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UNF MPA program assessment includes a number of elements:

1. An alumni survey from 2018 (page 2)
2. Student and alumni skills self-assessment, not submitted for 2023 (page 3)
3. Student skills direct assessments (page 6)
4. Program diversity (page 9)
5. Student completion and employment outcomes (page 11)

The University of North Florida Master of Public Administration program graduated its first student in 1978. Over forty years later the number of alumni has reached over 750. The program was first accredited in 1999 by what was then the [National Association of Schools of Public Policy, Affairs and Administration](http://www.naspaa.org/), and recently received its fourth reaccreditation, valid through 2026. This makes UNF-MPA the only accredited graduate program in public policy, public administration, and related fields offered in Northeast Florida.[[1]](#footnote-1)

Assessment, and public accountability regarding that assessment, is both a requirement of accreditation, and central to the fields of public policy and administration. This report combines the results of the program’s ongoing assessment plan, along with a summer 2018 survey of program alumni, carried out every 4-5 years.

## 1. Alumni survey

A third alumni survey of the UNF-MPA program was conducted in summer 2018. The survey received 132 responses. This was about 19% of the then 700 total graduates of the program, and a response rate of about 30% of the over 400 alums we have email addresses for. The UNF-MPA program saw an almost complete change of faculty from Fall 2010, and so many of the results below are presented separately for the years 2011 and beyond (n = 74), with the previous years (n = 58) also serving as a benchmark for current performance.

**Table 1**

**Overall alumni impression of MPA**

|  | Yes1978-2010 | Yes2011-2018 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Improvement in life satisfaction | 79.3% | 93.3% |
| Worth the investment in time and money | 89.7% | 96% |

More specifically, the survey gathered information regarding increased income after the MPA. These data are presented in Table 2. The data indicate a strong return on investment.

**Table 2**

**Increase in income after MPA graduation.**

| AY | Statistic | Increase in annual salary one year after | Increase in annual salary five years after |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1978-2010 | N | 50 | 51 |
| 1978-2010 | Mean ($) | 11,320 | 29,541 |
| 1978-2010 | Median ($) | 7,500 | 25,000 |
| 2011-2018 | N | 67 | 53 |
| 2011-2018 | Mean ($) | 12,552 | 23,987 |
| 2011-2018 | Median ($) | 9,000 | 20,500 |
| Total | N | 117 | 104 |
| Total | Mean ($) | 12,026 | 26,711 |
| Total | Median ($) | 8,000 | 21,000 |

The summer 2018 alumni survey also asked broader questions regarding faculty teaching, research, service, and advising. Results are presented in Table 3, on the next page.

**Table 3**

**Overall alumni program assessment**

| Faculty… | Percent poor/ fair | Percent Good/ very good | Percent excellent | Mean score (0-5 scale) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| …instruction 1978-2010 | 1.7 | 69.0 | 29.3 | 4.03 |
| …instruction 2011-2018 | 0.0 | 48.6 | 51.4 | 4.43 |
| …research 1978-2010 | 3.5 | 77.2 | 19.3 | 3.74 |
| …research 2011-2018 | 5.6 | 52.8 | 41.7 | 4.15 |
| …public service 1978-2010 | 12.3 | 70.2 | 17.5 | 3.56 |
| …public service 2011-2018 | 0.0 | 57.0 | 43.1 | 4.25 |
| Program management ‘78-2010 | 18.9 | 55.1 | 25.9 | 3.69 |
| Program management 2011-‘18 | 0.0 | 27.0 | 73.0 | 4.68 |

The results are clearly positive, with 90%+ assessing faculty teaching, research and public service, as well as program management, as good, very good or excellent throughout its 40-year history. Post 2010 program assessments have improved on previous efforts, with 100% of respondents rating the faculty good, very good or excellent in terms of teaching and public service, as well as program management.

## 2. Student and alumni skills self-assessment

Capstone students have been surveyed regarding perceptions of their professional development every year since 2011[[2]](#footnote-2). Skills assessed are those identified in the program’s mission and competencies.

The questions were coded as follows:

0 – Unchanged

1 – Unchanged, as prior experience left little room to improve

2 – Improved

3 – Improved significantly

Results are presented in Table 4 (Table 4a on the next page, then continued on 4b and 4c on the page after that). A large portion of students report improvement, or significant improvement in skill levels. Table 5 presents alumni self-assessments of improvements in skill levels.

