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CHAPTER I

BASIS FOR EVALUATING UNIVERSITY EXTENSION PROGRAMS

Statement of the Problem

The primary problem of this study was to establish a plan for evaluating university extension programs through a review of the literature and standards for accreditation. This plan included developing a set of criteria for evaluating the administration and policies of an extension program, and the establishment of areas of importance for evaluating the instructional efficiency of an extension program. A secondary problem of the study was to demonstrate the usefulness of the evaluation plan through an evaluation of the extension service at North Texas State University and to suggest changes, if needed, on the basis of the evaluation.

Included in the evaluation of the extension service at North Texas were (1) the study of the development of the extension service at North Texas; to describe the service and policies at present; and to compare the present practices with the criteria developed from the literature; (2) analysis of strengths and weaknesses of the extension course in graduate professional education as evaluated by instructors and students; (3) the comparison of extension and residence
Background and Significance of the Problem

Through the years, the center of gravity of education in the United States has been rapidly shifting. The focus of education during most of the nineteenth century was on elementary education, but shifted during the latter part of that period and the early part of the twentieth century to secondary education. As many of the goals in secondary education began to be realized and as society grew more complex, the emphasis moved to the colleges. This movement has not stopped, and "any sensitive educator can already feel the seismic vibrations forerunning another dramatic shift toward the adult years" (9, p. 95).

Adult education may be divided into several levels. Pockets of illiteracy and vocational inadequacy still exist and must be dealt with by basic adult education. Increasingly, however, there is a demand by adults for higher education. A number of forces motivate this demand. Among these are (1) a realization that those who cease to grow may consign themselves to a lower social status; (2) the demand by government, industry, and professional societies for higher
educational standards for admission to and continuation in employment; and (3) the geometric expansion of knowledge, which has necessitated additional learning. Probably the central reason, however, for the pressures on the institutions of higher learning is the fact that the average education of most adult Americans is already at such a high level that any continued education must be at the university level (9).

The great majority of adults who need to continue their education at the university level are employed full-time or have financial obligations which preclude their attending regular college classes. If the university is to meet its obligation to these individuals, it must be through some extension of the university's traditional functions.

Most American colleges have developed some sort of program loosely labeled "Extension." This has come to include, in some institutions, such diverse activities as conferences, short courses, on-campus night classes, off-campus night classes, radio and television programs, consultant services, and others. Some colleges, in an attempt to disassociate college credit classes from their other Extension activities, have labeled their credit programs as "University Adult Education" or "Continuing Education." The term "Extension" was traditionally most closely associated with regular college classes held at off-campus locations for college credit. At many of the non-land-grant schools, this is still
the interpretation given the term and it is in this tradi-
tional sense that this study is concerned with Extension.

Extension services in most institutions were born and
developed in response to the area demand. Little advance
planning was given such programs and the organization and
administration developed haphazardly as a response to crises
and emergencies. Some reorganization and review of adminis-
trative procedures have taken place, but few universities
have given this area the attention that other departments
have received (14).

Some university policies and practices tend to convey
the idea that Extension is not yet considered a completely
legitimate part of higher education. Probably the most
noticeable among these is the fact that most universities
and accrediting agencies limit the number of semester hours
that can be earned toward a degree by off-campus study. Of
forty-six universities that replied to this point to Morton's
survey for the National University Extension Association (11),
all but two set a limit on the number of semester hours of
extension credit that could be applied toward a degree.
"Setting an arbitrary limit to the number of extension
credits that may be applied toward a degree, thus can reason-
ably be interpreted as a covert recognition that standards
in extension classes are generally lower" (14, p. 94).

If Extension is to be used as one of the major tools in
meeting increasing demands for adult education at university
level, an evaluation should be made of the Extension service. If the administrative practices are found to be substandard, this should be corrected. If the implication that Extension courses are not fully comparable to residence offerings is found to be true, steps should be taken to remedy this. If an investigation should find that no real difference exists, the sigma should be removed from credit earned by Extension.

Extension classes began at North Texas State University during the 1920's, when many of the area teachers lacked a bachelor's degree. Summer work was such a slow process that a demand arose for off-campus late afternoon and evening classes during the school year. Over the years, this demand increased and spread to groups other than teachers (3). As most of the area teachers came to have bachelor's degrees, with the advent of a state salary schedule offering financial remuneration for advanced degrees, and with increased certification requirements, there arose a demand for Extension courses in professional education at the graduate level.

During the 1965-1966 school year, 88 Extension classes were offered by North Texas, totaling 2,416 enrollments, of which 1,281 were for graduate credit (13).

North Texas State University has been in the past, primarily a teacher preparing institution and even though it has now attained university status, a large percentage of its graduates still enter the teaching field. A large number of institutions of higher education with a history similar
to that of North Texas exist throughout the United States. Although each individual school has problems peculiar to its own extension operation, their problems, strengths, and weaknesses should be similar enough to those of North Texas that an investigation of the North Texas program could be useful to them in reviewing their own practices.

Definitions

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions were established:

1. **Extension service**—all phases of the planning, organization and administration of the program providing off-campus courses for college credit.

2. **Extension classes**—classes that are offered at an off-campus site for three semester hours of college credit.

3. **Graduate students**—students who have completed the baccalaureate degree and are enrolled in a college class in which graduate credit may be obtained, whether they are working toward an advanced degree, toward certification, or for self-improvement.

4. **Residence classes**—classes that are offered for college credit on the university campus.

Limitations of the Study

1. The criteria are applied only to North Texas State University Extension Service. To determine whether they would be equally applicable to other extension programs, it would be necessary to test them with other programs.
2. Only the courses offered by North Texas State University in graduate professional education were included in this study, as only in this area were a sufficient number of subjects secured who met both the extension and residence requirements for the study. It is believed that the information secured from this evaluation will have implications for Extension courses in other subject-matter areas.

3. The criteria developed in this study were based on the literature available, which was not as extensive as that in other subjects.

