Employer Feedback Survey

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

Program Profile
M Aeronautical Science
All Specializations

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.

		M Aeronautical Science					
	2001	2002	2003	2004	All Years		
Worldwide Campus	21	18	24	25	88		

Number of Respondents By Campus, Specialization and Year of Graduation.

			M Ae	ronautica	Science	
		2001	2002	2003	2004	All Years
Worldwide Campus	Aeronautics Spec	1	2	1	2	6
	Av/Aero Ops Spec	3	3	2	2	10
	Av/Aero Mgmt Spec	10	8	12	13	43
	Av/Aero Ed Tech Spec	0	0	0	1	1
	Human Factors in Av Sys Spec	0	0	0	2	2
	Av/Aero Safety Sys Spec	7	5	9	5	26

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
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide	2001	21	4.6%	18.4%	9.2%	67.7%
Campus	2002	18	11.1%	11.3%	16.6%	61.1%
	2003	24	4.0%	11.9%	24.9%	59.3%
	2004	25	12.0%	20.0%	12.0%	56.0%
	All Years	88	7.8%	15.5%	15.8%	60.8%

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

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

			2001	2002	2003	2004	All Years
Worldwide Campus	Unwtd # of Respondents		21	18	24	25	88
	Aerospace	Wtd Col %	13.8%	16.6%	11.9%	12.0%	13.4%
	Airline	Wtd Col %	9.2%	11.1%	.0%	.0%	4.6%
	Airport	Wtd Col %	4.6%	5.5%	11.9%	4.0%	6.6%
	Charter/freig	Wtd Col %	.0%	5.5%	4.0%	.0%	2.3%
	Corporate	Wtd Col %	.0%	.0%	4.0%	20.0%	6.5%
	Education	Wtd Col %	4.6%	5.5%	4.0%	8.0%	5.6%
	FBO (flight	Wtd Col %	.0%	.0%	7.9%	.0%	2.2%
	Flight training	Wtd Col %	.0%	.0%	9.1%	.0%	2.5%
	Government	Wtd Col %	13.8%	17.0%	7.9%	8.0%	11.3%
	Manufacturin	Wtd Col %	4.6%	.0%	4.0%	.0%	2.2%
	Military	Wtd Col %	26.2%	33.2%	27.7%	40.0%	31.9%
	Other	Wtd Col %	23.1%	.0%	4.0%	4.0%	7.7%
	Other	Wtd Col %	.0%	5.5%	4.0%	4.0%	3.3%

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

			Closely related	Somewhat related
		Unwtd # of Respondents	Wtd Col %	Wtd Col %
Worldwide	2001	21	58.5%	41.5%
Campus	2002	18	55.5%	44.5%
	2003	24	64.4%	35.6%
	2004	25	52.0%	48.0%
	All Years	88	57.7%	42.3%

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

			N	umber of ERAU	Graduates Kno	ow Professionall	у
		Unwtd # of	1	2-5	6-10	11-50	Over 50
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide	2001	21	9.2%	72.3%	9.2%	9.2%	.0%
Campus	2002	18	33.2%	16.8%	16.8%	22.1%	11.1%
	2003	24	23.7%	44.7%	11.9%	15.8%	4.0%
	2004	24	25.0%	37.5%	20.8%	8.3%	8.3%
	All Years	87	22.6%	43.5%	14.7%	13.6%	5.7%

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

How many ERAU graduates do you currently supervise? By Campus

			Number	of ERAU Gradua	ates Currently S	upervise
		Unwtd # of	1	2-5	6-10	Over 20
	Responde		Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide	2001	21	67.7%	18.4%	13.8%	.0%
Campus	2002	18	55.3%	39.2%	.0%	5.5%
	2003	24	64.4%	27.7%	7.9%	.0%
	2004	24	58.3%	37.5%	.0%	4.2%
	All Years	87	61.7%	30.5%	5.6%	2.3%

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	
			Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	
Worldwide	2001	20	14.5%	85.5%	
Campus	2002	18	33.2%	66.8%	
	2003	24	15.8%	84.2%	
	2004	25	8.0%	92.0%	
	All Years	87	17.1%	82.9%	

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	21	50.7%	40.1%	9.2%	
Campus	2002	18	61.1%	38.9%	.0%	
	2003	23	54.7%	37.0%	8.2%	
	2004	25	52.0%	28.0%	20.0%	
	All Years	87	54.4%	35.7%	10.0%	

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

What is your preference for hiring graduates? By Campus

			Į.	Preference for H	liring Graduates	3
		Unwtd # of	Strong Preference for ERAU Graduates	Some Preference for ERAU Graduates	No Preference	Strong Preference for Other Graduates
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide	2001	20	9.7%	19.3%	71.0%	.0%
Campus	2002	18	11.1%	16.6%	72.3%	.0%
	2003	22	.0%	39.9%	60.1%	.0%
	2004	21	14.3%	23.8%	57.1%	4.8%
	All Years	81	8.5%	25.4%	64.9%	1.2%

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

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

			Preference	for multi-lingual	candidates
		Unwtd # of	Strong Preference	Some Preference	No Preference
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide	2003	22	9.9%	55.8%	34.3%
Campus	2004	20	10.0%	25.0%	65.0%

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	
	Unwtd # of		Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important
		Respondents	Wtd Row % Wtd Row % Wtd Row %		
Worldwide	2003	24	32.8%	51.4%	15.8%
Campus	2004	25	48.0%	32.0%	20.0%

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	18	33.2%	55.5%	11.3%
Campus	2003	23	42.4%	57.6%	.0%
	2004	25	40.0%	60.0%	.0%
	All Years	66	38.9%	57.9%	3.2%

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	eeds
		Unwtd # of	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide	2001	21	27.7%	63.1%	4.6%	4.6%	.0%
Campus	2002	18	33.2%	61.1%	5.7%	.0%	.0%
	2003	24	19.8%	72.3%	4.0%	.0%	4.0%
	2004	25	36.0%	48.0%	12.0%	4.0%	.0%
	All Years	88	29.0%	61.1%	6.7%	2.2%	1.1%

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

He/she is a valuable employee By Campus

				Graduate	is a Valuable E	mployee	
		Unwtd # of	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide	2001	21	50.7%	44.7%	.0%	4.6%	.0%
Campus	2002	18	83.2%	11.1%	.0%	5.7%	.0%
	2003	24	68.4%	27.7%	.0%	.0%	4.0%
	2004	25	68.0%	20.0%	8.0%	4.0%	.0%
	All Years	88	67.2%	26.1%	2.2%	3.4%	1.1%

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	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
		Respondents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %
Worldwide	2001	21	50.7%	30.8%	13.8%	4.6%	.0%
Campus	2002	18	60.8%	27.7%	5.7%	5.7%	.0%
	2003	24	52.6%	35.6%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%
	2004	25	68.0%	16.0%	12.0%	4.0%	.0%
	All Years	88	58.1%	27.4%	8.9%	4.5%	1.1%

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 %
Worldwide	2001	21	23.1%	35.4%	36.9%	4.6%	.0%
Campus	2002	18	22.1%	27.7%	44.5%	.0%	5.7%
	2003	24	19.8%	52.6%	27.7%	.0%	.0%
	2004	25	16.0%	36.0%	44.0%	4.0%	.0%
	All Years	88	20.0%	38.6%	37.9%	2.2%	1.2%

ERAU General Skills Preparation and Usefulness on the Job MAS General Education Skills: All Specializations Combined

