

**University of Dayton
SOEAP Alumni Survey Report
Pilot Instrument
May 2005**

Two cohorts of alumni were identified to pilot test the alumni survey developed by the SOEAP Assessment Committee. Nineteen ninety-nine and 2004 graduates were asked to complete the survey and to provide comment on its content and format. They were also asked to give a general evaluation of the survey. Names, postal addresses, and e-mails of these alumni were provided by the Alumni office. The 1999 alumni group numbered 604 and the 2004 group numbered 651 (Table 1). Individuals for whom e-mails were available were sent the survey electronically and asked to respond using WebCT. Postal addresses were used for the remainder of the alumni. Alumni were apprised of a drawing for four \$50 gift certificates for those who returned the survey and the comment sheet.

Table 1: SOEAP Alumni Groups Surveyed

Alumni Groups	Number Sent			Number Returned		
	e-mail	postal	Totals	e-mail	postal	Totals
1999	191 (32%)	413	604	35 (18%)	30	65 (11%)
2004	104 (16%)	547	651	38 (36%)	100	138 (21%)

The survey return rates were 11% and 21% respectively for the 1999 and 2004 alumni groups. The various departments ranged from 6% to 14% return rate for 1999 alumni and from 16% to 26% for 2004 alumni (Table 2).

Table 2: Alumni Groups Surveyed by Department

Alumni Groups	1999				2004			
	Sent	Returned			Sent	Returned		
Dept.		e-mail	postal	Rate		e-mail	postal	Rate
EDA	144 (24%)	5	7	8%	180 (27%)	5	34	22%
EDC	118 (19%)	4	7	9%	142 (22%)	9	28	26%
EDT	274 (45%)	22	16	14%	271 (42%)	19	34	19%
HSS	64 (11%)	4	0	6%	57 (9%)	5	4	16%
Unknown	4 (<1%)	na	na	na	1 (<1%)	na	na	na
Total	604	35	30	11%	651	38	100	21%

1999 Respondent Demographics

The demographics of the two groups are represented in Table 3. The 1999 alumni group is 51% female and 49% male. All respondents are white. Fifty-one percent attended part time and 48% attended full time. Individuals from every department

responded. The majority (68%) of the respondents are alumni of graduate level programs. Eighty-eight percent took the majority of their classes on-campus. The majority indicated being employed in their major field of study (72%) and in a suburban location (51%).

2004 Respondent Demographics

The 2004 alumni group is 65% female and 35% male. The respondents include one Hispanic, one multiracial/multiethnic individual, five (4%) Black, non-Hispanic, and 131 (95%) white. Sixty-four percent attended part time and 36% attended full time. Individuals from every department responded. The majority (79%) of the respondents are alumni of graduate level programs. Seventy percent took the majority of their classes on-campus, 28% off-campus, and less than 1% were alumni of an on-line program. The majority indicated being employed in their major field of study (78%) and in a suburban location (51%).

Table 3: Demographics of Survey Populations

Alumni Year	1999	2004
Number of returns and % of return	65 (11%)	138 (21%)
Student Status		
Full Time	31 (48%)	49 (36%)
Part Time	33 (51%)	88 (64%)
Blank	1	1
Gender		
Male	32 (49%)	48 (35%)
Female	33 (51%)	90 (65%)
Nationality/Ethnicity		
Hispanic	0	1 (<1%)
Black, Non-Hispanic	0	5 (4%)
White, Non-Hispanic	65 (100%)	131 (95%)
Multiracial/multiethnic	0	1 (<1%)
Department/Level		
EDA (G)	13 (20%)	39 (28%)
EDC (G)	10 (15%)	37 (27%)
EDT (UG)	21 (32%)	32 (23%)
EDT (G)	18 (28%)	21 (15%)
HSS (UG)	0	1 (<1%)
HSS (G)	3 (5%)	8 (6%)
Coursework Taken		
On campus	57 (88%)	96 (70%)
Off campus	8 (12%)	39 (28%)
On line	0	2 (1%)
Blank	0	1 (<1%)
Current Employment		
In major field	47 (72%)	108 (78%)
Out-of-field	12 (19%)	26 (19%)
Not working	6 (9%)	4 (3%)
Current Job Location		
Urban	13 (20%)	37 (27%)
Suburban	33 (51%)	71 (51%)
Rural	10 (15%)	22 (16%)
NA	9 (14%)	6 (4%)
Blank	0	2 (2%)

Unit Outcome Results

The survey was designed to gather alumni responses about their knowledge, skills and valuing of the four unit outcomes identified in the Conceptual Framework. Specific questions were written to tap the outcomes. Items 10-14 addressed the outcome, Developing of Scholarly Practitioners; items 15-17 addressed, Engaging in Critical Reflection; 18 – 20 addressed, Building Community; and Items 21 -24 addressed the outcome, Embracing Diversity for Promotion of Social Justice.

