DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 262 742 HE 018 835

AUTHOR

Wright, Douglas A.

TITLE INSTITUTION Many College Freshmen Take Remedial Courses. National Center for Education Statistics (ED),

Washington, DC.

REPORT NO

NCES-85-211b

PUB DATE

Sep 85 16p.

NOTE PUB TYPE

Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE DESCRIPTORS MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

Academic Advising; Admission Criteria; *College Freshmen; Credit Courses; Educational Diagnosis; *Enrollment Trends; Higher Education; *High Risk Students; Learning Laboratories; Noncredit Courses; Private Colleges; *Program Effectiveness; Program

Evaluation; *Remedial Instruction; Remedial Mathematics; Remedial Reading; State Colleges; Tutoring; Two Year Colleges; Writing Instruction

ABSTRACT

The enrollment of collage freshmen in remedial courses was studied by the National Center for Education Statistics through its Fast Response Survey System. Also assessed were types of remedial support services, type of credit and requirement status, program evaluation and retention, and remedial course offerings. In 1983-1984, 25 percent of all college freshmen took one or more courses in remedial mathematics, 21 percent took remedial writing, and 16 percent took remedial reading. At least one course in math, reading, or writing was offered by 82 percent of schools. More offered remedial courses in writing and math than in reading. Overall, public, two-year, and open admission colleges were more likely to offer remedial courses than other colleges. Twenty-seven percent of freshmen enrolled in remedial courses at public colleges, compared to 15 percent at private colleges. At two-year colleges, 28 percent of freshmen enrolled, compared to 19 percent at four-year colleges. Ninety percent of institutions offered remedial support services such as diagnosis, learning assistance labs, tutoring, and counseling. About 70 percent of schools did not award credit for any remedial courses. Most schools offering remedial programs required students not meeting institutional standards to take remedial courses. (SW)



Office of the Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- [] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

September 1985

Contact: Douglas A. Wright (202) 254-7230

Many College Freshmen Take Remedial Courses

Many college freshmen are taking remedial courses as part of their standard workload, according to a recent survey by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) through its Fast Response Survey System. In 1983-84, 25 percent of all college freshmen took one or more courses in remedial mathematics. Almost as many (21 percent) took remedial writing, while 16 percent took remedial reading. 2

Course Offerings

The need for remedial education is reflected in the number of colleges and universities offering such help. In 1983-84, 82 percent of all institutions offered at least one course in math, reading, or writing. More offered remedial courses in writing (73 percent) and math (71 percent) than in reading (66 percent) (table 1). Overall, public, 2-year, and open admission colleges³ were more likely to offer remedial courses than other colleges. For example, 87 percent of public institutions offered remedial reading, as compared to 44 percent of private institutions. In general, estimates for public, 2-year, and open admission categories tend to be similar because over half of all institutions simultaneously fit these three categories.

In 1983-84, colleges typically offered only one or two separate remedial courses in a given subject. On the average, about two courses were offered in remedial writing, reading, and math. Only about 10 percent of colleges offered four or more courses in a remedial subject. Public, 2-year, and open admission schools on the average offered about one more course in each subject than did private, 4-year, and selective schools.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NCES 85-211b



-018 P3\$

Enrollment

According to college officials surveyed, remedial course enrollment increased considerably between 1978 and 1984. In fact, 63 percent of the estimated 2,300 schools offering remedial courses in 1984 reported enrollment increases of 10 percent or more since 1978. Some of these increases were large--30 percent or more in 19 percent of the schools with remedial courses (not shown in tables). The increases were greatest for 2-year, public, and open schools (table 2). Only 4 percent reported a decline of 10 percent or more and 33 percent reported no significant change.

Current enrollment in remedial courses followed a similar pattern. In remedial math courses, for example (table 2):

- 27 percent of freshmen enrolled in public colleges and 15 percent in private colleges;
- 28 percent of freshmen enrolled in 2-year colleges and 19 percent in 4-year colleges;
- 30 percent of freshmen enrolled in open colleges and 13 percent in selective and traditional admission colleges.

The predominant role of public, 2-year, and open admission colleges in remedial education is evident. Their role is further underlined in a comparison of all freshmen with those enrolled in remedial courses. Public institutions, for example, enrolled 85 percent of all freshmen and even more (about 90 percent) of remedial course freshmen. Similarly, 2-year and open admission colleges enrolled slightly less than two-thirds of all freshmen but almost three-quarters of the remedial course freshmen.

