Employer Feedback Survey

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

Program Profile BS Aerospace Engineering Daytona Beach Campus

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 Aerospace Engineering					
	2001	2002	2003	2004	All Years	
Daytona Beach	4	6	8	3	21	

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 Wtd Row %	1-2 years Wtd Row %	3-5 years Wtd Row %
Daytona	2001	4	50.0%	50.0%	.0%
Beach	2002	6	28.2%	53.9%	18.0%
	2003	8	31.8%	68.2%	.0%
	2004	3	66.7%	33.3%	.0%
	All Years	21	46.2%	49.8%	3.9%

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 Respondents		4	6	8	3	21
	Aerospace	Wtd Col %	50.0%	64.1%	83.2%	100.0%	79.6%
	Computer	Wtd Col %	.0%	.0%	8.4%	.0%	2.2%
	Government	Wtd Col %	.0%	.0%	8.4%	.0%	2.2%
	Military	Wtd Col %	.0%	18.0%	.0%	.0%	3.9%
	Other	Wtd Col %	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.0%
	Other	Wtd Col %	25.0%	18.0%	.0%	.0%	7.9%

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	4	75.0%	25.0%
Beach	2002	6	64.1%	35.9%
	2003	8	76.6%	23.4%
	2004	3	100.0%	.0%
	All Years	21	81.9%	18.1%

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 o	of ERAU Gradua	ates Know Profe	essionally
		Unwtd # of	1	2-5	6-10	11-50
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Daytona	2001	4	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	.0%
Beach	2002	6	53.9%	46.1%	.0%	.0%
	2003	8	15.0%	40.2%	44.9%	.0%
	2004	3	33.3%	33.3%	.0%	33.3%
	All Years	21	31.6%	40.6%	16.0%	11.8%

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	
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	
Daytona	2001	4	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	
Beach	2002	6	82.0%	18.0%	.0%	
	2003	8	70.1%	29.9%	.0%	
	2004	3	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	
	All Years	21	56.5%	31.7%	11.8%	

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	4	.0%	100.0%	
Beach	2002	6	.0%	100.0%	
	2003	8	15.0%	85.0%	
	2004	3	33.3%	66.7%	
	All Years	21	15.8%	84.2%	

Response options: 'Yes', 'No'.

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

1			Hiring involvemnet level		
		Unwtd # of	Make Final Deciaiton	Provide Input	No Involvement
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Daytona	2001	4	75.0%	25.0%	.0%
Beach	2002	6	18.0%	46.1%	35.9%
	2003	8	76.6%	23.4%	.0%
	2004	3	100.0%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	21	71.7%	20.4%	7.9%

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	
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	
Daytona	2001	4	.0%	75.0%	25.0%	.0%	
Beach	2002	5	.0%	21.9%	56.2%	21.9%	
	2003	8	.0%	15.0%	76.6%	8.4%	
	2004	3	33.3%	.0%	33.3%	33.3%	
	All Years	20	12.3%	20.7%	48.3%	18.7%	

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	Some Preference	No Preference
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Daytona	2003	8	8.4%	91.6%
Beach	2004	3	33.3%	66.7%

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

			Importance awarene international	ess and
		Unwtd # of	Somewhat Important	Not Important
		Respondents		
Daytona			70.1%	29.9%
Beach			66.7%	33.3%

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

			Anticipated changes to organization's need for av/aero professionals		
		Unwtd # of	Increased Need	No Changes	Decreased Need
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Daytona	2002	5	78.1%	21.9%	.0%
Beach	2003	8	38.3%	46.7%	15.0%
	2004	3	66.7%	33.3%	.0%
	All Years	16	59.8%	35.2%	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

			Education of ERAU Graduate Meets Company's Needs						
		Unwtd # of	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral				
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %				
Daytona	2001	4	75.0%	25.0%	.0%				
Beach	2002	6	35.9%	64.1%	.0%				
2003 2004		8	68.2%	23.4%	8.4%				
		3	66.7%	33.3%	.0%				
	All Years	21	61.7%	36.1%	2.2%				

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			
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %			
Daytona	2001	4	25.0%	75.0%			
Beach	2002	6	46.1%	53.9%			
	2003	8	53.3%	46.7%			
	2004	3	66.7%	33.3%			
	All Years	21	51.9%	48.1%			

