

Ph.D. Exit Survey Results

Department/Division included in analysis: Biomedical Engineering

Graduation years included in analysis: 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Summary Statistics	3
1.2	Overall Assessment	3
2	Training	4
2.1	Student Perceptions	4
2.2	Presentations and Publications	5
2.2.1	Presentations	5
2.2.2	Publications	5
3	Career Preparation and Employment Status at Graduation	6
3.1	Employment Status	6
3.2	Training for Employment	7
4	Mentoring, Advising, and Program Climate	9
4.1	Overall Assessment	9
4.2	Dissertation Advisor and Perception of Program Quality	9
4.3	Dissertation Advisor and Program Climate	10
4.4	Identifying Important Factors in Advising	10
4.5	Additional Faculty Mentors	11
4.5.1	Additional Mentorship and Perceptions of Program Quality	11
4.5.2	Additional Mentorship and Program Climate	12
4.6	Program Climate in Division	12
5	Free Response Questions	13
6	Additional Insights	14

1 INTRODUCTION

The data that follows was collected via the Exit Survey for Ph.D. Completers. Graduating doctoral students were invited to complete the survey in their final semester in the DEPARTMENT program. Nineteen of the twenty DEPARTMENT program graduates (95 %) completed the Exit Survey for Ph.D. Completers.

1.1 SUMMARY STATISTICS

Click [here](#) for summary data on PhD programs. These data include information such as total applications, admissions, matriculations, demographics, median GRE and GPA scores, and career outcomes.

1.2 OVERALL ASSESSMENT



Figure 1: Proportion of students who would recommend the same university to someone considering their field of study.




Figure 2: Assessment of students' overall satisfaction with three criteria: academic experience, student life experience, and overall experience.




Figure 3: Average score of student responses in academic experience, student life experience, and overall experience. 5: excellent, 1: poor.

2 TRAINING

2.1 STUDENT PERCEPTIONS




Figure 4: Average score of student perceptions of program quality where 5 is excellent and 1 is poor




Figure 5: Average score of student perceptions of training where 5 is excellent and 1 is poor

2.2 PRESENTATIONS AND PUBLICATIONS

2.2.1 PRESENTATIONS




Figure 6: Distribution of number of presentations students gave during their graduate studies on and away from campus

2.2.2 PUBLICATIONS




Figure 7: Distribution of number of works that have been published or is under review during graduate research

3 CAREER PREPARATION AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT GRADUATION

3.1 EMPLOYMENT STATUS




Figure 8: Distribution of students' postgraduate plans in the next year




Figure 9: Distribution of types of professional employment

3.2 TRAINING FOR EMPLOYMENT




Figure 10: Percentage of students who received training in writing grant proposal, preparing for job interviews, preparing a job talk, locating positions in academia, and locating positions outside of academia




Figure 11: Average score of student perceptions of training quality where 5 is excellent and 1 is poor






Figure 12: Average score of each training type for students of various professional employments where 4: Very satisfied and 1: Very dissatisfied for Physical Sciences and Engineering

4 MENTORING, ADVISING, AND PROGRAM CLIMATE

4.1 OVERALL ASSESSMENT



(a) Average score where 5 is excellent and 1 is poor



(b) Average score where 5 is definitely and 1 is definitely not

4.2 DISSERTATION ADVISOR AND PERCEPTION OF PROGRAM QUALITY




Figure 14: Average scores of training program and program quality between students likely and unlikely to select the same dissertation advisor again where 5 is excellent and 1 is poor

4.3 DISSERTATION ADVISOR AND PROGRAM CLIMATE




Figure 15: Average scores of climate of program and obstacles to success between students likely and unlikely to select the same dissertation advisor again where 5 is excellent and 1 is poor

4.4 IDENTIFYING IMPORTANT FACTORS IN ADVISING




Figure 16: Correlation between factors of advising and average scores of whether students would select dissertation advisor again. Top right means important and doing well. Top left means important but doing poorly. Bottom right means unimportant but doing well. Bottom left means unimportant and doing bad.

4.5 ADDITIONAL FACULTY MENTORS




Figure 17: Percentage of students with additional faculty mentors, and percentage of which mentors were within the same department

4.5.1 ADDITIONAL MENTORSHIP AND PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM QUALITY




Figure 18: Average scores of training program and program quality between students likely and unlikely to select the same dissertation advisor again where 5 is excellent and 1 is poor

4.5.2 ADDITIONAL MENTORSHIP AND PROGRAM CLIMATE




Figure 19: Average scores of climate of program and obstacles to success between students likely and unlikely to select the same dissertation advisor again where 5 is excellent and 1 is poor

4.6 PROGRAM CLIMATE IN DIVISION




Figure 20: Comparing department climate with division climate

5 FREE RESPONSE QUESTIONS

TODO

6 ADDITIONAL INSIGHTS

TODO