

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 027

CE 060 687

AUTHOR Lesko, Silvia Jo  
 TITLE TACSCE Research Annual 1991.  
 INSTITUTION Texas Association for Community Service and Continuing Education.  
 PUB DATE 91  
 NOTE 72p.  
 PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)  
 JOURNAL CIT TACSCE Research Annual; v6 n1 Fall 1991

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.  
 DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; \*Administrator Attitudes; College Administration; \*Continuing Education; Cost Effectiveness; Credit Courses; Deans; Diagnostic Teaching; \*Educational Research; \*Ethics; Higher Education; Institutional Characteristics; Noncredit Courses; Personnel; Profiles; Program Effectiveness; \*Remedial Programs; Salaries; State Surveys; Two Year Colleges; Undergraduate Study

IDENTIFIERS Texas

ABSTRACT

This annual contains the paper that won the 1991 President's Award of the Texas Association for Community Service and Continuing Education (TACSCE) as well as the runner-up paper and other articles. An editorial, "Learning to Crawl" (Silvia Lesko), focuses on the editor's "discovery" of the adult learner. "Ethics and Continuing Education" (Janet Harris), the award winner, describes a survey of Texas deans/directors and provides responses to questions in these general areas: ethics and the institution, ethics in practice, and ethics and the continuing education profession. The instrument and responses are appended. The runner-up paper, "One Institution's Experience with a State-Mandated Testing Remediation Program" (Sam Jes'Son, Michael Mezack) discusses a study of the cost efficiency and effectiveness of the Texas Academic Skills Program. The next paper, "1990 Personnel Profile/Salary Survey and Institutional Profile" (Howard Smith, Derek Skaggs), presents responses of 154 members of the TACSCE and Texas Administrators of Continuing Education of Community/Junior Colleges to questions regarding personnel and salary. Also described are responses of 69 continuing education administrators who are TACSCE members to a survey dealing with institutional characteristics. The final paper, "Do Credit and Non-Credit Courses Compete?" (Fred Voda, Silvia Lesko), reports similarities and differences between responses obtained from survey participants at Tarrant County Junior College and the University of Texas at Arlington. (YLB)

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
 \* from the original document. \*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

## **FOREWORD AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

**Howard W. Smith, Jr.**  
**Chair, Research Committee**

**Professor and Director**  
**Office of Policy Studies in Higher Education**  
**The University of North Texas**

The Research Annual represents the continued interest and support of TACSCE for professionals in community service and continuing education to be both active producers and consumers of research. Volume 6 maintains that tradition.

It is especially gratifying that the recipient of this year's President's Award has a distinguished record of service to TACSCE. In winning the President's Award, Janet Harris has now achieved another recognition of her commitment to her chosen profession. The runner-up paper is co-authored by another person, Michael Mezack III, who also has a long history of distinguished service to TACSCE. Both of these winners and the TACSCE membership should feel special pride in their accomplishments.

Special thanks to Silvia Lesko for her service as editor of the Research Annual, and to Fred Voda for serving as chair of the President's Award committee. Appreciation is also expressed to Mark Wasicoke of Texas Wesleyan University, Don Hale of Angelo State University, and Norman Stewart of Tarrant County Junior College for serving as the panel of judges for this year's competition.

Although the Research Committee is very proud of this year's edition, we want to again take the opportunity to encourage every member of TACSCE to participate in the President's Award competition. The real success of the competition and the Research Annual are only reflections of the interest and commitment of you, the TACSCE members.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword and Acknowledgements .....	i
Editorial: LEARNING TO CRAWL .....	ii
ETHICS AND CONTINUING EDUCATION: A SURVEY OF TEXAS DEANS/DIRECTORS .....	3
ONE INSTITUTION'S EXPERIENCE WITH A STATE-MANDATED TESTING REMEDIATION PROGRAM: A COST ANALYSIS .....	39
1990 PERSONNEL PROFILE/SALARY SURVEY AND INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE .....	57
DO CREDIT AND NON-CREDIT COURSES COMPETE? .....	66
THE 1990-91 TACSCE RESEARCH COMMITTEE .....	68

Editorial assistance for the 1991 TACSCE Research Annual was provided by Kim Florea and Alicia Lalmon, The University of Texas at Arlington.

## LEARNING TO CRAWL

Silvia Jo Lesko  
Editor, 1991 TACSCE Research Annual

Director of Conferences & Institutes  
The University of Texas at Arlington

I reached the "milestone" birthday this year...the one that I had somehow, long ago, decided would be the birthday where I would take stock. And part of that taking stock involved evaluating my professional life and the decisions I had made along the way that led me to the place I am today. As part of this procedure, I reviewed the 1989 and 1990 issues of this publication, and found myself amused in a major way by the editorial I wrote for the 1989 edition. Contrasting what I believed then, versus what I believe now, was one of the most beneficial exercises I put myself through. It is these new thoughts I would like to share with you in this 1991 Research Annual.

The point of the 1989 editorial, titled "The Challenge of It All," was that continuing education was a marvelous profession and an exciting career to pursue because of its variety...because it refused to be classified by one tidy definition...because it called upon administrators to use a multitude of different talents...because it put us on the forefront of trends. Naively I proclaimed that "I do it (work as a continuing education administrator), like most of my peers, for the challenge of it all."

And in 1989 that is exactly why I was a continuing educator, but that I thought I could speak for "my peers" was an idea that was as ludicrous as it was bold. It was as though an infant, who had just learned to turn over, was suggesting that all humans found turning over the most exciting and incredible experience on earth. Maybe some of you are in continuing education for the challenge of it all. Maybe many of you are most excited by the variety and the chance to explore your entrepreneurial side. But in the past two years, I've found something new to excite me about our profession, something that may have been your main impetus all along. Yes, I've gone past turning over and I'm learning to crawl. I've discovered the adult learner.

This is not to say that I was not aware of the adult learner before. I knew that our profession would not exist at all without this individual. I had done my homework, read the research. From Patricia Cross, I discovered who participates in adult learning and why (K. Patricia Cross, Adults as Learners, Jossey-Bass, 1981). From Raymond Wlodkowski, I learned strategies and techniques that could improve the learning experience for adults (Raymond J. Wlodkowski, Enhancing Adult Motivation to Learn, Jossey-Bass, 1985). David Kolb presented me with some ideas on learning styles that I have used to my advantage when training employees and in understanding certain office dynamics (David A. Kolb, Experiential Learning, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1984). And Peter Jarvis challenged me to consider adult learning within the social context each individual

brings to the classroom/learning experience (Peter Jarvis, Adult Learning in the Social Context, Croom Helm, 1987). Oh, I had encountered the adult learner, all right, but always between the pages of a book, never in the context of the classroom.

That changed for me in the spring of 1990. I won't go into the various circumstances that led to my entering the classroom as an instructor, rather than a student, but suddenly, one evening, there I was with a room full of adult learners. It was time to put all the theories I'd studied into practice. It was time to get a different perspective on adult education.

And what a glorious experience it has been. I am totally in awe of the people I have taught, the adults who have come and taken my classes. They have taught me so much more than I could ever teach them. They have taught me patience, for many of them have been working for years to add to their knowledge-base, taking one course here, another course there--entering the classroom whenever their hectic lives would allow.

They have taught me how totally blessed I have been. I was raised in an environment where learning was valued, and I've worked in a similar environment all of my life. Many of my students have had to overcome the jealousy and suspicion of their families and friends--people who thought that "book-learning" would make them "uppity." And yet, even with these objections from those near and dear to them, they have come to class and pushed themselves to the limit.

I've experienced the joy that comes when a student masters a concept or a skill--the great moment of "aha" that lights up someone's eyes--and their day. I've seen first hand the great moment when the adult learner scans through his or her experience-base looking for a match to the idea or theory that has just been presented, and the excitement that follows when a match is made. I've seen lives changed, I've seen ideologies challenged--I've seen adult learning as it happens. And it's the most incredibly exciting phenomenon I've ever witnessed.

So today, when someone asks me why I'm in the field of adult education, I have a new answer for them. Although I still believe that continuing education administration is one of the most dynamic and exciting professions on the planet, I'm no longer in it for the challenge of it all. I'm in it because I've fallen in love with the adult learner--not as a concept to be studied and researched--but as a living breathing individual who has given me more than I could ever return. Perhaps, in another two or three years, I'll discover another more exciting reason for enjoying my profession--and I'll learn to walk. But for now, I'm going to enjoy all the wonderful things that keep coming my way as I'm learning to crawl.

**ETHICS AND CONTINUING EDUCATION:  
A Survey of Texas Deans/Directors**

**Janet Harris  
Director, Continuing Education  
The University of Texas at Dallas  
Richardson, Texas**

**Abstract**

**The same areas of continuing education operations that create the flexibility which allows prompt response to community educational needs also produce ethical uncertainties. This survey of Texas Deans/Directors of Continuing Education elicits responses in four categories: ethics and the institution, ethics in practice, ethics and the continuing education profession, and subjects for further study. A summary of the responses indicates that Texas Deans/Directors view ethics as a crucial topic, one on which they would like institutional statements more clearly related to continuing education. They support a professional code of ethics but are uncertain how such a code can be specific enough to be useful and yet broad enough to respond to the diversity of continuing education operations. Deans/Directors believe that further consideration of issues related to programming, marketing, pricing, instructor selection, administration, and evaluation will be beneficial in illustrating how ethics influence practice.**

## **ETHICS AND CONTINUING EDUCATION: A SURVEY OF TEXAS DEANS/DIRECTORS**

### **Ethics In Practice**

**Donna S. Queeney, Editor of the Journal of Continuing Higher Education, describes the unique position of continuing education within institutions:**

**Continuing education is something of an anomaly. We are nonacademic units situated within academic institutions; entrepreneurs...located in nonprofit organizations. Many of our most successful practitioners are educators without formal preparation in the field. We are not as academically oriented as our faculty counterparts, but we are more academic than many of our colleagues working in other auxiliary enterprises. We are educators in a sense that housing and food service personnel, for example, are not (1989, p.114).**

**This ambiguity about continuing education permits the flexibility necessary to respond to educational needs of the community, but also creates special challenges in ethical conduct.**

**The term "ethics" often suggests issues like physician-assisted suicide, genetic engineering, organ transplants, and animal testing of consumer products. Although consideration of these topics is vital to a moral society, in reality, ethics operate most often at the micro level, when quick decisions on day-to-day procedures must be made without time for contemplation or reflection. For a continuing education department, therefore, professional ethics reside in the instinctive response to numerous situations, not only by the Dean/Director, but also by every individual representing the organization. As Ralph Brockett indicates, developing an ethical moral sense in continuing education means that "ethics must lie at the heart, not the periphery of what we do" (1988, p.14).**

