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**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

In accordance with college policy, the performance of each administrator in the Pamplin College of Business is formally evaluated every five years. The focus of the review is the individual's administrative activities and the accomplishments of the unit. This document is the report of the committee charged by Dean Sorensen with the responsibility for conducting the review for the Associate Dean for Graduate Programs. Dean Skripak has served in this capacity from August 2006 until the present. Under the Pamplin College of Business organization structure, the departments have primary responsibility for PhD programs, and Dean Skripak is responsible for all aspects of the three Master of Business Administration (MBA) programs: The resident program conducted on the Blacksburg campus; the Professional Master of Business Administration (PMBA) program conducted in Richmond and Roanoke; and the Executive Master of Business Administration (EMBA) conducted in Northern Virginia. The EMBA program and its director are being separately reviewed by another committee. Dean Skripak is responsible for the management and quality of the three MBA programs, as well as student recruitment, advising, job placement, and alumni relations. He also oversees hiring and maintaining highly qualified personnel in each of these programs.

The committee’s review has required the gathering of data from a number of individuals (faculty, secretaries, department heads and other administrators within the college, associate deans in comparable positions in other colleges of the university, other university administrators, and MBA faculty and students) and from other sources to evaluate Dean Skripak’s performance as an administrator and representative of the college. The report that follows provides detailed assessment of that data, leading the committee to a final conclusion that, during the current review period, Dean Skripak has done a commendable job under difficult circumstances that were largely beyond his control.

Comments and survey responses concerning Dean Skripak’s leadership skills, organizational abilities, honesty, integrity, and fairness, as well as his role as an advocate for the college were very favorable. He is seen as very well organized, an especially hard worker, and an articulate advocate for Pamplin College. His reputation as an ethical, honest, and collegial manager of graduate programs is particularly high outside the College. He was commended for his initiatives taken to combat the adversities of a soft market for MBA programs and their graduates.

In addition to the external sources, the committee reviewed Dean Skripak’s 2010-2011 annual report submitted to Dean Sorensen. As will be discussed below, the report disclosed problems the MBA programs have experienced and the steps taken to address those problems.

In summary, the Administrative Review Committee unanimously feels that Dean Skripak has done a commendable job of carrying out his duties under adverse circumstances. We recommend that he continue in this position.

**THE REVIEW PROCESS**

The Administrative Review Committee met with Dean Sorensen on September 6, 2011, to review the college's policy statement pertaining to the evaluation of college administrators and to initiate the review process. The composition of this committee consists of six faculty members of the Pamplin College and one department head. Gene Seago was selected as committee chair at this first meeting. Committee members are listed below:

Terry Cobb, Associate Professor of Management

Deborah Cook, Professor of Business Information Technology

Eloise Coupey, Associate Professor of Marketing

Ken McCleary, Professor of Hospitality & Tourism Management

George Morgan, Professor of Finance

Kent Nakamoto, Professor and Marketing Department Head

Gene Seago, Professor of Accounting and Information Systems

Dean Sorensen asked that the committee's report be received no later than November 4, 2011. In the discussion of the committee's charge, he noted that it was not necessary to solicit input from either him or Provost Mark McNamee because they would be the recipients of the report.

**Methodology**

As the foundation for this report, all 2010 and 2011 faculty, and students for the MBA and PMBA programs were asked to complete a survey related to their perceptions of job performance based upon their interactions with Dean Skripak in an official capacity. Administrators within and outside of the College who have a direct relationship with Dean Skripak were also asked to complete a survey. Survey respondents were asked to participate in the surveys on October 7 and reminded again a week later. Performance evaluations were also collected through a series of face-to-face interviews, phone calls and e-mail comments from administrators in other colleges as well as staff members who work for Dean Skripak. Feedback from these sources was collected between September 27 and October 21, 2011.

