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Long term Alumnus Performance and Evaluation after Graduation from a Distance Learning Hybrid Weekend Master’s Degree Program in Technology

1.0 - Abstract

What is the long-term experience of Master’s degree graduates after completing an accelerated weekend masters degree program (WMP)? This paper shares the results of a longitudinal follow-up study of nearly 300 professionals, most from business and industry, who graduated from Purdue University’s Center for Professional Studies in Technology and Applied Research (ProSTAR) programs. This cohort-based set of programs employs a hybrid classroom and distance-supported, innovatively-delivered graduate degree (MS) in technology. An online survey collected the data and cross-tabulation and frequency analysis identified the findings. Consequences; with respect to career experiences, advancement and salary; are reported and evaluative perspectives – generated in retrospect – shared. The paper also includes the context for this evaluation and follow-up and a benchmarking of its findings against a previously reported research from 2002. Finally, the implications for both the program and its continuous improvement provide feedback for the subsequent evolutions of ProSTAR programs.

On the whole, the data suggest the:

- WMP received an increasingly positive assessment over time,
- Program enhanced the students’ portfolio of skills, i.e., to assess, assimilate and apply learned content
- Program and students benefited from the continuous quality improvement process,
- Directed project was perceived as being an important part of the WMP and also important to the students,
- WMP provided a positive impact on student career, opportunities, job responsibilities and salary, and,
- Employers of the student’s were largely supportive with both time release and educational assistance and many with significant financial contributions.

2.0 - Overview

Often evaluations are reported based on one shot, post hoc assessments. This paper, however reports the results of a longitudinal follow-up study of nearly 300 business and industrial professionals who graduated from Purdue University’s College of Technology WMP. Additionally it interprets its findings in the light of a benchmark against a previously conducted (2002) evaluation of the same program. The respondents, who all were mature adults with responsible positions in business and industry; have had time to experience the effects of their Master’s degree and reflect on the outcomes. Because they have all graduated, they were deemed to be independent in that they were not beholden to the university in any way as might be the case if the evaluation were conducted prior to the award of the degree.
2.1 - Historical Context

On June 11, 1998, the College of Technology initiated the process for University, and subsequently Indiana Commission for Higher Education, approval of a non-traditional, fee-based weekend alternative to Purdue’s traditional campus tuition-based Master’s of Science with a major in Technology degree. This request stated:

Technology is transforming all aspects of our life, both at home and at work. Therefore, it is important that we consider the future of those individuals completing undergraduate degree programs in technology and engineering technology. … The demand for graduate technology education opportunities is a growing population that will continue to increase. Also, as this demand continues to grow, the need for greater flexibility in delivery will also expand. Competition for this potential customer base will encourage higher education administrators and faculty to evaluate new and innovative delivery systems to serve the educational needs of these customers. … This is not a new degree program, just a different delivery approach to an existing one. Technology and engineering technology programs continue to change and evolve in striving to meet society’s technological expectations and needs. It is imperative that graduate education be considered as an important element. A survey study conducted at Purdue University reported that 92% of the alumni and faculty indicated that graduate education in technology is important for the professional development of individuals working in industry and that there exist a perceived demand for graduate education in technology and engineering technology.

Subsequently, on October 13, 2000, the Indiana Commission on Higher Education (ICHE) approved the University request for delivering a hybrid distance-based alternative to traditional classroom-only programs. The entire process from conceptualization to full final approval took two years and four months. Readers will also note, from this proposal excerpt, that the concept of evaluation was integral to the program concept right from its beginning.

In the fall of 1998, the COT’s Department of Industrial Technology took a lead role in implementing, pursuant to authorization, the first WMP in Technology on the campus of Purdue University in West Lafayette, Indiana. The original offering was cohort-based and it employed a weekend format; meeting from Friday through Sunday. The cohort met three times a semester, twice in the summer semester, for a total of five semesters (Fall, Spring, Summer, Fall and Spring). After 22 months all members of the initial cohort format graduated in the May 2000 graduation ceremony. Because of its non-traditional approach, the state’s authorization included the establishing of a different fee structure than normal classes which resulted in a cost that was higher than conventional campus-based instruction.

