

JAMES A. GRAASKAMP COLLECTION OF TEACHING MATERIALS

III. REAL ESTATE DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATION

E. Masters Program

4. School of Business Exit Questionnaire for Master
Students

February 24, 1987

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Department Chairs
Evaluation Committee
Graduate Studies Committee

FROM: J. C. Hickman *JCH*

SUBJECT: Report on Master's Students' Exit Questionnaires

Transmitted herewith is a report by George Strother which summarizes his analysis of Exit Questionnaires distributed to graduating master's students in recent years. We owe George a debt of gratitude for making this analysis available.

Known weaknesses in our computing and library facilities are reinforced. Dissatisfaction with our budget imposed large classes also is apparent. The views on the foundations curriculum are not revolutionary.

A discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of raising admission standards to master's programs is in order. The constructive criticisms in this report will be answered by new facilities for library and computing and a more favorable students to faculty ratio. The improved ratio may be attainable only by reducing the size of the graduate program.

JCH:jb

Enclosure

REPORT ON MASTER'S STUDENTS' EXIT QUESTIONNAIRES

All master's degree candidates are mailed a packet in their final semester that includes the application for their degree and an exit questionnaire asking for personal information and attitudes about the School's program. The following analysis is based on questionnaires distributed beginning in May of 1984 and ending in August of 1986. Students receive the packet early in the term and the questionnaires are returned throughout the remainder of the term with a peak about mid-term.

The response rate on the questionnaire varies from 62% to 85% from term to term with an overall response of 76%. The response rate is highest in the spring term (77% to 85%) and lowest in summer session (62% to 68%). There were 1040 total graduates during the period under study and 793 completed the questionnaire. This report is divided into four sections: (a) general demographics, (b) composite attitudinal variables, (c) cross tabulations, and (d) open-ended comments. Data were tabulated in B5 under the supervision of Dave Dickens.

GENERAL DEMOGRAPHICS

Percentages in this section do not add to 100% for two reasons: (1) non-responses to questions and (2) rounding effects. Second majors were recorded but are not included in the cross tabulations.

Of the 793 respondents, 9.2% indicated a second major.

1. Sex: 31.53% female 68.35% male
2. Residence: 63% Wisconsin 35% non-resident
3. Status: 87% full-time 12% part-time
4. Age:
 - Under 24 16.8
 - 24-26 37.7
 - 27-30 24.3
 - 31-35 11.9
 - 36-40 5.8
 - 41 or over 1.3
 - No answer 2.3
5. Undergraduate degree:
 - a. University or college:

UW-Madison	36.4%
Other UW System	11.2%
Wisconsin Private	4.5%
Other U.S. Public	20.2%
Other U.S. Private	10.8%
Foreign	15.5%
 - b. Major

Business	47.2%
Economics	8.7%
Other Liberal Arts	30.3%
Engineering	7.4%
Other	5.7%

6. Full-time work experience (excluding summers):

None	38.2
About 1 year	11.2
1-2 years	14.1
More than 2 years	36.1

7. Degree sought

MBA	69.6
MS	25.9
MA	4.2

8. Graduate major(s) (includes second majors)

Accounting	7.3	Info Systems	9.1
Actuarial Sci.	1.1	Int'l Bus	5.9
Arts Admin	1.4	Management	5.9
Diversified	1.8	Marketing	18.3
Bus. Stats	0.1	Public Mgt	0.1
Finance	39.9	Q.A.	1.6
Health Care Fiscal	2.5	Real Estate	9.3
Health Serv. Admin	3.3	Risk & Ins.	1.1
		Transp. & Pub Utility	0.5

ATTITUDINAL VARIABLES

There were seventeen attitudinal variables divided into two general categories:

- (1) Academic support - 8 variables
- (2) Teaching Methods and Curriculum - 9 variables

<u>Academic support</u>	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Adequate</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Accessibility of faculty in <u>major</u> area:	53.85	40.23	5.55
Accessibility of faculty outside major area:	31.65	60.66	6.56
Overall quality of faculty in major area:	53.38	37.58	4.67
Overall quality of faculty outside major area:	34.43	61.54	2.77
Effectiveness of Placement Office:	34.05	39.85	10.59
Library Facilities of Business School:	15.38	45.78	38.21
Helpfulness of Dean's Office:	36.70	53.09	5.80
Computer Facilities of Business School:	24.34	53.47	20.18
<u>Teaching Methods and Curriculum</u>	<u>Too Much</u>	<u>Adequate</u>	<u>Too Little</u>
Case method as the primary form of instruction:	3.66	61.54	33.92
Orientation provided to <u>new</u> students:	0.63	60.15	37.33
Number of seminar-type courses available:	1.26	61.79	33.54
Number of courses offered in major area:	2.02	59.90	37.45
Number of guest lecturers from industry:	0.76	32.79	64.69
Flexibility in developing programs:	3.78	73.77	20.93
Number of required behavioral sci courses:	8.70	77.30	12.23
Number of courses involving projects with cos.	1.26	41.24	55.99
Number of required quantitative courses:	6.81	85.37	6.68

