

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 676

HE 005 801

AUTHOR McNally, James L.
TITLE On the Appeal of the Three-Year Baccalaureate Degree Program: A Second Look. Institutional Research Report No. 74-5.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Genesco. Coll. of Arts and Science.
PUB DATE Aug 74
NOTE 23p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Accelerated Programs; Acceleration; *Bachelors Degrees; College Students; *Degree Requirements; *Higher Education; Institutional Research; *Program Length; Questionnaires; Research Projects; Statistical Data
IDENTIFIERS SUNY College of Arts and Sciences at Geneseo; *Three Year Baccalaureate Degree Program

ABSTRACT

The State University of New York College of Arts and Sciences at Geneseo initiated a 3-year baccalaureate degree program in the fall 1971 semester by enrolling 106 freshmen representing six departmental majors. At the outset of the fall 1972 semester, every department was participating, and an additional 372 freshmen entered the program. After 2-years of experience with the program, the decision was made to remove all minimum requirements for participation, effective fall 1973. As a consequence, 655 students of a fall 1973 freshman class elected to become 3-year degree students. Separate questionnaires for fall 1973 participants and nonparticipants were distributed in October. The questionnaire for participants covered reasons for selecting the program plans for continuing in the program, and perceptions of the academic milieu. The questionnaire for nonparticipants consisted of items covering reasons for declining to participate as well as a series of questions paralleling those in the participant questionnaire. Following the return of the questionnaires, 15 randomly selected students were asked to respond to a structured interview to provide subjective feedback. Questionnaire results are categorized according to reasons for participation, reasons for not participating, preference for Geneseo, student regard for the program, area tests, transfer possibilities, academic milieu, advisement, and general reaction comments. For the most part, interview responses tended to confirm what was being reported on the questionnaires. For related document, see HE 005 799. (MJM)

ED 094676

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

REPORT NUMBER 74-5

ON THE APPEAL OF THE

THREE-YEAR BACCALAUREATE DEGREE PROGRAM

A SECOND LOOK

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

August 1974

James L. McNally

108 00 5-801

State University of New York
College of Arts & Science at
GENESEO

ON THE APPEAL OF THE
THREE-YEAR BACCALAUREATE DEGREE PROGRAM

A SECOND LOOK

I. BACKGROUND

The College initiated a 3-Year Baccalaureate Degree Program in the Fall 1971 Semester by enrolling 106 freshmen representing six departmental majors. Student participation in the Program was contingent upon invitation by the chairmen of the departments involved. At the outset of the Fall 1972 Semester, every department was participating and an additional 372 freshmen entered the Program. In order to be in the Program, this second group had to meet one of three academic criteria:

- a predicted grade point average of 2.5,
- a minimum Regents Scholarship Examination score of 200, or
- a combined minimum Scholastic Aptitude Test score of 1200.

Of particular note, with respect to this larger second group, is that a majority of the freshman class was eligible to participate while only two-thirds of those eligible elected to do so. As a result of such a response, a study was conducted to determine student reasons for participating as well as not participating in the 3-Year Degree Program.¹

After two years of experience with the Program, and given the fact that the majority of freshmen meet the academic criteria, the decision was made to remove all minimum requirements for participation, effective Fall 1973. As a consequence, 665 students of a Fall 1973 freshman class of over 1,000 elected to become 3-Year Degree students. The stage was thus set for a replication of the previous year's study in the context of an academically restricted program vs. an "open" one.

¹James L. McNally. "On the Appeal of the Three-Year Baccalaureate Degree Program." Office of Institutional Research, SUNY/Geneseo. Report No. 78-1. February 1978.

II. PROCEDURE

As with the initial study, separate questionnaires for Fall 1973 participants and non-participants were distributed during October. The questionnaire for participants covered reasons for selecting the Program, plans for continuing in the Program, and perceptions of academic milieu.² The questionnaire for non-participants consisted of items covering reasons for declining to participate as well as a series of questions paralleling those in the participant questionnaire.³

Following the return of the questionnaires, 15 randomly selected students were asked to respond to a structured interview to provide subjective feedback.⁴ Of these students, ten were participants and five were non-participants.

