Employer Feedback Survey

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

Program Profile M Business Administration in Aviation Worldwide Campus

Prepared by:

Kimberly Brantley Office of Institutional Research June 2007

Employer Feedback Survey Program Profile - M Business Administration in Aviation Classes of 2001, 2002, 2003 & 2004, 1 1/2 Years After Graduation

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.

	M E	M Business Administration in Aviation					
2001 2002 2003 2004 All					All Years		
Worldwide Campus	10	3	4	5	22		

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	More than 5 years
			Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide	2001	10	.0%	27.0%	18.2%	54.7%
Campus	2002	3	.0%	.0%	66.7%	33.3%
	2003	4	41.0%	41.0%	.0%	18.0%
	2004	5	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	40.0%
	All Years	22	18.2%	25.2%	21.7%	34.9%

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
Worldwide Campus	Unwtd # of Res	pondents	10	3	4	5	22
	Aerospace	Wtd Col %	.0%	.0%	41.0%	.0%	14.2%
	Airline	Wtd Col %	13.5%	.0%	.0%	60.0%	15.6%
	Corporate	Wtd Col %	.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	6.5%
	Education	Wtd Col %	.0%	.0%	.0%	20.0%	4.0%
	Flight training	Wtd Col %	.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	6.5%
	Government	Wtd Col %	19.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.9%
	Military	Wtd Col %	54.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	20.3%
	Other	Wtd Col %	.0%	.0%	18.0%	20.0%	10.3%
	Other	Wtd Col %	13.5%	.0%	41.0%	.0%	17.7%

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	Closely related	Somewhat related
		Respondents	Wtd Col %	Wtd Col %
Worldwide	2001	10	27.7%	72.3%
Campus	2002	3	.0%	100.0%
	2003	4	18.0%	82.0%
	2004	5	80.0%	20.0%
	All Years	22	29.5%	70.5%

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

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

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

			N	umber of ERAU	Graduates Kno	w Professionall	у
		Unwtd # of	1	2-5	6-10	11-50	Over 50
	Re		Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide	2001	10	31.8%	63.5%	4.7%	.0%	.0%
Campus	2002	3	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%
	2003	4	50.0%	.0%	41.0%	.0%	9.0%
	2004	5	.0%	60.0%	.0%	40.0%	.0%
	All Years	22	38.5%	34.9%	15.4%	8.1%	3.1%

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

How many ERAU graduates do you currently supervise? By Campus

			Number of	ERAU Graduate Supervise	es Currently
		Unwtd # of	1	2-5	6-10
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide	2001	10	81.8%	18.2%	.0%
Campus	2002	3	100.0%	.0%	.0%
	2003	4	100.0%	.0%	.0%
	2004	5	60.0%	20.0%	20.0%
	All Years	22	87.2%	8.7%	4.0%

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

Did you graduate from ERAU? By Campus

				Who Are Also raduates
			Yes	No
			Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide	2001	10	.0%	100.0%
Campus	2002	3	.0%	100.0%
	2003	4	9.0%	91.0%
	2004	5	.0%	100.0%
	All Years	22	3.1%	96.9%

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 %		
Worldwide	2001	10	54.7%	31.8%	13.5%		
Campus	2002	3	66.7%	33.3%	.0%		
	2003	4	59.0%	41.0%	.0%		
	2004	5	80.0%	20.0%	.0%		
	All Years	22	63.7%	32.9%	3.5%		

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

What is your preference for hiring graduates? By Campus

			Preferer	nce for Hiring Gr	aduates
		Unwtd # of	Some Preference for ERAU Graduates	No Preference	Some Preference for Other Graduates
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide	2001	9	5.5%	94.5%	.0%
Campus	2002	3	.0%	100.0%	.0%
	2003	4	.0%	91.0%	9.0%
	2004	5	20.0%	80.0%	.0%
	All Years	21	5.5%	91.3%	3.2%

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

			Preference fo candi	
		Unwtd # of	Some Preference	No Preference
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide	2003	4	.0%	100.0%
Campus	2004	5	20.0%	80.0%

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

				e of global awar national experie	
Ur		Unwtd # of	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important
		Respondents	Wtd Row % Wtd Row % Wtd Row %		
Worldwide	2003	4	9.0%	82.0%	9.0%
Campus	2004	5	20.0%	80.0%	.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 %
Worldwide	2002	3	33.3%	66.7%	.0%
Campus	2003	4	41.0%	18.0%	41.0%
	2004	5	60.0%	40.0%	.0%
	All Years	12	44.2%	36.7%	19.1%