4. The criteria developed in this study were based upon the ability of the author to interpret the literature.

Basic Assumptions

1. There are certain practices in the organization and administration of Extension that can serve as standards for the evaluation of an Extension service and these practices can be identified through a survey of literature on Extension.

2. There are practices in on-campus courses in graduate professional education that can serve as standards with which to compare the practices in Extension courses in graduate professional education.

3. Areas of importance, in which practices of Extension and on-campus courses in graduate professional education may be compared, can be identified by a survey of the literature on Extension.
4. Instructors who have taught both residence and Extension courses, and graduate students who have been enrolled in both residence and Extension courses, are capable of making a comparison of the practices in the two situations.

Survey of the Literature

The survey of the literature in this study had as its major purpose the development of a set of criteria. These criteria were necessary as bases for evaluating the organization, administration, and policies of Extension services. A secondary purpose was to discover issues and areas of importance in Extension practices. Criteria were developed from consistent patterns of concerns and problems that were covered by all of the major writers on Extension. Each area developed had to be considered a problem by all the writers before it was reworded into a criterion statement. Surveying the literature involved a thorough review and analysis of the published literature in the field of Extension for the past twenty years. As the authoritative writing in this field is limited, it was possible to do this. The available indices were used to locate all of the published articles in the periodical literature that dealt directly with this problem. Books in higher education that might have included materials concerning Extension programs and books that have been published directly in the field of Extension were examined.
To further validate the criteria, the accreditation regulations and policies of the Texas Association of Colleges and Universities and the Southern Association of Colleges and Universities were compared to the criteria. This examination further substantiated the criteria in that the accreditation regulations emphasized the same major points found in the periodical literature and the books that were examined.

A second section of the survey of the literature in the dissertation was devoted to isolating areas of importance in Extension class practices, from which an instrument was developed to compare Extension classes with residence classes. At first glance, there may be some overlap between the criteria developed for evaluation of the general program and the areas of importance developed for the evaluation of classes. However, in such cases, a closer examination will reveal that items that appear to overlap are attacked from a different point of view in each section. Libraries, for example, will be discussed in both sections. In section one, the availability of libraries when course offering is considered is discussed. In section two, the use of libraries and actual library practices are considered. These areas of importance deal chiefly with the quality
of the Extension instruction and the relationship of Extension instruction to college degree requirements.

Procedures for Collecting the Data

The data necessary for the completion of this study were obtained through the collection of information by three methods: structural interviews, a questionnaire, and an investigation of permanent records in the Registrar's Office at North Texas State University.

Structured interviews were used to collect information on the development, policies, administration and organization of the Extension Service. Persons interviewed were officials and former officials of North Texas State University, and include the Director of Extension, and all former Directors of Extension that were available. Also interviewed was any person whose official position might have had a bearing on the development of the Extension program. These persons were chosen after reviewing the standards developed from the literature and included the Director of Admissions, the Deans of the Colleges, and the Department heads and others.

Information used in evaluating the Extension classes was collected by the questionnaire method. The questionnaire was sent to all instructors still on the campus who had taught an Extension course in graduate professional education during either the 1964-65 or the 1965-66 school years.
One hundred students who were enrolled in Extension classes in graduate professional education during the 1964-65 and the 1965-66 school year were selected to complete the questionnaire. The permanent records of the above mentioned graduate students were examined and the names of all persons who had received six semester hours of graduate Extension credit from North Texas State University and had at least six semester hours graduate credit taken on the North Texas State University campus were selected. Only 100 names were found in the records that met the above qualifications and questionnaires were sent to these persons. A letter accompanied each questionnaire, explaining the nature and purpose of the study and asking for cooperation (see Appendix A).

The grades made in Extension were compared to the grades made in residence for the same graduate students to whom the questionnaires were sent. These grades were obtained from the student's permanent records in the Registrar's Office at North Texas State University. A check of student permanent records was also made of all students enrolled in Extension courses in graduate professional education courses during the 1965-65 and the 1965-66 school years to determine which students with residence work at North Texas State University took their first graduate level course by Extension.
The Interview

The interview was structured to obtain information regarding the areas that were developed in the study. The literature and accreditation standards on Extension were thoroughly analyzed and criteria were established for an Extension program. A number of questions pertinent to the areas were developed for each criterion. Also, included in the interview were a number of questions to the historical development of the Extension Service at North Texas State University. Persons interviewed were the Director of Extension, three former Extension directors, the Vice President for Administrative Affairs, and the Secretary to the President.

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire was developed to obtain information regarding how Extension courses in graduate professional education compare with graduate professional education courses taught on-campus. Areas of importance were developed from a thorough review of the literature. A number of questions were developed about practices and attitudes in Extension courses in each area, and the respondent was asked to rate those practices and attitudes with those he has observed in residence classes. The items on the questionnaire were organized into a five category rating scale. These categories were labeled
much below residence, somewhat below residence, about the same as residence, slightly superior to residence, greatly superior to residence.

The Jury

The items for the appraisal instrument were sent to the Directors of Extension at six Texas State Universities and Colleges. They were asked to rate the items as being very important, important, relevant, or irrelevant. These dimensions were arbitrarily assigned a numerical value. Items rated as "very important" were given a rank of four, those rated "important were given a rating of three, those rated as "relevant" were given a rating of two, and those rated as "irrelevant" were given a rating of one.

When the items were returned, each item was given a numerical value by totaling the ratings given them by the six judges. The number of items used in each area of the appraisal instrument was then determined. The item with the highest numerical score was included first and other items were used in descending order of their numerical value until the predetermined number of items had been included.

Procedures for Treating the Data

The information collected by interviews, questionnaire, and a search of student permanent records was examined and treated in the following manner:
1. The data obtained by interview on the history and development of the Extension Service were treated chronologically to present the background from which present policies and practices evolved.

2. The criteria developed from the literature were restated and the information on present policies and practices in the organization and administration of the Extension Service was presented under the appropriate criterion. Deviations of the practices and policies of North Texas State University from each criterion were noted and analyzed and used as a basis for suggestions and recommendations.

