1979

University Without Walls: A Comparative Analysis of Student and Faculty/Staff Opinions from Seven Selected Institutions

Kenneth W. Stetson
Loyola University Chicago

UNIVERSITY WITHOUT WALLS: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF STUDENT AND FACULTY/STAFF OPINIONS FROM SEVEN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

By

Kenneth Winslow Stetson

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

September

1978

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. Allan C. Ornstein, my dissertation advisor, for his support and penetrating advice. His demanding standards are both appreciated and respected.

My greatest debt is to my wife, Dixie, who has been an understanding partner throughout this undertaking. Without her constant encouragement, tolerance, endurance, and humor, I might never have finished the task. To my children--Jeff, Debbie, Steve, Mark--my heartfelt thanks for understanding and support over the years.

I also wish to thank my parents whose continuing encouragement and support helped me through more than two decades of higher education. My perseverance is a tribute to their counsel, guidance and endurance.

Finally, my thanks to Florence Levy who made numerous contributions to the manuscript throughout its development.

VITA

The author, Kenneth Winslow Stetson, was born March 21, 1937 in Alton, Illinois. His elementary education was obtained in public schools in Wisconsin, New Jersey, and Illinois. His secondary education was at East Alton-Wood River Community High School, Wood River, Illinois, where he graduated in 1955.

He entered the University of Wisconsin (Madison) and in June, 1961 was awarded a Bachelor of Science with majors in history and English.

In September, 1961 he began teaching at the senior high school in Jefferson, Wisconsin. He taught American History, English and International Relations. In 1963 he became the Social Studies Department Chairperson.

In June, 1963 he returned to the University of Wisconsin to begin work on a Masters degree in history. During the summer of 1965, he was awarded and NDEA fellowship to Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey to study late-Nineteenth Century American History. In summer, 1966 he received an NDEA fellowship to the University of Chicago to study American Colonial History. During the 1966-67 academic year, he was the recipient of a National Science Foundation grant to study economics at the University of Washington in Seattle.

In August, 1967 he was awarded a Master of Science from the University of Wisconsin (Madison). The title of his thesis was "A

Quantitative Approach to Britain's American Slave Trade, 1700-1773."

In July, 1968 he accepted a position at Kankakee Community College, Kankakee, Illinois as Assistant Professor and Social Science Divison Chairperson.

In December, 1969 his Masters slave trade research was published in Philip Curtin's The Atlantic Slave Trade: A Census.

In July, 1971 he accepted an administrative position at Northeastern Illinois University as admission officer in the Graduate College.

In October, 1972 he was admitted to the doctoral program in Curriculum and Instruction at Loyola University of Chicago.

In September, 1973 he accepted the position of Coordinator of Northeastern Illinois University's University Without Walls (UWW) program. In October of the same year, he was granted rank of Assistant Professor in the History Department. During September, 1974 he was given additional responsibility and appointed Associate Director of the Center for Program Development. He was awarded a sabbatical leave from July 1 through December 31, 1976.

In January, 1977 he was appointed Acting Assistant of the Vice President of Academic Affairs at Northeastern. In September of the same year, he accepted the position of Assistant to the Provost at Northeastern Illinois University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CONTENTS FOR APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

NATURE OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Nontraditional educational endeavors in higher education are not new; but in the past decade, such efforts in American higher education have grown steadily. Some institutions have been entirely dedicated to nontraditional approaches leading to baccalaureate degrees. New York's Empire State Program, for example, enrolled more than 3,300 students during the 1975-76 academic year at more than one hundred separate sites throughout the state.[1] More than 5,500 people graduated from the New York State Regents Program between 1972 and 1977.[2] Some nontraditional educational programs have also been tried on a nationwide basis. The purpose of this dissertation is to examine one of the national efforts in nontraditionalism--"University Without Walls."

The Problem

The University Without Walls (UWW) network began in Yellow Springs, Ohio and is part of the Union for Experimenting Colleges and

---

[1] College and University Enrollment in New York State: Fall, 1976; Preliminary Report (Albany: University of the State of New York, 1976), p. 10.

[2] Rex Reports: Newsletter of the Regents External Degrees (Albany: University of the State of New York, 1977), p. 7.

Universities (UECU), a consortium of institutions founded in 1964.[3] In July 1977, the administrative offices of UECU moved to Cincinnati, Ohio. The UWW Network represents a coordinated national effort to address the academic needs of a broadly based constituency not generally served by higher educational institutions in the United States. As stated in its initial summary, students enroll "in programs which constitute a distinct alternative to usual college offerings for undergraduates. Students range in age from 16 to 73."[4] Many non-traditional programs have been developed at other colleges and universities, but the present study is aimed only at UWW programs affiliated with UECU.

Although originally located at Antioch College, UECU is an independent entity. The Union, as it is commonly known, presently has 28 member institutions (see Appendix A), but each institution does not necessarily participate in all Union-related activities, programs or experiments--only half participated in UWW initially, for example. The most ambitious undergraduate experiment sponsored by UECU to date remains University Without Walls--a nationwide network of baccalaureate degree programs housed on fourteen specific campuses

---

[3]Antioch College, Bard College, Bennington College, Chicago Teachers College-North, Goddard College, Monteith College of Wayne State University, Masson College, New College of Hofstra University, Reed College, Sarah Lawrence College, and Stephens College.

[4]University Without Walls: First Report (Yellow Springs, Ohio: The Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities, 1972), p.4.

of Union members which began accepting students in 1971.[5] This network received financial support in the same year from the Ford Foundation and the U. S. Office of Education. In addition to supporting the central offices at Yellow Springs, the money was used to help underwrite the initial costs of each charter UWW program or unit. Each cooperating institution thus received approximately $40,000 over a three year period.[6]

Despite this apparent common background, the Union's University Without Walls network has been a mixed collection of programs--having almost as many differences as similarities. The purpose of the present study is to examine several of the largest programs and to determine selected strengths and weaknesses of this educational experiment. The programs to be examined are Antioch West, Chicago State University, Loretto Heights College, Northeastern Illinois University, Stephens College, University of Massachusetts, and the University of Minnesota. There are two purposes in this approach--first, to identify common programmatic features which transcend individual programs and, second, to examine both student and faculty views of this educational endeavor.

---

[5]Antioch College, Bard College, Chicago State College, Friends World College, Goddard College, Howard University, Loretto Heights College, New College (Sarasota), Northeastern Illinois State College, Roger Williams College, Stephens College, University of Massachusetts, University of Minnesota, and the University of South Carolina. Additional UWW programs were added at other institutions over the years, bringing the total to twenty-eight currently.

[6]Ernest Boyer and George Keller, "The Big Move to Non-Campus Colleges," Saturday Review 54 (July 17, 1971): 48.

The Rationale

The University Without Walls network, affiliated with the Union, is a nationwide educational undertaking utilizing common programmatic guidelines and educational philosophies. It seems apparent that such types of broadly based, easily accessible, flexible undergraduate degree programs are increasing. As Valley has noted, "from 1970 to 1974, approximately 30 state public education systems had either planned such programs or had appointed groups to see to their implementation."[7]

However, with the exception of the Union's initial summary of the University Without Walls effort, First Report, there has been no comprehensive examination of this educational undertaking. For example, an early evaluation team from the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools notes that its "observations and evaluation comments...are meant to be tentative."[8] A formal accreditation visit by the North Central Association is currently underway, however.

The present study should help to provide information about UECU/UWW in general as well as about the selected individual units within the UWW network. The increasing student population of UWW, from 2,211 students in 1972 to 3,784 students in 1974, indicates that

---

[7] John Valley, "Diversity Plus 2," College Board Review 96 Summer 1975): 17.

[8] Report of A Visit to Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities/University Without Walls, October 29-31, 1975, by Donald J. McCarty, Chairperson, p. 12.

this educational experiment has grown, although it remains a small program nationally.[9] Unfortunately, comparable enrollment data is not currently available because UECU now maintains student records only for the Union degree programs, not all programs with UWW students as reflected in the pre-1975 figures.

The Significance

The descriptive analysis of the seven selected programs should contribute additional information toward an overall examination of nontraditional approaches and degree programs in higher education. London points out that it is important to identify common elements in nontraditional programs "that would establish in the public's mind a view of nontraditional education not dissimilar from the view of traditional education."[10] Such issues as the length of time needed to acquire a degree, the kinds of learning activities to be incorporated into a degree-awarding process, and even whether or not to build new buildings or physical facilities, are all tied to the increasing growth of nontraditional endeavors. In this connection, it is anticipated that the present study could provide additional insight into these issues.

It is further hoped that the two segments of higher education--students and institutions--will gain from the study. For students,

---

[9]UECU/UWW student enrollment data; from Higher Education Graduate Information Systems (HEGIS) Reports, October 1 of each year.

[10]Herbert I. London, "The Case for Nontraditional Education," Change 8 (June 1976): 29.

there are many different options from which to choose, but not all should be viewed as equally productive for each specific student. Since UWW programs are quite new, not all programs can meet comprehensive academic needs. For example, Florida International University and Northeastern Illinois University provide limited program offerings for students wishing to become certified teachers.[11] Students in other UWW programs, such as Chicago State University and Hispanic International University, are not eligible for Veterans Administration benefits because of problems with the local UWW degree-granting process or institutional status.

Many institutions need to examine new directions, programs and curricular options as well. Moreover, a major issue facing colleges and universities today deals with the entire spectrum of change from students and programs to faculty and technology. Every nontraditional or innovative program will not suit each institution, of course, but with the additional information resulting from the present study, interested campuses should be aided in considering one or more options. However, long-term academic considerations are necessary regardless of the thrust of specific programs.

> One can applaud much of the attempt to innovate at the college level. However...all of the educational technology, new delivery systems of education, self-paced programming, and modular packaging cannot be better than the content which is conveyed...Overzealous innovative attempts that ignore these

---

[11] Northeastern Illinois University is the present name of Chicago Teachers College-North, a charter member of UECU in 1964.

> crucial functions are bound, in the long run to become vacuous.[12]

It is thus the purpose of the present study to assist students and institutions by presenting a comprehensive descriptive analysis of selected portions of one nontraditional endeavor--University Without Walls.

Definition of Terms

There is little agreement on the definition of nontraditional study; yet, an agreed-upon definition is important since that term forms the backdrop of many of today's innovative approaches in higher education. Gould and Cross define nontraditional education as "a group of changing educational patterns caused by changing needs of society,"[13] while Cross and Valley define it as the "explicit recognition that education should be measured by what a student knows rather than how or where he learns it."[14] The Carnegie Commission Study on Nontraditional Study concludes that "nontraditional study is more an attitude than a system and thus can never be defined except tangentially."[15] More recently Knowles pointed out that "'non-traditional study'

---

[12] Samuel E. Kellans, "Knowledge Renewal with Innovation," College and University Journal 13 (May 1974)

[13] Samuel Gould and K. Patricia Cross, eds., Explorations in Nontraditional Study (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972), p. 10.

[14] K. Patricia Cross, John Valley and Associates, Planning Nontraditional Programs: An Analysis of the Issues of Postsecondary Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974), p. 1.

[15] Samuel B. Gould, Chairman, Commission on Nontraditional Study, Diversity by Design (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973), p. xv.

...has a negative flavor and provides no clues as to the territory it is intended to describe."[16]

For the purposes of the present study, nontraditional study in higher education means flexible utilization of educational resources without conventional restrictions as to time limitations or geographic boundaries. Nontraditional study also means that there is no single method to achieve an educational goal in higher education, rather several different activities may be undertaken which would lead to the desired goal.

Collegiate nontraditional study often culminates in a baccalaureate degree. As a result, the term "external degree" is often associated with college-level nontraditional study. However, external degree programs represent only a small part of the total nontraditional education concept. A much larger part of nontraditional study is associated with nondegree educational pursuits, commonly referred to as adult or continuing education. Houle provides a basic definition of an external degree.

> An external degree is one awarded to an individual on the basis of some program of preparation (devised either by himself or by an educational institution) which is not centered on traditional patterns of residential collegiate or university study.[17]

---

[16]Malcolm S. Knowles, "Non-Traditional Study: Issues and Resolutions," Adult Education 8 (February 1975): 232.

[17]Cyril O. Houle, The External Degree (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973), p. 14.

Shulman has noted that "the phrase 'external degree' does not refer to any standardized type of degree program, but is a rubric for a variety of programs designed to deal with acknowledged needs in higher education."[18] Splaver has defined external degrees as being awarded on the "basis of all or most of the credits or competencies having been accumulated or acquired 'externally' beyond the college campus rather than 'internally' on the college campus in traditional classrooms or laboratories."[19]

There are several features usually found in external degree programs. Generally these programs are designed to serve working adults who often find traditional residency requirements insurmountable. These programs also assume that learning does not need to be confined to a single location or to any specific block of time. Further, availability, individualized curricular options and accessibility are features of most external degree programs.

University Without Walls is a specific kind of external degree program. UWW is not a copyrighted term and there are many programs which are identified by that acronym. However, for the purposes of the present study, UWW refers only to those degree-granting programs (see Appendix A) which are affiliated with the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities.

---

[18]Carol H. Shulman, "A Look at External Degree Structures," Research Currents: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education (November 1972): 1.

[19]Sarah Splaver, Nontraditional College Routes to Careers (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1975), p. 174.

Background of the Problem

Sponsored and partially administered by the Union, twenty-eight member institutions offer separate and distinct UWW programs. Although all units subscribe to certain basic programmatic tenets, each program is autonomous but can be grouped into one of three general categories--public host institution, private host institution, and independent/affiliated units.

Public host, or state-supported, institutions usually offer the institution's degree rather than the UECU/UWW degree (commonly called the Union degree). The ten public host institutions currently offering UWW programs are Chicago State University, Community College of Baltimore, Florida International University, Governors State University, Morgan State College, Northeastern Illinois University, University of Alabama/New College, University of Massachusetts, University of Minnesota, and the University of Wisconsin/Green Bay.

Private host institutions are those privately endowed or independent institutions which do not receive direct state support, although they also utilize their institution's degree in their UWW program rather than the Union degree. Thirteen private host institutions in the UECU/UWW network are Antioch College, Bard College, Berkeley/UWW, Goddard College, Hofstra University, Friends World College, Johnston College/University of Redlands, Loretto Heights College, Roger Williams College, Shaw University, Skidmore College, Stephens College, University of Pacific.

The five independent or affilitated units belonging to the Union are

small, private educational entities whose sole degree-granting capability is through UECU. Originally given degree-granting status by the Regents of the State of Ohio in 1971, the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities also received Candidacy Status through the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools in 1975. The five independent/affiliated UWW units in this group are: UWW/Flaming Rainbow (Tahlequah, Oklahoma); Hispanic International University (Houston, Texas); Universidad Boricua (Washington, D.C.); Universidad de Campesinos Libres (Fresno, California); and the University of California, San Diego (UWW/Tutorial Degree Program only is available through UECU).

In addition, two other UWW programs, UWW/Providence and UWW/Ohio, are affiliated with UECU as direct-entry programs. These two special units, administered through UECU's central offices in Cincinnati, are totally dependent upon the Union for all services--academic, financial, record-keeping, reporting--and will not be considered in this study.

Host institutions which sponsor UWW programs and have their own degree-granting capability--whether public or private--are clearly less dependent upon UECU than are the independent/affiliated units whose only degree capacity lies with the Union's degree-awarding mechanism.

Limitations

The present study examined seven programs (four public and three private) in the UECU/UWW network. No units from the independent/affiliated group were included in the study since most of the UWW

programs sponsored by these units vary considerably, serve a very small clientele, and are special mission, ethnic-based educational efforts. In the fall of 1974, less than 8 percent of the total students in the UECU/UWW network were part of these units, that is 286 out of 3,783 students.[20] No comparable data exists, however, to assess the current student distribution since UECU maintains student records only for UECU/UWW degree students.

The seven representative units chosen were selected from the public and private institutions based upon these criteria: size of student population, length of time in existence, geographic location, and number of graduates. While there will be no "typical" UWW unit in any category, the descriptive analysis should make it possible to make some workable generalizations about the effectiveness of this educational undertaking. It is clear, nonetheless, that there are differences--both academic and philosophical--within the University Without Walls network.

The public UWW units included in the present study are Chicago State University, Northeastern Illinois University, University of Massachusetts, and the University of Minnesota. Antioch West, Loretto Heights College, and Stephens College are the private UWW units included in the present investigation.

It must be pointed out, however, that the present study focused on only the UWW programs affiliated with the UECU network; it did not attempt to address the total issue of nontraditional programs in

---

[20]"UWW Self Study Task Force," October 7, 1976, p. 12. (Mimeographed.)

higher education nor deal with other UWW programs not part of the UECU network.[21] Numerous books have been written on the overall topic of nontraditional education, and it is not the purpose of this study to repeat the same general discussion.[22] The UECU/UWW experiment is only one of many individual efforts which fall under the umbrella concept of nontraditional approaches in higher education.

---

[21]The latter include Howard University and New York University, for example.

[22]See Gould Diversity by Design; Cross and Valley Planning Non-Traditional Programs; Carnegie Commission, Less Time, More Options: Education Beyond High School (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971); K. Patricia Cross, Beyond the Open Door (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The UECU/UWW network can be considered a specialized external degree program which itself can be considered part of a larger concept--nontraditional education. Since these terms are closely related, this chapter will be divided into several sections, each dealing with the literature relevant to the subtopic of nontraditionalism being addressed.

Nontraditional Education

Defining nontraditional education or nontraditional study is difficult. For anyone not familiar with the concept, several books would provide a general introduction. The Commission on Non-Traditional Study's Diversity by Design summarizes and discusses more than fifty specific recommendations which grew out of the Commission's work including broadened access to continuing education, flexible programmatic options, continued experimentation with nontraditional study, and increased collaboration among institutions, both private and public.[1] The section dealing with the composition of a baccalaureate degree is especially helpful since it addresses a variety of issues dealing with defining degrees in the context of nontraditional education. A more complete discussion of the work and findings of

---

[1]Samuel B. Gould, Chairman, Commission on Non-Traditional Study, Diversity by Design (San Franicsco: Jossey-Bass, 1973).

the Commission on Non-Traditional Study can be found in Gould and Cross.[2] There are chapters in the work which address four major aspects of the Commission's work--description of nontraditional study, problems of access to lifelong learning opportunities, traditional criteria for learning (emphasis on credit hours and classroom instruction), and features of external degree programs. A comprehensive summary of many facets of nontraditional education can also be found in Cross and Valley.[3] Of particular interest is the discussion concerning credit assessment and adult programs. The annotated bibliography is also a salient feature of the book. A recent attempt has been made to develop operational models based upon a careful examination of five nontraditional programs.[4] However, differences in size, content, educational delivery system, geographic dispersion, and financial resources mitigate against identifying any

---

[2]Samuel B. Gould and K. Patricia Cross, eds., Explorations in Non-Traditional Study (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972).

[3]K. Patricia Cross; John Valley and Associates, Planning Non-Traditional Programs: An Analysis of the Issues of Postsecondary Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974).

[4]The institutions were Empire State College, Central Michigan University--Institute for Career and Personal Development, Urban Regional Learning Center--Baltimore Campus, Loretto Heights College--University Without Walls, Florida International University--External Degree Program. The results of the study can be found in A Study of a Simulation Modeling Approach to Planning for Non-Traditional Educational Programs (Washington, D.C.: National Association of College and University Business Officers, Non-Traditional Education Study, 1977).

"typical" nontraditional program.

Degree-Granting Features of Nontraditional Programs

The degree-granting feature of nontraditional programs is perhaps the most commonly examined feature of that general topic. Houle is an often cited work on that subject, since he examines many programs where students can earn degrees without continuous attendance at a specific institution.[5] Many of these programs award credit for experiential learning as well as give continued off-campus learning opportunities as part of the degree process. Another summary of degree-granting features of alternative programs is described by Valley.[6] He examines several different degree programs and discusses the merits and problems of each, especially citing time shortening features and credit awards for nonclassroom learning. The author's treatment of both the Regents Program and the Empire State Program of New York is especially thorough. Levine and Weingant provide a general overview of flexible degree-granting undergraduate programs based upon an examination of 26 special programs.[7] The last chapter of the work, which deals with faculty, administration, and institutional philosophy, is useful as it discusses institutional issues confronting nontraditional degree sequences. The authors also present a

---

[5]Cyril O. Houle, The External Degree (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973).

[6]John R. Valley, Increasing the Options: Recent Developments in College and University Degree Programs (Princeton, N. J.: Office of New Degree Programs, Educational Testing Service, 1972).

[7]Arthur Levine and John Weingant, Reform of Undergraduate Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973).

balanced comparison of the problems and potentials of nontraditional degree patterns. Spurrs is more cautious in his evaluation of nontraditional degree programs.[8] He has reservations about too much time flexibility in such programs, and he is also concerned about proper labeling of free-elective curricular options. Spurrs feels that alternative learning experiences should be clearly identified. Vermilye presents several views on external degree programs which were discussed at the National Conference on Higher Education in 1972.[9] An important contribution of his work is the discussion of certification and credentialing of experience as opposed to education. The author points out the need for defining evaluation when he says, "We have developed ingenious schemes for accrediting schooling but no adequate means of judging a person's education."[10]

Statewide Programs

Some states have undertaken an examination of possible statewide programs, utilizing nontraditional programmatic and degree options. The California State University and Colleges consortium began a statewide program to bring "fundamental changes to higher education" in 1971. A three year progress report of that undertaking is now avail-

---

[8]Stephen H. Spurrs, Academic Degree Structures: Innovative Approaches, Principles of Reform in Degree Structures in the United States (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970).

[9]Dychman Vermilye, ed., The Extended Campus (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972).