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					
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %					
Daytona	2001	4	50.0%	50.0%	.0%					
Beach	2002	6	18.0%	82.0%	.0%					
2003		8	38.3%	53.3%	8.4%					
2004		3	66.7%	.0%	33.3%					
	All Years	21	45.7%	40.3%	14.0%					

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	Much Higher	Somewhat Higher	Equivalent	Somewhat Lower					
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %					
Daytona	2001	4	.0%	25.0%	75.0%	.0%					
Beach	2002	6	18.0%	46.1%	35.9%	.0%					
	2003	8	.0%	44.9%	55.1%	.0%					
	2004	3	.0%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%					
	All Years	21	3.9%	37.9%	46.4%	11.8%					

ERAU General Skills Preparation and Usefulness on the Job

Daytona Beach

								BS Aer	ospace Engi	neering						
			Employer	's Usefulne	ss of Skill							_				
		Unwtd#	Very	Somew hat	Not	Unwtd#		tence of thi			Unwtd#		ence of Gra			Very
		of Respon	Useful Wtd	Useful Wtd	Useful Wtd	of Respond	Wtd Row	Good Wtd	Average Wtd	Poor Wtd	of Respond	Wtd Row	Good Wtd	Average Wtd	Poor Wtd	Poor Wtd
Quantitative/mathematics	2001	dents 4	Row % 50.0%	Row % 50.0%	Row %	ents 4	% 50.0%	Row % 50.0%	.0%	.0%	ents 4	% 25.0%	Row % 75.0%	Row %	Row %	Row %
	2002	6	64.1%	35.9%	.0%	6	17.9%	46.2%	35.9%	.0%	6	17.9%	46.2%	35.9%	.0%	.0%
	2003	8	38.3% 100.0%	46.7%	15.0%	8	15.0% 66.7%	76.6%	8.4% 33.3%	.0%	8	15.0% 33.3%	76.6% 66.7%	8.4%	.0%	.09
	All Years	21	67.6%	28.3%	4.0%	21	39.4%	38.6%	21.9%	.0%	21	23.7%	66.1%	10.2%	.0%	.09
Basic PC software (word processing, spreadsheets,	2001	6	100.0% 82.1%	.0% 17.9%	.0%	6	75.0% 17.9%	25.0% 64.1%	.0% 17.9%	.0%	6	50.0%	50.0% 64.1%	.0% 35.9%	.0%	.09
etc.)	2002	8	100.0%	.0%	.0%	8	59.8%	40.2%	.0%	.0%	8	29.9%	61.7%	8.4%	.0%	.09
	2004	3	100.0%	.0%	.0%	3	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	3	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.09
Writing skills	All Years 2001	21	96.1% 50.0%	3.9% 50.0%	.0%	21 4	55.4% 50.0%	40.6% 25.0%	3.9% 25.0%	.0%	21	39.5%	50.4% 75.0%	10.2% 25.0%	.0%	.09
(non-technical)	2002	6	46.2%	53.8%	.0%	5	21.9%	56.3%	21.9%	.0%	5	.0%	78.1%	21.9%	.0%	.09
	2003	8	85.0%	15.0%	.0%	8	38.3%	46.7%	15.0%	.0%	8	.0%	76.6%	23.4%	.0%	.09
	2004 All Years	3 21	33.3% 52.7%	66.7% 47.3%	.0%	20	33.3% 35.3%	33.3% 40.0%	33.3% 24.7%	.0%	3 20	33.3% 12.3%	33.3% 60.7%	33.3% 27.0%	.0%	.09
Technical writing	2001	4	100.0%	.0%	.0%	4	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	.0%	4	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.09
	2002	6 8	64.1% 61.7%	17.9% 38.3%	17.9% .0%	6 8	17.9% 29.9%	64.1% 31.8%	17.9% 38.3%	.0%	6 8	.0%	64.1% 68.2%	17.9% 23.4%	17.9%	.09
	2003	3	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	3	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	.0%	3	33.3%	.0%	66.7%	.0%	.09
	All Years	21	70.0%	26.0%	3.9%	21	31.7%	38.4%	30.0%	.0%	21	14.0%	40.3%	41.7%	3.9%	.09
Speaking before an audience	2001	6	50.0% 82.1%	25.0% 17.9%	25.0%	6	50.0% 17.9%	50.0% 46.2%	.0% 35.9%	.0%	6	.0% 17.9%	50.0% 28.2%	.0% 35.9%	50.0% 17.9%	.09
	2002	7	34.7%	65.3%	.0%	7	32.7%	9.2%	41.8%	16.3%	7	.0%	32.7%	67.3%	.0%	.09
