

AN ASSESSMENT OF NONTRADITIONAL EDUCATION AMONG THE COLLEGIATE
MEMBERS OF THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS /

by

Edward Gordon Simpson, Jr.

Dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
in
ADMINISTRATION

APPROVED:

W. A. Keim, Co-Chairperson

M. C. Rockey, Co-Chairperson

G. I. Robertson, Jr.

H. W. Stubblefield

A. E. Thompson

April, 1977

Blacksburg, Virginia

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author gratefully acknowledges the direction and counsel provided by Dr. Marybelle C. Rockey in facilitating the successful conclusion of this study. Appreciation is extended to Dr. William A. Keim for his long and enduring support. Additionally, the author wishes to thank Dr. James I. Robertson, Jr., Dr. Harold W. Stubblefield, and Dr. Ann E. Thompson for their suggestions and guidance.

Completion of this study would have been impossible without the support of the administration of the Extension Division of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, which provided a leave of absence and financial aid during the period of research. The author also acknowledges the long-standing support of Dr. William L. Flowers, Jr., whose commitment to continuing education and professional development was a source of constant encouragement.

Appreciation is extended to the Leadership Development Program, a Ford Foundation Project administered under the auspices of the Southern Regional Council, for the award of a fellowship which helped support the author while undertaking this research project. The assistance of project director, Dr. K. Z. Chavis, and his staff is acknowledged.

To the staff of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the author expresses his sincere thanks for the educational opportunity provided him through an internship with the Commission on Colleges. Of special significance in the successful completion of this study were the counsel and guidance of

Executive Secretary of the Commission on Colleges; Dr. Grover J. Andrews, Associate Executive Secretary; and

Assistant Executive Secretary. Without the assistance of these individuals, the project would not have been completed. A special note of thanks is reserved for _____ also of the Commission staff. Additionally, appreciation is extended to the members of the Standard Nine Advisory Committee for their suggestions and direction in formulating the study.

The continual good humor and companionship of my fellow Commission on Colleges intern, _____ played no small role in seeing the study to completion, nor did the staff and patrons of Manuel's Tavern, Atlanta, Georgia. The assistance of all is hereby acknowledged.

For _____ appreciation is expressed for her unflagging support and assistance to the author throughout this undertaking.

The editorial assistance of Dr. Howard L. Sparks and the final manuscript preparation by _____ are gratefully acknowledged.

Sincere gratitude is expressed to my mother, _____ and to my late father, _____ for their support and faith that the task would be completed.

Finally, to my wife, _____ after twelve years and two and one-half degrees, thank you for your love, patience, editorial expertise, and for explaining to _____ and _____ that they really do have a father.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
 Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	2
PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES	8
NEED AND SIGNIFICANCE	10
DEFINITION OF TERMS	11
ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY	13
 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	
Introduction	15
Defining Nontraditional Postsecondary Education	15
Related Studies in Regional Accrediting Agencies	23
Surveys of Nontraditional Programs	27
Legitimization of Nontraditional Study	33
Discussion of Previous Research	42
 3. METHODOLOGY	48
Population	48
Instrumentation	48
Advisory Committee	53
Collection of Data	54
Treatment of Survey Data	57
Summary	58
 4. ANALYSIS OF DATA	60
DISTRIBUTION OF INSTITUTIONS OFFERING NONTRADITIONAL CREDIT PROGRAMS	61
Distribution by State	61
Distribution by Control and Clientele	63
Distribution of Nontraditional Programs by Institutional Level	63
Distribution of Institutions Planning Nontraditional Programs	65
Operational and Projected Nontraditional Programs	69
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COMMISSION ON COLLEGES' NONTRADITIONAL PROGRAMS	71
Degree Level of Nontraditional Programs	73

LRS/MS 6/1/81

Chapter	Page
Nontraditional Nature of Programs	75
Admissions	77
Awarding Credit	82
Student Services	83
Student Fees and Program Costs	86
Faculty	87
Enrollments and Graduates	91
Student Evaluation	94
Instructional Procedures Program Objectives, and Curricula	96
Nontraditional Program Objectives	101
Curriculum	104
Problems	108
Program Evaluation	110
NONTRADITIONAL PROGRAMS: AN OPINION	110
Summary	112
 5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	 118
 SUMMARY	 118
CONCLUSIONS	123
Nontraditional Program Frequency and Institutional Characteristics	123
Nontraditional Program Characteristics	125
Nontraditional Program Opinion Survey	131
IMPLICATIONS	132
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	141
 LITERATURE CITED	 144
 APPENDICES	
A. SURVEY INSTRUMENT: THE STANDARD NINE STUDY	147
B. STANDARD NINE STUDY ADVISORY COMMITTEE	219
C. SURVEY INSTRUMENT TRANSMITTAL LETTERS	221
D. FIRST FOLLOW-UP LETTER	225
E. SECOND FOLLOW-UP LETTER	227
F. NONTRADITIONAL DEGREE PROGRAMS: AN OPINION SURVEY	229
 VITA	 232

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1	The Number of Institutions Within Each State of the SACS Region and Their Classification by Public or Private Control and Clientele 49
2	Frequency of Institutional Responses to the Standard Nine Survey 56
3	Distribution by State of Institutions Reporting Nontraditional Programs 62
4	Distribution by Control, Clientele, and Degree Granting Level of Institutions Reporting Nontraditional Programs . . 64
5	Distribution by State of Institutions Planning Implementation of Nontraditional Programs by the End of Fiscal Year 1977-78 66
6	Distribution by Control, Clientele, and Degree Granting Level of Institutions Planning Implementation of Nontraditional Programs by the End of Fiscal Year 1977-78 . . 67
7	Distribution by Control, Clientele, and Degree Granting Level of Institutions with Operational (1975-76) or Planned (1977-78) Nontraditional Programs 70
8	Institutions with Nontraditional Programs (1975-76) or with Plans to Implement Nontraditional Programs (1977-78) . 72
9	Nontraditional Programs by Level 74
10	Areas in Which Programs Were Considered to be Nontraditional and the Number of Programs Possessing That Nontraditional Characteristic 76
11	Institutions with Special Admissions Policies for Nontraditional Programs 78
12	Institutions with Advanced Placement, Categories of Advanced Placement Examinations and Their Frequency of Use 81
13	Institutions with Nontraditional Programs Providing Selected Student Services 84
14	Relationship of Fees in Institutions with Traditional and Nontraditional Programs and Availability of Financial Aid for the Nontraditional Student 88

Table		Page
15	Characteristics of Faculty Teaching at Institutions with Nontraditional Programs	89
16	Enrollment in Nontraditional Programs by Number of Institutions for Fiscal Year 1974-75	92
17	The Percentage of Students Enrolled in a Nontraditional Program Receiving a Certificate or Diploma in 1974-75	93
18	Student Evaluation Methods for Nontraditional Programs by Institution	95
19	Length of Time Commission on Colleges Institutions Have Been Offering Nontraditional Programs	97
20	Institutions with Residency Requirements and Length of Residency Requirements for Nontraditional Programs	99
21	Selected Media Devices and Frequency of Use by Institutions in Nontraditional Programs	100
22	Learning/Instructional Methods Employed by the Institutions with Nontraditional Programs	102
23	Major Problems for Institutions in the Establishment and Maintenance of Nontraditional Programs	109

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The decade of the 1970's has brought with it the fruition of what might be considered an educational phenomenon in American postsecondary education. Generically defined as nontraditional learning, this phenomenon exists under a variety of descriptors, among them: the external degree, the off-campus degree, the weekend college, and the extended degree. Sifting through these numerous departures from the status quo has brought a variety of reactions from both educators and laymen. The nontraditional approach has been greeted with cries of joy from certain sectors for the apparent salvation it provides from the damning problems of educating modern, technocratic American society. Simultaneously, there are the less than harmonious cries of others who see at worst the blight of fraud and at best the lessening of quality attached to such educational options.

Caught in this debate are the regional accrediting agencies for postsecondary education in the United States. These agencies must assess what their institutional members consider to be acceptable and current practice. Having done this, standards or guidelines must be drafted which reflect the generally accepted conduct and philosophy of a particular agency's members. The institutions are measured against these standards.

The primary focus of this study was the assessment of nontraditional credit programs found among the members of one regional accrediting agency, the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of

Colleges and Schools (SACS). From this assessment came information for use by the Commission on Colleges in the formulation of a standard which is both current in terms of institutional practices and reflective of institutional philosophies.

BACKGROUND

A legacy to Americans from the violence and turbulence of the 1960's and the highly publicized corruption and immorality of its public officials during the 1970's has been the knowledge that the people have an inalienable right to expect their institutions to be responsive to their needs and wishes within the boundaries of a mature democratic society. Not only do the people now demand this right, but they also feel the compunction to express their desires as in no other period since the nation's founding. The tribulations of this era have led to a clearly defined statement of the rights and protections accorded minorities as well as a reaffirmation of the rights and privileges belonging to all.

Inherent within this reaffirmation there exists the belief, vigorous since Jeffersonian times, that a democratic society's health and progress depend upon the development and maintenance of educational opportunities for all the people. That individuals are seeking out these opportunities is attested by research (Cross and Valley, 1974) which indicated that over eighty million Americans between the ages of eighteen and sixty and not engaged in full-time study are seeking participation in a formalized learning experience. This significant proportion of the populous reflects a society cognizant of the pressures

to keep pace with technologies and skills which are capable of quickly rendering current proficiencies worthless.

Institutions of higher education are faced with adjustments which in their own way are just as critical to their continued survival and viability as the social changes of the last decade were necessary for the survival of American society. Indeed, modern societal changes in America are so inextricably entangled in the flexibility and responsiveness of the educational system that alterations to either profoundly affect the other to such an extent that consideration of one must involve consideration of both. Therefore, with the determination that opportunity of an equal degree shall be extended to all Americans, there is implicit within this pledge the promise that all shall be able to avail themselves of an educational experience adequate to their need. Consistent with this theme is the basic recommendation of the Commission on Non-Traditional Study (1973, p. 7) which stated that "full educational opportunity should be realistically available and feasible for all who may benefit from it, whatever their condition of life."

Such a philosophy may prove beneficial not only to those seeking expanded educational opportunities but to the institutions of higher learning themselves. As the Carnegie Commission (October, 1971) pointed out, higher education has been a growth industry in this nation for over three centuries. Enrollments have increased more rapidly than has the expansion of the population itself, but now a new era is upon institutions of higher learning. For the decade of the seventies, projections show a decline in the rate of enrollment growth when compared to the decade of the sixties; and enrollment in the 1980's, as indicated by

the census statistics, will reflect the diminishing birth rates of the 1962 through 1973 period.

That these sobering projections of 1971 are becoming all too real is indicated by the opening sentence of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's commentary, More Than Survival (1975, p. 1), "Higher Education in the United States is undergoing the greatest overall and long-run rate of decline in its growth patterns in all of its history." By reacting in a flexible and adaptable manner, it is possible that higher education can take steps to avert a potentially serious recession caused from the loss of traditional enrollments. This flexibility and adaptability can include many of the Carnegie Commission's recommendations such as open admissions for public two-year institutions (The Open Door Colleges, 1970); emphasis on the adult learner in the 1980's when college-age enrollments plateau (New Students and New Places, 1971); and the development of open universities and external degree programs (Less Time, More Options, 1971 and New Students and New Places, 1971).

As a manifestation of the socio-economic upheavels of the last decade, there has emerged on the higher education scene, particularly within the past five years, the phenomenon broadly labeled as nontraditional education. There has also been much talk of the new majority enrollee in higher education, the part-time student. Responding to the part-time student has forced many institutions in a heretofore unthinkable liberalization of policies regarding residency requirements, credit for non-college learning, open admissions and the like. While such changes have been needed and are recommended within the boundaries of

responsible quality control by the Carnegie Commission, the Commission on Non-Traditional Education and others, there remains a lingering dilemma for the academician who, reared in the traditions of the "normal" full-time student, feels the need to proceed step by step through Mr. Eliot's Harvard model of the elective system. Through this approach, and only through this approach, the traditionalists believe, can the student be educated in a fashion consistent with the "sound" philosophy of the learning establishment.

Even though most forms of the nontraditional degree are rediscoveries of educational vehicles that have been used in some fashion for years (Houle, 1973), there exists the need to establish the legitimacy of education's new structuring. The comments given above notwithstanding, the close relationship in terms of time elapsed between societal change and the alteration of the educational system is a recent phenomenon, with educators historically being among the most conservative members of society. Therefore, traditionalists in academia seek some act of certification for the new form. The legitimatization is logically forthcoming from the agency responsible for institutional accreditation. In the instance of this study, that agency is the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS).

Recent studies indicate, however (Cross, Valley, et al., 1974), that the majority of institutions experimenting with nontraditional study have not viewed the problem of accreditation as sufficient reason to retard or delay their developmental programs. In fact, the accrediting agencies are not viewed as the major obstacle to the implementation of the nontraditional degree nor is the problem of securing jobs or

vocational licenses for graduates. Instead, the graduate schools are seen as exerting more negative influence on the acceptance of the undergraduate nontraditional degree than are all other factors considered (1974). Such attitudes do not, however, relieve the accrediting agency of its obligation nor do they excuse the institution from compliance with what is considered current and acceptable practice among the members of its accrediting body. Indeed, the question was asked by Cross and Valley (1974, p. 8) ". . . how can accrediting agencies encourage flexibility in non-traditional studies while protecting the public against fraud?"

Hefferlin, writing in Planning Non-Traditional Programs (1974), noted that SACS (Commission on Colleges) revised its Standard Nine in 1971 in an effort to remain more closely in step with the unique accrediting needs of nontraditional study. Furthermore, in 1973 the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions on Higher Education (FRACHE) developed interim guidelines to deal with nontraditional study.* Continuing, Hefferlin stated that "the imperative task confronting approval and accrediting agencies is to move from structural criteria to those of the efficacy and efficiency of instruction. If they fail this task, their utility will have passed" (1974, p. 165).

The regional accrediting agencies, of which there are six in the United States, must assert the authority vested in them by their membership to insure the maintenance of acceptable practices. The Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools has been,

*Frache and the National Commission on Accrediting (NCA) merged in January, 1975, to form the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA).

as documented by Hefferlin (1974), a prime mover among these agencies in attempting to assess the nontraditional activity of its members and then to respond with appropriate standards for control and accreditation. Andrews (1972) has provided an analysis of the nature of accreditation by a regional agency (SACS) and its application to nontraditional activities involving specifically adult, extension and continuing education programs. From the work of Andrews, there emerged a revised Standard Nine adopted by the Commission on Colleges in 1971 to regulate "special activities." This is the Standard to which Hefferlin referred.

In striving to maintain this currency with developing trends in nontraditional education, the Commission on Colleges of SACS determined that a follow-up study to the original Standard Nine project should be undertaken. Consistent with this thinking and the challenge issued to accrediting agencies by the Commission on Non-Traditional Study (1973, p. 116) that "new, flexible attitudes toward accreditation must be adopted by the responsible agencies if they are to keep pace with what is required by the introduction of innovative and experimental programs," the Commission on Colleges sought to assess and review the nontraditional efforts of its members through a study of institutional compliance with the guidelines of Standard Nine as they currently exist and through an expanded survey of specific types of nontraditional study.

This assessment of current practice coupled with an opinion survey from the institutions would be reviewed by the Commission for an indication as to whether revisions in the current Standard Nine are warranted. That the membership expects and supports periodic studies

of this nature is evidenced by the following passage from the Standards of the College Delegate Assembly (1975, p. 2):

The Commission . . . reserves the right to call upon its members from time to time for specific information that may be useful to the membership. It also insists upon the right, or even obligation, to make special studies or investigations of member institutions.

From these calls for "specific information," the members would look to the Commission for leadership in assuring that the following is a viable statement: "The illustrative and interpretive material under each Standard applies to current situations and is subject to change by the Commission as evidence justifies" (Standards, p. 2, 1976).

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this study was to identify and describe the non-traditional credit programs offered by the member institutions of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. As a secondary purpose, this analysis was to provide the Commission on Colleges with data to assist the members and staff in assessing the need for possible revision of Standard Nine. This study was accomplished through addressing the following specific objectives:

- (1) The identification of those institutions among the membership of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools which offered a nontraditional degree program.
- (2) The identification of those institutions among the membership of the Commission on Colleges of the SACS which planned implementation of a nontraditional program by 1977-78.
- (3) The categorization of these institutions by identifying:
 - a. the number located in each of the eleven states of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools;
 - b. the degree

granting level; c. the type of control, either public or private; and d. the predominant clientele, either black or white.

- (4) The determination of the nontraditional nature of these programs as to whether they were considered nontraditional because of the type of student, location of program, type of instruction, program content, and/or delivery system.
- (5) The compilation of admission procedures for the nontraditional programs.
- (6) The review of advanced placement techniques and the types of placement examinations used for the nontraditional programs.
- (7) The documentation of procedures used in the awarding of credit and the transfer of credit for nontraditional programs.
- (8) The identification and description of those institutions which provided selected student services for their nontraditional enrollees.
- (9) The characteristics of the faculty used in the identified nontraditional programs as to their classification as regular or adjunct faculty, the screening procedures used in their employment and the methods employed for faculty evaluation.
- (10) The quantification of student enrollments in nontraditional programs.
- (11) The description of student evaluation procedures in nontraditional programs.
- (12) The examination of instructional/learning procedures in the nontraditional programs. Included were residency requirements, use of media, methods of learning/instruction, evaluation, and the length of time the programs had been operational.
- (13) The identification of the major problems encountered by the institutions in the establishment of the nontraditional programs.
- (14) The assessment of the specific goals and objectives of the nontraditional program to determine trends in philosophy and types of audiences served.
- (15) The discussion of examples of nontraditional curricula.
- (16) The survey of opinion within the membership of the Commission on Colleges which related to the acceptability and quality of nontraditional programs.

NEED AND SIGNIFICANCE

In the preceding discussion, the background, purpose, and objectives for this study were presented, revealing a need for the Commission on Colleges to be cognizant of the most recent development in nontraditional programs within their accrediting region. The language of Standard Nine is explicit in this regard (Standards, 1975, p. 24):

An institution contemplating the inauguration of an external or special degree program (nontraditional study) should inform the Executive Secretary of the Commission in advance and arrange for a preliminary advisory study by the Commission prior to undertaking the program.

Even if this procedure is accomplished in all situations, the entire membership of the Commission must be kept informed of current educational practices whereby, directly or indirectly, the academic programs of all are affected.

Given the potential size of the part-time student population as projected from national studies (Houle, 1973; Cross and Valley, 1974), there is a need to catalogue in an orderly fashion by state and type of institution and program, the nontraditional study options which are available to the educational consumer located within the eleven state region of SACS. Furthermore, the exigency exists requiring documentation of any emerging trends among the membership, for example, a predominance of private, graduate-level institutions offering nontraditional studies. With this information, the prospective student can more accurately assess the potentialities of his achieving the educational services best suited to his particular vocational or career needs.

By examination of enrollment and graduation data for nontraditional studies, educators in the SACS region can determine if they are meeting audience needs consistent with the information generated by the Commission on Non-Traditional Study, the Carnegie Commission and other relevant studies. Additionally, tabulation of an opinion survey on nontraditional degrees should provide an indicator as to the acceptability and legitimacy accorded such efforts by the academicians themselves. The necessity of acquiring this information is underscored by the Commission on College's requirement for developing policy statements based on educational practice considered current and acceptable. Opinion on nontraditional degrees skewed heavily pro or con could have major consequences on any revision of present policy.

Through examination of the membership of a regional accrediting body, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, there is possible an assessment of nontraditional credit program trends involving an entire population of institutions regulated by the same voluntary accrediting agency. From this descriptive study, the remaining regional accrediting bodies may gain insight as to current practices and philosophy of a peer agency, thus triggering further research on their part and, in the process, contributing to the total body of knowledge related to the emergence of nontraditional study in this nation as a legitimate alternative in higher education.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following definitions were in effect for this study:

Accreditation. "The recognition given to an educational institution or

program which has met the minimum standards of quality as established by a competent agency," (Andrews, 1972, p. 19).

Clientele. The term operationalized by the Commission on Colleges and used in conjunction with "black" or "white" to denote the predominate racial characteristic of the member institution's student body. Hereafter, institutions will be referred to as "black" or "white" with the understanding that this applies only to the predominant racial characteristic of the institutions' student clientele.

Comprehensive Level I Institution. An institution which awards the following two-year associate's degrees: associate of arts, associate of science, and associate of applied science.

Institutional Level. Member institutions of the Commission on Colleges are classified in the membership according to the highest level of degree offered. The following classifications are utilized: Level I - Associate Degree; Level II - Bachelor's Degree; Level III - Bachelor's and Master's Degrees; Level IV - Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctor's Degrees; Level V - Graduate Degrees only. (Commission on Colleges, 1975.)

Liberal Arts Level I Institution. An institution which awards only the two-year associate of arts degree.

Life and Work Experience Credit (non-college learning). Academic credit awarded toward completion of a certificate or degree based on a student's pursuits in a non-academic setting which provide learning for a formal academic requirement.

Nontraditional Study. All programs considered as nontraditional were for credit only. These programs differed from traditional ventures in terms of time, location, delivery system or methodology, and generally were thought of as specially designed degree programs for special audiences, delivered in special ways.

Special Activities. These programs are defined as: external or special degree programs, off-campus classes and units, independent study programs including correspondence and home study, conferences and institutes including short courses and workshops, foreign travel and study, media instruction including radio and television, and on-campus programs including special summer sessions and special evening classes.
(Standards, 1975, p. 22)

Standard Nine. The Standard of the College Delegate Assembly (The College Delegate Assembly is composed of one voting delegate from each member institution) which regulates the "special activities" of Commission on Colleges institutional members and which is one of the eleven Standards governing the accreditation of those members as described in Standards of the College Delegate Assembly (1975).

Technical Level I Institution. An institution which awards the two-year associate's degrees, associate of science and associate of applied science.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Following the background and purpose of the study discussed in Chapter 1, the relevant literature in the field of nontraditional study was reviewed in Chapter 2. The major emphasis of Chapter 3 was upon the methodology of the study, the design of the survey instrument, and the

treatment of the survey data. In Chapter 4, the results of the study generated from the data analysis were presented. The narrative was concluded in Chapter 5 with a summary as well as a discussion of the implications and conclusions arising from the results and of the recommendations for further research.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The major purpose of the study was to identify and describe the nontraditional programs offered by the member institutions of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. First, the related literature was reviewed to define nontraditional education as the term is currently understood and applied in postsecondary education. Secondly, there was a need to survey studies of a similar nature and, as a corollary to this portion of the investigation, to review studies which provided general characteristics of existing nontraditional programs. Finally, the genesis of the study came from the desire of a regional accrediting agency, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, to insure the quality of nontraditional programs offered by its institutional members; therefore, a brief discussion was presented which dealt with establishing the legitimacy of nontraditional programs.

Defining Nontraditional Postsecondary Education

The keystone of the nontraditional movement in postsecondary education is change. As with any breaking of tradition in the delivery of services by an established societal institution, in this instance higher education, both the consumer and the provider of service seek an explanation of that which is altered. Defining nontraditional study for

degree credit has often been a perplexing and frustrating undertaking. The endeavors related in the following pages are a summary of the major attempts to define the concept.

In 1973, the Commission on Non-Traditional Study with Samuel B. Gould as Chairman made a concerted effort to arrive at a satisfactory definition for the term "nontraditional study" by seeking a concensus from its panel of national experts. Although a definition was forthcoming from the Commission, they experienced difficulty in adequately explaining this educational concept. As Gould commented in Diversity by Design (1973, p. xv), the official report of the Commission, "most of us agreed that nontraditional study is more an attitude than a system and thus can never be defined except tangentially." The frustration of the Commission notwithstanding, its members came forward with this explanation of nontraditional study (p. XV):

This attitude puts the student first and the institution second, concentrates more on the former's need than the latter's convenience, encourages diversity of individual opportunity rather than uniform prescription, and deemphasizes time, space, and even course requirements in favor of competence and, where applicable, performance.

Cross and Valley (1974), writing in Planning Non-Traditional Programs, described the nontraditional concept as follows (p. 1):

Its greatest departure from traditional education is its explicit recognition that education should be measured by what the student knows rather than how or where he learns it. Beyond that, it builds upon two basic premises -- that opportunity should be equal for all who wish to learn and that learning is a lifelong process unconfined to one's youth or to campus classrooms.

This assessment of nontraditional learning is compatible with and is derived from that of the Commission on Non-Traditional Study. The

definition also underscored a general theme running through any assessment of the concept, which was an egalitarian spirit that all citizens should have access to higher education, a philosophy well articulated in Cross' (1971) Beyond the Open Door. While this remained a noble precept, it did not strike at the idea of quality and acceptability of practice so critical to the role of the regional accrediting agency.

By describing nontraditional learning as (p. 1) "a process unconfined . . . to campus classrooms," Cross and Valley (1974) alluded to an approach in nontraditional study which is often viewed as a synonymous term -- the external degree. As Bowen has noted in "Financing the External Degree" (1973, p. 479), "The term 'non-traditional study' as usually conceived, includes almost anything in higher education that is new, unusual, or not widely practiced." As such, nontraditional study acquires the characteristics of an umbrella term or generic descriptor. An analogous situation, perhaps, is the biologist who might view nontraditional study taxonomically as an educational kingdom with the external degree serving in the capacity of a sub-kingdom or certainly no less than a phylum. In numerous situations, then, the literature reflects the belief that many, if not most, of the characteristics of nontraditional study are manifested within the concept of the external degree.

Included among these shared characteristics is a difficulty in defining "external degree." Cross (1973, p. 415) commented that:

. . . one of higher education's most discussed innovations, the external degree, is characterized by paradox. It has no very precise definition, and yet people share a common understanding of what it represents.

Houle, writing in The External Degree, stated "The term itself has come to have countless meanings, some explicitly stated and others detectable only by inference," (1973, p. xiii). He continued, however, by advancing this definition (pp. 14-15):

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.

Houle conceded that this definition adopts a negative approach by saying in essence that "an external degree is not an internal degree."

The complexity of the problem faced in seeking a working definition for the two terms was not alleviated by Nelson (1974). His exasperation was reflected in the statement that (p. 176), "the term 'external degree' like 'nontraditional study' remains a broad rubric which can be defined almost any way an individual wants or fears it to be." Cross (1973), however, did attempt to define the external degree by providing characteristics she considered attributable to all examples of the degree. "Central to the concept" she believed "is the notion that learning must be defined as a quality of the student rather than an offering of the college . . . education is student centered." There is also extant an emphasis on "flexibility and individualization." Furthermore, Cross distinguished between the external degree and "the broader concept of nontraditional study," by proposing that the former is concerned to a greater extent with "certifying that the student meets certain standards set by the institution," (1973, pp. 417-418), a concept somewhat difficult to express within the standards of a regional accrediting agency.

Valley (1972), writing in Explorations in Non-Traditional Study, carried the generalized definition of the external degree to a greater specificity by proposing a taxonomy of six separate classifications for what he felt to be the major formats for the degree. First, he described the "administrative-facilitation model" which is the most common and is characterized by its similarity to traditional programs. The primary difference is that the degree (p. 97) "is earned outside the central structure of the university." An example of this approach is an administratively separate unit such as evening college. This definition has the danger of being too expansive because of the close similarity to traditional programs.

Second, Valley outlined the "modes of learning model" in which an institution "seeks to adjust to the capacities, circumstances, and interests of a different clientele from that which it customarily serves," that is, the institution seeks to serve an audience heretofore unreached through its traditional mission (p. 100). Third, he proposed the "examination model" in which the student gains credits or degrees from an institution purely on the basis of performance ratings from an examination. Instruction is not provided by the institution awarding the degree. Fourth is the validation model in which the institution evaluates the "total learning experience [of the student] in terms of its conception of a degree and indicates any additional requirements needed" (p. 113). The student presents a compilation of all educational experiences to date. These experiences include transcripts, examination scores, records of correspondence, and similar data. An assessment is made and compared against the institution's degree requirements. Those

requirements which remained unfulfilled can then be satisfied through a number of options, for example, more correspondence courses, examinations, and documented work experiences.

The fifth and sixth categories proposed by Valley are the "credits model" and the "complex-systems model." In the former classification, there is an arrangement whereby "an institution or agency . . . does not itself offer instruction [but] awards credits and degrees for which it sets standards and vouches for the quality of student programming" (p. 117). The final model, complex-systems, is Valley's attempt to be all inclusive and refers to those programs which combine facets of several external degree options to form what he describes "as an external degree system rather than an external degree program" (p. 119).

While Valley's attempt to provide a taxonomy for external degrees is valuable, there remains a problem. By defining external degree models, Valley may have mistakenly conveyed the impression that all which is labeled nontraditional exists within these six examples. Rather it should be understood that major portions of his models can be conducted on the institution's campus. What sets them apart is the curriculum format, delivery of information and evaluation procedures. The one exception to this is Valley's administrative-facilitation model which is predicated upon simply offering courses at locations remote from the campus, a circumstance which has become so commonplace since 1972 that to make it the sole criterion for labeling a program as nontraditional would not seem to be appropriate at this juncture. Nontraditional degree programs can exist without being external. There should emerge an appreciation for nontraditional education as a departure from the status

quo and as such the terminology "external degree" is a logical sub-unit but not an interchangeable synonym.

Despite these attempts of several years to arrive at satisfactory working definitions for nontraditional study and the external degree, other educators experienced sufficient dissatisfaction with those efforts to advance yet another terminology. Medsker, Edelstein, Kreplin, Ruyle, and Shea (1975) in Extending Opportunities for a College Degree felt confronted by a certain "impreciseness" when having to use the term "nontraditional." Indeed, the concept "external degree" while applicable to most of the situations encountered by Medsker and associates, still, in their thinking, did not provide sufficient explanation for all variations. Consequently, the descriptor finally agreed upon by the group was "extended degree programs," and was defined as follows:

A degree program with policies and procedures which enhance its convenience and appeal and with content of interest to students who are usually beyond what has been considered the conventional college age (p. vii).

