DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 104 460 JC 750 247

TITLE Conference Proceedings: Annual Ohio Developmental Education Conference (2d Cleveland, October 6-7, 1974).
INSTITUTION Cuyahoga Community Coll., Cleveland, Ohio.
PUB DATE 6 Mar 75
NOTE 94p.; Conference sponsored jointly by Cuyahoga Community College and the Ohio Board of Regents

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$4.43 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Bibliographies; Compensatory Education; Counseling; Curriculum Research; *Developmental Programs; Educational Finance; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Financial Support; *Junior Colleges; Program Costs; *Program Evaluation; *Remedial Programs; Student Needs
IDENTIFIERS *Ohio

ABSTRACT

For this conference "developmental education" was defined as "any program which assists students in overcoming any deficiencies they may have in their preparation for post-secondary education." This document includes summary reports of panel discussions and the texts of keynote addresses. Panel session topics include: (1) Developmental Education, What Is It?; (2) Methods of Evaluating the Effectiveness of Developmental Education Programs; (3) Counseling Students in Developmental Education; (4) Identifying and Recruiting Students in Need of Developmental Education; (5) Developmental Education Programs for Adults Returning to Formal Schooling; (6) What Does Research Say About Developmental Education: What's Being Done in Developmental Education in Other States?;and (7) Finding Funds for Developmental Education. Keynote addresses include a speech by Dr. Nolan M. Ellison, President of Cuyahoga Community College, entitled "Developmental Education or Educational Development, Means or Ends?" and a speech by Dr. James A. Norton, Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents, entitled "Closing Comments on Issues in Developmental Education." A list of references for a resource development library, evaluations of the conference, a list of conference participants, and a short bibliography on various topics pertinent to developmental education are also included. (DC)

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

Second Annual Ohio
Developmental Education
Conference
October 6-7, 1974

Co-sponsored by:
Ohio Board of Regents
and
Cuyahoga Community College

Office of Institutional Research and Evaluation
Office of Executive Vice President

March 6, 1975

Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

On October 6 and 7, 1974 the Second Annual Ohio Developmental Education Conference was held in Cleveland, cosponsored by the Ohio Board of Regents and Cuyahoga Community College. Conference activities were held on the Metropolitan Campus of Cuyahoga Community College and at the nearby Hollenden House. Over 200 persons attended or participated in the Conference sessions, representing nearly 60 campuses of higher learning from all areas of the state of Ohio. The conferees brought to this assembly a broad composition of institutional positions, viewpoints, and knowledge on the subject of developmental education. Their interest and enthusiasm to improve developmental activities in their institutions was the inspiration for the Conference and the goal toward which it was directed.

This Conference was the second annual statewide event to exchange information, discuss issues, and promote program development in developmental education under the aegis of the Ohio Board of Regents. The first in this series was held in the fall of 1973 at The Ohio State University. The Ohio Board of Regents and many interested educators in the state promoted the conference to bring together public and private, two-year and four-year institutions, to facilitate communication and further understanding among educators about this vital new area in higher education. The response both in 1973 and 1974 has been very favorable.

The 1974 Conference continued to work with a broad definition of developmental education: programs within institutions of higher learning which provide assistance to students to help them overcome any deficiencies they may have in their preparation for post-secondary education. Historically this effort focused on remediation in academic work, with the goal of bringing each student's academic performance "up to the norm." Today the attitudes and values of this notion are being extended. Institutions see themselves having an opportunity to provide for different learning levels and styles among their students. Their goal is to develop institutional flexibility to meet a wider range of students' needs. This means the coordination of a variety of institutional offices and departments including counseling, continuing edu- ion, and student recruiting as well as the academic departments.

There were panel discussions at the Conference devoted to a range of questions related to this effort: How can we evaluate a developmental education program? How can we identify students in need of developmental education? How do we counsel developmental students? What do we do for adults returning to school? What does research say about developmental education? How can we get funding for our developmental programs? These and other concerns were raised in the Conference sessions.

This document is intended to provide a summary of the panel sessions and to present the banquet addresses. These summary reports were prepared with reference to an audio tape recording of each session and a written summary prepared by the person present at each session with the recorder's responsibility.

An evaluation of the Conference was conducted using evaluation forms filled out and returned by conferees at the close of the Conference. The evaluation report is included in this document.

A short bibliography was compiled for this document from references submitted by panel participants on various topics pertinent to developmental education.

Finally, a list of conferees and other summary information has been included.

Audio tape recordings of the panel sessions and the banquet and luncheon addresses in cassette tape format may be obtained by written request to the Educational Media Center, Cuyahoga Community College, before December 31, 1975. The cost is $1.75 for a taped copy of each session. Any request for taped copies should indicate specifically the sessions for which tapes are being requested.

A word of acknowledgment is appropriate here. The Planning Sub-committee devoted considerable time and thought to develop the framework for the Conference program. The following persons are members of the Planning Sub-committee:

Malcolm Costa, Youngstown State University
Regina Goodman, Ohio Board of Regents
Thomas McCuistion, Clark Technical College
Elizabeth Menson, Ohio University, Lancaster Branch
William Watson, Ohio State University
Henry Whitcomb, Ohio Board of Regents

However, the Conference would not have been possible without the generous cooperation of the participants. We are sincerely grateful to them for their willingness to contribute their time and expertise. Finally, we thank the conferees for their enthusiastic support.

Additional copies of this Proceedings may be obtained through my office.

Richard C. Romoser
Conference Chairperson
Office of Institutional Research
and Evaluation
Cuyahoga Community College
700 Carnegie Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

(216) 241-5966

CONFERENCE PROGRAM LISTING

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 6, ACTIVITIES

12:00 Noon – 2:00 P.M.: Conference Registration, Metropolitan Campus. Theatre Lobby.

Free coffee, punch, conversation. Sign up for demonstrations.

2:00 P.M. – 3:25 P.M. Session 1: General Session Theatre
"Developmental Education, What Is It?"

Opening Remarks:

Henry Whitcomb, Director of Financial Management, Ohio Board of Regents

University Viewpoint:

Milton Wilson, Assistant Vice President and Dean for Human Relations, Kent State University

Technical College Viewpoint:

Albert Salerno, Dean of Instruction, Clark Technical College

Private College Viewpoint:

Doris Coster, Dean of Students, College of Wooster

Community College Viewpoint:

Barry Heermann, Chairman of Public Services, Sinclair Community College

3:30 P.M. – 5:00 P.M. Concurrent Sessions. (See information sheet distributed at registration.)

3:30 P.M. – 4:00 P.M. Session 2A: Paper Presentations

Humanities 106 — "Utilization of Inter-Personal Competence in a Preparatory Program." Robert B. Meacham, Director of Student Life and Counseling Services, University of Cincinnati.

Humanities 108 — "Innovative Methods of Recruiting Reading Students." Dorothy R. Judd, Troy State University.

4:00 P.M. – 4:30 P.M. Session 2B: Paper Presentations

Humanities 106 — "New Instructional Techniques." Hunter R. Boylan, Contingency Manager, Modular Achievement Learning Center, Bowling Green State University.

Humanities 108 — "Meeting Community Needs Through Developmental Education." Faye Curran, Coordinator of Developmental Education, Miami University-Middletown.

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 6, ACTIVITIES (Continued)

3:30 P.M. – 5:00 P.M. Session 3A: Demonstrations. (See demonstration information sheet available at registration for details)

Library 504	Biology Instruction, Joseph Clovesko, Assistant Professor, Cuyahoga Community College
Library 406	Communications Learning Center, Frances Franklin, Assistant Professor, Cuyahoga Community College
Science & Tech. 101	Chemistry Instruction, Louis Kotnik, Professor, Cuyahoga Community College
Humanities 320	Mathematics Learning Center, Jack Porter, Professor, Cuyahoga Community College
Humanities 117	"Academic Support Services: Preparatory and Continuing Studies in Developmental Education" Lynn Rosen, Moderator, Developmental Education, Eastern Campus, Cuyahoga Community College.
Science & Tech. 323	Nursing Education – The Learning Experience Guide for Students (LEGS) Program, Johnetta Mixon, Professor, Cuyahoga Community College.
Science & Tech. 115	Engineering Technology – "Individualized Instruction and Electric Currents," Margaret Taber, Professor, Cuyahoga Community College.

3:30 P.M. – 5:00 P.M. Session 3B: Peer Counseling Simulations
Helen Cook, Director of Student Development, University of Toledo (Sign-up at registration, limited to 12 persons per group. Select only one group, 1½ hours duration.)

Humanities 217	Group I:	"Group Communication Process."
Humanities 217	Group II:	"Problem-Solving."
Humanities 220	Group III:	"Interpersonal Communication."
Humanities 220	Group IV:	"Values Clarification."

4:45 P.M. – 5:15 P.M. Coffee/Tea/Soft Drinks
Humanities Lobby (by Rooms 101 and 102)

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 6, ACTIVITIES (Concluded)

5:15 P.M. – 6:30 P.M. **Concurrent Sessions**

Humanities 101

Session 4: "Methods of Evaluating the Effectiveness of Developmental Education Programs."

Moderator: Richard Romoser, Director of Institutional Research and Evaluation, Cuyahoga Community College

Panel: Peter Hampton, Director of Developmental Programs, University of Akron

Ralph Pruitt, Dean of Division of Special Studies, Cleveland State University

George Simmons, Director of Developmental Education, Lorain County Community College

Humanities 102

Session 5: "Counseling Students in Developmental Education."

Moderator: Madeleine McKivigan, Coordinator, Personal and Academic Effectiveness Program, Ohio Dominican College

Panel: Helen Cook, Director of Student Development, University of Toledo

Edward Florak, Vice President and Dean of Student Affairs, Jefferson County Technical Institute

Don Shrimplin, Instructor-Counselor, Cuyahoga Community College

7:00 P.M. – 9:00 P.M. **Session 6: Banquet Session**

Student Center Cafeteria Top Floor

Presiding: David Hill, Vice Chairman, Ohio Board of Regents

Address: "Developmental Education or Educational Development, Means or Ends." Nolen Ellison, President, Cuyahoga Community College

Announcements: Richard Romoser, Chairperson, Conference Planning Subcommittee

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 6, ACTIVITIES (Concluded)

9:00 P.M. – 10:30 P.M. **Session 7: Relax and Reflect**

East Ballroom A
Hollenden House

Cash Bar

Open discussion of selected topics. Ralph Pruitt, Dean of Division of Special Studies, Cleveland State University

MONDAY, OCTOBER 7, ACTIVITIES

9:00 A.M. – 10:30 A.M. **Concurrent Sessions**

East Ballroom A

Session 8: "Identifying and Recruiting Students in Need of Developmental Education."

Moderator: Anne Shearer, Assistant Dean, University Division, Director of Special services, Wright State University

Panel: Samuel Carrington, Director, Project Search, Cuyahoga Community College

Malcolm Costa, Director of Developmental Education, Youngstown State University

Rosemary V. Lips, Coordinator, Developmental Systems for Handicapped Students, Kent State University

Darwin Williams, Coordinator of Trio Programs and Director of Student Special Services, University of Cincinnati

MONDAY, OCTOBER 7 ACTIVITIES (Continued)

Parlors A,B,C

Session 9: "Developmental Education Programs for Adults Returning to Formal Schooling."

Moderator: Elizabeth Menson, Acting Assistant Campus Director, Ohio University, Lancaster Branch

Panel:
- James Lorion, Acting Dean and Director Continuing Education, Cuyahoga Community College
- Anne Saunier, Citizens' Task Force on Education, Staff, Ohio Board of Regents
- Henry Taylor, Director of Developmental Program for University Maintenance Personnel, University of Cincinnati

10:30 A.M. – 10:45 A.M. **Coffee/Tea/Soft Drinks**

East Ballroom Foyer — Conference Evaluation forms will be available here.

10:45 – 12:15 A.M. **Concurrent Sessions and Campus Tours** (Tour sign up at Registration or Conference Headquarters, Hollenden House)

Parlors A,B,C

Session 10: "What Does Research Say About Developmental Education? What's Being Done in Developmentol Education in Other States?"

Moderator: Mac A. Stewart, Assistant Dean, University College, Ohio State University

Panel:
- John Elder, Chairman, Developmental Studies, Sinclair Community College
- Donald Jelfo, Assistant Professor, Cuyahoga Community College
- David Williams, Director, Field Experiences, College of Education, Ohio State University

MONDAY, OCTOBER 7, ACTIVITIES (Concluded)

Eost Bollroom A

Session 11: "Finding Funds for Developmental Education."

Moderotor: Morgoret Arter, Director of Speciol Assistonce, Cuyohogo Community College

Pnnel: Anne Coughlin, Foundotion Associote, The Clevelond Foundotion

Hol Poyne, Deon of Developmentol Services, Oberlin College

Theodore Shermon, Vice President of Society Notionol Bonk, Greoter Clevelond Growth Associotion

10:45 A.M. – 12:15 A.M.

Meet in Lobby of Hollendon House

Tour to Cleveland State University

Visit to Division of Speciol Studies, hosted by Robert Ridenour, Assistont Deon of Speciol Studies, Clevelond Stote University

Meet in Greoter Clevelond Room

Tour to Metropolitan Campus, Cuyahoga Community College

Visit to Communicotions Leorning Center, Mothemotics Leorning Center, Nursing Educotion Center, Biology Open Lob, hosted by Mory Fitch-Smith, Stoff Assistont, Office of Institutiono! Reseorch ond Evoluotion, Cuyohogo Community College

12:30 P.M. – 2:00 P.M.

Eost Bollroom B

Session 12: Luncheon Meeting

Presiding: Robert Porillo, Vice President for Educotionol Plonning ond Development, Cuyohogo Community College

Address: Jomes Norton, Choncellor, Ohio Boord of Regents

SESSIONS AND SPEECHES

SESSION I

DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION, WHAT IS IT?

Opening Remarks:

Henry Whitcomb, Director of Financial Management,
Ohio Board of Regents

University Viewpoint:

Milton Wilson, Assistant Vice President and Dean for
Human Relations, Kent State University

Technical College Viewpoint:

Albert Salerno, Dean of Instruction, Clark Technical College

Private College Viewpoint:

Doris Coster, Dean of Students, The College of Wooster

Community College Viewpoint:

Barry Heermann, Chairman of Public Services, Sinclair
Community College

Recorder: David Stevenson, President, Metropolitan Campus,
Cuyahoga Community College

HENRY WHITCOMB: Opening Remarks

The Ohio Board of Regents is pleased to cosponsor this Conference with Cuyahoga Community College. We feel that many significant persons in the field of developmental education are here in attendance, and we look to all the conferees for a cooperative effort in tackling the problems and issues facing this new area in higher education. As a coordinating body, the Board of Regents looks to the educators around the state to develop a refined definition of the term "developmental education." We want to hear how it is viewed and carried out in all the different types of institutions represented here at this Conference. Our object is to search for this definition keeping clearly in mind that the chief concern must be to help our students.

To this end, the panelists for this session each represent a different facet of higher education in the state of Ohio: the four-year public university, the two-year technical college, the four-year private college, and the community/junior college. I welcome this conference and all you in attendance as an opportunity to help us clarify issues and, perhaps, find solutions. Thank you for your participation.

MILTON WILSON: University Viewpoint

In a four-year university, there is pressure for excellence. This shows among the different groups within universities in their different viewpoints of how to achieve this ideal. I believe that the predominant attitude of faculty, students, and administrators toward a definition of education should be revised in the light of the needs of students in the developmental area. When individuals with differences from the predominant groups are brought to the typical campus, the predominant attitude is that they are undesirably different and should be reduced to the norm. Among the differences regarded as undesirable are those related to non-European backgrounds and races. Many universities usually say that the prognosis for change is poor and that the perceived differences are not subject to change because of genetic variances. This attitude is incorrect since all of us attack knowledge from different points of view according to our childhood environments.

Administrators say that they support developmental education, but fail to back these assertions with financial support. They exhibit at best a very cautious positivism. The self-interest of members of the faculty is not served by educating those who are different and they, therefore, state that the university is not an appropriate place for remedial work and is not a social agency. Students either are not aware of programs in developmental education or are influenced by those who have benefited from them, but do not wish to acknowledge this benefit.

A more constructive attitude toward developmental education is needed. We should realize that by definition all education is developmental, that people have different learning styles, and that our challenge is to match these styles of learning with appropriate learning strategies.

In summary, it can be said that colleges and universities are suffering from an outmoded type of education based on deficit models, and that a constructive role in society has not yet been defined in terms of the current day.

