

**American University of Armenia**

**Graduate Student Exit Survey**

**2011**



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

E-mail: [abezhanyan@aua.am](mailto:abezhanyan@aua.am)  
Tel.: 0037410 51 25 16

October 18, 2011

## Introduction

During May-June 2011, 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 gather information from students on the level of student satisfaction with AUA graduate programs and to identify areas of possible improvement.

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 data from five years of Exit Surveys, 2006 through 2011.

## Methodology

### *Instrument Design and Timeline*

The instrument includes questions on academic program and curriculum evaluation, educational experiences, and general satisfaction with academic programs and University services. Demographic questions were asked for purposes of analysis. 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 23, 2010, and survey responses were collected through June 14, 2011.

### *Sample, Response Rate, Procedures*

The 2011 Graduate Student Exit Survey questionnaire was sent to 212 second-year students. The survey population included 35 students from the College of Engineering (CoE), 28 students from the Department of English Programs (DEP), 65 students from the School of Business and Management (SBM), 31 students from the School of Political Science and International Affairs (PSIA), 23 students from the College of Health Sciences (CHS) and 30 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 189 of 212 second year students participated in the survey, which denotes a response rate of 89.1 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 RATE AND BACKGROUND PROFILES**

<b>Table 1a: Distribution of respondents by degree</b>		
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Master of Industrial Engineering and Systems Management (MIESM)	24	12.7
Master of Business Administration (MBA)	48	25.4
Master of Political Science and International Affairs (MPS)	31	16.4
Master of Laws (LL.M.)	30	15.9
Master of Science in Computer and Information Science (MS CIS)	11	5.8
Master in Teaching English as Foreign Language (MA TEFL)	22	11.6
Master of Public Health (MPH)	23	12.2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>

<b>Table 1b: Response rate by academic program</b>			
	<b>Total # of students</b>	<b>Number of respondents</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Master of Industrial Engineering and Systems Management (MIESM)	24	24	100
Master of Business Administration (MBA)	65	48	74
Master of Political Science and International Affairs (MPS)	31	31	100
Master of Laws (LL.M.)	30	30	100
Master of Science in Computer and Information Science (MS CIS)	11	11	100
Master in Teaching English as Foreign Language (MA TEFL)	28	22	79
Master of Public Health (MPH)	23	23	100
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>89.1</b>

<b>Table 2: Distribution by gender</b>			
	<b>Number of students</b>	<b>Response rate frequency</b>	<b>Response rate percent</b>
Female	163	139	85.3
Male	49	46	93.9
Missing values		4	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>189</b>	

<b>Table 3: What was your employment status during most of your graduate education?</b>				
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Full time job	47	24.9	25.0	25.0
Part time job	30	15.9	16.0	41.0
Worked occasionally	45	23.8	23.9	64.9
Did not work	66	34.9	35.1	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	1	0.5	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		

<b>Table 4: Do you or your family own a personal desktop or notebook computer that you use for AUA work?</b>			
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Yes	165	87.3	89.2
No	20	10.6	10.8
Missing values	4	2.1	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

**Table 5: Where did you learn English before being admitted to AUA?**  
*(Multiple responses permitted)*

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (out of 189)</b>
School	110	59.5
University	105	56.8
Private tutoring	94	50.8
AUA Extension Program	28	15.1
AUA Department of English Programs	4	2.1
Studied myself	4	4.9
Other	22	11.9

**Table 6: Which choice was AUA?**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
First choice	164	86.8	87.7	87.7
Second choice	21	11.1	11.2	98.9
Third choice or lower	2	1.1	1.1	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	2	1.1	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		

**SATISFACTION WITH THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM**

<b>Table 7: Overall and in general, how would you rate your experience in your program?</b>				
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Excellent	48	25.4	25.4	25.4
Very Good	106	56.1	56.1	81.5
Satisfactory	32	16.9	16.9	98.4
Unsatisfactory	2	1.1	1.1	99.5
Very poor	1	0.5	0.5	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	0	0	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		
Mean= 1.95 ( <i>1=excellent and 5=very poor; missing values excluded</i> )				

<b>Table 8a: The sequence of courses was appropriate.</b>				
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Strongly agree	28	14.8	15.1	15.1
Agree	106	56.1	57.0	72.0
Neither agree nor disagree	21	11.1	11.3	83.3
Disagree	22	11.6	11.8	95.2
Strongly disagree	9	4.8	4.8	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	3	1.6	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		
Mean=2.34 ( <i>1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree</i> )				