Worldwide Campus

			Employer	's Usefulnes	ss of Skill			ompetence	of this ERA	U Graduate			<u>Co</u> mpet	ence of Gra	duates from	Other Instit	utions
		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 Respond	Excellent Wtd Row	Good Wtd	Average Wtd	Poor Wtd	Very Pool Wtd
		ents	Row %	Row %	Row %	ents	%	Row %	Row %	Row %	Row %	ents	%	Row %	Row %	Row %	Row
uantitative/mathematics	2001	20 18	22.7% 44.7%	58.0% 44.2%	19.3% 11.1%	19 16	20.3% 31.1%	39.1% 50.0%	30.5% 18.9%	10.2% .0%	.0%	17 14	17.0% 29.0%	37.8% 35.5%	39.6% 35.5%	5.7%	.C
	2003	24	28.9%	67.1%	3.9%	23	24.7%	54.8%	20.6%	.0%	.0%	22	21.4%	48.5%	30.0%	.0%	.0
	2004	25	44.0%	52.0%	4.0%	22	45.5%	36.4%	18.2%	.0%	.0%	18	11.1%	61.1%	27.8%	.0%	.0
asic PC software (word	All Years 2001	87	35.0%	55.9%	9.1%	80	30.5%	45.1%	22.0%	2.4%	.0%	71 17	19.4%	46.3%	32.9%	1.4%	.(
rocessing, spreadsheets,	2002	21 18	76.9% 94.5%	18.4% 5.5%	4.6%	20 18	42.0% 55.5%	33.8% 38.7%	19.3% 5.8%	4.8%	.0%	16	32.2% 37.6%	45.2% 43.8%	17.0% 18.6%	5.7%	.0
tc.)	2003	24	88.2%	11.8%	.0%	23	41.1%	50.7%	8.2%	.0%	.0%	22	12.9%	64.3%	22.8%	.0%	
	2004	25	84.0%	16.0%	.0%	22	36.4%	50.0%	9.1%	4.5%	.0%	19	21.1%	47.4%	31.6%	.0%	
/riting skills	All Years 2001	88 21	85.7% 86.2%	13.2% 9.2%	1.1% 4.6%	83 20	43.4% 24.2%	43.7% 56.5%	10.6% 9.7%	2.3% 9.7%	.0%	74 17	24.9% 17.0%	51.1% 43.5%	22.7% 33.9%	1.3% 5.7%	
on-technical)	2002	18	77.6%	22.4%	.0%	18	44.2%	33.2%	22.6%	.0%	.0%	16	24.9%	44.1%	24.9%	6.2%	
	2003	23	83.6%	16.4%	.0%	22	25.7%	61.4%	12.9%	.0%	.0%	21	.0%	62.7%	37.3%	.0%	
	2004 All Years	25	72.0% 79.7%	28.0% 19.2%	.0%	22 82	31.8% 31.1%	50.0%	18.2%	.0%	.0%	19 73	.0%	47.4% 50.1%	52.6%	.0%	ļ .
echnical writing	2001	87 21	64.5%	30.8%	4.6%	20	19.3%	50.8% 53.2%	15.7% 17.8%	2.4% 9.7%	.0%	17	11.3%	33.9%	37.5% 49.1%	5.7%	
	2002	18	66.8%	27.6%	5.5%	17	35.1%	47.1%	11.7%	6.1%	.0%	15	26.8%	40.1%	26.5%	6.6%	
	2003	24	43.4%	52.6%	3.9%	23	32.9%	37.0%	30.1%	.0%	.0%	22	.0%	47.2%	52.8%	.0%	
	2004 All Years	24 87	66.7% 59.8%	29.2% 35.7%	4.2% 4.5%	21 81	23.8% 27.7%	47.6% 45.9%	28.6% 22.7%	.0%	.0%	18 72	5.6% 9.8%	44.4% 41.8%	44.4% 44.3%	5.6% 4.1%	
peaking before an	2001	21	64.5%	26.2%	9.2%	19	25.4%	45.9%	20.3%	5.1%	5.1%	16	12.0%	46.1%	36.0%	6.0%	
dience	2002	18	72.1%	27.9%	.0%	18	38.7%	50.0%	11.3%	.0%	.0%	17	23.7%	35.1%	35.4%	5.9%	
	2003	24	84.2%	11.8%	3.9%	24	23.7%	60.5%	15.8%	.0%	.0%	22	4.3%	47.2%	48.5%	.0%	
	2004	25	68.0%	28.0%	4.0%	22	31.8%	45.5%	18.2%	4.5%	.0%	18	.0%	50.0%	44.4%	5.6%	
stening skills	All Years 2004	88 25	72.5% 76.0%	23.1% 24.0%	4.4%	83 23	29.5% 43.5%	50.5% 34.8%	16.4% 21.7%	2.3%	1.2%	73 19	9.6% 5.3%	44.7% 47.4%	41.6% 47.4%	4.1%	\vdash
	All Years	25	76.0%	24.0%	.0%	23	43.5%	34.8%	21.7%	.0%	.0%	19	5.3%	47.4%	47.4%	.0%	\vdash
plied research	2001	21	49.3%	36.9%	13.8%	19	20.3%	39.1%	35.6%	.0%	5.1%	16	18.0%	34.1%	41.9%	6.0%	
formation gathering and alysis)	2002	18	66.8%	33.2%	.0%	18	44.5%	49.7%	.0%	5.8%	.0%	16	31.6%	49.7%	12.4%	6.2%	
.,.,	2003	24 25	51.3% 76.0%	44.7% 20.0%	3.9% 4.0%	23 23	41.1% 43.5%	28.8% 34.8%	30.1% 21.7%	.0%	.0%	22 19	.0%	60.0% 52.6%	40.0% 42.1%	.0%	
	All Years	88	60.9%	33.6%	5.5%	83	37.7%	37.5%	22.4%	1.3%	1.2%	73	12.5%	50.1%	34.7%	2.7%	
itical thinking	2001	21	86.2%	9.2%	4.6%	20	43.5%	37.2%	9.7%	9.7%	.0%	17	17.0%	37.8%	39.6%	5.7%	
	2002	18	83.4%	16.6%	.0%	18 23	55.3%	27.9%	5.5%	11.3%	.0%	16	25.4%	49.7%	24.9%	.0%	
	2003	24 25	76.3% 72.0%	23.7% 28.0%	.0%	23	41.1% 39.1%	38.3% 43.5%	20.6% 13.0%	.0%	.0%	22 19	8.6% 10.5%	60.0% 47.4%	31.4% 42.1%	.0%	
	All Years	88	79.0%	19.9%	1.1%	84	44.3%	37.1%	12.6%	6.0%	.0%	74	14.8%	49.4%	34.5%	1.3%	
dependent work	2001	21	76.9%	18.4%	4.6%	20	56.5%	29.0%	9.7%	4.8%	.0%	17	20.9%	45.2%	28.3%	5.7%	
	2002	18	83.4% 84.2%	16.6%	.0%	18 24	66.6%	27.6% 44.7%	.0% 7.9%	5.8%	.0%	16 22	25.4% 4.3%	43.5% 70.0%	31.1%	.0%	-
	2003	24 25	80.0%	15.8% 20.0%	.0%	23	47.4% 43.5%	39.1%	17.4%	.0%	.0%	19	5.3%	42.1%	25.7% 52.6%	.0%	
	All Years	88	81.1%	17.8%	1.1%	85	52.7%	35.8%	9.1%	2.4%	.0%	74	13.1%	51.4%	34.2%	1.3%	
anning, scheduling, and	2001	21	76.9%	18.4%	4.6%	20	33.8%	42.0%	19.3%	.0%	4.8%	17	11.3%	43.5%	39.6%	5.7%	
rrying out projects	2002	18 24	83.4% 88.2%	16.6% 11.8%	.0%	18 23	55.5% 58.9%	33.2% 32.9%	11.3% 4.1%	.0%	.0%	16 22	18.9% 8.6%	37.6% 51.5%	37.3% 35.7%	6.2% 4.3%	
	2004	25	88.0%	12.0%	.0%	23	43.5%	39.1%	17.4%	.0%	.0%	19	5.3%	47.4%	47.4%	.0%	
	All Years	88	84.4%	14.5%	1.1%	84	48.1%	36.8%	12.9%	1.1%	1.2%	74	10.7%	45.5%	39.8%	4.0%	
efining and solving oblems	2001	21	81.6%	13.8%	4.6%	20	33.8%	42.0%	19.3%	4.8%	.0%	17	17.0%	49.1%	22.6%	11.3%	
DDICITIS	2002	18 24	83.4% 72.4%	16.6% 27.6%	.0%	18 24	49.7% 31.6%	38.9% 52.6%	5.5% 15.8%	5.8%	.0%	16 22	18.9% 8.6%	43.8% 65.7%	31.1% 25.7%	6.2%	
	2004	25	80.0%	20.0%	.0%	22	40.9%	40.9%	18.2%	.0%	.0%	19	.0%	47.4%	47.4%	5.3%	
	All Years	88	79.0%	19.9%	1.1%	84	38.5%	44.1%	15.0%	2.4%	.0%	74	10.7%	52.4%	31.5%	5.3%	
orking in groups/teams	2001	21	86.2%	9.2%	4.6%	20	38.7%	46.8%	9.7%	4.8%	.0%	17	17.0%	37.8%	28.3%	17.0%	
	2002	18 24	83.4% 72.4%	16.6% 27.6%	.0%	18 23	61.1% 49.3%	33.4% 42.4%	.0% 8.2%	5.5%	.0%	16 22	25.4% 8.6%	24.9% 65.7%	49.7% 25.7%	.0%	
	2004	25	80.0%	20.0%	.0%	21	42.9%	42.4%	14.3%	.0%	.0%	18	11.1%	61.1%	27.8%	.0%	
	All Years	88	80.1%	18.8%	1.1%	82	47.8%	41.6%	8.2%	2.4%	.0%	73	15.0%	48.8%	32.2%	4.0%	
ading/guiding others	2001	21	63.1%	32.3%	4.6%	20	33.8%	27.5%	38.7%	.0%	.0%	17	11.3%	37.8%	50.9%	.0%	₽-
	2002	18 24	83.4% 72.4%	16.6% 27.6%	.0%	18 23	49.7% 41.1%	38.9% 42.4%	5.8% 16.4%	5.5%	.0%	16 22	18.9% 8.6%	50.0% 57.1%	18.6% 34.3%	12.4%	\vdash
	2004	25	72.0%	28.0%	.0%	22	31.8%	45.5%	22.7%	.0%	.0%	19	.0%	57.9%	42.1%	.0%	
ananaihla+: '	All Years	88	72.4%	26.5%	1.1%	83	38.9%	38.8%	21.1%	1.2%	.0%	74	9.4%	51.2%	36.6%	2.8%	
sponsible actions and cision making	2001	21 18	90.8% 83.4%	4.6% 16.6%	4.6%	20 18	38.7% 44.2%	32.3% 50.0%	24.2%	4.8% 5.8%	.0%	17 16	17.0% 12.4%	37.8% 44.1%	33.9% 37.3%	11.3%	E
•	2002	24	80.3%	19.7%	.0%	23	44.2%	50.0%	8.2%	.0%	.0%	22	12.4%	57.1%	37.3%	.0%	۲°
	2004	25	84.0%	16.0%	.0%	23	39.1%	43.5%	17.4%	.0%	.0%	19	10.5%	47.4%	42.1%	.0%	
::	All Years	88	84.5%	14.4%	1.1%	84	40.7%	44.2%	12.6%	2.4%	.0%	74	13.1%	47.3%	35.5%	2.6%	1
ility to adapt to change	2004 All Years	25 25	84.0% 84.0%	16.0% 16.0%	.0%	23 23	47.8% 47.8%	34.8% 34.8%	13.0% 13.0%	4.3% 4.3%	.0%	19 19	5.3% 5.3%	57.9% 57.9%	36.8% 36.8%	.0%	\vdash
derstanding other	2001	25	81.6%	13.8%	4.6%	20	29.0%	51.7%	19.3%	.0%	.0%	17	11.3%	49.1%	28.3%	11.3%	\vdash
pple and other points of	2002	18	77.9%	22.1%	.0%	18	44.5%	38.7%	11.3%	5.5%	.0%	16	12.4%	44.1%	37.3%	.0%	6
rv	2003	24	63.2%	36.8%	.0%	23	37.0%	38.3%	24.7%	.0%	.0%	22	8.6%	42.9%	44.3%	4.3%	—
	2004 All Years	25 88	76.0% 74.2%	24.0% 24.6%	.0%	23 84	34.8% 36.2%	47.8% 44.1%	13.0% 17.4%	4.3% 2.4%	.0%	19 74	5.3% 9.3%	57.9% 48.3%	36.8% 37.2%	.0%	Η.
vironmental awareness	2001	21	74.2% 46.1%	35.5%	1.1%	18	36.2% 16.1%	21.4%	17.4% 51.8%	10.7%	.0%	16	12.0%	48.3% 18.0%	52.1%	18.0%	1
	2002	18	39.2%	44.2%	16.6%	15	33.1%	40.1%	19.9%	6.9%	.0%	13	15.3%	31.3%	45.8%	.0%	7
	2003	24	35.5%	52.6%	11.8%	21	26.9%	50.7%	22.4%	.0%	.0%	21	13.4%	40.3%	46.2%	.0%	F
	2004	25	32.0%	60.0%	8.0%	22	27.3%	36.4%	36.4%	.0%	.0%	19	10.5%	42.1%	42.1%	5.3%	⊢.
litical and economic	All Years 2001	88 21	37.9% 36.9%	48.7% 46.1%	13.4% 17.0%	76 20	25.7% 19.3%	37.5% 19.3%	32.8% 48.3%	4.0% 13.0%	.0%	69 17	12.7% 17.0%	33.8% 28.3%	46.4% 33.9%	5.6% 20.9%	1
areness	2002	18	33.4%	50.0%	16.6%	17	29.3%	35.1%	29.8%	5.9%	.0%	15	13.3%	40.4%	39.8%	6.6%	
	2003	24	32.9%	63.2%	3.9%	23	20.6%	63.0%	16.4%	.0%	.0%	22	4.3%	42.9%	52.8%	.0%	
	2004 All Veers	25	28.0%	48.0%	24.0%	20	30.0%	45.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	17	5.9%	58.8%	29.4%	5.9%	
owledge of	All Years 2002	88 18	32.6% 27.9%	52.1% 55.5%	15.3% 16.6%	80 16	24.4% 31.1%	41.5% 50.0%	29.5% 18.9%	4.6%	.0%	71 14	9.7% 14.2%	42.5% 50.3%	40.0% 21.3%	7.8% 7.1%	7
itical/physical	2002	24	27.6%	64.5%	7.9%	23	24.7%	63.0%	12.3%	.0%	.0%	22	4.3%	55.7%	40.0%	.0%	
ography ´	2004	25	24.0%	60.0%	16.0%	20	30.0%	40.0%	30.0%	.0%	.0%	17	11.8%	41.2%	35.3%	11.8%	
	All Years	67	26.4%	60.3%	13.3%	59	28.2%	51.8%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	53	9.3%	49.8%	33.4%	5.6%	1