The questions asked in the online surveys were tailored to reflect Dean Skripak’s administrative relationship with the particular group. Participants were asked to evaluate Dean Skripak’s performance on a scale of 1 to 5. Personal interviews were conducted with the Pamplin College of Business department heads, the graduate programs staff, the coordinators of joint degree programs with other colleges, and the dean of the graduate school.

**Online Survey**

The online surveys consisted of statements about various aspects of Dean Skripak’s job performance. All of these were positively framed. Respondents indicated the extent to which they disagreed or agreed with each statement by choosing one of the following responses: *strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree,* or *strongly agree.*

**Face-to-face Interviews and E-Mail Comments**

Perceptions of Dean Skripak’s performance as Associate Dean were solicited directly from faculty, students, and staff. The respondents were given the opportunity to meet in person with members of the committee or to provide comments electronically on the following dimensions of performance: (1) representation of the college at the university level, (2) leadership abilities, (3) honesty and integrity, (4) planning and organizational skills, (5) timeliness in meeting deadlines, (6) strengths and weaknesses, (7) overall performance in the position of Associate Dean, and (8) any other factors the respondent considers important.

**Objective Measures**

In additiontosurveying faculty, administrators, and students, the Committee inlcuded some objective measures of the success of the MBA programs under Dean Skripak’s charge. The measures selected and our assessments will be discussed in a later portion of this report.

### 

### The Results of the Surveys

The results of this survey showed generally strong approval of Dean Skripak’s performance (see Attachment 1). Table 1 of Attachment 1 contains responses to the summary question broken down by administrative staff. Table 2 contains the responses from the MBA and PMBA faculty, and Table 3 is the survey results from MBA and PMBA students. Dean Skripak consistently received scores of over 4.0, which indicates the participants in the study are pleased with Dean Skripak’s leadership.

The lowest scores that Dean Skripak received related to admission standards for the programs, but even these scores were midrange (above 3.0). Comments on this issue were submitted by faculty and students, as will be further discussed below.

Based on the data in Attachment 1, Dean Skripak scores in the “high 3s” to “mid-4s” across all questions related to his office operations, representation of Pamplin’s graduate programs, and the conduct of the MBA and PMBA programs. Those issues with standard deviations of 1.0 and higher, as well as those with mean scores of less than 4.0 are worth further consideration. On the whole the open-ended responses seem to be well thought out and provide considered elaboration on the rankings provided. The open ended comments of faculty and staff members are presented in Attachment 2, below.

#### Administrator-Staff Survey Results

Because the staff constituted unacceptably small numbers, to assure confidentiality, they were grouped with other administrators in this survey. Overall, the administrator-staff results indicate that respondents believe Dean Skripak performance as Dean of Graduate programs is very good to excellent both working externally (e.g., representing the graduate programs to others) and internally (e.g., the conduct of office operations).

#### Faculty Survey Results

Overall, responding faculty who teach in the MBA and PMBA programs indicate that Dean Skripak’s performance is good. Respondents indicate that Dean Skripak and his staff are generally responsive to their needs and the needs of the students. One possible area for review by Dean Skripak might be the faculty perception about the criteria for admission to the on-campus MBA program.

Respondents also gave Dean Skripak overall good performance reviews for the administration of the program. Areas that may need attention include developing and integrating the curriculum, and promoting the program to potential students. Open-ended comments indicate, however, that many respondents believe Dean Skripak is in a difficult position with regard to working with the curriculum because he has little line authority to do so.

**Student Survey Results**

When the students’ responses for the MBA and PMBA programs are aggregated, Dean Skripak received good marks for how he and his staff run the MBA and PMBA programs. Separating the aggregate results into MBA and PMBA sets, however, show differences in perceptions between the students of the two programs. MBA students generally give lower marks for scheduling courses, curriculum design, and the overall worth of the program while PMBA respondents give higher marks on these issues. PMBA respondents, on the other hand, give lower marks to support of job searching than MBA students.