3. The evaluations and mean ratings given by the instructors and graduate students on each item from the questionnaire were presented in chart form. The mean ratings of the instructors and students were compared and formed the bases for suggestions and recommendations.

4. The grade point average was computed for Extension grades and for residence grades for each student and a mean grade point average for all Extension grades and for all residence grades were computed from this information. A Fisher's $t$ test for the significance of the difference between the means of related groups was computed and a $t$ table consulted to determine the level of significance. The findings were arbitrarily accepted or rejected at the 5 per cent level of significance.
\[ \bar{D} = M_1 - M_2 \]

\[ \sqrt{\frac{D^2}{N} - M_D^2} \]

\[ \frac{N - 1}{N} \]

\( M_1 = \text{Mean of Extension grade point averages} \)

\( M_2 = \text{Mean of residence grade point averages} \)

\( N = \text{Number of cases} \)

\( D = \text{Difference between Extension grade point average and resident grade point average} \)

5. The number of graduate students who took their first graduate course by Extension was tabulated and compared by the use of percentage to the total number of persons completing graduate Extension courses during the period covered by the study.
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CHAPTER II

ESTABLISHING A SET OF CRITERIA AND AREAS OF IMPORTANCE

Introduction

Any examination of the literature on extension teaching service meets with at least three difficulties: (1) the diversity of the programs in the different universities, (2) the varying attitudes among educators as to university responsibility for community service, and (3) a confusion of terms. Weaver (64), who visited the campuses and investigated the graduate extension programs of twenty universities, was impressed with the fact that each program had its own unique characteristics, dictated by the circumstances under which it evolved, and bearing the imprint of the men who shaped it. He observed that universally applicable or even widely acceptable solutions are hard to come by, as "... a satisfactory solution hammered out within the personality of one institution ..." is not necessarily wise in another (64, p. 242).

The attitude of the University as to its obligation for community service creates another difficulty in determining from the literature, practices that embody acceptable approaches to extension. It would be safe to say that all
universities feel some obligation for service to the people other than the college-age youth of the area that they serve; but the nature and extent of that service is a matter of considerable dispute. Attitudes range from the idea that any demand of the public should be served by the university to the idea that the university should limit itself to extension courses for credit that are identical to those offered on campus. Because of this difference in attitudes, extension programs and practices vary widely and many authors write from the frame of reference of their own institution, apparently assuming that all programs are identical to theirs. When such an author fails to define the type program he has in mind, one may analyze, for example, an article on the techniques of teaching an extension class and not be sure whether the writer has in mind a class on Christmas package wrapping or a class in psychology for credit. Similarly, even among universities that offer extension courses for credit only, attitudes vary from that which believes it to be the duty of the university to stimulate students to continue their education, to that which grudgingly provides a service only if it is demanded by a large number of people. Petersen states that due to this wide range of opinion "... any analysis of university adult education necessarily reflects, at least in its emphasis and overtones, the point of view of the analyst" (52, p. 52).
Another difficulty encountered in reviewing the literature on extension is a lack of standardization of terms. A number of different terms refer to identical practices, yet each term may also have several other meanings. The terms, "extension," "continuing education," and "adult education," for example, are all used to refer to off-campus classes for college credit. However, the term "extension" is also used to refer to any number of practices that are in no way related to college classes, "continuing education" is used to refer to vocational courses of a non-credit nature, and "adult education" is used to describe almost any activity for adults that can vaguely be called educational. One must be careful when reading the literature on extension to examine the context in which the terms are used.

Weaver states that in spite of the differences in practices and opinions "... as one travels among the universities, one finds that certain common problems and aspirations reveal themselves with impressively consistent regularity" (64, p. 242). Likewise, a careful review of the literature reveals, with considerable consistency, certain practices that are considered to be most acceptable in an extension program.

Establishing the Criteria

The criteria established for this study were derived from the literature on extension, current practices as
reported in the literature, and accreditation standards. Since North Texas State University is a member of The Association of Texas Colleges and Universities and The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the accreditation standards of these organizations were considered as requirements when developing the criteria. The standards of other accrediting agencies were considered as a part of the literature.

In establishing the criteria, only those areas in which a considerable consensus exists have been developed, and even within these areas an attempt has been made to show the range of attitudes and practices. However, in a few areas of especial importance, an attempt has been made to present both sides of controversial issues, even when no consensus and no conclusions were reached. Using the above rationale, enough evidence was discovered to warrant establishing criteria in the following areas: Administrative Organization, Financial Basis, Articulation, Teacher Personnel, Course Offering, Admissions, Public Service, and Research.

The criteria developed for this study are for an Extension Service limited to the offering of off-campus courses for college credit and have particular applicability only to a program of this nature. Some of the
standards, however, might have meaning for Extension programs of a different type with only slight revisions.

Financial Basis

Program support.—Opinion on how an Extension program should be financed varies widely. Views range from the belief that the Extension division should be operated upon the same financial basis as any other part of the university, to the belief that the service, due to its nature, should be entirely self-supporting.

Burch (14) states that nobody expects the child's parents to pay the full cost of his education from kindergarten through college. The theory behind this is that a society which prizes the individual will assure him the maximum opportunity for an education. Yet, when an adult seeks further education "... there is a strong feeling among both educators and members of the public that he ought to pay the full cost" (14, p. 44).

In an extensive study of Extension work for Montana State College, Petersen (52) concludes that charges should be exactly the same as for equivalent courses on the main campus, and deplores the fact that most Extension divisions must be self-supporting. He states that
no other division of the university is expected to support itself; and the partial exception to this rule in the case of general extension, merely an accidental effect of historical development, few administrators even attempt to justify in terms of organizational principles (52, p. 146).

At the opposite end of the spectrum, Knowles (35) points out that from the beginning extension activities have been expected to be largely self-supporting, and justifies this by the fact that extension courses are an extra service of the university and that adults are able to pay for what they get. Gratton (30) agrees that extension students, who are usually adults and self-supporting members of the community, should pay for their own education at rates which will make the extension service self-supporting.

