Employer Feedback Survey

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

Program Profile BS Aeronautical Science

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 Aeronautical Science					
	2001 2002 2003 2004 All Yea						
Daytona Beach	23	16	22	9	70		
Prescott	10	9	10	6	35		

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

		Unwtd # of	Less than 1 year	1-2 years	3-5 years
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Daytona	2001	23	55.9%	44.1%	.0%
Beach	2002	16	50.0%	36.8%	13.2%
	2003	22	62.9%	37.1%	.0%
	2004	9	65.9%	34.1%	.0%
	All Years	70	59.1%	38.3%	2.6%
Prescott	2001	10	80.0%	20.0%	.0%
	2002	9	22.2%	77.8%	.0%
	2003	10	74.8%	25.2%	.0%
	2004	6	66.7%	33.3%	.0%
	All Years	35	61.4%	38.6%	.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
Daytona Beach	Unwtd # of Res	pondents	21	16	22	9	68
	Airline	Wtd Col %	15.2%	.0%	4.6%	34.1%	13.7%
	Airport	Wtd Col %	.0%	6.6%	.0%	.0%	1.3%
	Air Traffic	Wtd Col %	.0%	.0%	.0%	9.2%	2.2%
	Charter/freig	Wtd Col %	10.2%	6.6%	13.9%	.0%	8.0%
	Corporate	Wtd Col %	10.2%	.0%	4.6%	11.4%	6.8%
	FBO (flight	Wtd Col %	20.3%	56.6%	32.5%	45.4%	37.3%
	Flight training	Wtd Col %	23.2%	26.4%	18.6%	.0%	16.8%
	Government	Wtd Col %	.0%	3.8%	.0%	.0%	.8%
	Military	Wtd Col %	10.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.7%
	Other	Wtd Col %	10.8%	.0%	25.8%	.0%	10.3%
Prescott	Unwtd # of Res	pondents	10	9	10	5	34
	Airline	Wtd Col %	.0%	.0%	25.2%	40.0%	14.8%
	Airport	Wtd Col %	10.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.9%
	Education	Wtd Col %	.0%	11.1%	.0%	.0%	2.8%
	FBO (flight	Wtd Col %	80.0%	44.4%	58.3%	40.0%	57.0%
	Flight training	Wtd Col %	10.0%	33.3%	16.5%	20.0%	19.6%
	Other	Wtd Col %	.0%	11.1%	.0%	.0%	2.8%

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	Closely related	Somewhat related
		Respondents	Wtd Col %	Wtd Col %
Daytona	2001	23	88.2%	11.8%
Beach	2002	16	73.6%	26.4%
	2003	22	76.8%	23.2%
	2004	9	100.0%	.0%
	All Years	70	84.9%	15.1%
Prescott	2001	10	90.0%	10.0%
	2002	9	100.0%	.0%
	2003	10	87.4%	12.6%
	2004	6	83.3%	16.7%
	All Years	35	90.1%	9.9%

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

			Number of ERAU Graduates Know Professionally					
		Unwtd # of	1	2-5	6-10	11-50	Over 50	
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	
Daytona	2001	23	4.6%	37.5%	23.0%	16.4%	18.4%	
Beach	2002	16	13.2%	36.8%	19.8%	23.6%	6.6%	
	2003	21	4.9%	34.0%	34.0%	19.5%	7.6%	
	2004	9	.0%	45.4%	34.1%	9.2%	11.4%	
	All Years	69	5.3%	38.3%	28.1%	16.9%	11.4%	
Prescott	2001	10	10.0%	20.0%	30.0%	40.0%	.0%	
	2002	9	.0%	22.2%	11.1%	33.3%	33.3%	
	2003	10	.0%	33.0%	12.6%	50.4%	3.9%	
	2004	6	16.7%	50.0%	16.7%	16.7%	.0%	
	All Years	35	7.2%	31.2%	18.2%	34.5%	8.9%	

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

How many ERAU graduates do you currently supervise? By Campus

			Number of ERAU Graduates Currently Supervise					
		Unwtd # of	1	2-5	6-10	11-20	Over 20	
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	
Daytona	2001	22	44.1%	33.8%	7.6%	9.7%	4.8%	
Beach	2002	16	33.0%	36.8%	10.4%	19.8%	.0%	
	2003	21	48.6%	34.0%	9.7%	7.6%	.0%	
	2004	8	25.6%	25.6%	25.6%	23.1%	.0%	
	All Years	67	39.0%	32.7%	12.8%	14.2%	1.4%	
Prescott	2001	10	40.0%	20.0%	30.0%	10.0%	.0%	
	2002	9	11.1%	33.3%	22.2%	22.2%	11.1%	
	2003	10	33.0%	25.2%	12.6%	25.2%	3.9%	
	2004	6	66.7%	16.7%	.0%	.0%	16.7%	
	All Years	35	38.5%	23.5%	16.5%	13.6%	7.9%	

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

Did you graduate from ERAU? By Campus

			Supervisors Who Are Also ERAU Graduates		
		Unwtd # of	Yes	No	
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	
Daytona	2001	23	28.3%	71.7%	
Beach	2002	16	26.4%	73.6%	
	2003	22	21.2%	78.8%	
	2004	9	31.9%	68.1%	
	All Years	70	26.8%	73.2%	
Prescott	2001	10	10.0%	90.0%	
	2002	9	44.4%	55.6%	
	2003	10	29.1%	70.9%	
	2004	6	16.7%	83.3%	
	All Years	35	24.2%	75.8%	

Response options: 'Yes', 'No'.

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

			Hiring involvemnet level			
		Unwtd # of	Make Final Deciaiton	Provide Input	No Involvement	
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	
Daytona	2001	23	69.7%	25.7%	4.6%	
Beach	2002	16	63.2%	33.0%	3.8%	
	2003	22	74.2%	21.2%	4.6%	
	2004	9	77.3%	22.7%	.0%	
	All Years	70	71.5%	25.1%	3.4%	
Prescott	2001	10	70.0%	30.0%	.0%	
	2002	9	55.6%	44.4%	.0%	
	2003	10	58.3%	41.7%	.0%	
	2004	6	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	
	All Years	35	63.1%	36.9%	.0%	

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

What is your preference for hiring graduates? By Campus

				Preference for Hiring Graduates					
		Unwtd # of	Strong Preference for ERAU Graduates	Some Preference for ERAU Graduates	No Preference	Some Preference for Other Graduates	Strong Preference for Other Graduates		
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %		
Daytona	2001	22	19.3%	34.5%	43.5%	2.7%	.0%		
Beach	2002	15	20.6%	34.3%	38.2%	.0%	6.9%		
	2003	21	9.7%	29.2%	56.2%	4.9%	.0%		
	2004	9	22.7%	56.8%	20.5%	.0%	.0%		
	All Years	67	17.7%	38.5%	40.3%	2.1%	1.3%		
Prescott	2001	10	10.0%	50.0%	40.0%	.0%	.0%		
	2002	9	55.6%	11.1%	33.3%	.0%	.0%		
	2003	10	58.3%	12.6%	29.1%	.0%	.0%		
	2004	6	16.7%	.0%	66.7%	16.7%	.0%		
	All Years	35	33.2%	19.5%	43.0%	4.4%	.0%		

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

			Preference for multi-lingual candidates		
		Unwtd # of	Strong Preference	Some Preference	No Preference
				Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Daytona	2003	21	9.7%	31.9%	58.4%
Beach	2004	8	.0%	25.6%	74.4%
Prescott	2003	10	12.6%	25.2%	62.2%
	2004	6	16.7%	.0%	83.3%

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

				e of global awar national experie	
		Unwtd # of	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Daytona	2003	22	16.5%	41.7%	41.7%
Beach	2004	9	22.7%	56.8%	20.5%
Prescott	2003	10	12.6%	33.0%	54.3%
	2004	6	.0%	50.0%	50.0%

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

				nanges to organ v/aero professio	
		Unwtd # of	Increased Need	No Changes	Decreased Need
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Daytona	2002	15	68.6%	24.5%	6.9%
Beach	2003	22	62.9%	37.1%	.0%
	2004	9	77.3%	11.4%	11.4%
	All Years	46	69.3%	25.1%	5.6%
Prescott	2002	9	77.8%	22.2%	.0%
	2003	10	67.0%	33.0%	.0%
	2004	6	66.7%	33.3%	.0%
	All Years	25	70.5%	29.5%	.0%

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

			Edu	cation of ERAU	Graduate Meets	s Company's Ne	eds
		Unwtd # of	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Daytona	2001	23	36.9%	41.5%	7.2%	7.2%	7.2%
Beach	2002	16	17.0%	69.8%	6.6%	.0%	6.6%
	2003	22	25.8%	55.7%	13.9%	4.6%	.0%
	2004	8	25.6%	61.6%	12.8%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	69	27.2%	55.7%	10.3%	3.4%	3.4%
Prescott	2001	10	70.0%	20.0%	10.0%	.0%	.0%
	2002	9	55.6%	44.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%
	2003	10	67.0%	29.1%	.0%	.0%	3.9%
	2004	6	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	35	56.3%	40.1%	2.8%	.0%	.8%

