Combined Percentage Excellent and Very Good
2006	2.13	71.2
2007	2.21	64.3
2008	1.93	83.0
2009	2.00	81.0
2010	2.19	69.8
<i>(1=excellent and 4 unsatisfactory; missing values excluded)</i>		

Table C: Which of the following WAS emphasized in your program? <i>(Multiple responses permitted)</i>			
	Year	Frequency	Percent of total respondents
Connections between ideas and practices	2006	64	57.7
	2007	75	58.1
	2008	74	68.5
	2009	69	69.0
	2010	25	58.1
Theoretical knowledge	2006	77	69.4
	2007	85	69.9
	2008	72	66.7
	2009	60	60.0
	2010	29	67.4
Problem solving	2006	78	70.3
	2007	95	73.6
	2008	88	81.5
	2009	68	68.0
	2010	28	65.1
Research	2006	76	68.5
	2007	82	63.6
	2008	69	63.9
	2009	58	58.0
	2010	28	65.1

Applied Research	2006	37	33.3
	2007	49	37.9
	2008	32	29.6
	2009	26	26.0
	2010	10	23.3

Table D: Which of the following SHOULD BE more emphasized in your program?
(Multiple responses permitted)

	Year	Frequency	Percent of total respondents
Connections between ideas and practices	2006	70	63.1
	2007	80	62.1
	2008	59	54.6
	2009	51	51.0
	2010	22	52.4
Theoretical knowledge	2006	27	56.8
	2007	21	18.3
	2008	17	15.7
	2009	25	25.0
	2010	10	23.8
Problem solving	2006	57	51.4
	2007	70	54.3
	2008	49	45.4
	2009	48	48.0
	2010	23	54.8
Research	2006	37	33.3
	2007	40	31.0
	2008	44	40.7
	2009	37	37.0
	2010	12	28.6
Applied Research	2006	58	52.3
	2007	62	48.9
	2008	57	52.8
	2009	40	40.0
	2010	14	33.3

Table E: Means of how often students used the following activities during coursework

	Year	Mean*
Memorizing facts and ideas from lectures and readings	2006	4.26
	2007	4.48
	2008	4.42
	2009	4.19
	2010	4.64
Analyzing cases or situations in-depth	2006	5.42
	2007	5.45
	2008	5.75
	2009	5.39
	2010	5.33
Synthesizing ideas and/or information into new more complex interpretations and relationships	2006	4.72
	2007	5.14
	2008	5.30
	2009	5.00
	2010	5.14
Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods	2006	5.24
	2007	5.14
	2008	5.65
	2009	5.17
	2010	5.53
Applying theories or concepts to practical problems/situations	2006	5.34
	2007	5.33
	2008	5.51
	2009	5.47
	2010	5.60
<i>(1=never and 7=always; missing values excluded)</i>		

Table F: Satisfaction with Support in the Degree Program

	Year	Mean*	Combined Percentage Very Satisfied and Satisfied
Student advising (e.g., guidance on academic requirements, thesis/essay)	2006	2.12	72.1
	2007	2.14	76.6
	2008	1.88	89.4
	2009	1.88	88.8
	2010	2.23	72.7
Adequacy of support for research (e.g., research facilities such as labs and centers)	2006	2.77	50.5
	2007	2.56	55.6
	2008	2.08	75.0
	2009	2.08	75.8
	2010	2.11	77.3
Opportunity for research experience or practical skills application	2006	2.72	46.8
	2007	2.60	53.2
	2008	2.24	65.0
	2009	2.50	52.1
	2010	2.20	68.2
Communications about academic policies and procedures	2006	2.41	58.7
	2007	2.58	55.2
	2008	2.27	64.7
	2009	2.23	63.4
	2010	2.12	79.1
Opportunities for formal student evaluations of instruction	2006	2.29	68.5
	2007	2.32	68.3
	2008	2.04	79.4
	2009	2.06	78.7
	2010	2.23	72.1
Support of staff in the degree program	2006	2.05	79.1
	2007	2.03	80.0
	2008	1.84	90.3
	2009	1.82	90.4
	2010	1.89	86.4

(1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)

