DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 594 08 CE 009 701

AUTHOR Berg, Marvin
TITLE Open Entry/Open Exit Study. Final Report.
INSTITUTION North Central Technical Inst., Wausau, Wis.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.; Wisconsin State Board of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education, Madison.
REPORT NO VT-103-515
BUREAU NO 15-090-151-226
PUB DATE Jun 76
NOTE 129p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; *Educational Alternatives; *Educational Needs; Employer Attitudes; *Open Education; *Open Enrollment; Post Secondary Education; *Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; School Surveys; Student Attitudes; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Technical Institutes

ABSTRACT

Open entry/open exit refers to formats and procedures which allow learners to enter a program whenever they are ready and available, and allows them to leave or complete programs when competencies for job entry are attained. This study sought to provide base data on the concept of open entry/open exit by surveying involved individuals and to provide information of the effectiveness of sample programs through an evaluation of job entry performance levels, materials and procedures, and accompanying delivery systems. Occupational programs and courses at five Wisconsin technical institutes and one Iowa community college were studied. Four different questionnaires were developed and administered to 910 respondents, including 76 employers and public agency officials, 259 prospective students, 519 present students, and 56 staff members. Thirty-nine staff members were also interviewed. Survey results, which include open-end responses and comments, are presented in a series of 39 tables. Following are major findings of the study: (1) Prospective students and present students indicated they have a need for open entry/open exit, (2) students and staff felt that this was a viable, feasible, and beneficial approach, (3) employer and public agency respondents expressed favorable attitudes towards this approach, and (4) use of an individualized instructional system was viewed favorable, but presented the most obstacles. (Author)

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 15.090.151.226

OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT STUDY

Marvin Berg, Research Investigator

Dr. Russell C. Paulsen, Administrator
Research and Development

North Central Technical Institute
Wausau, Wisconsin

Lawrence B. Hoyt, District Director

RESEARCH CONSORTIUM: North Central Technical Institute
District One Technical Institute
Fox Valley Technical Institute
Moraine Park Technical Institute

June 1976

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant or contract with the Wisconsin Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education, partially reimbursed from an allocation of federal funds from the U. S. Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgement in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinion stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official consortium member, State Board, or U. S. Office of Education position or policy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Appreciation is expressed to those who have contributed to this study.

To Dr. Russell Paulsen, Administrator, Research and Development, North Central Technical Institute, for his guidance and encouragement.

To the Research Administrators at the other three consortium schools, namely, Mr. Wayne Atkins of District One Technical Institute; Mr. Dominic Bordini of Fox Valley Technical Institute, and to Mr. Art Weiner of Moraine Park Technical Institute for their assistance and support.

To Mr. Roland Krogstad, staff member of the Wisconsin Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education, and Dr. Orville Nelson, University of Wisconsin-Stout for their guidance and advice.

Finally, gratitude is expressed to the prospective students, students, employers, agencies, instructors, and administrators who gave of their time to participate in the study.

Marvin Berg

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

SUMMARY

Problem--Students seeking post-secondary education are anxious to begin and complete their studies and enter the labor market with minimum delay. Under traditional educational systems, delays in entering and completing educational activities tend to discourage students and prospective students. Open Entry/Open Exit refers to formats and procedures which allow learners to enter a program whenever they are ready and available, and allows them to leave or complete programs when competencies for job entry are attained.

Purpose--This study sought to provide base data on the concept of Open Entry/Open Exit beginning with data on the interests, needs, and perceptions of such involved individuals as prospective students, present students, staff, employers, and public agency employees. The study also sought to evaluate sample Open Entry/Open Exit programs in regard to the determination of job entry performance levels, provide sample materials and procedures, and provide information on the effectiveness of accompanying delivery systems.

Methodology--Occupational programs and courses at five Wisconsin Technical Institutes and one Iowa Community College were studied. Four different questionnaires were developed and administered to 910 respondents including 76 employers and public agency officials, 259 prospective students, 519 present students, and 56 staff members. Thirty-nine of this latter group were also interviewed.

Findings--Included in the study's findings are the following:

1. Prospective students and present students indicate they do have a need for Open Entry/Open Exit and strong interest in such an approach, particularly if it allows them to complete their studies early to seek employment.

2. Students and staff feel that Open Entry/Open Exit is a viable, feasible, and beneficial approach. Staff members further believe that the cost/benefit relationship of Open Entry/Open Exit is favorable, and that Open Entry/Open Exit is suitable for diploma and associate degree programs.

3. Employer and public agency respondents indicated very favorable views toward Open Entry/Open Exit, particularly in the areas of employment flexibility and possible cost savings.

4. Use of an individualized instructional system was viewed favorably by involved respondents, but was also viewed as presenting the most obstacles to effecting Open Entry/Open Exit.

Recommendations--Based on the findings of the study, recommendations are made and include specific considerations to be made before initiation or expansion of Open Entry/Open Exit. These include considerations regarding management system components, job entry performance levels, in-class procedures, and delivery system employed. These and other areas are also suggested as deserving of more study.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background. The Open Entry/Open Exit concept in education refers to procedures in educational programs and courses that allow the learner to enter a formal educational setting at times other than the beginning of the traditional school term; frequency of entry is generally considered to be greater under an Open Entry/Open format than under a more traditional one. Entry points under this concept are variable (and the concept is often labeled Variable Entry/Exit) and these points might occur every several months, monthly, weekly, or even daily. The Open Exit facet of the concept in its most narrow context is the mirror of Open Entry, viz., the learner leaves at times other than the traditional end of the school term.

As considered in this simple way, Open Entry/Open Exit would appear to offer many advantages over the more traditional systems: Entering students (including those entering from other educational institutions and those entering as unemployed) would be able to enter without long delays. Employer-sponsored individuals or groups and those participating in governmental agency programs would experience little or no delay in entering vocational training programs or segments of programs. Likewise, those completing their programs and desired coursework would be exiting the educational institutions not en masse, as in the traditional educational calendar, but at points spaced throughout the calendar year according to the students' completion dates. Such a variable exit procedure would appear especially valuable in regard to the matching of job candidates to the job market.

In addition to the above view of Open Entry/Open Exit as an administrative structure involving variable entry/exit calendar dates, the concept has generally come to mean much more. In the wider scope, Open Entry/Open Exit sees the learner entering the formal learning process at variable times but also entering and probably being placed at a point in the process suitable to that learner's needs and abilities. And the learner involved in an occupational-related curriculum will exit the formal learning process when prepared for job-entry performance.

In this wider scope, the concept of Open Entry/Open Exit has become more closely associated with competency based instruction. At the least, it implies that a competency based instructional deliver system will be employed to accomplish the timing or calendar-related outcomes that Open Entry/Open Exit refers to in the narrower sense.

This slight semantic problem can be more easily understood perhaps by the realization that Open Entry/Open Exit in its narrower, calendar, sense can be accomplished simply by shortening all courses or breaking long courses into shorter courses. As an example, consider a 36 week vocation program normally taught in a traditional two semester school year. Each course in that program could be broken into courses that are, for example,

six weeks in length. Then at the end of the first six weeks of school, new courses would begin and entry allowed. What happens, however, if any of the new courses require prerequisite knowledge or skills gained in courses the first six weeks? Is the educational institution to also offer those beginning courses as well as those courses for continuing students? And what would happen when another set of learners would be entering at the beginning of the third six-week block? Would courses be offered for them as well as advanced courses for those who had already completed one or two six-week blocks?

"Yes" would be a practical answer only if student numbers were very large, perhaps colossal. Such a system would be closely akin to the traditional semester format except that students would be entering and exiting, in the case of our example, every six weeks.

Note that in the example used above, prerequisite knowledge or skills were necessary before movement inside the program could occur. Therefore, if an educational program can be devised or structured in such a way that there are no prerequisites for any courses, that each course, whatever its length, stands alone, then Open Entry/Open Exit (in its narrowest sense) can be accomplished by simple division of the curriculum into free-standing time blocks. Again, this would be closely akin to the traditional semester format except that students would be entering and exiting more frequently.

The above discussion of the two views--narrow and wide--that can be taken toward understanding the concept of Open Entry/Open Exit becomes important when we turn to a situation where an educational institution is desirous of establishing an Open Entry/Open Exit format for a specific educational program. If the program's curriculum is capable of re-structuring into free-standing blocks with no prerequisites, then, conceivable, Open Entry/Open Exit in its narrowest sense could be accomplished with little or minor change in the instructional delivery system employed. Such a step might be an interim or final step in the program's evolution. If the educational institution is desirous of establishing Open Entry/Open Exit in the wider sense--that view incorporating a competency based instructional delivery system--then learners would enter the formal learning process when they are ready to and when an opening is available to them. They would be assessed as to competencies already held and placed at an appropriate point in the learning process. They would proceed at their own pace using a wide variety of available learning paths and materials, and they would exit the process at variable times--when they have attained the competencies desired, e.g., if an occupational program, when they have attained the competencies needed to perform at job entry level.

Application to Wisconsin Vocational, Technical and Adult Education. Whether viewed narrowly or in a wider scope, the concept of Open Entry/Open Exit appears deserving of close study for Wisconsin Vocatioal, Technical and Adult Education. The mission statements and plans of the state system and its districts speak of greater service to all who seek assistance and can benefit from the services offered. Wisconsin VTAE

educators have long emphasized their primary goal of assisting those who wish to prepare themselves for job entry. Open Entry/Open Exit would appear to do just that in a manner that is flexible and that takes cognizance of a learner's individuality. Related job placement activities would also appear to be enhanced in service to both the job seeker and to the employer. Needed would be such warnings as that expressed by Lowell A. Burkett, American Vocational Association Executive Director and Editor-in-Chief of the AVA Journal:

> "Unless postsecondary institutions permit open entry and open exit and relax academic requirements, the ultimate result could be that vocational programs designed to prepare students for job entry will move out of public education."*

Apparently served, also, would be wider societal goals such as the development of self-motivated learners and growth of the concept of education being a continuing, life-long activity. And perhaps, Open Entry/Open Exit has the potential to facilitate vocational-technical educational efforts in a manner that will make the best possible use of educational resources in a time of increasing concern over the costs, efficiency, and effectiveness of all educational efforts.

*BURKETT, LOWELL A. Latest Word from Washington, American Vocational Association Journal, 1975, October, p. 9.

Objectives of the Study. Interest in the concept of Open Entry/Open Exit and its further applications and development within the Wisconsin Vocational, Technical and Adult Education system manifested itself in a 1975 research priorities study prepared for the Research Committee of the Wisconsin Association of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education Administrators by the Research Coordinating Unit. In that study, research in Open Entry/Open Exit was ranked as priority number four. The project proposed to answer that research need through the following objectives:

A. To select a sample of Open Entry/Open Exit pilot programs within the four districts representing this consortium, in certain selected VTAE districts in Wisconsin other than the consortium districts, several such programs in other parts of the nation and the DACUM project located in Nova Scotia, Canada.

B. To assess student and staff interests and needs (as viewed by students and staff) for Open Entry/Open Exit programs and to determine their view of the feasibility of Open Entry/Open Exit education in the Wisconsin VTAE system.

To obtain employer and Job Service perceptions, needs and interests and reactions to Open Entry/Open Exit programming.

C. To evaluate the above mentioned Open Entry/Open Exit pilot programs with respect to:

1. determining whether or not competencies for job entry performance levels have been identified and <u>how</u> these competencies have been determined.

2. determining the appropriate procedures which are required to successfully institute an Open Entry/Open Exit program; e.g., installation of time clocks for student time management, institution of a record keeping system for assessing student progress, need for para-professional assistance, etc.

3. determining the effectiveness of Open Entry/Open Exit as contrasted with traditional methods on a course by course basis.

D. Identify and provide sample curriculum materials, learning activities and student assessment and grading systems for Open Entry/Open Exit.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

As mentioned in the project objectives, the research project was a consortium effort with the consortium made up of District One Technical Institute, Fox Valley Technical Institute, Moraine Park Technical Institute, University of Wisconsin-Stout, and North Central Technical Institute which acted as lead district. The first step after preparation of a work plan was to confer with the Research Administrators of the consortium districts to verify and discuss the objectives and research methods, and to gather member input on possible resources. Methodology to meet each of the project objectives was adopted as follows:

OBJECTIVE A - SELECTION OF PILOT PROGRAMS

The selection of sample programs and courses researched appears in Table 1.

Although a DACUM project was part of the originally written objective on program selection, a majority of consortium members felt it should be omitted from consideration as a resource for this initial look at Open Entry/Open Exit. The reasoning was that the DACUM approach's unique strength and appeal is in the methodology employed to develop and assess competencies. While this methodology might be of interest when the Open Entry/Open Exit concept is in its first stages of implementation, it is only a minor part of the Open Entry/Open Exit concept and should be researched in depth if/when competency development and verification has been shown to be a critical factor.

OBJECTIVE B - ASSESSMENT OF INTERESTS, NEEDS, PERCEPTIONS, OF STUDENT, STAFF, EMPLOYERS.

To accomplish the assessment of student and staff interests and needs, and determine their view of the feasibility of Open Entry/Open Exit, the following instruments were developed:

1. A Prospective Student questionnaire to be completed primarily by high school seniors. (Appendix A)

2. A Student/Staff questionnaire which included items to measure student and staff attitudes toward Open Entry/Open Exit, questions on the individual student's need for Open Entry/Open Exit, and questions on possible benefits. (Appendix B, pages 1 & 2)

TABLE 1

SELECTION OF PROGRAMS, COURSES AND LOCATIONS

Name of School	Programs, Courses
Kirkwood Community College Cedar Rapids, Iowa	*Accounting I, II, III *Typing I, II, III *Welding
District One Technical Institute Eau Claire, Wisconsin	Accounting I *Typing I, II, III
Fox Valley Technical Institute Appleton, Wisconsin	*General Education areas of Communications, Psychology & Math Skill subjects for the following programs: Account Clerk, *Auto Body, *Auto Mechanics, *Clerk Typist, Diesel Mechanics (quarter), Food Prep Assistant, *Industrial Drafting, Mechanical Design, Metal Fab Welding, Printing, Restaurant and Hotel Cookery, *Secretarial Science, Stenographic, *Truck Driving
Moraine Park Technical Institute Fond du Lac, Wisconsin	*Business Machines area *Food Service *Typing I, II, III
Waukesha County Technical Institute Pewaukee, Wisconsin	*Business Machines area *Math area *Shorthand II, III, Professional *Typing I, II, III, Professional
North Central Technical Institute Wausau, Wisconsin	*Business Machines area *CETA Office Skills, CETA Welding *Tech Math I, *Building Construction & Surveying, Typing I, II, III

NOTE: The above were the schools selected as resources for the study. Accompanying each school name are the programs/courses that appeared to meet the study's definition of Open Entry/Open Exit. An asterisk (*) has been used to indicate those areas where responses were given by STUDENTS when asked on their questionaire, "...what programs/courses have you been in contact with at your school or are in contact with now that are Open Entry/Open Exit?"