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

He/she is a valuable employee By Campus

			Graduate is a Valuable Employee									
		Unwtd # of	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree					
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %					
Daytona	2001	23	34.9%	55.3%	.0%	7.2%	2.6%					
Beach	2002	16	50.0%	43.4%	6.6%	.0%	.0%					
	2003	22	35.1%	46.4%	9.3%	9.3%	.0%					
	2004	8	25.6%	74.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%					
	All Years	69	36.0%	54.5%	4.0%	4.8%	.8%					
Prescott	2001	10	70.0%	30.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%					
	2002	9	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%					
	2003	10	54.3%	29.1%	12.6%	.0%	3.9%					
	2004	6	16.7%	66.7%	16.7%	.0%	.0%					
	All Years	35	51.9%	40.2%	7.1%	.0%	.8%					

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

He/she is a good candidate for promotion By Campus

				Graduate is a	Good Candidate	for Promotion	
		Unwtd # of	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Daytona	2001	23	23.0%	67.1%	.0%	9.8%	.0%
Beach	2002	16	36.8%	50.0%	13.2%	.0%	.0%
	2003	22	39.7%	41.7%	9.3%	4.6%	4.6%
	2004	8	25.6%	38.4%	35.9%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	69	31.2%	50.1%	13.2%	4.2%	1.3%
Prescott	2001	10	40.0%	30.0%	30.0%	.0%	.0%
	2002	9	33.3%	55.6%	11.1%	.0%	.0%
	2003	10	41.7%	29.1%	25.2%	.0%	3.9%
	2004	6	16.7%	50.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	35	32.7%	41.2%	25.3%	.0%	.8%

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 Grad	uate Compared Institutions	to Graduates Fi	rom Other
		Unwtd # of	Much Higher	Somewhat Higher	Equivalent	Somewhat Lower	Much Lower
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Daytona	2001	23	13.8%	44.1%	27.7%	11.8%	2.6%
Beach	2002	16	30.2%	46.2%	19.8%	3.8%	.0%
	2003	20	23.3%	25.6%	46.0%	5.1%	.0%
	2004	8	12.8%	51.2%	35.9%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	67	19.5%	41.1%	32.9%	5.7%	.8%
Prescott	2001	10	10.0%	60.0%	30.0%	.0%	.0%
	2002	9	22.2%	66.7%	11.1%	.0%	.0%
	2003	10	29.1%	70.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%
	2004	6	16.7%	16.7%	50.0%	16.7%	.0%
	All Years	35	18.8%	52.6%	24.2%	4.4%	.0%