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 o	f ERAU Gradua	te Meets Compa	any's Needs	
		Unwtd # of	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Strongly Disagree	
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	
Worldwide	2001	10	13.5%	68.2%	13.5%	4.7%	
Campus	2002	3	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	.0%	
	2003	4	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	
	2004	5	20.0%	80.0%	.0%	.0%	
	All Years	22	31.3%	64.0%	3.5%	1.2%	

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

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

He/she is a valuable employee By Campus

			Graduate is a Valuable Employee									
		Unwtd # of	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Strongly Disagree						
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %						
Worldwide	2001	10	54.7%	27.0%	13.5%	4.7%						
Campus	2002	3	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	.0%						
	2003	4	59.0%	41.0%	.0%	.0%						
	2004	5	60.0%	40.0%	.0%	.0%						
	All Years	22	53.1%	42.2%	3.5%	1.2%						

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	Strongly Disagree						
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %						
Worldwide	2001	10	68.2%	.0%	27.0%	4.7%						
Campus	2002	3	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	.0%						
	2003	4	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%						
	2004	5	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	.0%						
	All Years	22	66.7%	21.1%	11.0%	1.2%						

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	Somewhat Higher	Equivalent	Somewhat Lower				
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %				
Worldwide	2001	10	31.8%	63.5%	4.7%				
Campus	2002	3	.0%	100.0%	.0%				
	2003	4	59.0%	41.0%	.0%				
	2004	5	40.0%	60.0%	.0%				
	All Years	22	36.7%	62.1%	1.2%				