In terms of academic support the two areas of highest dissatisfaction are the library and computer facilities, with more than a third indicating dissatisfaction with the library facilities and about one-fifth indicating dissatisfaction with computer facilities. The ten percent dissatisfaction with placement services is difficult to interpret because of some ambiguity in the question and a 15% non-response. This section of the questionnaire is being redesigned to give a clearer picture of attitudes about the placement office. The problem is compounded partly because the questionnaire is turned in some time before graduation. The placement office does have a more detailed survey after graduation and their survey is more informative.

With respect to teaching methods and curriculum the areas in which a majority indicate dissatisfaction are the shortage of guest lecturers from industry and the number of courses involving projects with companies. There appears thus to be a desire on the part of students for more "real world" experiences. In addition a third or more students indicate dissatisfaction as follows:

a. too little use of cases	33.9%
b. too little new student orientation	37.3
c. too few seminar-type courses	33.5
d. too few courses in major area	37.5

CROSS TABULATIONS

Cross tabulations were run on each of the demographic variables (with the exception of sex) and each of the attitudinal variables. Chi squares were run on each pairing as a rough screening on each cross tab. This was a "rough screening" because of the number of cells with expected frequencies of less than five, which generally led to overstated levels of significance. The main purpose of this rough screening was to eliminate from this report those cross tabulations that would be of little or no importance. Percentages were computed on all other cross tabs and are reported in the following tables with two exceptions: (1) some that were basically self-evident such as the table that showed that older students in general had more work experience than younger students, and (2) where, in the interest of brevity, a brief summary seems preferable to a complete table.

Age relationships. In general age does not seem to produce numerous differences. Where it does it is not clear whether age per se or the relationship of age to prior work experience or to part-time status is the governing factor. The following conclusions summarize the age variables that are most significant:

- a. Older students (27 and over) were less likely to rate the services of the placement office as "very good" (36% to 49%).
- b. Younger students (under 27) were less likely to rate the helpfulness of the Dean's office as "very good" (30% to 48%).
- c. Younger students were more likely to feel that there were too few courses in their major area (43% to 30%).

- d. There were only negligible age differences in attitudes about which courses should be required.
- e. Older students were less likely to use the placement office (21% to 40%). This result has to be qualified by the high non-response to the placement office questions.

Full-Time and part-time students. In general there were few marked differences between full-time and part-time students. Part-time students were more likely to have accepted a position at the time they completed the questionnaire. They were less likely to have used the placement office. These relationships are probably the result of the fact that most part-time students were currently employed and in a number of cases expected to continue in their current jobs.

Work experience. The following tables show relationships between the amount of work experience and attitudinal variables but even though these relationships are significant the meaning of these relationships does not seem to have any ready explanation.

Table 1. Work experience and placement office effectiveness percents

Work exper.	Very good	Adequate	Poor	
None				N = 280
About 1 yr	45	44	11	N = 82
1-2 yrs	39	49	12	N = 94
More than 2 yrs	34	48	18	N = 211
	37	50	12	

Table 2. Work experience and number of required behavioral science courses percents

Work exper.	Too much	Adequate	Too little	
None	10	77	13	N = 299
About 1 yr	5	84	11	N = 88
1-2 yrs	5	77	17	N = 111
More than 2 yrs	10	80	10	N = 278

Undergraduate degrees.