ERAU General Skills Preparation and Usefulness on the Job

Daytona Beach

		-						E	S Aeronauti	cal Science	:						
			Employer	's Usefulnes	ss of Skill												
		Unwtd#	Very	on the Job Somew hat	Not	Unwtd#	С	ompetence	of this ERAL	J Graduate	Very	Unwtd#	Compe	tence of Gra	duates from	Other Instit	very
		of Respond	Useful Wtd	Useful Wtd	Useful Wtd	of Respond	Excellent Wtd Row	Good Wtd	Average Wtd	Poor Wtd	Poor Wtd	of Respon	Excellent Wtd Row	Good Wtd Row	Average Wtd	Poor Wtd	Poor Wtd
Quantitative/mathematics	2001	ents 21	Row % 46.4%	Row % 33.3%	Row % 20.3%	ents 16	% 36.8%	Row % 26.4%	Row % 26.4%	Row % 10.4%	Row %	dents 13	.0%	% 54.1%	Row % 32.9%	Row % 12.9%	Row %
	2002	15 21	32.3% 38.9%	60.6% 46.5%	7.1% 14.6%	14 20	22.8% 20.4%	50.0% 40.9%	27.2% 38.7%	.0%	.0%	13 20	16.5% 5.1%	45.9% 20.4%	29.4% 69.3%	8.2% 5.1%	.0%
	2004	9	34.0%	43.3%	22.7%	7	44.0%	11.9%	44.0%	.0%	.0%	5	20.8%	16.9%	62.3%	.0%	.0%
Basic PC software (word	All Years 2001	66 22	38.4% 63.4%	44.9% 24.1%	16.7% 12.4%	57 18	30.3% 44.2%	32.7% 35.0%	34.5% 17.5%	2.5%	.0%	51 16	9.4% 10.4%	33.0% 59.4%	51.0% 30.2%	6.6%	.0%
processing, spreadsheets,	2002	15	42.4%	39.4%	18.2%	13	32.9%	16.5%	42.4%	8.2%	.0%	12	17.9%	53.8%	28.2%	.0%	.0%
etc.)	2003	20 9	40.9% 34.0%	48.9% 66.0%	10.2%	17 8	36.2% 25.6%	33.6% 25.6%	30.2% 48.8%	.0%	.0%	17	12.1% 17.2%	33.6%	54.3% 82.8%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	66	45.9%	44.3%	9.8%	56	35.0%	28.6%	33.9%	2.5%	.0%	51	13.9%	37.4%	48.7%	.0%	.0%
Writing skills (non-technical)	2001 2002	21 16	64.5% 39.6%	25.4% 60.4%	10.1%	18 15	22.8% 21.2%	14.6% 35.4%	56.9% 36.4%	5.7% 7.1%	.0%	15 14	13.7% 7.6%	45.1% 42.4%	27.5% 34.8%	13.7% 15.2%	.0%
(non teeninear)	2002	21	48.6%	36.8%	14.6%	17	12.1%	51.7%	30.2%	6.0%	.0%	16	.0%	48.6%	51.4%	.0%	.0%
	2004	9	45.4%	43.3%	11.3%	7	29.4%	14.7%	56.0%	.0%	.0%	6	17.2%	.0%	82.8%	.0%	.0%
Technical writing	All Years 2001	67 21	50.2% 38.4%	40.2% 41.3%	9.6%	57 18	21.0% 17.5%	29.3%	44.9% 52.5%	4.8% 5.8%	.0%	51 15	9.1% 7.1%	35.6% 32.3%	48.1% 42.4%	7.2% 18.2%	.0%
	2002	16	26.4%	63.2%	10.4%	14	15.2%	30.4%	46.7%	7.6%	.0%	13	8.2%	24.7%	58.8%	8.2%	.0%
	2003 2004	21 9	34.0% 22.7%	36.8% 31.9%	29.2% 45.4%	16 6	12.9% 34.4%	35.7% 17.2%	45.0% 48.4%	6.4%	.0%	15 5	.0%	31.3% 16.9%	68.7% 62.3%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	67	30.8%	42.2%	27.0%	54	19.2%	26.3%	48.3%	5.2%	1.0%	48	8.0%	27.2%	57.8%	7.0%	.0%
Speaking before an audience	2001	22 16	53.8% 43.4%	38.6% 43.4%	7.6% 13.2%	17 14	18.1% 38.0%	30.2% 45.7%	45.7% 16.3%	6.0%	.0%	15 14	.0%	41.2% 38.0%	45.1% 31.5%	6.9% 7.6%	6.9%
	2003	21	56.2%	19.5%	24.3%	15	13.7%	38.2%	41.2%	6.9%	.0%	14	7.4%	26.3%	66.4%	.0%	.0%
	2004 All Years	9 68	43.3% 49.8%	11.3% 27.6%	45.4% 22.6%	7	29.4% 24.2%	41.3% 38.3%	29.4% 34.0%	.0%	.0%	6 49	17.2% 11.4%	31.2% 34.3%	51.6% 48.7%	.0%	.0%
Listening skills	All Years 2004	68	100.0%	.0%	.0%	53 8	24.2% 51.2%	38.3%	12.8%	.0%	.0%	49	11.4% 17.2%	34.3% 14.0%	48.7% 68.8%	.0%	1.9%
	All Years	9	100.0%	.0%	.0%	8	51.2%	36.0%	12.8%	.0%	.0%	6	17.2%	14.0%	68.8%	.0%	.0%
Applied research (information gathering and	2001	22 15	42.1% 25.3%	43.4% 28.3%	14.5% 46.5%	17 11	30.2% 9.9%	36.2% 60.6%	27.6% 29.6%	6.0%	.0%	14	.0%	36.8% 64.8%	48.4% 29.6%	7.4% 5.6%	7.4%
analysis)	2003	21	29.2%	46.5%	24.3%	15	6.9%	38.2%	54.9%	.0%	.0%	13	.0%	28.4%	71.6%	.0%	.0%
	2004 All Years	9 67	54.6% 38.3%	22.7% 36.3%	22.7% 25.4%	8 51	25.6% 19.4%	51.2% 45.2%	23.2% 33.7%	.0%	.0%	6 44	17.2% 4.3%	.0%	82.8% 59.2%	.0%	.0%
Critical thinking	2001	22	65.5%	26.9%	7.6%	21	35.5%	28.3%	25.4%	10.9%	.0%	16	.0%	48.6%	45.0%	6.4%	.0%
	2002	16	67.0%	33.0%	.0%	15	32.3%	46.5%	21.2%	.0%	.0%	14	15.2%	42.4%	30.4%	12.0%	.0%
	2003	22 9	67.5% 77.3%	27.8% 11.3%	4.6% 11.3%	19	30.0% 25.6%	32.3% 51.2%	26.9% 12.8%	10.8% 10.4%	.0%	18	11.4% 17.2%	20.3% 17.2%	68.3% 65.6%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	69	69.2%	24.6%	6.1%	63	31.0%	38.5%	22.0%	8.5%	.0%	54	10.4%	32.1%	53.1%	4.4%	.0%
Independent work	2001	22 16	65.5% 73.6%	31.7% 26.4%	2.8%	21 15	28.3% 32.3%	30.4% 39.4%	35.5% 28.3%	.0%	5.8%	17 14	6.2% 22.8%	40.7% 50.0%	49.6% 22.8%	.0%	3.5% 4.3%
	2003	22	90.7%	4.6%	4.6%	19	46.1%	37.7%	10.8%	5.4%	.0%	18	11.4%	28.5%	54.4%	5.7%	.0%
	2004 All Years	9 69	43.3% 69.0%	56.7% 28.9%	.0%	63	38.4% 36.4%	25.6% 33.1%	25.6% 24.9%	10.4% 3.9%	.0%	6 55	17.2% 13.7%	14.0% 33.6%	68.8% 49.1%	.0% 1.7%	.0%