But, the program incorporated other innovations beyond its delivery system, schedule and fee structure. To be consistent with its goal of developing practical skills and knowledge immediately, or at least quickly, applicable to business and industry, its plan of study, shown in Figure 1, incorporates a base of essential core studies, flexible and easily tailored courses to insure relevance to emerging technologies, and a guided, industry focused applied research and
development project called simply the Directed Project. The latter was deliberately designed to require work commensurate to what is typically expected of a master’s degree thesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Semester 1 (Fall '09):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measurement and Evaluation in Industry and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AIDC For Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research &amp; Writing for Business &amp; Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 2 (Spring '10):</td>
<td>Analysis of Research in Industry &amp; Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design of Experiments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problems in Business &amp; Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 3 (Summer '10):</td>
<td>Interpersonal Skills for Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar in Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directed M.S. Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 4 (Fall '10):</td>
<td>Quality and Productivity in Industry &amp; Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Management in Industry and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directed M.S. Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 5 (Spring '11):</td>
<td>Leadership and Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Planning and Marketing in Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directed M.S. Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. WMP Plan of Studies

The Directed Project is a project agreed upon between the student, student’s company and the faculty advisor. The project is intended to parallel the thesis format and employs research and development methodologies to generate a project with potential for significant return on investment to the student’s company. Frequently, a member of the student’s company serves on the student’s graduate committee – but precautions are taken to avoid conflict of interest. The Directed Project results in a document which is essentially equivalent in size and standard to conventional theses. The university and program faculty also implemented procedures to guard the confidentiality of the project information where necessary.

Since the initial 1999 program offering, there have been 19 unique offerings of this program, some with minor variation for company-specific interests in areas of concentration. Not all cohort-based programs were available for public enrollment. Some programs were created specifically for companies who wished to fund an entire cohort themselves and subsequently make basic underlying modifications for concentrations more applicable to their company.

Due to the perceived success of the program, as demonstrated by its growth in enrollment, it became necessary to evolve an administrative structure that positioned the program at the
College level and thereby increase its availability and extend its reach into all eight departments in the College. To this end, a Center for Professional Studies in Technology and Applied Research (ProSTAR) was approved by Purdue University and in February 2009 it was established as an academic Center in the College of Technology. The major focus for ProSTAR’s professional education activities was a Master’s degree emphasizing technology leadership and innovation skills including process improvement and quality management. This focus has more recently been expanded to include others addressing priority needs identified by the College’s departments and their constituencies.

2.2 - Evaluation Design

As evidenced by the initial program rationale and the 2002 assessment, the COT’s faculty and ProStar’s leadership are committed to the continuous quality improvement process. Consequently, they established both formative and summative evaluation as strategic goals. Furthermore, given the nature of the WMP program, it was necessary to employ both quantitative and qualitative assessment of the program’s performance.

In an attempt to better understand how the graduates interpreted their experience, how they assimilated their acquired knowledge and how they applied their acquired and assimilated knowledge, a qualitative inductive approach was employed to ascertain the effectiveness of the program with respect to its intended goals as well as the extent to which it met its students’ expectations. In recognition of the multiple purposes to be served by the evaluation; summative, formative and ex post facto; the researchers employed selected aspects of each approach as they designed the methodology for the study reported in this paper.

A summative evaluation is concerned with making judgments after something has occurred. In our case, we sought to establish whether the WMP program had accomplishing its goals. The reported study is summative because we asked graduates to make culminating judgments about this after they had completed the program. However, the evaluation was also formative because it was longitudinal and in essence it was concerned with making improvements to the program under evaluation. The researchers sought “to identify ways in which experience can serve as a springboard to improving the selected program next time it is offered (p. 152)”.

Notably the evaluation design also employed a key aspect of ex post facto evaluation. Such evaluation differs from formative and summative in that its “purpose is to compare the results of” of one implementation of the program to others” (p. 152). In our case we evaluated across the 13 iterations of the WMP that have completed during the last 10 years. The six cohorts currently underway were excluded from the evaluation because their participants have not yet graduated. Because the results from the 2002 evaluation have already been reported part of the currently reported evaluation is made after the fact, hence, ex post facto.