Table 3. Number of courses in the major area by undergraduate major (percents)

	Too much	Adequate	Too little	
Business	2	56	41	N = 374
Econ	1	55	43	N = 69
Liberal Arts	2	64	34	N = 238
Engineering	2	60	38	N = 58
Other	0	82	18	N = 44

Table 4. Should have OB Requirement by undergraduate major (percents)

	Yes	No	
Business	84	16	N = 335
Econ	66	33	N = 64
Liberal Arts	77	23	N = 213
Engineering	80	20	N = 55
Other	93	7	N = 43

Table 5. Access to faculty in major by undergraduate college (percents)

	Very good	Adequate	Poor	N
UW-Madison	59	36	5	289
UW-XXX	49	44	7	89
Wis Private	53	47	0	36
US Public	53	41	6	159
US Private	50	43	7	86
Foreign	53	43	3	123

Table 6. Effectiveness of the placement office by undergraduate college (percents)

	Very good	Adequate	Poor	N
UW-Madison	45	44	11	258
UW-XXX	49	43	8	74
Wis Private	53	41	6	32
US Public	36	49	16	140
US Private	39	50	11	72
Foreign	24	56	20	86

Table 7. New student orientation by undergraduate college (percents)

	Too much	Adequate	Too little	N
UW-Madison	0	72	28	280
UW-XXX	0	60	40	89
Wis Private	0	54	46	35
US Public	1	60	39	157
US Private	0	52	48	86
Foreign	2	50	48	122

Cross tabulations by graduate major. Cross tabulations were run on all majors and all attitudinal variables. The tables that follow include all which seemed to have some relevance and some degree of differentiation among majors. Several cautions need to be noted in interpreting these results. Although percents were computed on all majors it is evident that the numbers involved in a majority of the majors are so small that a large variable error can be expected. Nevertheless, percents facilitate comparisons between response categories when viewed with caution. In addition, all graduates were asked to evaluate master's degree requirements (and most responded) even though the M.S. and M.A. candidates' requirements did not always include some of the courses listed and they were thus evaluating courses that they had not taken. Furthermore, the roughly one-third of all respondents who had B.B.A. degrees had typically taken undergraduate equivalents of the requirements of M.B.A. first year courses and were thus also indicating opinions about different courses than those judged by students in the two year master's program. Finally, all of these results need to be preceded by the qualifying phrase: "students' perceptions of"

For those interested in the details the 25 tables that follow give department by department reactions subject to the cautions indicated in the preceding paragraph. For those who would prefer a summary the following highlights may suffice.

Majors represented by only one respondent are disregarded in these highlights.

Table 8. Access to faculty in the major area: a substantial majority in each major field saw access as adequate or very good with smaller majors more frequently seeing access as very good.

Table 9. Quality of faculty in the major area: the top five leaders in this area were actuarial science, arts administration, real estate, risk and insurance, and accounting. *

Table 10. Quality of faculty outside major area: in almost all instances candidates saw the quality within their major area as superior to that outside the major; exceptions were health care fiscal management and health services administration by smaller margins, and information systems by a larger margin.

Table 11. Effectiveness of the placement office: the problem of interpreting these responses has been noted earlier; the highest levels of dissatisfaction were in the diversified major and health services administration; of the larger departments accounting came out best.

Table 12. Computer facilities: there was no major in which a majority rated the computer facilities as very good; in the department that presumably would be most dependent on computers, information systems, a majority rated the facilities as poor.

Table 13. Courses using case method: with two exceptions a majority of each major felt that the number of courses using the case method was adequate. The two exceptions were finance and risk and insurance. Nevertheless it should be noted that a significant minority, generally about one-fourth, felt

there was too little use of the case method. It should be noted that the question applies to all courses--not courses in the major field alone.

Table 14. Number of courses in the major area. A substantial number of students felt that there were too few courses in their major area. In the case of information systems, quantitative analysis, and transportation and public utilities, a majority felt this way.

Tables 15 and 16. Guest lecturers and company projects. Taken together these tables indicate that a very substantial number of students felt that there should be more "real world" experiences as part of the programs. Among the larger departments this was especially notable in finance and information systems majors.

Tables 17-28. Course requirements. In general, there seems to be a high level of acceptance of the course requirements by nearly all major groups. Substantial differences between majors seem to be the exception rather than the rule. Arts administration, the diversified major, health services administration, and real estate are the departments that deviate most often from the general trends. Since, of these four, only the diversified major is subject to all of these requirements, many of these respondents are expressing opinions about requirements that do not apply to them.

Table 29. Satisfaction with master's education at Wisconsin: as to numbers affected, low levels of satisfaction ("somewhat satisfied" or "very dissatisfied"--note the absence of a "somewhat dissatisfied" category) are indicated by 20% of the 292 respondents in finance and 39% of the 59 respondents in information systems. In three instances, on the other hand, a majority of students checked "very satisfied": actuarial science, arts administration, and real estate. *

Table 30. Do it again at Wisconsin. While in every major a majority said they would do it again at Wisconsin, the following departments had five or more students answering "no": finance, information systems, and international business. On the other hand, only one accounting major and no real estate majors answered "no" for the top score among the larger (20 more respondents) departments. *

Table 31. Accepted position yet. As noted previously, because the questionnaire was typically returned by midterm, responses to this question are not too informative.