**Table 4a**

**Student skill self-assessment: post-test (Capstone PAD6066)**

|  | Class | Skills were Unchanged | Skills were Improved | Skills were Improved significantly | Mean score1-3 scale |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Communication: write | 2015-17 | 0 | 46 | 54 | 2.54 |
| Communication: write | Spring ‘18 | 0 | 57 | 43 | 2.46 |
| Communication: write | Spring ‘19 | 6 | 56 | 39 | 2.35 |
| Communication: write | Spring ‘20 | 0 | 36 | 64 | 2.64 |
| Communication: write | 2021-23 | 8 | 39 | 54 | 2.48 |
| Communication: speak | 2015-17 | 19 | 56 | 24 | 2.03 |
| Communication: speak | Spring ‘18 | 7 | 71 | 21 | 2.12 |
| Communication: speak | Spring ‘19 | 11 | 72 | 17 | 2.06 |
| Communication: speak | Spring ‘20 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 2.50 |
| Communication: speak | 2021-23 | 8 | 67 | 39 | 2.20 |
| Communication: listen | 2015-17 | 10 | 68 | 22 | 2.12 |
| Communication: listen | Spring ‘18 | 7 | 64 | 29 | 2.22 |
| Communication: listen | Spring ‘19 | 6 | 61 | 33 | 2.27 |
| Communication: listen | Spring ‘20 | 0 | 43 | 57 | 2.49 |
| Communication: listen | 2021-23 | 8 | 39 | 54 | 2.48 |
| Local governance | 2015-17 | 4 | 34 | 61 | 2.55 |
| Local governance | Spring ‘18 | 0 | 20 | 80 | 2.80 |
| Local governance | Spring ‘19 | 6 | 50 | 44 | 2.32 |
| Local governance | Spring ‘20 | 0 | 43 | 57 | 2.57 |
| Local governance | 2021-23 | 0 | 46 | 54 | 2.54 |
| Problem solving | 2015-17 | 2 | 56 | 42 | 2.46 |
| Problem solving | Spring ‘18 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 2.50 |
| Problem solving | Spring ‘19 | 6 | 50 | 44 | 2.32 |
| Problem solving | Spring ‘20 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 2.50 |
| Problem solving | 2021-23 | 0 | 23 | 77 | 2.77 |
| Professional ethics | 2015-17 | 5 | 51 | 44 | 2.39 |
| Professional ethics | Spring ‘18 | 0 | 43 | 57 | 2.57 |
| Professional ethics | Spring ‘19 | 0 | 44 | 56 | 2.56 |
| Professional ethics | Spring ‘20 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 2.50 |
| Professional ethics | 2021-23 | 8 | 46 | 46 | 2.38 |
| Management theory | 2015-17 | 2 | 39 | 59 | 2.57 |
| Management theory | Spring ‘18 | 0 | 21 | 79 | 2.79 |
| Management theory | Spring ‘19 | 0 | 44 | 56 | 2.54 |
| Management theory | Spring ‘20 | 0 | 43 | 57 | 2.57 |
| Management theory | 2021-23 | 0 | 54 | 46 | 2.46 |
| Economic constraints | 2015-17 | 4 | 24 | 71 | 2.65 |
| Economic constraints | Spring ‘18 | 7 | 29 | 64 | 2.57 |
| Economic constraints | Spring ‘19 | 6 | 56 | 39 | 2.35 |
| Economic constraints | Spring ‘20 | 0 | 14 | 86 | 2.86 |
| Economic constraints | 2021-23 | 8 | 23 | 69 | 2.61 |