Kowalski summaries the three types of evaluations in saying "...summative evaluation may or may not be comparative. It could be used to select one option from many, or it could be used simply to determine if a program did or did not meet its goals. Formative evaluation seeks to improve a program by identifying the degree to which objectives have been met and by using this information to adjust goals, procedures and the like. It is noncomparative. Ex post facto
evaluation is comparative. It compares the results of a given program with the previous results of the same program”.

The evaluation methodology we employed therefore is both formative and summative as well as comparative in that the intent was to ascertain whether the outcomes of the program, as mutually viewed by the WMP’s administrators and graduates, have been satisfied. And, if so, to what degree or level of quality? Additionally, because the findings were used to improve the operation and content of the WMP the design clearly incorporated a formative aspect.

After establishing the evaluation design described in the preceding paragraphs, the researchers developed a set of 6 research question(s) that served to structure the data gathering:

1. What is the overall assessment of the WMP by its graduates over time (i.e., by cohort)?
2. What are the participant’s assessments of the WMP’s effects on their personal portfolio of skills (by cohort)?
3. Is there evidence that the on-going quality improvement mechanisms are working and to what degree?
4. What are the participant’s assessments of the directed project over time (by cohort)?
5. What are the impacts of the WMP on its graduates’ careers over time?
6. What are the employer reactions to the WMP as perceived by the graduates?

2.3 - Methodology

The purpose of this 10-year longitudinal study was to use systematic evaluation research methods to ascertain the effectiveness of a master’s of science in technology degree for working professionals. The methodology of this study employed the following six steps.

1. Identify purposes for the evaluation of the WMP.
2. Create an instrument and procedures to collect data which address each of the research questions.
3. Execute the procedures to collect the data.
4. Record, condition and analyze the collected data.
5. Interpret the findings resulting from the analysis and develop conclusions relevant to each of the research questions
6. Develop a set of recommendations for both future practice of the WMP as well as for further research.

2.3.1 - Population and Sample

The cohorts sampled in this study were the graduates of the 13 WMPs over a 10-year period that had been completed by May 2010. The faculty of these programs, as well as the employer’s of the graduates from the program, were not part of this survey. They are, however, identified as key for additional research to deepen understanding and take advantage of the continuous process improvement process. Figure 2 provides the cohort size and number of responses by cohort. Appendix A depicts the number of respondents by cohort by question. Additionally, to enhance our response rate, we are currently continuing to make personal calls to those who did not respond in an attempt to gather additional data for program improvement.
2.3.2 - Instrumentation and Validity

The survey of employed by this study evolved from two primary sources: (a) it was premised heavily on an original Latif & Dyrenfurth study which addressed comparable research questions, and (b) a collaborative effort of the researchers and senior graduate faculty (Dr. James Mohler) highly experienced in research methods. This development process resulted in a survey which is provided in Appendix B. To ensure we were measuring the content we were intending to measure and not something else (content validity), we deliberately structured the survey questions around key dimensions of the concept, namely:

- Program satisfaction
- Directed Project
- Post-program personal experience
- Post-Program employer experience

This effort essentially established face validity. Although some aspects of predictive validity might be construed from comparison of responses to questions pertaining to salary increases and promotions, no formal procedures were employed to calculate predictive validity.

2.3.3 - Protocol

To ensure the protection of human subjects and that the confidentiality or personally obtained information would be maintained through the research, the survey instrument, targeted population, and methodology for data collection were submitted for, and subsequently approved, for a Category 2 research exemption by the Purdue University Institutional Review Board under the Office of the Vice President for Research.

The survey was deployed using two procedures: (a) The primary method used by the large majority of the respondents, involved Qualtrics™ – an on-line internet-based survey, and (b) direct phone calls to those who did not respond to the original Qualtrics™ survey. The actual Qualtrics™ survey may be found in Appendix B to this document. In general, the survey asked graduates to report, on a five-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree) their personal assessment of the question target. Graduates were allowed to skip questions and this did not affect subsequent questions. This resulted in varying response rates for each question but no analyses or interpretations of such variations were pursued.