ALBERT SALERNO: Technical College Viewpoint

The mission of the technical college in developmental education is narrower than that of the university or community college. Students need specific abilities in mathematics, communications skills, the ability to analyze, to report and to communicate.

The technical college's answer to the problems of students who are underskilled is to offer pre-technical courses during the summer and to concentrate in mathematics, communications, and science. These pre-technical courses are reinforced during the academic year by learning center techniques. Peer tutoring has proven helpful as well as counseling of students. We must orient counselors toward developmental students to lead students to assess their own abilities.

If open admissions are an essential part of the technical institution, then a real commitment to developmental education is required. As in the university, faculty members do not believe in the developmental students and feel little obligation toward them. Also, funding is a problem since there is not an equitable distribution of funds among various types of institutions.

Administrators must understand the meaning of "open admissions" and commit the school. Technical colleges' student schedules are long in class hours making it difficult to take advantage of developmental opportunities. Therefore, technical colleges should change their institutional models to accomodate the necessary, up-dated changes.

DORIS COSTER: Private College Viewpoint

The College of Wooster has been involved in the developmental education for many years inasmuch as it traditionally admitted the sons and daughters of missionaries and ministers of its support denomination without reference to their academic abilities. Following World War II the College began to consider its need to institute developmental programs since many students entering the College did not have the previous level of ability in reading and writing skills. The see-sawing methodologies of teaching in elementary and secondary schools led to a lack of preparation of students. Changes in student abilities made the old methods of learning difficult to administer since some persons felt that it was necessary to help those who were admitted but who could not attain the same levels of performance as had previously been the standard. The traditional liberal arts and curriculum teachers could not accommodate these students. Finally everyone decided that the obligation to minority and other developmental students did not end with admission.

In answer to these problems the College developed a peer tutoring program in Freshman Composition. In a developmental learning center the student received two hours of tutoring per week and access to reading machines. In the view of Wooster College it is desirable that the staff and study skills personnel not be specialized and divided from the remainder of the faculty.

There are a number of factors to consider in developmental education which go beyond the basic ability to read and write. Among these factors are hostility, defensiveness, cognitive and personal differences. Developmental education should, therefore, be regarded as total education and include, in addition to skills, the basic qualities of how a student feels about himself and his environment. Developmental education should also consider its basic aims such as fulfillment of the individual and the individual's contribution to society. Related to this aspect of education is the problem of career planning and placement, life planning, and decision-making.

In the College of Wooster, developmental education seeks to have integrity of purpose, to be consistent to standards, and to challenge the concept that the student is a hapless victim in the system of education.

BARRY HEERMAN: Community College Viewpoint

The community college is a flexible institution relating to many types of people. As an "open door" institution it is heterogeneous. This implies that there are many means of education depending upon students' needs and preparation. Homogeneous instruction programs do not work with heterogeneous students. It would doom "open door" schools, and the "open door" is the key to a community college's opportunity.

Developmental education in the community college is a no-nonsense resource for serving as humanely as possible the needs of students with skill deficiencies. Self-pacing, tutoring, guidance, open laboratory, alternate instructional approaches are all encompassed in the community college's approach to instruction. Developmental education must be considered as a part of the whole community college mission. Educators must change their views of students who have not had good secondary education, strong self concepts, strong skills, or adaptation to traditional lecture systems. The community college's minority groups (i.e. blacks, veterans, etc.) are forcing a change in this attitude. The community college requires "people specialists," not just discipline specialists. The heterogeneity of students in a community college is its life blood.

SESSION IV:

METHODS OF EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Moderator: Richard C. Romoser, Director of Institutional Research and Evaluation, Cuyahoga Community College

Panelists: Peter J. Hampton, Director of Developmental Programs, University of Akron

Ralph Pruitt, Dean of Special Studies, Cleveland State University

George A. Simmons, Director of Developmental Education, Lorain County Community College

Recorder: Lynn Rosen, Moderator, Academic Support Services, Eastern Campus, Cuyahoga Community College

Dr. Romoser welcomed the participants and stated that this session had been scheduled as a result of recommendations at last year's conference to study evaluation of developmental programs. It appears to be an even more important area with the statewide thrust of educators and the Regents' staff to develop a statewide reporting system.

RICHARD ROMOSER: A Structural Evaluation Approach

The evaluation of developmental education programs should be based upon a systematic collection of evidence in order to determine whether an objective has been achieved. Such an evaluation should serve two purposes:

(1) external--as a comprehensive aggregate measure of accountability to the State

(2) internal--as a disaggregated measure of program effectiveness to be utilized as a basis for program improvement.

This might be in the form of one report containing all results. In order to accurately assess "the nature of things," a research design should be constructed. This will set limitations upon the interpretation of results. This limiting effect should clearly refer to the statement of program objectives, thereby effecting a problem approach.

To construct a research design, the developmental program must be examined to determine its precise objectives. These objectives must be measurable. The difficulty comes in selecting criteria with which to measure these objectives. Consideration should be given to the nature and circumstances of evidence collected. Measures should include concerns regarding the source of evidence as well as the circumstances under which evidence is collected. It is important to be as specific as possible in order to get more useful measurements.

A plan should consist of the following components: (1) inputs (resources), (2) process (sequence of activities), (3) outputs (products). This process for evaluation then contributes to the flow: Plans → evaluation → next plans.

This process is a regenerating one which can be applicable on a wide basis. It also offers opportunities for building accountability into evaluation of developmental programs.

PETER J. HAMPTON: Assessing Program Effectiveness

The University of Akron provides a model for assessing the effectiveness of developmental education programs in order to demonstrate the necessity for the inclusion of such programs in institutional budgeting.

The model program utilizes the following procedures:

(1) Anecdotal method--questionnaires are distributed at the completion of every quarter with responses classified into behavior modalities in which students perceive assistance with adjustment problems (i.e., academic adjustment, personal adjustment, social adjustment).

(2) Vertical improvement method--pre- and post-achievement tests (McGraw-Hill Basic Skills) in Mathematics, Reading, Writing, and Study Skills are administered to students in developmental courses to assess whether they are prepared for beginning courses.

(3) Horizontal improvement method--students enrolled in developmental courses are compared with students who needed developmental education assistance but did not take it.

Each of these procedures has specific measurable objectives. Results of The University of Akron evaluation indicate:

(1) Students perceived developmental education courses as effective in improving personal and social adjustment.

(2) There was improvement in English, Mathematics, Reading, and Study Skills among students in developmental education courses.

(3) The mean GPA of students in developmental education courses was slightly higher than the mean GPA of those who should have been in developmental education courses.

These procedures have been successful to date and may provide applications to other developmental programs.

RALPH PRUITT: Selection of Measurable Criteria

Efforts should be made to support the value of developmental education services. Such efforts should demonstrate accountability and measure effectiveness.

The selection of criteria with which to measure the objectives of a program is important. Possible criteria are: mean GPA, a student's persistence measured by completion of services in quarters, and a student's attitude toward the developmental education program measured through counseling/instructing/tutoring, etc.

In Roueche and Kirk's recent book, Catching-up: Remedial Education, a study of five institutions produced the following findings:

(1) Students needing developmental education who enrolled in developmental education programs made significantly higher grades than those who needed developmental education but did not enroll.

(2) Students in developmental education evidenced grade improvements each year.

(3) Grades regressed when students in program left developmental education program and entered regular programs.

(4) Students in developmental education programs persisted in college to a greater extent than students who needed developmental education but did not enroll.

(5) Students in developmental education programs were more satisfied with instruction than with counseling.

(6) Between 1969 and 1971, 50 to 54 percent of students in sample developmental education programs completed their third semester of College. Between 1969 and 1970, thirty-five percent of the group samples completed two years of college.

Cleveland State University provides an evaluation model which incorporates Roueche and Kirk's criteria and others. Cleveland State University's developmental education program operates in response to a statement of measurable objectives which are obtainable within one school year.

These were sample objectives

(1) to attain a quality of support services so that 70 percent of the students attain acceptable GPA averages.

(2) to elevate students' rate of reading to 200 words per minute with 80 percent comprehension after one quarter of instruction and to 300 words per minute with 80 percent comprehension after two quarters of instruction.

The Cleveland State University developmental education model provides the following accountability model:

(1) selection--admission

(2) diagnosis--pre-test

(3) prescriptive methodology--based on needs

(4) evaluation--post test, grade point, counselor reports

(5) next level of experience

To date this program has proved to be effective.

GEORGE SIMMONS: Internal and External Evaluation Models

Two types of evaluation might be appropriate for developmental education programs.

First, an external evaluation could be developed with evaluative data compiled and submitted outside the institution. This could be used by federal and state agencies, e.g. Ohio Board of Regents, with several functions.

(a) it could monitor spending of funds,

(b) it could serve as justification for continued and increased dollar support, and

(c) it would provide a data base for comparing programs between/among institutions.

A number of factors would be relevant to this type of evaluation:

(a) enrollment figures (by type of program),

(b) rate of attrition (by type of program),

(c) number and percentage of students achieving selected educational goals, and

(d) program costs (student cost/hour).

Second, an internal study would provide valuable evaluation functions. It would identify program strengths and weaknesses. Faculty support could be determined through questionnaires, and informal student reactions and comments could be sought. Certain objective measures would need to be determined in this form of program assessment:

(a) enrollment figures (i.e. number of developmental students compared to total headcount)

(b) test data (i.e. developmental student test scores compared to total student test scores, pre- and post-test score percentiles).

A statewide testing program would not be recommended.

An internal evaluation could also serve as a formal follow-up study. A study of this nature would examine the attrition rate by comparing equal groups in its research design and considering the "stop out" or returning students. It also would study achievements after completion of the developmental course:

(a) by examining success in courses that rely on skills developed in developmental courses, i.e. courses requiring reading skills, (must have equal groups and be sure that the developmental course preceeded the regular course), and

(b) by developing an historical data base of pre- and post-developmental course test scores (must have a large enough number of students to be significant).

This internal evaluation would be useful inside the institution and would not be for outside purposes.

Finally there are basic questions which must be asked: Are the tests valid? Are the placement criteria accurate? Is the content of the courses the best/most appropriate for efficient learning?

We must examine all these areas in order to develop a proper program of internal and external evaluations.

SESSION V:

COUNSELING STUDENTS IN DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION

Moderator: Madeleine McKivigan, Coordinator, Personal and Academic Effectiveness Program, Ohio Dominican College

Panel: Helen Cooks, Director of Student Development, University of Toledo

Edward Florak, Vice President and Dean of Student Affairs, Jefferson County Technical Institute

Don Shrimplin, Counselor, Western Campus, Cuyahoga Community College

Recorder: Richard Curtis, Dean of Student Services, Western Campus, Cuyahoga Community College

MADELEINE McKIVIGAN: Counseiing Goals for Developmental Students

Ms. McKivigan gave opening remarks, setting the stage for presentations from the panel. She suggested four counseling tasks towards which professionals working in developmental education must help their students strive. The four tasks were:

(1) Learning to learn - how to study effectively, "manipulating" the system, thinking clearly and logically.

(2) Learning to cope - handling disabling emotions, frustrations, and other difficulties.

(3) Learning to choose - learning to decide, learning the purpose of things, and the importance of the individual, e.g. What do I believe in? Where am I going?

(4) Learning to relate - the ability to communicate, acquire social competence and open relationships with peers, faculty and staff.

Ms. McKivigan also suggested that each of the tasks mentioned above could be divided into four sub-tasks, namely;

(a) Developing knowledge of self and the environment.

(b) Approaching the tasks of studying and dealing with personal relationships.

(c) Adopting minimal changes in present behavior or environment that lead to additional positive changes.

(d) Organizing and planning decision questions, e.g. what are my current plans, what do I want to do in the future?

EDWARD L. FLORAK: Group Counseling Techniques in Self Confrontation

Dr. Florak described specific methods originally developed by Solomon Machover and Daniel S. Malamud and published in their book Toward Self Understanding: Group Techniques in Self Confrontation. These were used at Allegheny Community College in the Developmental Reading and Study Skills Course. These methods were employed to stimulate intense, personal, emotional involvement in a large group. The group sessions were predicated on the idea that self understanding is an essential ingredient of positive mental health.

The principal technique the counselor employed was confrontation. These confrontations were brought about by experiments planned around novel, open-ended tasks in which the students could participate or observe. The goal was to give relatively normal students the opportunity to confront themselves and others. The purpose was to sharpen their identity, heighten self acceptance, and relate to others more meaningfully.

Groups of 12 to 15 students were organized among the students enrolled in the Developmental Reading and Study Skills Course. The groups met twice a week for 45 minutes of instruction and practice in reading the study materials. The third session each week was scheduled for one hour and 30 minutes. This schedule was initiated the first week and continued to the end of the term. Numerous group experiments such as writing capsules, autobiographies, and examining birthorders, were used in helping students gain self-awareness.

Conclusions by Dr. Florak's staff were that the methods used in the program were successful in increasing students' ego strength, but were not sufficient to change attitudes towards teachers and school programs. Recommendations following the completion of the program from staff included changing the order of some of the weekly experiments and strengthening the direction of effecting changes in attitudes and values similar to the change in the ego strength. It was also suggested that extending the group experience beyond one term might provide continuous experience and counseling.

DON SHRIMPLIN: Effective Problem Solving Counseling

Mr. Shrimplin described his work with groups of students at Cuyahoga Community College, Western Campus, using a model called EFFECTIVE PROBLEM SOLVING COUNSELING (EPS).

The EPS model was first developed by Thomas Magoon and his counseling staff at the University of Maryland. Since its inception, the EPS model has been revised six times. The EPS process is best characterized as a self-directed learning program which teaches the student six steps

necessary for effective problem-solving. The steps are: (1) define the problem, (2) gather relevant information, (3) weigh the evidence gathered, (4) choose among alternative plans or goals, (5) take action on plan, and (6) review plan periodically. The format is that of twelve mimeographed color-coded parts, each consisting of a carefully arranged sequence of questions. The questions are designed to resemble the conversational form that counselors would use in conferences with students dealing with educational and career problems. The student responds to the question in writing, item by item.

A descriptive handout of the EPS model was presented to the audience. Mr. Shrimplin described the following advantages of this model:

1. It is structured and thorough to insure student involvement.
2. It serves as a future resource for the student.
3. It emphasizes student responsibility.
4. It provides a group approach without group counseling constraints.
5. It has face validity, i.e., students see where they are going.
6. It helps to solidify decision-making.
7. It provides for counselor narrative and evaluation.

The disadvantages of the EPS program were listed as follows:

1. There is no value scale. The work value or social value is unclear.
2. Personality types are missing.

Mr. Shrimplin indicated that he organizes the program into eight sessions, 50 minutes in length, and also has individual counseling with the students from the group. He suggested that creating a full quarter credit course using this model might be beneficial.

HELEN COOKS: Peer Counseling

Mrs. Cooks described a program of peer counseling operating on the campus of the University of Toledo. Working with developmental students in counseling programs, peer counselors are trained to alleviate some of the adjustment hardships encountered by developmental students who are trying to develop an understanding of themselves.

Students' learning is increased when they share in the orchestration of their own education. The key in the effort to increase a student's skill is to enlist him/her as a more active and effective learner/worker. This is the basis for the Peer Counseling Program. Engaging students in a program where they interact with other students through peer counseling maximizes the efficiency of all the students.

Mrs. Cooks also pointed to issues and concerns expressed by peer counselors in an evaluation of the program done this year:

1. Peer counselors experienced pressures in coordinating time requirements of the job and personal interests.

2. There were problems in establishing validity as a peer counselor and re-establishing credibility as a peer.

3. It was sometimes difficult to deal in a positive way with the stigma associated with peer counseling, caused by students' misconceptions of the role of a peer counselor.

4. There was an inherent incongruence in functioning dually as a student and peer counselor.

5. It was sometimes difficult to translate skills acquired in a laboratory situation to the world of reality in an effective manner.

Following the panel's formal presentations, an informal question and answer period was held.

1. The selection process of peer counselors, their academic standing, and the training given to each of the peer counselors was examined.

2. Additional questions were discussed about peer counselors centered on their educational major, how they were taught counseling strategies, how referrals were made to professional staff by peer counselors after students had worked with them, and whether peer counselors were doing academic advising.

The following is a list of recommendations derived from the meeting of these panel members and from the full session meeting:

Funding:

1. There should be an increase in the funding for additional staff and the purchase of necessary materials for use in counseling the student in developmental education.

2. There should be categorical funding for staff.

3. Monies should be allocated for research and follow-up of students in developmental education programs or courses.

4. Monies should be allocated for in-service training for counselors and faculty working directly with students in developmental education.