3. Additional questions for staff personnel to further measure their attitudes toward Open Entry/Open Exit and to measure their views of the use of Open Entry/Open Exit in diploma and associate degree programs as well as a question on the expected cost/benefit relationship. (Appendix B, pages 1A, 2A, and 2B)

To obtain "employer and Job Service perceptions, needs, and interests and reactions", a questionnaire was developed as shown in Appendix C.

OBJECTIVE C - EVALUATION OF PILOT PROGRAMS

Written instruments did not appear to be plausible methodology to fully meet the objectives requiring evaluation of the pilot programs. Written questions on individualized instruction did appear suitable for meeting, in part, objective C-3 (determining the effectiveness of Open Entry/Open Exit on a course by course basis), and two pages (pages 3 and 4, Appendix B) of such questions were developed and attached to the Student/Staff questionnaire mentioned above. The main thrust, however, of the evaluation research under objective C (C-1, job entry performance levels; C-2, appropriate procedures; and further study of C-3, course by course evaluation) appeared to be best accomplished through personal interviewing, and an Interview Outline (Appendix D) was developed to be used in this area.

OBJECTIVE D - IDENTIFICATION OF SAMPLE MATERIALS AND ACTIVITIES

Portions of the interview outline were also developed to meet the objectives regarding job entry performance levels and appropriate Open Entry/Open Exit procedures as well as objective D which called for the identification of sample materials, activities, and student assessment procedures.

All instruments were tested at North Central Technical Institute, and minor revisions were made in the questionnaires. In the case of the Interview Outline, some weaknesses appeared, primarily in regard to how valid the instrument would be in measurement of such "soft data" areas as effectiveness and benefits. It was decided to proceed with its use as a further instrument test and, also, as the most appropriate means available to attempt to completely meet all of the study's objectives.

The following definition of Open Entry/Open Exit was used throughout the study and provided to respondents on each of the study's questionnaires:

> A course or program is to be considered Open Entry/Open Exit if it fits into any of the following categories:
>
> 1. Allows a student to enter school at times other than the typical beginning of the school semester (for example: monthly or weekly), OR:

2. Allows a student to earn a grade, rating, diploma, or degree and leave the course or program before the typical end of the semester, OR:

3. Both of the above.

Research activities were conducted by the principal investigator working out of the lead district. Research administrators in the consortium districts acted as an ad hoc advisory committee and also were responsible for coordinating school visits and assisting with distribution and collection of the study's instruments.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

OBJECTIVE A - SELECTION OF PILOT PROGRAMS

An analysis of the instruments administered, locations at which research was conducted, and responses received is summarized in Table 2.

TABLE 2

IDENTIFICATION OF STUDY INSTRUMENTS, LOCATIONS AND RESPONSES

Location	Prospective Student	Student	Staff	Employer Agency	Total Questionnaires	Interviews
Kirkwood	0	93	9	0	102	6
District 1	91	49	9	13	162	5
Fox Valley	39	145	17	6	207	12
Moraine Park	21	79	7	19	126	3
Waukesha	69	81	5	13	167	5
NCTI	40	72	9	25	146	6
Total Responses	259	519	56	76	910	39

Table 2 indicates that of the 910 total questionnaires, over 500 were from students and 259 were from prospective students. There were 39 interviews conducted.

No minimum number of completed instruments had been established as it was realized from the beginning that administration of the instruments would be done according to the availability of resources at each location visited. While the responses collected certainly appear adequate for research purposes, larger sample numbers would appear desirable, particularly in the areas of staff and employer/agency questionnaires.

OBJECTIVE B - ASSESSMENT OF INTERESTS, NEEDS, PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT, STAFF, EMPLOYERS.

To measure student and staff views and attitudes toward the concept of Open Entry/Open Exit, as defined above, 13 attitudinal questions were asked of both student and staff respondents. (Appendix B, page 1)

Responses received to these 13 questions are shown in Table 3. Five hundred-nineteen responses were received from students and fifty-six from staff members. All respondents (and this is true throughout the study for all student/staff questionnaire items) had been or were presently in contact with programs or courses that met the above definition of Open Entry/Open Exit.

In viewing the differences in total percentages, any items that evoked a relatively strong response (Strongly Agree plus Agree or Strongly Disagree plus Disagree) have been indicated by an asterisk (*) where the percentages total 65% or more. Likewise, items eliciting a very strong response (percentages of Strongly Agree plus Agree or Strongly Disagree plus Disagree total 85% or more) are indicated by a double asterisk (**). Using that arbitrarily established dividing line, the responses show strong or very strong response patterns by one or both groups of respondents to 10 out of the 13 items.

Included among these 10 response patterns (all favoring Open Entry/Open Exit) are those showing disagreement with the statement that Open Entry/Open Exit tends to lower academic standards, and agreement with statements that Open Entry/Open Exit tends to attract students, that it appears to meet important demands and needs of the individual, and that Open Entry/Open Exit appears feasible at the respondents' schools. Also noted are items that show very high staff agreement with statements that student enrollment should be opened more than 3 or 4 times per year, and that there is a growing demand by adult students and potential adult students for Open Entry/Open Exit. Weak agreement or disagreement, or uncertainty are expressed in the response patterns to items regarding the faculty being enthusiastic about Open Entry/Open Exit, the ability of schools offering quality services without Open Entry/Open Exit, and enrollment procedures being complicated and troublesome.

An additional twenty-one attitudinal-type questions were included on the questionnaires completed by staff members. The responses to these questions, as shown in Table 4, were analyzed by percentages with an administrator/instructor breakdown. In the table, an asterisk (*) is used to indicate those questionnaire items that evoked a relatively strong response (percentages of Strongly Agree plus Agree or Strongly Disagree plus Disagree total 65% or more). Items showing a very strong response (percentages of Strongly Agree plus Agree or Strongly Disagree plus Disagree total 35% or more) are indicated by a double asterisk (**).

TABLE 3

STUDENT/STAFF REACTIONS TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS
REGARDING OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT

Questionnaire Item	Student n=519 Staff n= 56	Percentage of Response SA	A	U	D	SD
There is a need for student enrollment to be opened more than 3 or 4 times per year.	Student	15	38	26	20	1
	**Staff	56	33	7	4	0
The Open Entry/Open Exit approach creates general confusion because students are enrolling and leaving school throughout the school year.	Student	2	18	13	48	19
	*Staff	2	7	9	52	30
The Open Entry/Open Exit approach tends to lower our school's academic standards.	*Student	2	9	18	48	22
	**Staff	2	4	7	41	44
The Open Entry/Open Exit approach tends to attract students to our school.	**Student	17	51	27	4	
	*Staff	33	44	22	0	
Our faculty is enthusiastic about Open Entry/Open Exit.	Student	9	25	59	5	1
	Staff	11	28	54	7	0
The Open Entry/Open Exit approach appears to meet important demands and needs of the individual.	*Student	20	55	16	7	1
	**Staff	43	48	7	2	0
Our school can offer top quality educational services without utilizing the Open Entry/Open Exit approach.	Student	4	32	3	23	4
	Staff	7	31	22	31	7
Students enrollment procedures are complicated and troublesome with the Open Entry/Open Exit approach.	Student	4	20	20	46	10
	Staff	9	22	15	41	11

TABLE 3 Continued

STUDENT/STAFF REACTIONS TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM REGARDING OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT

Questionnaire Item	Student n=519 Staff n= 56	Percentage of Response SA	A	U	D	SD
Open Entry/Open Exit provides the student graduate with better access to job openings.	*Student	21	52	20	5	1
	*Staff	52	30	13	4	2
There is a growing demand by adult students and potential adult students for Open Entry/ Open Exit.	Student	16	47	29	6	1
	**Staff	41	46	11	2	0
With the Open Entry/Open Exit approach, students are more inclined to withdraw from their programs and drop out of school.	Student	2	13	23	47	14
	*Staff	2	6	17	56	20
Open Entry/Open Exit for students should not be encouraged.	*Student	2	7	18	44	29
	*Staff	0	13	4	39	44
I feel the Open Entry/ Open Exit approach can work at this school.	*Student	31	52	11	5	0
	**Staff	48	41	6	2	2

SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
U = Undecided
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

* Percentages of Strongly Agree plus Agree or Strongly Disagree plus Disagree = 65% or more.

**Percentages of Strongly Agree plus Agree or Strongly Disagree plus Disagree = 85% or more.

TABLE 4

STAFF VIEWS ON QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM
REGARDING OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT

Questionnaire Item	Student n=519 Staff n= 56	Percentage of Response SA	A	U	D	SD
The Open Entry/Open Exit approach is useful only for non-credit courses.	**Admin (n=20)	0	0	0	47	53
	**Instr (n=36)	3	6	6	42	44
The approach tends to aid in the recruitment and retention of faculty.	Admin	5	5	84	5	0
	Instr	3	14	61	17	6
We don't have the time to fully develop the Open Entry/ Open Exit approach.	*Admin	5	5	16	58	16
	Instr	14	22	17	39	8
The approach is viewed as a passing fad by our faculty/ staff.	*Admin	0	0	21	63	16
	Instr	6	8	33	47	6
Open Entry/Open Exit could endanger our school's accreditation.	**Admin	0	0	5	42	53
	*Instr	0	6	11	58	25
The Open Entry/Open Exit approach is useful only in Diploma programs.	**Admin	0	0	5	42	53
	**Instr	3	3	6	64	25
Most instructors feel that utilization of an Open Entry/ Open Exit format is a possible threat to their jobs.	Admin	0	16	47	26	11
	*Instr	6	14	11	47	22
Our Administration and staff do not have the know-how to successfully implement an Open Entry/Open Exit approach.	**Admin	0	11	0	53	37
	*Instr	0	6	11	50	31
Our school should move toward initiating Open Entry/Open Exit in all Diploma programs.	Admin	21	26	32	21	0
	Instr	11	28	33	19	8

TABLE 4 Continued

STAFF VIEWS ON QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM
REGARDING OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT

Questionnaire Item	Student n=519 Staff n= 56	Percentage of Response SA	A	U	D	SD
Open Entry/Open Exit operation permits better distribution of teacher work loads.	Admin	11	21	58	11	0
	Instr	8	22	36	19	14
More staff is needed to implement the concept of Open Entry/Open Exit.	Admin	5	26	32	32	5
	Instr	11	31	22	28	8
Open Entry/Open Exit should be limited to one or two programs as an experiment during the first year.	Admin	11	53	16	16	5
	Instr	14	39	17	25	6
Instructors need considerable time for curriculum revision before attempting Open Entry/ Open Exit.	**Admin	47	47	5	0	0
	*Instr	47	36	6	8	0
Class size must be reduced to permit Open Entry/Open Exit of students.	Admin	5	16	21	32	26
	Instr	14	14	17	44	8
The problem of reporting student's grades and attendance is aggravated by an Open Entry/Open Exit approach.	Admin	21	11	16	47	5
	Instr	14	33	3	31	19
Open Entry/Open Exit makes it difficult for teachers to keep proper student records.	*Admin	11	11	11	53	16
	Instr	3	28	6	39	25
Scheduling of students is not a major problem.	Admin	5	21	16	42	16
	Instr	14	47	17	19	3
A more efficient method must be developed to secure actual current student enrollment and student progress in each class.	*Admin	21	53	21	5	0
	Instr	11	36	31	17	0

23

TABLE 4 Continued

STAFF VIEWS ON QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM
REGARDING OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT

Questionnaire Item	Student n=519 Staff n= 56	Percentage of Response SA	A	U	D	SD
Scheduling of teachers is a major problem with the Open Entry/Open Exit approach.	Admin	5	26	11	47	11
	Instr	8	17	17	53	6
A department (e.g., the accounting department or the communications department) should not go to an Open Entry/Open Exit format unless the great majority of teachers in that department are supportive.	*Admin	37	47	0	16	0
	*Instr	31	39	11	14	6
A move toward Open Entry/Open Exit in all areas is necessary if our school is to meet the training and education demands of the communities we serve.	Admin	11	42	11	26	0
	Instr	14	28	19	19	8

SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
U = Undecided
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

* Percentages of Strongly Agree plus Agree or Strongly Disagree plus Disagree = 65% or more.

**Percentages of Strongly Agree plus Agree or Strongly Disagree plus Disagree = 85% or more.

The analysis does point out very strong feelings against the statement that the Open Entry/Open Exit approach is useful only for non-credit courses or diploma programs and also feelings against any endangering of school accreditation. High agreement was exhibited by both administrators and instructors to the item indicating that instructors need considerable time for curriculum revision before attempting Open Entry/Open Exit. In addition, high agreement or disagreement was indicated in the items involving possession of know-how needed to successfully implement Open Entry/Open Exit, whether Open Entry/Open Exit causes instructor difficulties in student record keeping, and whether there should be a majority of instructors supportive before a department adopts an Open Entry/Open Exit format.

Noted, also, are items which did not evoke strong responses but, instead, show varying patterns of agreement, uncertainty, and disagreement, all at the same time. Included in this category are items involving schools initiating Open Entry/Open Exit in all diploma programs, better distribution of teacher work loads, staff needed, reduction of class size necessary, reporting problems with student grades and attendance, and whether schools should move toward Open Entry/Open Exit to meet community needs.

In an attempt to learn how essential it was that student programs be on an Open Entry/Open Exit format, the following question was asked on all Student/Staff questionnaires:

> For you, as a student, is it essential that your program be on an Open Entry/Open Exit format? (If you are not a student, select the answer you feel would apply to most students at your school.)

The responses (Table 5) show 39 percent of both student and staff respondents indicated a "No" reply. The student "Yes" percentage was 58 percent and the staff was 31 percent. (Thirty percent of the staff respondents left this item unanswered.) Use of the word "essential" in the question produced a clear-cut and meaningful dichotomy, the results of which show a high percentage of both respondent groups indicating that Open Entry/Open Exit is essential to the student.

Immediately following the answers given to this questionnaire item, respondents were asked to explain their answers. Because of the large number, student responses were tabulated by general comment area and this tabulation is presented in Table 6. All staff replies are provided in Table 7.

Table 6 shows that 17 percent of all student responses (both "Yes" and "No") offered comments to the effect that it was essential to them that their program be Open Entry/Open Exit because instruction would probably be individualized with special emphasis on self-pacing. Another 12 percent of student comments gave evidence that Open Entry/Open Exit was essential because of the possibility of early completion.