	2004	3	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	3	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	3	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	.0%	.09
Listening skills	All Years 2004	20	47.3% 100.0%	48.6%	4.0%	18	44.0% 33.3%	31.3% 33.3%	20.3% 33.3%	4.5%	18	17.5% 33.3%	33.4% 33.3%	40.3% 33.3%	8.8%	.09
	All Years	3	100.0%	.0%	.0%	3	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	.0%	3	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	.0%	.09
Applied research (information gathering and	2001	4	100.0%	.0%	.0%	3	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	3	.0%	66.7%	.0%	.0%	33.39
analysis)	2002	7	53.8% 51.0%	28.2% 49.0%	17.9%	6 7	17.9% 32.7%	64.1% 41.8%	17.9% 25.5%	.0%	6 7	.0%	64.1% 67.3%	35.9% 16.3%	.0% 16.3%	.09
* *	2004	3	100.0%	.0%	.0%	3	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	3	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.09
Outsianal shrindrian	All Years 2001	20	77.3%	18.7%	4.0%	19 4	37.9%	38.6% 100.0%	23.5%	.0%	19	25.1%	53.7%	12.7% 50.0%	4.3%	4.29
Critical thinking	2001	6	75.0% 100.0%	25.0%	.0%	6	28.2%	53.8%	17.9%	.0%	6	10.3%	50.0% 53.8%	35.9%	.0%	.09
	2003	7	100.0%	.0%	.0%	7	41.8%	32.7%	25.5%	.0%	7	9.2%	90.8%	.0%	.0%	.09
	2004 All Years	3 20	100.0% 96.0%	.0%	.0%	3 20	66.7% 41.0%	.0%	33.3% 22.5%	.0%	3 20	33.3% 16.7%	66.7% 67.2%	.0% 16.2%	.0%	.09
Independent work	2001	4	75.0%	25.0%	.0%	3	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	.0%	3	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.09
•	2002	6	100.0%	.0%	.0%	6	28.2%	53.8%	17.9%	.0%	6	28.2%	17.9%	35.9%	17.9%	.0%
	2003	7	100.0% 100.0%	.0%	.0%	7	74.5% 66.7%	9.2%	16.3% 33.3%	.0%	7	9.2% 66.7%	.0%	32.7% 33.3%	.0%	.09
	All Years	20	96.0%	4.0%	.0%	19	55.5%	23.5%	21.1%	.0%	19	34.1%	32.1%	29.5%	4.2%	.0%
Planning, scheduling, and	2001	4	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	3	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	.0%	3	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	.0%
carrying out projects	2002	7	82.1% 100.0%	17.9%	.0%	6 7	17.9% 32.7%	28.2% 51.0%	53.8% 16.3%	.0%	7	.0%	28.2% 51.0%	71.8% 49.0%	.0%	.09
	2004	3	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	3	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	3	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	.0%	.0%
Defining and solving	All Years 2001	20 4	63.8%	32.2% 25.0%	4.0%	19 4	42.1% 25.0%	28.4% 50.0%	29.5%	.0%	19	12.6%	41.0% 75.0%	46.5% 25.0%	.0%	.09
Defining and solving problems	2001	6	75.0% 100.0%	.0%	.0%	6	35.9%	28.2%	25.0% 35.9%	.0%	6	17.9%	28.2%	53.8%	.0%	.09
	2003	7	100.0%	.0%	.0%	7	41.8%	41.8%	16.3%	.0%	7	9.2%	58.2%	32.7%	.0%	.09
	2004 All Years	3 20	100.0% 96.0%	.0% 4.0%	.0%	3 20	66.7% 46.8%	.0%	33.3% 28.3%	.0%	3 20	66.7% 30.4%	33.3% 45.2%	.0%	.0%	.09
Working in groups/teams	2001	4	75.0%	25.0%	.0%	4	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	.0%	4	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	.0%	.09
	2002	6	82.1%	17.9%	.0%	6	46.2%	17.9%	35.9%	.0%	6	10.3%	35.9%	53.8%	.0%	.0%
	2003	7	83.7% 100.0%	16.3%	.0%	7	67.3% 66.7%	32.7% 33.3%	.0%	.0%	7	9.2% 66.7%	90.8%	.0%	.0%	.09
