Employer Feedback Survey

Classes of 2001, 2002, 2003 & 2004, 1 1/2 Years After Graduation

Program Profile
BS Professional Aeronautics

Prepared by:

Kimberly Brantley
Office of Institutional Research
June 2007

This Program Profile contains Employer Feedback Survey results for this degree program only, for the Classes of 2001, 2002, 2003 & 2004. Almost every question from the instrument is included. Some of the skill verbiage required abbreviation in order to fit in the tables; please refer to the survey instrument if clarification is needed. Employer comments for 'strengths' and 'weaknesses' of the degree program have been included.

In an effort to correct for disproportionate response rates and adjust the respondent profile so that it was representative of the target population, the data were weighted by gender, campus, program, and year of graduation. Percentages in the data tables represent the weighted result (the number of respondents has been left unweighted, however). Please use caution when interpreting results for programs with a small number of respondents; results based on very few respondents may not be representative. Programs for which there were fewer than three respondents are excluded.

Number of Respondents
By Campus and Year of Graduation.

	BS Professional Aeronautics				
	2001	2002	2003	2004	All Years
Worldwide Campus	19	14	18	16	67

Graduate's length of time at present position
(as reported by the graduate on the preceding Alumni Survey)
By Campus

		Unwtd # of Respondents	Less than 1 year	1-2 years	3-5 years	More than 5 years
			Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide Campus	2001	19	21.1%	21.1%	5.3%	52.6%
	2002	14	34.2%	10.5%	15.8%	39.5%
	2003	18	8.6%	8.6%	17.7%	65.1%
	2004	16	25.0%	18.8%	12.5%	43.8%
	All Years	67	22.3%	14.4%	13.2%	50.0%

Response options: 'Less than 1 year', '1-2 years', '3-5 years', 'More than 5 years'.

Best description of graduate's field of work
(as reported by the graduate on the preceding Alumni Survey)
By Campus

			2001	2002	2003	2004	All Years
Worldwide Campus	Unwtd # of Respondents		19	14	18	16	67
	Aerospace	Wtd Col %	10.5%	7.9%	5.9%	6.3%	7.5%
	Airline	Wtd Col %	5.3%	7.9%	11.8%	31.3%	14.7%
	Airport	Wtd Col %	10.5%	5.3%	5.9%	6.3%	6.8%
	Charter/freig	Wtd Col %	5.3%	.0%	2.7%	.0%	1.8%
	Computer	Wtd Col %	.0%	.0%	5.9%	.0%	1.5%
	Corporate	Wtd Col %	15.8%	15.8%	5.9%	18.8%	14.0%
	FBO (flight	Wtd Col %	.0%	.0%	2.7%	.0%	.7%
	Flight training	Wtd Col %	.0%	.0%	.0%	6.3%	1.7%
	Government	Wtd Col %	10.5%	15.8%	11.8%	6.3%	11.1%
	Manufacturin	Wtd Col %	5.3%	.0%	11.8%	.0%	4.2%
	Military	Wtd Col %	21.1%	23.7%	29.6%	18.8%	23.3%
	Other	Wtd Col %	10.5%	15.8%	.0%	6.3%	8.0%
	Other	Wtd Col %	5.3%	7.9%	5.9%	.0%	4.7%

Relationship of graduate's job to his/her field of study at ERAU
(as reported by the graduate on the preceding Alumni Survey)
By Campus

		Unwtd # of Respondents	Closely related	Somewhat related
			Wtd Col %	Wtd Col %
Worldwide Campus	2001	19	63.2%	36.8%
	2002	14	57.9%	42.1%
	2003	18	55.9%	44.1%
	2004	16	81.3%	18.8%
	All Years	67	64.8%	35.2%

Response options: 'Closely related', 'Somewhat related'. Graduates who responded 'Not related' on their Alumni Survey were excluded from consideration for the Employer Feedback Survey.

Approximately how many ERAU graduates do you know professionally?
By Campus

		Unwtd # of Respondents	Number of ERAU Graduates Know Professionally				
			1	2-5	6-10	11-50	Over 50
			Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide Campus	2001	19	10.5%	36.8%	31.6%	15.8%	5.3%
	2002	14	7.9%	47.4%	21.0%	15.8%	7.9%
	2003	18	26.3%	41.4%	14.5%	17.7%	.0%
	2004	16	6.3%	43.8%	18.8%	25.0%	6.3%
	All Years	67	12.8%	42.7%	20.9%	18.8%	4.9%

Response options: '1', '2-5','6-10','11-50','Over 50'.

How many ERAU graduates do you currently supervise?
By Campus

		Unwtd # of Respondents	Number of ERAU Graduates Currently Supervise			
			1	2-5	6-10	Over 20
			Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide Campus	2001	19	57.9%	36.8%	.0%	5.3%
	2002	14	60.5%	31.6%	.0%	7.9%
	2003	17	74.8%	12.6%	12.6%	.0%
	2004	16	37.5%	31.3%	12.5%	18.8%
	All Years	66	57.2%	27.9%	6.6%	8.4%

Response options: '1', '2-5','6-10','11-50','Over 50'.