Worldwide Campus

Vorldwide Campus							N	1 Business /	Administratio	n in Aviatio	n					
			Employer	's Usefulne: on the Job Somew	ss of Skill		С	ompetence	of this ERAL	J Graduate			Compe	tence of Gra	aduates from utions	Other
		Unwtd # of Respond	Very Useful Wtd	hat Useful Wtd	Not Useful Wtd	Unwtd # of Respond	Excellent Wtd Row	Good Wtd	Average Wtd Row	Poor Wtd	Very Poor Wtd	Unwtd # of Respond	Excellent Wtd Row	Good Wtd	Average Wtd Row	Poor Wtd
Quantitative/mathematics	0004	ents	Row %	Row %	Row %	ents	%	Row % 9.5%	% 40.5%	Row %	Row %	ents 9	%	Row %	%	Row %
Quantitative/mathematics	2001	10	77.0% 33.3%	23.0% 66.7%	.0%	10	45.2% .0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	4.8%	2	26.6%	46.8% 50.0%	21.1% 50.0%	5.5%
	2003 2004	4 5	91.0% 40.0%	9.0%	.0%	4 5	.0% 20.0%	91.0% 20.0%	9.0% 60.0%	.0%	.0%	4	.0%	50.0%	50.0% 50.0%	.0%
	All Years	22	65.9%	60.0% 34.1%	.0%	22	15.6%	57.5%	25.6%	.0%	1.2%	19	6.9%	50.0% 49.2%	42.5%	1.4%
Basic PC software (word	2001	10	77.0%	18.3%	4.8%	10	50.0%	18.3%	27.0%	.0%	4.8%	9	26.6%	36.7%	31.2%	5.5%
processing, spreadsheets, etc.)	2002	3 4	66.7% 91.0%	.0% 9.0%	33.3%	2 4	50.0%	50.0% 100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1 4	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
	2004	5	100.0%	.0%	.0%	5	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	4	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%
Writing skills	All Years 2001	22 10	84.5% 81.7%	7.8% 13.5%	7.7% 4.8%	21 10	29.3% 36.5%	57.7% 18.3%	11.7% 27.0%	.0% 13.5%	1.3% 4.8%	18	15.6% 26.6%	64.0% 21.1%	18.9% 46.8%	1.5% 5.5%
(non-technical)	2002	3	100.0%	.0%	.0%	3	33.3%	.0%	66.7%	.0%	.0%	2	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%
	2003	<u>4</u> 5	100.0% 80.0%	.0%	.0%	5	.0%	59.0% 60.0%	41.0%	.0%	.0%	4	.0%	91.0% 50.0%	9.0%	.0%
	All Years	22	91.3%	7.5%	1.2%	22	19.9%	37.3%	34.1%	7.5%	1.2%	19	14.4%	51.5%	32.6%	1.4%
Technical writing	2001	10	58.7%	23.0% 66.7%	18.3% 33.3%	9	21.1%	21.1%	36.7% 100.0%	15.6%	5.5%	9	26.6%	31.2% 50.0%	36.7% 50.0%	5.5%
	2003	4	91.0%	9.0%	.0%	4	.0%	59.0%	41.0%	.0%	.0%	4	.0%	91.0%	9.0%	.0%
	2004 All Years	5 22	40.0% 54.7%	40.0% 30.1%	20.0% 15.2%	4 19	25.0% 10.1%	25.0% 33.9%	25.0% 45.8%	25.0% 8.7%	.0%	4 19	.0%	50.0% 61.7%	25.0% 25.3%	25.0% 6.1%
Speaking before an	2001	10	63.5%	31.7%	4.8%	10	63.5%	.0%	31.7%	4.8%	.0%	9	26.6%	21.1%	46.8%	5.5%
audience	2002 2003	3	66.7% 100.0%	33.3%	.0%	3	66.7%	.0% 91.0%	33.3% 9.0%	.0%	.0%	2	50.0%	.0%	50.0% 50.0%	.0%
	2004	5	80.0%	.0%	.0%	5	.0%	40.0%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	4	.0%	50.0%	25.0%	.0%
Liatanina akill-	All Years	22	80.1%	18.7%	1.2%	22	33.3%	39.6%	21.8%	5.3%	.0%	19	14.4%	35.0%	44.5%	6.1%
Listening skills	2004 All Years	5 5	100.0% 100.0%	.0%	.0%	5	20.0%	40.0% 40.0%	40.0% 40.0%	.0%	.0%	4	.0%	50.0% 50.0%	50.0% 50.0%	.0%
Applied research	2001	10	77.0%	18.3%	4.8%	10	45.2%	36.5%	13.5%	.0%	4.8%	9	26.6%	36.7%	31.2%	5.5%
(information gathering and analysis)	2002	3 4	33.3% 91.0%	66.7% 9.0%	.0%	3 4	33.3% 9.0%	33.3% 82.0%	33.3% 9.0%	.0%	.0%	2	.0%	50.0% 91.0%	50.0% 9.0%	.0%
	2004	5	40.0%	60.0%	.0%	5	20.0%	60.0%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	4	.0%	75.0%	25.0%	.0%
Critical thinking	All Years 2001	22 10	65.9% 77.0%	32.9% 18.3%	1.2% 4.8%	22 10	25.3% 31.7%	56.4% 36.5%	17.1% 27.0%	.0%	1.2% 4.8%	19	6.9% 22.3%	67.8% 33.0%	23.9% 38.8%	1.4% 5.8%
ormour miniming	2002	3	100.0%	.0%	.0%	3	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	2	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%
	2003	5	100.0%	.0%	.0%	5	18.0% 20.0%	82.0% 40.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4	.0%	91.0% 50.0%	9.0%	.0%
	All Years	22	94.1%	4.7%	1.2%	22	31.4%	45.9%	21.5%	.0%	1.2%	18	13.2%	54.9%	30.5%	1.4%
Independent work	2001	10	77.0% 66.7%	18.3% 33.3%	4.8%	10	63.5% 66.7%	18.3%	13.5% 33.3%	.0%	4.8%	9	21.1%	52.3% 50.0%	21.1% 50.0%	5.5%
	2003	4	100.0%	.0%	.0%	3	9.9%	90.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%
	2004 All Years	5 22	100.0% 87.6%	.0% 11.2%	.0% 1.2%	5 21	40.0% 41.8%	40.0% 42.5%	20.0% 14.4%	.0%	.0%	4 19	.0% 5.4%	75.0% 55.3%	25.0% 37.8%	.0%
Planning, scheduling, and	2001	10	85.7%	9.5%	4.8%	10	58.7%	9.5%	27.0%	.0%	4.8%	8	22.3%	22.3%	49.5%	5.8%