In actual practice, the extension divisions at a large number of universities must be self-supporting (60). The two main sources of income for an extension service are fees and appropriations. Sheats reports that a median of 78 per cent of the financial support for extension divisions in 1952 came from student fees and a median of 22 per cent came from appropriations (61, p. 435). Morton, in a more comprehensive survey in 1952, found that in most institutions 50 to 75 per cent of the extension division costs were supported by student fees (47, p. 97). This, however, may not give a true picture of off-campus courses for credit, as all extension activities are more highly subsidized than off-campus credit activities (47). Godard (27), however, indicates that
even those extension divisions which report that their program must be self-supporting may actually be profiting from appropriations if they use such general university services as the registrar, business office, and library.

Although there is little agreement as to how the extension division should be financed, there is definitely a consensus that it should not be a money-making project for the university (14, 27, 32, 43, 47, 52, 60). Knowles states that 96 per cent of the evening colleges (which included extension services) "... reported that, year in and year out, their income is greater than their expenditures, and that most of them must turn any excess of income over expenditures over to the general fund of the institution at the end of the year" (35, p. 87). None of the literature surveyed offers a defense for this practice.

Moore (22) is especially critical of the practice of using the extension division as a source of revenue for the university. He believes that to the extent that money-making becomes paramount, education becomes subordinate. Petersen (52) is even more critical of extension as a money-making device and blames most of the evils found in extension upon the fact that extension departments must become "peddlers of popular commodities" in order to produce revenue for the university.
Instructor compensation.—Two schools of thought exist as to instructor pay for teaching extension classes. One group maintains that the teaching of extension classes should be a regular part of the instructor's teaching load and that no extra stipend should be given. The majority group, however, contends, for a variety of reasons, that extra money should be paid to off-campus instructors. In practice, almost all of the universities included in several surveys did pay extra for off-campus instruction (47, 61, 62).

Petersen states that "when extension courses are taught by regular day faculty, we recommend that they be made a regular rotating portion of each faculty member's teaching load, with no extra pay" (52, p. 149). To some extent, this idea appears to be inconsistent with Petersen's view that the quality of instruction is related to the instructor's willingness to teach the course.

The Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in its accreditation standards for graduate work states that "... the assigning of graduate extension courses to regular faculty members as an additional responsibility for extra pay is indefensible in any but emergency or other exceptional circumstances" (1, p. 58). The Association further recommends that when the regular faculty must be assigned to extension classes, their on-campus load should be reduced. Taken in context, the attitude of the Association seems to be a concern that the instructor not be overloaded,
rather than opposition to the principle of extra pay in itself.

The idea that extension teaching should be a part of the instructor's normal load with no extra compensation is viewed by Woodburne (66) as being completely unrealistic. He states that

If a professor of history, for example, were reduced from ten classroom hours of regular teaching to six in order to take on extension courses, the regular campus faculty would have to be increased at the going salary rates for regular appointments rather than at the reduced rates of present compensation for extension teaching. These reduced rates are based customarily on the fees received in most sections of the country. They are unlikely to exceed one-half of the salary for regular faculty teaching on a classroom hour basis. If extension were made a part of regular teaching loads in any widespread way, the cost of additional faculty appointments to make such an arrangement possible would be more than most institutions could afford, except for a very short period of time (66, pp. 190-191).

Weaver (64) expresses somewhat the same thought as Woodburne, although his concern is with the difficulty of securing the needed additional faculty members for such an arrangement.

Another reason for the desirability of extra pay for extension teaching, advanced by a group of extension directors (48), was that regular faculty promotion is many times based on research work done by the instructor, and that the number of hours spent in extension teaching decreases the amount of research that can be done. The extra pay for extension
teaching is a substitute for the extra pay such a promotion would bring the instructor. The majority of instructors in Wilde's (65) survey also believed that there should be extra pay for extension teaching.

Probably the main support for extra pay for extension teaching is in the discussion by many of the authorities of the various aspects of instructor compensation, as though there were no question that there should be extra pay for extra work (37, 42, 43, 47, 49, 61). Lean (37), for example, mentions that one university controls extension instructor overload with a regulation that prevents a faculty member from earning more than $500 extra in one year, and Norman observes that "... pay for off-campus teaching really should be higher than for the equivalent amount of work on the campus" (49, p. 123).

Sheats (61) and Morton (47) report a number of bases for instructor stipends. Among these are flat amount, distance of travel, semester hours, clock hours, relation to campus salary and rank, and number of students in the class. No recommendation was found in the literature as to the best method for determining instructor payment, but there was agreement that instructor payment should not be based upon the number of students in the class (42, 49, 52).

The Association of Texas Colleges and Universities (42) forbids its members to base extension instructor fees on enrollments. Petersen states that
if the adult educator is forced to regard his students as customers, he must define his program as commodities. Like any other businessman, he tries both to adapt his product to public taste and through advertising, to induce the public to accept it. The choice between educational offerings is put on the same level as the choice among several brands of breakfast food (52, p. 24).

Quite probably, the arguments previously advanced against the extension division's being considered a money-making project for the university would apply equally against the practice of basing instructor salaries upon enrollment. Nowhere in the literature, however, is the practice of requiring a minimum number of students before a course is offered, condemned.

The following criterion for evaluating the financial basis of an extension service is derived from the foregoing literature:

Criterion 1. The extension service should not be considered a money-making project. Instructors should receive extra pay for extension teaching and the instructor's salary should be based upon some basis other than the number of students enrolled in the course.

Articulation

There is considerable consensus that the planning of extension courses and the maintenance of high standards is the responsibility of the whole institution. Shannon states that
To be worthy of the name university extension, an outreach operation must be of, and not simply in the university. By whatever means it is achieved, there must be a direct and consistent relationship between extension personnel and all offices, departments, schools, and colleges of the university (60, p. 73).

The Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, in its accreditation standards for extension, sums up this idea by stating

The content and quality of each course, the admission requirements, the preparation of the faculty, and the adequacy of physical facilities should be recognized as college policy matters and as reflecting the integrity of the institution (45, p. 97).