Following this assessment, Medsker, et al. have developed four broad classifications under which, they feel, all approaches to the extended degree may be grouped. Their first category is the "extended-campus approach" which is characterized by conventional classroom study, the relaxation of residency regulations and a specified curriculum for meeting degree requirements. Second is the "liberal studies/adult degree approach" selected for its concentration on liberal arts studies and the alternating of self-study and resident seminar tactics. Emphasizing individualized, contracted study and the development of community learning resources is the third approach, "individualized study." Finally,

there is the fourth approach, "degree-by-examination." This method is noninstructional and develops from a prescribed curriculum permitting candidates to exhibit mastery of a content area through specially designed examinations (pp. 11-31).

Medsker and his colleagues have gotten closer to an operational definition of nontraditional study although they did not wish to define the concept as nontraditional. The four models they have described address both the problem of defining different approaches to the external degree, which they do through the extended campus approach with its limited residency regulations and conventional classroom situations, and the problem of describing learning arrangements which depart from the conventional through individualized learning, contracts and degrees through examination. More so than Gould, Valley and Cross, Medsker and the others have successfully achieved a marriage of the philosophical approach advanced by Gould and his nontraditional study as an attitude and the concrete model approach utilized by Valley in his discussion of the external degree.

Patton (1975) suggested that the extended degree program as advanced by the University of California (Medsker's model) was not initiated in the fashion normally thought of for the external degree. Instead, educational opportunities were provided for part-time students on the several campuses of the University. Having such programs on campus indicated options which could not be classified as external in nature but which were nontraditional in attitude, as was suggested by Gould. More recently, however, the Extended University has acquired additional characteristics of the external degree. The latter is

defined simply by Patton as a program "in which courses needed to satisfy the requirements of the degree are taken at an off-campus location" (p. 428).

Concluding this examination of nontraditional learning definitions came the Commission on Colleges' own version rendered in 1971 as a part of Standard IX, Special Activities. The language which was adopted was presented under the fifth section of the Standard's "Illustrations and Interpretations" as follows (1971, p. 24):

5. External or Special Degree Programs (Nontraditional Study). An external or special degree program comprises a course of study different from the traditional undergraduate degree. A nontraditional program may or may not require on-campus study or residence and relies almost entirely on independent study and examination.

The Commission on Colleges does not make the assumption that all academic studies off-campus are or should be considered nontraditional in nature. The Commission used the broad term "nontraditional study" to describe external and special degree programs. One implication of this usage was that not all nontraditional study is considered to be an external degree. Under illustration and interpretation number six of Standard IX, the Commission made it clear that off-campus courses "should maintain the academic integrity of the institution" (p. 24). When off-campus offerings have become sufficiently comprehensive to a particular clientele in a specific location, the institution should seriously consider the establishment of a center or regional campus (SACS, 1975).

Related Studies in Regional Accrediting Agencies

Review of the major research efforts in nontraditional education completed by the regional accrediting agencies revealed that only the

Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools had conducted substantive research in the area of nontraditional study as it related to standards for accreditation. The research of the Commission on Colleges was conducted by Grover J. Andrews, an associate executive secretary of the commission, and resulted in an unpublished doctoral dissertation entitled "Public Service in Higher Education: A Status Study of Accreditation in Adult and Continuing Education," (1972). Andrews had as the two major objectives of his study, the determination of programs within the Commission which fell into the categories of adult and continuing education and the identification of those other programs of a public service nature in the nontraditional approach. His second objective was to develop and recommend to the Commission a standard which dealt with establishing guidelines for institutions offering adult and continuing education and other nontraditional study programs.

Among the definitions used to establish the parameters of his study, Andrews defined nontraditional study as follows (p. 23):

An external or special degree program comprises a course of study different from the traditional degree which may or may not require on-campus study or residence and which relies almost entirely on independent study and examination.

In the subsequent reporting of data, Andrews did not group the credit programs into a single category under the title "nontraditional." Andrews' use of the term "nontraditional" in his study was broadly done to include the concept of adult and continuing education, both credit and noncredit, as well as to specify a particular approach to the awarding of degree credit. The broad definition of nontraditional study operationalized by Andrews makes the direct comparison with this

study's narrowly defined credit programs more difficult. However, the Andrews credit program response categories were easily distinguishable from noncredit and the relevant findings are briefly summarized below.

In the category of off-campus college academic programs, Andrews discovered that 138 of 560 institutions (24.6 percent) conducted off-campus credit courses with another 182 institutions having instruction off campus on an irregular basis. Further examination revealed, of the 138 institutions, there were twenty-six with full undergraduate and twenty-three with full graduate degree programs provided off campus. None of the 138 institutions reported any differential in the admission requirements for off campus and on campus.

In eighty-three institutions, faculty teaching in the off-campus programs were regular faculty of the institution in 76 to 100 percent of the instances; thirty-one institutions used regular faculty in 51 to 75 percent of the instances; and in fifty-one institutions, less than half the off-campus program was taught by regular faculty.

The classification, late afternoon-evening college programs on campus, referred to those programs offered under the auspices of the adult and continuing education component of the institutions and did not include normal extensions of the daytime schedule. Responses demonstrated that 142 or 25.4 percent of the 560 member schools had such academic programs. The foreign travel and study category of the survey disclosed that twenty-nine institutions had an academic program abroad supplemented with seminars, readings, and reports required for academic credit.

From the analysis of all data produced in his study, Andrews concluded that a new standard "which would encourage institutions in the development of innovative programs for education at all levels to all publics was needed" (p. 97). Furthermore, he felt such a standard would legitimize and assist in the organization of the relatively new educational field of continuing education.

The new standard which emerged from Andrews' findings was Standard IX, Special Activities, and was unanimously adopted by the institutional members of the College Commission at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Association in Miami Beach, Florida, on December 1, 1971. The standard, in its entirety, is included as part of the survey instrument in Appendix A.

Particular value was derived from the Andrews study in his discussion of accreditation, its purposes and functions as well as its relationship to adult and continuing education. Speaking of the responsibilities of those institutions with a public service function, Andrews noted that many traditional institutions have been hesitant to initiate their public service responsibilities because of the generally nontraditional structuring of such activities. He continued by stating that "a positive move on the part of regional accreditation to legitimize [emphasis added] the public service function as an acceptable part of the academic community would greatly accelerate" (p. 17) such program development in the traditional institutions.

Because of the goal of legitimization, the Andrews study provided the bench mark for regional accrediting associations which were attempting to respond to the rapidly expanding field of adult and continuing

education through the establishment of standards or guidelines to direct their institutional members interested in implementing nontraditional program activities. Continued change in the field since 1971 has necessitated further review of nontraditional programs with the lingering need for program legitimization remaining of paramount concern to the institutions and the regional accrediting associations. Developments in the field of continuing education have been so expansive and substantive that examination of specialized areas within the generic field studied by Andrews has become essential. Therefore, the need to examine specifically those programs which have come to be understood as credit non-traditional degrees emerged as a derivative of the much broader need to again assess the public service/continuing education activities of the Commission on Colleges' member institutions.

Surveys of Nontraditional Programs

In 1974, Ruyle and Geiselman reported the results of a 1972 nationwide survey conducted by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at Berkeley. The purpose of this survey was to identify all nontraditional program opportunities within the entire population of American colleges and universities; and, at this time, it remains the only available comprehensive study of its kind.

The Education Directory of the U.S. Office of Education was used as the source document. Eliminated from consideration were eleven institutions located in territories outside the United States as well as two-hundred professional schools. A questionnaire was mailed to eligible institutions totaling 2,670 in number. Nonrespondents were sent a

postcard requesting that they indicate whether they conducted nontraditional programs even if they could not respond to the questionnaire. Of the responses, 1,185 were judged acceptable for the report with 47 percent having indicated that they offered nontraditional programs. However, this figure may have been high in that of the 724 institutions which responded by postcard, only 37 percent felt that they had a nontraditional program. Therefore, if the 739 nonrespondent institutions were similar to the 724 which returned the postcard, then the actual percentage of institutions with nontraditional degree programs may have been closer to a range of between 35 and 40 percent rather than to the 47 percent described. The more salient findings of the survey are summarized in the following narrative.

Student opportunities. The study revealed that 17 percent of the institutions did not actively seek the enrollment of adults twenty-five years and older (considered as a part-time, nontraditional student for purposes of this discussion). The heaviest recruitment came from the community colleges but universities sought out the adult student in two out of three situations. Seventy-five percent of all institutions, however, did permit students to earn an undergraduate degree by part-time attendance.

The majority of part-time work and degrees granted was accomplished at the community colleges with colleges and universities following in that order. Public institutions were more active in this area than were the private schools. Only three percent of the institutions assessed part-time students at the same rate they would have paid

for full enrollment. Additionally, more than half of the colleges and universities had some type of financial assistance for the part-time student. The study of counseling services revealed that 80 percent of the institutions utilized normal counseling procedures with no adjustment for the adult part-time student. In the majority of instances, more student services were available before and after evening/weekend classes from the two-year colleges than from the senior and university level institutions.

Opportunities for non-classroom learning. Concerning the issue of awarding credit for experience not directly related to the classroom, the majority of institutions did not permit credit for work experiences such as the Peace Corps or other volunteer and professional situations. Approximately 8 percent of all institutions awarded credit in some fashion for work experience. More than 50 percent of the schools gave credit for non-coursework such as community theater, writing a book, or volunteer work in a community agency.

Credit by examination was an approach utilized by two-thirds of the institutions surveyed. The states of New York and New Jersey have methods for students to earn degrees entirely by examination but no restriction on the amount of credit which can be earned was a rarity in most institutions. A reduction in the length of time needed to earn a degree by the examination method was possible at 63 percent of the colleges and universities.

Nontraditional programs. In addition to the questions dealing with the adult, part-time student and institution-wide policies adapted to this

audience, there was a section of the survey which dealt specifically with nontraditional programs which were defined as follows (p. 237):

". . . any specially designed programs based on new or unconventional forms of education free of the time or place limitations of traditional classroom instruction."

The programs were considered nontraditional if they were found to be unconventional in any of four ways: (1) type of student, those individuals who were fully employed and pursuing credit work or who were occupied in such a way as to be unable to be a full-time student; (2) location, those classes which were taught off-campus or were pursued through independent study at home; (3) method, those approaches to learning which were nonlecture, or different from normal practices in postsecondary education; and (4) content, which could have been the same or different from conventional courses as long as the program was presented to atypical students in an atypical location through some atypical approach.

Responses indicated that 560 institutions or 47 percent considered at least one of their programs to be nontraditional as measured against the four criteria. The programs were offered in such diverse areas as industrial sites, prisons, military bases and homes. Closer inspection revealed, however, that some institutions had listed programs outside the limits provided. When these institutions were removed, there still remained 386 or 33 percent of the respondents offering a total of 641 programs. Projecting the totals for the entire population of American institutions, the research staff concluded that from 1,000 to

1,400 nontraditional programs existed even if only half as many programs were offered by the 1,485 nonresponding schools.

Public two-year institutions offered approximately one-third of all the programs while public universities and independent and religious senior colleges each provided approximately 15 percent of the total. Geographic distribution of the programs showed a predominance in the West and Mideast. The Rocky Mountains States, which had the highest proportion, reported 41 percent of their institutions with nontraditional efforts. The Southeastern schools had the lowest percentage along with the Plains States at 28 percent and the Southwest with 30 percent.

The degree levels of the nontraditional programs were revealed as follows: (1) certificate, less than degree level, 11 percent; (2) associate degree, 21 percent; (3) bachelor's degree, 25 percent; (4) graduate or professional degree, 8 percent. Analysis of the four nontraditional criteria demonstrated that the great majority of programs were considered nontraditional because of the students (70 percent) or because of the location (67 percent). Institutions described their programs as nontraditional in method in 57 percent of the responses and as nontraditional in content in 48 percent of the situations. Programs marked nontraditional in 24 percent of the cases were occupationally oriented, 15 percent were of the same content as traditional curricula, 6 percent emphasized liberal studies, and 3 percent dealt with social problems. The remaining programs were a combination of a traditional and nontraditional curricula. In the majority of cases, 62 percent, the nontraditional programs had some concentration in career and occupational training.

Programs which offered only daytime instruction numbered 12 percent while 44 percent held classes during the day and at other times. Sixty percent had classes in the late afternoon and at night and 25 percent provided weekend classes. Multiple day segments of instruction were offered in 20 percent of the cases.

In the fiscal area, most of the programs were subsidized initially but were expected to be self-supporting after the developmental stage. Of 351 selected programs, only two were self-supporting from tuition and grants in the first five years of operation. The majority of self-supporting programs was found in the private sector.

In 60 percent of the programs, regular faculty taught conventional classes as well as the nontraditional. Over 50 percent of the programs utilized adjunct faculty from business, the professions and the arts, but in only about 17 percent of the cases did these faculty constitute the majority.

In 1972, the majority of the programs was relatively new. Those which had been in operation less than a year comprised 26 percent of the total. The one to two years category had 36 percent and the three to five years block reported 24 percent. In each of the categories, six to ten years and longer than ten years, there was a count totaling 7 percent.

As with any new and developing field, there were problems. The team of researchers at Berkeley discovered that lack of financing (41 percent) was the major hurdle followed by the problem of assessing nonclassroom learning (40 percent). In descending order came "concern about academic standards," 34 percent and "faculty resistance," 32 percent. Such topics as acceptance by graduate and professional schools

were thought serious by only 18 percent. Accreditation was seen as a problem by 10 percent of the respondents.

In summary, the study done by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at Berkeley represents the most definitive examination of nontraditional programs yet accomplished. However, because of the breadth of the survey, regional peculiarities are not as easily identified, particularly those which may relate to accreditation and the philosophy of a regional accrediting agency. Although under the "problem" section of the survey, accreditation was seen as an issue in only 10 percent of the cases. There was, nevertheless, a direct correlation between accreditation and concern about academic standards in which the latter was seen as a problem by 34 percent of the respondents. Therefore, a similar study, using as a population the member institutions of a regional accrediting agency, would be of value for comparative purposes in many categories as well as providing a different philosophy for such a project. Additionally, there would be value in attempting to determine the emergence of any trends within a particular region of the country vis-a-vis nontraditional education.

Legitimization of Nontraditional Study

Breaking with tradition generally creates a simple dichotomy. On one side of the issue (the new approach) there is praise for the evolution and recognition of new and, hopefully, better concepts for dealing with an established situation. The remaining side of the issue is composed of those who wish to retain the status quo. Birenbaum (1971) has observed that the traditions of the Western university (excluding the

Latins) are anti- and even counter-revolutionary. Within this Western environment, however, revolutionary knowledge has been produced, but its use has been to continue the status quo. Even so, the major character of this nation is revolutionary. If Birenbaum was correct, and if the dichotomy between traditional and nontraditional educators emerges, the latter may well owe any success they enjoy to the triumph of this innate revolutionary spirit.

Continuation of the status quo versus the embarkation upon nontraditional study is the choice facing the administrators and faculty members of numerous postsecondary institutions. Their choice is complicated in that they are not free to reach a decision on whether "to go nontraditional" or remain as they are. The student clientele, upon which the survival of their institutions depends, is changing from the relatively easily serviced, full-time, on-campus, eighteen to twenty-two year old to an older, part-time, commuter or nonresident student. The constant for each type of student, however, remains the successful attainment of the appropriate credential -- the degree -- to insure acceptance and success in the professional, business, and academic worlds. As Newman (1971) has observed, "going to college" in the decade of the sixties became a "socially conditioned reflex" (p. 4), while career objectives and requirements for promotion within firms and agencies are contingent upon the achievement of certain educational credentials (Green and Sullivan, 1975).

The part-time student majority is forcing the issue with traditionalists. Writing in Lifelong Learners -- A New Clientele for Higher Education, Pitchell (1974) noted that Office of Education surveys

indicated part-time students comprised 55 percent (credit and noncredit) of the postsecondary population of students in 1969. This percentage rose to over 57 percent in 1972. During the same period, part-time students increased at a rate more than twice that of full-time students.

Houle, in 1971, categorized almost twelve million persons over twenty-five as "partial college attenders," those having one to three years of postsecondary experience. If present trends continue, this body of potential students will grow to over twenty-two million by 1990 (1973, p. 428). Green and Sullivan (1975) revealed that during the fall term of the 1974 academic year, fully one-third of all student enrollments came from adults aged twenty-five and over. Medsker (1975) and his associates, while investigating the extended degree, discovered that the median age of the involved students was slightly over thirty.

From the assessments, there obviously exists an audience which is older, of considerable magnitude, and because of the age factor, probably employed; thus, these older students require special programs to fit their unique schedules. When institutions depart from the norm and begin development of special programs which utilize new approaches in the awarding of degree credit, many traditionalists view such a departure from the status quo as a serious threat to academic standards.

Hefferlin (1974) has offered the most succinct discussion of the problem with and the need for achieving legitimacy in the nontraditional movement. He made the following observation (p. 150):

To remain viable, the non-traditional movement must gain and retain legitimacy; yet the agencies that provide legitimacy -- state approval agencies and voluntary accrediting agencies -- of necessity operate on a basis of traditional and conventional standards. Non-traditional study thus raises a double problem:

how to assure the public of educational quality without restricting the growth of imaginative programs, and how to encourage innovation while safeguarding the interests of the public and existing institutions.

Thus, the problem was clearly stated by Hefferlin and, in so doing, he underscored the need for intensive examination of the issue by the regional accrediting agencies. The regional accrediting agencies (voluntary accreditation), Hefferlin felt, establish the standard for mediocrity in education while government guidelines determine minimal standards. Hefferlin reviewed the difficulties encountered through insufficient state controls to insure quality, in addition to the shortcomings of federal regulation. He suggested that state quality control would be marginal at best with the federal sector becoming increasingly involved in the control of nontraditional education and consumer protection.

In the arena of voluntary accreditation, Hefferlin stated that not for several decades have issues been of such importance and significance. There were also encouraging actions, from Hefferlin's viewpoint, being taken by the regional accrediting agencies regarding nontraditional programs rather than an exhibition of "dogged intransigency." In most instances, there have been few roadblocks deliberately constructed by the agencies to block development of innovative programs. Hefferlin pointed out, however, that some educators improperly use the mission of the agencies to imply that the introduction of a nontraditional program will endanger the entire institution's accreditation. While unable to prevent all misrepresentations, the agencies can strive to correct these misconceptions through action against any institutional

officers who convey the impression that the accrediting agencies stifle innovation.

The regional accrediting agencies are by their very nature, as pointed out by Hefferlin, the protectors of accepted standards and do not easily function as agents of change. He commented on the steps that had been taken by the national accrediting bodies concerning the establishment of evaluation guidelines for nontraditional study. These actions predated the subsequent founding of a single national agency, the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) but, nevertheless, provided the basis for the later efforts by COPA. The accrediting agencies of professional programs were seen by Hefferlin as having failed to respond to nontraditional education to a far lesser extent than the regional bodies.

Hefferlin captured the task facing voluntary accreditation when he stated (p. 167):

. . . with the growth of non-traditional forms of education that rely on few of the structures and processes formerly deemed necessary in education, the reorientation of accrediting standards -- long needed whether or not non-traditional study had developed -- has become imperative.

If this reorientation is accomplished, then accrediting bodies will have provided the American public with its most worthwhile service, having insured "that students won't be had, and that patrons won't be rooked" (p. 168).

The commentary by Hefferlin provided an assessment of the problems facing nontraditional education in establishing its own legitimacy and the role which must be assumed by the regional accrediting agencies in helping with this establishment of legitimacy. From Hefferlin's

vantage point, periodic reviews and examinations of guidelines like the Commission on Colleges' Standard Nine Study are essential to the preservation of a viable accrediting body and to the continuance of innovative educational practices.

Pressure for alternatives or changes in traditional postsecondary education have manifested themselves from many sources and always with these manifestations have been raised the issues of quality and legitimacy. Legitimization remains the key to acceptance for nontraditional activity and obtaining this legitimacy, as noted by Hefferlin, rests in large part with the regional accrediting agencies. As Orlans (1975, p. 1) has observed, "One idea underlies all accrediting: the status of being accredited is good." Gould and Cross (1974) specified appropriate accreditation of offerings as a necessary step to insure and protect quality. But, the accrediting mechanisms in many cases are as traditional and inflexible as the institutions they accredit.

Dickey wrote in 1971 that accreditation, as it was then operating, did "not provide sufficiently valid information regarding the real heart of the educational endeavor, namely, the instructional program itself" (p. 146). This was written prior to the Andrews study for SACS in 1971-72 but is cited to convey what many consider to be a generally applicable characteristic. Dickey continued by specifying the inadequacies of the accrediting process vis-a-vis nontraditional study (p. 146):

Our present procedure for assessing quality in higher education through the accrediting process needs to be restructured largely because the criteria, developed and applied by individuals steeped in the traditional approaches to education, no longer meet the needs of institutions serving a wide variety of students. Standards used today assume one kind of institution (basically of a traditional nature), but in reality these standards are applied to many different types of institutions.

Warren (1975) chastised both traditionalists and reformers for having failed to define the "degree symbol." Regional accrediting associations permit member institutions to define their own specific missions and purposes. The associations then attempt to insure that the purpose of each is being achieved through measurement against standards for physical facilities, faculty credentials, and the like. The institutions and the associations feel that these standards have a bearing on the process which yields a degree at a particular institution. However, Warren concluded that "until the degree and the capabilities it is expected to represent are defined, no one will be able to say whether or not the accreditation process is maintaining the right standards" (p. 139).

Gould and Cross (1972) succinctly commented on the hesitancy of the educational establishment to accept nontraditional work as comparable to the rigors of traditional approaches.

The terms external degree or individualized learning or patterns of flexibility have a suspiciously permissive ring, especially in the ears of the traditionalist educators and a host of laymen as well, who consider current philosophies and practices of colleges and universities already too liberalized and weakened . . . They look on flexibility as no more than a synonym for escape from regulation and responsibility (p. 8).

Warren (1973) felt there were numerous administrators and faculty members who view the awarding of credit for external learning as a forerunner of the decline in quality of academic standards and the degree itself. Lindquist, Martorana and Kuhns (1975) supported this thinking. The latter two noted that historically such "radical institutions" as normal schools, land-grant colleges and open-door community colleges have been subjected to charges that each offered second-rate programs.

Pursuing the rationalization for this attitude, Martin (1975) enumerated three broad reasons for resistance to innovative curricula and programs. First, the programs are often of poor quality with no developmental concept of goals and evaluation prior to initiation. Second, faculties are faced with an inordinate amount of displeasing intellectual labor in designing these programs when they must struggle with issues of value and human nature on an institution-wide scale and not just at the departmental level. Third, many students and faculty have lost sight of what a curriculum is, considering it to be a cafeteria of courses serving vocational and idiosyncratic needs. Some students view prescribed programs of courses as retarding their attainment of desired educational goals.

Despite the social eruptions and demographic changes already noted which together have combined to produce dramatic aberrations in many existing societal institutions, the natural structure of postsecondary education is inherently resistant to change. Sikes, Schlesinger and Seashore (1974, pp. 38-39) have written:

Educational institutions have many blocks to innovation and creativity typical of bureaucracies. A key block is that schools prize order, rationality, predictability, and impersonal modes of operating . . . Change to some degree runs counter to orderliness and predictability; it can be planned and controlled, but inherently it calls for new behaviors, different interactions, altered assumptions, and revised attitudes.

Keeton (1975) stated the problem a bit more bluntly, "Red tape is strangling reform in higher education" (p. 30). Continuing, he expanded on the source of the problem ". . . the real enemies of higher education reform are the competitors who stand to lose markets, and the supporters (or at least noncontenders) who see no need to change the procedures and standards by which reforms are legitimized" (p. 31).

Realistically, there is much truth in Kimmel's contention that "as with the traditional forms of academic recognition, the status of the institution awarding recognition for non-traditional learning will, in large measure, determine the respect accorded that recognition" (1972, p. 91). Whatever the source of the legitimizing agent, nontraditional study has come too far to be ignored by even the staunchest conservative. "The settling-in period has come," as Mickey (1973) phrased it, "and care must be taken to design programs that will at once preserve the vitality of individualization and innovation, and the credibility of tradition" (p. 453).

The debate has continued, however, with a national forum conducted through the printed media. The question was posed by the editors of Change magazine, "How can nontraditional college programs best acquire the legitimacy of traditional offerings and institutions?" (August 1976, pp. 52-56). There were several suggestions from respondents which cast something of a different light upon how best to achieve the much sought after legitimacy. Some of the more germane comments are summarized below.

Lichtman, in the Change magazine "Dialog" forum, questioned whether achieving the sanctity of traditional programs was setting the goal high enough. She noted that recent national surveys revealed that 7 percent of the college graduates polled could not make out a check properly, nor could 36 percent calculate the tax on small purchases. Continuing, Lichtman rejected the standard of comparison which measures traditional against nontraditional. Instead, she felt that the emphasis

should be on the development of the students rather than the conditions under which they are educated.

Arden supported Lichtman when he suggested "that a nontraditional program should not seek to acquire 'the legitimacy of traditional offerings,' except by being so good at what it does that the educational establishment first tolerates it, then envies it, and finally emulates it" (p. 55). Whatever the steps to achieving the elusive and much sought after legitimacy for nontraditional education, Goodman summarized the spirit advanced by all those who commented in the Change forum when he said that "the outcome is primary; the process and the means are secondary" (p. 56).

Ultimately, "credibility of tradition" seems destined to prevail, for as Ferris (1975) has stated, "Sooner or later all nontraditional forms of education stop being nontraditional. They become defunct or they become a new tradition" (p. 1). Such an observation may afford comfort for some; however, others may find little solace in discovering that Nyquist (1974) has more accurately assessed their attitudes by stating that "more than one person has observed, the external degree is really an old idea whose time has come or, . . . a bad idea whose time has come, and it is doomed to succeed" (p. 63).

Discussion of Previous Research

From the review of literature came a genuine concern of educators that a workable definition for nontraditional learning was necessary in order to conceptualize and explain the nontraditional movement in post-secondary education. Attempts at defining nontraditional education were

made from either one or two approaches or some combination thereof. In the first situation, there was the process of establishing the philosophical precepts of the movement through conceptualization of the attitudes and ideas, such as the definition provided by Gould and his colleagues from the Commission on Non-Traditional Study. In this instance, they expressed nontraditional study as "more an attitude than a system" and an arrangement whereby the competencies achieved are more important than the systems in which teaching and learning occur.

The second approach to defining the issue came from the construction and discussion of models which could be conveniently labeled and then fitted with the umbrella terms, nontraditional or external degrees. Valley provided six model categories for the external degree while Houle sought to explain it as an idea. Regardless of the model, a basic premise evolved from all definitions which was that the student's goals were of paramount concern rather than the institution's or as Cross defined it, ". . . learning must be defined as a quality of the student rather than an offering of the college."

Medsker and his colleagues felt the term "nontraditional" itself left something to be desired because of its "impreciseness." They advanced the terminology "extended degree programs" with a definition which stressed convenience to the adult student who was occupied with things other than full-time study. In addition, they further defined the concept through four models under which all options for their definition could be grouped. Medsker, more so than Gould, Valley and Cross, successfully achieved a marriage of the philosophical approach advanced

by Gould and his nontraditional study as an attitude and the concrete model approach utilized by Valley in his discussion of the external degree.

The definition provided by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools was too narrow in its focus as situations were described involving only the undergraduate degree. Also stipulated was that a nontraditional approach relies for the most part on independent study and examination. Such a technique places emphasis upon the system of learning rather than the student outcome addressed by Gould, et al.

Emerging from this portion of the review came the obvious need to again attempt the quantification and conceptualization of nontraditional learning through a revised definition, and from this definition to provide a guide to the regional accrediting agency for the measurement and development of its standards of quality.

The characteristics of nontraditional programs as they existed in institutions throughout the United States in 1972 were definitively described by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at Berkeley with the publication of findings in 1974. Andrews had preceded the Berkeley study with his 1971 analysis of the membership of the Southern Association's Commission on Colleges. From his study, Andrews developed Standard IX which regulates the special activities of institutions including their nontraditional study programs. There have been no subsequent studies either of national or regional scope. Of particular value in now conducting a broad descriptive study on nontraditional programs in the Southern Association is the need to reaffirm Andrews's goal

in his earlier work which was to legitimize such activities as nontraditional education. Additionally, there would be the added benefits of possibly discovering trends which may be emerging in nontraditional study and, perhaps, also reconfirming trends predicted and situations described in both the Berkeley and Andrews studies of 1972 and 1971, respectively.

Concluding the review of literature was an examination of the credibility and legitimacy of nontraditional study. Hefferlin noted that for the nontraditional movement to remain viable it must gain legitimacy while protecting the interests of the public and insuring quality. He felt that the regional accrediting agencies are faced with their most important issues in decades in dealing appropriately with the rapid growth of nontraditional degree programs. Hefferlin described the task facing voluntary accreditation as "the reorientation of accrediting standards -- long needed whether or not non-traditional study had developed" Other writings basically reflected Hefferlin's position that, while the natural structure of postsecondary education is inherently resistant to change, the nontraditional process has come too far to be ignored and that the regional accrediting agencies are instrumental in effecting the necessary attitudinal changes needed to assure the acceptability of nontraditional instruction and learning.

From this charge to voluntary accreditation comes yet another reason for the assessment and analysis of nontraditional programs among the membership of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Attempts must be made by the regional agencies to operationalize a definition for nontraditional programs in order to

fulfill responsibilities to their member institutions. The models developed by Medsker and Valley are useful tools in conceptualizing what the definition should be.

Studies sweeping in breadth such as those implemented by the Commission on Non-Traditional Study have provided invaluable data on the attitudes of nontraditional students, approaches to nontraditional study, and the acceptance of such by current educators. However, not since the Andrews study has any research effort addressed the peculiar needs of a regional accrediting agency. The agencies cannot operate only from the knowledge of apparent national trends but must have knowledge of that which is current and accepted practice among their memberships. The Gould, Cross, Valley and Medsker efforts do not provide this necessary information for a specific regional accrediting agency. Also, these authors are not sufficiently current for such a rapidly evolving field of education.