carrying out projects	2002	3	100.0%	.0%	.0%	3	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%
	2003 2004	5	100.0% 100.0%	.0%	.0%	5	59.0% 60.0%	41.0% 20.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4	.0% 25.0%	50.0% 50.0%	50.0% 25.0%	.0%
	All Years	22	96.3%	2.4%	1.2%	22	67.1%	20.7%	6.9%	4.0%	1.2%	18	10.3%	43.2%	45.1%	1.4%
Defining and solving problems	2001	10	90.5%	4.8%	4.8%	10	50.0% 33.3%	18.3% 66.7%	27.0%	.0%	4.8%	8 2	22.3%	38.8% 50.0%	33.0% 50.0%	5.8%
	2003	4	100.0%	.0%	.0%	3	9.9%	90.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%
	2004 All Years	5 22	80.0% 93.5%	20.0%	.0% 1.2%	5 21	20.0% 27.3%	60.0% 60.1%	20.0% 11.3%	.0%	.0%	4 18	.0% 5.5%	75.0% 52.0%	25.0% 41.0%	.0%
Working in groups/teams	2001	10	90.5%	4.8%	4.8%	10	54.8%	27.0%	13.5%	.0%	4.8%	8	22.3%	55.3%	16.5%	5.8%
	2002 2003	3 4	100.0% 100.0%	.0%	.0%	3	33.3% 9.9%	33.3% 90.1%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	2	.0%	50.0% 50.0%	50.0% 50.0%	.0%
	2004	5	100.0%	.0%	.0%	5	60.0%	20.0%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	4	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	.0%
Leading/guiding others	All Years 2001	22 10	97.6% 54.8%	1.2% 40.5%	1.2% 4.8%	21 10	36.9% 63.5%	47.3% 4.8%	14.4% 27.0%	.0%	1.3% 4.8%	18	10.3% 22.3%	51.3% 33.0%	36.9% 38.8%	1.4% 5.8%
angrading onlors	2002	3	100.0%	.0%	.0%	3	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	2	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%
	2003 2004	4 5	59.0% 60.0%	41.0% 40.0%	.0%	4 5	18.0% 20.0%	82.0% 60.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4	.0%	50.0% 75.0%	50.0%	.0% 25.0%
	All Years	22	66.1%	32.7%	1.2%	22	39.5%	41.8%	13.4%	4.0%	1.2%	18	5.5%	50.6%	37.7%	6.2%
Responsible actions and decision making	2001 2002	10	95.2% 100.0%	.0%	4.8%	10	68.3% 66.7%	.0%	27.0%	.0%	4.8%	7 2	17.5% .0%	58.8%	17.5% 100.0%	6.2%
	2003	4	59.0%	41.0%	.0%	4	9.0%	91.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%
	2004 All Years	5 22	80.0% 80.5%	20.0% 18.3%	.0% 1.2%	5 22	40.0% 41.7%	60.0% 50.2%	.0% 6.9%	.0%	.0% 1.2%	4 17	.0% 4.1%	75.0% 49.1%	25.0% 45.3%	.0% 1.5%
Ability to adapt to change	2004	5	80.5%	18.3%	.0%	5	20.0%	60.0%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	4	.0%	49.1% 50.0%	45.3% 50.0%	.0%
	All Years	5	80.0%	20.0%	.0%	5	20.0%	60.0%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	4	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%
Understanding other people and other points of	2001	10	95.2% 66.7%	.0%	4.8%	10	50.0%	27.0% 33.3%	13.5% 66.7%	9.5%	.0%	8 2	22.3%	38.8% 50.0%	33.0% 50.0%	5.8%
view	2003	4	100.0%	.0%	.0%	4	9.0%	91.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%
	2004 All Years	5 22	80.0% 88.2%	20.0% 10.5%	.0% 1.2%	5 22	20.0%	40.0% 53.0%	40.0% 24.5%	.0%	.0%	4 18	.0% 5.5%	50.0% 47.2%	50.0% 45.8%	.0% 1.4%
Environmental awareness	2001	10	27.8%	58.7%	13.5%	9	42.2%	.0%	52.3%	5.5%	.0%	6	21.2%	7.5%	63.7%	7.5%
	2002	3 4	.0%	66.7% 50.0%	33.3%	2	.0% 9.0%	.0%	100.0% 41.0%	.0%	.0%	2	.0%	.0%	100.0% 9.0%	.0%
	2004	5	.0%	80.0%	20.0%	4	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	4	.0%	25.0%	75.0%	.0%
Political and economic	All Years 2001	22 10	24.5% 27.8%	61.6% 72.2%	14.0%	19 10	19.2% 31.7%	24.9% 4.8%	54.5% 53.9%	1.4% 9.5%	.0%	16 8	4.3% 22.3%	45.9% 5.8%	48.2% 66.0%	1.5% 5.8%
awareness	2002	3	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	2	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	2	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%
	2003	4	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	4	9.0%	50.0%	41.0%	.0%	.0%	4	.0%	91.0%	9.0%	.0%
	2004 All Years	5 22	.0% 24.5%	80.0% 65.0%	20.0% 10.5%	20	25.0% 17.1%	.0%	75.0% 52.2%	.0%	.0%	18	.0% 5.5%	25.0% 51.1%	75.0% 42.0%	.0%
Knowledge of	2002	3	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	3	.0%	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	.0%	2	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%
political/physical geography	2003	4 5	50.0% 20.0%	50.0% 60.0%	.0%	4	9.0% 25.0%	50.0%	41.0% 75.0%	.0%	.0%	4	.0%	50.0% 25.0%	50.0% 75.0%	.0%
	All Years	12	37.5%	57.1%	5.4%	11	10.2%	33.9%	55.9%	.0%	.0%	10	.0%	33.5%	66.5%	.0%
RAU Preparation response	ontiona for the	Close of 20	02 and 200	4 curyour 1	'Excollant'	2-'Good' 2-	'Avorago' 4	'Poor' 5-'\	lone Door							