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 MAS Core Skills: All Specializations Combined

Worldwide Campus

		1						M A -								
								M Ae	ronautical So	cience						
			Usefulnes	s of skill or	the Job		Compe	tence of thi	s ERAU Gra	duate			Competen	ce of other	Graduates	
		Unwtd # of Respond ents	(1) Very Useful Wtd Row %	(2) Somew hat Useful Wtd Row %	(3) Not Useful Wtd Row %	Unwtd # of Respond ents	(1) Very Good Wtd Row %	(2) Good Wtd Row %	(3) Average Wtd Row %	(4) Poor Wtd Row %	Unwtd # of Respon dents	(1) Very Good Wtd Row %	(2) Good Wtd Row %	(3) Average Wtd Row %	(4) Poor Wtd Row %	(5) Very Poor Wtd Row %
(A) Air transportation	2001	17	33.9%	45.2%	20.9%	13	30.8%	46.2%	23.1%	.0%	10	.0%	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	.0%
as part of system	2002	11	45.7%	36.2%	18.1%	8	87.6%	12.4%	.0%	.0%	8	13.0%	12.4%	74.6%	.0%	.0%
	2003	17	27.3%	67.2%	5.5%	16	40.4%	42.3%	17.3%	.0%	16	.0%	11.5%	88.5%	.0%	.0%
	2004	19	31.6%	52.6%	15.8%	14	35.7%	35.7%	28.6%	.0%	12	16.7%	25.0%	50.0%	8.3%	.0%
	All Years	64	33.5%	51.7%	14.8%	51	44.5%	36.6%	18.9%	.0%	46	6.5%	21.1%	66.0%	6.3%	.0%
(B) Basic elements of	2001	16	.0%	41.9%	58.1%	8	.0%	12.5%	87.5%	.0%	7	.0%	.0%	57.1%	42.9%	.0%
STS	2002	11	27.2%	27.2%	45.7%	7	28.6%	42.9%	28.6%	.0%	7	.0%	28.6%	71.4%	.0%	.0%
	2003	17	5.5%	40.0%	54.6%	11	24.4%	51.3%	24.4%	.0%	13	.0%	14.0%	65.1%	14.0%	7.0%
	2004	19	15.8%	57.9%	26.3%	14	35.7%	42.9%	21.4%	.0%	12	16.7%	16.7%	66.7%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	63	11.0%	43.4%	45.7%	40	24.2%	39.4%	36.4%	.0%	39	4.9%	15.0%	65.3%	12.3%	2.4%
(C) Materials/practices	2001	16	18.0%	24.0%	58.1%	9	11.1%	33.3%	44.4%	11.1%	7	.0%	14.3%	28.6%	57.1%	.0%
used in A/A vehicles	2002	11	18.1%	63.8%	18.1%	8	37.3%	37.3%	25.4%	.0%	8	.0%	25.4%	62.1%	12.4%	.0%
	2003	17	10.9%	56.3%	32.8%	13	20.9%	58.1%	20.9%	.0%	14	.0%	13.1%	86.9%	.0%	.0%
	2004	19	31.6%	42.1%	26.3%	14	42.9%	21.4%	35.7%	.0%	12	8.3%	25.0%	66.7%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	63	20.0%	45.2%	34.8%	44	28.8%	38.0%	31.0%	2.2%	41	2.3%	19.1%	66.6%	12.0%	.0%
(D) Human factors	2001	17	62.2%	32.2%	5.7%	15	25.5%	55.4%	19.1%	.0%	13	7.3%	34.3%	51.1%	7.3%	.0%
problems and analysis	2002	11	72.8%	27.2%	.0%	9	33.2%	44.7%	22.1%	.0%	9	11.6%	11.1%	55.3%	22.1%	.0%
	2003	17	50.9%	49.1%	.0%	16	28.9%	48.0%	23.1%	.0%	16	.0%	23.1%	76.9%	.0%	.0%
	2004	19	68.4%	21.1%	10.5%	17	52.9%	29.4%	17.6%	.0%	15	13.3%	33.3%	53.3%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	64	62.8%	32.7%	4.5%	57	35.5%	44.1%	20.3%	.0%	53	7.4%	26.5%	60.3%	5.7%	.0%
(E) Major steps in	2001	17	33.9%	32.2%	33.9%	11	25.7%	48.7%	25.7%	.0%	10	9.4%	34.5%	37.4%	18.7%	.0%
developing a research	2002	11	63.8%	36.2%	.0%	9	33.2%	44.7%	22.1%	.0%	9	11.6%	22.1%	66.3%	.0%	.0%
study	2003	17	38.2%	45.4%	16.4%	15	30.6%	38.7%	30.6%	.0%	15	.0%	24.5%	75.5%	.0%	.0%
	2004	19	36.8%	47.4%	15.8%	16	50.0%	25.0%	18.8%	6.3%	15	13.3%	26.7%	40.0%	20.0%	.0%
	All Years	64	41.2%	40.8%	18.0%	51	35.8%	37.9%	24.4%	1.9%	49	8.0%	26.8%	55.4%	9.8%	.0%
(F) Analysis of five	2001	16	24.0%	24.0%	52.1%	9	22.2%	44.4%	33.3%	.0%	9	11.1%	44.4%	22.2%	22.2%	.0%
major research	2002	10	40.3%	59.7%	.0%	8	24.9%	50.3%	24.9%	.0%	8	13.0%	12.4%	74.6%	.0%	.0%
methodologies	2003	17	45.4%	27.3%	27.3%	14	26.1%	47.8%	26.1%	.0%	14	.0%	13.1%	86.9%	.0%	.0%
	2004	19	36.8%	47.4%	15.8%	15	40.0%	20.0%	40.0%	.0%	14	14.3%	21.4%	50.0%	14.3%	.0%
l	All Years	62	36.4%	37.7%	25.8%	46	29.5%	38.9%	31.6%	.0%	45	8.8%	21.6%	61.0%	8.6%	.0%

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

ERAU General Skills Usefulness on the Job and Competence of Graduates All Years Combined