Did you graduate from ERAU?
By Campus

| | | Unwtd # of Respondents | Supervisors Who Are Also ERAU Graduates | |
| | | | Yes | No |
			Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide Campus	2001	19	10.5%	89.5%
	2002	14	7.9%	92.1%
	2003	18	11.8%	88.2%
	2004	15	20.0%	80.0%
	All Years	66	12.6%	87.4%

Response options: 'Yes', 'No'.

What is your level of involvement in the hiring of new workers?
By Campus

| | | Unwtd # of Respondents | Hiring involvemnet level | | |
| | | | Make Final Deciaiton | Provide Input | No Involvement |
			Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide Campus	2001	19	52.6%	36.8%	10.5%
	2002	13	57.1%	42.9%	.0%
	2003	18	46.8%	41.4%	11.8%
	2004	15	66.7%	26.7%	6.7%
	All Years	65	55.9%	36.9%	7.2%

Response options: 'Make Final Decision', 'Provide Input', 'No Involvement'.

What is your preference for hiring graduates?
By Campus

| | | Unwtd # of Respondents | Preference for Hiring Graduates | | | |
| | | | Strong Preference for ERAU Graduates | Some Preference for ERAU Graduates | No Preference | Some Preference for Other Graduates |
			Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide Campus	2001	17	5.9%	29.4%	58.8%	5.9%
	2002	14	7.9%	57.9%	34.2%	.0%
	2003	17	18.9%	37.7%	43.4%	.0%
	2004	15	6.7%	46.7%	46.7%	.0%
	All Years	63	10.0%	44.1%	44.8%	1.2%

Response options: 'Strong preference for other graduates', 'Some preference for other graduates', 'No preference', 'Some preference for ERAU graduates', 'Strong preference for ERAU graduates'.

What preference do you have for multi-lingual candidates?
By Campus

		Unwtd # of Respondents	Preference for multi-lingual candidates		
			Strong Preference	Some Preference	No Preference
			Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide Campus	2003	17	6.3%	50.3%	43.4%
	2004	15	20.0%	20.0%	60.0%

New question as of the Class of 2003 survey.
Response options: 'Strong Preference', 'Some Preference', No Preference'.

How important do you consider global awareness and international experience
for new employees?
By Campus

		Unwtd # of Respondents	Importance of global awareness and international experience		
			Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important
			Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide Campus	2003	17	31.4%	68.6%	.0%
	2004	16	31.3%	62.5%	6.3%

New question as of the Class of 2003 survey.
Response options: 'Very Important', 'Somewhat Important', 'Not Important'.

What changes do you anticipate in your organization's need for aviation and
aerospace professionals in the near future?
By Campus

		Unwtd # of Respondents	Anticipated changes to organization's need for av/aero professionals		
			Increased Need	No Changes	Decreased Need
			Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide Campus	2002	14	57.9%	42.1%	.0%
	2003	17	53.1%	40.6%	6.3%
	2004	15	46.7%	46.7%	6.7%
	All Years	46	52.6%	43.1%	4.3%

New question as of the Class of 2002 survey.
Response options: 'Increased Need', 'No Changes', 'Decreased Need'.

The education of the graduate meets our company's needs
By Campus

		Unwtd # of Respondents	Education of ERAU Graduate Meets Company's Needs				
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
			Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide Campus	2001	19	10.5%	63.2%	10.5%	5.3%	10.5%
	2002	14	44.7%	47.4%	7.9%	.0%	.0%
	2003	15	46.4%	46.4%	7.2%	.0%	.0%
	2004	15	46.7%	40.0%	13.3%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	63	38.1%	48.6%	9.8%	1.2%	2.3%

Response options: 'Strongly Disagree', 'Disagree', 'Neutral', 'Agree', 'Strongly Agree'.

He/she is a valuable employee
By Campus

		Unwtd # of Respondents	Graduate is a Valuable Employee			
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Strongly Disagree
			Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide Campus	2001	19	52.6%	31.6%	.0%	15.8%
	2002	14	68.4%	31.6%	.0%	.0%
	2003	15	71.9%	24.8%	3.3%	.0%
	2004	15	60.0%	33.3%	6.7%	.0%
	All Years	63	63.4%	30.5%	2.6%	3.5%

Response options: 'Strongly Disagree', 'Disagree', 'Neutral', 'Agree', 'Strongly Agree'.

He/she is a good candidate for promotion
By Campus

		Unwtd # of Respondents	Graduate is a Good Candidate for Promotion			
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Strongly Disagree
			Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide Campus	2001	19	26.3%	52.6%	5.3%	15.8%
	2002	14	52.6%	39.5%	7.9%	.0%
	2003	15	64.7%	24.8%	10.4%	.0%
	2004	15	46.7%	46.7%	6.7%	.0%
	All Years	63	48.0%	41.0%	7.6%	3.5%

Response options: 'Strongly Disagree', 'Disagree', 'Neutral', 'Agree', 'Strongly Agree'.