**One consequence of the "action-oriented nature" of continuing education is "unreflective choice: decisions are made on the basis of tradition, organizational press, or other factors, rather than on a consistent, defensible philosophical position" (Sork, 1988, p.37). Brockett summarizes the process of ethical decision making in practice: recognizing a personal value system; acknowledging that responsibilities of an adult educator extend "simultaneously in several, often conflicting directions"; and understanding ways in which values are "operationalized" (1988,pp.9-10). The task of continuing educators is to apply this decision-making process to the ethical micro-challenges that occur on a daily basis.**

**To provide leadership for establishing a climate for ethical action, Stephen Kerr offers the Ten Commandments of Executive Integrity:**

- 1. Tell the truth.**
- 2. Obey the law.**

3. Reduce ambiguity.
4. Show concern for others.
5. Accept responsibility for the growth and nurturing of subordinates.
6. Practice participation, not paternalism.
7. Provide freedom from corrupting influences.
8. Always act.
9. Provide consistency across cases.
10. Provide consistency between values and actions. (1988, pp.126-27)

Although Kerr's commandments are clearly applicable to the operation of a continuing education department or center, a reorganization of these same guidelines reveals conflicts and, in some cases, direct contradictions between the items listed. As Tom Peters concludes, "Anyone who is not very confused all the time about ethical issues is out of touch with the frightful (and joyous) riches of the world. But at least being actively confused means that we are actively considering our ethical stance and that of the institutions we associate with. That's a good start" (1989, p.26). This survey of the attitudes of Texas Deans/Directors is a "start" on generating dialogue and further investigation about ethics in practice in continuing education.

### **Impetus for Survey**

This study resulted from interest sparked by the 1990 Association for Continuing Higher Education national conference held in Miami, Florida, on the theme of "Ethical and Quality Issues in Continuing Higher Education." The author of this report and Dr. Veva Vonler, Associate Dean of the Graduate School and Director of Continuing Education at Texas Woman's University, presented a discussion on "Ethics and the Bottom Line: Issues for Self-Supporting Continuing Education Centers." Much of the presentation focused on scenarios related to programming, marketing, administering, and evaluating continuing education, with special emphasis on generating income. While preparing for the ACHE session, the presenters discovered that articulating a philosophy of ethics suitable to an action-oriented continuing education center is possible, but difficult. A much easier approach concentrates on ethics in practice--on specific situations, and a discussion of ethical issues raised and decisions made.

Although the scenario approach solved the problem of the ACHE presentation format, it raised other questions which intrigued the presenters. Do other Dean/Directors have more clearly articulated ethical philosophies that serve as the basis for their operations? Do these philosophies translate into fixed standards, or is ethical conduct based on situation-by-situation decisions? What areas of operation generate the greatest number of ethical uncertainties? Do Deans/Directors support a formal code of ethics for continuing education? Would the topic of ethics generate the interest among Texas Dean/Directors that it had at the national conference?

## **Survey Process**

The instrument devised to generate responses from Deans/Directors focused on four general areas: ethics and the institution, ethics in practice in continuing education, ethics and the continuing education profession, and topics which warrant further research or discussion. As the sample survey form in the appendix shows, questions solicited both direct "yes" or "no" responses as well as comments and explanations. This format allowed for clarification and elucidation by respondents even though the survey contained only fourteen basic questions. The working definition of ethics used in the survey was a "set of beliefs that serve as guides to action."

From a list of Texas education institutions supplied by the Texas Coordinating Board, 108 Deans/Directors received the survey. Project staff contacted schools to be certain that an active continuing education operation existed and to determine the appropriate individual to survey. Only one individual per institution completed the questionnaire. Multi-campus institutions received a survey for each major campus with a continuing education department. To verify the data and indicate the number of years of continuing education experience of the individual completing the survey, each Dean/Director signed the completed form. All data is reported without reference to the specific institution or individual who completed the survey. Because of unique factors in the operating environments of public and private, two- and four-year institutions, responses are organized in these categories.

## **Survey Responses**

### Profile Information

Of 108 surveys distributed, 52 Deans/Directors or 48% returned the questionnaires. Respondents included 28(54%) from two-year schools, 14(27%) from four-year public, 9(17%) from four-year private, and 1(2%) from an upper-level institution. Years of experience in Dean/Director positions ranged from a high of 21 years to a low of 3 weeks.

### Ethics and the Institution

Responses reveal that 58% of the Deans/Directors believe their institutions do not have a clear statement of ethical guidelines; 42% indicated that clear guidelines exist. Although 52 responded to this question, only 35 answered the question about whether these guidelines were adequate for continuing education operations. Of these respondents, 49% said "yes" and 51% said "no." The split was evident in responses from both two-year and four-year institutions. Less than one-third of the Deans/Directors report that their personal ethics conflict with their institutions' ethics in practice. Four-year public institutions show the greatest split on the issue, with 5 responding "yes" and 8 "no." Four-year public institutions reveal the greatest solidarity with all 9 responses "no."

## Ethics in Practice

To the question of whether ethics in practice should be determined by a set of standards applied consistently regardless of the situation, of 48 who completed the question, 28(58%) said "no" and 20(42%) "yes." To the question of whether ethics should be determined by each situation or context or the practice, of 45 responding 34 (76%) said "yes" and 11(24%) "no." Respondents (88%) overwhelmingly indicated that ethics were not a "problem" at their institutions, and 40(80%) of 50 respondents indicated that ethical principles are taken for granted based on institutional policy or longstanding practice.

When asked to list the areas that generate the most ethical uncertainties, Deans/Directors cited programming (14 responses), pricing (11), faculty selection (7), marketing (7), administration (7), and evaluation (4). "Other" areas included tampering with enrollment limits, determining salaries, self-serving actions of faculty, licensing/certification, co-sponsorships, and admission of credit seeking non-degree students. Specific examples described by respondents appear in the appendix.

To focus on the basis of ethical operation, respondents identified the "most important ethical principle" on which their continuing education centers operate. Responses can be summarized in five principles: treating students with dignity, decency, and courtesy; consistency in implementing policies; social responsibility to provide access; educational quality for a fair price; and delivery of what is promised. Over 86% stated that these principles are clearly articulated to the continuing education staff; 71% felt the standards are clearly explained to instructors; and 82% believe that the administration receives clear statements of these principles. More than 81% responded that ethics do not differ substantially between credit and noncredit programs.

When asked whether their "ethics in practice" have changed during the time they have held positions as Dean/Director, 78% responded "no." Of the 11 who said "yes," 9 have an average of 9.5 years of experience with a range from 7 to 17. Those who indicated a change noted shifts to focus more on quality, consumer-oriented education, expectations of higher performance and accountability, less rigidity in applying standards, more emphasis on standards, income more than quality, and values rather than "rules."

## Ethics and the Continuing Education Profession

Respondents indicated that 30 of 50 are familiar with the Principles of Good Practice developed by the Council on the Continuing Education Unit. Only 22 of 38 said that they operate using these guidelines. When asked if they supported development of a formal code of ethics for continuing education, 36 of 48 replied "yes" and 12 "no." Explanations included linking a code to professionalism, consistency, and the basic nature of an educational setting. Concerns involved too great a diversity in operations, a divergence from the code already in place at each institution, and a diminishing of the flexibility of continuing education.

## **Comments**

Deans/Directors cited a need for further dialogue and/or research in the areas of finance, programming, and equity; marketing; guidance for instructor selection; CEU misuse; staffing; and an individual's personal views in relation to continuing education.

## **Conclusions and Implications for Further Study**

Responses to the survey support the following conclusions:

1. Deans/Directors in Texas indicate a strong interest in ethics. The number of responses from schools, and the diversity of the attitudes revealed and the comments made suggest the subject is at the "heart, not the periphery" of continuing education practice in Texas.
2. More than half of the institutions responding do not have a statement of ethics that, in the opinion of the chief operating officer of continuing education, fits the needs of continuing education.
3. The Deans/Directors support the consistent application of ethical standards but recognize that the unique nature of continuing education requires ethical decisions based on a situation-by-situation basis.
4. The same areas of operation which give continuing education flexibility--programming, marketing, pricing, instructor selection, administration, and evaluation--also generate the greatest ethical uncertainties.
5. Deans/Directors support a code of ethics or some standard statement of ethical principles to help guide operations but are uncertain how a code can be specific enough to be useful and yet broad enough to respond to the diversity of continuing education operations.

This survey reflects the continuation of dialogue begun at the national level and permeating continuing education across the nation. Although it constitutes only a beginning in assessing attitudes and proposing action, responses indicate that the topic warrants more study. A follow-up questionnaire supported by interviews of respondents in this survey of Texas Deans/Directors would be one productive step. In-depth studies of ethical issues related to programming, marketing, pricing, instructor selection, administration, and evaluation would further clarify how ethics influence practice. Sessions on ethics at the annual conference of the Texas Association for Community Service and Continuing Education and the Texas Administrators of Continuing Education will expand the dialogue. Conducting this survey in other states and in regions of the Association of Continuing Higher Education will produce data on whether the attitudes of

**Texas Deans/Directors are indicative of those in other geographical areas. In Megatrends 2000, John Naisbett predicts that ethical considerations in biotechnology and other areas will be "played out on a larger field--a new concern for ethics in general"(1990,p.266). As with many other innovations in education, continuing education should lead the way into the next century. Further research on ethics will be a "start."**

## References

- Brockett, Ralph G. (1988). Ethics and the adult educator. Ethical Issues in Adult Education. New York: Teacher College Press.
- Kerr, Stephen. (1988). Executive Integrity: The Search for Higher Human Values in Organizational Life. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Naisbett, John. (1990). Megatrends 2000. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.
- Peters, Tom. (1989, September 18). Ethical considerations should be an everyday part of business. Dallas Business Journal, 26.
- Queeney, Donna S. (1989, Spring/Summer). The role of writing in continuing higher education. Continuing Higher Education Review, 53, 113-117.
- Sork, Thomas J.(1988). Ethical issues in program planning. In Ralph Brockett (Ed.) Ethical Issues in Adult Education (pp.34-50). New York: Teachers College Press.