Worldwide Campus

·							M Aeronauti	cal Science			·			
						A	eronautics S	Specialization	1					
		Employer	's Usefulne on the Job			Compe	tence of thi	s ERAU Gra	duate		Compet	ence of Gra	duates from	Other
	Unwtd # of Respond	Very Useful Wtd	Somew hat Useful Wtd	Not Useful Wtd Row	Unwtd # of Respond	Excellent Wtd Row	Good Wtd	Average Wtd Row	Poor Wtd	Unwtd # of Respond	Excellent Wtd Row	Good Wtd	Average Wtd Row	Poor Wtd
Quantitative/mathematics	ents 6	Row % 49.9%	Row % 50.1%	.0%	ents 6	% 32.6%	Row % 33.4%	% 17.4%	Row % 16.5%	ents 6	.0%	Row % 66.1%	33.9%	Row %
Basic PC software (word processing, spreadsheets, etc.)	6	100.0%	.0%	.0%	6	17.4%	66.1%	16.5%	.0%	6	.0%	67.2%	32.8%	.0%
Writing skills (non-technical)	6	82.6%	17.4%	.0%	6	33.8%	32.3%	17.4%	16.5%	6	17.4%	32.3%	50.2%	.0%
Technical writing	6	83.7%	.0%	16.3%	6	17.4%	32.3%	33.8%	16.5%	6	.0%	50.9%	49.1%	.0%
Speaking before an audience	6	100.0%	.0%	.0%	6	33.8%	48.8%	17.4%	.0%	6	.0%	67.2%	32.8%	.0%
Listening skills	2	100.0%	.0%	.0%	2	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	2	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%
Applied research (information gathering and analysis)	6	83.5%	16.5%	.0%	6	33.8%	49.8%	16.5%	.0%	6	17.4%	49.8%	32.8%	.0%
Critical thinking	6	83.7%	16.3%	.0%	6	16.3%	32.3%	17.4%	33.9%	6	.0%	49.8%	50.2%	.0%
Independent work	6	100.0%	.0%	.0%	6	33.8%	66.2%	.0%	.0%	6	.0%	83.7%	16.3%	.0%
Planning, scheduling, and carrying out projects	6	100.0%	.0%	.0%	6	16.3%	66.2%	17.4%	.0%	6	.0%	49.8%	50.2%	.0%
Defining and solving problems	6	83.5%	16.5%	.0%	6	16.3%	49.8%	33.9%	.0%	6	.0%	49.8%	50.2%	.0%
Working in groups/teams	6	84.0%	16.0%	.0%	6	33.8%	48.8%	.0%	17.4%	6	.0%	66.1%	33.9%	.0%
Leading/guiding others	6	83.5%	16.5%	.0%	6	16.3%	49.8%	16.5%	17.4%	6	.0%	49.8%	50.2%	.0%
Responsible actions and decision making	6	100.0%	.0%	.0%	6	32.6%	50.9%	16.5%	.0%	6	.0%	49.8%	50.2%	.0%
Ability to adapt to change	2	100.0%	.0%	.0%	2	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	2	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%
Understanding other people and other points of view	6	82.6%	17.4%	.0%	6	16.3%	66.2%	.0%	17.4%	6	.0%	49.8%	33.8%	16.5%
Environmental awareness	6	.0%	66.2%	33.8%	5	.0%	39.1%	60.9%	.0%	5	.0%	19.4%	80.6%	.0%
Political and economic awareness	6	16.3%	32.5%	51.2%	5	.0%	39.1%	60.9%	.0%	5	.0%	19.4%	80.6%	.0%
Knowledge of political/physical geography	5	.0%	39.1%	60.9%	4	.0%	48.9%	51.1%	.0%	4	.0%	24.2%	75.8%	.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 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 Usefulness on the Job and Competence of Graduates All Years Combined

Worldwide Campus

						M Ae	ronautical So	cience					
							autics Specia						
						_					_		
		Usefulne	ss of skill or	n the Job		Comp	etence of thi	s ERAU Gra	duate		Competer	ce of other (3raduates
	Unwtd # of Respond ents	(1) Very Useful Wtd Row %	(2) Somew hat Useful Wtd Row %	(3) Not Useful Wtd Row %	Unwtd # of Respond ents	(1) Very Good Wtd Row %	(2) Good Wtd Row %	(3) Average Wtd Row %	(4) Poor Wtd Row %	Unwtd # of Respond ents	(2) Good Wtd Row %	(3) Average Wtd Row %	(4) Poor Wtd Row %
(A) Air transportation as part of system	6	33.8%	50.2%	16.0%	6	33.9%	66.1%	.0%	.0%	6	17.4%	66.1%	16.5%
(B) Basic elements of STS	6	17.4%	49.1%	33.4%	6	17.4%	48.6%	33.9%	.0%	6	17.4%	82.6%	.0%
(C) Materials/practices used in A/A vehicles	6	33.8%	33.8%	32.5%	6	17.4%	66.1%	.0%	16.5%	6	17.4%	66.1%	16.5%
(D) Human factors problems and analysis	6	82.6%	17.4%	.0%	6	16.3%	66.2%	17.4%	.0%	6	33.8%	48.8%	17.4%
(E) Major steps in developing a research study	6	82.6%	17.4%	.0%	6	16.3%	66.2%	17.4%	.0%	6	17.4%	82.6%	.0%
(F) Analysis of five major research methodologies	6	16.0%	84.0%	.0%	6	.0%	66.2%	33.8%	.0%	6	33.9%	66.1%	.0%
(G) Advances in Aviation/Aerospace aerodynamics	6	67.7%	32.3%	.0%	6	33.9%	48.6%	17.4%	.0%	6	51.4%	48.6%	.0%
(H) Value of simulation in aviation training programs	6	50.2%	49.8%	.0%	6	.0%	65.1%	34.9%	.0%	6	16.5%	66.1%	17.4%
(I) Operation of tech meteorology data computer sys	6	.0%	33.8%	66.2%	5	.0%	38.6%	41.7%	19.7%	5	.0%	80.3%	19.7%
(J) Evaluation of aircraft and spacecraft systems	6	84.0%	16.0%	.0%	6	17.4%	66.1%	16.5%	.0%	6	17.4%	82.6%	.0%
(K) Analysis of spacecraft propulsion systems	6	.0%	50.2%	49.8%	5	.0%	79.2%	20.8%	.0%	5	.0%	100.0%	.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'