Andrews' research accomplished much of what was required as a first step by voluntary accreditation, but his research efforts have not been emulated by agencies outside the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Furthermore, his 1971 findings have become dated and there is pressure, as described by Hefferlin, on voluntary accreditation to do more in the arena of guideline development for the evaluation of nontraditional education. Certainly, a follow-up study to the Andrews project would be beneficial both to SACS and voluntary accreditation as a whole.

The Berkeley Center for Research and Development in Higher Education supplied characteristics of nontraditional programs as they

existed in 1972 as well as their geographical distribution. A study by the Commission on Colleges would be valuable in determining what characteristics and trends exist at the regional level which verify, refute, or show changes in the findings of the Berkeley study.

In summary, this review of literature has shown that no recent in-depth studies have been made by regional accrediting agencies concerning the status of nontraditional programs among their memberships. At the national level, several major research efforts have occurred in the field of nontraditional education, but none approached the venture strictly from the special interests of voluntary accreditation. However, assessment of the literature had indicated that regional accrediting agencies such as SACS are being expected to provide more leadership in the review and evaluation of nontraditional learning. Therefore, an extensive audit of the status of nontraditional programs among the members of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association was both appropriate and germane to the research which should be conducted regionally and nationally.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

The discussion in this chapter addressed the population examined in the study and the design of the instrument used to survey the members of this group. An advisory committee provided insight and guidance in instrument construction. This effort was reviewed as were the procedures employed for the collection of data. Additionally, discussion was provided concerning mail survey reliability and the treatment of the survey data. The chapter was concluded with a brief summary.

Population

The population for the study encompassed the entire membership of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. By including the extra territorial members of the Commission located in Latin America in conjunction with the membership of the eleven state SACS region, 672 institutions were surveyed. The data presented in Table 1 provide the number of institutions located in each state and their control, either public or private, as well as their major clientele, either black or white.

Instrumentation

Developing an instrument for the follow-up study of Standard Nine: Special Activities involved a thorough review of the Standard as approved and adopted by the Delegate Assembly of the Commission on Colleges in December, 1971. Also closely inspected was the Andrews research (discussed in Chapter 2) "Public Service in Higher Education:

Table 1

The Number of Institutions Within Each State of the SACS
Region and Their Classification by Public or
Private Control and Clientele

State	Number of Institutions			Clientele		
	Public	Private	(Total)	Black	White	Total
Alabama	30	17	(47)	9	38	(47)
Florida	37	23	(60)	3	57	(60)
Georgia	32	28	(60)	9	51	(60)
Kentucky	21	24	(45)	1	44	(45)
Louisiana	16	11	(27)	5	22	(27)
Mississippi	24	10	(34)	8	26	(34)
North Carolina	61	37	(98)	11	87	(98)
South Carolina	29	17	(46)	4	42	(46)
Tennessee	23	37	(60)	7	53	(60)
Texas	82	45	(127)	10	117	(127)
Virginia	39	27	(66)	5	61	(66)
Extra Territorial*			(2)			
Total	394	276	(672)	72	598	(670)

*The two extra territorial institutions were located in Mexico where the institutional classifications of public and private do not have the same connotations as the terms are used in connection with institutions in the United States. Additionally, the clientele classification of these institutions was not required for SACS records; therefore, these categorizations were omitted from the totals.

A Status Study of Accreditation in Adult and Continuing Education Programs," which formed the basis for the previous revision of Standard Nine. After reviewing these and related materials and discussing areas of particular concern with the Commission staff, a survey instrument, the Standard Nine Study (Appendix A), containing the following topics was developed. Those sections marked with an asterisk indicate the portions of the SACS Standard Nine Follow-Up Study which were used in this research effort.

- I. Standard Nine -- Special Activities
 - A. Administration and Organization
 - B. Financial Resources
 - C. Faculty
 - D. Students
 - *E. External or Special Degree Programs
(Nontraditional)
 - F. Off-Campus Classes and Units
 - G. Independent Study
 - H. Conferences and Institutes
 - I. Media Instruction
 - J. Foreign Travel and Study
 - K. On-Campus Programs
- II. Awarding Credit for Life and Work Experience
(Non-College Learning)
- III. Awarding Credit Through Learning Contracts
- *IV. Survey of Each Nontraditional Degree Program
Offered by Your Institution
- *V. Nontraditional Programs: An Opinion
- VI. Contractual Relationships
- VII. The Continuing Education Unit

Section I, "Standard Nine -- Special Activities," reflected questions structured on the content of the Standard as it now exists. To determine the extent of usage and application of Standard Nine by the

membership, a verification by survey seemed to offer the best approach for securing such information. Therefore, the sub-parts of Section I, A through K, represent ideas contained in the "Illustrations and Interpretations" portion of the Standard. Sub-part E, dealing with the nontraditional degree, provided the foundation data for this study. Many questions in the sub-part were suggested and influenced by the instrument designed by Cross and Valley in Planning Non-Traditional Programs (1974).

Section II, "Awarding Credit for Life and Work Experience (Non-College Learning)," was developed in the attempt to gain extensive and detailed information in an area considered to be one of the most controversial and fast developing facets of nontraditional learning. Ideas for question content in this section were adapted from Meyer's Awarding College Credit for Non-College Learning (1975).

The rationale for Section III, "Awarding Credit Through Learning Contracts," followed the reasoning utilized for Section II in that the Commission felt a strong need to document the usage and types of learning contracts extant among the members. Berte's (ed.) Individualizing Education by Learning Contracts (1975) provided source material for the questions in this section.

Section IV, "Survey of Each Nontraditional Degree Offered by Your Institution," was structured in a fashion to promote comprehensive answers and explanations regarding each specific nontraditional program offered by a particular institution, thus providing an insight into the philosophy and curriculum of the institution's program.

Section V, "Nontraditional Programs: An Opinion," came from the desire to assess the opinion of at least one typical administrator in all the Commission's colleges and universities regarding his attitude on the acceptability, legitimacy and problems of nontraditional study. The optimum response sought was an opinion from the president and/or chief academic officer and, where appropriate, the administrator of special activities of each institution.

Section VI, "Contractual Relationships," dealt with a topic currently not addressed by Standard Nine. The construction of questions for this subject was generated by the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education's (FRACHE) "Interim Guidelines on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations" and "Interim Guidelines for Contractual Arrangements," (1973). These guidelines remain in effect even though FRACHE became part of the Council of Postsecondary Accreditation in 1975.

Section VII, "The Continuing Education Unit," was relevant for the non-credit activities of member institutions and, as such, was of major consequence to Standard Nine. Questions on the continuing education unit (CEU) were prompted by review of The Continuing Education Unit, Criteria and Guidelines (National Task Force, 1974) and The Continuing Education Unit (SACS, 1973).

Each section of the survey instrument was introduced with a brief statement which provided a rationale for its inclusion and instructions for completion. After reading the instructions, the respondent was permitted to indicate, if appropriate, that the section was not applicable to his institution.

Advisory Committee

To insure that the follow-up study reflected the areas of concern most widely shared by the member institutions, the Executive Council of the Commission on Colleges authorized the formation of an advisory committee to work with the researcher in clarifying problems with the questionnaire and in making suggestions about content and format. Eight persons were named to the committee from two-year and senior institutions and seven different states. Included among the group was the co-chairman of the researcher's graduate committee. The name, title and institution of those who participated on the committee are found in Appendix B.

Of major consequence to the survey instrument and the data gathered was the assurance that content validity had been achieved in the development of the instrument. Kerlinger stated: "Content validation is guided by the question: Is the substance or content of the property being measured?" (1973, p. 48). A primary function of the Standard Nine Advisory Committee lay in the establishment of content validity through their judgment.

After the initial draft of the survey instrument was completed, the document was mailed to the committee. This group then convened for a two-day session in which all sections of the questionnaire were examined. Six of the individuals completed the survey as a pretest. Subsequent to the revisions incorporated into the instrument by the advisory committee, there were further alterations and suggestions made by staff of the Commission on Colleges with Dr. Grover J. Andrews, Associate Executive Secretary of the Commission having general supervisory responsibility.

Collection of Data

When the survey instrument had been approved for distribution, two copies of the questionnaire were mailed to each member school. The documents were transmitted under cover letters (Appendix C) dated March 31, 1976, from the Executive Secretary of the Commission on Colleges, Mr. Gordon W. Sweet. One copy of the instrument was addressed to the institutional president while the second copy was mailed to "Deans and Directors of Continuing Education" (special activities). Two copies of the instrument were mailed to each institution to insure delivery and to expedite completion of the questionnaire by getting it into administrative channels more quickly. The cover letters in each instance explained the existence of the other document to the presidents and the deans/directors of continuing education. A return date of May 1, 1976, was requested.

If respondents had problems or questions when completing the questionnaire, the president and/or the administrator of special activities was instructed to call Dr. Grover Andrews or the researcher for clarification and assistance. Questionnaires which were returned containing obvious errors or which omitted the opinion section were mailed back to the institution with a request for correction or completion.

Subsequent to the initial mailing, a follow-up letter (Appendix D) from the Executive Secretary was sent to all non-respondents. Through telephone conversations with representatives of several institutions, it became apparent that mail delivery of the questionnaire had lagged, in some cases, several weeks. Therefore, the first follow-up letter was not mailed until May 26, 1976, with a return requested for June 4, 1976. At

the time of the second mailing, 583 responses had been received. The first follow-up letter stimulated an additional thirty-two responses for a total of 615.

A second follow-up letter (Appendix E) from the Executive Secretary was transmitted the week of June 14 asking for immediate returns if possible. The final number of processed responses totaled 656 or approximately 98 percent of the population. The responses are presented in Table 2 by institutional level, state, institutional control and clientele.

Kerlinger (1973) in commenting on the reliability of mail questionnaires felt that two serious drawbacks exist with this method of collecting data. First, there is the problem of inadequate returns from the sample or population and, second, there is the inability to check responses. Concerning the issue of insufficient returns, he suggested that a response of at least 80 to 90 percent is required before valid generalizations can be made. This study exceeded those requirements as the return was 98 percent. With the institutional data available in SACS files, characteristics of the nonrespondents could also be examined, a procedure Kerlinger recommended. The difficulty encountered with checking the information submitted by respondents was minimized when much of the data could be compared with trends reflected in the institutional profiles of the members. The "profile" is an annual report required from the membership indicating, among other things, enrollments, academic program expenditures, and related data.

Table 2

Frequency of Institutional Response to the
Standard Nine Survey (N=672)

State	Total No. of Institutions	Institutions Responding	Percent of Total
Alabama	47	46	97.9
Florida	60	60	100.0
Georgia	60	57	95.0
Kentucky	45	41	91.1
Louisiana	27	26	96.3
Mississippi	34	33	97.0
North Carolina	98	98	100.0
South Carolina	46	46	100.0
Tennessee	60	59	98.3
Texas	127	125	98.4
Virginia	66	65	98.5
Extra Territorial	2	0	0.0
Total	<u>672</u>	<u>656</u>	<u>97.6</u>
 <u>Level</u>			
Level I	299	293	97.9
Level II	174	168	96.6
Level III	111	108	97.3
Level IV	70	70	100.0
Level V	18	17	94.4
Total	<u>672</u>	<u>656</u>	<u>97.6</u>
 <u>Control</u>			
Public	394	393	99.7
Private	276	261	94.6
Total*	<u>670</u>	<u>654</u>	<u>97.6</u>
 <u>Clientele</u>			
Black	72	66	91.7
White	598	588	98.3
Total*	<u>670</u>	<u>654</u>	<u>97.6</u>

*The two extra territorial institutions are not involved in this category.

Treatment of Survey Data

The individual sections of the survey instrument were color coded and a computer generated label affixed on the first page of each. This label contained the name of the institution and its identification number in the SACS data bank. Such a procedure facilitated the transfer of information from the questionnaire to the computer format so that sections of the instrument could be quickly separated and coded with less likelihood of error.

Each question in the survey instrument had a coding blank supplied in the right hand margin to permit numerical coding by hand. This information was transferred, also by hand, to coding sheets which then served as source documents for computer programmers. The sections of the questionnaire were coded as separate units to facilitate summaries and collations. The survey instruments were retained by the Commission on Colleges and a hand audit was done on all questionnaires to insure that no nontraditional programs had been omitted. Finally, a computer printout of all invalid responses was hand audited against the original questionnaires and the necessary corrections reprogrammed.

Analysis of the data took two forms. Those questions requiring a "Yes," "No," or "Other" response were grouped in a fashion to permit inspection of category totals. Questions requiring a written response were examined individually and summarized manually. There were sixty-nine questions coded for this study from the complete seventy-one page instrument with material selected from Sections I-E, and V. The data contained in Section IV were analyzed by hand because of the nature of the responses.

Organization of the data was done in a manner which permitted the examination of summaries and trends by:

- a) degree-granting level of institution
- b) clientele, black or white
- c) control, public or private
- d) state distribution

While all the data compiled for the Standard Nine project were not utilized in this study, a computer program has been designed to make possible the retrieval of information contained in each section. Through a design matrix, summaries, percentages, and comparisons can be executed in an almost limitless variety of ways for further study by the Commission on Colleges.

Summary

The population for the study consisted of the 672 members of the Commission on Colleges of SACS. A research instrument was designed to gather data through a mail survey. The instrument consisted of seven computer and color-coded sections designed with assistance from an advisory committee and the staff of the Commission on Colleges.

Data collection was implemented by the mailing of two questionnaires to each institution, one to the president and one to the administrator for special activities. A response period of four weeks was given. Subsequently, two follow-up letters were sent to all nonrespondents. These resulted in a final return of 98 percent which is found acceptable for drawing valid conclusions from the survey data (Kerlinger, 1973).

Treatment of the data involved grouping category totals for inspection. Through a design matrix, summaries, percentages, and comparisons were executed in a variety of ways which permitted analysis of

nontraditional programs by level, state, clientele, and type of institutional control. Finally, the data which were not examined in this study remain available for future research and reference.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The data analyzed in this chapter were derived from the information supplied by the administrative staffs of 656 of 672 member institutions of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Schools. Providing a structure and guide for the analysis was the major purpose of the study which was the identification and description of the nontraditional credit programs offered by the Commission's member institutions. Also part of the study's purpose was the charge to provide the Commission on Colleges with data which might assist the members and staff in assessing the need for possible revision of Standard Nine.

The chapter was organized in a manner which categorized the data for analysis into units corresponding with the study's sixteen objectives. The category totals and percentages obtained from responses to the questions in the survey instrument were described in the narrative. When possible, the data from the narrative description were summarized into tables. The data presented dealt with the institutional distribution of the nontraditional programs throughout the eleven state SACS region and included a projection of programs to begin by 1977-78. The various non-traditional efforts were categorized by degree granting level, clientele and control of the institutions offering them. Following this came an examination of several aspects of the nontraditional programs including degree level, nontraditional nature of program, admissions procedures, awarding of credit, student services, student fees, program costs, faculty, enrollments and graduates, student evaluation, instructional

procedures, curriculum and program objectives, problems, program evaluation, and an opinion survey dealing with the acceptability of nontraditional education.

DISTRIBUTION OF INSTITUTIONS OFFERING NONTRADITIONAL CREDIT PROGRAMS

An important objective of the study was to determine the number of nontraditional programs which existed among the member institutions of the Commission on Colleges. Table 3 revealed that eighty institutions out of 656 indicated that they were engaged in a nontraditional credit effort with institutions participating at each degree granting level.

Distribution by State

The nontraditional programs were distributed throughout the states within the SACS region. The state having the highest percentage of colleges and universities with a nontraditional program was Alabama which reported ten institutions or 21.3 percent of its total. Texas was second and had twenty-two schools or a percentage of 17.3 followed by Florida with ten institutions or 16.7 percent of its total. The percentages dropped somewhat to Tennessee which ranked fourth with seven of sixty institutions offering nontraditional programs for 11.7 percent of the total. Fifth was Virginia with 10.6 percent or seven out of sixty-six institutions. North Carolina ranked number six with nine of ninety-eight institutions for a percentage of 9.2. Following in seventh place came Mississippi with three of thirty-four institutions or 8.8 percent. Georgia had five institutions of sixty offering nontraditional programs for 8.3 percent. Two states, Kentucky and South Carolina, each had

Table 3

Distribution by State of Institutions
Reporting Nontraditional Programs

State	Total No. of Inst. in State	Inst. with Nontrad. Progs.	Percent of Total With Nontrad. Progs.
Alabama	47	10	21.3
Florida	60	10	16.7
Georgia	60	5	8.3
Kentucky	45	3	6.7
Louisiana	27	3	3.7
Mississippi	34	3	8.8
North Carolina	98	9	9.2
South Carolina	46	3	6.5
Tennessee	60	7	11.7
Texas	127	22	17.3
Virginia	66	7	10.6
Extra Territorial	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	0.0
Total	672	80	

three institutions with nontraditional programs which was 6.7 percent and 6.5, respectively, of all their accredited institutions. The lowest percentage was reported by Louisiana which had only one institution of twenty-seven (3.7 percent) with a nontraditional effort.

Distribution by Control and Clientele

As shown in Table 4, of the eighty institutions with nontraditional programs, thirty-five were private colleges and universities. This was 12.7 percent of the total number of private institutions. The remaining forty-five institutions comprised the public sector involved with nontraditional efforts, and this was 11.4 percent of the schools under public control. At ten of the institutions, the predominant clientele was black which was 13.9 percent of the black institutions in SACS, while the remaining seventy had a white clientele which was 11.7 percent of the white institutions.

Distribution of Nontraditional Programs by Institutional Level

There were twenty-three colleges with nontraditional programs (Table 4) at the two-year or associate degree granting level. This category total was subdivided into three areas with four institutions in the comprehensive liberal arts category, eighteen institutions in the comprehensive vocational-technical category, and the single remaining school in the technical institute category.

Nontraditional programs in the baccalaureate and graduate institutions showed a relatively even distribution with the exception of the graduate only category. The number of institutions beyond the

Table 4

Distribution by Control, Clientele, and Degree Granting Level of Institutions Reporting Nontraditional Programs

Control	Public	Private	Total	Clientele	Black	White	Total
No. of Inst. With Nontrad. Programs	45	35	80	No. of Inst. With Nontrad. Programs	10	70	80
Total No. of Inst.	394	276		Total No. of Inst.	72	598	
% With Nontrad. Programs	11.4	12.7		% With Nontrad. Programs	13.9	11.7	
Degree Granting Level	Associate Degree		Baccalaureate and Graduate Degree		Grand Total		
	Comp. Lib. Arts	Comp. Vo-Tec	Tech. Inst.	Total	Baccal. Masters	Baccal. & Masters & Doctorate Only	Grad. Total
No. of Inst.	4	18	1	23	16	17	2 57 80

associate's level which offered nontraditional programs totaled fifty-seven. Colleges offering only the baccalaureate indicated a nontraditional program in twenty-two instances. The second largest category included seventeen institutions which granted baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral degrees. Institutions which granted baccalaureate and masters degrees were the third largest grouping with sixteen members. There were two responses in the category which offered only graduate work.

Distribution of Institutions Planning Nontraditional Programs

The review of literature demonstrated that the emergence of the part-time student as the majority in higher education helped stimulate many of the new nontraditional programs. Because of the rapid entry of institutions into the nontraditional degree field, the question was asked, "If at present your institution has no nontraditional program, is there one planned for implementation within the next two years?" There was a significant affirmative response to this question in which forty-eight institutions indicated that implementation of a nontraditional program was planned by the end of the 1977-78 fiscal year. Accordingly, an analysis of categories was done with these institutions similar to that done with institutions already having operational nontraditional programs. These data are displayed in Table 5 for the distribution by state while the other categories are presented in Table 6.

State. The total number of institutions projecting nontraditional programs by 1977-78 was forty-eight. Institutional responses indicated

Table 5

Distribution by State of Institutions Planning
Implementation of Nontraditional Programs
by the End of Fiscal Year 1977-78

State	Total No. of Inst. in State	Inst. Planning Nontrad. Programs	% of Total Planning Nontrad. Programs
Alabama	47	7	14.9
Florida	60	4	6.7
Georgia	60	1	1.7
Kentucky	45	4	8.9
Louisiana	27	5	18.5
Mississippi	34	3	8.8
North Carolina	98	3	3.1
South Carolina	46	4	8.7
Tennessee	60	6	10.0
Texas	127	5	3.9
Virginia	66	6	9.1
Extra Territorial	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	0.0
Total	672	48	

that Louisiana had the largest percentage of colleges planning to implement a nontraditional program before the end of the 1977-78 fiscal year. The total for Louisiana was five which was 18.5 percent of its institutional total of twenty-seven. Alabama had the second largest percentage of institutions contemplating the initiation of a nontraditional program with 14.9 percent or seven of forty-seven colleges and universities. Third in the ranking came Tennessee with six institutions out of sixty or 10.0 percent planning such programs, followed by Virginia with six of sixty-six schools for 9.1 percent. Next came Kentucky, Mississippi, and South Carolina with almost identical percentages of 8.9 percent (four of forty-five), 8.8 percent (three of thirty-four), and 8.7 percent (four of forty-six) respectively. Florida reported four institutions out of sixty (6.7 percent) planned to have nontraditional programs, while the states having the lowest percentage of institutions implementing programs were Texas (five of 127 for 3.9 percent), North Carolina (three of ninety-eight for 3.1 percent), and Georgia (one of sixty for 1.7 percent).

Degree Granting Level. Of the forty-eight institutions which projected the implementation of a nontraditional program, ten were at the associate degree level (Table 6). The three categories of institutions under this broad classification revealed that the comprehensive vocational-technical schools projected seven nontraditional programs and the comprehensive liberal arts schools anticipated three. No programs of a nontraditional nature were anticipated in the technical institutions.

The remaining thirty-eight institutions were baccalaureate and graduate degree granting colleges or some combination of these. Highest

among all classifications was the strictly baccalaureate degree granting school. These institutions gave fourteen affirmative responses and were closely followed by the colleges awarding the baccalaureate and masters which totaled thirteen. Eleven institutions which offered the baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate reported that nontraditional degrees were being readied. Finally, those institutions offering just graduate degrees confirmed that none had plans to begin a nontraditional program.

Control and clientele. The distribution of these institutions between the public and private sectors showed that a majority of the nontraditional efforts were developing at the public colleges and universities (Table 6). Public institutions numbered twenty-seven (6.8 percent of the total) with private schools having submitted twenty-one responses (7.6 percent of the total) indicating a nontraditional program was planned. Analysis of the institutions by clientele groups revealed that predominantly white colleges and universities had thirty-seven (6.2 percent of the total) with nontraditional efforts, and black institutions had eleven (15.3 percent of the total). Most significant was the discovery that the number of predominantly black institutions planning nontraditional degrees was projected to have an increase of over 100 percent, from ten to a total of twenty-one.

Operational and Projected Nontraditional Programs

The summary data of nontraditional programs, operational and planned, are presented in Table 7 for the categories of degree level, control, and clientele. Combining the number of institutions with an

operationalized nontraditional program with the number of projected programs through fiscal year 1978 revealed that almost one of every five (19.0 percent) member institutions would ultimately be offering a nontraditional program (Table 8). With 36.2 percent, Alabama had the largest number of Commission member institutions with nontraditional programs or plans to implement them. Closely grouped, but at significantly lower percentages than reported by Alabama, were four states: Florida, 23.3 percent; Louisiana, 22.0 percent; Tennessee, 21.7 percent; and Texas, 21.2 percent. Following these institutions came Virginia at 19.7 percent. Responses of the colleges and universities from the remaining states indicated that the following percentages of institutional Commission members would have nontraditional programs by the end of the 1977 fiscal year: Mississippi, 17.6 percent; Kentucky, 15.6 percent; South Carolina, 15.2 percent; North Carolina, 12.2 percent; and Georgia, 10 percent.

Of the 128 nontraditional programs which are projected to be operational by 1977-78, thirty-three will be at the associate level and ninety-five at the baccalaureate or graduate levels. The institutional control of these programs showed that seventy-two were in the public sector and fifty-six in the private. Classification by clientele revealed twenty-one black institutions and 107 white institutions planned to implement nontraditional programs.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COMMISSION ON COLLEGES' NONTRADITIONAL PROGRAMS

The data presented in the following sections are a compilation of the characteristics of all institutions with nontraditional programs

Table 8

Institutions with Nontraditional Programs (1975-76) or with
Plans to Implement Nontraditional Programs (1977-78)

State	Number of Institutions	Institutions with Nontraditional Degrees			Percent of Total
		Operational 1975-76	Projected 1977-78	Total	
Alabama	47	10	7	17	36.2
Florida	60	10	4	14	23.3
Georgia	60	5	1	6	10.0
Kentucky	45	3	4	7	15.6
Louisiana	27	1	5	6	22.0
Mississippi	34	3	3	6	17.6
North Carolina	98	9	3	12	12.2
South Carolina	46	3	4	7	15.2
Tennessee	60	7	6	13	21.7
Texas	127	22	5	27	21.2
Virginia	66	7	6	13	19.7
Extra Territorial	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	0.0
Total	672	80	48	128	

among the membership of the Commission on Colleges and, as such, provided a description of those programs.

Degree Level of Nontraditional Programs

Having identified the number of institutions with nontraditional programs and their distribution through the eleven state SACS regions, there was an attempt to group by level the total number of programs by each institutional classification. In response to the question, "What is the level of your nontraditional program?" there was a total of eighty-nine responses which indicated that several institutions offered more than one program since eighty schools had reported at least one nontraditional program. The second part of the question asked that each respondent "please check all that apply" of these categories: associate, baccalaureate, masters, doctoral, and other. The findings for this request are presented in Table 9.

There were twenty-nine nontraditional programs at the associate level which represented 32.6 percent of the overall total. Nontraditional offerings at the baccalaureate level were in a plurality at 47.2 percent with forty-two degrees reported. Graduate programs with thirteen responses composed only 14.6 percent of the nontraditional effort. The majority of these came in the master's category with ten (11.2 percent). The three doctoral programs were 3.4 percent of the total. Constituting the final category was "other" with five responses or a 5.6 percent share. These "other" were certificate programs rather than degree programs.

Table 9
 Nontraditional Programs
 by Level (N=89)

Program Level	No. of Programs	Percent of Nontraditional Programs
Associate	29	32.6
Baccalaureate	42	47.2
Masters	10	11.2
Doctoral	3	3.4
Other	<u>5</u>	<u>5.6</u>
Total	89*	100.0

*There were eighty-nine individual nontraditional programs reported by eighty institutions; an indication that some institutions offered more than one nontraditional program.

Nontraditional Nature of Programs

A major aspect of the study concerned the determination of the manner in which the institutions classified their degrees as nontraditional. The question was asked "In which of the following five areas is your institution's program considered nontraditional? Please check any that apply: (a) type of student, (b) location of program, (c) type of instruction (method), (d) program content, (e) delivery systems."

As indicated in Table 10, there were multiple responses for many of the nontraditional degrees. The most frequently cited nontraditional characteristic of the programs was the type of student being served. Fifty-five respondents checked this category representing a characteristic of 61.8 percent of the identified nontraditional programs. The second most prevalent nontraditional characteristic proved to be the location of the program with forty responses or 44.9 percent of the total.

Significantly, the type or method of instruction and program content were not as frequently mentioned as a characteristic of the eighty-nine programs. The responses were thirty-seven for method of instruction and thirty-four for program content, or 41.6 percent and 38.2 percent respectively.

No institution reported its program as being nontraditional because of the delivery system employed. This category may have been interpreted as a corollary of the "type of instruction" making respondents unsure as to the manner in which they should reply.

Table 10

Areas in Which Programs Were Considered to be Nontraditional
and the Number of Programs Possessing That Nontraditional
Characteristic (N=89)

Nontraditional Area	Number	Percent of Nontraditional Programs
Type of Student	55	61.8
Location of Program	40	44.9
Type of Instruction (method)	37	41.6
Program Content	34	38.2
Delivery Systems	0	0.0

Admissions

A major component of any educational program is the criteria for admission. The admissions policies for the several institutions were reviewed and categorized by a set of questions pertaining to this area of concern. First, each institution with a nontraditional program was asked to respond to the question, "Has your institution established special admissions policies for its nontraditional students?" Results from this question showed that fifty (62.5 percent) of the eighty institutions had set special admissions policies.

Working from this broad question, an attempt was made to gain a more detailed analysis and categorization of these "special admissions policies." Specifically, there was an effort to determine if admissions guidelines for the nontraditional degrees took into consideration open admissions, age and maturity, work experience, sex (e.g., programs just for women or just for men), minority groups, and other categories not listed. The data are presented in Table 11.

Of particular interest was the response from thirty-six institutions which indicated that 45.0 percent of the colleges and universities with nontraditional programs had open admissions. Ranked closely behind open admissions was the consideration given to work experience by thirty-three institutions (41.2 percent). Age and maturity of applicants were listed as an area of special consideration by thirty-one institutions or 38.8 percent of the eighty schools which reported nontraditional programs.

After these three areas, special consideration for women's, men's, or minority group programs was given little weight. Four institutions considered the sex of the applicant during the admissions process and

Table 11

Institutions with Special Admissions Policies for
Nontraditional Programs (N=80 Institutions)

	Number	Percent
Institutions with Special Admissions Policies	50	62.5
Special Admissions Category		
Open admissions	36	45.0
Age and maturity	31	38.8
Work experience	33	41.2
Sex (e.g., programs just for women or just for men)	4	5.0
Minority groups	3	3.8
Other	14	17.5

three considered minority group applicants, or 5.0 percent and 3.8 percent respectively. In the general category, "other," fourteen institutions or 17.5 percent of the total listed admissions policies not specifically addressed by the categories provided. Examples of the "other" classifications were programs designed specifically for prison inmates and military personnel.