The return response rate for both years and both groups exceeded fifty percent. In general, the return rate per year was higher for participants than for non-participants. (See TABLE 1) The results of particular note are presented in the following section.

TABLE 1
3-YEAR DEGREE PROGRAM SURVEY

Total Questionnaires	Participants		Non-Participants	
	Fall 1972	Fall 1973	Fall 1972	Fall 1973
Sent	367	665	213	415
Returned	296	397	149	212
% Returned	80.7	59.7	70.0	52.3

²See Appendix A

³See Appendix B

⁴See Appendix C

III. QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

A. Reasons for Participation

Students participating in the 3-Year Program were asked to indicate the most important reason for their decision. The response pattern was somewhat similar for both years in that the most frequently checked options were in the rank order of enter "*graduate or professional school sooner*," "*save money*," and "*avoid general freshman courses*." However, the response option reflecting the largest percentage change between years was "*avoid general freshman courses*," which was noted by 21.5% of the Fall 1973 group compared to 12.8% of the Fall 1972 group. (See TABLE 2)

TABLE 2
MOST IMPORTANT REASON FOR PARTICIPATING

Reason	Participants	
	Fall 1972 (N=296) %	Fall 1973 (N=395) %
Save money	34.1	29.4
Grad or Prof. School sooner	36.5	34.7
Avoid general freshman courses	12.8	21.5
Support myself sooner	9.5	6.1
Prefer experimental curriculum	1.7	1.0
Other	5.4	7.3

There were no major differences between the groups in their responses to a question regarding the second reason for participating. Again, frequently noted reasons were the same as previously reported with the rank order being "*save money*," "*avoid general freshman courses*," and enter "*graduate or professional school sooner*." (See TABLE 3)

TABLE 3
SECOND MOST IMPORTANT REASON FOR PARTICIPATING

Reason	Participants	
	Fall 1972 (N=294) %	Fall 1973 (N=393) %
Save money	37.8	35.9
Grad or Prof. School sooner	21.8	21.9
Avoid general freshman courses	23.1	23.7
Support myself sooner	11.9	13.5
Prefer experimental curriculum	3.1	1.3
Other	2.4	3.8

B. Reasons for Not Participating

There were some differences between the non-participant groups in the most important reason for declining the Program. Over one-fourth of the Fall 1972 group compared to 15.3% of the Fall 1973 group indicated that their non-participation was owing to "*major not included in program.*" On the other hand, 23.3% of the Fall 1973 group noted the most important reason for declining as being "*limit college social life.*" Only 12.7% of the earlier group so indicated. (See TABLE 4) A comparison between the groups on the second important reason for not participating was not possible because of response option variation from the 1972 to the 1973 versions of the questionnaire.

TABLE 4
MOST IMPORTANT REASON FOR NOT PARTICIPATING

Reason	Non-Participants	
	Fall 1972 (N=111) %	Fall 1973 (N=197) %
Inferior degree	20.0	19.0
Hinder graduate school chances	10.9	16.0
Limit college social life	12.7	23.3
Major not included in program	27.3	15.3
No teaching certificate in 3 years	16.4	16.0
Major & teaching certif. not included	12.7	10.4

C. Preference for Geneseo

A large majority of participants and non-participants for both years reported that Geneseo was either their first or second choice. In terms of the College being the first choice, 70.3% of the Fall 1972 non-participants reported such a preference compared to 65.9% of the participants for the same year. In Fall 1973 the pattern was reversed in that 64.6% of the Fall 1973 participants indicated such a preference compared to 59.9% of the non-participant group. (See TABLE 5)

TABLE 5
PREFERENCE FOR ATTENDING GENESEO

Choice	Participants		Non-Participants	
	Fall 1972 (N=296) %	Fall 1973 (N=396) %	Fall 1972 (N=145) %	Fall 1973 (N=212) %
First	65.9	64.6	70.3	59.9
Second	22.3	17.9	17.2	22.6
Third	5.1	5.8	6.9	4.7
Uncertain	3.7	1.5	2.8	1.4
Other	3.0	10.1	2.8	11.3

