DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 017   CE 047 785

AUTHOR   Hale, Charles
TITLE   Continuing Education Program Analysis Guide.
PUB DATE   11 Dec 86
NOTE   57p.
PUB TYPE   Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Information
                 Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *Continuing Education; Delivery Systems; Enrollment
                 Influences; *Higher Education; Literature Reviews;
                 Needs Assessment; Organization; *Participant
                 Characteristics; *Program Evaluation; Program Guides;
                 *Role of Education

ABSTRACT
                 This literature review on continuing education and on
continuing education organizational structure begins with a
discussion of the participants. Participant demographics, reasons for
enrollment, and deterrents to participation are considered. The role
of higher education in continuing education is described in terms of
the role of the community college and the four-year college and
university. A section on structuring continuing education covers
curricular planning and assessment, curricular design and delivery,
curricular areas and requirements, program finance (credit programs,
noncredit programs, assessing productivity), program organization
(administration, student matriculation, admissions, support
services), evaluation, and accreditation. An appendix contains the
program analysis guide based on the review of the literature.
Sections of this assessment instrument pertain to documenting the
support and necessity for a continuing education program, program
finance and administration, academic governance, and evaluation
(program, faculty, student). (YLB)

Continuing Education

Program Analysis

Guide

By:

Charles Hale, Ed.S., C.H.E.
Doctoral Candidate
University of Florida
Department of Educational Leadership
College of Education

Dr. A. Smith

Seminar: Higher Education Curriculum

11 December 1986

2

Table of Contents

Continuing Education

Program Analysis

1

4

INTRODUCTION

Strother and Klus (1982) have writt..... "....y's educational systems are being extended: beyond the traditio.al period of formal education; into adult life, wor...g life, public service, and society at large;... Neither age, locale, no... occupation set limits" (p. xiv). Strother and Klus (1982) went on to label this process of extending education as "continuing education." The results of a study conducted by Wagner (1982) would indicate that continuing education is "big business among America's two year colleges, four year schools, and universities." Wagner (1982) stated that 22,650,000 adult Americans participated in postcompulsory education in 1980. He also reported that continuing education programs carried on by American higher education accounted for 30.4 percent of all postcompulsory education and training conducted in the U.S. in 1980. See Table 1.

Table 1
Postcompulsory Education and Training
in the U.S., 1980 by Two and Four Year Schools

Four Year Schools[a]	Number (1000s)	Percent of Total
Full time	7,900	10.6
Part-time	3,500	4.7
Noncredit	3,100	4.2
Two Year Schools[b]		
Full time	2,000	2.7
Part-time	2,700	3.6
Noncredit	3,450	4.6

[a] Includes universities
[b] Excludes proprietary schools

Source: Wagner, A. P. (1982). Postcompulsory education and training: An inventory of programs and sources of support. Education and Urban Society, 14 (3), 271-300.

2

To facilitate our discussion of continuing education some common definitions have been proposed. Strother and Klus (1982) defined continuing education as, "organized instruction for part-time students" (p. xv). Currently, continuing education takes two forms, credit and noncredit. For the purposes of this paper, credit continuing education is defined as "organized instruction which may or may not lead to the earning of a formal college certificate or degree but for which semester hours or credits are awarded." Noncredit continuing education is defined as "organized instruction which when completed does not lead to the awarding of a formal college certificate or degree and for which no semester hours or credits are awarded." Accepting these operational definitions, this paper will consider (1) who participates in continuing education programs; (2) the role of higher education in continuing education; and (3) organizational structures for the delivery of continuing education services.

Who Participates in Continuing Education?

In this section we will consider (1) participant demo-
graphics, (2) reasons for enrollment, and (3) deterrents to
participation. Credit programs will be considered separately
from noncredit programs, where appropriate.

Participant Demographics

Credit Continuing Education

Wagner (1982) found that 77 percent of participants were
between 25 and 54 years of age in credit continuing education
programs offered by four year colleges or universities while 71
percent of participants were within the same age cohort in two
year college programs. In terms of race and ethnic origin, most
participants were white and were in the upper middle to highest
income quartile. Two year colleges tended to enroll more lower
income participants than four year schools. In terms of gender,
females "out-enrolled" males in credit continuing education
programs operated by two year schools by 1.7 to 1. Four year
schools enrolled about 10 percent more females than males. See
Table 2.

4

7

Table 2
Credit Continuing Education
Participant Characteristics

School Type	Characteristics Age in Years				
	17-24	25-34	35-54	55-64	65+
Four Year	17	47	30	5	1
Two Year	22	35	36	6	1

	Race and Ethnic Origin			
	White	Black	Hispanic	Other
Four Year	91	5	2	2
Two Year	89	5	4	2

	Income Quartile			
	Lower	Lower Middle	Upper Middle	Highest
Four Year	7	24	34	33
Two Year	12	29	32	27

	Gender	
	Male	Female
Four Year	45	55
Two Year	37	63

Source: Wagner, A. P. (1982). Postcompulsory education and
training. An inventory of programs and sources of support.
Education and Urban Society, 14 (3), 271-300.

Noncredit Continuing Education

In a study of 4,631 community services students from six
Florida community colleges, Nickens (1977) reported the demo-
graphic summary found in Table 3. The participants in Nickens'
(1977) study were largely white, between 25 and 54 years of age,
female, and married. A study by Welton (1983), found similar
demographic patterns except for age. Welton's sample was
somewhat younger than Nickens'.

Table 3
Noncredit Continuing Education Student Profile

Age	%		Marital Status	%
<18	4.3		Single	21.6
19-21	5.3		Married	63.9
22-24	9.9		Divorced	9.1
25-34	30.7		Separated	1.8
35-44	18.4		Widowed	3.6
45-54	15.1			
55-64	10.1		Sex	
65+	5.5			
			Female	59.6
Race			Male	40.4
White	86.5			
Black	4.0			
Other	9.5			

Source: Nickens, J. M. (1977). Who takes community service courses and why. Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, 2 (1), 11-19.

When comparing both credit and noncredit continuing education students, it appears that there are few significant demographic differences, at least as a function of these three studies.