Open ended responses from MBA students (see Attachment 3) generally note Dean Skripak’s difficult position in regard to controlling the curriculum and the course instructors. There are a number of comments as well about the need to improve the selection of instructors. Only three comments were offered by PMBA respondents with one mentioning the need for periodic program review of the curriculum. These comments are reproduced in Attachment 3.

**Overall Performance of Dean Skripak According to Respondents**

Overall, the survey results indicate that Dean Skripak does a very good job in his position as Associate Dean for Graduate Programs. The most common summary comment offered by respondents was “Steve does an excellent job under extremely difficult circumstances.”

**Interviews and Results**

The conclusions presented represent a synthesis of the personal interviews and are organized along the same dimensions as the interview questions: 1) representation of the college at the university level; 2) leadership abilities; 3) honesty and integrity; 4) planning and organizational skills; 5) timeliness in meeting deadlines; 6) strengths and weaknesses; 7) overall performance in the position of Associate Dean.

**Representation of the College at the University Level**

Dean Skripak was uniformly viewed as a very strong and articulate representative of Pamplin College in dealings with members of the broader university community. Comments often reflect a substantial respect for Dean Skripak’s ethics and adherence to standards of academic excellence. The committee feels Dean Skripak does an excellent job on this dimension.

**Leadership**

Department heads within the college as well as the administrators of joint degree programs in engineering, building construction and the Via Medical College agree that Dean Skripak possesses and exercises strong leadership skills. One administrator commented that, “Steve is a talented and experienced person from whom both students and faculty can benefit.” One administrator commented that “the college is lucky to have someone like Dean Skripak in this position. ” Another offered that, “Steve is a hardworking professional administrator that is fair to all.” Several respondent noted that Dean Skripak faces difficulties dealing with faculty issues because the faculty member may feel his or her supervisor is the department head, rather than Dean Skripak.

**Honesty and Integrity**

Dean Skripak consistently received high marks in terms of honesty and integrity. One administrator commented that in regard to integrity, “Steve was an exemplar to the faculty and administration.”

**Planning and Organizational Skills**

The feedback on Dean Skripak’s planning and organizational skills were uniformly positive. Several respondents indicated that he is constantly trying to address challenges in regard to the future of the MBA programs, and is constantly searching for niches that the program might serve.

**Strengths and Weaknesses**

As the above indicates, Dean Skripak is widely viewed as being a very effective leader with good organizational skills. He is considered to be a very effective and articulate spokesperson for the Pamplin College in dealing with other colleges and the graduate school.   
While he is highly regarded by faculty, staff and students within the College, he is especially highly regarded by those persons outside the College who had worked with him on the joint degree programs. Moreover, he is generally viewed by all the groups surveyed as a very hard worker who is determined to make the MBA programs successful.

No weaknesses were noted for Dean Skripak, but several respondents noted the obstacles he faces in achieving success. As mentioned above, he lacks direct control over the faculty, course content and scheduling.

**Objective Measures**

In addition to the opinions of those who work with or who are served by Dean Skripak, there are some objective measures of success in administering an MBA program. The Committee believes there are four important indicators of the success of an MBA program: (1) published rankings, (2) number of applications for admission, (3) job placement rate of recent graduates, and (4) starting salaries of graduates. Each of these measures is provided in Dean Skripak’s 2010-2011 Annual Report. The discussion below relates primarily to the on-campus MBA program.

The Virginia Tech MBA program was ranked 73rd by the US News & World Report survey. The ranking is based on a composite of the other three indicators listed above, combined with GMAT scores, and undergraduate GPA. The Committee feels that achieving this ranking is a modest success: Virginia Tech ranked higher than College of William & Mary, North Carolina State, University of Pittsburg, Louisiana State University, University of Oregon, Florida State University, and University of Oklahoma. Virginia Tech’s MBA program was ranked a few places below the University of South Carolina, University of Georgia, and the University of Tennessee.