D. Student Regard for the Program

In order to assess the drawing power of the Program, participants were queried as to their willingness to attend Geneseo regardless of the existence of the Program. Slightly over one-fifth of the Fall 1973 group indicated that they would not have attended, compared to 13.6% of the earlier group. (See TABLE 6)

TABLE 6
WILLINGNESS TO ATTEND GENESEO REGARDLESS OF
3-YEAR DEGREE PROGRAM

Response	Participants	
	Fall 1972 (N=295) %	Fall 1973 (N=389) %
Yes	86.4	79.2
No	13.6	20.8

Student commitment to the Program may be inferred from a hypothetical question pertinent to making the same decision to participate. Although a large majority of the participant groups would have repeated the decision to participate, more of the Fall 1972 group would have done so with 78.6% responding "Yes" compared to 66.2% of the Fall 1973 group. In addition, 26.8% of the Fall 1973 group was "Uncertain" compared to 19.7% of their predecessors. (See TABLE 7)

TABLE 7
IN RETROSPECT WOULD CHOOSE 3-YEAR DEGREE PROGRAM AGAIN

Response	Participants	
	Fall 1972 (N=295) %	Fall 1973 (N=396) %
Yes	78.6	66.2
No	1.7	7.1
Uncertain	19.7	26.8

E. Area Tests

Standardized Area Tests in Social Science, Humanities, and Natural Science of the Undergraduate Program for Counseling and Evaluation (Educational Testing Service) were administered to demonstrate student proficiency in these core areas. The overwhelming student reaction to them was *"challenging and representative of college level work."* Relatively few students considered them to be *"easy,"* yet 17.7% of the Fall 1973 students considered them to be *"challenging but a repeat of high school work"* compared to 5.7% response from the Fall 1972 group. (See TABLE 8)

TABLE 8
PARTICIPANT REACTIONS TO AREA TESTS

Response	Participants	
	Fall 1972 (N=281) %	Fall 1973 (N=384) %
Challenging and representative of introductory college work	70.8	74.7
Easy and representative of introductory college work	2.5	5.7
Challenging but a repeat of high school work	5.7	17.7
Easy and a repeat of high school work	1.1	1.8
No opinion	19.9	- -

F. Transfer Possibilities

Student commitment to the Program and to the goal of obtaining a baccalaureate degree from Geneseo can also be inferred from transfer plans, both within the College and to another college. The Fall 1972 participants were much more resolved about staying in the Program than were Fall 1973 participants. Whereas 72.6% of the former group plan to remain in the Program, 59.2% of the latter group were so inclined. Moreover, a smaller percentage of the Fall 1972 group plan on transferring to the four-year program compared to their counterparts. (See TABLE 9)

TABLE 9
PLAN ON TRANSFERRING TO 4-YEAR PROGRAM

Response	Participants	
	Fall 1972 (N=296) %	Fall 1973 (N=395) %
Yes, transfer	1.7	9.9
No, remain in program	72.6	59.2
Uncertain	25.7	30.9

In terms of transferring to another college, more of the participant groups plan on remaining at Geneseo compared to the non-participant groups. In fact, over 70% of the participant groups plan on remaining while the corresponding response rates per year for the non-participant groups were noticeably lower. (See TABLE 10)

TABLE 10
PLAN ON TRANSFERRING TO ANOTHER INSTITUTION

Response	Participants		Non-Participants	
	Fall 1972 (N=296) %	Fall 1973 (N=397) %	Fall 1972 (N=146) %	Fall 1973 (N=212) %
Yes	4.1	6.3	6.2	16.5
No	79.4	71.5	69.9	55.7
Uncertain	16.6	22.2	24.0	27.8

G. Academic Milieu

If one of the reasons for the 3-Year Degree Program is to reduce the repetition between high school and college work, then the response pattern to such a question should differentiate participants from non-participants. Such was the case between the groups for both years (although the data were not overwhelming), and more so in Fall 1973 where 18.5% of the non-participants considered their studies to be "moderately" to "very repetitious" compared to 13.7% for the participants in the same year. (See TABLE 11)