3.0 - Evaluation Findings

The evaluation instrument was a survey sent to all graduates of the ProSTAR Master’s of Science in Technology program under the Weekend format. Of the 214 graduates solicited, there
were 46 responses, or a 21% response rate. Of the 46 responses, 91% (42) were male and 9% (4) were female. Figures 3 and 4 depict the actual size, gender and age characteristics of each cohort.

Figure 3. Gender Demographics by Cohort
The survey focused on four areas of interest:

1. Program satisfaction
2. Directed Project
3. Post-program personal experience
4. Post-Program employer experience

Each of the areas of interests was assessed using a number of questions soliciting responses via a Likert scale and each permitted additional open-ended responses to allow graduates to express their perspectives. The Likert scale employed a five-point scale ranging from Strongly Agree (5) to Strongly Disagree (1).

3.1 - Program Satisfaction

The program satisfaction research area of interest is represented by the following research questions and attendant survey instrument questions:

- Research Question #1 - What is the overall assessment of the WMP by its graduates over time (i.e., by cohort)?
Research Question #2 - What has been the participant’s assessment of the WMP on their personal portfolio of skills (by cohort)?

Research Question #3 - Is there evidence that the on-going quality improvement mechanisms are working and to what degree?

Evidence to answer the research question was secured from the responses to the following survey questions and summary results are presented in Figure 5:

- Question #5 - I increased my technical problem solving skills as a result of the WMP.
- Question #6 - I increased my ability to learn new skills and techniques as a result of the WMP.
- Question #7 - I increased my ability to access, synthesize and analyze information as a result of the WMP.
- Question #8 - I increased my ability to interpret information and make decisions as a result of the WMP.
- Question #9 - I feel that the WMP met my learning expectations.
The data show that the majority of the responses in the Program Satisfaction area were in the range of Agree to Strongly Agree. In reviewing the two largest homogenous cohorts, cohort 11 and cohort 12, there is a positive change in cohort survey responses; with cohort 12 providing the greater of the two cohorts. Cohort 11 and cohort 12 provided the greatest opportunity for continuous process improvement.

3.2 - Directed Project

The Directed Project research area of interest is represented by the following research question and attendant survey instrument questions asking about Post-Program completion assessment. The results are presented in Figure 6:

- Research Question #4 - What has been the participant’s assessment of the directed project over time (by cohort)?

Behavioral evidence to support whether the research question can be assessed from the findings was acquired through the following survey instrument questions:

- Question #10 - My directed project was fully implemented at my workplace (or in a practical setting).
- Question #11 - My directed project resulted in savings of money and/or time.
- Question #12 - My directed project was valuable to my company.
- Question #13 - My directed project was valuable to my supervisor.
- Question #14 - My directed project was valuable to me.
- Question #15 - The directed project is an important part of the WMP.
The survey findings reflect 6 of the 12 cohorts agree or strongly agree reporting the directed project was implemented fully in their company. Of the 6 cohorts reporting agree or strongly agree the directed project was fully implemented in their company, all 6 cohorts reported the directed project resulted in savings to their company. The survey reflects 7 of the 12 cohorts agree or strongly agree the directed project was valuable to their company. The survey findings reflect 4 of the 12 cohorts agree or strongly agree the directed project was valuable to their supervisor. The survey findings reflect 12 of the 12 cohorts agree or strongly agree the directed project was important to the graduate. The survey findings reflect 12 of the 12 cohorts agree or strongly agree the directed project is important to the WMP. The data reflect that 10 of the 12 cohorts strongly agree the directed project was important to the WMP.
3.3 - Post-Program Personal Experience

The Post-Program research area of interest is represented by the following research question and attendant survey instrument questions:

- Research Question #5 - What has been the impact of the WMP on its graduate’s career over time?