Reasons for Enrollment

Credit Continuing Education

Strother and Klus (1982) described the standard external degrees as "traditional degrees - associate, bachelor's, master's and doctor's - but are designed for part-time students." Modes of earning credits include: credit by examination, tutorials, self-paced learning, transfer credits, experiential learning, and learning contracts (Strother & Klus, 1982). Students enrolled in degree granting programs are most likely motivated by the economic prospects associated with the degree sought. However, this may not be the case with the able elderly as Bass (1986)

6

points out. Bass has developed a typology of education offerings
to older adults which included an education program that
"[provided] specialized career training in professional roles for
the older person desiring to re-enter the primary, secondary, or
voluntary labor market." Bass (1986) went on to describe a
program operated by the University of Massachusetts/Boston where
elders participated in a career certificate program within the
undergraduate program.

Noncredit Continuing Education

Noncredit continuing education programs may award a certifi-
cate of completion as opposed to a formal degree. Nondegree
curricula may employ a short-course format which might require a
residential period or a part-time study format. The part-time
study format offers a student the option of taking either a
single course or several for personal or vocational development.
There is little standardization requirements leading to the award
of certificates of completion save where programs are linked to
the licensing requirements of a government agency or professional
association (Strother and Klus, 1982).

Welton (1983) studied the motivation of 621 subjects
who participated in credit and noncredit community education
activites. His subjects reported the following motivation
factors: (a) fun (89.2%), (b) fellowship (86.4%), (c) learning
something new (79.9%), (d) self-esteem (77.6%), (e) leisure
(74.9%), (f) hobby (69.9%), (g) physical fitness (68.3%), (h)
creativity (68.3%), (i) bored (64.1%), (j) health concerns

7

(54.6%), (k) physical competition (54.5%), (l) job (38.5%), and (m) college credit (18%). Nickens (1977) reported that his subjects' leading six motivational factors were: (a) improve chances for employment (42.1%), (b) further cultural or social development (38.7%), (c) learn a hobby (33.5%), (d) improve financial planning skills (28.7%), (e) improve consumer skills (21%), and (f) increase understanding of alternative lifestyles (20.5%).

The chief motivators for Welton's (1983) sample were recreational in nature while those for Nickens' (1977) sample were a combination of economic and recreational. The year 1977 was a year of economic hardship for many Americans which may explain the prominent role of economic motivation for Nicken's sample.

Deterrents to Participation

Scanlan and Darkenwald (1984) studied 750 allied health professionals and their continuing education patterns. Using a mailed survey questionnaire, Scanlan and Darkenwald obtained a return rate of 69.8 percent. Using factor analysis, the researchers found six categories of deterrents to participation. These deterrents were: (1) disengagement, (2) cost, (3) family constraints, (4) perception of benefit, (5) perception of quality, and (6) work constraints. Four of the deterrents to participation are clearly programming characteristics (i.e., lack of quality, cost, lack of benefit and work constraints). While the study cannot be generalized beyond the study population,

8

these data do suggest the types of barriers nonparticipants may encounter which prevent enrollment in continuing education programs.

Using a taxonomy developed by Nickens (1977), Willett (1982) classified the courses in which 427 noncredit continuing education students enrolled as follows:

Community and civic affairs	3%
Family life	27%
Leisure time and recreation	29%
Personal health	5%
Cultural	20%
General career attitudes	12%
Specific career skills	4%

Willett followed these same subjects for five years. She reported that 54 percent of the subjects reenrolled at the two year school (Elgin Community College, Elgin, IL) at least once beyond their initial semester of attendance. While sixty-seven percent of reenrollees attended more than one subsequent semester, 26 percent of reenrollees attended a credit class. Willett (1982) compared persisters and nonpersisters using Nickens (1976) Taxonomuy. Consult Table 4.

9

Table 4
Persisters and Nonpersisters
by Nicken's Taxonomy

Category	Persisters	Nonpersisters	Total
Specific career skills	94%	6%	16
Cultural	77%	23%	87
General career attitudes	70%	30%	50
Community and civic affairs	54%	46%	13
Leisure time and recreation	48%	52%	126
Personal health	38%	62%	21
Family life	34%	66%	114
Total	231	196	427

Source: Willett, L. H. (1982). Continuing education student flow analysis. Research in Higher Education, 17 (2), 155-168.

Chi-square analysis (x^2 = 56.04, p<.05, df = 6) revealed significant differences between persisters and nonpersisters as a function of initial course enrollment. Nonpersistence was highest in the family life and personal health categories. Willett concluded that Houle's (1961) three categories of adult education participants existed. These three categories were: (1) goal oriented students with clear objectives (nonpersisters); (2) activity oriented students whose learning is not related with announced purposes of the activity (noncredit persisters), and (3) those persons who are learning oriented and seeking knowledge for its own sake (credit persisters).

Analysis of these data suggested that many of the deterrents to participation are the same for credit and noncredit continuing education participants. Other barriers might include lack of support services, eg. student advising or access in terms of site

10

and time of day (Bass, 1986). By taking steps to remediate these barriers, a continuing education organizational structure can be designed to enable nonparticipators to enroll in continuing education programs.

11

Role of Higher Education in Continuing Education

The Community College

It is a widely held tenet among community college supporters that community colleges are the peoples' college and as a consequence provide an array of educational services to their communities. One component of the comprehensive community college is continuing education (Fuller, 1979). Lahti (1978) has suggested that community colleges are "seen as offering a quality education at a lower cost and as making continuing education a possibility for all adults in the community." Fordyce (1976) posed the question, "What then is the role and scope of continuing education for the community junior college?" Fordyce answered his own question when he wrote, "we must continue to look at the...student and his characteristics as we fashion continuing education programs...the learner...will use his learning for whatever purpose appropriate for him."

Explicit in Fordyce's statement is the belief that student needs should determine continuing education programming. Based upon Fordyce's definition, the process of continuing education is cyclical and subject to external as well as internal influences. Hence, the need for an organization delivery system that not only provides structure but flexibility as well.