TABLE 11
PROGRAM OF STUDY COMPARED WITH HIGH SCHOOL

Response	Participants		Non-Participants	
	Fall 1972 (N=295)	Fall 1973 (N=145)	Fall 1972 (N=145)	Fall 1973 (N=210)
Very repetitious	2.0	1.8	2.1	3.3
Moderately repetitious	15.6	11.9	17.2	15.2
Slightly repetitious	35.3	30.1	38.6	30.0
Essentially different	47.1	56.2	42.1	51.4

H. Advisement

Academic advisement is a perennial topic in higher education. More of the participants for a given year tend to consult with academic advisors than do non-participants. Such a pattern is particularly evident in Fall 1973 where 70.7% of the participants reported seeing their academic advisors once or twice since orientation compared to 58.7% of the non-participants. (See TABLE 12)

TABLE 12
CONSULTATION WITH ACADEMIC ADVISORS

Response	Participants		Non-Participants	
	Fall 1972 (N=295)	Fall 1973 (N=395)	Fall 1972 (N=146)	Fall 1973 (N=206)
Once	30.2	53.7	17.8	45.6
Twice	10.5	17.0	6.8	13.1
On several occasions	3.1	4.3	0.0	5.3
None	56.3	25.1	75.3	35.9

I. General Reaction Comments

Several students offered comments at the end of the questionnaire. Representative sample comments from each group are presented in Appendix D.

IV. STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

A total of 15 randomly selected students (10 participants and 5 declines) were interviewed by Institutional Research Office staff members. For the most part, responses tended to confirm what was being reported on the questionnaires.

- A. The prospects for saving money and attending graduate school sooner were welcomed by participants. One participant was the oldest of five children and the anticipated fiscal strain on the family was a prime factor in selecting the Program. Three of the non-participants reported that their majors were not readily accommodated in the Program, while others were uncertain as to their major.
- B. Sources of influence for participants varied. Parents and college staff members were most frequently noted, yet a few said that no one in particular had influenced them; rather, they had arrived at their decision by themselves.
- C. Most of the students interviewed felt that the best way to communicate the 3-Year Degree Program to high school students was via high school guidance counselors. There were mixed reactions to the usefulness of printed announcements which were generally considered second best to a personal approach. In this regard, one student commented, *"Pamphlets don't work — they are only thrown away."*
- D. In terms of recommending the Program to other students, both types of students felt that having some idea as to one's major and possible career goal is important because of the limited time period. One student commented that the Program was *"not really that different from the four-year program except that you can avoid core courses."* Two students would remind prospective participants to be alert to the possibility of transferring to another college in that exemption from core requirements at Geneseo might not apply to other colleges.
- E. Interviewee reactions were varied to a general statement about 3-year students *"rushing through college with fewer opportunities for social and academic growth."* Representative responses were:

- Academically, maybe, because of missing broadening scope of introductory courses. Socially - you are what you make it, whether 3 years or 4.
- Some students feel the pressure of being "boxed" in.
- Statement is false. Not rushing, but cutting out baloney. First year most growth* - after that, minimal. One year less of prolonging education really won't make a difference.
*Social growth implied.

V. DISCUSSION

A. Reasons for Participation

The more obvious reasons for participating in the Program, *"save money,"* enter *"graduate or professional school sooner,"* and *"avoid general freshman courses,"* were again empirically validated. However, the reason showing the largest percentage increase between the two years was *"avoid general freshman courses."* Such a development suggests that Fall 1973 participants were somewhat more interested in avoiding perceived repetition in course work or courses in which they have no interest compared to the more "pressing" reasons of saving money and early entrance to graduate school. If such is the case, an open admissions policy to the Program may have an even greater impact on general education core requirements because of the larger number of students involved.

B. Reasons for Not Participating

Since the establishment of the 3-Year Degree Program in the Fall of 1971, the number of degree majors has increased so that by the Fall of 1973 nearly every major -with the important exceptions of Elementary Education, Special Education, and Medical Technology - was available in both a Three-Year and Four-Year version. This increase should have served to reduce the number of students electing not to participate because of the non-availability of an intended program. The elimination of programatic barriers should allow more students to make the decision on the basis of more fundamental personal feelings and concerns.