TABLE 5

STUDENT/STAFF VIEWS OF WHETHER IT IS ESSENTIAL
THAT STUDENT PROGRAM BE OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT

	Student (n=519)	Staff (n= 56)
YES, is essential that my program be Open Entry/Open Exit	58%	31%
NO, is not essential that my program be Open Entry/Open Exit	39%	39%

TABLE 6

EXPLANATIONS OFFERED BY STUDENTS AS TO WHY IT IS ESSENTIAL
THEIR PROGRAMS BE OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT

General Response Category	Number of Responses	Percent of Total Student Responses
YES - requires that instruction be individualized, particularly self-paced.	86	17
YES - finish program/course early	63	12
YES - find a job sooner, more easily.	39	8
NO - not essential but desirable, convenient.	29	6
NO - makes no difference.	26	5
YES - enter program/course without long delay.	23	4
NO - balanc[illegible] program not Open Entry/ Open E[illegible]	22	4
Miscellaneous [illegible]mments or blank	231	44
Totals	519	100

Staff respondents (Table 7) also made mention of self-pacing and early completion and, in explanation of the "No" replies, most frequently mentioned that Open Entry/Open Exit did not appear essential.

In a question asking prospective students, students, and staff about the most important student reason for having an Open Entry/Open Exit approach, staff responses (see Table 8) were highest in indicating individualized instruction as most important (30 percent); prospective students and students responses were significantly lower in this category. Instead, prospective students and students indicated a marked consensus (55 percent and 44 percent), choosing as the most important reason the possibility of completing a program in less time and seeking work sooner. However, only 9 percent of staff respondents indicated this as the most important reason.

Where the respondents chose the answer "Other (specify)", in almost all cases they indicated that two or three of the offered alternatives were considered most important.

Two additional questions were asked of staff respondents to learn of their views on feasibility of Open Entry/Open Exit for Associate Degree programs and Diploma programs. Responses received are shown in Table 9. With both the Associate Degree and Diploma questions, replies were concentrated in the "somewhat feasible" and "very feasible" reply areas. Negative replies were very low percentages of total responses. A slightly higher percentage of replies indicated "very feasible" and "extremely feasible" for diploma programs as compared to associate degree programs. Responses from administrators consistently tended toward higher feasibility for both questions.

Table 10 presents the responses received to the question (addressed to staff respondents only), "How do you, in your position, view the relationship between total costs and total benefits when the Open Entry/Open Exit approach is compared to the traditional approach?"

As the table shows, there is little difference in the responses given by administrators when compared to instructor responses. There is, however, a definite pattern toward the favorable side of the response rating scale. Responses indicating a somewhat unfavorable relationship were only 16 percent of the administrator respondents and 14 percent of instructor. The balance felt that the cost/benefit relationship would be comparable to the relationship existing in the traditional approach.

The 56 staff respondents were given the opportunity to reply to several open-ended questions regarding Open Entry/Open Exit. These questions and the verbatim replies are given in Tables 11-16.

TABLE 7

STAFF EXPLANATION TO QUESTION ON WHETHER IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT STUDENT PROGRAM BE OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT

Question: For you, as a student, is it essential that your program be on an Open Entry/Open Exit format? (If you are not a student, select the answer you feel would apply to most students at your school.) Please explain your answer to the previous question.

Comments by those answering "yes"

Students bring a wide variety of previously acquired skills and knowledge with them. Variable entry/exit is the only way to effectively accommodate the needs.

In welding, we would not serve the number of students without Open Entry.

Because students have such a wide variety of backgrounds and skills, individualized instruction will provide better opportunities for learning the skill correctly and proficiently.

We have existed without so it is difficult to say essential or not. In many cases, a program must be analyzed to determine what is to be gained. I know of no program where success depends upon open entry/open exit as such, not necessary however.

Spread out job seeking grads over an extended time period rather than dumping all on market at once.

Certain areas as secretarial, accounting, programming, clerk typist. Courses where discussion are essential to learning, No.

My program is the Math subjects. With the varied background of our students in Mathematics, our program in Math. gives credit to the students with good backgrounds. Not all students start at the same level.

We have students entering with various skill levels. With Open Entry/Open Exit they can finish testing or Typing I and enter Typing II any time in semester.

Industry needs people all year long, not just in May or June - students are ready to begin classes all year, not just in September. The waiting lists show this point.

Are we not as educators, committed to making education as available and realistic as possible to our students (including prospective students)? Then isn't any alternative which furthers these requirements essential and desirable?

Student can graduate any month and enter job market at different times. Student must complete work before graduation.

Handle more students, progress faster, graduate any time for better job opportunity.

TABLE 7 Continued

Comments by those answering "yes"	
Opportunities for job placement would be better. Completers of the program would be "spread" out over the year. I suppose the student would prefer this because they could begin school and finish school exactly as they themselves choose to.	If I were employed and a better position opened for which I needed some training, I would want this training for this position now. If I waited until January or September, it would be too late, if I were unemployed and waited to train for a position, I do not want to wait to get started. I would want to start now!
Comments by those answering "no"	
Beneficial but not essential (8 identical or similar replies) Most students are not familiar with the concept of Open Entry/Open Exit. They can adjust to school's schedule but is more convenient if they have open entry/open exit offered. Individualized instruction also good. There are extremely few students that cannot meet a specific schedule if they have a real desire & sincere interest in the topic of areas involved. Adjustments can be made but recruitment job is more difficult if conventional enrollment is used. Students can make more hasty decisions with Open Entry. Parts of the program could and should be Open Entry/Open Exit. But many areas would be left with major gaps if a student just left at their choice of time - the materials are not all well suited to self pacing.	Most students feel that attending school is a full time position. At present, I believe that Open Entry would not be greatly utilized, even though it is beneficial. Open Entry/Open Exit depends on philosophy and objectives of instructional staff, development of competency based learning system, availability of all necessary learning materials, necessary facilities, and employment need at various times. The Open Entry approach to education can definitely help students complete their studies and compete for jobs much sooner than other approaches to education. As individuals, we like something that is familiar and comfortable. Having taken one unstructured course, I still prefer the regular classroom for my own learning.

TABLE 8

SELECTED IMPORTANT REASONS FOR
OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT

Question: From the student's viewpoint, what do you feel is the most important reason for having an Open Entry/Open Exit approach at your district Technical Institute? Circle one letter.	Percentage of Response		
	Student (n=519)	Staff (n= 56)	Prospective Student (n=259)
Those seeking entry into school can enter more easily, with minimum waiting.	18	20	12
Instruction is usually individualized when the program is Open Entry/Open Exit.	21	30	17
The student is able to complete a program in less time and seek work sooner.	44	9	55
From the student's viewpoint, there are no important reasons for Open Entry/ Open Exit.	3	2	2
Other (specify)	9	20	7
No opinion or blank	5	20	7

TABLE 9

STAFF VIEWS ON FEASIBILITY OF OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT
FOR USE IN ASSOCIATE DEGREE AND DIPLOMA PROGRAMS

Questionnaire Item	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE			
	Associate Degree		Diploma	
	Admin (n=20)	Instr (n=36)	Admin (n=20)	Instr (n=36)
Extremely feasible. All Associate Degree (Diploma) programs should be Open Entry/Open Exit. Extremely high benefits to individuals and society.	11	8	21	14
Very feasible and very beneficial. Appears to apply to Associate Degree (Diploma) programs.	47	33	68	56
Somewhat feasible. Applies to Associate Degree (Diploma) programs. Somewhat beneficial to individuals and society.	32	42	0	22
Not feasible. Doesn't appear to apply to Associate Degree (Diploma) programs. No benefits.	0	8	0	3
Definitely not feasible nor beneficial. Does not belong with Associate Degree (Diploma) programs.	0	0	0	0

TABLE 10

STAFF VIEWS ON COST/BENEFIT RELATIONSHIP OF OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT AS COMPARED TO TRADITIONAL APPROACH

Question: How do you, in your position, view the relationship between total costs and total benefits when the Open Entry/Open Exit approach is compared to the traditional approach?	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE	
	Administrator (n=20)	Instructor (n-36)
Extremely favorable. Costs much lower in relationship to benefits received.	11	8
Highly favorable. Costs somewhat lower in relationship to benefits received.	37	42
The relationship is about the same as with the traditional approach.	37	28
Somewhat unfavorable. Costs somewhat higher in relation to the benefits received.	16	14
Extremely unfavorable. Costs very high compared to benefits received.	0	0

TABLE 11

STAFF OPEN COMMENTS ON PROGRAM AREAS
SUITABLE FOR OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT

Question: What specific program areas (Associate Degree or Diploma) do you feel lend themselves best to the Open Entry/Open Exit approach?

Skill Areas - (17 identical or similar replies)

Both.

Most programs. Some more difficult to accomplish.

Food service.

All Diploma areas. Most Associate Degree areas - The Social Service Associate Degree program are least effective with this system.

Labs.

Vocational Diploma - shop related.

Vocational Printing
Industrial Drafting
Mechanical Design

Drafting
Machine Shop
Auto Mechanics
Auto Body
Secretarial Science
Welding - any skill oriented type course.

Truck driving
Auto Body
Drafting

Shop or lab programs in both levels.

Secretarial.

Most Diploma and some Associate Degree, especially in the Trade and Industry area.

Typing.

I do not feel that there are any programs that are not adaptable to Open Exit approach.

Secretarial Science
Medical Secretary
Clerk Typist

Trade and Industry
Health

Business Education (Clerk Typist)

The key to success is the materials. I am not familiar with all the materials for all the areas. Not every person can read material (even fair material).

Skill development - lab/shop oriented courses - where they can easily be evaluated/measured. Heavy theory - oriented courses/ programs would be more difficult to implement, I would think - but don't know.

TABLE 11 Continued

If the Instructor wants to make it work, it will work for any program.	Clinical area.
All.	Business - Office occupation General Education Welding - Machine Shop - Auto Mechanics, Auto Body
Business Education - motor skills area.	Diploma, such as vocational programs, as the students have such a diversity of abilities.
Those based primarily on the learning of a set procedure - mathematics, typing and perhaps many initial skills within the major(s).	Diploma
Possible for all.	Typing
Each program must be analyzed - dependent upon competencies to be developed.	In areas where instructors and staff believe in it.

Table 11 reveals that program areas involving skills were, by far, the areas that respondents felt lend themselves best to the Open Entry/Open Exit approach.

TABLE 12

STAFF OPEN COMMENTS ON PROGRAM AREAS NOT SUITABLE FOR OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT

Question: What program areas (Associate Degree or Diploma) do not lend themselves to the Open Entry/Open Exit approach? Why?

Lecture and discussion or academic courses.

Accounting. Why? Technical involvement.

Social Service Programs and Health. Why? Need for effective education and sequential learning.

Nursing - Why? 1827 State requirements.

Programs with fixed, sequential courses (content).

Electronics Technology. Why? Because of the sequence of courses. There should be entry more than once a year, but not as frequently as when openings occur.

Academic Science and Math classes, English and Social Studies. Why? There is a need in these classes for considerable discussion. Open ending and individualizing limits opportunities for discussion - even eliminates it entirely.

Electronics Technician. Why? Almost everything is sequential.

None. Why? In all seriousness, where there is a will, there is a way.

General Education. Why? Need classroom participation.

Those that lean toward the academic or theory type of instruction.

Distributive (Marketing) Why? Primarily classroom - requiring interpersonal interchange with other students.

Shorthand. Why? Need to see teacher write on board, have enthusiasm, promote goals.

Social Science, Health - Nursing Comm. Skills. Why? Require interaction with others - or have lab scheduling problems.

Some subjects needing an interchange or expression of ideas.

Lecture/Discussion courses.

Business Law and Marketing courses. Why? Class discussion essential to learning of concept application.

Those requiring development of theory, conclusion drawing, extensive laboratory. Why? Setups and procedures too difficult to individualize.

Radiological Technology. Why? Some programs have outside accrediting groups that require "X" number of clinical hours.

TABLE 12 Continued

Child Care. Why? The total lab experience would be very costly to offer in Open Entry/Open Exit. The learnings are very much sequentiated and need teacher contact and student teacher-child instruction.	Concept courses - Human Relations Some beginning skills (Shorthand) Why? Interaction among students, class discussion, and teacher approval frequently are needed for these courses to be successful.
Accounting - Associate Degree. Why? Due to the depth needed in the advanced courses.	Those which have maximum emphasis on abstract understandings and appreciations.
Any course where discussion is involved should be in a traditional class so that all students may benefit from the exchange of ideas among students.	I think none.
All courses involving theory. Why? Students learn more in less time from live lecture and demonstrations and question and answer periods than from packaged material. Instructor can update lectures with minimum time and labor. Students tend to learn only enough to complete the requirements of individualized courses, and spend too much time reading instructions, lose interest, become bored with viewing audio-visual packaged instruction, and lack motivation from peer/instructor discussion, and from peer competition.	Specialized Programs - Legal, Medical, Insurance.
Our Associate Degree programs are not fully individualized, this causes some problems.	Those who are dependent upon interaction for maximizing competency development. However, most programs at front and back ends should provide this.
Where group actions or decisions play a significant part of course problems.	None. Why? It is not the area but (People - instructors, Administrators, etc. S.D.P.I.)
	I don't believe that the Open Entry/Open Exit approach is inappropriate for any program area. However, I have found few people, i.e., instructors outside of the trade and industry area who are open to the idea.
	Electronics - Mechanical Arts. Why? Need more instructions given at a special time by instructor.

As Table 12 shows, respondents felt that program areas that were conceptual, sequential, and demanded group interaction were these areas that did not lend themselves to Open Entry/Open Exit.

TABLE 13

STAFF OPEN COMMENTS ON PROGRAM AREAS WITH GREATEST NEED FOR OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT

Question: In what program areas is there the greatest need for Open Entry/Open Exit. Why?

Job Training.	Typing students come with varied training and ability and need a varied amount of time to master the course as a foundation for secretarial science courses. I'm not acquainted with T & I, etc.
Technical Associate Degree Programs. Why? Students want it.	Skill subjects.
Manual Skill competencies.	Secretarial Science and Medical Secretary.
Difficult to answer.	In theory - wherever needs of business, industry, government, need skilled people year around and where we have expressed needs by potential students.
There is a need for entrance into programs more than once per year. Most programs that are extremely structured could use more flexibility such as Electronic Servicing and Electronics Technology. Possible entrance could be on a quarter basis or at 6 week blocks.	Clerical.
I haven't given it any thought. Why? As a teacher it isn't in my realm to tell the teachers in another area that they should have their programs individualized or open-ended; this is between them and the administration.	Business Education - Motor skills area. Why? Concepts are for building skill, not needed in class discussion.
Lets try for as many as possible.	Those in which a significant number of students have considerable background - Why bore them to death?
All - (3 replies)	All. Why? Decreasing supply of high school grads.
Diploma level lab or shop programs.	Food Service Clothing Construction Industrial Sewing Skill Development areas
Most Diploma Programs.	To be determined at our school on the basis of student need.
Typing. Why? Many students take this.	
I don't know that this can be identified.	