**Table 4b**

|  | Class | Skills were Unchanged | Skills were Improved | Skills Improved significantly | Mean score1-3 scale |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Quantitative skills | 2015-17 | 14 | 61 | 24 | 1.98 |
| Quantitative skills | Spring ‘18 | 0 | 86 | 14 | 2.14 |
| Quantitative skills | Spring ‘19 | 12 | 61 | 28 | 2.11 |
| Quantitative skills | Spring ‘20 | 8 | 50 | 43 | 2.29 |
| Quantitative skills | 2021-23 | 0 | 31 | 69 | 2.38 |
| Diverse workforce | 2015-17 | 3 | 60 | 38 | 2.35 |
| Diverse workforce | Spring ‘18 | 7 | 57 | 36 | 2.29 |
| Diverse workforce | Spring ‘19 | 0 | 56 | 44 | 2.44 |
| Diverse workforce | Spring ‘20 | 7 | 43 | 50 | 2.36 |
| Diverse workforce | 2021-23 | 31\* | 15 | 54 | 2.23 |
| Public policy | 2015-17 | 9 | 42 | 49 | 2.32 |
| Public policy | Spring ‘18 | 0 | 33 | 64 | 2.64 |
| Public policy | Spring ‘19 | 0 | 44 | 56 | 2.56 |
| Public policy | Spring ‘20 | 0 | 36 | 64 | 2.64 |
| Public policy | 2021-23 | 0 | 31 | 69 | 1.70 |
| Globalization | 2015-17 | 7 | 39 | 54 | 2.42 |
| Globalization | Spring ‘18 | 7 | 36 | 57 | 2.50 |
| Globalization | Spring ‘19 | 0 | 56 | 44 | 2.44 |
| Globalization | Spring ‘20 | 0 | 29 | 71 | 2.71 |
| Globalization | 2021-23 | 0 | 46 | 54 | 2.54 |
| Role of public service | 2015-17 | 2 | 46 | 51 | 2.46 |
| Role of public service | Spring ‘18 | 0 | 36 | 64 | 2.64 |
| Role of public service | Spring ‘19 | 0 | 44 | 56 | 2.56 |
| Role of public service | Spring ‘20 | 0 | 14 | 86 | 2.86 |
| Role of public service | 2021-23 | 0 | 31 | 69 | 2.69 |
| Concentration expertise | 2015-17 | 2 | 32 | 66 | 2.61 |
| Concentration expertise | Spring ‘18 | 0 | 30 | 70 | 2.70 |
| Concentration expertise | Spring ‘19 | 0 | 39 | 61 | 2.61 |
| Concentration expertise | Spring ‘20 | 0 | 36 | 64 | 2.64 |
| Concentration expertise | 2021-23 | -- | -- | -- | -- |

**Student skill self-assessment: post-test (Capstone PAD6066)**

\* This may reflect those students came into the program with diversity skills and experiences.

**Table 4c**

**Program culture**

|  |  | Very poor | Poor | Good | Very good | Mean1-4 scale |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Faculty culture of diversity/ inclusion | Spring ‘20 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 57 | 3.57 |
| Faculty culture of diversity/ inclusion | 2021-23 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 62 | 3.62 |
| Student culture of diversity/ inclusion | Spring ‘20 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 43 | 3.43 |
| Student culture of diversity/ inclusion | 2021-23 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 62 | 3.62 |

**Table 5**

**Alumni skill self-assessment: Whole sample**

|  | Alumni skills were Unchanged | Alumni skills were Unchanged (prior exp.) | Alumni skills were Improved | Alumni skills were Improved significantly | Mean score\* 1978-2010 | Mean score\* 2011-2018 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Communication: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Communication: writing | 2.2 | 2.3 | 55.3 | 40.2 | 2.16 | 2.51 |
| Communication: speaking | 6.9 | 6.8 | 59.5 | 26.7 | 2.05 | 2.19 |
| Communication: listening | 4.5 | 7.6 | 56.8 | 31.1 | 2.16 | 2.22 |
| Local governance | 0.7 | 0.8 | 38.6 | 59.8 | 2.50 | 2.65 |
| Critical thinking/ analysis | 1.5 | 0.8 | 53.8 | 43.9 | 2.38 | 2.45 |
| Professional ethics | 7.6 | 5.3 | 49.2 | 37.9 | 2.21 | 2.28 |
| Management theory | 1.5 | 0.8 | 43.2 | 54.5 | 2.47 | 2.57 |
| Economic constraints | 2.4 | 4.5 | 45.8 | 47.3 | 2.33 | 2.47 |
| Quantitative skills | 3.0 | 0.8 | 50.8 | 45.5 | 2.38 | 2.45 |
| Diverse workforce | 7.6 | 7.6 | 53.0 | 31.8 | 2.10 | 2.22 |
| Public policy | 1.5 | 0.8 | 51.5 | 46.2 | 2.45 | 2.43 |
| Globalization | 3.9 | 0.8 | 31.3 | 64.1 | 2.38 | 2.74 |
| Role of public service  | 2.3 | 3.0 | 45 | 49.6 | 2.35 | 2.51 |
| Concentration expertise | 2.3 | - | 52.7 | 45 | 2.33 | 2.50 |

\* To maintain comparable results, this is calculated using a 0-2-3 scoring system, with 0 for both unchanged categories, 2 for improved, and 3 for improved significantly.