In Fall 1973, the percentage of students not participating because of lack of program availability declined. At the same time, the number of students not participating because they feared a loss of time for social life or reduced chances for graduate school acceptance increased. Regardless of the validity or non-validity of these reasons, if students feel them as potential constraints, they will act upon them. It is, of course, more evident that no program, including a time-shortened degree program, meets the interests of every student.

C. Preference for Geneseo

The large percentage of students reporting that the College was their first or second choice is not surprising. Given the current college admissions scene - the beginning of a buyer's market - such a response would likely be the case at most state colleges. Of note, however, is the slightly higher percentage of Fall 1973 participants compared to non-participants who noted that Geneseo was their first choice. Perhaps, the existence of the 3-Year Degree Program is starting to serve as a unique attraction for the College.

D. Student Regard for the Program

A more direct way of reviewing the influence of the 3-Year Degree Program in attracting students to the College is to determine student willingness to attend regardless of the existence of the Program. More of the Fall 1973 participants, compared to those of the preceding year, may have been attracted to Geneseo because of the Program. This evidence implies that an open admissions policy will also serve as an admissions recruitment aid.

E. Area Tests

A large majority of both participant groups consider the tests to be difficult. The initial faculty decision to use these tests was somewhat controversial, particularly regarding their appropriateness. Student reaction - finding the tests challenging and representative of college level work - tends to support the decision to use the tests. However, it will be prudent to continue monitoring student reaction in order to determine if the Area Tests assume the role of a deterrent to students' electing the Program.

F. Transfer Possibilities

A larger percentage of Fall 1972 participants plan on remaining in the Program than do their Fall 1973 participant counterparts. From this it would appear that a selective admissions policy tends to attract students with a stronger commitment to the Program. Further evidence to this effect can be inferred from plans to transfer to another institution. Again, Fall 1972 participants reflect a stronger commitment to remain than recent participants. Non-participants for both years tend to be less sure about remaining at Geneseo. In sum, one could speculate that although an open admissions policy will attract more students to the Program and, perhaps, to the College, the resolve to remain in the Program and at Geneseo is not as great as when a selective admissions policy is in effect. Perhaps, there is also a lesser feeling of status.

G. Academic Milieu

Although the percentage differences are not very large, there is evidence to the effect that non-participants tend to find their course work more repetitious of high school than do participants. Such evidence tends to support one of the reasons for the 3-Year Degree Program, *i.e.*, there is a fair amount of repetition between high school and college, especially at the introductory course level. A larger percentage of the Fall 1973 participants (open admissions policy) find their course work "*essentially different*" than do the Fall 1972 participants (selective admissions policy.) This finding would suggest that academically a more heterogeneous group is attracted to the Program when an open admissions policy is in effect.

H. Advisement

It is not particularly unusual that after summer orientation participants should see academic advisors to a greater extent than non-participants. New programs tend to entail such services. However, a larger percentage of Fall 1973 participants also saw their advisors at least once or twice compared to participants of the year before. Not only does the 3-Year Program require more advisement services than the traditional program, it also implies more of such services when the Program is open to all as opposed to selective.

VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Three-Year Degree Program participants tend to differ from non-participants in their responses to similar questions. In addition, participants admitted under a selective admissions policy tend to differ in responses from those of open admissions participants. Generally speaking, selective participants appear to be more committed to the Program and goal-oriented compared to the open admissions participant group. The Program is still in its experimental trial period and further evaluation will serve to support or disprove observations to date.

In any event, the open admissions policy to the Program seems to truly have afforded Geneseo students less time and more options in their pursuit of the baccalaureate.

###

Appendix A

PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

(white)

Appendix B

NON-PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

(yellow)



STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCE
GENESE0, NEW YORK

Office of Institutional Research

October 1973

Dear Student:

As a 3-Year Degree Program student your help is needed in providing additional insight regarding the Program. Not only are Geneseo personnel interested in overall reactions to the Program, but a host of individuals at the State and National level as well. Moreover, if adjustments are needed in the Program, your reactions will be necessary to provide us with direction.