TABLE 1[illegible] Continued

Skill programs. Why? Need for developing skills rather than the extra nice things to know.	Many, too numerous to individually list.
In courses where each student has to develop their own skill.	All. Why? Areas of high student dropout in most cases will benefit most.
Refresher courses. Why? Utilized mainly by adults currently employed or wanting to return to work.	Most. Why? Converting a program to an Open Entry/Open Exit format results in the program becoming more vocational in character. Frills tend to be dropped and only those features essential to the training of students for jobs are retained.
Diploma (as our Voc. Math and Bus. Math). Why? The students have such a diversity of abilities.	
Skill area. Why? If materials are good - there is no problem (record keeping is a problem however).	Skills. Why? In community colleges we get such a wide variety of backgrounds in skills. Open Entry/Open Exit provides an individualized pace for these people.
Motor skill areas. Why? Usually women desiring to enter the labor market. Some desiring to re-enter. Big turnover in this area of work.	Especially those which emphasize the acquisition of occupational skills. Why? Most efficient way to teach, and perhaps, best way for students to learn mastery.
Skill. Why? Students have different backgrounds. Slow students shouldn't hold back the students with more ability.	
Beginning level - greater numbers easier materials.	
Diploma Voc. Tech. Why? Student accommodation.	

As Table 13 shows, approximately one-half the respondents indicated skill areas as having the greatest need for Open Entry/Open Exit; a large number of responses indicated that the need is much more widespread.

TABLE 14

STAFF OPEN COMMENTS ON OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT ADVANTAGES

Question: Possible advantages associated with Open Entry/Open Exit include economic advantages - less time spent in job preparation, on the job more quickly; community advantages such as better service; and advantages to individuals, employers, agencies such as CETA, etc. Which of these, or others, do you think are the major advantages of the Open Entry/Open Exit approach?

Advantages to individual students, employers and agencies.	Student can enter at his convenience and exit at times more advantageous for employment.
All of above and better utilization of facilities.	Better service to community.
It changes education toward student needs and interests.	Community advantages.
All of the above - (6 replies)	Especially beneficial for CETA needs - would eliminate need for most class size projects students could be slotted.
On the job more quickly, student can take only what he thinks he needs to become qualified all or part. Better use of space.	Students take jobs and still finish course.
On the job more quickly; Community advantages such as better service, and advantages to individuals, employers, agencies, such as CETA, etc.	Serve more people when they want to enroll, recognize past learning, student can start where he is.
Entry multiple times/year. Graduation at any time. More consistent use of staff and facilities. Don't graduate until competency is reached.	Community service - education when needed.
You eliminate the student who is going to try and slide by in 2 years or whatever.	Does not hold students back. Promotes efficiency and speed.
All are involved in an Open Entry/Open Exit system.	Community advantages such as better service - we could give the people of the community the service they want and need - individuals - we could give the individual the type of training he or she wants, employers, we could have better people for them when they need them.

39

TABLE 14 Continued

On the job more quickly. Allows a student with some skill to complete course more quickly than having to start at the beginning. Creates better job possibilities - e.g., not having everyone graduating at the same time, allows for individual differences (everyone working at own speed.) The student can enter the course at a level of his ability (based on high school background) and then the student progresses at his own rate. Based on his mathematical ability. Provides services when customer wants to start. Not have to wait for everyone else, or have more time if needed. Continuous availability of trained personnel for employers; their needs do not coincide with the way we train people. The right instructors (with reasonable sized classes) can spend more time with those who need it. We should not downgrade the quality of the program, however. Advantages to community. Many students just brush up on skills before going on the job. Less time required for skill attainment by motivated students. Advantage to the individual student. They are only required to spend the time they need to master the materials. Less time spent in job preparation. Able to serve people as need arises.	Community advantages. Students do not go on job sooner, but it many times offers student option of work time during or concurrent with education. I'm not sure any of the above have been proven. I believe the advantage to be that it provides more opportunity for the student to make choices. It lends itself to the adult and part-time student the best. Alternatives should be available to regular full time diploma and Associate Degree students. In our situation the biggest advantage is that adults can come at any time, refresh their skills and then be prepared for a job. Advantages to agencies such as CETA. Be able to go from one course to the next in Typing and Shorthand much faster. Most advantageous to the mature individual who needs work in a relatively short period of time. Less time spent in job preparation advantage to individuals. Better service to community. On the job faster. Advantage to student - enrollment available when he is ready. Steady turnout of students. Steady influx to job market.

In Table 14, respondents offered a wide spectrum of advantages with no clear grouping or consensus; some emphasis on advantages accruing to the individual and the community.

TABLE 15

STAFF OPEN COMMENTS ON OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT
DISADVANTAGES

Question: Disadvantages often associated with Open Entry/Open Exit include high costs (facilities, instructional, supportive) problems with curriculum, control, scheduling of students, staff, facilities, necessity for continuous large enrollments in programs, etc. Which of these, or others, do you think are the major disadvantages of the Open Entry/Open Exit approach?

Scheduling and maintaining year round staff.	I feel that any or all of these can be handled.
Most of the above are objections voiced by someone who has not tried the concept. I feel with careful orientation and a careful approach, the above objections can <u>all</u> be answered.	Staff and facilities.
Supportive services need to accept the fact that they are <u>supportive</u> and must be willing to adjust to the system.	Scheduling, records, costs.
Mixing Open Entry and traditional courses in the same program.	Control - requires more self discipline on the part of student.
Scheduling, of students and staff, the mechanics.	Curriculum control, scheduling of staff.
From what I have observed, students cannot get all of their supportive classes on an open entry basis. Therefore, they are committed to being in school for a longer period of time than if they were in a lock step program from Sept. to June.	Not enough experience to answer.
Hard to predict when openings will occur. Difficult to convince supportive services to adjust.	Curriculum and scheduling, however, we handle this by using open periods; i.e., student may type any hour. Two teachers (55 machines) are available at all times except 9th where the full time secretary gives out equipment. The student holds the assignment completed 9th hour until the next day when a teacher is available. Two teachers man the lab at a time. Each teacher has a daily load of 5 hours and is more efficient with no more than two consecutive hours, we have also found that the course must be highly organized with compatible personnel and as few different teachers as possible.

TABLE 15 Continued

All are involved - but #15 (advantages) outweighs #16 (disadvantages) in most cases.	Many Open Entry/Open Exit programs are individualized and this requires a lot of reading. The slow or poor reader is at a disadvantage in comparison to other students and may feel social pressure to drop out due to relatively slow progress.
I feel that it should work and must be promoted.	Mechanics of reporting grade, attendance, etc. Remodel facilities.
I do not see these as disadvantages, they are merely obstacles that must be worked out and overcome to give better education. There is a lot of curriculum to write to organize the program, this takes a lot of time and work, scheduling of students will be more problem than now but this should not deter us.	Scheduling supportive services.
	Acceptance of the concept by a traditionally trained staff. It is usually assumed that Open Entry/ Open Exit means "programmed instruction".
Time taken to orient new students - becomes very repetitious, very time-consuming.	Not enough experience to say which are the major disadvantages.
Poorly developed materials (programmed) used across the board will poorly train all students. Instructor motivation is less (some react by saying that those who feel this way are on an ego trip) satisfaction in the job is important to any worker, including educators. Just being a "log" is not motivating. You really can't prepare for all students needs and hence a tendency to not prepare. I taught 1 year in this system and would not like to do it - no way!! It may be just right for some but not for me.	In our situation, the biggest disadvantage is inadequate staffing of an open lab situation.
	Necessity for continuous large enrollments in programs. High cost producing good packaged instructional material, requires much time and a high degree of expertise in subject matter and individualizing course. High cost of revising materials for changes in laws, equipment, etc. to keep instruction current.
	The record keeping!
On a full scale program, we would have to study each area.	Control could be very time consuming. Cheating can run rampant. Grades might not reflect true picture. Need improved devices to see if standards are really met. More controls needed.
Scheduling is a major problem of both instructor and students.	Less motivated students drop the course more quickly than if they were identified with a group.

TABLE 15 Continued

Scheduling of students.	Uneven usage of facilities - peak times demand more equipment than is consistently used.
Scheduling students and teaching students to budget time wisely are the major disadvantages.	All of them.
Overcoming attitudes of disadvantages and use as challenges to overcome.	The lack of experience in setting priorities and scheduling their time causes a great deal of trouble (incompletions) for the younger students. The more mature student is even hampered by this.
None.	

Responses contained in Table 15 range widely over the areas of instruction and related services and activities.

TABLE 16

ADDITIONAL STAFF OPEN COMMENTS ON
OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT

Question: What additional comments would you like to make regarding the Open Entry/Open Exit approach as you have experienced it?

Don't say, "We will do so!" Don't set a date as "we will completely individualize and Open Entry/Open Exit by September, 1976." As stated before, good orientation and planning is required!

Need for academic counseling is increased. Would recommend that counselors be assigned to departments.

I don't feel that all programs can be open on the same format. In my mind, any time you accept students more than once a year, you are making the program more flexible. Some programs with prerequisites do not lend themselves to complete open ending.

Open Entry programs may entail year-round operation. This involves hiring teachers for longer periods or hiring added teachers. This is running contrary to austerity measures advocated by various sources - governmental and administrative.

The staff is the key to success!

It will work very well if you want it to.

I think it works well here.

This approach demands great flexibility from both the instructors and administration.

I feel "weekly" entry is possibly unnecessary. Some courses and some programs operate better with part "small-group" work and individualized. I would suggest in cases like that maybe the "small-group" should be collected and started.

Need teachers who believe in it - probably not for everyone.

I believe its greatest potential good, lies in the potential for greatly improved quality in the instructional process.

It is okay - much of the time, do not feel like a teacher - simply a paperchecker.

I feel that it should work and must be promoted.

We cannot expect to take a group of students, put them through a structured program all the same time for the same length and send them out on the job market with the skills they want and need. Students have different needs and goals and achieve these needs and goals at different rates. Therefore, we must become more flexible to meet these needs of the students along with the needs of industry.

Works excellent on a small scale program such as CETA, however, on a school-wide program, a thorough study should be made.

TABLE 16 Continued

It should only be utilized where need is indicated.	My major concern is to provide alternative educational method and serve the students.
My experience in regard to this concept, past and present, as an instructor and as a registrar, have not been positive. It would (could) leave out our peaks, but it would become a "treadmill" (more than now) job. Collecting "non-resident" tuition forms, making schedule changes, watching pre and re-registration, checking graduation requirements, recognition (commencement) etc. could certainly require really different numbers of people than we have now. Without the instructors taking care of and being responsible for 1) seeing that only enrolled students are in class, 2) taking attendance, 3) following the non-attenders, it would be giant leap backward.	It is more difficult for the teacher - students starting and stopping at any time, takes time from the teacher. When the teacher is responsible for several courses, it is a strain on the teacher to be prepared and ready to answer any question on any subject at any time. Very exhausting for instructor - 7 hours a day with several skill courses in one continuous open laboratory is impossible to endure semester after semester. Four to five hours would be maximum. Enrollment in entire lab, is approximately 650 students, 2 instructors, and one aide. Instructor is continuously bombarded with questions on different lessons of different courses, on equipment operation, on malfunction of machines, review of tests, orientation of new students, etc. Individual help must be given for common problem areas - instructor must repeat same help 30-50 times in one semester instead of two or three times - this is trying - to his disposition, patience, and enthusiasm. It saps one's energy to a degree that there is little left for evaluating and revising course materials, motivating slow students, or supervising progress of students.
I work there - it has been highly successful. A teacher here is spoiled for lecture classes as attention is given to each student. The teacher can use endless patience without pressure from the impatient ones in a group setting.	Implementation is difficult - all areas and levels of administration and instruction must be ready and will be "bend and adjust".
The Open Entry/Open Exit type program needs a very specific list of requirements, methods of checking the students' completion of the requirements, a system of going back - receiving - and retesting when initial efforts fail, and a fast method of indicating to the student how they're doing at any point in the course.	

TABLE 16 Continued

Some faculty are opposed. I feel students should have this opportunity. It is a definite advantage in Vocational, Technical.	Can be useful, but must have some limits and considerable controls to be really effective. It might tend to miss some vital areas that the prospective employee definitely needs. Attitudes, discipline, attendance, industry can't operate on "I'll work when I feel like it" - student might get distorted idea.

Table 16 certainly presents no clear grouping of opinions; instead, a wide range of important areas received comment.

The question "To what extent do you feel Open Entry/Open Exit programs would be beneficial to entering students?" was posed to all questionnaire respondents. A comparison of the replies to this question is contained in Table 17. There appears to be agreement that the benefits to entering students would be "highly beneficial" as indicated by the model responses of 36 percent to 40 percent. A higher percentage of staff (33%) than any of the other responding categories indicated "extremely beneficial". Very low percentages of responses fell in the "no benefits" category.

In a question addressed to Prospective Students, respondents were asked if they would have a need for their technical institute program to be Open Entry/Open Exit. The results as shown in Table 18 show two-thirds of the respondents indicated they would have such a need; explanations of the responses are tabulated in Table 19.

However, in a related question, Prospective Students were asked the specific question, "If you were to attend your district technical institute on a full time basis, how important would it be to you that your program is on an Open Entry/Open Exit format?" Responses as shown in Table 20 point out a large percentage of prospective students do not have strong feelings toward whether their technical institute programs are Open Entry/Open Exit. And the accompanying comments (not shown) matched those responses with most comments falling into the categories of "Makes no difference" or "Would attend anyway".

No explanation is apparent for the discrepancy between the two response patterns. Perhaps the question on importance was a better measurement of the respondents' feelings because of the larger number of available choices. Or, the respondents felt that if offered a choice, they would opt for Open Entry/Open Exit, but if the choice involving attending or not attending the Technical Institute, they were not as decisive.

In an attempt to gain insight into which months are preferred by students to enter and complete their programs, the following two questions were posed to Prospective Students, Students, and were also included on the Staff questionnaires:

1. What month would you have preferred (for prospective students the question read "would you prefer") to enter your program as a full time student? (If you are not a student, select the month you feel most full time students would prefer.) (Write the numbers 1,2,3, underneath your first 3 choices.)

2. What months would you prefer to complete your studies or graduate? (If you are not a student, select the month you feel most full time students would prefer.) (Write the numbers 1,2,3, underneath your first 3 choices.)

TABLE 17

VIEWED DEGREE OF BENEFITS TO ENTERING STUDENTS
IF PROGRAMS OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT

	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE			
	Prospective Student (n=259)	Student (n=519)	Staff (n=56)	Employer/ Agency (n=76)
Extremely beneficial	19	17	33	14
Highly beneficial	43	40	41	36
Beneficial	29	29	7	28
Some benefits	8	12	7	17
No benefits	1	1	0	3
Not applicable, blank	0	1	12	2

TABLE 18

PROSPECTIVE STUDENT NEEDS FOR
OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT

Question: If you were a student entering your district Technical Institute in the near future, would you have a need for your program to be Open Entry/Open Exit?	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE (n=259)
Yes	66
No	31
Blank	3

TABLE 19

EXPLANATIONS OFFERED BY PROSPECTIVE STUDENTS
ON NEED FOR PROGRAM TO BE
OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT

General Response Category	Number of Responses	Percent of Total Student Responses
No - makes no difference	47	18
Yes - find a job sooner, more easily	45	17
Yes - enter program/course without long delay	27	10
Yes - finish program/course early	25	10
Yes - requires the instruction be individualized	18	7
No - not essential but desirable, convenient	8	3
Miscellaneous comments or blank	89	35
Totals	n= 259	100

TABLE 20

IMPORTANCE TO PROSPECTIVE STUDENTS OF TECHNICAL INSTITUTE PROGRAM BEING OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT

(n=259)	Percentage of Response
Critical importance. Would not attend if not Open Entry/Open Exit.	3
High importance. Might not attend if not Open Entry/Open Exit.	24
No opinion. Neutral.	54
Low importance. Would probably attend if not Open Entry/Open Exit.	10
No importance. Would attend even if not Open Entry/Open Exit.	18
Blank	2

The responses are shown in Table 21 and Table 22. In both tables, only the responses totaling 8 percent or more are shown. Use of this filter appears to highlight the salient findings and still present all meaningful data.