<b>Table 8b: Academic policies and procedures were communicated adequately.</b>				
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Strongly agree	35	18.5	18.9	18.9
Agree	122	64.6	65.9	84.9
Neither agree nor disagree	20	10.6	10.8	95.7
Disagree	6	3.2	3.2	98.9
Strongly disagree	2	1.1	1.1	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	4	2.1	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		
Mean=2.02 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)				

<b>Table 8c: Information about degree requirements was communicated adequately.</b>				
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Strongly agree	45	23.8	24.9	24.9
Agree	113	59.8	62.4	87.3
Neither agree nor disagree	18	9.5	9.9	97.2
Disagree	3	1.6	1.7	98.9
Strongly disagree	2	1.1	1.1	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	8	4.2	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		
Mean=1.92 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded)				

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

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Strongly agree	43	22.8	23.1	23.1
Agree	107	56.6	57.5	80.6
Neither agree nor disagree	29	15.3	15.6	96.2
Disagree	4	2.1	2.2	98.4
Strongly disagree	3	1.6	1.6	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	3	1.6	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		

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

**Table 8e: In general, faculty members prepared carefully for their courses.**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Strongly agree	44	23.3	23.8	23.8
Agree	112	59.3	60.5	84.3
Neither agree nor disagree	20	10.6	10.8	95.1
Disagree	9	4.8	4.9	<b>100.0</b>
Strongly disagree	0	0	0	
Missing values	4	2.1	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		

Mean=1.97 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded)



<b>Table 8f: In general, the courses I took were well taught.</b>				
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Strongly agree	32	16.9	17.1	17.1
Agree	116	61.4	62	79.1
Neither agree nor disagree	29	15.3	15.5	94.7
Disagree	7	3.7	3.7	98.4
Strongly disagree	3	1.6	1.6	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	2	1.1	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		
Mean=2.11 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)				

<b>Table 8g: There was good communication between faculty and students regarding student needs, concerns, and suggestions.</b>				
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Strongly agree	70	37.0	37.6	37.6
Agree	70	37.0	37.6	75.3
Neither agree nor disagree	32	16.9	17.2	92.5
Disagree	11	5.8	5.9	98.4
Strongly disagree	3	1.6	1.6	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	<b>3</b>	1.6	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		
Mean=1.96 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)				

**Table 8h: Interactions among students and faculty were characterized by mutual respect.**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Strongly agree	81	42.9	43.3	43.3
Agree	89	47.1	47.6	90.9
Neither agree nor disagree	13	6.9	7.0	97.9
Disagree	3	1.6	1.6	<b>100.0</b>
Strongly disagree	1	0.5	0.5	
Missing values	2	1.1	<b>100</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		
Mean=1.68 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)				

**Table 8i: Overall, faculty in my department were interested in the professional development of students.**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Strongly agree	52	27.5	27.8	27.8
Agree	99	52.4	52.9	80.7
Neither agree nor disagree	27	14.3	14.4	95.2
Disagree	8	4.2	4.3	99.5
Strongly disagree	1	.5	.5	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	2	1.1	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		
Mean=1.97 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)				

**Table 8j: There were many opportunities outside the classroom for interaction between students and faculty.**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Strongly agree	38	20.1	20.3	20.3
Agree	90	47.6	48.1	68.4
Neither agree nor disagree	38	20.1	20.3	88.8
Disagree	17	9.0	9.1	97.9
Strongly disagree	4	2.1	2.1	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	2	1.1	<b>100</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		

Mean= 2.25 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)

**Table 8k: The courses I took were valuable for my future career.**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Strongly agree	62	32.8	33.2	33.2
Agree	98	51.9	52.4	85.6
Neither agree nor disagree	24	12.7	12.8	98.4
Disagree	3	1.6	1.6	<b>100.0</b>
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	<b>100</b>	
Missing values	2	1.1		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		

Mean= 1.83 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)

**Table 8l: I believe that my program provided me with the skills needed in my field.**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Strongly agree	66	34.9	35.5	35.5
Agree	89	47.1	47.8	83.3
Neither agree nor disagree	28	14.8	15.1	98.4
Disagree	3	1.6	1.6	<b>100.0</b>
Strongly disagree	3	1.6	<b>100.0</b>	
Missing values	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		

Mean=1.83 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)

**Table 8m: My graduate school experiences were relevant to my career goals.**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Strongly agree	55	29.1	29.6	29.6
Agree	102	54.0	54.8	84.4
Neither agree nor disagree	25	13.2	13.4	97.8
Disagree	3	1.6	1.6	99.5
Strongly disagree	1	.5	.5	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	3	1.6	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		