	All Years	20	87.8%	12.2%	.0%	20	59.5%	28.4%	12.1%	.0%	20	32.8%	51.1%	16.2%	.0%	.09
Leading/guiding others	2001	4	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	2	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	2	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.09
	2002	7	71.8% 74.5%	28.2% 25.5%	.0%	6 7	17.9% 41.8%	17.9% 32.7%	46.2% 9.2%	17.9% 16.3%	6 7	.0% 9.2%	17.9% 49.0%	64.1% 41.8%	17.9%	.09
	2004	3	.0%	100.0%	.0%	3	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	.0%	3	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	.0%	.09
Doenoneible setions on	All Years 2001	20	43.0%	48.9% 50.0%	8.1%	18 4	33.4%	30.8%	26.9% 25.0%	8.9%	18 4	15.6% .0%	35.3% 50.0%	44.7%	4.4%	.09
Responsible actions and decision making	2001	6	50.0% 100.0%	.0%	.0%	6	25.0% 17.9%	50.0% 64.1%	17.9%	.0%	6	.0%	64.1%	25.0% 35.9%	.0%	25.09
=	2003	7	100.0%	.0%	.0%	7	25.5%	49.0%	9.2%	16.3%	7	9.2%	65.3%	25.5%	.0%	.09
	2004 All Years	3 20	33.3% 67.8%	66.7% 32.2%	.0%	3 20	66.7% 38.6%	.0%	33.3% 22.4%	.0% 4.1%	3 20	33.3% 14.4%	66.7% 63.1%	.0% 18.5%	.0%	.09
Ability to adapt to change	2004	3	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	3	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	3	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	.0%	.09
	All Years	3	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	3	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	3	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	.0%	.0%
Understanding other people and other points of	2001	6	50.0% 82.1%	25.0% 17.9%	25.0%	3 6	33.3% 17.9%	66.7% 64.1%	.0% 17.9%	.0%	3 6	.0%	66.7% 82.1%	33.3% 17.9%	.0%	.09
view	2002	7	100.0%	.0%	.0%	7	25.5%	58.2%	16.3%	.0%	7	9.2%	74.5%	16.3%	.0%	.09
	2004	3	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	3	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	3	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	.0%	.09
Environmental awareness	All Years 2001	20 4	75.8% 25.0%	20.1% 25.0%	4.0% 50.0%	19	40.2%	38.7% 50.0%	21.1% 50.0%	.0%	19	15.0%	59.8% 50.0%	25.3% 50.0%	.0%	.09
anaronos	2002	6	17.9%	82.1%	.0%	6	17.9%	17.9%	64.1%	.0%	5	.0%	21.9%	78.1%	.0%	.09
	2003	7	25.5%	41.8%	32.7%	6	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	6	.0%	69.5%	30.5%	.0%	.09
	2004 All Years	3 20	.0%	66.7% 57.1%	33.3% 28.4%	2 16	50.0% 21.2%	50.0% 40.5%	.0%	.0%	2 15	50.0% 16.8%	50.0% 48.5%	.0% 34.7%	.0%	.00
Political and economic	2001	4	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	2	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	2	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.01
awareness	2002	6	.0%	100.0%	.0%	6	.0%	35.9%	64.1%	.0%	5	.0%	21.9%	78.1%	.0%	.00
	2003	7	16.3%	51.0% 66.7%	32.7% 33.3%	6	.0%	58.6%	41.4%	.0%	6	.0%	58.6% 50.0%	41.4%	.0%	.00
	All Years	20	8.2%	63.5%	28.4%	16	31.8%	32.3%	35.9%	.0%	15	16.8%	45.3%	37.9%	.0%	.00
Knowledge of	2002	6	.0%	82.1%	17.9%	6	.0%	35.9%	64.1%	.0%	5	.0%	21.9%	78.1%	.0%	.09
political/physical geography	2003	7	16.3%	34.7% 66.7%	49.0% 33.3%	6 2	.0%	58.6%	41.4%	.0%	6	.0%	58.6%	41.4%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	16	4.9%	61.2%	33.9%	14	35.6%	30.2%	34.2%	.0%	13	37.9%	25.7%	36.4%	.0%	.09