The number of applications for admission is best evaluated in terms of trends. The number of applications for admission for 2011 was slightly below the 2006 level. This is after a dramatic increase in 2009 followed by similarly dramatic (40%) decrease in 2010. Declines in applications have occurred nationally in most MBA programs. The decline in applications nationally has been attributed to current economic conditions,[[1]](#footnote-1) which have undoubtedly contributed to the decline in applications to the Virginia Tech programs. Attaining a turnaround in applications will be a serious challenge.

Job placement is another cause for concern. Only 57% of the 2010 graduating class were employed within 90 days of graduation. Some of this low placement rate can be attributed to economic conditions. For those who attained jobs, however, their starting salaries were impressive, an average of slightly over $70,000 per year, which was approximately $20,000 greater than undergraduate starting salaries.

In conclusion, based on the Committee’s measure, the on-campus MBA program has achieved some notoriety, as evidenced by its ranking by the US News survey. However, the program needs much improvement in terms of applications for admission and the placement of its graduate. This lack of success may be due to general economic conditions and not the result of the administration of the program.

Dean Skripak has responded to these challenges by promoting the joint degree initiatives with other colleges in the university and by seeking to develop internship programs with employers. The joint programs have not attracted a significant number of students, but they were only recently begun. Over half (53%) of the first year students had summer internships in 2010. Dean Skripak has used tuition surcharges to recruit students and to attract more employers to campus. He has also proposed a new masters program that would attract non-business graduates without prior work experiences.

In summary, the on-campus MBA program is experiencing difficulties that are largely beyond Dean Skripak’s control. He has devoted considerable effort to overcoming problems that may be mitigated when the economy improves.

**SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

In conclusion, the Administrative Review Committee unanimously feels that Dean Skripak is doing a very good job overall and an excellent job on some dimensions. We recommend that he should continue in this position. We believe that Dean Skripak performs his duties very competently and serves as an excellent and highly- respected representative of the College to the wider university. Moreover, he is well suited to addressing some formidable challenges.

**Attachment 1**

### Table 1: Administrative-Staff Survey Results

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequencies** | | | | |  | | |  |
| **Dean Skripak:-** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **M** | **SD** |
| Exhibits good planning and organizational skills. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | **4.6** | 0.5 |
| Exhibits good leadership qualities. | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 | **4.3** | 1.0 |
| Exhibits honesty and integrity in his interactions. | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 | **4.3** | 1.0 |
| Is willing to discuss problems and suggestions related to Pamplin Graduate Programs. | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | **4.3** | 0.8 |
| Is successful in meeting deadlines. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | **4.6** | 0.7 |
| Is effective in providing information and support for faculty committees. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | **4.3** | 0.7 |
| Is effective in addressing problems that are brought to him by students. | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | **4.1** | 0.8 |
| Is effective in achieving results that are in the best interest of the College. | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 5 | **4.1** | 1.1 |
| Communicates effectively with other Pamplin Deans. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | **4.3** | 0.8 |
| Communicates effectively with department heads. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | **3.8** | 1.0 |
| Communicates effectively with the faculty. | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | **3.8** | 1.2 |
| Is effective in representing the Pamplin Graduate Programs to other departments and divisions at Virginia Tech. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 | **4.4** | 1.0 |
| Notes: N = 12; Response Rate = 71%; M= Mean; SD = Standard Deviation; 1=Strongly Disagree, 3=Neutral,  5=Strongly Agree,  \*=Not enough information | | | | | | | | | |