								M Aeronauti Av/Aerosp							
			Employer	's Usefulne on the Job	ss of Skill		Comp		is ERAU Gra	eduato.		Compe		aduates fron	n Othe
		Unwtd #	Very Useful	Somew hat Useful	Not Useful	Unwtd#	Excellen t	Good	Average	Poor	Unwtd#	Excelle nt	Good	Average	Poo
		Respond ents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Respond ents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Respond ents	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wtd Row %	Wt Row
Quantitative/math	2001	9	27.8%	51.6%	20.6%	9	31.0%	48.4%	20.6%	.0%	8	34.5%	42.5%	23.0%	
ematics	2002	8 12	38.2% 25.0%	49.4% 75.0%	12.4%	7	28.2% 36.4%	57.1% 45.5%	14.7% 18.2%	.0%	10	67.2% 50.0%	.0%	32.8% 20.0%	
	2004	13	46.2%	53.8%	.0%	12	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	.0%	9	11.1%	33.3%	55.6%	
	All Years	42	34.6%	58.2%	7.1%	39	32.6%	44.7%	22.7%	.0%	33	39.0%	28.4%	32.6%	
Basic PC software	2001	10	62.6%	37.4% 12.4%	.0%	10	43.9%	37.4%	18.7% 12.9%	.0%	8	42.5%	46.0%	11.5%	
(word processing, spreadsheets, etc.	2002	8 12	87.6% 75.0%	25.0%	.0%	8	50.0% 36.4%	37.1% 54.5%	9.1%	.0%	7 10	42.9% 20.0%	28.8% 70.0%	28.2% 10.0%	
)	2004	13	76.9%	23.1%	.0%	12	25.0%	58.3%	8.3%	8.3%	10	20.0%	30.0%	50.0%	
	All Years	43	75.0%	25.0%	.0%	41	37.8%	47.7%	12.1%	2.4%	35	30.3%	44.5%	25.2%	
Writing skills (non-technical)	2001	10	90.6% 74.7%	9.4% 25.3%	.0%	10	9.4% 49.4%	81.3% 24.7%	9.4% 25.9%	.0%	8 7	11.5% 28.2%	54.0% 57.7%	34.5% 14.1%	
(non toormous)	2003	11	81.8%	18.2%	.0%	10	40.0%	50.0%	10.0%	.0%	9	.0%	77.8%	22.2%	
	2004 All	13	61.5%	38.5%	.0%	12	25.0%	41.7%	33.3%	.0%	10	.0%	20.0%	80.0%	
	Years	42	76.5%	23.5%	.0%	40	29.6%	50.5%	19.9%	.0%	34	8.9%	51.1%	40.0%	
Technical writing	2001	10	56.1% 62.9%	43.9% 24.7%	.0%	10	9.4%	74.8% 57.1%	15.8%	.0%	8	11.5% 50.0%	23.0% 33.6%	65.5% 16.4%	
	2003	12	58.3%	41.7%	.0%	11	45.5%	54.5%	.0%	.0%	10	.0%	60.0%	40.0%	
	2004 All	13	61.5%	38.5%	.0%	12	25.0%	33.3%	41.7%	.0%	10	10.0%	20.0%	60.0%	10.
	Years	43	59.6%	37.9%	2.4%	40	26.8%	54.1%	16.3%	2.7%	34	15.0%	34.5%	47.7%	2.
Speaking before an audience	2001	10	46.8% 62.4%	53.2% 37.6%	.0%	10	18.7% 37.1%	62.6% 50.0%	18.7% 12.9%	.0%	8	11.5% 50.0%	54.0% 24.7%	34.5% 25.3%	
	2003	12	75.0%	16.7%	8.3%	12	25.0%	66.7%	8.3%	.0%	10	10.0%	50.0%	40.0%	
	2004 All	13	69.2%	30.8%	.0%	12	25.0%	33.3%	33.3%	8.3%	10	.0%	20.0%	70.0%	10
Listoping chills	Years	43	63.9%	33.8%	2.2%	42	25.8%	53.1%	18.8%	2.3%	36	17.0%	37.0%	43.4%	2
Listening skills	2004 All	13	76.9%	23.1%	.0%	12	50.0%	16.7%	33.3%	.0%	10	10.0%	20.0%	70.0%	
Annlied records	Years	13	76.9% 62.6%	23.1%	.0%	12	50.0%	16.7% 43.9%	33.3% 37.4%	.0%	10	10.0%	20.0% 42.5%	70.0% 34.5%	
Applied research (information	2001	8	62.9%	37.1%	.0%	8	37.6%	49.4%	.0%	12.9%	7	57.7%	28.2%	14.1%	
gathering and analysis)	2003	12	83.3%	16.7%	.0%	11	54.5%	45.5%	.0%	.0%	10	.0%	80.0%	20.0%	
,,	2004 All	13 43	69.2% 70.1%	23.1%	7.7%	12 41	50.0% 40.6%	16.7% 37.7%	33.3% 19.0%	.0%	10 35	10.0%	20.0%	70.0% 36.1%	
Critical thinking	Years 2001	10	100.0%	.0%	.0%	10	46.8%	43.9%	9.4%	.0%	8	23.0%	42.5%	34.5%	
Chical thinking	2002	8	75.3%	24.7%	.0%	8	37.1%	50.0%	.0%	12.9%	7	57.7%	28.2%	14.1%	
	2003	12	91.7%	8.3%	.0%	11 12	45.5% 50.0%	45.5% 16.7%	9.1%	.0%	10	10.0%	80.0% 20.0%	10.0%	
	2004 All	13 43	69.2% 83.9%	30.8%	.0%	41	45.4%	37.8%	25.0% 11.8%	5.0%	10 35	25.9%	43.4%	60.0% 30.6%	
Independent work	Years 2001	10	81.3%	18.7%	.0%	10	81.3%	9.4%	9.4%	.0%	35	30.9%	46.0%	23.0%	
пиврепиент могк	2002	8	75.3%	24.7%	.0%	8	50.0%	37.1%	.0%	12.9%	7	57.7%	28.2%	14.1%	
	2003	12	83.3% 76.9%	16.7% 23.1%	.0%	12 12	58.3% 50.0%	41.7% 25.0%	.0%	.0%	10 10	10.0%	60.0% 20.0%	30.0% 70.0%	
	All	43	79.4%	20.6%	.0%	42	60.1%	28.0%	9.3%	2.6%	35	25.1%	38.9%	36.0%	
Planning,	Years 2001	10	90.6%	9.4%	.0%	10	46.8%	34.5%	18.7%	.0%	8	11.5%	42.5%	46.0%	
scheduling, and carrying out	2002	8	75.3%	24.7%	.0%	8	50.0%	37.1%	12.9%	.0%	7	42.9%	28.8%	28.2%	
projects	2003	12 13	91.7% 76.9%	8.3% 23.1%	.0%	11 12	63.6% 41.7%	36.4% 33.3%	.0%	.0%	10 10	20.0%	50.0% 30.0%	20.0% 60.0%	10
	All	43	83.9%	16.1%	.0%	41	50.3%	35.2%	14.5%	.0%	35	20.0%	38.2%	39.1%	2
Defining and	Years 2001	10	90.6%	9.4%	.0%	10	46.8%	43.9%	9.4%	.0%	8	23.0%	54.0%	11.5%	11
solving problems	2002	8	75.3%	24.7%	.0%	8	37.1%	50.0%	.0%	12.9%	7	42.9%	42.9%	14.1%	
	2003	12 13	75.0% 69.2%	25.0% 30.8%	.0%	12 12	33.3% 33.3%	50.0% 33.3%	16.7% 33.3%	.0%	10 10	20.0%	60.0% 20.0%	20.0% 70.0%	10
	All	43	77.2%	22.8%	.0%	42	37.4%	43.8%	16.1%	2.6%	35	20.0%	43.9%	30.5%	5
Working in	Years 2001	10	81.3%	18.7%	.0%	10	46.8%	34.5%	18.7%	.0%	8	11.5%	54.0%	11.5%	23
groups/teams	2002	8 12	75.3%	24.7%	.0%	8	50.0%	50.0% 36.4%	.0%	.0%	7	57.7%	14.1%	28.2%	
	2003	12	75.0% 69.2%	25.0% 30.8%	.0%	11 12	54.5% 33.3%	36.4% 41.7%	9.1% 25.0%	.0%	10	20.0%	50.0% 40.0%	30.0% 50.0%	\vdash
	All Years	43	74.9%	25.1%	.0%	41	45.6%	40.2%	14.2%	.0%	35	23.1%	40.7%	30.7%	5
Leading/guiding	2001	10	71.9%	28.1%	.0%	10	46.8%	34.5%	18.7%	.0%	8	11.5%	54.0%	34.5%	
others	2002	8 12	75.3% 58.3%	24.7% 41.7%	.0%	8	37.1% 36.4%	50.0% 36.4%	12.9% 27.3%	.0%	7 10	42.9% 10.0%	42.9% 40.0%	14.1% 50.0%	\vdash
	2004	13	69.2%	30.8%	.0%	12	25.0%	41.7%	33.3%	.0%	10	.0%	40.0%	60.0%	
	All Years	43	68.2%	31.8%	.0%	41	35.9%	40.2%	23.9%	.0%	35	14.5%	44.0%	41.5%	
Responsible	2001	10	90.6%	9.4%	.0%	10	56.1%	25.2%	18.7%	.0%	8	11.5%	54.0%	23.0%	11
actions and decision making	2002	8 12	75.3% 83.3%	24.7% 16.7%	.0%	8	37.1% 45.5%	50.0% 54.5%	.0%	12.9%	7 10	28.2% 10.0%	43.6% 50.0%	28.2% 40.0%	
-	2004	13	76.9%	23.1%	.0%	12	33.3%	41.7%	25.0%	.0%	10	10.0%	30.0%	60.0%	
	All Years	43	81.7%	18.3%	.0%	41	43.0%	42.4%	11.9%	2.6%	35	14.2%	44.1%	38.9%	2
Ability to adapt to change	2004 All	13	69.2%	30.8%	.0%	12	41.7%	25.0%	25.0%	8.3%	10	10.0%	30.0%	60.0%	
	Years	13	69.2%	30.8%	.0%	12	41.7%	25.0%	25.0%	8.3%	10	10.0%	30.0%	60.0%	
Understanding other people and	2001 2002	10 8	81.3% 75.3%	18.7% 24.7%	.0%	10 8	28.1% 50.0%	62.6% 24.7%	9.4% 25.3%	.0%	8 7	11.5% 28.2%	54.0% 43.6%	23.0% 28.2%	11
other points of	2003	12	75.0%	25.0%	.0%	11	45.5%	27.3%	27.3%	.0%	10	10.0%	50.0%	30.0%	10
view	2004 All	13	69.2%	30.8%	.0%	12	41.7%	33.3%	16.7%	8.3%	10	10.0%	40.0%	50.0%	
	Years	43	74.9%	25.1%	.0%	41	40.9%	37.5%	19.3%	2.4%	35	14.2%	46.9%	33.5%	5
Environmental awareness	2001 2002	10 8	46.8% 50.6%	34.5% 37.1%	18.7% 12.4%	9	10.3% 42.3%	31.0% 28.8%	48.4% 14.1%	10.3% 14.7%	8	11.5% 32.8%	23.0% 34.3%	42.5% 32.8%	23
	2003	12	41.7%	50.0%	8.3%	10	30.0%	60.0%	10.0%	.0%	10	30.0%	40.0%	30.0%	L
	2004	13	30.8%	61.5%	7.7%	12	25.0%	33.3%	41.7%	.0%	10	10.0%	30.0%	50.0%	10
	All Years	43	41.5%	47.1%	11.5%	38	25.9%	38.5%	30.1%	5.4%	34	20.2%	31.9%	39.3%	8
Political and	2001	10	37.4%	46.8%	15.8%	10	18.7%	28.1%	37.4%	15.8%	8	11.5%	34.5%	23.0%	30
awareness	2002	8 12	37.6% 25.0%	50.0% 75.0%	12.4%	8 11	24.7% 18.2%	24.7% 72.7%	38.2% 9.1%	12.4%	7 10	28.2% 10.0%	43.6% 40.0%	28.2% 50.0%	
	2004	13	23.1%	61.5%	15.4%	11	27.3%	45.5%	27.3%	.0%	9	.0%	55.6%	33.3%	11
	All Years	43	29.9%	59.3%	10.8%	40	22.1%	43.7%	27.5%	6.7%	34	11.7%	43.4%	34.3%	10
Knowledge of	2002	8	37.6%	62.4%	.0%	8	24.7%	50.0%	25.3%	.0%	7	28.2%	43.6%	28.2%	
oolitical/physical geography	2003	12	33.3% 30.8%	58.3% 53.8%	8.3% 15.4%	11	18.2% 36.4%	72.7% 27.3%	9.1% 36.4%	.0%	10	10.0% 11.1%	60.0%	30.0% 44.4%	22
	All		070	20.070	. 5. 1 /3		-5.173		23.173	.0,0					

ERAU Preparation response options for the Class of 2003 and 2004 survey: 1=Excellent', 2=Good', 3=Average', 4=Poor', 5=Very Poor'.

Competence response options for the Class of 2001 and 2002 survey: 1=Very Good', 2=Good', 3=Average', 4=Poor', 5=Very Poor'.