Planning, scheduling, and	2001	22	77.9%	17.2%	4.8%	20	36.6%	29.1%	26.1%	8.2%	.0%	17	12.4%	18.6%	62.8%	6.2%	.0%
carrying out projects	2002	16 22	73.6% 62.9%	26.4% 27.8%	.0% 9.3%	15 18	46.5% 26.0%	25.3% 34.2%	21.2% 34.2%	7.1% 5.7%	.0%	14 17	15.2% 6.0%	50.0% 24.2%	30.4% 63.8%	.0%	4.3%
	2003	9	77.3%	22.7%	.0%	8	38.4%	25.6%	36.0%	.0%	.0%	6	17.2%	.0%	82.8%	.0%	.0%
D.C	All Years	69	72.6%	23.4%	4.0%	61	36.3%	28.8%	29.6%	5.3%	.0%	54	12.2%	23.4%	60.0%	3.5%	1.0%
Defining and solving problems	2001	22 16	85.5% 76.4%	9.7% 23.6%	4.8%	19 15	21.5% 42.4%	43.1% 28.3%	30.0% 29.3%	5.4%	.0%	15 14	13.7% 22.8%	45.1% 30.4%	34.3% 46.7%	6.9%	.0%
	2003	22	81.4%	13.9%	4.6%	19	30.0%	48.5%	16.2%	5.4%	.0%	17	6.0%	42.3%	45.7%	6.0%	.0%
	2004 All Years	9 69	77.3% 80.6%	22.7% 16.8%	.0%	8 61	38.4% 32.3%	25.6% 37.3%	36.0% 27.4%	.0%	.0%	6 52	17.2% 14.3%	.0%	82.8% 50.9%	.0%	.0%
Working in groups/teams	2001	22	82.1%	15.2%	2.8%	21	25.4%	40.6%	28.3%	.0%	5.8%	16	13.6%	40.8%	34.0%	7.8%	3.9%
	2002	15 21	53.5% 70.8%	46.5% 19.5%	.0% 9.7%	14 19	30.4%	45.7% 43.1%	23.9% 26.9%	.0%	.0%	14 18	30.4% 11.4%	38.0% 37.4%	31.5% 45.6%	.0%	.0%
	2004	9	68.1%	31.9%	.0%	8	38.4%	48.8%	12.8%	.0%	.0%	6	17.2%	14.0%	68.8%	.0%	.0%
F / :P /	All Years	67	70.0%	26.5%	3.5%	62	30.7%	44.2%	23.3%	.0%	1.7%	54	17.5%	33.5%	44.3%	3.7%	1.0%
Leading/guiding others	2001	22 16	57.9% 66.0%	29.7% 34.0%	12.4%	20 15	21.4% 32.3%	32.1% 46.5%	40.5% 21.2%	3.1%	3.1%	15 14	7.1% 22.8%	14.1% 34.8%	70.7% 30.4%	.0%	8.1%
	2003	22	58.3%	27.8%	13.9%	18	17.1%	20.3%	56.9%	5.7%	.0%	17	6.0%	21.5%	66.4%	6.0%	.0%
	2004 All Years	9 69	77.3% 64.3%	22.7% 28.3%	.0% 7.4%	8 61	25.6% 23.6%	51.2% 36.6%	12.8% 34.1%	10.4% 4.9%	.0%	6 52	17.2% 12.6%	31.2% 24.8%	51.6% 55.9%	.0%	.0%
Responsible actions and	2001	22	84.8%	4.8%	10.3%	21	30.4%	33.3%	30.4%	2.9%	2.9%	17	6.4%	29.1%	60.9%	.0%	3.6%
decision making	2002	16 22	80.2% 81.4%	19.8% 9.3%	9.3%	15 19	49.5% 30.0%	25.3% 43.1%	18.2% 16.2%	7.1%	.0%	14 18	30.4% 5.7%	42.4% 48.8%	27.2% 45.6%	.0%	.0%
	2004	9	88.7%	11.3%	.0%	8	38.4%	38.4%	23.2%	.0%	.0%	6	17.2%	17.2%	65.6%	.0%	.0%
Ability to adapt to change	All Years 2004	69 9	83.9% 88.7%	10.7% 11.3%	5.5%	63 8	36.1% 38.4%	35.5% 38.4%	22.3% 12.8%	5.2%	.8% 10.4%	55 6	13.8% 17.2%	35.6%	49.7% 82.8%	.0%	1.0%
	All Years	9	88.7%	11.3%	.0%	8	38.4%	38.4%	12.8%	.0%	10.4%	6	17.2%	.0%	82.8%	.0%	.0%
Understanding other people and other points of	2001 2002	22	51.0%	41.4%	7.6%	21	20.3%	48.6%	25.4%	2.9%	2.9%	17	.0%	44.5%	48.2%	.0%	7.3%
view	2002	16 22	63.2% 72.2%	36.8% 23.2%	.0%	14 19	38.0%	15.2% 21.6%	46.7% 43.1%	.0% 5.4%	.0%	13 18	8.2% 11.4%	57.6% 31.7%	34.1% 51.2%	.0%	.0%
	2004	9	77.3%	22.7%	.0%	8	25.6%	51.2%	12.8%	.0%	10.4%	6	17.2%	17.2%	65.6%	.0%	.0%
Environmental awareness	All Years 2001	69 22	65.9% 55.9%	30.7% 44.1%	3.4%	62 20	27.7% 31.3%	35.3% 26.1%	31.4% 39.6%	2.3%	3.3%	54 16	8.9% 13.2%	37.6% 39.6%	49.8% 47.2%	1.8%	2.0%
	2002	16	39.6%	56.6%	3.8%	14	14.7%	58.9%	26.3%	.0%	.0%	13	8.0%	55.7%	36.4%	.0%	.0%
	2003	21 9	46.5% 56.7%	38.9% 31.9%	14.6% 11.3%	16 7	16.5% 29.4%	12.9% 29.4%	57.8% 41.3%	12.9%	.0%	16	.0% 17.2%	19.3%	67.9% 82.8%	12.9%	.0%
	All Years	68	50.2%	42.2%	7.6%	57	23.5%	30.6%	41.7%	4.2%	.0%	51	9.1%	28.8%	58.4%	3.7%	.0%
Political and economic awareness	2001 2002	20	29.8%	45.8%	24.4%	16	32.1%	12.8%	38.5%	16.5%	.0%	13	.0%	39.8%	44.3%	15.9%	.0%
anatorioss	2002	15 21	28.3% 22.2%	53.5% 38.9%	18.2% 38.9%	12 13	17.3% 8.0%	25.9% 20.4%	56.8% 63.7%	.0%	.0%	12	8.6%	25.9% 20.4%	65.4% 63.7%	.0%	.0%
	2004	9	34.0%	43.3%	22.7%	7	29.4%	29.4%	41.3%	.0%	.0%	6	17.2%	.0%	82.8%	.0%	.0%
Knowledge of	All Years 2002	65 15	28.4% 32.3%	44.7% 32.3%	27.0% 35.4%	48 11	22.5% 29.6%	21.8% 19.7%	49.1% 50.7%	6.6%	.0%	44 11	6.3% 9.9%	21.6% 39.4%	63.9% 50.7%	6.1%	2.1%
political/physical	2003	21	14.6%	56.2%	29.2%	14	7.4%	26.3%	59.0%	7.4%	.0%	14	.0%	11.5%	73.7%	7.4%	7.4%
geography	2004	9	34.0%	66.0%	.0%	7	44.0%	.0%	44.0%	11.9%	.0%	6	17.2%	.0%	82.8%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	45	26.0%	53.3%	20.8%	32 2='Good' 3=	26.9%	14.7%	51.2%	7.1%	.0%	31	8.6%	15.5%	70.3%	2.8%	2.8%

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='Excellent', 2='Good', 3='Average', 4='Poor', 5='Very Poor'. Usefulness response options: 1='Very Useful', 2='Somewhat Useful', 3='Not Useful'