Mean=1.89 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)

**Table 8n: My program was intellectually challenging and stimulating.**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Strongly agree	62	32.8	33.5	33.5
Agree	97	51.3	52.4	85.9
Neither agree nor disagree	23	12.2	12.4	98.4
Disagree	3	1.6	1.6	<b>100.0</b>
Strongly disagree	0	0.0	<b>100</b>	
Missing values	4	2.1		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		

Mean=1.82 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)

**Table 8o: I would recommend my graduate program to prospective students.**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Strongly agree	74	39.2	39.6	39.6
Agree	87	46.0	46.5	86.1
Neither agree nor disagree	18	9.5	9.6	95.7
Disagree	6	3.2	3.2	98.9
Strongly disagree	2	1.1	1.1	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	2	1.1	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		

Mean=1.80 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)

<b>Table 8p: If I had the opportunity to make the choice again, I would enroll in this program again.</b>				
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Strongly agree	74	39.2	39.6	39.6
Agree	63	33.3	33.7	73.3
Neither agree nor disagree	36	19	19.3	92.5
Disagree	7	3.7	3.7	96.3
Strongly disagree	7	3.7	3.7	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	2	1.1	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		
Mean=1.98 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded)				

<b>Table 8q: I believe that the AUA grading system is fair.<sup>1</sup></b>				
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Strongly agree	53	28.0	28.5	28.5
Agree	84	44.4	45.2	73.7
Neither agree nor disagree	37	19.6	19.9	93.5
Disagree	9	4.8	4.8	98.4
Strongly disagree	3	1.6	1.6	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	3	1.6	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		
Mean=2.06 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)				

<sup>1</sup> Measure added in 2011.

**Table 8r: I believe that the grading system of my academic program is fair.**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Strongly agree	44	23.3	23.5	23.5
Agree	96	50.8	51.3	74.9
Neither agree nor disagree	38	20.1	20.3	95.2
Disagree	6	3.2	3.2	98.4
Strongly disagree	3	1.6	1.6	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	2	1.1	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		

Mean=1.45 (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)

<b>Table 9: What are the three most important differences between AUA and other universities and colleges?</b> <i>(Open-ended question; Responses recoded)</i>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Western style of education and teaching style	50	12.35
Given knowledge/skills and its applications in practice	51	12.59
Higher level of education	47	11.60
Professionalism of faculty	42	10.37
AUA atmosphere and culture	39	9.63
Fair grading system/Fairness/Equity	30	7.41
Resources (access to Internet, e-mail, student server, new technologies, library)	25	6.17
Leadership and organizational management (staff, curriculum, policies, schedule)	23	5.68
Communication and interaction between faculty and students	19	4.69
English-speaking environment	17	4.20
Students' attitude toward study	13	3.21
Corruption-free environment	12	2.96
Foreign faculty members	10	2.47
Career development opportunities (research, jobs, etc.)	8	1.98
Encouragement of team work and individual learning	7	1.73
Student-centered approach to learning	6	1.48
Financial aid services	4	0.99
Higher tuition	2	0.49
<b>Total comments</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>100.0</b>



<b>Table 10: What are the three things you liked most about AUA?</b> <i>(Open-ended question; Responses recoded)</i>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Quality of education/Western teaching style/Academic processes	54	12.68
Facilities/Resources/Library	49	11.5
Professors/Professionals/Experts in the field	48	11.27
Teaching methodology and interesting assignments	34	7.98
Relationship with faculty/Student-centered approach	30	7.04
AUA atmosphere and culture	30	7.04
My Department/School/Courses	29	6.82
Organizational management (staff, discipline/policies, schedules)	21	4.94
Community/Friends/Student life	20	4.7
AUA Building	17	3.99
Analytical thinking/problem solving	17	3.99
Fairness/Honesty/Equity	16	3.76
Career development opportunities (jobs, research, conferences, internships, networks, etc.)	13	3.05
Teamwork	11	2.58
Academic freedom/independence/values	10	2.35
Practicability of received knowledge	7	1.64
Financial aid programs	6	1.41
English-speaking environment	5	1.17
Foreign lecturers	5	1.17
Students' attitude toward the study	1	0.23
Power	1	0.23
Security	1	0.23
Graduation Ceremony	1	0.23
<b>Total comments</b>	<b>426</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**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)*

