



UNF-MPA student learning outcomes and program assessment

Prepared by
G.G. Candler
MPA assessment coordinator

Revised 27 October 2025

UNF MPA program assessment includes a number of

1. Student and alumni skills self-assessment, not submitted for 2023 (page 1)
2. Student skills direct assessments (page 4) elements:
3. Program diversity (page 7)
4. Student completion and employment outcomes (page 8)
5. An alumni survey from 2018 (page 9)

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](#), 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

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 fall 2024 survey of program alumni.

¹ Nova Southeastern has facilities in Jacksonville, and offers an accredited online and hybrid degree ([link](#)). Jacksonville University's Master of Public Policy program is not accredited ([link](#), and [link](#)).

1. Student skills self-assessment

Capstone students have been surveyed regarding perceptions of their professional development every year since 2011². 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 1 (Table 1a on the next page, then continued on 1b on the page after that). A large portion of students report improvement, or significant improvement in skill levels. Though casual observation appears to show that 2024 results are lower than recent trends, none of the differences are statistically significant at a 95% confidence level.

Table 1a
Student skill self-assessment: post-test (Capstone PAD6066)

	Class	Skills were Unchanged	Skills were Improved	Skills were Improved significantly	Mean score 1-3 scale
Communication: write	2015-17	0	46	54	2.54
Communication: write	2018-20	2	50	48	2.46
Communication: write	2021-23	8	39	54	2.48
Communication: write	2024	0	60	40	2.40
Communication: speak	2015-17	19	56	24	2.03
Communication: speak	2018-20	6	65	28	2.20
Communication: speak	2021-23	8	67	39	2.20
Communication: speak	2024	20	60	20	2.00
Communication: listen	2015-17	10	68	22	2.12
Communication: listen	2018-20	4	60	39	2.35
Communication: listen	2021-23	8	39	54	2.48
Communication: listen	2024	0	73	27	2.27
Local governance	2015-17	4	34	61	2.55
Local governance	2018-20	2	39	59	2.54
Local governance	2021-23	0	46	54	2.54
Local governance	2024	0	53	47	2.47
Problem solving	2015-17	2	56	42	2.46
Problem solving	2018-20	4	48	50	2.46
Problem solving	2021-23	0	23	77	2.77
Problem solving	2024	7	47	47	2.40
Professional ethics	2015-17	5	51	44	2.39
Professional ethics	2018-20	0	46	54	2.54
Professional ethics	2021-23	8	46	46	2.38
Professional ethics	2024	0	60	40	2.40
Management theory	2015-17	2	39	59	2.57
Management theory	2018-20	0	37	63	2.63

² Due to pandemic complications, we surveyed 2021-2023 graduates via qualtrics, and report them together.

Management theory	2021-23	0	54	46	2.46
Management theory	2024	7	60	33	2.27
Economic constraints	2015-17	4	24	71	2.65
Economic constraints	2018-20	2	35	61	2.54
Economic constraints	2021-23	8	23	69	2.61
Economic constraints	2024	0	47	53	2.53

Table 1b
Student skill self-assessment: post-test (Capstone PAD6066)

	Class	Skills were Unchanged	Skills were Improved	Skills Improved significantly	Mean score 1-3 scale
Quantitative skills	2015-17	14	61	24	1.98
Quantitative skills	2018-20	7	65	28	2.17
Quantitative skills	2021-23	0	31	69	2.38
Quantitative skills	2024	7	60	33	2.27
Diverse workforce	2015-17	3	60	38	2.35
Diverse workforce	2018-20	4	52	44	2.40
Diverse workforce	2021-23	31	15	54	2.23
Diverse workforce	2024	20	47	33	2.13
Public policy	2015-17	9	42	49	2.32
Public policy	2018-20	0	39	61	2.67
Public policy	2021-23	0	31	69	2.69
Public policy	2024	0	67	33	2.33
Globalization	2015-17	7	39	54	2.42
Globalization	2018-20	2	41	57	2.54
Globalization	2021-23	0	46	54	2.54
Globalization	2024	7	60	33	2.27
Role of public service	2015-17	2	46	51	2.46
Role of public service	2018-20	0	33	67	2.67
Role of public service	2021-23	0	31	69	2.69
Role of public service	2024	0	73	27	2.27
Concentration expertise	2015-17	2	32	66	2.61
Concentration expertise	2018-20	0	40	60	2.60
Concentration expertise	2021-23	--	--	--	--
Concentration expertise	2024	0	33	67	2.67

Table 2 presents Capstone perceptions of the faculty and student culture of diversity in the program. This was first trialed in 2020, went on hiatus during the pandemic, and returned in 2024. Results are positive.