[10]Ibid., p. 137.

able.[11] The report summarizes the efforts made in three broad areas: 1) improvement of instruction and evaluation, 2) making resources more available to "new publics," (i.e., groups not normally served by higher education institutions), and 3) more efficient use of resources. The portion of the report dealing with extended and external degree programs for adults pursuing part-time programs could be used as a model for other states to examine.[12]

Another state which has recently begun to assess current external degree programs is Illinois. An initial survey of state programs has been undertaken, although it was limited to operational degree programs serving predominately adult students pursuing part-time programs.[13] Degree programs available at junior and community colleges, four year institutions (both public and private) and through consortia agreements are included in the survey. However, since this effort is only in the data-gathering state, no conclusions are yet available at this time. A more useful and complete survey of nontradi-

---

[11] New Approaches to Higher Education Within the California State University and Colleges: A Status Report (Sacramento: California University and Colleges, 1974).

[12] A more comprehensive examination of the many external and special degree programs implemented by this consortium of 19 institutions can be found in Charles Davis, ed. The 1,000 Mile Campus (Rohnert Park, Calif.: Commission on External Degree Programs, 1972).

[13] Availability & Features of External Degree Programs offered by Institutions in State of Illinois (Springfield, Ill.: Illinois Council on Continuing Education, External Degree Task Force, 1976). (Mimeographed.)

tional programs in Illinois is contained in a report describing special programs with the Board of Governors institutions.[14] After a brief examination of specific nontraditional programs at each of the five member institutions,[15] the Report addresses the issue of alternative program evaluation based upon five basic areas: accessibility, flexibility, personalization, synthesis, and use of resources.

Wisconsin has also examined statewide opportunities utilizing a different approach to nontraditional programs. All of the institutions of higher learning in the state were brought under one coordinating board so that programmatic cooperation could be facilitated. The next step in the Wisconsin plan is to initiate a statewide external degree program using both traditional and nontraditional learning opportunities. However, fiscal constraints have delayed the Regents Program, as the statewide effort is known, and inplementation has been postponed for several months.[16]

Clientele Served by Nontraditional Programs

Another important aspect of nontraditional education concerns who is being served by such programs. Do alternative approaches attract students whose demographic characteristics differ from

---

[14] Report of the Speical Task Force on Nontraditional Education in the Board of Governors System (Springfield, Ill.: Illinois Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities, 1975).

[15] Chicago State University, Eastern Illinois University, Governors State University, Northeastern Illinois University, and Western Illinois University.

[16] Wisconsin State Journal, September 25, 1977, p. 6.

traditional college-aged students (i.e., 18 - 22 age cohorts), implying a new thrust to higher education? The Carnegie Commission points out that as students in higher education change (usually older students returning), institutions have to change accordingly.[17] For example, such issues as availability of evening classes, weekend classes and residency requirements affect potential new clients of an educational institution. In another of its publications the Commission points out the need for new, alternative means for students to achieve degrees.

> The Commission recommends that alternative avenues by which students can earn degrees or complete a major portion of their work for a degree be extended to increase accessibility of higher education for those to whom it is now unavailable because of work schedules, geographic locations, or responsibilities in the home.[18]

Valentine notes that if more flexible approaches are developed to serve the needs of older learners, these same approaches might also serve the traditional college-age student as well.[19] Because of retrenchment and student enrollment problems, he argues that alternative approaches will eventually occur anyway and that older students are simply accelerating curricular modification at this time. Elsewhere,

---

[17]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Reform on the Campus: Changing Students, Changing Academic Programs (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972).

[18]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Less Time, More Options: Education Beyond High School (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971), p. 20.

[19]John A. Valentine, "The Liberal Arts College and the Experienced Learner," College Board Review 93 (Fall 1974): 10-17.

Vermilye asserts the need for directing collegiate resources for non-degree programs serving the adult population on a continuing basis, in consort with the general field known as adult and/or continuing education.[20]

In examining a specific external degree program, Anstett identifies several different clientele groups being served in New York State.[21] By analyzing the first graduating class of the Regents Program, the author found several key facts: more than half of the graduating class were in the military, the mean age of graduates was 34 (range 20-63), more than half of the graduates were not residents of the state and 85 percent of the graduates were employed full-time. A 1976 survey of the first 386 bachelor degree graduates indicates that "almost half of the Regents External Degree baccalaureate graduates... attempt to pursue post-graduate work. Four out of five such graduate applications are accepted."[22]

Specific types of new learners have also been identified as comprising the "new clientele." Cross focuses on ethnic minorities and women as being two distinct groups for which more flexible collegiate

---

[20]Dychman Vermilye, ed., Lifelong Learners--A New Clientele for Higher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974).

[21]Robert R. Anstett, "The Regents External Degree Program and Its Graduates," College and University 49 (Winter 1974): 154-161.

[22]Rex Reports: Newsletter of the Regents External Degrees (Albany: University of the State of New York, 1977), p. 6.

options are required.[23] Berger identifies these two groups as well as two to four million potential college students who are presently affiliated with labor unions.[24] Each work cited also deals with the overall issue of "open door" policies and their impact on institutions as well as students. Burkett singles out adult, part-time students as an entire population to be served with availability and relevance being the most important issues for them in higher education.[25]

Time Required to Complete a Baccalaureate Degree

The length of time required to complete a baccalaureate degree is another important facet of nontraditional study. External examinations, time-shortened degree options, work-related, off-campus learning, and other similar approaches have added a time factor to many nontraditional programs. Work-related study, for example, is often part of nontraditional study since the aim of many such programs is to combine work (practical experience) with study (intellectual inquiry). Frequently such combined study is part of a formal internship arrangement or part of an independent study project. Regardless, the net

---

[23]K. Patricia Cross, Beyond the Open Door (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971); idem, "The New Learners," Change 5 (February 1973): 31-34.

[24]Brigitte Berger, "The Coming Age of People Work," Change 8 (May 1976): 31-34.

[25]J.E. Burkett, "Higher Education's Growing Edge," Educational Record 58 (Summer 1977): 259-69.

effect of this combined work and study process is often a method for accelerating a baccalaureate degree as more credit hours can be earned since a proportion of the study is accounted for at work.

Off-campus learning opportunities not related to a student's employment offers another avenue to reduce the time to graduate. Gross groups many of these opportunities under the rubric of the "invisible university" which includes libraries, museums, theaters, and other similar facilities.[26]

A comprehensive discussion of this time factor can be found in the Carnegie Commission's Report on this issue.[27] The Commission notes that "the length of time spent in undergraduate college education can be reduced roughly by one-fourth without sacrificing educational quality."[28] Valley also devotes a large part of Increasing the Options to time-shortening developments in the United States since 1963.[29] He describes major new programs as well as looks at proposals and studies regarding new curricular and programmatic alternatives being investigated.

---

[26]Ronald Gross, The Lifelong Learner (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1977). See Chapter Five.

[27]Carnegie Commission, Less Time, More Options.

[28]Ibid., p. 1.

[29]Valley, Increasing the Options.

On the other hand, Spurrs cautions that there can be too much emphasis on shortened time approaches leading to degrees.

> Degree structures should be flexible in time required for the completion of the academic programs in order to encourage acceleration, but should have rather specific overall time limits in order to discourage too attenuated an effort.[30]

In addition to specific time-shortening questions, there are issues of qualitative judgment of nonclassroom learning activities which need to be addressed. Forrest, Knapp and Pendergrass point out that "another problem that arises in using portfolios is the fact that different standards are used for traditional and experiential learning."[31]

Assessment and Evaluation of Nonclassroom Learning

Nontraditional education has created a need for the evaluation and assessment of nonclassroom learning. "Experiential" or "life learning," as this concept is often interchangeably called, is another new and expanded field within higher education. Assessment allows for formal recognition (and often credit) of community-based learning in many nontraditional degree programs.

Perhaps the most notable single effort in the field of assessing nonclassroom learning is the extensively funded CAEL project--Cooperative Assessment of Experiential Learning. Although most of the publications already produced by CAEL are only working drafts, the com-

---

[30]Spurrs, Academic Degree Structures, p. 26.

[31]Aubrey Forrest, Joan E. Knapp, and Judith Pendergrass, "Tools and Methods of Evaluation," in Experiential Learning, ed. Morris T. Keeton and Associates (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976), p. 164.

plexity of life experience assessment is rapidly becoming more apparent.[32] Park, a member of the CAEL Assembly (composed of representatives from member institutions), discusses the difficulties on which systematic assessment techniques have floundered.[33] For example, the meaning of the baccalaureate degree cannot be agreed upon. Many CAEL members believe that the degree should be altered, but they cannot agree upon the new degree's academic content or context. Although the meetings of the entire Assembly have been generally unproductive, the efforts of the task forces resulted in the first comprehensive identification of the myriad of problems associated with the assessment issue. Some of these problems include: who should perform assessments, is portfolio development a learning experience itself worthy of some academic recognition, how does experiential learning relate to the field of adult education?

A thorough review of the entire range of problems and issues related to assessment and the award of college credit is also presented by Meyer.[34] Using a case study approach, he reviews several currently

---

[32]CAEL has produced several working papers including: "A Student Handbook on Preparing A Portfolio for Assessment of Prior Experiential Learning"; and "The Use of Expert Judgment in the Assessment of Experiential Learning." (Mimeographed.)

[33]Dabny Park, "The Cooperative Assessment of Experiential Learning," Adult Education 23 (February 1975): 242-47.

[34]Peter Meyer, Awarding College Credit for Non-College Learning (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975).

operational assessment programs and discusses the strength and weaknesses of each. The major strength seems to be the process of translating a student's competence into specific skills and knowledge which can be identified as part of a degree program. An essential weakness in the process is the student's inability to separate themselves from what they feel is an equitable assessment of credit from the professional judgment made of their competencies. (Several UWW programs which use credit hours as the basis for awarding degrees are included in the case studies.)

Meinert and Penny present the argument that there must be established means and methods in awarding credit for such experiences.[35] They stress that institutional standards must be honored as part of any assessment criteria as a primary component of institutional quality control for such awards.

> A twofold imperative emerges from analyzing the award of credit for life learning experiences: academic credibility must be maintained while at the same time recognition must be given to the significant learning that occurs outside the formal collegiate system of instruction.[36]

Quality Control/Evaluation

A central issue in nontraditional programs is quality control. Miller notes that "making nontraditional education fully creditable

---

[35]Charles W. Meinert and Sherry Penny, "Credit for Life Experience: Establishing Institutional Policy and Procedures," Journal of Higher Education 46 (May/June 1975): 339-48.

[36]Ibid., p. 347.

is a task of no small magnitude or importance."[37] However, Martin points out the frustration of trying to measure the quality of new programs against older, established ones. "Surely then, the new must undergo what the old underwent, in order to prove that it is fulfilling its promise. In most instances, however, older efforts have never been investigated in disciplined ways."[38] Baldi echoes the lack of applicable standards for evaluation. "The real objective, therefore, ought to be to determine relevant indices of good practice by which external degree programs should be judged."[39] Thrash describes the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions in Higher Education's Statement on Accreditation and Non-Traditional Study as "a tentative working set of guidelines."[40] She later summarizes the general problem as being a "continuous effort to improve assessment procedures....The

---

[37]Jerry W. Miller, "Credit for Nontraditional Education: A Conceptual Framework for Recognition," Educational Record 55 (Summer 1974): 188-92.

[38]Warren B. Martin, "Thoughts on Evaluation and Imagination," in The New Colleges: Toward an Appraisal, ed. Paul L. Dressel (Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1971), p. 314.

[39]H. Victor Baldi, "External Degree Programs: In Search of New Definitions for Quality," North Central Association Quarterly 51 (Fall 1976): 275.

[40]Patricia Thrash, "Standards and Accreditation in Nontraditional Study," in Explorations in Competency Module Development: Re-Linking Higher Education and the Human Services, ed. Robert Agranoff et al (Dekalb, Ill.: Center for Governmental Studies, Northern Illinois University, 1975), p. 31.

task which all agencies must address is the development of assessment procedures adequate to the evaluation of diverse institutions."[41]

Evaluation and quality judgments regarding nontraditional programs are still in the early developmental stages. With the exception of a few small-scale, single program follow-up studies, there has been no systematic evaluation of nontraditional programs. However, the Empire State College program in New York is currently planning a substantial longitudinal evaluation of its present statewide degree-granting enterprise.[42] By surveying current students, faculty and graduates along with dropouts, the Program Effectiveness and Related Cost Study (PERC) will draw conclusions and make recommendations regarding five programmatic elements: outcomes, costs, faculty involvement, student impressions, and variety of learning programs. Given the scope of this evaluation effort, it could prove to be the most comprehensive ever attempted in the field of nontraditional education. Unfortunately, the first preliminary findings are not expected to be published until late-1978.

University Without Walls Network

Since the UECU/UWW network has been in operation only six years, there are few works which deal with UWW as part of the totality of non-

---

[41]Patricia Thrash, "Evaluation of Nontraditional Learning Forms: The Extended Campus Program," North Central Association Quarterly 51 (Fall 1976): 287.

[42]Program Effectiveness and Related Cost Study (PERC) (Saratoga Springs, N.Y.: Office of Research and Evaluation, Empire State College of the State of New York, 1976). (Mimeographed.)

traditional study. As indicated earlier, UECU's First Report is a description of the UWW network as it was operating in 1972. A subsequent report was scheduled for publication in 1976, but the document was never produced. However, as part of its accreditation process, UECU did produce a comprehensive self-study guide which contains new information about UWW.[43]

Gould stresses the availability of UWW in existing institutions when he notes "some nontraditional programs such as University Without Walls are already being developed for college-age students within existing institutions."[44] Nelson, however, calls attention to the more unique contribution of certain UWW programs which are competency-based.

> A few institutions, such as the University Without Walls at the University of Minnesota and Antioch-West in San Francisco, have had the courage to break the credit hour barrier and to define their curricular and degree requirements in terms other than credit or semester hours. In these few cases such conversion of experience to academic credit hours are not appropriate, but the credit-hour seems largely entrenched as the coin of the academic realm.[45]

The Ford Foundation notes that UWW "transcends the individual campuses with their limitations of viewpoint and politics, but avoids centralized control or uniformity imposed from outside"[46] Levine and

---

[43]Self Study in Progress Report (Cincinnati, Ohio: Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities, 1977).

[44]Gould, Diversity by Design, p. 4.

[45]Fred A. Nelson, "Has the Time Gone for an External Degree?" Journal of Higher Education 45 (March 1974): 180.

[46]Ronald Gross, Higher/Wider/Education: A Report on Open Learning (New York: Ford Foundation, 1976), p. 16.

Weingart points to the student emphasis in UWW as one of its essential contributions to nontraditionalism. "Today, much of the effort in student-centered curriculum is being spent on projects like University Without Walls....which use the world as their campus and are completely student oriented."[47] Minimal residency requirements are the feature of UWW which Adams cites as being valuable.

> There are several institutions--The University Without Walls, Empire State College of New York, and Minnesota's Metropolitan State College, for example--for which it is possible to get a degree without ever attending a single class on campus. The institutions, in fact, have no campuses of their own.[48]

Of course, not everyone is convinced that UWW is necessarily the best answer to contemporary educational needs in higher education. London makes a strong criticism of the UECU/UWW network when he questions the educational validity of awarding "life experience" credit in haphazard fashion in some UWW programs.[49] Assessing nonclassroom learning is a frequently identified difficulty in nontraditional educational programs. Another factor to consider is quality or academic standards of nontraditional programs.[50] Who assesses what is another important issue.

---

[47]Levine and Weingart, Reform of Undergraduate Education, p. 97.

[48]Velma A. Adams, "Adult Education: Where the Bread and Action Are." College Management 8 (April 1973): 9.

[49]Herbert London, "University Without Walls: Reform or Rip-Off?" Saturday Review, September 16, 1972, pp. 62-65.

[50]Richard B. Heydinger, "The Assessment of Student Performance: A Model & the Reforms," Paper Presented at the American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, Illinois, 25 March 1975.

Haberman also addresses several issues related to competency assessments and awarding credit for nonclassroom learning.[51] He raises fifteen specific questions including who should award credit, how such credit should be applied to a baccalaureate program once awarded, and who should be eligible to receive such credit awards. A more thorough treatment of issues surrounding competency-based undergraduate programs can be found in Trivett.[52] He questions the long-term impact of such programs, however, because he feels they may be too complex to implement. "This complexity is a result of the attempt to analyze what an institution is trying to do, to translate that purpose into broad goals, and make operational in statements of competencies that can be measured."[53] Stecher is critical of the College Level Examination Program (CLEP).[54] He is especially concerned about the questions used in these nationwide examinations and about the standards used to award credit.

Although University Without Walls is but a small part of the total spectrum of nontraditional higher education, UWW nonetheless embodies many of the salient features discussed above--assessment of

---

[51]Martin Haberman, "New Entry Requirements and New Programs for College Students," in Allan C. Ornstein and Steven I. Miller, ed., Policy Issues in Education (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Company, 1976), pp. 95-107.

[52]David A. Trivett, Competency Programs in Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 7, 1975).

[53]Ibid., p. 63.

[54]Carl A. Stecher, "CLEP and the Great Credit Giveaway," Change 9 (March 1977): 36-41.

nonclassroom learning, implementation of competency-based programs, academic quality issues, and external degree features. The present study should add to the knowledge of these issues since the survey instrument was designed to secure information about most of these issues so the data collected in the study can be examined and described.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The Nature of Field Research

The general research methodology chosen for the analysis of the national UECU/UWW network's selected UWW program was based upon a field research model. Precisely defining this research methodology was difficult, since several different terms were used to describe this approach--"participant observation," "field research," and "action research."

McCall and Simmons provided a general overview of the participant observation methodology when they noted "it is probably misleading to regard participant observation as a single method," since it is a research enterprise which combines "several methods towards a particular end....acquiring scientific information."[1] They also commented that participant observation is a type of research enterprise which has proven most popular and fruitful in the study of dynamics of all varieties of reasonably compact social organizations."[2] Denzin supported participant observation as being "deliberately unstructured in its

---

[1]George McCall and J. Simmons, ed., Issues in Participant Observation (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969), p. 1.

[2]Ibid., p. 341.

research design as to maximize the discovery and verification of theoretical propositions."[3] Bogan also focused on the flexibility features of participant observation when he pointed out that "in many situations we have no idea what is important; therefore, to go into a research project...with specific hypotheses to test imposes a preconceived reality on the situation."[4]

Action research has been defined by Corey as "the process by which practitioners attempt to study their problems scientifically."[5] Schofield identified education as a suitable field for action research and a vehicle for reform.[6] However, action research is not a precise, tightly controlled methodology. "The very nature of action research makes it highly improbable that the investigator or investigators will know definitely and in advance the exact pattern of the inquiry that will develop."[7] Therefore, precise outcomes of the present study will lead to some specific recommendations presented in the last chapter of this manuscript.

---

[3]Norman K. Denzin, The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods (Chicago: Aldine Publishing, 1970), p. 186.

[4]Robert Bogan, Participant Observation in Organizational Settings (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1972), p. 19.

[5]Stephen M. Corey, Action Research to Improve School Practices (New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1953), p. 6.

[6]Michael Schofield, Social Research (London: Heinemann Educational, 1969), p. 38.

[7]Corey, Action Research, p. 13.

Field research is a term also used in the literature to describe field-based study which often incorporates action research techniques as well as participant observation. Johnson noted, for example, "in social science literature, 'participant observation' and 'field research' are often used interchangeably."[8] Freeman and Sherwood note that field studies "are essential in evaluation research, in order to estimate the extent to which outlines of a program are actually carried out."[9] Field research allows for many different outcomes--both individual and group. While the primary thrust of the present study is an examination of the degree-granting process in seven UWW programs, the investigator has relied on field research and concepts to collect the data.

Rationale for Use of Field Research

Since only seven of the twenty-eight UECU/UWW programs were examined as part of the present study, and since the units vary programmatically, each program was studied on an individual basis. The rational for selecting this approach was summarized by Freeman and Sherwood.

> [T]he level and depth of the information may vary from case to case, and indeed typically does. Consequently, the investigator may be comparing a relatively superficial and bland response with a detailed and perhaps affect laden response.[10]

---

[8]John M. Johnson, Doing Field Research (New York: Free Press, 1975), p. ix.

[9]Howard E. Freeman and Clarence C. Sherwood, Social Research and Social Policy (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970), p. 101.

[10]Ibid., p. 100.

In order for any study to be useful, of course, some comparative data should be obtained. The most logical means for collecting data in the present study seemed to be a survey technique which aimed at securing data from three target groups--students, faculty and staff--from each UWW program being studied. The intent of the survey approach was to examine whether or not these University Without Walls programs were achieving the educational goals for which they were established.

The essential component of the field study was a questionnaire systematically developed by the investigator. Since UWW programs use different methods of recordkeeping, fiscal accounting, reporting faculty involvement, and other such administrative matters, it was necessary to design a survey instrument which allowed for the collection of broad-based data needed for the study. An examination of current UWW records would not provide consistent information nor would such an examination afford any possible analysis of the selected UWW programs. Therefore, it was necessary to design a questionnaire which would supply appropriate data needed for the study. As Wrightstone et al observed, "questionnaires are appropriate also for securing data which are not readily available or not conveniently assembled."[11] Since the purpose of the present study was to examine the effectiveness of each of the seven UWW programs, Corey's emphasis on the practicability of field-based research is appropriate as further support for the methodology.[12]

---

[11]J. Wayne Wrightstone; Joseph Justman; Irving Robbins, Evaluation in Modern Education (New York: American Book Company, 1956), p. 138.

[12]Corey, Action Research, p. 142.

Problems of Field Research

Field research has been often criticized as being too vague or unscientific. Travers, for example, describes this type of research as being "nothing more than good management practice."[13] The lack of objectivity in this methodology was the criticism of Phillips when he notes "the field experiment tends to incorporate fewer controls and to achieve less closure: as a result, objective verification suffers."[14] Proponents of field research are also aware of the limitations of that methodology.

> The very size of the sample, the differences in the life situations of the individuals making up various segments of the sample, and the sheer mechanical complexity of the research, all force the field staff to rely on relatively simple and mechanical procedures in processing the data.[15]

The issue of research bias was identified by Vidich when he observes that "complete and total neutrality is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to assume even where research considerations seem to demand it."[16]

---

[13]Robert M.W. Travers, An Introduction to Educational Research (New York: Macmillan Company, 1964), p. 55.