Pretest for admission. Another aspect of the admissions process for the nontraditional programs among the Commission on Colleges membership was the testing procedures which were used to screen program applicants. The question, "Are there any pretests required for admission to your nontraditional program?" was asked in order to gain this information. There were fifteen affirmative responses.

To determine whether the tests were of a national standardized variety or an institutional test, respondents were asked what types of tests they used and were given the above two choices. Analysis of this question revealed that a combination of the two procedures had been operationalized in twelve instances. Fourteen responses revealed use of national standardized tests and twelve responses indicated that the institutions used tests developed by their own staffs.

Miscellaneous admissions criteria. In an attempt to identify the variety of additional admissions criteria exercised by the membership vis-a-vis their nontraditional programs, the following question was posed: "Are students screened for admissions in other ways (e.g., interviews)?" A significant number of respondents, fifty, indicated that other options and criteria were in use. Among these additional admissions criteria,

the most frequently mentioned was the interview process, which was utilized in over 62 percent of the programs.

Advanced placement. Another aspect of the admissions process is admitting students to a specific degree program with advanced standing. To determine the magnitude of this practice among the eighty institutions with a nontraditional program, the colleges and universities were asked if a student could gain advanced placement in their nontraditional program through examination. Sixty-four institutions indicated that this option was available to the student. The data on advanced placement are displayed in Table 12.

The responses were further analyzed to ascertain what type of examinations were predominant. Most frequently used by the institutions was the College Level Examination Program (CLEP) with sixty-two participants or 77.5 percent of the schools with nontraditional programs. The second greatest frequency of test category emerged as those examinations developed by the respective institutions themselves. Exactly half, forty, indicated the use of these tests. The remaining specific option, the College Proficiency Examination, garnered thirteen responses or 16.2 percent of the total. Using the category "other" as a catchall, there were twelve responses with the most frequently mentioned options being the assessment of nonclassroom learning acquired through experience and the United States Armed Forces Instruction Examination (USAFI). The trend reflected by these data was that combinations of the several testing options were frequently used.

Table 12

Institutions with Advanced Placement, Categories
of Advanced Placement Examinations
and their Frequency of Use (N=80)

	Number	Percent
Institutions with Advanced Placement	64	80.0
Advanced Placement Examinations		
College Level Examination Program (CLEP)	62	77.5
College Proficiency Examination (CLEP)	13	16.2
Institutional	40	50.0
Other	12	15.0

Awarding Credit

One of the most important aspects of the study given the non-traditional programs dealt with the awarding of credit. Indeed, many programs are termed nontraditional primarily by virtue of the practices employed for awarding degree credit. A major component of the credit award process in nontraditional programs has been the evaluation of work experience or non-college learning for the purpose of assigning credits. In reply to the question, "Does your institution's nontraditional program award credit for work experience?," a significant number of colleges and universities responded affirmatively. Exactly one-half (50 percent) of the answers indicated credit was provided for work experience.

Another dimension of awarding credit through nonformalized learning situations was addressed by the question, "Does your institution's nontraditional program award credit for noncoursework (e.g., civic involvement, work in governmental agencies, community theater)?" Again, there was a significant affirmative response from the institutions. Thirty respondents or 37.5 percent of the institutions revealed this method of awarding credit to be a part of their nontraditional programs. Examples which were provided included internships with various governmental agencies and arrangements made within the boundaries of learning contracts and demonstrated competencies. Some respondents also interpreted the sample categories as work experience.

Transfer of credit. A large majority of the institutions permitted the transfer of credit from previous educational experiences as long as the experiences could be documented by appropriate transcripts. Seventy-one of the institutions (88.8 percent) had implemented this policy. However,

there was a broad spectrum of policies among the respondents when asked to provide the maximum percentage of transfer credits which was permissible in their respective nontraditional degrees. Only fifty-nine of the institutions responded to this portion of the questionnaire. Of this total, six indicated that they permitted no transfer of credit, eight allowed as much as 25 percent of the degree requirements to be transferred, six institutions permitted a transfer of no more than one-third of all degree credits, seven permitted as much as one-half of all credits to be transferred, eight would approve two-thirds, and finally, twenty-four institutions accepted up to three fourths of all degree requirements in transfer. Under the heading of "other," there were institutions which exercised such options as unlimited credit transfer but then also required a period of residency or some type of project. Courses taken under consortium arrangements were in some cases considered the equivalent of courses taken in residence at the degree granting institution.

Student Services

The data which relate to student services are presented in Table 13. Since nontraditional programs have developed in large measure as a response to audiences unable to fit the typical student patterns, there was the desire to learn if students outside these normal patterns had access to regular student services and to gain information on additional services provided for the nontraditional student. Consistent with this desire, an attempt was made to learn if students were provided an orientation on the operation and philosophy of the respective nontraditional programs in order that they might better understand the purposes of their

Table 13

Institutions with Nontraditional Programs Providing
Selected Student Services (N=80)

Services	Number	Percent
Orientation	63	78.8
Flexible Scheduling	60	75.0
Library	78	97.5
By degree-granting institution	72	90.0
By other colleges or universities	49	61.2
By public libraries	50	62.5
Other		
Academic Advising	78	97.5
By degree-granting institution	66	82.5
By other colleges or universities	9	11.2
Other	9	11.2
Counseling	75	93.8
By degree-granting institution	72	90.0
By other colleges or universities	6	7.5
Other	7	8.8
Computer	46	57.5
By degree-granting institution	41	51.2
By other colleges or universities	9	11.2
By industry or business	4	5.0
Other		
Other Services	1	1.2

chosen programs. Replies from sixty-three institutions gave evidence that such an orientation process was part of the overall service provided for nontraditional students. This represented a 78.8 percent segment of the eighty colleges and universities having nontraditional programs.

Sixty institutions or 75 percent answered affirmatively when the question was posed, "Does your institution provide for special scheduling of its nontraditional program activities (e.g., weekends)?" Additionally, it was felt to be important to discover the accessibility to students of such services as library, computer, academic advising, counseling and any other student support services which might be provided for nontraditional students. Seventy-eight of eighty institutions or 97.5 percent indicated that their nontraditional students had access to adequate library facilities. Furthermore, these facilities, in seventy-two instances (90.0 percent) belonged to the institution offering the degree. Supporting the library option were the alternative or supplementary services provided by other colleges and universities as well as public libraries, forty-nine (61.2 percent) and fifty (62.5 percent) instances respectively.

Nearly 98 percent (seventy-eight) of the institutions provided academic advisement. Only nine (11.2 percent) institutions reported that staffs at other colleges or universities were utilized for their nontraditional students while sixty-six (87.5 percent) stated that academic advisement came from the institution offering the degree. Miscellaneous options such as armed forces education advisors involved 11.2 percent or nine institutions.

Counseling was another service almost universally provided to the nontraditional student. Seventy-five (93.8 percent) of eighty schools

reported its availability with seventy-two (90 percent) institutions responsible for some aspect of the service themselves. Staff at other colleges and universities were seldom used with only six (7.5 percent) responses reported. There were seven institutions (8.8 percent) with miscellaneous arrangements for the service.

Of least concern to the institutions with nontraditional degrees appeared to be the need for student computer access. This may have resulted from the fact that most of the available degree options would not normally have required computer usage as a program requirement. However, over half the institutions did provide the service with 57.5 percent (forty-six schools) having reported its availability. Forty-one institutions, or slightly more than half (51.2 percent), utilized their own computers, and the facilities of other colleges or industry provided service in nine (11.2 percent) and four (5 percent) instances respectively. Several respondents indicated that all student services were available to the nontraditional students at their institution. Others specified that they provided services such as career counseling, job placement, and financial aid offices.

Student Fees and Program Costs

With increased costs, a source of concern to educators was a need to discover if nontraditional programs tended to cost more or less than traditional efforts. Consistent with the need for this information came the desire to determine how many institutions had a fee adjustment for their nontraditional students. Significantly, twenty-two institutions or 27.5 percent reported a lower fee structure for their nontraditional

programs while only five institutions or 6.2 percent indicated that fees were higher for their nontraditional programs than for their traditional. The data on student fees, program costs, and institutions with financial aid are contained in Table 14.

In response to the question, "Is there financial aid available for students in your institution's nontraditional program?" a significant proportion, fifty-nine institutions, answered affirmatively. This response represented 73.8 percent of the colleges and universities with nontraditional degrees but still left students at over one-fourth of the institutions with no financial assistance.

Faculty

Of paramount importance to any instructional program is the faculty. Institutions with nontraditional degrees, because many possess greatly reduced residency requirements or none at all, have been criticized for their excessive use of adjunct faculty. Additionally, criticism has been leveled at schools for their failure to provide appropriate faculty orientation for the new thinking and attitudes which must be brought to focus on nontraditional program teaching and guidance. There emerged, therefore, a desire to look at faculty evaluation procedures and the magnitude of regular faculty involvement in nontraditional programs. The data on nontraditional program faculty are displayed in Table 15.

When the question was asked, "Which of the following categories comprises the nontraditional faculty at your institution?," the respondents were given the following choices: (a) regular, on-campus faculty who also participate in your traditional programs; (b) adjunct faculty;

Table 14

Relationship of Fees in Institutions with Traditional and
Nontraditional Programs and Availability of Financial
Aid for the Nontraditional Student (N=80)

Adjustment of Fees for Nontraditional Students	Number	Percent
No adjustment of fees	49	61.2
Fees are lower	22	27.5
Fees are higher	5	6.2
No response	4	5.0
Total	80	99.9*
Institutions with financial aid available to students in nontraditional programs	59	73.8

*Because of rounding, percentage totals do not equal exactly 100 percent.

Table 15

Characteristics of Faculty Teaching at Institutions
with Nontraditional Programs (N=80)

Employment Category for Faculty	No. of Institutions	Percent of Institutions Using This Category	Percent of Program Taught by Each Faculty Category	
Regular	72	80.0	77.9	
Adjunct	48	60.0	22.1	

	Number	Percent
Institutions providing faculty orientation for nontraditional programs	37	46.2
Faculty are screened before teaching in nontraditional programs	58	72.5

Faculty Evaluation Procedures	Number	Percent
Supervisor evaluation	63	78.8
Peer evaluation	18	22.5
Student evaluation	11	13.8

(c) other. Seventy-two institutions or 90.0 percent reported that their regular faculty participated in the nontraditional programs to some extent. Also reported was that 60.0 percent or forty-eight of the institutions utilized adjunct faculty in some capacity. The percentage of the programs actually taught by regular faculty was revealed to be 77.9 percent with 22.1 percent adjunct. One institution (1.2 percent) reported using another option. It was significant that the great majority of colleges and universities utilized some percentage of regular faculty in their nontraditional efforts.

When asked if there were any special training or orientation provided faculty who were teaching in the nontraditional area, only thirty-seven institutions (46.2 percent) responded affirmatively. However, fifty-eight institutions (72.5 percent) did have a screening process for their faculty before the latter were permitted to teach in the nontraditional program. Although 90.0 percent of the institutions had regular faculty participation, full-time faculty positions for fiscal year 1974-75 were reported at only an average of four per nontraditional program.

Evaluation procedures for faculty took several formats. The most popular evaluation method of the three options provided was evaluation by a supervisor with sixty-three institutions (78.8 percent) employing this approach. Peer evaluation ranked second with eighteen institutions or 22.5 percent using this method in some capacity and the third most frequently used method was student evaluation of faculty which was undertaken at eleven institutions (13.8 percent).

Enrollments and Graduates

Another aspect of nontraditional education in the Commission on Colleges included student enrollment in nontraditional programs. Data are presented in Table 16.

The question "How many students were enrolled in your institution's nontraditional program in the fiscal year 1974-75?" produced responses from only sixty-two institutions; eighteen did not respond to this question. There were thirteen colleges or universities (16.2 percent) with less than twenty-five enrollments. Ten schools (12.5 percent) had between twenty-five and fifty enrollments. Those institutions with enrollments in the fifty-one to one hundred range constituted 10 percent or eight schools. In the 101 to 150 category came six institutions (7.5 percent) followed by the 151 to 200 grouping also containing six institutions (7.5 percent). Significantly, there were nineteen institutions (23.8 percent) in the more than 200 enrollments category. This grouping composed the largest segment in the analysis.

The attempt was made to assess what percentage of students enrolled in the nontraditional programs received either a certificate of completion or diploma during the 1974-75 fiscal year (Table 17). Twenty-three institutions (28.8 percent) did not answer this question and another twenty-three reported that the information was unavailable. Thirty-five percent of the schools (twenty-eight) revealed that less than 25 percent of their enrollments graduated during that year while 5 percent of the institutions reported graduations at the rate of 26 to 50 percent of total enrollments. Of little significance was the percentage of enrollment graduations for the 51 percent to 75 percent and 76 percent

Table 16

Enrollment in Nontraditional Programs by Number of
Institutions for Fiscal Year 1974-75 (N=80)

Category of Student	Number	Percent
Enrollments		
Less than 25 enrollments	13	16.2
25 - 50 enrollments	10	12.5
51 - 100 enrollments	8	10.0
101 - 150 enrollments	6	7.5
151 - 200 enrollments	6	7.5
More than 200 enrollments	19	23.8
No response	<u>18</u>	<u>22.5</u>
Total	80	100.0

Table 17

The Percentage of Students Enrolled in a Nontraditional Program
Receiving a Certificate or Diploma in 1974-75 (N=80)

<u>Completion Category</u>	<u>No. of Institutions</u>	<u>Percent of Institutions</u>
Failed to respond	23	28.8
Information unavailable	23	28.8
Less than 25%	28	35.0
Between 26% and 50%	4	5.0
Between 51% and 75%	1	1.2
Between 76% and 90%	1	1.2
More than 90%	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	80	100.0

to 90 percent segments. One institution (1.2 percent) fell into each category. There were no responses at the greater than 90 percent level.

When translated into the equivalent of full-time students, there was an average of 151.5 students per nontraditional program. This total did not include three institutions which reported figures totaling several thousand. Inspection of their institutional files showed that incorrect information had been provided on the questionnaire. Additionally, some institutions could not supply the data in the format requested; therefore, the accuracy of this average figure is questionable.

Student Evaluation

Appropriate evaluation of student work has been a focal point of concern as related to the maintenance of acceptable academic standards in nontraditional programs. In order to explore evaluation methods in the nontraditional programs, the respondents were given six options for student evaluation in addition to being permitted to supply written comments and other methodologies. Results of this question are tabulated in Table 18.

Two evaluation procedures, the written examination and a combination written and oral examination were by far the most popular evaluation methods with forty-four (55.0 percent) and forty-one institutions (51.2 percent), respectively using these methods. Slightly more than one-third (33.8 percent) of the respondents used oral testing procedures. Jury evaluation ranked as the next most frequently operated evaluation system with twelve institutions (15 percent) having employed that method. Peer evaluation was used by eight institutions (10 percent) while the least popular evaluation approach appeared to be a combination peer and jury

Table 18
Student Evaluation Methods for Nontraditional
Programs by Institution (N=80)

Evaluation Method	Number	Percent
Written examination	44	55.0
Written and oral examination	41	51.2
Oral examination	27	33.8
Jury evaluation	12	15.0
Peer evaluation	8	10.0
Peer and jury evaluation	3	3.8
Other	14	17.5

evaluation used by only three colleges (3.8 percent). Fourteen institutions (17.5 percent) provided other options with accompanying narrative. From the data, it is obvious that many institutions employed several combinations of the above alternatives.

Instructional Procedures,
Program Objectives, and Curricula

A critical aspect of any successful and quality educational program rests with the development of a philosophically and educationally sound curriculum and mechanism for the delivery of that curriculum. Most of the characteristics which make a degree program nontraditional in the eyes of layman and educator alike are associated with instructional methods and the formation of curriculum.

In Table 19, data are presented for the institutions which were asked the number of years their nontraditional programs had been offered. As might have been expected from the recent surge of interest in nontraditional education, the majority of institutions had operationalized their programs within the last three years. Eighteen schools (22.5 percent) were in the first year while thirty institutions (37.5 percent) had begun programs within the last one to three year period. In operation from four to six years were fourteen institutional programs (17.5 percent), while seven colleges (8.8 percent) had offered degrees between seven and ten years, and four (5 percent) institutions had been involved with nontraditional degrees longer than ten years. Seven schools (8.8 percent) did not submit a response to the question.

Residency. Nontraditional education often felt to be manifested in the external degree and with this is the waiver of residency requirements.

Table 19

Length of Time Commission on Colleges Institutions
Have Been Offering Nontraditional Programs (N=80)

Number of Years Degree Has Been Offered	Number of Institutions	Percent
First year	18	22.5
Between 1 and 3 years	30	37.5
Between 4 and 6 years	14	17.5
Between 7 and 10 years	7	8.8
Longer than 10 years	4	5.0
No response	<u>7</u>	<u>8.8</u>
Total	80	100.1*

*Because of rounding, percentage totals do not equal exactly 100 percent.

Significantly, when the question was asked "Does your nontraditional program have a residency requirement?," forty-three institutions, slightly more than half (53.8 percent), reported that some portion of the program must be completed in residence, as is shown in Table 20.

This finding was studied further by placing the various residency requirements into time increments. It was discovered that seventeen institutions (39.5 percent) had a residency requirement of less than an academic year. Those colleges and universities which required a full academic year numbered nineteen or 44.2 percent. There were only three institutions (7.0 percent) which required a residency longer than one year, and four institutions (9.3 percent) failed to respond.

Media. Because many portions of nontraditional programs are nonresident and may be conducted on an unusual scheduling basis, a need emerged to learn of the role played by media and technical devices which might convey segments of the instructional program (Table 21). Seven categories were provided. Television was discovered to be the most frequently used media option. Twenty institutions (25.0 percent) used this medium as a learning aid for part of their nontraditional programs. Computer assisted instruction was second with eight institutions (10.0 percent) having employed this device. Radio and newspapers were used by six institutions (7.5 percent in each case). In two schools (2.5 percent), students had the services of a telelecture system while there were no institutions utilizing telewriter. Miscellaneous instructional aids such as films, videotapes, and cassettes were part of the programs at twenty schools (25.0 percent). Some institutions also used various combinations of the media options.

Table 20

Institutions with Residency Requirements and Length of
Residency Requirements for Nontraditional Programs

	Number	Percent (N=80)
Institutions with residency requirement	43	53.8
Length of Residency	Number	Percent (N=43)
Less than an academic year	17	39.5
An academic year	19	44.2
Longer than an academic year	3	7.0
No response	<u>4</u>	<u>9.3</u>
Total	43	100.0

Table 21

Selected Media Devices and Frequency of Use by Institutions
in Nontraditional Programs (N=80)

Media Option	Number	Percent
Television	20	25.0
Radio	6	7.5
Computer Assisted Instruction	8	10.0
Telewriter	0	0.0
Telelecture	2	2.5
Newspaper	6	7.5
Other	20	25.0

Learning/instructional methods. The data summarizing the learning methods employed in the nontraditional programs are shown in Table 22. Of major concern in establishing the predominant characteristics of non-traditional programs offered by institutions within the Commission on Colleges was the need to establish the most common patterns of learning methodologies. Consistent with this attempt, five options were listed for the respondents' consideration. Significantly, the answers revealed that the most popular teaching approach for the nontraditionalists was the traditional method of lecturing. Sixty institutions (75.0 percent) employed this technique as an instructional/learning device.

The second most frequently used instructional/learning approach was independent study. Thirty-seven institutions (46.2 percent) utilized this option. In third place, with twenty-nine institutions (36.2 percent) came field work and internships, and in fourth place was the tutorial method with twenty-two (27.5 percent) institutions. Instruction and learning conducted via correspondence proved the least popular method with only nine institutions (11.2 percent) participating. The category "other" had seventeen respondents. Among these additional approaches were interdisciplinary team taught courses, laboratory experiments, practicums, institutes, cluster groups, and workshops.

Nontraditional Program Objectives

From the review of literature, a general theme emerged which explained the rapid development of the nontraditional movement in post-secondary education as an institutional response to the new majority audience, the part-time student. To define this theme further, the Commission on Colleges' institutions were asked to provide the specific

Table 22

Learning/Instructional Methods Employed by the Institutions
with Nontraditional Programs (N=80)

Method	Number	Percent
Traditional Lectures	60	75.0
Independent Study	37	46.2
Field Work, Internship	29	36.2
Tutorial	22	27.5
Correspondence	9	11.2
Other	17	21.2

purposes, goals and/or objectives of their nontraditional programs. Representative examples are provided in the following narrative.

One university sought to serve the needs of students whose educational and career goals were not met by the institution's traditional departmental majors. With the assistance of faculty advisory committees, each student could design an interdisciplinary contract degree using the existing resources of the university. The faculty also derived benefit from the opportunity to explore curricular ideas which spanned several departments ranging from interdisciplinary courses to full degree programs.

At the associate degree level, one junior college had designed its nontraditional efforts as career programs for those students who did not plan to go beyond two years of college. According to this institution, the degree options were set up to provide professional, social, cultural, and personal enrichment, as well as a curriculum broad enough to offer a foundation for a liberal education and specialized enough to provide for career training. The program options included criminal justice, poultry technology, and fashion merchandising.

Another institution, at the baccalaureate and graduate level, stated that it sought to meet the varied needs of mature adult students (twenty-five years of age or older) who might not need or desire the traditional bachelor of science or arts degrees. Additionally, it sought to serve those persons who were confronted with obstacles barring their pursuit of a more conventional degree. One college had designed specialized program opportunities geared toward the development of communication skills in the adult student while another said simply that

it sought to meet the needs of a clientele (within its community and region) who was not in a position to avail itself of the traditional approaches. This theme was frequently reported by institutions at all levels and more completely stated by a college which sought to take the resources of the university to the people. In so doing, individuals were able to continue their education without interrupting a career through having to leave their employment and relocate their families for the purpose of furthering their educations as traditional students.

Finally, one university listed several objectives, among them the desire to serve a variety of students from many educational backgrounds, to provide an alternative form of education that was cost effective when compared to more traditional programs, to improve academic standards by re-examining specific levels of achievement and competency needed for baccalaureate-level work, and to find new ways to determine necessary competencies while also striving to personalize and humanize the educational process.

Curriculum

The various curricula described by the institutions with non-traditional programs included those which, according to the reporting colleges, were identical to their traditional programs. The nontraditional nature of these programs arose from program location or through the specialized use of media, not from the curricula. However, several of the institutions with atypical curricula provided detailed explanations.

One university had three major divisions in its curriculum. The first, liberal studies, constituted the general educational component of

this curriculum. These studies were composed of six courses totaling thirty-four semester hours which were required of all enrollees whether they chose the liberal studies or professional baccalaureate options offered by this particular institution. Course concentrations were in Communications I and II, six hours at each level; humanities, six hours; social sciences, six hours; natural sciences, six hours; leisure and recreation, four hours. All courses were interdisciplinary and team-taught, but there was provision for equivalency through transfer credit.

The second major division of studies was entitled thematic studies which were junior and senior level, interdisciplinary, team-taught courses concentrating on themes, problems, issues, epochs, or cultures studied from several disciplinary points of view. A professional studies student was required to complete one thematic study (six to nine hours) while a liberal studies student had to successfully complete two thematic studies (twelve to eighteen semester hours).

The third and final division of this curriculum was categorized as individualized studies which required eighty to eighty-nine semester hours for completion. This portion of the student's program included the Coordinated Study (degree major) which was composed of thirty upper divisional hours from at least two disciplines. The Synthesizing Project evolved from the student's chosen major as nine semester hours of an intensive independent study. Electives constituted the remaining hours needed to complete degree requirements.

Another university offered a degree in education at the graduate level which required the satisfactory completion of six modules of study. These modules included curriculum development in higher education,

applied educational research and evaluation, and learning theory and applications. With the exception of two eight day summer institutes held a year apart, all learning activity was conducted off campus.

A liberal arts women's college had constructed a curriculum for its nontraditional program founded on these aims: first, a degree program best suited to the individual needs of the mature woman; second, the integration of that program into the school's existing curricula with minimal adjustments to the established academic program; and, third, the fulfillment of the public service role described by the revised Standard Nine (1971) of SACS. The rationale for the degree came from a desire to be consistent with current national trends in postsecondary education (i.e., the development of nontraditional degree programs), and the college also felt it gained a broader admissions spectrum through such an effort. Additionally, this institution had determined that no significant additional costs would be required to operate the program.

The curriculum which emerged led to a Bachelor of General Studies with 114 semester credit hours. Included was an interdisciplinary studies course that introduced the general studies curriculum. After this came a minimum of thirty hours in the individual emphasis area (major). The above courses followed the guidelines of established major programs or self-structured majors. Supplementing the major was a program of electives. At least thirty-six credit hours of the degree were required from junior or senior level courses.

The individual emphasis portion of the Bachelor of General Studies was designed to meet personal educational objectives. Students had to prepare statements of their educational goals and objectives for

approval by advisors and appropriate administrative units. Elective hours were chosen by students in consultation with advisors and were determined by the individual emphasis of each student.

A final example of a curriculum for a nontraditional program came from an institution offering the Bachelor of Liberal Studies. This curriculum proved to be a competency based one in which a student had to attain an acceptable proficiency in seven areas in order to graduate. Each of the seven areas was defined with specific objectives followed by a listing of courses considered to be appropriate examples of those which could be used as partial fulfillment for competency area requirements while bibliographies were developed to aid independent study and program review.

As a sample from the program, one competency required that a student should be acquainted with theory of knowledge by knowing how to acquire it and how to use it. The specific competency objectives called for the student to be familiar with theories of knowledge and ways of learning using empirical, statistical, intuitive, mystical, and aesthetic methods. Also, the student should understand research techniques and how they differed as well as understanding the manner in which to apply knowledge affectively. Examples of academic courses used to achieve these objectives included English entries in writing and research writing, philosophy courses in critical thinking, and research and statistics courses. From the field experiences phase came samples such as publication of an article in a recognized professional journal, authoring a proposal which was externally funded or being primary lobbyist for a bill passed by some legislative body within the past two years.

These examples of nontraditional program curricula were not exhaustive. They reflected the activities of certain Commission member institutions and their thinking in attempting to meet the educational needs of a nontraditional clientele.

Problems

The commencement of any venture which runs counter to accepted custom and practice faces numerous obstacles which must be overcome before credibility and legitimacy can be established. Therefore, it was felt appropriate that a list of potential problem areas in establishing a nontraditional degree would be useful in planning as well as serving to identify the most troublesome areas for current nontraditionalists. The data for this question are in Table 23.

Eight potential problem areas were given the respondents with instructions to check all that applied in the implementation and conduct of their nontraditional programs. The categories were as follows: (a) lack of student acceptance, (b) lack of faculty acceptance, (c) lack of money, (d) lack of marketability for graduates, (e) lack of an audience, (f) permission of accrediting agency to begin, (g) institutional concern for maintaining quality programs, and (h) lack of acceptance for advanced training (professional, graduate schools).

The fear for loss of quality within the institution emerged as the most frequently cited problem in establishing a nontraditional degree. Twenty-five institutions (31.2 percent) saw this as their primary concern. The lack of financial support was seen as the second most common problem with twenty-one schools (26.2 percent) having checked this response.

Table 23

Major Problems for Institutions in the Establishment
and Maintenance of Nontraditional Programs (N=80)

Problem	Number	Percent
Institutional concern for maintaining quality programs	25	31.2
Lack of money	21	26.9
Lack of faculty acceptance	13	16.2
Lack of student acceptance	10	12.5
Lack of an audience	3	3.8
Permission of accrediting agency to begin	2	2.5
Lack of acceptance for advanced train- ing (professional, graduate schools)	2	2.5
Lack of marketability for graduates	1	1.2

Third came the problem of faculty acceptance as thirteen institutions (16.2 percent) saw this as a major obstacle. Lack of student acceptance was the fourth most cited response with ten colleges (12.5 percent) having viewed this as a problem.

There was a dramatic drop in frequency of response for the remaining problem areas. The lack of an audience was checked only three times (3.8 percent) which ranked it fifth. Tied for sixth were two categories, permission of accrediting agencies and admission to graduate schools. Each had two responses (2.5 percent). Last came the problem of graduate marketability with only one institution (1.2 percent) having seen this as a problem.

Program Evaluation

One aspect of building a successful and quality educational program is the continued process of evaluation from which weaknesses and problems can be identified and resolved. In response to the question, "Has your nontraditional degree program been evaluated by authorities from other universities?," there came twenty-seven affirmative replies (33.8 percent). Although this revealed that just slightly more than one school in three had submitted to an external evaluation, the narrative responses submitted under Section IV demonstrated that many of the institutions had implemented in-depth self-evaluation techniques.

NONTRADITIONAL PROGRAMS: AN OPINION

Certain questions among those which provided the data presented in the preceding pages required an opinion or subjective judgment. In addition, there seemed considerable value in doing a simple opinion

survey on certain fundamental points related to the nontraditional degree. Each institution in the Commission on Colleges was asked to complete the opinion survey whether each did or did not offer a non-traditional degree. By conducting such a survey, the Commission could gain insight into the acceptability and course of future development for nontraditional degrees among the member institutions of the Commission on Colleges. The institutional president or chief academic officer and the chief administrative officer for special activities were asked to respond. The answers for all questions in the opinion survey were supplied by 140 presidents, 281 chief academic officers, 241 administrators for special activities, and 43 "others." The data related to the opinion survey are found in Appendix D.

To the question, "Do you support the concept of the nontraditional degree?," there were 508 affirmative responses and 114 negatives. However, when asked, "Do you feel that the nontraditional degree is a logical option within the framework of your institutional mission?," 370 replies indicated that it was a logical option while 246 felt that it was not.

The respondents were asked to comment on the issue of quality with the question, "Do you feel that 'most' nontraditional degrees are second rate when compared to the traditional approach?" The consensus was that "most" of the degrees were not "second-rate," but the response was only 329 negative answers to 240 affirmative replies. As a financial consideration, the question was posed, "Do you 'like' the idea of a nontraditional degree for economic reasons (i.e., it is less expensive for your institution)?" The negative tally was 403 and the affirmative total was 165. When asked "Do you feel that faculties generally support

the concept of the nontraditional degree?," the administrators replied overwhelmingly in the negative, 487 "No" to 103 "Yes."