Training:

1. A one-week summer seminar for counselors of students in developmental education should be sponsored to allow counselors to exchange ideas, theories, practices to help the students in developmental education.

2. A quarterly meeting of oevelopmental education counselors should be held to exchange ideas, practices, and to sharpen skills.

Administrative:

1. A flexible but distinguishing definition of developmental education and the "developmental education student" should be established.

2. There should be a meeting of counselors working directly with the developmental education students with the Ohio Board of Regents to explain their needs, offer suggestions, and to establish a direct chanel of communication between counselors and the Board of Regents.

3. Forms should be simplified to allow the counselors more time to provide direct services to the students and the faculty.

BANQUET ADDRESS

"Developmental Education or Educational Development, Means or Ends?"

By Dr. Nolen M. Ellison
President, Cuyahoga Community College

I would like to extend a hearty welcome to Chancellor Norton, and those at the head table, as well as to thank Attorney Hill for those kind remarks. I suspect that none of us moving in society today really merits anyone's accolades for things we do because they simply must be done. However, I appreciate the remarks and I would sincerely hope that at some point in my life I would merit them.

To the guests here at the head table, and to those of you in the audience this evening, I would like to take a moment to personally welcome each of you to Cuyahoga Community College and to the Second Annual Developmental Education Conference. We have looked forward to this occasion with great anticipation as it has provided us the opportunity to offer this Conference in cooperation with the Ohio Board of Regents.

There are a number of persons who have played important roles in making this conference a success so far. I sat in on several of the sessions earlier this afternoon and I believe we're going to have a very fine conclusion to a fine start. Some definitions have been opened that simply had to be opened, so that we might move ahead profitably in the area of developmental education.

One individual who has been on the firing line of responsibility and who deserves special recognition this evening, is a gentleman who in all probability wouldn't want to stand, but I'm going to mention his name anyway. He's been the person running between the Board of Regents and Cuyahoga Community College, and his name is Dr. Richard Romoser.

Dick is the Director of Institutional Research and Evaluation for Cuyahoga Community College, and we believe that this institution is fortunate in having him. He is one of a number of people committed not only to the concept of developmental education, but to education in the highest sense of opportunities and access.

When I arrived to assume my responsibilites at the College in August, preparations were already underway for the Conference--the second, hopefully, in a series of significant steps here in Ohio to put the spotlight on this critical area of special student assistance. It was clear when I arrived that this matter is vital to the perceived long-term success of higher education's attempts to serve successfully the needs of "new students" in our institutions. My assessment, however, does not come from direct knowledge of the state of the art of developmental education here in Ohio, but rather from my intense interest in viewing the accomplishments of developmental education efforts

In the states of Washington, Missouri, Michigan, and Kansas--states I have been most closely associated with in the past ten years.

I have spent a significant amount of time in the past two months reviewing the Citizens' Task force Report on Higher Education in Ohio, the historical posture of the Ohio Board of Regents on the matter of developmental education. I have examined the current stance of the Regents, and the commitment of the Chancellor and his staff to concerns about educational quality as a major theme and issue in Ohio's institutions of higher learning. It has become even more evident now that developmental education is an important topic for the state and its institutions of higher learning, and its people who work in that system.

This Conference then becomes the second forum in the statewide effort for practitioners to share their successes, their concerns, and their failures related to this interesting, exciting, and important area. For administrators it is a place to listen to those on the firing line present their views and battle reports on accomplishments to date in the field. It is also a place for the collective reporting of faculty, administrators, Regents, and others interested in the future of access to opportunity and quality of opportunity available to those seeking to be educated in our institutions.

The topic that I agreed to address briefly this evening, "Developmental Education or Educational Development: Means or Ends," could have ended with a question mark, to focus upon the need to engender responses to the questions posed. My comments this evening are made in light of this topic as a question.

It is generally agreed that, although the college-going rate of Ohioans is below the national average, the mix and composition of student bodies in our institutions reflects the mix and composition of the general citizenry in our communities. Ohio, like other states, has faced increasing enrollments of large numbers of traditionally non-college-going populations over the past several years. And while the state trails almost ten percent behind the national average of high school graduates going on to higher education,[1] and the state's percentage of enrollment-to-population trails slightly less than .8 of one percent behind the national average,[2] Ohio's institutions, even with these less than adequate figures, contain a wide range of the "new students" who appeared in the latter 60's and early 70's seeking to be educated in our institutions. These "new students" include adults and senior citizens, both racial and ethnic minorities, and returning veterans. There are, in addition, those "hopeful others" seeking to take society up on the promise that the good life and/or personal fulfillment is somehow tied to levels of educational attainment.

Several forces in American society in the past ten years have placed direct pressures upon our institutions of higher learning, their faculties, their staffs, and their administrators, to "come down from the ivory tower" and to serve the needs of society more effectively by educating a larger percentage of its citizens. All of public post-secondary or higher education has been asked to open the doors of access and opportunity to those who traditionally have not had the chance to

exercise options in American higher education. In the past ten years, we have had to respond to particularly strong national sentiment for universal access to higher education, and the dual pressures of lifelong education and career opportunities for everyone.

These pressures and related responses can be directly tied to the following two facts reported in the April 1, 1974 issue of Orbit, a U. S. Department of Labor news sheet. It cited that:

One, the number of professional and technical jobs, those that usually require a college degree, will grow faster than jobs in any other occupational group. However, the vast majority of the 60 million job openings expected to become available between 1972-1985 will be open to persons who have not completed four years of college education.

Two, educational requirements will continue to rise for most jobs, including jobs in the clerical and blue collar fields. Post-high school training, such as that acquired through apprenticeships and junior/community colleges and two-year branch institutions, will become increasingly important in the years to come.

While many have viewed the effects of these societal concerns and pressures in the past several years as contributing to the so-called decline in quality in our institutions, it is these people who have not fully understood the role of education, and certainly higher education in America, over the past hundred years. America's land grant colleges, founded in 1863 in the Morrill Act, were the forerunners of the movement to democratize higher education and make it relevant to the needs of all people in American society, not merely to the select few who because of parents or relatives could afford to attend colleges. Higher education was out of the reach of thousands of Americans in the past history of this country.

The great debates that ensued with the maintenance of relatively low tuition and increased financial aid for students in public institutions, and increased access, have been viewed cautiously at the national as well as the local level.

The Carnegie Commission, in two of its most important reports, A Chance to Learn and The Campus and the City, reports that it viewed the greatest single hurdle for disadvantaged and other non-traditional students entering higher education to be the lack of a quality educational background and a shaky mastery of skills and concepts in individual perceptions in learning. The Commission concluded that such students are foredoomed to academic failure in conventional or traditional college settings without considerable "special help." Consistent with much of the current literature and ongoing investigations in the field, it was concluded that without such special help an open door admissions policy is little more than a revolving door leading only to repetitions

of earlier frustrations and not to higher education. These frustrations, experienced by the individual student, the faculty or staff person working with that student, and the institution as a whole, lead inevitably to conflict and confrontation--two phenomena to which our institutions do not respond well.[3] We learned this lesson on our campuses in the 60's.

A number of advanced educators in the community college movement have suggested that it is high time for institutions to face the task of adapting themselves to meet student needs, instead of trying to change students to fit traditional patterns of post-secondary and higher education. However, it has become increasingly apparent that this task of adapting institutions to student bodies with varied educational backgrounds is not a neatly circumscribed one with easy solutions.

Special efforts in student services, academic departments, and academic support units must be integrated and impact on students as a total person, in order to produce the best possible opportunity for educational success. It is increasingly apparent that staff development, and other specially directed institutional activities to prepare the faculty, staff, and administrators to meet this challenge, are vitally important to each of us here tonight.

It is increasingly apparent to progressive institutions, which attempt to address systematically these issues as a fundamental part of educational development and instructional improvement, that student-centered humanistic learning environments can foster positive results with the so-called non-traditional or disadvantaged students. Roueche and Kirk, mentioned in one of the earlier sessions today, reported this result in a recent publication of their findings in a national study of five significant and selected two-year programs.[4] This confirms the perception that it can be done.

In the report of its national study on the topic, The Carnegie Commission cited the following four areas as important to meet successfully the varied educational needs of the "new students." It cited strong evidence that institutional success with the so-called "disadvantaged student" is enhanced when the institution:

One, provides highly individualized, humanistic educational programs at least for the foundation year,

Two, makes available a greater range of student services, including adequate financial aid counseling, educational and vocational counseling, health services, and, at least, initial or emergency personal counseling or health services,

Three, devotes a greater portion of its resources to the entry level students,

And four, modifies the institutional reward structure to provide adequate rewards for excellence in teaching and commitment to these students.[5]

In addition, the Commission recommended that colleges enrolling large numbers of disadvantaged, particularly minority students, review their institutional programs in each of these four areas to determine if they are designed properly to meet the full educational needs.[6]

The Commission recommended that state financing authorities and the local agencies review their policies for funding community colleges, specifically to determine whether adequate funding is available for this segment of higher education with its difficult and important task as a community institution.[7]

While the State of Ohio can certainly be proud of past gains in this critical area, which has been totally ignored by most states, the Board of Regents, the Governor and the state legislature cannot rest on this past record. Since the door of access is so interlocked with developmental education and instructional and educational improvements, it is a travesty to the issue of real opportunity to address the former without the latter. If the Governor's statements were correctly interpreted in the newspaper this morning, it will be important that he hears again a full explanation of the relationship between expanding the Ohio Instructional Grants Program and the 15 million dollar budget item in the Board of Regents Budget. This is currently earmarked for developmental education activities that simply must accompany our institutions' commitment to educate the students. A major objective of this Conference should be to clarify the critical relationship of access/opportunity to success. It is this relationship that becomes most critical to each program on every campus in the State of Ohio. The issue of access simply must be interlocked with the issue of opportunity for success. Those who do not believe that success is possible by these students, I suggest, should move to another area of their university, college or campus. Unless the people working with students who need special help do believe that they are capable of success, are willing to give them the help they need, and understand their attitudes toward those students, the ultimate opportunity still evades those students. I believe in the work of Rosenthal and Jacobsen, and others who reviewed this problem of expectations, aspirations, and attitudes of faculty, and students, and administrators.[8]

From a programmatic perspective, the issues now have become centered around the question of what modeling is most desirable to meet the complex educational support needs of these "new students." I suspect that more times than not institutions have sought to design program responses without clearly defining the goals and objectives that were to be accomplished. Consequently, most institutions have developed highly fragmented inadequate models of remedial or developmental education that do not effectively serve the range of human or academic needs of students seeking access and opportunity in our institutions.

Institutional program modeling for developmental education must be developed around the concept of "wholistic" modeling. This says that institutions must commit themselves to respond, and not commit simply the Director of Developmental Education to meet all the needs of those students in our institutions. We respond best in higher education to fragmentation, and not to systematic modeling of how institutions can address the needs of students. Educational or instructional improvement activities must be designed to relate strongly with student development and student support programs in such a way that necessary linkages permit a smooth movement of students through the institution and its educational processes. In my view, a comprehensive model must contain a strong program of staff development, consistent with my earlier comments on the Carnegie Commission's recommendations, if the model is to be self-renewing and self-generating within the entire institution.

Fragmented developmental education modeling, or maintaining barriers between traditional student service activities and instructional areas, merely serves to heighten the "cycle of frustration" described by Palola and Oswald in their recent publication.[9] These authors suggest that "the mandate for change, focused on totally new and different approaches to education of the disadvantaged, and on the wrench from traditional methodology to the startling new in urban education, sharpens the old concerns and heightens the old frustrations." The authors describe in a very succinct, classical fashion this cycle of frustration, and remind us to review that cycle as we review our programs in our institutions. They describe the cycle as follows:

First, the problem is identified: to meet the educational needs of low income or the so-called disadvantaged student.
Second, traditional rules and ways are used in an effort to resolve the problems.
Third, there is uncertainty generated about how this educational challenge can be met using traditional modeling.
And fourth, conflict and animosity arise as it becomes clear that this non-traditional problem cannot be solved with traditional approaches.
The fifth step is a simple return back to the recognition that we have a problem.[10]

This cycle of frustration in our institutions must be broken for the vast number of citizens in this society if American higher education is to play the significant role inherent in the belief that education can solve our problems. For these individuals the reality of the cycle of frustration must be faced within our institutions.

Since institutions of higher learning do not handle conflict well, the disruption of personal perceptions and feelings that occur as a result of inadequate institutional responses to student needs, serves to heighten the anxieties of all concerned. This relates not only to students and their anxieties, but to faculty members and to administrators, who as a part of the institution also do not handle conflict well.

The question of institutional program modeling, I believe, is most important to future efforts in developmental education and/or educational development. This new area of program modeling will need a common language so that what people do can be defined both by title and location within an institution's developmental education model.

The registration lists 150 of you who have roles in something called developmental education. We assume that's true or you wouldn't be at the Conference. Of the 150 registrations, I think I counted close to 120 different titles: positions classified all the way from instructor-lecturer-counselor, three different titles within an institution, to director-supervisor-coordinator of special developmental education programs for special disadvantaged students, to you-name-it-we-have-it, and we're all here. I see this as significant because, as I said to the Chancellor, it's an art form in search of a definition. And that's what makes the Conference so vital as a second step in this state's attempt to address systematically the questions that are before it.

I can speak somewhat authoritatively, having just come from the state of Washington. I'm probably the newest in the room as a member of higher education in the State of Ohio. As I've watched other states, I believe that Ohio can be proud. I do not think that there are very many states in the union that could assemble such a cross section of higher education--150 people from community colleges, two-year branch colleges, four-year institutions, graduate schools, ethnic studies programs, developmental studies programs, the trio programs, upward bound, talent search, student special services, and Title III people. However, we can't rest here. You must help us develop the definitions we need, and that is the challenge to this Conference.

Continued and increased funding must be available from the state and federal governments to aid in meeting the "extra costs" associated with this effort. I am convinced that there are incremental costs in doing the job properly. We simply cannot educate a student who comes to our institutions at 8th, 9th, or 10th grade reading level, at that same $1600 per FTE that we spend on a student with A's in high school. The Federal Government in its Higher Education Amendments of 1972 has attempted but failed to build cost-of-instruction into its financial aid program for disadvantaged students. This cost-of-instruction provision was necessary to have money to follow those students into those institutions that have disproportionately accepted the challenge without any incremental dollars from funding sources, either at the local or the state level. In the meantime, with little or no assistance from the outside, institutions seeking to educate larger numbers of this non-traditional college-going group must commit hard institutional funding to these efforts or admit to students when they enter the door their chances for success are questionable, within the traditional structure of our institutions. To do anything less is to perpetuate the travesty upon students who enter our institutions, helpless without educational supports within the institution from the administration, the faculty, and within our confines.

In light of sound, viable institutional program modeling, built on what I call the less pejorative concepts associated with education development and instructional improvements with new teaching-learning strategies, the question of ends or means becomes quite clear. As you continue to forge ahead in your efforts to serve all students in a more efficient and effective manner, my hope is that each of you here tonight will continue to support and share a collective frame of reference, during this second step to create definitions for developmental education in the State of Ohio.

In my view the answer to the question, "Means or Ends?" must be addressed by looking at program goals. If the goal is successful acquisition of knowledge or learning by students who enter our institutions, then all our efforts here tonight, and as you leave here tomorrow, are clearly means and not ends.

Thank you.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Cuyahoga County Regional Assembly on Higher Education, The Citizens' Task Force on Higher Education, sponsored by the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, Cleveland, Ohio, July 1974, p. 1.

[2]Ibid, p. 2.

[3]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, The Campus and the City (New York: McGraw-Hill) 1972, p. 3.

[4]John E. Roueche and R. Wade Kirk, Catching Up: Remedial Education (San Francisco: Jossey Bass), 1973.

[5]Carnegie Commission, op. cit., p. 45.

[6]Ibid., p. 46.

[7]Ibid.

[8]Robert Rosenthal and Lenor Jacobson, Pygmalion in the Classroom (New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston), 1968.

[9]Ernest G. Palola and Arthur R. Oswald, Urban Multi-Unit Community Colleges: Adaptation for the 70's. (Berkeley: University of California) 1972, p. 49.

[10]Ibid, p. 50.

OTHER REFERENCES

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, A Chance To Learn (New York: McGraw Hill), 1970.