[14]Bernard S. Phillips, Social Research: Strategy and Tactics (New York: Macmillan Company, 1971), p. 122.

[15]Arthur J. Vidich and Joseph Bensman, "The Validity of Field Data," Human Organization 13 (Spring 1954): 27.

[16]Arthur J. Vidich, "Participant Observation and the Collection and Interpretation of Data," in Issues in Participant Observation, ed. McCall and Simmons (Menlo Park, Calif.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969), p. 84.

Reliability and validity in field research is another difficult issue. Filstead summarizes this problem.

> One of the major problems associated with qualitative methodology are the questions of validity and reliability....[H]ow can we be sure we know what others know (validity) and should we expect a stability to social life which would allow sociologists (and other social scientists) to identify a constancy in this life at different points in time (reliability)?[17]

Campbell, a strong advocate of field research, states that "there are no reliability or validity studies of observation field work that [he is] aware of."[18] Sjoberg and Nett, rather than tackle the issue of reliability and validity, insist that in field research "we must judge the adequacy of evidence in terms of whether the data are logically meaningful over a period of time or in terms of some broader cross-cultural perspective."[19]

It is important to examine field research not as a specific entity, but rather as a research technique which can be appropriate in certain instances. That point was made by Corey when he identifies practicality as a central outcome of field-based studies.

---

[17]William J. Filstead, "The Promises and Problems of Qualitative Methodology," address before the faculty of American University, 17 April 1974, p. 11.

[18]Donald T. Campbell, "Qualitative Knowing in Action Research," Paper presented at the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, 1 September 1974, p. 22.

[19]Gideon Sjoberg and Roger Nett, A Methodology for Social Research (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), pp. 298-99.

> The thesis of this book is that teachers, supervisors, and administrators would make better decisions and engage in more effective practice if they, too, were able and willing to conduct research as a basis for these decisions and practices.[20]

Freeman and Sherwood stress the evaluatory function of field-based investigations as being an essential component of that research technique. "It is simply not possible to undertake adequate evaluation research without field investigations."[21]

Field Research Design

The present study concentrated on the degree-granting process of the UECU/UWW network by examining programs at seven institutions. As part of the study, students, faculty and staff members were asked to complete questionnaires. (A staff person was defined as a member of the institution's professional staff whose responsibility in the UWW program was not direct instruction or academic advisement. Specifically, such duties could include student career counseling and advising, facilitating student-related problems--either in the program or at the institution--and programmatic administration.) The questionnaires were designed with a number of subscales and items so that the data collected could be further analyzed, especially comparing student and faculty/staff impressions of each program.

Since it was not feasible to survey each of the Union's twenty-

---

[20]Corey, Action Research, p. 6.

[21]Freeman and Sherwood, Social Research, p. 101.

eight member institutions (as explained in Chapter I), seven host institutions were examined--four public and three private or independent. The public institutions which participated were Chicago State University, Northeastern Illinois University, the University of Massachusetts, and the University of Minnesota. Three private institutions--Antioch College/West, Loretto Heights College, and Stephens College--also participated. Each of these institutions was selected because they had operated a UWW program since 1971, the year the UECU-sponsored UWW effort began nationally.

Development and Design of Questionnaire

The student questionnaire is shown in Appendix B, the faculty/staff instrument in Appendix C. These instruments were developed by the investigator over an eight month period. Each questionnaire was divided into four sections in order to separate discrete data. The demographic sections asked the respondent to provide basic information regarding both personal and programmatic background. In the second section the respondent was asked to provide basic factual programmatic information. The third section asked the respondent to give opinions regarding personal experience in UWW. Finally, each respondent was asked to give opinions about statements from an "ideal" standpoint, assuming they could design their own "UWW-type" degree program. Sections three and four (the opinion sections) of each questionnaire were identical, thus allowing for a comparative analysis of each UWW program from both a student and faculty-staff perspective. Further, there was an additional

section in the student questionnaire which allowed the student respondents to indicate what major factors contributed to their decision about entering a UWW program. There was no comparable section in the faculty/staff instrument since the purpose of these questions was to identify why students opt for a UWW baccalaureate degree program.

In January 1977, twenty judges reviewed the draft of the faculty/staff questionnaire. These judges were professional educators involved with UWW programs at fifteen institutions who were attending a national UWW conference. Their institutions were Antioch College/West, Bard College, Chicago State University, Flaming Rainbow University, Florida International University, Governors State University, Hispanic International University, Loretto Heights College, Northeastern Illinois University, Stephens College, Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities (program person), Universidad de Campesinos Libres, University of Massachusetts, University of Minnesota, and UWW/Ohio (Columbus). Fifteen UWW students from Stephens College (7), Chicago State (3), and Northeastern Illinois University (5) reviewed the student questionnaire. The suggestions, criticism, deletions, and additions identified by the judges were incorporated into the succeeding draft of the instruments.

While there was no need to verify demographic and programmatic information in the questionnaire, it was necessary to verify specific validity and reliability estimates for section three.[22] (The statements

---

[22]Only items which were accepted by at least fifteen of the twenty faculty/staff judges were retained. At least eleven of the fifteen student judges had to accept an item for it to be included in the student questionnaire.

in section four, the "ideal" program section, were derived from section three; thus, the estimate of validity and reliability of the statements in section three were considered appropriate for section four as well.)

After validity and reliability estimates were established statistically (see the following section), a final draft was prepared of both the student and faculty/staff questionnaires. These instruments, along with a proposed introductory cover letter to accompany the questionnaire, were sent to the cooperating UWW program directors at the seven institutions included in the present study. Telephone calls were placed to each director to learn if there were any problems created by any of the material. While some suggestions were made regarding specific phraseology, no substantive problems were identified. Consequently, both questionnaires and the accompanying cover letters were prepared and printed, incorporating the minor changes identified.

Validity

Phillips' definition of validity is:

> Validity refers to whether a measure, in fact, measures what it purports to measure....In other words, a measuring instrument is judged valid when its results are deemed comparable with other relevant evidence.[23]

Therefore, the UWW questionnaire should measure whether the individual UWW programs were meeting the general educational objectives they were created to address as measured by a comparison of responses from the real and "ideal" sections.

---

[23]Derek R. Phillips, Abandoning Method (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973), p. 86.

To determine the validity of section three, fifty opinion-type statements constructed by the investigator were given to twenty UWW directors, faculty, and staff judges. They were asked to determine whether or not the statements focused on salient programmatic features of UWW. If fifteen or more of the twenty judges agreed on an individual statement, it was retained; if fourteen or fewer concurred, the statement was eliminated. After the statements were reviewed by the judges, the remaining ones were considered to have "face validity." The identical fifty statements were given to fifteen UWW students, and, in the same manner, the statement's face validity was determined. (Eleven of the fifteen student judges needed to concur for a statement to be retained.)

The remaining statements (reduced to forty items through the face validity screening) were then pilot-tested, using twelve faculty/staff respondents from Northeastern Illinois University (eight faculty, four staff). Responses to the statements were tested for item discrimination and only items which discriminated at .30 or above were incorporated into the final draft questionnaire.[24] Sax supports the .30 level of discrimination.[25] Table 1 summarizes the results of the analysis reflecting the elimination of five items.

---

[24]The range of opinions was from "strongly agree" to "no opinion" or "nor basis for judgment". Numerical values were assigned for each response and the item discrimination was calculated from that data.

[25]See especially Gilbert Sax, Principles of Educational Measurement and Evaluation (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing, 1974), pp. 231-39.

TABLE 1

PEARSON CORRELATION ANALYSIS OF PILOT-TEST STATEMENTS

(n=12)

Group I (Degree Process)		Group IV (Academic Quality)	
S1	.7573	S1	.7985
S2	.5942	** S2	.0357
** S3	.2009	S3	.4435
S4	.7902	S4	.4019
S5	.6589	S5	.8425
S6	.5867	S6	.8412
S7	.6243	S7	.6052
S8	.6079	S8	.5171
S9	.5732	S9	.6264
		S10	.4847
Group II (Student Responsibility)		S11	.5019
		S12	.4366
S1	.7339	S13	.4389
S2	.6395	S14	.4561
S3	.5101	S15	.5590
S4	.7907	S16	.6438
** S5	.2197	S17	.8699
S6	.7708		
** S7	.1867		
Group III (Programmatic Features)			
S1	.4217		
S2	.7046		
S3	.8529		
S4	.4765		
** S5	.0747		
S6	.5877		
S7	.6364		

** Items eliminated after pilot-test stage

Finally, to determine whether or not each group of statements collectively discriminated from other groups, a Pearson correlation analysis of the groups was executed, giving the data presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2

BETWEEN GROUP PEARSON CORRELATION ANALYSIS
(n=12)

Group	Paired Group	Correlation
1	2	-.2041
1	3	.2567
1	4	.0130
2	3	.2122
2	4	-.3880
3	4	-.1609

Group 1 - Degree Process
Group 2 - Student Responsibility
Group 3 - Programmatic Features
Group 4 - Academic Quality

The investigator concluded that each group of statements had high within group correlation, and that each group of statements was focusing on different programmatic aspects. Analysis of ten student responses in that pilot-testing phase produced similar correlation data so the statements were incorporated into both final questionnaires.

Reliability

The reliability of the opinion portion of the questionnaire was determined by employing a split-half technique. Two sample groups from Northeastern were selected--eight faculty and fourteen recent UWW

graduates; however, only six faculty and six students returned the completed instruments. These groups were logical choices inasmuch as both groups were composed of adults and other individuals in the other UWW programs should have similar views. The responses were divided into equal halves using an odd-even numerical separation. The responses of each half were correlated using the Pearson analysis which yielded the results reported in Table 3. The odd-even correlation was .8118.

TABLE 3

SPLIT-HALF RELIABILITY PEARSON ANALYSIS

Variable	Cases (n)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Even	12	49.5000	6.9479
Odd	12	47.0833	6.4872

r=.8118

The reliability of the opinion portion of the questionnaire should also be enhanced if Sjoberg and Nett's observation prove to be correct. "If we are working with a stable and homogeneous group, we can expect the reliability of our instrument to be fairly high."[25] This gauge of reliability, of course, presupposes homogeneity of individuals involved in the UWW programs studied. The demographic section of the questionnaire provided data to verify the homogeneity assumption of the respondent population.

---

[25]Sjoberg and Nett, Methodology for Social Research, p. 301.

CHAPTER IV

SURVEY OF THE PROGRAMS

The Survey

The student and faculty/staff questionnaires were sent to the participating UWW program directors in mid-November 1977 for mailing to potential respondents. Each questionnaire, introductory cover letter and return envelope was enclosed in another envelope and sealed prior to distribution to the program directors. This was done to facilitate mailing from each program since only address labels and postage were then required. It was requested that the questionnaires be returned by November 30 (see Appendix D and E).

Unfortunately, the crush of holiday mail apparently delayed the delivery of the questionnaires and, as a consequence, it was necessary for the investigator to incorporate responses received through January 31, 1978 into the study. The most serious problem with the distribution of the questionnaires occurred at Antioch College/West where the cooperating program director left and the program's administrative offices moved. These two events resulted in no distribution of the questionnaire outside the San Francisco area so the returns from that institution were limited. After talking with the present acting director, the investigator estimated that only thirty student and twenty faculty questionnaires were distributed.

As indicated in Table 4, more than forty four percent of the potential respondents returned the instrument, of which more than forty two percent were usable.

TABLE 4

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRES

	Students			Faculty/Staff		
Institution	Number Distributed	Number Returned	Percent	Number Distributed	Number Returned	Percent
Antioch	30	11	36.7%	20	8	40.0%
Chicago St.	68	29	42.6	30	11	36.7
Loretto	116	42	36.2	30	14	46.7
U Mass	150	51	34.0	100	34	34.0
U Minn	213	82	38.5	100	40	40.0
N'eastern	105	55	52.4	75	50	66.7
Stephens	554	224	40.4	80	27	33.8
Subtotal	1236	494	40.0	435	184	42.3
Returned after deadline		19			6	
Unusable/incorrectly completed		7			3	
TOTAL RETURNED (n)		520	42.1		193	44.4

A recent questionnaire-based survey of part-time students in Illinois produced similar return rates. Of the 2,025 students enrolled in colleges and universities in the Illinois survey, 863, or 42.6 percent, responded. The response rate of this survey was enhanced by mailing follow-up materials to individuals who had not responded within two

weeks of the initial distribution of the questionnaire.[1] Although the investigator in the UWW survey did not employ a follow-up technique, the return rate is remarkably similar to the Illinois study. Further, it appears that the potential respondents in both studies were quite similar also--older, working adults active in higher education.

Programmatic Differences

Although the present research project is based upon an individual case study approach of each of the seven UWW programs, there are three factors which could affect the results if looked at in the aggregate. Specifically, there might be differences due to funding (private versus public), delivery of academic program (credit-based versus competency-based), or staffing model (core staff advisement versus decentralized advisement). While the statistical implications of the responses to the questionnaire are treated in Chapter V, it would be useful to examine each of these organizational or service factors at this point. The demographic and programmatic portions of the student and faculty/staff questionnaires were utilized for this comparison.

In general this examination addresses several of the "organizational concepts" of the University Without Walls as identified in the First Report; specifically, who is served by these programs (students).[2] In other words, are UWW programs making opportunities

---

[1] "Summary of Data, Study of Illinois Adult Learners, Presented to Board of Higher Education," (Springfield, Ill.: Joint Education Committee of the Illinois Legislature, 1978). (Mimeographed.)

[2] University Without Walls: First Report (Yellow Springs, Ohio: Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities, 1972).

available in higher education while more traditional colleges and universities are not? According to federal statistics, the percentage of minority students attending four year colleges and universities was 13.5 in fall, 1976.[3] In the seven UWW programs surveyed in the present study, the percentage of minority students was 23.4 and this data is summarized in Table 5.

TABLE 5

STUDENT ETHNIC COMPARISON

Ethnic Background	Nationwide, 1976[3] (n=215,890)	Selected UWW, 1977 (n=494)	UECU, 1977[4] (n-612)
Black	8.4%	10.9%	33.0%
Native American	0.9	8.9	17.0
Oriental	2.0	0.2	1.0
Spanish Surname	2.2	3.4	16.0
TOTAL	13.5	23.4	67.0

While the UWW data are from a small sample, they are representative of the ethnic student population served by the total UWW network as described by data in 1975.[5] The high proportion of minority students in the UECU-sponsored UWW programs is the result of the special outreach mission of these programs. Each UECU unit was designed to reach specific

---

[3]Chronicle of Higher Education, January 10, 1977, p. 12.

[4]Self Study in Progress Report (Cincinnati, Ohio: Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities, 1977), p. 23.

[5]Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities, "Briefing Paper on UECU and UWW Prepared for the North Central Association Biennial Visit Evaluation Team," October, 1975, p. 3. (Mimeographed.)

ethnic groups and these data reflect that in the aggregate. It appears that UWW is reaching different types of students which is consistent with its original mission.

Each UWW program is an independent entity and thus has programmatic differences. However, there is similarity between the UWW programs when viewing the demographic data generally. For example, almost two-thirds of the student respondents in the present study are female (375 of 490). Although two programs (Loretto Heights and Stephens) show a somewhat skewed sexual distribution, the data are more similar than different. Table 6 presents the complete data.

TABLE 6

UWW STUDENTS BY SEX DISTRIBUTION

Institution	Female		Male	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Antioch West	6	54.5%	5	45.5%
Chicago State	21	72.4	8	21.6
Loretto Heights	36	85.7	6	14.3
Massachusetts	33	64.7	18	35.3
Minnesota	50	62.5	30	37.5
Northeastern	31	56.4	24	43.6
Stephens	198	88.4	24	11.6
TOTALS	375	76.5	115	23.5

The age distribution of students participating in the seven selected UWW programs is also similar. Table 7 summarizes this data.

TABLE 7

AGE DISTRIBUTION BY INSTITUTION

(Percent)

Institution	(n)	Under 18	18-22	23-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	Over 60
Antioch	(11)	-0-	9.1%	45.5%	36.3%	-0-	9.1%	-0-
Chicago St	(29)	-0-	-0-	3.4	24.1	51.8	20.7	-0-
Loretto	(42)	-0-	16.7	21.4	23.8	16.7	16.7	4.7
U Mass	(51)	-0-	7.8	31.4	27.5	15.7	17.6	-0-
U Minn	(82)	1.2	7.3	30.5	36.6	12.2	9.8	2.4
N'eastern	(55)	-0-	1.8	20.0	27.3	23.6	25.5	1.8
Stephens	(224)	-0-	1.3	10.8	37.9	29.9	19.2	0.9
TOTAL	(494)	0.2	4.5	18.4	33.4	24.3	17.8	1.4

Ethnic composition of students in the UWW programs participating in the present study shows diversity. Although almost three-quarters of the total student population is Caucasian, there are many minority students in UWW. Table 8 presents this data by program.

TABLE 8

ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION BY INSTITUTION

(Percent)

Institution	(n)	Black	Caucasian	Native American	Oriental	Spanish Surname	Other
Antioch	(11)	9.1%	81.8%	-0-	-0-	9.1%	-0-
Chicago St	(29)	48.4	44.8	3.4	-0-	-0-	3.4
Loretto	(41)	7.3	68.4	2.4	-0-	14.6	7.3
U Mass	(51)	9.8	72.5	11.8	-0-	3.9	2.0
U Minn	(82)	6.1	78.1	13.4	1.2	-0-	1.2
N'eastern	(55)	30.9	52.7	7.3	-0-	9.1	-0-
Stephens	(224)	4.0	84.4	9.4	-0-	1.3	0.9
TOTAL	(493)	10.9	74.8	8.9	0.2	3.5	1.7

While the faculty/staff response to the questionnaire was relatively small, it was useful to compare data from this group with national data. Since few systematic investigations have been made of UWW programs, examining information from the present study might provide some insight into the differences (or similarities) of the two groups. For example, 37.1 percent of the UWW faculty/staff respondents were female while the comparable proportion in all public and private four year colleges and universities was 34.2 percent.[6]

A commonly held belief that professional educators involved with UWW tend to be younger, newer in the field, and lower ranked individuals on campus was not borne out by the data (see Table 6). Tenure was held by 74.8 percent of the UWW faculty respondents who identified teaching as their primary institutional responsibility. The 1976 national data for tenure in colleges and universities was 61 percent.[7] Again, it was not the purpose of the present study to generalize regarding UWW programs and the totality of higher education. Nonetheless, these data do reflect on some of the generally held perceptions of UWW and these comparisons should be viewed in that light.

Data from 1976 for four year public and private colleges and universities and the data from the teaching faculty responses to the UWW

---

6 Digest of Educational Statistics, 1976 Edition (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, (1977), p. 608.

7 Chronicle of Higher Education, 20 September 1976, p. 18.

questionnaire are summarized in Table 9.

TABLE 9

HIGHEST DEGREE HELD BY TEACHING FACULTY
(Percent)

Degree	Nationwide, 1976[8] (n=371,581)	UWW, 1977 (n=183)
Doctorate	58.9%	76.7%
Masters	30.5	20.7
Professional	8.1	2.6
Bachelors	2.5	-0-

These data suggest that the academic preparation of teaching faculty was more heavily skewed toward doctoral degrees than faculty members in higher education in general.

The overall demographic data reflected a professional teaching preparation higher than might have been expected, especially considering the nontraditional enterprise UWW represented. Ewing, for example, cites institutional conservatism as a major impediment in curricular reform.[9] However, the faculty demographic data seems to indicate that alternative curricular choices (e.g., UWW) can be supported by the more traditionally accepted academic leaders--professors with terminal degrees and tenure.

Academic rank was another means of comparing traditional institutional personnel with those people involved in these seven UWW programs.

---

8 Digest of Educational Statistics, 1976, p. 607

9 Wallace K. Ewing, "Reshaping the Curriculum: What Does It Really Mean?" College and University 49 (Spring 1974): 96-113.

TABLE 10

COMPARISON OF ACADEMIC RANK
(Percent)

Rank	Nationwide, 1976[10] (n=289,000)	UWW, 1977 (n=183)
Professor	26.9%	31.6%
Associate Professor	28.8	28.2
Assistant Professor	32.4	25.6
Instructor	10.1	3.4
Other	1.8	.9
No Rank	-0-	10.3

Using these data, the personnel with teaching responsibilities involved in UWW programs have similar ranks with their nationally distributed counterparts. However, the national data are only for ranked faculty members, thereby eliminating the "no rank" category which UWW staff personnel frequently hold.

Differences in Public and Private UWW Institutions

Funding means and support levels frequently create programmatic and/or personnel differences between public and private (independent) institutions. To determine what differences might exist between these two types of institutions in the UWW sample, the faculty/staff responses to the demographic section of the questionnaire were divided into two groups according to the type of funding supporting each institution. Table 8 summarizes this demographic data.