Accreditation was addressed with two questions; the first, "Do you think that accreditation of nontraditional degrees is a problem for the institution?" The responses showed that 344 felt it was a problem and 256 did not. The second question, "Do you think that accreditation of nontraditional degrees is a problem for the accrediting agency?," had 303 affirmative and 267 negative replies.

An opinion was sought from the administrators concerning the marketability of graduates with nontraditional degrees. This included their ability to secure jobs and to gain admission to graduate schools. Three hundred ninety-three respondents did not see it as a problem while 186 did. Asked if they felt the nontraditional degree was a fad scheduled to run its course, the administrators answered that they did not think this to be the situation by a vote of 411 to 150.

According to the administrators, students were felt to support the nontraditional degree by a clear margin of 347 to 218. In conclusion, the administrators were asked to mark the categories provided to indicate what they considered to be the greatest hurdles in establishing a non-traditional degree within an institution. The categories follow and are presented in descending order of importance as voted by the respondents: (a) faculty, 523; (b) graduate school officials, 285; (c) central administration, 256; (d) registrars, 218; (e) students, 110; (f) other, 8.

Summary

The analysis of data revealed that in the 1975-76 academic year eighty institutions had programs they considered nontraditional. These

institutions were identified from the population of the study which entailed the entire membership of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. At the time of the study this population was 672 institutions. Of the 672 members, 656 or 97.6 percent responded to the survey instrument.

The state which had the largest percentage of its institutions with a nontraditional program was Alabama with ten of forty-seven schools (21.3 percent). Louisiana had the smallest percentage (3.7 percent). Overall, only 11.9 percent (eighty colleges) of the member institutions offered nontraditional programs. Twenty-three institutions were at the associate degree level and fifty-seven were at the baccalaureate and graduate levels. The institutional control of the colleges and universities with nontraditional programs had forty-five schools from the public sector and thirty-five from the private sector. Ten of the institutions had a predominantly black clientele and seventy were composed of a white clientele.

By the end of 1977-78, the data showed that an additional forty-eight institutions planned the implementation of nontraditional programs. This was an additional 7.1 percent of the total Commission membership. Ten of the forty-eight colleges were at the associate degree level, twenty-seven were publicly supported and eleven had a black clientele. These data projected to 19.0 percent (128 institutions) of the Commission membership having and planning to have nontraditional programs by the end of the 1977-78 academic year.

By degree level, the institutions with nontraditional programs had twenty-nine at the associate, forty-two at the baccalaureate, ten at

the masters, three at the doctoral, and five with certificate programs for a total of eighty-nine. The institutions judged their programs non-traditional because of student clientele in fifty-five instances (61.8 percent). Forty of the programs (44.9 percent) were nontraditional because of location while thirty-seven (41.6 percent) and thirty-four (38.2 percent) programs were judged nontraditional in the areas of instruction and content, respectively.

Special admissions procedures were operational at fifty institutions (62.5 percent) and thirty-six schools (45.0 percent) had open admissions. Advanced placement could be secured at sixty-four institutions (80.0 percent) while the majority of schools provided selected student services which included the following: orientation (78.8 percent), flexible scheduling (75.0 percent), library (97.5 percent), academic advising (97.5 percent), and counseling (93.8 percent). Additionally, students at fifty-nine colleges and universities (73.8 percent) had financial aid available to them under the auspices of the nontraditional programs. Program fees were higher at only five institutions (6.2 percent) while the majority of schools (forty-nine, 61.2 percent) showed no fee adjustment whatsoever.

Seventy-two institutions (90.0 percent) reported that they used some percentage of their regular faculty as instructors in their non-traditional programs. The average percentage of the programs taught by regular faculty was reported at 77.9 percent and 22.1 percent taught by adjunct faculty. Forty-eight institutions employed adjuncts in some capacity for their nontraditional programs. Less than half the colleges and universities (thirty-seven schools, 46.2 percent) provided faculty

orientation for those teaching in nontraditional programs. But, more than seventy percent (fifty-eight institutions) screened faculty before they were assigned nontraditional responsibilities. In most institutions (sixty-three, 78.8 percent) faculty evaluations were completed by supervisory personnel but students also provided faculty evaluations in eleven colleges (13.8 percent).

Analysis of enrollment data showed that a plurality of the nontraditional programs (nineteen, 23.8 percent) had more than 200 students enrolled while twenty institutions (25.0 percent) had enrollments in the range of fifty-one to two-hundred. The most popular method of evaluating the enrollees was through written examination by which forty-four schools (55.0 percent) measured student performance. A combination of oral and written examinations proved to be the second most popular method as it was used at forty-one institutions (51.2 percent).

Among the characteristics of the nontraditional programs which were revealed was that the majority of the programs (forty-eight, 60.0 percent) were in their first three years of operation. Over half the institutions (forty-three, 53.8 percent) had a residency requirement with the largest group (nineteen, 44.2 percent) having stipulated a year's minimum residency. Also, media devices such as television and radio were used in the nontraditional programs, but they were not used in the majority of cases. Television proved to be the most popular option and was used by one-quarter of the schools (twenty institutions). The most frequently employed instructional/learning method was the traditional lecture in use at sixty colleges and universities (75.0 percent).

Also surveyed were the major problems encountered by the schools in establishing and maintaining their nontraditional programs. The most frequently mentioned problem surfaced as a general institutional concern for the maintenance of quality which was cited by twenty-five institutions (31.2 percent). Second in frequency came fiscal concerns (twenty-one schools, 26.9 percent). Marketability of nontraditional graduates was seen as the area of least concern.

To assess attitudes about nontraditional programs, an opinion survey was included in the questionnaire. The results of the survey taken from responses by institutional presidents, chief academic officers and administrators for special activities in all SACS institutions showed overwhelming support for the concept of the nontraditional degree (508 pro and 114 con). Other questions indicated that the administrators (523 respondents) felt most faculties did not support the concept of the nontraditional degree.

In the area of program objectives for the nontraditional efforts, a general theme emerged which saw institutions attempting to meet the educational needs of students who were older, established, working persons unable to avail themselves of traditional avenues to obtaining a degree or certificate. The curricula of the nontraditional programs often bore close resemblance to traditional offerings at the same institutions. However, there were those schools which had expended great effort in designing programs to emphasize the individuality and personal interests of the participating students while also striving to insure a sound fundamental education upon which the student could build with

personal objectives. Often these curricula employed modules or program divisions which were competency based but structured around independent study, learning contracts, internships and field experiences.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Chapter 5 was organized into four major divisions. The first division provided a summary of the entire study beginning with the purpose and objectives of the research and continuing through the methodology and analysis of data. Second came a discussion of the conclusions drawn from analysis of the data. The third division of the chapter was a presentation of the implications derived from the data analysis. And, concluding the chapter came a discussion of recommendations for further research.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to identify and describe the non-traditional credit programs offered by the member institutions of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. As a secondary purpose, there was a desire to provide the Commission on Colleges with data to assist the members and staff in assessing the need for possible revision of Standard Nine. The study was accomplished through addressing sixteen specific objectives. Among these objectives was the identification of all institutions with the membership of the Commission on Colleges of SACS which offered a non-traditional degree program. Additionally, the identification of those institutions among the membership which planned implementation of a nontraditional effort by 1977-78 was also sought. Characteristics of the nontraditional programs were categorized and included a compilation

of admission procedures, advanced placement techniques, documentation of procedures used in the awarding of credit, a description of student services provided, identification of major problems encountered by institutions in the establishment of their nontraditional programs, curriculum and program objectives, student fee structures, program costs, evaluation procedures for faculty and students, instructional methodologies, and an opinion survey related to the acceptability and quality of nontraditional programs.

The population for the study consisted of the 672 members of the Commission on Colleges of SACS. A research instrument was designed to gather data through a mail survey. The instrument consisted of seven computer and color-coded sections designed with assistance from an advisory committee and the staff of the Commission on Colleges.

Data collection was implemented by the mailing of two questionnaires to each institution, one to the president and one to the administrator for special activities. These resulted in a final return of 97.6 percent. Treatment of the data involved grouping category totals for inspection. Through a design matrix, summaries, percentages, and comparisons were executed in a variety of ways which permitted analysis of nontraditional programs by level, state, clientele, and type of institutional control.

The analysis of data revealed that in the 1975-76 academic year, eighty institutions (11.9 percent) had programs they considered nontraditional. Of the eleven states compiling the membership in the Southern Association, Alabama had the largest percentage (21.3 percent) of schools providing a nontraditional program. Louisiana had the smallest percentage

(3.7 percent). Forty-five of the institutions fell into the public sector and thirty-five into the private, while clientele categories showed ten black and seventy white institutions. However, by the end of 1977-78, the data showed that an additional forty-eight institutions planned the implementation of such programs. This was an additional 7.1 percent of the total Commission membership and brought the overall projected total by the end of 1977-78 to 19 percent of the membership.

By degree granting level, the institutions with nontraditional programs had twenty-nine at the associate, forty-two at the baccalaureate, ten at the masters, three at the doctoral, and five with certificate programs for a total of eighty-nine. The bulk of the programs (61.8 percent) was judged nontraditional because of student clientele. Forty of the programs (44.9 percent) were nontraditional because of location while thirty-seven (41.6 percent) and thirty-four (38.2 percent) programs were judged nontraditional in the areas of instruction and content, respectively.

Fifty of the eighty institutions had special admissions procedures for their nontraditional programs. This special procedure included thirty-six schools, or 45 percent, with open admissions. Advanced placement could be secured at sixty-four institutions and the great majority of schools provided selected student services such as orientation programs, flexible scheduling, library facilities, academic advising, and counseling.

Faculty characteristics revealed that seventy-two institutions, or 90 percent, reported that they used some percentage of their regular faculty as instructors in their nontraditional programs. Forty-eight

institutions employed adjuncts in some capacity for their nontraditional programs, but the average percentages of each program taught by regular faculty was reported at 77.9 percent, and 22.1 percent taught by adjunct faculty.

Analysis of the enrollment data showed that a plurality of the nontraditional programs had more than 200 enrollments while twenty institutions had enrollments in the range of 51 to 200. The most popular method for evaluating the enrollees was through written examination. Forty-four schools (55.0 percent) measured student performance in this fashion. A combination of oral and written examinations proved to be the second most popular method, which was in use at forty-one institutions (51.2 percent).

Many of the nontraditional programs were in the early phases of operation. Forty-eight or 60.0 percent of the institutions reported that their nontraditional efforts were in the first three years of operation. Other characteristics of the programs included residency requirements in 53.8 percent of the reporting institutions. The most frequently employed learning/instructional method was the traditional lecture in use at sixty colleges and universities (75.0 percent). Second was independent study in use at thirty-seven institutions (46.2 percent), and third was internship operational at twenty-nine institutions (36.2 percent).

The institutions were also surveyed as to the major problems they had encountered in establishing and maintaining their nontraditional programs. The most frequently mentioned problem surfaced as a general institutional concern for the maintenance of quality. This problem was

cited by twenty-five institutions. Second in frequency came fiscal concerns and third came faculty resistance. The marketability of nontraditional graduates was seen as the area of least concern to the reporting institutions.

Among the findings of the opinion survey which was compiled from responses by institutional presidents, chief academic officers, and administrators for special activities in all SACS institutions was that there existed overwhelming support for the nontraditional degree (508 pro and 114 con). The administrators who completed the survey also felt that most faculties did not support the concept of the nontraditional degree.

Program objectives for the nontraditional efforts seemed to demonstrate a basic commonality among the participating institutions. This common purpose was a desire to meet the educational needs of clientele who were older, established, working individuals unable to avail themselves of traditional avenues of obtaining a degree or certificate. The curriculum of a nontraditional program, in many instances, closely paralleled the traditional curriculum at the same institution; however, there were those schools which had designed programs to emphasize the individuality and personal interest of the participating students, while also insuring a sound educational venture. Several examples of the curricula employed modules or program divisions which were competency based but structured around independent studies, learning contracts, internships, and field experiences.

CONCLUSIONS

Nontraditional Program Frequency
and Institutional Characteristics

1. The number of institutional programs was less than expected.

From the examination of data provided by the 656 responding institutional members of the Commission on Colleges, the frequency of nontraditional programs does not appear to be of the magnitude which could have been expected based on the 1972 findings of staff from the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at Berkeley. Combining the projected number of institutions planning to implement a nontraditional program by 1977-78 with those already operationalized made a total of only 19 percent of the commission on Colleges' members conducting a nontraditional effort. The Berkeley study had established that between 35 and 40 percent of all institutions (nationally) had a nontraditional program; however, a regional analysis showed that schools in the Southeast had the lowest percentage of nontraditional programs. Since this area forms the major portion of the Southern Association's territory, such a finding could explain the lower percentage of institutions with a nontraditional program in the Commission on Colleges of SACS. With the projected program implementation in the Commission, the conclusion may be drawn that Commission on Colleges members, while slightly behind the national average, are currently in a period of rapid growth and expansion of their nontraditional programs which may reduce this differential.

The Andrews study in 1971 revealed that almost 25 percent of the Commission's membership (138 of 560 institutions) regularly conducted

off-campus credit courses. Of these 138 institutions, twenty-six had full graduate degree programs off campus. In 1971, the membership may have thought that all these programs were nontraditional degrees by virtue of location. Therefore, in 1971, 8.8 percent of the Commission colleges and universities could have been considered to have a nontraditional degree using location as the sole criterion for nontraditionality. This cannot be proven, however, as the other criteria determining the nontraditional degree were not in effect making an accurate comparison with this study most difficult.

Alabama proved to be the state most favorably disposed toward nontraditional programs among its institutions, while Georgia had the smallest percentage of its schools offering such programs. No apparent reason was available to explain the distribution of nontraditional study throughout the states in the SACS region.

2. More private than public institutions offered nontraditional programs.

Analysis of institutional control revealed that a slightly higher percentage of private institutions (20.3 percent) than public (18.3 percent) would offer nontraditional programs by 1977-78. This information did not appear to suggest a trend of nontraditional programs developing more rapidly at either public or private schools.

3. Black institutions were significantly more involved with nontraditional programs than were white institutions.

The student clientele of the colleges and universities with nontraditional programs was shown conclusively to be white in a ratio of better than five-to-one in terms of institutional numbers. However, a far greater percentage of black institutions (29.2 percent) than white

(17.9 percent) were engaged in nontraditional program activities which indicated that schools with a black clientele have proven to be more willing to break with educational traditions than have white institutions.

4. The trend in nontraditional programs was at the baccalaureate graduate level institutions rather than the associate level institutions.

The two year institutions composed 44.5 percent of the Commission on Colleges' population; yet, these schools were only involved in slightly more than one quarter of the nontraditional programs either in operation or projected by 1977-78. They would not, therefore, be expected to provide the growth edge for nontraditional education within the membership of the Commission. This growth would apparently come from the Level IV institutions (baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate) which showed that 40 percent of these schools would have nontraditional programs by 1977-78. The degree expected most frequently to be nontraditional was the baccalaureate followed by the associate's degree.

Nontraditional Program Characteristics

1. Many programs labeled nontraditional often had numerous traditional characteristics.

A summary of nontraditional program characteristics demonstrated conclusively that programs are most often viewed as nontraditional because of the student clientele being served. This observation confirms the earlier findings of the Berkeley study done at the national level. The second most common nontraditional characteristic was program location which was also found to be the situation in the Berkeley research. Method of instruction and program content were the least frequently mentioned

areas of nontraditionality in both the SACS and Berkeley studies. Examination of these four characteristics led to the conclusion that many educators are extremely concerned with the atypical nature of classroom facilities and instructional locations. Their concern with these conditions is greater, perhaps, than with the method of instruction or program content, although numerous programs obviously combine several or all of the nontraditional characteristics. However, the real reason for this concern may be the degree of nontraditionism which traditional educators wish to implement. Teaching atypical students in different locations is probably more palatable for the traditionalist than radical curriculum revisions.

Evaluation procedures for nontraditional students had a decidedly traditional flavor in that the most frequently used method was the written examination. However, oral examinations either alone or in combination with written tests indicated that nontraditional programs were tending to lean more heavily on the individualized approach explicit in the oral method. This led to the conclusion that nontraditional programs were exploring student evaluation options outside the approaches commonly found in postsecondary education.

Significantly, the most popular instructional method was the traditional lecture. This could be expected since the most frequently reported nontraditional program characteristics were student and location, not method of instruction. Therefore, the majority of programs conducted by the Commission's colleges and universities might logically be thought to utilize a traditional mode of instruction.

The program objectives of the nontraditional offerings were generally to provide services to students who were older (several years past traditional college age, for example), working and unable to avail themselves of the traditional curriculum and who had found previously closed to them all options for obtaining a degree in the traditional mode. Various curricula for the nontraditional programs were structured into divisions or modules which were often designed for an interdisciplinary approach. Many of the curricula were closely modeled after traditional modes already established at the institution. However, in those truly nontraditional curricula there seemed to be an emphasis on competency based, modular structuring in the nonvocational areas. The trend appeared to be, however, a continuation of traditional curricula provided for nontraditional students in atypical locations.

These data led to the conclusion that while innovative programs for nontraditional audiences are being developed and implemented, the old traditions and attitudes do not die easily. Some programs break with the status quo to a much greater extent than do others reflecting, perhaps, a gradual testing of the water before making the big plunge philosophy or a "take what you can get" approach. Genuinely, the institutions within the Commission on Colleges appear to be modifying historically conservative educational approaches, but this modification may best be described as restrained and deliberate.

2. Access to nontraditional programs reflected the egalitarian spirit in postsecondary education of the 1960's and 1970's.

In the area of admissions, there seems to be a strong movement to permit special student clienteles genuine accessibility to degree

opportunities in postsecondary education. These admissions policies are a reflection of the egalitarian spirit in postsecondary education about which Cross and others have written. The significant percentage of institutions with open admissions policies and with admissions procedures favoring the mature, working adult is indicative of a trend in nontraditional education among Commission schools to serve the part-time student. Additionally, this service carries the implicit desire to address the educational needs of students heretofore denied opportunities at the postsecondary level through lack of appropriate academic preparation or because of financial needs which require full-time employment. Significantly, no particular emphasis was given to the design of nontraditional programs for women or minority groups. The central purpose of the great majority of nontraditional programs appeared to be primarily service to those audiences which had been unable to avail themselves of educational opportunities in the traditional sense. No particular group was singled out to receive special assistance.

Review of admissions procedures supported the conclusion that the institutions with nontraditional programs were interested in serving the peculiar needs of special students. Interview processes were common in the programs. Also, the institutions were consciously attempting to liberalize and broaden credit transfer policies as well as award credit through examination and for nonformalized learning situations. These liberalized transfer policies would seem to indicate that institutions in the Commission, at least those with nontraditional programs, were becoming more lenient in this area and were working to overcome the historically stringent credit transfer policies found in higher education.

3. The issues relating to nontraditional program costs were unclear.

The great majority of the colleges and universities were cognizant of the need to extend special student services such as library resources, academic advisement, and counseling to their nontraditional students. Yet, program expense did not appear exorbitant in that fees for nontraditional and traditional programs were relatively parallel. This fact led to the conclusion that institutions did not view nontraditional education either as a formula for alleviating pressing fiscal problems or as a source of financial strain. Indeed, realistic fiscal support for nontraditional programs appeared clearly within the realm of possibility for institutions wishing to implement such a program; yet, paradoxically costs were reported as a significant problem just as in the 1972 Berkeley study. This could lead to the possible conclusion that institutional administrators may have been unwilling to deal with the problems which dual fee structure might precipitate but felt pressure to provide nontraditional programs.

4. The use of instructional technology was not widespread.

The conclusion may be drawn that nontraditional programs among the Commission members did not place a premium on the use of technological hardware as an instructional aid. Television proved to be the most frequently used medium but was involved in only 25 percent of the examples. Other than cassettes, tapes, and movies, no other media aids received wide usage which could indicate that the independent study options of many degrees were relying more heavily on the individual, unaided, reading skills of the student rather than technological support.

5. The nontraditional programs were not completely dominated by the external degree.

The development of the nontraditional programs among Commission institutions does not appear skewed heavily in favor of completely external degrees. Over half the institutions had a residency requirement and there was no reason to expect a dramatic change in this characteristic. Such a requirement indicated that educators at Commission schools felt on-campus experiences and contacts were an extremely valuable part of any degree effort whether traditional or nontraditional. Waiver of all residency requirements could in many instances facilitate operation of programs by eliminating space problems and by permitting the employment of less expensive adjunct faculty. Another explanation for the retention of residency requirements in a relatively high percentage of the programs could stem from the fact that the programs were designed to be campus based and were not intended as external degrees. For example, these programs may share characteristics with Valley's administrative-facilitation model or Medsker's extended-campus approach.

6. Regular institutional faculty characterized the nontraditional programs.

The institutions within the Commission on Colleges stressed the importance of using their regular faculties in nontraditional programs. While adjunct staffs would probably prove less expensive, the schools seemed committed to teaching or supervising the greatest portion of their nontraditional ventures through the auspices of regular faculty. Additionally, concern for faculty preparation and philosophical attitudes toward nontraditional education was apparently the impetus behind widespread use of faculty screening and orientation procedures.

7. Nontraditional program enrollments and graduates were not numerous.

Enrollment trends did not indicate massive student numbers for the present in nontraditional education within the population of the Commission on Colleges. While a significant percentage of the institutions had over 200 enrollments for the 1975 fiscal year, this figure represented a small fraction of the overall membership. Graduation totals from nontraditional degree programs were not of a magnitude to have any immediate substantial effects on job markets or graduate schools.

Respondents to the Commission on Colleges survey did not substantiate the findings of the Berkeley study regarding the problem nontraditional graduates had gaining admission to graduate and professional schools. Only two institutions with nontraditional degrees felt that admission to such schools for their graduates might be unusually difficult. At the time this survey completed, however, many of the programs may not have operated a sufficient length of time to produce enough graduates for this problem to have manifested itself.

Nontraditional Program Opinion Survey

1. Commission on College's institutional administrators strongly endorsed nontraditional programs.

The opinion survey conducted among institutional presidents, chief academic officers and administrators for special activities led to the conclusion that these administrators represented a body of strong support for the concept of the nontraditional degree. However, when the

concept of a nontraditional degree was viewed within the context of their own institutions' particular stated missions, support dwindled appreciably. Generally, the combined responses of these three administrative groups supported nontraditional education, felt the movement was permanent, and saw faculty as the greatest obstacle to establishing a nontraditional program. Drawing conclusions from this information would indicate that academic administrators may have a difficult struggle ahead with their faculties concerning educational philosophies, the audiences to be served by their institutions, and the methods of service.

IMPLICATIONS

1. A new definition of nontraditional programs is required for the Commission on Colleges.

The research of nontraditional education as conducted among the members of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and schools revealed that broad and varied interpretations existed as to what type of program constituted a nontraditional approach. In order to construct appropriate standards or guidelines for the evaluation of nontraditional degree programs within the framework of institutional accreditation, the Commission membership must have a common understanding of what the general tenets and philosophies are that govern a truly nontraditional learning experience. Only when this has been achieved can valid peer evaluations occur. Therefore, the Commission on Colleges should move to revise its definition of nontraditional study to more accurately reflect current attitudes and practices.

From the descriptions provided by Commission institutions, the definition of an external or special degree as presented under illustration five of Standard Nine is far too narrow and limited to be applicable to the contemporary understanding of the concept as currently used within the Commission on Colleges. Obviously, to speak only of courses of study "different from the traditional undergraduate degree" is to eliminate several excellent graduate-level nontraditional programs from consideration. For the uninitiated, such a definition carries the implication that the Commission considers only undergraduate education receptive to a nontraditional interpretation.

The Commission definition states that nontraditional programs may or may not require residency on the campus of the degree granting institution. This statement is consistent with the policies reported by the membership and coincides with several program models described in the literature. A similar statement should be retained for any revised definition to alleviate possible misconceptions that to be nontraditional a degree must be external.

Finally, the Commission on Colleges completed their definition of a nontraditional degree by specifying that the curriculum and instructional processes are built primarily around independent study and examination. Data from the Commission membership indicated, however, that a significant number of the programs were reported as nontraditional solely because the institution felt it was serving a clientele of part-time students and/or the classes were held in locations remote from the resident campus. The curricula were the same as those employed for the schools's traditional academic programs.

Regarding attitudes about what constitutes nontraditional education, atypical students and class locations at one time were sufficiently unique to warrant a raised eyebrow or disapproving comment from traditionalists. Now, however, the part-time student is the rule, not the exception, and traditional classes are held everywhere. A traditional lecture presented to a group of students is not really that nontraditional because the classroom may be in a church, Y.M.C.A., public building, or business office rather than on an institution's private grounds. Because of space restrictions, many community colleges are regular users of facilities such as those mentioned above and have been for years. The same is true for numerous urban universities. Location should be considered a nontraditional factor when the location genuinely alters the traditional delivery and accessibility of the program, for example, programs offered aboard ships, within prisons, or specially designed abroad programs which involve experiences other than simply traditional study at a foreign university.

Since the part-time student has been the majority student for several years, it is a misnomer to label programs nontraditional which are traditional in all respects other than service to miscellaneous part-time students. When a program is designed for a specific audience such as may be found in a vocational field, then the program may be considered nontraditional, for the degree is intended for students other than those who comprise the institution's normal clientele.

The above assumptions about students and program locations require that, in most instances, for a program to be truly nontraditional, its atypical characteristics must be derived from type of instruction or

program content (curriculum). The Commission on Colleges recognized this when, as part of their definition for special or nontraditional degrees, they specified a reliance "almost entirely on independent study and examination." This forced compartmentalization of curriculum has the danger of limiting the concept of nontraditional education; yet, there is within this approach the more than offsetting strength of establishing concrete guidelines which help eliminate confusion and misunderstanding as to the determination of what comprises a nontraditional curriculum. Therefore, a definition of nontraditional degree programs should include some specification as to what would logically be involved with a nontraditional curriculum while retaining the necessary flexibility for innovation which is inherent within the nontraditional movement.

With the continued rapid expansion of nontraditional programs projected for the Commission on Colleges, some common understanding of current nontraditional education should be expressed in the standards of the Commission on Colleges. The existing definition of special or nontraditional degrees should be revised to more clearly reflect what is intended by the Commission when speaking of nontraditional programs. Such a revision would benefit the accreditation and evaluation process of institutions with nontraditional programs. For these reasons, there is provided, for contemplation by the Commission on Colleges, a definition of nontraditional degree programs which may be considered in the possible revision of that portion of Standard Nine (Section 5) dealing with "external and special degrees (nontraditional education)." The definition which follows should be considered as the introductory paragraph to Section 5.

5. Nontraditional Degree Programs

Nontraditional studies are recognized as being largely defined by and a function of the educational philosophies of the institutions implementing the programs. As such, certain characteristics may be considered generally applicable in categorizing any program as nontraditional. A nontraditional program may include work at the certificate, associate, baccalaureate and graduate levels. Nontraditional study involves a radical departure from an institution's normal method of instruction, the clientele served and/or the criteria used for awarding credit. Such programs may or may not require on-campus study or residence and are thought to emphasize the individual student through extensive use of independent study, credit by examination, credit through demonstrated competencies and non-college learning, as well as by accessibility to an academic program which would be unavailable in normal circumstances.

2. Flexibility of private institutions favors development of nontraditional programs.

The distribution of nontraditional programs as reported by the membership of the Commission on Colleges showed a slightly higher percentage of private institutions than public with nontraditional programs. While the differential was not so great as to suggest a sweeping trend toward such program activity in the private sector, the evidence may well point to the greater flexibility and freedom enjoyed by private schools. Private institutions are not faced with the time delays generated from the approval process required for new degrees or directions in education necessitated by the state boards and bureaucracies which control the public sector. Instead, private colleges and universities are free to respond quickly to identified needs and new clienteles when they perceive such actions are warranted. This shortened response time of the private sector may explain in large measure the slightly greater percentage of these institutions with a nontraditional commitment.

3. Black institutions may feel pressured to respond in the nontraditional mode.

By clientele groups, the black colleges and universities were significantly more involved with nontraditional programs than were the white institutions. The implications of this trend may well relate to the black institutions feeling that, in order to remain competitive, they must be quickly responsive to newly recognized student audiences within their service region or face potentially serious enrollment losses. Additionally, the black institutions may be more willing to break with tradition because of historical perspectives which underscore the importance of education to minority groups in achieving successful career and vocational development.

4. Major challenges face faculty and administrators.

Of the many problems facing schools which plan to conduct a nontraditional program, respondents to the opinion survey saw internal faculty acceptance as a major area of concern. Faculty attitudes from the traditional educational standpoint could become a source of disagreement and conflict given the strong endorsement of nontraditional education provided by the three groups of institutional administrators who were surveyed. The successful implementation of a nontraditional learning experience depends largely on the acceptance and support of the concept by an institution's faculty. Should this support fail to materialize, there is a negative carry over to the students who are quick to perceive faculty dissatisfaction which leads, in turn, to student dissatisfaction. Faculty resent being "ordered" to undertake an academic exercise for which their philosophical acceptance may be ambivalent at best. As a

result of these attitudes, there may fall to the academic administrator the responsibility of altering the faculty's preconceived notions and biases if he is charged with the responsibility to implement innovative services for new student clienteles and, in the process, reorient his institution's historical mission of service. The sensitivity and skill with which the administrator attempts to alter traditional faculty ideas toward nontraditional methodology may eventually determine the success or failure of the programs, student attitudes notwithstanding. If, as the analysis of data indicates, the combined opinions of institutional presidents, chief academic officers, and administrators for special activities lend a strong majority of support to the nontraditional movement, while faculty majorities are perceived to oppose it, there exists a major challenge for college and university administrators to make their institutions responsive to the new student clienteles.