Compared to graduates from other institutions, his/her knowledge and skill level is:
By Campus

| | | | Skill Level of ERAU Graduate Compared to Graduates From Other Institutions | | | | |
| | | Unwtd # of Respondents | Much Higher | Somewhat Higher | Equivalent | Somewhat Lower | Much Lower |
			Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide Campus	2001	18	5.6%	33.3%	44.4%	11.1%	5.6%
	2002	14	23.7%	42.1%	34.2%	.0%	.0%
	2003	17	25.2%	34.3%	40.6%	.0%	.0%
	2004	14	7.1%	50.0%	42.9%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	63	16.1%	40.2%	40.2%	2.3%	1.2%

ERAU General Skills Preparation and Usefulness on the Job

Worldwide Campus

BS Professional Aeronautics

Skill	Year	Unwtd # of Respondents	Employer's Usefulness of Skill on the Job			Unwtd # of Respondents	Competence of this ERAU Graduate					Unwtd # of Respondents	Competence of Graduates from Other Institutions				
			Very Useful Wtd Row %	Somewhat Useful Wtd Row %	Not Useful Wtd Row %		Excellent Wtd Row %	Good Wtd Row %	Average Wtd Row %	Poor Wtd Row %	Very Poor Wtd Row %		Excellent Wtd Row %	Good Wtd Row %	Average Wtd Row %	Poor Wtd Row %	Very Poor Wtd Row %
Quantitative/mathematics	2001	19	52.6%	36.8%	10.5%	16	25.0%	25.0%	31.3%	6.3%	12.5%	15	26.7%	33.3%	20.0%	20.0%	.0%
	2002	13	34.3%	57.1%	8.6%	12	28.1%	31.2%	40.6%	.0%	.0%	10	11.5%	30.7%	57.7%	.0%	.0%
	2003	18	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	16	45.3%	35.3%	19.4%	.0%	.0%	13	8.0%	67.9%	24.1%	.0%	.0%
	2004	15	33.3%	40.0%	26.7%	13	23.1%	38.5%	38.5%	.0%	.0%	9	.0%	11.1%	88.9%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	65	42.2%	46.3%	11.5%	57	31.0%	33.0%	32.2%	1.3%	2.6%	47	11.6%	37.4%	46.3%	4.8%	.0%
Basic PC software (word processing, spreadsheets, etc.)	2001	19	68.4%	15.8%	15.8%	16	25.0%	37.5%	18.8%	6.3%	12.5%	15	20.0%	40.0%	26.7%	6.7%	6.7%
	2002	14	100.0%	.0%	.0%	14	23.7%	57.9%	18.4%	.0%	.0%	12	9.4%	43.7%	46.9%	.0%	.0%
	2003	18	91.4%	8.6%	.0%	16	54.7%	45.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	13	3.6%	72.3%	24.1%	.0%	.0%
	2004	15	73.3%	26.7%	.0%	13	30.8%	30.8%	38.5%	.0%	.0%	10	.0%	50.0%	40.0%	.0%	10.0%
	All Years	66	84.2%	12.5%	3.3%	59	33.9%	43.9%	18.5%	1.2%	2.4%	50	8.1%	51.7%	35.0%	1.5%	3.7%
Writing skills (non-technical)	2001	19	47.4%	36.8%	15.8%	16	18.8%	50.0%	18.8%	.0%	12.5%	15	13.3%	20.0%	53.3%	13.3%	.0%
	2002	13	82.9%	17.1%	.0%	14	15.8%	65.8%	18.4%	.0%	.0%	11	10.3%	34.5%	55.2%	.0%	.0%
	2003	18	79.6%	20.4%	.0%	16	64.7%	28.8%	6.5%	.0%	.0%	13	16.1%	51.8%	32.1%	.0%	.0%
	2004	15	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	13	23.1%	30.8%	46.2%	.0%	.0%	10	.0%	30.0%	60.0%	.0%	10.0%
	All Years	65	70.1%	26.5%	3.4%	59	31.2%	44.3%	22.1%	.0%	2.4%	49	10.1%	34.8%	49.8%	3.0%	2.3%
Technical writing	2001	19	36.8%	47.4%	15.8%	15	13.3%	26.7%	40.0%	13.3%	6.7%	14	7.1%	21.4%	50.0%	21.4%	.0%
	2002	14	57.9%	39.5%	2.6%	14	23.7%	39.5%	36.8%	.0%	.0%	12	9.4%	18.8%	71.9%	.0%	.0%
	2003	17	78.3%	18.9%	2.9%	16	58.2%	41.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	13	.0%	59.9%	40.1%	.0%	.0%
	2004	15	40.0%	60.0%	.0%	13	15.4%	46.2%	38.5%	.0%	.0%	10	.0%	20.0%	70.0%	.0%	10.0%
	All Years	65	53.9%	41.3%	4.8%	58	29.0%	39.4%	27.9%	2.5%	1.2%	49	4.3%	30.3%	58.6%	4.4%	2.3%
Speaking before an audience	2001	19	42.1%	31.6%	26.3%	15	33.3%	13.3%	26.7%	13.3%	13.3%	13	15.4%	46.2%	30.8%	7.7%	.0%