U. S. Department of Labor, Orbit, U. S. Government Printing Office, April 1, 1974.

SESSION VIII:

IDENTIFYING AND RECRUITING STUDENTS IN NEED OF DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION

Moderator: Anne Shearer, Assistant Dean, University Division, Director of Special Services, Wright State University

Panelists: Don Basile, Associate Professor and Director of Reading and Study Skills Center, University of Cincinnati

Samuel Carrington, Director, Project Search, Cuyahoga Community College

Malcolm Costa, Director of Student Development, Youngstown State University

Rosemary V. Lips, Coordinator, Developmental Systems for Handicapped Students, Kent State University

Recorder: Eugene Malone, Director of Admissions and Records, Eastern Campus, Cuyahoga Community College

ANNE SHEARER: Independent or Integrated Developmental Programs

Dr. Shearer introduced the session by describing the issue of whether developmental education programs should continue to exist independent of the institution or become integrated into all educational components of the institution. She stated that proponents of the two points of view attempt to defend their positions in the following manner:

Position 1. Developmental education should be part of the total institution and not a separate department. Institutional commitment is vital to the future of development education programs and are best identified when they represent permanent components of the main structure.

Position 2. Developmental education should be treated as a separate component within the institution in order to guarantee that the special services for developmental education students are carried out. The responsibility for the developmental education program must be clearly defined and is best accomplished when the program is independent of other bureaucratic structures.

Dr. Shearer suggested that this subject addresses the problem and the necessity of making institutions more responsive to the needs of the variety of students which they admit.

DON BASILE: Use of Diagnostic Processes to Identify Developmental Education Students

Mr. Basile described the use of diagnostic processes to identify developmental students and prescribe services for them. He stated that developmental education students seldom respond to publications and publicity about available services, and thus, other means of identification need to be developed. One successful method of determining who the developmental students are and suggesting appropriate services to them is through diagnostic tests.

The University of Cincinnati identifies special groups by their special needs such as: 1) skill upgrading for high school and technical training for custodians; 2) developmental program for black medical students; and 3) Northern Kentucky Action Commission Program for Appalachian Students.

During the Summer of 1974, all students registering for the two-year University College participated in a comprehensive diagnostic program. The ACT scores were used as a basis for identifying students requiring further diagnosis. These students were then administered a standardized mathematics test; the College English Placement Test, and the Iowa Reading Test to diagnose their academic skills. Group tutoring was prescribed for those students needing group reinforcement. Individual tutoring was available also.

However, it is not always necessary to do a formal diagnosis. Many times an informal diagnosis can accomplish similar results. It can be as pragmatic as recognizing that a student is failing a course and needs immediate assistance. Therefore, one should allow for the inclusion of criteria other than test data to determine the needs of developmental education students.

As a final comment, Mr. Basile noted that early diagnosis is often vital to the survival of the developmental education student and should be done prior to entering classes if possible. This allows for developmental services to be built into the student's schedule from the start.

SAMUEL CARRINGTON: Project Search

Mr. Carrington discussed the recruiting program PROJECT SEARCH at Cuyahoga Community College. Project Search is a federally funded program designed to identify and recruit the "disadvantaged" student for institutions of higher education on a national level. Under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, Cuyahoga Community College made a commitment to actively seek out "disadvantaged" individuals in Greater Cleveland who desire an education. Due to environmental and psychological factors these persons are often not aware of the educational opportunities available to them. Project Search approached this problem by establishing outreach centers in the low-income areas of the metropolitan area. Students are identified, counseled and referred to institutions who indicate a willingness to meet their needs.

The students recruited range from very well prepared students to the student whose life has been filled with one failure after another. They are recruited from pool halls, bowling alleys, bars, street corners, or wherever the non-traditional student resides. Some of the recruits attend Cleveland institutions, while others enroll in institutions throughout Ohio and the United States.

The Project Search files are filled with reports from colleges and universities depicting success stories of the students recruited through the methods described above. Over the past several years, Project Search in Cleveland has successfully placed over 2,200 students in post-secondary institutions from New York to California. This is the success to date and all indicators point to further growth in the program.

MALCOLM COSTA: Recruitment of Special Groups for Developmental Programs

Mr. Costa discussed the ways in which developmental education can be a change agent in the large institution. He suggested the developmental education programs should attempt to enroll students who represent all segments of the broader society. This includes students from all economic, social and educational levels who can benefit from the services.

Developmental education is defined in House Bill 86, in a nebulous manner, and addresses itself to the non-traditional student. This includes students with remedial needs, skill upgrading needs, retraining needs and reinforcement needs to adjust to a modern technological society. A major factor which has contributed to developmental education programs in Ohio has been the admittance of non-traditional students. Federal regulations and declining college and university enrollments have been in part responsible for developmental education programs. These programs have taken many shapes and represent an attempt to meet the needs of many specific groups. Rural applicants, minorities, veterans, elderly persons, former prison inmates and handicapped students are among the many student groups requiring assistance in one form or another in our institutions today. These are groups toward which developmental education recruiters should direct themselves.

Ideally, developmental education program leaders should attempt to move into the institutional structure. Naturally, it requires a strong commitment from the faculty and administration. This approval provides an opportunity to design developmental education programs to serve all the students and avoids the stigma often attached when the program serves one or two segments of the student population. The total approach also begins to develop a coalition of students with similar kinds of problems from differing backgrounds, thus maintaining a healthy learning environment.

ROSEMARY V. LIPS: Developmental Services for Physically Handicapped Students

Miss Lips discussed the necessity for programs for handicapped students in post-secondary education. She suggested that services to handicapped students should not be viewed as an auxiliary service. Rather, they should be a vital part of our colleges and universities.

Traditionally, the handicapped student has been denied the educational and social opportunities available to the able-bodied student. These opportunities are unavailable for the handicapped student not only because of physical barriers, but because of discriminatory attitudes held by society. Since universities are commited to maximizing the educational potential of students meeting the admission requirements, the need for breaking down the physical and psychological barriers facing the handicapped student must be met.

Over ten million Americans are classified as physically handicapped beyond the normal range of human differences. Many of these individuals are of college age and are seeking to find an institution of higher learning which can meet their unique needs. Based on the tenet that higher education is a right rather than a privilege, our American universities must realize their obligation to this particular group of individuals.

How does one define the "handicapped student?" The definition used by Rusalem in Guiding the Physically Handicapped College Student states that a physically handicapped college student is one having activity limitations ascertainable by a physician or other professional personnel which affect his functioning on the campus to such a degree that one or more special services not offered to other students and/or intensified existing services are required for his continued successful functioning, academically and/or socially.

Meeting the unique needs of the physically handicapped involves accessibility:

A. Physical - This can be defined as architectural accessibility which includes:

   1. Ramps where steps otherwise exist.
   2. Elevators in buildings above one story.
   3. Modified transportation which is usable by the wheelchair traveler.
   4. The lowering and/or modifying of existing public phones, drinking fountains and elevator buttons.

B. Academic - Academic accessibility can, in part, be met by present developmental education programs. However, it is important to note that not all handicapped students are in need of the usual developmental programming. Supportive services must exist to eliminate handicaps in the classroom. These services include:

   1. Readers
   2. Writers
   3. Test proctors
   4. Library attendants

C. Attitudinal - Attitudinal accessibility involves the development of an accepting climate among faculty and staff as well as students. This is as important as physical accessibility. Without understanding, programs cannot develop, and changes cannot be made. Methods of achieving this understanding include:

1. Newsletters.
2. Articles in the student newspaper.
3. Sponsoring of Disability Day - faculty, staff and students engage in activites from a wheelchair or blindfolded. Awareness workshops follow these experiences. This experience more than any other has worked to heighten the awareness of administrators who are in a position to activate changes.
4. Sponsoring of events such as wheelchair basketball games, etc.

These services have been neglected many times in our attempts to respond to student needs. They should become a vital part of institutional services.

SESSION IX:

DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR ADULTS RETURNING TO FORMAL SCHOOLING

Moderator: Elizabeth Menson, Acting Assistant Campus Director, Lancaster Branch, Ohio University

Panel: James Lorion, Acting Dean and Director Continuing Education, Cuyahoga Community College

Anne Saunier, Citizens' Task Force on Education, Battelle Institute

Henry Taylor, Director of De :pmental Program for University Maintenance Pers. ıel, University of Cincinnati

Recorder: David C. Mitchell, Dean of Instruction, Eastern Campus, Cuyahoga Community College

ELIZABETH MENSON: Developmental Adult Programs

Mrs. Menson dealt with programs for the adult student with special reference to the program at the Lancaster Branch of Ohio University.

She suggested that there need to be developmental education programs that give attention to the special needs of the intermittent student. Effective counseling and academic advising integrated into educational programs could enhance the opportunities of success for intermittent students. The intermittent student many times is an adult returning to school. What are some his/her needs? What assistance is recommended?

Looking about the state, it is questionable if there ever existed in preponderant numbers "ideal" students who entered college from high school, did not stop-out, and progressed in two or four years to respective academic degrees. If such was the situation, it is not the wave of the future. At the Lancaster Branch of Ohio University, the typical student is 27 years old, is married with two children, and carries a part-time load of 10 or 11 hours. There is a 30 percent turn-over of students every quarter. Students regularly return after one or more quarters. Some take five to seven years for two-year degrees and require ten years for four-year degrees.

Developmental education funds should be made available to serve intermittent students in their developmental education needs up to graduate education. These students need assistance. Developmental education funds have justifiably been misused from the time they became available, four years ago. They appear to be needed more by the part-time adult stop-out student than by the "ideal" student who enters directly from high school and progresses steadily to a degree. For example, intermittent students have higher success rates in developmental education than typical 18-year olds. The intermittent students stay in developmental education longer. They are committed and highly motivated. More attention should be focused on the growing group of students, the life-long learners.

HENRY TAYLOR: Developmental Programs for University Employees

Mr. Taylor described a three-month old program at the University of Cincinnati called the Employees Developmental Education Program (EDEP). It provides high school equivalency to cleaning and janitorial personnel at the University. Mr. Taylor suggested that developmental education programs should be considered for non-academic personnel who can benefit from such programs.

As the result of a labor agreement, the University of Cincinnati instituted this developmental education program for cleaning staff with classes during their working hours. Many employees have been denied upgrading because of lack of education and skills. Some of these employees have high school diplomas. Both the University and participating employees are expected to benefit from EDEP. The EDEP philosophy is based on educating adults as whole persons, maintaining relevancy to life experiences and avoiding educational experiences that may have alienated these adults when in public schools.

Students need a total learning experience to cope with a complex technological society. For this reason, EDEP attempts to provide for total learning experience rather than simple preparation to pass the GED test. Program personnel believe that orienting study to replicate public school study would expose students to experiences that alienated them when in public schools. Rather than teach for the GED and relegate expansion of other educational skills to secondary importance, the program is directed to provide for total learning experience with study for the GED a collateral benefit. The GED test was designed for adolescents and lacks large scale relevance for adults.

In this light, a curriculum that integrates learning experiences and life experiences of students is recommended. It should be a heuristic curriculum. It should be based on a core concept with goals of perceive, think, know, value, and do.

In EDEP the curriculum, instruction and evaluation are designed for integration of learning experiences with life experiences of students. Students review possible ideas and select one of common interest. This idea becomes a core concept for the three to six week unit of study. The core concept is used for the groups that are not functionally illiterate. The core concept is an integrated, total methological approach to learning. The way in which core concepts are approached depends on academic levels of groups. The core concept provides a total learning process by integrating content and skills. It also enhances enjoyment of learning. More institutions should consider this aspect of adult education.

ANN SAUNIER: Developmental Education Needs of Women

Ms. Saunier is involved with designing and managing various programs for women in the state of Ohio including educational programs.

She suggested that special attention should be given to the developmental needs of adult women through specific programs. Ms. Saunier described the situations in which many women currently find themselves. Adult women are being forced out or voluntarily leaving the role of home-maker to return to the work force. Some use college as the route to obtain marketable skills. They have all of men's problems and some unique problems. Many are divorced and/or have no economic security. Many are entering college contrary to the desires of husbands from whom they may receive no financial or psychological support. If they have academic or marketable skills, they are probably outdated.

Programs for entering and returning adult women should be based on provision of psychological support with emphasis on improving concepts of self-worth. Many adult women need psychological support. They may not have had supporting experiences outside the home. They are unsure of their ability to cope with college. Women's developmental education programs should take advantage of relevance of home experiences (managing money and home) to college experiences.

Perhaps adult women's developmental programs could be housed in several settings, for example, continuing education, developmental education and women's centers. The individual should be allowed to choose the setting that she prefers.

JAMES LORION: Summer Pre-College Program at Metropolitan Campus

Dr. Lorion described a pre-college developmental program involving adults, held at the Metropolitan Campus of Cuyahoga Community College in the summer of 1974.

The model for the Summer Pre-College Program was prepared with short planning time. It was intended to serve a particular population with a particular purpose: it was directed through the continuing education division to adults who could benefit from special study in communication skills. The program was planned, offered and evaluated in collaboration with full-time faculty. It provided for flexible scheduling because of time constraints of participants. It provided variety in program experience through modules of study scheduled so that students could move comfortably from module to module. Instructors advised and placed students in modules.

Much attention was given to individuals, thus requiring much time. The instructors suggested that future classes should be smaller than those first scheduled, about 15 persons. Also they thought that the modules should be longer, tentatively two weeks in order to determine progress.

Students were 66 percent female. Forty percent were over 25 years old and fifty percent had been college students at one time. This type of program should be geared to serve the non-traditional life-long learner.

In summary, any student with or without high academic skills will probably need improvement in some skill. Developmental education is appropriately directed to providing for the special needs of adult students returning to formal schooling.

SESSION X:

"WHAT DOES RESEARCH SAY ABOUT DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION?"
"WHAT'S BEING DONE IN DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION IN OTHER STATES?"

Moderator: Mac A. Stewart, Assistant Dean, University College, Ohio State University

Panelists: John Elder, Chairman, Developmental Studies, Sinclair Community College

Donald Jelfo, Assistant Professor, Eastern Campus, Cuyahoga Community College

David williams, Director, Field Experiences, College of Education, Ohio State University

Recorder: Carl Gaetano, Director of Counseling, Metropolitan Campus, Cuyahoga Community College

JOHN ELDER: Research Findings on Developmental Programs in Other States

Mr. Elder addressed the subject of research findings on developmental education programs in other states. He found the following to be trends in developmental education during the past five years:

1. Remedial English was the most offered course in the junior college.
2. Remedial Reading is the second most offered course.
3. Remedial Math is the third most offered course.

Further, he indicated that a stronger commitment, on the part of the colleges, in both funding and instruction has evolved. Many of the faculty working in the developmental programs are now there because they have requested to be there.

The organizational aspects of developmental programs usually fall into three categories:

1. Separate division functions within the college;
2. Department functions within a division with its own division head;
3. Different divisions within the college handle developmental education course, i.e. the English area.

Most developmental education courses are listed in the area of English, Math, Reading and tutoring. A survey of developmental programs in North Carolina and Virginia revealed that of forty or more institutions surveyed, most of the schools were concerned with any program that

would be successful: the concept being that anything that works is good. The study revealed that there were almost as many different programs as there were schools reporting. A similarity was that most of the schools were working in the areas of elementary and secondary English, Math and Reading.

Two outstanding programs mentioned by Elder are the programs at Tarrant County Community College, and Southeastern Community College of North Carolina. Tarrant County Community College has a separatist program which is one year in length with all courses taught by the developmental staff. The program consists of 36 semester hours of freshman college credit and provides the first half of the Associate Degree for students. Southeastern College in North Carolina has broken away from the traditional models. The Southeastern program is called "The Advancement Studies Program," and is an experimental program designed for the non-traditional or higher risk student. Learning is individualized for the use of self-instructional programs and utilizes audio tutorial methods.

Elder concluded by stating that developmental programs receive fundings generally through: federal grants, state grants, and/or direct state subsidies.

DONALD JELFO: Developmental Education Research in Two-Year Institutions

Mr. Jelfo focused upon research on Developmental Education programs in two-year institutions. He interpreted developmental education in a two-year institution as "making good on the open-door policy." In doing this, he found the following points to be important:

1. Fees should be maintained that are within the students' means.
2. An instructional style and/or atmosphere should be developed suited to the needs of the students who do attend.
3. A series of program offerings should be planned that are suited to the needs and styles of students.

The distinguishing factor between the open-door policy and the four-year selective admissions policy lies in the diversity of students. There is almost invariably a more heterogeneous student body at the open-door institution than at the selective four-year institution. The following are often characteristics of students who attend the junior/community college:

a. A high school average, (if, in fact, they did graduate from high school) of a low C average or below.
b. Severe deficiencies in basic communication and mathematics skills.
c. Poor study habits.
d. Poor motivation.
e. Lack of desire to stay in school.
f. Unrealistic and ill-defined goals.
g. Home environments with minimum cultural advantages and minimum standards of living. (Quite often they are the first in their families to attend college.)