Cooperation between the Division of Extension and the subject-matter departments is especially vital. The subject-matter department has the primary responsibility for setting and maintaining high course standards, deciding whether any particular course can practically be adapted to an off-campus setting, supplying competent instructors, and approving all instructors hired by the Division of Extension who are not regular faculty members.

The Division of Extension has the responsibility for determining the demand for particular courses, seeing that facilities recommended by the subject-matter departments are available for screening instructors who, though successful in teaching undergraduates, do not meet the division's requirements for the instruction of adults, and for interpreting adult needs to subject-matter departments so that courses
can be designed to meet those needs without lowering standards (6, 10, 16, 26, 27, 31, 32, 35, 37, 42, 45, 47, 52, 61, 62, 65, 66).

The only dissent found in the literature from the idea of shared responsibility is a suggestion by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in connection with graduate level courses that "One safeguard for the quality of off-campus courses is to have them set up, controlled, and supervised through the same departmental, faculty, and administrative channels as other courses and taught by full-time faculty members as part of their normal loads" (1, p. 58).

It can readily be seen that such an arrangement would cause much duplication of work, confusion in travel arrangements, and waste of funds. A panel of extension directors (10) also has suggested that a lack of skill in dealing with adults under such an arrangement could ruin an otherwise good program.

In a survey by Wilde (65) of six institutions, 79 per cent of the regular faculty felt that administrative responsibility for off-campus courses should rest with the division of extension and 75 per cent felt that the academic responsibility should rest with the various campus departments.

Although there was little disagreement that the responsibility for extension courses was a joint affair, there was some disagreement as to the exact division of authority and
as to the machinery by which such cooperation and communication should be attained. Some authorities felt that the Division of Extension should have a little more authority in academic matters because of its familiarity with the unique needs and abilities of adults (32, 35, 52). Woodburne (66), however, believes that complete academic control should rest with the department because "... many of the courses offered by adult education bear credit toward regular degrees offered by the regular undergraduate and graduate colleges and professional schools and not by the division of adult education" (55, p. 188).

The Association of Texas Colleges and Universities (42) states that "Supervision of instruction (of extension courses) is vested in the academic department to which the course content is logically related" and that for efficient administration "... each institution shall appoint a director ... for the various supplemental program ..."
The Association also states that "There shall be but one set of academic standards covering academic matters and these shall be applied to the institution as a whole in all of its academic program" (42, p. 66).

A number of devices were suggested to maintain close cooperation between the Division of Extension and the subject-matter departments. These include councils of various compositions, liaison persons within the Division of Extension detailed to the various departments, and joint-hiring of
faculty members by the Division of Extension and the departments (6, 16, 35, 48, 61). Sheats (61) concludes, after citing examples, that the actual organization makes little difference, but should be consistent with the size and peculiar problems of the institution, and that the administrative officer in charge of extension should "... have direct access to the president's office and ... [be] ... involved in the policy making group which advises the president on university-wide policies and decisions" (61, p. 188).

The following criterion on articulation between the Division of Extension and the subject-matter departments was derived from the above literature:

Criterion 2. The planning of extension courses and the maintenance of high standards should be the responsibility of the whole institution. Especially close cooperation should exist between the Division of Extension and the various disciplines within the institution, with the Division of Extension primarily concerned with administration and the subject-matter department primarily concerned with setting and maintaining standards.

Teaching Personnel

Instructor selection.-- Three major kinds of instructors are used by extension divisions: full time extension instructors; part-time instructors recruited from business, the professions, and industry; and part-time instructors from
the regular university faculty. The multiplicity of extension activities, many of them non-credit, conducted by some universities makes it difficult to determine exactly which kind of instructor usually teaches off-campus courses for college credit.

A large number of full time instructors and non-faculty part time instructors are employed by the extension divisions of some universities, but reports from these institutions usually do not indicate the type extension activity in which these people are engaged. The University of Indiana, for example, reports 90 full time extension instructors on its staff and Rutgers University employs 1,000 part time non-faculty teachers. The case of Rutgers, however, gives an indication as to the use of non-faculty instructors in extension divisions. All 1,000 non-faculty teachers are engaged in non-credit activities (37). Grumman (31), reporting on classes taught by full time extension instructors at the University of North Carolina, stated that most of the students in such classes attended purely for reasons of personal improvement and cultural background. It is quite probable that in most of the institutions reporting the use of full time instructors and part-time instructors from outside sources, a large percentage of these people may be engaged in non-credit work.

The postulate that most degree-credit courses in extension are presently taught by regular faculty members is
reinforced by Morton's (47) survey. He found that more than half of the institutions reporting did not employ any full-time instructors and that most of this group used, exclusively, the part-time services of the regular faculties of the universities. It would seem probable that, of the institutions that did use full-time instructors, at least some of these were used in non-credit activities and that some regular faculty members were used to teach extension classes for credit. This would indicate that the majority of degree-credit extension classes are taught by regular faculty members.

There is, however, some use of non-faculty instructors for credit courses. Shannon reports that some of the large urban universities engage part-time non-faculty teachers whose qualifications are subject to review and approval by appropriate university departments. He adds that "... residence deans are understandably reluctant to go too far in this direction. 'It's a problem of providing institution identity, an attitude of being one of us' ..." (60, p. 81).

Very few instances were found in the literature where the use of persons other than regular faculty members for credit courses was actively advocated. One of these was Bower, who states that regular faculty instructors were used in extension courses at New York University when they were found to be effective with adults, but to fill the remainder of the extension teaching staff "... we go out into the market place of talent, which ... is full of possibilities" (7, p. 61). McGrath also believes that to a certain extent
the extension teaching staff should have an identity of its own as "the schools and divisions, concerned with other matters, will not usually give the time, energy, and imagination required for the creation of satisfactory adult degree programs" (43, p. 95).