The Four Year College and Univeristy

Queeny (1984) maintained that "universities have both a responsibility and a right to exercise leadership in this area

[continuing education]." Similar thoughts have been echoed by

K. Patricia Cross (1981).

Queeny (1984) summarized the role of universities in

continuing education as:

> "Universities have tremendous potential to pro-
> vide meaningful continuing professional education.
> Such education enhances both the economic and the
> educational goals of universities. It also offers
> higher education an exceptional opportunity to serve
> its students throughout their lives, to enable them
> to revitalize their knowledge and skills throughout
> their careers. (p. 17)

The Chronical of Higher Education (1985) wrote, "No longer

are they the Rodney Dangerfield of acadame". Mr. Votruba of the

State University of New York at Binghamton was quoted as saying:

> "Our marketing skills are particularly useful now
> that the number of adult and part-time learners
> is increasing...Recruitment and retention of adult
> students require a special approach. We understand
> adult students. We can help our institution integrate
> adult students into the campus, and we can provide the
> necessary support services to keep them here." (p. 26)

An analysis of these author comments would suggest (1)

universities and by extension four year colleges have a role to

play in providing continuing education and (2) the provision of

continuing education services will assist learners in accomplish-

ing educational objectives and help the university realize its

institutional as well as economic goals.

13

Structuring Continuing Education

The systems theory as described by Rakich, Longest, and Darr (1985) considers the effect institutional inputs, conversion processes, and outputs, as well as interinstitutional and intrainstitutional influences, have upon the continuing education system. The systems theory provides an all encompassing perspective for interpreting, categorizing, and ordering a continuing education program's component parts together with their attendant influences. Continuing education inputs would be identified as students, student needs, student services, curriculum, faculty, administrative, financial, and material resources. The conversion process is the interaction between inputs and the student, within the institution. Satisfactory outputs would be achievement of student and program goals. In this section, Structuring Continuing Education, we will consider:

> Curricular Planning and Assessment
> Curricular Design and Delivery
> Curricular Areas and Requirements
> Program Finance
> > Credit Programs
> > Noncredit Programs
> > Assessing Productivity
> Program Organization/Administration
> Student Matriculation
> > Admissions .
> > Student Support Services
> Evaluation
> Accreditation

Based upon the following review of the literature, the program analysis guide found in Appendix A was developed.

Taffe and Rocco (1981) have defined access for adults to higher education to be more of the character of a civil right

14

17

than a social ideal. They suggested that adult access is impeded when: (1) the location or time of program excludes or discourages adults, (2) inadequate financial programative support is provided, (3) support services are not provided, (4) the organizational structure and internal support is not complementary to adults, or (5) the institution promises more than it can deliver. Taffe and Rocco (1981) advise that "each institution must work out its own plan, sensitive to the needs of the adults it can serve."

Curricular Planning and Assessment

Murphy (1981) in describing the campus planning of adult degree programs (and by extension, noncredit programs) outlined four preliminary steps in which the institution should engage:

> "(1) look closely at the needs of the learners, who will be a diverse group; (2) examine the mission and the capabilities of the college and recognize what can be changed to accommodate a new program; (3) discuss the program and its impact on the college as a whole with all of the sectors of the college community; and (4) learn about the market for the program--the buyers and the other sellers." (pp. 7-8)

Murphy maintained that (1) any program which ignored client needs would not be viable; (2) a smaller institution should carefully identify the specific market it intended to serve; (3) an intended program should be in cong. ience with the college's mission; (4) all segments of the campus community should be involved in planning discussions and; (5) knowledge of the potential market and competition is essential to program viability.

15

Cole and Cole (1983) developed a process model for inter-agency cooperation which may be used to describe the program planning process suggested by Murphy (1981). The Cole Model is presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1.

I. Clientele Identification

V. Evaluation   II. Needs Identification

IV. Action

III. Goals and Objectives

Cole and Cole (1983) outlined several sub-steps under each of the major headings in their model:

I. Clientele Identification
   A. Map Social System
   B. Identify Subsystems
   C. Identify Clientele
   D. Locate Clientele
   E. Identify Leadership
   F. Establish Communication

II. Needs Identification
   A. Macro
   B. Micro
   C. Priorities
   D. Identify Resources

III. Goals and Objectives
   A. Macro
   B. Micro
   C. Short Term
   D. Long Term

IV. Action
   A. Develop Plans
      1. Alternatives
      2. Activities
   B. Determine Respon-
      sibilities
      1. Chairman
      2. Support
   C. Implement

V. Evaluation
   A. Process
   B. Outcome

According to the Cole Model (1983) an institution should (1) identify its clientele; (2) identify the clientele's needs; (3)

16

formulate program goals and objectives; (4) implement the program (take action); and (5) evaluate outcome.

In terms of program development, Knox (1982) reported that larger [continuing education] offices were more willing to take risks and initiative in launching new continuing education curricula than smaller ones. The most widespread use of continuing education curricula was to alert participants to new developments in the field and in providing information. The source of ideas for most new continuing education program was the preferences of the faculty followed by participant suggestions and formal needs assessments.

Curricular Design and Delivery

In commenting on program design and delivery, Murphy (1981) suggested three techniques for designing the program based upon the institution's preliminary research: (1) a brainstorming session, (2) a formal committee, or (3) an individual. In terms of curricular delivery systems, Murphy (1981) suggested and commented on five delivery systems:

Delivery System	Comment
Weekend Colleges	Attendance every two to four weekends is sufficient for academic progress
Evening Classes	Usually one or two classes per week is scheduled. Can use clusters for distant learners.

17

Radio and Television	High production costs usually restrict use to public colleges and universities.
Home correspondence, or Independent Study	Many courses can be packaged this way. Audio and video elements have been used recently. Can provide student support through occasional meetings, letters or telephone calls.
Individualized or Tutorial Study	Intense work with a single teacher.

Weekend colleges, evening classes and correspondence study have been popular and cost effective means of providing continuing education either credit or noncredit. Tutorial study can be expensive but almost always benefits the students. Other delivery systems include single or multiday institutes and on line computing.

Curricular Areas and Requirements

Murphy (1981) reported that institutional pressures would likely advocate for the offering of courses in least demand while the community would request courses in high demand by traditional students. Murphy (1981) went on to suggest three mechanisms through which an institution might configure its continuing education curriculum; (1) modify an existing program; (2) develop a new curriculum, or (3) allow students to design their own programs. Murphy (1981) raised the question, "To what extent are adults in a credit continuing education program required to complete the institution's general education requirement?" According to Murphy (1981) a related issue is, "to what extent

18

are adults required to complete traditional graduation require-
ments and how is this to be done." Murphy (1981) also pointed
out that alternative credit earning mechanisms are needed for
adults who have work or job experience related to the degree
sought (eg. CLEP and PEP).