As noted earlier, 16 to 25 percent of college freshmen took one of the three basic remedial courses. However, remedial coursework represented only 5 percent of the total freshman courseload (table 3). One explanation for this is that freshmen taking remedial courses also take nonremedial courses.

Selected Characteristics of Remedial Programs

In addition to courses in basic skill areas, most schools (90 percent) usually offer remedial support services such as diagnosis, learning assistance labs, tutoring, and counseling. Overall, 33 percent of schools reported having a separate department or division devoted to remedial/developmental studies. Departments were more likely to be present in public (47 percent), 2-year (43 percent), and open admission (46 percent) colleges and universities (table 4).

Some schools (24 percent) reported having a special pre-admission summer program. An average of 8 percent of their students enrolled in such programs (not shown in tables). Unlike regular remedial courses, pre-admission summer programs were available more frequently at 4-year, traditional, and selective schools than at 2-year and open admission schools. About onethird of traditional and selective schools had such programs.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE TO THE

While remedial courses are most frequently offered in the basic skill areas of reading, writing, and math, 58 percent of the schools offered additional remedial courses in student development. Furthermore, 21 percent offered remedial courses in academic areas other than reading, writing, or math (table 4). Schools offering these alternatives averaged about three for each (2.9 for student development and 2.8 of other academic subjects) (not shown in tables).

Type of Credit and Requirement Status

An issue of much discussion in planning remedial programs concerns whether or not college credit should be awarded. Some researchers have found that remedial courses for credit are more successful because they increase a student's motivation. Others have viewed granting credit as a lowering of college standards.

About 70 percent of schools do not award degree credit for any remedial courses (table 5). About 53 percent award institutional credit, which counts in determining enrollment status and is part of a student's record, but does not count toward degree or certificate completion. Using writing as an example, 53 percent reported awarding institutional credit, 25 percent elective degree credit, 6 percent subject degree credit, and 16 percent awarded no formal credit. Statistics were very similar for reading and math. Colleges with larger remedial enrollments awarded degree credit less often than those with smaller enrollments. Public and 2-year institutions (and to a lesser extent institutions with open admissions) offered such credit less often than other institutions.

In the majority of schools offering remedial programs, students not meeting institutional standards were required to take remedial courses. Sixty-four percent of these schools required remedial writing, 59 percent remedial math, and 51 percent remedial reading. A larger percent of private and 4-year schools required remedial courses than public and 2-year schools (table 5).

Program Evaluation and Retention Data

Schools with remedial programs were asked to evaluate the success or effectiveness of several aspects of their programs on a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high). Ratings were obtained in each of four areas: courses, support services, organization and policy, and outcome for remedial students.

Most respondents rated their programs moderately high, with an overall average of 3.8 (not shown in tables). Highest ratings were given to teacher attitude, teacher training, and curriculum content and structure, each with an average of 4 or higher (table 6). Lowest ratings were given to program evaluation, degree completion rate, and breadth of course offerings. Thirty percent of respondents rated program evaluation below-average (1 or 2) and 19 percent rated degree completion below-average (not shown in tables).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



Respondents were further asked what percentage of their students completed remedial courses and how many stayed in college to the second year. Results showed 74 percent successfully completed remedial reading courses, 71 percent remedial writing, and 68 percent remedial math (table 7). Retention rates were somewhat lower. Overall, students taking one or more remedial courses were retained at only a slightly lower rate than all freshmen (table 7). In schools keeping records, 64 percent of all freshmen were retained, and 60 percent of students taking one or more remedial courses were retained. Schools not keeping records estimated a 57 percent retention rate for all freshmen and 52 percent for remedial students. Overall, 65 percent of all freshmen and 58 percent of remedial freshmen were retained to the second year.

Survey Background

This survey was performed under contract with Westat, Inc., using the Fast Response Survey System (FRSS). FRSS was established by NCES to collect small quantities of data needed for education planning and policy formation, quickly and with a minimum burden on respondents.

In August 1984, questionnaires were mailed to a stratified national probability sample of 51l institutions of higher education, representing a universe of 3,238 colleges and universities. The survey form (see appendix) was completed by the person designated by the college or university president as most familiar with the program. The response rate for the survey was 96 percent. Responses were adjusted for nonresponse and weighted to national totals. All statements of comparison made in the text are significant at the 90 percent confidence level or better. Standard errors for selected items are presented in table 8 as a general guide to the precision of the numbers in the tables. A subsequent report will present further information on the results of the survey.