The data presenting the preferred months of entry (Table 21) shows that while 28 percent of the staff respondents selected August as the month most students would select as first choice, only 16 percent of the students and 12 percent of prospective students selected August. September was, by far, the first choice of students and prospective students. After August and September, January was the month most often selected throughout the three choices. "No preference" was the first choice of 12 percent of the student respondents and 9 percent of prospective students.

In Table 22 presenting the preferred months to complete or graduate, staff respondents estimated that 26 percent of students would have no preference while 10 percent of the student responses actually indicated no preference as did 13 percent of prospective students. April, May and June appear to be the preferred months for students to complete or graduate, while prospective students' preferences run a month or two earlier. Overall, while there is some evidence of preference for non-traditional starting and completion dates, the findings do indicate quite strongly that the traditional entry months of August and September and completion months of May and June command the highest preferences.

TABLE 21

PREFERRED MONTHS TO ENTER DISTRICT TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE (8% or more)					
	Prospective Student (n=259)		Student (n=519)		Staff (n=56)	
	month		month		month	
First Choice	Jan.	12	Jan.	8		
	Aug.	12	Aug.	16	Aug.	28
	Sept.	33	Sept.	45		
	Oct.	10				
No Preference		9		12		19
Second Choice	Jan.	14	Jan.	22	Jan.	19
	Feb.	7	Feb.	9		
	Aug.	12	Aug.	12		
	Sept.	12	Sept.	16		
	Oct.	16	Oct.	12		
Third Choice	Jan.	8	Jan.	13	Jan.	15
	Feb.	7				
	Mar.	7				
	Oct.	15	Oct.	13	Oct.	9
	Nov.	16	Nov.	8		
	Dec.	10				

TABLE 22

PREFERRED MONTHS TO COMPLETE STUDIES OR GRADUATE

	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE (8% or more)					
	Prospective Student (n=259)		Student (n=519)		Staff (n=56)	
	month		month		month	
First Choice	Jan.	9				
	Mar.	14				
	Apr.	15	Apr.	19	Apr.	13
	May	24	May	20	May	37
			June	8		
No Preference		13		10		26
Second Choice			Jan.	8		
	Mar.	9				
	Apr.	18	Apr.	15		
	May	15	May	17		
	June	11	June	16	June	13
Third Choice	Mar.	9				
	Apr.	12				
	May	15	May	8		
	June	17	June	18		
			Dec.	8		

In a question addressed only to Employer/Agency respondents, views were gathered on whether the respondents felt Open Entry/Open Exit programs at their local Technical Institute would be beneficial to their organizations. The responses, as shown in Table 23 indicate a very large percentage of "some benefits" to "extremely beneficial" responses, and only 5 percent indicating "no benefits".

An immediate follow-up question was then asked to learn whether respondents felt that their district Technical Institute should be on an Open Entry/Open Exit format. The full question and findings are contained in Table 24 and show a very high percentage, 75, indicating that "Yes, I believe our district Technical Institute should be on an Open Entry/Open Exit format." Definite "no" replies numbered only 5 for 7 percent of the total. A more in-depth look at the reasons for the high percentage of affirmative answers can be obtained by a study of the respondents' replies to a request for the reason for their "yes", "no opinion", or "no" answer. Overall, these verbatim replies contained in Table 25 are highly supportive of Open Entry/Open Exit, primarily for reasons regarding employment.

In an effort to learn what might happen to employee usage of local Technical Institute's programs and courses if those programs and courses were using an Open Entry/Open Exit format, a question to this effect was included on the Employer/Agency questionnaire. Before the question was posed, however, respondents were requested to give an estimate of how many employees were presently using Technical Institute offerings. These estimates are given in Table 26.

Table 27 shows the responses received when the employers were asked what they felt would be the employee usage if all courses and programs offered by the district Technical Institute would be on an Open Entry/Open Exit format.

The two tables together show that, while the present employee usage is estimated as relatively low, 50 percent of the employers felt that usage would increase if all programs and courses were Open Entry/Open Exit.

In an effort to gain insight into employer needs for Technical Institute graduates and the associated months of hiring, the Employer/Agency questionnaire contained the following question:

> For your organization, the anticipated majority of hiring of new full time permanent employees over the next five years will be in the occupational area of: (Please list the areas and circle the preferred months for hiring.)

TABLE 23

EMPLOYER/AGENCY VIEWS ON WHETHER OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT PROGRAMS WOULD BE BENEFICIAL TO THEIR ORGANIZATION

	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
Extremely beneficial	9	12
Highly beneficial	18	24
Beneficial	23	30
Some benefits	14	18
No benefits	4	5
Blank, not applicable	8	11
Totals	n=76	100

TABLE 24

EMPLOYER/AGENCY VIEWS ON WHETHER THEIR DISTRICT SHOULD BE ON OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT FORMAT

Question: From your point of view, do you believe that your district Technical Institute should be on an Open Entry/Open Exit format?	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
Yes	57	75
No opinion	13	17
No	5	7
Blank	1	1
Totals	n=76	100

TABLE 25

EMPLOYER/AGENCY EXPLANATIONS OF VIEWS ON WHETHER THEIR TECHNICAL INSTITUTE SHOULD BE ON OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT

Question: From your point of view, do you believe that your district Technical Institute should be on an Open Entry/Open Exit format? Why?

Yes. We would be able to train an employee immediately when the need arises, and not have to wait until a semester starts.	In some courses perhaps yes - but in structured courses with a sequence it seems impractical to keep starting students during the semester - better to all start at once.
Yes. I feel strongly that an Open Entry/Open Exit policy will better meet the needs of students and employers and this will serve the broader needs of society more effectively. This is true because people are more mobile, not only in their trade, but in their employment and in their life styles and their decision-making. It is quite common for individuals to desire entry to courses at all times throughout the year and there is of course a need on the part of employers for employees at all times throughout the year.	No opinion. I feel this doesn't affect our program - but feel it would definitely affect the teaching staff and their comments would be more beneficial.
	Yes. Present and prospective students in our area will be able to utilize the flexibility and plan his training and education around his vocation. He can start and suspend his educational program as the demands of his vocation dictate. He can move at his own pace.
It might minimize the influx of people into the labor market at a set point each year. It could enable the prospective employee to be ready to fill a job within a shorter time span. The Tech. grads would not have to compete with summer and high school students for a limited number of jobs.	This type of program would allow the students to be available for employment at different times in the year. This is beneficial to the employer because he would have an opportunity to recruit when the vacancy is available rather than wait for graduation.
Job openings occur at intervals other than 2 or 3 times per year.	Students that we sponsor could start very soon, rather than waiting for traditional semester starts. Theoretically our cost sponsorship could be reduced by very good students finishing early.
Yes. Better use of facilities and teachers.	All of our people go through our own apprenticeship training.

TABLE 25 Continued

Yes. A public facility that is idle 3 months per year is wasteful. For various reasons, students (illness, financial, family problems, etc.)may prevent them from enrolling at the ordinary periods of Sept. and Jan. Some students may have the ability and desire to complete their course sooner - they should be allowed to do so.	So there is a constant input of qualified candidates in the job market. Openings in business not revolve around graduation dates.
As an employer, I feel this system would provide a constant flow of candidates to employers eliminating the glut associated with normal graduation.	It would greatly facilitate our training needs.
Yes. Graduates would be coming into the labor market at a more even rate. It should be beneficial to the person seeking employment as well as those employing new personnel.	Yes. Relieve the pressure of enrollment at 3 specific times. Better utilization of training stations. Spread graduates over the year rather than 3 times.
Better utilization of equipment, facilities and personnel.	Allow students to proceed at his/her own rate.
It will allow employers to fill openings that occur at times other than graduation.	This system would allow people to enter the job market on a continuing basis throughout the year rather than all at one time. Employer labor needs do not always coincide with school graduations.
The institute serves a cross segment of the general population and this format would facilitate greater access to the whole.	Yes. I can't say all courses and programs should be on this format, rather, especially elective type coursework would be best served in this manner. Classes and work could be set up and time limits established so the student could work and develop at his/her own pace.
In some courses of study, but not for all students. Some need the structuring that a formal class has.	It would assist in filling openings that occur at times other than the traditional graduation dates.
Yes. Efficiency of effort. Overall cost reductions.	Yes. Because we employ during the entire year.
Cut our costs.	Allows an even flow into the Job Market.
57	At least consider on a limited pilot run basis.

TABLE 25 Continued

This program would provide trained people in a sequence that corresponds to the needs of business and industry.	Will tend to release more qualified or trained individuals into the labor market more quickly.
To have an Open Entry concept one would have to individualize the curriculum. With an individualized curriculum would come competency based curriculum and I believe maximum progress. Too much time now is spent keeping a class together K-12 in H.S. and in Post-secondary schools.	Provides greater flexibility to students. Enables employers to enroll new employees in classes when they begin work. Can be coordinated with job changes - new job need for training can be satisfied at time of change. Enables each student to complete course work at own speed.
Allows greater flexibility for student (especially helpful to new residents of area) (returning veterans, etc.)	To provide educational services - as the need occurs.
For the benefit of the exceptional child. For the benefit of the student who decides late that he would like to start.	This would help a limited number. However, I see administration problems. Possibly a limited number of subjects that would lend to this type of operation.
1) In my view, the Open Entry/ Open Exit program would provide greater flexibility, thus accommodating students who may have completed the high school program prior to the usual June graduation. 2) If planned appropriately, the Open Entry/Open Exit program would allow the technical institute to recognize skills and competencies acquired in high school or other training programs.	Employees could go to school at the most appropriate time to help them with their immediate job/career aspirations. Exceptional students could graduate early and go on to the next course plus they would be able to apply the knowledge quicker to their jobs thru accelerated education.
Because our community action agency functions to some extent as a work training ground and employees prosper in many positions on their "potential" to acquire the needed job skills, it would be very helpful if Voc. courses were offered that employees could enter and exit from when <u>they need</u> the course and not on a quarter or semester basis.	To give the student a chance to obtain a job at any time of the year. Instead of all seeking employment at the same time.
	If a student has completed the requirements for a degree, he/she could enter the labor market prior to traditional graduation.
	Schools could accommodate more students for the same or less cost. And graduating students whether first-time job seekers or those being retrained - would spend less total time in school and would enter the work force more quickly.

58

TABLE 25 Continued

No. Believe this would curtail or limit opportunity for continued or extra educational benefits with a full, regular semester of study. No. Obvious difficulty of evaluating graduates to other members of class. No comparison possible with OE.	No. Not totally. On a specific class or program basis OK. No. Concerned that practice skills would not be emphasized. Test passing would become overriding goal.

TABLE 26

EMPLOYER ASSESSMENT OF EMPLOYEE USAGE OF TECHNICAL INSTITUTE'S PROGRAM/COURSE

(n=76)	Percentage of Response
Approximate number known and given	9
Less than 5% of our employees enroll each year	47
6-25% of our employees enroll each year	17
Over 25% of our employees enroll each year	1
Not applicable, blank	26

TABLE 27

EMPLOYER ASSESSMENT OF EMPLOYEE USAGE OF TECHNICAL INSTITUTE'S PROGRAMS/COURSES IF OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT FORMAT IN USE

(n=76)	Percentage of Response
Usage greatly increased	3
Usage somewhat increased	47
No change, about the same usage	36
Usage somewhat decreased	0
Usage greatly decreased	0
Not applicable, blank	14

The results, as shown in Table 28, show that for the great majority of the occupational areas listed, employers have no preferred months of hiring. (Actual names of occupational areas listed are not shown.)

Results certainly indicate that employers do not have a need or preference to do the bulk of their hiring in the traditional "completion" months of May, June, and January. These results, when coupled with employer comments throughout the survey, indicate preferences for variable employee availability dates because of a variable needs pattern.

To further explore this area of availability and hiring of Technical Institute graduates, employer/agency respondents were then asked what changes would occur in their recruitment/hiring patterns if graduates were available throughout the year. The actual question and a tabulation of responses are contained in Table 29. Of those respondents who were employers, the majority indicated there would be no change in recruitment efforts. Twenty percent of the total responses indicated there would be an increase in recruitment efforts, and 3 percent indicated their recruitment efforts would decrease. None of the 76 respondents checked that they were already hiring graduates from Open Entry/Open Exit programs.

TABLE 28

EMPLOYER/AGENCY ANTICIPATED HIRING OF FULL TIME EMPLOYEES BY MONTH AND NUMBER OF OCCUPATIONAL AREAS
(n=76)

Month	Number of Occupational Areas
January	5
February	2
March	6
April	1
May	4
June	4
July	3
August	4
September	5
October	4
November	0
December	0
No Preference	79

TABLE 29

EXPECTED CHANGES IN EMPLOYER RECRUITMENT/HIRING
IF TECHNICAL INSTITUTE GRADUATES
AVAILABLE THROUGHOUT YEAR

Question: What changes in your organization's recruitment and hiring of Technical Institute graduates do you forsee if those graduates were available throughout the year rather than only at the end of the semester? (If your organization is already hiring Technical Institute graduates of programs which are Open Entry/Open Exit, please check here __ and indicate what your reaction has been since you have become aware of the changeover.)

	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
Increase in recruitment efforts	15	20
No change in recruitment efforts	27	35
Decrease in recruitment efforts	2	3
Blank, not applicable	32	42
Totals	n=76	100

Both employer/Agency and Staff questionnaires contained the following question:

> From society's or the community's viewpoint, what do you feel is the most important reason for having an Open Entry/Open Exit approach at our school? Circle one letter.

The answer selection and percentage of responses are contained in Table 30. Responses of both Employer/Agency and Staff respondents show high and well distributed agreement with the items concerning costs, job openings filling more quickly, and students spending less time in school. The "other" category also showed high commonality with the great majority of comments (not shown) indicating that more than one of the first three choices--"a", "b", or "c"--were the preferred answers (indicating also a weakness of the question). A low percentage of both Employer/Agency and Staff respondents indicated there were no important reasons for Open Entry/Open Exit. A comparison of Employer/Agency to Staff responses shows a higher percentage (than Staff) of Employer/Agency respondents believing that cost savings (if they exist) and filling job openings more quickly would be important reasons for Open Entry/Open Exit.