Table 2
Program culture

		Very poor	Poor	Good	Very good	Mean 1-4 scale
Faculty culture of diversity/ inclusion	Spring '20	0	0	43	57	3.57
Faculty culture of diversity/ inclusion	Spring '24	0	0	40	60	3.40
Student culture of diversity/ inclusion	Spring '20	0	0	57	43	3.43
Student culture of diversity/ inclusion	Spring '24	0	0	53	47	3.47

2. 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. The results are presented in Table 3, and have generally not been positive (and contrary to generally strong student self-assessment of their own quantitative analysis skills), with a variety of factors changing over the years that has made it difficult to identify the problem. After a stronger 2024 evaluation, 2025 has remained above our long-term trends. Even with the strong 2024 result in the 2021-24 test group, 2025 produced statistically significant, higher results for both the interpretation ($p = .042$), and critical analysis of quantitative data ($p = .021$).

Table 3
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 '21-24	11.1	37.0	35.2	16.7	1.57
Statistical interpretation: Spg '25	7.7	23.1	23.1	46.2	2.08
Critical analysis: Spg '16-20	13.8	46.2	16.9	23.1	1.49
Critical analysis: Spg '21-24	13.0	40.7	31.5	14.8	1.48
Critical analysis: Spg '25	7.7	23.1	23.1	46.2	2.08
Table presentation: Spg '16-20	3.1	7.7	38.5	50.8	2.37
Table presentation: Spg '21-24	5.6	3.7	35.2	55.6	2.41
Table presentation: Spg '25	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Sample sizes: 2016-20 = 65; 2021-4 = 54 2015 = 13.

We have worked on a second assessment for this competency, in part due to the historical poor results shown in Table 3. In spring 2018 we piloted a quiz dealing with central concepts in statistical analysis, and interpretation of correlation, and multivariate regression data. This has then been implemented in both Introductory and Capstone classes in 2019 (with some pandemic disruptions). Results have been promising. To date (2025) we have had 48 Intro, and 60 Capstone students take the quiz. An improvement has been identified, Capstone students have answered 7.5 correct, compared to 5.6 in the introductory class ($p < .001$). 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, that can then be addressed. For example, Capstone students were especially weak understanding the concept of the unit of analysis (40% correct); regression beta coefficients (40%); dichotomous/ 'dummy' variables (13% correct in correlation, 20% in regression), the unstandardized regression coefficient (21%), and the regression adjusted r^2 (37%). This was a multiple choice quiz, with five answers for each, so guessing should have yielded 20% right, on average.

Public management essay

Table 4 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 essays are assessed on our 0-3 standard rubric for program assessment.

Table 4
Intro and Capstone compared,
public management essay

Assessment item	Class	Mean score	Probability
Discipline knowledge	Intro	1.84	<.001
	Capstone	2.45	
Critical analysis	Intro	1.80	<.001
	Capstone	2.55	
Research	Intro	1.86	<.001
	Capstone	2.32	
Writing	Intro	2.20	<.001
	Capstone	2.54	
Combined	Intro	1.94	<.001
	Capstone	2.47	

The table combines the scores from 2010-11 to 2024-25 (Intro n = 230; Capstone n = 281 for all classes for which results are available. Capstone students score both substantively, and statistically higher than incoming MPA students.

Table 5 breaks down the public management essay results by learning outcomes. In a change from previous reports, the results are presented as a five-year running average. Sample size from Intro classes was 63, and Capstone 71 (58 from 2021-4, and 13 in 2025). This allows comparison of current year Capstone results to both the previous four Capstones, as well as a five year Intro average. Results remain consistent with recent trends, and show improvement through the program. The 2025 Capstone outperformed the 5 year Intro scores with statistical significance of $p < .001$, except for $p = .004$ for Writing quality.