For More Information

For information about this survey or the Fast Response Survey System, contact Douglas Wright, National Center for Education Statistics, 1200 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20208-1628, telephone (202) 254-7230. For single copies of this bulletin, contact the Statistical Information Office at the same address or telephone (202) 254-6057.



-4-

Notes

- The term "remedial" is used to refer to any course or program designed for students lacking the skills necessary to perform college-level work as required by the institution. Other terms for these courses include "compensatory," "basic skills," or "developmental."
- Since the survey did not record the overlap between remedial subjects—that is, the number of students taking courses in one subject who also took courses in at least one other—the total taking remedial subjects is unknown. Depending on the extent of multiple enrollment in such subjects, the proportion of freshmen taking courses in one or more of these subjects may range anywhere from 25 to 62 percent. The upper limit of 62 percent was obtained by adding the percentages for each of the three subjects as if there were no overlap, and probably overstates the true percentage significantly, since students who take courses in one remedial subject are likely to take courses in another.
- Colleges were classified based on the selectivity of their admission criteria according to the Chronicle Four-Year College Databook, 1984, published by Chronicle Guidance Publications Inc., Moravia, New York. The classifications are defined by the Chronicle Data Books as follows: open schools accept all high school graduates; liberal schools accept some students from the lower half of the high school class; traditional schools accept all students from the top half of the class; and selective schools prefer students in the top 25 percent.
- Includes courses in such topics as career planning, decisionmaking, and some study skills.
- Suanne Roueche, "Elements of program success: Report of a national study." In J. Roueche (ed.), A New Look at Successful Programs (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1983).
- The retention rate measures the extent to which remedial students are able to successfully complete coursework and remain within the college or university. Colleges were asked the percentages of all freshmen and remedial freshmen retained in school at the start of their second year, i.e., students who were both eligible for the second year and who enrolled.

Retention information is difficult to obtain. Sixty-three percent of colleges reported they kept records on the percent of total freshmen retained to the second year, but only 35 percent reported they kept separate records on the percent of remedial students retained. Retention records were more frequently kept by 4-year than 2-year schools. Because 2-year schools have a large percent of part-time students, retention information is difficult to collect and interpret.



Of the total sample, 27 schools were determined to be out of scope because they did not have freshmen students and 2 were closed. The weighted total of schools from the sample is thus 2,785, somewhat lower than the universe file of 3,238.



Table 1.--Institutions of higher education offering remedial courses, and average number of courses offered in remedial reading, writing, and math, by control, type of institution, and admission criteria: United States, 1983-84

		Inst	A					
Institutional	Number with		ercent off more remed	Average number of courses offered				
characteristic	freshmen	Reading, writing, or math	Reading	Writing	Math	Reading	Writing	Meth
All institutions	2,785	82	66	73	71	1.9	1.8	2.0
Control								
Public	1,419 1,366	94 70	87 44	89 56	88 53	2.2 1.3	2.1 1.3	2.5 1.3
ype of institution								
2-year	1,295 1,490	88 78	80 53	78 69	82 61	2.2 1.5	2.2 1.4	2.5 1.5
dmission criteria								
Open	1,258 714 354 459	91 72 80 68	87 54 52 37	83 61 75 62	85 64 65 48	2.2 1.5 1.4 1.5	2.1 1.5 1.3 1.5	2.5 1.5 1.4 1.6

Table 2.--Change in enrollment since 1978, and percent of freshmen enrolled in remedial reading, writing, and math courses, by control, type of institution, and admission criteria: United States, 1983-84

		Enrollment	Freshmen enrolled in remedial courses*				
Institutional characteristic	Total 10 percent Stayed about 10 per		Decreased 10 percent or more	Reading	Writing	Meth	
		Percenta	<u> </u>	Percent			
All institutions	10 0	63	33	4	16	21	25
Control							
Public	100 100	70 54	26 42	5 4	18 9	22 12	27 15
Type of institution							
2-year	100 100	69 58	27 38	5 4	19 12	23 17	28 19
Admission criteria			,				
Open	100 100 100 100	72 57 54 48	24 39 39 48	4 4 7 4	20 14 9 6	24 17 13 14	30 18 13 13

^{*} These percentages exclude students enrolled in pre-admission summer programs.