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

							BS Ae	ospace Eng	ineering					
							Compe	etence of this	s ERAU					
			Usefulness of skill (2)		the Job		55	Graduate			Com	petence of	other Gradu	ates
		Unwtd #	(1) Very Useful	Somew hat Useful	(3) Not Useful	Unwtd #	(1) Very Good	(2) Good	(3) Average	Unwtd #	(1) Very Good	(2) Good	(3) Average	(4) Poor
		Respond ents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Respond ents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Respond ents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
(A) Apply knowledge of math and science	2001 2002	4	100.0%	.0%	.0%	4	75.0%	25.0%	.0%	4	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%
or main and colonice	2002	7	72.0% 74.5%	28.0% 25.5%	.0%	7	.0%	44.0% 32.7%	56.0% 25.5%	7	.0%	16.0% 58.2%	84.0% 16.3%	.0%
	2004	3	100.0%	.0%	.0%	3	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	3	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	.0%
(B) Design and	All Years 2001	18	88.6% 25.0%	11.4% 50.0%	.0%	18	50.9% 33.3%	20.3% 33.3%	28.9% 33.3%	18	33.2%	49.1% 66.7%	17.7% 33.3%	.0%
conduct experiments	2002	4	72.0%	28.0%	.0%	4	.0%	72.0%	28.0%	4	.0%	16.0%	56.0%	28.0%
	2003 2004	7	16.3%	67.3%	16.3%	6	39.0%	11.0%	50.0%	6	.0%	61.0%	39.0%	.0%
	All Years	3 18	33.3% 33.3%	33.3% 44.7%	33.3% 22.0%	2 15	50.0% 33.9%	50.0% 40.1%	.0%	2 15	.0%	100.0% 66.0%	.0%	.0%
(C) Analyze and interpret experimental	2001	4	75.0%	25.0%	.0%	4	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	4	.0%	75.0%	25.0%	.0%
data	2002	7	72.0% 32.7%	28.0% 51.0%	.0%	6	.0% 39.0%	72.0% 30.5%	28.0% 30.5%	6	.0% 19.5%	16.0% 61.0%	84.0% 19.5%	.0%
	2004	3	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	3	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	3	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	.0%
(D) Apply knowledge	All Years 2001	18	59.7% 50.0%	35.9% 50.0%	4.5%	17 4	46.0%	28.3% 100.0%	25.6%	17	32.1%	31.1% 50.0%	36.8% 50.0%	.0%
of aerodynamics	2002	4	72.0%	28.0%	.0%	4	.0%	44.0%	56.0%	3	.0%	22.2%	77.8%	.0%
	2003	7	49.0%	51.0%	.0%	7	41.8%	25.5%	32.7%	7	32.7%	25.5%	41.8%	.0%
	2004 All Years	3 18	66.7% 59.7%	33.3% 40.3%	.0%	3 18	33.3% 24.6%	33.3% 44.6%	33.3% 30.8%	3 17	33.3% 23.1%	66.7% 46.6%	.0%	.0%
(E) Apply knowledge	2001	4	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	3	.0%	100.0%	.0%	3	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	.0%
of aircraft performance	2002	4	.0%	72.0%	28.0%	2	.0%	36.4%	63.6%	3	.0%	61.1%	38.9%	.0%
· · · · · · · · ·	2003 2004	7	49.0% 66.7%	41.8% 33.3%	9.2%	6	53.9% 66.7%	10.1%	36.0% 33.3%	6	18.0% 33.3%	36.0% 33.3%	46.1% 33.3%	.0%
	All Years	18	48.4%	40.3%	11.3%	14	47.0%	21.6%	31.4%	15	19.8%	42.6%	37.6%	.0%
(F) Apply knowledge of stability and control	2001	4	25.0% 72.0%	50.0%	25.0%	3 4	.0%	66.7% 44.0%	33.3%	3	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	.0%
,	2003	7	49.0%	28.0% 25.5%	25.5%	5	.0% 43.8%	34.2%	56.0% 21.9%	5	.0%	36.4% 65.8%	63.6% 34.2%	.0%
	2004	3	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	3	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	2	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%
(G) Apply knowledge	All Years 2001	18	55.3% 25.0%	33.3% 75.0%	11.4%	15 4	24.9%	40.4% 75.0%	34.7% 25.0%	12	19.6%	56.7% 33.3%	23.6% 66.7%	.0%