Usefulness response options: 1=Very Useful', 2='Somewhat Useful', 3=Not Useful'

ERAU Degree Specific Skills Preparation and Usefulness on the Job

Worldwide Campus

									ronautical S							
									Aerospace N							
			Usefulne	ss of skill or (2)	the Job		Comp	etence of the	nis ERAU Gr	raduate			Competend	ce of other	Graduates	
		Unwtd # of Respond	(1) Very Useful Wtd	Somew hat Useful Wtd	(3) Not Useful Wtd	Unwtd # of Respond	(1) Very Good Wtd	(2) Good Wtd	(3) Average Wtd	(4) Poor Wtd Row	Unwtd # of Respond	(1) Very Good Wtd	(2) Good Wtd	(3) Averag e Wtd	(4) Poor Wtd	(5) Very Poor Wtd
		ents	Row %	Row %	Row %	ents	Row %	Row %	Row %	%	ents	Row %	Row %	Row %	Row %	Row %
(A) Air transportation as	2001	9	31.0%	31.0%	38.1%	6	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	.0%	4	.0%	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	.0%
part of system	2002	4	50.6%	24.7%	24.7%	2	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2	51.1%	.0%	48.9%	.0%	.0%
,	2003	7 10	28.6% 30.0%	71.4% 50.0%	.0%	6 7	50.0% 42.9%	50.0% 28.6%	.0% 28.6%	.0%	6 5	.0%	33.3% 20.0%	66.7% 40.0%	.0%	.0%
	All															
	Years	30	32.9%	45.2%	21.9%	21	48.0%	37.7%	14.2%	.0%	17	12.4%	23.2%	52.7%	11.7%	.0%
(B) Basic	2001	9	.0%	20.6%	79.4%	4	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	4	.0%	.0%	25.0%	75.0%	.0%
elements of STS	2002	4	.0%	49.4%	50.6%	1	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	1	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%
	2003	7	14.3% 20.0%	28.6% 60.0%	57.1% 20.0%	3 8	66.7% 37.5%	33.3% 37.5%	.0%	.0%	4 6	.0%	50.0% 16.7%	25.0% 66.7%	.0%	25.0%
	All															
	Years	30	9.6%	39.1%	51.3%	16	30.9%	31.5%	37.6%	.0%	15	6.7%	19.7%	47.0%	20.2%	6.5%
(C)	2001	9	10.3%	31.0%	58.7%	5	.0%	40.0%	60.0%	.0%	4	.0%	.0%	25.0%	75.0%	.0%
Materials/practice s used in A/A	2002	4	.0%	75.3%	24.7%	2	48.9%	.0%	51.1%	.0%	2	.0%	51.1%	48.9%	.0%	.0%
vehicles	2003	7 10	14.3%	42.9%	42.9% 30.0%	7	50.0%	25.0%	25.0% 42.9%	.0%	5 5	.0%	40.0%	60.0%	.0%	.0%
	All		30.0%	40.0%			57.1%	.0%		.0%		.0%	40.0%	60.0%	.0%	.0%
	Years	30	16.1%	42.7%	41.2%	18	38.7%	16.5%	44.8%	.0%	16	.0%	31.5%	49.7%	18.8%	.0%
(D) Human factors	2001	9	41.3%	48.4%	10.3%	8	23.0%	65.5%	11.5%	.0%	7	13.0%	22.0%	52.0%	13.0%	.0%
problems and	2002	4	50.6%	49.4%	.0%	3	32.8%	34.3%	32.8%	.0%	3	34.3%	.0%	65.7%	.0%	.0%
analysis	2003	7	28.6%	71.4%	.0%	6	16.7%	66.7%	16.7%	.0%	6	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%
	2004	10	60.0%	20.0%	20.0%	8	37.5%	25.0%	37.5%	.0%	6	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	.0%	.0%
	All Years	30	45.8%	44.5%	9.7%	25	27.3%	49.3%	23.4%	.0%	22	13.7%	29.0%	52.9%	4.4%	.0%
(E) Major steps in	2001	9	20.6%	48.4%	31.0%	6	14.9%	40.2%	44.8%	.0%	6	14.9%	25.3%	29.9%	29.9%	.0%
developing a	2002	4	75.3%	24.7%	.0%	3	32.8%	34.3%	32.8%	.0%	3	34.3%	.0%	65.7%	.0%	.0%
research study	2003	7	28.6%	57.1%	14.3%	6	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	.0%	6	.0%	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	.0%
	2004	10	30.0%	40.0%	30.0%	7	42.9%	28.6%	14.3%	14.3%	6	16.7%	16.7%	33.3%	33.3%	.0%
	All Years	30	33.0%	44.3%	22.6%	22	26.5%	34.0%	35.1%	4.4%	21	14.3%	21.3%	46.0%	18.4%	.0%
(F) Analysis of five	2001	9	20.6%	20.6%	58.7%	5	20.0%	20.0%	60.0%	.0%	5	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	40.0%	.0%
major research	2002	4	50.6%	49.4%	.0%	3	32.8%	34.3%	32.8%	.0%	3	34.3%	.0%	65.7%	.0%	.0%
methodologies	2003	7	42.9%	28.6%	28.6%	5	40.0%	20.0%	40.0%	.0%	6	.0%	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	.0%
	2004	10	40.0%	30.0%	30.0%	7	42.9%	28.6%	28.6%	.0%	6	16.7%	16.7%	33.3%	33.3%	.0%
	All Years	30	36.0%	29.4%	34.6%	20	34.8%	25.3%	39.9%	.0%	20	15.5%	19.7%	44.9%	19.9%	.0%
(G)	2001	8	11.5%	46.0%	42.5%	6	16.7%	16.7%	66.7%	.0%	5	20.0%	.0%	60.0%	20.0%	.0%
Production/procur	2002	4	24.7%	50.6%	24.7%	2	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2	.0%	51.1%	48.9%	.0%	.0%
ement mgmt in manufacturing	2003	7	28.6%	42.9%	28.6%	5	20.0%	60.0%	20.0%	.0%	6	.0%	50.0%	33.3%	16.7%	.0%
manufacturing	2004	10	10.0%	40.0%	50.0%	6	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	5	20.0%	20.0%	40.0%	20.0%	.0%
	All Years	29	16.8%	43.9%	39.2%	19	37.5%	20.6%	41.9%	.0%	18	11.1%	27.9%	44.5%	16.5%	.0%
(H)	2001	8	34.5%	30.9%	34.5%	6	29.9%	40.2%	29.9%	.0%	6	14.9%	.0%	55.2%	29.9%	.0%
Supply/distribution	2002	4	.0%	49.4%	50.6%	1	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%
functions in the logistic system	2003	7	28.6%	42.9%	28.6%	6	16.7%	50.0%	33.3%	.0%	6	16.7%	33.3%	33.3%	16.7%	.0%
logistic system	2004	10	20.0%	60.0%	20.0%	7	28.6%	28.6%	28.6%	14.3%	6	16.7%	16.7%	50.0%	16.7%	.0%
	All Years	29	23.3%	46.0%	30.6%	20	29.3%	37.0%	28.9%	4.8%	19	15.2%	15.0%	49.5%	20.3%	.0%
(I) Strategic	2001	8	46.0%	42.5%	11.5%	8	11.5%	77.0%	.0%	11.5%	7	13.0%	35.0%	39.0%	13.0%	.0%
planning/strategic	2002	4	49.4%	50.6%	.0%	3	32.8%	.0%	67.2%	.0%	3	34.3%	.0%	65.7%	.0%	.0%
management concepts	2003	7	57.1%	42.9%	.0%	7	14.3%	57.1%	28.6%	.0%	6	.0%	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	.0%
осповрю	2004	10	50.0%	30.0%	20.0%	7	42.9%	28.6%	14.3%	14.3%	5	.0%	40.0%	40.0%	.0%	20.0%
	All Years	29	50.4%	39.6%	10.0%	25	23.4%	49.0%	19.9%	7.8%	21	9.7%	30.5%	46.2%	9.1%	4.6%
(J) Interaction of	2001	8	46.0%	34.5%	19.4%	6	16.7%	66.7%	16.7%	.0%	5	20.0%	20.0%	40.0%	20.0%	.0%
maintenance with	2002	4	24.7%	49.4%	25.9%	2	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	2	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%
ops/logistics/traini	2003	7	71.4%	14.3%	14.3%	6	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	.0%	6	.0%	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	.0%
ng	2004	10	60.0%	20.0%	20.0%	7	71.4%	.0%	28.6%	.0%	5	20.0%	20.0%	60.0%	.0%	.0%
	All	29	53.4%	27.2%	19.4%	21	42.9%	33.1%	24.0%	.0%	18	11.1%	22.0%	55.9%	11.0%	.0%
(K) Key factors	Years 2001	7														
impacting on R	2001	4	26.0% 25.9%	13.0% 49.4%	61.0% 24.7%	6 2	16.7% 48.9%	50.0% 51.1%	33.3%	.0%	6 2	16.7% 51.1%	16.7%	50.0% 48.9%	16.7% .0%	.0%
and D programs	2002	7	28.6%	49.4%	28.6%	4	48.9% 25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	.0%	5	.0%	40.0%	48.9%	20.0%	.0%
	2004	10	.0%	60.0%	40.0%	6	50.0%	16.7%	33.3%	.0%	5	20.0%	20.0%	60.0%	.0%	.0%
	All	28	17.6%	41.8%	40.6%	18	33.4%	39.1%	27.5%	.0%	18	17.2%	21.9%	49.9%	11.0%	.0%
	Years	<u>≥8</u>	17.0%	41.8%	40.0%	18	33.4%	39.1%	27.5%	.0%	18	17.2%	21.9%	49.9%	11.0%	.0%

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

ERAU General Skills Usefulness on the Job and Competence of Graduates All Years Combined