ERAU General Skills Preparation and Usefulness on the Job

Prescott

								E	S Aeronaut	ical Science	9						
			Employer	's Usefulne	ss of Skill				(4): 504							011 1 12	
		Unwtd# of Respond	Very Useful Wtd	Somew hat Useful Wtd	Not Useful Wtd	Unwtd # of Respond	Excellent Wtd Row	Good Wtd	Average Wtd	Poor Wtd	Very Poor Wtd	Unwtd # of Respon	Excellent Wtd Row	Good Wtd Row	Average Wtd	Poor Wtd	Very Poor Wtd
O 4 i 4 - 4 i / 4 i 4 i	10004	ents	Row % 55.6%	Row %	Row %	ents	%	Row %	Row %	Row %	Row %	dents	%	%	Row % 50.0%	Row %	Row
Quantitative/mathematics	2001	9 8	25.0%	50.0%	.0% 25.0%	9	55.6% 16.7%	22.2% 50.0%	22.2% 33.3%	.0%	.0%	6	25.0%	25.0% 33.3%	66.7%	.0%	.0
	2003	9	76.7%	23.3%	.0%	9	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	6	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.C
	2004 All Years	32	.0%	83.3% 52.5%	16.7% 10.6%	5 29	.0%	60.0% 47.9%	40.0% 24.1%	.0%	.0%	5 25	.0% 7.7%	40.0% 27.1%	60.0% 65.2%	.0%	.0
Basic PC software (word	2001	10	50.0%	40.0%	10.0%	10	30.0%	20.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	7	.0%	14.3%	85.7%	.0%	.0
processing, spreadsheets, etc.)	2002	8	50.0% 66.2%	37.5% 33.8%	12.5%	7 9	28.6% 33.3%	42.9% 62.3%	28.6% 4.4%	.0%	.0%	7	14.3%	28.6%	42.9% 100.0%	14.3%	.0
,	2003	6	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	5	.0%	80.0%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	5	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	.0%	.0
	All Years	32	48.1%	41.2%	10.7%	31	23.0%	48.9%	28.2%	.0%	.0%	25	9.7%	23.2%	63.4%	3.7%	.0
Writing skills (non-technical)	2001	10	40.0% 25.0%	60.0% 50.0%	.0% 25.0%	10	20.0% 25.0%	30.0% 37.5%	50.0% 37.5%	.0%	.0%	7 8	.0%	28.6% 37.5%	57.1% 37.5%	14.3% 12.5%	.0
(2003	9	28.9%	71.1%	.0%	9	18.9%	62.3%	14.5%	.0%	4.4%	6	.0%	.0%	78.3%	21.7%	.0
	2004	6	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	4	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	4	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0
Technical writing	All Years 2001	33 10	32.5%	57.1% 60.0%	10.3% 40.0%	31 9	17.0%	43.0% 55.6%	39.1% 44.4%	.0%	1.0%	25 6	9.9%	25.4% 16.7%	53.1% 66.7%	11.6% 16.7%	.0
	2002	8	12.5%	50.0%	37.5%	7	14.3%	57.1%	28.6%	.0%	.0%	7	.0%	42.9%	42.9%	14.3%	.0
	2003	9	28.9% 16.7%	52.2% 50.0%	18.9% 33.3%	8	4.6%	60.5% 50.0%	30.3% 50.0%	.0%	4.6%	5 4	.0%	.0%	100.0% 50.0%	.0%	.C
	All Years	33	13.2%	53.4%	33.4%	28	4.4%	55.8%	38.7%	.0%	.0% 1.0%	22	25.0% 6.9%	24.3%	60.1%	8.8%	.0
Speaking before an	2001	10	50.0%	30.0%	20.0%	10	30.0%	40.0%	30.0%	.0%	.0%	7	.0%	28.6%	71.4%	.0%	.0
audience	2002	8 9	62.5% 47.8%	25.0% 37.7%	12.5% 14.5%	8 9	25.0% 18.9%	50.0% 47.8%	25.0% 33.3%	.0%	.0%	8	25.0%	12.5% 21.7%	50.0% 56.6%	12.5% 21.7%	.0
	2004	6	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	6	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	6	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	.0%	.0
	All Years	33	47.8%	35.9%	16.3%	33	18.4%	46.6%	35.0%	.0%	.0%	27	12.2%	24.7%	56.3%	6.8%	.0
Listening skills	2004 All Years	6	66.7% 66.7%	33.3% 33.3%	.0%	6	16.7% 16.7%	66.7% 66.7%	16.7% 16.7%	.0%	.0%	6	16.7% 16.7%	50.0% 50.0%	33.3% 33.3%	.0%	.C
Applied research	2001	10	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	9	44.4%	22.2%	22.2%	11.1%	.0%	6	.0%	16.7%	83.3%	.0%	.0
(information gathering and analysis)	2002	8	12.5%	62.5%	25.0%	6	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	6	.0%	16.7%	83.3%	.0%	.0
analysis)	2003	9	14.5% 50.0%	81.1% 33.3%	4.4% 16.7%	8 5	19.7%	50.0% 80.0%	30.3% 20.0%	.0%	.0%	5	.0%	.0%	100.0% 40.0%	.0%	.C
	All Years	33	31.4%	51.4%	17.1%	28	21.6%	46.0%	28.9%	3.5%	.0%	23	6.5%	21.1%	72.4%	.0%	.0
Critical thinking	2001	10	90.0%	10.0%	.0%	10	60.0%	20.0%	10.0%	10.0%	.0%	8	12.5%	50.0%	25.0%	12.5%	.0
	2002	8 9	75.0% 71.1%	25.0% 28.9%	.0%	8 9	25.0% 47.8%	75.0% 23.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	8	12.5%	12.5%	75.0% 100.0%	.0%	.C
	2004	6	83.3%	16.7%	.0%	6	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	6	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0
Independent work	All Years 2001	33 10	81.0% 100.0%	19.0%	.0%	33 10	33.0% 60.0%	46.1% 20.0%	17.9% 10.0%	3.0% 10.0%	.0%	28 7	6.7%	32.7% 57.1%	57.2% 42.9%	3.4%	.C
maepenaem work	2002	8	100.0%	.0%	.0%	8	62.5%	37.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	8	37.5%	12.5%	50.0%	.0%	.0
	2003	9	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	9	23.3%	62.3%	14.5%	.0%	.0%	6	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0
	2004 All Years	6 33	66.7% 84.2%	33.3% 15.8%	.0%	6 33	16.7% 41.4%	33.3% 36.0%	50.0% 19.6%	.0%	.0%	6 27	16.7% 15.6%	33.3% 28.4%	50.0% 56.0%	.0%	.0
Planning, scheduling, and	2001	10	80.0%	20.0%	.0%	10	60.0%	30.0%	10.0%	.0%	.0%	7	28.6%	28.6%	42.9%	.0%	.0
carrying out projects	2002	8	75.0%	25.0%	.0%	8	37.5%	62.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	8	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0
	2003 2004	9	62.3% 50.0%	37.7% 33.3%	.0% 16.7%	9	37.7%	33.3% 40.0%	14.5% 60.0%	14.5%	.0%	6 5	.0%	.0%	100.0% 40.0%	.0%	.0
	All Years	33	67.1%	28.3%	4.6%	32	35.5%	40.9%	20.6%	3.0%	.0%	26	20.4%	26.1%	53.5%	.0%	.0
Defining and solving problems	2001	10	90.0% 62.5%	10.0% 37.5%	.0%	10	70.0% 25.0%	20.0% 50.0%	.0%	10.0%	.0%	7 8	.0%	28.6% 12.5%	71.4% 62.5%	.0%	.0
problems	2002	9	62.3%	37.7%	.0%	9	23.3%	47.8%	28.9%	.0%	.0%	6	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0
	2004	6	83.3%	16.7%	.0%	6	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	6	16.7%	50.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0
Working in groups/teams	All Years 2001	33 10	76.4% 70.0%	23.6% 30.0%	.0%	33 10	35.8% 50.0%	36.0% 30.0%	25.2% 20.0%	3.0%	.0%	27	12.2% 14.3%	26.8% 42.9%	61.0% 42.9%	.0%	.0
Working in groups/teams	2002	8	75.0%	25.0%	.0%	8	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	8	25.0%	37.5%	37.5%	.0%	.0
	2003	9	47.8%	52.2%	.0%	9	23.3%	33.3%	28.9%	14.5%	.0%	6	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0
	2004 All Years	33	66.7% 65.8%	33.3% 34.2%	.0%	33	16.7% 35.5%	16.7% 31.6%	66.7% 30.1%	.0%	.0%	6 27	.0%	33.3% 31.6%	66.7% 58.1%	.0%	.0
Leading/guiding others	2001	10	60.0%	30.0%	10.0%	10	40.0%	20.0%	30.0%	10.0%	.0%	8	.0%	12.5%	87.5%	.0%	.0
	2002	8	75.0%	25.0%	.0%	8	50.0%	37.5%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	8	25.0%	12.5%	62.5%	.0%	.0
	2003	9 5	62.3% 60.0%	37.7% 40.0%	.0%	9	23.3%	33.3% 50.0%	28.9% 50.0%	14.5%	.0%	6	.0%	.0% 16.7%	78.3% 50.0%	.0%	.0
	All Years	32	64.1%	32.8%	3.1%	33	28.0%	34.9%	31.3%	5.8%	.0%	28	17.0%	11.9%	67.8%	3.3%	.0
Responsible actions and decision making	2001	10	80.0%	20.0%	.0%	10	40.0%	20.0%	30.0%	10.0%	.0%	7 8	.0%	42.9% 25.0%	57.1% 50.0%	.0%	.C
ooomaking	2002	9	87.5% 71.1%	12.5% 28.9%	.0%	9	50.0% 23.3%	37.5% 47.8%	12.5% 28.9%	.0%	.0%	6	.0%	.0%	78.3%	21.7%	.0
	2004	6	83.3%	16.7%	.0%	6	33.3%	33.3%	16.7%	.0%	16.7%	6	16.7%	50.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0
Ability to adapt to change	All Years 2004	33 6	80.9% 83.3%	19.1% 16.7%	.0%	33 6	37.1%	33.2% 66.7%	22.1% 33.3%	3.0%	4.6%	27 6	12.2%	33.7% 33.3%	50.7% 66.7%	3.4%	.0
	All Years	6	83.3%	16.7%	.0%	6	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	6	.0%	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	.0
Understanding other people and other points of	2001	10	100.0%	.0%	.0%	10	30.0%	50.0%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	8	.0%	25.0%	75.0%	.0%	.(
people and other points of view	2002	8	62.5% 47.8%	25.0% 52.2%	12.5%	8 9	37.5% 23.3%	50.0% 18.9%	.0%	12.5% 14.5%	.0%	8	25.0%	25.0%	50.0% 100.0%	.0%	.0
	2004	6	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	6	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	6	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0
Environmental awareness	All Years 2001	33 10	71.9% 60.0%	25.2% 40.0%	2.9%	33 10	22.1% 20.0%	43.9% 50.0%	28.3% 30.0%	5.7%	.0%	28 8	6.5% 12.5%	29.1%	64.3% 75.0%	.0% 12.5%	.0
LITATIONINE III AWARENESS	2001	8	25.0%	62.5%	12.5%	8	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	8	12.5% 25.0%	12.5%	62.5%	.0%	.0
	2003	9	28.9%	66.7%	4.4%	9	4.4%	37.7%	57.9%	.0%	.0%	6	.0%	.0%	78.3%	21.7%	.0
	2004	6	16.7%	66.7%	16.7%	6	.0%	16.7%	83.3%	.0%	.0%	6	.0%	16.7%	83.3%	.0%	.0
Political and economic	All Years 2001	33 10	33.9% 30.0%	57.8% 60.0%	8.3% 10.0%	33 9	18.3%	32.7% 77.8%	49.1% 22.2%	.0%	.0%	28 7	9.9%	8.5% 14.3%	74.9% 71.4%	6.7% 14.3%	.(
awareness	2002	8	12.5%	62.5%	25.0%	7	42.9%	28.6%	28.6%	.0%	.0%	7	28.6%	.0%	71.4%	.0%	.(
	2003	9	14.5%	37.7%	47.8%	9	4.4%	23.3%	72.3%	.0%	.0%	6	.0%	.0%	78.3%	.0%	21.7
	2004 All Years	6 33	16.7% 19.3%	50.0% 53.4%	33.3% 27.3%	5 30	.0%	20.0% 39.9%	80.0% 49.5%	.0%	.0%	5 25	.0% 7.4%	20.0% 9.8%	80.0% 75.2%	.0%	3.7
Knowledge of	2002	8	12.5%	37.5%	50.0%	6	33.3%	16.7%	33.3%	16.7%	.0%	6	16.7%	.0%	83.3%	.0%	.0
political/physical geography	2003	9	28.9%	33.3%	37.7%	9	4.4%	37.7%	57.9%	.0%	.0%	6	.0%	.0%	78.3%	21.7%	.0
	2004 All Years	6 23	16.7% 18.8%	33.3% 34.7%	50.0% 46.5%	5 20	.0%	40.0% 32.6%	60.0% 51.7%	.0%	.0%	5 17	.0% 5.4%	40.0% 17.2%	60.0% 72.0%	.0% 5.4%	.C
RALL Preparation response on											.073		3,0		0 /0	20	