Faculties are also faced with a challenge. This study has portrayed faculty (not intentionally) as the intransigent villains who are often guilty of blocking innovation and progress in postsecondary education, but it has not provided a forum for rebuttal. In fairness to the many dedicated and concerned faculty members, they certainly do have the right, indeed, the responsibility to challenge that which they perceive may threaten standards of quality and excellence. However, incumbent upon all is the obligation to retain an open mind in assessing the potentialities and/or liabilities of nontraditional education, just as each would fairly approach a new research problem in his or her academic discipline.

5. Program legitimization seems to remain a function of traditional characteristics.

That the maintenance of quality is an issue of paramount concern to the member institutions of the Commission was demonstrated by their having named the possible lessening of academic quality as the primary problem encountered with the establishment of a nontraditional program. This expression of concern for quality would carry with it the implicit charge to the Commission on Colleges to initiate appropriate procedures, reviews, and standards for insuring that the membership was protected from diminished expectations of academic performance and accountability. The furor over maintenance of standards may be one reason that so many of the programs which were christened nontraditional by their institutions continued to reflect very traditional characteristics of teaching and evaluation, implying that many educators believe that the legitimacy of their nontraditional efforts may be directly proportional to the percentage of traditional methodologies in the make-up of their "innovative" programs.

6. Nontraditional program graduates as well as traditional graduates require an innovative credit transfer system.

Placement of nontraditional graduates into jobs and graduate schools may yet prove to be a serious complication. At present, however, there are probably too few graduates of nontraditional programs to have stimulated a measurable region-wide response either for or against their acceptance. Concern for the postgraduate fate of the nontraditional student may be premature and illfounded as graduates of such programs may never constitute a significant part of the overall student population. Nevertheless, evaluation of nontraditional transcripts and the experiences

contained therein represents a problem of considerable dimensions, and the solution to this problem carries broad ramifications for all of postsecondary education. For nowhere, it seems, do institutions demonstrate more provincialism or do they more jealously guard territorial imperatives than in the field of credit transfer. Until there is unhesitating acceptance of qualified students from nontraditional programs into traditional efforts, there will always exist an insidious and, perhaps unconscious, prejudice and discrimination against the individual who participates in a nontraditional experience.

Transfer policies must be revolutionized not just for nontraditional programs, but for the traditional approaches as well. The mobile, part-time student accumulates credits from many institutions and he or she should not be penalized by dated, ultra-conservative credit transfer policies. Transcript formats must be revised to provide an accurate assessment of non-college learning, work experience, and acquired proficiencies. To accomplish these revisions, the thinking of institutional registrars must be modified by administrators just as faculty conceptions will need to be altered along with those of graduate and professional school officials.

7. Prompt action is needed concerning the possible revision of Standard Nine.

Finally, the extremely high rate of response to the Commission's "Standard Nine Study" would indicate a significant level of concern and interest by the membership in the arena of special activities. Appropriate governing committees within the Commission and the Commission staff itself should accept this as an indication of support from the

membership and proceed quickly with attempts to revise Standard Nine as deemed necessary from analysis of the survey data. Through prompt action, the interests of the member colleges and universities and voluntary accreditation will best be served in dealing with the assessment of nontraditional education.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

From this descriptive study of nontraditional education within the boundaries of a voluntary regional accrediting agency, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, came several additional topics for related research and investigation. These topics follow:

1. The most obvious project would be a replication of the study in the remaining five regional accrediting agencies. From this data, the accrediting bodies could gain true insight into the attitudes and practices of their membership vis-a-vis nontraditional education. Comparisons among the regions could be accomplished which would identify trends that were developing either regionally or nationally.

2. Since voluntary accreditation is genuinely concerned with the maintenance of quality educational programs, and since aspersions have been cast upon the nontraditional sector as having failed in this area of quality, a comparison should be done between the academic and career achievements of students who have graduated from traditional programs and those who have graduated with nontraditional degrees. Specifically, a sampling from both graduate groups should be monitored to determine acceptance and success in graduate and professional schools as well as achievements in vocational and career opportunities. This

evidence combined with standardized test scores could provide conclusive proof as to whether the education of nontraditional students is inferior to that received by students in the traditional mode.

3. The apparent leadership and high percentage of black institutions in the field of nontraditional programming may warrant investigation to explain this phenomenon.

4. An analysis should also be done on the tendency for nontraditional programs to develop more easily and frequently at private colleges and universities than at those schools within the public sector.

5. From the study there emerged a strongly perceived bias against nontraditional programs by most institutional faculties. In view of this finding, an in-depth analysis of faculty attitudes toward nontraditional programs should be effected. Educational philosophies should be assessed from faculty who have participated in nontraditional education and from those who have not. Extrapolation from such studies might show if attitudinal and philosophical adjustments occur after exposure to the nontraditional and whether the adjustments are negative or positive.

6. A study by state of nontraditional programs would be useful in explaining why some states seem to stimulate nontraditional programs and others do not. This problem could be investigated through legislative factors, postsecondary governance models, and financial support.

7. Financing postsecondary education at all levels is an issue of critical importance to higher education. Therefore, a thorough cost analysis of nontraditional programs would be useful in order that institutions planning to enter the nontraditional field might have an indication of the financial burdens which may accrue from such ventures.

8. A corollary of the financial research would be an examination of current enrollments and prospective enrollments to assist in the determination of a viable clientele which would permit continued innovation and experimentation.

9. A second corollary of the cost analysis would be the financial burden and feasibility of providing extensive traditional student services for a nontraditional audience to determine whether the additional cost may limit the expansion of nontraditional programs.

10. Because of the volume of data generated from the study, a further breakdown and analysis of nontraditional programs by degree granting level would yield more detail about the characteristics of each degree in terms of curriculum, vocational orientation, and technology employed. Additionally, specific areas could be examined such as the effects of liberalized admissions policies on student performance.

LITERATURE CITED

- Andrews, G. J. "Public service in higher education: a status study of accreditation in adult and continuing education programs." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, 1972. ✓
- Arden, E. Dialog. In Change, 8 (August 1976).
- Berte, N. R. (Ed.) Individualizing Education by Learning Contracts. New Directions for Higher Education, No. 10, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975.
- Birenbaum, W. M. Something for everybody is not enough. In W. T. Furniss (Ed.) Higher education for everybody? issues and implications. Washington, D. C.: American Council of Education, 1971, 65-81.
- Bowen, H. R. Financing the external degree. Journal of Higher Education, June 1973, 44, 479-490.
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Less time, more options: education beyond the high school. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The open door colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New students and new places. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. More than survival. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975.
- Cross, K. P. Beyond the open door. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1974.
- Cross, K. P. The external degree: introduction. Journal of Higher Education, June 1974, 44, 415-425.
- Cross, K. P. and Valley, J. R. Planning non-traditional programs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1974.
- Dickey, F. G. Accreditation: A means of determining quality. In W. T. Furniss (Ed.) Higher education for everybody? issues and implications. Washington, D. C.: American Council of Education, 1971, 145-147.
- Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education. Interim guidelines on contractual relationships with non-regionally accredited organizations. March 14, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

- Ferriss, W. Introduction: shaping a new tradition. In D. W. Vermilye (Ed.) Learner-centered reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975, 1-3.
- Goodman, O. B. Dialog. In Change, 8 (August 1976).
- Gould, S. B. Preface. In Commission on Non-Traditional Study. Diversity by design. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1973, ix-xxii.
- Gould, S. B. and Cross, K. P. (Eds.) Explorations in non-traditional study. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972.
- Green, M. F. and Sullivan, J. J. Credit for non-collegiate learning. Educational Record, Fall 1975, 4, 254-261.
- Hefferlin, J. B. Avoiding cut-rate credits and discount degrees. In K. P. Cross and J. R. Valley Planning non-traditional programs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1974.
- Houle, C. O. The external degree. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1973.
- Houle, C. O. The potential audience for the external degree. The Journal of Higher Education, June 1973, 44, 426-434.
- Keeton, M. T. In D. W. Vermilye (Ed.) Learner-centered reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975.
- Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Kimmel, E. W. Problems of Recognition. In S. B. Gould and K. P. Cross (Eds.) Explorations in non-traditional study. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972.
- Lichtman, J. Dialog. In Change, 8 (August 1976).
- Martin, E. P. Innovative Programs and Curricula. In C. T. Stewart and T. R. Harvey (Eds.) Strategies for significant survival. New Directions for Higher Education, No. 12, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975.
- Martorana, S. U. and Kuhns, E. Managing academic change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975.
- Medsker, L. L. and others. Extending opportunities for a college degree: practices, problems, and potentials. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1975.
- Meyer, P. Awarding college credit for non-college learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1976.

- Mickey, B. M. Designing the external degree program. Journal of Higher Education, June 1973, 44, 453-461.
- National Taskforce on the Continuing Education Unit. The continuing education unit criteria and guidelines. Washington, D. C.: National University Extension Association, 1974.
- Nelson, F. A. Has the time gone for an external degree? Journal of Higher Education, March 1974, 45, 174-183.
- Newman, F. Report on higher education. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1971.
- Newman, F. The second Newman report: national policy and higher education. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1973.
- Nyquist, E. B. Nontraditional approaches. Today's Education, November-December 1974, 63(4), 63-66.
- Orlans, H. Private accreditation and public eligibility. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1975.
- Patton, C. V. Extended education in an elite institution. Journal of Higher Education, July-August 1975, 46, 427-444.
- Pitchell, R. F. Financing part-time students. In D. W. Vermilye (Ed.) Lifelong learners - a new clientele for higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1974.
- Ruyle, J. and Geiselman, L. A. Non-traditional programs and opportunities. In K. P. Cross and J. R. Valley Planning non-traditional programs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1974, 53-94.
- Sikes, W. W., Schlesinger, L. E., Seashore, C. N. Renewing higher education from within. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1974.
- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The continuing education unit. Atlanta, 1973.
- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Standards of the college delegate assembly. Atlanta, 1975.
- Valley, J. R. External degree programs. In S. B. Gould and K. P. Cross (Eds.) Explorations in non-traditional study. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972.
- Warren, J. R. Alternatives to degrees. D. W. Vermilye (Ed.) Learner-centered reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT: THE STANDARD NINE STUDY

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Colleges
Atlanta, Georgia

Standard Nine Study

I. STANDARD NINE - SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

This study deals specifically with institutional implementation of Standard Nine of the College Delegate Assembly of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Answers to questions in this portion of the study will be used to determine the following:

1. The application of Standard Nine in terms of institutional usage, i.e., the degree to which its policies have been implemented by members of the College Delegate Assembly.
2. The effectiveness of Standard Nine in setting a conceptual base for an institution's "special activities" program and for serving as a legitimate part of the overall evaluation and accreditation process.
3. The need to update Standard Nine in order to more accurately reflect the types of "special activities" being engaged in by members of the Commission on Colleges and how these activities might best be evaluated for accreditation purposes in terms of acceptable practice.
4. The practices of member institutions in the "special activities" field (organizational patterns, kinds of programs, numbers of students, kinds of students) during the 1974-75 fiscal year.

The Standard Nine questionnaire is divided into parts which correspond to the "Illustrations and Interpretations" sections of the Standard itself. Preceding the questionnaire is the entire Standard Nine narrative with the definition of special activities underlined. As each illustration is addressed, the questions pertaining to that section will be preceded by the narrative for that particular illustration.

Following the questions which relate specifically to the illustrations and interpretations of Standard Nine, there are six additional sections with questions which develop in further detail selected topics classified under special activities. An outline of the complete questionnaire follows:

- I. Standard Nine - Special Activities
 - A. Administration and Organization
 - B. Financial Resources
 - C. Faculty
 - D. Students
 - E. External or Special Degree Programs
 - F. Off-Campus Classes and Units
 - G. Independent Study
 - H. Conferences and Institutes
 - I. Media Instruction
 - J. Foreign Travel and Study
 - K. On-Campus Programs
- II. Awarding Credit for Life and Work Experience (Non-College Learning)
- III. Awarding Credit Through Learning Contracts
- IV. Survey of Each Non-Traditional Degree Program Offered by Your Institution
- V. Nontraditional Programs: An Opinion
- VI. Contractual Relationships
- VII. The Continuing Education Unit

Please answer all the questions or indicate which questions are not applicable (N/A) to your institution.

We need your frank answers to the questions to give us a data base for evaluating Standard Nine. This survey is not for accreditation purposes.

STANDARD NINE

Special Activities

Many institutions have developed a variety of supplemental and special educational programs in fulfilling their stated objectives, their public and community service demands, and their responsibilities to their constituents. Special activities programs are defined as: ~~external or special degree programs, off-campus classes and units, independent study programs including correspondence and home study, conferences and institutes including short courses and workshops, foreign travel and study, media instruction including radio and television, and on-campus programs including special summer sessions and special evening classes.~~

An institution inaugurating, continuing, or expanding special activities programs should have resources available beyond those provided for the basic academic programs of the institution. Since the quality and excellence of all instructional programs should be of constant concern to every institution, it is essential that the provisions for special activities should include an adequate administrative organization, a sound financial base, a competent faculty, and sufficient and adequate facilities for the program offered.

The Commission does not wish to be restrictive on new special activities programs of a member institution but rather seeks to encourage innovation and an imaginative approach to providing quality instruction according to the educational needs of the college's constituents. An institution contemplating the inauguration of a new special activity not covered by this Standard shall inform the Executive Secretary of the Commission in advance as to the nature, design, and purpose of the new program area. An institution may solicit an advisory opinion of the Executive Secretary of the Commission as to the appropriateness of a contemplated new activity.

Unless specifically qualified in the Illustrations, credit regulations for the special activities programs should be consonant with those of the total institution. The amount of credit for each course or program should be determined in advance through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution. Noncredit programs should be appropriately identified and recorded by means of the continuing education unit (c.e.u.).

On-campus programs of a special activities nature, whether designated as continuing education or as adult and extension activities, should be coordinated within the organizational structure of the institution relative to special activities, and they should be governed by the policy guidelines of the institution.

The Standards of the College Delegate Assembly apply directly to all programs. It shall be the responsibility of the parent institution to justify all special activities (credit or noncredit) within the framework of its stated purpose and objectives as a function of its central mission. All special activities programs must be compatible with the total educational program of the institution.

Special activities shall always be evaluated and judged by the Commission on Colleges as part of its function in recommending the granting or reaffirming of accreditation of the total institution.

Illustrations and Interpretations

1. Administration and Organization

Each member institution involved in special activities will provide appropriate organizational structure and administrative processes according to the magnitude of its program. These must be well defined and should be clearly understood by the total institution. Institutional or-

ganization should recognize and provide a separate identity (a clearly identifiable and defined administrative unit) for special activities under the direction of a designated administrative officer (e.g., vice chancellor, vice president, dean, director, or coordinator). All policies and regulations affecting special activities should be formulated by the administrative officer in conjunction with and as a part of campus-wide administrative and academic advisory groups.

The administrative unit for special activities shall be responsible for coordination of all special activities within the institution, both on and off campus.

Procedures within the institution for the establishment of new programs, interinstitutional agreements and arrangements, and resources allocation should recognize special activities as an integral part of the total institution. The administrative unit should provide for continuous systematic evaluation of programs and offerings within the total scope of special activities.

The continuing education unit should be used as the basic instrument of measurement for an individual's participation in and an institution's offering of non-credit classes, courses, and programs. A c.e.u. is defined as ten contact hours of participation in an organized continuing education (adult or extension) experience under responsible sponsorship, capable direction, and qualified instruction. Information and guidelines on c.e.u. may be obtained by writing to the Executive Secretary of the Commission. The c.e.u. records will serve as a part of the full-time equivalent student account for the institution.

2. Financial Resources

The administrative unit for special activities should operate under a clearly identified budget on a fiscal year basis. The budget should be prepared and administered (internal management and accounting) by the designated officer of the unit in conformity with the fiscal policies and procedures of the central business office of the institution. Institutional or general fund support for special activ-

ities should be consistent with institutional policy for support of all divisions or units within the total institution.

Special activities should not be determined solely on the principle of being "self-supporting" but rather on the principle of fulfilling the educational responsibility of the institution to its constituents. Necessary financial resources must be available and committed to support the special activities of the institution.

3. Faculty

Provision of an adequate and qualified faculty and staff to support the special activities program is essential to maintaining the academic quality of the institution. Full-time faculty and staff members in special activities should be accorded the same recognition and benefits as other faculty and staff members of the institution.

All who teach in special activities must have competence in the fields in which they teach, attested to by advanced study culminating in appropriate graduate degrees, or by extensive work experience in the teaching fields or in a professional practice which is of the highest quality.

Policies governing the amount of teaching allowed, overloads, and compensation for full-time faculty members from other units of the institution assigned to special activities programs should be developed and approved jointly by the administrative head of the special activities unit and the appropriate administrative and academic personnel of the institution.

4. Students

It should be recognized by the total institution that the nature and characteristics of the typical special activities student is somewhat different from that of the regular full-time college or university student. The special activities student is usually older, career oriented, and engaged in a full-time job. Student development services should be provided and be developed cooperatively by the administrative unit for special activities with other appropriate units of the institution.

Policies should be developed for admissions, registration procedures, counseling and guidance services, and records. The characteristics of these policies should be directly related to the nature, character, and need of the special activities student.

5. *External or Special Degree Programs (Nontraditional Study)*

An external or special degree program comprises a course of study different from the traditional undergraduate degree. A nontraditional program may or may not require on-campus study or residence and relies almost entirely on independent study and examination. An institution inaugurating, continuing, or expanding an external or special degree program should develop specific policies and guidelines which include admission policies with special attention to the age and maturity of the individual, to his prior educational achievement and vocational and avocational experiences, and to his goals and objectives. Guidelines concerning transfer of credit, credit by examination (e.g., College Level Examination Program of the College Entrance Examination Board and the institution's own examinations) and residency requirements (periodic seminars and special sessions), if any, need to be established. Methods of evaluating a student's progress, including advising and counseling, should be explicit. Evaluation and examination procedures to determine that the individual has successfully completed the degree requirements must be clearly outlined and fully developed.

An institution contemplating the inauguration of an external or special degree program should inform the Executive Secretary of the Commission in advance and arrange for a preliminary advisory study by the Commission prior to undertaking the program.

6. *Off-Campus Classes and Units*

Courses taught in an off-campus setting should maintain the academic integrity of the institution. Special attention should be given to insure the appropriateness of the courses to the students.

Courses requiring laboratories, extended library study, or other special materials should not be offered unless arrangements are made to provide the necessary resources.

When an off-campus program in a particular locality grows to the extent that the institution is offering a comprehensive academic program to a specific student body, then the institution should consider the establishment of a special off-campus unit such as a center or regional campus. The parent institution should provide an organization for full-time administration of the unit, for faculty, for library staff, and for physical facilities, that are comparable to their campus counterparts.

These programs and the amount of credit or c.e.u.'s for each should be determined in advance through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution.

7. *Independent Study*

Independent study programs including correspondence courses basically fall into one of two categories. One type is the formalized independent study course or program which may lead to a degree. Academic standards in such programs and courses shall be consistent with standards in on-campus classes and may require such formal requirements as written reports, examinations, and on-campus conferences with faculty.

A second type of independent study is that which relates to the study which a person may do on his own and for which he may seek credit from the institution by examination, such as the CLEP.

These programs and the amount of credit or c.e.u.'s for each should be determined in advance through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution.

8. *Conferences and Institutes*

Conferences and institutes and their

many variations are an important part of the special activities programs of many institutions. For purposes of identification and clarification the following categories and definitions may be useful:

CONFERENCE

A general type of meeting usually of one or more days' duration, attended by a fairly large number of people. A conference will have a central theme but is often loosely structured to cover a wide range of topics. The emphasis is on prepared presentations by authoritative speakers, although division into small group sessions for discussion purposes is often a related activity.

INSTITUTE

Generally similar to a conference, but more tightly structured to provide a more systematic development of its theme, with the emphasis more on providing instruction in principles and techniques than on general information. Participants are usually individuals who already have some competence in the field of interest. Institute programs may have certain continuity, meeting on a yearly basis for example.

SHORT COURSE

A sequential offering, as a rule under a single instructor, meeting on a regular basis for a stipulated number of class sessions over a short period of time (e.g., one to three weeks, etc.) Quizzes and examinations may be given depending upon the determination of requirements. The noncredit course under the public service definition may resemble the credit course in everything but the awarding of credit. It may also be more informal and more flexible in its approach in order to meet the needs of students.

WORKSHOP

Usually meets for a continual period of time over a period of one or more days. The distinguishing feature of the workshop is that it combines instruction with laboratory or experimental activity for the participants. The emphasis is more likely to be on skill training than on general principles.

SEMINAR

A small grouping of people with the primary emphasis on discussion under a leader or resource person or persons. In continuing higher education, a seminar is more likely to be a one-time offering, although it may continue for several days.

SPECIAL TRAINING PROGRAM

A skill program which offers a combination of instruction and practice. The approach is usually on a more individualized basis than a workshop.

These programs and the amount of credit or c.e.u.'s for each should be determined in advance through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution.

9. Media Instruction

Media instruction includes any form of instruction offered in special activities through television, radio, computer assisted instruction (CAI), telewriter, telelecture, and other such forms of media instruction which may develop.

These programs and the amount of credit or c.e.u.'s for each should be determined in advance through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution.

10. Foreign Travel and Study

Credit shall not be permitted for travel *per se*. Degree credit shall be granted only for residence or travel abroad involving an academic program supplemented by seminars, reading, reports, or similar academic exercises based on the same criteria for credit as independent study. Special attention should be directed to the quality of the academic programs at the foreign institution or institutions.

These programs and the amount of credit or c.e.u.'s for each should be determined in advance through the regular

channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution.

11. On-Campus Programs

Many of the special activities of an institution are conducted on campus. Such programs include evening classes and special summer sessions which are not a part of the regular schedule and curriculum of the institution and other types of programs which are conducted on campus in continuing education and adult and extension activities (e.g., conferences, institutes, short courses, workshops, seminars, and special training programs).

These programs and the amount of credit or c.e.u.'s for each should be determined in advance through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution.

Section I

For Data
Processing
Use Only

A. ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANIZATION

1. *Administration and Organization*

Each member institution involved in special activities will provide appropriate organizational structure and administrative processes according to the magnitude of its program. These must be well defined and should be clearly understood by the total institution. Institutional organization should recognize and provide a separate identity (a clearly identifiable and defined administrative unit) for special activities under the direction of a designated administrative officer (e.g., vice chancellor, vice president, dean, director, or coordinator). All policies and regulations affecting special activities should be formulated by the administrative officer in conjunction with and as a part of campus-wide administrative and academic advisory groups.

The administrative unit for special activities shall be responsible for coordination of all special activities within the institution, both on and off campus.

Procedures within the institution for the establishment of new programs, interinstitutional agreements and arrangements, and resources allocation should recognize special activities as an integral part of the total institution. The administrative unit should provide for continuous systematic evaluation of programs and offerings within the total scope of special activities.

The continuing education unit should be used as the basic instrument of measurement for an individual's participation in and an institution's offering of non-credit classes, courses, and programs. A c.e.u. is defined as ten contact hours of participation in an organized continuing education (adult or extension) experience under responsible sponsorship, capable direction, and qualified instruction. Information and guidelines on c.e.u. may be obtained by writing to the Executive Secretary of the Commission. The c.e.u. records will serve as a part of the full-time equivalent student account for the institution.

1. Does your institution have an identifiable administrative unit that has major responsibility for special activities? (check one)
 - a. _____ Yes
 - b. _____ No
2. If your response to #1 is "Yes," how is the unit officially designated in your institution? (Example--your administrative unit may be designated as a division, department, school, college or continuing education.)

Official designation of administrative unit responsible for special activities.

3. What is the official title of the administrative officer in your institution who has major responsibility for your administrative unit in special activities?

Title of administrative officer for special activities.

1A

8 _____

9-10 _____

11-12 _____

4. To whom does your chief administrative officer for special activities report with respect to programs, personnel, and budget?

Title of administrator to whom special activities officer reports.

For Data
Processing
Use Only

13-14 _____

5. At what level of the administrative organization of your institution does your chief officer for special activities function? (check one)

a. _____ At a higher level than your academic deans

b. _____ At the same level of your academic deans

c. _____ At a lower level than your academic deans

d. _____ Other (please specify) _____

15-16 _____

6. What is the staffing pattern of your administrative unit that has major responsibility for special activities? Please indicate the number of staff members that fit each of the categories designated below.

No. of staff
positions

Classification

a. _____	Full-time Professional Administrative	17 _____
b. _____	Full-time Professional Faculty	18 _____
c. _____	Part-time Professional Administrative	19 _____
d. _____	Part-time Faculty	20 _____
e. _____	Full-time Secretarial-Clerical	21 _____
f. _____	Part-time Secretarial-Clerical	22 _____

7. Listed below are several specialized programs that could be encompassed within your administrative unit for special activities. Please check those programs that you have in your organization.

- a. _____ Late afternoon-evening college academic programs on the main campus of your institution. 11
8 _____
- b. _____ Off-campus college academic programs. 9 _____
- c. _____ Conferences, workshops, short courses, and institutes 10 _____
- d. _____ Independent self-directed study programs. (i.e., correspondence courses; computer assisted instruction, CAI; educational television, ETC) 11 _____
- e. _____ Compensatory education program.(i.e., college preparatory developmental work) 12 _____
- f. _____ Cultural enrichment programs. (music, art, literature, writing, lectures) 13 _____
- g. _____ Interdisciplinary institutes, centers, especially designed to treat pragmatic community-based problems. 14 _____
- h. _____ University Resource Referral Service.(i.e., assuming a major leadership role by directing the public to faculty resources.) 15 _____
- i. _____ Foreign Travel Study Programs. 16 _____
- j. _____ Learning contracts. 17 _____
- k. _____ Tutorial. 18 _____
- l. _____ Newspaper courses. 19 _____
- m. _____ Traditional programs. 20 _____
- n. _____ Other (please specify) _____ 21-24 _____
- _____
- _____

For Data Processing Use Only

Sheet to be keypunched after p. 40.

For Data
Processing
Use Only

8. Are policies and regulations affecting special activities programs at your institution formulated by the special activities administrative officer in conjunction with and as a part of campus-wide administrative and academic advisory groups?

a. _____ Yes

b. _____ No

c. _____
Title of person answering this question.

Please comment if you wish. _____

1A

25 _____

26-27 _____

9. Do your institution's special activities programs have a regular evaluation by:

a. Students _____ Yes _____ No

28 _____

b. Faculty _____ Yes _____ No

29 _____

c. Administration, special activities _____ Yes _____ No

30 _____

10. Please attach an organizational chart of the unit responsible for the administration and delivery of your special activities programs.

11. Are there other units (schools, divisions, departments) within your institution which sponsor special activities programs and which are not a part of the administrative unit?

a. _____ No

b. _____ Yes. Please identify and list two types of programs and within which unit they are administratively based:

31 _____

32-33 _____

12. Please check the space beside the word or words which most accurately reflect your satisfaction with the administration and organization illustration of Standard Nine.

a. _____ Most dissatisfied

b. _____ Dissatisfied
(continued on next page)

For Data
Processing
Use Only

- c. _____ Slightly dissatisfied
 d. _____ Slightly satisfied
 e. _____ Satisfied
 f. _____ Most satisfied

34 _____

B. FINANCIAL

2 Financial Resources

The administrative unit for special activities should operate under a clearly identified budget on a fiscal year basis. The budget should be prepared and administered (internal management and accounting) by the designated officer of the unit in conformity with the fiscal policies and procedures of the central business office of the institution. Institutional or general fund support for special activities should be consistent with institutional policy for support of all divisions or units within the total institution.

Special activities should not be determined solely on the principle of being "self-supporting" but rather on the principle of fulfilling the educational responsibility of the institution to its constituents. Necessary financial resources must be available and committed to support the special activities of the institution.

1. Does your administrative unit for special activities operate under an identified budget on a fiscal year basis?
- a. _____ Yes
 b. _____ No
2. If "No," what is the arrangement? _____

3. Is the budget prepared and administered (internal management and accounting) by the designated officer of the special activities unit in conformity with the fiscal procedures of your institution's central business office?
- a. _____ Yes
 b. _____ No

35 _____

36 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

4. Are your institution's special activities determined solely on the principle of being "self-supporting"?
- a. _____ Yes
- b. _____ No
5. What was the total annual operating budget in the fiscal year 1974-75 for your institution's special activities?
- \$ _____
6. Please check the space beside the word or words which most accurately reflect your satisfaction with the financial resources illustration of Standard Nine.
- a. _____ Most dissatisfied
- b. _____ Dissatisfied
- c. _____ Slightly dissatisfied
- d. _____ Slightly satisfied
- e. _____ Satisfied
- f. _____ Most satisfied

37 _____

38-42 _____

43 _____

C. FACULTY

3. Faculty

Provision of an adequate and qualified faculty and staff to support the special activities program is essential to maintaining the academic quality of the institution. Full-time faculty and staff members in special activities should be accorded the same recognition and benefits as other faculty and staff members of the institution.

All who teach in special activities must have competence in the fields in which they teach, attested to by advanced study culminating in appropriate graduate degrees, or by extensive work experience in the teaching fields or in a professional practice which is of the highest quality.

Policies governing the amount of teaching allowed, overloads, and compensation for full-time faculty members from other units of the institution assigned to special activities programs should be developed and approved jointly by the administrative head of the special activities unit and the appropriate administrative and academic personnel of the institution.

For Data
Processing
Use Only

If the faculty illustration of special activities does not apply to your institution, please check the space provided and move to the next section.

_____ Does not apply

1. During the period of July 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975 how many of your regular full-time faculty members (teaching and research) were involved in at least one (1) special activity?

Number of full-time faculty members involved in at least one (1) special activities program. Count each faculty member only once regardless of the number of programs in which he may have participated.

44-47 _____

2. Do faculty receive recognition (e.g., promotion considerations) for their participation in special activities.

- a. _____ Yes
b. _____ No

48 _____

Please attach any institutional policy statements addressing this matter.

3. How many full-time teaching and research faculty members (as so defined by your institution) were employed by your institution during the period of July 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975?