TABLE 30

EMPLOYER/AGENCY AND STAFF VIEWS ON COMMUNITY
REASONS FOR OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT

Question: From society's or the community's viewpoint, what do you feel is the most important reason for having an Open Entry/Open Exit approach at your district Technical Institute? (Circle one letter.)	Percentage of Response	
	Employer/Agency (n=76)	Staff (n=56)
a. Schools could accommodate more students for the same or less cost.	32	16
b. Job openings would be filled more quickly.	22	13
c. Graduating students - whether first time job seekers or those being retrained--would spend less total time in school and would enter the work force more quickly.	24	30
d. From society's or the community's viewpoint, there are no important reasons for Open Entry/Open Exit.	3	4
e. Other (specify) _____	14	29
f. No opinion	5	4

Employer/Agency respondents were given the opportunity to comment openly with the following questionnaire item:

> Please comment on any of the previous nine questionnaire items. You may also wish to comment on the general concept of Open Entry/Open Exit as it applies to you and your organization.

The comments received in reply are contained in Table 31. In general, while they point out several areas of concern, the comments are in line with other comments and other data from this particular questionnaire, namely, that Open Entry/Open Exit appears as quite valuable and worthwhile from the Employer/Agency view.

TABLE 31

EMPLOYER/AGENCY OPEN COMMENTS ON
OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT

Please comment on any of the previous nine questionnaire items. You may also wish to comment on the general concept of Open Entry/Open Exit as it applies to you and your organization.

I feel very strongly that Open Entry/Open Exit program format is much more responsive to the needs of individuals in society in today's age of fast changing employment needs and demands and an age of great mobility in terms of movement among employers and occupation.

The time factor would certainly seem to be an advantage to the student and potential employee. However, I would hope that this type of plan would also be convenient and possible for the faculty providing the education. If the quality of the course would suffer because of the latter, I would definitely feel the whole thing was a disadvantage, for all concerned.

I can see some benefits and also drawbacks.

Although it is unlikely that we would increase our recruitment efforts many business firms most probably would make a greater effort to seek graduates all during the year. I sincerely think that change is healthy for the job market.

Most help hired are part-time.

Open Entry and Exit would be most beneficial to employees seeking to improve or add new job skills.

Cannot forsee any detrimental effects of implementing Open Entry/Open concept.

Could also use for employee upgrading and basic training.

In today's job market, the availability of entry level positions or on-the-job training is limited. Whether the Open Entry/Open Exit program would provide too many entry level personnel for the market may be a problem.

I'm wondering about the quality of training received on Open Entry/Open Exit programs.

Open Entry/Open Exit concept would not affect our facility appreciably but I do see some advantages.

No objection to overall concept, provided class sizes are kept to economically feasible proportions.

Constant availability of manpower is one of the true benefits of this program.

Good idea.

The people may be available when we need them.

Excellent idea. We are constantly seeking qualified candidates - not just in January and June.

TABLE 31 Continued

The reason more people in the Berlin area do not take advantage of MPTI is simply because it is too darn far away. The driving time in ideal conditions is 45 min., in bad weather, it can be 2 hours. Also, more Berlin students would live in Fond du Lac during the school period except that there is a severe shortage of nice rooms within walking distance to the Institute. Even the rent for the poor rooms and the rooms over one mile away from the Institute, is too high for most students. It's really too bad that the State, in all its great wisdom, has so many empty dormitories at the universities, whereas now, the many students attending MPTI in Fond du Lac cannot find a decent place to room near the Institute. I now only call the Institute in May and December. With the Open Entry/Open Exit concept functioning, I'm sure I would call whenever I had an opening for a possible graduate.	Without an in-depth anal is of the numbers of students you anticipate enrolling in the Open Entry/Open Exit plan, I believe it provides eater flexibility which is much needed in the educational system today. Secondly, it would seem to me that it would enhance the employees potential for employment because if there were sufficient number of students participating in this plan, it would have the effect of staggering the completion dates of their work so that Hiring practices could be spread out over all the months of the year rather than concentrating upon the spring graduates or the mid-winter graduates as we do now.
The change in recruitment would be that which is carried out when I need someone rather than when graduation is scheduled.	The only advantage I can see in a program of this type is that it would decrease the number of available candidates for jobs at any given time and distribute their availability throughout the year.
It will naturally create less competition for jobs, it will also give students a chance to enter programs throughout the year rather than just twice a year.	"Peaks and valleys" would be leveled off in that the student supply and employer's demand would be on a more "even keel". The concept appears to have some practical potential.
Good idea.	Would mean an increase in craining counseling.
All but impossible to establish legitimate ranking scales for graduates. Would be impossible to predict employee hiring times in an open entry situation.	1) Our remote location prevents continuing education programs. 2) Recruiting would be more difficult - lack of opportunity to compare prospects with fellow grads.

OBJECTIVE C - EVALUATION OF PILOT PROGRAMS

Job Entry Performance Levels

Specific questions regarding the establishment of job entry performance levels and the methods used to establish those levels were asked in each interview (n=39). The respondents in all cases felt that there was a close relationship between the performance levels needed for job entry and the level being attained at the culmination of their programs and individual courses. The primary methods used to establish these levels are contained in Table 32.

In reply to questions regarding the validity of levels established by such sources as materials suppliers, textbook publishers, and even instructional staff and advisory committees, approximately one-half of the respondents pointed out that their students do complete their programs and courses with a wide range of competencies but the jobs the students enter require a correspondingly wide range of competencies. Stated another way, these respondents felt there was no single job entry performance level associated with, for example, a vocational diploma program; instead, there was a range of performance levels. All respondents felt that what was being done in their specific Open Entry/Open Exit programs/courses was closely attuned to job market requirements.

Student Time Management

In regard to the management and accounting for student time and attendance, the approaches found could be considered as spread along a continuum from "tightly managed" to "loosely managed". (See Appendices E, F, G, H and I for examples of control sheets and schedules employed.) No two approaches observed were exactly alike and most fell somewhere in between the following two examples of the extremes:

1. Example of "tightly managed". The example or profile selected is in a lab setting. Each regular student in the program spends six hours (arbitrarily set) per day in the lab, five days per week. Students punch in and out on a time clock for both attendance and also for each module or lesson completed. Students cannot be in the lab unless assigned to that hour. When first set up, the lab was more open and flexible but demand for entrance increased greatly plus the school wanted to optimize facility usage. There is more flexibility in assigning hours for attendance in the evenings and on Saturday mornings.

   For each student who is assigned lab hours for that particular day, a daily time card is placed in a rack. Hours of attendance (and student progress) is recorded by an aide whose salary is divided between the budgets of the registrar and the particular department. The aide also handles the waiting list and all recording required in the registrar's office.

TABLE 32

PRINCIPAL METHODS USED TO ESTABLISH JOB ENTRY PERFORMANCE LEVELS

Method	Observed Programs/Courses
Instructors plus advisory committees	General Education - all programs/courses surveyed as are serving occupational areas.
	Business Lab Fox Valley T.I., Kirkwood C.C.
	Welding - Kirkwood C.C., done by modules over six year period.
Instructional Materials Suppliers	Business Lab - District One T.I., Moraine Park T.I., North Central T. I.
Major text accompanying course	Accounting - District One T.I., Kirkwood C. C.
Recent Task Analysis	Food Service - Fox Valley T. I., Moraine Park T. I., Waukesha County T. I. - in conjunction with a statewide articulation project.
	Auto Mechanics - Fox Valley T. I.
	Auto Body - Fox Valley T. I.
	Metal Fab. Welding - Fox Valley T.I.
	Machine Tool - District One T. I., with district-wide high school articulation project plus reference to task analysis done by Fox Valley T. I., Fox Valley T. I.
	Vocational Printing - Fox Valley T. I.

Essentially, in this setting, hours are being sold. To do this, a study was made to determine average number of hours needed to complete each individualized module, and allowances built in for the slow learner. If a student does not complete the modules contracted for in the allotted time, the student must register again for whatever needs to be completed and pay the appropriate fees.

2. A profile of a "loosely managed" student time management situation would appear as follows: Students have a choice of enrolling in either the course section traditionally structured or the more "individualized" or "open" section. In fact, students may have the freedom to move back and forth from section to section according to their needs. There is no formal procedure for attendance and no set hours assigned for the student to be in the lab or classroom. Students can come according to their own schedules and stay in the course until such time as they complete the course requirements.

It should be noted that the number of courses fitting this latter description was very few although several interviewees mentioned evolution from this mode. Furthermore, many instances of a variation of this setting were noted in which a strict attendance policy was utilized until such time as the student completed the course requirements at which time attendance was no longer required. Also, in many courses allowing self-pacing, benchmarks were often used to indicate to students how far along they should be if progressing normally and satisfactorily.

In business labs, some had policies that students were assigned hours but could come in at non-assigned hours if work stations were available. Other labs allowed a selection of hours at course entry, but with controls to ensure that not all the "choice" hours were taken by students from any one program. Students could come in at other hours if there were openings. Other labs had assignment of students by hour and no returning to the lab outside of those hours (because of capacity usage) except by special arrangements; in these cases, there were attempts made to provide hours and machines in other classrooms.

Recording Student Progress

In all of the Open Entry/Open Exit programs and courses studied, some type of record was used to record student progress. Examples of these records can be seen in Appendices F, J, K, L and M. The records were constructed to reflect the needs of that particular curriculum and staff. In some cases, student activity and progress (e.g., modules or units completed) were incorporated into one record along with a daily time card; in others, there was a progress record incorporating the entire course plan. Sometimes, several records were used. A few progress records incorporated benchmarks to guide students as to where they should be if progressing satisfactorily. Other procedures called for periodic review (e.g., every three weeks) of all progress cards to determine which students were not progressing satisfactorily.

There were several instances where procedures used for recording student progress were similar to those used in a DACUM approach. (Sample in Appendix L.) Competencies or learning units were listed and the degree of attainment of any one competency (or proficiency in a unit) was indicated by a numerical score assigned by the instructor, or, in some cases, assigned by the instructor in conjunction with the student.

Likewise, one business lab studied used a record card with no letter grades. Instead, once the objective for a module was attained, a pass grade was recorded and the registrar notified. If a module set of 6 mods (3 credits) was not complete at the end of a school term, the student received an Incomplete for a grade; the student was then carried over to the enrollment of the next term and signed an agreement to complete that set during the current term. If the student did not complete, a failure grade was awarded. Cited disadvantages of this method were the work involved in following up students and the length of the student transcript due to the reporting of a Pass/Fail for each module. Consideration was being given to handling the progress reporting and grading in the department and reporting to the registrar only the final Pass/Fail for the course.

Another business lab studied used a policy whereby no notification of a grade was sent to the registrar if a student completed early in the term and progressed to another course in that lab. The in-course record keeping was handled within the department. At the end of the school term, a letter grade was sent to the registrar for the course completed early and a NC grade was sent for the course in progress. The student then had to enroll for that course at the beginning of the next term.

This procedure seemed to reduce the communication requirements between the department and the registrar and also reduce some of the off-cycle enrollment problems; however, it allowed students to be in a course without formal enrollment. Also, it conceivably would allow a student to complete two courses and receive credit for two courses even though enrollment and fee paying had taken place for only one course.

In yet another lab setting, a grade card was furnished to the registrar when a student completed early and the student was instructed to enroll in the next lab course by contacting the registrar's office. Problems were encountered with the necessary follow-up to ensure that students had actually enrolled and paid the fees before re-entering the lab.

Another school's procedures followed with all of their Open Entry/Open Exit programs and courses required the student to pay a pro-rate share of tuition charges when the student enrolled off-cycle, during the school term. If the course was not completed by the end of the term, the student then had to re-enroll (and pay fees) at the beginning of the next term. In cases where the re-enrolling student had only short time to complete course requirements, full tuition was charged but a refund policy was followed.

In connection with this particular set of procedures, a computer generated roster was sent monthly to the instructors. If a student had completed course requirements during that month, a grade was to be entered on the roster by the instructor. (This grade entry was then used to generate a computation of total hours that the student had spent in that course.) The absence of a grade entry was to be evidence of active enrollment. Withdrawals were to be so noted on the roster. Problems encountered were situations where grades and withdrawals were not posted to the monthly rosters and withdrawal slips provided were not used with a resulting decrease in roster accuracy.

Associated with the use of each Open Entry/Open Exit shop, lab or learning center studied was a policy as to maximum time allowed for a student to continue in a course without re-enrolling and paying fees. One business lab allowed a maximum of 27 weeks to complete a course. Several had no time limits. The balance and great majority did have an established number of hours or weeks (e.g., 18 weeks or hour equivalent) and required re-enrollment and payment of fees when a student went beyond.

Waiting Lists

For those schools studied that had Open Entry/Open Exit programs with waiting lists, the primary difference was in who compiled and managed the list and made the contacts. In most cases, the department involved in cooperation with student services office, compiled the list and contacted those on the list prior to a program opening. In the other situations, waiting lists were primarily the responsibility of the student services (or a separate admissions) office, and they made the calls upon notification from the department involved. Problems encountered involved the giving of sufficient advance notice of an opening, the actual locating of those on the waiting list and the filling of openings when unexpected openings occurred, e.g., at the beginning of a new term when pre-enrolled students failed to show.

As stated in the chapter on Methodology, one of the objectives (C-3) of the study was to evaluate effectiveness of the instruction used in an Open Entry/Open Exit setting. Obviously, instructional effectiveness is a vast research area, and this study only attempted to take a brief look at the delivery systems being used in conjunction with programs/courses that were Open Entry/Open Exit. The results of that brief look are contained in the next six tables, Table 33 through Table 38.

Table 33 presents Student/Staff and total responses to the questionnaire items pertaining to Individualized Instruction. (Page 3 and 4 of Appendix B) Items that evoked a relatively strong response (percentages of Strongly agree plus Agree or Strongly Disagree plus Disagree equal 65% or more) are indicated by an asterisk (*). Likewise, items evoking a very strong response (total percentages of Strongly Agree plus Agree or Strongly Disagree plus Disagree equal 85% or more) are indicated by a double asterisk (**).

Very strong response patterns are noted in such comment areas as individualized instruction allowing the student freedom to set his/her learning pace, the student is taught to be independent, and that a student is not held back because of other students. Among the many statements covering individualized instruction that elicited a relatively strong response--both agreement and disagreement--are those involving students having some freedom to concentrate on certain areas within a course, avoiding unnecessary review, student attrition, grading, and an overall assessment of benefits being greater than the drawbacks.

Many statements, however, did not evoke strong responses but, instead, show varying patterns of agreement, uncertainty, and disagreement all at the same time. Included are statements regarding students not working up to their full capacity, not enough opportunity for classroom discussion, students gaining more knowledge/skill per unit-of-time input, and better placement of graduates.