Table 32. Position through placement office. Although preliminary at best, there seems to be some indication that the placement office plays a more important role in the job search of some majors than in others. Of the larger departments it would seem that the placement office plays a significant role in the job search for accounting, actuarial science, health care fiscal management, information systems, and marketing and a lesser role in health services administration, international business, management, real estate, and risk and insurance. *

Table 8. Access to faculty in the major area by major. %

	Very Good	Adequate	Poor	N
Accounting	75	25	0	57
Actuarial Sci	100	0	0	9
Arts Admin.	91	9	0	11
Diversified	14	79	7	14
Bus. Statistics	100	0	0	1
Finance	40	53	7	312
Health Care F.	67	17	17	18
Health Serv. Adm.	54	42	4	24
Info. Systems	46	39	15	59
Internat'l. Bus.	54	46	0	28
Management	43	50	8	40
Marketing	66	31	2	124
Public Mgmt.	100	0	0	1
Quant. Anal.	75	25	0	8
Real Estate	72	25	3	72
Risk & Ins.	88	12	0	8
Transport & P.U.	100	0	0	4

Table 9. Quality of Faculty in major area - by major - %

	Very Good	Adequate	Poor	N
Accounting	86	14	0	57
Actuarial Sci	100	0	0	9
Arts Admin.	100	0	0	11
Diversified	29	71	0	14
Bus. Statistics	100	0	0	1
Finance	52	44	4	311
Health Care F.	61	28	11	18
Health Serv. Adm.	36	64	0	25
Info. Systems	12	58	30	60
Internat'l. Bus.	46	46	7	28
Management	60	38	2	40
Marketing	61	38	1	124
Public Mgmt.	100	0	0	1
Quant. Anal.	63	38	0	8
Real Estate	89	11	0	71
Risk & Ins.	88	13	0	8
Transport & P.U.	75	25	0	4

Table 10. Quality of faculty outside of major area - by major. %

	Very Good	Adequate	Poor	N
Accounting	35	63	2	57
Actuarial Sci.	78	22	0	9
Arts Admin.	27	64	9	11
Diversified	36	64	0	14
Bus. Statistics	100	0	0	1
Finance	27	69	4	310
Health Care F.	72	28	0	18
Health Serv. Adm.	42	54	4	24
Info. Systems	38	62	0	60
Internat'l. Bus.	32	68	0	28
Management	33	68	0	40
Marketing	40	57	3	123
Public Mgmt.	0	100	0	1
Quant. Anal.	38	63	0	8
Real Estate	39	58	3	67
Risk & Ins.	63	38	0	8
Transport & P.U.	50	50	0	4

Table 11. Effectiveness of placement office - by major - %

	Very Good	Adequate	Poor	N
Accounting	64	32	4	50
Actuarial Sci.	89	0	11	9
Arts Admin.	25	50	25	4
Diversified	0	57	43	7
Bus. Statistics	0	0	0	0
Finance	39	50	11	276
Health Care F.	71	18	12	17
Health Serv. Adm.	0	70	30	10
Info. Systems	31	47	22	51
Internat'l. Bus.	35	48	17	23
Management	21	59	21	29
Marketing	42	45	12	113
Public Mgmt.	0	100	0	1
Quant. Anal.	33	50	17	6
Real Estate	39	52	9	66
Risk & Ins.	50	50	0	4
Transport & P.U.	25	50	25	4

Table 12. Computer facilities -
by major - %

	Very good	Adequate	Poor	N
Accounting	28	60	12	58
Actuarial Sci	25	63	13	8
Arts Admin.	17	67	17	6
Diversified	7	50	43	14
Bus. Statistics	0	100	0	1
Finance	24	61	16	308
Health Care F.	39	56	6	18
Health Serv. Adm.	35	60	5	20
Info. Systems	7	42	52	60
Internat'l. Bus.	32	50	18	28
Management	25	50	25	40
Marketing	23	51	27	124
Public Mgmt.	0	100	0	1
Quant. Anal.	25	75	0	8
Real Estate	42	40	18	72
Risk & Ins.	43	43	14	7
Transport & P.U.	0	50	50	4

Table 13. No. courses using case
method as the primary form of instruction.
by major. %