**Table 1: Administrative-Staff Survey Results (Continued)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequencies** | | | | |  |  |
| **Dean Skripak:** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **M** | **SD** |
| Is effective in representing the Pamplin Graduate Program to University administrators. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | **4.6** | 0.5 |
| Is effective in representing the Pamplin Graduate Program to other institutions. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | **4.6** | 0.5 |
| Is effective in obtaining resources for the Pamplin Graduate Program. | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | **4.2** | 0.9 |
| Uses funds allocated to the Pamplin Graduate Program wisely. | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | **4.4** | 0.9 |
| Is effective in hiring and supervising staff. | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | **4.3** | 1.1 |
| Communicates effectively with the staff of the Dean's office. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4.3** | 0.8 |
| Assigns work to staff in a fair manner. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | **4.2** | 0.8 |
| Distributes resources to staff in a fair manner. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | **4.4** | 0.9 |
| Is effective in implementing those elements of the College of Business strategic plan that are relevant to the Graduate Program. | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | **4.2** | 0.8 |
| Is effective in promoting the Pamplin Graduate Program to potential employers of our graduate students. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | **4.4** | 0.7 |
| Is effective in promoting the Pamplin Graduate Program to potential graduate students. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | **4.4** | 0.7 |
| Notes: N = 12; Response Rate = 71%; M= Mean; SD = Standard Deviation; 1=Strongly Disagree, 3=Neutral, 5=Strongly Agree. Responses of “Not enough information” not reported. | | | | | | | |

### Table 2: MBA and PMBA Faculty Survey Results

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequencies** | | | | |  |  |
| **Dean Skripak and his staff : †** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **M** | **SD** |
| Are responsive to my needs as a faculty member. | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 15 | **4.3** | 1.2 |
| Do an effective job scheduling courses. | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 11 | **4.2** | 0.9 |
| Provide strong support in terms of classroom needs (projectors, seating, etc). | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 8 | **4.1** | 1.0 |
| Do an effective job of advising graduate students. | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | **4.1** | 1.2 |
| Do an effective supporting job search activities of our students. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | **4.1** | 1.0 |
| Do an effective job helping students in the admissions process into the graduate program. | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | **3.9** | 1.2 |
| Are effective in addressing problems brought to them by students. | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 9 | **4.3** | 0.9 |
| **Dean Skripak:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supports the faculty when dealing with difficult student issues. | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 10 | **4.1** | 1.3 |
| Helps facilitate cross-course integration of the curriculum. | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 7 | **3.7** | 1.2 |
| Does an effective job advocating for the kind of curriculum needed in a quality graduate program. | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 8 | **3.8** | 1.4 |
| Is effective in promoting the Pamplin Graduate Program to potential graduate students. | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4 | **3.8** | 1.0 |
| Exhibits good planning and organizational skills. | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 10 | **4.1** | 1.1 |
| Is successful in meeting deadlines. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | **4.5** | 0.7 |
| Exhibits good leadership qualities. | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 12 | **4.4** | 1.0 |
| Exhibits honestly and integrity in his interactions. | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 15 | **4.6** | 1.0 |
| Communicates effectively with the faculty. | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 13 | **4.1** | 1.3 |
| Communicates effectively with department heads. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | **4.6** | 0.8 |
| Is effective in providing information and support for faculty committees. | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | **4.1** | 0.9 |
| Is effective in obtaining resources for the Pamplin Graduate Program. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | **4.0** | 1.0 |
| Uses funds allocated to the Pamplin Graduate Program wisely. | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 | **4.0** | 1.3 |
| How would you assess the admission standards of the MBA programs? †† | 2 | 4 | 11 | 1 | 0 | **2.6** | 0.8 |
| Notes: N = 22; Response Rate = 54%. Responding Faculty teaching in 1, 2, & 3 programs (N=11, 8, 3 respectively); M= Mean; SD = Standard Deviation; † 1=Strongly Disagree, 3=Neutral, 5=Strongly Agree.  †† 1=Far too low, 3=About right, 5=Far too high. Responses of “Not enough information” not reported. One MBA respondent indicated that he/she should have been classified as PMBA faculty. | | | | | | | |