The literature reveals, however, that there is a considerable degree of agreement that extension classes for college credit should be taught by regular faculty members (8, 16, 22, 42, 52, 60, 62, 64, 66). Several reasons were advanced for this belief. Woodburne states that "Except in a very few instances, it is rare to find these people (non-faculty instructors) as well-trained as the resident faculty and as qualified to give more than an elementary type of instruction" (66, p. 190). Shannon (60) believes that the quality of work by full time extension instructors is suspect and suggests that such teachers run the risk of losing touch with the parent schools and colleges. Weaver contends that no matter how strong the professional background of a teacher from government or industry may be, and no matter what his experience, he is not, and by circumstances cannot be, a closely integrated part of the traditions and standards of the on-campus departments (64, p. 246).

Bradley (8), Vice-President of the University of Missouri, probably best sums up the reasons for using regular faculty members in extension classes when he declares that I would contend that teaching programs should come directly out of the resident teaching departments. I do not believe an extension service should develop a teaching staff separate
from that of the resident departments. In fact, it would be an ideal system if members of departments could be rotated on the extension staff so that residence and extension staffs were composed of the same persons. In the first place, although it is more true in some fields than in others that yesterday's research is today's subject matter, no teaching program can long maintain its quality without the study, research, and graduate work which is centered in the department. A university department will eventually have a teaching program no more advanced than a good high school extension program can supply. In fact, here lies the superiority of the university over the high school extension program. Anyone who has the price can buy well-trained teachers. The prestige and quality of university teaching is not the result so much of the kind of people that are employed but rather the kind of life they lead while they are employed. The atmosphere of learning, study, graduate work, and research is what makes the university instruction the best we can offer today (8, pp. 121-122).

The Association of Texas Colleges and Universities specifies in its minimum standards, that at least 50 percent of the instruction in off-campus courses must be done by full-time members of the faculty of the institution, and that other extension instructors must have "... qualifications comparable in terms of academic training, experience, and fields of specialization ... to regular faculty members" (42, p. 63). A number of other authorities felt that when it is necessary to use persons other than regular faculty members for extension teaching, the qualifications should be the same as those for regular faculty and that such appointments should have the approval of the department concerned (6, 22, 31, 33, 39, 59, 60, 66).
Teacher load.—A great deal of concern exists that when regular faculty members are used to teach extension classes, they should not be overloaded (27, 37, 44, 48, 64, 65, 66). Woodburne observes that

the requirement of a working week for a normal teaching load amounts to forty to fifty hours, including course preparation, grading of papers, consultation with students, and so on, without any allowance of time for scholarly study or research. When research and writing are added, the time requirements of a working week of able and conscientious faculty frequently go as high as fifty-five hours a week or more. To ask faculty people to add another four or five hours as week of extension classroom teaching on top of this program becomes well nigh impossible . . . " (66, p. 189).

Many institutions, in an attempt to avoid overloading instructors, limit the number of extension courses per academic year that can be assigned a faculty member to one or two. In other institutions, no limit is set but the on-campus teaching load is considered before extension assignments are made (37, 44, 48). McMahon states that everyone devotes some of his time and energy to pursuits other than his regular occupation. These activities may consist of supplementary employment, church work, hobbies, community service, or in the case of the full-time faculty member, extension teaching. He further states, however, that "... there appears to be a general tendency to limit such teaching," and that "the institutions have recognized the dangers inherent in excessive overload teaching and have limited the discretionary judgment of the individual faculty member . . . " (44, p. 92).
At least some of the extension instructors themselves believe that the amount of extension instruction for regular faculty members should be limited. Two-thirds of the instructors surveyed by Wilde (65) felt that from two to six semester hours was the maximum load that could be handled effectively during an academic year.

The research of McCormick (41) seemed to indicate that the attitude of instructors was a major factor in the differences found to exist between residence and extension work. A willingness to teach extension classes appeared to Petersen (52) to contribute to the quality of instruction, and of the instructors surveyed by Wilde (65), 88 per cent expressed the idea that off-campus classes should be assigned only to those instructors willing to take them.

The following criterion on extension teaching personnel was derived from the above literature:

Criterion 3. Extension instructors should be full-time faculty members of the university. Persons who are not a part of the regular faculty should not be used as instructors except in cases where special competencies are needed. Instructor off-campus load should be limited by policy and the instructor should accept the assignment of a class without coercion.
Course Offering

Catalog courses.—Considerable controversy exists as to whether all the work in which university extension deals should be of university level (47, p. 32). Most of this disagreement, however, centers around the non-credit activities of the divisions of extension, and nowhere in the literature was found an advocate of college credit for courses of a sub-college nature. It is not within the scope of this study to examine the merits of non-credit extension work.

There is some debate, however, as to the type of courses that should be offered for credit. Brown, one of the few to advocate completely different courses for adults from those offered to undergraduates on campus, contends that there is a great question... as to whether the particular slicings of human knowledge into our present course structure is the most successful arrangement for meeting the growth needs of people in present day society. Too often this division of subject matter in departments has resulted in a fractionalizing of subject matter that simply does not meet the need of the present society. Not only may the slicings be the wrong ones— but I suspect that many of the slicings are too thin (12, pp. 118-119).

Petersen (52) is of an opposing view and suggests that university level means that the extension courses are those that are equivalent to residence courses, those that would be recognized by university catalog description, or those which colleges and universities usually provide and which college faculties would recognize as being of college level.
He believes, however, that an adaptation of the course or methods to special demands of particular sectors of the population without lowering the standards is a legitimate practice. A number of other authorities concur with this idea that orienting a course toward the needs of a group and adapting methods of instruction for the students enrolled does not of itself lower standards (6, 10, 16, 20, 27, 35, 43, 48).

The Association of Texas Colleges and Universities (42) is even more definite about course offering than Petersen. In its minimum standards it states that "extension courses will be chosen from those regularly announced in the college catalog" (42, p. 69). Although the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools is not as specific, the same spirit is manifest in its statement that "the standards of the College Delegate Assembly apply directly to all programs involving academic credit" (45, p. 96).

Graney gives a basic reasoning for the use of identical courses both on and off-campus in degree credit programs. He states that

It is the service of the parent institution expanded through teaching faculties and material facilities to as wide a segment of the community as is possible. Implicit in this purpose is the limitation of services offered to those which currently exist on campus. Such offerings are of college grade; they originate from research and study at the parent institution; and they take advantage of any available campus teaching staff, instructional equipment, materials, and facilities.
This purpose directs the attention of general extension to those persons who desire and need formal collegiate instruction, but who are unable to take residence at the institution as regular students (29, p. 12).