Alumni were asked to rate each of the items as to knowledge gained and ability to use that knowledge on a agree-disagree scale where: 4 = agree, 3= agree somewhat, 2 = disagree somewhat, and 1 = disagree. The value of these same items were rated on an importance-unimportance scale where: 4 = Very important, 3= important, 2 = unimportant, and 1 = very unimportant. Overall, as indicated by tables 4, 5, 6 and 7, alumni gave high ratings to their knowledge gained, ability to use that knowledge and the valuing of that learning by themselves and by their professions.

As scholarly practitioners (Table 4), alumni, in both 1999 and 2004 rated their knowledge and skill acquisition for doing the jobs for which they were prepared at a 3.5 or better on the 4 point scale. Items 12, 13, and 14 were rated relatively lower than items 10 and 11 by both alumni groups. The ratings were still above a 3.0 on the four point scale. The importance of knowledge, skills, professional/student relationships, data driven decision making and use of technology were generally rated higher than the acquisition of the related knowledge and skills.

Table 4: Developing Scholarly Practitioners

As a result of my learning at UD,	Knowledge		Ability to put knowledge into practice		Relative Importance to you		Relative Importance to your profession	
	1999	2004	1999	2004	1999	2004	1999	2004
10. I have the knowledge needed to do the job for which I was prepared.	3.52	3.66	3.60	3.64	3.65	3.80	3.65	3.82
11. I have the skills necessary to do the job for which I was prepared.	3.55	3.61	3.55	3.57	3.72	3.80	3.72	3.78
12. I study the links between what I do as a professional and students' learning.	3.12	3.38	3.15	3.37	3.20	3.52	3.25	3.55
13. I use data to support my professional decision-making, and problem solving.	3.28	3.17	3.20	3.23	3.22	3.28	3.32	3.36
14. I incorporate technology into my practice.	3.17	3.28	3.17	3.25	3.29	3.28	3.40	3.36

Alumni, both 1999 and 2004 groups, rated their knowledge of critical reflection (Table 5) slightly higher (3.34 - 3.58) than their skill at using it (3.28 to 3.53) for making personal choices, examining the professional/student relationship or using it as a tool to guide practice. The 1999 group rated the valuing of critical reflection at about the same level

for themselves and for their professions. The 2004 group, on the other hand, rated the valuing of critical reflection higher on a personal level than by their professions.

Table 5: Engaging in Critical Reflection

As a result of my learning at UD,	Knowledge		Ability to put knowledge into practice		Relative Importance to you		Relative Importance to your profession	
	Alumni	Year	1999	2004	1999	2004	1999	2004
15. I take time to seriously reflect on the professional choices I make.	3.55	3.58	3.40	3.53	3.49	3.63	3.43	3.49
16. I take time to seriously reflect on the values that drive my decisions affecting students/clients.	3.52	3.53	3.43	3.45	3.51	3.54	3.51	3.46
17. I take time to reflect upon how professional knowledge guides the practices of myself and my colleagues.	3.34	3.34	3.28	3.40	3.22	3.49	3.25	3.47

Alumni ratings by both groups on building community (Table 6) were consistently higher than the other three outcome areas. Items 18 & 19 addressing knowledge, skill to use that knowledge, and valuing the creation of positive environments and functioning as a team member were rated above a 3.6 on a four point scale. Item 20, establishing ethical partnerships, was rated lower with ratings ranging from 3.36 to 3.54.

Table 6: Building Community

As a result of my learning at UD,	Knowledge		Ability to put knowledge into practice		Relative Importance to you		Relative Importance to your profession	
	Alumni	Year	1999	2004	1999	2004	1999	2004
18. I create a positive learning environment/ community for all students/clients.	3.82	3.75	3.71	3.67	3.83	3.84	3.82	3.76
19. I function as a team member and promote teamwork within my context.	3.77	3.67	3.68	3.70	3.65	3.71	3.68	3.64
20. I establish ethical partnerships with stakeholders that promote the development of the individual.	3.54	3.38	3.46	3.36	3.42	3.47	3.48	3.47

Alumni ratings around diversity (Table 7) showed the most variability. Items 21, 22 and 24 related to awareness of personal biases, knowing that personal culture background and beliefs are contextual and working with diverse populations were rated higher (3.38 to 3.82) than item 22 related to social justice in the Marianist tradition (2.62 to 3.0). The 2004 group generally rated items 21, 22, and 24 higher than did the 1999 group. With regard to item 23, advocating for social justice in the Marianist tradition, the 1999 group was consistently higher with there rating than was the 2004 group.