NOTE.--Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

Table 3.--Students enrolled in remedial reading, writing, and math courses, and percent of freshmen remedial course hours, by control, type of institution and admission criteria: United States, 1983-84

	Number of		Percent o			
Institutional characteristic	freshmen (in millions)	Freshmen	Remedial reading students	Remedial writing students	Remedial math students	Percent of total freshmen remedial course hours*
All institutions	4.8	100	100	100	100	5.3
Control						
Public	4.1 .7	85 15	92 8	91 9	91 9	5.8 2.8
Type of institution						
2-year	3.0 1.8	63 37	73 27	70 30	71 29	6.1 4.2
Admission criteria						
Open	3.1 .7 .4 .5	65 16 9 10	77 13 5 4	74 13 6 7	78 12 5 6	6.6 4.2 2.8 3.0

^{*} Estimates based on sum of reported total number of hours taken in remedial reading, writing, and math as a percent of the total number of first-year, full-time-equivalent (FTE) students multiplied by 30 hours (assumed FTE hours).

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{NOTE}}.\text{---Details}$ may not add to totals because of rounding.



10

Table 4.--Institutions of higher education with remedial/development resources, by control, type of institution, and admission criteria: United States, 1983-84

Institutional	Number with	Percent with remedial/developmental resources									
characteristic	freshmen	Support services	Pre-admission summer programs	Department or division	Other acs- demic courses	Student devel- opment courses					
Ail institutions .	2,785	90	24	33	21	58					
Control											
Public	1,419 1,366	97 82	27 20	47 18	23 17	68 44					
Type of institution											
2-year	1,295 1,490	94 86	15 31	43 24	28 14	71 45					
Admission criteria											
Open	1,258 714 354 459	99 81 93 78	21 17 34 34	46 25 23 19	26 12 16 20	70 43 58 40					

Includes temedial courses in academic subjects other than reading, writing, or math (e.g., high school level science or social studies).

 $^{^2}$ Includes courses in such topics as career planning, decision-making, and some study skills.

Table 5.—Percent of institutions with certain credit offerings and requirement status for remedial courses in reading, w. ling, and math, by control, type of institution, and admission criteria: United States 1983—84

	Institutional characteristic										
Course characteristic	All	Con	trol	Тур	e		Admis	sion criteria			
	institutions	Public	Private	2-year	4-year	Open	Liberal	Traditional	Selective		
Type of credit	_			-			<u> </u>	-1 <i>.</i>			
Reading											
No formal credit	18 54 25 4	13 61 23 3	27 39 28 7	19 57 23 1	16 50 26 8	17 58 22 4	11 54 29 7	14 37 46 4	42 45 10 2		
Writing											
No formal credit	16 53 25 6	13 62 21 4	22 40 30 8	12 62 23 3	20 45 26 9	12 62 21 5	5 60 29 6	22 33 36 9	44 32 20 4		
Math											
No formal credit	19 52 23 6	15 60 20 5	27 38 28 8	19 57 20 4	21 45 27 8	16 57 21 7	16 57 24 3	34 26 31 9	27 43 25 5		
Requirement status											
Reading											
Mandatory	51 49	46 54	61 39	45 55	59 V1	46 54	71 29 -	47 53	46 54		
driting											
Mandatory	64 36	58 42	74 26	54 46	73 27	56 44	79 21	60 40	75 25		
Ma th											
Mandatory	59 41	54 46	68 32	52 48	67 33	53 47	75 25	63 37	51 49		

NOTE.--Percents may not add to 100 because of rounding.



Table 6.--Average ratings of remedial program aspects services, by control, type of institution, and admission criteria: United States, 1983-84

		Institutional characteristic										
Program aspect/service*	All Control		Ту	pe	Admission criteria							
	institutions	Public	Private	2-year	4-year	Open	Liberal	Traditional	Selective			
Course-related				•					L			
Teacher motivation/attitude Teacher training/experience Curriculum content/structure . Breadth of offerings	4.2 4.0 4.0 3.4	4.1 3.9 4.0 3.6	4.2 4.1 3.9 3.2	4.1 4.0 4.0 3.6	4.2 4.1 3.9 3.3	4.1 4.0 4.0 3.6	4.2 4.0 4.0 3.5	4.3 4.0 4.0 3.5	4.1 4.0 3.8 3.0			
Support services												
Training labs	3.9 3.8 3.8 3.8 3.6	3.9 3.8 3.6 3.7 3.6	3.8 3.9 4.1 3.9 3.7	3.9 3.8 3.0 3.8 3.6	3.9 3.8 3.9 3.8 3.6	3.9 3.8 3.7 3.8 3.6	4.0 3.9 3.8 3.9 3.7	4.1 3.8 4.0 3.8 3.6	3.7 3.7 4.0 3.7 3.6			
Organization and policy												
Placement policy Program coordination Program evaluation	3.8 3.6 3.1	3.7 3.6 3.0	3.9 3.6 3.3	3.7 3.6 3.1	3.9 3.6 3.2	3.7 3.6 3.0	3.9 3.6 3.3	4.0 3.6 3.4	3.6 3.4 3.0			
Outcome for remedial students												
Remedial course completion Overall program success Increased skill level Improved self-concept Degree completion rate	3.9 3.7 3.6 3.6 3.2	3.6 3.6 3.5 3.5	4.0 3.8 3.7 3.6 3.3	3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.0	3.9 3.7 3.7 3.6 3.3	3.6 3.7 3.6 3.5 3.0	3.7 3.8 3.6 3.5 3.1	4.1 3.7 3.8 3.6 3.4	4.1 3.7 3.7 3.8 3.6			