of aerospace	2002	4	.0%	44.0%	56.0%	2	.0%	36.4%	63.6%	2	.0%	36.4%	63.6%	.0%
materials	2003	7	58.2%	32.7%	9.2%	7	25.5%	41.8%	32.7%	7	.0%	58.2%	41.8%	.0%
	2004 All Years	3 18	.0%	100.0% 68.4%	.0%	3 16	.0% 7.7%	66.7% 58.5%	33.3% 33.8%	2 14	.0%	50.0% 48.8%	50.0% 51.2%	.0%
(H) Apply knowledge	2001	4	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	3	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	3	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	.0%
of aircraft and spacecraft structures	2002	4	.0%	72.0%	28.0%	3	.0%	22.2%	77.8%	2	.0%	36.4%	63.6%	.0%
	2003	7	90.8% 33.3%	9.2% 66.7%	.0%	7	41.8% 33.3%	25.5% 33.3%	32.7% 33.3%	7 2	.0%	58.2% 50.0%	41.8% 50.0%	.0%
	All Years	18	42.4%	48.8%	8.8%	16	26.9%	34.4%	38.6%	14	.0%	54.7%	45.3%	.0%
(I) Apply knowledge of propulsion	2001	4	25.0%	50.0% 44.0%	25.0% 56.0%	3 2	.0%	100.0% 36.4%	.0%	2	.0%	100.0% 36.4%	.0%	.0%
	2002	7	32.7%	41.8%	25.5%	6	39.0%	41.4%	19.5%	6	.0%	69.5%	30.5%	.0%
	2004	3	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	2	100.0%	.0%	.0%	2	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%
(J) Apply knowledge	All Years 2001	18	39.6%	27.2% 25.0%	33.3% 75.0%	13	50.8%	36.4%	12.8% 100.0%	12	.0%	42.0%	37.8% 100.0%	.0%
of orbital mechanics	2002	4	.0%	.0%	100.0%	2	.0%	36.4%	63.6%	2	.0%	36.4%	63.6%	.0%
	2003	7	.0%	51.0%	49.0%	6	.0%	61.0%	39.0%	6	.0%	41.4%	58.6%	.0%
	2004 All Years	3 18	.0%	.0%	100.0% 81.6%	10	.0%	100.0% 62.5%	.0% 37.5%	10	.0%	100.0% 53.1%	.0%	.0%
(K) Apply knowledge	2001	4	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	2	.0%	.0%	100.0%	2	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%
of spacecraft dynamics	2002	7	.0%	28.0% 9.2%	72.0% 58.2%	3 6	.0%	22.2% 61.0%	77.8% 39.0%	3 6	.0%	22.2% 30.5%	77.8% 69.5%	.0%
	2004	3	.0%	.0%	100.0%	1	.0%	.0%	100.0%	1	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%
	All Years	18	8.9%	15.7%	75.4%	12	.0%	29.4%	70.6%	12	.0%	16.9%	83.1%	.0%
(L) Apply knowledge of control systems	2001	4	50.0% 44.0%	25.0% 56.0%	25.0%	3	33.3%	33.3% 61.1%	33.3% 38.9%	3	33.3%	33.3% 61.1%	33.3% 38.9%	.0%
	2003	7	32.7%	67.3%	.0%	7	32.7%	34.7%	32.7%	7	.0%	51.0%	49.0%	.0%
	2004 All Years	3 18	66.7% 50.9%	33.3% 44.7%	.0%	3 16	33.3% 29.0%	33.3% 37.2%	33.3% 33.8%	3 16	33.3% 19.2%	33.3% 42.1%	33.3% 38.7%	.0%
(M) Apply knowledge	2001	18	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	3	.0%	.0%	100.0%	3	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	.0%
of circuits, electronics, &	2002	4	28.0%	72.0%	.0%	4	28.0%	44.0%	28.0%	4	.0%	16.0%	56.0%	28.0%
instrument	2003	7	16.3% 33.3%	51.0% 33.3%	32.7% 33.3%	6 2	19.5% 50.0%	41.4% 50.0%	39.0%	6	.0%	50.0%	50.0% 50.0%	.0%
	All Years	18	26.4%	47.2%	26.5%	15	28.2%	37.8%	34.0%	15	22.4%	23.5%	48.4%	5.6%
(N) Identify, formulate, and solve	2001	4	100.0% 100.0%	.0%	.0%	4	50.0% 28.0%	50.0% 16.0%	.0%	4	50.0%	50.0% 16.0%	.0%	.0%
engineering problems	2003	7	100.0%	.0%	.0%	7	58.2%	16.0%	25.5%	7	16.3%	51.0%	32.7%	.0%
	2004	3	100.0%	.0%	.0%	3	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	3	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	.0%
(O) Use techniques,	All Years 2001	18	100.0%	.0%	.0%	18	55.3% 25.0%	15.8% 75.0%	28.9%	18 4	39.5% 25.0%	38.4% 75.0%	17.7%	4.4%