Program Finance

Credit Classes

In most publicly supported institutions, credit continuing
education is supported in the same manner for adults as for
traditional students. In some cases, as in Mississippi,
part-time evening students do not generate the same full time
equivalency (FTE) as full time students. This results in
somewhat less state funding. In many private colleges, the
credit continuing education program is fully self-supporting.

Noncredit

Community college continuing education classes are for the
most part self-supporting and usually do not carry academic
credit. Breneman and Nelson (1981) in _Financing Community_
Colleges: An Economic Perspective described the financing of
this aspect of community colleges as:

> "Current financing practices of the states and localities
> for noncredit activites are not well documented...if public
> funds are not forthcoming to support such activities,
> forcing them to depend on student fees, it is unlikely that
> they will amount to more than a marginal activity at most
> institutions...The majority of states appear to make no
> provision for support of noncredit activities." (p. 184)

19

Assessing Productivity

Murphy (1981) commented that a credit or noncredit continuing education program's finance requirements would depend upon the institution's budgetary process, size and scope of the program, and the extent to which its establishment and success are a priority within the institution. Murphy (1981) felt: (1) there would be longer delays in securing funding in public institutions than in private ones; (2) a rational program budgeting system must be created and maintained; (3) the nature and amount of student charges must be determined; and (4) access to student financial aid must be established and financial aid parameters developed.

In their study of adult education program costs and finance, Kasl and Anderson (1983) categorized cost information into three levels:

Level 1:   Costs directly linked to individual learning activity (eg. instructor salary, materials, travel, per diem, rent for meeting rooms).

Level 2:   Administrative (eg. general expenses of operating the department).

Level 3:   Overhead resources expended in general program support by the institution (eg. financial and legal services or building maintenance and operation).

Kasl and Anderson (1983) proposed that program costs and income be converted to a common unit which would allow for comparisons. A participant learning hour (PLH) is one learner participating in a learning activity for one hour. Programs with lower costs per PLH would be more cost effective than those with

20

higher costs per PLH. If income per PLH exceeded cost per PLH, then the program would be generating a profit. Kasl and Anderson (1983) found that continuing education programs operated by colleges and universities generally turned a profit.

In many institutions, the data required to employ Kasl and Anderson's model (1983) is not available. The model proposed by Dickinson (1985) may provide beneficial. Dickinson (1985) outlined the data necessary to calculate indicators of productivity. These were:

Potential Measures of
  Output Included:

1. The number of courses operated by a program administrator.
2. The number of registrations recorded for the courses operated.
3. The number of student contact hours (SCH = PLH) in the courses operated, calculated for each course by multiplying the number of hours in the course times the number of registrants, then summing the total for all courses.

Potential Measures of
  Input Included:

1. Full time equivalent (FTE) staff members, including administrators and clerical staff.
2. The net costs of the operation, calculated by adding all costs of instruction and administration, including salaries, office rental, advertising, and other expenses, then subtracting fee income and any other revenues.

Indicators of productivity calculated from the above data are:

1. Number of courses per FTE staff member.
2. Number of registrations per FTE staff member.
3. Number of SCH per FTE staff member.
4. Net cost per course.
5. Net cost per registration.
6. Net cost per SCH.

21

In order to place the productivity indicators into context, Dickinson suggested that the following descriptive data be provided:

1. Average class size, calculated by dividing number of courses into the number of registrations.
2. Number of SCH per registration.

Using the Dickinson model, the following indicators are made available:

Program Administrators FTE
Clerical Staff FTE
Population base
Registration
Courses
Courses/FTE staff
Registrations/FTE staff
SCH/FTE staff
Net cost/course
Net cost/registration
Net cost/SCH
Average class size
SCH/registration

While the Kasl and Anderson (1983) model differs from Dickinson's (1985), the models may be blended together. This hybrid model would generate indicators of productivity as well as profitability. In his study of continuing education units, Knox (1982) found that, "almost all income was from fees paid by participants [but] most offices obtained some additional funds for new ventures."

Program Organization/Administration

Murphy (1981) identified two organizational models for continuing education programs. He described the largely separate and distinct continuing education as:

"It probably has its own dean or director, publishes its own promotional literature, conducts its own recruitment and admissions program, keeps academic records of its students, hires its own faculty, and even conducts its own graduation." (p. 20)

The advantages of self-contained units are: (1) quickly and easily established; (2) facilitates innovation; and (3) generally employs a staff sympathetic to the needs of continuing education students. The chief disadvantage is that such an organization may have a narrow base of support within the institution, and hence it may be difficult to obtain help and cooperation from other units of the institution.

The second model described by Murphy (1981) is that of the integrated model. In this model, the continuing education unit is integrated into the organizational framework of the institution and functions as an "ordinary" office or department.

Strother and Klus (1982) described similar models but approached the task of organization from a centralization versus decentralization perspective. The fully centralized model was described as: (1) where the continuing education head reports to the institution's CEO; (2) the section has its own budget and staff; (3) determines its own programming; and (4) has the power to grant academic appointments, rank, tenure, and titles to faculty and staff. The completely decentralized model may be described as: (1) the continuing education director is a staff position; (3) programming authority rests with the residential teaching departments; (3) the continuing education director reports to a dean or other institutional subdivision; and (4)

23

26

power to grant academic appointments, rank, tenure, titles rests with the residential teaching departments.

According to Strother and Klus (1982) centralization has several advantages: (1) able to recruit a fully committed staff; (2) has flexibility in budgeting; (3) able to maintain a mission oriented, problem centered, cross-disciplinary operation; and (4) promotes risk taking and innovation. The chief disadvantage of centralization is that it develops an institution within an institution. The advantages of decentralization are: (1) the program is fully integrated into the total academic unit; (2) the resources of each teaching department may be accessible; and (3) there may be incentives for all faculty to participate. With decentralization there are problems: (1) course offerings may be narrower; (2) course offerings may reflect faculty interests rather than clientele needs; (3) loss of budgetary and programming flexibility; and (4) possibility of discrimination between continuing education faculty and residential teaching faculty. Strother and Klus (1982) described the staff function model. Within the staff function model there is: (1) a strong top staff position with control over budget allocations and (2) courses and part-time faculty require the approval of an academic department head or dean.