Table 7: Embracing Diversity for Promotion of Social Justice

As a result of my learning at UD,	Knowledge		Ability to put knowledge into practice		Relative Importance to you		Relative Importance to your profession		
	Alumni Year	1999	2004	1999	2004	1999	2004	1999	2004
21. I am aware of my own biases regarding diverse populations.		3.43	3.55	3.38	3.51	3.45	3.48	3.54	3.46
22. I know that not everyone shares my background and beliefs.		3.80	3.82	3.58	3.75	3.43	3.67	3.49	3.54
23. I am an advocate for social justice in the Marianist tradition for the students/clients with whom I now work.		3.0	2.81	2.86	2.76	2.92	2.82	2.94	2.62
24. I work effectively with people from diverse populations		3.57	3.62	3.43	3.54	3.62	3.69	3.72	3.62

General Candidate Support

In addition to tapping the alumni's opinion about the unit's four outcomes, alumni were asked to respond items 25 to 29 related to faculty modeling, academic supports, professional/leadership opportunities outside classes, class scheduling, and a general evaluation of their UD experience. Table 8 shows that the 1999 group rated their entire education program experience (item 29) slightly higher than did the 2004 group (3.58 and 3.49, respectively). Both groups rated class scheduling the highest regarding their experience and the highest regarding the importance of classes scheduled to facilitate program completion. The ratings by both groups on item 26 indicated that the SOEAP individuals responsible for advising, resolution of problems, and professional guidance were available. Opportunities for professional growth and development beyond class work was provided and valued by both groups. Item 25, relating to faculty as models of advocacy for social justice in the Marianist tradition, was perceived as present, and was rated as important, but not very important to the alumni. It appeared less important to the 1999 group (2.94) than to the 2004 group (3.04).

Table 8: General SOEAP Candidate Support

Additional Questions about the SOEAP	Your Experience		Relative Importance to you	
	1999	2004	1999	2004
Read each item and fill in the word and number that most closely represent s your opinion.	4 = Often 3 = Seldom 2 = Rarely 1 = Never		4 = Very Important 3 = Important 2 = Unimportant 1 = Very Unimportant	
	1999	2004	1999	2004
25. SOEAP faculty members model advocacy for social justice in the Marianist tradition.	3.22	3.43	2.94	3.04
26. SOEAF faculty, staff and administrators were available to me for advising, resolution of personal issues, and professional guidance.	3.46	3.53	3.58	3.67
27. I was given opportunities, beyond class work, to develop professional and leadership skills.	3.37	3.43	3.63	3.54
28. The way courses were scheduled aided me to complete my program in a timely fashion.	3.82	3.67	3.95	3.89
	Alumni Year		2004	
29. How would you evaluate your entire educational experience in the SOEAP?	3.58		3.49	

Additional Comments

A space was provided for responders to make additional comment about their UD experience. These comments fell into four broad categories: Faculty/Staff comments, program/course comments, scheduling comments, and general UD/SOEAP comments. Table 9 is a summary of the number of comments sorted as positive and negative in each of the areas. There were comments on 46 the 130 surveys returned. This represents 35% of the respondents. Some comments included both positive and negative thoughts; therefore, some comments were coded in two areas. The 46 comments yielded 67 codings. Faculty/staff comments were the most prevalent, followed by program/course comments, then general UD/SOEAP comments and finally scheduling comments.

These comments are only those received via the mail. On-line comments have yet to be coded. A list of specific comments will be provided each department.

Table 9: Comments received by mail from 35% of the respondents

Department	Faculty/Staff		Program/Course		Scheduling		UD/SOEAP	
	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-
EDC	7	3	2	4	2	1	2	0
EDT	7	8	2	4	0	2	7	1
HSS	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
EDA	5	2	3	2	0	1	0	0
Total	19	13	7	11	2	4	10	1
% of total	48%		27%		9%		16%	

SOEAP Climate Assessment

The final ratings the two alumni groups were asked to provide were related to personal observations of behaviors toward individuals of diversity by SOEAP faculty, staff, and students. Respondents were asked to respect/disrespect scale where: +2 = very respectful, +1 = respectful, 0 = no observation, -1= disrespectful, -2= very disrespectful.

Table 10 shows that both the 1999 and the 2004 found faculty, staff and fellow students respectful toward all groups identified. The highest ratings were given to the most visible of the diversity aspects: gender, age, race, and ethnicity.

Table 10: Climate Assessment Results

Respect/Disrespect Related to Alumni Year	SOEAP Faculty		SOEAP Staff		SOEAP Student body	
	1999	2004	1999	2004	1999	2004
30. Gender	1.11	1.17	1.09	1.02	1.11	1.21
31. Age	1.11	1.22	0.94	1.02	1.08	1.21
32. Race	1.02	1.09	0.89	0.96	0.89	1.09
33. Ethnicity	1.0	1.06	0.89	0.91	0.95	1.09

34. Religion	0.86	0.91	0.80	0.77	0.98	0.90
35. Language	0.74	0.90	0.68	0.81	0.72	0.95
36. Exceptionalities	0.63	0.93	0.66	0.81	0.68	0.91
37. Geographical Area	0.78	0.99	0.69	0.86	0.85	0.95
38. Socioeconomic Status	0.85	1.05	0.74	0.88	0.94	0.92
39. Sexual Orientation	0.55	0.76	0.49	0.70	0.51	0.75

Climate Comments:

Not yet coded. These are in a data base that Diann is going to have to walk me through.

Major Survey Findings and Recommendations

Would like to give more thought and gather thinking from chairs and assessment committee.

Survey Content and Format Feedback

Not compiled for coding as yet.