Table 5
Public Management essay, by learning outcomes (%)

Class	Insufficient major	Insufficient minor	Prof. Adequate	Prof. Mastery	Mean Score
PM theory (%) Intro-AY 2021-25	15.9	22.2	23.8	38.1	1.84
PM theory (%) Caps-Spg 2021-24	0.0	12.1	32.8	55.2	2.43
PM theory (%) Caps-Spg 2025	0.0	7.7	0.0	92.3	2.85
Crit. analysis (%) Intro-AY 2021-25	12.7	27.0	25.4	34.9	1.83
Crit. analysis (%) Caps-Spg 2021-24	0.0	3.4	22.4	74.1	2.71
Crit. analysis (%) Caps-Spg 2025	0.0	7.7	0.0	92.3	2.85
Research (%) Intro-AY 2021-25	17.5	14.3	30.2	38.1	1.89
Research (%) Caps-Spg 2021-24	3.4	6.9	29.3	60.3	2.47
Research (%) Caps-Spg 2025	7.7	0.0	7.7	84.6	2.69
Writing (%) Intro-AY 2021-25	6.3	12.7	25.4	55.6	2.30
Writing (%) Caps-Spg 2021-24	0.0	10.3	19.0	70.7	2.60
Writing (%) Caps-Spg 2025	0.0	0.0	7.7	92.3	2.92

Concentration assessment

Finally, Table 6 presents the results for the cumulative, through AY2023-4, 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 6
Concentration assessment exercise, by Spring 2013-24 Capstone competency
(with Capstone mean, 2021-5 in parenthesis)

	Insufficient major	Insufficient minor	Prof. Adequate	Prof. Mastery	Mean (Caps 21-24)
<u>Nonprofit</u> (n = 73)					
Critical policy thinking (%)	1.4	6.8	8.2	83.6	2.74 (2.81)
Management literature (%)	2.7	4.1	11.0	82.2	2.73 (2.81)
<u>Local government</u> (n = 53)					
Critical policy thinking (%)	5.7	5.7	20.8	67.9	2.51 (2.46)
Management literature (%)	3.8	5.7	22.6	67.9	2.55 (2.54)
<u>Health admin</u> (n =16)					
Critical policy thinking (%)	12.5	6.3	25.0	56.3	2.25 (2.5)
Management literature (%)	0.0	18.8	18.8	62.5	2.44 (2.75)
<u>Public Policy</u> (n = 22)					
Critical policy thinking (%)	9.1	4.5	13.6	72.7	2.50 (2.75)
Public policy literature (%)	0.0	9.1	13.6	77.3	2.68 (3.0)
<u>National Security</u> (n=1)					
Critical policy thinking (%)	0	0	100.0	0	2.0
Management literature (%)	0	0	100.0	0	2.0
<u>Generalist option</u> (n = 47)					
Critical thinking (%)	2.1	23.4	12.8	61.7	2.34 (2.50)
Literature (%)	6.4	23.4	8.5	61.7	2.26 (2.50)

Given the relatively small sample sizes for each academic year (the AY2023-24 graduates included 4 nonprofit, 4 local government, 4 generalist, 2 public policy, 2 health administration, and no national security graduates), we have presented these results cumulative. A clear trend of solid learning outcomes can be seen. To compare more recent AY results with the cumulative results to date, the 2022-24 Capstone results are presented in parentheses in the final column.

3. Program diversity

As indicated, we added two new items to the student exit survey in Table 7: 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.

Tables 7-9 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.

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
2023-24	45	39	7	3	31

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 '24	54	19	0	4	26

* Fall 2021 data for 'active' students.

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
2023-24	60	30	5	5	20

Table 10 presents faculty diversity. We have added the three adjuncts to the 2021-22 tally, as this more accurately reflects faculty students are exposed to.

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
2023-4	4	2	1	1	8

4. Student completion and employment outcomes

Beyond the student satisfaction and income data presented below in Section 5, we also provide to our accrediting body the following data on student completion rates, and employment data by sector.