Mr. Jelfo indicated that the style of instruction in the traditional college is, in many instances, defeating the non-traditional student currently attending the institution as a minority or disadvantaged student. As a result of the failure rate, many schools have developed programs to assist students. These programs have fallen under the umbrella title of developmental education. They are designed to improve a student's skills to the extent that he might be able to succeed in the regular traditional college curriculum. The attitude of the institution, however, is that the student must be changed to fit in, rather than having the institution change to meet the needs of the student.

In a review of the literature, Mr. Jelfo analyzed studies which evaluated programs in two-year schools. He distinguishes between two groups: those studies which were done in the early 1960's and those studies which followed the 1960's. He found that the typical program of the early 1960's consisted of a series of remedial courses in reading, writing, and arithmetic. This pattern seemed to be the case in 80 percent of the colleges surveyed. However, 20 percent of the schools did offer a fuller curriculum dealing with compensatory education. The traditional programs, in most instances, were found to be ineffective, and it was learned that many of the students even failed the remedial courses. The following reasons were set forth for these failures:

1. Questionable placement procedures.
2. Lack of agreement about what should be taught in the course.
3. Lack of suitable instructional material and confusion about proper methodology and course content.
4. Lack of knowledge about students' reading and writing abilities.
5. Lack of knowledge about students' personal problems.
6. A variety of highly subjective grading standards.
7. Insufficient experimentation.

Generally, as Roueche stated in 1967, there is a paucity of research on the evaluation of remedial programs on the college level. In those instances where institutions have evaluated their programs, they have found that remedial programs have not assisted students to the extent that those students could, at the completion of the program, enter traditional or regular college classes.

With the onset of the 1970's, many community colleges attempted to change the concept of remedial education or compensatory education. As a result, a number of factors were considered: General education components in Social Science, English, and the Science areas were added, along with the concept of remedial programs. The concepts behind the general education components were that the style of instruction should be altered, along with some of the instructional materials, to fit the needs of the students. Along with the change in curriculum patterns, additions were made in the support areas, e.g., student tutors, peer counselors, specifically assigned professional counselors and, in some instances, a new type of course also was included in the developmental package which evolved around the development of a positive self concept, attitudes of self and career planning.

Roueche and Kirk, in Catching-Up with Remedial Education evaluated five successful programs. In the summary of this study they listed certain commonalities which, as factors, should be considered by institutions interested in developing developmental education programs. These are listed below:

1. The community college should emphasize and work to achieve its goal of serving all students in its community.
2. Only instructors who volunteer to teach non-traditional students should ever be involved in developmental programs.
3. A separately organized division of developmental studies should be created with its own staff and administrative head.
4. Curriculum offerings in developmental programs should be relevant.
5. Regular college curriculum offerings should be comprehensive.
6. All developmental courses should carry credit for graduation or program certification.
7. Grading policies and practices should be non-punitive.
8. Instruction should accommodate individual differences and permit students to learn and proceed at their own paces.
9. The counseling function in developmental programs must be of real value to students.
10. Efforts should be made to alleviate the abrupt transition from developmental studies to traditional college curricula.
11. Once programs are established, effective recruiting strategies should be developed to identify and enroll non-traditional students.

DAVID WILLIAMS: Research on Recruitment, Admissions and Special Developmental Programs

Mr. Williams addressed his statement to the areas of recruitment, admissions, enrollment, and special developmental programs.

In a survey of 129 colleges conducted by the College Entrance Examination Board, it was indicated that a wide variety of methods were used by the colleges seeking to recruit minority students. The most common methods used were: (1) visits to high schools, (2) contacts with personnel, (3) assistance from minority students. The waiver of fees was found to be helpful, but it was not considered a significant aspect of recruitment. Only 40 percent of the colleges polled, which admitted 500 minority students yearly, used minority personnel to assist with the recruitment process. The survey revealed that highly regarded recruitment aides or techniques were the use of minority staff and the development of special programs of a tutorial nature.

In admissions, the major problem with which most minorities were confronted was the criteria for admission set by most institutions of higher education. The criteria recommended by Tarrant County Community College (N.C.) for consideration by admissions officers in minority admission are the following:

1. Recommendations from the principal and counselors.
2. Recommendations from community organizations.

3. Talent search projects.
4. Upward Bound or similar bridging programs.
5. Visits by recruiting teams.
6. Personal interviews with/and campus visits by potential students.

In another survey, the following characteristics in non-academic areas were also considered important in the process of the admissions of minority students to college programs:

1. Evidence of ability to handle college level work.
2. A willingness to accept some measure of personal responsibility for achievement or failure.
3. A minimal perception of self growth by the student.
4. An emotional perserverance in the face of frustrating circumstances.
5. A motivation to improve circumstances of life.
6. An indication of leadership potential.
7. The capacity to think and plan creatively.
8. Special talents such as music, etc.
9. Success in an activity requiring sustained effort.
10. Ability to distinguish realistically between what is desired and what is possible.

The two most significant factors in this order were items #2 and #5.

Mr. Williams indicated that despite the gains in enrollment that Blacks and Spanish-surnamed students have made in institutions of higher education in the United States, they are still proportionately far behind the proportion of minority persons in the total population. Blacks make up 16.8 percent of the United States population according to the 1970 census. They make up only 10.6 percent of undergraduate enrollment in college. Of all the Bachelor's Degrees earned in 1970, Whites earned 92.1 percent, Blacks earned 5.2 percent, Asians 1.0 percent, and Spanish-surnamed students earned 1.2 percent. A great number of minority students are turning toward the community vocational technical programs or terminal programs as a means of attaining education beyond high school.

Gordon and Wilkerson, in their publication Compensatory Educational Programs for the Disadvantaged Student, state that there are many types of special developmental programs in elementary and secondary schools, plus a good number in junior community colleges, but there are not that many programs in four-year schools of higher education. The most traditional mode of compensatory education are special programs for the disadvantaged student in remedial instruction. Most special programs include academic tutoring as a part of the total process.

These authors placed emphasis on peer tutoring as an important part of compensatory education. A significant point of consideration in any program for the disadvantaged is that everyone must work toward raising the level of expectation and motivation of the student to remain in school. Counseling in this respect, stated the authors, should be a never-ending process. Strong emphasis should be placed on the small group, teacher-student relationship.

A total review by the aforementioned authors concludes that a tremendous amount of resources would be necessary to ward off the effects of poverty, and that an emphasis should be placed on preventive education with considerable input at the elementary and secondary levels, rather than significant intervention at a later stage in the educational process. The following points (concerning compensatory education) were suggested for consideration:

1. Special compensatory programs should be initiated in all institutions of higher learning to narrow the gap between minority and regular students.
2. Significant efforts should be made by academic powers to exhibit a willingness to establish an appropriate atmosphere for learning for the disadvantaged.
3. Changes should be made in the curriculum which are necessary to assist the disadvantaged.
4. Minority students should be permitted to carry lighter academic loads even if it takes them longer than four years to achieve the four-year degree.
5. Consideration should be given to a re-evaluation of the traditional grading system to assist the disadvantaged.
6. Additional support services should be provided, such as paraprofessional counselors, to establish a positive transition into campus life.

SESSION XI

FINDING FUNDS FOR DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION

Moderator: Margaret H. Arter, Director of Special Assistance, Cuyahoga Community College

Panel: Anne Coughlin, Foundation Associate, The Cleveland Foundation

Hal Payne, Dean of Developmental Services, Oberlin College

Francis G. H. Sherman, Vice President of Society National Bank, Greater Cleveland Growth Association

Recorder: Julia Harding, Department Head of English and Director Communications Learning Center, Metropolitan Campus, Cuyahoga Community College

The participants in this seminar each represented a different "constituency." One could say that two, Ms. Coughlin and Mr. Sherman, represented "givers" and two, Dr. Arter and Mr. Payne, represented "receivers" of developmental education funds. Moreover, two represented the private sector of the economy, one, the public sector and one, both public and private. These excellent resource people outlined a systematic approach to acquiring funding, a list of common pitfalls, and a compendium of sources for funding.

To acquire funding from external sources, one must begin in one's own institution. Faculty and staff working directly in a service area are the ones best able to formulate specific, concise, and cogent proposals. They should have the assistance of a grants person to help them match their proposals with the most likely sources of funding. Concurrently, they must obtain a commitment from their own institution to fund a project after the initial "seed money" is spent. The format of the proposal varies enormously depending on where one is applying.

In general, local, private foundations are inclined to look at the end product of any given proposal. That is to say, they are interested in supporting programs which aid the non-traditional student in his education, which provide specialized training necessary to acquire a job, and which increase the educational institution's contribution to the local community. In the public sector, guidelines are available for each of the legislative acts listed below.

It is important that proposals give adequate attention to the aims of both the institution and the grantor, that programs begun with external funding will be guaranteed continuance with institutional funding, and that the proposal is a response to demonstrable student need.

In addition, one must assure the grantor that the proposal is not a duplication of existing efforts, does not include regular operational expenses, and is not "research" per se.

FUNDING SOURCES:

One should look to the grants person for assistance in locating funds, but in the absence of such a person one can begin with:

1. The Foundation Library in New York

2. The Foundation Center Library in New York with a branch depository in Cleveland, in the Cleveland Foundation's office

3. The Policy Book of the Greater Cleveland Growth Association--available by writing to:

   Greater Cleveland Growth Association
   690 Union Commerce Building
   Cleveland, Ohio 44115
   (216-621-3300)

4. The Guide to Federal Assistance for Education, vols. I and II--published by Appleton, Century, Croft.

5. Higher Education in the States--published by the Education Commission of the States.

6. The Law and Lure of Endowment Funds: Report to the Ford Foundation--published by the Education Endowment Series.

7. National Council of University Research Administrators' bibliography for research administrators.

Federal and State Acts pertaining to developmental education:

Higher Education Act, 1965 as amended
- Title III, Aid to Developing Institutions, both Basic and Advanced
- Title IV-A, Talent Search, Upward Bound - Trio programs
- Title VI-A, Undergraduate instructional equipment - improved instruction
- Title II-A, Strengthen library resources of colleges and universities; II-B also

Education of the Handicapped (PL 91-230);
- Title VI-C, deaf-blind centers
- Title VI-F, learning for the deaf through film and other media; also research and training personnel for use of media
- Title VI-D, train teachers and others who educate handicapped

Adult Education Act of 1966, as amended:
Literacy programs for adults - can be non-credit courses in colleges through state discretionary funds

National Science Foundation:
- Instructional Scientific Equipment, Div. of Higher Education in Science
- Alternatives in Higher Eudcation
- College Faculty Workshops
- Faculty Research Participation
- Minority Institutions Science Improvement (Chartered for minorities)
- Technological Innovation in Education

Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education
National Endowment for the Humanities (Also social sciences humanistically oriented):
- Education Projects Grants
  - Planning Grants
  - Program Grants
- Media Grants

State of Ohio - Developmental Education:
- Present expenditures
- Recommended expenditures - FY'76 and FY'77
- Remedial Education to be separate subsidy from Developmental in budget recommended.
- Proposed instructional subsidy - $600,000 for FY'76 and FY'77.

PROPOSAL OUTLINE:

What Should A Proposal to a Private Foundation Include?

I. Cover letter summarizing purpose, amount requested, time limits, and background of the proposal.

II. General information
  - A. Name of institution
  - B. Address
  - C. Name of Chief Executive Officer and phone number

III. Nature of the Project
  - A. Brief, but concise statement of purpose
  - B. Timetable of project planning, operation, and evaluation
  - C. Immediate and long range results expected
  - D. Relationship of results expected to institution's mission statement
  - E. Effect of project on other organizations and the community
  - F. Amount requested by year or over several years
  - G. Use to which funds will be put (personnel, equipment, etc.)
  - H. Rationale for funds needed to carry out stated purpose should include:
    1. Demonstration that this project is not similar to other existing efforts

2. Demonstration that this project has the full support of the institution requesting funding

3. Demonstration that this project requires funding above and beyond normal operating expenses

IV. Personnel
- A. Names of trustees and officers of requesting organization
- B. Nature of their appointment--compensated or not
- C. Frequency of meetings
- D. Qualifications of staff personnel
- E. Need for additional staff and their line responsibility

V. Finances
- A. Operating budget current year and last
- B. Total disbursements last fiscal year
- C. Organization's fiscal year (as opposed to calendar or academic year)
- D. Source of current income
- E. Provisions for financing beyond the grant period
- F. Other foundations to which this project has been submitted
- G. Previous foundation grants
- H. Anticipated budget for this project
- I. Provisions for an independent audit of budget expenditures
- J. Tax status of the institution

VI. Evaluation
- A. Type or progress reports planned--frequency, distribution
- B. Provisions for objective evaluation of results of this project
- C. Existence of professional support for this project
- D. Summary of institution's performance to date

RECOMMENDATIONS OF SESSION:

1. The Ohio Board of Regents formula for subsidy should be revised to avoid discrimination against those institutions which receive no external funding at all.

2. The Ohio Board of Regents should grant developmental education funds to private colleges in the state provided that such institutions demonstrate they are retaining the developmental education student and serving him well.

3. Funding accountability should be increased to insure what is accomplished with money allocated. If it is not being used wisely in one place, it should be transferred to another worthwhile effort.

ADDENDUM TO SESSION XI:

REFERENCES FOR A RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT LIBRARY

PUBLIC SOURCES:

American Education

By: Office of Public Affairs, USOE
From: Superintendent of Documents*
Cost: $4.50 per year (monthly)

Bulletin of Occupational Education

From: AACJC**
Cost: $3.00 per year (monthly)

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA)

By: U. S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB)
From: Superintendent of Documents*
Cost: $7.00 (plus $2.50 for binder)-annual
Other: Includes all matter in "HEW Catalog of Assistance"

Change (The Magazine of Higher Learning)

From: Change Magazine
Box 2450
Boulder, Colorado 80302
Cost: $12.00 per year (monthly)

The Chronicle of Higher Education ("The Chronicle")

From: The Chronicle of Higher Education
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 667-3344
Cost: $21.00 per year (weekly newspaper)

College and University Business

From: McGraw-Hill Institutional Publications
1221 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020
Cost: Free to qualified colleges
($15.00 to others)

College and University Journal

From: American College Public Relations Association
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Cost: $9.50 per year (five issues)

College and University Reporter ("CCH")

From: Commerce Clearing House, Inc.
4025 W. Peterson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60646
Cost: $520.00 per year (2-rin binder volumes, weekly updates)
Other: Considered an essentia sic source of information.

Community and Junior College Journal

From: AACJC**
Cost: $5.00 per year (monthly)

Congressional Directory-current year

From: Superintendent of Documents*
Cost: $6.80 (annual)

Congressional Staff Directory (current is 16th Ed.)

From: Congressional Staff Directory
300 New Jersey Avenue, S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20003
(202) 546-6300
Cost: $13.50 (annual)

Education Directory (Higher Education)

By: National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)
From: Superintendent of Documents*
Catalog No: HE 5.250:50000-72 (pub'd 1972-73)
Cost: $6.00 (annual)

Educational Resources

From: Educational Resources Systems, Inc.
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue
Box 6180
Washington, D.C. 20044
Cost: $45.00 per year (monthly pamphlet)

Federal and State Student Aid Programs

By: Subcommittee on Education (Senate)
(Document #92-90) (Senate)
From: Superintendent of Documents*
Catalog No.: 5271-00213 (Stock Number)
Cost: $.45 (1972)

Federal Notes

From: Federal Notes
University of Southern California
Board Administration 250
University Park
Los Angeles, California 90007
Cost: $35.00 per year (twice monthly)

Federal Register (FR)

From: Superintendent of Documents*
Cost: $25.00 per year (every working day)

Federal Research Report

From: The Federal Research Group
104 South Michigan Avenue
Room 725
Chicago, Illinois 60603
Cost: $25.00 per year (twice monthly)

Grants Administration Manual

By: HEW Staff
From: Superintendent of Documents*
Cost: $7.50
Type: Looseleaf, punched for 3-ring binder

GUIDE to Federal Assistance for Education ("The GUIDE")

From: Educational Division
Appelton Century Crofts
440 Park Avenue, South
New York, New York 10016

Cost: $375.00/year (21 looseleaf volumes, monthly update)

Higher Education and National Affairs

From: American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Cost: $25.00 per year (weekly newsletter)

How our Laws are Made

From: Superintendent of Documents*
Catalog no.: 5271-0304 (Stock Number)
Cost: $.35
Other: Paperback published June 30, 1972

Special

From: AACJC Office of Governmental Affairs**
Cost: Free (monthly)
Other: Mailed to College Presidents

U. S. Government Manual (formerly U. S. Gov't Organization Manual)

From: Superintendent of Documents*
Cost: $3.00 (updated each July)

PRIVATE SOURCES:

Foundation Directory

From: The Foundation Center
888 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10019
Cost: $15.00 per edition

Foundation News

From: Council on Foundations Inc.
888 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10019
Cost: $15.00 per year

Information Quarterly

From: The Foundation Center
888 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10019
Cost: $7.50 per year

*Superintendent of Documents
U. S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D. C. 20402

**American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
Suite 410
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 293-7050

L U N C H E O N A D D R E S S

"Closing Comments on Issues in Developmental Education"

By Dr. James A. Norton
Chancellor, Ohio Board of Regents

Thank you very much, Bob. On behalf of the Board of Regents and myself, I want to thank you for attending this conference on developmental education.