---

10 The Condition of Education, 1976 (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1976), p. 137.

SELECTED UWW FACULTY/STAFF DEMOGRAPHIC COMPARISONS: PUBLIC AND PRIVATE
(Percent)

Category	Private[a] (n=49)	Public[b] (n=135)	Category	Private[a] (n=49)	Public[b] (n=135)
Responsibility			**Tenure**		
Teaching	46.9%	69.4%	Yes	42.2%	61.4%
UWW Staff	46.9	12.7	No	57.8	38.6
Other	6.2	17.9			
Age			**Academic Rank**		
			Professor	10.2	23.9
25 - 29	12.2	3.0	Assoc. Prof.	...	27.6
30 - 39	49.1	39.6	Ass't. Prof.	12.2	26.1
40 - 49	20.4	29.9	Instructor	12.2	4.5
50 - 59	16.3	26.1	Other	12.2	9.0
60 and over	2.0	1.4	No Rank	53.2	9.0
Ethnic Background			**Highest Degree**		
Black	2.1	8.3	Doctorate	40.8	64.9
Caucasian	97.9	72.8	Masters	55.1	24.7
Native American		7.6	Bachelors	4.1	6.0
Oriental		2.3	Other Prof.	...	3.7
Spanish Surname		4.5	Assoc. Degree	...	.7
Other		4.5	No Degree	...	...
Sex			**Length of Service**		
Female	56.3	31.1	2 years or less	26.5	5.2
Male	43.7	68.9	3 to 5 years	32.7	24.6
			6 to 8 years	22.4	26.1
			9 or more years	18.4	44.1

[a]Antioch West, Loretto Heights, Stephens

[b]Chicago State, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Northeastern

It should be noted that several differences exist between the two groups of responses. For example, 97.9 percent of the faculty/staff personnel in the private institution's UWW programs were Caucasian while only 72.8 percent of the public institution's UWW personnel were Caucasian. In addition, 40.8 percent of the private institution's respondents had doctorates while 64.9 percent of the public institution's UWW respondents had that degree. Academic rank of the professional staff was also markedly different. The higher proportion of unranked staff in the private institutions was the result of the independent status of the UWW programs in those institutions. UWW staff personnel are hired for service to the UWW program, but they are not selected by academic departments, hence academic rank is usually not available. Another difference was the length of service represented by each group: 40.8 percent of the faculty or staff members involved with UWW in private institutions had been at the institution at least six years. However, 70.2 percent of the public institution's UWW faculty/staff personnel had been at the institution for at least six years. Moreover, the differences in tenure percentages between the two groups do not account for such a great difference in length of service.

Most demographic characteristics of students in each group of institutions, however, were strikingly similar. However, as shown in Table 12, sexual and racial distributions were markedly different.

TABLE 12

UWW STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC COMPARISON: PUBLIC AND PRIVATE
(Percent)

Category	Private[a] (n=277)	Public[b] (n=207)
Age		
Under 18	...	.5%
18 - 22	4.0%	5.1
23 - 29	13.7	24.4
30 - 39	35.8	30.4
40 - 49	26.7	21.2
50 - 59	18.4	17.0
60 and over	1.4	1.4
Sex		
Female	87.3	63.8
Male	12.7	37.2
Ethnic Background		
Black	4.6	18.9
Caucasian	79.6	65.9
Native American	7.7	10.1
Oriental	...	.5
Spanish Surname	6.3	3.2
Other	1.8	1.4
Employment		
Full-time	65.5	65.4
Part-time	14.9	21.7
Homemaker	11.3	2.3
Unemployed, seeking	3.6	5.5
Unemployed, not seeking	4.7	5.1

[a]Antioch West, Loretto Heights, Stephens

[b]Chicago State, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Northeastern

The noticeable difference in racial and sexual distribution in Table 9 was the result of the largely female, mostly Caucasian student populations of both Stephens College and Loretto Heights. Approximately eighty five percent of Stephen's UWW program was composed of registered nurses and more than ninety percent of the program was female (198 of 224 students). Loretto Heights' female population was about 86 percent. Both Stephens and Loretto Heights serve predominately Caucasian students--217 of 266 combined, or about 82 percent.

Age distribution and full-time employment figures were almost the same. The percentage of students in private and public institutions between the ages of 23 and 49 was 76.2 and 76 percent respectively. In addition, 65.5 percent of the students in UWW programs at private institutions were employed full-time, and 65.4 percent of the students at public institutions were full-time employees.

Academic Degree Delivery Systems

Essentially two different methods of securing baccalaureate degrees were possible in University Without Walls programs--credit-hour model or competency model. Either method represented an academic delivery system with unique features. For example, competency-based programs were quite flexible programmatically but academic progress was difficult to assess. Credit-based programs on the other hand were frequently assessed in number of hours needed to satisfy specific requirements (e.g., to graduate), although often restrictive due to requirements in specific departments or disciplines. Table 13 presents the faculty/staff data aggregated by both delivery systems.

SELECTED UWW FACULTY/STAFF DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS BY ACADEMIC DELIVERY SYSTEM
(Percent)

Category	Competency-based (n=98)[a]	Credit-Based (n=86)[b]	Category	Competency-based (n=98)[a]	Credit-based (n=86)[b]
Responsibility			**Tenure**		
Teaching	60.2%	67.0%	Yes	56.8%	56.4%
UWW Staff	15.3	30.6	No	43.2	43.6
Other	24.5	2.4			
			Academic Rank		
Age			Professor	21.4	18.8
25 - 29	4.1	7.1	Assoc. Prof.	22.4	17.6
30 - 39	45.9	37.6	Ass't. Prof.	26.6	17.6
40 - 49	27.6	27.1	Instructor	4.1	9.4
50 - 59	20.4	27.1	Other	12.3	7.1
60 and over	2.0	1.1	No Rank	13.2	29.5
Ethnic Background			**Highest Degree**		
Black	6.3	7.1	Doctorate	58.2	58.8
Caucasian	77.1	82.1	Masters	31.6	34.1
Native American	6.3	4.8	Bachelors	6.1	4.7
Oriental	1.0	1.2	Other Prof.	3.1	2.4
Spanish Surname	2.0	2.4	Assoc. Degree	1.0	...
Other	7.3	2.4	No Degree	...	...
Sex			**Length of Service**		
Female	36.5	39.3	2 years or less	9.2	12.9
Male	63.5	60.7	3 to 5 years	26.5	27.1
			6 to 8 years	24.5	25.9
			9 or more years	39.8	34.1

[a]Antioch West, Minnesota, Northeastern

[b]Chicago State, Loretto Heights, Massachusetts, Stephens

These data show remarkably similar demographic characteristics: indeed, only academic rank reflects any noticeable difference between the faculty and staff participants--70.4 percent of the faculty/staff members in the competency-based programs have academic ranks of assistant professor or higher while 54 percent of their professional counterparts hold those ranks in the credit-based programs.

As was true in the comparison of faculty/staff in public and private institutions, there are few demographic differences in the students irrespective of which delivery system their institution utilizes. The complete data are incorporated into Table 14.

TABLE 14

STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS BY ACADEMIC DEGREE DELIVERY SYSTEM (Percent)

Category	Competency-based (n=146)[a]	Credit-based (n=344)[b]
Age		
Under 18	.7%	...
18 - 22	5.4	9.0%
23 - 29	27.7	21.3
30 - 39	33.2	25.5
40 - 49	15.5	24.6
50 - 59	15.5	18.0
60 and over	2.0	1.6
Sex		
Female	56.9	83.7
Male	43.1	16.3
Ethnic Background		
Black	15.5	18.2
Caucasian	68.9	64.5
Native American	10.1	6.6
Oriental	.7	...
Spanish Surname	4.1	6.6
Other	.7	4.1
Employment		
Full-time	64.2	56.5
Part-time	18.2	27.9
Homemaker	2.0	5.7
Unemployed, seeking	6.8	6.6
Unemployed, not seeking	8.8	3.3

[a]Antioch West, Minnesota, Northeastern

[b]Chicago State, Loretto Heights, Massachusetts, Stephens

The difference in student sex distribution was again caused by Loretto Heights and Stephens being part of the same group. Almost three out of four Chicago State UWW students were female as well. Complete sex distribution can be found in Table 6.

Staffing Pattern for Selected UWW Programs

Two basic staffing patterns have evolved to serve students in UWW programs--core staff and decentralized staff. In the core staff pattern primary service to UWW students--advising and counseling--is provided by a full-time staff member of the UWW programs, called a core staff person. This person works with many students as both an academic advisor and program facilitator. Academic advising deals with documenting past learning, developing a degree plan (the student's individual curriculum), and planning for the completion of the degree program. Core staff people usually have no additional responsibility at the host institution and their singular role is to serve the students in the UWW program.

The decentralized staffing pattern is highlighted by a small administrative UWW staff which handles procedural and recordkeeping matters, but which does not programmatically advise students. This important academic task is performed by full-time faculty members at the institution and such advisement is normally an additional responsibility, beyond the expected teaching, research and service responsibilities of the faculty member. Most frequently, UWW advisement is the responsibility of a large number of faculty advisors, each of whom

works with from one to four UWW students. Illustrative of this point, 68.4 percent of the faculty/staff respondents from the institutions using decentralized academic advisement reported that their UWW advisement took ten percent or less of their professional time.

Table 15 provides the complete data of demographic characteristics comparing the two different staffing patterns. Not surprisingly, more than one-third of the respondents of the core staff model were UWW staff personnel, while more than 72 percent of the decentralized staff personnel were teaching faculty members. The differences in tenure proportions can also be explained by the staffing and advisement pattern utilized by the institution. Length of service was also different, probably due to the potentially temporal nature of UWW staff appointments. On the other hand, teaching faculty appointments tend to be more permanent in nature, especially with 65.5 percent of the decentralized staffing model respondents having tenure.

TABLE 15

SELECTED UWW FACULTY/STAFF CHARACTERISTICS: CORE STAFF AND DECENTRALIZED ADVISEMENT
(Percent)

Category	Core[a] (n=73)	Decentralized (n=111)	Category	Core[a] (n=73)	Decentralized[b] (n=111)
Responsibility			**Tenure**		
Teaching	50.0%	72.1%	Yes	38.7%	66.4%
UWW Staff	34.7	13.5	No	61.3	33.6
Other	15.3	14.4			
Age			**Academic Rank**		
			Professor	18.1	21.6
25 - 29	8.3	3.6	Assoc. Prof.	9.7	27.1
30 - 39	45.9	39.7	Ass't. Prof.	27.8	18.9
40 - 49	23.6	29.7	Instructor	11.0	3.6
50 - 59	20.8	25.2	Other	15.3	6.3
60 and over	1.4	1.8	No Rank	18.1	22.5
Ethnic Background			**Highest Degree**		
Black	4.3	8.2	Doctorate	48.6	64.9
Caucasian	82.3	77.4	Masters	41.7	27.0
Native American	4.3	6.2	Bachelors	8.3	3.6
Oriental	1.3	.9	Other Prof.	1.4	3.6
Spanish Surname	2.9	1.8	Assoc. Degree	...	.9
Other	4.3	5.5	No Degree	...	...
Sex			**Length of Service**		
Female	42.9	34.5	2 years or less	19.4	5.4
Male	57.1	65.5	3 to 5 years	34.8	21.6
			6 to 8 years	12.5	33.3
			9 or more years	33.3	39.7

[a]Antioch, Chicago State, Loretto Heights, Minnesota

[b]Massachusetts, Northeastern, Stephens

Because the core staffing pattern requires a relatively large staff, UWW programs using this pattern usually have independent program status; that is, distinct programmatic and budgetary identity. As such they may hire their own staff people to serve specific tasks in the UWW program. However, since these individuals are not hired as part of an academic discipline or department, they frequently are not hired with academic rank. This means that people do not have to have a doctoral degree to be employed in UWW, even though teaching positions at the institution might require a terminal degree as a condition of employment. The information in Table 15 reflects both aspects of this situation as only 27.8 percent of the core staff personnel have rank of associate or full professor while 48.7 percent of the decentralized staff hold those ranks. Further, only 48.6 percent of the core staff have doctorates, although 64.9 percent hold doctorates in the decentralized staffing UWW model. This same difference between the staffing pattern can be seen in the specific professional responsibility each group identifies. Core staff advisors compose 34.7 percent of the total professional staff respondents in the core staff model, while only 13.5 percent of the decentralized advising staff respondents identified themselves as UWW staff.

Again, as was true in the earlier student demographic comparisons, there was little difference when grouping students by staffing pattern employed by the institution for advisement. However, the proportion of younger students (i.e., those 29 and under) in the core staffing pattern

was noticeably higher. This was the outgrowth of two special programs combining UWW with several local community colleges so that comprehensive articulation could be available to students. Also, both Loretto Heights and Minnesota were involved with prison projects which encouraged younger offenders to participate in degree programs through UWW. The sex differences between the two groups was explained in Table 6. Student data are presented in Table 16.

TABLE 16

STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS
BY STAFFING PATTERN
(Percent)

Category	Core[a] (n=162)	Decentralized[b] (n=328)
Age		
Under 18	.6%	...
18 - 22	8.5	2.4
23 - 29	24.4	15.5
30 - 39	31.2	34.5
40 - 49	19.5	26.7
50 - 59	13.4	20.0
60 and over	2.4	.9
Sex		
Female	69.8	79.9
Male	30.2	20.1
Ethnic Background		
Black	13.8	9.4
Caucasian	68.2	77.3
Native American	7.8	9.4
Oriental	.6	...
Spanish Surname	6.6	3.0
Other	3.0	.9
Employment		
Full-time	57.3	69.6
Part-time	23.2	15.2
Homemaker	4.3	8.8
Unemployed, seeking	7.3	3.0
Unemployed, not seeking	7.9	3.4

[a]Antioch, Chicago State, Loretto, Minnesota

[b]Massachusetts, Northeastern, Stephens

Length of Time Required to Complete a Baccalaureate Degree

The length of time required to complete a baccalaureate degree is usually viewed as four years. Financial aid standards, academic scholarships, talent awards, and numerous other support programs are usually available for four years in recognition of this time factor. However, the time required to complete an undergraduate degree is under review. In one of its more sweeping statements, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education declared that a substantial reduction of time was possible and even critics of time-shortening approaches agree with the concept of speeding up the time spent in undergraduate education. Spurrs, for example, states, "Degree structures should be flexible in time required for the completion of the academic program in order to encourage acceleration."[11]

Both the student and faculty/staff respondents shared similar views on the length of time necessary to earn a baccalaureate degree in UWW. Table 17 presents the data. It is interesting that fifteen percent more faculty/staff respondents than student respondents believed that the UWW program required less time to complete than a traditional undergraduate degree program. Students would have been more likely to view UWW as a time-shortening academic vehicle. There was close agreement on the actual time expected to be devoted to earning a degree in UWW. As

---

[11] Stephen H. Spurrs, Academic Degree Structure: Innovative Approaches, Principles of Reform in Degree Structures in the United States (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970), p.26.

TABLE 17

COMPARISON OF EXPECTED LENGTH OF TIME TO GRADUATE IN UWW

(Percent)

Classification	Students (n=484)	Faculty/Staff (n=182)
Actual Length		
Less than 1 year	9.1%	3.3%
Between 1 and 2 years	48.4	54.1
Between 2 and 3 years	27.9	36.9
More than 3 years	13.8	5.7
Comparative Length		
Less time	38.5	53.8
About the same time	25.5	17.9
More time	15.6	10.9
No basis for judgment	19.4	16.8

many as 57.5 percent of the students responded that they expected to complete their degree in two years or less, while 57.4 percent of the faculty and staff identified the same period of time for the completion of a degree.

It must be pointed out, however, that the time shortening feature of UWW has another aspect. While the role of flexible programming and individual advisement contribute to speeding up a UWW student's graduation, the previous formal college education of an individual was also important. Formal credit in higher education is the standard coin of the academic realm, and, if a student already has three or more years of formal coursework, the UWW program may not be doing anything more than merely concluding an academic program which began earlier.

In order to minimize the confusion of semester or quarter hour

credits, and to account for the flexible use of credit recognition in competency-based UWW programs, formal college credit in the present study was noted in years of credit transferred to the host institution. This data, identified by the students, is summarized in Table 18.

TABLE 18

PREVIOUS FORMAL COLLEGE CREDIT EARNED BY UWW STUDENTS
(Percent)

No previous credit	12.1%
About one year	20.9
About two years	28.5
About three years	25.1
More than three years	13.8

(n=484)

There was close agreement between these data and the information summarized in Table 17. For example, 12.1 percent of the student respondents indicated transfer of less than one year of formal college credit while 13.8 percent of the students expected to take more than three years to graduate in UWW. In addition, 12.6 percent of the students indicated transfer of more than three years of college credit while 9.1 percent of the students expected to graduate in less than one year. While the investigator made no attempt to compare each individual response to verify the direct relationship of the responses, the proportions appear strikingly similar.

In addition, 148 of the 484 UWW student respondents (30.6 percent) indicated the number of credits accepted by the host institution. While the range of these credit hours was from 3 to 105 semester hours,

the average was 45 hours, or about a year and a half of formal college work. These data also are consistent with both Table 17 and Table 18, although the data came from different portions of the questionnaire.

Comparative Academic Quality

The issue of academic quality is difficult to address. Non-traditional or alternative educational endeavors are often viewed with skepticism and suspicion because they differ from the accepted practices in higher education. A 1971 survey of 259 graduate deans, for example, found that "most graduate deans have negative feelings about non-traditional" educational efforts.[12] Yet Cross argues that current practices in higher education may not be equally effective for all people. "The impetus for change in the remaining years of this century will come from a recognition that higher education does not offer all of its constituencies equally good learning experiences."[13]

In an attempt to assess faculty and staff views of the academic quality of their UWW programs, several different questions addressing that issue were incorporated into the survey instrument. Table 19 presents the results of that information.

---

[12]James R. Schoemer, James E. Thomas and Wendell H. Bragonier, "A Study of the Effect of Non-traditional Grades on Admission to Graduate School and the Awarding of Financial Assistance," College and University 48 (Spring 1973): 153.

[13]K. Patricia Cross, "The Instructional Revolution," in Individualizing the System, ed. Dyckman W. Vermilye (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976), p. 51.

TABLE 19

FACULTY/STAFF OPINION
OF ACADEMIC QUALITY
(Percent)

Issue	Faculty/Staff Opinion
Academic Quality	(n=180)
Higher quality in UWW	26.7%
About the same quality	46.6
Lower quality in UWW	13.9
No basis for judgment	12.8
Quality of UWW Graduates	(n=181)
Better prepared than others	47.5
About the same preparation	26.0
Not as well prepared	12.1
No opinion	14.4

The people involved with UWW generally have a positive feeling for the academic quality of the program. For example, almost half of the professional respondents felt that UWW graduates were better prepared than graduates in traditional undergraduate programs at their institution. This view may be self-serving since these people work closely with the UWW students and thus might feel required to have a high opinion of their own professional efforts. It may also be that these individuals have a low regard for graduates from their own institutions in more traditional programs. Nonetheless, it was worth noting the high proportion of respondents who indicated that UWW was at least as sound academically as traditional baccalaureate programs at their institutions.

In both sets of data in Table 19, there was a marked difference between higher and lower quality in UWW as identified by the faculty/staff respondents. Specifically, almost twice as many respondents indicated the academic quality in UWW was higher than the respondents who judged UWW as being lower in quality. The assessment of graduate quality was even more one-sided. Almost four times the number of faculty/staff respondents judged UWW students as being better prepared than the respondents who indicated UWW graduates were not as well prepared.

However, in the opinion of the UWW faculty and staff respondents, their professional colleagues did not share their high regard for UWW. Table 20 provides the data for that comparison. Although 71.8 percent of

TABLE 20

UWW QUALITY VIEWED BY
NON-INVOLVED PROFESSIONALS
(Percent)

Opinion of UWW	Colleagues View (n=182)
Better than other programs	11.5%
About the same	20.9
Not as good as other programs	39.6
No basis for judgment	28.0

the faculty/staff respondents viewed the academic quality of UWW as the same or higher than traditional undergraduate programs, only 32.4 percent of their professional colleagues not involved with UWW shared that view. Indeed, more than three times as many colleagues not associated with the program were viewed as regarding UWW as being not as good as traditional

programs as opposed to those who regarded UWW as better.

Not surprisingly, students had a somewhat higher regard for the UWW program's quality than did the faculty and staff. These data are presented in Table 21. Almost 42 percent of the student respondents

TABLE 21

STUDENT OPINION OF ACADEMIC QUALITY IN UWW
(Percent)

UWW Academic Quality	Student View (n=493)
Higher quality	42.1%
About the same	38.3
Lower quality	2.8
No basis for judgment	16.8

indicated that the academic quality of UWW was higher than the traditional program's quality. Only 2.8 percent believed that UWW was of lower quality. However, the proportion of UWW students who felt that the quality of their programs was at least as good as the quality in traditional programs at the institution was not widely different from the faculty/staff view--students, 80.4 percent (Table 21); faculty/staff 73.3 percent (Table 19).

Participation in UWW

The involvement of professional people outside the usual collegiate setting was one of the goals of the UWW program when it was established. A major UECU "organizing concept" for UWW was that "many persons outside the regular educational institution can contribute

significantly to students' undergraduate experience."[14] Since all of the UWW programs surveyed (except Stephens) use off-campus experts as resource people and advisors, faculty and staff respondents were asked to judge the contribution of off-campus, non-collegiate personnel involved with UWW. Excluding the Stephens' responses, the results of that question are presented in Table 22.

TABLE 22

FACULTY/STAFF OPINION OF INVOLVEMENT OF OFF-CAMPUS, NON-COLLEGIATE PERSONNEL
(Percent)

Role of Off-Campus People	(n=156)
Enhances the quality	63.5%
Does not affect it in either direction	14.7
Detracts from the quality	5.1
No opinion	16.7

The proportion of respondents indicating that off-campus people enhanced the quality of UWW was surprisingly high--more than 60 percent felt these personnel improved the program. This was especially true when coupled with the fact that 59.8 percent of the faculty/staff respondents had academic ranks of associate or full professor (see Table 10). Seemingly these professional respondents were acknowledging noticeable contributions from non-collegiate personnel outside the normally accepted academic criteria--campus-based instruction with professionally trained personnel.

---

[14] First Report, p. 30.

Not too much should be made of this point, however, because UWW students usually try to combine formal education with practical experience. The off-campus personnel were frequently associated with UWW students in an employment setting. Table 23 presents the information on UWW student employment.

TABLE 23

UWW STUDENT EMPLOYMENT AND RELATIONSHIP TO DEGREE PROGRAM
(Percent)

Employment	Student Response (n=492)
Employment Status	
Full-time	65.4%
Part-time	17.9
Homemaker	7.3
Unemployed, seeking	4.5
Unemployed, not seeking	4.9
Relationship to UWW	
Directly related	41.1
Somewhat related	30.3
Unrelated	16.1
Not applicable	12.6

More than seven of every ten UWW student respondents indicated that their employment was related to their academic degree program. Conversely, only 16.1 percent of these same student respondents identified their job as being unrelated to their UWW degree program. The proportion of respondents indicating that their employment was either unrelated or not applicable to their educational program (28.7 percent)

can be explained by the homemaker or unemployed status identified by 16.7 percent of the same student respondents. In other words, there appears to be consistency between the proportion of UWW student respondents indicating current employment and the proportion of student identifying their jobs as being related to their UWW program.