**APPENDIX**

# ETHICS AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

## Questionnaire

\*Profile Information

Name of Respondent	Title
Institution	Years of Dean/Director Experience
Two Year _____ Four year _____ Public _____ Private _____ Other _____	
Responsibility for _____ credit _____ noncredit programs	
Total 1989-1990 programs _____ credit _____ noncredit programs	
Total 1989-1990 enrollment _____ credit _____ noncredit	

**WORKING DEFINITION OF ETHICS:** Set of beliefs that serves as a guide to action

### Ethics and Your Institution

Does your institution have a clear statement of ethical guidelines? \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No Does your institution's statement provide adequate guidance for ethical practices in Continuing Education? \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

Do you experience conflicts between the interpretation of "ethical practices" by your administration and the way you guide operations in Continuing Education? \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

Do you experience conflicts between the way ethics operates *in practice* at your institution and your *personal* code of ethics? \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

### Ethics In Practice

Should "ethics in practice" be determined by a set of standards applied consistently regardless of the situation? \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No By each situation or context of the practice? \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

Are ethical issues a major problem in your operation? \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No Are ethical principles taken for granted based on institutional policy or longstanding practice? \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

\* All responses will be reported without reference to individual completing the questionnaire or the institution.

What area of your operation generates the most ethical uncertainties?  Programming  
 Faculty Selection  Marketing  Pricing  Administration  Evaluation  
 Other (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

Describe briefly one example from the area indicated above. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

What is the most important ethical principle on which your department/center operates? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Are the ethical standards on which you want your Continuing Education programs to operate clearly articulated to your staff?  Yes  No To your instructors who conduct your classes?  
 Yes  No To your administration?  Yes  No

Are there major differences in ethical issues of practice between credit and noncredit programming?  
 Yes  No If you answer "yes," please identify one. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Have your "ethics in practice" changed during the time you have been Dean/Director?  Yes  
 No If you answer "yes," briefly indicate how. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

### Ethics and the Continuing Education Profession

Are you familiar with the *Principles of Good Practice* developed by the Council on the Continuing Education Unit?  Yes  No

Do you base the guidelines upon which your Continuing Education department/center operates on the *Principles*?  Yes  No

Do you support the development of a formal "code of ethics" for Continuing Education?  Yes  
 No Briefly explain. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

### Comments

Please indicate what specific operational areas or specific ethical issues you would like to discuss with your colleagues and/or would suggest for further research. Please add any other comments about ethics and continuing education. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## SURVEY RESULTS

### Profile Information

#### Respondents

	Surveyed	Responded
Two Year	57	28
Four Year Public	31	14
Four Year Private	19	9
Other	1	1

#### Years of Dean/Director Experience

	High	Low	Average
Two Year	21	8 months	8.21
Four Year Public	17	3	8.73
Four Year Private	10	3 weeks	4.15
Other	12	12	12

### Ethics and Your Institution

Does your institution have a clear statement of ethical guidelines?

	Yes	No
Two Year	11	17
Four Year Public	5	9
Four Year Private	6	3
Other	0	1

Does your institution's statement provide adequate guidance for ethical practices in Continuing Education?

	Yes	No
Two Year	7	10
Four Year Public	7	4
Four Year Private	4	3
Other	0	0

Do you experience conflicts between the interpretation of "ethical practices" by your administration and the way you guide operations in Continuing Education?

	Yes	No
Two Year	6	20
Four Year Public	6	8
Four Year Private	0	9
Other	0	1

Do you experience conflicts between the way ethics operate in practice at your institution and your personal code of ethics?

	Yes	No
Two Year	6	21
Four Year Public	5	8
Four Year Private	0	9
Other	1	0

## Ethics In Practice

Should "ethics in practice" be determined by a set of standards applied consistently regardless of the situation?

	Yes	No
Two Year	11	15
Four Year Public	6	8
Four Year Private	2	5
Other	1	0

By each situation or context of the practice?

	Yes	No
Two Year	18	8
Four Year Public	10	2
Four Year Private	6	1
Other	0	0

Are ethical issues a major problem in your operation?

	Yes	No
Two Year	5	23
Four Year Public	0	14
Four Year Private	1	7
Other	0	1

Are ethical principles taken for granted based on institutional policy or longstanding practice?

	Yes	No
Two Year	20	5
Four Year Public	11	3
Four Year Private	6	2
Other	1	0

What area of your operation generates the most ethical uncertainties?

	Programming	Faculty Selection	Marketing
Two Year	8	5	4
Four Year Public	5	0	1
Four Year Private	1	2	2
Other	0	0	0

	Pricing	Administration	Evaluation
Two Year	7	6	1
Four Year Public	3	1	2
Four Year Private	1	0	1
Other	0	0	0

Other (Please Specify)

Two Year

Faculty-student interactions, appeals process

Tampering with the max enrollment limits on certain classes

Salary

Request from certain students whose requests violate legal and ethical practices

**Four Year Public**

**Faculty in classroom (self-serving)**

**Responding to requests for granting CEU's for outside programs**

**Licensing/Certification**

**Joint sponsorship of non-credit programs**

**Four Year Private**

**Admission of credit-seeking non-degree students**

**Describe briefly one example from the area indicated above.**

**Two Year**

**Courses are priced at what the market will bear generally Therefore, classes range in price from \$1.50 per hour to \$5 per hour--and this does not imply that the education in the \$5/hr course is better than that in the \$1.50/hr course.**

**Inflating CE enrollments by "riding" existing programs in the community for headcount only**

**Refunds-changing rules on people-2**

**Faculty selection - friend of someone; give them one course to try out their skills; students may suffer-4**

**Qualified faculty available, but lack the credentials required by state regulation**

**Meeting the expectations of standards created by course description and promotional efforts**

**CE has too often become a "profit center"**

**Having various accounts/grants. Using another internal account to pay for program because a federal account does not allow that purchase**

**Not sharing information on RFPI with sister institutions because one campus wants to be greedy**

**If a faculty member wants to make life difficult for a student, the student is at a distinct disadvantage**

**Concern arises over pricing special/contract offerings**

**Infringement in the program area of another college in the system**

**Classes taught by "specialists" who have a tendency to recruit clients**

**Some programs are planned in conflict with others that are similar**

**Pressure from certain groups or administrators to give CEU's when it is not appropriate**

**Registration/fee collection/book-sales at off-campus sites**

**Consistent pricing strategies, fulfilling all promises made in advertisements**

**Foreign students wanting to legalize status through CE enrollment**

**Request for certificates for insufficient hours of attendance**

### Four Year Public

No formal follow-up after courses to evaluate effectiveness

Have offered courses that the community finds objectionable and have tried to cancel

Responding to requests that may or may not be suitable for a state supported institution

"Too much - too little" for work/effort involved

Fairness

Should we do "Winning at Blackjack" - we've been approached to do so, but declined

A psychiatric hospital wants us to grant CEU's for their programs, but are our CEU's going to be helpful to the participants who may need a specific professional agency's approval? Will they know the difference before paying?

Providing services to organizations and groups that wish to bypass principles of sound practice

Differentiate pricing for different audiences of the same programs

### Four Year Private

We have to be ethical in our selection of faculty so that we will reflect the mission of the university, and still we must adhere to policies and practices that will not discriminate

We have qualified faculty, but they don't have the credentials required by accrediting agencies

Programs good for university image versus programs good for the public

On occasion we are asked to admit a student based on factors unrelated to academic history, abilities, or potential

Failure of instructor to hand out evaluation forms

Effectively pricing courses to attract participants and also provide income for the program and instructor salaries

What is the most important ethical principle on which your department/center operates?

### Two Year

Treat people with dignity, decency and courtesy-5

Addressing legitimate needs with high quality and integrity at a fair price

Honesty in all operations-7

Consistency of delivery of quality instruction as promised

It is fair and beneficial to all concerned

Meet the needs of our students

Respect for each individual

Service and cost formulas and quality-2

Openness about decisions

To provide quality education offerings backed by a sound educational foundation  
 Respect for individuals and belief in institution's mission  
 That education is a right, not a privilege, and we have a social responsibility to  
 make it accessible

**Four Year Public**

Equal treatment of all customers; present only educational programs  
 Honesty, fairness and dedication to our students-6  
 To deliver what is promised  
 If it's not right, don't do it  
 Educational value for a reasonable price

**Four Year Private**

Deliver what we promise  
 Honesty, justice-3  
 Fairness to students-2  
 The Christian faith as it relates to education-2

**Other**

Consistency

Are the ethical standards on which you want your Continuing Education programs to  
 operate clearly articulated to your staff?

	Yes	No
Two Year	24	3
Four Year Public	12	2
Four Year Private	6	2
Other	1	0

To your instructors who conduct your classes?

	Yes	No
Two Year	21	7
Four Year Public	9	5
Four Year Private	5	3
Other	1	0

**To your administration?**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Two Year</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Four Year Public</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Four Year Private</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Other</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>

**Are there major differences in ethical issues of practice between credit and noncredit programming?**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Two Year</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Four Year Public</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Four Year Private</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Other</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

**If you answered "yes," please identify one.**

**Two Year**

**Credit and CE said to be the same in value, but in practice credit is valued more**

**Four Year Public**

**Set curriculum versus flexibility to change creates some problems**

**Other**

**Administration development and financial support of new programs which compete with long standing CE programs**

Have your "ethics in practice" changed during the time you have been selected Dean/Director?

	Yes	No
Two Year	7	20
Four Year Public	2	12
Four Year Private	2	7
Other	0	1

If you answered "yes," briefly indicate how.

Two Year

Have come to focus more on quality product  
 Standards are more consumer-oriented and will challenge unethical practices  
 Due to the accountability issue through all our institutions, I have found myself expecting higher performance from myself and others  
 More flexible and less rigid in applying standards  
 We strive for fairness and have become more standard in most areas of operation  
 I am inclined to focus more on how much money we bring in than on program quality, and this bothers me.

Four Year Public

From a set of fixed standards to some flexibility  
 More flexible, less tied to "rules" more attached to values

Four Year Private

Former dean was fired for "ethical misconduct" which led to many changes

## **Ethics and the Continuing Education Profession**

Are you familiar with the Principles of Good Practice developed by the Council on the Continuing Education Unit?

	Yes	No
Two Year	13	14
Four Year Public	11	3
Four Year Private	6	2
Other	0	1

Do you base the guidelines upon which your Continuing Education department/center operates on the Principles?