As a tie-in to the attitudinal questions on individualized instruction, two separate questions were posed to respondents regarding levels of motivation associated with individualized instruction. The first question was "What level of motivation do you feel is required of a student to succeed in an individualized instruction (I-I) setting?" and the results are contained in Table 34. The table shows that respondents felt an average-to-high level of motivation is necessary to succeed in an individualized instruction setting. Responses to the second question, "What percent of the students at our school have sufficient motivation in an individualized instruction setting?" are summarized in Table 35. The table shows that most respondents feel that 50% or more of their student body have the motivation to succeed in an individualized instruction setting.

TABLE 33

STUDENT/STAFF REACTIONS TO COMMENTS REGARDING INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION

Questionnaire Item	Student n=519 Staff n=56	Percentage of Response SA	A	U	D	SD
Individualized instruction allows more freedom for the student to set his/her own learning pace.	**Student	52	41	3	2	0
	**Staff	52	39	6	0	0
Students do not work up to their full capacity.	Student	3	14	18	47	16
	Staff	11	17	13	39	17
Individualized instruction allows a more realistic and practical experience for the student.	* Student	20	61	13	4	1
	Staff	20	44	20	6	4
Does not provide sufficient motivation to the slow learner.	Student	5	25	21	37	10
	Staff	15	26	11	33	9
Not enough opportunity for classroom discussion and exchange of ideas.	Student	6	32	22	32	7
	Staff	20	31	19	19	9
Student is taught to be independent.	**Student	27	61	7	3	1
	*Staff	24	54	7	13	0
Supervision over the learning process and learning progress is lacking.	Student	4	13	21	49	11
	*Staff	2	11	15	46	24
Students do not have enough contact time with instructors.	Student	5	17	15	49	12
	*Staff	7	11	9	46	24
The student is not held back because of any other student.	**Student	36	54	4	4	1
	**Staff	57	33	4	2	2
Students lack motivation to complete the required course work.	Student	2	15	18	52	11
	Staff	2	20	20	46	9
Individualized Instruction produces an atmosphere that facilitates learning.	*Student	11	55	24	6	1
	*Staff	20	50	19	9	0

TABLE 33 Continued

		SA	A	U	D	SD
Does not allow usage of a variety of teaching techniques.	Student	2	27	26	35	9
	Staff	7	24	6	43	19
Student is allowed freedom to choose areas of concentration within each particular course.	*Student	15	62	14	5	1
	*Staff	15	57	11	11	2
Some students have a tendency to cover material too quickly with the result that the knowledge is not retained.	Student	5	37	27	26	4
	Staff	7	24	30	30	6
The course objectives are clearly understood by the student.	Student	4	50	31	11	2
	Staff	13	48	15	19	2
Students can avoid unnecessary review.	*Student	11	57	14	15	2
	*Staff	11	61	7	13	4
Lack of materials forces some students to wait until someone else is finished with the materials.	Student	6	33	19	34	6
	Staff	2	26	6	50	11
Individualized instruction is a cause of students dropping out of school.	*Student	1	6	26	45	21
	*Staff	4	4	22	43	26
Students gain more knowledge/ skill per unit-of-time input.	Student	10	53	29	5	1
	Staff	17	39	30	7	6
Results in more satisfactory placement of our school graduates.	Student	8	42	43	4	0
	Staff	9	31	48	6	2
Does not allow for a meaningful grading of students' performance.	*Student	3	10	20	54	11
	*Staff	2	6	17	46	26
Through credit by examination allows recognition of learning that took place outside the formal classroom or in other schools.	Student	5	44	41	5	1
	*Staff	35	41	7	6	0
Benefits to all involved are greater than the drawbacks.	*Student	22	50	22	3	1
	*Staff	46	38	12	4	0

TABLE 33 Continued

SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
U = Undecided
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

* Percentages of Strongly Agree plus Agree or Strongly Disagree plus Disagree = 65% or more.

** Percentages of Strongly Agree plus Agree or Strongly Disagree plus Disagree = 85% or more.

TABLE 34

STUDENT/STAFF VIEWS ON LEVEL OF MOTIVATION REQUIRED FOR SUCCESS IN AN INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION SETTING

	Percentage of Response	
	Student (n=519)	Staff (n=56)
Absolutely none. Student will succeed in Individualized Instruction without motivation.	2	4
Very little motivation required to succeed in Individualized Instruction.	5	0
Average motivation required of student to succeed in Individualized Instruction.	46	52
High motivation required to succeed in Individualized Instruction.	38	35
Very high motivation necessary for student to succeed in Individualized Instruction.	4	6

TABLE 35

STUDENT/STAFF ESTIMATE ON PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS POSSESSING SUFFICIENT MOTIVATION TO SUCCEED IN INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION

	Percentage of Response	
	Student (n=519)	Staff (n=56)
Less than 25%	4	4
25% to 50%	16	20
50% to 75%	46	28
Over 75%	25	39

In a question relating individualized instruction to the problem of student attrition (Table 36), responses point out a positive relationship between individualized instruction being used as the instructional delivery system and prevention of student withdrawal. A minority (32 percent) felt that individualized instruction was "not important" or "absolutely not important" in preventing student withdrawal, while 60 percent felt it was "important" to "critically important". (Remaining 8 percent were blank.) Caution should be observed, however, in interpreting these results. The middle choice in the rating scale "Important. Tends to keep students from withdrawing" is not a neutral or average type answer as are most of the mid-scale items throughout the Student/Staff questionnaire. While this may cloud the results somewhat, the findings tend to show a strong possibility of a relationship between instructional mode and student attrition.

In the last item on the questionnaire regarding individualized instruction, respondents were asked for their comments regarding individualized instruction. Student responses have been categorized by comment area and are presented in Table 37. As the table shows, the salient finding is the high percentage of students who commented on the self-pacing aspects of individualized instruction.

Staff comments on individualized instruction (contained in full in Table 38) show no real consensus but do give further insight into the many aspects of individualized instruction and its relationship to Open Entry/Open Exit.

TABLE 36

STUDENT/STAFF ASSESSMENT OF IMPORTANCE OF INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION IN PREVENTING STUDENT WITHDRAWAL

Question: Is Individualized Instruction (I-I) a factor in keeping students from withdrawing from our school before their program is completed?	Percentage of Response	
	Student (n=519)	Staff (n=5[illegible])
Critically important. Without individualized instruction, would definitely withdraw.	3	4
Highly important. Without I-I, would consider withdrawing.	13	17
Important. Tends to keep students from withdrawing.	46	41
Not important. Would most likely complete program if instruction not individualized.	27	30
Absolutely not important. Would complete even if instruction not I-I.	5	6

TABLE 37

SUMMARY BY COMMENT AREA OF STUDENTS' OPEN COMMENTS
ON INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION

General Response Category	Number of Responses	Percent of Total Student Responses
Valuable because allows self-pacing.	114	22
Teaches responsibility, independence.	24	5
General comments indicating approval.	32	6
Valuable as allows flexibility.	21	4
Not enough instructor assistance--too many students.	18	3
Enhances learning--good learning atmosphere.	16	3
Not suitable for everyone or for all courses.	14	3
Structure is missing yet needed.	13	3
Not enough discussion time.	7	1
Allows more time with instructor.	7	1
Eliminates unwanted competition.	4	1
Miscellaneous comments, blank.	249	48
Totals	n=519	100

TABLE 38

STAFF OPEN COMMENTS ON
INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION

Please include any comments you wish to make regarding Individualized Instruction as you have experienced it.

Don't force it down students and faculty throats (one department chairman is). Use it where instructors want and can deal with it. We all are different and hence one way is not right or best for all. Lets offer alternative approaches and a mixture, so that people get variety and maintain interest. Finding out student, employer needs, interest, and concerns are important. I would suggest that questions be developed and directed to potential/past employers of our students - to see how they react. This approach via researching students/staff is a good way. Specialist/consultants should be available to help start and maintain programs so that each new one doesn't have to start from the beginning. This has been the case here to date: The best staff working with students but poorly-developed materials will turn off both. Our Math materials are great-some others are "way out" and on amateur level - not professional.

It is the only viable approach to education in most Vocational-Technical programs.

Motivation of slow learner real problem.

In the trade and industry of VTI, we like to refer to individualized instruction and open ending as flexible education. We have many individualized and open-ended programs and probably no two of them are structured alike. The important thing to remember when contemplating flexibility is that: What your staff feels is workable will be successful. If the staff is forced to individualize and open end your chances of failure are greatly increased.

The biggest drawbacks that I have observed concerning the students is their unwillingness to read. They won't fully read instructions, then go off on a tangent because of it. They will not read assignments - texts - references - merely peruse them. They are not reading oriented and do not know how to use resources. As a consequence, they make demands on the teacher for the most rudimentary things and look for answers from the teacher for things very thoroughly covered in the text of resources.

Students are responsible for their own performance. However, their potential success is closely related to the instructor's interest and follow-through of attendance and performance.

More instruction by teacher/student close contact.

TABLE 38 Continued

Only have received complaints in the Math area. Don't know why. Maybe poor materials or doesn't lend itself to individualization. No complaints from any other individualized area of instruction.

Don't knock it if you have not tried it - it works.

In my classes, there are very few students who wish to proceed in individualized instruction. They want to proceed through group work.

There are more factors involved in student withdrawal than any method of instruction.

All teachers in department must be involved in Individualized Instruction from very beginning to teaching. Individualized instruction succeeds best when all teachers agree. Individualized instruction must allow for individual student differences as well as teacher differences.

Great way to handle post-secondary level students who come with varied backgrounds and mastery. The best method I've seen in 20 years!

Very hard to draw conclusions on the basis of the experience of MPTI. My answers are influenced by general knowledge about individualized instruction.

Most students will meet certain deadlines set by instructor. Few will push to finish early! But they have had very little knowledge of going with this method!

Students are responsible for their own performance. However, their potential success is closely related to the instructor's interest and follow-through of attendance and performance.

I am strongly in favor of it. Makes students read directions - no spoon feeding - creates more independence. Allows for individual differences - creates atmosphere of flexibility the instructor needs - enables the "Whole thing" to work.

Has been very successful in the Business Education area.

Each class different - need different focus. Lab work boring for instructor. Don't get to know students for depth. Work attitudes and other intangibles lost with lab. Number of students contact hours increased with lab.

Some students for the very first time in their academic careers, find success in the individualized instruction and this affects their motivation in such a positive manner it changes their entire outlook toward future materials and related learning.

Problems of control. Too much student "cheating" although some grades may be there, understanding may not. Control.

It might lack competition motive between students, but it allows people to attend school who otherwise might not, increased enrollment, and allows better student to move at their own pace.

79

TABLE 38 Continued

The use of the word "Individualized instruction" is not clear. Allowing students to work at their own pace is not the same as allowing them to choose what they will learn. I don't think the term "individualized instruction" can be used to mean one or the other or both all at the same time.	The good student will learn regardless of the type of instruction used. The average or below average student needs teacher direction. They have more questions and if the teacher is not available, they will become frustrated and give up. They also have a difficult time disciplining themselves to come into an open lab situation.

In addition to the questionnaire items associated with individualized instruction, questions were also posed in the interviews regarding the relationship between Open Entry/Open Exit and such possible measures of effectiveness as attrition rate, program enrollment, and program completion data. All programs/courses researched had shown enrollment increases. Despite increasing enrollments, however, several interviewees stated that the completion rates associated with Open Entry/Open Exit were definitely lower. Explanations offered were that Open Entry/Open Exit had facilitated "jobbing out" as students completed those blocks of instruction desired. Also, students in an Open Entry/Open Exit setting were much less hesitant to job-out before completion knowing they could quite easily re-enter the educational process.

Viewing attrition as an indicator of effectiveness, one school noted that the attrition rate in welding dropped from approximately 25 percent to 3 or 4 percent with the advent of the individualized lab. Another school observed that, in typing, attrition was running approximately the same as before the lab was established; an individualized accounting course at that same school and a Tech Math I course at another had experienced decreased attrition rates over a 1-2 year period.

Most respondents stated that they had not compared attrition rates under differing instructional modes; in general, they felt that because of the recentness of their moves to an Open Entry/Open Exit format, a comparison of attrition rates would not be meaningful unless done over a longer period of time. Several respondents felt that any attrition data would be meaningless. They felt that under the traditional mode, those who were motivated to "stick it out" until program completion were probably not the self-motivated learners; and under an Open Entry/Open Exit approach, those who would complete the entire program would be the self-motivated, high-achieving learner whereas that student who viewed program completion as simply 2 or 4 semesters of time in school would tend to be the dropout.

In reply to other interview questions relating individualized instruction to Open Entry/Open Exit, one observation by respondents did occur quite regularly, namely, that the reluctance of instructional staff to embrace individualized instruction could certainly be a formidable obstacle to achieving Open Entry/Open Exit. In no situation surveyed did that reluctance act to totally block movement toward Open Entry/Open Exit, but it was identified as a problem-causing factor in the establishment of most of the Open Entry/Open Exit programs and courses studied.

Additional respondent observations on individualized instruction (as it relates to Open Entry/Open Exit) included the following:

1. Achieving Open Entry/Open Exit without any individualized instruction would be very costly, but each and every course in the program does not have to be individualized. Non-individualized courses, however, have to be non-sequential and conducted within the time span corresponding to frequency of entry dates.

2. Changes made in instructional delivery systems to effect Open Entry/Open Exit will not decrease instructional costs, at least in the short run. Developmental costs are very high. For the areas of Home Economics, Trade and Industry, and Business, long term instructional costs (developmental costs included) should be lower with individualized instruction. For the General Education area, costs would be higher.

3. The pre- and co-emergence of an extremely strong instructional materials service is a necessary adjunct to movement toward instructional systems allowing Open Entry/Open Exit and appears as an important factor in instructor attitudes. However, because of the uniqueness that each system will eventually develop, it is not necessary nor desirable that "complete readiness" be accomplished beforehand. There is a constant need to revise and update materials, and ignoring this need is an ever present danger.

4. Logistics problems in lab type settings involving large, bulky items such as autos, tractors, appliances, equipment, etc., are relatively minor.

5. Where entire programs are individualized and Open Entry/Open Exit, student counselors should be assigned by program area and physically located in those areas.

6. Because of the additional record keeping and follow-up presently associated with individualized instruction, registrar's office costs can be expected to increase. If the individual department handles all or part of the additional record keeping, departmental costs will rise.

7. Negotiated work contracts sometimes do not allow an increase in the student/staff ratio in certain areas utilizing a lab setting. Likewise, contracts sometimes do not allow instructor contact with students from more than 1 or 2 courses in any one contact hour, reducing any possible savings to station utilization.

OBJECTIVE D - IDENTIFICATION OF SAMPLE MATERIALS AND ACTIVITIES

Curriculum Materials

Table 39 provides a listing of courses noted in the study that allow full or partial Open Entry/Open Exit and the sources of instructional materials for these courses. Also listed are the names of personnel who would be in a position to furnish sample curriculum materials and other details regarding these courses. The list does not purport to be totally inclusive of all Open Entry/Open Exit curriculum activities occurring at the schools shown.