Knox (1982) found that most of the continuing education departments had a full or part-time director who reported to the dean. Typically, the dean was supportive and allowed the director considerable latitude. Most faculty members viewed

24

continuing education activities as marginal. Knox (1982)
concluded: "In general, most CPE [Continuing Professional
Education] offices depended on the flow of support and resources
which people outside the office could readily withhold. This
contributed to a degree of instability which kept pressure on
the director to sustain the effort." The major characteristics
associated with organizational vitality were: (1) the quality of
educationl leadership; (2) success in obtaining support; and (3)
involvemnt of practitioners [participants].

Strother and Klus (1982) listed six criteria for judging an
effective continuing education organization. While these six
criteria may not be equally applicable to noncredit continuing
education, they are generally indicative. These criteria are:

1. The presence of understanding and active leadership by
   key faculty and administrators;
2. Is there a separate budgetary identity for the unit;
3. Is someone given clear responsibility for the adminis-
   tration and maintenance of the program;
4. Is the program integrated with the total institution
   (i.e., does continuing education enjoy full academic
   citizenship);
5. Is the mission statement clearly articulated and
   reasonable; and
6. Is the program sufficiently decentralized so as to
   ensure student access?

When developing criteria to aid in the determination of
whether or not a structure is effective, one should consider
Taafe's and Rocco's (1981) discussion of administrative and
organizational characteristics that impede adult access. The
criteria should be added to Strother's and Klus' (1982) listing:

25

7. Does the time and days of class offerings encourage adult attendance; ·
8. Are adequate student support services provided; and
9. Is the institution sympathetic to adult learner needs?

It is the opinion of this investigator that a determination of program organizational effectiveness rests on the collective answers to these questions.

26

Student Matriculation

Admissions

Most continuing education students will encounter an admissions process. Murphy (1981) maintained that (1) admissions problems of adults must be identified; (2) procedures should be modified to the extent possible to facilitate adult registration; (3) it may not be necessary for adults to sit for the same standardized examinations as traditional students; (4) open admissions may be appropriate for adults; and (5) the admissions application should be appropriate for adults. Murphy (1981) also raised the questions, "How much influence [does] the adult program director have in determining who can be admitted?" Murphy went on to suggest that: (1) a program orientation be provided; (2) academic counseling be provided; (3) student services (eg. library, learning labs, or placement centers be available); (4) courses be scheduled at convenient locations and times; and (5) faculty should be sympathetic to adult learning styles and nontraditional needs.

Student Services

Strother and Klus (1982) listed essential student services as (1) admissions, registration, and records; (2) financial aid; (3) information; (4) counseling and advising; (5) logistic support - parking, food, lodging, etc.; and (6) library services - eg. tutorial and audiovisual services. Other auxiliary services might include (1) health services; (2) extracurricular activities; and (3) placement. Strother and Klus (1982) further

27

30

delineated counseling services into six types: (1) assessment;
(2) career information; (3) skill development; (4) motivation
evaluation; (5) personal counseling; and (6) advice on academic
procedures and requirements. Murphy (1981) concluded that
continuing education programs which provide for student services
have higher retention and graduation rates.

Program and Student Evaluation

Murphy (1981) outlined a process by which program and
student evaluations may be conducted. Student evaluation may be
accomplished through the use of standardized tests, teacher-made
tests, oral interview, and student questionnaires. Faculty may
be evaluated via student performance, student evaluations, peer
review, or self-appraisal. Program evaluation may be accomplish-
ed by comparing student and/or faculty quality indicators in a
longitudinal fashion. Other program evaluation indicators might
include (1) a comparison of program accomplishments with earlier
goals and objectives; (2) analysis of program-preference informa-
tion data; (3) analysis of student opinions about the program; or
(4) analysis of faculty opinions about the program.

Accreditation

As a general rule, credit continuing education is accredited
while noncredit continuing education is not. However, some
noncredit programs while not accredited by a collegiate body, are
accredited by a professional association (eg. the National
Dietary Manager's Association's approval of U. F.'s dietary
manager correspondence study course). Mason (1986) in her reivew

28

of case law and higher education accreditation, reported that in the 1930's the courts held accreditation agencies to be private agencies engaged in a voluntary act and hence removed from judicial review. By the middle 1970's, the courts adopted the posture that accrediting agencies were quasi-public agencies and hence their actions (usually withdrawing a school's accreditation) will be subject to closer judicial scrutiny than in the past. Many credit continuing education programs operate through off-campus clusters within their home state. Such programs share in the parent institution's licensure and accreditation. However, some programs like Nova University operate across state lines anad hence need to acquire a license to operate in a different state. While licensure and accreditation are technically different, it is becoming harder to distinguish between them as the following excerpt from Mason's paper will attest.

"The latest in the cases involving accreditation and accrediting agencies was Nova University v. Educational Institution Licensure Commission (287 SE 2nd 872 (1984)). Nova, a private educational institution incorporated in Florida sought to operate a doctorate of public administration program in the District of Columbia. In order to do so, Nova applied for a license, as required by statute, and was denied. The University challenged on the grounds that: (1) the District's statute was not applicable to schools like Nova, conferring degrees outside the District; (2) the statute is unconstitutional on its face (to Nova or any conceivable application) because it violated the first amendment; (3) the statute and its regulations were unconstitutionally vague; and (4) the denial was arbitrary, capricious, and unsupported by substantial evidence in the record. The [licensure] Commission maintained that the denial was based on failure to meet requirements for adequate full-time faculty and library resources. The court found in favor of the Commission.

The case listed substantial evidence supporting the Commission's decision. Court records showed the statute to be

29

very clear, as well as the regulations listing eleven
criteria for issuing licenses. The Nova case seemed to rest
on the fact that the degrees would actually be conferred in
Florida, [and] not the District. It was only operating in
or teaching in the area.

In the District of Columbia's statute, it was stated by the
court that a license was needed to "operate" and/or confer
degrees. Further, that the requirement was reasonable and
in compliance with the intent of the legislature. The
statute was intended to stop fraud, corruption, and excep-
tion by entities that came into the District to set up
degree mills, a problem the area had experienced.

Evidence showed that the faculty consisted of nine
Florida-campus faculty, and thirty-three preceptors (travel-
ing, contracted faculty). The Florida faculty would provide
50% of the program instruction, but held other responsi-
bilities; were non-tenured, and within a one year period
experienced a 50% turnover rate. Nova planned on using the
library facilities at two small colleges and other public
libraries in the area. The Commission felt this would not
be a sufficient degree of stability and continuity for the
statute's intent and purpose.