	2002	14	52.6%	39.5%	7.9%	13	22.8%	34.3%	42.9%	.0%	.0%	11	20.7%	13.8%	55.2%	10.3%	.0%
	2003	18	59.1%	38.2%	2.7%	16	45.3%	48.2%	6.5%	.0%	.0%	13	16.1%	51.8%	32.1%	.0%	.0%
	2004	15	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	13	23.1%	46.2%	30.8%	.0%	.0%	10	.0%	20.0%	50.0%	30.0%	.0%
	All Years	66	48.9%	37.6%	13.5%	57	31.1%	37.2%	26.7%	2.5%	2.5%	47	13.4%	32.2%	42.7%	11.7%	.0%
Listening skills	2004	15	86.7%	13.3%	.0%	13	30.8%	46.2%	23.1%	.0%	.0%	10	.0%	30.0%	50.0%	10.0%	10.0%
	All Years	15	86.7%	13.3%	.0%	13	30.8%	46.2%	23.1%	.0%	.0%	10	.0%	30.0%	50.0%	10.0%	10.0%
Applied research (information gathering and analysis)	2001	19	52.6%	21.1%	26.3%	15	26.7%	26.7%	26.7%	6.7%	13.3%	14	14.3%	14.3%	50.0%	14.3%	7.1%
	2002	14	73.7%	26.3%	.0%	14	50.0%	42.1%	7.9%	.0%	.0%	12	9.4%	28.1%	53.1%	9.4%	.0%
	2003	18	65.1%	34.9%	.0%	16	64.7%	22.3%	12.9%	.0%	.0%	13	8.0%	67.9%	24.1%	.0%	.0%
	2004	15	73.3%	13.3%	13.3%	12	41.7%	25.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	9	.0%	33.3%	44.4%	11.1%	11.1%
	All Years	66	66.9%	24.1%	9.0%	57	47.7%	29.8%	18.8%	1.3%	2.5%	48	8.1%	36.9%	42.9%	8.3%	3.9%
Critical thinking	2001	19	63.2%	21.1%	15.8%	16	31.3%	18.8%	31.3%	6.3%	12.5%	15	13.3%	40.0%	33.3%	6.7%	6.7%
	2002	14	81.6%	18.4%	.0%	14	47.4%	21.0%	31.6%	.0%	.0%	12	28.1%	18.8%	53.1%	.0%	.0%
	2003	18	70.4%	29.6%	.0%	16	64.7%	22.3%	12.9%	.0%	.0%	13	24.1%	43.8%	32.1%	.0%	.0%
	2004	15	100.0%	.0%	.0%	12	33.3%	41.7%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	10	10.0%	30.0%	60.0%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	66	79.5%	17.2%	3.3%	58	45.6%	25.7%	24.9%	1.2%	2.5%	50	19.7%	32.4%	45.0%	1.5%	1.5%
Independent work	2001	19	73.7%	10.5%	15.8%	16	43.8%	18.8%	18.8%	6.3%	12.5%	15	33.3%	6.7%	53.3%	6.7%	.0%
	2002	14	84.2%	15.8%	.0%	14	57.9%	18.4%	23.7%	.0%	.0%	12	37.5%	9.4%	43.7%	9.4%	.0%
	2003	18	82.3%	17.7%	.0%	16	51.8%	38.8%	9.4%	.0%	.0%	13	16.1%	48.2%	35.8%	.0%	.0%
	2004	15	86.7%	13.3%	.0%	13	46.2%	30.8%	23.1%	.0%	.0%	10	.0%	30.0%	50.0%	10.0%	10.0%
	All Years	66	82.1%	14.6%	3.3%	59	50.6%	26.9%	18.8%	1.2%	2.4%	50	22.5%	23.4%	45.2%	6.5%	2.3%
Planning, scheduling, and carrying out projects	2001	19	47.4%	36.8%	15.8%	16	12.5%	43.8%	18.8%	12.5%	12.5%	15	13.3%	33.3%	40.0%	6.7%	6.7%
	2002	14	84.2%	15.8%	.0%	14	57.9%	18.4%	23.7%	.0%	.0%	12	28.1%	25.0%	46.9%	.0%	.0%
	2003	18	79.6%	20.4%	.0%	16	58.2%	35.3%	6.5%	.0%	.0%	13	.0%	75.9%	24.1%	.0%	.0%
	2004	15	73.3%	26.7%	.0%	13	46.2%	30.8%	23.1%	.0%	.0%	10	.0%	30.0%	50.0%	10.0%	10.0%
	All Years	66	72.4%	24.3%	3.3%	59	46.3%	30.9%	18.0%	2.4%	2.4%	50	11.3%	41.0%	40.2%	3.7%	3.7%
Defining and solving problems	2001	19	63.2%	21.1%	15.8%	16	31.3%	18.8%	25.0%	12.5%	12.5%	15	20.0%	20.0%	46.7%	6.7%	6.7%
	2002	14	76.3%	23.7%	.0%	14	42.1%	18.4%	39.5%	.0%	.0%	12	9.4%	37.5%	43.7%	9.4%	.0%
	2003	18	70.4%	29.6%	.0%	16	71.2%	15.9%	12.9%	.0%	.0%	13	16.1%	51.8%	32.1%	.0%	.0%
	2004	15	100.0%	.0%	.0%	13	38.5%	38.5%	23.1%	.0%	.0%	10	10.0%	20.0%	50.0%	20.0%	.0%
	All Years	66	78.1%	18.6%	3.3%	59	46.8%	22.7%	25.6%	2.4%	2.4%	50	13.6%	33.4%	42.8%	8.8%	1.5%
Working in groups/teams	2001	19	68.4%	10.5%	21.1%	16	31.3%	18.8%	31.3%	6.3%	12.5%	15	13.3%	26.7%	40.0%	20.0%	.0%
	2002	14	84.2%	15.8%	.0%	14	52.6%	23.7%	23.7%	.0%	.0%	12	18.8%	34.4%	46.9%	.0%	.0%