	Too much	Adequate	Too little	N
Accounting	7	67	26	57
Actuarial Sci	0	75	25	8
Arts Admin.	18	55	27	11
Diversified	0	57	43	14
Bus. Statistics	0	100	0	1
Finance	2	49	49	312
Health Care F.	0	94	6	18
Health Serv. Adm.	4	65	30	23
Info. Systems	5	75	20	59
Internat'l. Bus.	4	71	25	28
Management	10	65	25	40
Marketing	6	68	26	123
Public Mgmt.	0	100	0	1
Quant. Anal.	0	100	0	8
Real Estate	1	77	21	71
Risk & Ins.	0	38	63	8
Transport & P.U.	25	50	25	4

Table 14. Number of courses in major area by major. %

	Too much	Adequate	Too little	N
Accounting	7	60	33	57
Actuarial Sci	0	88	13	8
Arts Admin.	0	55	45	11
Diversified	0	69	31	13
Bus. Statistics	0	100	0	1
Finance	2	60	38	312
Health Care F.	0	78	22	18
Health Serv. Adm.	0	83	17	24
Info. Systems	2	20	78	60
Internat'l. Bus.	0	57	33	28
Management	0	58	43	40
Marketing	1	64	35	123
Public Mgmt.	0	100	0	1
Quant. Anal.	0	38	63	8
Real Estate	4	79	17	72
Risk & Ins.	13	75	13	8
Transport & P.U.	0	0	100	4

Table 15. Guest lecturers from industry - by major - %

	Too much	Adequate	Too little	N
Accounting	0	75	25	56
Actuarial Sci	0	63	38	8
Arts Admin.	0	90	10	10
Diversified	0	46	54	13
Bus. Statistics	0	0	100	1
Finance	0	21	79	310
Health Care F.	6	78	17	18
Health Serv. Adm.	0	78	22	23
Info. Systems	0	39	61	59
Internat'l. Bus.	4	25	71	28
Management	0	15	85	40
Marketing	1	31	68	121
Public Mgmt.	0	0	100	1
Quant. Anal.	0	0	100	8
Real Estate	1	69	30	71
Risk & Ins.	13	63	25	8
Transport & P.U.	0	25	75	4

Table 16. Courses with company projects - by major - %

	Too much	Adequate	Too little	N
Accounting	0	41	59	58
Actuarial Sci	0	38	63	8
Arts Admin.	0	82	18	11
Diversified	0	57	43	14
Bus. Statistics	0	0	100	1
Finance	0	31	69	308
Health Care F.	0	39	61	18
Health Serv. Adm.	2	40	58	24
Info. Systems	2	40	58	60
Internat'l. Bus.	0	66	44	27
Management	5	54	41	39
Marketing	3	50	47	123
Public Mgmt.	0	100	0	1
Quant. Anal.	0	0	100	8
Real Estate	0	55	45	69
Risk & Ins.	13	38	50	8
Transport & P.U.	0	25	75	4

Table 17. Number of required quantitative courses - by major - %

	Too much	Adequate	Too little	N
Accounting	7	90	3	58
Actuarial Sci	0	100	0	8
Arts Admin.	0	78	22	9
Diversified	14	71	14	14
Bus. Statistics	0	0	100	1
Finance	7	86	6	311
Health Care F.	11	89	0	18
Health Serv. Adm.	0	96	4	24
Info. Systems	7	85	8	60
Internat'l. Bus.	11	82	7	28
Management	15	83	3	40
Marketing	7	85	7	122
Public Mgmt.	0	100	0	1
Quant. Anal.	13	63	25	8
Real Estate	1	90	9	70
Risk & Ins.	0	100	0	8
Transport & P.U.	0	100	0	4

Table 18. Financial accounting requirement - by major - %

	Def. Require	Prob. Require	Prob. Not Require	Def. Not Require	N
Accounting	88	10	2	0	52
Actuarial Sci	80	20	0	0	5
Arts Admin.	91	9	0	0	9
Diversified	54	38	8	0	13
Bus. Statistics	0	100	0	0	1
Finance	89	10	1	0	287
Health Care F.	94	6	0	0	17
Health Serv. Adm.	72	28	0	0	18
Info. Systems	73	27	0	0	56
Internat'l. Bus.	88	13	0	0	24
Management	85	12	3	0	34
Marketing	71	25	4	0	114
Public Mgmt.	100	0	0	0	1
Quant. Anal.	75	25	0	0	8
Real Estate	77	21	2	0	56
Risk & Ins.	88	13	0	0	8
Transport & P.U.	25	50	0	25	4