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

Worldwide Campus

		M Business Administration in Aviation														
			Usefulne	Usefulness of skill on the Job (2)				Competence	of this ERA	U Graduate			Competence of other Graduates			
		Unwtd#	(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
		Respond ents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Respond ents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Respond ents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
(A) Apply concept of group	2001	5	36.5%	63.5%	.0%	5	.0%	53.9%	36.5%	9.5%	.0%	4	13.1%	.0%	86.9%	.0%
dynamics, etc in impl org goals	2002	2	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	2	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	2	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%
	2003	4	59.0%	41.0%	.0%	4	59.0%	.0%	41.0%	.0%	.0%	3	.0%	15.3%	84.7%	.0%
	2004	5	80.0%	20.0%	.0%	5	20.0%	60.0%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	4	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	.0%
	All Years	16	59.2%	40.8%	.0%	16	30.4%	31.7%	36.5%	1.5%	.0%	13	8.9%	30.0%	61.0%	.0%
(B) Apply concts/strat in market	2001	5	36.5%	36.5%	27.0%	4	50.0%	.0%	36.9%	13.1%	.0%	3	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%
plan w/emphasis on av/aero	2002	2	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	2	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	2	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%
	2003	4	9.0%	.0%	91.0%	3	45.1%	9.9%	45.1%	.0%	.0%	2	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%
	2004	5	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	4	25.0%	50.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	4	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
	All Years	16	19.7%	23.9%	56.4%	13	32.7%	16.0%	43.7%	7.5%	.0%	11	7.7%	7.7%	76.8%	7.7%
(C) Analyze financial statements	2001	5	9.5%	53.9%	36.5%	4	36.9%	.0%	36.9%	13.1%	13.1%	3	20.7%	.0%	79.3%	.0%
within organizations	2002	2	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	2	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	2	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%
	2002	4	18.0%	41.0%	41.0%	4	41.0%	18.0%	41.0%	.0%	.0%	3	.0%	15.3%	84.7%	.0%
	2003	5	.0%	80.0%	20.0%	3	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	3	33.3%	.0%	66.7%	.0%
	All Years	16	9.2%	54.3%	36.5%	13	25.5%	20.7%	50.2%	1.8%	1.8%	11	10.2%	6.1%	83.7%	.0%
(D) Access, analyze, and	2002	2	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	2	.0%	50.0%	50.2%	.0%	.0%	2	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%
communicate information	2002	4	100.0%	.0%	.0%	4	41.0%	18.0%	41.0%	.0%	.0%	3	.0%	15.3%	84.7%	.0%
communicate miormation	2003	5	80.0%	20.0%	.0%	5	40.0%	60.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	.0%
	All Years	11	84.5%	6.0%	9.6%	11	32.9%	36.6%	30.5%	.0%	.0%	9	8.2%	27.5%	64.3%	.0%
(E) Apply stat/guest apply six to	2001	6	28.8%	71.2%	.0%	6	21.2%	.0%	63.7%	15.0%	.0%	5	9.5%	27.5%	63.5%	.0%
(E) Apply stat/quant analysis to business problems	2001	2	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	2		.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%		.0%			.0%
business problems							.0%					2		50.0%	50.0%	
	2003	4	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	4	41.0%	59.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	3	.0%	15.3%	84.7%	.0%
		5	40.0%	60.0%	.0%	4	25.0%	50.0%		25.0%		4	25.0%	.0%	50.0%	25.0%
(5)	All Years	17	43.5%	48.8%	7.7%	16	27.1%	35.6%	29.2%	8.1%	.0%	14	8.4%	20.9%	64.1%	6.5%
(F) Integrate knowledge of economic concepts to av/aero	2001	5	36.5%	9.5%	53.9%	4	13.1%	36.9%	36.9%	13.1%	.0%	3	.0%	79.3%	20.7%	.0%
ops	2002	2	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	2	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	2	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%
орз	2003	4	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	3	45.1%	.0%	54.9%	.0%	.0%	2	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%
	2004	5	.0%	100.0%	.0%	4	25.0%	50.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	4	.0%	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%
	All Years	16	5.8%	56.1%	38.1%	13	27.8%	16.5%	48.2%	7.5%	.0%	11	.0%	16.7%	67.9%	15.4%
(G) Form/execute	2001	5	9.5%	63.5%	27.0%	5	36.5%	.0%	53.9%	9.5%	.0%	4	.0%	13.1%	86.9%	.0%
strategies/policies to achieve org goals	2002	2	.0%	.0%	100.0%	1	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	1	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%
yuais	2003	4	9.0%	9.0%	82.0%	4	50.0%	9.0%	41.0%	.0%	.0%	3	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%
	2004	5	60.0%	40.0%	.0%	5	20.0%	60.0%	.0%	20.0%	.0%	4	.0%	75.0%	.0%	25.0%
	All Years	16	20.4%	24.0%	55.6%	15	35.1%	20.6%	37.2%	7.1%	.0%	12	.0%	25.5%	66.8%	7.7%
Understand functions/scope	2001	6	28.8%	71.2%	.0%	6	21.2%	21.2%	42.5%	15.0%	.0%	5	9.5%	.0%	90.5%	.0%
human resources*	All Years	6	28.8%	71.2%	.0%	6	21.2%	21.2%	42.5%	15.0%	.0%	5	9.5%	.0%	90.5%	.0%
Apply/analysis of managerial	2001	5	9.5%	63.5%	27.0%	4	36.9%	.0%	50.0%	13.1%	.0%	3	20.7%	.0%	79.3%	.0%
accounting concepts*	All Years	5	9.5%	63.5%	27.0%	4	36.9%	.0%	50.0%	13.1%	.0%	3	20.7%	.0%	79.3%	.0%
Knowledge of systems	2001	6	7.5%	92.5%	.0%	6	28.8%	21.2%	42.5%	7.5%	.0%	5	.0%	36.5%	63.5%	.0%
concepts/decisions/info sys*	All Years	6	7.5%	92.5%	.0%	6	28.8%	21.2%	42.5%	7.5%	.0%	5	.0%	36.5%	63.5%	.0%