	2003	18	73.7%	26.3%	.0%	16	51.8%	48.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	13	.0%	75.9%	24.1%	.0%	.0%
	2004	15	73.3%	26.7%	.0%	13	46.2%	30.8%	23.1%	.0%	.0%	10	10.0%	20.0%	60.0%	10.0%	.0%
	All Years	66	75.3%	20.3%	4.4%	59	46.6%	31.0%	18.7%	1.2%	2.4%	50	10.0%	40.1%	42.5%	6.7%	.0%
Leading/guiding others	2001	19	47.4%	36.8%	15.8%	16	12.5%	43.8%	31.3%	.0%	12.5%	15	13.3%	20.0%	53.3%	6.7%	6.7%
	2002	14	68.4%	31.6%	.0%	14	39.5%	28.9%	31.6%	.0%	.0%	12	18.8%	18.8%	62.5%	.0%	.0%
	2003	18	61.8%	35.5%	2.7%	16	45.3%	51.8%	2.9%	.0%	.0%	13	.0%	56.2%	43.8%	.0%	.0%
	2004	15	66.7%	26.7%	6.7%	13	38.5%	30.8%	30.8%	.0%	.0%	10	10.0%	20.0%	40.0%	30.0%	.0%
	All Years	66	61.8%	32.5%	5.8%	59	35.5%	38.3%	23.7%	.0%	2.4%	50	10.8%	28.9%	50.6%	8.3%	1.5%
Responsible actions and decision making	2001	19	63.2%	21.1%	15.8%	16	31.3%	37.5%	12.5%	.0%	18.8%	15	20.0%	13.3%	46.7%	13.3%	6.7%
	2002	14	76.3%	23.7%	.0%	14	50.0%	18.4%	31.6%	.0%	.0%	12	18.8%	40.6%	40.6%	.0%	.0%
	2003	18	73.7%	26.3%	.0%	16	58.2%	38.8%	2.9%	.0%	.0%	12	8.7%	43.7%	47.6%	.0%	.0%
	2004	15	93.3%	6.7%	.0%	13	46.2%	30.8%	23.1%	.0%	.0%	10	10.0%	10.0%	70.0%	10.0%	.0%
	All Years	66	77.2%	19.4%	3.3%	59	47.6%	30.6%	18.2%	.0%	3.6%	49	14.6%	28.1%	50.5%	5.3%	1.5%
Ability to adapt to change	2004	15	80.0%	20.0%	.0%	13	46.2%	38.5%	15.4%	.0%	.0%	10	.0%	20.0%	50.0%	20.0%	10.0%
	All Years	15	80.0%	20.0%	.0%	13	46.2%	38.5%	15.4%	.0%	.0%	10	.0%	20.0%	50.0%	20.0%	10.0%
Understanding other people and other points of view	2001	19	42.1%	42.1%	15.8%	16	31.3%	18.8%	31.3%	12.5%	6.3%	15	13.3%	6.7%	60.0%	13.3%	6.7%
	2002	14	60.5%	39.5%	.0%	14	34.2%	26.3%	39.5%	.0%	.0%	12	9.4%	40.6%	50.0%	.0%	.0%
	2003	18	67.7%	32.3%	.0%	16	64.7%	25.9%	9.4%	.0%	.0%	13	16.1%	48.2%	35.8%	.0%	.0%
	2004	15	86.7%	13.3%	.0%	13	23.1%	46.2%	30.8%	.0%	.0%	10	.0%	20.0%	50.0%	30.0%	.0%
	All Years	66	65.3%	31.4%	3.3%	59	39.0%	29.6%	27.7%	2.4%	1.2%	50	9.8%	30.4%	48.5%	9.7%	1.5%
Environmental awareness	2001	19	26.3%	57.9%	15.8%	16	18.8%	25.0%	37.5%	12.5%	6.3%	15	13.3%	6.7%	60.0%	20.0%	.0%
	2002	13	37.1%	54.3%	8.6%	13	17.1%	54.3%	28.6%	.0%	.0%	11	20.7%	24.1%	55.2%	.0%	.0%
	2003	18	35.5%	55.9%	8.6%	15	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	11	9.1%	54.5%	36.4%	.0%	.0%
	2004	15	53.3%	46.7%	.0%	13	23.1%	38.5%	38.5%	.0%	.0%	10	.0%	10.0%	80.0%	10.0%	.0%
	All Years	65	38.6%	53.5%	7.9%	57	25.1%	40.6%	30.6%	2.5%	1.3%	47	11.2%	24.0%	57.8%	7.1%	.0%
Political and economic awareness	2001	19	15.8%	47.4%	36.8%	15	20.0%	20.0%	33.3%	13.3%	13.3%	14	14.3%	.0%	64.3%	21.4%	.0%
	2002	13	20.0%	71.4%	8.6%	11	31.0%	31.0%	37.9%	.0%	.0%	8	15.0%	30.0%	55.0%	.0%	.0%
	2003	18	5.9%	73.7%	20.4%	15	33.3%	46.7%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	12	8.3%	50.0%	41.7%	.0%	.0%
	2004	15	33.3%	60.0%	6.7%	13	15.4%	53.8%	30.8%	.0%	.0%	10	10.0%	20.0%	60.0%	10.0%	.0%
	All Years	65	18.8%	63.8%	17.3%	54	25.2%	39.4%	30.0%	2.7%	2.7%	44	11.6%	26.0%	54.7%	7.7%	.0%
Knowledge of political/physical geography	2002	13	20.0%	68.6%	11.4%	12	28.1%	28.1%	43.7%	.0%	.0%	10	11.5%	46.2%	42.3%	.0%	.0%
	2003	18	23.7%	53.2%	23.1%	15	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	12	8.3%	50.0%	41.7%	.0%	.0%
	2004	15	40.0%	46.7%	13.3%	15	7.7%	61.5%	30.8%	.0%	.0%	10	10.0%	20.0%	60.0%	10.0%	.0%
	All Years	46	28.0%	55.9%	16.1%	40	25.5%	43.2%	31.3%	.0%	.0%	32	9.9%	39.2%	47.7%	3.2%	.0%