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Improve the quality of instructors	48	14.91
More practical emphasis on study	31	9.63
Attract more foreign professors	25	7.76
Provide more opportunities for internships, workshops, conferences, summer school, study tours, extracurricular activities	23	7.14
Academic program and courses improvements	21	6.83
More effective class management	16	4.97
Respect and consider students' opinions/Student Council	15	4.66
Improve facilities (computer service, library, air conditioning, vending machines, cleaning)	14	4.35
Improve grading and student performance evaluation system	14	4.35
Improve relationships between faculty, students and alumni	10	3.11
Add Armenia-related assignments and courses (legal, business)	10	3.11
Increase standards for admission	8	2.48
Support with job placement and post-graduation career development	8	2.48
Increase the number of elective courses	8	2.48
Provide sport and entertainment activities	7	2.17
Availability of more scholarships	7	2.17
Have exchange programs with universities abroad	6	1.87
Improve the overall quality of education	6	1.87
Improve the communication system (interdepartmental, between the staff/faculty and students)	6	1.87
Offer narrow specializations	5	1.55
Improve services in cafeteria (food, prices)	5	1.55
More focus on research/more research facilities	4	1.24

Improve the service in Room 19 (Student Academic Affairs Office)	4	1.24
Add PhD component	3	0.93
Focus on problem solving	3	0.93
Add English speaking classes	2	0.62
Improve the teaching materials	2	0.62
Offer on-line registration possibility	2	0.62
Add computer program courses (SPSS)	2	0.62
Increase the overall student body	2	0.62
Improve theoretical section	2	0.62
Decrease the number of students per class	1	0.31
Change the name of Industrial Engineering (the name is frightening people, rename it in order to be attractive)	1	0.31
Improve AUA website	1	0.31
<b>Total comments</b>	<b>322</b>	<b>100.0</b>

## ATTITUDES ON STUDENT LEARNING

<b>Table 12a: Which of the following WAS emphasized in your program?</b> <i>(Multiple responses permitted)</i>		
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent of total respondents (n=189)</b>
Problem solving	139	73.5
Research	130	68.8
Connections between ideas and practices	127	67.2
Theoretical knowledge	119	63.0
Applied Research	68	36
Other	6	3.2

<b>Table 12b: Which of the following SHOULD BE more emphasized in your program?</b> <i>(Multiple responses permitted)</i>		
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent of total respondents (n=184)</b>
Connections between ideas and practices	106	57.6
Theoretical knowledge	42	22.8
Problem solving	82	43.4
Research	62	32.8
Applied Research	89	47.1
Other	11	5.8

**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
MIESM	<i>Was done</i>	13 (54%)	15 (62.5%)	21 (87.5%)	9 (37.5%)	10 (41.67%)	24
	<i>Should be more</i>	12 (50%)	6 (25%)	9 (37.5%)	8 (33.3%)	13 (54.17%)	
MBA	<i>Was done</i>	34 (70.83%)	26 (54.17%)	36 (75%)	32 (66.67%)	15 (31.25%)	48
	<i>Should be more</i>	31 (64.58)	5 (10.42)	18 (37.5%)	13 (27.08%)	20 (41.67%)	
MPS	<i>Was done</i>	22 (70.97%)	26 (83.87%)	22 (70.97%)	27 (87.1%)	9 (29.03%)	31
	<i>Should be more</i>	19 (61.29%)	14 (45.16%)	20 (64.52%)	13 (41.94%)	13 (41.94%)	
LL.M.	<i>Was done</i>	17 (56.67%)	18 (60%)	24 (80%)	25 (83.33%)	7 (23.33%)	30
	<i>Should be more</i>	19 (63.33%)	9 (30%)	14 (46.67%)	6 (20%)	15 (50%)	
MS CIS	<i>Was done</i>	8 (72.73%)	3 (27.27%)	8 (72.73%)	5 (45.45%)	3 (27.27%)	11
	<i>Should be more</i>	3 (27.27%)	4 (36.36%)	1 (9.09)	3 (27.27%)	6 (54.55%)	
MA TEFL	<i>Was done</i>	20 (90.91%)	17 (77.27%)	14 (63.64%)	16 (72.73%)	15 (68.18%)	22
	<i>Should be more</i>	9 (40.91%)	3 (13.64%)	12 (54.55%)	11 (50%)	12 (54.55%)	
MPH	<i>Was done</i>	13 (56.52%)	14 (60.87%)	14 (60.87%)	16 (69.57%)	9 (39.13)	23
	<i>Should be more</i>	13 (56.52%)	1 (4.35%)	8 (34.78%)	8 (34.78%)	10 (43.48%)	