^{**}Discontinued questions.

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

Those garnered through self actualization and personal determination.

Flexibility to meet degree requirements with minimal impact on regular job.

His skills in organizing, planning are excellent, good work ethics, good skills in research, identifying and solving problems.

I see significant improvement in employee's confidence, having a strong foundation gained through her degree program for tackling tough business assignments. Employee is now heading the Budget Office for Air Force's Air Combat Command (HQ for all bomber and fighter wings in the United States)Communications Group and doing well.

Class of 2002

Strong organizational and presentation skills

Class of 2003

An adult learner shows motivation and an interest in the business world when attending classes at night. With all the other activities adults could choose from, selecting education as an option indicates self discipline and a desire to improve oneself in the hopes of furthering his or her career.

Group Dynamics, leadership, analysis & decision- making.

Goal oriented, motivated, planning & great techniques in decision making within the scope of his job; He works in petroleum operations field.

Good broad based knowledge.

Class of 2004

Critical thinking

Communications

Employer Feedback Survey Program Profile - M Business Administration in Aviation Classes of 2001, 2002, 2003 & 2004, 1 1/2 Years After Graduation

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

Class of 2001

His writing skills are below average, particularly technical writing.

Systems engineering; Process development are completely ignored. None of the essential SEI CMM/CMMI, processes are even addressed.

Haven't seen any weaknesses I can attribute to the degree program--everything I've perceived related to the degree program has been positive.

Class of 2002

Works well independently- lesser skills when working with the group and team building.

Class of 2003

It is no longer available (MBAIA).

Application of specialized skills in aviation/aerospace not utilized in this department.

Student is working in a petroleum industry not in aviation field. N/A

Weak in design aspects.

Class of 2004

Strategic Planning