Last evening, Dr. Ellison told me that this was unique as a statewide operation. We think it is certainly one of the fundamental operations that we need in the State of Ohio if we are to meet the challenges that have been imposed, not only by the change in the times, but also by what is an historical commitment in Ohio: that any person who wants an education should not be hampered by the institutions in achieving it. It is a commitment we made a long time ago, that we sometimes have difficulty living up to, but it is still our ideal today. Your participation in this conference is one of the ways in which we hope to make the ideal become reality.

These are very sobering times. Perhaps you read the editorial in yesterday's Plain Dealer in which the publisher of the newspaper suggested that probably Western civilization never again would be quite the same. Whether that is a profound and true statement or not, it certainly catches the mood of the times. All of us are waiting just as eagerly as those persons who have large investments in the stock market, wondering what is going to happen with the President and his proposals for our economy. We have a feeling of pervasive malaise that, for the time being at least, things are in charge and we are not.

It is in the middle of this sort of atmosphere that I have been travelling around the State of Ohio, talking to people about higher education. I want to report that I find people are interested in higher education, that they believe strongly in it, and that they are prepared to evaluate very carefully the proposals which we have offered to the State. I regard it as a good omen in bad times that people are not forsaking the techniques and the institutions that have provided leadership in times past. Higher education is certainly among those institutions. We believe that we have outlined for the State of Ohio some sound proposals that are going to receive very serious consideration by the people and by the legislators who represent them.

Today, I would like to present a few random thoughts that tie together this major preoccupation of mine with the budget and the work that you have been doing here at this Conference.

Post-secondary education is a very difficult sort of thing to explain to people. Perhaps you notice I just ran a ringer into my sentence when I moved from "higher education" to "post-secondary education." Traditionally, we talk about higher education, but in the last few years we have begun to pay some attention to a much more complex concept. Post-secondary education is education coming after the completion of elementary and secondary education, or is education for those persons who, as a matter of chronology, have become older than the persons traditionally served by elementary and secondary education. We really are talking about post-secondary education today, whether we follow the leadership of the Federal government in its various programs, or the designation by the Governor of the Ohio Board of Regents as a statewide post-secondary education planning commission, or whether we focus on the major institution of post-secondary education.

If you look at the budget we have presented to the legislature, you will notice that we are trying to provide a system in which all levels of education are appropriately treated and funded. Moreover, it is one which focuses special attention on special places for efforts we have not been making at all. We are proposing, for example, that we get out and recruit people to technical education. We are proposing the appointment of 35 persons who will serve throughout the State as recruiters of students to tecnnical education and as coordinators with employers, so that we tie the student, the school, and the employer closer together.

There are some people who want to make all facets of higher education alike: they all should be universities, or they all should be technical colleges, or they all should be private or they all should be public. I think if you look at overall needs and the service institutions, you see a clear indication that nothing short of the total system of higher education, of post-secondary education, will suffice.

I point this out because when we look at the total clientele available for us to serve, we notice how it has changed. As Dr. Parilla noted, we are going to enter a period in the near future when the number of persons of what we call traditional college age will decline in number. There will be fewer of them on the college scene. Following World War II, the appearance of large numbers of males beyond traditional college age was an aberration. It was the first time we ever had such a large number of males above college age, but it was just a precursor of things to come. Today and in the decade to come, we will find large numbers of males beyond college age, plus some other persons who did not appear in the 1940's following World War II: females and persons who were not represented because of their minority or other special status.

This year, we are finding more part-time students than ever before in the history of Ohio, and they are in an age range from just out of high school up to what I used to think of as very old people. When you recognize this new population, you ask the question, "What is it that we are going to be called on to support? What is the need for the State to put in money?" We are going to have to do some very careful thinking.

Last night Dr. Ellison quoted some statistics pointing to the fact that the number of jobs in our society requiring college degrees is going up. By the middle of the 1980's probably one of every five jobs will require a person who has spent at least four years in post-secondary education. This is a new demand on us. Equally new is the fact that such a large percentage of the other jobs will require some post-secondary education, at least one year or two years, or three years in the case of some programs that currently are being developed.

The people who come to college today are recognizing a fact that we often do not recognize when we talk about manpower needs: that the real demand for higher education, both socially and personally, many times is not described for the job we think we have immediately at hand. For an example, think for just a moment of the number of women who believe that to provide adequate mothering and caring of children they should be well educated; that going to college is something desirable for a woman in preparation for or paralleling her mothering function. Certainly we do not need a baccalaureate degree to describe a mother, but which of us believes it unimportant in the long run to encourage every woman heading a household or serving as a mother in a household? Think about the qualifications we really would like to have for individuals in society. Women who make the educational investment would like to have these as well, not solely because of prospects of a job at some time, but because it is part of the enriching experience they demand for themselves. Manpower experts seldom ever look at this. Yet it is one of the very real, social, and personal demands that we put on the post-secondary education system.

If we really mean that we shall provide services for all types of persons, we must believe in something like developmental education. There is no way we can make opportunity real for people without recognizing that we must take people where they are and then encourage them to move ahead. We cannot take them at the level where they theoretically should be. I think we sometimes overburden our elementary and secondary education systems by suggesting that they had an obligation which they are failing to fulfill. If you look at the results of the educational process and the quality of the persons who come out of our elementary and secondary schools today, and compare them with those who came out 40 years ago, or 30, 20 or 10 years ago, I submit you will not be seriously disappointed. But, regardless of how individuals come through the secondary system, the obligation is ours to make certain that their post-secondary opportunity is a real one.

When we posed the problem this year to presidents of schools and colleges in the State as to what it would cost to begin providing an adequate developmental education program, not one of them was content with the budget we have for the current year. The legislature appropriated two and one-half million dollars this year, for our supplementary programs. We are recommending this figure to be increased another million dollars.

In addition, we recommend removal of courses called remedial education, separation of them from the whole concept of developmental education, and their addition into the regular subsidy formula within this coming biennium. Remedial education did not come about to meet the special needs of the 1960's. It is not something that will go away in the 1980's. It merely recognizes the fact that people coming into education at any given level bring different educational resources with them, and regardless of how our colleges or our secondary schools work, there always will be some persons who are going to need special assistance to achieve what they want to achieve and what they are capable of achieving. We suggest that remedial education should be part of the regular system, and it should be paid for that way.

Our recommendation shows that the Board of Regents is interested in developmental education. The legislature is interested also. We feel certain it will be funded. At the same time, we know that there are some serious questions which must be faced, and you as a group are in your second year of beginning to work on these five questions: What is developmental education? Who is it for? It may be for one group on one campus and a slightly different group on another campus. There is no reason for every campus to serve everyone. Not only is it impossible, but the system makes some variety a desirable option. How should developmental education be organized? How is it to be delivered?

I have the feeling that in developmental education, many things are going on not unlike some that have been going on for a long time in college teaching. Most college teachers (I am sure this is not true of many of you) come into their classrooms horribly prepared for the task. They know a great deal about the subject they are to teach, but they start re-inventing the wheel as to how they should deliver information. It's fascinating. You would think each of us had to devise a technique for laying out a course plan, even though we all produce about the same package, regardless of where we start or with whom we talk.

I have the feeling we are doing the same thing in the field of developmental education. Each of us is trying to re-invent it. I wonder if we are going to be stupid enough to continue. I wonder if we really believe there are no other people who understand how learning occurs. I wonder if all will try to become real experts in learning and teaching, and do all the necessary basic research, or if we will share, not solely in conferences like this, but in journals and in our training sessions, among ourselves and with our colleagues, the results of all of the experimentation taking place.

I know most of us feel like the often-quoted farmer, faced with the county agent trying to give him some literature on how to farm. He pointed out to the agent, "I don't farm now half as well as I know how." All of us are faced with that same attitude, but I submit that it is still worthwhile to take the literature the county agent is passing out.

I feel that the developmental education program which reinvents everything that is necessary is a waste of time and money, because there are specialists in this field. If you and your group have not invited a consultant from outside to come and question what you are doing, you are wasting a great deal of energy.

How do you deliver these services? We must examine this problem. Dr. Parilla asked me another question, "How do you evaluate them?" A special session was devoted to this. He asked "How do you finance and fund them? Financing and funding tie in with all these other questions--what is it, and who for, and how well is it being done.

At this time, I would like to charge Bill Watson and Dick Romoser with a special problem. They were the chairmen last year and this year of the planning groups which put these programs together. I would like both of you together to send to me about December 15 a special note of plans by which by the middle of January we could convene a special task force to work on the techniques of reporting developmental education. We need to know what we are talking about when we talk to the public and the legislators, and not least when we talk to ourselves.

The real commitment in the field of developmental education, as Dr. Ellison pointed out clearly last night, is not our special programs, but the entire institutional response. We are dealing with an extremely complex system with many different parts that must be healthy, and that must work together if we are going to accomplish our goals in developmental education and in post-secondary education as a whole. Thank you for the effort you are devoting to it.

CONFERENCE EVALUATION

EVALUATION OF SECOND ANNUAL OHIO DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION CONFERENCE

As noted earlier, this conference was the second annual conference sponsored by the Ohio Board of Regents. Since the conference might be one of an on-going series of conferences, we undertook to examine the strengths and weaknesses of the conference for use in improving future efforts of this kind.

Of course, each conferee developed a personal evaluation of the sessions, the presentations, the organization and the communications which occured on October 6-7. We developed a questionnaire to elicit these personal evaluations from conferees for an overall evaluation.* This questionnaire was designed to obtain information for analysis to produce suggestions for improvement of next year's conference.

Sixty-eight evaluation forms were turned in. Figure 1 shows the total of responses to items on the front side of the evaluation form and Figure 2 shows the responses occuring most frequently for items on the reverse side of the form.

An analysis was conducted to compare the conferees' ratings of the individual sessions. The data for this comparison were obtained from Item #5 of the evaluation form. Table 1 presents the means and standard deviations of ratings given to each session. Also presented are the numbers of those who attended each session among those 68 who completed evaluation forms. Since approximately one-third of the total number of conferees completed evaluation forms, the "Attendance" numbers must be tripled to get an idea of the total attendance at each session.

The ratings of the sessions were compared to determine which sessions were rated more favorably. We compared the sessions with all possible pairs of means and obtained t values. The t values of each set of compared sessions which exceeded the .05 significance level are presented in Table 2. Note that positive figures indicate that the column item was rated more favorably than the row item, e.g. the Banquet Session was rated more favorably than the General Session (2.4).

The evaluators also were interested to see if the returned questionnaires gave a representative sample of responses from the various groups of developmental education personnel who attended the conference. Table 3 presents several categories into which the total number of conferees were divided and into which the sample of 68 returned questionnaires was divided. The significance of difference was calculated with Chi Square. The contrast of those who work directly with students and those with support/administrative positions indicated that the ratings are highly weighted by conferees who work directly with students.

---

*The questionnaire, which was included in each conference information folder, is shown in Figures 1 and 2.

EVALUATION FORM

SECOND ANNUAL OHIO DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION CONFERENCE

cosponsored by
Ohio Board of Regents
and
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio
OCTOBER 6-7, 1974

The total number of questionnaires returned was 68.

Not all results of this conference can be reflected in this evaluation, but the planning for next year's conference will take this evaluation into account. Please be candid and as thorough as possible.

The general purpose of this conference was to facilitate communication by providing the opportunity for the exchange of information and ideas and for clarifying issues, perhaps leading to the presentation of recommendations to serve as focal points for further action.

Background Information:

(1) Your type of institution: [35] 2-year [28] 4-year or more [4] Other ____ specify
1-NO ANSWER

(2) [59] Public [8] Private [1] Proprietary
0-NO ANSWER

(3) Your function: [37] Primarily directly working with students [1] Primarily support services but not administrative [22] Primarily administrative services [8] Other ____ specify
0-NO ANSWER

(4) [35] Female [33] Male 0-NO ANSWER

Evaluation

(5) What sessions did you attend and how would you rate them overall?

Session Number	Session Type	Attendance		If attended, overall rating				
		Yes	No	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	NO ANSWER
1	General Session	58	10	19	33	5	1	
2	Paper Presentation	24	44	10	9	4	1	
3A	Demonstrations	35	33	11	16	6	2	
3B	Peer Counseling	12	56	9	1	2	0	
4	Evaluation Panel	35	33	12	12	10	1	
5	Counseling	21	47	4	11	4	1	1
6	Banquet Session (Not Food)	60	8	31	23	3	0	3
7	Relax and Reflect	39	29	7	18	10	1	3
8	Recruiting	36	32	11	17	6	1	1
9	Adults	18	50	8	7	1	0	2
10	Research	25	43	7	16	2	0	
11	Funding	22	46	14	7	1	0	
Tour CCC		3	65	2	1	0	0	
Tour CSU		9	59	5	1	0	1	2
12	Luncheon Session (Not Food)	39	29	18	8	0	0	13
	Your rating of the conference overall			14	24	3	0	27

(6) Please circle the session number (in question above) of the best session you attended.

Fig. 1: Totals of Responses on Front Side of Evaluation Form

(7) Which sessions did you feel dealt with each of the following:

Type of Discussion	Write in the Session Numbers
Information Exchange	1, 2, 3, 3A, 3B, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, tours
Identifying/Clarifying Issues	1, 3B, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11
Considering Recommendations	1, 5, 6, 11, 12

(8) What were the outstanding weaknesses and strengths of the sessions you attended?

WEAKNESSES (please cite session(s) number(s) Too many panelists

Schedule too tight	Poor paper presentations
No time for "brainstorming"	Too many lectures, not enough group activities
Organization overdone	Discussions too general, need specifics, e. g. teaching methods, course content
Too few instructors present	
Not enough time for information exchange, question and answer, demonstrations	
Too many activities scheduled between 3:30-5:00 p.m. on Sunday	

STRENGTHS (please cite session(s) number(s)

Implementation of Program	Panelists well prepared
Organization of program	Speakers were representative
Well prepared leaders	Counseling
Pertinent topic selection	Campus tours
Banquet and luncheon speakers	Varied group of conferees (sex, age, race)
Peer counseling	

(9) If a special statewide study group were to be organized to consider some aspect of developmental education during the coming months, what aspect would you recommend as the most important for study? If you list more than two aspects, please indicate which should be studied first.

(10) Which session(s) should be eliminated from next year's conference? Please cite session numbers(s).

Relax and reflect; the "What Is It?" session

(11) We intended to provide opportunities for you to meet and talk with colleagues from around the state. Please comment on our attempts. For example, were the coffee breaks too short, too long, too many, too few? Were the meals awkwardly set up? Were the facilities for conversation at the Relax and Reflect session appropriate? Coffee breaks too short; no place to sit and talk

Meals awkwardly set up; too crowded

Need a structured exchange session rather than informal cocktail session

(12) What else can you say about the conference?

Start on another day than Sunday

Registration fee was too expensive

Fig. 2: Most Frequent Responses to Items on Reverse Side of Evaluation Form

TABLE 1

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF RATINGS, BY SESSION, OF THOSE WHO ATTENDED AND GAVE EVALUATIONS

Session	Number Who:		Of those who attended and gave evaluations	
	Attended	Evaluated	Mean	Standard Deviation
General Session	58	58	3.21	.663
Paper Presentation	24	24	3.17	.850
Demonstrations	35	35	3.03	.845
Peer Counseling	12	12	3.58	.759
Evaluation	35	35	3.00	.862
Counseling	21	20	2.90	.768
Banquet	60	57	3.49	.596
Relax and Reflect	39	36	2.86	.751
Recruiting	36	35	3.09	.770
Adults	18	16	3.44	.609
Research	25	25	3.20	.566
Funding	22	22	3.59	.577
Tour Cuyahoga Community College	3	3	3.67	.471
Tour Cleveland State University	9	7	3.43	1.050
Luncheon	39	26	3.69	.462
Overall Conference	68	41	3.27	.585

Although the information collected via the evaluation questionnaire did lead to firm recommendations for the next conference, the evaluators speculated that another conference might be more effective if sessions were directed specifically to either (a) information about programs that work and what they do that succeeds or (b) presenting, clarifying, and discussing issues in developmental education. By identifying the primary function of the session, the panelists would be better able to delimit their presentations. The panelists should also be chosen four to five months in advance of the conference to give them adequate time to prepare. Finally the next conference would hopefully build upon the benefits of the previous two conferences, using the records of those events as the "jumping off" points for the next conference.