Alumni results are strong across the board, with 85%+ indicating their skills had improved in all categories. Especially impressive are the results for writing skills and critical thinking, and the results for understanding of local governance, management theory, and public policy. Mean scores also show improvement from the 1978-2010 period to the 2011-18 period.

## 3. Student direct assessments

### Quantitative analysis assessment

We have had a quantitative analysis assessment exercise since 2015, in which students interpret, in written form, statistical data presented to them.

We have worked on a second assessment for this competency presented in Table 6, next page, in large part due to the mixed results in Table 6. In spring 2018 we piloted a quiz dealing with central concepts in statistical analysis. Results have been promising. To date (2023) we have had 40 Intro, and 33 Capstone students take the quiz. An improvement was identified, Capstone students answering 7.6 correct, compared to 5.8 in the introductory class (p = .006). This exercise still leaves ample room for improvement in the Capstone class. More important, the format allows easy identification of key concepts that Capstone students have not understood.[[3]](#footnote-3)

**Table 6**

**Quantitative analysis exercise, by Capstone learning outcomes**

(%, and on 0-3 scale for mean score)

|  | Insufficient major | Insufficient minor | Prof.Adequate | Prof.Mastery | Mean Score |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Statistical interpretation: Spg ‘16-20 | 12.3 | 43.1 | 24.6 | 20.0 | 1.52 |
| Statistical interpretation: Spg ‘21 | 18.9 | 31.3 | 43.4 | 6.3 | 1.38 |
| Statistical interpretation: Spg ‘22 | 25.0 | 41.7 | 25.0 | 8.3 | 1.17 |
| Statistical interpretation: Spg ‘23 | 0.0 | 58.3 | 33.3 | 8.3 | 1.46 |
| Critical analysis: Spg ‘16-20 | 13.8 | 46.2 | 16.9 | 23.1 | 1.49 |
| Critical analysis: Spg ‘21 | 18.9 | 25.0 | 50.0 | 6.3 | 1.44 |
| Critical analysis: Spg ‘22 | 33.3 | 41.7 | 16.7 | 8.3 | 1.00 |
| Critical analysis: Spg ‘23 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 1.23 |
| Table presentation: Spg ‘16-20 | 3.1 | 7.7 | 38.5 | 50.8 | 2.37 |
| Table presentation: Spg ‘21 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 43.8 | 43.8 | 2.25 |
| Table presentation: Spg ‘22 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 33.3 | 50.0 | 2.25 |
| Table presentation: Spg ‘23 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 75.0 | 2.77 |

### Public management essay

Table 7 presents overall results for our ‘public management essay’. In this component of the program’s assessment, incoming students (PAD6060 Public Administration in Modern Society) write an essay on a prominent historical article about American public administration. In the Capstone class students write a second essay, this one on a similar article. The table combines the scores from 2010 to 2023 (Intro n = 215; Capstone n = 252) for all classes for which results are available. Capstone students score both substantively, and statistically higher than incoming MPA students.

In terms of the most recent data, we look to have a strong PAD6060 (Intro) class coming in. The Fall 2023 Intro (n = 14) scored as well as the Spring 2023 Capstone (n = 12): 2.43 v. 2.58, (p = .585). Otherwise, Capstone outperformed Intro in Command of the Public management literature (p <.001), Critical thinking (p <.001), Research (p = .043), and overall (p = .033).

Table 8 breaks down the public management essay results by learning outcomes. In a change from previous reports, the results are presented as a three-year running average. Sample size from Intro classes was 33, and Capstone 56. Results remain consistent with recent trends and show improvement through the program.

**Table 7**

**Intro and Capstone compared, public management essay**

| Assessment item | Class | Mean score | Probability |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Discipline knowledge  | Intro | 1.82 |  < .001 |
|  | Capstone | 2.43 |  |
| Critical analysis | Intro | 1.79 | <.001 |
|  | Capstone | 2.50 |  |
| Research | Intro | 1.83 | <.001 |
|  | Capstone | 2.30 |  |
| Writing | Intro | 2.19 | <.001 |
|  | Capstone | 2.52 |  |
| Combined | Intro | 1.93 | <.001 |
|  | Capstone | 2.44 |  |