Summary

There were specific differences--both demographic and programmatic--which were presented in the preceding tables. In the aggregate, there were more similarities than differences in both student and faculty/staff data. For example, there was little difference between faculty and staff groups when age, ethnic background, academic rank, and highest degree were considered (Tables 9, 10, 13, and 15). There was also considerable agreement regarding academic quality in UWW among faculty and staff (Table 19). Involvement of off-campus personnel (Table 22), length of time to complete a degree program in UWW (Table 17), and the view of non-involved professional colleagues (Table 20) all show a consistent agreement among the faculty and staff respondents. The issues on which most of the inconsistencies were found tended to be programmatically related. For example, academic rank and highest degree data were different when public and private institutions were compared (Table 11) and when advisement patterns were compared (Table 15). Nonetheless, the aggregate analysis indicated that there was strong agreement on most matters connected with UWW in the seven programs examined as judged by faculty/staff respondents.

Student respondents also reflected a high level of agreement on matters related to UWW. As with the faculty/staff group, the student data showed consistency in the aggregate. There were some differences in age, sex, and ethnic background which were noticeable in institutional comparisons (Tables 6, 7 and 8). However, on such matters as length of time to graduate in UWW (Table 17), overall academic quality (Table 21), and the role of employment to the UWW program (Table 23), there was little difference in the information from students when considered collectively.

In sum, there was consistency in the UWW data, from both student and faculty/staff respondents. It should be noted, however, that each UWW program in the present study had a least one common feature--it offered its own institution's degree. Also, at each institution, UWW represents only a small portion of the total academic program and usually UWW needed to conform to institutional criteria and academic standards. Thus, the already existing set of institutional degree expectations would seem to force UWW programs into some kind of institutional conformity.

CHAPTER V

INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

Introduction

The demographic and programmatic data secured through the survey of the seven University Without Walls programs was reported in Chapter IV. The data from the two opinion sections of the survey instrument were used to provide a basis for an analysis of each program. The opinion portions of each questionnaire were divided into two general categories--"actual" UWW program and an "ideal" UWW-type program.

The actual portion asked each respondent to judge the present UWW program in terms of personal experience by indicating an opinion on thirty seven specific statements. In the ideal section, each respondent was asked to give opinions regarding an ideal UWW-type program using twenty five statements as the basis for their responses. Twenty four of the statements in each section were identical, thus allowing for a comparison of responses.

Reliability

When the pilot-testing of the questionnaire was conducted during the development phase of the present study, the reliability of the instrument was calculated using twelve sample respondents--six students and six faculty/staff individuals (see Table 3). In order to confirm the reliability of the actual survey instrument, another reliability test was run using data from the total sample.

Using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program called Reliability, the responses to the sixty two variables from the opinion portions of the questionnaire (thirty seven from "actual", twenty five from "ideal") were analyzed. In order to get the greatest value from the reliability analysis, only data from respondents indicating an opinion on all of the sixty two variables was included. This allowed for a comprehensive analysis, although the total number of responses incorporated was only slightly greater than fourteen percent (98 of 694). The grand mean of the variables was 4.5654 and the reliability coefficient was .7926. This reliability level was similar to the pilot-test level of .8118.

Factor Analysis

During the pilot-testing stage, a Pearson correlation analysis was used to support the separation of the present UWW program statements into four categories--degree process, student responsibility, programmatic features, and academic quality. It was useful to analyze data (24 identical statements) from the entire study to see if that original grouping remained valid.

An SPSS program (Factor Analysis) was used to verify the earlier categorization. Correlation coefficients were calculated for each variable and an eigenvalue assigned to each factor. (An eigenvalue is a measure of total variance accounted for by the initial factors or variables.) Thirteen factors were identified as explaining the total variation of each of the single variables (Y1 - Y37). However, thirteen factors were unrealistically large so the investigator selected a six

factor analog which accounted for 71.5 percent of the original variability.

Another factor analysis, using six factors rather than thirteen, was employed which identified four factors as accounting for 90.6 percent of the remaining variance in the thirty seven variables. Finally, an additional factor analysis was used resulting in four factors with the following transformation matrix:

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Factor 1	.71464	.57408	.38524	.10639
Factor 2	.63287	.76426	.00086	.12401
Factor 3	.29794	.24661	.92215	.00709
Factor 4	.00034	.15976	.03502	.98653

Factor 1 corresponded to academic quality issues; Factor 2 with programmatic features; Factor 3 with degree process; and Factor 4 with student responsibility (see Table 1 for comparison).

The highly correlated variables identified in each of the factors were similar to those variables found in the field test correlations. Therefore, the factor analysis was accepted as indicating that each group of variables was highly correlated within its factor (group) while not being significantly correlated with other factors or groups of variables.

Aggregate Analysis

Because each of the seven University Without Walls programs was a unique academic undertaking, the investigator needed to determine whether or not students and faculty/staff groups at each institution shared common views of the UWW programs. Therefore, it was necessary to determine whether or not the student and faculty/staff responses at each

institution were equally distributed for each set of paired responses. To see if there was uniformity throughout the seven institutions on specific issues in UWW, the aggregated data from all student and faculty/staff respondents at each institution were compared. For example, Y1 stated, "Development of the degree plan is the primary responsibility of the student." Z1 was the same statement except it was restated in the "ideal" section as "Development of a degree plan in a UWW-type program should be the primary responsibility of the student."

Using this comparative technique, only four opinion items in the questionnaire were identified as being commonly viewed by both student and faculty/staff respondents. Table 24 presents the data.

TABLE 24

AGGREGATE FACULTY/STAFF AND STUDENT
OPINION OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Acquiring an education in a specific field is most important feature in UWW (Y20 - Z11)							
Faculty/Staff							
Real	14	29	30	74	19	15	181
Ideal	12	39	42	77	9	2	181
Students							
Real	45	134	73	191	26	21	490
Ideal	57	119	133	156	16	7	488
Minimal enrollment or residency requirements are strength of this program (Y26 - Z18)							
Faculty/Staff							
Real	21	67	25	24	3	42	182
Ideal	81	92	8	0	0	0	181
Students							
Real	69	181	80	49	8	103	490
Ideal	220	252	10	2	1	2	487
Different admission standards are used for UWW students (Y28 -Z17)							
Faculty/Staff							
Real	30	84	12	12	3	42	183
Ideal	48	85	16	20	9	3	181
Students							
Real	56	188	41	43	12	151	491
Ideal	96	221	56	78	27	8	486

TABLE 24

(Continued)

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Qualifications for faculty members are the same in UWW and in more traditional programs (Y30 - Z19)							
Faculty/Staff							
Real	34	75	9	35	5	23	181
Ideal	50	64	14	41	10	2	181
Students							
Real	94	169	27	38	12	151	491
Ideal	139	201	39	74	22	12	487

These data show, for example, the 48.4 percent of the faculty/staff respondents and 51 percent of the student respondents either agreed or agreed strongly on current practices regarding minimal enrollment. Further, in an ideal UWW-type program, 95.6 percent of the faculty/staff and 96.9 percent of the students indicated the same degree of agreement regarding minimal enrollment or residency being a strength. The remaining three issues show similar levels of agreement. It was concluded, therefore, that there were few programmatic or academic features of the University Without Walls programs which were common in each of the seven programs examined. This was the investigator's original impression and an important reason

for employing an analysis of individual institutions.

Three of the four statements agreed upon by both student and faculty/staff people were procedural; one was programmatic:

1) Acquiring an education in a specific field is (should be) the most important feature of a UWW program. [Programmatic]

2) Minimum enrollment or residency requirements are (should be) a strength in the UWW program.

3) Different admission standards are (should be) used for UWW students than are (should be) used for students in traditional degree programs at this institution.

4) Qualifications for faculty members working in UWW are (should be) the same as the qualifications for regular faculty members in more traditional programs at this institution.

Given the nature of the demographic profile of the UWW students, it was not surprising that education in a specific field was viewed as an important feature of UWW by both the students and faculty/staff personnel. Education in a specific field or area, often desirable because of a student's employment, was shown as a key factor in a student's choice of UWW. The remaining three statements merely acknowledge institutional practices regarding UWW.

Institutional Analysis

Since each UWW program was examined individually, it was necessary to review data for each program separately. In order to determine whether or not the students and faculty/staff members shared common views about UWW, their opinion responses were analyzed. As explained in Chapter IV there were several different programmatic approaches used in UWW--delivery systems, credit hours, and staffing patterns. However, each program was internally consistent so while there were differences between

programs, there would be few programmatic differences within a single program. Therefore, it was assumed that faculty/staff and student respondents would have similar bases for comparison even though their opinions might differ on isolated single issues or topics.

Antioch College/West

Because of the small response at Antioch West, it was not clear whether or not there were differences between student perceptions and faculty/staff views. Since the data represented a very small sample, the results should be viewed as inconclusive at best.

Chicago State University

The faculty and staff at Chicago State University concluded that the UWW program's actual operation and the ideal expectation for the program were congruous. In their view, in other words, there was close agreement between both the real and ideal opinions of UWW. Although the total number of faculty/staff respondents was small, it does represent responses from more than one-third of the professional people involved with UWW at Chicago State. However, the investigator considered the data sufficient to conclude that the faculty/staff group was necessarily satisfied or dissatisfied with the present program.

The students, however, did not agree on four issues as reflected in the composite data in Table 25. In each case the students felt that the present UWW program did not achieve what they felt it should in these areas. However, it must be noted that only one of these concerns (Y27-Z16) was related to academic or programmatic issues. The remainder were related to procedural program matters.

TABLE 25

CHICAGO STATE UNIVERSITY STUDENT
OPINIONS OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Student involvement in hiring (Y9 - Z6)							
Real	1	3	5	11	8	1	28
Ideal	2	11	6	9	0	1	29
Reduced tuition and fees in UWW (Y14 - Z7)							
Real	1	2	1	14	7	4	29
Ideal	7	8	5	7	0	2	29
Advising process helpful in UWW (Y25 - Z14)							
Real	5	19	1	2	1	0	28
Ideal	14	15	0	0	0	0	29
Clearly defined academic controls (Y27 - Z16)							
Real	2	12	4	4	4	4	29
Ideal	5	22	1	1	0	0	29

The discrepancy between the student opinion of the real and ideal UWW program can be easily seen. For example, on the issue of clearly defined academic controls, 48.3 percent of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. However, 93.1 percent of the same

respondents indicated agreement or strong agreement on the issue from the perspective of an ideal UWW-type program.

Two issues identified by the students at Chicago State were predictable. Student participation in professional staff selection is usually not the practice at the institution. Choice of academic personnel is usually left to department or discipline members who have credentials to select their peers. Therefore, it was not surprising that student involvement in hiring was viewed differently in an ideal setting. Because Chicago State is a public institution, tuition and fee structure for all students is set by institutional policy. As a consequence, it is extremely difficult to establish a differentiated tuition or fee rate for a special program. Since UWW is a credit-based program leading to a baccalaureate degree, tuition and fees are fixed throughout the university. Thus, irrespective of the UWW student opinion, it is doubtful if the current tuition policy can be changed.

Loretto Heights College

In three cases the faculty and staff at Loretto Heights were dissatisfied with the present UWW program--two issues were programmatic, one procedural. Table 26 presents the data.

TABLE 26

LORETTO HEIGHTS COLLEGE FACULTY/STAFF
OPINION OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Selection of new students is responsibility of UWW staff (Y3 - Z3)							
Real	0	2	1	6	5	0	14
Ideal	5	7	1	1	0	0	14
UWW students learn about a wide variety of subjects (Y15 - Z8)							
Real	1	6	1	5	1	0	14
Ideal	4	7	3	0	0	0	14
There are clearly defined academic quality controls (Y27 - Z16)							
Real	2	3	3	5	1	0	14
Ideal	5	9	0	0	0	0	14

Since 13 of the 14 professional respondents at Loretto Heights College were UWW staff personnel, their opinions on student selection (Y3 - Z3) were not surprising. The practice in the program was to have a committee of staff people interview potential students prior to admission. As indicated in the data, however, that practice was not being followed. The issue of academic quality controls was a problem for Loretto Heights

respondents as it had been at Antioch. Apparently in an attempt to provide programmatic flexibility in UWW, there was a feeling that appropriate academic controls were not being exercised.

Unfortunately, fourteen respondents do not represent an appropriate sample of the Loretto Heights College UWW faculty and staff. These general conclusions, therefore, must be considered tentative.

Loretto Heights' students as in the case of Chicago State's students, identified three of the four issues which were procedural rather than programmatic. However, in the last three items in Table 27 the students showed concern about present practices being more undesirable than those in an ideal UWW-type program. For example, the students felt that standardized tests (e.g., GRE, CLEP) were currently used more widely than they felt they should be. Similarly, the students felt that the present UWW program was more interdisciplinary than desirable in an ideal analog. Complete information on these student identified issues is presented in Table 27.

TABLE 27

LORETTO HEIGHTS COLLEGE STUDENT OPINION OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Reduced tuition and fees in UWW (Y14 - Z7)							
Real	2	3	3	15	13	6	42
Ideal	13	10	9	6	0	3	41
Faculty committee assessment of prior learning (Y2 - Z12)							
Real	9	26	2	2	1	2	42
Ideal	3	18	5	9	5	1	41
Interdisciplinary rather than one field (Y32 - Z21)							
Real	11	27	3	0	0	1	42
Ideal	8	21	7	4	1	0	41
Use of standardized tests (Y36 - Z24)							
Real		8	7	9	3	15	42
Ideal		6	9	7	12	7	41

The issue of faculty committee assessment of prior learning was noticeably disparate. As seen in Table 26, 14 of 41 respondents (36.6 percent) disagreed to some extent that a committee should evaluate prior learning. Only 3 of 42 student respondents (7.1 percent) indicated that the practice was part of the present UWW program at Loretto Heights. Apparently the

UWW students felt that the UWW staff should assess earlier learning which was not the typical practice at most institutions. Willingham, for example, identified institutional acceptance of prior learning when he noted, "the important point is that assessment should have the effect of emphasizing what the institution wants to emphasize."[1] It would be difficult to believe that a UWW staff would be more representative of an institution than its traditional academic staff.

University of Massachusetts

Only two issues were singled out by the Massachusetts faculty and staff members involved with UWW. The students were also concerned about these same issues and each group was concerned that the present program was falling short of the ideal level for academic control. The specific data are displayed in Table 28.

---

[1]Warren W. Willingham, "Critical Issues and Basic Requirements for Assessment," in Morris Keaton and Associates, Experiential Learning (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976), p. 230.

TABLE 28

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS FACULTY/STAFF
AND STUDENT OPINION OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Clearly defined academic quality controls (Y27 - Z16)							
Faculty/Staff							
Real	3	11	5	8	2	5	34
Ideal	18	13	1	0	0	1	33
Students							
Real	2	17	13	12	2	4	50
Ideal	8	35	2	2	1	1	49
Clearly defined method for determining graduation (Y37 - Z23)							
Faculty/Staff							
Real	3	18	3	4	2	3	33
Ideal	20	12	1	0	0	0	33
Students							
Real	3	33	3	5	1	5	50
Ideal	19	28	1	1	0	1	50

It is evident in both issues that there is a discrepancy between present practice (real) and an ideal UWW-type program. For example, 41.1 percent of the faculty and staff feel that the present UWW program has clearly defined academic quality controls; however, 93.9 percent of these same respondents believe that such controls should exist. Student responses show a similar pattern--38 percent and 87.9 percent respectively--on the

same issue.

The data clearly show that these two issues were central to the UWW program at Massachusetts. It was apparently the ambiguity of the UWW process which concerned the faculty/staff members most. For example, the bulk of the Massachusetts respondents were teaching faculty members (28 of 34, or 82.4 percent). In addition, 85.3 percent were involved with the UWW program for three or more years. The opinions of these respondents, therefore, must be considered realistic given the knowledge of UWW they should have had.

The faculty/staff concerns, however, were not considered as necessarily meaning general dissatisfaction with the UWW program. Table 29 presents additional data from the survey instrument.

TABLE 29

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS FACULTY/STAFF
OPINION OF ACADEMIC QUALITY IN UWW

Classification	Faculty/Staff (n=34)
UWW Compared with Traditional Programs	
Higher quality in UWW	23.5%
About the same	44.1
Lower quality in UWW	20.6
No basis for judgment	8.8
UWW Graduates Compared with Traditional Graduates	
UWW better prepared	38.2
About the same	35.3
UWW not as well prepared	17.6
No opinion	5.9

It should be noted also that only two of the twenty four issues in UWW were not consistent as seen in the comparison of real and ideal opinions of the Massachusetts faculty and staff.

In addition to the academic quality control concerns shared with the faculty and staff respondents, the students found discrepancy in four procedural areas within their UWW program. These data are shown in Table 30.

TABLE 30

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS STUDENT
OPINION OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Student admission is responsibility of UWW staff (Y3 - Z3)							
Real	2	7	10	16	7	8	50
Ideal	15	20	9	4	1	0	49
Student involvement in hiring (Y9 - Z6)							
Real	5	12	3	11	5	14	50
Ideal	14	16	7	9	1	2	49
Reduced tuition and fees in UWW (Y14 -Z7)							
Real	1	20	4	14	8	3	50
Ideal	13	21	6	6	1	2	49
Advising process helpful (Y25 - Z14)							
Real	2	34	8	2	3	1	50
Ideal	16	33	0	0	0	0	49

In each case the students felt that the present UWW program did not conform to their view of an ideal UWW-type program. The most striking disparity was in student admission where the students believed the UWW staff should become more involved in the selection process. Comparing the results of the data on this issue, 18 percent of the students believed that the selection of new students was being done by the UWW staff while 71.4 percent believed selection should be done by this group. In addition, 72 percent believed that the advising process was currently helpful, while 100 percent thought such advising should be helpful.

University of Minnesota

The only joint concern shared by both students and faculty/staff members at Minnesota was the matter of clearly defined graduation requirements. Two additional issues were identified by the faculty and staff and Table 31 summarizes the concerns of the Minnesota professional respondents.

TABLE 31

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA FACULTY/STAFF
OPINION OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Wide variety of subject areas, not concentration (Y15 - Z8)							
Real	0	8	3	15	4	9	39
Ideal	10	13	11	5	0	0	39

TABLE 31

(Continued)

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Clearly defined academic quality controls (Y27 - Z16)							
Real	4	10	7	9	2	6	38
Ideal	23	14	1	0	0	1	39
Academic accountability and quality controls, same for UWW and traditional (Y35 - Z20)							
Real	2	8	2	16	5	6	39
Ideal	8	16	5	7	2	1	39

Only 20.5 percent of the respondents felt that the present UWW program offered a wide variety of subject choices. Conversely, 59 percent felt in an ideal UWW-type program a wide variety of subject areas should be available. In a similar manner, 25.6 percent of the faculty and staff felt that the same accountability and quality controls should apply to both UWW and more traditional programs. However, more than twice that number (61.5 percent) believed that the same criteria should be used in an ideal UWW-type setting.

Student opinion at Minnesota was similar to opinion of other UWW students in that the concerns centered on procedural rather than academic

matters. Table 32 presents the data on four issues with which the students indicated disagreement.

TABLE 32

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA STUDENT OPINION
OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Student admission is responsibility of UWW staff (Y3 - Z3)							
Real	4	19	16	17	4	22	82
Ideal	18	34	15	7	3	5	82
Reduced tuition and fees in UWW (Y14 -Z7)							
Real	3	9	5	32	25	8	82
Ideal	23	29	14	12	1	2	81
Student programs in UWW usually not available at institution (Y18 - Z10)							
Real	31	39	5	2	1	4	82
Ideal	10	38	22	11	0	0	81
Advising process helpful (Y25 - Z14)							
Real	19	45	11	3	2	1	81
Ideal	43	37	1	0	0	0	81

The students at Minnesota were the only ones who showed concern about the

academic programs in UWW being unavailable at the institution. Specifically, 89.7 percent indicated that students could now develop academic programs not usually available at the baccalaureate level at Minnesota. However, only 59.3 percent of these same students believed that such a situation should occur in an ideal UWW-type program. No evidence was found to explain this concern. Nonetheless, coupled with the apparent dissatisfaction regarding advisement, it may indicate that too much programmatic flexibility was found to be a difficulty by students when working closely with faculty members on unique curricula. The balance of the student concerns reflected those of students in most other UWW programs.

Northeastern Illinois University

Faculty and staff members at Northeastern indicated a high degree of dissatisfaction between the actual and ideal opinions of the UWW program at the institution. Major concerns identified by this group are summarized in Table 33.

TABLE 33

NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY FACULTY/STAFF
OPINIONS OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Wide variety of subject areas, not concentration (Y15 - Z8)							
Real	4	8	5	22	8	3	50
Ideal	14	18	8	10	0	0	50
Advising process helpful (Y25 - Z14)							
Real	14	28	5	2	0	1	50
Ideal	25	25	0	0	0	0	50
Clearly defined academic quality controls (Y27 - Z16)							
Real	6	16	9	10	3	6	50
Ideal	28	21	1	0	0	0	50
Same quality controls in UWW as in more traditional programs (Y35 - Z20)							
Real	3	9	6	23	6	2	49
Ideal	11	21	6	8	2	2	50
Interdisciplinary rather than concentrated (Y32 - Z21)							
Real	11	15	10	9	2	3	50
Ideal	15	23	9	3	0	0	50
Clearly defined graduation requirements (Y37 - Z23)							
Real	9	26	2	7	2	3	49
Ideal	25	23	1	0	1	0	50
Use of standardized tests (Y36 - Z24)							
Real	0	2	4	14	9	20	49
Ideal	4	9	16	8	11	2	50

It appeared that UWW at Northeastern was suspect in quality in the view of the faculty/staff respondents. This apparent suspicion could be the result of UWW being the only non-credit-based degree program at the institution, resulting in difficulty with faculty members understanding the unique features of the competency-based UWW program. However, the degree of difference between the present and ideal UWW-type program seemed to reflect a real concern about academic quality.