TABLE 2

T VALUES OF COMPARED SESSIONS AT .05 SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL

	General Session	Paper Presentations	Demonstrations	Peer Counseling	Evaluation	Counseling	Banquet	Relax and Reflect	Recruiting	Adults	Research	Funding	Tour CCC	Tour CSU	Luncheon
General Session							2.4	-2.3				2.4			3.3
Paper Presentation															2.7
Demonstrations							3.0					2.7			3.6
Peer Counseling					-2.0	-2.4		-2.8							
Evaluation				2.0			3.2					2.8			3.7
Counseling				2.4			3.5			2.2		3.2			4.2
Banquet	-2.4		-3.0		-3.2	-3.5		-4.4	3.4		-2.0				
Relax and Reflect	2.3			2.8			4.4			2.6		3.8			4.9
Recruiting							-3.4					2.6			
Adults						-2.2		-2.6							
Research							2.0					2.3			3.3
Funding	-2.4		-2.7		-2.8	-3.2		-3.8	-2.6		-2.3				
Tour CCC															
Tour CSU															
Luncheon	-3.3	-2.7	-3.6		-3.7	-4.2		-4.9	-3.5		-3.3				

*Note: Positive figures indicate that the column item was evaluated more favorably than the row item, e.g. the Banquet Session was rated more favorably than the General Session (2.4).

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF TOTAL CONFERENCE REGISTRATION WITH CONFEREES WHO RETURNED EVALUATION FORMS

Categories	Total Conferees	Respondents		Significance of Difference
		N	% of Conferees	
Two-Year	95	35	*37%*	Not Significant
Four-Year	98	28	*28%*	
Public	166	59	*36%*	Not Significant
Private	26	8	*31%*	
Works with Students	67	37	*55%*	.001 level
Support/Administrative	127	31	*24%*	
Female	90	35	*39%*	Not Significant
Male	113	33	*29%*	
TOTAL	203*	68	Avg. *35%*	

*The totals of each category vary slightly and do not total 203 because of occasional responses of "other."

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEXT YEAR'S CONFERENCE

The following suggestions for future conference organization were taken from responses to items 9, 10, 11, and 12 of the evaluation form. Many persons made similar suggestions, so duplications have been eliminated.* However, this list comprehensively represents the ideas and suggestions which conferees felt should be considered in planning future conferences on developmental education.

1. Invite publishers to present latest materials.
2. Provide for greater distribution of printed materials, i.e. unpublished papers.
3. Invite nationally or regionally prominent persons in the field who can contribute to developmental education in Ohio.
4. Hold the conference twice a year.
5. The conference should be three days in length, not two days.
6. Begin on another day than Sunday.
7. Insist on stricter adherence to time limits by panelists.
8. Develop a newsletter system to provide information on specific methods and programs.
9. Focus on sessions for instructional personnel rather than for administrators.
10. Hold sessions for specialized subject area personnel to get together, i.e. all math instructors.
11. Present more information on adult education programs.
12. Hold session on individualized instruction and use of educational media.
13. Hold session on aid to private colleges.
14. Hold session on teacher training and teaching methods.
15. Present more information and discussion on "adequate" funding.
16. Hold session on the role of community colleges in developmental education.

*Obviously, these suggestions might be assigned different weights. There was no attempt to do this at this time.

CONFERENCE INFORMATION

SECOND ANNUAL DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION CONFERENCE

October 6-7, 1974

LIST OF CONFEREES AND PARTICIPANTS

Mr. Ray Ackley
Assistant Professor of English
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mrs. Jean Allen
Counselor
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Ms. Dawn Anderson
Instructor, Academic Department
Terra Technical College
Fremont, Ohio 43420

Mr. Richard Armanini
Counselor
Northwest Technical College
Archbold, Ohio 43502

Mr. Ronald E. Armitage
Director, Student Services
Stark Technical College
Canton, Ohio 44720

Mr. Barry A. Aronson
Assistant Professor
Geauga Campus
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio 44242

Dr. Margaret H. Arter
Director of Special Assistance
District Administration Services
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mr. Ya-Seem As'Sami
Campus Ombudsman
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Ms. Lollie M. Bailey
Director, Student Educational Services
Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, Ohio 44106

Ms. Bettie J. Baker
Associate Professor of History
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Ms. Melody K. Baker
Assistant to Dean, Special Studies
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mr. James F. Barnes
Dean, Afro-American Studies
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio 45701

Ms. Nancy Barnett
Senior Instructor
Scioto Technical College
Lucasville, Ohio 45648

Ms. Carol J. Bartoletti
Assistant Director
Trumbull Campus
Kent State University
Warren, Ohio 44483

Dr. Don Basile
Associate Professor and Director of Reading and Study Skill Center
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221

Ms. M. G. Beekley
Reading and Study Skills Specialist
Mansfield Campus
Ohio State University
Mansfield, Ohio 44906

LIST OF CONFEREES - (Continued)

Ms. Henrietta Bibbs
Counselor
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Dr. John J. Binder
Assistant Dean, Student
Academic Services
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio 44242

Mrs. Douglas D. Bond
Member, Board of Trustees
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mr. Hunter R. Boylan
Contingency Manager, Modular
Achievement Learning Center
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

Mrs. Edith O. Brashares
Department Head, History and
Political Science
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Ms. Emma J. Brown
Instructor, Study-Skills
Wright State University
Dayton, Ohio 45431

Ms. Carolyn Bubenzer
Tutoring Program Director
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio 45701

Dr. Lance C. Buhl
Director, Educational
Consulting Study
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mrs. Jeanne Burgie
Reading Instructor
Hocking Technical College
Nelsonville, Ohio 45764

Mr. Shannon Burns
Director, Writing Skills Program
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio 45701

Mr. Andrew Buynacek
Director of Counseling
Lakeland Community College
Mentor, Ohio 44060

Ms. Marian W. Candon
Professor of Nursing
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mr. Samuel R. Carrington
Director, Project Search
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mr. Jon M. Cindric
Coordinator of Developmental
Programs
University of Akron
Akron, Ohio 44325

Ms. Catherine M. Clark
Program Coordinator
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43202

Mr. Joseph Clovesko
Assistant Professor of Biology
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

LIST OF CONFEREES - (Continued)

Ms. Gwendolyn Coleman
Coordinator - Counselor
Black Resources Center
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio 45701

Mr. Richard A. Collins
Instructor
Hocking Technical College
Nelsonville, Ohio 45764

Mr. Douglas Cook
Director of Developmental
Mathematics Lab
Michael J. Owens Technical
College
Perrysburg, Ohio 43551

Mrs. Helen Cooks
Director of Student Development
University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio 43606

Mr. Malcolm J. Costa
Director of Student Development
Youngstown State University
Youngstown, Ohio 44503

Mrs. Doris Coster
Dean of Students
College of Wooster
Wooster, Ohio 44691

Ms. Anne Coughlin
Foundation Associate
Cleveland Foundation
Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Mrs. Wanda Crenshaw
Associate Professor,
Assistant Librarian
Eastern Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Warrensville Township, Ohio 44122

Ms. Ruth Cruise
Instructor
Youngstown State University
Youngstown, Ohio 44503

Mr. Marcelino Cuellar
Hispanic Student Affairs
Specialist
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

Mrs. Faye Curran
Coordinator of
Developmental Education
Middletown Branch
Miami University
Middletown, Ohio 45052

Mr. Richard C. Curtis
Dean of Student Services
Western Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Parma, Ohio 44130

Ms. Erva P. Curtiss
Instructor, Reading and Study
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221

Ms. Queen F. Degraphenreid
Director of Upward Bound
Ohio Wesleyan University
Delaware, Ohio 43015

Mr. Timothy Dodds
Acting Director of
Admissions and Records
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mr. Jerome Dunn
Director, Continuing Education
Stark Technical College
Canton, Ohio 44720

Mr. John Elder
Chairman, Developmental Department
Sinclair Community College
Dayton, Ohio 45402

Dr. Nolen Ellison
President
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

LIST OF CONFEREES - (Continued)

Mrs. Leatrice Emeruwa
Assistant Professor of
English, Communications
Learning Center
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mr. Ronald Etter
Assistant Director,
Learning Center
The College of Wooster
Wooster, Ohio 44691

Mr. Ronald Evans
Counselor, College Skills
Specialist
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio 44242

Mr. Robert Ewald
Assistant Professor of English
Findlay College
Findlay, Ohio 45840

Mr. James J. Flannery
Member, Ohio Board of Regents
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Dr. Edward L. Florak
Vice President and Dean of
Student Affairs
Jefferson County Technical
Institute
Steubenville, Ohio 43952

Ms. Cathleen Fluty
Chairman, General Studies
Scioto Technical College
Lucasville, Ohio 45458

Mr. John A. Forman
Assistant Director, Admini-
stration and Educational
Resources
Stark County Campus
Kent State University
North Canton, Ohio 44720

Mrs. Frances M. Franklin
Assistant Professor of English
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Dr. Carl Gaetano
Director of Counseling
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mr. William O. Gillespie
Assistant Dean,
Developmental Services
Oberlin College
Oberlin, Ohio 44074

Dr. D. V. Giovannazzo
Chairman of Education
College of Mount St. Joseph
Mount St. Joseph, Ohio 45051

Ms. Regina L. Goodman
Facilities Analyst
Ohio Board of Regents
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Mr. Carlos P. Gray
Coordinator of Developmental
Education
Miami University
Oxford, Ohio 45056

Mr. F. Russell Grill
Instructor of English
Franklin University
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Dr. Peter J. Hampton
Director, Department of
Development Programs
The University of Akron
Akron, Ohio 44325

Ms. Julia Harding
Department Head of English
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

LIST OF CONFEREES - (Continued)

Mr. Hershell Hardy
Assistant Dean for Student Development
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221

Ms. Captola Harris
Recruitment Coordinator, Student Development
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

Mr. James S. Hartman
Assistant Dean
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio 45701

Mr. Peter Havholm
Director, Learning Center
The College of Wooster
Wooster, Ohio 44691

Mr. Francis Hazard
Director
Tuscarawas Campus
Kent State University
New Philadelphia, Ohio 44663

Ms. Celia B. Hazlett
Hispanic Affairs Counselor
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

Dr. Barry Heermann
Chairman, Division of Public Services
Sinclair Community College
Dayton, Ohio 45402

Mr. John L. Henderson
Dean for Student Development
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221

Dr. Angela Hergenroeder
Professor, Business Administration
Western Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Parma, Ohio 44130

Mr. David Hill
Vice Chairman
Ohio Board of Regents
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Ms. Sandra J. Holden
Assistant Dean of Students
Denison University
Granville, Ohio 43023

Ms. Elizabeth Hoobler
Assistant Professor, English
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio 44242

Mr. Richard R. Howard
Student Services Counselor
Scioto Technical College
Lucasville, Ohio 45648

Mr. Paul J. Hutt
Instructor of Mathematics
Franklin University
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Mr. Curtis F. Jefferson
Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mrs. Helen Jefferson
Coordinator, Medical Assisting, CLA, MLT
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mr. Donald Jelfo
Assistant Professor of History and Political Science
Eastern Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Warrensville Township, Ohio 44122

Mr. C. Fred Jenkins
Campus Ombudsman
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

LIST OF CONFEREES - (Continued)

Mr. James Jilek
Counseling Director
Urbana College
Urbana, Ohio 43078

Dr. H. Andrew Johnson
Chairman, Board of Trustees
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mr. Allen Joplin
Director of Special Services
Central State University
Wilberforce, Ohio 45384

Mrs. Dorothy H. Judd
Troy State University
Troy, Alabama 36081

Ms. Rose Ann Kalister
Coordinator, Developmental
English Program
Lancaster Branch
Ohio University
Lancaster, Ohio 43130

Mr. Charles Kershaw
Student Coordinator
Youngstown State University
Youngstown, Ohio 44503

Mr. David L. Kinzel
Assistant to the
Campus President
Western Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Parma, Ohio 44130

Dr. John J. Koral
President
Western Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Parma, Ohio 44130

Dr. Louis Kotnik
Dean, Business and Science
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Dr. Martin L. Krauss
Dean, Arts and Sciences
Western Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Parma, Ohio 44130

Ms. Janell B. Lang
Michael J. Owens Technical
College
Perrysburg, Ohio 43551

Mr. Alan J. Lange
Instructor of General Studies
Lima Technical College
Lima, Ohio 45804

Mr. Sam H. Lane
Project Associate
Educational Consulting Study
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mr. Ranaldo Lawson
Coordinator, Developmental
Assistance
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio 44242

Mrs. Espelita Lencyk
Interviewer
Youngstown State University
Youngstown, Ohio 44503

Dr. Frank E. Liguori
Dean, Business Administration
and Technologies
Western Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Parma, Ohio 44130

Ms. Rosemary V. Lips
Coordinator, Developmental
Services for
Handicapped Students
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio 44242

LIST OF CONFEREES - (Continued)

Dr. James Lorion
Acting Dean, Community Services
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Dr. Alan MacCracken
Assistant Professor
Walsh College
Canton, Ohio 44720

Dr. Susan P. Mahan
Coordinator, Occupational Therapy Assisting
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mr. Eugene W. Malone
Director of Counseling, Admissions and Records
Eastern Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Warrensville Township, Ohio 44122

Mr. Larry W. Manahan
Dean of Instruction
Northwest Technical College
Archbold, Ohio 43502

Mr. Orin J. Martin
Reading Instructor
Cleveland Institute of Art
Cleveland, Ohio 44106

Ms. Peggy H. McCanne
Instructor, Developmental Reading
Franklin University
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Mr. Tom McCort
Project Investigator for Core-Curriculum Grant, Assistant Professor of Allied Health
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Ms. Nancy McCracken
Instructor, English
Youngstown State University

Mr. Thomas M. McCuistion
Director, Instructional Services
Clark Technical College
Springfield, Ohio 45505

Mrs. Florence P. McGeoch
Developmental Reading Instructor
Hocking Technical College
Nelsonville, Ohio 45764

Ms. Madeleine L. McKivigan
Coordinator of Developmental Psychology
Ohio Dominican College
Columbus, Ohio 43219

Dr. Martin M. McKoski
Director of Writing - Reading Laboratory
University of Akron
Akron, Ohio 44325

Ms. Evelyn McMichael
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mr. Robert B. Meacham
Director of Student Life and Counseling Services
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221

Mr. Charles L. Means
Vice Provost for Minority Affairs
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

Ms. Elizabeth C. Menson
Acting Assistant Director
Lancaster Branch
Ohio University
Lancaster, Ohio 43130

Mr. Stephen M. Merrill
Part-time instructor
Frankling University
Columbus, Ohio 43215

LIST OF CONFEREES - (Continued)

Dr. David C. Mitchell
Dean for Instruction
Eastern Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Warrensville Township, Ohio 44122

Mrs. Dora E. Mitchum
Director of Program Development
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Mrs. Johnetta B. Mixon
Acting Department Head of
Nursing Education
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mrs. June R. Morgenstern
Associate Professor of Psychology
Eastern Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Warrensville Township, Ohio 44122

Mr. Carl Moyler
Director, Title III
Urbana College
Urbana, Ohio 43078

Mr. Robert H. Mustard
Coordinator of Developmental
Education
Lima Campus
Ohio State University
Lima, Ohio 45804

Mr. Gaston Ndyajunwoha
Assistant Professor of
Mathematics
Eastern Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Warrensville Township, Ohio 44122

Miss Audrey Norman
Student Planning Coordinator
Central State University
Wilberforce, Ohio 45384

Dr. James A. Norton
Chancellor
Ohio Board of Regents
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Ms. Joan M. Packer
Assistant Professor of
Psychology, LIP Counselor
Tuscarawas Campus
Kent State University
New Philadelphia, Ohio 44663

Ms. Mary Paolucci
Assistant Director
University of Akron
Akron, Ohio 44325

Mrs. Ida D. Papcum
Associate Professor of Nursing
Western Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Parma, Ohio 44130