^{*} Respondents rated the effectiveness of their own activities on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = low, 5 = high).



Table 7.--Percent of students completing remedial courses, percent of schools keeping records of retention to the second year, and percent of all freshmen and remedial freshmen retained to the second year, by control, type of institution, and admission criteria: United States, 1983-84

		ercent of			chools keeping retention to	Р	Percent reported retained to second year					
Institutional characteristic	students completing remedial course				year for	To	tal freshmen	Remedial freshmen				
	Reading	Writing	Meth	All freshmen	Freshmen taking one or more remedial course	keeping	Schools not keeping records (estimates given)	keeping	Schools not keeping records (estimates given)			
All institutions	74	71	68	63	35	64	57	60	52			
Control												
Public	73 85	70 82	67 81	50 75	28 42	62 70	56 74	58 70	51 60			
Type of institution												
2-year	71 80	68 77	68 69	47 76	26 43	55 71	54 66	55 66	49 60			
Admission criteria												
Open	71 78 87 85	68 73 83 83	67 69 75 76	44 75 77 81	23 44 44 47	56 65 70 79	54 60 72 83	55 63 64 76	49 54 64 72			

Table 8.--Standard errors of selected items

Item	Estimate	Standard error
Percent of institutions having:		
Remedial writing course, all institutions	73.0	1.7
Remedial math course, private institutions	53.1	2.6
Momedad mach course, private institutions	22.1	2.6
everage number of courses offered in remedial		
writing by private institutions	1.3	•04
ercent of public institutions in which remedial		
enrollment remained the same	25.7	1.6
ercent of freshmen students enrolled in:		
Remedial reading course, all institutions	44.6	4.0
Remedial reading course, all institutions	16.4	1.2
Remedial writing course, 2-year institutions	23.2	.9
Remedial writing course, 4-year institutions	16.7	2.2
Remedial writing course, traditional admission institutions	12.8	4.5
Remedial writing course, selective admission institutions	14.1	2.7
ercent of institutions having:		
Remedial pre-admission summer program, traditional		
admission institutions		7.0
	34.4	3.2
Remedial department or division, all institutions	32.9	2.3
Remedial courses in academic subjects other than		
reading, writing or math, all institutions	20.5	2.3
ercent of institutions awarding:		
Institutional credit for remedial writing, all institutions	53.5	2.2
No formal credit for remedial writing, traditional	77.7	2.2
admission institutions	47 6	
admission institutions	13.5	5.7
ercent of institutions in which courses are mandatory for:		
Remedial writing, all institutions	64.0	2.9
Remedial reading, liberal admission institutions	70.5	5.1
verage rating on a scale of 1 to 5:		
Remedial curriculum, all institutions	4.0	.04
Overall remedial program success, all institutions	3.7	
Demodia announce completion / ween intallutions		.03
Remedial course completion, 4-year institutions	3.9	.05
verage percent of remedial freshmen retained to second year	57 .6	5.9
verage percent of all freshmen retained to second year	6 5.1	7.0

NOTE.--Statistics used in this report are subject to sampling variability. The estimated standard error of a statistic (a measure of the variation due to sampling) can be used to examine the precision obtained in a particular sample. If all possible samples were surveyed under similar conditions, intervals of 1.645 standard errors below to 1.645 standard errors above a particular statistic would include the average result of these samples in approximately 90 percent of the cases. For example, for the first item in the table (percent of institutions having remedial writing courses), a 90 percent confidence interval is from 69.9 to 76.1 (73.0 + 1.645 times 1.7). If this procedure were followed for every possible sample, about 90 percent of the intervals would include the average from all possible samples.