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	25	8	15	16	16	16	16	0
2016-17	22	10	15	15	15	15	15	0
2017-18	30	11	20	22	23	23	23	0
2018-19	19	10	14	14	14	14	14	1
2019-20	28	14	19	21	21	21	21	0
2020-21	23	10	14	15	15	15	15	4
2021-22	19	5	7	7	7	7	7	8
2022-23	13	6	6	6	6	6	6	4
2023-4	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

	2016-18	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
National or central government	1	1	0	1	1	0
State government	8	3	1	2	2	5
City, county, or other local govt	12	2	4	5	6	1
Overseas government	0	1	0	0	0	1
Domestic nonprofit	17	4	3	3	2	3
International nonprofit	0	0	0	0	0	0
Private sector – research/ consulting	2	1	1	7	0	0
Private sector – not research/ consult'g	14	2	6	0	0	3
Obtaining further education	2	0	0	0	0	0
Military service	3	0	1	0	0	0
Unemployed (not seeking employ)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unemployed (seeking employ)	0	2	0	0	0	0
Status unknown	8	0	2	4	0	2
Total	67	16	18	22	11	15

5. Alumni survey

The third alumni survey of the UNF-MPA program was conducted in summer of 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.

	Yes 1978-2010	Yes 2011-2018
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.

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 15.

Table 15
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.

A follow-up survey has been done for 2024, though the full analysis has not yet been completed. The report noting the general findings is included below.



Master of Public
Administration Program

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Georgette Dumont
g.dumont@unf.edu

2024 UNF MPA ALUMNI SURVEY RESULTS

Executive Summary

The 2024 Alumni Survey provides valuable insights into the experiences and trajectories of graduates from the UNF-MPA program. The data highlights engagement across multiple graduation cohorts, offering a glimpse into the long-term impact of the program and the evolving demographics of its alumni network.

Key Findings:

- **Graduation Cohorts:** The survey responses reflect participation from graduates spanning three distinct time periods: 1989-1999 (5 respondents), 2000-2010 (13 respondents), and 2011-2015 (15 respondents). The increasing response rate among more recent graduates suggests growing connectivity and engagement within the alumni community.
- **Demographic Trends:** A notable concentration of responses from 2011-2015 graduates highlights a stronger representation of newer alumni, indicating potential opportunities for targeted outreach and program development to sustain engagement.
- **Areas for Improvement:** Feedback from earlier cohorts indicates gaps in outreach and communication efforts. Strengthening alumni engagement across all graduation periods through tailored events, professional development opportunities, and digital platforms may enhance connectivity and the overall impact of the alumni network.
- **Program Impact:** The survey underscores the program's ability to support alumni over decades, reinforcing its importance in shaping professional and academic paths. This data will be instrumental in identifying areas for program enhancement to better meet the needs of future students and employers.
- **Program Outcomes:** Survey responses, once again, indicated very strong program outcomes with most respondents noting that hard skill sets improved or improved significantly because of the program. Still, more emphasis can be placed on soft skills required to be successful in the workplace.

The findings from the 2024 Alumni Survey serve as a valuable resource for understanding the influence of the UNF-MPA program on its graduates and identifying actionable steps for improvement. The program has already begun to increase the modality of courses to meet students where they are. These results, along with market survey data completed by the university will help steer the MPA program into the future.

Survey Results

Respondent Demographics

1. Please indicate your year of graduation from the UNF-MPA program:

Years	Count	%
1989-99	5	7%
2000-10	13	19%
2011-15	15	22%
2016-19	14	21%
2020-23	20	30%

My concentration in the MPA program was:	
Local government	30%
Nonprofit management	22%
Public policy	13%
Health administration	4%
National security	0%
General administration/ Generalist option	31%

2. Ethnicity origin (or Race): Please specify your ethnicity.

White	70%
Hispanic or Latino	8%
Black or African American	13%
Native American or American Indian	2%
Asian / Pacific Islander	2%
Other	3% ³
Prefer not to say	2%
Total	100%

3. To which gender do you most identify?

Female	41%
Not listed	2%
Prefer not to say	3%
Male	54%
Total	100%

³ Multiracial

4. Please indicate the county and state in which you are currently employed (or, if retired or unemployed, where you now reside):

Location	%
Duval County, FL	53%
NEFL County	10%
Other Florida County	15%
Other US and International	22%

5. Please indicate your current employment sector

Sector	Perc.
National or central government	9%
State, provincial, or regional government	26%
City, county, or other local government	34%
Foreign government (all levels)	0%
Nonprofit domestic-oriented	12%
Nonprofit/NGOs internationally oriented	1%
Private sector - research/consulting	4%
Private Sector but not research/consulting	7%
Obtaining further education	3%
Other	3%
Total	100%