Number of full-time equivalent research/teaching faculty members employed by institution.

49-52 _____

4. Does your institution use criteria for selecting qualified faculty and staff to support the special activities program?

- a. _____ Yes
b. _____ No

53 _____

5. Does your institution accord the same recognition and benefits to full-time special activities faculty and staff as is accorded other faculty and staff in the institution?

- a. _____ Yes
b. _____ No

54 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

6. Listed below are several descriptive statements concerning salary arrangements for your special activities faculty and administration personnel. Please check those which apply to your institution.
- a. Full-time personnel in special activities are on the same salary scale as other comparable university personnel. 55 _____
 - b. There is a special salary scale for special activities personnel. 56 _____
 - c. Full-time personnel from other divisions or departments of the institution participating in special activities (teaching or administration) receive payment in addition to their regular salary for their services. 57 _____
 - d. Part-time personnel recruited from outside your institution for participation in special activities programs (teaching only) are paid for their services: (Please check those appropriate)
 - (1) On a per credit hour base
 - (2) On a per course base
 - (3) On a contact hour base
 - (4) Other (list) 58 _____

7. Has the administrative head of special activities participated jointly with other institutional administrative and academic personnel in the formulation of policies governing the amount of teaching time, overloads and compensation for full-time faculty members from other units of the institution?
- a. Yes
 - b. No 59 _____
8. Please check the space beside the word or words which most accurately reflect your satisfaction with the faculty illustration of Standard Nine.
- a. Most dissatisfied.
 - b. Dissatisfied
 - c. Slightly dissatisfied
- (continued on next page)

For Data
Processing
Use Only

- d. _____ Slightly satisfied
- e. _____ Satisfied
- f. _____ Most satisfied

60 _____

D. STUDENTS

4 Students

It should be recognized by the total institution that the nature and characteristics of the typical special activities student is somewhat different from that of the regular full-time college or university student. The special activities student is usually older, career oriented, and engaged in a full-time job. Student development services should be provided and be developed cooperatively by the administrative unit for special activities with other appropriate units of the institution.

Policies should be developed for admissions, registration procedures, counseling and guidance services, and records. The characteristics of these policies should be directly related to the nature, character, and need of the special activities student.

1. In the following areas, has your institution developed policies for your special activities students which are purposely designed for this client group?

a. Admissions

_____ Yes _____ No

61 _____

b. Registration

_____ Yes _____ No

62 _____

c. Counseling and Guidance

_____ Yes _____ No

63 _____

d. Records

_____ Yes _____ No

64 _____

e. Special Parking Areas

_____ Yes _____ No

65 _____

f. Babysitting Services

_____ Yes _____ No

66 _____

g. Representation in Student Government

_____ Yes _____ No

67 _____

(continued on next page)

For Data
Processing
Use Only

h. Food Services (e.g., special hours for cafeterias)

_____ Yes _____ No

68 _____

i. Financial Aid (e.g., scholarships, work-study)

_____ Yes _____ No

69 _____

2. Please check the space beside the word or words which most accurately reflect your satisfaction with the student illustration of Standard Nine.

a. _____ Most dissatisfied

b. _____ Dissatisfied

c. _____ Slightly dissatisfied

d. _____ Slightly satisfied

e. _____ Satisfied

f. _____ Most satisfied

70 _____

E. EXTERNAL OR SPECIAL DEGREE PROGRAMS (NONTRADITIONAL STUDY)

5. *External or Special Degree Programs
(Nontraditional Study)*

An external or special degree program comprises a course of study different from the traditional undergraduate degree. A nontraditional program may or may not require on-campus study or residence and relies almost entirely on independent study and examination. An institution inaugurating, continuing, or expanding an external or special degree program should develop specific policies and guidelines which include admission policies with special attention to the age and maturity of the individual, to his prior educational achievement and vocational and avocational experiences, and to his goals and objectives. Guidelines concerning transfer of credit, credit by examination (e.g., College Level Examination Program of the College Entrance

Examination Board and the institution's own examinations) and residency requirements (periodic seminars and special sessions), if any, need to be established. Methods of evaluating a student's progress, including advising and counseling, should be explicit. Evaluation and examination procedures to determine that the individual has successfully completed the degree requirements must be clearly outlined and fully developed.

An institution contemplating the inauguration of an external or special degree program should inform the Executive Secretary of the Commission in advance and arrange for a preliminary advisory study by the Commission prior to undertaking the program.

If your institution does not have a nontraditional degree, please answer questions #1 and #2 before proceeding to Section F.

For Data
Processing
Use Only

SHOULD YOUR INSTITUTION HAVE MORE THAN ONE NONTRADITIONAL STUDY PROGRAM, PLEASE REPRODUCE SECTION E AND COMPLETE IT FOR EACH NONTRADITIONAL PROGRAM AT YOUR INSTITUTION.

For the purpose of completing Section E, please consider the following definition:

Nontraditional Study: All programs considered as nontraditional study will be for credit only. These programs may differ from traditional ventures in terms of time, location, delivery system or methodology and generally will be thought of as specially designed degree programs for special audiences, delivered in special ways.

1. Is your institution currently conducting a nontraditional program?

a. Yes

b. No

18

8 _____

2. If at present, your institution has no nontraditional program is there one planned for implementation within the next two years?

a. Yes

b. No.

9 _____

3. What is the level of your nontraditional program? Please check all that apply.

Name of Degree(s)

a. Associate _____

b. Baccalaureate _____

c. Master's _____

d. Doctoral _____

e. Other (please specify) _____

10 _____
11-21 _____
22 _____
23-33 _____
34 _____
35-45 _____
46 _____
47-57 _____
58 _____
60-70 _____

4. In which of the following five areas is your institution's program considered nontraditional. Please check any that apply.

a. Type of student

71 _____

b. Location of program

72 _____

c. Type of instruction (method)
(continued on next page)

73 _____

	For Data Processing Use Only
d. _____ Program content	74 _____
e. _____ Delivery systems	75 _____
5. Has your institution established special admissions policies for its nontraditional students?	
a. _____ Yes	
b. _____ No	76 _____
6. Do your institution's admissions policies give special consideration to any of the following when considering applicants for your nontraditional program? Please check all that apply and mark your first priority with an asterisk.	10 _____
a. _____ Open admissions	8 _____
b. _____ Age and maturity	9 _____
c. _____ Work experience	10 _____
d. _____ Sex (e.g., programs just for women or just for men)	11 _____
e. _____ Minority groups	12 _____
f. _____ Other (please specify) _____	13 _____

7. In what ways are the factors checked in #6 applied differently in considering applicants for nontraditional programs as compared with applicants for traditional programs?	

_____	14-15 _____
8. Are there any pre-tests required for admission to your nontraditional program?	
a. _____ Yes	
b. _____ No	16 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

9. What types of tests are used?
- a. National standardized test
 - b. Institutional examination
10. Are students screened for admission in other ways (e.g., interviews)?
- a. No
 - b. Yes. Please identify _____

11. Can a student achieve advanced placement in your institution's nontraditional program through examination?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
- Please identify the type of examination checking all that apply and marking your first priority with an asterisk.
- c. CLEP (College Level Examination Program)
 - d. CPEP (College Proficiency Examination)
 - e. Institutional
 - f. Other (please specify) _____

12. Are students given any orientation into the operation and philosophy of the nontraditional study so that they understand its purposes?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
13. Does your nontraditional program have a residency requirement?
- a. Yes
 - b. No

17 _____

18 _____

19 _____

20 _____

21 _____

22 _____

23 _____

24-25 _____

26 Blank

27 _____

28 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

14. If "Yes," how long is the period of residency?
- a. Less than an academic year
- b. An academic year
- c. Longer than an academic year (please specify)
-
-
- 29 _____
- 30-31 _____
15. Does your institution provide for special scheduling of its non-traditional program activities (e.g., weekends)?
- a. Yes
- b. No
- 32 _____
16. Is there any fee adjustment for students in your nontraditional program?
- a. No
- b. Fees are lower
- c. Fees are higher
- 33 _____
17. Is there financial aid available for students in your institution's nontraditional program?
- a. Yes
- b. No
- 34 _____
18. Do the students of your nontraditional program have access to the following facilities or services?
- a. Library
- Yes
- No
- Where?
- Your own library
- Other colleges or universities
- (continued on next page)
- 35 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

_____ Public libraries
 _____ Other (specify) _____

36-49 _____

b. Computer

_____ Yes
 _____ No

50 _____

Where?

_____ Your own computer
 _____ Other colleges or universities
 _____ Industry or business
 _____ Other (specify) _____

51-61 _____

c. Academic Advising

_____ Yes
 _____ No

62 _____

Where?

_____ Your own staff
 _____ Other colleges or universities
 _____ Other (specify) _____

63-73 _____

d. Counseling

_____ Yes
 _____ No

10

8 _____

Where?

_____ Your own staff
 _____ Other colleges or universities

(continued on next page)

For Data
Processing
Use Only

_____ Other (specify) _____

9-15 _____

e. _____ Other student support services (please specify)

16-25 _____

19. Does your institution have a time limit for the completion of its nontraditional degree program?

- a. _____ No
- b. _____ 3 years or less
- c. _____ 4-6 years
- d. _____ 7-10 years
- e. _____ Longer than 10 years

26 _____

20. Where does the majority of instruction for your institution's non-traditional program take place?

- a. _____ On-campus
- b. _____ Operationally separate unit
- c. _____ Centers (off-campus), regional campuses

27 _____

28 _____

29 _____

21. Does your institution's nontraditional program award credit for work experience?

- a. _____ Yes
- b. _____ No

30 _____

22. Does your institution's nontraditional program award credit for non-course work (e.g., civic involvement, work in governmental agencies, community theatre)?

- a. _____ Yes
- b. _____ No

31 _____

23. If "Yes," please specify. _____

32 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

24. Does your institution's nontraditional program provide for transfer of credit from previous educational experiences which are documented by transcripts of the work?
- a. Yes
- b. No
- 33 _____
25. What is the maximum percentage of program credits which can be transferred from other sources to your institution's nontraditional program?
- a. No transfer credit permitted
- b. Up to 25% of the degree requirements
- c. Up to 33 1/3% of the degree requirements
- d. Up to 50% of the degree requirements
- e. Up to 66 2/3% of the degree requirements
- f. Up to 75% of the degree requirements
- g. Other (please specify) _____
- _____
- 34 _____
26. Which of the following categories comprises the nontraditional faculty at your institution? Check all that apply.
- a. Regular, on-campus faculty who also participate in your traditional programs
- _____ % Percentage of total programs taught by regular faculty
- 35 _____
- 36-39 _____
- b. Adjunct faculty
- _____ % Percentage of total program taught by adjunct faculty
- 40 _____
- 41-44 _____
- c. Other (please specify) _____
- _____
- 45-48 _____
- 49-52 _____
27. Is there special in-service training or orientation for your faculty participating in the nontraditional program?
- a. Yes
- b. No
- 53 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

28. Are faculty screened in any fashion before being permitted to teach in your institution's nontraditional program?

a. Yes

b. No

54 _____

29. How are faculty evaluated in your institution's nontraditional program?

a. Student evaluations

b. Peer evaluations

c. Supervisor evaluations

d. Other (please specify) _____

55 _____

56-66 _____

30. How many faculty FTE's were generated by your institution's non-traditional program in the fiscal year 1974-75 according to your institution's formula for an FTE?

57-60 _____

31. How are students evaluated in your institution's nontraditional program? Please check all that apply and mark your first priority with an asterisk.

E1

a. By written examination

8 _____

b. By oral examination

9 _____

c. By written and oral examinations

10 _____

d. Peer evaluation

11 _____

e. Jury evaluation

12 _____

f. Peer and jury evaluation

13 _____

g. Other (please specify) _____

14 _____

15-16 _____

32. How many student FTE's were generated by your institution's non-traditional program in FY 1974-75? A student FTE is defined as follows:

For Data
Processing
Use Only

Full-Time Enrollment (FTE) for Students

- a. Total the number of students carrying a load of twelve (12) or more credit hours in collegiate (degree) programs at the close of registration for the most recent fall term.
- b. Total the credit hour loads of part-time students in collegiate (degree) programs at the close of registration for the most recent fall term and divide this total by twelve (12).
- c. Total FTE's = a + b (Round to the nearest whole FTE)
- d. _____ Total
33. Which of the following media devices, if any, are used in your institution's nontraditional program? Please check all that apply and mark your first priority with an asterisk.
- a. _____ Television
- b. _____ Radio
- c. _____ Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI)
- d. _____ Telewriter
- e. _____ Telelecture
- f. _____ Newspaper
- g. _____ Other (please specify) _____

- h. _____ None
34. How long has your institution been offering nontraditional programs?
- a. _____ First year
- b. _____ Between 1 and 3 years
- c. _____ Between 4 and 6 years
- d. _____ Between 7 and 10 years
- e. _____ Longer than 10 years

17-18 _____

19 _____

20 _____

21 _____

22 _____

23 _____

24 _____

25 _____

26-27 _____

28 _____

29 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

35. What is the focus of your institution's nontraditional program?
Check all that apply.
- a. Vocational
 - b. General liberal arts
 - c. Traditional
 - d. Other (please specify) _____
- 29 _____
36. Which method of learning constitutes the major portion of your institution's nontraditional program? Please check all that apply and mark your first priority with an asterisk.
- a. Correspondence
 - b. Traditional lectures
 - c. Tutorial
 - d. Field work, internship
 - e. Independent study
 - f. Other (please specify) _____
- 31 _____
32 _____
33 _____
34 _____
35 _____
36 _____
37-38 _____
37. What percentage of students enrolling in your institution's non-traditional program completed all requirements for diploma or certificate in the fiscal year 1974-75?
- a. Information unavailable
 - b. Less than 25%
 - c. Between 26% and 50%
 - d. Between 51% and 75%
 - e. Between 76% and 90%
 - f. More than 90%
- 39 _____
40 _____
38. How many students were enrolled in your institution's nontraditional program in the fiscal year 1974-75?
- a. Fewer than 25
 - b. 25-50
- 41 _____
42 _____
- (continued on next page)

- | | For Data
Processing
Use Only |
|--|------------------------------------|
| c. _____ 51-100 | 43 _____ |
| d. _____ 101-150 | 44 _____ |
| e. _____ 151-200 | 45 _____ |
| f. _____ More than 200 (please specify) _____ | 46 _____ |
| <hr/> | |
| 39. What were the major problems in your institution's nontraditional program in the fiscal year 1974-75? Please check all that apply and mark your first priority with an asterisk. | |
| a. _____ Lack of student acceptance | 47 _____ |
| b. _____ Lack of faculty acceptance | 48 _____ |
| c. _____ Lack of money | 49 _____ |
| d. _____ Lack of marketability for graduates | 50 _____ |
| e. _____ Lack of an audience | 51 _____ |
| f. _____ Permission of accrediting agency to begin (May have been prior to FY 1974-75) | 52 _____ |
| g. _____ Institutional concern for maintaining quality programs | 53 _____ |
| h. _____ Lack of acceptance in advanced training (professional, graduate schools) | 54 _____ |
| 40. Has your nontraditional degree program been evaluated by authorities from other universities? | 55 _____ |
| a. _____ Yes | |
| b. _____ No | 56 _____ |

For Data
Processing
Use Only

F. OFF-CAMPUS CLASSES AND UNITS

6. *Off-Campus Classes and Units*

Courses taught in an off-campus setting should maintain the academic integrity of the institution. Special attention should be given to insure the appropriateness of the courses to the students. Courses requiring laboratories, extended library study, or other special materials should not be offered unless arrangements are made to provide the necessary resources.

When an off-campus program in a particular locality grows to the extent that the institution is offering a comprehensive academic program to a specific student body, then the institution should consider the establishment of a special off-campus unit such as a center or regional campus. The parent institution should provide an organization for full-time administration of the unit, for faculty, for library staff, and for physical facilities, that are comparable to their campus counterparts.

These programs and the amount of credit or c.e.u.'s for each should be determined in advance through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution.

If the off-campus classes and units illustration is not applicable to your institution, please check the space provided and move to the next section on page 32.

_____ Does not apply

1. Does your institution supply and insure that appropriate resources are available to support all off-campus courses requiring such facilities as laboratories and those for extended library study.
 - a. _____ Yes
 - b. _____ No

2. Has your institution established a center or regional campus because of the growth of an off-campus program?
 - a. _____ Yes
 - b. _____ No

1F

8 _____

9 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

3. Does your institution provide for full-time administration of this center or regional campus?
- a. Yes
- b. No
- for library staff?
- c. Yes
- d. No
- for physical facilities?
- e. Yes
- f. No
4. Are the above, in your judgment, comparable to their campus counterparts (i.e., can students secure the same qualities in services off-campus as on-campus)?
- a. Administration: Yes No
- b. Library: Yes No
- c. Physical Facilities: Yes No
5. Are the programs and amount of credit offered through these centers or regional campuses determined in advance through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution?
- a. Yes
- b. No
6. Please check the space beside the word or words which most accurately reflect your satisfaction with the off-campus classes and units illustration of Standard Nine.
- a. Most dissatisfied
- b. Dissatisfied
- c. Slightly dissatisfied
- d. Slightly satisfied
- e. Satisfied
- f. Most satisfied
- 10 _____
- 11 _____
- 12 _____
- 13 _____
- 14 _____
- 15 _____
- 16 _____
- 17 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

G. INDEPENDENT STUDY

7. Independent Study

Independent study programs including correspondence courses basically fall into one of two categories. One type is the formalized independent study course or program which may lead to a degree. Academic standards in such programs and courses shall be consistent with standards in on-campus classes and may require such formal requirements as written reports, examinations, and on-campus conferences with faculty.

A second type of independent study is that which relates to the study which a person may do on his own and for which he may seek credit from the institution by examination, such as the CLEP.

These programs and the amount of credit or c.e.u.'s for each should be determined in advance through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution.

If your institution does not have an independent study program, please check the space provided and move to the next section on page 33.

_____ Does not apply

1. Does your institution conduct a formalized independent study program which may lead to a degree?
 - a. _____ Yes
 - b. _____ No

2. Does your institution's formalized independent study have any of the following as a part of its program? Please check all that apply and mark your first priority with an asterisk.
 - a. _____ Written reports
 - b. _____ Oral examinations
 - c. _____ Written examinations
 - d. _____ Oral and written examinations
 - e. _____ On-campus conferences with faculty

(continued on next page)

18 _____

19 _____

20 _____

21 _____

22 _____

23 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

- f. Other (please specify) _____

- 24 _____
25-26 _____
3. Does your institution conduct an independent study program for which the student may seek credit from the institution by examination, such as the CLEP?
- a. Yes
- b. No
- 27 _____
4. Does your institution determine in advance the amount of credit or CEU's (non-credit) to be awarded through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution?
- a. Yes
- b. No
- 28 _____
5. Please check the space beside the word or words which most accurately reflect your satisfaction with the independent study illustration of Standard Nine.
- a. Most dissatisfied
- b. Dissatisfied
- c. Slightly dissatisfied
- d. Slightly satisfied
- e. Satisfied
- f. Most satisfied
- 29 _____
- H. CONFERENCES AND INSTITUTES
- Conferences and institutes and their many variations are an important part of the special activities program of many institutions. For purposes of identification and clarification the following categories and definitions may be useful in answering the questions.
- Please note the category, read the definition and indicate whether it is appropriate for your institution, then provide the total number for FY 1974-75, if your answer is "Yes."
- If your institution does not conduct conferences and institutes, please check the space provided and move to the next section on page 36.
- Does not apply

For Data
Processing
Use Only

1. CONFERENCE

A general type of meeting usually of one or more days' duration, attended by a fairly large number of people. A conference will have a central theme but is often loosely structured to cover a wide range of topics. The emphasis is on prepared presentations by authoritative speakers, although division into small group sessions for discussion purposes is often a related activity.

a. _____ Yes

b. _____ No

c. _____ Total conferences; July 1, 1974 - June 30, 1975

d. _____ Total enrollment (headcount); July 1, 1974 - June 30, 1975

30 _____

31-33 _____

34-39 _____

2. INSTITUTE

Generally similar to a conference, but more tightly structured to provide a more systematic development of its theme, with the emphasis more on providing instruction in principles and techniques than on general information. Participants are usually individuals who already have some competence in the field of interest. Institute programs may have certain continuity, meeting on a yearly basis for example.

a. _____ Yes

b. _____ No

c. _____ Total institutes; July 1, 1974 - June 30, 1975

d. _____ Total enrollment (headcount); July 1, 1974 - June 30, 1975

40 _____

41-43 _____

44-49 _____

3. SHORT COURSE

A sequential offering, as a rule under a single instructor, meeting on a regular basis for a stipulated number of class sessions over a short period of time (e.g., one to three weeks, etc.) Quizzes and examinations may be given depending upon the determination of requirements. The noncredit course under the public service definition may resemble the credit course in everything but the awarding of credit. It may also be more informal and more flexible in its approach in order to meet the needs of students.

		For Data Processing Use Only
a.	_____ Yes	
b.	_____ No	50 _____
c.	_____ Total short courses; July 1, 1974 - June 30, 1975	51-53 _____
d.	_____ Total enrollment (headcount); July 1, 1974 - June 30, 1975	54-59 _____
4. WORKSHOP		
<p>Usually meets for a continual period of time over a period of one or more days. The distinguishing feature of the workshop is that it combines instruction with laboratory or experimental activity for the participants. The emphasis is more likely to be on skill training than on general principles.</p>		
a.	_____ Yes	
b.	_____ No	60 _____
c.	_____ Total workshops; July 1, 1974 - June 30, 1975	61-63 _____
d.	_____ Total enrollment (headcount); July 1, 1974 - June 30, 1975	64-69 _____
5. SEMINAR		
<p>A small grouping of people with the primary emphasis on discussion under a leader or resource person or persons. In continuing higher education, a seminar is more likely to be a one-time offering, although it may continue for several days.</p>		
a.	_____ Yes	
b.	_____ No	70 _____
c.	_____ Total seminars; July 1, 1974 - June 30, 1975	71-73 _____
d.	_____ Total enrollment (headcount); July 1, 1974 - June 30, 1975	74-79 _____
6. SPECIAL TRAINING PROGRAM		
<p>A skill program which offers a combination of instruction and practice. The approach is usually on a more individualized basis than a workshop.</p>		

	For Data Processing Use Only
a. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	1G
b. <input type="checkbox"/> No	8 _____
c. <input type="checkbox"/> Total special training programs; July 1, 1974 - June 30, 1975	9-11 _____
d. <input type="checkbox"/> Total enrollment (headcount); July 1, 1974 - June 30, 1975	12-17 _____
7. Does your institution determine in advance the amount of credit and/or CEU's (non-credit) to be awarded through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution?	
a. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	1H
b. <input type="checkbox"/> No	8 _____
8. Please check the space beside the word or words which most accurately reflect your satisfaction with the conferences and institutes illustration of Standard Nine.	
a. <input type="checkbox"/> Most dissatisfied	
b. <input type="checkbox"/> Dissatisfied	
c. <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly dissatisfied	
d. <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly satisfied	
e. <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfied	
f. <input type="checkbox"/> Most satisfied	9 _____
I. MEDIA INSTRUCTION	

9. Media Instruction

Media instruction includes any form of instruction offered in special activities through television, radio, computer assisted instruction (CAI), telewriter, telelecture, and other such forms of media instruction which may develop.

These programs and the amount of credit or c.e.u.'s for each should be determined in advance through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution.

For Data
Processing
Use Only

If media instruction for special activities does not apply to your institution, please check the space provided and move to the next section on page 38.

_____ Does not apply

1. Does your institution offer any instruction in special activities through the following media. Please check all that apply and mark your first priority or major emphasis with an asterisk.
 - a. _____ Television
 - b. _____ Radio
 - c. _____ Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI)
 - d. _____ Telewriter
 - e. _____ Telelecture
 - f. _____ Newspaper
 - g. _____ Other (please specify) _____

2. Does your institution determine in advance the amount of credit and the CEU's (non-credit) to be awarded through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution?
 - a. _____ Yes
 - b. _____ No

3. Please check the space beside the word or words which most accurately reflect your satisfaction with the media instruction illustration of Standard Nine.
 - a. _____ Most dissatisfied
 - b. _____ Dissatisfied
 - c. _____ Slightly dissatisfied
 - d. _____ Slightly satisfied
 - e. _____ Satisfied
 - f. _____ Most satisfied

10 _____

11 _____

12 _____

13 _____

14 _____

15 _____

16 _____

17-18 _____

19 _____

20 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

J. FOREIGN TRAVEL AND STUDY

10. *Foreign Travel and Study*

Credit shall not be permitted for travel *per se*. Degree credit shall be granted only for residence or travel abroad involving an academic program supplemented by seminars, reading, reports, or similar academic exercises based on the same criteria for credit as independent study. Special attention should be directed to the quality of the academic programs at the foreign institution or institutions.

These programs and the amount of credit or c.e.u.'s for each should be determined in advance through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution.

If foreign travel and study does not apply to your institution, please check the space provided and move to the next section on page 39.

_____ Does not apply

1. Does your institution award degree credit for residence and travel abroad which includes an academic program?
 - a. _____ Yes
 - b. _____ No

2. Does your institution determine in advance the amount of credit and the CEU's (non-credit) to be awarded through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution?
 - a. _____ Yes
 - b. _____ No

3. Please check the space beside the word or words which most accurately reflect your satisfaction with the foreign travel and study illustration of Standard Nine.
 - a. _____ Most dissatisfied
 - b. _____ Dissatisfied
 - c. _____ Slightly dissatisfied
 - d. _____ Slightly satisfied

(continued on next page)

21 _____

22 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

- e. _____ Satisfied
f. _____ Most satisfied

23 _____

K. ON-CAMPUS PROGRAMS

11. *On-Campus Programs*

Many of the special activities of an institution are conducted on campus. Such programs include evening classes and special summer sessions which are not a part of the regular schedule and curriculum of the institution and other types of programs which are conducted on campus in continuing education and adult and extension activities (e.g., conferences, institutes, short courses, workshops, seminars, and special training programs).

These programs and the amount of credit or c.e.u.'s for each should be determined in advance through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution.

If the on-campus programs of special activities does not apply to your institution, please check the space provided and move to page 40, part L.

1. Does your institution conduct on-campus, as part of its special activities, any of the following:
- a. Evening classes - Those classes offered by your institution which are administratively based in your special activities unit. If these classes are based in your regular academic program and are in fact just an extension of the day schedule, they are not to be included.
- _____ Yes
_____ No
_____ Total student FTE's for July 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975
- b. Special summer sessions which are not part of the regular schedule and curriculum of the institution.
- _____ Yes
_____ No
_____ Total student FTE's for July 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975
(continued on next page)

24 _____

25-30 _____

31 _____

32-37 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

- c. Other types of programs which are conducted on campus in continuing education, adult and extension activities. (e.g., conferences, institutes, short courses, workshops, seminars, and special training programs).

_____ Yes

_____ No

38 _____

2. Does your institution determine in advance the amount of credit and the CEU's (non-credit) to be awarded through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution?

a. _____ Yes

b. _____ No

39 _____

3. Please check the space beside the word or words which most accurately reflect your satisfaction with the on-campus programs illustration of Standard Nine.

a. _____ Most dissatisfied

b. _____ Dissatisfied

c. _____ Slightly dissatisfied

d. _____ Slightly satisfied

e. _____ Satisfied

f. _____ Most satisfied

40 _____

- L. Please comment on any illustration or interpretation of Standard Nine or the entire Standard as to its appropriateness for the situations addressed or its failure to address appropriate situations. Attach additional pages as needed.

Section II-2

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Colleges
Atlanta, Georgia

Standard Nine Study

II. Awarding Credit for Life and Work Experience
(Non-College Learning)

This section is a detailed questionnaire on the Standard Nine illustration for nontraditional programs.

To more accurately incorporate accreditation criteria in any possible revision of Standard Nine, the Commission on Colleges is seeking information on institutional practices related to non-college learning or work experience. This area of nontraditional activity is not addressed in the current Standard.

If your institution does not award credit for work experience or non-college learning, please indicate that this section does not apply by marking the space provided and move to the next section on page 47.

_____ This section of the questionnaire does not apply
to my institution.

Section II

For Data Processing Use Only

1. Did your institution permit the faculty-student body responsible for curriculum to weigh the evidence that crediting prior, non-college learning is legitimate and worth doing before implementing such a policy?

_____ Yes

_____ No

Comment: _____

2 A

2. Did your institution permit wide dissemination and discussion of plans to credit non-college learning among institutional decision-makers, faculty, students, cost experts, and other institutions, the latter to determine acceptability of credits?

_____ Yes

_____ No

Comment: _____

8 _____

3. Did your appropriate institutionwide policy-making group vote to begin accepting credit for prior learning/work experience?

_____ Yes

_____ No

Comment: _____

9 _____

10 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

- 4. Did your committee or group charged with implementing the credit process for prior learning represent the various interests concerned (faculty, students, support staff, counseling, registrar, admissions)?

_____ Yes

_____ No

Comment: _____

11 _____

- 5. Before any students were evaluated, did your institution decide exactly what was to be credited, when the crediting was to be accomplished, and whether or not prior learning needed to be related to future goals?

_____ Yes

_____ No

Comment: _____

12 _____

- 6. Did your institution determine before the start of the program what student and institutional costs would be, how supporting revenue could be raised, and whether or not faculty would receive remuneration through payment or release time?

_____ Yes

_____ No

Comment: _____

13 _____

- 7. Did your institution make the decision that faculty will receive recognition through the usual reward systems of promotion and

For Data
Processing
Use Only

tenure for their efforts in assessing prior learning?

Yes

No

Comment: _____

14 _____

8. Did your institution develop proper application forms along with clear, concise, descriptive materials to be sent students upon initial application? These materials would provide an overview of what is creditable and how the examination of prior learning will take place.

Yes

No

Comment: _____

15 _____

9. Does the system of internal records and transcripts of your university reflect adequately what has been credited and by what method the crediting has been carried out?