	Yes	No
Two Year	10	9
Four Year Public	8	5
Four Year Private	4	2
Other	0	0

**Do you support the development of a formal "code of ethics" for Continuing Education?**

	Yes	No
Two Year	20	6
Four Year Public	8	5
Four Year Private	7	1
Other	1	0

**Briefly explain.**

**Two Year**

A general code of ethics is good for any profession. It is appropriate for professions to attempt to "police themselves"

Reflects well on us as professionals

Each institution should be responsible for its own code of ethics-2

A code of ethics is inherent to an education setting

Basic standardization will elevate the profession

Why should this "code" differ from that subscribed to by the general institution

Situations differ drastically between 2 and 4 year institutions and between the services, location, demographics of 2 year institutions

**Four Year Public**

We are too much a part of our parent institutions to have the freedom to conduct our operations with a different code

Each university-community is too different for formal code

TAMU ethics

Not really important as they would have to be so broad as to be almost meaningless

Financial pressures can force people in CE to do questionable things

NUCEA is working on principles of good/sound practices

I think any code that would apply to all the diverse areas of CE would have to be too general to be really useful-2

**Four Year Private**

Anything that would be a helpful source of ideas would be welcome

Because of the open nature of CE, a code of ethics is critical

Shouldn't the institution be responsible for establishing a code of ethics?

**Other**

**Encourage consistent behavior between institutions**

**Comments**

**Please indicate what specific operational areas or specific ethical issues you would like to discuss with your colleagues and/or would suggest for further research. Please add any other comments about ethics and continuing education.**

**Two Year**

**I believe finance, programming, and equity issues are often at cross purposes.**

**Striking a balance that enables quality programming, access for all, and financial success is a major challenge, particularly in a rural area.**

**Ethics statements generally are recognized as the coming of age within an organization. It is a professional and philosophical statement.**

**Ethics or a way of doing business rather than a set of propositions, i.e., "Ethics is something you do"**

**Marketing in CE within a "code of ethics"**

**A past president indicated whom we could use as CE instructors based on his personal likes or dislikes with no legitimate reason for not hiring. Often his biases were harmful to the college and CE.**

**Four Year Public**

**Responsibility of CE professionals in reporting CEU misuse; dealing with others on campus who have other views of what is ethical. Can we develop a "code of ethics" that allows for the vast differences in CE and still mean something?**

**There are staff issues that might also be considered**

**Marketing, programming, instructor selection**

**Four Year Private**

**Relationship between a person's world view, paradigm, and ethical beliefs ought to be explored**

## **Institutions Responding**

**Angelo State University  
Austin College  
Austin Community College  
Baylor University  
Brazosport College  
Brookhaven College  
Cedar Valley College  
College of the Mainland  
Collin County Community College  
Dallas Baptist University  
East Texas State University  
El Centro College  
Galveston College  
Houston Baptist University  
Incarnate Word College  
Kilgore College Longview Center  
Lamar University at Orange  
Lamar University at Beaumont  
LeTourneau University  
Midland College  
Midwestern State University  
Navarro College  
North Harris County College - East Campus  
North Harris County College - South Campus  
Northeast Texas Community College  
Panola College  
Richland College  
San Antonio College  
San Jacinto College - Central  
South Plains College - Levelland  
Southern Methodist University  
St. Phillip's College  
Stephen F. Austin State University  
Tarleton State University  
Tarrant County Junior College  
Tarrant County Junior College Northwest  
Texarkana College  
Texas Christian University  
Texas Engineering Extension Service Texas A & M  
Texas Tech  
Texas Woman's University  
Tyler Junior College**

**University of Houston**  
**University of Houston - Clear Lake**  
**University of Houston at Victoria**  
**University of Texas Arlington**  
**University of Texas at Dallas**  
**University of Texas at El Paso**  
**University of Texas at Tyler**  
**Vernon Regional Junior College**  
**Wayland Baptist University**  
**West Texas State University**

# **ONE INSTITUTION'S EXPERIENCE WITH A STATE-MANDATED TESTING REMEDIATION PROGRAM: A COST ANALYSIS**

**Sam Jas'Son and Michael Mezack III  
Texas Tech University  
Lubbock, Texas**

## **introduction**

Since there is growing evidence throughout Texas and the rest of the nation that large numbers of college students and college graduates lack academic skills in reading, writing, and mathematics, the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP) was developed as an instructional program to ensure that all students attending public institutions of higher learning in Texas have the academic skills to perform effectively in college-level course work. The major impetus for the development of the TASP has been A Generation of Failure: The Case for Testing and Remediation in Texas Higher Education, a report published by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) (Committee on Testing, 1986). In the spring of 1987, the Texas Legislature passed House Bill 2182 (HB 2182), which mandated the development of the TASP Test. "According to a recent nationwide study, the average high school graduate today graduates with better than a B average and yet reads below the eighth grade level" (Hartley, 1987). The Committee on Testing (1986) and the Texas Tech University Planning Commission (1986) also stated that approximately one-third of entering students at Texas colleges and universities cannot pass a basic skills test.

The California State Postsecondary Education Commission (1983) furnished an overview of remediation in higher education and reported that there are differences of opinions but "one fact is clear: an alarming number of students entering colleges and universities today lack adequate skills in reading, writing, and mathematics."

Despite many critics of the TASP who suggested that colleges and universities should not be in the remedial business, the Southern Regional Educational Board (1985) viewed remediation as critical to improving quality of undergraduate education while maintaining access. Similar views have been stated by the New Jersey Basic Skills Council (1988). The Committee on Testing (1986) examined the growing problem of basic skills deficiencies and the potential solutions, and indicated there is a national problem of remediation.

The experience of both the states of New Jersey (1988) and Florida (Schinoff, 1988) makes it clear that testing and remediation must go hand in hand. There is no point in identifying problems unless there is a willingness to do something about them. The Committee on Testing (1986) was concerned with the critical question of the effect of the TASP on different ethnic and minority groups (p. 36) and planned specifically for the TASP Test to improve minority success.

The TASP has five components: (1) diagnostic testing, (2) advisement, (3) placement, (4) remediation, and (5) program evaluation. With this program, students who are under-prepared in reading, mathematics, and/or writing will be identified. If testing indicates a need for building certain skills in any or all of the skill areas, students are required to enroll in and continue remediation programs until all three parts are passed. The TASP Test must be passed before a student is awarded an associate degree or is allowed to take junior or senior level courses.

House Bill 2181 requires that all students entering institutions of higher education in Texas in the fall of 1989 or later take the TASP Test and that each institution must have remediation activities for students not passing the test. HB 2182 directs the state of Texas to fund approved non-degree credit remedial courses. Additionally, the State Board of Education was to develop formulas to augment institutional funding of other remedial academic programs. The bill called for additional funding required under such formulas to be met by state appropriation for fiscal years 1990-1991 and thereafter.

The purpose of the TASP is to enrich the quality of higher education for Texas students. Further, to enable those students to benefit more fully from their college courses, remedial activities will be offered to improve their basic skills and reduce the dropout percentage.

The TASP Test was developed under the guidance of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) and the Texas Education Agency (TEA). National Evaluations Systems, Inc. (NES) of Amherst, Massachusetts was selected to develop and administer the TASP Test. The TASP Test aims to provide a comparison of the skill levels of an individual student with the skill levels students should have to perform effectively in an undergraduate degree program.

In view of the significant costs involved in the development and administration of the TASP to the state, the institutions, and the individual students, it was important to ascertain the costs of this program. Further, at a time when state funding is limited, cost analysis should be even more significant and useful. Moreover, in view of the uniqueness of this program (the TASP examination has been available only since the spring of 1989), studies of this nature should prove useful to the administrators, policy makers, and other interested groups, including parents and students who may be involved in improving the TASP in the future.

The basic objective is to conduct a study that will show the elements of cost of the TASP statewide and at Texas Tech University. The study examines the cost elements, possible benefits, and makes recommendations to administrators, policy makers, and interested groups.

The following are the specific objectives:

- (1) To establish a list of first-year costs. The main entities incurring costs are the institution, the students, and the state of Texas. Analysis of the first-year cost figures for each of these three entities is provided.
- (2) To identify possible benefits to the institution, such as retention, student achievement (grade point average--GPA), and long-range revenue increment.
- (3) To determine possible benefits to the students in terms of their achievement (GPA) and persistence (or retention).
- (4) To develop a list of recommendations that can be used by TASP administrators, policy makers, and other interested groups.

Although many questions are of interest, in a study so early in the history of the program, it is necessary to limit the number of variables. The problem, purpose, and variables were chosen because they should indicate if further study is needed and, if so, in what direction. Since this study is confined to one campus and its specific students and the TASP administration, generalization to other institutions cannot be made. However, with necessary modifications, this study may be used to project estimated costs and cost-effectiveness of the TASP at other institutions.

### **History and Background**

To provide additional insight and background, different remedial and developmental education at selected post-secondary institutions in states like California, Maryland, Washington, Georgia, Virginia, Nevada, Kansas, New Jersey, and Florida were reviewed.

The 1990 TASP Test Registration Bulletin published by THECB, the TEA, and NES provides relevant information about the TASP. The legislative response to A Generation of Failure was an extension of existing requirements for students entering teacher preparation programs. Since 1984, teacher education candidates have been required to pass an academic skills test as a condition for admission. The THECB and the TEA agreed to develop jointly a single test that would serve both as a criterion for admission to public and private teacher education programs and as the test mandated by HB 2182 for students entering public colleges and universities. In September 1987, the NES was selected to develop and administer the testing component of the new academic skills program.

Texas educators, working with the NES staff, defined the skills to be measured on the test, developed the specific test instrument to measure these skills, and recommended performance standards for each section of the test.

The final report, A Generation of Failure: The Case for Testing and Remediation in Texas Higher Education, published in July 1986, was a monumental effort giving momentum to the formation, establishment, and implementation of the TASP.

In literature today, the terms "remedial" and "developmental" are often used interchangeably. The California Postsecondary Education Commission (1983) differentiated the two in simple terms. Remedial education applies to those efforts or programs intended to overcome or correct academic deficiencies. On the other hand, developmental education has a more universal and positive connotation referring to the development of skills, attitudes, and strengths, and the correction of weaknesses. The TASP is remedial in that it is aimed specifically at basic skills deficiencies, but developmental in that it seeks to broadly assist college students in achieving success.

Since there appears to be two approaches to higher education, i.e., meritocracy and egalitarianism, remedial courses are designed to remove academic deficiencies (Cross, 1971, p.5) of those students who lack the basic skills needed, and bring out a compromise between these two approaches. Boyer, et al. (1986) surveyed the efforts of states to improve the quality of undergraduate education. All 50 states and the District of Columbia have initiatives to improve undergraduate education.