ERAU Preparation response options for the Class of 2003 and 2004 survey: 1='Excellent', 2='Good', 3='Average', 4='Poor', 5='Very Poor'.
Competence response options for the Class of 2001 and 2002 survey: 1='Very Good', 2='Good',3='Average', 4='Poor', 5='Very Poor'.
Usefulness response options: 1='Very Useful', 2='Somewhat Useful', 3='Not Useful'

ERAU Degree Specific Skills Preparation and Usefulness on the Job

Worldwide Campus

		Usefulness of skill on the Job				Competence of this ERAU Graduate						Competence of other Graduates					
		Unwtd # of Respondents	(1) Very Useful Wtd Row %	(2) Somewhat Useful Wtd Row %	(3) Not Useful Wtd Row %	Unwtd # of Respondents	(1) Very Good Wtd Row %	(2) Good Wtd Row %	(3) Average Wtd Row %	(4) Poor Wtd Row %	(5) Very Poor Wtd Row %	Unwtd # of Respondents	(1) Very Good Wtd Row %	(2) Good Wtd Row %	(3) Average Wtd Row %	(4) Poor Wtd Row %	(5) Very Poor Wtd Row %
(A) Knowledge/understanding of av law/regulations	2001	15	53.3%	26.7%	20.0%	13	15.4%	53.8%	7.7%	7.7%	15.4%	12	16.7%	33.3%	33.3%	8.3%	8.3%
	2002	1	100.0%	.0%	.0%	1	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	1	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%
	2003	13	76.9%	23.1%	.0%	13	61.5%	23.1%	15.4%	.0%	.0%	11	.0%	63.6%	27.3%	9.1%	.0%
	2004	13	69.2%	30.8%	.0%	13	46.2%	30.8%	15.4%	7.7%	.0%	10	.0%	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	.0%
	All Years	42	68.5%	26.1%	5.4%	40	42.3%	32.6%	16.5%	4.8%	3.7%	34	4.4%	44.7%	36.4%	12.3%	2.2%
(B) Understand/app of mgmt theory/concepts	2001	15	40.0%	46.7%	13.3%	13	30.8%	38.5%	23.1%	.0%	7.7%	12	25.0%	16.7%	50.0%	8.3%	.0%
	2002	1	.0%	100.0%	.0%	1	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	1	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%
	2003	13	61.5%	38.5%	.0%	13	46.2%	38.5%	15.4%	.0%	.0%	11	.0%	72.7%	27.3%	.0%	.0%
	2004	13	61.5%	30.8%	7.7%	12	41.7%	25.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	9	.0%	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	42	53.6%	40.0%	6.4%	39	39.0%	32.2%	26.9%	.0%	1.9%	33	6.9%	41.4%	49.4%	2.3%	.0%
(C) Understand/use of accounting and financial information	2001	15	26.7%	40.0%	33.3%	11	18.2%	9.1%	63.6%	.0%	9.1%	10	20.0%	10.0%	50.0%	20.0%	.0%
	2002	1	.0%	100.0%	.0%	1	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	1	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%
	2003	13	23.1%	61.5%	15.4%	12	41.7%	33.3%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	10	.0%	70.0%	30.0%	.0%	.0%
	2004	13	7.7%	76.9%	15.4%	12	16.7%	41.7%	41.7%	.0%	.0%	9	.0%	33.3%	55.6%	11.1%	.0%
	All Years	42	17.6%	62.7%	19.7%	36	25.1%	29.7%	43.1%	.0%	2.1%	30	5.0%	38.9%	47.3%	8.9%	.0%
(D) Use of stats/quantitative techniques to solve problems	2001	15	40.0%	46.7%	13.3%	13	15.4%	30.8%	38.5%	7.7%	7.7%	12	8.3%	25.0%	58.3%	.0%	8.3%