Table 19. Managerial accounting requirement - by major - %

	Def. Require	Prob. Require	Prob. Not Require	Def. Not Require	N
Accounting	75	25	0	0	52
Actuarial Sci	40	40	20	0	5
Arts Admin.	25	50	25	0	8
Diversified	69	31	0	0	13
Bus. Statistics	0	100	0	0	1
Finance	73	24	3	0	287
Health Care F.	76	24	0	0	17
Health Serv. Adm.	80	20	0	0	20
Info. Systems	70	30	0	0	56
Internat'l. Bus.	75	21	4	0	24
Management	80	17	3	0	35
Marketing	72	26	2	0	115
Public Mgmt.	100	0	0	0	1
Quant. Anal.	75	25	0	0	8
Real Estate	56	35	9	0	57
Risk & Ins.	63	25	13	0	8
Transport & P.U.	50	25	0	25	4

Table 20. Corporation finance requirement - by major - %

	Def. Require	Prob. Require	Prob. Not Require	Def. Not Require	N
Accounting	90	10	0	0	52
Actuarial Sci	80	20	0	0	5
Arts Admin.	50	38	13	0	8
Diversified	84	15	0	0	13
Bus. Statistics	0	100	0	0	1
Finance	90	10	0	0	287
Health Care F.	76	24	0	0	17
Health Serv. Adm.	28	50	22	0	18
Info. Systems	75	23	2	0	56
Internat'l. Bus.	88	13	0	0	24
Management	77	20	3	0	35
Marketing	79	18	3	0	114
Public Mgmt.	100	0	0	0	1
Quant. Anal.	87	13	0	0	8
Real Estate	79	19	2	0	58
Risk & Ins.	100	0	0	0	8
Transport & P.U.	25	25	25	25	4

Table 21. Marketing requirement by major - %

	Def. Require	Prob. Require	Prob. Not Require	Def. Not Require	N
Accounting	58	33	8	2	52
Actuarial Sci	60	20	20	0	5
Arts Admin.	100	0	0	0	9
Diversified	62	31	8	0	13
Bus. Statistics	0	100	0	0	1
Finance	71	26	2	1	288
Health Care F.	65	29	6	0	17
Health Serv. Adm.	53	37	11	0	19
Info. Systems	64	30	5	0	56
Internat'l. Bus.	83	17	0	0	24
Management	69	29	3	0	35
Marketing	91	9	0	0	114
Public Mgmt.	0	100	0	0	1
Quant. Anal.	50	38	13	0	8
Real Estate	55	40	3	2	58
Risk & Ins.	75	25	0	0	8
Transport & P.U.	25	75	0	0	4

Table 22. Organizational behavior requirement - by major - %

	Def. Require	Prob. Require	Prob. Not Require	Def. Not Require	N
Accounting	46	35	17	2	52
Actuarial Sci	60	20	20	0	5
Arts Admin.	91	0	9	0	9
Diversified	50	43	0	7	14
Bus. Statistics	0	100	0	0	1
Finance	44	31	20	5	288
Health Care F.	47	35	12	6	17
Health Serv. Adm.	37	42	16	5	19
Info. Systems	48	38	13	2	56
Internat'l. Bus.	67	17	13	4	24
Management	71	29	0	0	35
Marketing	52	36	11	1	114
Public Mgmt.	0	100	0	0	1
Quant. Anal.	50	25	25	0	8
Real Estate	31	38	26	5	58
Risk & Ins.	75	13	13	0	8
Transport & P.U.	0	75	25	0	4

Table 23. Statistics Requirement - by major... %

	Def. Require	Prob. Require	Prob. Not Require	Def. Not Require	N
Accounting	58	42	0	0	52
Actuarial Sci	20	60	20	0	5
Arts Admin.	75	0	25	0	8
Diversified	43	43	14	0	14
Bus. Statistics	100	0	0	0	1
Finance	76	20	3	0	287
Health Care F.	65	35	0	0	17
Health Serv. Adm.	58	26	16	0	19
Info. Systems	64	30	5	0	56
Internat'l. Bus.	83	17	0	0	23
Management	71	26	3	0	35
Marketing	73	25	3	0	113
Public Mgmt.	0	100	0	0	1
Quant. Anal.	63	38	0	0	8
Real Estate	55	36	9	0	58
Risk & Ins.	75	25	0	0	8
Transport & P.U.	50	50	0	0	4