The ultimate success of the TASP is predicated on the accuracy of student course placement, professional advisement, and student success in classes. To achieve success will require the full participation of all members of the college community, including administrators, faculty, and students. A true "team approach" to the student will be required and on-going training in advisement techniques will be necessary, since effective advising would usually require more than using diagnostic test scores only. A comprehensive, individualized approach to advisement is of utmost importance (Howry, 1988).

### Methodology

Since the purpose of this research was to examine the cost-benefits of the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP) administration, the costs are broadly divided into three groups: i) costs to the state of Texas (test development and administration costs, Coordinating Board expenses, and supplemental academic services costs), ii) costs to the institution (capital, personnel, and operational costs), and iii) costs to the individual student (registration fee to the test, etc.); and the benefits into three categories: i) benefits to the state, ii) benefits to the institution, and iii) benefits (economic and non-economic) to the students.

The information was gathered from the following sources to ascertain the cost effectiveness of the TASP implementation at Texas Tech University: 1) Historical background information from the documents provided by such sources as the Higher Education Coordinating Board of Texas, the Texas Education Agency, National Evaluation Systems, Inc., Texas Tech University, and general bibliographic information; costs incurred by individual students; and approximate costs borne by the state of Texas.

TASP Test scores available at the Texas Tech TASP administrative office for 437 students who had taken remedial courses in reading, mathematics, and writing at Texas Tech University were compared with their re-test scores after taking remedial courses by running paired comparisons of  $t$  test. The differences were significant at the .01 level of confidence. Also from the data furnished by the Registrar's office for 354 students at Texas Tech University, correlation analyses were conducted for different variables, including high school rank, college GPA, SAT scores, ACT scores, TASP Test scores, and sex by ethnicity (white, black, hispanic, and other races). Also, correlation analysis was conducted by gender for all the above mentioned variables. Further, correlation coefficients were compared for white males, white females, black males, black females, hispanic males, hispanic females, other males, and other females.

Although the correlation analyses reveal some interesting findings, since the N's were small, the findings are inconclusive.

### Findings

In this study, both efficiency (costs of the TASP) and effectiveness (did remedial courses improve performances on the TASP test) issues were examined. In other words, there was an attempt to ascertain the cost benefits of the Texas Academic Skills Program at one Texas university. The costs examined were incurred by the state, the institution, and the students.

**State Costs** The costs to the state during 1989-90 were \$9,392,902. With 96,017 students taking the TASP test, the per-student cost was \$97.83.

**University Costs** University costs were as follows:

Capital costs for 1989-90 were \$48,000 with 6,225 students involved in TASP. The costs would be \$7.71/student. Personnel costs for 1989-90 were \$120,000, thus, \$19.18/student; and operational costs for 1989-90 were \$73,000, thus, \$11.73/student. The total cost to the University was \$38.72/student. This amount (\$38.72) was reimbursed to the University by the State and is included in the \$97.83 cost to the State listed above.

**Student Costs** The cost to the student was \$24 registration fee plus the cost of The Official TASP Test Study Guide, which was \$12.00, thus, the total cost to each student was \$36.00.

### Total Costs

Cost incurred by all entities on a per student basis during 1989-90 was \$133.83

**Achievement Data** In order to ascertain the effectiveness of remediation by the university, the TASP test scores in reading, mathematics, and writing for 437 students who failed in the first attempt were compared to those scores in reading, mathematics, and writing in the subsequent attempt after those students took remedial courses at the University.

**Table 1 Paired-Comparisons t Test, TASP Test Scores Before and After Remediation (N=437)**

Variable	Mean	Standard Error of Mean	t	Significance Level
Dift. Reading	44.51612903	4.29410843	10.37	.0001
Dift. Math	30.67441860	2.28817931	13.41	.0001
Dift. Writing	49.95348837	2.24310160	22.27	.0001

From Table 1, it appears that remediation enabled students to improve their scores on the TASP test, and would thus indicate that students improved their basic skills and thus enhanced their chances of being successful students. Due to the lack of data relating to GPA's at the end of fall 1989 and spring 1990 for entering freshman who took the TASP Test, their achievement in terms of GPA's could not be compared. This is, however, an area that needs additional study and research.

Correlation analyses were conducted for selected variables, i.e., high school rank, GPA, SAT or ACT scores, TASP scores on reading, mathematics, and writing, with gender and ethnic background as the dependent variables. Although the findings are inconclusive because of small N's, there were some differences by gender and ethnic variables that may be indicative of some real differences, and need to be studied using a larger and more representative sample.

It is interesting to note that, even though the findings are inconclusive, there may be some differences by gender and ethnic variables. Some variables like GPA and TASP Test scores seem to have a high multiple correlation (R) for white students, while variables of simple correlation coefficients (r) appear to be important to black and Hispanic students.

## **Conclusions**

**It was found that remediation apparently was effective, i.e., there was a significant increase in TASP scores after students completed the necessary remediation. At a total cost of \$133.83 per student, it would appear the costs are reasonable; however, there will be a need to develop a data base from which a true cost benefit analysis might be determined in which economic and non-economic benefits are considered along with the cost information.**

**For the State of Texas, as well as for any state, the bottom line must consider not only actual costs, but also student achievement and retention gains, otherwise, we have little less than a hollow sounding gong.**

## REFERENCES

- An Assessment of Developmental and Remedial Education in the University of Nevada System. (1984, November).**
- Boyer, C. M., McGuinness, and Sims, C., Jr. (1986, February). State initiatives to improve undergraduate education. Education Commission of the States Survey Highlights. Washington, D.C: American Association for Higher Education.**
- California Postsecondary Education Commission. (1983, January). Promises to keep: Remedial education in California's public colleges and universities. Sacramento: Author.**
- Committee on Testing. (1986, July 17). A generation of failure: The case for testing and remediation in Texas higher education: Final report of the committee on testing to the coordinating board. Texas College and University Systems. Austin: Author.**
- Cross, P.K. (1971). Beyond the Open Door. Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers.**
- Gainons, F. & others. (1986, November). Remedial/developmental programs in Kansas institutions of higher education, fiscal year 1985: A supplemental report. Topeka: Kansas State Department of Education.**
- Hartley, M.P. (1987, Fall). H.E.L.P. for students; One university's approach to increasing student retention. College and University: The Journal of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. 63(1), 80-94.**
- Howry, C. (1988, October 11). Collin County Community College District, McKinney and Plano (TX). Paper presented to the National Academic Advising Association, Watson National Convention, Miami, Florida.**
- Maryland State Board for Higher Education. (1985, April). Remedial education in Maryland's public higher education institutions. Postsecondary Education Research Reports. Annapolis.**
- New Jersey Basic Skills Council. (1988, January 22). Results of the New Jersey college basic skills placement testing: Fall 1987 entering freshman. Trenton: New Jersey Department of Higher Education.**
- New Jersey College Basic Skills Placement Testing. (1988). Fall 1987: Entering freshmen. Trenton: New Jersey State Department of Higher Education.**

- Schinoff, R. B. (1988, October). The Florida plan: Mandated entry and exit testing. Paper presented to the National Academic Advising Association, National Convention, Miami, Florida.
- Southern Regional Education Board Commission for Educational Quality. (1985). Access to quality undergraduate education. Atlanta, Georgia.
- State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. (1981, February). Developmental education in Virginia.
- State of Georgia System Summary. (1983, February). Developmental studies.
- Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB). (1990-91). TASP Test Registration Bulletin. Texas Education Agency, National Evaluation Systems, Inc.
- Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB). (1989, July). Program development, chapter 5, subchapter p: Texas academic skills program, Advising Source Book. Austin, TX.
- Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB). (1989, June). Improvement for undergraduate education in Texas: College-level competencies. Report for the college-level instructional competencies committees. Waco, Texas: Davis Brothers Publishing Company.
- Texas Tech University Planning Committee. (1986, June). Texas Tech in the twenty-first century: A background report for study and discussion. Lubbock: Author.
- Washington State Board for Community College Education. (1983, December 7). Community College News.

# **1990 PERSONNEL PROFILE/SALARY SURVEY AND INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE**

**Howard W. Smith, Jr.**  
The University of North Texas  
and  
**Derek Skaggs**  
Texas Christian University

## **I. PERSONNEL PROFILE/SALARY SURVEY**

Personnel Profile/Salary Survey questionnaires were mailed to members of the Texas Association of Community Service and Continuing Education (TACSCE) and Texas Administrators of Continuing Education of Community/Junior Colleges (TACE). Additional questionnaires were mailed to continuing education professionals in Texas who were not members of TACSCE or TACE. Questionnaires totaling 316 were mailed, of which 154 usable responses were received.

### **PERSONNEL/SALARY SURVEY RESPONSE**

Questionnaires mailed	316
Usable questionnaires	154
Percentage of response	49%

### **RESPONSE BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION**

A majority of the responses received were from continuing education professionals at two-year colleges (65%). No responses were received from private two-year colleges. Responses from four-year public (16%) and private (17%) institutions were almost equal, with a slightly better response from four-year private institutions. The remainder of the responses (3%) were from upper division institutions and technical schools.

### TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Number of Responses	Percentage of Response
Two-year public	100	65%
Two-year private	0	0%
Four-year public	24	16%
Four-year private	26	17%
*Other	4	3%
TOTAL	154	100%

\*Upper division institutions and technical schools

### RESPONSE BY TITLE

A majority of the responses from all types of institutions were received from the title Director (46%). Dean was the second-most common title among two-year college responses (20%) and four-year private institution responses (20%) and four-year private institution responses (15%). Coordinator was the second-most common title of four-year public respondents (17%).

### TYPE OF INSTITUTION

TITLE	2-YR PUB.	4-YR PUB.	4-YR PRI.	OTHER	TOTAL
VP/Provost	1	0	1	0	2
Dean	20	1	4	0	25
Director	40	13	16	2	71
Assoc/Asst Dean	15	1	0	1	17
Assoc/Asst Dir.	1	3	1	0	5
Coordinator	11	4	2	1	18
Other	12	2	1	0	15
TOTAL	100	24	26	4	154

### RESPONSE BY SEX

A little more than half of the responses from all types of institutions were female (51%). Responses from four-year institutions were primarily from females (public 67%, private 60%). Responses from two-year institutions were primarily from males (54%).

#### TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	2-YR PUB.	4-YR PUB.	4-YR PRI.	OTHER	TOTAL
Male	53	8	10	3	74
Female	45	16	15	1	77
TOTAL	98	24	25	4	151

Frequency missing = 3

### RESPONSE BY RESPONSIBILITY

Respondents were asked to report their primary area and level of responsibility in their continuing education organization. As has been the case in the past, non-credit programming continues to be the primary area of responsibility of respondents at all types of institutions (77%). One-third of the respondents from four-year public institutions and one-fifth from four-year private institutions report involvement in credit and non-credit programming.

#### TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	2-YR PUB.	4-YR PUB.	4-YR PRI.	OTHER	TOTAL
Non-credit	85	15	14	3	117
Credit	3	1	4	0	8
Both	5	8	5	1	19
Other	6	0	2	0	8
TOTAL	99	24	25	4	152

Frequency missing = 2

## LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY IN NON-CREDIT

Most respondents report single campus or college-wide programming as the primary level of responsibility (53%). Second most common responses at four-year institutions were evenly split among the remainder of the choices; however, multi-campus programming at two-year colleges was clearly the second choice (36%).

### TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	2-YR PUB.	4-YR PUB.	4-YR PRI.	OTHER	TOTAL
Specific Prog.	16	2	3	0	21
Campus Prog.	42	18	16	3	79
Multi-campus	35	1	3	0	39
Other	5	2	1	1	9
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>148</b>

Frequency missing = 6

### NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES

A majority of the institutions report having full-time employees (83%). Numbers of full-time employees range from 0 to 47, with a majority of all types of institutions ranging from 1-10 full-time employees.

### TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	2-YR PUB.	4-YR PUB.	4-YR PRI.	OTHER	TOTAL
Total employees	581	72	95	23	771
Average/all	5.8	3	3.7	5.8	5
Range	0-47	0-10	0-23	0-15	0-47

## NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS BY NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES REPORTED

EMPLOYEES	TYPE OF INSTITUTION				TOTAL
	2-YR PUB.	4-YR PUB.	4-YR PRI.	OTHER	
0	19	5	10	1	35
1-10	69	19	12	2	95
11-25	17	0	4	1	22
26-50	2	0	0	0	2
50+	0	0	0	0	0

## RESPONSE BY CLASSIFICATION/TIME STATUS

Almost all respondents indicated being full-time administrators (97%).

EMPLOYEES	TYPE OF INSTITUTION				TOTAL
	2-YR PUB.	4-YR PUB.	4-YR PRI.	OTHER	
Administrator					
Full-time	98	24	24	3	149
Part-time	2	0	1	1	4

Frequency missing = 1

## RESPONSE BY REPORTING LINES

Respondents were asked to report the title of the person to whom they report. The most common titles for four-year institutions were Vice President or Provost (public 42%, private 54%). At two-year colleges Dean was the most common title (41%), with a fairly significant portion of the respondents reporting to a Vice President or Provost (26%).

## TITLES OF ADMINISTRATORS TO WHOM CONTINUING EDUCATION PERSONNEL REPORT

TITLE	TYPE OF INSTITUTION				TOTAL
	2-YR PUB.	4-YR PUB.	4-YR PRI.	OTHER	
Chancellor/ President	8	0	1	1	10
VP/Provost	26	10	14	1	51
Dean	41	6	7	1	55
Director	10	4	3	0	17
Assoc/Asst Dean or Dir	12	1	0	1	14
Other	3	3	1	0	7
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>154</b>

### LEVEL OF EDUCATION BY TITLE

Respondents were asked to report their level of education. Most Deans have earned doctorates (60%), while most Directors and Associate/Assistant Deans have earned at least a master's. A fifth of all respondents report their level of education to be less than a master's.

### TYPE OF DEGREE

TITLE	ASSOC	BACH	MASTER	DR	TOTAL
VP/Provost	0	0	1	0	1
Dean	0	0	10	15	25
Director	1	12	37	21	71
Asst/Assoc Dean	1	4	8	4	17
Asst/Assoc Dir	0	1	3	1	5
Coordinator	2	7	5	2	16
Other	1	4	5	3	13
TOTAL	5	28	69	46	148

Frequency missing = 6

## RESPONSE BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Most respondents have earned a master's, with the second largest group holding a doctorate.

### TYPE OF INSTITUTION

TYPE OF DEGREE	2-YR PUB.	4-YR PUB.	4-YR PRI.	OTHER	TOTAL
Associate	2	0	2	1	5
Bachelor's	16	3	1	1	21
Master's	51	9	10	2	72
Doctorate	26	8	12	0	46
Other	0	3	0	0	3
TOTAL	95	23	25	4	147

Frequency missing = 7

### RESPONSE BY ACADEMIC FIELD OF HIGHEST DEGREE

Respondents were asked to report their major field of study. The responses were grouped into seven academic fields of study. Any major not considered as part of the seven fields of study was reported in the other category. Respondents report education/counseling as the most common field of study (50%). Liberal arts and humanities was the second most common field of study (26%). Of the remaining portion, business/human resources was the most common (13%).

### TYPE OF INSTITUTION

ACADEMIC FIELD	2-YR PUB.	4-YR PUB.	4-YR PRI.	OTHER	TOTAL
Business/Human Resources	9	3	4	3	19
Education/Counseling	51	7	12	0	70
Fine Arts	3	0	0	0	3
Liberal Arts/Humanities	26	6	5	0	37
Math/Sciences/Engineering	2	1	1	1	5
Nursing/Health	2	0	0	0	2
Other	4	0	1	0	5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>141</b>

Frequency missing = 13

### RESPONSE BY TIME ON THE JOB, AT INSTITUTION, AND TIME IN CONTINUING EDUCATION

	2-YR PUB.	4-YR PUB.	4-YR PRI.	OTHER
<b>Time on Job</b>				
Most years	30	17	10	18
Fewest years	1	1	1	1
Average yrs	5.7	4.9	3.9	7
<b>Time at Institution</b>				
Most years	24	23	26	18
Fewest years	1	1	1	3
Average yrs	8.9	9	7.1	7.8
<b>Time in CE</b>				
Most years	30	28	17	12
Fewest years	1	1	1	1
Average yrs	8.9	10.6	6.7	5.5

## RESPONSE BY SALARY

Respondents were asked to report their salary for the 1989-1990 academic year.

### AVERAGE SALARIES BY INSTITUTION, BY SEX

As reported in the 1989 study, average salaries for females were lower at all types of institutions. Average salaries reported were highest for males employed by four-year public institutions. There is a wide gap in salary ranges for all institutions. Minimum female salaries were reported lower at four-year institutions. Males reported lower minimum salaries at two-year and other institutions.

#### TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	2-YR PUB.	4-YR PUB.	4-YR PRI.	OTHER	TOTAL
<b>Avg. Salary</b>	<b>38,859</b>	<b>37,375</b>	<b>33,880</b>	<b>32,445</b>	<b>38,656</b>
Male	42,847	53,125	39,200	33,260	43,076
Female	34,361	29,500	30,333	30,000	32,557
<b>Max Salary</b>	<b>99,000</b>	<b>69,000</b>	<b>70,000</b>	<b>56,000</b>	<b>99,000</b>
Male	99,000	69,000	70,000	56,000	99,000
Female	61,000	63,000	68,000	30,000	68,000
<b>Min Salary</b>	<b>12,000</b>	<b>12,000</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>9,780</b>	<b>9,780</b>
Male	12,000	42,000	31,000	9,780	9,780
Female	15,000	12,000	10,000	30,000	10,000

### AVERAGE SALARIES BY TITLE, BY SEX FOR TWO-YEAR AND FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Average salaries for females at two-year colleges, regardless of the title, were less than average salaries for males. The same is true for four-year institutions with the exception of Dean.

#### TWO-YEAR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

TITLE	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
VP/Provost	60,000	0	60,000
Dean	48,500	52,667	49,158
Director	38,494	35,000	36,573
Assoc/Asst Dean	48,625	36,714	43,067
Assoc/Asst Dir	0	38,000	38,000
Coordinator	32,000	31,833	31,900
Other	33,900	27,500	31,500

**FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS**

TITLE	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
VP/Provost	0	0	0
Dean	42,350	68,000	48,200
Director	46,846	34,000	39,759
Assoc/Asst Dean	0	42,000	42,000
Assoc/Asst Dir	0	25,000	25,000
Coordinator	0	19,667	19,667
Other	35,000	18,333	22,500

**AVERAGE SALARIES BY DEGREES, BY SEX FOR TWO-YEAR  
AND FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS**

**TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS**

DEGREE	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Associate	0	17,500	17,500
Bachelor's	25,200	30,389	29,261
Master's	42,656	36,333	40,380
Doctorate	46,869	40,900	44,573

**FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS**

DEGREE	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Associate	0	15,000	15,000
Bachelor's	0	23,800	23,800
Master's	39,167	30,538	33,263
Doctorate	48,500	43,000	46,300

**AVERAGE SALARY BY LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY, BY SEX  
FOR TWO-YEAR AND FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS**

Average salaries for females at all institutions were lower than males. Average salaries do not necessarily reflect the increased amount of responsibilities. For example, average salaries for females in both two-year and four-year institutions with multi-campus responsibilities were less than females with campus responsibilities. The same is also true for males with campus responsibilities compared with males having responsibilities for a specific program.

**TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS**

RESPONSIBILITIES	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Specific Programs	39,778	29,857	35,438
Campus	39,746	36,700	38,361
Multi-campus	47,823	33,167	40,286
Other	45,500	39,000	44,200

**FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS**

RESPONSIBILITIES	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Specific Programs	37,667	27,800	31,500
Campus	48,071	32,550	38,941
Multi-campus	0	25,500	25,500
Other	31,000	17,500	22,000

**AVERAGE SALARIES BY SEX, FOR TIME ON THE JOB, TIME AT INSTITUTION, AND TIME IN CONTINUING EDUCATION**

Average salaries for females were lower than salaries for males in every category. As one would expect, the more time on the job, at the institution and in continuing education means a higher average salary.

<b>TIME ON JOB</b>	<b>MALE</b>	<b>FEMALE</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
0-5 years	38,255	30,196	33,289
6-10 years	43,435	32,444	38,609
11+ years	56,538	48,667	55,062

<b>TIME AT INSTITUTION</b>	<b>MALE</b>	<b>FEMALE</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
0-5 years	34,580	26,703	30,026
6-10 years	41,467	32,370	35,619
11+ years	51,000	39,444	46,840

<b>TIME IN CE</b>	<b>MALE</b>	<b>FEMALE</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
0-5 years	35,532	27,214	30,239
6-10 years	41,250	35,285	37,865
11+ years	49,261	36,211	44,583

**RESPONSE BY AVERAGE BEGINNING SALARY**

Respondents were asked to report their annual beginning salary for their present position. As with the average current salary responses, female salaries lagged behind males with one exception. Reported maximum beginning salaries for females were higher than males at two types of institutions: two-year and four-year public.