MPA Program Outcomes

6. As a result of the MPA program at UNF, my communication skills in writing were:

Not changed	10%
Improved	57%
Improved significantly	33%
<hr/>	
Total	100%

6a. Please indicate why you think you did not improve in this area:

Previous experience left little room to improve	57%
Lack of MPA curriculum	14%
Poor MPA teaching	14%
Poor effort on my part	0%
Other	15% ⁴
<hr/>	
Total	100%

7. As a result of the MPA program at UNF, my communication skills in speaking were:

Not changed	16%
Improved	54%
Improved significantly	30%
<hr/>	
Total	100%

7a. Please indicate why you think you did not improve in this area:

Previous experience left little room to improve	64%
Lack of MPA curriculum	27%
Poor MPA teaching	0%
Poor effort on my part	9%
Other	0%
<hr/>	
Total	100%

8. As a result of the MPA program at UNF, my communication skills in listening were:

Not changed	10%
Improved	65%
Improved significantly	25%
<hr/>	
Total	100%

⁴ Poor effort on first set of advisors

8a. Please indicate why you think you did not improve in this area:

Previous experience left little room to improve	75%
Lack of MPA curriculum	13%
Poor MPA teaching	12%
Poor effort on my part	0%
Other	0%
<hr/>	
Total	100%

9. As a result of the MPA program at UNF, my understanding of governance in a local context was:

Not changed	3%
Improved	38%
Improved significantly	59%
<hr/>	
Total	100%

9a. Please indicate why you think you did not improve in this area:

Previous experience left little room to improve	100%
Lack of MPA curriculum	0%
Poor MPA teaching	0%
Poor effort on my part	0%
Other	0%
<hr/>	
Total	100%

10. As a result of the MPA program at UNF, my ability to analyze, synthesize, think critically, solve problems and make decisions was:

Not changed	3%
Improved	49%
Improved significantly	48%
<hr/>	
Total	100%

10a. Please indicate why you think you did not improve in this area:

Previous experience left little room to improve	100%
Lack of MPA curriculum	0%
Poor MPA teaching	0%
Poor effort on my part	0%
Other	0%
<hr/>	
Total	100%

11. As a result of the MPA program at UNF, my understanding of professional ethics was:

Not changed	16%
Improved	42%
Improved significantly	42%
Total	100%

11a. Please indicate why you think you did not improve in this area:

Previous experience left little room to improve	82%
Lack of MPA curriculum	0%
Poor MPA teaching	9%
Poor effort on my part	0%
Other	9%
Total	100%

12. As a result of the MPA program at UNF, my ability to apply the theory and principles of management and leadership was:

Not changed	3%
Improved	51%
Improved significantly	46%
Total	100%

12a. Please indicate why you think you did not improve in this area:

Previous experience left little room to improve	50%
Lack of MPA curriculum	0%
Poor MPA teaching	0%
Poor effort on my part	0%
Other	50% ⁵
Total	100%

13. As a result of the MPA program at UNF, my awareness of the economic constraints within which leaders and managers operate was:

Not changed	7%
Improved	52%
Improved significantly	41%
Total	100%

⁵ There could've been more learning opportunities to make that direct connection.

13a. Please indicate why you think you did not improve in this area:

Previous experience left little room to improve	60%
Lack of MPA curriculum	40%
Poor MPA teaching	0%
Poor effort on my part	0%
Other	0%
<hr/>	
Total	100%

14. As a result of the MPA program at UNF, my quantitative analytical skills were:

Not changed	7%
Improved	55%
Improved significantly	38%
<hr/>	
Total	100%

14a. Please indicate why you think you did not improve in this area:

Previous experience left little room to improve	33%
Lack of MPA curriculum	33%
Poor MPA teaching	17%
Poor effort on my part	0%
Other	17% ⁶
<hr/>	
Total	100%

15. As a result of the MPA program at UNF, my ability to interact productively with a diverse and changing workforce and citizenry was:

Not changed	26%
Improved	41%
Improved significantly	33%
<hr/>	
Total	100%

15a. Please indicate why you think you did not improve in this area:

Previous experience left little room to improve	78%
Lack of MPA curriculum	17%
Poor MPA teaching	5%
Poor effort on my part	0%
Other	0%
<hr/>	
Total	100%

⁶ Course with simplified practical knowledge would have been preferred.