**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
	MIESM	MBA	MPS	LL.M.	MS CIS	MA TEFL	MPH	
Applying theories or concepts to practical problems/situations	5.21	5.60	6.03	5.31	5.45	5.59	5.26	5.53
Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods	5.29	5.38	6.06	5.55	5.45	5.73	5.43	5.56
Analyzing cases or situations in-depth	4.88	6.00	5.97	5.66	5.36	5.50	5.00	5.58
Synthesizing ideas and/or information into new more complex interpretations and relationships	4.75	5.27	5.65	5.17	5.27	5.81	5.22	5.30
Memorizing facts and ideas from lectures and readings	4.54	4.38	5.19	5.41	4.70	3.86	4.96	4.72

**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)*

	<b>Mean</b>
Making presentations to forums typical of your field of study <sup>2</sup>	5.99
Ability to function as part of a team	5.89
Ability to plan and carry out projects independently	5.86
Ability to critically analyze ideas and information	5.72
Ability to solve analytical problems	5.68
Presenting papers at conferences/seminars	5.58
Writing skills	5.50
Speaking skills	5.49
Network with others in the field	5.48
English Writing skills <sup>3</sup>	5.45
English Speaking skills <sup>4</sup>	5.41
Ability to lead and guide others	5.36
Applying scientific methods of inquiry	5.32
Computer skills	4.83
Submitting papers for publication	4.59

---

<sup>2</sup> Measure added in 2011.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

**SATISFACTION WITH DEGREE PROGRAM SERVICES**

<b>Table 16a: Student advising (e.g. guidance on academic requirements, thesis/essay)</b>				
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Very satisfied	53	28.0	28.5	28.5
Satisfied	111	58.7	59.7	88.2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	16	8.5	8.6	96.8
Unsatisfied	5	2.6	2.7	99.5
Very unsatisfied	1	0.5	0.5	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	3	1.6	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		
Mean= 1.87 ( <i>1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded</i> )				

<b>Table 16b: Adequacy of support for research (e.g. research facilities such as labs and centers)</b>				
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Very satisfied	52	27.5	28.3	28.3
Satisfied	100	52.9	54.3	82.6
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	25	13.2	13.6	96.2
Unsatisfied	4	2.1	2.2	98.4
Very unsatisfied	3	1.6	1.6	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	5	2.6	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		
Mean= 1.95 ( <i>1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded</i> )				



**Table 16c: Opportunity for research experience or practical skills application**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Very satisfied	37	19.6	20.3	20.3
Satisfied	103	54.5	56.6	76.9
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	32	16.9	17.6	94.5
Unsatisfied	7	3.7	3.8	<b>98.4</b>
Very unsatisfied	3	1.6	1.6	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	7	3.7	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		
Mean= 2.10 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)				

**Table 16d: Communication about academic policies and procedures**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Very satisfied	38	20.1	21.1	21.1
Satisfied	89	47.1	49.4	70.6
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	45	23.8	25.0	95.6
Unsatisfied	6	3.2	3.3	98.9
Very unsatisfied	2	1.1	1.1	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	9	4.8	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		
Mean= 2.14 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)				

<b>Table 16e: Opportunities for formal student evaluation of instruction</b>				
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Very satisfied	48	25.4	26.2	26.2
Satisfied	98	51.9	53.6	79.8
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	30	15.9	16.4	96.2
Unsatisfied	6	3.2	3.3	99.5
Very unsatisfied	1	.5	.5	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	6	3.2	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		
Mean= 1.98 ( <i>1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded</i> )				

<b>Table 16f: Staff support in the degree program</b>				
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Very satisfied	58	30.7	31.7	31.7
Satisfied	108	57.1	59.0	90.7
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	14	7.4	7.7	98.4
Unsatisfied	2	1.1	1.1	99.5
Very unsatisfied	1	.5	.5	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	6	3.2	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		
Mean= 1.80 ( <i>1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded</i> )				

## SATISFACTION WITH UNIVERSITY SERVICES

<b>Table 17a: Classroom facilities and equipment</b>			
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Very satisfied	139	73.5	73.5
Satisfied	45	23.8	97.4
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2	1.1	98.4
Unsatisfied	1	0.5	98.9
Very unsatisfied	2	1.1	<b>100.0</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
Mean= 1.32 ( <i>1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded</i> )			

<b>Table 17b: Services provided by Student Academic Affairs Office (Room 19)</b>			
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Very satisfied	90	47.6	47.6
Satisfied	62	32.8	80.4
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	21	11.1	91.5
Unsatisfied	10	5.3	<b>96.8</b>
Very unsatisfied	6	3.2	<b>100.0</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
Mean= 1.84 ( <i>1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded</i> )			