One of the most surprising results reflected in Table 33 was the role of standardized tests. Only 4.1 percent of the faculty/staff respondents felt that the present UWW program was using standardized tests while 26 percent believed such tests should be used in an ideal setting. No other institution's data reflected a similar desire for more such testing. However, it should be noted that the desirability of such testing might be as an exit exam, thereby confirming the student's competence in a more traditional manner. Acceptable performance by a UWW student with such instruments would provide concrete evidence of academic ability, something frequently lacking in competency-based programs.

Given these data, it was somewhat difficult to understand why 72.3 percent of these same respondents identified the academic quality of the UWW program as being the same or higher quality than the more traditional programs at the institution. Further, 71.5 percent of the Northeastern faculty and staff respondents indicated that UWW graduates were as well or better prepared than graduates of more traditional baccalaureate degree programs at the institution. Table 34 presents the data.

TABLE 34

NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY FACULTY/STAFF OPINION OF ACADEMIC QUALITY IN UWW

Issue	Faculty/Staff
UWW Compared with Traditional Programs	(n=47)
Higher quality in UWW	40.4%
About the same quality	31.9
Lower quality in UWW	17.0
No basis for judgment	10.7
UWW Graduates Compared with Traditional Graduates	(n=49)
UWW better prepared	53.1
About the same	18.4
UWW not as well prepared	20.4
No opinion	8.1

For whatever reasons, however, more concerns about UWW were identified by the faculty and staff respondents at Northeastern than at most of the other six programs or institutions.

Student perceptions at Northeastern were quite different from those of the professional staff. Other than the concerns shared with the faculty and staff regarding clearly defined graduation and helpful advising, the students identified only the selection of new students and possible tuition differential as points of disagreement when comparing the present program to the ideal analog. All other features of the UWW program at Northeastern were viewed as compatible by the students.

Stephens College

There was more discrepancy between the present and ideal UWW program at Stephens than at any other institution in the present study. Both the students and the faculty/staff respondents confirmed the disparity of two issues--existence of clearly defined academic quality controls and curricular choice restriction. The data on both topics is presented in Table 35. On each of the issues, the students and faculty/staff members

TABLE 35

STEPHENS COLLEGE FACULTY/STAFF AND STUDENT OPINION OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Clearly defined academic conrols (Y27 - Z16)							
Faculty/Staff							
Real	6	9	5	6	1	0	27
Ideal	16	11	0	0	0	0	27
Students							
Real	36	133	20	6	0	29	224
Ideal	78	129	9	4	1	1	222
Curricular choices in UWW greater (Y33 - Z22)							
Faculty/Staff							
Real	0	4	4	15	3	1	27
Ideal	5	9	8	4	1	0	27
Students							
Real	20	50	34	52	7	61	224
Ideal	33	114	53	19	0	3	222

agreed that the present UWW program at Stephens did not reach the desired level of an ideal UWW-type program.

In addition, the faculty and staff respondents from Stephens identified three other areas of concern which are presented in Table 36.

TABLE 36

STEPHENS COLLEGE FACULTY/STAFF OPINIONS OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Wide variety of subject areas, not concentration (Y15 - Z8)							
Real	4	12	4	4	3	0	27
Ideal	12	11	3	1	0	0	27
Academic accountability and control, same for UWW and traditional (Y35 - Z25)							
Real	4	13	1	8	1	0	27
Ideal	9	15	2	1	0	0	27
Academic quality should be similar in UWW and other programs (Y35 - Z20)							
Real	4	13	1	8	1	0	27
Ideal	13	14	0	0	0	0	27

These data show that program quality was the most pronounced matter at Stephens in UWW since all five of the issues identified were directly related to program quality. This may be the result of how the Stephens'

UWW program was structured. It was essentially a course-based degree program where instruction was provided at off-campus sites by regular Stephens' faculty. In other words, existing courses were taken to off-campus sites, but little nontraditionalism was part of the Stephens' UWW program. Therefore, there should have been close agreement between UWW and Stephens' traditional undergraduate program since the two were essentially the same.

The major programmatic difference in UWW at Stephens was that there was a required residency seminar (three weeks long) which was required of all UWW students. The seminar was held at the main campus at Columbia, Missouri. Portfolio development was undertaken during the seminar and the basic rules of the UWW program were explained. After that, Stephens' UWW program operated along the lines of a traditional extension program utilizing off-campus teaching sites. Thus the differences identified between the real and ideal UWW-type program were merely the perception that UWW should look more like the conventional Stephens' curriculum. The data in Tables 34 and 35 reflected that view.

Student opinion of the present UWW program and the ideal analog were also divided. Nine of the twenty four paired variables reflected disparate measures as judged by the students. Two of these issues were already shown in Table 35; the remainder were incorporated into Table 37.

TABLE 37

STEPHENS COLLEGE STUDENT OPINIONS OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Student degree plan development (Y1 - Z1)							
Real	21	126	9	59	5	1	221
Ideal	22	95	26	67	12	0	222
Reduced tuition and fees (Y14 - Z14)							
Real	6	20	12	95	41	49	223
Ideal	86	130	4	2	0	0	222
Student planning freedom (Y16 - Z9)							
Real	67	146	5	3	1	1	223
Ideal	54	133	23	9	1	0	220
Increased formal classroom instruction (Y23 - Z13)							
Real	7	25	37	113	39	3	224
Ideal	11	60	50	77	22	2	222
Advising process helpful (Y25 - Z14)							
Real	50	130	20	18	2	4	224
Ideal	86	130	4	2	0	0	222
Interdisciplinary rather than concentrated (Y32 - Z21)							
Real	57	135	17	8	1	5	223
Ideal	47	113	40	17	2	3	222
Clearly defined graduation requirements (Y37 - Z23)							
Real	36	161	9	7	2	8	223
Ideal	73	139	7	1	3	0	223

As shown in Table 36, the disagreement between the present program and its ideal counterpart was evident. Indeed, even the basic tenet of the UWW approach--student responsibility in the development of the degree plan--was questioned. Although 66.5 percent of the student respondents cited student responsibility for the degree plan in the present program, only 52.7 percent believed that the student should plan his/her degree plan in an ideal UWW-type program. This was the only instance in the present study where too much student freedom was identified as a concern in an operating UWW program. Also, more students wanted concentrated fields of study than wanted interdisciplinary experiences in the ideal UWW analog. In all other institutions the desire was for more interdisciplinary exposure.

The student opinion of the UWW program at Stephens was at odds with the majority of student responses at the other institutions. However, this might be attributed to the off-campus nature of the Stephens College UWW program where there was little need for student flexibility because the program was course-based and fairly well prescribed.

Summary

Although the bulk of this chapter was devoted to identifying and explaining specific issues which appeared inconsistent in UWW, it must be noted that the majority of issues examined in the present study were accepted; that is, there was little difference between what the respondents experienced (real) versus what they wanted (ideal). This result should not be lost in the myriad of details presented in this chapter.

It was clear also, moreover, that the similarities within UWW were greater than the differences. In the aggregate there were twenty four issues examined in the present study, only four of which were consistently questioned or at least showed internal inconsistency. The remaining twenty, however, represent a foundation upon which most of the UWW respondents--both faculty/staff and students--agreed. The high level of programmatic agreement can be attributed partly to the commonality of each program--awarding the institutional degree to UWW graduates.

Hopefully, the four issues identified would recieve the attention of the people at each institution responsible for the UWW programs. These same concerns should be of interest to the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities through its continuing involvement in University Without Walls.

CHAPTER VI

TWO CASE STUDIES

Introduction

University Without Walls programs at seven institutions were examined as part of the present study. Chapter IV presented demographic and programmatic information which showed that despite occasional inconsistencies, each program was more similar than different. Chapter V dealt with the interpretations of the data from the opinion portions of the questionnaires. Again, despite some differences, the student and faculty/staff respondents did not indicate markedly different opinions when comparing the present and ideal UWW-type programs. The purpose of this chapter is to examine closely two specific cases where UWW programs were examined--Loretto Heights College and Northeastern Illinois University.

Loretto Heights College

Loretto Heights is a small (800 students), private, residential, liberal arts college in Denver with approximately 100 UWW students (not all of whom register each term) and a staff of about thirty, counting full-and part-time personnel. Loretto Heights' UWW program is based upon a 128 semester hour requirement for graduation and the program is a distinct entity within the institution; that is, it has its own budget, personnel and administrative offices. The program also retains its own

tuition fees to support the program, although a percentage is given to the institution in return for the UWW office space. Loretto's UWW is an independent program using the location and degree-granting function of the college, but without formal ties to the regular academic people and programs at the institution.

Service to UWW students is provided by a central core staff which is responsible for the process aspects of the UWW program. The title "learning facilitator" is used to identify the myriad of functions provided by the advisor in regards to the process matters in UWW. Such issues include documentation of prior learning, field supervision to bring job and study interests together, and regular assessment of the student's program.

Academic components of the Loretto Heights UWW program are the responsibility of the "resource person" who acts as the content specialist for the student. This responsibility includes directing the development of learning contracts and evaluating the results at the conclusion of the contract. Typically a contract is for sixteen weeks and assessment is in terms of a specific number of semester credit hours. Resource people are frequently off-campus experts whose expertise, experience, involvement, and interests correspond to the UWW student's program. During participation with the UWW program, these individuals are appointed Adjunct Faculty by the president of the college. Resource people may continue for several learning contracts, but typically are involved for only a single contract. Regular Loretto Heights faculty are also used as resource people in UWW, usually through a release-time model. There

is no direct compensation for services for resource people.

The UWW student's professional "team" is the learning facilitator and the resource person. During each learning contract an assessment is made of the student's progress and credits are assigned for the academic achievements. A detailed evaluation is prepared and submitted to the UWW office for incorporation into the student's transcript. Often these materials lead to a 30-40 page final degree transcript which is essentially narrative in style. Thus, credit hours are used for each learning contract, but the documentation of the learning is reported in narrative style.

In addition to the 128 semester hour requirement, the UWW student must satisfactorily complete a Degree Review Session in which the student's depth area is reviewed. As part of that Session the student presents a "major work" or "synthesis of learning" related to their depth area or area of academic concentration. In addition, the student is required to demonstrate knowledge in breadth areas--learning in related or cognate fields. Finally, the Review Session evaluates competence in communication, personal growth, and creativity.

Northeastern Illinois University

Northeastern is a public, commuter institution with 10,000 students located on the northwest side of Chicago. About 150 students are part of the current UWW program which has a full-time staff of two professionals and three civil service people. The UWW program at Northeastern is a competency-based program which awards the institutional degree (either

a Bachelor of Arts or Science) upon satisfactory completion of the degree requirements. The program is funded through normal state appropriations and is considered an integral part of the institution. Students participating in UWW at Northeastern pay the same tuition and fees, have the same privileges and responsibilities, and have access to the same institutional resources as other undergraduates at the university.

Service to Northeastern UWW students is coordinated through the central administrative office, but academic advisement is provided by a full-time Northeastern faculty or staff member. The role of the UWW staff is to handle procedural matters (i.e., registration, financial aid) rather than provide on-going facilitator support such as that provided at Loretto Heights. Orientation to UWW generally is provided by the central staff who also puts students in touch with faculty advisors with common interests.

Academic advisement is provided by a permanent professional staff member of the institution. Usually the academic advisor is a teaching faculty member, but other staff people often serve as academic advisors. An example of the latter would be the Director of Learning Services who might work with a student interested in media or other related fields. Each trimester the student and the academic advisor develop learning goals which are formally assessed at the end of the term in a document known as a Trimesterly Report. This document outlines in detail what the student has accomplished and contains a comprehensive evaluation of

the student's performance by the academic advisor. This summary is forwarded to the UWW offices for incorporation into the student's file.

In addition to an academic advisor, the UWW student at Northeastern usually has a community advisor who is normally associated with the student at his/her place of employment. The role of the community advisor is to help the student build upon work experience as part of the degree process. This process is much like a supervised field internship, jointly administered by the community advisor and academic advisor who collaborate on the development of these work-related learning activities. If the student has a community advisor, that person is also involved with the development and evaluation of the Trimesterly Report.

At Northeastern the UWW student's "team" is the academic and community advisors. Each trimester of active involvement (i.e., registration) results in a Trimesterly Report which includes evaluation statements from the advisors. After receipt of the Report in the UWW office, the academic advisor is eligible for compensation--either directly to the individual advisor or to the advisor's department or budgetary unit. There is no compensation for the community advisor.

When the student and advisor(s) agree that the student's progress toward graduation has proceeded satisfactorily, a graduation Review Board is convened. The Board is charged with assessing depth, breadth, and the student's ability to communicate. A packet of materials is assembled by the student for presentation to the Board. These materials usually include excerpts from Trimesterly Reports, original papers, and the like to give the Board members concrete evidence of the student's achievement.

The Board is the sole body which can authorize a UWW student's graduation.

Degree Process Comparison

With a brief background of each program, it is useful to compare specific programmatic features of both programs, especially in view of the differences between them.

Admissions

Each program uses an open-ended application form which allows students to creatively explain their projected academic program based upon their individual interests. Both Loretto Heights and Northeastern have an admissions committee which reviews applications and selects students for the program. The UWW staff performs that function at Loretto, while representatives of a faculty/student advisory committee perform that task at Northeastern. Although the members of the selection committee change frequently, the admission process is similar at both institutions.

Orientation

Formal orientation to both programs is required of each student. At Loretto Heights the UWW staff has developed a comprehensive orientation course which introduces the UWW process, portfolio development, assessment requirements, and other salient features of the program. This credit course is required of all new students and not infrequently a second semester follow-up course is necessary. One of the major outcomes of this course is the assignment of one of the UWW staff learning facilitators

to each student. This assignment is based upon the student's interests and the facilitator's background, interest, and work load.

The Northeastern orientation to UWW bears no credit and is designed to acquaint the student with a competency-based program. This is especially necessary since UWW is the only degree program at the institution not based upon credit hours (120 semester hours are required to graduate from the traditional undergraduate program). In addition, an important outcome of orientation is the identification of potential academic advisors. The students are given several names of university personnel who might be interested in working with them on their UWW program. It is then the responsibility of the student to contact, meet, and confirm academic advisement. Only if the student cannot secure advisement does the UWW staff personnel become involved.

Assessment of Prior Learning

The formal assessment of prior learning at Loretto Heights is comprehensive. There are three opportunities for assessment--transfer credit, credit by examination, and advance standing credit. Formal transfer credit is evaluated by a UWW staff member (Coordinator of Documentation and Research) and the student. Once agreement is reached, transfer credit is entered formally on the student's transcript, much the way such work is recorded in a traditional program. The basic difference is that the evaluation is done by the UWW staff, not the institutional evaluation staff at Loretto Heights.

Challenge examinations may be taken by students where departments

offer such opportunities. In addition, credit may be earned through the College Level Examination Program (CLEP), a nationwide standardized test prepared by the College Entrance Examination Board. Credit awarded through this testing process is also indicated on the student's transcript.

Advance standing credit is awarded through an evaluation of a student-prepared portfolio which describes previous nonclassroom learning--often called experiential learning. An interdisciplinary committee is convened to make the credit awards and this usually occurs during the first learning contract as part of the orientation course.

Transfer credit at Northeastern for its UWW program is processed through the institution's evaluation office. Acceptance of credit is determined by the normal process and any resulting credit is reflected on the student's transcript as it is for all undergraduates having transfer credit. The UWW personnel do not become involved with either the assessment or award of transfer credit.

Since Northeastern's program does not use credit hours, there are no challenge exams, CLEP results or portfolio assessments. However, student developed portfolios are encouraged so that each trimester's learning activities may be coordinated with past experiences and/or competencies developed prior to admission to the UWW program.

Degree Plan Development

The individual student's degree plan is the product of the student and his/her advisors. In both programs the degree plan development is

similar, although the nature of credit hours requires that the Loretto UWW degree plan be more prescribed. At Northeastern the degree plan is more open-ended and progress is assessed more on a term-by-term basis than it is at Loretto Heights where the course model is used. There is also more direction at Loretto because of the role of the learning facilitator. The academic advisor at Northeastern is designated as the overall coordinator of the degree plan, but the main emphasis is on the academic component of the program.

Individualized Learning

The individual curriculum of each student is different in UWW. As a consequence, whether formal learning contracts (Loretto) or summary assessments (Northeastern) are used, there will be many differences. However, despite the different nomenclature, learning activities and evaluation techniques are similar at both institutions. Again, formal credit hour learning contracts are more structured than the Trimesterly Reports, but the degree process is similar at both institutions. The use of off-campus learning opportunities is available in both programs as well.

Graduation Review

As was true in several other programmatic aspects, the graduation process at both institutions is similar. Each program requires the development of a packet of materials for review by a graduation committee. Each program requires demonstrated evidence of depth (area of academic concentration), breadth (the "liberal arts" or broad range of competencies outside the major field of interest), and the ability to communicate.

The formal graduation packet provides evidence of a student's writing ability and the oral examination format of the committee allows it to judge the student's speaking ability (oral communication).

Once graduation is approved, it is the function of both UWW programs to assist the student in preparing the final transcript. At Loretto Heights the final transcript is essentially narrative in content with credit hour totals specified at appropriate places in the narrative. At Northeastern the degree transcript is the same for a UWW student as for an undergraduate in a traditional program. However, rather than credit hours and courses, the transcript contains the entry "Participated in University Without Walls" for each term the student registered. Documentation identifying specific learning activities for each of these terms is retained in the UWW offices. Accompanying the degree transcript is a narrative abstract of the student's UWW program, outlining the key features of the learning activities.

Summary

Although only Loretto Heights and Northeastern have been discussed in detail here, the other UWW programs examined in the present study would not represent a major departure from the issues and processes described using these two institutions. Competency-based programs have institutional processes similar to Northeastern and credit-based programs use approaches similar to Loretto Heights. Obviously some differences would be found, but on the whole Loretto Heights and Northeastern are representative of the degree process of the entire group of colleges and universities who participated in the present study.

CHAPTER VII

Conclusions

The present study was an attempt to examine one segment of non-traditional higher education--University Without Walls. As already indicated, there was no single program which represented UWW; rather, each program had facets which made it unique. While it was easy to identify institutions which offer UWW programs, it was impossible to generalize about the content, conduct and nature of such baccalaureate endeavors. None of the seven programs surveyed, for example, embodied all of the tenets identified in the First Report of the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities which laid out the UWW organizing concepts.

Chapter IV examined demographic and programmatic data obtained in the survey, but clearly no single UWW program was more representative than another from either prespective. Grouping institutions together by delivery system, advisement method, or funding base showed more commonality among the programs, although discrepancies were also apparent. What was discernible was that there were few programmatic aspects which were similar at all institutions. Yet, several general observations seem worth noting.

Personnel in UWW

The quality and preparation of those professional educators involved in UWW were uniformly high, exceeding in the aggregate the preparation, academic rank and tenure proportions of teaching faculty nationwide

(Tables 9 and 10). There was also evidence to indicate that UWW was held in high regard at the institutions examined in the present study (Table 19). A plausible explanation for the high proportion of tenured professors involved with UWW might be that they had nothing to lose by becoming involved--their participation was risk-free and, therefore, unimportant. Another possible explanation was that a disproportionately high number of senior faculty members returned the questionnaire, thus skewing the data. The latter explanation, however, does not seem valid given the consistent demographic information on faculty and staff which emerged from the institutions. Regardless, the quality of the professional staffs was higher than the investigator had anticipated.

Students in UWW

A second generalization concerned students in UWW--as a group they showed more similarity than was anticipated. Demographic information reflected the expected age distributions and employment patterns (Tables 7 and 23 respectively), but the student respondents showed more formal involvement in higher education than was anticipated. For example, 67 percent of the total student respondents indicated that they had two or more years of formal college credit upon entering UWW (Table 18). Further, more than forty percent of the students indicated that graduation would take two or more years (Table 17). Considered together, these data suggest that UWW was closer than expected to a four year experience. That outcome was even more unexpected given the time shortening concept so often associated with nontraditional programs in general, and UWW in particular.

Academic Aspects in UWW

Student opinion identified in Chapter V indicated some concerns among UWW students regarding the academic aspects of their programs. A good example of this feeling was that students at five of the seven institutions surveyed indicated that the present academic quality controls were not as clearly defined as they should be. Students also pointed out that the advising process needed improvement.

Faculty and staff respondents also singled out the same two issues as essential concerns. In addition, clearly defined graduation requirements was frequently mentioned as a source of concern by these respondents. Not surprisingly, academic matters were of more interest to the faculty and staff than were procedural or administrative concerns.

Summary

Despite identifiable commonalities in both student and faculty/staff responses, the overall picture which emerged from UWW was mixed. Except for the above, there were few issues, topics, or programmatic practices which were uniformly accepted or questioned throughout the seven programs examined. What emerged was a mixed set of reactions and feelings which were seemingly more related to the institution than to UWW. UWW seemed to be more a function of institutional choice with its concomitant strengths and weaknessess than a philosophical commitment to criteria, goals or objectives associated with the program. What is evident from the present study was that there was a wide range of reactions to UWW--both positive and negative. There were similarities to be sure, but the conclusion was clear: UWW was a unique academic program available at a

number of institutions which shared one basic feature--the name, University Without Walls.

Two of the most frequently identified issues--clearly defined quality controls and clearly defined graduation requirements--are academic issues. In both issues there appeared to be difficulty in establishing overall academic control in several UWW programs. For example, because a learning "team" was involved with a student's program, there were frequent concerns indicating confusion about which person on the team had final academic responsibility. There was confusion in both core staff advisement and decentralized advisement models. The scope of that concern can be seen in that all the institutions except Antioch identified academic quality controls as a problem area.