Shannon is in agreement with Graney as to the purpose of extension credit offering and adds that "... extension is under pressure from both internal and external sources to replicate as exactly as possible the pattern of residence instruction, so as to in no way jeopardize the applicability of credits earned toward an academic degree" (60, p. 28). Creese (22) and Woodburne (66) concur that extension courses should be the same courses that are offered in residence because these credits will be applied to a degree from the resident department.

Facilities.—The tone of most of the literature indicates that the writers assume that proper facilities will be available and are important although they only mention them in a casual way. Blee, for example, in commenting on extension courses for teachers, states that "... where there are few individuals involved or where special facilities are required, teachers should be given such encouragement and assistance as will enable them to pursue off-campus programs away from their own communities ..." (6, p. 162). Petersen also mentions facilities quite casually, stating that "... we believe that a university, if it has or can acquire the necessary facilities, faculty, and other resources, should
engage in adult education" (52, p. 129). Another casual mention of facilities is made by McGrath when he asks the question, "Do established policies, practices, faculties, facilities, and accessibility now equip institutions of higher education to meet these emerging responsibilities?" (43, p. 90). These authors, and others too numerous to name, mention facilities on the same level with policies, faculties, and other essentials for extension courses, which would indicate that they believe them to be important to the off-campus classes even though they do not choose to elaborate upon them.

Some of the accrediting agencies are more specific about facilities. The Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools states in its minimum standards for extension that

the adequacy of physical facilities should be recognized as . . . reflecting the integrity of the institution. Care should be exercised in the selection of courses for this type of program. Courses requiring laboratories or extended library study should not be approved unless facilities equal to those expected on the home campus are available (45, p. 97).

The Association of Texas Colleges and Universities is even more explicit in its statement that "an adequate library in keeping with the type of work being offered must be available. Classrooms and laboratories must be of sufficient size and contain sufficient equipment to accommodate classes of acceptable size. Other physical facilities must be conducive to effective teaching" (42, pp. 66-67).
The problem of adequate facilities has been one of the more vulnerable spots in the extension program. Woodburne states that

one of the difficulties of extension teaching has been that raised by . . . the limitations of libraries and other facilities if the course is taught off-campus or in another town. These factors reduce in considerable measure the prospect of dealing with the subject at the same level of competence and rigor as in a regular course of instruction on the campus (66, p. 189).

Pierson (53) warns further that the availability of a large collection of materials in a public library does not necessarily insure an adequate library from a research point of view. Weaver supports this idea by suggesting that libraries, laboratories, and classrooms designed to meet the students' needs "... are impossible to duplicate in an off-campus setting" (64, p. 247).

One member of a panel of extension directors (48) states that "the selection of courses to be offered is as important as the personnel. Courses which require a great deal of library materials should be avoided" (6, p. 55). Dugan (26) lists adequate facilities as being one of the two essential factors of a good extension course. He states that "... certain extension classes in well-selected courses, with adequate facilities and well-qualified instructors, result in student achievement comparable to that obtained in similar campus courses" (26, p. 44).
The following criterion on course offering was derived from the above literature:

Criterion 4. Extension should be selected from those regularly announced in the college catalog. Only those courses should be offered for which adequate facilities required by the course are available in sufficient quantity and quality at the off-campus site.

Public Service

The university's community.--A large part of the literature on university extension mentions community service as a legitimate function and, in fact, an obligation of an institution of higher learning, but very few concise definitions of "community" are attempted. Creese (22), however, suggests that the word "community" has two dimensions--area and population. Each university has its own geographic community. It is the geographic area or political subdivision which is normally served by the university. It may be a state or a region within the state and, sometimes, the boundaries of the university's community is set forth in legislation. Carlson (17) mentions that for some municipal universities, the corporate limits form the boundaries of the institution's community.

Creese contends that

... the university's natural community is not necessarily the whole population of a political area bounded by city or state lines. For a
college of medicine, the natural community is that of the local physicians; for the school of education, it is the community of teachers and schoolmen; and for the engineering college, it is the community of engineers, industrial executives, foremen, and skilled workers of industry (22, p. 83).

From the point of view of the degree-credit program of university extension, the university's community would consist of those persons within its geographic area who are qualified by the university's admission policies to undertake degree-credit work.

Service.--The universities in the United States have traditionally performed three interdependent services: teaching, research, and public or community service (10, 13, 16, 19, 29, 60, 62). Brubacher (13) states that the aspect of service as a function of university responsibility is an American innovation added to the older English concept of teaching general culture to the educated gentleman, and the German concept of scholarly research for its own sake. It is suggested by Brouillette (11) that the first federal land grant act, The First Morrill Act, was largely instrumental in helping to change the older, more limited conception of university responsibility.

A number of authorities believe that the concept of service is based upon "... the democratic concept that the university should strive continually to live the life of its adult constituency to higher planes in all fields of social
activity" (2, p. 231). The university in a democratic society justifies its existence by its function of service to the public that supports it (2, 4, 13, 15, 19, 29, 30, 64). Sheats (62) adds, however, that while the adult education activities of the extension service are a definite part of the service rendered by the university to the public, it is not the only service area. The fact that the word "service" has come to carry the implication that it must be immediate, practical and tangible, is deplored by Charters. He states that the idea of service has sometimes degenerated to the point that "the reasoning seems to be: we (the university) will do what you (the taxpayers) want if you will give us additional funds to do what we want" (19, p. 85). There is a consensus that public or community service is a responsibility of the university and that adult education is at least one form of that service.

Limitations of public service.--A number of authorities either state or imply that the public service activities of the university must be limited. Brown (12) and Carlson (17) warn that the university cannot be "all things to all people," and Sheats warns that

Granted the critical need for rapidly increasing our social literacy and our civic competency, it must still be acknowledged that even the best intentions and most enthusiastic efforts of our universities and colleges are scarcely adequate to the needs of some eighty-five million adults (63, p. 78).
Since the sphere of the university in public service must be limited, the degree-credit program, which is only a part of the adult education program of the university, will be even more limited.