16. As a result of the MPA program at UNF, my understanding of, and ability to contribute to, the public policy process was:

Not changed	6%
Improved	44%
Improved significantly	50%
Total	100%

16a. Please indicate why you think you did not improve in this area:

Previous experience left little room to improve	25%
Lack of MPA curriculum	25%
Poor MPA teaching	0%
Poor effort on my part	25%
Other	25%
Total	100%

17. As a result of the MPA program at UNF, my awareness of the impact of globalization on public management was:

Not changed	6%
Improved	56%
Improved significantly	38%
Total	100%

17a. Please indicate why you think you did not improve in this area:

Previous experience left little room to improve	25%
Lack of MPA curriculum	25%
Poor MPA teaching	0%
Poor effort on my part	25%
Other	25%
Total	100%

18. As a result of the MPA program at UNF, my understanding of the role of public service in contemporary governance was:

Not changed	7%
Improved	43%
Improved significantly	50%
Total	100%

18a. Please indicate why you think you did not improve in this area:

Previous experience left little room to improve	60%
Lack of MPA curriculum	0%
Poor MPA teaching	0%
Poor effort on my part	0%
Other	40%
<hr/>	
Total	100%

19. As a result of the MPA program at UNF, my expertise in policy and management in my MPA area of concentration was:

Not changed	4%
Improved	47%
Improved significantly	49%
<hr/>	
Total	100%

20. Please estimate your change in life satisfaction as a result of the MPA degree:

Worsened	2%
Not changed	9%
Improved	46%
Improved significantly	43%
<hr/>	
Total	100%

21. Looking back, do you think the MPA degree was worth the investment in time and money?

No	9%
Yes	91%

Faculty

22. Rate your perception of the overall quality of instruction provided by MPA faculty:

Poor	0%
Fair	1%
Good	18%
Very good	40%
Excellent	41%
Total	100%

23. Please rate your perception of the overall quality of research done by MPA faculty:

Poor	2%
Fair	4%
Good	27%
Very good	34%
Excellent	33%
Total	100%

24. Please rate your perception of the overall quality of public service done by MPA faculty:

Poor	2%
Fair	7%
Good	30%
Very good	28%
Excellent	33%
Total	100%

25. Please rate your perception of the overall quality of program management (advising, scheduling, etc.) provided by the MPA Director:

Poor	0%
Fair	0%
Good	13%
Very good	41%
Excellent	46%
Total	100%

Program Development

26. Currently the MPA program can only be completed by coming to campus for some, if not most classes. In the future, you would like to see: (select all that apply)	
More online courses, but still at least some on-campus requirements.	18%
More hybrid courses (online and face to face components of a course).	28%
The ability to complete the MPA program online (both a face-to-face option and an online option).	22%
Offer the MPA program completely online only.	1%
Offer the MPA program both online and face-to-face.	22%
Only offer the MPA program face-to-face (either with or without some online or hybrid courses).	9%

27. How did you first learn about the MPA Program?

Google	27%
UNF UG Student	15%
UNF Website	8%
Co-worker/friend	19%
At an event	4%
Faculty Member	10%
MPA Alumni	8%
Grad School/Career Fair	4%
Other	6%

General Feedback - Positive

- **Career Foundation:** The program provided a strong foundation for pursuing both civilian and military career paths.
- **Program Director:** The Program Director was praised for offering great insights and friendship.
- **Long-term Impact:** Alumni from almost 20 years ago still think highly of the university and the MPA program.
- **Faculty Support:** Faculty, especially Dr. Candler and Dr. Dumont, were supportive and encouraged critical thinking.
- **Research Methods Class:** The importance of understanding data analysis and report writing was highly valued.
- **Promotion:** The MPA degree positively affected career promotions, such as to the position of utility director.
- **Hiring Manager:** Alumni are now hiring managers and supervisors to other graduates of the program.
- **Higher Education Fit:** The MPA degree fits well with the work of administrative employees in universities.

General Feedback - Negative

- **Degree Value:** One respondent felt the degree was a waste of sixty-nine thousand dollars.
- **Course Catalog:** There is a need to enhance the course catalog selection with courses that are actually offered.
- **Pay Increase:** Significant pay increase was not realized until 12 years after graduation.