**Table 8**

**Public Management essay, by learning outcomes (%)**

|  | Class | Insufficient major | Insufficient minor | Prof.Adequate | Prof.Mastery | Mean Score |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PM theory (%) | Intro-AY 2021-23 | 24.2 | 18.2 | 21.2 | 36.4 | 1.70 |
| PM theory (%) | Caps-Spg 2021-23 | 0.0 | 9.5 | 35.7 | 54.8 | 2.45 |
| Critical analysis (%) | Intro-AY 2021-23 | 21.2 | 15.2 | 30.3 | 33.3 | 1.76 |
| Critical analysis (%) | Caps-Spg 2021-23 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 26.2 | 69.0 | 2.64 |
| Research (%) | Intro-AY 2021-23 | 27.3 | 12.1 | 21.2 | 39.4 | 1.73 |
| Research (%) | Caps-Spg 2021-23 | 2.4 | 4.8 | 33.3 | 59.5 | 2.50 |
| Writing (%) | Intro-AY 2021-23 | 6.1 | 15.2 | 27.3 | 51.5 | 2.24 |
| Writing (%) | Caps-Spg 2021-23 | 0.0 | 11.9 | 14.3 | 73.8 | 2.62 |

### Concentration assessment

Finally, Table 9 presents the results for the cumulative, through AY2020-21, Concentration assessment. The exercise consists of an essay in which students are asked to discuss the major challenges facing their concentration area. Generalist Option students are asked to discuss major challenges facing the UNF-MPA mission competency of “understanding local governance in a global context.” Students are assessed on their critical policy thinking, and on their knowledge of the literature in their concentration area.

**Table 9**

**Concentration assessment exercise, by Spring 2013-23 Capstone competency**

**(with Capstone mean, 2021-3 in parenthesis)**

|  | Insufficient major | Insufficient minor | Prof. Adequate | Prof. Mastery | Mean (Caps ’21-3) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Nonprofit (n = 67) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical policy thinking (%) | 1.5 | 7.5 | 9.0 | 82.1 | 2.72 |
| Management literature (%) | 3.0 | 4.5 | 11.9 | 80.6 | 2.70 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Local government (n = 44) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical policy thinking (%) | 6.8 | 6.8 | 25.0 | 61.4 | 2.41 |
| Management literature (%) | 4.5 | 6.8 | 27.3 | 61.4 | 2.45 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Health admin (n =13) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical policy thinking (%) | 15.4 | 7.7 | 30.8 | 46.2 | 2.08 |
| Management literature (%) | 0.0 | 23.1 | 23.1 | 53.8 | 2.31 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public Policy (n = 17) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical policy thinking (%) | 11.8 | 5.9 | 17.6 | 64.7 | 2.35 |
| Public policy literature (%) | 0.0 | 11.8 | 17.6 | 70.6 | 2.59 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| National Security (n=1) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical policy thinking (%) | 0 | 0 | 100.0 | 0 | 2.0 |
| Management literature (%) | 0 | 0 | 100.0 | 0 | 2.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Generalist option (n = 43) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical thinking (%) | 2.3 | 25.6 | 11.6 | 60.5 | 2.30 |
| Literature (%) | 7.0 | 25.6 | 7.0 | 60.5 | 2.21 |

Given the relatively small sample sizes for each academic year (the AY2020-21 graduates included 3 nonprofit, 9 local government, 3 public policy, 1 health administration, and no national security or generalist graduates), we have presented these results cumulative. A clear trend of solid learning outcomes can be seen. To compare AY 2020-21 results with the cumulative results to date, the overall numbers are presented in parentheses in the final column.

## 4. Program diversity

We added two new items to the student exit survey in Table 4: student perceptions of MPA faculty culture of diversity and inclusion, and student perceptions of MPA student culture of diversity and inclusion. This, incidentally, was added to our assessment plan in fall 2019. Both indicators show that all students felt the program culture of diversity and inclusion was good or very good.