**Table 17c: Financial aid services e.g. scholarships, loans, work study**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Very satisfied	81	42.9	44.0	44.0
Satisfied	48	25.4	26.1	70.1
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	40	21.2	21.7	91.8
Unsatisfied	11	5.8	6.0	97.8
Very unsatisfied	4	2.1	2.2	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	5	2.6	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		
Mean= 1.96 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)				

**Table 17d: Advising for students on policies and rights and responsibilities**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Very satisfied	47	24.9	24.9
Satisfied	80	42.3	67.2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	52	27.5	94.7
Unsatisfied	6	3.2	97.9
Very unsatisfied	4	2.1	<b>100.0</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
Mean= 2.15 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)			

<b>Table 17e: Library resources in the field of study</b>				
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Very satisfied	93	49.2	49.5	49.5
Satisfied	71	37.6	37.8	87.2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	21	11.1	11.2	98.4
Unsatisfied	2	1.1	1.1	99.5
Very unsatisfied	1	.5	.5	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	1	.5	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		
Mean= 1.65 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)				

<b>Table 17f: Computer resources</b>			
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Very satisfied	90	47.6	47.6
Satisfied	72	38.1	85.7
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	21	11.1	96.8
Unsatisfied	5	2.6	99.5
Very unsatisfied	1	.5	<b>100.0</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
Mean= 1.70 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)			

<b>Table 17g: Food services</b>				
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Very satisfied	36	19	19.3	19.3
Satisfied	77	40.7	41.2	60.4
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	51	27.0	27.3	87.7
Unsatisfied	18	9.5	9.6	97.3
Very unsatisfied	5	2.6	2.7	<b>100.0</b>
Missing values	2	1.1	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>		
Mean=2.35 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)				

<b>Table 17h: Career advising and planning</b>			
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Very satisfied	33	17.5	17.5
Satisfied	69	36.5	54.0
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	71	37.6	91.5
Unsatisfied	12	6.3	97.9
Very unsatisfied	4	2.1	<b>100.0</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
Mean=2.39 (1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)			

## EMPLOYMENT PLANS

<b>Table 18: What are your immediate employment plans?</b>		
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
I am seeking employment	66	34.9
I am already employed in a position that I think is appropriate for my degree	33	17.5
I am already employed but not in a position that I think is appropriate for my degree	55	29.1
I will continue my graduate education	11	5.8
I am not seeking employment right now	10	5.3
I don't know yet	7	3.7
Other	6	3.2
Missing values	1	.5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>

<b>Table 19: If you are seeking employment, which BEST describes your potential employer?</b>			
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Embassies and international organizations	48	25.4	29.1
Foreign-funded development projects and companies	51	27.0	30.9
Educational and research institutions	10	5.3	6.1
Businesses and enterprises	35	18.5	21.2
Armenian government and agencies	8	4.2	4.8
Armenian non-governmental organizations	4	2.1	2.4
Other	2	1.1	1.2
Don't know	2	1.1	1.2
Not applicable	5	2.6	3.0
Missing values	24	12.7	<b>100.0</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

<b>Table 20: Have you ever used the services offered at the AUA Alumni and Career Development Office?</b>			
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid percent</b>
Yes	81	42.9	44.0
No	103	54.5	56.0
Missing values	5	2.6	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

<b>Table 20a: List of the services used</b>	
	<b>Frequency</b>
Announcements on vacancies, internships, lectures, trainings, conferences, summer schools	62
Participation in resume writing workshops, consultation on resume and cover letter writing	11
Advise for internship, summer school	2
Participation in meetings with perspective employers	3
Participation in job orientation sessions	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>81</b>



**CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

<b>Table 21: Have you ever participated in AUA Extension Program courses?</b>			
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid percent</b>
Yes	65	34.4	35.5
No	118	62.4	64.5
Missing values	6	3.2	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

<b>Table 21a: Courses taken at AUA Extension</b>	
<b>Name of the course</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
TOEFL	23
General English courses in six levels	12
GRE	8
GMAT	4
TOEFL IBT Preparation course	4
TOEFL PBT Preparation course	3
English writing course	3
Oral communication	2
Photography	1
PR and Communication	1
Leadership	1
Free English courses for aspirants (graduate students in the National Academy of Sciences)	1
English for business communication	1
LSAT	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>65</b>

<b>Table 22: Courses that AUA Extension can provide to support lifelong learning needs</b>	
<b>Name of the course</b>	<b>Number of responses</b>
Speaking courses	10
Trainings on business (banking, finance, stock market, technologies, management)	9
Writing courses	2
Design, fashion	2
Preparation to ACCA exams	1
C+	1
Java development	1
Unix (Linux)	1
Programming	1
Leadership, ethics	1
Public health management	1
Risk management	1
Database development courses	1
Public Relations	1
Biostatistics	1
Proposal / grant writing	1
GRE verbal	1
Course on Islam	1