Behavioral evidence to support whether the research question can be assessed from the findings was acquired through the following survey instrument questions and results are provided in Figure 7:

- Question #16 - I have obtained a higher level position because I completed the WMP.
- Question #17 - I obtained a position with a better employer because I completed the WMP.
- Question #18 - I have increased professional opportunities because I completed the WMP.
- Question #19 - My job responsibilities increased because I completed the WMP.
- Question #20 - My salary increased because I completed the WMP.
The survey data reflect that 10 of the 12 cohorts agree or strongly agree the graduates were afforded additional professional opportunities. The survey data reflect that 6 of the 12 cohorts agree or strongly agree the graduates obtained a higher-level position within their current company. The survey data reflect that 4 of the 12 cohorts agree or strongly agree the graduates obtained a position with another company.

3.4 - Post-Program Employer Experience

The Post-Program research area of interest is represented by the following research questions and attendant survey instrument questions. Figure 8 provides the summary of responses.

- Research Question #6 - What has been the employer reaction to the WMP?

Behavioral evidence to support whether the research question can be assessed from the findings was acquired through the following survey instrument questions:
- Question #21 - My employer provided financial support for my participation in the WMP.
- Question #22 - My employer provided release time for my coursework.
- Question #23 - Overall, my employer was supportive of my participation in the WMP.

The survey data reflect that 9 of the 12 cohorts agree or strongly agree their employer provided some level of financial support. The survey data reflect that 2 of the 12 cohorts agree or strongly agree their employers provided release time. The survey data reflect that 9 of the 12 cohorts agree or strongly agree their employer was supportive of their participation in the WMP.

4.0 - Conclusions and Recommendations

This paper reflects the results of a 10-year longitudinal and follow-up, study of nearly 225 business and industrial professionals who graduated from Purdue University’s College of Technology WMP.

This paper provided descriptions of the follow-up methodology as well as the career experiences, advancement and salary implications of a graduate degree (MS) in technology. Additionally, evaluative perspectives – generated in retrospect – have been shared. This paper also established the context for this evaluation by means of benchmarking it against a previously reported study from 2002.
The purpose of this study was to use evaluation research methods to assess the effectiveness of a master’s of science in technology degree for working professionals. The study focused on four areas of interest:

1. Program satisfaction
2. Directed Project
3. Post-program personal experience
4. Post-Program employer experience

Each of the above areas of interests were represented by one or more research questions. The evaluation design resulted in a set of 6 research question(s):

- Research Question #1 - What is the overall assessment of the WMP by its graduates over time (i.e., by cohort)?
- Research Question #2 - What has been the participant’s assessment of the WMP on their personal portfolio of skills (by cohort)?
- Research Question #3 - Is there evidence that the on-going quality improvement mechanisms are working and to what degree?
- Research Question #4 - What has been the participant’s assessment of the directed project over time (by cohort)?
- Research Question #5 - What has been the impact of the WMP on its graduate’s career over time?
- Research Question #6 - What has been the employer reaction to the WMP?

4.1 - Research Question #1 - What is the overall assessment of the WMP by its graduates over time (i.e., by cohort)?

In examining the findings we noted that the respondents reported a generally positive increase in their problem solving skills. In examining the data, the survey respondents reported a generally positive increase in their ability to learn new skills. They also reported a generally positive increase in their ability to access, synthesize and analyze data which may well have engendered their positive assessment of their ability to interpret and make decisions. Given these results, the researchers concluded that the WMP program had a positive participant assessment and that this increased over time.

4.2 - Research Question #2 - What has been the participant’s assessment of the WMP on their personal portfolio of skills (by cohort)?

In examining the data, the survey respondents reported a generally positive increase in their problem solving skills and they were generally positive about their ability to learn new skills. Consequently, the researchers concluded that the WMP program has had a generally increasing positive impact on each cohort’s personal portfolio of skills.

4.3 - Research Question #3 - Is there evidence that the on-going quality improvement mechanisms are working and to what degree?