Yes

No

Comment: _____

16 _____

10. Did your institution develop a student counseling system which contains a prior learning assessment seminar or process where an advisor helps students think through

For Data
Processing
Use Only

life/work experiences and translate them into statements of learning?

Yes

No

Comment: _____

17 _____

11. Did your institution establish specific criteria for the material the student is to include in the portfolio of documented prior learning?

Yes

No

Comment: _____

18 _____

12. Did your institution establish specific guidelines for the methodologies used to examine all the data in the portfolio (e.g., the treatment of transfer credits, acceptable percentiles from national examinations)?

Yes

No

Comment: _____

19 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

13. Is examination of your students' prior learning conducted
by a committee rather than on a one-to-one basis?

_____ Yes

_____ No

Comment: _____

20 _____

Section III-3

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Colleges
Atlanta, Georgia

Standard Nine Study

III. Awarding Credit Through Learning Contracts

This section is a detailed questionnaire on the Standard Nine illustration for nontraditional programs.

The Commission on Colleges is seeking information in this section of the questionnaire related to contracts, a subject also inadequately addressed by Standard Nine. A possible revision of Standard Nine could result should the survey indicate to the Commission that member institutions are participating in this nontraditional activity to a significant degree. Such a revelation might logically call for the introduction of criteria to define an accreditation procedure for the evaluation of the use of learning contracts.

If your institution does not award credit by learning contract, please indicate that this section does not apply by marking the space provided and move to the next section on page 52.

_____ This section of the questionnaire does not apply to my institution.

Section III

For Data
Processing
Use Only

1. Which part of your institution's curriculum does contract learning represent? Please check all that apply and mark your first priority with an asterisk.

- a. _____ Total curriculum
- b. _____ Substituted as an alternative for various courses
- c. _____ An option for a grade in existing courses
- d. _____ Other (please specify) _____

3 A

8 _____

9 _____

10 _____

11 _____

12-13 _____

2. Which of the following models does your institution emphasize as a prime goal of the learning contract? Please check all that apply and mark your first priority with an asterisk.

- a. _____ Vocational competencies
- b. _____ Professional competencies
- c. _____ Academic approach in a particular discipline
- d. _____ Academic approach for interdisciplinary work
- e. _____ Aesthetic learning experiences
- f. _____ Other (please specify) _____

14 _____

15 _____

16 _____

17 _____

18 _____

19 _____

20-21 _____

3. Are there any restrictions at your institution related to contract design or content?

- a. _____ Yes
- b. _____ No

22 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

4. If "Yes," are the restrictions on
- a. Content. Please explain. _____

 _____ 23 _____
- b. Design. Please explain. _____

 _____ 24 _____
5. Is the contract agreement between individual student and individual sponsor subject to any veto by a curriculum committee or administrator at your institution?
- a. Yes 25 _____
- b. No
6. Which of the following evaluation procedures does your institution use in its contract learning programs. Please check all that apply and mark your first priority with an asterisk.
- a. Written examinations only 26 _____
- b. Oral examinations only 27 _____
- c. Written and oral examinations 28 _____
- d. Peer evaluation 29 _____
- e. Jury evaluation 30 _____
- f. National standardized testing 31 _____
- g. Institutional standardized testing 32 _____
- h. Other (please specify) _____
 _____ 33 _____
 _____ 34-35 _____
- i. None 36 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

7. Are new students in your contract learning program given any initial standardized testing?
- a. Yes
- b. No
- 37 _____
8. If "Yes," please specify the test.
- a. School and College Abilities Test
- b. American College Test
- c. Institutional test
- d. Other (please specify) _____
- _____
- _____
- 38 _____
- 39 _____
- 40 _____
- 41 _____
- 42-49 _____
9. Does your institution's learning contract require a clearly stated set of learning goals and objectives to be agreed upon by the student and his mentor prior to the initiation of the learning experience?
- a. Yes
- b. No
- 50 _____
10. Are there provisions in your institution's learning contract to permit changes which reflect new or revised educational and vocational goals on the part of the student?
- a. Yes
- b. No
- 51 _____
11. Does your institution require that student and mentor agree upon methodology and evaluation before the implementation of any contract?
- a. Yes
- b. No
- 52 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

12. Do the learning contracts of your institution provide students with due process when disagreements arise between student and faculty concerning the adequate completion of agreed upon contractual terms?
- a. _____ Yes
- b. _____ No
13. Please attach to this section any samples of contract forms which may be in use at your institution.
14. Please list the names of the types of contracts in use by your institution and briefly explain their purposes. Attach additional pages as needed.

53 _____

Section IV-4

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Colleges
Atlanta, Georgia

Standard Nine Study

IV. Survey of Each Nontraditional Degree Program Offered by
Your Institution

This section is a detailed questionnaire on the Standard Nine illustration for nontraditional programs.

This section of the questionnaire will seek information on specific nontraditional degree programs offered by your institution. Should your institution not offer any nontraditional programs, please indicate by checking the space provided and move to the next section on page 56.

_____ This section of the questionnaire is not applicable to my institution.

To establish adequate criteria for the accreditation of non-traditional programs, the Commission on Colleges needs detailed information relating to the nontraditional activities in which your institution is engaged. This section of the Standard Nine study is for the purpose of gathering data in some detail in such areas as curriculum development and methods for awarding credit. Through an assessment of your specific degree programs and the analysis of data contained in Section I. E, a profile of nontraditional activity

should emerge within the membership of the Commission on Colleges. A determination can then more easily be made as to whether Standard Nine should be revised to reflect any significant developments in nontraditional, credit special activities.

Data for this section should be as current as possible. When current information is unavailable please use FY 1974-75 as a base. Please attach additional pages for the discussion of each degree and restate the number and question before answering.

Section IV

For Data
Processing
Use Only

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| | 4 A |
| 1. What is the name of your nontraditional program? | 1-63 _____ |
| 2. What are the specific purposes, goals and/or objectives of this nontraditional program? | 64 _____ |
| 3. Please describe in detail the curriculum content of your nontraditional program. | |
| 4. What delivery mode does your institution utilize in implementing its nontraditional program (e.g., time/space considerations, independent study approaches, external degrees, media utilization)? | 65-66 _____ |
| 5. What methods of learning does your nontraditional program entail? | 67-68 _____ |
| 6. What are the admissions criteria for your nontraditional program? | 69-70 _____ |
| 7. How is advanced standing achieved by a student in your nontraditional program (e.g., credit by examination, credit for work experience)? | 71-72 _____ |
| 8. What provisions have been made in your nontraditional program for student advisement and counseling? | 73-74 _____ |
| 9. What are the completion requirements for your nontraditional program and how and for what is credit awarded once the student has been accepted into the program? | 75-76 _____ |
| 10. What learning resources are available to your nontraditional program (e.g., library, computer, experts in the field)? | 77-78 _____ |
| 11. What is the evaluation process for your students completing the nontraditional program? | 79 _____ |
| 12. What is the evaluation process for the program itself? | 80 _____ |
| 13. What does your nontraditional program cost per student to operate? | 81-84 _____ |
| 14. How many students are in this nontraditional program-- head count and FTE? | 85-89 _____ |
| 15. Does your institution have any contractual arrangement with other institutions, businesses or industries in which your students may earn credit through predetermined processes? Please explain. | 90-91 _____ |

For Data
Processing
Use Only

16. Please attach any brochures/pamphlets describing your nontraditional program along with admission and evaluation forms and any other related materials which you think would be useful.
17. Please attach any institutional policy statements concerning your nontraditional program activities.

Section V-5

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Colleges
Atlanta, Georgia

Standard Nine Study

V. Nontraditional Programs: An Opinion
(To Be Answered By All Institutions)

After you have reviewed and completed the questionnaires dealing with nontraditional programs, the Commission on Colleges would value a separate response of opinion from the institutional president or chief academic officer and the chief administrative officer responsible for special activities. Therefore, please submit two separate responses to this section if your institution has an administrative officer for special activities.

The preceding sections of the questionnaire have included some questions requiring an opinion or subjective judgment. However, candid answers to the following questions may well provide an insight into the acceptability and future development of nontraditional programs among the member institutions of the Commission on Colleges. Your cooperation in this endeavor is sincerely appreciated. Please give us your opinion even though your institution may not have a nontraditional degree.

Certain questions may appear answerable with a simple "Yes" or "No;" however, a few words of comment will be appreciated.

Section V

For Data
Processing
Use Only

1. Do you support the concept of the nontraditional degree?

Yes

No

Comment: _____

5A

8-9 _____

2. Do you feel that the nontraditional degree is a logical option within the framework of your institutional mission?

Yes

No

Comment: _____

10-11 _____

3. Do you feel that "most" nontraditional degrees are second-rate when compared to the traditional approach?

Yes

No

Comment: _____

12-13 _____

4. Do you "like" the idea of a nontraditional degree for economic reasons (i.e., it is less expensive for your institution)?

Yes

No

Comment: _____

14-15 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

5. Do you feel that faculties generally support the concept of the nontraditional degree?

Yes

No

Comment: _____

16-17 _____

6. Do you think that accreditation of nontraditional degrees is a problem for the institution?

Yes

No

Comment: _____

18-19 _____

Do you think that accreditation of nontraditional degrees is a problem for the accrediting agency?

Yes

No

Comment: _____

39-40 _____

7. Do you think that the marketability of nontraditional graduates is a problem? This includes their ability to secure jobs and admission to graduate and professional schools.

Yes

No

Comment: _____

20-21 _____

8. Do you think that the nontraditional degree is a fad scheduled to run a cycle of popularity and then fade into relative obscurity?

Yes

No (continued on next page)

For Data
Processing
Use Only

Comment: _____

22-23 _____

9. Do you think that students generally support the concept of a non-traditional degree?

_____ Yes

_____ No

Comment: _____

24-25 _____

10. Which group, in your opinion, represents the biggest hurdle to establishing a nontraditional degree within an institution? Please check all that apply and mark your first priority with an asterisk.

_____ Students

26 _____

_____ Faculty

27 _____

_____ Central Administration

28 _____

_____ Graduate School Officials

29 _____

_____ Registrars

30 _____

_____ Other (please specify) _____

31-32 _____

Comment: _____

33 _____

11. Please add any comments on nontraditional programs which you have not had the opportunity to express.

12. Who completed this section of the questionnaire?

- _____ President
- _____ Chief Academic Officer
- _____ Administrator for Special Activities
- _____ Other

For Data
Processing
Use Only

34 _____

35 _____

36 _____

37-38 _____

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Colleges
Atlanta, Georgia
Standard Nine Study

VI. Contractual Relationships

The Commission on Colleges is attempting to determine the extent to which accredited member institutions have agreed upon contractual arrangements with unaccredited external organizations for the purpose of offering courses and awarding credit with these organizations. Criteria for accrediting such relationships do not currently exist in the Standards of the College Delegate Assembly. There may be a need to establish such criteria depending upon the level of involvement by institutional members.

If your institution has no contractual arrangement with any unaccredited organization (either a business, industry or educational institution) please indicate that this section does not apply by marking the space provided and moving to the next section on page 65.

_____ This section of the questionnaire does not apply to
my institution.

Section VI

For Data
Processing
Use Only

1. Your institution's primary purpose of offering courses or programs under a contractual arrangement is to supplement the educational program.
- a. Yes 6A
- b. No 8 _____
2. What ancillary purposes provide a basis for offering such programs or courses? Please check all that apply and mark your first priority with an asterisk.
- a. Auxiliary services 9 _____
- b. Anticipated income 10 _____
- c. Public relations 11 _____
- d. Other (please specify) _____ 12 _____
- _____ 13-14 _____
- _____
3. Has your institution determined the value and level of all credit courses under the contract in accordance with established institutional procedures?
- a. Yes
- b. No 15 _____
4. As the sponsoring institution, are the courses offered for credit, through the contract, under your institution's sole and direct control?
- a. Yes
- b. No 16 _____
5. Does your institution guarantee that conduct of the contractual courses meets the standards of your regular programs as disclosed fully in your institutional publications?
- a. Yes
- b. No 17 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

6. Does your contract specifically designate the officers of your institution and those of the contracting organization who are empowered to execute the contract?

a. _____ Yes

b. _____ No

18 _____

7. Is there a definite understanding between your institution and the contracting organization regarding the work to be performed, the period of the agreement, and the conditions under which any possible renewal or renegotiation of the contract would take place?

a. _____ Yes

b. _____ No

19 _____

8. Please check all the items in the following list for which clear responsibility has been established between your institution and the contractor.

a. _____ Indirect costs

20 _____

b. _____ Approval of salaries

21 _____

c. _____ Equipment

22 _____

d. _____ Subcontracts and travel

23 _____

e. _____ Property ownership and accountability

24 _____

f. _____ Inventories and patents

25 _____

g. _____ Publications and copyrights

26 _____

h. _____ Accounting records and audits

27 _____

i. _____ Security

28 _____

j. _____ Termination costs

29 _____

k. _____ Tuition refund

30 _____

l. _____ Student records

31 _____

m. _____ Faculty facilities

32 _____

n. _____ Safety regulations

33 _____

o. _____ Insurance coverage

34 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

9. Does your institution furnish the student with a copy of your enrollment agreement before payment is made?

a. _____ Yes

b. _____ No

35 _____

Section VII-7

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Colleges
Atlanta, Georgia

Standard Nine Study

VII. The Continuing Education Unit

This section is a detailed questionnaire on Standard Nine non-credit special activities.

This section of the questionnaire addresses the non-credit aspect of your institution's special activities as measured by the Continuing Education Unit (CEU). Should your institution not conduct non-credit special activities or should your institution conduct non-credit special activities but not award the CEU, please check the appropriate space which follows.

- a. We do not conduct non-credit special activities at our institution.
- b. We conduct non-credit special activities at our institution, but we do not award the CEU.

Do not complete this section of the questionnaire if you have checked either a. or b. above.

If you are completing Section VII or have checked b. above, your responses will in no way affect the accreditation of your institution.

Section VII

For Data
Processing
Use Only

1. Does your administrative unit for special activities arrange for the awarding of the Continuing Education Unit (CEU)?

7A

a. Yesb. No

8 _____

2. Are there other units (schools, divisions, departments) within your institution which arrange for the awarding of CEU's?

a. Yesb. No

9 _____

3. Criteria for Awarding Individual CEU's

Standard Nine of the Standards of the College Delegate Assembly states, "The Continuing Education Unit should be used as the basic unit of measurement for an individual's participation in an institution's offering of non-credit classes, courses, and programs." In order to fulfill the above statement for measuring an individual's participation in an institution's total offering of non-credit special activity programs, it is necessary that, in addition to the definition of the Continuing Education Unit, that certain criteria be utilized before individual CEU's are awarded.

The following seven criteria have been established by the Commission on Colleges, in light of guidelines devised by the National Task Force on the CEU, as necessary for the awarding of CEU's. After each criterion, please indicate whether your institution adheres to that specific guideline.

- a. The non-credit activity is planned in response to an assessment of educational need for a specific target population.

 Yes No

10 _____

- b. There is a statement of objective and rationale.

 Yes No

11 _____

- c. Content is selected and is organized in a sequential manner.

 Yes No

12 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

- d. There is evidence of pre-planning which should include opportunity for input by a representative of the target group to be served, the faculty area having content expertise, and continuing education personnel.

_____ Yes

_____ No

13 _____

- e. The activity is of an instructional nature and is sponsored or approved by an academic or administrative unit of the institution best qualified to affect the quality of the program content and to approve the resource personnel utilized.

_____ Yes

_____ No

14 _____

- f. There is a provision for registration for individual participants and to provide data for institutional reporting.

_____ Yes

_____ No

15 _____

- g. Appropriate evaluation procedures are utilized and criteria are established for awarding CEU's to individual students prior to the beginning of the activity. This may include the evaluation of student performance, instructional procedure, and course effectiveness.

_____ Yes

_____ No

16 _____

4. Does your institution award CEU's for non-credit offerings which do not meet the criteria listed in 3, a-g above?

a. _____ Yes

b. _____ No

17 _____

5. Does your institution account for non-credit courses, programs, and activities which do not meet the criteria for awarding individual CEU's by recording instead institutional CEU's?

a. _____ Yes

b. _____ No

18 _____

For Data
Processing
Use Only

6. Does your institution follow the criteria for the recording of institutional CEU's?

Criteria for "institutional" CEU's follow:

- a. The activity is a planned education experience of a continuing education nature.

_____ Yes

_____ No

- b. The activity is sponsored by an academic or administrative unit of the institution qualified to affect the quality of the program content and to select and approve the resource personnel utilized.

_____ Yes

_____ No

- c. Record of attendance is required for institutional reporting use and a file of program materials will be maintained by the administrative unit for special activities. Attendance records may be in terms of accurate headcount.

_____ Yes

_____ No

7. Has your institution implemented the CEU as a uniform system of measurement of a student's participation in non-credit activities?

a. _____ Yes

b. _____ No

8. Has your institution implemented an institutional accounting system to determine total non-credit activity through individual CEU's and institutional CEU's?

a. _____ Yes

b. _____ No

9. Has your institution established a transcript type of recordkeeping procedure for recording individual CEU non-credit activities?

a. _____ Yes

b. _____ No

19 Blank

20 _____

21 _____

22 _____

23 _____

24 _____

25 _____

For Data Processing Use Only

10. If "Yes," is this recordkeeping responsibility assigned to the registrar for the institution?

a. Yes

b. No

26 _____

11. What were your total FTE enrollments for non-credit activities during the 1974-75 academic year using the following formula?

$$\text{Contact hours} \times \text{students} \div 430^* = \text{FTE}$$

*430 is based on 12 (hours equalling one FTE) times 12 (weeks equalling one quarter) times 3 (one academic year) equalling 432, rounded to 430 for one academic year FTE.

$$\text{Contact Hrs.} \times \text{Students} \div 430 = \text{FTE}$$

a.

Institutional CEU			
-------------------	--	--	--

27-31 _____

$$\text{Contact Hrs.} \times \text{Students} \div 430 = \text{FTE}$$

b.

Individual CEU			
----------------	--	--	--

32-39 Blank

40-47 _____

12. When your institution is involved with one or more institutions in a CEU program, is there a decision made in the planning stage of the program as to which institution will record and which institution(s) will report the earned CEU's ?

a. Yes

b. No

48 _____

13. Does your institution use the CEU as part of a funding formula to support non-credit activities?

a. Yes

b. No

49 _____

14. Please attach copies of the following:

- a. Your institutional plan for the CEU
- b. Any CEU related institutional guidelines which you have implemented or have ready for implementation
- c. Any forms used to record, transmit CEU data
- d. Any certificates given to participants to denote awarding of CEU's
- e. Any other CEU related document or form which may be in use at your institution

For Data
Processing
Use Only

15. Please list in decreasing order the five client groups receiving the largest number of individual CEU's from your institution (e.g., nursing, banking).

- a. _____ (highest)
 b. _____
 c. _____
 d. _____
 e. _____

50-55 _____

Opinion

16. Do you feel that the Continuing Education Unit is doing the job for which it was designed?

- a. _____ Yes
 b. _____ No

56-57 _____

Comment:

17. Do you support the concept of the CEU?

- a. _____ Yes
 b. _____ No

58-59 _____

Comment:

18. Who answered questions #16 and #17?

- a. _____ President
- b. _____ Chief academic officer
- c. _____ Administrator for special activities
- d. _____ Other

For Data
Processing
Use Only

60 _____

61 _____

62 _____

63-64 _____

65-----

APPENDIX B
STANDARD NINE STUDY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

STANDARD NINE STUDY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. Edgar J. Boone
Director, Department of Adult
and Continuing Education
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, NC 27607

Dr. William A. Keim
President, Pioneer College
560 Westport Road
Kansas City, MO 64111

Mr. Glen Fleeman
Director of Continuing Education
Forsythe Technical Institute
Winston-Salem, NC 27103

Dr. Jerome Keuper
President
Florida Institute of Technology
Melbourne, FL 32901

Mr. Maurice Inman
Director of University Extension
University of Mississippi
University, MS 38677

Dr. John Rhodes
Vice President for Public
Service and Continuing
Education
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152

Dr. Howard Jordan
Vice Chancellor for Public Service
University System of Georgia
244 Washington Street, S.W.
Atlanta, GA 30334

Dr. James Styles
Vice Chancellor
Tarrant County Junior College
Fort Worth, TX 76102

Dr. Grover J. Andrews
Associate Executive Secretary
Commission on Colleges, SACS
Atlanta, GA 30308

APPENDIX C
SURVEY INSTRUMENT TRANSMITTAL LETTERS



SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

795 Peachtree Street, N.E. • Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Phone 875-8011 Area Code 404

March 31, 1976

TO: Presidents of Member Institutions

The Executive Council of the Commission on Colleges has authorized a follow-up study for Standard Nine, Special Activities (Continuing Education, Extension Activities, Nontraditional Programs, and the Continuing Education Unit). The last review and study of Standard Nine was completed in December, 1971, the collection of data having taken place the previous year. With the highly dynamic and expanding state of the special activities area, there is a need to review the Standard which regulates these programs to insure that it reflects currently good and acceptable practice as it exists among the membership.

To accomplish this task, we are seeking from the member institutions a comprehensive inventory of all activities conducted under Standard Nine. Particular emphasis is being given nontraditional programs and the Continuing Education Unit. This material will be used as base data for a possible revision of the Standard.

Enclosed is the questionnaire. We realize that you may not have at your institution all the types of programs listed and that some of the programs you have may not fit the categorizations we have made. However, we will appreciate the information on any of your operational programs in the special activities category regardless of the school or department in which they may be administratively based.

A copy of this questionnaire has also been mailed to the Dean or Director of Adult, Extension or Continuing Education programs on your campus. This was done to inform that individual of the work we are doing on Standard Nine. You may wish to designate this person to gather the information for your institution.

Recognizing that your time has many demands upon it, we would respectfully ask you to take a few moments to respond personally to Section V, Nontraditional Programs: An Opinion. If you are unable to complete this section, please have your institution's chief academic officer answer the questions. Your thoughts on this major aspect of the study will be most helpful.



Presidents of Member Institutions
Page 2
March 31, 1976

An early return of the questionnaire will be appreciated but, if possible, no later than May 1. This time frame is necessary in order that we may begin compiling and analyzing the data for a report to the Executive Council in June, 1976.

The responses from your institutions will be treated in a confidential manner. There will be no identification of institutions in any release of data. Results of the study will be made available for your information.

Should you have any questions concerning the questionnaire or the study, please call Dr. Grover Andrews or Mr. Edward Simpson at (404) 875-8011.

Sincerely,

Gordon W. Sweet
Executive Secretary
Commission on Colleges

Enclosure



SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

795 Peachtree Street, N.E. • Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Phone 875-8011 Area Code 404

March 31, 1976

TO: Deans and Directors of Adult, Extension and Continuing Education Programs

A questionnaire for the gathering of information on your program of adult, extension or continuing education has been mailed to the President of your institution. These data will be used as a basis for the possible revision of Standard Nine, Special Activities.

It is urgent that the information be returned as soon as possible, but no later than May 1. This time frame is necessary in order that we may begin compiling and analyzing the data for a report to the Executive Council in June, 1976 and for any subsequent reports at the Annual Meeting to the Commission on Colleges and the College Delegate Assembly in December, 1976.

A copy of the questionnaire is enclosed for your use. Only one copy is to be returned from each institution. The official copy from your institution should come from the President and bear his signature.

Any assistance which you can provide will be appreciated. The responses from your institutions will be treated in a confidential manner. There will be no identification of institutions in any release of data. Results of the study will be made available for your information.

Should you have any questions concerning the questionnaire or the study, please call Dr. Grover Andrews or Mr. Edward Simpson at (404) 875-8011.

Sincerely,

Gordon W. Sweet
Executive Secretary
Commission on Colleges

Enclosure

APPENDIX D
FIRST FOLLOW-UP LETTER



SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

795 Peachtree Street, N.E. • Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Phone 875-8011 Area Code 404

On March 31, 1976, two copies of a survey questionnaire dealing with Standard Nine and the Non-Traditional Degree were mailed to your institution. One questionnaire was sent to the institutional presidents, while the second was distributed to all Deans and Directors of continuing education. The requested deadline for the return of the completed questionnaire was May 1, 1976. As this date approached, however, we learned that untimely mail deliveries had created in some instances a four week delay in the arrival of the survey forms.

The majority of the questionnaires have been received, but we would like responses from all members. Therefore, we are requesting a June 4, 1976 return date for this information.

Should you have questions or if you have not received a questionnaire, please call Mr. Edward Simpson here at the Commission on Colleges (404/875-8011) for assistance.

Thank you for your support of this important Commission study.

Sincerely,

Gordon W. Sweet
Executive Secretary
Commission on Colleges

GWS/mk

APPENDIX E
SECOND FOLLOW-UP LETTER

**SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS**

795 Peachtree Street, N.E. • Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Phone 875-8011 Area Code 404

On March 31, 1976 an important questionnaire dealing with Standard Nine: Special Activities was mailed to each member of the Commission on Colleges. Our records do not indicate a response from your institution. I realize there have been many pressures on you and your staff with the ending of the spring session, commencement and related events. Indeed, because of the earlier delays in mail delivery, your questionnaire may have already been returned but, as yet, has not been received by this office. If this is the case, please disregard this letter and we thank you for your effort. Should you have been unable to return the questionnaire by this time, a response from your institution is still desired and will be most helpful to our study.

Even though you may not have "special activities" at your institution, we need an indication of this, as well as a completed Section V, Nontraditional Programs: An Opinion. Your cooperation and assistance in completing this Commission on Colleges project is appreciated.

Should you require further information or have any questions, please call Mr. Edward Simpson (404/875-8011).

Sincerely,

Gordon W. Sweet
Executive Secretary
Commission on Colleges

GWS:mjr

APPENDIX F
NONTRADITIONAL DEGREE PROGRAMS:
AN OPINION SURVEY

An Opinion Survey on Nontraditional Degree Programs Compiled from the Responses of Institutional Presidents, Chief Academic Officers, and Administrators for Special Activities

Question	Response	
	Yes	No
Do you support the concept of the nontraditional degree:	508	114
Do you feel that the nontraditional degree is a logical option within the framework of your institutional mission?	370	245
Do you feel that "most" nontraditional degrees are second-rate when compared to the traditional approach?	240	329
Do you "like" the idea of a nontraditional degree for economic reasons (i.e., it is less expensive for your institution)?	165	403
Do you feel that faculties generally support the concept of the nontraditional degree?	103	487
Do you think that accreditation of nontraditional degrees is a problem for the institution?	344	256
Do you think that accreditation of nontraditional degrees is a problem for the accrediting agency?	303	267
Do you think that the marketability of nontraditional graduates is a problem? This includes their ability to secure jobs and admission to graduate and professional schools.	393	186
Do you think that students generally support the concept of a nontraditional degree?	347	218

Which group in your opinion represents the biggest hurdle to establishing a nontraditional degree within an institution? Please check all that apply and mark your first priority with an asterisk.

110 Students

523 Faculty

256 Central Administration

285 Graduate School Officials

218 Registrars

8 Other

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 1 of 2**

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 2 of 2**

AN ASSESSMENT OF NONTRADITIONAL EDUCATION
AMONG THE COLLEGIATE MEMBERS OF THE
SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

by

Edward Gordon Simpson, Jr.

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study was to identify and describe the nontraditional credit programs offered by the member institutions of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. As a secondary purpose, there was a desire to provide the Commission on Colleges with data to assist the members and staff in assessing the need for possible revision of Standard Nine. The study was accomplished through addressing sixteen specific objectives. Among these objectives was the identification of all institutions within the membership of the Commission on Colleges of SACS which offered a nontraditional degree program. Additionally, the identification of those institutions among the membership which planned implementation of a nontraditional effort by 1977-78 was sought. Characteristics of the nontraditional programs were categorized and included a compilation of admission procedures, advanced placement techniques, documentation of procedures used in the awarding of credit, a description of student services provided, identification of major problems encountered by institutions in the establishment of their nontraditional programs, curriculum and program objectives, student fee structures, program costs, evaluation procedures for faculty and students, instructional methodologies, and an opinion survey related to the acceptability and quality of nontraditional programs.

The population for the study consisted of the 672 members of the Commission on Colleges of SACS. A research instrument was designed to gather data through a mail survey. The instrument consisted of seven computer and color-coded sections designed with assistance from an advisory committee and the staff of the Commission on Colleges.

Slightly less than 98 percent of the Commission's member institutions responded to the questionnaire. From the analysis of data, several major conclusions were drawn. First, there was evidence which suggested that the members of the Commission on Colleges had not engaged in nontraditional study to the extent expected. Second, the trend in nontraditional programs for the Southern Association's Commission on Colleges was at the baccalaureate level. Third, the programs often had numerous traditional characteristics. The institutions offering the nontraditional programs considered them to be nontraditional because of the location or setting of the programs and because of the student types enrolled, rather than because of curriculum or instructional/learning methodologies. Fourth, faculty were thought by administrators to be the greatest hurdle to implementation of a nontraditional program because faculty were felt to view such undertakings as lacking in quality and as a threat to academic standards. Fifth, institutions with a predominantly black student clientele were participating in nontraditional education to a greater extent than were the institutions having a white clientele. Sixth, more private than public institutions were offering nontraditional programs. Seventh, access to nontraditional programs reflected the egalitarian spirit in postsecondary education of the 1960's and 1970's.

Eighth, the issues relating to nontraditional program costs were unclear. Ninth, the use of instructional technology was not widespread. Tenth, the external degree was not the dominant nontraditional format as a majority of the programs had a residency requirement. Eleventh, non-traditional programs were operationalized predominantly through the involvement of regular institutional faculty rather than adjunct instructors. Twelfth, nontraditional program enrollments and graduates were not numerous. Thirteenth, Commission on Colleges institutional administrators strongly endorsed nontraditional programs.

The major implication of the study led to a suggested revision of the Commission on College's current definition of nontraditional degree programs in order that the institutional membership might better understand what is current and accepted practice among its members vis-a-vis nontraditional learning.