Table 24. Mathematical analysis requirement - by major - %

	Def. Require	Prob. Require	Prob. Not Require	Def. Not Require	N
Accounting	38	54	8	0	52
Actuarial Sci	20	80	0	0	5
Arts Admin.	50	13	39	0	8
Diversified	69	8	23	0	13
Bus. Statistics	0	100	0	0	1
Finance	57	34	7	1	286
Health Care F.	53	29	18	0	17
Health Serv. Adm.	16	32	37	16	19
Info. Systems	47	40	12	0	57
Internat'l. Bus.	54	33	13	0	24
Management	51	34	11	3	35
Marketing	49	39	11	2	111
Public Mgmt.	0	100	0	0	1
Quant. Anal.	50	50	0	0	8
Real Estate	40	36	21	3	58
Risk & Ins.	63	25	0	12	8
Transport & P.U.	25	25	25	25	4

Table 25. Economics requirement - by major - %

	Def. Require	Prob. Require	Prob. Not Require	Def. Not Require	N
Accounting	46	48	6	0	52
Actuarial Sci	100	0	0	0	5
Arts Admin.	88	0	0	13	8
Diversified	79	14	7	0	14
Bus. Statistics	0	100	0	0	1
Finance	71	25	4	0	287
Health Care F.	53	35	12	0	17
Health Serv. Adm.	63	37	0	0	19
Info. Systems	63	34	2	2	56
Internat'l. Bus.	83	13	4	0	24
Management	53	41	6	0	34
Marketing	54	38	8	1	114
Public Mgmt.	100	0	0	0	1
Quant. Anal.	50	38	13	0	8
Real Estate	52	34	14	0	58
Risk & Ins.	75	25	0	0	8
Transport & P.U.	100	0	0	0	3

Table 26. Policy requirement -
by major - %

	Def. Require	Prob. Require	Prob. Not Require	Def. Not Require	N
Accounting	48	36	10	2	50
Actuarial Sci	80	20	0	0	5
Arts Admin.	50	33	17	0	6
Diversified	71	14	14	0	14
Bus. Statistics	100	0	0	0	1
Finance	67	26	6	1	291
Health Care F.	43	43	14	0	14
Health Serv. Adm.	44	44	0	13	16
Info. Systems	48	33	17	2	54
Internat'l. Bus.	63	25	8	4	24
Management	60	37	3	0	35
Marketing	65	27	4	4	114
Public Mgmt.	100	0	0	0	1
Quant. Anal.	88	13	0	0	8
Real Estate	20	52	8	3	61
Risk & Ins.	100	0	0	0	8
Transport & P.U.	50	25	0	25	4

Table 27. Advanced statistics
requirement - by major - %

	Def. Require	Prob. Require	Prob. Not Require	Def. Not Require	N
Accounting	30	48	20	2	54
Actuarial Sci	0	60	40	0	5
Arts Admin.	0	50	50	0	6
Diversified	21	43	36	0	14
Bus. Statistics	100	0	0	0	1
Finance	51	31	15	3	289
Health Care F.	43	25	31	0	16
Health Serv. Adm.	29	35	24	12	17
Info. Systems	39	39	18	4	56
Internat'l. Bus.	71	17	8	4	24
Management	40	34	20	6	35
Marketing	46	37	15	3	114
Public Mgmt.	100	0	0	0	1
Quant. Anal.	75	25	0	0	8
Real Estate	15	53	24	9	55
Risk & Ins.	50	25	25	0	8
Transport & P.U.	25	75	0	0	4

Table 28. Operations management requirement—by major—%

	Def. Require	Prob. Require	Prob. Not Require	Def. Not Require	N
Accounting	25	57	20	4	51
Actuarial Sci	60	40	0	0	5
Arts Admin.	33	50	17	0	6
Diversified	36	36	29	0	14
Bus. Statistics	0	100	0	0	1
Finance	26	43	23	7	287
Health Care F.	36	50	14	0	
Health Serv. Adm.	41	47	12	0	17
Info. Systems	38	42	20	0	55
Internat'l. Bus.	50	29	17	4	24
Management	34	43	20	3	35
Marketing	33	39	24	4	112
Public Mgmt.	100	0	0	0	1
Quant. Anal.	100	0	0	0	8
Real Estate	15	54	27	4	52
Risk & Ins.	50	25	25	0	8
Transport & P.U.	25	25	25	25	4

Table 29. Satisfaction with master's education at Wisconsin—by major—%

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very dissatisfied	N
Accounting	34	57	9	0	56
Actuarial Sci	89	11	0	0	9
Arts Admin.	73	9	9	9	11
Diversified	21	71	7	0	14
Bus. Statistics	100	0	0	0	1
Finance	26	54	18	2	292
Health Care F.	44	44	11	0	18
Health Serv. Adm.	27	59	9	5	22
Info. Systems	14	47	31	8	59
Internat'l. Bus.	24	60	8	8	25
Management	27	58	15	0	33
Marketing	31	57	12	0	117
Public Mgmt.	0	100	0	0	1
Quant. Anal.	13	63	25	0	8
Real Estate	62	35	3	0	66
Risk & Ins.	50	25	25	0	8
Transport & P.U.	0	75	25	0	4