Worldwide Campus

							ronautical So						
						Av	Aerospace (Ops					
			's Usefulnes	ss of Skill		Comp	etence of this Graduate	s ERAU		Compe		aduates fron	n Other
	Unwtd #	Very Useful	Somew hat Useful	Not Useful	Unwtd#	Excellen t	Good	Average	Unwtd #	Excelle nt	Good	Average	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 %
Quantitative/mathe matics	10	20.1%	39.8%	40.1%	7	28.8%	42.8%	28.4%	7	.0%	71.6%	28.4%	.0%
Basic PC software (word processing, spreadsheets, etc.)	10	100.0%	.0%	.0%	8	62.4%	25.3%	12.3%	8	50.4%	37.2%	12.3%	.0%
Writing skills (non-technical)	10	60.2%	39.8%	.0%	8	26.1%	49.6%	24.3%	8	13.1%	49.2%	37.7%	.0%
Technical writing	10	40.7%	59.3%	.0%	8	26.1%	49.6%	24.3%	8	13.1%	49.2%	37.7%	.0%
Speaking before an audience	10	69.8%	10.5%	19.7%	7	28.6%	57.4%	14.1%	7	.0%	56.1%	43.9%	.0%
Listening skills	2	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	2	.0%	100.0%	.0%	1	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%
Applied research (information gathering and analysis)	10	30.8%	49.4%	19.8%	8	38.1%	37.6%	24.2%	7	.0%	85.9%	14.1%	.0%
Critical thinking	10	70.0%	30.0%	.0%	9	44.9%	33.4%	21.7%	8	.0%	75.3%	24.7%	.0%
Independent work	10	70.0%	30.0%	.0%	9	44.9%	33.4%	21.7%	8	.0%	74.6%	25.4%	.0%
Planning, scheduling, and carrying out projects	10	70.0%	30.0%	.0%	9	22.3%	56.0%	21.7%	8	.0%	62.3%	37.7%	.0%
Defining and solving problems	10	60.2%	39.8%	.0%	8	38.1%	37.6%	24.3%	8	.0%	61.6%	38.4%	.0%
Working in groups/teams	10	79.7%	20.3%	.0%	8	50.3%	49.7%	.0%	8	.0%	49.2%	50.8%	.0%
Leading/guiding others	10	59.9%	40.1%	.0%	8	38.1%	37.2%	24.7%	8	.0%	62.3%	24.7%	13.1%
Responsible actions and decision making	10	70.1%	29.9%	.0%	9	33.9%	44.4%	21.7%	8	.0%	62.3%	37.7%	.0%
Ability to adapt to change	2	100.0%	.0%	.0%	2	100.0%	.0%	.0%	1	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%
Understanding other people and other points of view	10	70.1%	29.9%	.0%	9	22.3%	56.0%	21.7%	8	.0%	62.3%	37.7%	.0%
Environmental awareness	10	30.3%	60.1%	9.6%	7	14.8%	28.7%	56.5%	7	.0%	42.3%	57.7%	.0%
Political and economic awareness	10	20.4%	69.8%	9.8%	8	13.1%	37.2%	49.7%	8	.0%	62.3%	37.7%	.0%
Knowledge of political/physical geography	7	28.6%	71.4%	.0%	6	33.2%	50.9%	15.9%	6	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%

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

ERAU Degree Specific Skills Usefulness on the Job and Competence of Graduates All Years Combined

Worldwide Campus

	M Aeronautical Science										
	Av/Aerospace Ops										
	Usefulness of skill on the Job				Competence of this ERAU Graduate				Competence of other Graduates		
	Unwtd # of Respond ents	(1) Very Useful Wtd Row %	(2) Somew hat Useful Wtd Row %	(3) Not Useful Wtd Row %	Unwtd # of Respond ents	(1) Very Good Wtd Row %	(2) Good Wtd Row %	(3) Average Wtd Row %	Unwtd # of Respond ents	(2) Good Wtd Row %	(3) Average Wtd Row %
(A) Air transportation as part of system	7	28.3%	71.7%	.0%	6	34.0%	.0%	66.0%	6	.0%	100.0%
(B) Basic elements of STS	7	15.2%	28.3%	56.5%	4	26.5%	24.3%	49.1%	4	.0%	100.0%
(C) Materials/practices used in A/A vehicles	7	.0%	71.7%	28.3%	4	26.5%	49.1%	24.3%	4	.0%	100.0%
(D) Human factors problems and analysis	7	72.1%	27.9%	.0%	6	50.7%	.0%	49.3%	6	.0%	100.0%
(E) Major steps in developing a research study	7	29.1%	28.2%	42.7%	4	50.9%	24.8%	24.3%	4	26.5%	73.5%
(F) Analysis of five major research methodologies	7	29.1%	14.2%	56.6%	4	50.9%	.0%	49.1%	4	.0%	100.0%
(G) Past/present/future airspace and ATC technology	5	60.7%	19.9%	19.3%	3	34.7%	.0%	65.3%	3	.0%	100.0%
(H) Roles and responsibilities in accident investigation	5	19.9%	39.1%	41.0%	3	35.0%	.0%	65.0%	3	.0%	100.0%
(I) Crash site investigation	5	39.7%	21.1%	39.3%	2	51.7%	48.3%	.0%	2	.0%	100.0%
(J) Management and operations related to Air Carriers	5	60.7%	.0%	39.3%	3	34.7%	.0%	65.3%	3	.0%	100.0%
(K) Qualifications and training of aircraft dispatchers	5	19.3%	39.7%	41.0%	3	35.0%	32.2%	32.8%	3	32.2%	67.8%
(L) Responsibilities associated with Corporate Aviation	5	.0%	80.1%	19.9%	3	35.0%	.0%	65.0%	3	.0%	100.0%

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

ERAU General Skills Preparation and Usefulness on the Joh

Worldwide Campus M Aeronautical Science Employer's Usefulness of Skill Competence of this ERAU Graduate Competence of Graduates from Other Institutions Unwtd # of Respond Unwtd # of Respond Unwtd# Poor Useful Wtd Wtd of Respond 2002 2003 2004 40.0% 67.8% 40.0% 22.5% 51.6% 100.0% 50.09 34.5% 3.6% 25 23.19 22.7% 3.8% 22 57.1% 38.6% 4.3% Basic PC software (word processing, spreadsheets, etc.) .0% 25.0% 100.0% 80.0% .0% 9.7% 25.0% 92.7% 3.6% 3.7% 25 45.89 42.9% 7.5% 3.8% .0% 22 64.2% 22.6% 4.3% Writing skills (non-technical) 50.0% 50.0% 38.8% 66.7% .0% 92.8% 3.6% 3.7% 25 34.2% 54.3% 7.7% 3.8% .0% 22 8.6% 47.3% 35.2% 8.9% .0% Years 2001 .0% .0% 2002 2003 2004 60.0% 9.7% .0% 80.0% 20.0% 50.09 50.0% .0% 100.0% .0% 26 58.9% 33.9% 7.2% 25 34.1% 30.9% 31.2% 3.8% .0% 22 4.3% 42.9% 43.9% 8.9% .0% Year 2001 2002 85.7% 80.0% 14.3% .0% 42.9% 16.7% 25.0% 20.0% 50.0% 29.1% 60.0% 40.0% 75.09 .0% 100.0% .0% 14.9% 26 25 38.2% 39.3% 3.8% 8.9% .0% 81.6% 14.7% 3.7% 3.8% 22 4.3% 42.8% 44.0% Listening skills .0% .0% 60.0% 40.0% .0% 75.0% .0% 25.0% .0% .0% 66.7% 33.3% .0% 60.0% 40.0% .0% 75.0% .0% 25.0% .0% .0% .0% 33.3% .0% .0% 66.7% 28.6% 28.6% 16.7% 25.0% .0% 9.7% .0% 70.9% 70.9% 50.0% 100.0% 50.0% .0% .0% .0% 100.0% .0% 26 51.6% 41.2% 7.2% 25 34.3% 30.9% 31.0% .0% 3.8% 22 4.3% 43.8% 8.9% .0% 43.1% Critical thinking 14.3% .0% 14.3% 42.9% 14.3% 100.0% 61.2% .0% .0% 29.1% 80.0% .0% 66.7% 33.3% .0% 26 74.8% 21.5% 3.7% 25 53.9% 31.2% 11.1% 3.8% .0% 22 8.5% 43.1% 44.1% 4.3% .0% Independent work 71.4% 14.3% 14.3% 28.6% 57.1% 14.3% 16.7% 16.7% .0% 33.3% 33.3% 2002 2003 2004 All 51.6% 60.0% 40.0% .0% 50.0% 25.0% 25.0% .0% .0% .0% 66.7% 33.3% .0% .0% 26 81.8% 14.5% 3.7% 25 50.1% 38.7% 7.5% 3.8% .0% 22 4.3% 52.3% 39.1% 4.3% .0% Planning, scheduling, and 57.1% 28.6% 28.6% 42.9% 14.3% 14.3% 6 16.7% 66.7% 16.7% .0% 2002 2003 2004 25.0% .0% 75.0% 29.1% 90.3% .0% 25.0% .0% 66.7% 33.3% 26 85.4% 10.9% 3.7% 25 62.4% 22.5% 7.6% 3.7% 3.8% 22 4.3% 47.0% 39.8% 8.9% .0% 2001 2002 2003 2004 All 85.7% 100.0% 70.9% 14.3% .0% .0% 9.7% .0% .0% .0% .0% .0% 16.7% .0% .0% Defining and solving problems 26 85.6% 10.7% 3.7% 25 46 1% 42.6% 7 5% 3.8% .0% 22 4 3% 61.2% 25.6% 8 9% .0% 85.7% 100.0% 70.9% 100.0% Working in groups/teams 14.3% 42.9% 80.0% 42.9% 14.3% 33.3% 33.3% 16.7% 75.0% 16.7% 29.1% 33.3% 85.6% 10.7% 3.7% 25 53.5% 39.0% 3.7% 3.8% .0% 22 12.9% 52.3% 30.5% 4.3% .0% 71.4% 100.0% 80.6% 28.69 80.09 48.49 .0% .0% .0% 16.7% .0% 25.0% 80.0% 66.7% 33.3% 50.0% 25.0% 25.0% .0% .0% 49.7% 81.9% .0% 52.7% 85.7% 100.0% 14.3% 28.69 14.3% 14.3% 33.3% 33.3% 16.7% 2001 2002 2003 2004 making 19.4% 80.6% 100.0% 38.8% 51.6% 25.0% 29.1% 33.3% 51.6% 33.3% 89.2% 3.7% 42.0% 11.3% 21.2% 39.7% 100.0% 50.0% 50.0% 100.0% .0% Ability to adapt to change .0% .0% .0% .0% .0% .0% .0% .0% 50.0% 71.4% 100.0% 48.4% 19.4% 50.0% 80.0% 20.0% 25.0% 25.0% .0% .0% .0% 66.7% 33.3% .0% 3.7% 42.1% 22 8.5% 4.6% Years 2001 2002 2003 2004 Environmenta 33.3% 20.0% 40.0% 38.8% 20.0% 25.0% 29.1% 50.0% .0% .0% .0% .0% .0% 75.0% 41.9% .0% 33.3% 70.9% .0% 80.0% 50.0% .0% 66.7% 33.3% 14.8% 23 32.89 28.5% 4.1% .0% 20 28.6% 42.9% 14.3% 33.3% 33.3% 25.0% .0% 9.7% 40.0% 19.4% 33.3% 51.6% 51.6% .0% 70.99 .0% 29.1% 29.1% 100.0% .0% .0% 37.7% 4.0% 21 44.1% 18.2% 24 35.6% 36.9% 23.5% .0% 46.0% 9.3% .0% 26 9.0% 35.8% 20.0% 19.4% 20.0% 33.3% 50.0% 61.2% .0% 40.0% 66.7% .0% 50.0% 50.0% .0% .0% 60.0% 33.3% .0% 14.8% 14 40.4% 70.2% .0% .0% 6.5% 15.0% 40.7% 39.1%