skills, tools necessary	2002	4	100.0%	.0%	.0%	4	28.0%	44.0%	28.0%	4	.0%	44.0%	56.0%	.0%
for eng practice	2003 2004	7	83.7%	16.3%	.0%	7	58.2%	32.7%	9.2%	7	25.5%	58.2%	16.3%	.0%
	All Years	3 18	100.0% 95.5%	.0% 4.5%	.0%	3 18	66.7% 50.9%	.0%	33.3% 20.0%	3 18	66.7% 37.6%	.0%	33.3% 26.4%	.0%
(P) Design a/c	2001	4	75.0%	.0%	25.0%	3	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	3	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%
system, component, or mission to meet	2002	7	28.0% 58.2%	44.0% 32.7%	28.0%	7	.0%	61.1% 49.0%	38.9%	7	.0% 9.2%	22.2% 65.3%	38.9% 16.3%	38.9% 9.2%
needs	2004	3	.0%	66.7%	9.2%	2	.0%	50.0%	25.5% 50.0%	2	.0%	.0%	16.3% 100.0%	.0%
(0) He desert	All Years	18	33.5%	42.1%	24.4%	15	14.6%	54.1%	31.4%	15	3.2%	43.0%	44.9%	8.8%
(Q) Understand eng decisions on	2001	4	50.0%	25.0% 84.0%	25.0% 16.0%	3 2	.0%	66.7% 36.4%	33.3% 63.6%	3	.0%	33.3% 36.4%	66.7% 63.6%	.0%
society/environment	2003	7	25.5%	58.2%	16.3%	6	30.5%	19.5%	50.0%	6	.0%	30.5%	69.5%	.0%
	2004	3	.0%	33.3%	66.7%	1	100.0%	.0%	.0%	1	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%
(R) Understand	All Years 2001	18	15.8% 100.0%	46.6% .0%	37.6%	12	35.8% 25.0%	28.1% 50.0%	36.1% 25.0%	12	.0%	48.1% 50.0%	51.9% 25.0%	.0%
professional and	2002	4	72.0%	28.0%	.0%	4	28.0%	44.0%	28.0%	4	.0%	44.0%	56.0%	.0%
ethical responsibility	2003	7	100.0%	.0%	.0%	6	89.0%	11.0%	.0%	7	25.5%	41.8%	32.7%	.0%
	2004 All Years	3 18	100.0% 95.6%	.0%	.0%	3 17	33.3% 44.3%	66.7% 46.5%	.0% 9.2%	3 18	33.3% 24.5%	66.7% 53.4%	.0%	.0%
(S) Recognize need	2001	4	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	4	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	4	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	.0%
to continue professional	2002	4	28.0%	72.0%	.0%	4	28.0%	16.0%	56.0%	4	.0%	44.0%	56.0%	.0%
development	2003	7	100.0% 66.7%	.0%	.0%	6	69.5% 66.7%	30.5% 33.3%	.0%	7	41.8% 66.7%	41.8%	16.3% 33.3%	.0%
	All Years	18	66.8%	33.2%	.0%	17	57.9%	32.9%	9.2%	18	42.1%	27.2%	30.8%	.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 2004 survey. 1= Excellent', 2= Good', 3= Average', 4= Poor', 5= Very Poor'. Competence response options: 1= Very Useful', 2= Somewhat Useful', 3= Not Useful'
Setulness response options: 1= Very Useful', 2= Somewhat Useful', 3= Not Useful'
Setulness response options: 1= Very Useful', 2= Somewhat Useful'
Setulness response options: 1= Very Useful', 2= Somewhat Useful'
Setulness response options: 1= Very Useful' = Somewhat Useful'
Setulness response options: 1= Very Useful' = Somewhat Useful'
Setulness response options: 1= Very Useful' = Somewhat Useful'
Setulness response options: 1= Very Useful' = Somewhat Useful'
Setulness response options: 1= Very Useful' = Somewhat Useful'
Setulness response options: 1= Very Useful' = Somewhat Useful'
Setulness response options: 1= Very Useful' = Somewhat Useful'
Setulness response options: 1= Very Useful' = Somewhat Useful'
Setulness response options: 1= Very Useful' = Somewhat Useful'
Setulness response options: 1= Very Useful' = Somewhat Useful'
Setulness response options: 1= Very Useful' = Somewhat Useful'
Setulness response options: 1= Very Useful' = Somewhat Useful'
Setulness response options: 1= Very Useful' = Somewhat Useful'
Setulness response options: 1= Very Useful' = Somewhat Usefu