Determining eligibility for graduation from a UWW program was also singled out as a problem. There appears to be at least two parts to that issue--the role of experiential learning and the different institutional requirements of other baccalaureate programs. Credit assessment or competence designation of nonclassroom learning remains a difficult matter. Obviously the manner in which such credit was assessed and how the credit was applied to a UWW program affected the overall degree process. Even at three of the credit-based UWW programs (Loretto Heights, Massachusetts, Stephens), graduation determination was identified as a problem, indicating that assessment of nonclassroom learning was not automatically resolved by assigning specific credits for such learning.

Regardless of what name the final graduation review process had,

there was difficulty in awarding the host institution's degree to a graduate in a UWW program. Despite attempts to "mirror" traditional academic degree programs and requirements, UWW remained suspect for its graduation process. An "area of concentration" was considered somewhat analogous to a traditional undergraduate major and "breadth" was similar to a general education requirement in a more traditional program. The graduation process was hampered by the ambiguity of the UWW programmatic requirements.

UECU Network

As indicated in Chapter I, individual UWW programs grew as part of a programmatic network coordinated by the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities. Unfortunately, UECU has never been a network, but rather a collection of individual baccalaureate-level, degree granting programs which had too little in common. Maintenance of student records, for example, created a problem. The central office of UECU has never had accurate records for UWW students because no systematic method for processing such information was established. Individual institutions or programs maintained records, but nowhere in the UECU "network" was there any central repository for student information.

Despite high sounding principles of broadened educational opportunities through UWW, there has been no network-wide commitment toward these goals. Stephens' UWW program, for example, drew students mostly from rural areas with minimal minority representation (Table 8) and served registered nurses as a main feature of the program. The nurses were predominantly women who were actively employed (Table 6). Urban-based programs in Chicago and Denver on the other hand showed a diverse student population

(Table 8). Clearly, however, there was no "network" basis for students in UWW; rather, institutional priorities and commitments appeared to be individually determined, probably by the host institution sponsoring the UWW program.

Programmatic information was not exchanged, even between programs in the same city (Chicago State and Northeastern, for example). Individual programs experimented with different approaches or programmatic configurations only to find out part way through the effort that one or more other UWW programs had attempted the same thing. Unfortunately, there was rarely any exchange of information because there was no procedure in the "network" to facilitate movement of such information. From 1974-76, Northeastern's UWW program offered a Career Ladder Drug Abuse program for field workers in the area of drug abuse. Despite joint funding with UECU, Northeastern's effort in this field (funded for $250,000 over two years) never was disseminated within the UECU "network". Consequently, when a New Orleans UWW program was funded for the same type of drug abuse program in 1977, there was no exchange of ideas, personnel, or other information whereby one program within the network could benefit from another's experience.

Perhaps the most glaring failure of UECU's networking efforts was in programmatic information not being exchanged. UWW programs had to start without support from UECU. This meant that each new UWW program was a product of its individual environment, unable to select appropriate components or features from similar programs elsewhere in the UECU network. It was not surprising to find concerns about graduation requirements, academic

quality controls and other related issues in the present study since there was little information available from other UWW programs from which to build.

Topics for Further Research

UWW encompassed many academic features, not all of which were part of the mainstream of contemporary higher education. Quantification of previous nonclassroom learning, for example, was part of UWW, but many other baccalaureate programs did not incorporate this philosophy in more traditional curricula. While the Cooperative Assessment of Experiential Learning (CAEL) group has done a great deal of developmental work in this field, there remains need for further research on the implications of certifying previous learning. The disparity of opinion in the present study on academic quality issues in UWW should be considered additional evidence that the role of experiential learning needs to be clarified. Haberman made the same point in the issues he raised about credit awards.[1]

In addition, the role of nonclassroom learning and formal recognition or assessment of that learning could have an impact on standardized tests. Stecher, for example, warned about problems of assessment from the standpoint of inflated awards.[2] Further, students whose academic backgrounds contained substantial recognition of experiential learning might skew the

---

[1]Martin Haberman, "New Entry Requirements and New Programs for College Students," in Policy Issues in Education, ed. Allan C. Ornstein and Steven I Miller (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Company, 1976), pp. 95-107.

[2]Carl A Stecher, "CLEP and the Great Credit Giveaway," Change 9 (March 1977): 36-41.

results of nationwide standardized examinations.

Although there was no specific attempt to address the assessment issue in the present study, it was indicated that the problem exists in UWW. A faculty respondent from the University of Massachusetts wrote, "credit for prior experience weakens the degree--the student already has received "credit" for prior experience in terms of job experience. A degree should show additional strengths."

Utilization of faculty members in one-to-one learning situations should be examined in detail. As the overall enrollments in higher education are projected to decline in the 1980's, more creative use of existing teaching talent will be required. UWW-type curricular arrangements might be a means of meeting changing student needs as well as a method of creatively involving the teaching faculty in flexible, but responsible, academic enterprises. Once a decision on who should do assessment of prior learning was made, moreover, a faculty member (or group of faculty members) could be assigned assessment as part of the academic load. If such a model were adopted, assessment could be elevated to a level where it could be part of someone's academic responsibility. Currently, assessment was often done for minor compensation or gratis, depending upon the availability of staff or faculty resources.

Longitudinal studies of UWW graduates should be undertaken to assess the overall impact of these programs. Most present UWW programs have small-scale follow-up studies on their own graduates, but the investigator is unaware of any comprehensive longitudinal studies currently underway. A recent study of 134 external degree programs and their graduates might serve

as a model.[3] Additionally, there were a few suggested topics incorporated in a recent UECU publication.[4]

A comprehensive assessment of faculty attitudes at institutions offering UWW programs would also be useful. The present study showed that professional staff people involved directly with UWW generally reacted positively to it, while acknowledging that their non-participating colleagues did not have a high regard for the program. Some studies have been undertaken, but these efforts are too limited at the present time.[5]

Eventually, someone will probably undertake a cost-benefit analysis of UWW hoping to determine its economic feasibility. Stephens College recently expanded its UWW program due to the favorable income effects of providing instruction off-campus, while charging full tuition which included overhead expenses for on-campus instructional facilities. Despite such obvious financial advantages in UWW, any cost-benefit study will concentrate, hopefully, more on the benefit and less on the cost aspects of UWW.

There are a myriad of issues in UWW which need more study. Unfortunately, the nature of the program dictates a costly research design because of the individualization of the academic experience in these programs. Close cooperation among UWW directors is also a prerequisite because

---

[3]Carol P. Sosdian and Laure M. Sharp, The External Degree as a Credential: Graduates' Experiences in Employment and Further Study (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1978).

[4]Self Study in Progress Reports (Cincinnati, Ohio: Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities, 1977).

[5]Jeffrey N. Johnson, "Community Faculty in the University Without Walls at the University of Minnesota: A Preliminary Description," Alternative Higher Education 1 (Fall 1976): 5-13.

students seemingly identify with "their" UWW program rather than with a network of similar programs throughout the country. In the present study, for example, the students' addresses were never given to the investigator; rather, the UWW program directors used their mailing lists to distribute the questionnaires. This seemed to be the most practical way to deal with the issue of privacy of student information. Obviously, there are other similar matters which would require working closely with individual UWW programs in any future research. A great deal of money has been made available to support and launch UWW. It is unfortunate that some of these resources have not been directed at comprehensively assessing, examining and analyzing University Without Walls.

A faculty member from Massachusetts (Amherst Campus) wrote:

> The purpose of U.W.W.--as I understand it--is really fine. However, I feel that in many instances an incorrect perspective, re: academic responsibility (student/univeristy) is given or fostered. Students from UWW program do not identify with the degree granting institution. [They] do not see the experience as reciprocal--maybe a result of feeling that one has gotten a degree out of U.W.W., but not an education. I would like to see U.W.W. succeed, however, I think it is time to go back to the drawing board and re-design a more satisfying package.

Perhaps this view is too extreme, but there were enough issues raised about UWW at each institution to warrant a thorough re-examination. So long as the issues related to academic quality remain unresolved, there will be continuing disagreement about University Without Walls.

REFERENCES

Adams, Velma A. "Adult Education: Where the Bread and Action Are." College Management 8 (April 1973): 9-14.

Anstett, Robert R. "The Regents External Degree Program and Its Graduates." College and University 49 (Winter 1974): 154-61.

A Study of A Simulation Modeling Approach to Planning for Non-Traditional Educational Programs. Washington, D.C.: National Association of College and University Business Officers, 1977.

"Availability & Features of External Degree Programs offered by Institutions in State of Illinois." Springfield, Ill.: Illinois Council on Continuing Higher Education, External Degree Task Force, 1976. (Mimeographed.)

Berger, Brigitte. "The Coming Age of People Work." Change 8 (May 1976): 31-34.

Bogan, Robert. Participant Observation in Organizational Settings. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1972.

Burkett, J.E. "Higher Education's Growing Edge." Educational Record 58 (Summer 1977): 259-69.

"CAEL's Research and Development Activities." Experiential Education 2 (March/April 1977): 3-4.

Campbell, Donald T. "Qualitative Knowing in Action Research." Paper presented at the American Psychological Association, New Orleans. 1 September 1974.

Chronicle of Higher Education, 20 September 1976.

_____, 10 January 1977.

_____, 20 March 1978.

College and University Enrollment in New York State: Fall, 1976 (Preliminary Report). Albany: University of the State of New York, 1976.

Cross, K. Patricia. Beyond the Open Door. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

_____. "The New Learners." Change 5 (February 1973): 31-34.

_____. "The Instructional Revolution." In Individualizing the System, pp. 49-61. Edited by Dyckman W. Vermilye. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Cross, K. Patricia, and Valley, John R. and Associates. Planning Non-Traditional Programs: An Analysis of the Issues of Postsecondary Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Corey, Stephen M. Action Research to Improve School Practices. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1953.

Davis, Charles, ed. The 1,000 Mile Campus. Los Angeles: Office of the Chancellor, California State University and Colleges, 1972.

Denzin, Norman K. The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1970.

Digest of Educational Statistics, 1976 Edition. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1977.

Dressel, Paul L., ed. The New Colleges: Toward an Appraisal. Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1971.

Ewing, Wallace K. "Reshaping the Curriculum: What Does It Really Mean?" College and University 49 (Spring 1974): 96-113.

Filstead, William J. "The Promises and Problems of Qualitative Methodology." Paper presented to the Department of Sociology, American University. 17 April 1974. (Mimeographed.)

Forest, Aubrey; Knapp, Joan E.; and Pendergrass, Judith. "Tools and Methods of Evaluation." In Experiential Learning, pp. 161-188. Edited by Morris Keeton and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Freeman, Howard E. and Sherwood, Clarence C. Social Research and Social Change. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Gould, Samuel B. Diversity by Design. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Gould, Samuel B. and Cross, K. Patricia, ed. Explorations in Non-Traditional Study. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Gross, Ronald. Higher/Wider/Education: A Report on Open Learning. New York: Ford Foundation, 1976.

_____. The Lifelong Learner. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1977.

Haberman, Martin. "New Entry Requirements and New Programs for College Students." In Policy Issues in Education, pp. 95-107. Edited by Allan C. Ornstein and Steven I. Miller. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company, 1976.

Heydinger, Richard B. "The Assessment of Student Performance: A Model & the Reforms." Paper presented to the American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, Illinois. 25 March 1975.

Houle, Cyril O. The External Degree. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Johnson, Jeffrey N. "Community Faculty in the University Without Walls at the University of Minnesota: A Preliminary Description." Alternative Higher Education 1 (Fall 1976): 5-13.

Johnson, John M. Doing Field Research. New York: Free Press, 1975.

Keeton, Morris T. and Associates. Experiential Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Kellams, Samuel E. "Knowledge Renewal with Innovation." College and University Journal 13 (May 1974): 5-8.

Knowles, Malcolm S. "Non-Traditional Study: Issues and Resolutions." Adult Leadership 23 (February 1975): 232-35.

Less Time, More Options: Education Beyond High School. Report by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Levine, Arthur, and Weingant, John. Reform of Undergraduate Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

London, Herbert I. "The Case for Nontraditional Education." Change 8 (June 1976): 25-29.

_____. "University Without Walls: Reform or Rip-Off?" Saturday Review 55 (16 September 1972): 62-65.

Martin, Warren Bryan. "Thoughts on Evaluation and Imagination." In The New Colleges: Toward an Appraisal, pp. 307-17. Edited by Paul L. Dressel. Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1971.

McCall, George J., and Simmons, J.L., eds. Issues in Participant Observation. Menlo Park, Calif.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.

Meinert, Charles W., and Penny, Sherry. "Credit for Life Experience: Establishing Institutional Policy and Procedures." Journal of Higher Education 46 (May/June 1975): 339-48.

Meyer, Peter. Awarding College Credit for Non-College Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Miller, Jerry W. "Credit for Nontraditional Education: A Conceptual Framework for Recognition." Educational Record 55 (Summer 1974): 188-92.

Nelson, Fred A. "Has the Time Gone for an External Degree?" Journal of Higher Education 45 (March 1974): 174-83.

New Approaches to Higher Education Within the California State University and Colleges: A Status Report. Sacramento: California University and Colleges, 1974.

Nie, Norman H. et al. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Second Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Park, Dabny. "The Cooperative Assessment of Experiential Learning." Adult Education 23 (February 1975): 242-47.

Phillips, Bernard S. Social Research: Strategy and Tactics. New York: Macmillan Company, 1971.

Phillips, Derek L. Abandoning Method. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Program Effectiveness and Related Cost Study (PERC). Saratoga Springs, N.Y.: Office of Research and Evaluation at Empire State College of the State University of New York, 1976. (Mimeographed.)

Reform on the Campus: Changing Students, Changing Academic Programs. Report by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Report of A Visit to Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities/ University Without Walls, October 29-31, 1975. Chicago: North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, 1975.

Report of the Special Task Force on Nontraditional Education in the Board of Governors System. Springfield, Ill.: Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities, 1975.

Rex Reports: Newsletter of the Regents External Degrees. 2 (Summer 1977).

Ridgeway, James. "Universities Without Walls." The New Republic March 24, 1973, pp. 17-19.

Sax, Gilbert. Principles of Educational Measurement and Evaluation. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1974.

Schoemer, James R.; Thomas, James E.; and Bragonier, Wendell H. "A Study of the Effects of Non-Traditional Grades on Admission to Graduate School and the Awarding of Financial Assistance." College and University 48 (Spring 1973): 147-53.

Schofield, Michael. Social Research. London: Heinemann Educational, 1969.

Self Study in Progress Report. Cincinnati, Ohio: Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities, 1977.

Sjoberg, Gideon, and Nett, Roger. A Methodology for Social Research. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968.

Sosdian, Carol P., and Sharp, Laure M. The External Degree as a Credential: Graduates' Experiences in Employment and Further Study. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1978.

Splaver, Sarah. Nontraditional College Routes to Careers. New York: Julian Messner, 1975.

Spurrs, Stephen H. Academic Degree Structures: Innovative Approaches, Principles of Reform in Degree Structures in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Stecher, Carl A. "CLEP and the Great Credit Giveaway." Change 9 (March 1977): 36-41.

"Summary of Data, Study of Illinois Adult Learners, Presented to Board of Higher Education." Springfield, Ill.: Joint Education Committee of the Illinois Legislature, 1978. (Mimeographed.)

The Condition of Education, 1976. Washington, D.C.: National Center of Educational Statistics, 1976.

Thrash, Patricia A. "Evaluation of Nontraditional Learning Forms: The Extended Campus Program." North Central Association Quarterly 51 (Fall 1976): 280-87.

_____. "Nontraditional Institutions and Programs: A Challenge for the Accreditation Process." North Central Association Quarterly 49 (Winter 1975): 321-33.

Travers, Robert M.W. An Introduction to Educational Research. New York: Macmillan Company, 1964.

Trivett, David A. Competency Programs in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 7, 1974.

Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities. "Briefing Paper on UECU and UWW Prepared for the North Central Association Biennial Visit Evaluation Team." Yellow Springs, Ohio, October 1975. (Mimeographed.)

_____. University Without Walls: First Report. Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1972.

"UWW Self Study Task Force." 7 October 1976. (Mimeographed.)

Valentine, John A. "The Liberal Arts College and the Experienced Learner." College Board Review 93 (Fall 1974): 10-17.

Valley, John R. "Diversity Plus 2." College Board Review 96 (Summer 1975): 17-21, 31-32.

_____. Increasing the Options: Recent Developments in College and University Degree Programs. Princeton, N.J.: Office of New Degree Programs, Educational Testing Service, 1972.

Vermilye, Dyckman W., ed. Individualizing the System. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

_____, ed. Learner-Centered Reform: Current Issues in Higher Education 1975. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

_____, ed. Lifelong Learner--A New Clientele for Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

_____, ed. The Extended Campus. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Vidich, Arthur J., and Bensman, Joseph. "The Validity of Field Data." Human Organization 13 (Spring 1954): 20-27.

Willington, Warren W. "Critical Issues and Basic Requirements for Assessment." In Experiential Learning, pp. 224-44. Edited by Morris Keeton and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Wisconsin State Journal, 25 September 1977.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

UNION FOR EXPERIMENTING COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES MEMBER INSTITUTIONS

Antioch College; Yellow Springs, Ohio

Bard College; Annandale-on-Hudson, New York

Chicago State University

Community College of Baltimore; Baltimore, Maryland

Florida International University; Miami, Florida

Friends World College; Huntington, New York

Goddard College; Plainfield, Vermont

Governors State University; Park Forest South, Illinois

Hispanic International University; Houston, Texas

Hofstra University; Hempstead, New York

Johnston College, University of Redlands; Redlands, California

Loretto Heights College; Denver, Colorado

Morgan State College; Baltimore, Maryland

Northeastern Illinois University; Chicago, Illinois

Roger Williams College; Bristol, Rhode Island

Shaw University; Raleigh, North Carolina

Skidmore College; Saratoga Springs, New York

Stephens College; Columbia, Missouri

Universidad Boricua; Washington, D.C.

Universidad de Campesinos Libres; Fresno, California

University of Alabama, New College; University, Alabama

University of California, San Diego (Extended Studies); La Jolla, California

University of Massachusetts; Amherst, Massachusetts

University of Minnesota; Minneapolis, Minnesota

University of the Pacific; Stockton, California

University of Wisconsin, Green Bay; Green Bay, Wisconsin

UWW/Berkeley; Berkeley, California

UWW/Flaming Rainbow; Tahlequah, Oklahoma

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

Kenneth Stetson
Northeastern Illinois University
5500 N. St. Louis Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60625

UWW STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

College/University _____

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Age (check one)

___ under 18
___ 18 - 22
___ 23 - 29
___ 30 - 39
___ 40 - 49
___ 50 - 59
___ 60 and over

Sex (check one)

___ Female
___ Male

Ethnic Background (check one)

___ Black
___ Caucasian
___ Native American
___ Oriental
___ Spanish Surname
___ Other

Dependents, include self (check one)

___ one
___ two
___ three
___ four
___ five or more

Employment (check one)

___ full-time
___ part-time
___ homemaker
___ unemployed, seeking employment
___ unemployed, not seeking employmer

Are you the primary wage earner in your family? (check one)

___ yes
___ no
___ equal

PROGRAMMATIC INFORMATION

1. How long have you been involved with this UWW program?
(check one)

___ one year or less
___ two years
___ three years
___ four or more years

2. How many academic people (including faculty and staff) do you work with regularly as part of your UWW program?
(check one)

___ one or two
___ three or four
___ five or more

3. With whom do you work at least 25% of the time on the academic portions of your UWW program?

(check all that apply)

___ UWW staff person (facilitator)
___ college/university faculty member affiliated with UWW
___ college/university faculty member not affiliated with UWW
___ professional educator from a different institution
___ off-campus person who is not an educator

4. Who has been most helpful in helping you develop your UWW program?

(check one)

___ academic advisor
___ UWW staff/facilitator
___ off-campus person
___ other person
___ no opinion

5. How much formal college credit did you have prior to being accepted into this UWW program?

(check one)

___ no previous credit
___ about one year
___ about two years
___ about three years
___ more than three years

6. How long do you expect your UWW program to take from admission to graduation?

(check one)

___ less than one year
___ between one and two years
___ between two and three years
___ more than three years

7. How do you think the length of time to acquire a degree in UWW compares with that of a traditional degree program at this institution?

(check one)

___ less time
___ about the same time
___ longer time
___ no basis for judgment

8. How do you think the academic quality of your UWW program compares with that of the traditional degree programs at this institution?

(check one)

___ higher quality
___ about the same quality
___ lower quality
___ no basis for judgment

9. Are you satisfied with the current admission (selection) process for new students into UWW?

(check one)

___ yes
___ no
___ no basis for judgment

10. Once admitted, were you required to attend a formal orientation into this UWW program before you were able to begin working toward your degree?

(check one)

___ yes
___ no
___ not applicable

11. Were you offered the opportunity of locating an academic advisor to work with you on your UWW program?

(check one)

___ yes
___ no
___ not applicable

12. The assessment of your prior, nonclassroom learning was done by:

(check all that apply)

___ individual on-campus faculty member(s)
___ committee of several on-campus faculty members
___ individual UWW staff member
___ committee of UWW staff members
___ committee of other composition
___ no assessment has been done
___ no basis for judgment

13. If you received credit, how much credit for prior, nonclassroom learning did you receive?

(indicate one)

_____ credits (please indicate number of semester or quarter hours)
___ not yet determined
___ credit hours not used in program
___ unknown

14. Is your current employment related to your UWW program?

(check one)

___ directly related
___ somewhat related
___ unrelated
___ not applicable

OPINION OF THE PRESENT UWW DEGREE PROCESS

In the following portion of this questionnaire, please give your opinion about your personal experience in this UWW program. To the right of each statement, please circle the letter(s) representing your opinion based upon experience in this program.

Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable (or no basis for judgment)
AS	A	N	D	DS	NA

Example:

A baccalaureate degree is not very important in today's society.	AS	A	N	(D)	DS	NA

- -

1. Development of a degree plan is the primary responsibility of the student.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
2. A committee of faculty members from several disciplines assesses non-classroom learning before credit or academic recognition is awarded.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
3. Selection of new students into the UWW program is the responsibility of the UWW staff rather than a committee.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
4. Off-campus people not involved with UWW have a high regard for the academic quality of the program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
5. Most faculty members at this institution who are not involved with the UWW program react positively to it.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
6. Approval of in-program learning activities is the basic responsibility of the academic advisor or UWW staff person rather than a committee.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
7. Graduate schools and other post-baccalaureate programs view UWW as an acceptable undergraduate degree program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA

8. Final approval of the degree plan is made by the individuals involved with the student's UWW program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
9. When new people are hired to assist with the institution's UWW program, students are part of the group selecting these individuals.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
10. When off-campus, non-collegiate personnel are utilized in a UWW program, the academic quality of the degree program is enhanced.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
11. Participation in orientation is necessary for a student's success in UWW.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
12. The present administrative structure of this UWW program is well suited to the needs of UWW students at this institution.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
13. The current method for determining when graduation requirements have been fulfilled is appropriate.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
14. Tuition and related fees for UWW students are less than those for students in traditional degree programs at this institution.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
15. UWW students learn about a wide variety of subject areas in the UWW program rather than concentrate on one or just a few subject areas.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
16. Students enjoy freedom in planning their own learning experiences in UWW.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
17. A majority of learning activities in UWW take place off campus, without the institution's faculty or UWW staff providing supervision.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
18. Students in UWW develop academic programs which are not usually available in traditional baccalaureate programs at this institution.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA

Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable (or no basis for judgment)
AS	A	N	D	DS	NA

19. Students in UWW get more individual attention than students in regular undergraduate degree programs at this institution.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
20. Acquiring an education in a specific field is the most important feature of a UWW degree program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
21. Writing skills are emphasized in UWW.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
22. The present periodic reviews and evaluations of a student's UWW program are sufficient to insure the academic quality of the degree program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
23. Increased emphasis needs to be placed upon formal classroom instruction as part of the UWW program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
24. UWW students closely identify with the institution sponsoring their UWW program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
25. The advising process in UWW is helpful in establishing realistic learning goals.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
26. Minimal enrollment or residency requirements are a strength in this UWW program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
27. There are clearly defined academic quality controls in UWW.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
28. Different admission standards are used for UWW students than are used for students in traditional degree programs at this institution.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA

29. Self-paced learning is an important feature of this UWW program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
30. Qualifications for faculty members working in UWW are the same as the qualifications for regular faculty members in traditional programs at this insitution.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
31. The controls of academic quality in this UWW program are appropriate and effective.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
32. UWW is an interdisciplinary educational experience rather than an experience which concentrates on only one field of study.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
33. Curricular choices are greater in UWW than in more traditional undergraduate degree programs at this institution.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
34. Individual UWW degree programs are weakened when only one or two individuals help the student develop his/her course of study.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
35. Academic accountability and quality control are the same for UWW as they are for more traditional degree programs at this institution.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
36. Standardized tests (GRE, CLEP, ACT, etc.) are used at some point in this UWW program to assess the student's learning or achievement.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
37. There is a clearly defined method for determining when graduation requirements have been fulfilled.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA

INTEREST IN UWW

Below are several possible reasons for your participation in a UWW program. Please select the letter which best represents your feelings about the statement and place the letter next to the statement's number in the blank.

V---Very Important
S---Somewhat Important
I---Important
U---Unimportant
N---Neutral
D---Did Not Consider

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

____ 1. I liked the challenge of making my own educational decisions.

____ 2. My needs were in a field of study which is not offered at most colleges or universities.

____ 3. I needed a general studies or broad liberal arts education.

____ 4. My career goals would be enhanced by choosing specific learning activities related to my job as part of my UWW program.

____ 5. I thought UWW would provide more experiential learning opportunities.

____ 6. I thought UWW would allow more independent (nonclassroom) learning opportunities.

____ 7. I thought that a traditional degree program would be too restricting.

____ 8. I thought UWW would be easier than a more traditional degree program.

____ 9. I thought I would get more individual attention in UWW.

___ 10. I wanted a means of certifying my previous nonclassroom learning.

___ 11. I wanted to combine several disciplines as part of an undergraduate degree program.

___ 12. Some of the courses required by other degree programs did not fit my educational needs or interests.

___ 13. I thought UWW would allow me to develop and learn useful career skills.

___ 14. I thought UWW would be helpful in developing and improving fundamental skills.

___ 15. Because of job and/or family commitments, I was unable to complete the degree requirements in a reasonable time in a more traditional degree program.

___ 16. I thought being admitted to UWW would be easier than being accepted into a more traditional degree program.

OPINION OF AN "IDEAL" UWW-TYPE DEGREE PROCESS

The concluding section of this questionnaire asks for your opinion regarding an "ideal" UWW-type program. If you could design an ideal individualized, baccalaureate level degree program, what opinion would you have about each of the following statements. (Please circle the letter(s) to the right of each statement which reflects your opinion of the statement as part of your "ideal" degree program.)

Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable (or not part of an "ideal" program)
AS	A	N	D	DS	NA

Example:

More UWW-type undergraduate degree programs should be developed. AS (A) N D DS NA

- -

1. Development of a degree plan in a UWW-type program should be the primary responsibility of the student. AS A N D DS NA

2. Formal credit or some form of academic recognition should be awarded for previous, nonclassroom learning. AS A N D DS NA

3. Selection of new students should be the responsibility of the program's staff rather than a general college/university committee. AS A N D DS NA

4. Approval of in-program learning activities should be the basic responsibility of an academic advisor rather than a more general committee.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
5. Final approval of a degree plan should be made by the individuals involved with a student's UWW-type program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
6. When new people are hired to assist with a UWW-type program, students should be part of the group selecting these individuals.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
7. Tuition and related fees for students in a UWW-type program should be less than those for students in more traditional degree programs.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
8. Students should learn about a wide variety of subject areas rather than concentrate on one or a limited number of subject areas.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
9. Students should enjoy freedom in planning their own learning programs.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
10. Students should develop curricula which are not usually available in more traditional baccalaureate degree programs.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
11. Acquiring an education in a specific field should be the strongest feature of a UWW-type degree program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
12. A committee of faculty members at the institution should assess nonclassroom learning before credit or academic recognition is awarded.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
13. Increased formal classroom instruction should be incorporated into a UWW-type degree program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA

Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable (or not part of an "ideal" program)
AS	A	N	D	DS	NA

14.	The advising process should be helpful in establishing realistic learning goals for each student.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
15.	Minimal enrollment or residency requirements should be a strength in a UWW-type degree program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
16.	There should be clearly defined academic quality control in a UWW-type degree program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
17.	Different admission standards should be used for students in a UWW-type program than are used for students in more traditional degree programs.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
18.	Self-paced learning should be an important feature of a UWW-type degree program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
19.	Qualification for faculty members working in a UWW-type program should be the same as the qualifications for regular faculty members in more traditional programs.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
20.	The control for academic quality in a UWW-type degree program should be similar to the controls in more traditional undergraduate programs.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
21.	A UWW-type degree program should be an interdisciplinary educational experience rather than an experience which concentrates on only one field of study.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
22.	Curricular choices in a UWW-type program should be greater than those available in more traditional undergraduate degree programs.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA

23. There should be a clearly defined method for determining when graduation requirements have been fulfilled in a UWW-type program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
24. Standardized tests (GRE, CLEP, ACT, etc.) should be used at some point in a UWW-type program to assess a student's learning or achievement.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
25. Academic accountability and quality control in a UWW-type program should be the same as those used in more traditional undergraduate degree programs.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE IN THIS STUDY. PLEASE RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE SELF-ADDRESSED, STAMPED ENVELOPE PROVIDED.

APPENDIX C

Kenneth Stetson
Northeastern Illinois University
5500 N. St. Louis Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60625

FACULTY/STAFF UWW QUESTIONNNAIRE

College/University _____

Primary responsibility at this institution (check one)

____ Teaching duties
____ UWW Staff (includes advising, administration, counseling, etc.)
____ Other Professional responsibilities

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Age (check one)
___ under 25
___ 25 - 29
___ 30 - 39
___ 40 - 49
___ 50 - 59
___ 60 and over

Ethnic Background (check one)
___ Black
___ Caucasian
___ Native American
___ Oriental
___ Spanish Surname
___ Other

Sex (check one)
___ Female
___ Male

Tenure (check one)
___ Yes
___ No

Academic Rank (check one)
___ Professor
___ Assoc. Prof.
___ Ass't. Prof.
___ Instructor
___ Other
___ No Rank

Highest Degree (check one)
___ Doctorate
___ Masters
___ Bachelors
___ Other professional degree (MD, JD, etc.)
___ Associate degree
___ No degree

Length of Service at Institution (check one)
___ two years or less
___ three to five years
___ six to eight years
___ nine or more years

PROGRAMMATIC INFORMATION

1. How long have you been involved with this UWW program?
(check one)

___ one year or less
___ two years
___ three years
___ four or more years

2. With how many UWW students are you currently working?

(check one)

___ none
___ one to three
___ four to six
___ seven to nine
___ ten or more

3. What percentage of your professional time is devoted to the UWW program?

(check one)

___ 10% or less
___ 11 - 25%
___ 26 - 50%
___ 51 - 75%
___ 76% and greater

4. On the average, how long does it take a UWW student to graduate at this institution after being admitted to the UWW program?

(check one)

___ less than one year
___ between one and two years
___ between two and three years
___ more than three years
___ no basis for judgment

5. If you agree to work with a UWW student, is formal orientation to the program required before you can begin working with a student?

(check one)

___ yes
___ no
___ not applicable
___ unknown

6. Do you discuss an individual student's UWW program prior to agreeing to work with the student?

(check one)

___ always
___ usually
___ sometimes
___ never

7. Assessing the prior, nonclassroom learning of a UWW student is the responsibility of:

(check one)

___ single faculty member
___ committee of several faculty members
___ individual UWW staff member
___ committee of UWW staff people
___ joint committee
___ no assessment is done
___ unknown

8. What is the maximum allowable credit for prior learning in this UWW program?

(check one)

_____ credits (please indicate number of sem. or qrt. hour
___ no maximum limit
___ credit hours not used
___ unknown

9. How do you think the length of time to acquire a degree in UWW compares with that of a traditional degree program at this institution?

(check one)

___ less time required in UWW
___ about the same
___ more time required in UWW
___ no basis for judgment

10. How do you think the academic quality of the UWW program compares with that of more traditional programs at this institution?

(check one)

___ higher quality in UWW
___ about the same quality
___ lower quality in UWW
___ no basis for judgment

11. Are you satisfied with the present admission (selection) process for new students in UWW?

(check one)

___ yes
___ no
___ no basis for judgment

12. How do your professional colleagues at this institution view the quality of the UWW program?

(check one)

___ better than the traditional undergraduate degree program
___ about the same
___ not as good as the traditional undergraduate program
___ no basis for judgment

13. How does the involvement of off-campus, non-collegiate personnel in UWW affect the quality of the program?

(check one)

___ enhances the quality
___ does not affect it in either direction
___ detracts from the quality
___ no opinion

14. From your experience, how would you compare UWW graduates with those from more traditional undergraduate degree programs at this institution?

(check one)

___ better prepared than other graduates

___ about the same preparation

___ not as well prepared as other graduates

___ no opinion

15. What motivation or incentive is there for you to work with a UWW student?

(check all that apply)

___ receive release time from other assigned duties

___ receive additional compensation

___ required assignment

___ personal interest in non-traditional/individualized education

___ service to students and to institution

___ other (please specify)

_____

_____

___ no opinion

- -

OPINION OF THE PRESENT UWW DEGREE PROCESS

In the following portion of this questionnaire, please give your opinion about your personal experience in this UWW program. To the right of each statement, please circle the letter(s) representing your opinion based upon experience in this program.

Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable (or no basis for judgment)
AS	A	N	D	DS	NA

Example:

A baccalaureate degree is not very important in today's society. AS A N (D) DS NA

1. Development of a degree plan is the primary responsibility of the student.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
2. A committee of faculty members from several disciplines assesses non-classroom learning before credit or academic recognition is awarded.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
3. Selection of new students into the UWW program is the responsibility of the UWW staff rather than a committee.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
4. Off-campus people not involved with UWW have a high regard for the academic quality of the program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
5. Most faculty members at this institution who are not involved with the UWW program react positively to it.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
6. Approval of in-program learning activities is the basic responsibility of the academic advisor or UWW staff person rather than a committee.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
7. Graduate schools and other post-baccalaureate programs view UWW as an acceptable undergraduate degree program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
8. Final approval of the degree plan is made by the individuals involved with the student's UWW program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
9. When new people are hired to assist with the institution's UWW program, students are part of the group selecting these individuals.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
10. When off-campus, non-collegiate personnel are utilized in a UWW program, the academic quality of the degree program is enhanced.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
11. Participation in orientation is necessary for a student's success in UWW.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA

Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable (or no basis for judgment)
AS	A	N	D	DS	NA

12.	The present administrative structure of this UWW program is well suited to the needs of UWW students at this institution.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
13.	The current method for determining when graduation requirements have been fulfilled is appropriate.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
14.	Tuition and related fees for UWW students are less than those for students in more traditional degree programs at this institution.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
15.	UWW students learn about a wide variety of subject areas in the UWW program rather than concentrate on one or just a few subject areas.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
16.	Students enjoy freedom in planning their own learning experiences in UWW.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
17.	A majority of learning activities in UWW take place off campus, without the institution's faculty or UWW staff providing supervision.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
18.	Students in UWW develop academic programs which are not usually available in traditional baccalaureate programs at this institution.	AS	A	N	DS	NA	
19.	Students in UWW get more individual attention than students in regular undergraduate degree programs at this institution.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
20.	Acquiring an education in a specific field is the most important feature of a UWW degree program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
21.	Writing skills are emphasized in UWW.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA

22. The present periodic reviews and evaluations of a student's UWW program are sufficient to insure the academic quality of the degree program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
23. Increased emphasis needs to be placed upon formal classroom instruction as part of the UWW program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
24. UWW students closely identify with the institution sponsoring their UWW program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
25. The advising process in UWW is helpful in establishing realistic learning goals.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
26. Minimal enrollment or residency requirements are a strength in this UWW program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
27. There are clearly defined academic quality controls in UWW.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
28. Different admission standards are used for UWW students than are used for students in traditional degree programs at this institution.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
29. Self-paced learning is an important feature of this UWW program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
30. Qualifications for faculty members working in UWW are the same as the qualifications for regular faculty members in more traditional programs at this institution.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
31. The controls of academic quality in this UWW program are appropriate and effective.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
32. UWW is an interdisciplinary educational experience rather than an experience which concentrates on only one field of study.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA

33. Curricular choices are greater in UWW than in more traditional undergraduate degree programs at this institution. AS A N D DS NA

34. Individual UWW degree programs are weakened when only one or two individuals help the student develop his/her course of study. AS A N D DS NA

35. Academic accountability and quality control are the same for UWW as they are for more traditional degree programs at this institution. AS A N D DS NA

36. Standardized tests (GRE, CLEP, ACT, etc.) are used at some point in this UWW program to assess the student's learning or achievement. AS A N D DS NA

37. There is a clearly defined method for determining when graduation requirements have been fulfilled. AS A N D DS NA

OPINION OF AN "IDEAL" UWW-TYPE DEGREE PROCESS

The concluding section of this questionnaire asks for your opinion regarding an "ideal" UWW-type program. If you could design an ideal individualized, baccalaureate level degree progam, what opinion would you have about each of the following statements. (Please circle the letter(s) to the right of each statement which reflects your opinion of the statement as part of your "ideal" degree program.)

Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable (or not part of an "ideal" program
AS	A	N	D	DS	NA

Example:

More UWW-type undergraduate degree programs should be developed. AS (A) N D DS NA

- -

1. Development of a degree plan in a UWW-type program should be the primary responsibility of the student. AS A N D DS NA

2. Formal credit or some form of academic recognition should be awarded for previous, nonclassroom learning.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
3. Selection of new students should be the responsibility of the program's staff rather than a general college/ university committee.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
4. Approval of in-program learning activities should be the basic responsibility of an academic advisor rather than a more general committee.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
5. Final approval of a degree plan should be made by the individuals involved with a student's UWW-type program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
6. When new people are hired to assist with a UWW-type program, students should be part of the group selecting these individuals.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
7. Tuition and related fees for students in a UWW-type program should be less than those for students in more traditional degree programs.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
8. Student should learn about a wide variety of subject areas rather than concentrate on one or a limited number of subject areas.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
9. Students should enjoy freedom in planning their own learning programs.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
10. Students should develop curricula which are not usually available in more traditional baccalaureate degree programs.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
11. Acquiring an education in a specific field should be the strongest feature of a UWW-type degree program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
12. A committee of faculty members at the institution should assess nonclassroom learning before credit or academic recognition is awarded.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA

Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable (or not part of an "ideal" program)
AS	A	N	D	DS	NA

13. Increased formal classroom instruction should be incorporated into a UWW-type degree program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
14. The advising process should be helpful in establishing realistic learning goals for each student.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
15. Minimal enrollment or residency requirements should be a strength in a UWW-type program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
16. There should be clearly defined academic quality control in a UWW-type degree program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
17. Different admission standards should be used for students in a UWW-type program than are used for students in more traditional degree programs.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
18. Self-paced learning should be an imporatant feature of a UWW-type degree program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
19. Qualifications for faculty members working in a UWW-type program should be the same as the qualifications for regular faculty members in more traditional programs.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
20. The control for academic quality in a UWW-type degree program should be similar to the controls in more traditional undergraduate programs.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
21. A UWW-type degree program should be an interdisciplinary educational experience rather than an experience which concentrates on only one field of study.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA

22. Curricular choices in a UWW-type program should be greater than those available in more traditional undergraduate degree programs.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
23. There should be a clearly defined method for determining when graduation requirements have been fulfilled in a UWW-type program.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
24. Standardized tests (GRE, CLEP, ACT, etc.) should be used at some point in a UWW-type program to assess a student's learning or achievement.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA
25. Academic accountability and quality control in a UWW-type program should be the same as those used in more traditional undergraduate degree programs.	AS	A	N	D	DS	NA

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE IN THIS STUDY. PLEASE RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE SELF-ADDRESSED, STAMPED ENVELOPE PROVIDED.

APPENDIX D

NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
BRYN MAWR AT ST. LOUIS AVENUE • CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60625 • (312) 583-4050

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

November 10, 1977

Dear UWW student:

The first UWW programs began in 1971 at twenty institutions across the country. However, although several thousand people have participated in this unique academic experience, no comprehensive study of UWW has been undertaken, except by individual UWW programs, usually for specific local reasons.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to survey UWW students at seven institutions, both public and private, and to assess their reactions to the UWW experience. These institutions, which award their own degrees to graduates of their UWW programs, are Antioch College/West, Chicago State University, Loretto Heights College, Northeastern Illinois University, Stephens College, the University of Massachusetts, and the University of Minnesota. Your participation in this study will help provide information about the overall effectiveness of UWW programs nationally.

Questionnaires are often considered an invasion of privacy or a waste of time. Unfortunately, there is no better way to assess your reactions to UWW except through this type of information gathering technique. I hope you will take a few minutes to complete this questionnaire and return it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided. (Because your responses are anonymous, there is no way for me to send reminders, follow-up requests, pleas, or other commonly used inducements to encourage you to return the questionnaire. This is the only request for participation you will receive.)

I have worked closely with the director of your UWW program in coordinating this study. Your response is completely voluntary and confidential. Your name and address were not given to me. The director of your UWW program arranged for the distribution of this questionnaire. However, I will pay for all mailing costs so that neither you nor your program have been financially obligated by this study.

Please return the questionnaire by NOVEMBER 30, 1977. Thank you in advance for your helpful participation. When the summary of the questionnaire's data is available, it will be sent to your UWW director.

Best wishes for a productive and rewarding experience in UWW.

Sincerely,

Ken Stetson
Assistant to the Provost

APPENDIX E

NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
BRYN MAWR AT ST. LOUIS AVENUE • CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60625 • (312) 583-4050

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

November 10, 1977

Dear Colleague:

The first UWW programs began in 1971 at twenty institutions across the country. However, although several thousand people have participated in this unique academic experience, no comprehensive study of UWW has been undertaken except by individual UWW programs, usually for specific local reasons.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to survey UWW staff, advisors, faculty members, and other professional people at seven institutions and to assess their reactions to UWW. These institutions, which award their own degrees to graduates of their UWW programs, are Antioch College/West, Chicago State University, Loretto Heights College, Northeastern Illinois University, Stephens College, the University of Massachusetts, and the University of Minnesota. Your participation in this study will help provide information about the overall effectiveness of UWW programs nationally.

Questionnaires are often considered an invasion of privacy or a waste of time. Unfortunately, there is no better way to assess your reactions to UWW except through this type of information gathering technique. I hope you will take a few minutes to complete this questionnaire and return it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided. (Because your responses are anonymous, there is no way for me to send reminders, follow-up requests, pleas, or other commonly used inducements to encourage you to return the questionnaire. This is the only request for participation you will receive.)

I have worked closely with the director of the UWW program at your institution in coordinating this study. Your response is completely voluntary and confidential. Your name was not given to me. The UWW director arranged for the distribution of this questionnaire.

Please return the questionnaire by NOVEMBER 30, 1977. Thank you in advance for your helpful participation. When the summary of the questionnaire's data is available, it will be sent to the UWW director at your institution.

Sincerely,

Ken Stetson
Assistant to the Provost

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Kenneth Winslow Stetson has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Allan C. Ornstein, Director
Professor, Curriculum and Instruction, Loyola

Dr. Joseph Barney
Assistant Professor, Management, Loyola

Dr. Barney Berlin
Associate Professor and Chairman,
Curriculum and Instruction, Loyola

Dr. Ronald Cohen
Assistant Professor, Curriculum and Instruction, Loyola

Dr. Ronald Morgan
Assistant Professor, Educational Foundations, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

9/15/78
Date

Allan Ornstein
Director's Signature