### Table 3: MBA and PMBA Student Survey Results

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MBA Respondents**: N=45; Response Rate=47% | **Frequencies** | | | | |  |  |
| **The graduate office and its staff:-** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **M** | **SD** |
| Do an effective job at advising. | 1 | 4 | 5 | 18 | 17 | **4.0** | 1.03 |
| Do an effective job at supporting job search for its students. | 3 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 24 | **4.2** | 1.14 |
| Do an effective job at scheduling courses so that they are available when needed. | 2 | 6 | 8 | 16 | 13 | **3.7** | 1.16 |
| Do an effective job making sure the curriculum covers the kind of courses I need. | 2 | 6 | 6 | 20 | 10 | **3.7** | 1.12 |
| Did an effective job of helping me in the admissions process of the graduate program. | 4 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 22 | **4.0** | 1.27 |
| Have been responsive to my needs during my studies in the graduate program. | 3 | 1 | 3 | 23 | 15 | **4.0** | 1.06 |
| Dean Skripak himself is available to deal with difficult issues. | 2 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 22 | **4.2** | 1.10 |
| The admission standards for the program are at an appropriate level. | 3 | 3 | 11 | 20 | 7 | **3.6** | 1.07 |
| Overall, I believe the benefits of the graduate program are worth the costs. | 3 | 5 | 5 | 17 | 13 | **3.7** | 1.22 |
| **PMBA Respondents:** N=14; Response Rate=30% | **Frequencies** | | | | |  |  |
| **The graduate office and its staff:** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **M** | **SD** |
| Do an effective job at advising. | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 6 | **4.0** | 1.00 |
| Do an effective job at supporting job search for its students. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | **3.6** | 0.98 |
| Do an effective job at scheduling courses so that they are available when needed. | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | **4.2** | 0.93 |
| Do an effective job making sure the curriculum covers the kind of courses I need. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | **4.2** | 0.99 |
| Did an effective job of helping me in the admissions process of the graduate program. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 11 | **4.6** | 0.84 |
| Have been responsive to my needs during my studies in the graduate program. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | **4.4** | 0.51 |
| Dean Skripak himself is available to deal with difficult issues. | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | **4.1** | 1.27 |
| The admission standards for the program are at an appropriate level. | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 2 | **3.8** | 1.01 |
| Overall, I believe the benefits of the graduate program are worth the costs. | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 6 | **4.2** | 0.83 |
| Notes: M= Mean; SD = Standard Deviation; 1=Strongly Disagree, 3=Neutral, 5=Strongly Agree. Responses of “Not enough information” not reported. | | | | | | | |

**Table 3: MBA and PMBA Student Survey Results (Continued)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total All Respondents**: N=59; Response Rate=42% | **Frequencies** | | | | |  |  |
| **The graduate office and its staff:** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **M** | **SD** |
| Do an effective job at advising. | 1 | 4 | 11 | 19 | 23 | **4.0** | 1.02 |
| Do an effective job at supporting job search for its students. | 3 | 2 | 5 | 16 | 25 | **4.1** | 1.13 |
| Do an effective job at scheduling courses so that they are available when needed. | 2 | 7 | 9 | 21 | 19 | **3.8** | 1.13 |
| Do an effective job making sure the curriculum covers the kind of courses I need. | 2 | 7 | 8 | 24 | 16 | **3.8** | 1.10 |
| Did an effective job of helping me in the admissions process of the graduate program. | 4 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 33 | **4.2** | 1.20 |
| Have been responsive to my needs during my studies in the graduate program. | 3 | 1 | 3 | 30 | 20 | **4.1** | 0.98 |
| Dean Skripak himself is available to deal with difficult issues. | 2 | 3 | 5 | 12 | 27 | **4.2** | 1.12 |
| The admission standards for the program are at an appropriate level. | 4 | 3 | 13 | 28 | 9 | **3.6** | 1.05 |
| Overall, I believe the benefits of the graduate program are worth the costs. | 3 | 5 | 8 | 21 | 19 | **3.9** | 1.15 |
| Notes: M= Mean; SD = Standard Deviation; 1=Strongly Disagree, 3=Neutral, 5=Strongly Agree. Responses of “Not enough information” not reported. | | | | | | | |

### 
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