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

Class of 2001

Strong technical skills, good design background, solid writing skills, high achiever, motivated, well prepared for job market.

Good knowledge of mathematics and science and outstanding skills in the use of engineering tools such as computer software and database manipulation

(Name omitted) is in a conceptual aircraft design group. He has an excellent understanding of the process and all the disciplines required to do his job.

This graduate shows a very strong problem solving skills. He was maturity beyond his years of experience. When given a problem, he can see many of the potential issues that others with more experience do not see. He is able to understand the problem quickly, identify potential solutions and is not afraid to express his opinion on a technical issue.

Class of 2002

Taught him to work independently and within groups. Has an overall knowledge of the system and what the component requirements are.

Cares about the end product; team player; good background.

Critical Thinking, Problem Analysis, and Independent Problem Solution

Has good pragmatic aero skills.

All around competent engineering skills and good attitude/work ethic.

Class of 2003

(Name omitted) has broad based knowledge. He is able to apply to his work. He is dedicated and hardworking.

Computer based design/ analysis

Strong math and science background, excellent engineering problem solving skills.

- * PC knowledge
- *Writing skills
- *Independent work
- *Team work
- *Planning & Completing projects
- *Understanding/ Working with people
- *Learning & Following processes
- *Engineering background

Attention to detail and strong work ethic, able to pick up concepts quickly

Class of 2004

I think that the size of my ERAU data sample is too small to actually answer this survey. That said, (name omitted) is driving to be a leader of people instead of a technical expert. He is doing several things that will help in develop these leadership skills more

Engineering foundation is solid. Displays innovation and creativity in current position.

- -Understands aviation principles.
- -Strong engineering talent.
- -Motivation towards Aeronautics.

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

Class of 2001

None, only weakness is lack of experience. (Name omitted) is an excellent engineer who will become even better within the next 5 years.

Technical writing, preparing the student to work in teams, and communication skills

If there is a weakness, it is his knowledge of electronics and circuit design. With many of the designs of aircraft relying more and more on electronics, a better understanding of eletronics would be helpful. His knowledge of control theory has helped him significantly but a better understanding of electronics would round out his excellent education.

Class of 2002

None at this time.

Communication/Public Speaking

Class of 2003

None that I am aware of at this time.

professionalism/ ethics

I noted no weaknesses in the degree program.

*We are a systems/ software engineering company so this graduate lacked the system processes that other graduates have.

Class of 2004

Stability and control is very important in my discipline. (Name omitted) could not adequately explain the short period or Dutch roll mode, which surprised me from an aerospace engineer.

None

-None- See 18 Below