**ADDENDUM A****2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 EXIT SURVEY DATA: COMPARATIVE TABLES**

<b>Table A: Student opinions about their graduate programs</b>			
	<b>Year</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Combined Percentage Strongly Agree and Agree</b>
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
	2011	2.34	72.0
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
	2011	2.02	84.9
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
	2011	1.92	87.3

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
	2011	1.96	75.3
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
	2011	1.68	90.9
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
	2011	2.02	80.6
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
	2011	2.25	68.4

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
	2011	1.97	84.3
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
	2011	1.97	80.7
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
	2011	2.11	79.1
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
	2011	1.83	85.6

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
	2011	1.82	85.9
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
	2011	1.89	84.4
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
	2011	1.80	86.1
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
	2011	1.98	73.3

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
	2011	1.83	83.3
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
	2011	2.06	73.7
I believe that the grading system of my academic program is fair	2011	2.08	74.9
<i>(1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree; missing values excluded)</i>			

<b>Table B: Overall and in general, how would you rate your experience in your program?</b>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Combined Percentage Excellent and Very Good</b>
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
2011	1.95	81.5
<i>(1=excellent and 4 unsatisfactory; missing values excluded)</i>		

**Table C: Which of the following WAS emphasized in your program?**  
*(Multiple responses permitted)*

	<b>Year</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent of total respondents</b>
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
	2011	127	67.2
Theoretical knowledge	2006	77	69.4
	2007	85	69.9
	2008	72	66.7
	2009	60	60.0
	2010	29	67.4
	2011	119	63.0
Problem solving	2006	78	70.3
	2007	95	73.6
	2008	88	81.5
	2009	68	68.0
	2010	28	65.1
	2011	139	73.5



Research	2006	76	68.5
	2007	82	63.6
	2008	69	63.9
	2009	58	58.0
	2010	28	65.1
	2011	130	68.8
Applied Research	2006	37	33.3
	2007	49	37.9
	2008	32	29.6
	2009	26	26.0
	2010	10	23.3
	2011	68	36

<b>Table D: Which of the following SHOULD BE more emphasized in your program?</b> <i>(Multiple responses permitted)</i>			
	<b>Year</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent of total respondents</b>
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
	2011	106	57.6

Theoretical knowledge	2006	27	56.8
	2007	21	18.3
	2008	17	15.7
	2009	25	25.0
	2010	10	23.8
	2011	42	22.8
Problem solving	2006	57	51.4
	2007	70	54.3
	2008	49	45.4
	2009	48	48.0
	2010	23	54.8
	2011	82	43.4
Research	2006	37	33.3
	2007	40	31.0
	2008	44	40.7
	2009	37	37.0
	2010	12	28.6
	2011	62	32.8
Applied Research	2006	58	52.3
	2007	62	48.9
	2008	57	52.8
	2009	40	40.0
	2010	14	33.3
	2011	89	47.1

**Table E: Means of how often students used the following activities during coursework on a scale of 1 to 7 (1=never and 7=always; missing values excluded)**

	<b>Year</b>	<b>Mean</b>
Memorizing facts and ideas from lectures and readings	2006	4.26
	2007	4.48
	2008	4.42
	2009	4.19
	2010	4.64
	2011	4.72
Analyzing cases or situations in-depth	2006	5.42
	2007	5.45
	2008	5.75
	2009	5.39
	2010	5.33
	2011	5.58
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
	2011	5.30

Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods	2006	5.24
	2007	5.14
	2008	5.65
	2009	5.17
	2010	5.56
	2011	5.56
Applying theories or concepts to practical problems/situations	2006	5.34
	2007	5.33
	2008	5.51
	2009	5.47
	2010	5.60
	2011	5.53

**Table F: Satisfaction with support in the degree program**

	<b>Year</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Combined Percentage Very Satisfied and Satisfied</b>
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
	2011	1.87	88.2
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
	2011	1.95	82.6
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
	2011	2.10	76.9

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
	2011	2.14	70.6
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
	2011	1.98	79.8
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
	2011	1.80	90.7

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

**Table G: Satisfaction with university services**

	<b>Year</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Combined Percentage Very Satisfied and Satisfied</b>
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
	2011	1.32	97.4
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
	2011	1.70	85.7
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
	2011	1.65	87.2