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='Excellent', 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

Daytona Beach

			1					E	SS Aeronauti	ical Science							
			Usefulnes	ss of skill or	n the Job			Competence	e of this ERA	AU Graduate	•			Competen	ce of other (Graduates	
		Unwtd # of	(1) Very Useful	Somew hat Useful	(3) Not Useful	Unwtd#	(1) Very Good	(2) Good	(3) Average	(4) Poor	(5) Very Poor	Unwtd #	(1) Very Good	(2) Good	(3) Average	(4) Poor	(5) Very Poor
		Respond ents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Respond ents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Respon dents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
(A) Understanding	2001	19	73.4%	11.3%	15.3%	18	52.5%	29.2%	5.8%	9.2%	3.3%	13	16.5%	24.7%	45.9%	12.9%	.0%
aerodynamic performance of aircraft	2002	12	91.0%	9.0%	.0%	12	67.9%	17.9%	14.1%	.0%	.0%	11	9.9%	35.2%	39.4%	15.5%	.0%
	2003	21 4	90.3%	4.9%	4.9%	20	46.0% 71.1%	33.5% 28.9%	15.3%	5.1%	.0%	19	16.2% 55.2%	32.3% 44.8%	51.5%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	56	86.6%	7.0%	6.5%	53	55.3%	28.4%	10.4%	4.8%	1.1%	45	18.1%	32.0%	42.9%	7.0%	.0%
(B) Use of electronic	2001	18	71.8%	12.0%	16.2%	17	61.9%	6.2%	18.6%	9.7%	3.5%	12	9.0%	41.0%	41.0%	9.0%	.0%
navigation and flight control systems	2002	11 19	43.2% 80.8%	37.8% 19.2%	18.9%	10 19	26.9% 26.9%	52.2% 56.9%	20.9% 16.2%	.0%	.0%	10 18	10.4% 5.7%	20.9% 28.5%	41.8% 56.9%	16.4% 8.9%	10.4%
	2003	4	100.0%	.0%	.0%	3	71.1%	28.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2	55.2%	.0%	44.8%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	52	73.5%	17.8%	8.7%	49	43.3%	36.5%	16.0%	3.1%	1.1%	42	12.1%	27.5%	48.3%	9.8%	2.4%
(C) Crew coordination (cockpit resource	2001	19	67.7%	14.5%	17.7%	17	49.6%	18.6%	22.1%	6.2%	3.5%	12	17.9%	41.0%	32.1%	9.0%	.0%
management)	2002	12 20	80.8% 69.3%	5.1% 20.4%	14.1% 10.2%	11 18	47.3% 26.0%	37.8% 39.9%	14.9% 28.5%	.0% 5.7%	.0%	10 17	10.4% 6.0%	52.2% 36.2%	26.9% 51.7%	10.4% 6.0%	.0%
	2004	4	100.0%	.0%	.0%	3	35.6%	35.6%	28.9%	.0%	.0%	2	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	55	75.4%	12.7%	11.9%	49	39.1%	32.1%	23.6%	4.0%	1.1%	41	9.7%	47.1%	35.9%	7.3%	.0%
(D) Knowledge of flight physiology, awareness	2001	19 12	67.7% 82.1%	14.5% 9.0%	17.7% 9.0%	17 12	43.4% 50.0%	18.6% 41.0%	24.8% 9.0%	13.3%	.0%	12 11	9.0%	50.0%	32.1% 45.1%	9.0%	.0%
of flight psy	2002	20	82.1% 69.3%	30.7%	.0%	12	35.3%	41.0% 26.9%	32.3%	5.4%	.0%	11	17.1%	45.1% 22.8%	45.1% 60.1%	.0%	.0%
	2004	4	78.7%	21.3%	.0%	3	35.6%	35.6%	28.9%	.0%	.0%	2	.0%	55.2%	44.8%	.0%	.0%
(5)	All Years	55	72.6%	20.1%	7.3%	51	41.0%	28.3%	24.6%	6.1%	.0%	43	9.4%	38.0%	47.9%	4.7%	.0%
(E) Awareness of safety and accident prevention	2001	18 12	81.2% 85.9%	12.8% 14.1%	6.0%	17 12	55.8% 44.9%	15.9% 46.2%	22.1% 9.0%	6.2%	.0%	13 11	8.2% .0%	41.2% 60.6%	37.6% 29.6%	12.9% .0%	.0% 9.9%
	2003	20	79.6%	15.3%	5.1%	18	20.3%	51.2%	28.5%	.0%	.0%	17	12.1%	39.6%	48.3%	.0%	.0%
	2004	4	100.0%	.0%	.0%	3	35.6%	64.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
(E) He denotes d'on the	All Years	54	84.2%	12.1%	3.6%	50	38.6%	40.5%	18.9%	2.0%	.0%	43	7.1%	50.3%	36.6%	3.7%	2.3%
(F) Understanding the concepts and process	2001	19 12	65.3% 73.1%	22.6% 26.9%	12.1%	17 11	60.3% 29.6%	18.1% 45.1%	15.5% 25.4%	6.0%	.0%	12 11	8.6% 9.9%	17.3% 29.6%	65.4% 25.4%	8.6% 35.2%	.0%
of meteorology	2003	20	94.9%	5.1%	.0%	19	30.0%	48.5%	16.2%	5.4%	.0%	18	5.7%	37.4%	45.6%	5.7%	5.7%
	2004	4	78.7%	21.3%	.0%	3	35.6%	64.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2	.0%	55.2%	44.8%	.0%	.0%
(G) Instrument flight	All Years 2001	55	79.1%	17.1%	3.8%	50	40.3%	39.9%	15.9%	3.9%	.0%	43	7.0%	31.7%	46.1%	12.9%	2.3%
skill	2001	19 12	79.0% 91.0%	8.9% 9.0%	12.1%	18 12	52.5% 67.9%	23.3% 17.9%	15.0% 14.1%	5.8%	3.3%	13 11	16.5% 19.7%	21.2% 35.2%	49.4% 45.1%	12.9%	.0%
	2003	20	79.6%	15.3%	5.1%	18	43.1%	34.2%	17.1%	5.7%	.0%	17	24.2%	39.6%	30.2%	6.0%	.0%
	2004	4	100.0%	.0%	.0%	3	35.6%	35.6%	28.9%	.0%	.0%	2	55.2%	44.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%
(H) Multi-engine/high	All Years 2001	55 19	84.5% 62.1%	9.9%	5.6% 8.9%	51 19	50.7% 50.8%	27.3% 20.2%	17.1% 20.2%	3.9% 5.6%	1.1% 3.2%	43 14	23.7% 15.7%	33.8% 31.5%	36.5% 40.4%	6.0% 12.4%	.0%
performance aircraft	2002	11	70.4%	19.7%	9.9%	10	28.1%	32.8%	39.1%	.0%	.0%	9	.0%	43.9%	43.9%	12.3%	.0%
operations	2003	20	54.0%	30.7%	15.3%	17	39.6%	30.2%	24.2%	6.0%	.0%	16	12.9%	48.6%	19.3%	12.9%	6.4%
	2004 All Years	4 54	100.0% 66.1%	.0%	.0%	3 49	71.1% 45.2%	.0%	.0%	28.9% 7.5%	.0% 1.2%	41	55.2% 15.1%	44.8% 41.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%
(I) Knowledge of	2001	19	79.0%	15.3%	5.6%	19	50.8%	11.3%	25.8%	8.9%	3.2%	14	31.5%	12.4%	31.5%	24.7%	.0%
Federal Aviation	2002	12	91.0%	9.0%	.0%	12	32.1%	35.9%	32.1%	.0%	.0%	11	9.9%	25.4%	49.3%	9.9%	5.6%
Regulations	2003	20	89.8%	5.1%	5.1%	18	48.8%	34.2%	17.1%	.0%	.0%	17	15.5%	18.1%	54.3%	12.1%	.0%
	2004 All Years	4 55	100.0% 88.1%	.0%	.0%	3 52	71.1% 48.4%	28.9% 26.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2 44	55.2% 22.3%	44.8% 20.4%	.0%	.0% 14.2%	.0%
(J) Aeronautical	2001	19	73.4%	12.1%	14.5%	18	35.9%	23.9%	27.4%	9.4%	3.4%	13	17.1%	47.6%	22.0%	13.4%	.0%
decision making (judgement skills)	2002	12	91.0%	9.0%	.0%	12	26.9%	59.0%	14.1%	.0%	.0%	11	29.6%	9.9%	35.2%	19.7%	5.6%
u=agomon annoj	2003	20 4	84.7% 100.0%	10.2%	5.1%	18	37.4% 35.6%	39.9% 35.6%	17.1% 28.9%	.0%	5.7%	17	6.0%	51.7% 100.0%	30.2%	12.1% .0%	.0%
	All Years	55	84.5%	9.1%	6.3%	51	35.6%	35.6%	28.9%	3.0%	3.1%	43	14.2%	44.9%	26.4%	13.2%	1.3%
(K) Actions, attitudes,	2001	19	73.4%	17.7%	8.9%	18	40.8%	17.5%	29.2%	5.8%	6.7%	13	16.5%	37.6%	32.9%	8.2%	4.7%
and knowledge sec. considerations	2002	12 20	59.0% 48.9%	32.1% 46.0%	9.0%	11 17	.0% 27.5%	39.4%	50.7% 36.2%	9.9%	.0%	10	.0% 12.9%	10.9%	78.1% 51.4%	10.9%	.0%
	2003	4	48.9% 78.7%	21.3%	5.1%	3	27.5% 35.6%	36.2% 64.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	16	.0%	35.7% 55.2%	51.4% 44.8%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	55	62.7%	31.0%	6.3%	49	27.5%	33.8%	32.5%	4.0%	2.3%	41	9.9%	32.6%	51.3%	4.9%	1.4%
(L) Dealing with integrity issues	2002	12	73.1%	17.9%	9.0%	12	32.1%	44.9%	14.1%	9.0%	.0%	11	9.9%	9.9%	70.4%	9.9%	.0%
100455	2003	20 4	79.6% 100.0%	.0%	.0%	18	26.0% 71.1%	39.9%	22.8% 28.9%	.0%	.0%	17	6.0%	33.6% 55.2%	48.3% 44.8%	12.1% .0%	.0%
	All Years	36	81.9%	10.3%	7.8%	33	35.5%	34.7%	21.0%	8.7%	.0%	30	6.6%	28.4%	55.2%	9.9%	.0%
(M) Developing your	2002	12	44.9%	55.1%	.0%	12	17.9%	53.8%	28.2%	.0%	.0%	11	9.9%	19.7%	70.4%	.0%	.0%
moral character	2003	20	79.6%	10.2%	10.2%	18	26.0%	45.6%	22.8%	5.7%	.0%	17	18.1%	33.6%	48.3%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	4 36	78.7% 69.5%	21.3% 25.3%	.0% 5.2%	33	71.1% 31.0%	.0%	28.9% 25.5%	.0%	.0%	30	.0% 13.2%	55.2% 31.7%	44.8% 55.2%	.0%	.0%
(N) Assertiveness in a	2002	12	71.8%	28.2%	.0%	11	9.9%	39.4%	50.7%	.0%	.0%	11	19.7%	9.9%	70.4%	.0%	.0%
leadership or subordinate role	2003	20	64.2%	25.6%	10.2%	18	31.7%	28.5%	34.2%	5.7%	.0%	17	6.0%	51.7%	36.2%	6.0%	.0%
220.0	2004 All Years	4 36	78.7% 69.3%	21.3% 25.4%	.0%	32	71.1% 32.0%	.0%	28.9% 38.2%	.0% 3.0%	.0%	30	.0%	.0%	100.0% 55.3%	.0%	.0%
(O) Ground/Flight	2003	20	79.6%	15.3%	5.1%	18	37.4%	39.9%	22.8%	.0%	.0%	17	6.0%	51.7%	30.2%	12.1%	.0%
training	2004	4	100.0%	.0%	.0%	3	71.1%	28.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
(D) Time onest in	All Years	24	85.4%	11.0%	3.7%	21	45.7%	37.1%	17.1%	.0%	.0%	19	4.9%	60.6%	24.7%	9.9%	.0%
(P) Time spent in FTD/Simulators	2003	20 3	48.9% 35.6%	30.7% 64.4%	.0%	16 2	29.3%	38.6%	32.1% 100.0%	.0%	.0%	15 2	.0%	.0%	65.7% 100.0%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	23	45.8%	38.4%	15.8%	18	23.7%	31.1%	45.2%	.0%	.0%	17	.0%	27.4%	72.6%	.0%	.0%
PALL Preparation respons																	