The following survey form is brief and should take no longer than a couple of minutes to complete. I ask that you give serious attention to completing the form by circling the letter of the response option (*circle one letter only*) which best reflects your response to each question. Two questions near the end are "open-ended" and thus provide you with an opportunity to expand upon your reactions to the Program to date.

Individual responses will be kept anonymous and only group responses will be reported. The code number at the top of the form is for follow-up purposes only.

Please return your completed form via the enclosed envelope as soon as possible, preferably by NOVEMBER 19, to:

Dr. James L. McNally
Office of Institutional Research
Erwin 220

I thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

James L. McNally
Director

1. What is the most important reason for your participating in the 3-Year Degree Program?
 - a. I will be able to save money.
 - b. I can enter graduate or professional school sooner.
 - c. I will be able to avoid general freshman courses.
 - d. I will be able to support myself financially sooner.
 - e. I like the idea of an experimental curriculum.
 - f. Other (*give reason*) _____
2. What is the second most important reason?
 - a. I will be able to save money.
 - b. I can enter graduate or professional school sooner.
 - c. I will be able to avoid general freshman courses.
 - d. I will be able to support myself financially sooner.
 - e. I like the idea of an experimental curriculum.
 - f. Other (*give reason*) _____
3. Did the existence of the 3-Year Degree Program influence your decision to come to Geneseo?
 - a. Yes, strong influence.
 - b. Yes, moderate influence.
 - c. No, did not influence my decision.
4. Did you attend the group program during the orientation period at which Mrs. Joan Schumaker presented the 3-Year Program, or did you discuss this program with her at a later date?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
5. When did you make the decision to participate in the 3-Year Program?
 - a. Senior year in high school.
 - b. Summer orientation program.
 - c. Beginning of Fall semester.
 - d. Some other time (*please explain*) _____
6. Which source of information about the 3-Year Program was most helpful to you in making your decision?
 - a. College representative.
 - b. Newspaper or magazine article.
 - c. College announcement.
 - d. Friends already in Program.
 - e. Other source (*please explain*) _____
7. As to your decision to attend Geneseo, was this college your:
 - a. First choice.
 - b. Second choice.
 - c. Third choice.
 - d. Fourth or lower choice.
 - e. Uncertain as to choice level.
8. If Geneseo did not have a 3-Year Degree Program, would you still have decided to attend the College?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

If "No", what other College would you have attended? _____

9. In retrospect, would you choose the 3-Year Program again?
- Yes
 - Uncertain
 - No
- If "No", why not? _____
10. Do you plan on transferring to the 4-Year Program within the next semester or two?
- Yes
 - No
 - Uncertain
- If "Yes", why? _____
11. Do you plan on transferring to another four-year college within the next semester or two?
- Yes
 - No
 - Uncertain
- If "Yes", why? _____
12. How do you regard your present course work?
- Easy.
 - Moderately difficult.
 - Quite difficult.
 - Very difficult.
13. How do you regard your present course work in comparison to your high school work?
- Very repetitious.
 - Moderately repetitious.
 - Slightly repetitious.
 - Essentially different from high school work.
14. Do you consider your program of study to be notably different from those taken by 4-year students?
- Yes
 - No
 - Uncertain
- If "No", why? _____
15. Have you taken one or more of the Comprehensive Area Tests required of 3-Year Program students?
- Yes
 - No
16. How do you regard these tests?
- Easy, and a repeat of high school work.
 - Challenging, but still a repeat of high school work.
 - Easy, and representative of introductory college-level work.
 - Challenging, and representative of introductory college-level work.
17. Have you changed your major since beginning the 3-Year Program?
- Yes
 - No
 - Have not declared a major.
- If "Yes", why? _____