While not holding the Nova program substandard, the [Commis-
sion stated that the] deficiencies present[ed] an unac-
ceptable risk that the program would be "substandard" or
"transient" or would result in the conferral of "false or
misleading" degrees. The courts agreed with the decision.

The courts have demonstrated that accrediting agencies will
be reviewed according to aquasi-public standard. With
increased reliance on their decisions, the agencies may be
classified under a quasi-governmental status based on the
state action argument. This would require greater involve-
ment with state and federal governments in functions
controlling higher educational institutions. While some
would argue that this would threaten academic autonomy and
freedoms, others would encourage more state control, through
the agencies, to insure quality.

The licensing commission in the District of Columbia acted
as an accrediting agency and as an arm of the state, effec-
tively becoming a quasi-governmental entity. If "field
programs" expand from Nova and other institutions, it is
likely that licensing agencies, statutes, state action, and
accreditation will become indistinguishable." (pp. 7-8)

30

Van Cott's (1986) analysis of the applicable case law agreed with the synthesis presented by Mason (1986). Van Cott went on to write:

> "It may be that external-degree programs are the new wave of the future in spite of Nova University's attempts at implementation. Administrators and faculty in higher education need to analyze the concept of external-degree programs as well as other innovative approaches to higher education; and learn from Nova University's mistakes." (p. 6)

31

34

References

Bass, S. A. (1986). Matching educational opportunities with the able elderly. _Lifelong Learning_, 9 (5), 4-7.

Breneman, D. W. & Nelson, S. C. (1981). _Financing Community colleges: An economic perspective_. Washington, D. C., The Brookings Institution.

Chronicle of Higher Education. University Continuing Education Divisions: Up from Second-Class Campus Citizenship. 30 (8), 23, 26. August 24, 1985.

Cole, J. & Cole, M. (1983). A model of interagency cooperation. _Lifelong Learning_, 6 (9), 10-11.

Cross, K. P. (1981). Preface. In Ronald H. Miller (ed.), _Providing Access to Alternative College Programs_. No City: The Scarecrow Press.

Dickinson, G. (1985). Assessing productivity in continuing education management. _Lifelong Learning_, 8 (4), 16-18.

Fordyce, J. W. (1976). Continuing education as external relations. _Peabody Journal of Education_, 53 (3), 151-156.

Fuller, J. W. (1979). _Continuing education and the community college_. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Hankin, J. N. & Fey, P. A. (1985). Reassessing the commitment to community service. In William L. Deegan and Dale Tillery (eds.) _Renewing the American Community College_. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Houle, C. O. (1961). _The inquiring mind_. Madison, WS: University of Wisconsin Press.

Kasl, E. S. & Anderson, R. E. (1983). Understanding program costs and finance. _Lifelong Learning_, 7 (1), 12-14, 31.

Knox, A. B. (1982). Organizational dynamics in university continuing professional education. _Adult Education_, 32 (3), 117-129.

Lahti, R. E. (1978). New markets for community colleges. _Community and Junior College Journal_, 48 (4), 8-11.

Mason, D. (1986). Accrediting agencies and the law. Unpublished paper. University of Florida.

Murphy, L. R. (1981). Campus planning of adult degree programs. In Ronald H. Miller (ed.) Providing Access to Alternative College Programs. No City: The Scarecrow Press.

Nickens, J. M. (1976). A taxonomy for community services. (In New Directions for Community Services: Reaching Out Through Community Services, No. 14, Summer, 1976.) Gainesville, FL: University of Florida.

Nickens, J. M. (1977). Who takes community service courses and why. Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, 2 (1), 11-19.

Pfanzer, R. G. & East, J. R. (1984). Weekend College: Teaching biology on Saturdays. JCST, 14 (2), 110-114.

Queeney, D. (1984). The role of the university in continuing professional education. Educational Record, 65 (3), 13-17.

Rakich, J. S.; Longest, B. B. & Darr, K. (1985). Managing Health Services Organizations. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders.

Scanlan, C. S. & Darkenwald, G. G. (1984). Identifying deterrents to participation in continuing education. Adult Education Quarterly, 34 (3), 155-166.

Strother G. B. & Klus, J. P. (1982). Administration of Continuing Education. Belmont, C. A. & Wadsworth.

Taffe, T. & Rocco, T. N. (1981). Access to higher education for adults. In Ronald H. Miller (ed.), Providing Access to Alternative College Programs. No City: The Scarecrow Press.

Van Cott, M. L. (1986). Nova University's Nontraditional Approach to Higher Education: Innovation or Deception. Unpublished paper. University of Florida.

Wagner, A. P. (1982). Postcompulsory education and training. An inventory of programs and sources of support. Education and Urban Society, 14 (3), 271-300.

Welton, G. (1983). Why people participate in community education activities. Community Education Journal, 12 (4), 20-22.

Willett, L. H. (1982). Continuing education student flow analysis. Research in Higher Education, 17 (2), 155-164.

Appendix A

Continuing Education Program

Analysis Guide

34

37

I. Documenting the Support and Necessity for a Continuing
    Education Program (Credit or Noncredit)

    A. Needs Assessment

        1. Is the program learner centered, i.e., based
            on learner needs? Yes   No

        2. Which of the needs that have been identified can
            most appropriately be met by the institution?

            _____

            _____

        3. Whom is the program designed to serve?

            _____

            _____

            _____

    B. Institutional Mission and Capability

        1. What does the institution do well or is well known
            for? (Identify)

            _____

            _____

        2. Can these attributes be of value to adult
            students? If so, how?

            _____

            _____

        3. Does the present mission statement encompass the
            needs of adult learners?   Yes   No

        4. If the present mission statement does not encom-
            pass the needs of adult learners, how can it be
            modified to do so? (Identify)

            _____

            _____

35

5. Does the institution have the organizational capability and capacity to successfully support the proposed program? Yes   No   Maybe   If may be, explain.

_____

_____

C. Involvement of Campus Constituencies

1. Have institutional administrators, faculty, and students been involved in discussions concerning the proposed program? Yes   No '   Explain.

_____

_____

2. What is the extent of support or opposition within each of these three sectors of the institutional community?

Administrators:_____

_____

Faculty:_____

_____

Students:_____

_____

D. Knowing the Market

1. What are other colleges or universities within the institution's service area doing to meet the need(s) of adult learners?