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

Prescott								E	3S Aeronaut	ical Science							
			Usefulnes	ss of skill o	n the Job			Competence	e of this ERA	AU Graduate				Competen	ce of other	Graduates	
		Unwtd # of	(1) Very Useful	Somew hat Useful	(3) Not Useful	Unwtd #	(1) Very Good	(2) Good	(3) Average	(4) Poor	(5) Very Poor	Unwtd #	(1) Very Good	(2) Good	(3) Average	(4) Poor	(5) Very Poor
		Respond ents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Respond ents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Respon dents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
(A) Understanding	2001	8	87.5%	12.5%	.0%	8	87.5%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	6	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	.0%	.0%
aerodynamic performance of aircraft	2002	8	100.0%	.0%	.0%	8	87.5%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	8	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%
•	2003	6 4	100.0% 75.0%	.0%	.0%	6 4	92.2% 25.0%	7.8% 50.0%	.0% 25.0%	.0%	.0%	5 4	.0% 25.0%	36.1% 50.0%	27.7% 25.0%	36.1%	.0%
	All Years	26	90.1%	9.9%	.0%	26	73.1%	20.8%	6.0%	.0%	.0%	23	23.4%	39.7%	31.5%	5.4%	.0%
(B) Use of electronic navigation and flight	2001	8	87.5%	12.5%	.0%	8	75.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	6	16.7%	50.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%
control systems	2002	8	37.5% 100.0%	50.0%	12.5%	8	62.5% 66.7%	25.0% 33.3%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	8 5	12.5%	25.0% 27.7%	50.0% 63.9%	12.5% 8.4%	.0%
	2003	4	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	4	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	4	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	26	65.3%	30.9%	3.7%	26	52.0%	32.2%	15.8%	.0%	.0%	23	15.0%	31.8%	47.8%	5.4%	.0%
(C) Crew coordination (cockpit resource	2001	8	62.5%	37.5%	.0%	8	50.0%	37.5%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	6	16.7%	16.7%	66.7%	.0%	.0%
management)	2002	8 6	75.0% 100.0%	25.0%	.0%	8	75.0% 41.1%	25.0% 58.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	8 5	12.5% .0%	50.0% 8.4%	37.5% 83.1%	.0% 8.4%	.0%
	2004	4	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	4	.0%	25.0%	75.0%	.0%	.0%	4	25.0%	.0%	75.0%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	26	68.7%	31.3%	.0%	26	44.1%	33.9%	22.0%	.0%	.0%	23	15.0%	22.0%	61.7%	1.3%	.0%
(D) Knowledge of flight physiology, awareness	2001	8	87.5%	12.5%	.0%	8	75.0%	12.5%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	6	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	.0%	.0%
of flight psy	2002	8	100.0% 100.0%	.0%	.0%	6	87.5% 41.1%	12.5% 58.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	8 5	25.0%	37.5% 8.4%	37.5% 55.4%	.0%	.0%
	2004	4	25.0%	75.0%	.0%	4	.0%	25.0%	75.0%	.0%	.0%	4	.0%	25.0%	75.0%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	26	78.0%	22.0%	.0%	26	55.7%	22.3%	22.0%	.0%	.0%	23	16.8%	33.1%	44.7%	5.4%	.0%
(E) Awareness of safety and accident prevention	2001	8	100.0% 100.0%	.0%	.0%	8	87.5% 87.5%	12.5% 12.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	6 8	16.7% 25.0%	50.0% 12.5%	33.3% 62.5%	.0%	.0%
	2002	6	100.0%	.0%	.0%	6	66.7%	7.8%	25.6%	.0%	.0%	5	.0%	8.4%	55.4%	36.1%	.0%
	2004	4	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	3	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	3	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	.0%
(=)	All Years	26	87.9%	6.0%	6.0%	25	67.4%	22.2%	10.4%	.0%	.0%	22	13.4%	33.7%	47.1%	5.7%	.0%
(F) Understanding the concepts and process	2001	8	100.0% 87.5%	.0% 12.5%	.0%	8	62.5% 62.5%	37.5% 37.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	6 8	16.7% 25.0%	33.3% 12.5%	50.0% 62.5%	.0%	.0%
of meteorology	2003	6	92.2%	7.8%	.0%	6	15.6%	58.9%	25.6%	.0%	.0%	5	.0%	8.4%	.0%	91.6%	.0%
	2004	4	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	4	.0%	25.0%	75.0%	.0%	.0%	4	.0%	25.0%	75.0%	.0%	.0%
(C) In atrum and flight	All Years 2001	26	83.1%	16.9%	.0%	26	40.6%	37.6%	21.8%	.0%	.0%	23	12.5%	20.6%	53.3%	13.6%	.0%
(G) Instrument flight skill	2001	8	100.0% 100.0%	.0%	.0%	8	62.5% 75.0%	25.0% 25.0%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	6 8	16.7% 25.0%	33.3% 37.5%	33.3% 37.5%	16.7%	.0%
	2003	6	100.0%	.0%	.0%	6	58.9%	41.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	5	.0%	8.4%	83.1%	8.4%	.0%
	2004	4	75.0%	25.0%	.0%	4	.0%	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	.0%	4	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%
(H) Multi-engine/high	All Years 2001	26 8	94.0% 50.0%	6.0% 50.0%	.0%	26 8	50.7% 50.0%	33.4% 25.0%	9.9% 25.0%	6.0%	.0%	23 6	12.5%	22.2% 33.3%	59.7% 50.0%	5.5% 16.7%	.0%
performance aircraft	2001	8	75.0%	25.0%	.0%	8	75.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	8	12.5%	62.5%	25.0%	.0%	.0%
operations	2003	6	100.0%	.0%	.0%	6	41.1%	33.3%	25.6%	.0%	.0%	5	.0%	.0%	36.1%	63.9%	.0%
	2004	4	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	4	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	4	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%
(I) Knowledge of	All Years 2001	26 8	64.8% 100.0%	35.2%	.0%	26 8	44.1% 75.0%	32.2% 25.0%	23.6%	.0%	.0%	23	4.1% 16.7%	42.4% 50.0%	39.7% 16.7%	13.8% 16.7%	.0%
Federal Aviation	2002	8	100.0%	.0%	.0%	8	75.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	8	37.5%	37.5%	25.0%	.0%	.0%
Regulations	2003	6	100.0%	.0%	.0%	6	58.9%	15.6%	25.6%	.0%	.0%	5	.0%	.0%	36.1%	63.9%	.0%
	2004 All Years	4 26	75.0% 94.0%	25.0% 6.0%	.0%	4 26	25.0% 60.6%	.0%	75.0% 21.8%	.0%	.0%	23	25.0% 23.3%	.0%	75.0% 37.7%	.0%	.0%
(J) Aeronautical	2001	8	100.0%	.0%	.0%	8	75.0%	12.5%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	6	16.7%	50.0%	16.7%	16.7%	.0%
decision making	2002	8	100.0%	.0%	.0%	8	87.5%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	8	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%
(judgement skills)	2003	6	100.0%	.0%	.0%	6	15.6%	84.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	5	.0%	8.4%	83.1%	8.4%	.0%
	All Years	4 26	50.0% 87.9%	25.0% 6.0%	25.0% 6.0%	3 25	33.3% 61.7%	33.3% 27.7%	33.3% 10.6%	.0%	.0%	3 22	33.3% 20.5%	33.3% 31.0%	33.3% 42.5%	.0%	.0%
(K) Actions, attitudes,	2001	8	75.0%	25.0%	.0%	8	62.5%	25.0%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	6	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	.0%
and knowledge sec. considerations	2002	8	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	8	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	8	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%
co.ioidorationo	2003 2004	6 4	92.2% 25.0%	7.8% 75.0%	.0%	6 4	7.8%	41.1% 25.0%	51.1% 75.0%	.0%	.0%	5 4	.0%	.0%	36.1% 75.0%	63.9%	.0%
	All Years	26	58.0%	42.0%	.0%	26	35.7%	27.4%	37.0%	.0%	.0%	23	8.2%	32.0%	50.3%	9.5%	.0%
(L) Dealing with integrity	2002	8	75.0%	12.5%	12.5%	7	57.1%	28.6%	14.3%	.0%	.0%	7	28.6%	57.1%	14.3%	.0%	.0%
issues	2003	6	74.4%	25.6%	.0%	6	15.6%	58.9%	25.6%	.0%	.0%	5	.0%	8.4%	.0%	91.6%	.0%
	2004 All Years	4 18	75.0% 74.9%	25.0% 19.7%	.0%	17	25.0% 35.8%	50.0% 43.4%	25.0% 20.8%	.0%	.0%	4 16	50.0% 30.6%	25.0% 34.7%	25.0% 15.3%	.0%	.0%
(M) Developing your	2002	8	87.5%	.0%	12.5%	7	71.4%	14.3%	14.3%	.0%	.0%	7	42.9%	28.6%	28.6%	.0%	.0%
moral character	2003	6	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	6	15.6%	58.9%	25.6%	.0%	.0%	5	.0%	.0%	63.9%	36.1%	.0%
	2004 All Years	4	75.0%	25.0%	.0%	4	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	4	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%
(N) Assertiveness in a	2002	18 8	78.7% 87.5%	15.9% 12.5%	5.5%	17	41.6% 87.5%	.0%	30.1% 12.5%	.0%	.0%	16 8	36.5% 12.5%	21.2% 50.0%	34.7% 37.5%	7.7%	.0%
leadership or	2002	6	74.4%	25.6%	.0%	6	41.1%	33.3%	25.6%	.0%	.0%	5	.0%	.0%	91.6%	8.4%	.0%
subordinate role	2004	4	75.0%	25.0%	.0%	4	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	4	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%
(O) Ground/Flight	All Years 2003	18	80.3%	19.7%	.0%	18	55.7%	24.6%	19.7%	.0%	.0%	17	14.5%	40.0%	43.9%	1.7%	.0%
training	2003	6 4	100.0% 25.0%	.0%	.0%	6 2	41.1%	58.9% 50.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	5 2	.0%	.0%	83.1% 50.0%	8.4%	.0%
	All Years	10	53.4%	31.1%	15.5%	8	22.6%	54.9%	22.6%	.0%	.0%	7	23.6%	4.5%	67.5%	4.5%	.0%
(P) Time spent in	2003	6	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	6	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	5	.0%	.0%	63.9%	36.1%	.0%
FTD/Simulators 200	2004	2	.0%	.0%	100.0%	0	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	0	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
EDALI Drangration respons	All Years	8	36.6%	18.3%	45.1%	6	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	5	.0%	.0%	63.9%	36.1%	.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'

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

Class of 2001

He is a great team player and a very good flight instructor

(Name omitted) is employed in a part-time capacity that does not fully draw upon her educational background.

He was a very strong student during his basic introduction and flight training.

He is well rounded in aviation.

Graduate came to us with a solid aeronautical foundation.

Good study habits and well rounded

The knowledge of abiding by company policy and operations and technical competency.

Very motivated to aviation career.

(Name omitted) demonstrates flexibility with the ability to serve as company pilot and chief operator of our CAD equipment for our airport projects.

None-Average

Aeronautical knowledge

Procedure oriented, excellent customer's relation skills.

His understanding of aircraft performance, electronic navigation and flight control systems. Also his strong knowledge of FAA regulations is a plus.

Technical competence and understanding the university and flight programs.

Knowledge of aeronautical issues. Ability to resolve complex situations.

Good overall knowledge

Strong in aerodynamics!