EXAU Preparation response options for the Class of 2003 and 2004 survey: 1="Excellent", 2="Good", 3="Average", 4="Poor", 5="Very Poor". Usefulness response options: 1= Very Useful", 2="Somewhat Useful", 3="Not Useful" (3="Not useful", 4="Poor", 5="Very Poor". Useful "services response options: 1= Very Useful", 2="Somewhat Useful", 3="Not Useful"

ERAU Degree Specific Skills Preparation and Usefulness on the Job

Worldwide Campus

		M Aeronautical Science												
		Av/Aerospace Safety Sys												
			Usefulness of skill on the Job				Competence of this ERAU Graduate				Competence of other Graduates			
(A) Air transportation as	2001	Unwtd # of Respond ents 5	(1) Very Useful Wtd Row % 40.0% 50.0%	(2) Somew hat Useful Wtd Row % 60.0% 25.0%	(3) Not Useful Wtd Row % .0% 25.0%	Unwtd # of Respond ents 5	(1) Very Good Wtd Row % 20.0%	(2) Good Wtd Row % 60.0%	(3) Average Wtd Row % 20.0%	Unwtd # of Respond ents 4	(1) Very Good Wtd Row % .0%	(2) Good Wtd Row % 75.0%	(3) Average Wtd Row % 25.0%	(4) Poor Wtd Row % .0%
part of system	2003	5	31.6%	68.4%	.0%	5	47.5%	36.7%	15.8%	5	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%
	2003	4	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	3	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	3	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	.0%
	All Years	18	36.5%	52.9%	10.6%	16	46.7%	36.1%	17.1%	15	6.1%	24.5%	69.4%	.0%
(B) Basic elements	2001	4	.0%	75.0%	25.0%	3	.0%	33.3%	66.7%	2	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%
of STS	2002	4	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	3	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	3	.0%	33.3%	66.7%	.0%
	2003	5	.0%	68.4%	31.6%	4	18.8%	62.4%	18.8%	5	.0%	.0%	68.4%	31.6%
	2004	4	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	2	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	2	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%
	All Years	17	11.2%	50.4%	38.4%	12	14.7%	55.0%	30.2%	12	7.5%	8.0%	70.0%	14.6%
(C)	2001	4	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	3	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	2	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%
Materials/practices used in A/A	2002	4	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	3	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	3	.0%	.0%	66.7%	33.3%
vehicles (D) Human factors problems and analysis	2003	5	15.8%	68.4%	15.8%	5	15.8%	68.4%	15.8%	5	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%
	2004	4	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	3	33.3%	.0%	66.7%	3	33.3%	.0%	66.7%	.0%
	All Years	17	27.4%	45.2%	27.4%	14	19.4%	47.8%	32.8%	13	6.9%	7.0%	78.7%	7.4%
	2001	5	80.0%	20.0%	.0%	5	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	4	.0%	75.0%	25.0%	.0%
	2002	4	100.0%	.0%	.0%	3	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	3	.0%	.0%	66.7%	33.3%
	2003	5	68.4%	31.6%	.0%	5	31.6%	52.5%	15.8%	5	.0%	15.8%	84.2%	.0%
	2004	4	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	4	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	4	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	.0%
	All Years	18	74.5%	25.5%	.0%	17	38.2%	51.0%	10.8%	16	5.7%	28.7%	59.4%	6.1%
(E) Major steps in developing a research study	2001	5	60.0%	20.0%	20.0%	4	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	3	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	.0%
	2002	4	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	3	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	3	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%
	2003	5	31.6%	52.5%	15.8%	5	31.6%	52.5%	15.8%	5	.0%	31.6%	68.4%	.0%
	2004	4	25.0%	75.0%	.0%	4	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	4	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	.0%
	All Years	18	41.6%	48.2%	10.2%	16	40.4%	42.5%	17.1%	15	6.1%	36.4%	57.5%	.0%
(F) Analysis of five major research methodologies	2001	4	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	3	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	3	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	.0%
	2002	3	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	2	.0%	100.0%	.0%	2	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%
	2003	5	52.5%	31.6%	15.8%	5	15.8%	68.4%	15.8%	4	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%
	2004	4	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	4	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	4	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	.0%
	All Years	16	47.8%	40.8%	11.4%	14	26.0%	54.6%	19.4%	13	7.0%	21.0%	72.1%	.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?" - Worldwide Campus

Class of 2001

His leadership problem solving and people skills are of great use to us.

Understanding the global transportation system and how airlines fit in. Training pilots and use of simulators. Solving problems and developing improvements to doing our business.

Good understanding of air transportation system, good presentation skills, and good analytical skills.

It is aeronautical based.

Program management and leadership

Able to work independently, needs minimal supervision; professional, flexible in job performance; works well with others, especially customers; comfortable, confident in dealing with the public; constantly improving knowledge base with courses.

This employee is well organized and displays good work ethical behavior patterns.

The degree program provides a proper balance of course specific information to ensure a well prepared and rounded graduate to step into major aviation position.

Independent thinker, problem solver.

Local

Structured and relevant to today's world.

Solid understanding of safety management; very disciplined

Learning about aerodynamics. Specialization with CNS/ATM.

Not enough personal experience/interaction for me to say.

Technical knowledge

Class of 2002

Communicative and research skills.

Application to current job.

(Name omitted) is an officer in the USAF and exceeds all standards. It is likely a combination of his education, experience, and upbringing.

Practical application vs. theoretical "Real world" familiarity.

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

Continued Learning

Understanding the air transportation system as it relates to ATC and airfield management.

Very well organized. Good at special projects and reports.

Not really sure what this degree is about or what special skills it provides to the graduate.

Broadening his perspective

Research capabilities, Human Factors, Materials Research, SMTE of the Art Materials and Practices.

Class of 2003

Good instructor for WS

Understanding of the overall of airlift elements.

Conducting a certified degree program remotely + but continually challenges the student to excel and enables the student to meet those challenges.

(Name omitted) is the finest individual I have ever worked with. He has over 30 years of experience in this industry. He has a great work ethic, & he gets along with people.

Greater knowledge of aviation/ air transport.

Ability to work autonomously

Independent, criticized thinking

Work Ethics

Follow up

Because of uniqueness of degree, can branch out into new territories we could not do before.

Decision making

Very knowledgeable in most aviation-related subjects.

-Excellent decision making

-solid leadership

Still considering this.

Strong safety issues and concerns that have been adopted by this institution.

Time management and organizational skills

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

None apparent-did not know graduate was in ERAU program. Graduate is two echelons down from my position (over 400 people in organization).

Class of 2004

Increased situational awareness in everyday operating.

Any pursuit of additional education is useful. This program seemed to make the candidate consider situations and areas that he would normally encounter in his current position. Who knows when that additional knowledge will become useful to the current or future candidate.

Don't Know

N/A

Independent thinking, ability to construct & carry our projects.

(Name omitted) was under my supervision for only a few months. If I had to say a strength he has, it would be his ability to do research and development.

Makes him better to deal with aviation problems

Their ability to manage people. I believe these skills were acquired overtime and the graduate's studies of Human Factors.

Focus on aviation/ aerospace safety and systems.

Increased awareness human factors that can be applied to our flight safety program.

Ability to investigate aircraft accidents, analyze the facts, prepare a factual report of the facts, and draft meaningful safety recommendations

I don't have enough knowledge of this program to form an opinion.

Technical abilities, writing and speaking abilities.

Have not had enough interaction, but doing well in his current program of study in systems engineering.

Good understanding of airport management issues.

The graduates ability to identify problems, conduct research & produce superior technical & non -technical reports indicates a strong emphasis in his degree program.

Excellent in all areas for this employee

Comments from the question "Considering this FRAII graduate, what weaknesses do you

perceive in his/her degree program?" - Worldwide Campus
Class of 2001 Working with people as a supervisor.
Have not observed any.

Personnel management, finance, accounting functions.

Grammar issues mostly related to writing skills ability regarding the English Language. This employee origin is from Persia.

Perceived lack of business/project management experience.

Cost

Need classes on critical thinking, often rushes to judgment.

See #12

Speaking (group presentations) is poor.

Class of 2002

None noted.

We need graduate level thinkers with specific specialities this degree generic

Lack of enough courses on people to people relations

Estimating Practices.

Class of 2003

none

None noted.

none

Some lack of skill in dealing and relating with people having conflicting personalities or those challenging his authority. More classes in "people skills" would have been helpful to him.

None

At this point, none. Stress integrity, quality, and critical thinking in all professions.

none

computer applications
Overqualified for most airport entry-level positions but under qualified for experienced positions.
none
Still considering this as well.
The classes for this degree program were more basic than what was expected.
none
unknown
Class of 2004 None noted
As is the case with graduates from many instituations, many of the classes completed are viewed as just another wing on the ladder to completion. I am not sure this candidate understood the usefulness or application of the courses that he took.
Don't Know
N/A
None
No comment
None
None
None
This is difficult to answer at this time. His education will display itself in future roles & responsibilities.
None
Same as above.
None
No weakness- just needs experience.
None