In examining the data, the survey respondents reported a generally positive increase over program offerings in their ability to access, synthesize and analyze data. In examining the data,
the survey respondents reported a generally positive increase over program offerings in their ability to interpret and make decisions. The generally increasingly positive findings would suggest quality improvement efforts have been successful.

Generally, over time, each program cohort reported an increasingly positive assessment of the program and a positive impact on their portfolio of skills. Given the faculty remained relatively constant over time, these overall increasingly positive responses suggest the program demonstrated continuous process improvement, most likely through participant input and evaluations.

4.4 - Research Question #4 - What has been the participant’s assessment of the directed project over time (by cohort)?

The data are mixed about reporting directed projects being fully implemented over time. Fully, 7 of the 13 cohorts reported below average that their projects were fully implemented. The data do not support a positive trend in reporting their directed project resulted in savings of money and/or time. Fully, 7 of the 13 cohorts reported below average that their project resulted in savings of money and/or time. The data is mixed and does not reflect a positive trend that the project was valuable to the respondent’s company. The data suggests a positive trend in that the project was valuable to the cohort respondent’s supervisor. This last finding reflects the projects were more important to the cohort respondent’s supervisor than to the cohort respondent’s company. This finding might be a reflection of the projects not being fully implemented in respondent’s company. There was a positive trend in reported cohort data that the project was valuable to the students. There was a positive trend in reported cohort data that the project was an important part of the WMP.

Generally, the data reflect that the directed project was valuable to the respondent’s personally, and to their supervisor, and, that the project was perceived as an important part of the WMP. The data does not reflect a positive trend in whether the project was implemented in the respondent’s company or that it reflected in savings of money and/or time. While there may be many reasons for not experiencing full project implementation or savings either financially and/or in time, one might extrapolate the directed project was not tied as closely to the student’s company as it should have been. Alternatively stated, had the project been more closely aligned to company objectives and had the project been perceived as valuable in saving money and/or time, the project may have been perceived more positively by the student’s employer and/or had been given the opportunity for full implementation.

4.5 - Research Question #5 - What has been the impact of the WMP on its graduate’s career over time?

The data were positive in that many graduates were promoted to a higher-level position after they completed the WMP. The data also were positive in that some graduates also reported securing of better positions with another employer. In general this suggests that the program provided an increase in professional opportunities and a commensurate increase in job responsibilities. The data also reflected positive assessments by graduates in terms of salary increases after completing the WMP. The researchers concluded, therefore, that the WMP has had a positive impact on the careers of its graduates.
4.6 - Research Question #6 - What has been the employer reaction to the weekend master’s program?

The responses indicated that employers generally provided financial support for student participation in the WMP. The data also highlighted that employers additionally supported participation in the WMP by providing release time.

4.7 - Overall Conclusion

In summary, the conclusions reached by the researchers were that the:

- WMP received an increasing positive assessment over time,
- Program enhanced the personal portfolio of student skills,
- Program and students benefited from quality improvements to assess, assimilate and apply learned content,
- Directed project was important to the student and perceived as important part of the WMP,
- WMP provided a positive impact on the student’s career, opportunities, job responsibilities and salary, and,
- Employers of the student’s were supportive both in time release and through educational assistance.

In comparing the findings from the previous benchmarked study of 2002, both studies found the program enhanced the personal portfolio of student skills, improved student ability to assess, assimilate and subsequently apply learned content. In both studies, the student employers were supportive of the programs.

5.0 – Recommendations

As with all good research projects, this evaluation resulted in a set of recommendations for both further research and for the improvement of the operation and content of the program. To address the overarching program improvement goal, the researchers recommend that:

- The directed project should be tied more closely to desired outcomes of the employers to more readily ensure a positive outcome in financial and/or time savings to the company

Additionally, the researchers also recommend that ProSTAR faculty continue to invest in research and evaluation in the following directions:

- Evaluative information should be obtained directly from the graduates’ employers
- Evaluative information should be obtained directly from the faculty of the program
- Another follow-up should be conducted in three years.
- The delivery format in terms of meeting schedules and time should be assessed against student availability to ensure that our target constituencies can continue to take full advantage of ProSTAR’s offerings.
### Appendix A – Number of Respondents by Cohort by Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohorts Surveyed</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 5: Increased Problem Solving Skills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6: Increased Ability to Learn New Skills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7: Increased Ability to Access, Synthesize and Analyze</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8: Increased Ability to Interpret Info &amp; Make Decisions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 9: Met my Learning Expectations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 10: Project Fully Implemented</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 11: Project Resulted in Savings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 12: Project Valuable to Company</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 13: Project Valuable to Supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 14: Project Valuable to me</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 15: Directed Project Important part of WMP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 16: Obtained Higher Level Position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 17: Obtained Position with Another Company</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 18: Afforded Professional Opportunities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 19: Increase in Job Responsibilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 20: My Salary Increased</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 21: Employer Provided Financial Support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 22: Employer Provided Release Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 23: Employer was Supportive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B - Survey Questions Grouped by Topics.

Section 1: Demographics

(Question types: various q-t)

Research Question(s):

- How have the demographics of the weekend master’s program changed over time (by cohort)?

Survey Questions:

1. Gender
2. Age (range)
3. Email
4. May we contact you via email if we need to follow up on any of these questions?

Section 2: Program Satisfaction

(Question types: 5 pt Likert scale; strongly agree to strongly disagree)

Research Question(s):

- What is the overall assessment of the weekend master’s program by its graduates over time (i.e., by cohort)?
- What has been the participant’s assessment of the weekend master’s program on their personal portfolio of skills (by cohort)?
- Is there evidence that the on-going quality improvement mechanisms are working and to what degree?

Survey Questions:

- Question #5 - I increased my technical problem solving skills as a result of the Weekend Masters Program.
- Question #6 - I increased my ability to learn new skills and techniques as a result of the Weekend Masters Program.
- Question #7 - I increased my ability to access, synthesize and analyze information as a result of the Weekend Masters Program.
- Question #8 - I increased my ability to interpret information and make decisions as a result of the Weekend Masters Program.
- Question #9 - I feel that the Weekend Masters program met my learning expectations.

Section 3: Directed Project
(Question types: 5 pt Likert scale; strongly agree to strongly disagree)

Research Question(s):

- What has been the participant’s assessment of the directed project over time (by cohort)?

Survey Questions:

- Question #10 - My directed project was fully implemented at my workplace (or in a practical setting).
- Question #11 - My directed project resulted in savings of money and/or time.
- Question #12 - My directed project was valuable to my company.
- Question #13 - My directed project was valuable to my supervisor.
- Question #14 - My directed project was a valuable to me.
- Question #15 - The directed project is an important part of the Weekend Master Program.

Section 3: Post-Program (Personal)

(Question types: 5 pt Likert scale; strongly agree to strongly disagree)

Research Question(s):

- What has been the impact of the weekend master’s program on its graduate’s career over time?

Survey Questions:

- Question #16 - I have obtained a higher level position because I completed the Weekend Masters Program.
- Question #17 - I obtained a position with a better employer because I completed the Weekend Masters Program.
- Question #18 - I have increase professional opportunities because I completed the Weekend Masters Program.
- Question #19 - My job responsibilities increased because I completed the Weekend Masters Program.
- Question #20 - My salary increased because I completed the Weekend Master Program.

Section 4: Post-Program (Employer)

(Question types: 5 pt Likert scale; strongly agree to strongly disagree)

Research Question(s):

- What has been the employer reaction to the weekend master’s program?
Question #21 - My employer provided financial support for my participation in the Weekend Masters Program.

Question #22 - My employer provided release time for my coursework.

Question #23 - Overall, my employer was supportive of my participation in the Weekend Masters program.

Question #24 - May we contact your supervisor to survey their opinion of the Weekend Masters program on your skills and development?

Section 5: Reflection

(Question types: text box for data entry)

Question #25 - What were the most beneficial aspects of the Weekend Masters Program?

Question #26 - What were the least beneficial aspects of the Weekend Masters Program?

Question #27 - Anything else you would like to comment on concerning the Weekend Masters Program?
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