Class of 2002

(Name omitted) has been continuously employed at Aviation Atlanta, Inc., as a Certified Flight Instructor since April 30, 2003, and under my direct supervision. Our operation consists of seventeen full time instructors, a chief instructor, two assistant chiefs, six part time dispatchers, and three aviation mechanics. (Name omitted) works well as a team member with the other instructors, dispatchers and mechanics. As his supervisor I receive favorable comments form his colleagues, his students and senior management. (Name omitted) conducts flight training under 14 CFR 141 and 14 CFR 61 to a wide variety of pilot candidates seeking private, commercial, and flight instructor certificates and instrument and multi-engine ratings. In addition he is a designated stage

check instructor for students enrolled in Private, Instrument, Commercial and Multi-Engine. His students consist of young adults preparing themselves for the airlines and midlife professionals learning to fly in pursuit of business, pleasure, and recreation. During (Name omitted) employment with Aviation Atlanta, Inc. his performance consistently exceeds the job requirements and he has received "superior" evaluations. He is routinely prepared in advance for his students, and his paper work is consistently accurate, complete and submitted in a timely manner. I have conducted stage checks on his student and have found them to be well prepared. From their proficient flying and safety actions, the high quality of his training is clearly evident. On his own initiative, (Name omitted) volunteered for Check Instructor training and after performing well in training was approved as a check instructor. Also, on his own initiative he volunteered as a mentor to new hires. His performance as a mentor has been excellent. In addition, (Name omitted) is viewed as the "professor emeritus" within our company and is thus used by both senior management and his colleagues for assistance to deal with difficult aviation technical problems. During my personal interactions with (Name omitted), I have found him to be exceptionally thorough in his concern for the well being of his student and energetically interested in his professional development as a pilot and flight instructor. His communication skills are extremely good in effectiveness with a wide variety of people of different ages, walks of life, and goals in aviation. He demonstrates a sincere interest in the welfare of his students by his thoroughness and preparation. (Name omitted) is able to accurately recognize his limitations as evidenced by his prompt requests for assistance when difficult situations arise. (Name omitted) is always cheerful, energetic, and relates in a friendly manner with his colleagues, students and management. He routinely demonstrates an above average intelligence and intellectual curiosity. During times when he does not have scheduled students, (Name omitted) is observed studying aviation material. (Name omitted) presents a professional image in his mannerisms, interactions, and his dress when he is on duty and on site. Were (Name omitted) to leave the company at this time, he would be re-hired without reservation based on his performance to date.

Good knowledge base. He has been better than most ERAU graduates that I have been in contact with.

Technical Knowledge; Systems, Performance, Regulation

Knowledge regarding Airline culture and know how.

Well educated, well prepared.

Very knowledgeable in all aspects of aviation.

Strong

Very good technical background, above average flying skills, especially instrument flying for the level of experience obtained at graduation.

Good pilot, great personality

Understanding technical applications of learned theory.

Obviously higher knowledge level. I don't know if you teach professionalism, but marked difference in professionalism and common courtesy of ER grads.

Class of 2003

Skill level and competency

GPS use. use of new technology aircraft knowledge

Knowledge of the G.A. system and our place in it, a good fit for a no problem "employer can do attitude. -very important!

Aviation skills are good- such as pilot skills

He has excellent knowledge of required subjects; aerodynamics, FAA regulations, weather, etc.

The overall knowledge of the aviation industry and the evidence of their extensive training.

Professional procedural approach to piloting an aircraft.

Deep and sincere interest in flight training

Very trainable as 2nd in command but needs a lot of work before upgrade. Good IFR skills.

Knowledge of aviation in general along with good computer skills.

Outstanding all around knowledge and flight skills.

Nothing above average from any other flight school or college.

Good overall aeronautical knowledge base.

High level of situational awareness.

Integrates well in team environment.

Integrity and values are high

High regard for safety

He presently is not flying but is a supervisor of station operations.

The flight training. Seems that (Name omitted) is great with instrument procedures and approaches. As an alumnus, I can see that the Flight Dept. is still maintaining the highest standards with respect to safety.

Fantastic communication and leadership skills.

This graduate was better expressed than most of the recent ERAU interviewees we have seen in the past. He was ready to work as a flight instructor immediately.

Class of 2004

Dedication to aviation, high goal & standards

His ability to adapt to flying & flight instruction outside the area of ERAU curriculum.

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

Program Profile - BS Aeronautical Science

Very Structured

It attracts those who love aviation

He presents very thorough and well planned ground lessons.

CRM, Multiengine/High Performance A/C ops.

None

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

Class of 2001

Outstanding pilot skills. Excellent Instrument skills. Converses at any level.

(Name omitted) is very perceptive when analyzing her students' performance and that of others' students. Without being arrogant or overbearing. When her opinion is needed she offers it clearly adn completely.

ERAU graduates, as with this one have very solid aviation foundation. There are no holes in their basic training.

Planning, scheduling projects- a 'self-starter'; leadership, motivational skills, and critical thinking

(Name omitted) is a very professional instructor and takes pride in being thorough with his students. He appears to enjoy keeping up to date on all areas of aviation, which I consider extremely important.

Attention to detail when concentrating on a particular project. Although he is not in a flight position, I can see his cockpit skills being very thorough and detailed.

Class of 2002

Excellent overall knowledge; 'well rounded'

Impressed with professionalism of this and other ERAU graduates.

Multi-engine instruction experience

Class of 2003

Knowledge

Not relating explicitly to this candidate, most ERAU grads have a good understanding of all attributes listed above A-5

Technical Knowledge

Lots of multiengine time - only employee I can insure to teach in our multiengine a/c because of how much more multiengine time she graduated with.

Solid Aeronautical Foundation

Excellent abilities to work/think independently.

Strong Aeronautical Foundation

Class of 2004

Communicates well with students regarding lesson plans. Volunteers for line-related duties. Gets along well with others.

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

Program Profile - BS Aeronautical Science

Ability to follow directions & work independently

Strong in instrument flying skills and radio communications.

Computer

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

Class of 2001

The job is not challenging enough to give me such feedback.

I am unable to answer that as I did not fly or work with First Officer (Name omitted) on a day to day situation. However, I would say that paper work 'reports' could have been better.

Graduate was challenged by the complexity of jet transport aircraft at a major airline. His study techniques required improvement to progress in this program.

No weaknesses

Solving problems.

There are no apparent weaknesses and we look forward to (Name omitted) maturing and growing with the company.

None-Average

General studies, humanities, history.

Degree program only prepares applicants for airline jobs. A large percentage will work in other areas and are very ill prepared. They need better writing skills and more knowledge about other parts of the industry other than commercial aviation.

Lack of initiative.

Lacking interpersonal skills.

Lack of Part 135 ops

I don't know, but I know where to find it!

Communication, writing and verbal skills!

Class of 2002

Decision making in general aviation.

Very cocky. Ego out of line. I have 2 professional pilot grads here. They are both like that. Unlikely that I would promote or recommend either one.

I see no weakness

In working with private pilot applicants (student pilots) tends to get too technical with instruction because of background.

Too regimented. Needs to learn to be flexible with syllabus when weather changes. Not enough IFR actual time.

2 of 4 very shy.

Class of 2003

The understanding and value of integrity

Being able to think instead of being a robot

presentation skills

Sometimes these (pro pilots) over evaluate. Complicate, and exaggerate issues. Needs some instructions in business educate.

Need more people skills- need to talk more with passengers

Would like to see better people skills; better customer relations\service; a mentoring attitude (seeing things from the customer's perspective)

Sometimes seems unaware of need of management for feedback or "closure"

Basic flying skills in single engine aircraft not up to desired strengths.

Ratings are given too fast without developing basics. Poor VFR skills

none

none

No weakness in this graduate. I have known some ERAU graduates that are very cocky because of the degree. Flight education should be viewed as a never ending journey.

Not being taught how to use common sense and professionalism.

With this graduate as well as others from ERAU, sometimes lacking ability to correlate academics to "real life flying."

Technical - Hands on experience with aircraft systems

None

Overall, (Name omitted) has no concern of Corporate America. His inadequate knowledge and poor business etiquette in a professional setting is a major weakness and appears to have no sign of changing/improving.

Some exposure to running a FAR Part 61 flight school would be good experience. Basic business skills.

Class of 2004

Employer Feedback Survey	Program Profile - BS Aeronautical Science
Classes of 2001, 2002, 2003 & 2004, 1 1/2 Years After Graduation	

N/A

None thus far.

Sometimes too Structured

Very little independent decision making or problem solving

I feel that much more emphasis needs to be placed in teaching professional flight instructors the art of customer service. Many new CFIS lack skills in time management.

None

None

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

Class of 2001

Could be a little stronger in the team work area. Her peers (who are outstanding instructors) see the student as a person who circumvents the organizational chain of command in an effort to rapidly advance.

Initially, somewhat, inflexible - after some training and explaination they realize, more than one method all getting the correct results.

Not noted at this time.

Organizational and problem solving skills are weak.

Class of 2002

Lack of exposure to the industry outside of ERAU.

Lack of exposure to many types of aircraft. The similar fleet type while cost effective for you is not in the real world.

Improve basic flying skills, stalls, spins, crosswind landings.

Transition from student to employee issues, majoring, professionalism, etc..

Class of 2003

None

Leadership, Followership, Teamwork

English writing skills grammar.

Is only now learning that flying can be fun and safe- her training was so strict that she seemed to not remember that flying is fun.

Ethics/ Work Ethic

Work Ethic

None

Class of 2004

Overt obsession with money, sometimes to the consideration of his students.

Speaking in front of audience, taking basic instructions & building onto them.

Could be stronger in interpersonal communications and resolving concerns in working relationships.

Math