18. After the initial orientation and registration for the first semester, how many times have you found it necessary to consult with your academic advisor?
- Not at all.
 - Once.
 - Twice.
 - More than two times.
19. Which of the following best describes your impression of your academic advisor regarding your program?
(Mark one from each column, unless responding "g")
- | | |
|---|--|
| a. Quite knowledgeable about my program. | d. Quite willing to help me with my questions or problems. |
| b. Moderately knowledgeable about my program. | e. Moderately willing to help me when I need it. |
| c. Not at all knowledgeable about my program. | f. Not at all willing to help me. |
| g. Have not seen my advisor yet. | |
20. What academic and/or student personnel services not currently being provided do you feel a need for?
-
-
21. Have you heard about the availability of College services from official announcements or guides, or have you generally had to rely on the "grapevine" to learn about services and where to go for help?
- Have generally heard about services from College announcements.
 - Have heard about various services from College and grapevine sources.
 - Have heard about services almost completely from grapevine sources.
 - Have heard very little about services from any source.
22. Do you have any other general reactions regarding the 3-Year Degree Program?
-
-



STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCE
GENESEO, NEW YORK

Office of Institutional Research

October 1973

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dear Student:

As one eligible to participate in Geneseo's 3-Year Degree Program and having declined an invitation to do so, you have much to offer in providing additional insight regarding the Program. In a sense, your perceptions represent "*the other side of the coin,*" and help to round out the picture. Not only are Geneseo personnel interested in overall reactions to the Program, but a host of individuals at the State and National level as well. Moreover, if adjustments are needed in the Program, your reactions will be necessary to provide us with direction.

The following survey form is brief and should take you no longer than a couple of minutes to complete. I ask that you give serious attention to completing the form by circling the letter of the response option (*circle one letter only*) which best reflects your response to each question. Two questions near the end are "*open-ended*" and thus provide you with an opportunity to expand upon your reactions to the Program to date.

Individual responses will be kept anonymous and only group responses will be reported. The code number at the top of the form is for follow-up purposes only.

Please return your completed form via the enclosed envelope as soon as possible, preferably by NOVEMBER 19, to:

Dr. James L. McNally
Office of Institutional Research
Erwin 220

I thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

James L. McNally
Director

CODE: _____

ACADEMIC MAJOR: _____

1. What is the most important reason for your not participating in the 3-Year Degree Program? *(fill in)*
- It might be an inferior degree.
 - It might not be readily accepted for graduate or professional school.
 - I might not be able to participate fully in college social life.
 - My major field (*or intended major*) is not included in the 3-Year Program.
 - I would not be able to obtain a provisional teaching certificate at the end of three years.
 - My major field and provisional certification are not included in the 3-Year Program.
2. What is the second most important reason for your not participating in the 3-Year Degree Program?
- It might be an inferior degree.
 - It might not be readily accepted for graduate or professional school.
 - I might not be able to participate fully in college social life.
 - My major field (*or intended major*) is not included in the 3-Year Program.
 - I would not be able to obtain a provisional teaching certificate at the end of three years.
 - My major field and provisional certification are not included in the 3-Year Program.
 - Some other reason (*please specify*) _____
3. Did the existence of the 3-Year Degree Program influence your decision to come to Geneseo?
- Yes, strong influence.
 - Yes, moderate influence.
 - No, did not influence my decision.
4. Did you attend the group program during the orientation period at which Mrs. Joan Schumaker presented the 3-Year Program, or did you discuss this program with her at a later date?
- Yes
 - No
5. Do you feel that you had sufficient information on which to base your decision not to participate?
- Yes
 - No
- If "No", what other information could you have used? _____
6. In retrospect, would you make the same decision again not to participate?
- Yes
 - No
- If "No", why not? _____
7. If it were possible for you to transfer to the 3-Year Program, would you do so?
- Yes
 - No
- If "Yes", why? _____

8. As to your decision to attend Geneseo, was this College your:
- First choice.
 - Second choice.
 - Third choice.
 - Fourth or lower choice.
 - Uncertain as to choice level.
9. Do you plan on transferring to another four-year college within the next semester or two?
- Yes
 - No
 - Uncertain
- If "Yes", why? _____
10. Do you consider your program of study to be notably different from those taken by 3-year students?
- Yes
 - No
 - Uncertain
- If "No", why not? _____
11. How do you regard the Area Tests required of 3-Year students (*by hearsay*)?
- Not familiar with them.
 - Easy, and a repeat of high school work.
 - Challenging, but still a repeat of high school work.
 - Easy, and representative of introductory college-level work.
 - Challenging, and representative of introductory college-level work.
12. How do you regard your present course work?
- Easy.
 - Moderately difficult.
 - Quite difficult.
 - Extremely difficult.
13. How do you regard your present course work in comparison to your high school work?
- Very repetitious.
 - Moderately repetitious.
 - Slightly repetitious.
 - Essentially different from high school work.
14. Have you changed your major since beginning college?
- Yes
 - No
 - Have not yet declared a major.
- If "Yes", why? _____ How many times? _____
15. After the initial orientation and registration for the first semester, how many times have you found it necessary to consult with your academic advisor?
- Not once.
 - Once.
 - Twice.
 - More than two times.