Table 30. Still get degree at Wisconsin.—by major—%

	Yes	No	N
Accounting	98	2	54
Actuarial Sci	100	0	8
Arts Admin.	91	9	11
Diversified	93	7	14
Bus. Statistics	100	0	1
Finance	83	17	272
Health Care F.	100	0	18
Health Serv. Adm.	81	19	21
Info. Systems	77	23	57
Internat'l. Bus.	75	25	24
Management	94	6	33
Marketing	85	15	111
Public Mgmt.	100	0	1
Quant. Anal.	63	38	8
Real Estate	100	0	67
Risk & Ins.	100	0	8
Transport & P.U.	75	25	4

Table 31. Accepted position get. by major — %

	Yes	No	
Accounting	40	60	52
Actuarial Sci	33	67	9
Arts Admin.	27	73	11
Diversified	54	46	13
Bus. Statistics	100	0	1
Finance	27	73	286
Health Care F.	44	56	18
Health Serv. Adm.	43	57	21
Info. Systems	27	73	59
Internat'l. Bus.	17	83	24
Management	36	64	33
Marketing	27	73	117
Public Mgmt.	100	0	1
Quant. Anal.	25	75	8
Real Estate	25	75	67
Risk & Ins.	75	25	8
Transport & P.U.	0	100	4

Table 32. Was position obtained thru placement office — by major — %

	Yes	No	N
Accounting	81	19	21
Actuarial Sci	75	25	4
Arts Admin.	0	100	3
Diversified	0	100	7
Bus. Statistics	0	100	1
Finance	30	70	84
Health Care F.	56	44	9
Health Serv. Adm.	0	100	10
Info. Systems	53	47	17
Internat'l. Bus.	0	100	4
Management	8	92	13
Marketing	50	50	32
Public Mgmt.	0	100	1
Quant. Anal.	100	0	2
Real Estate	28	72	18
Risk & Ins.	20	80	5
Transport & P.U.	—	—	0

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

Students were invited to make comments on any aspect of the program. Approximately 40% of the respondents availed themselves of the opportunity. Their comments are categorized topically as follows:

Teaching methods	143	comments
Departments and majors	124	"
Curriculum and course requirements	115	"
Faculty	80	"
Computer services	45	"
Library facilities	36	"

The numbers given by categories exceed the total number of comments since many of the respondents made comments that fell in two or more categories and are thus repeated in the following listing by categories.

Comments are also subdivided by the date of graduation although in general there do not seem to be marked trends within the narrow time frame of this report. Adverse comments substantially outnumber favorable comments--probably in part reflecting the greater inclination of dissatisfied students to make written comments. Most of the comments expand on issues covered in the questionnaire. Readers of this report will find that reading these comments adds depth to the problems reflected by the distribution of check marks on the objective items in the questionnaire. A few new or otherwise underdeveloped issues surface that warrant special notice. Excessive class size prompts a number of comments with attendant observations on teaching methods that minimize student participation. A number of comments appear about the inadequacy of the late afternoon and evening program in serving the needs of part-time students. The desire for more "real world" applications in courses focuses to some degree on the respondents' perceptions that a number of the faculty lack experience in the things they teach about. Coupled with this is a feeling that the research bias of many faculty detracts from their interest in teaching and makes their courses too theoretical. There are also frequent comments about faculty turnover and its effect on the quality of the program.

In addition to items mentioned in the preceding paragraph that bring out issues not covered in the objective questionnaire, a substantial majority of the comments simply expand on points covered in the questionnaire--the inadequacy of computer and library facilities, deficiencies in terms of quantity and quality of course offerings, dissatisfaction with course content and teaching methods, the need for more and better academic support functions in admissions, advising, and placement, and the relative lack of contact and interaction with the business world.

It is difficult to put the results of these exit questionnaires into a meaningful context because we have no comparative data. How would UW-Whitewater or Northwestern University look if their graduates had completed the same questionnaire? How would the results in this time frame compare with results that might have been obtained in the period from 1970 to 1974? My own impression from having spent a substantial amount of hands-on time with the data is that the results leave little grounds for complacency and provide considerable food for thought as to ways in which improvements might be made even granting the harsh realities of budget and top administrative support that constrain the choices open to the administration and faculty of this School.