**TYPE OF INSTITUTION**

	<b>2-YR PUB.</b>	<b>4-YR PUB.</b>	<b>4-YR PRI.</b>	<b>OTHER</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>Avg Beg Salary</b>	<b>27,000</b>	<b>28,708</b>	<b>22,880</b>	<b>21,945</b>	<b>26,643</b>
<b>Male</b>	<b>27,623</b>	<b>35,750</b>	<b>29,100</b>	<b>19,260</b>	<b>28,362</b>
<b>Female</b>	<b>26,298</b>	<b>25,188</b>	<b>18,733</b>	<b>18,733</b>	<b>24,684</b>
<b>Max Beg Salary</b>					
<b>Male</b>	<b>51,000</b>	<b>47,000</b>	<b>58,000</b>	<b>32,000</b>	<b>53,000</b>
<b>Female</b>	<b>53,000</b>	<b>55,000</b>	<b>28,000</b>	<b>30,000</b>	<b>55,000</b>
<b>Min Beg Salary</b>					
<b>Male</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>14,000</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>9,780</b>	<b>9,780</b>
<b>Female</b>	<b>13,000</b>	<b>12,000</b>	<b>12,000</b>	<b>30,000</b>	<b>12,000</b>

## TWO-YEAR COLLEGE PERSONNEL PROFILE

If you are a continuing education professional at a two-year college, chances are that you.....

are male, (1989 - female)  
are called DIRECTOR,  
are classified as an administrator,  
are responsible for non-credit programming,  
are employed full-time,  
are responsible for a campus or college-wide program,  
have 5.8 employees, (1989 - 9)  
report to a dean,  
have a Master's degree,  
earned your degree in the field of Education/Counseling,  
earn about \$38,859 per year, (1989 - \$36,664)  
have held your present job for 5.7 years, (1989 - 5.1)  
have worked at your current school for 8.9 years, (1989 - 8.6)  
have been in continuing education 8.9 years. (1989 - 8.6)

## FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE PERSONNEL PROFILE FOR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

If you are a continuing education professional at a four-year public institution, chances are that you.....

are female,  
are called DIRECTOR,  
are classified as an administrator,  
are responsible for non-credit programming,  
are employed full-time,  
are responsible for a campus or college-wide program,  
have 3 employees, (1989 - 3.5)  
report to a vice president or provost, (1989 - dean)  
have a Master's degree, (1989 - Master's/Doctorate)  
earned your degree in the field of Education/Counseling, (1989 - Business)  
earn about \$37,375 per year, (1989 - \$37,075)  
have held your present job for 4.9 years,  
have worked at your current school for 9 years, (1989 - 8.1)  
have been in continuing education 10.6 years. (1989 - 7.7)

**FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE PERSONNEL PROFILE**  
**FOR PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS**

**If you are a continuing education professional at a four-year private institution, chances are that you.....**

**are female,**  
**are called DIRECTOR,**  
**are classified as an administrator,**  
**are responsible for non-credit programming,**  
**are employed full-time,**  
**are responsible for a campus or college-wide program,**  
**have 3.7 employees, (1989 - 2.8)**  
**report to a vice president or provost,**  
**have a Doctorate degree, (1989 - Master's or Doctorate)**  
**earned your degree in the field of Education/Counseling,**  
**earn about \$33,880 per year, (1989 - \$32,808)**  
**have held your present job for 3.9 years, (1989 - 3.6)**  
**have worked at your current school for 7.1 years, (1989 - 7.4)**  
**have been in continuing education 6.7 years. (1989 - 9.5)**

## II. INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE

A survey of Texas institutions of higher education offering non-credit programming was conducted by the Texas Association of Community Service and Continuing Education (TACSCE) Research Committee through the Office of Policy Studies in Higher Education, University of North Texas. Questionnaires were mailed to continuing education administrators holding membership in TACSCE and the Texas Administrators of Continuing Education at Community/Junior Colleges (TACE). Additional questionnaires were sent to institutions not members of TACSCE or TACE listed in the Texas section of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Officers (AACRAO) 1989-1990 Member Guide. A total of 123 questionnaires was mailed, yielding 69 usable responses; a 56% response rate.

### RESPONSE BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

A majority of the responses were received from two-year public institutions (58%). No responses were received from two-year private institutions. The next largest response was from four-year private colleges and institutions (22%), followed by four-year public institutions (16%). Last year more four-year public institutions responded than four-year private. The remainder of the responses were received from other types of institutions such as technical schools and upper-division universities (4%).

<u>Type of Institution</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentages</u>
Two-year public	40	58%
Two-year private	0	0%
Four-year public	11	16%
Four-year private	15	22%
Other	3	4%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100%</b>

### RESPONSE BY TITLE

The prevalent title of those responding to the questionnaire throughout all types of institutions was Director (54%). The title of Dean was the next highest response at all institutions (25%). This would indicate administrators responsible for continuing education programs are in the upper portion of the institutional administrative structure.

### TYPE OF INSTITUTION

<u>Title</u>	<u>2-yr. Pub.</u>	<u>4-yr. Pub.</u>	<u>4-yr. Priv.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Provost	1	0	0	0	1
Associate VP	0	0	1	0	1
Dean	14	1	1	1	17
Director	15	9	11	2	37
Asst/Assoc Dean	6	0	0	0	6
Coordinator	2	1	0	0	3
*Other	2	0	1	0	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>68</b>

### RESPONSE BY TITLE OF SUPERVISOR

Most chief continuing education administrators at all types of institutions report to a Vice President/Vice Chancellor or Provost (53%). Chief continuing education administrators at four-year institutions report to a Vice President or Provost; at two-year institutions they report to either a Vice President (43%) or Dean (38%). Of the responses, a fairly significant percentage of chief continuing education administrators at two-year schools report directly to the President of their institution (18%).

### TYPE OF INSTITUTION

<u>Title</u>	<u>2-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr Priv.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Chancellor	1	0	0	0	1
President	6	0	0	1	7
VP/Provost/ Vice Chancel.	17	7	10	2	36
Assoc. VC	0	0	1	0	1
Dean	15	3	3	0	21
Other	1	1	0	0	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>68</b>

## RESPONSE BY NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES

Chief continuing education administrators were asked to report the total number of full-time professional and clerical personnel assigned to the continuing education program. Total number of employees reported was 515. Numbers reported at any institution ranged from 0-40. Most institutions (68%) reported having staffs of 1-10 employees. Most of the remaining institutions (25%) reported staffs of 11-25 employees. The average number of employees at two-year and four-year public institutions dropped compared with last year's report, while four-year private institutions remained the same.

### INSTITUTION TYPE

	<u>2-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr Priv.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Number reported	367	64	66	18	515
High	40	13	24	13	-
Low	1	0	0	1	-
Average (all)	9	6	4	6	7

### NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS REPORTING BY NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES REPORTED

	<u>2-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr Priv.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
0	0	1	3	0	4
1-10	28	7	10	2	47
11-25	11	3	2	1	17
26-50	1	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	40	11	15	3	69

### RESPONSE BY FULL-TIME FACULTY

Of those responding, approximately a quarter (23%) of the institutions report having full-time non-credit faculty. Of those institutions, all were public and only one was four-year.

**TYPE OF INSTITUTION**

	<u>2-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr Priv.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Number reported	57	4	0	0	61
High	15	4	0	0	-
Low	0	0	0	0	-
Average (all)	1.4	.4	0	0	.88
Average (off those with employees)	3.8	4	0	0	3.8

**NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS REPORTING BY NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES REPORTED**

**TYPE OF INSTITUTION**

	<u>2-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr Priv.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
0	25	10	15	3	53
1-10	13	1	0	0	14
11-25	2	0	0	0	2
TOTAL	40	11	15	3	69

**RESPONSIBLE FOR NON-CREDIT REGISTRATION**

A majority of the continuing education offices at all institutions (88%) reported having responsibility for the registration process for non-credit courses. Only seven two-year colleges and one four-year private institution reported the process occurring in another office. Of those reporting "no", most indicated the Registrar's Office was responsible for performing registration for non-credit courses.

**TYPE OF INSTITUTION**

	<u>2-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr Priv.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
No	7	0	1	0	8
Yes	33	11	14	3	61
TOTAL	40	11	15	3	69

## RESPONSIBLE FOR FEE COLLECTION

A majority of continuing education offices were responsible for collection of fees for non-credit courses (84%). Eleven offices reported not having fee collection responsibilities; ten were two-year colleges, and one was a four-year private institution. Of those eleven, most indicated the business office or bursar's office was responsible for non-credit fee collection.

### TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	<u>2-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr Priv.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
No	10	0	1	0	11
Yes	30	11	14	3	58
TOTAL	40	11	15	3	69

## RESPONSE BY INSTRUCTOR HOURLY PAY

Respondents were asked to report the average hourly pay for non-credit, continuing education instructors. Four-year institutions reported having the highest average hourly rate of pay for all institutions.

### TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	<u>2-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr Priv.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
No. reporting	40	11	15	3	69
High/hour	\$20	\$90	\$50	\$35	-
Low/hour	\$11	\$10	\$12	\$10	-
Average/hour	\$16	\$23	\$23	\$20	\$19

## RESPONSE BY ENROLLMENTS, COURSE SECTIONS, AND CONTACT HOURS

### COURSE ENROLLMENTS

Respondents reported the total of non-credit enrollments. Enrollment numbers indicated a wide range of sizes of programs. Two-year institutions reported the highest average enrollment per institution, while four-year private institutions reported the lowest. The average enrollment per institution for all institutions would indicate most schools have programs of moderate to small size.

### TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	<u>2-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr Priv.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
High	54,000	11,000	9,000	6,000	489,019
Low	0	0	0	2,000	-
Average	9,800	4,049	2,764	3,667	7,087

### NUMBER OF COURSE SECTIONS REPORTED

Respondents were asked to report the annual number of course sections offered. Of those reporting, two-year institutions offered the highest average of course sections per year (528) while four private institutions offered the lowest number of sections (145). The figures indicated a wide range of sections offered by each institutional type.

#### TYPE OF INSTITUTIONS

	<u>2-yr. Pub.</u>	<u>4-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr Priv.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
High	3,500	1,100	500	325	26,318
Low	0	0	5	69	-
Average	528	222	145	198	381

### NUMBER OF CONTACT HOURS REPORTED

Respondents were asked to report the total number of non-credit contact hours by multiplying enrollment and course contact hours. The figures again reported a wide range of contact hours for all institutions. Two-year institutions reported the highest average of contact hours (138,598), while other institutions (technical schools and upper division institutions) reported the lowest.

#### TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	<u>2-yr. Pub.</u>	<u>4-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr Priv.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
High	849,000	296,380	201,780	30,000	6,751,141
Low	0	0	0	20,000	
Average	138,598	60,767	30,918	25,000	97,843

## RESPONSIBILITY FOR CREDIT CLASSES

Respondents were asked to report whether or not their continuing education office was responsible for coordinating credit classes. Most two-year institutions reported they were not responsible for credit classes (63%). More four-year private and other (technical school and upper division institutions) reported having credit responsibilities than not. Almost half of four-year public institutions reported having credit responsibilities.

### TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	<u>2-yr. Pub.</u>	<u>4-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr Priv.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
No	24	6	7	1	38
Yes	14	5	8	2	29
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>*38</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>67</b>

\*Frequency missing = 2

## RESPONSE BY ABILITY TO CALCULATE TOTAL CEUs

Continuing Education Unit (CEU) is a nationally recognized form of recording non-credit learning activity. One CEU is equal to ten hours of instruction. Respondents were asked if they had a system for calculating total CEUs awarded. Most two-year institutions (62%) reported "no", while a majority of the remaining institutions responded "yes."

### TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	<u>2-yr. Pub.</u>	<u>4-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr Priv.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
No	24	3	6	0	33
Yes	15	8	9	3	35
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>*39</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>68</b>

\*Frequency missing = 1

### RESPONSE BY TOTAL CEUs AWARDED

Respondents were asked to report the total number of CEUs awarded. The figures indicate a wide range of CEUs awarded by institution (highest 90,000; lowest 0) and by average of CEUs awarded by type of institution (highest 10,733; lowest 1,362).

#### TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	<u>2-yr. Pub.</u>	<u>4-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr Priv.</u>	<u>Other</u>
High	90,000	14,000	13,452	20,000
Low	0	0	0	200
Average	4,761	2,663	1,362	10,733

### RESPONSE BY TOTAL BUDGET

Respondents were asked to report the total budget for their continuing education programs. Two-year public institutions claimed the highest budget figures in terms of total annual budget (12.5 million) and average (684,323).

#### TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	<u>2-yr. Pub.</u>	<u>4-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr Priv.</u>	<u>Other</u>
High	12,500,000	1,200,000	600,000	300,000
Low	2,000	20,000	16,000	69,000
Average	684,323	384,545	116,505	206,333
No. reporting	40	11	15	3

### RESPONSE BY SELF SUPPORTING

Respondents were asked to report whether they considered their continuing education operation to be self-supporting. An overwhelming majority (78%) indicated they were self-supporting. One hundred percent of the other (technical schools and upper division institutions); 85% of the two-year public; and 73% of the four-year public institutions claimed to be self-supporting. Forty percent of the private schools reported not to be self-supporting.

### TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	<u>2-yr. Pub.</u>	<u>4-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr Priv.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
No	6	3	6	0	15
Yes	34	8	9	3	54
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>69</b>

### RESPONSE BY PERCEPTION OF FUTURE ACTIVITY

Respondents were asked to anticipate the level of activity for their continuing education operations. Optimism characterized the feelings of most respondents with almost three quarters (71%) anticipating an increase in activity; twenty eight percent predict activity to remain the same. Only one institution predicted a decrease in the level of activity. Four-year private institutions were not as optimistic as the remaining institutions, with almost half of them anticipating the level of activity to remain the same.

### TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	<u>2-yr. Pub.</u>	<u>4-yr. Pub</u>	<u>4-yr Priv.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Increase	31	9	8	1	49
Decrease	1	0	0	0	0
Same	8	2	7	2	19
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>69</b>

## **INSTITUTIONAL PROFILES**

### **TWO-YEAR PUBLIC COLLEGES**

**The continuing education program of a two-year public institution in Texas is likely to . . .**

**have a director as the top administrator;**

**have its top administrator report to vice president or provost;**

**have nine full-time employees (administrative, professional, or clerical);**

**have 1.5 faculty assigned to teach non-credit courses full time;**

**be responsible for conducting non-credit registration and collect fees for non-credit courses;**

**pay non-credit instructors \$16 per hour;**

**have completed 9,800 course enrollments in 528 course sections with 138,598 contact hours;**

**be primarily responsible for non-credit programming only;**

**have an annual budget of \$684,323;**

**have a self-supporting non-credit program;**

**expect an increase in the level of non-credit activity in the forthcoming year.**

## **FOUR-YEAR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS**

**The continuing education program of a four-year public institution in Texas is likely to . . .**

**have a director as the top administrator;**

**have the top administrators report to a vice president or provost;**

**have six full-time employees (administrative, professional, or clerical);**

**have four faculty assigned to each non-credit courses full time;**

**be responsible for conducting non-credit registration and collect fees for non-credit courses;**

**pay non-credit instructors \$23 per hour;**

**have completed 4,049 course enrollments in 222 course sections with 60,767 contact hours;**

**be primarily responsible for non-credit programming only;**

**have a system for calculating total CEUs awarded;**

**have awarded 2,663 CEUs;**

**have an annual budget of \$384,545;**

**have a self-supporting non-credit program;**

**expect an increase in non-credit activity in the forthcoming year.**

## **FOUR-YEAR PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS**

**The continuing education program of a four-year private institution in Texas is likely to . . .**

**have a director as the top administrator;**

**have the top administrator report to a vice president or provost;**

**have four full-time employees;**

**have no faculty assigned to teach non-credit courses full time;**

**be responsible for conducting non-credit registration and collect fees for non-credit courses;**

**pay non-credit instructors \$23 per hour;**

**have completed 2,764 course enrollments in 145 course sections with 30,918 contact hours;**

**be primarily responsible for credit programming as well as for non-credit;**

**have a system for calculating total CEUs awarded;**

**have awarded 1,362 CEUs;**

**have a total annual budget of \$116,505;**

**have a self-supporting non-credit program;**

**expect an increase in non-credit activity in the forthcoming year.**

# **TACSCE RESEARCH COMMITTEE PROJECT**

## **DO CREDIT AND NON-CREDIT COURSES COMPETE?**

**Dr. Fred Voda**  
Dean of Community Services  
Tarrant County Junior College

**Silvia Jo Lesko**  
Director of Conferences & Institutes  
The University of Texas at Arlington

In the Spring of 1990, two members of the TACSCE Research Committee set out to duplicate a study that had first been reported in the 1986 Research Annual as the President's Award Runner-Up Paper, and that had been tested again by members of the Research Committee in the spring of 1987. The question at the heart of the study was "Are non-credit and credit courses in competition, or are they complementary?"

Dr. Fred Voda of TCJC examined and updated the survey instruments that were used in the previous two studies. Sixteen items were included on the questionnaire, including basic data items on sex, age, and highest level of education. Questions regarding survey participant's past experience with credit and non-credit courses, as well as their plans for future participation in credit and non-credit courses were included on the questionnaire. Silvia Lesko of The University of Texas at Arlington evaluated Dr. Voda's instrument and agreed to participate in the study.

The surveys were distributed to students attending non-credit courses at Tarrant County Junior College (TCJC) and The University of Texas at Arlington (UTA) during the spring of 1990. It was decided that these two institutions would be perfect choices for this new study as they would round out the types of institutions being investigated. The 1987 survey (conducted by Dr. Robert Patterson of Southern Methodist University, Dr. James Powell of Texarkana Community College, and Dr. Jerry Springfield, formerly of Angelina College) surveyed an urban private university, and two rural community colleges. The data compiled from TCJC, an urban community college, and UTA, an urban public university, could then be studied in light of the former survey, with similarities and differences for the various types of schools measurable.

There are many reports and articles that can be written based on data derived from the study. On these pages, we are limiting our report to the similarities and differences that we noted between the responses obtained from the survey participants at TCJC and those at UTA.

**The similarities included:**

- 1) Most respondents were between the ages of 22-44, with the largest single category being between the ages of 29-38.**
- 2) An overwhelming majority of the respondents indicated that their non-credit experience had increased their curiosity to discover and explore ideas in other courses.**
- 3) The majority of the respondents would not have preferred to take the course in which they were enrolled for credit, although they would have taken the course if it were offered for credit only.**
- 4) Most of the respondents enrolled in non-credit courses during the spring of 1990 had not considered enrolling in credit courses for the same semester.**
- 5) Most respondents indicated they would be more open to enrolling in a credit course in the future.**

**The differences were found in these categories:**

- 1) There were more male than female respondents at the community college as opposed to the public university.**
- 2) Most of the university respondents had a bachelor's degree or better; most of the community college respondents had less than a bachelor's degree.**
- 3) More community college respondents had taken a course at the school before.**

**The data compiled from the study showed, once again, that there is no competition between the credit and non-credit offerings at both schools. In fact, the data clearly show that enrollment in a non-credit course increased the willingness of the respondents to take a credit course or program. This response clearly indicates that non-credit courses are, for many schools, a recruitment tool for the institution.**

## THE 1990-91 TACSCE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

**Stancie Chamberlain**  
Associate Director, Off-Campus Institutes  
University of Houston, Houston, TX

**Dr. Gary Goodwin**  
Assistant Dean for Community Service  
Tarrant County Junior College--NE Campus,  
Hurst, TX

**Barbara Leaman**  
Director of Partnership Programs  
Southwestern University, Georgetown, TX

**Silvia Jo Lesko**  
Director of Conferences & Institutes  
The University of Texas at Arlington,  
Arlington, TX  
Editor-1991 TACSCE Research Annual

**Victoria Oglesby**  
Dean of Applied Sciences  
Paris Junior College, Paris, TX

**Judith A. Pouncey**  
Associate Dean, Continuing Education  
El Centro College, Dallas, TX

**Aubrey D. Sharpe**  
Director, Continuing Education for Business  
and Industrial Technology  
Tyler Junior College, Tyler, TX

**Derek Skaggs**  
Director, Office of Extended Education  
Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, TX

**Dr. Howard W. Smith**  
Professor and Director, Office of Policy  
Studies in Higher Education  
The University of North Texas, Denton, TX  
Chair, TACSCE Research Committee

**Dr. Frederick Voda**  
Dean of Community Services  
Tarrant County Junior College District,  
Fort Worth, TX  
Chair, President's Award Committee

**Dr. David Wells**  
Dean of Community Services  
Tarrant County Junior College District,  
Fort Worth, TX