PAST RESPONSE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS MASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

Perm spprovsd CMB No. 1850-0550 App. Exp. 10/84

SURVEY OF REMEDIAL/DEVELOPMENTAL ST IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

This report is authorized by law (20 U.S.C. 1221e-1). While you are not required to respond, your coeperation is needed to make the results of this survey comprehensive, accurate, and timely.

Definition of Remedial/Developmental Studies for Furposes of this Study: Program, course, or other activity (usually in the area of reading, writing, or math! for students lacking those skills necessary to perform college level work at the level required by your institution. Throughout this questionmenter these activities are referred to as "remedial/developmental;" however, your institution may use other names such as "compensatory," "hasic exilis," or some other term. Please answer the survey for any activities meeting the definition above, regardless of name; however, do not include English as a second lenguage when taught primarily to foreign students. Pleass enswer for your reguler undergreduete programs. If exect dets are not evailable, give your best estimate. Check which of the following remedial/developmental activities/structures are present at your institution. A. Special pre-edmission/enrollment summer | | | C. Support activities (e.g., counseling, tutoring) | | | | program (e.g., Upward Bound, atc.) B. Acedemic year and/or summer course(s) D. Remedisl department or division If your institution has no courses, support activities, or summer programs, skip to $\underline{\text{Question 7}}$; if you have support activities only, skip to $\underline{\text{Question 5}}$. Enter information requested in Ports A-G for remedial/developmental courses in each subject eres listed for academic year 1983-4, including summer courses. For these subjects in which you have no remedial courses, enter "0" in Part A and answer only Port E. Math λ. Number of separate courses (Do not count courses repeated in more than one semester or multiple sections of the same course more than once). Most frequent type of credit (enter one): 1=No formal credit 2=Institutional credit, does not meet subject or graduation 3=Degree credit, elective only 4=Degree credit, meete subject requirements. C. Most frequent type of requirement etetus (enter one): l=Mandetory; 2=Voluntery Approximate total remedial/developmental undergraduate course hours in subject in 1983-4 (e.g., 30 students take e 3 hour course and 20 take e 2 hour course = 130 hours remedial math). Estimated percent of entering freehmen needing one or more remedial Courses. Satimated percent of antering freeheen who <u>enrolled</u> in one or more remedial courses (Give unduplicated count of atudents within G. Average percent of students passing or successfully <u>completing</u> the remedial course(s). 3. About what percent of entering freehmen participate in a special pre-admission/enrellment summer program (e.g., Upward Bound, etc.)? Overell, has remedial course enrellment since 1978: Increased |_|; Decreased |_|; Stayed about the same |_|? If enrollment has increased or decreased, indicate approximate percent of change: 10 to 30 percent |__|; 31 to 50 percent |__|: 51 percent or mere |__|. 5. On 8 scale of 1-5 (1=10w. 5=high), rate the success or effectiveness of each, of the following especia/services of your remedial/developmental program. If you do not have 8 given service, enter "N" for "Not Provided", Remedial Course Related C. Remedial Organisation/Policy 1. Breadth of offeringe 1. Placement policy appropriate to student needs..... 2. Curriculum content/etructure . 3. Tescher/training experience .. ___ 2. Coordination of remedial programs 4. Teacher motivation/attitude .. _ 3. Progrem evaluation/follow-up Remedial Support Services Rating D. Outcome for Remedial Students 1. Diagnosis 1. Skill level incresse 2. Counseling 2. Self concept imprevement 3. Remedial course completion rate_ 4. Learning sseistence labe (e.g., reading or writing labe) 4. Degree/certificate completion rate 5. Oversl1 support services _ 5. Overell program success In addition to those courses listed in Question 2, does your institution offer remedial/developmental courses
in: Academic subjects other than basic skills (e.g., science, business)? Yes | 1 | 1 No | 1 | 1 yes, number of these courses offered in 1983-4 B. Student development (e.g., human potential, career planning)? Yes | 1 to []. If yes, number of these courses offered in 1983-4 Indicate whether records have been kept by your institution over the lest 2 to 3 years for the items listed. If yes, enter information; if ne, places give your best estimate. Average percent of entering freehmen retained by east of escond year: Records kept: Yes |___| No |___|; Percent retained Average percent of entering freshmen who have taken one or more remedial courses retained by start of second year: Records kept: Yes | | No | | | | | Percent retained | Courses.) _t. Enter "N" if you have no remedial Person completing this form: Name_ Phone (



NCES Porm No. 2379-20, 8/84