	2002	1	100.0%	.0%	.0%	1	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	1	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%
	2003	13	30.8%	69.2%	.0%	13	38.5%	46.2%	15.4%	.0%	.0%	11	.0%	72.7%	18.2%	9.1%	.0%
	2004	13	38.5%	53.8%	7.7%	12	16.7%	50.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	9	.0%	33.3%	55.6%	11.1%	.0%
	All Years	42	38.4%	55.2%	6.4%	39	23.4%	42.0%	30.7%	1.9%	1.9%	33	2.3%	43.7%	44.9%	6.8%	2.3%
(E) Understanding of safety issues/prevention techniques etc	2001	15	60.0%	20.0%	20.0%	13	30.8%	30.8%	23.1%	.0%	15.4%	12	16.7%	25.0%	50.0%	8.3%	.0%
	2002	1	100.0%	.0%	.0%	1	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%
	2003	13	84.6%	15.4%	.0%	13	69.2%	15.4%	15.4%	.0%	.0%	11	.0%	63.6%	27.3%	9.1%	.0%
	2004	13	84.6%	15.4%	.0%	12	58.3%	25.0%	8.3%	8.3%	.0%	9	.0%	22.2%	55.6%	22.2%	.0%
	All Years	42	78.5%	16.1%	5.4%	39	56.8%	22.1%	14.2%	3.0%	3.8%	33	4.6%	36.8%	45.9%	12.7%	.0%
(F) Knowledge/understand mgmt concepts/issues/practices	2001	15	26.7%	60.0%	13.3%	13	15.4%	30.8%	38.5%	7.7%	7.7%	12	8.3%	33.3%	58.3%	.0%	.0%
	2002	1	.0%	100.0%	.0%	1	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	1	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%
	2003	13	30.8%	69.2%	.0%	13	53.8%	30.8%	15.4%	.0%	.0%	11	9.1%	63.6%	27.3%	.0%	.0%
	2004	13	61.5%	30.8%	7.7%	12	16.7%	58.3%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	9	.0%	11.1%	77.8%	11.1%	.0%
	All Years	42	39.8%	53.8%	6.4%	39	28.9%	39.6%	27.7%	1.9%	1.9%	33	5.6%	35.5%	55.3%	3.6%	.0%
(G) Knowledge/understand aero sci/tech/ops	2001	15	46.7%	40.0%	13.3%	13	23.1%	38.5%	30.8%	.0%	7.7%	12	8.3%	41.7%	25.0%	16.7%	8.3%
	2002	1	.0%	100.0%	.0%	1	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	1	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%
	2003	13	69.2%	30.8%	.0%	13	61.5%	23.1%	15.4%	.0%	.0%	11	.0%	63.6%	36.4%	.0%	.0%
	2004	13	46.2%	53.8%	.0%	12	33.3%	50.0%	8.3%	8.3%	.0%	9	.0%	11.1%	77.8%	11.1%	.0%
	All Years	42	52.3%	44.1%	3.6%	39	39.5%	35.8%	19.8%	3.0%	1.9%	33	2.3%	37.8%	49.4%	8.2%	2.3%

ERAU Preparation response options for the Class of 2003 and 2004 survey: 1='Excellent', 2='Good', 3='Average', 4='Poor', 5='Very Poor'.
Competence response options for the Class of 2001 and 2002 survey: 1='Very Good', 2='Good',3='Average', 4='Poor', 5='Very Poor'.
Usefulness response options: 1='Very Useful', 2='Somewhat Useful', 3='Not Useful'

Comments from the question "Considering this ERAU graduate, what strengths do you perceive in his/her degree program?" - Worldwide Campus

Class of 2001
Organizational Mgt and mission completion

More application, less theoretical.

Did not remember this graduate specifically. I am a student at Embry Riddle myself.

Provides skills that are useful in multiple job series within the Air Force.