Competitor   Activity

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

36

II. Program Finance and Administration

A. How is the program financed? Describe.

_____

_____

_____

_____

1. What is the tuition level?

_____

_____

_____

2. What percent of program cost is met by student tuition?

_____

_____

3. Which financial aid programs are available to students?

_____

_____

_____

4. Are adult students able to take advantage of financial aid opportunities? Yes No   If no, why?

_____

_____

5. How productive is the program?

1. Background Data

a. Program Administrators FTE   _____

b. Clerical Staff FTE   _____

37

c.   Population base   _____

d.   # Registrations   _____

e.   # Courses   _____

f.   # Instructors   _____

g.   Program Income $_____

      (1) Tuition $_____

      (2) Grants $_____

      (3) Contracts $_____

      (4) Other $_____

h.   Program Cost
      [Direct + Administrative +
      Overhead =] $_____

      (1) Direct
          Costs $_____

          (a) instructors $_____

          (b) materials $_____

          (c) travel $_____

          (d) per diem $_____

          (e) rent $_____

          (f) other
             _____ $_____

      (2) Administrative
          Costs $_____

          (a) Adminis-
              trators $_____

          (b) Clerical $_____

          (c) Postage,
              supplies $_____

          (d) Equipment $_____

(e) Office
                        space $____ _____

                    (f) Utilities $_____

                    (g) Other
                        _____ $_____

              (3) General Overhead $_____

                  10% of Direct and
                  Administrative Costs

         i.   Net Profit (or loss) of Operation
              (Profit) Income-Cost =
                                                 $_____

                    Income $_____

                    Cost $_____

    2.   Traditional Program Indicators

         a.   Number of Courses/FTE staff
              member
                                                 _____

         b.   Number of registration/FTE
              staff member
                                                 _____

         c.   Net Cost/Course   _____

         d.   Net Cost/Registration   _____

         e.   Net Cost/PLH   _____

         f.   Student FTE   _____

         g.   Student Credit Hours   _____

         h.   Other _____   _____

6.   Does tuition vary according to program cost or is
     tuition "fixed"? Yes   No   If program based,
     describe.

     _____

     _____

     _____

                        39

7. What happens to program profits, if any?

_____

_____

B. How is the program administered/organized?

1. Does the institution have a separate and distinct continuing education unit? Yes No Comments.

_____

_____

2. Does the institution have its continuing education unit integrated into the exiting administrative framework? Yes No Comments.

_____

_____

3. What is the character of the program's organizational/administrative structure including reporting requirements?

_____

_____

a. To whom does the chief continuing education officer report?

_____

_____

	Program	Outside Academic Department	Shared	Other	N/A
b. Where does programming authority rest?	___	___	___	___	___

40

c. Who has the
   authority
   to:

   (1) recruit
       faculty? _____   _____   _____ _____ _____

   (2) approve
       faculty
       for
       teaching _____   _____   _____ _____ _____

   (3) assign
       faculty
       to a
       course? _____   _____   _____ _____ _____

   (4) grant
       rank? _____   _____   _____ _____ _____

   (5) grant
       tenure? _____   _____   _____ _____ _____

   (6) grant
       titles? _____   _____   _____ _____ _____

d. Who writes
   the budget? _____   _____   _____ _____ _____

e. Who admin-
   isters the
   budget? _____   _____   _____ _____ _____

f. Who approves
   shifts of
   budgetary
   resources? _____   _____   _____ _____ _____

                                     YES   NO

g.   Does the program enjoy
     strong institutional
     support?
                                     _____   _____

h.   Is someone given clear
     responsibility for
     program administration
     and maintenance?
                                     _____   _____

41

44

i. Is the program's continuing
    education mission
    statement clearly artic-
    ulated and reasonable?   _____   _____

j. Is there a mechanism for
    allowing and encouraging
    student input?   _____   _____

k. Are student support
    services provided?   _____   _____

4. Is there a computerized management information
    system capable of generating data for program
    management purposes? Yes No Comment.

    _____

    _____

    _____

5. Faculty Selection

    a. Who recruits, selects (approves), and assigns
        faculty members to teach courses?

        _____

        _____

    b. What type of faculty members are utilized?

                                   <u>YES</u>   <u>NO</u>

    (1) part-time adjuncts   _____   _____

    (2) part-time faculty   _____   _____

    (3) full-time adjuncts   _____   _____

    (4) full-time faculty   _____   _____

    c. Is in-service training provided to program
        faculty on a regular basis? Yes No If
        so, what type?

        _____

42

d.   If in-service training is provided, is it required?

_____

_____

e.   What is the mechanism for faculty evaluation, retention, and dismissal?

_____

_____

_____

f.   What is the nature of the academic freedom that program faculty enjoy?

_____

_____

_____

g.   Are full-time program faculty eligible for tenure? Is so, what are the requirements?

_____

_____

III. Academic Governance

A.   The Process for Student Matriculation (Student Support Services)

1.   The student admissions process

a.   Who handles the program's student admissions process?

_____

_____

b.   What are the unique admissions problems facing the program's students?

_____

_____

43

c.   Does the institution's admissions regulations
     impede or facilitate adult enrollment?
     Yes   No   Describe.

     _____

     _____

d.   What is the nature of the evidence adult
     students must submit of prior academic
     experiences?

                                    YES   NO

     1. open admissions   ____   ____

     2. high school tran-
        scripts
                                    ____   ____

     3. standardized
        test scores
                                    ____   ____

     4. personal interview
                                    ____   ____

     5. other _____   ____   ____

e.   Can adult applicants be forgiven for poor
     earlier grades? Yes   No   Comment.

     _____

     _____

f.   Is the institution's admissions application
     appropriate for adult applicants?
     Yes   No   Comment.

     _____

     _____

g.   How much influence does the continuing
     education program director have in determin-
     ing who is allowed to enroll in the program?

     _____

     _____

44

47

h. What is the quality of cooperation from the admission's office?

_____

_____

2. The student orientation process.

a. Who handles the student "entry" or orientation process?

_____

_____

b. Does the program orientation process help adult students acquire information about the program and institution? Yes No Comment.

_____

_____

c. In what form(s) is (are) the student orientation information provided?

	YES	NO
1. Handbook	___	___
2. Tutorial	___	___
3. Video Cassette	___	___
4. Audio Cassette	___	___
5. Newsletter	___	___
6. Class Announcements	___	___
7. Other _____	___	___

d. Is there a mechanism for continuous follow-up information? If so, what?