Services provided by Room 19 (Student Academic Affairs Office)	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
	2011	1.84	80.4
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
	2011	1.96	70.1
Career advising and planning ( <i>omitted in 2009 and 2010</i> )	2006	2.87	37.6
	2007	2.69	43.7
	2008	2.50	49.5
	2009-2010	-	-
	2011	2.39	54.0
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
	2011	2.35	60.4



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
	2011	2.15	67.2
<i>(1=very satisfied and 5=very unsatisfied; missing values excluded)</i>			

<b>Table H: Means of how much graduate education at AUA contributed to development in the following areas on a scale of 1 to 7 (1=no contribution and 7=very significant contribution; missing values are excluded)</b>		
	<b>Year</b>	<b>Mean</b>
Writing skills	2006	5.82
	2007	5.62
	2008	5.84
	2009	5.53
	2010	5.66
	2011	5.50
Ability to critically analyze ideas and information	2006	5.77
	2007	5.78
	2008	6.07
	2009	5.67
	2010	5.70
	2011	5.72

Ability to plan and carry out projects independently	2006	5.62
	2007	5.66
	2008	6.17
	2009	5.86
	2010	5.59
	2011	5.86
Ability to solve analytical problems	2006	5.60
	2007	5.65
	2008	6.09
	2009	5.59
	2010	5.53
	2011	5.68
Ability to function as part of a team	2006	5.44
	2007	5.50
	2008	6.11
	2009	6.11
	2010	5.41
	2011	5.89

Presenting papers at conferences/seminars	2006	5.39
	2007	5.55
	2008	6.16
	2009	5.92
	2010	5.16
	2011	5.58
Speaking skills	2006	5.34
	2007	5.17
	2008	5.72
	2009	5.41
	2010	5.77
	2011	5.49
Applying scientific methods of inquiry	2006	5.31
	2007	5.36
	2008	5.63
	2009	5.31
	2010	5.28
	2011	5.32

Computer skills	2006	5.05
	2007	5.32
	2008	5.10
	2009	5.01
	2010	4.44
	2011	4.83
Ability to lead and guide others	2006	4.97
	2007	5.19
	2008	5.63
	2009	5.41
	2010	4.88
	2011	5.36
Network with others in the field	2006	4.28
	2007	4.73
	2008	5.32
	2009	5.29
	2010	4.76
	2011	5.48

Submitting papers for publication	2006	4.05
	2007	4.43
	2008	4.77
	2009	4.64
	2010	4.07
	2011	4.59
Making presentations typical to your field of study	2011	5.99
English writing skills	2011	5.45
English speaking skills	2011	5.41

<b>Table J: What are your immediate employment plans?</b>			
	<b>Year</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
I am seeking employment.	2006	45	40.5
	2007	46	35.9
	2008	38	35.2
	2009	32	32.0
	2010	13	29.5
	2011	66	34.9

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
	2011	55	29.1
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
	2011	33	17.6
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
	2011	11	5.8
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

	2011	10	5.3
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
	2011	7	3.7
Other	2006	1	0.9
	2007	3	2.3
	2008	1	0.9
	2009	4	4.0
	2010	2	4.5
	2011	6	3.2

<b>Table K: Which BEST describes your potential employer?</b>			
	<b>Year</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Business and enterprises	2006	17	17.2
	2007	23	20.7
	2008	20	19.6
	2009	25	28.7
	2010	1	7.7
	2011	35	21.2

Educational and research institutions	2006	15	16.2
	2007	6	5.4
	2008	16	15.7
	2009	5	5.7
	2010	2	15.4
	2011	10	6.1
Foreign-funded development projects and companies	2006	28	28.3
	2007	28	25.2
	2008	27	26.5
	2009	24	27.6
	2010	4	30.8
	2011	51	30.9
Embassies and international organizations	2006	29	29.3
	2007	26	23.4
	2008	24	23.5
	2009	18	20.7
	2010	5	38.5
	2011	48	29.1



Armenian Government	2006	3	3.0
	2007	9	8.1
	2008	3	2.9
	2009	4	4.6
	2010	-	-
	2011	8	4.8
Armenian non-governmental organizations	2006	5	5.0
	2007	3	2.7
	2008	7	6.9
	2009	2	2.3
	2010	-	-
	2011	4	2.4
Other	2006	-	-
	2007	4	3.6
	2008	1	1.0
	2009	1	1.1
	2010	-	-
	2011	2	1.2
Don't know, N/A	2006	1	1.0
	2007	12	10.8
	2008	4	3.9
	2009	8	9.2
	2010	1	7.7
	2011	7	4.2