A very good understanding of aviation law, and FAR's. In today's changing world that is a must.
He has always been a good employee however, after finishing his degree he's now a great employee, if not my best. It made such a difference (Name omitted) received two promotions, a very nice pay increase. Plus we re-paid him the cost of his degree. A very good investment for my company.

He was able to step into the job with little training for the job required.

(Name omitted) was better prepared to manage an aviation site than my average pilot.

Professional manner exhibited.

Well-rounded and disciplined

The aviation focus is very helpful in this position.

Knowledge & understanding of aviation law & regulations. Applied research. P/C skills - Excel in particular. Decision making

(Name omitted) is a great employee and very good manager. (Name omitted) brought a lot of aviation knowledge to the table with him prior to attending ERAU. (Name omitted) was an FAA ATC prior to working for the airlines.

Strong aeronautical and excellent people skills.

Knowledge of aviation industry, knowledge of airport/airline operations and understanding of airport safety issues.

He has been to school, not enough time in his new position to evaluate his ability and the usefulness of his degree.

Class of 2002
I am not sure. The individual listed is an exceptional person. He is very smart to begin with.

Planning, schedulng, and carryout projects on a timely manner.

Critical thinking in a dynamic work/technology environment. Maintenance organization, Management Principles/Concepts, and Statistical Analysis

(Name omitted) is inquisitive and ambitious. Her technical know how and avionics background is refreshing.

Much experience. Good leadership. Great critical thinking and info gathering skills.

His planning skills and management skills is definitely an asset.

Strong leader problem solver.

Knowledge and understanding of aviation regulations, focus on safety concerns and works well with others.

Superb graduate! Precious industry experience provided good basis for degree program. Degree was the icing on the cake. Completed distance learning degree while juggling full-time job and family responsibilities. A sure sign of career success.

1. Flying - practical knowledge
2. Aeronautical vs. insurance coverage issues - great
3. Assertive and punctual

His ability to define a problem and then to figure a way to solve problems.

Development of analytical skills, good record keeping.

Class of 2003
Mgt. Theory & concepts.

Overall knowledge is excellent.

Strong analysis/ problem solving

Technical writing and analytical skills

Knowledge and understanding of technology

Ability to take charge, ask the tough questions. Listens to what is going on, and barge decisions on the facts available. Takes initiatives to follow thru a process to acquire results.

Knowledge of aviation Human factors & regulations.

Contained in survey answers to question 14.

Ability to work with people.

Uses problem solving techniques with programming documentation.

He comes well-rounded with a broad spectrum of knowledge about aviation.

Class of 2004

Most are very good critical thinkers and have already developed the necessary skills to compete in the employment market.

-understanding accounting and financial information
-management concept
-Project planning

Self discipline to complete

He is very cooperative. Displays flexibility in work schedule and job assignments. Has positive attitude, goes above and beyond in time of need.

The curriculum has provided this graduate with the knowledge and well -rounded skill set to be highly successful in her chosen career path as a professional corporate pilot. Additionally, this individual has the ability and potential to progress into management

(Name omitted) understanding of safety issues, quantitative problem solving and analytical thought process are strengths.

N/A

Understanding of safety issues, aviation registration, planning scheduling and completion of project.

Commitment to program, character, safety awareness

Comments from the question "Considering this ERAU graduate, what weaknesses do you perceive in his/her degree program?" - Worldwide Campus

Class of 2001
n/a

From what I know nothing.

For our work, none.

I couldn't point to anything either specific or general.

Not heavy on statistical analysis.

Vague knowledge of technical areas

Unknown

Writing skills, i.e. context, spelling, and grammar

I'm sure (Name omitted) took a lot out of his degree program.

Weak understanding of management/labor relationships.

Utilization of spreadsheets/financial information to make management decisions.

Planning/scheduling

Same as above #12

Class of 2002
I cannot come up with any at this time.

Chain of command expectations (e-mail, contacting, analysis, etc.)

Financial/Accounting practices and methods. Earned Value Management Systems in particular would be very useful.

General business skills such as accounting and knowing how to use standard Microsoft software applications were lacking. Yet, with OJT, she quickly learned.

Speaking

Confidence building

Verbal and writing skills. Grammar and other English letter writing skills.

Class of 2003

None noted.

May wish to consider Human Relations affects/ inputs-- How does an HR program affect the business.

Ability to present information in a clear and focused format. Could use more presentation skills.

Sometimes gets too detailed loosing focus on the issue, stops refocuses then ok.

Public speaking some writing skills

None

Needs more training in time utilization.

None.

Class of 2004
None

PC application, word processing and spreadsheets using different computer formats such as Excel, word. This employee home schooled in most areas now and is very proficient.

None identified

At times, a lack of detail when completing company paperwork.

This graduate has shown no weaknesses only strengths.

(Name omitted) is probably over qualified for his current position and may be a little bored.

Lack of knowledge in 121-135-145 operational requirements.

N/A

Non- technical writing.

Statistical Analysis & Techniques