_____

_____

45

e.   Describe the student orientation process.

_____

_____

_____

_____

3.   The mechanism for student academic counseling.

a.   Is someone available at convenient times and
      locations (for the student) to provide
      academic counseling? Yes   No   Comment.

_____

_____

b.   Who provides academic counseling to students?

                                    YES   NO

      1. Admissions counselor   ____   ____

      2. program coordinator   ____   ____

      3. faculty   ____   ____

      4. other _____   ____   ____

c.   Through what mechanism is academic counseling
      provided?

                                    YES   NO

      1. telephone   ____   ____

      2. mails   ____   ____

      3. before or after classes   ____   ____

      4. group counseling sessions ____   ____

      5. counseling provided out-
         side class meeting times   ____   ____

      6. counseling provided only
         at main campus   ____   ____

46

7. individual counseling
   session _____ _____

8. other _____ _____ _____

d. What is the mechanism for resolving student
    complaints/answering questions? Describe.

    _____

    _____

4. What provisions have been made for student
    auxillary services?

    a. How are student text books paid for and
        obtained?

        _____

        _____

    b. Are students made aware of what libraries
        exist in their communities? Yes No
        Comment.

        _____

        _____

    c. Have arrangements been made with libraries
        off the institution's main campus that would
        allow adult students to use those facilities?
        Yes   No   Comment.

        _____

        _____

    d. Are continuing education students allowed to
        utilize the institution's:

                                        YES   NO

        1. library   _____   _____

        2. learning labs   _____   _____

        3. microfilm facilities   _____   _____

        4. check out library books   _____   _____

47

5. health services   _____   _____

6. other _____   _____   _____

    e.   Are continuing education students eligible to utilize the institution's placement services, if any?

_____

_____

B.   Curriculum Development

    1.   What is the approval process for curricular adoption or modification?

		YES	NO
a.	Administrative fiat	_____	_____
b.	Faculty committees	_____	_____
c.	Administrative committees	_____	_____
d.	Faculty and administrative committees	_____	_____

    2.   What is the mechanism by which a course or course of study is developed and subsequently approved?

_____

_____

_____

    3.   Who determines which courses are to be taught as well as when and where?

_____

_____

    4.   Describe how particular courses are selected for offering?

_____

_____

48

5. Who evaluates the utility and quality of the
    curriculum?

    _____

    _____

6. Are course prerequisites waived for adults? Yes
    No   Describe.

    _____

    _____

7. Are class syllabi prepared for each course and how
    long are they kept? Yes No

    _____

    _____

C. What curricular delivery system(s) is (are) employed?

                                        Yes   No

1. Weekend college   ____   ____

2. Evening Classes on compus   ____   ____

3. Extension (cluster) classes   ____   ____

4. Radio or Television   ____   ____

5. Audio or Video Cassettes   ____   ____

6. Home, correspondence study   ____   ____

7. Independent study   ____   ____

8. Tutorial Study   ____   ____

9. Short Course(s)   ____   ____

10. On line computing   ____   ____

11. Other _____   ____   ____

49

52

D. Curricular Areas

1. What <u>broad</u> curricular areas does the program include?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Are adult students required to complete general education requirements? Yes   No   If yes, describe the general education requirement.

<u>Core:</u> _____

<u>Distribution:</u> _____

<u>Integration:</u> _____

E. Earning Credits

1. Are program requirements credit accumulation based? Yes   No

_____

_____

2. Are program requirements competency based? Yes   No

_____

_____

3. May credits be transferred in:

		Yes	No
a.	From other institutions	___	___
b.	From job experience/training	___	___

50

c. From individual study _____ _____

d. From National Proficiency
    Examinations (CLEP, PEP) _____ _____

e. From experimental learning
    portfolios _____ _____

f. Other _____ _____ _____

F. Graduation Requirements (If applicable)

1. What are the program's graduation requirements?

General Education: _____

Major: _____

Electives: _____

2. What Degrees or Certificates are through the
    continuing education program?

    _____

    _____

    _____

V. Evaluation: Program, Faculty, and Student

A. Program Evaluation

1. Are program objectives clearly specified?
    Yes   No   Comment.

    _____

    _____

    _____

2. Is the program attracting the desired audience?
    Yes   No   Comment.

    _____

    _____

    _____

51

3. Are the curricula areas and delivery systems the ones the students need and want? Yes   No
   Comment.

   _____

   _____

   _____

4. How well do student services meet adult learner needs?

   _____

   _____

   _____

5. Are the courses accessible to the adult student?

		YES	NO
a.	Adequate in number of offerings	___	___
b.	Adequate in frequency of offerings	___	___
c.	Adequate in class starting and ending times	___	___
d.	Accessible in terms of location	___	___
e.	Adequate in instructional techniques employed	___	___
f.	Other _____	___	___

6. What is the means by which the continuing education program is evaluated?

		YES	NO
a.	Comparison of results with anticipated accomplishments	___	___
b.	Faculty appraisal	___	___

52

c.   Student appraisal   ___   ___

d.   Administrative appraisal   ___   ___

e.   Program review (internal)   ___   ___

f.   Program review (external)   ___   ___

g.   Accreditation (institution's) ___   ___

h.   Accreditation (professional) ___   ___

i.   Other _____   ___   ___

7.   Does the program's evaluation plan contain each of the following?

	YES	NO
a. Demographic and program-preference information for every student	___	___
b. Student evaluations of courses	___	___
c. Regular evaluations of program effectiveness	___	___

B. How is faculty teaching quality assessed?

	YES	NO
1. Student evaluation	___	___
2. Administrative evaluation	___	___
3. Peer review	___	___
4. Self study	___	___
5. Other _____	___	___

53

C.   Student Evaluation

   1.   Are the standards against which student accom-
        plishment is measured clearly articulated and
        reasonable?   Yes   No   Comment.

        _____

        _____

   2.   What is the means by which student accomplishment
        is measured?

                                              YES   NO

        a.   Teacher-made exams   _____   _____

        b.   Standardized tests   _____   _____

        c.   Oral interviews   _____   _____

        d.   Student self-appraisal   _____   _____

        e.   other _____   _____   _____

   3.   Are copies of teacher made exams retained by the
        continuing education program.   Yes   No   If yes,
        for how long?

        _____

        _____

54