16. Which of the following best describes your impression of your faculty advisor regarding your program (if you have seen him/her)?
(Mark one from each column, unless responding "g")
- | | |
|---|--|
| a. Quite knowledgeable about my program. | d. Quite willing to help me with my questions or problems. |
| b. Moderately knowledgeable about my program. | e. Moderately willing to help me when I need it. |
| c. Not at all knowledgeable about my program. | f. Not at all willing to help me. |
| g. Have not seen my advisor yet. | |

17. What academic and/or student personnel services not currently being provided do you feel a need for?
-
-
-

18. Have you heard about the availability of College services from official announcements or guides, or have you generally had to rely on the "grapevine" to learn about services and where to go for help?
- Have generally heard about services from College announcements.
 - Have heard about various services from College and grapevine sources.
 - Have heard about services almost completely from grapevine sources.
 - Have heard very little about services from any source.

19. Do you have any other general reactions regarding the 3-Year Degree Program?
-
-
-

INTERVIEW FORM
3-YEAR DEGREE FOLLOW-UP SURVEY
FALL 1973

1. Why are you in the program? _____
Extent of Commitment - _____
Anticipated Problems - A. During Program _____
B. Post Graduate Plans _____
2. Did anyone in particular influence your decision to participate? _____
3. What do you feel is the best way to communicate the 3-Year Degree Program to high school students? _____
4. Do you think the 3-Year option is a good reason for choosing Geneseo? _____
Did you choose Geneseo for that reason? _____
5. What would you really tell a friend about the 3-Year Degree Program? _____
6. What sort of group identity do you feel you share with other 3-Year students? _____
7. Critics of the 3-Year Program have claimed that participants are "Rushing through college; specifically, their opportunities for social and academic growth are reduced." What is your reaction to such a statement? _____
8. Do you feel that the Area Tests are appropriate for the 3-Year Degree Program? _____
9. Do you feel that 4-Year students should be able to transfer into the 3-Year Program? _____
10. Other reactions: _____

Appendix D

GENERAL REACTION COMMENTS

PARTICIPANTS - FALL 1973

"I think it's quite foolish for a student not to participate because he cannot lose anything & if he doesn't pass the three tests, he can easily transfer to the four yr. program."

"Excellent idea - wouldn't be surprised to see many more colleges adopting it."

"Although my courses are generally harder than general freshman ones and my grades may be somewhat resultingly lower, I appreciate the freedom of choice it gives me and the avoidance of general repetitious classes."

"It is a very good program & will probably make it possible for a lot of people to attend a 4 yr. school who may have not previously had an opportunity financially."

"It's a pretty good deal - I like it."

NON-PARTICIPANTS - FALL 1973

"I might join if I knew what I wanted but ... wish we knew whether the 3-year degree would be as good as a 4-year degree. Even advisors disagree."

"Basically it seems a good idea. I'm almost sorry I'm not in it now. Perhaps it's just a case of 'grass being greener.' Generally, it seems like a good program."

"The 3-year program is bad because it rushes student through college during a period when they should be taking their time. If you can get a degree in 3 years, why not also in 2 yrs. or even in 1 year. College is something to be experienced not to be rushed through and pumped out into society."

"I think it is rushing the student even if he is willing. Employers are bound to hire 4 year over 3 year students."

"It is often said that college is the best 4 years of your life (both academically & socially). I like to keep it that way. - 'Life is a heap of doing - both working and enjoying. Involve yourself in both.' There is no need to change."

"Sounds good but I think it needs a little more maturity in years."