TABLE 39

IDENTIFICATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS SOURCES AND ASSOCIATED PERSONNEL FOR OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT COURSES

Program/Course	School	Materials	Supervisor	Instructor
Home Economics				
Food Service	FVTI	self,	Bob Martin	Mary Davis
	MPTI	self, purchased	D. Rosenkranz	Ron Speirs
Trade & Industry				
Auto Body	FVTI	self, purchased	Jerry Wolf	Bob Smith
Auto Mechanics	FVTI	self, purchased	Jerry Wolf	Matt VanderVeelen
Truck Driving	FVTI	self, purchased	Jerry Wolf	Dale Kussrow
Industrial Drafting	FVTI	self	Jerry Wolf	Henry Roesler
Welding	Kirkwood	self	Jack Neuzil	Derrell Lockhart
General Education				
Tech. Math I	NCTI	MATC	Tom Kerkes	Dave Andrews
Building Construction & Surveying	NCTI	MATC, self	Tom Kerkes	Larry Korpela
Math - all areas	FVTI	MATC, self	Leigh Gisvold	
Tech Math I, II	WCTI	MATC, self	Shri Krishan	Don Nelson
Business Math	WCTI	self	Shri Krishan	
Industrial Math	WCTI	self	Shri Krish	
Communications - all areas	FVTI	self	Leigh Gisvold	Fred Timm
Psychology - all areas	FVTI	self	Leigh Gisvold	Neal Aronson
Business				
Accounting I	Dist. 1	Prentice Hall, Alex		Phillip Tremain
Accounting I, II, III	Kirkwood	Currie & Crane, Alex		Faye Giessner

TABLE 39 Continued

Program/Course	School	Materials	Supervisor	Instructor
Typing I & II	FVTI	Media System, self		Nancy Wittrock
Typing I, II, III	Kirkwood	self	Don Rath	
	NCTI	self	Don Zandi	Joe Zahringer
	Dist. 1	Media Systems		Ann Brehm & Helen Carroll
Typing I, II, III, professional	MPTI	Media Systems		J. Dreischmeier
	WCTI	Media Systems, Gregg self	Jim Eigenfeld	
Typing III & IV	FVTI	Gregg, self		Nancy Wittrock
Secretarial/Clerical Machines	NCTI	self	Don Zandi	Joe Zahringer
Specialized Office Equip.	WCTI	IBM, self	J. Eigenfeld	
Machine Calc.	Dist. 1	self	Jackie Gardner	
	MPTI	Media Systems, self		Gen Lyneis
	NCTI	Media Systems, self	Don Zandi	Joe Zahringer
Auto Elec. Calc.	FVTI	Media Systems		Nancy Wittrock
	WCTI	Southwestern, self	J. Eigenfeld	
Filing	FVTI	Southwestern, self		Nancy Wittrock
Office Procedures	FVTI	Gregg, self		Nancy Wittrock
Records Management	FVTI	Southwestern		Nancy Wittrock
	NCTI	Southwestern	Don Zandi	Joe Zahringer
Secretarial Procedures	FVTI	Gregg, self		Nancy Wittrock
Shorthand all	FVTI	Gregg, self		Nancy Wittrock
	WCTI	Gregg, self	J. Eigenfeld	
Machine Transcription-Medical	FVTI	Western Tape		
Machine Transcription	MPTI	Media Systems	Ron Koski	J. Dreischmeier
	FVTI	IBM		
Machine Transcription-Legal	FVTI	Gregg, Western Tape, self		Nancy Wittrock Nancy Wittrock

TABLE 39 Continued

Program/Course	School	Materials	Supervisor	Instructor
Card Punch	[illegible] I	Automated Inst.		Gen Lyneis
Mini Computer	MPTI	self		Gen Lyneis
Machine Operation Accounting	MPTI	self		Gen Lyneis
CETA - Business Skills	NCTI	self		Betty Battist

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion of Findings

Needs and Interests - The study appears successful in meeting its objectives in the area of researching the views and interests toward the Open Entry/Open Exit concept. The generalized highlights include:

1. Prospective students and students indicate they do have a need and interest in Open Entry/Open Exit, particularly if the approach can allow them to complete their studies early so they can seek employment sooner. However, both prospective students and students showed preferences for traditional entry and exit times.

2. Both students and staff feel that Open Entry/Open Exit is a viable, feasible, and beneficial approach that can be implemented in both associate degree and diploma programs, especially those involving skill are

3. Flexibility in matching job opportunities to job seeker and the possibility of lower educational costs were the features of Open Entry/Open Exit that appealed most to respondents in the Employer/Agency category. The study found this group as possessing the strongest positive feelings concerning the Open Entry/Open Exit concept.

Job Entry Performance Levels - The educational institution considering Open Entry/Open Exit and the necessary steps to attain it will most likely be considering the use of an individualized instruction delivery system. Implementing a successful move or change to such a delivery system would appear to be greatly facilitated by a critical review of the program and course objectives, and the relationship of those objectives to the program's job entry performance levels.

As the findings show, there are several methods being used of reaffirming what competencies a completer of a program/course should possess to be able to perform at job entry performance levels. The study did not show how valid these methods are in matching the learning objectives of the programs/courses to what the actual job entry performance levels are in the employment world.

Procedures - Student Time Management - Many variables appear to be operational when an institution determines procedures that will be used for student time management in an Open Entry/Open Exit setting. As noted in the Findings and Analysis Chapter, there were schools who had instituted their Open Entry/Open Exit efforts with a "loose" management policy in tune with a pure Open Entry/Open Exit concept. For many reasons such as control, students simply not attending, student procrastination, poor utilization of

facilities, demand for entry into programs, and reporting and attendance policies, procedures were eventually changed toward a more tightly managed system. Overall it appears that this study did not identify any one best approach to student time management. Instead, it simply noted what was being done and some of the weaknesses and strengths of existing procedures.

Procedures - Recording Student Progress - As with the topic of student time management, the study did not identify any one best approach for recording of student progress in an Open Entry/Open Exit setting. It did present several alternative sets of procedures with accompanying advantages and disadvantages.

In all cases of Wisconsin contacts made, all concerned and involved with reporting and recording of student progress were unanimous in their replies when asked about the factor that has the most bearing on their (or anyone considering Open Entry/Open Exit) reporting and recording system, namely, what are, or will be, the requirements or guidelines set out by the Wisconsin Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education. Likewise, there was unanimity in a desire for any forthcoming changes in requirements to be promulgated without delay so that the schools' management systems could be adjusted accordingly and planning activities be continued.

Instruction - While the attitudinal questions on individualized instruction, the question on the cost/benefit relationship, and the interview questions on attrition, instructional costs, and enrollment gave some insight into the "effectiveness of Open Entry/Open Exit...on a course by course" basis, it would appear that this objective was not completely met by the present study. Because of the inferential relationship between Open Entry/Open Exit and individualized instruction, satisfactory measurements of the effectiveness of alternative delivery systems (as the objective implies) will demand research pursuits far beyond those allowed by this study's parameters.

But such research would appear valuable. If, for instance, a school wishes to establish Open Entry/Open Exit as an alternative (or sole) approach to be used in a specific program, it will certainly be considering individualized instruction as the delivery system to be employed in total or in part. The school may well find sufficient instructional staff willing/anxious to effect the necessary changes in one instructional area (or part of a program) but what is to be done if natural evolution and development call for further movements to Open Entry/Open Exit and remaining staff is unwilling (or actually hostile) to make the necessary instructional changes?

Before such questions (and many others) can be addressed, the probable effectiveness of any delivery system under consideration should be established. First, effectiveness will have to be carefully defined, and that would appear to be the most difficult portion of the task. And obtaining agreement on that definition will be no less difficult. Some may equate effectiveness with program enrollment and completion--others with placement or performance on the job. Still others might say that the most important measure would be whether or not the product was a self-motivated learner. Though the area appears beset with difficult questions, it also appears that the answers to these questions are needed and valuable.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT

Based on the findings of this study, the following would appear to be valid considerations for those contemplating initiation or expansion of an Open Entry/Open Exit format:

1. There is evidence of a need by prospective students and present students for Open Entry/Open Exit. There is certainly evidence of interest; that interest, however, centers primarily on the possibility for early completion of a program/course with lesser emphasis on flexibility of entry and exiting.

2. Employers indicate very high support of the Open Entry/Open Exit concept as do personnel from such public agencies as CETA sponsors, Job Service, Community Action programs, etc. While most of this support centers around employment flexibility, some of the support stems from assumed savings in costs.

3. Skill areas, both diploma and associate degree, should be the areas first selected for Open Entry/Open Exit. Area with growing enrollment demands, including demands for services in enabling centers, appear as logical first choices.

4. Caution should be observed in selecting areas for Open Entry/Open Exit if program completion is considered important to that program's strength.

5. Job entry performance levels and accompanying competencies for each program under consideration should be revalidated using a new or recent task analysis. To save time and dollars, however, the recommended procedure would be to use, as much as possible, what has already been accomplished. Task analyses and competency lists for jobs that match many of Wisconsin VTAE programs have been compiled by other schools, colleges and universities, government agencies, and associations. Modifications of these, if necessary, and subsequent review and verification by local advisory committees would give a Technical Institute a sound base as it moves, then, to establish the learning objectives, learning paths, materials, etc., that accompany the instructional modes used to effect Open Entry/Open Exit.

6. Some type of formal communication network made up of all who have interests in the management system should be established. This might be an ad hoc committee with representatives from the areas of instruction, all areas of student services, as well as general administration including data processing.

7. Whether it be human nature or other reasons that deserve more research attention, it does appear that many students do need to have specific hours established when they will be in "class". Whether assigned or chosen, therefore, hours of contact should be definitely established.

8. The presence of a time clock may in itself be a factor in attendance management. Its product--the time card--is certainly a factor primarily in the work it involves and its use. Daily or weekly hand tabulating is effective, gives immediate data if attended to, but is very time consuming. Use of time cards readable directly by computer would obviously be an improvement but only if the feedback is not delayed. A 30-day clock and time card offers less frequent tabulating plus a record of recent attendance to the reviewing instructor. In-class procedures could be established to ensure such a review, e.g., any card not punched in could be reviewed by the instructor and/or held by him for next-session discussion with the student.

9. For in-class procedures involving reporting of student progress, a recommendation would be that some system of progress benchmarks or guidelines be established and made well known to each student. These would serve to keep the student informed as to whether he/she is progressing at a rate acceptable to all concerned.

10. Attitudes of students and staff who have had exposure to an individualized delivery system (used in conjunction with an Open Entry/Open Exit format) are favorable toward that type of system.

11. The many problems associated with adoption of an individualised delivery system appear to pose the greatest obstacle to achieving Open Entry/Open Exit. Instructional staff attitudes toward the delivery system and probable role changes must be considered as highly influential in determining eventual success.

12. On a long term basis, a favorable atmosphere and attitude of enthusiasm toward operations in the delivery system can be fostered by such actions as appropriate in-service activities, appropriate educational offerings for staff, faculty exchange or mission projects, media and other materials development.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

To assist in intelligent planning and decision-making in regard to Open Entry/Open Exit, further study appears wise and should be conducted in line with the following observations:

1. Except in the case of Prospective students, this study looked at the views and interests of those students and staff who possessed some degree of familiarity with Open Entry/Open Exit. It would appear appropriate, therefore, that further studies in this area also include respondents who have had little or no exposure to Open Entry/Open Exit so that the corresponding relationships may be compared.

2. Since the findings did show strong prospective student and present student interests and needs concerning Open Entry/Open Exit, as well as a possible relationship between Open Entry/Open Exit instructional modes and student aptitude, further study of the inter-relationships of these variables appears valuable.

3. Research into the feasibility and value of a cataloging of task analyses, competency lists, (and individualized instruction materials) should be considered for the Wisconsin VTAE System. Original emphasis could be placed on diploma programs common to all/most Districts. The benefits from the availability and use of such data would appear to extend far beyond the considerations of Open Entry/Open Exit.

4. In conjunction with consideration of other elements of a system based on competencies required for job entry, it is recommended that studies be made of alternative methods of evaluating competency attainment. Included in the methods to be studied would be the approach used in the MDTA system where students participate in the assessment and attainment levels for each competency are recorded and provided to the student as well as to prospective employers.

5. As suggested in the Discussion section on Instructional Delivery Systems, the entire area of alternate instructional systems contains many questions that will take much study and work to accurately answer. But, since this area seemed to pose many difficulties where Open Entry/Open Exit was being used, study in this area appears to be needed and valuable.

6. In the area of costs, this study's respondents pointed out some basic considerations that must be faced when the cost/benefits aspects of Open Entry/Open Exit are being studied. These considerations such as attaining increased facility/station usage, developmental and on-going instructional costs, complete record keeping costs, and other cost aspects will have to be more closely studied, and studied, of course, in relationship to the possible benefits that Open Entry/Open Exit can provide.

7. Additional recent implementations of Open Entry/Open Exit should be sought out and studied as field tests of the entire concept and its many sub-systems. Such testing, in conjunction with this study and others, should provide a decision-making model that would have widespread applicability and value.

APPENDI

APPENDIX A

PROSPECTIVE STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

OPEN ENTRY/OPEN EXIT RESEARCH PROJECT

Sponsored by the Wisconsin Board of Vocational-Technical & Adult Education

NAME _____ AGE ___Under 21
_____21-25
_____over 25

MARITAL STATUS: _____ ___Single _____Married

NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS: _____

SEX: _____Male _____Female ARE YOU A VETERAN? _____Yes _____No

DEFINITION: A course or program is to be considered Open Entry/Open Exit if it fits into any of the following categories:

1. Allows a student to enter school at times other than the typical beginning of the school semester (for example, student enrollment could take place weekly or monthly).

OR:

2. Allows a student to earn his/her grade, rating, diploma, or degree and leave the course or program whenever all coursework has been completed.

3. Both of the above

1. With this definition in mind, to what extent do you feel Open Entry/Open Exit programs would be beneficial to students entering your district Technical Institute?
CHECK ONE ANSWER ON LINE PROVIDED

Extremely beneficial (1)	Highly beneficial (2)	Beneficial (3)	Some benefits (4)	No benefits (5)
___	___	___	___	___

2. Please comment on your answer to the previous question.

3. From the student's viewpoint, what do you feel is the most important reason for having an Open Entry/Open Exit (see definition above) approach at your district Technical Institute?
CIRCLE ONE LETTER:

a. Those seeking entry into school can enter more easily, with minimum waiting.
b. Instruction is usually individualized when the program is Open Entry/Open Exit.
c. The student is able to complete a program in less time and seek work sooner.
d. From the student's viewpoint, there are no important reasons for Open Entry/Open Exit.
e. Other (specify)_____