**Table 10**

**Student diversity: admissions (%)**

| Year | Female | Black | Hispanic | Asian | Total # |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2010-15 | 56 | 22 | 8 | 7 | 245 |
| 2015-16 | 52 | 29 | 3 | 6 | 31 |
| 2016-17 | 59 | 38 | 6 | 3 | 34 |
| 2017-18 | 64 | 32 | 5 | 2 | 44 |
| 2018-19 | 52 | 30 | 11 | 0 | 27 |
| 2019-20 | 49 | 40 | 11 | 3 | 35 |
| 2020-21 | 74 | 47 | 5 | 3 | 38 |
| 2021-22 | 62 | 14 | 7 | 3 | 29 |
| 2022-23 | 50 | 39 | 7 | 11 | 28 |

**Table 11**

**Student diversity: completion (%)**

| Year | Female | Black | Hispanic | Asian | Total # |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2010-15 | 55 | 18 | 9 | 5 | 134 |
| 2015-16 | 68 | 23 | 9 | 0 | 22 |
| 2016-17 | 30 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 10 |
| 2017-18 | 41 | 24 | 12 | 0 | 17 |
| 2018-19 | 44 | 19 | 13 | 0 | 16 |
| 2019-20 | 58 | 11 | 0 | 5 | 19 |
| 2020-21 | 63 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| 2021-22 | 53 | 32 | 5 | 5 | 21 |
| 2022-23 | 67 | 44 | 9 | 0 | 11 |

**Table 12**

**Student diversity: currently enrolled (%)**

| Year | Female | Black | Hispanic | Asian | Total (#) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Fall ‘20 | 54 | 36 | 8 | 4 | 50 |
| Fall ‘21\* | 62 | 25 | 8 | 5 | 63 |
| Fall ‘22 | 55 | 29 | 7 | 3 | 58 |
| Fall ‘23 | 48 | 30 | 8 | 8 | 50 |

 \* Fall 2021 data for ‘active’ students.

Tables 10-12 present student diversity data. Gender diversity is about normal for US MPA programs, with a moderate over-representation of women. Racial diversity in admissions broadly reflects the NE Florida region, with 22 (Northeast Florida) to 30% (Jacksonville) of the region being African American, and just under 10% Hispanic.

Table 13 presents faculty diversity. We have added the three adjuncts to the 2021-22 tally, as this more accurately reflects faculty students are exposed to.

**Table 13**

**Faculty diversity**

| Year | Female | Black | Hispanic | Asian | Total |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2010-11 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| 2011-18 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6-8 |
| 2018-20 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6-7 |
| 2020-21 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 2021-22 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 |
| 2022-23 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8 |

## 5. Student completion and employment outcomes

Beyond the student satisfaction and income data presented above in Section 1, we also provide to our accrediting body the following data on student completion rates, and employment data by sector.

**Table 14**

**Student time to completion (cumulative years)**

| AY | Enroll | 2 years | 3 years | 4 years | 6 years | 6+ years | Total | Continuing |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2010-15 | 32.8 | 16.8 | 3.8 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 22.6 | 0 |
| 2015-16 | 23 | 8 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| 2016-17 | 23 | 10 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 1 |
| 2017-18 | 34 | 13 | 22 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 1 |
| 2018-19 | 18 | 9 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| 2019-20 | 26 | 14 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 3 |
| 2020-21 | 25 | 10 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 6 |
| 2021-22 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 |
| 2022-23 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 |

Table 14 identifies that many students enrolled in the program graduate within 2 to three years of entering the program. As seen in Table 15, most students who graduate from the program are employed by six months after graduation in various sectors.

**Table 15**

**Placement data by field of employment, six months after graduation, by AY**

|  | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| National or central government | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| State government | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| City, county, or other local government | 6 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Overseas government | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Domestic nonprofit | 6 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| International nonprofit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Private sector – research/ consulting | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| Private sector – not research/ consulting | 6 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Obtaining further education | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Military service | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Unemployed (not seeking employment) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unemployed (seeking employment) | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Status unknown | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 |
| Total | 29 | 20 | 20 | 16 | 18 | 22 | 11 |

1. Nova Southeastern has facilities in Jacksonville, and offers an accredited online and hybrid degree ([link](https://www.nova.edu/campuses/jacksonville/degree-programs.html)). Jacksonville University’s Master of Public Policy program is not accredited ([link](https://www.naspaa.org/doc/2021-2022-annual-roster-accredited-programs), and [link](https://www.ju.edu/about/accreditation-information.php)). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Due to pandemic complications, we surveyed 2021-2023 graduates via Qualtrics, and report them together. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. For example, Capstone students were especially weak understanding the concept of the unit of analysis (27% correct), a regression beta coefficient (30%), and a regression coefficient for a dummy variable (12%), a correlation dummy variable (15%), the unstandardized regression coefficient (21%), and the regression adjusted r2 (33%). This was a multiple-choice quiz, with five answers for each, so guessing should have yielded 20% right. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)