Dr. Robert E. Parilla
Vice President for Educational
Planning and Development
District Administrative Services
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mr. James H. Patrick
Dean of Instruction
Hocking Technical College
Nelsonville, Ohio 45764

Ms. Rose Mary Pattison
Assistant to Vice-Chancellor
Ohio Board of Regents
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Mr. Hal D. Payne
Dean, Developmental Services
Oberlin College
Oberlin, Ohio 44074

Ms. Elizabeth Peavy
Reading Specialist
Central State University
Wilberforce, Ohio 45384

Mrs. Mitzi Perry-Miller
Staff Assistant to Executive
Vice President
District Administrative Services
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

LIST OF CONFEREES - (Continued)

Mr. Stephen J. Petercsak, Jr.
Director, Reading-Study Center
Otterbein College
Westerville, Ohio 43081

Ms. Anne Pfannenstein
Supervisor of Developmental Education
Columbus Technical Institute
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Mr. Jack Porter
Professor of Mathematics
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Ms. Bonnie Prince
Instructor of Communications
Hocking Technical College
Nelsonville, Ohio 45764

Dr. Ralph Pruitt
Dean, Division of Special Studies
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Ms. Regina Radebaugh
Director, Tutorial Services
Lakeland Community College
Mentor, Ohio 44060

Ms. Margaret E. Ralston
Assistant Dean for Developmental Services
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio 44242

Ms. Jacque Rawls
Tutor, Student Developmental Center
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio 45701

Mrs. Barbara H. Rawson
Assistant Director to Program Staff
Cleveland Foundation
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Dr. Robert Rennert
Assistant Professor of English
Findlay College
Findlay, Ohio 45840

Ms. Elaine Richman
Coordinator of Developmental Education and Academic Advisor
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Mrs. Delores A. Ridenour
Assistant Professor of Reading in Developmental Education
Lorain County Community College
Elyria, Ohio 44035

Dr. Robert Ridenour
Assistant Dean and Director, Student Development
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Dr. Gus T. Ridgel
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Central State University
Wilberforce, Ohio 45384

Mr. Philip M. Ringle
Counselor
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Ms. Gloria D. Robinson
Ombudsman's Office
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Ms. Brenda Rodgers
Student Coordinator of Student Development Program
Youngstown State University
Youngstown, Ohio 44503

LIST OF CONFEREES - (Continued)

Dr. Richard C. Romoser
Director, Institutional Research and Evaluation
District Administrative Services
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Dr. Lynn S. Rosen
Coordinator, Academic Support Services
Eastern Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Warrensville Township, Ohio 44122

Mr. Thomas Rosenthal
Communication Specialist
Youngstown State University
Youngstown, Ohio 44503

Mr. James Rounds
Counselor
North Central Technical College
Mansfield, Ohio 44906

Mrs. Evelyn Rusk
Counselor
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mrs. Dora Ryder
Staff Assistant
District Administrative Services
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mr. Albert A. Salerno
Dean
Clark Technical College
Springfield, Ohio 45505

Ms. Anne Saunier
Staff, Citizens' Task Force on Education
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Mrs. Mary J. Sawers
Instructor, Education Department
Mary Manse College
Toledo, Ohio 43620

Ms. Saunie Schuster
Assistant Coordinator/ Developmental Education
Miami University
Oxford, Ohio 45056

Dr. Anne B. Shearer
Director of Special Services
Wright State University
Dayton, Ohio 45431

Dr. Robert E. Shepack
President
Eastern Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Warrensville Township, Ohio 44122

Mr. Francis G. H. Sherman
Vice President of Society National Bank
Greater Cleveland Growth Association
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mrs. Ann Shrider
Assistant Professor of Mathematics
Eastern Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Warrensville Township, Ohio 44122

Mr. Don Shrimplin
Counselor
Western Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Parma, Ohio 44130

Ms. Gigi Sigel
Counselor
University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio 43606

Mr. George A. Simmons
Director of Developmental Education
Lorain County Community College
Elyria, Ohio 44035

Mrs. Mary F. Smith
Staff Assistant
District Adminstrative Services
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

LIST OF CONFEREES - (Continued)

Dr. James C. Spencer
Assistant Professor of
Philosophy
Western Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Parma, Ohio 44130

Dr. Gerald Stacy
Director ASP Program
Mary Manse College
Toledo, Ohio 43620

Dr. David Stevenson
President
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Dr. Mac A. Stewart
Assistant Dean,
University College
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Mr. Myron Stoll
Member, Board of Trustees
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Dr. Fred C. Sutton
Coordinator, Industrial
Management
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Ms. Jean M. Swaino
Guided Studies Specialist -
Developmental Education
Agricultural Technical Institute
Ohio State University
Wooster, Ohio 44691

Mrs. Margaret R. Taber
Professor, Engineering Technology
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mr. Booker Tall
Director, Black Affairs
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mr. Henry Taylor
Director, Developmental Program
for University Maintenance
Personnel
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221

Mrs. Anne Thomas
Assistant Professor, Developmental
English
Sinclair Community College
Dayton, Ohio 45402

Mr. Maurice Thornton
Equal Employment Opportunities
Director
District Administrative Services
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Mrs. Jane Tresville
Director, Career Opportunities
Project
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Ms. Gloria Vance
Head of Department of
Developmental Education
Washington Technical College
Marietta, Ohio 45750

Ms. Karen H. Vance
Developmental Education Instructor
Clark Technical College
Springfield, Ohio 45505

Dr. William H. Watson
Associate Dean,
University College
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

LIST OF CONFEREES - (Continued)

Dr. Gale Weisman
Associate Professor
of Mathematics
Findlay College
Findlay, Ohio 45840

Mr. Henry L. Whitcomb
Director, Financial Management
Ohio Board of Regents
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Mr. Kenneth Wiley
Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, Ohio 44106

Mr. David W. Williams
Coordinator, Student Field
Experiences
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Ms. Iris G. Williams
Admissions Counselor
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Dr. Milton E. Wilson, Jr.
Assistant Vice President and
Dean for Human Relations
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio 44242

Mr. Robert C. Wise
Director, Academic Department
Terra Technical College
Fremont, Ohio 43429

Mr. Stanley Witherspoon
Evaluation Specialist
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

Mr. Robert D. Wooster
Director, Business Technologies
Northwest Technical College
Archbold, Ohio 43502

Mr. Jack Wright
Academic Advisor
Marion Campus
Ohio State University
Marion, Ohio 43302

Mr. Dale A. Young
Director of Continuing Education
Malone College
Canton, Ohio 44709

Ms. Eleanor S. Young
Assistant Professor
Sinclair Community College
Dayton, Ohio 45402

Ms. Edith Zais
Coordinator of Learning Development
Programs
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio 44242

Sister Joan M. Zinn
Instructor of Physical Sciences
Metropolitan Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

INSTITUTIONS REPRESENTED AT THE SECOND ANNUAL
OHIO DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION CONFERENCE

Two-Year Junior/Community Colleges

1. Cuyahoga Community College

   Eastern Campus
   Metropolitan Campus
   Western Campus

2. Lakeland Community College

3. Lorain County Community College

4. Sinclair Community College

Two-Year Technical Colleges/Institutes

1. Clark Technical College

2. Columbus Technical Institute

3. Hocking Technical College

4. Jefferson County Technical Institute

5. Lima Technical College

6. North Central Technical College

7. Northwest Technical College

8. Michael J. Owens Technical College

9. Scioto Technical College

10. Stark Technical College

11. Terra Technical College

12. Washington Technical College

INSTITUTIONS REPRESENTED (Continued)

Four-Year Private Colleges/Universities

1. Case Western Reserve University
2. Cleveland Institute of Art
3. College of Mount St. Joseph
4. College of Wooster
5. Denison University
6. Findlay College
7. Franklin University
8. Malone College
9. Mary Manse College
10. Oberlin College
11. Ohio Dominican College
12. Ohio Wesleyan University
13. Otterbein College
14. Urbana College
15. Walsh College

Four-Year Public Universities

1. Bowling Green State University
2. Central State University
3. Cleveland State University
4. Kent State University

    Main Campus
    Geauga Campus
    Stark County Campus
    Trumbull Campus
    Tuscarawas Campus

INSTITUTIONS REPRESENTED (Continued)

Four-Year Public Universities
(Continued)

5. Miami University

   Main Campus
   Middletown Campus

6. Ohio State University

   Main Campus
   Agricultural Technical Institute
   Lima Campus
   Mansfield Campus
   Marion Campus

7. Ohio University

   Main Campus
   Lancaster Branch

8. University of Akron

9. University of Cincinnati

10. University of Toledo

11. Wright State University

12. Youngstown State University

TOTAL NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS: 43

INSTITUTIONAL POSITIONS REPRESENTED BY CONFEREES

Ohio Board of Regents, Members and Staff	6
Presidents, Vice Presidents, and Staff	11
Deans, Assistant Deans, and Staff	27
Institutional Offices, Directors and Staff	23
Program Directors/Coordinators, and Staff	52
Department Heads/Chairmen	8
Professors/Instructors	48
Counselors, Directors and Staff	19
Other Positions: Institutional Trustees, Foundation Representatives, No Position, etc.	15
	209*

*Certain individuals hold more than one position. Each position was recorded here, so the total number is slightly greater than the total number of conferees.

REFERENCE MATERIALS

REFERENCE MATERIALS ON DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION: A SHORT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, A. "This Way Out: Slum Youngsters Choose College, but It Takes Courage To Stick," American Education, 3 (1967), 2-4ff.

Austin, Ernest H. Jr. "Cultural Deprivations: A Few Questions," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII (October, 1965), 67.

Ausubel, David P. "A Teaching Strategy for Culturally Deprived Pupils: Cognitive and Motivational Considerations," School Review, LXXXI (Winter, 1963), 454-63.

Barnes, E. J. The Utilization of Behavioral and Social Sciences in Minority Group Education: Some Critical Implications. Washington, D.C.: The American Psychological Association, September, 1971. Mimeographed.

Berg, E.H. Selected Factors Bearing on the Persistence and Academic Performance of Low Ability Students in Four California Junior Colleges. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Berkeley: University of California, 1965.

Bossone, R. M. "Understanding Junior-College Students: Proposals for Meeting Their Special Needs." Journal of Higher Education, 36 (1965), 279-283.

Bowman, D. Quantitive and Qualitative Effects of Revised Selection and Training Procedures in the Education of Teachers for the Culturally Disadvantaged. ERIC No. ED-941-851. Undated.

Bradley, N. E. "The Negro Undergraduate Student: Factors Relative to Performance in Predominantly White State Colleges and Universities in Tennessee." Journal of Negro Education, 36 (1967), 15.

Cassidy, S. W. Impact of a High-Demand College in a Large University on Working Class Youth. Vols. I and II. Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University, August 31, 1968. ERIC No. ED-025-223.

Clark, Kenneth B. "The Cult of Cultural Deprivation: A Complex Social Psychological Phenomenom." Environmental Deprivation and Enrichment. New York: Ferkhauf Graduate School of Education, Yeshiva University, 1965, 41-42

Clark, Kenneth B. Dark Ghetto: Dilemnas of Social Power. New York; Harper and Row, 1965.

Clark, R. A. and Beatty, W. H. "Conceptual Framework for Teacher Education." Mental Health and Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: Association for Student Teaching, 1967.

Clarke, J. R. A Curriculum Design for Disadvantaged Community Junior College Students. Gainesville: University of Florida, April, 1966. ERIC No. ED-015-754.

Coleman, O. S., et al. Equality of Education Opportunity. U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Committee on Students with College Aptitude from Disadvantaged Environments, WCA Commission on Research and Service. Effective Practices in Meeting the Needs of Students with College Aptitude from Disadvantaged Environments. Chicago: North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, June, 1974.

Cross, K. P. Beyond the Open Door: New Students to Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Deutsch, Martin. Minority Group and Class Status as Related to Social and Personality Factors in Scholastic Achievement. Ithaca, New York: Society for Applied Anthropology, 1960.

DeVecchio, Richard C. "Characteristics of Non-Returning Community College Freshmen." College Student Personnel, 13 (1972), 429-432.

Dunphy, Philip W. Career Development for the College Student. Cranston, Rhode Island: The Carroll Press, 1969.

Education Policies Commission, National Education Association. American Education and the Search for Equal Opportunity, Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1965.

Eisenberg, Leon. "Strengths of the Inner City Child." Baltimore Bulletin of Education, XLI (1963-64), 10-16.

Ellis, R. A. "Some New Perspectives on Upward Mobility." Urban and Social Change Review, 4 (1970), 15-17.

Fasteau, Steven. "Development of a Community College Program for Physically Handicapped Students." Rehabilitation Literature, 33 (1972), 267.

Ferrin, Richard I. "Developmental Programs in Midwestern Community Colleges." Higher Education Surveys, Report No. 4. Evanston, Illinois: College Entrance Examination Board, February, 1971.

Furniss, W. T. "Racial Minorites and Curriculum Change." and "The Campus and the Racial Crisis." in D. D. Nichols and K. Mills (eds.). Background Papers for 1969 American Council on Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1970.

Ginsberg, Eli. Guiding the Disadvantaged. Boston: Summer Institute for Administrators of Pupil Personnel Services, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1964.

Gordon, Edmund W. "Opportunities in Higher Education for Socially Disadvantaged Youth" in College Entrance Examination Board, From High School to College. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1964.

Gordon, Edmund W. and Wilkerson, Doxey A. Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged. Programs and Practices: Preschool through College. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966.

Gurin, P., Gurin, G., Lao, R. C. and Beattie, M. "Internal-External Control in the Motivational Dynamics of Negro Youth." Journal of Social Issues, 25 (1969), 29-53.

Gurin, P., and Katz, D. Motivations and Aspiration in the Negro College Student. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, November, 1966, ERIC No. ED-010-537.

Havighurst, Robert J. "Who Are the Socially Disadvantaged?" Chapter I in "Educational Planning for Socially Disadvantaged Children and Youth." Journal of Negro Education, XXXIII (Summer, 1964), 210-17.

Hess, Robert D. Educability and Rehabilitation: The Future of the Welfare Class. Chicago: 13th Groves Conference on Marriage and the Family, 1964.

Irwin, Martha and Russell, Wilma. The Community is the Classroom. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1971.

Klineberg, Otto. "Life is Fun in a Smiling, Fair-Skinned World." Saturday Review, (February 16, 1963), 77.

Lansky, L. M. "Changing the Classroom: Some Psychological Assumptions." in P. Runkel, et al. (eds). The Changing College Classroom. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Lips, Rosemary and Mitchell, K. "Attendants Trained to Aid Handicapped Students." Journal of Rehabilitation. November-December, 1973.

Mackler, B. "Blacks Who Are Academically Successful." Urban Education, 5 (1970), 210-237.

Magoon, T. M. "Developing Skills for Solving Educational and Vocational Problems." in John D. Krumboltz and Carl E. Thoresen (eds.) Behavioral Counseiing: Cases and Techniques. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

McClelland, D. C. and Friedman, G. A. "A Cross-Cultural Study of the Relationship Between Child-Training Practices and Achievement Motivation Appearing in Folk-Tales." In G. E. Swanson, T. M. Newcomb and E. L. Hartley (eds.). Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1952.

Miller, T. K., Antenen, W. W. and Duncan, J. A. "High-Risk Students in Junior College: A Special Program." The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 49 (1971), 537-543.

Monroe, Charles R. Profile of the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Moore, W. Jr. Against the Odds: The High-Risk Student in the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Passow, Harry A. The Gifted, the Creative, the Underachiever. Boston: Summer Institute for Administrators of Pupil Personnel Services, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1964.

Riessman, F. The Culturally Deprived Child. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

Rotter, J. B. "Generalized Expectancies for Internal Versus External Control or Reinforcement." Psychological Monographs, 80 (1966), 1-28.

Roueche, John E. Salvage, Redirection or Custody? Remedial Education in the Community Junior College. Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, 1968.

Rouche, John E. and Kirk, Wade. Catching Up - Remedial Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Rusalem, Herbert. Guiding the Physically Handicapped College Student. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962.

Weinstein, Gerald and Fantini, Mario. The Disadvantaged: A Challenge to Education. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

White, R. W. "Motivation Reconsidered: The Concept of Competence." Psychological Review, 66 (1959), 5.

Williams, R. L. "What Are We Learning from Current Programs for Disadvantaged Students?" Journal of Higher Education, 40 (April, 1969), 274-285.

Woollatt, Lorne H. Why Capable Students Drop Out of High School. Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLV (November, 1961), 1-8.