Table G: Satisfaction with University Services

	Year	Mean*	Combined Percentage Very Satisfied and Satisfied
Classroom facilities and equipment	2006	2.23	71.2
	2007	2.25	73.0
	2008	2.28	68.6
	2009	1.60	94.9
	2010	1.39	100.0
Computer resources	2006	2.93	44.1
	2007	2.72	52.8
	2008	2.12	79.8
	2009	1.98	77.8
	2010	2.16	68.2
Library resources in your field of study	2006	2.63	53.6
	2007	2.22	74.0
	2008	1.94	82.7
	2009	1.83	88.9
	2010	1.91	83.7
Services provided by Room 19 – Student Academic Affairs	2006	2.18	68.5
	2007	2.15	74.0
	2008	2.05	79.0
	2009	2.09	73.7
	2010	1.67	93.0
Financial aid services – scholarships, loans, work study	2006	2.40	57.3
	2007	2.20	65.1
	2008	1.95	72.8
	2009	2.00	70.4
	2010	2.28	60.0
Career advising and planning <i>(replaced in 2009 with separate measures, see Table 16 in this report)</i>	2006	2.87	37.6
	2007	2.69	43.7
	2008	2.50	49.5
	2009	-	-
Food services	2006	2.79	48.6
	2007	2.81	38.1
	2008	2.43	60.6
	2009	2.00	54.1
	2010	2.62	50.0
Advising for students on policies and rights and responsibilities	2006	2.50	50.5
	2007	2.52	53.2
	2008	2.36	61.0
	2009	2.20	67.7
	2010	2.31	64.3

(1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)

Table H: Means of how much graduate education at AUA contributed to development in the following areas:

	Year	Mean*
Writing skills	2006	5.82
	2007	5.62
	2008	5.84
	2009	5.53
	2010	5.66
Ability to critically analyze ideas and information	2006	5.77
	2007	5.78
	2008	6.07
	2009	5.67
	2010	5.70
Ability to plan and carry out projects independently	2006	5.62
	2007	5.66
	2008	6.17
	2009	5.86
	2010	5.59
Ability to solve analytical problems	2006	5.60
	2007	5.65
	2008	6.09
	2009	5.59
	2010	5.53
Ability to function as part of a team	2006	5.44
	2007	5.50
	2008	6.11
	2009	6.11
	2010	5.41
Presenting papers at conferences/seminars	2006	5.39
	2007	5.55
	2008	6.16
	2009	5.92
	2010	5.16
Speaking skills	2006	5.34
	2007	5.17
	2008	5.72
	2009	5.41
	2010	5.77
Applying scientific methods of inquiry	2006	5.31
	2007	5.36
	2008	5.63
	2009	5.31
	2010	5.28

Computer skills	2006	5.05
	2007	5.32
	2008	5.10
	2009	5.01
	2010	4.44
Ability to lead and guide others	2006	4.97
	2007	5.19
	2008	5.63
	2009	5.41
	2010	4.88
Network with others in the field	2006	4.28
	2007	4.73
	2008	5.32
	2009	5.29
	2010	4.76
Submitting papers for publication	2006	4.05
	2007	4.43
	2008	4.77
	2009	4.64
	2010	4.07
<i>(1=no contribution and 7=very significant contribution; missing values are excluded)</i>		

Table J: What are your immediate employment plans?

	Year	Frequency	Percent
I am seeking employment	2006	45	40.5
	2007	46	35.9
	2008	38	35.2
	2009	32	32.0
	2010	13	29.5
I am already employed but not in a position that I think is appropriate for my degree	2006	25	22.5
	2007	33	25.8
	2008	28	25.9
	2009	26	26.0
	2010	7	15.9
I am already employed in a position that I think is appropriate for my degree	2006	22	19.8
	2007	39	30.5
	2008	24	22.2
	2009	23	23.0
	2010	11	25.0
I will continue my graduate education	2006	10	9.0
	2007	4	3.1
	2008	6	5.6
	2009	4	4.0
	2010	6	13.6
I am not seeking employment right now	2006	4	3.6
	2007	2	1.6
	2008	7	6.5
	2009	4	4.0
	2010	3	6.8
I don't know yet	2006	4	3.6
	2007	1	0.8
	2008	4	3.7
	2009	7	7.0
	2010	2	4.5
Other	2006	1	0.9
	2007	3	2.3
	2008	1	0.9
	2009	4	4.0
	2010	2	4.5