The off-campus credit program is limited in three major areas—(1) by course offering; (2) by the kind of community or public it serves; and (3) by the available resources at its command. The limitation of course offerings is discussed in another section of this paper.

Conley (20) believes that there are basically three kinds of public which the college credit programs are limited to serving—those persons who need credit toward a regular degree, those persons who already have a college education but who need to stay abreast of the developments in their fields, and those who need vocational and professional skills that are in harmony with the objectives of the university. One or more of these areas is mentioned as an area of the university off-campus credit program’s responsibility by a number of authorities (2, 6, 7, 29, 43, 52).

The university is limited by its resources, both material and personnel. One of the dangers foreseen by several authorities in the field of adult education is the danger of overextending the resources of the institution (2, 12, 17, 28, 64). Gordon (28) is of the opinion that community service does not mean performing every job the community wants done. Only if no other agency exists that
is capable of rendering the service is the university obliged to perform the service, and then only when the unique sources of the university can make some significant contributions. Brown (12) states that each institution must set its own limits in terms of its resources, and in this Carlson (17) concurs. Weaver adequately sums up this thinking when he states that

no matter how convincingly the need for broadened opportunities in education may be presented, it clearly will be to everyone's disadvantage, both inside and outside the university community, if the core of the on-campus program is weakened by overextending the off-campus programs (64, p. 246).

Meeting the needs of the public.--Adult education is based upon the premise that adults have certain needs which should be met, and Conley states that "the university does not merely attempt to meet the conscious needs and interests of adults with suitable programs, but . . . through careful community analysis the real needs are discovered and interpreted by the university, and programs are planned accordingly" (20, p. 15). Petersen (52) believes that the very use of the term "felt needs," implies that there are "unfelt needs" and that these should be discovered by the extension division and programs devised to meet them.

There is considerable support for the idea that the university extension division should not be content to provide only those services which are requested, but should actively search for the areas where its services are needed
While some authorities are rather vague about the methods that the university should use in determining community needs, some do have suggestions. The most frequently mentioned method was the survey (3, 14, 47, 59, 60).

Following are some of the methods for determining community needs used by the universities replying to Morton's survey (47, p. 120).

- Sending out inquiry sheets, or making surveys through interviews
- Consulting with community leaders of all kinds
- Consulting with educational leaders in the community
- Consulting with teachers and representatives from teachers' associations
- Watching trends for areas needing new training techniques
- By recommendation of faculty organizers or supervisors in the professional fields.

Program publicity.—Morton (47) states that extension programs would be much more widely patronized if all the persons in need of them were aware of their existence. It appears to him that one of the weaknesses of most extension divisions is a lack of information service to the potential users. Other adult educators also feel that there is a need for the extension division to more adequately inform the community of the classes that are available (14, 18; 49, 59, 60).
Among the more militant advocates of extension promotion were a group of extension administrators who felt that the "... universities have been too conventional in promoting their classes. The opinion was the universities should follow the patterns used by business concerns in selling their products, and that if our classes are worth selling to the public, we should use aggressive selling methods to promote the work" (49, p. 124). Shannon points out that commentators on the university extension scene are unanimous in saying that extension must make clear to many groups the meaning and value of education ... and point out the availability of specific opportunities by utilizing to the fullest degree the many publicity methods by which university extension may be promoted (60, pp. 88-89).

The fact that some extension divisions are not keeping potential students informed as to the availability of extension classes is upheld by Schulman's (59) survey of 135 public school districts in California. One of the complaints most often voiced was that the teachers did not know about the courses being offered. Carter (13) mentions that very little use seems to be made of the mass media in informing potential students of courses to be offered.

The following are some of the most commonly used methods of publicizing extension classes used by the universities responding to Morton's survey (47, p. 123).

Stories in newspapers, house organs, and other periodicals
Word-of-mouth publicity from users of extension classes
Direct mail
Brochures, flyers, and other printed promotional material
Radio and television announcements
Catalog of offerings
Personal contacts with teachers and teachers' associations
Personal contacts with business and industry

Nowhere in the literature was legitimate publicity of extension classes condemned. The only implication that promotion might not be desirable was mentioned in connection with the extension service used as a money-making project which is discussed in another section of this paper.

The following criterion on public service is derived from the foregoing survey of the literature:

Criterion 5. The university should feel an obligation to provide extension classes to meet the needs of the public to the full extent that its resources will allow. Some organized and effective method should be employed to determine the needs of the community and an adequate system of publicity for course offerings should be used.

Admissions

Admissions is an area in which the critics of extension activities have been especially vocal. The fact that admission policies, to a great extent determine the quality of a
program, is generally understood. The Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools states that "perhaps no single index of an institution's caliber is more significant than the appropriateness of its admission policy as evidenced in requirements, standards, and procedures" (1, p. 50).

Critics of the admissions policies in off-campus classes stress the fact that the differences in previous academic training and aptitude for intellectual work make the teaching of these classes extremely difficult. The admission of an applicant to the regular day program of a university depends upon his meeting certain requirements, which usually include graduation from a secondary school with certain prescribed courses, a required rank in his graduating class, and/or attainment of specified aptitude test scores. The off-campus credit student, on the other hand, frequently needs only to appear at registration with sufficient funds to pay his tuition and fees (44).

That this practice is widespread is attested to by DeCrow who states that in his survey of evening colleges (which included extension)

of the schools reporting, fifty per cent note that admission requirements in evening credit programs differ from those for admission to credit programs in the day division of the university. The differences mentioned all suggest that gaining admission to the evening program is easier, or at least, less formalistic and tedious than entering the day division (24, p. 19).
Petersen confirms this and adds that "on some campuses students who flunk out of the regular day college are permitted to make up the courses by extension" (52, p. 93). Zahn (68), in her comparison of the abilities of extension and resident students in California, states that because there were no admission requirements to extension classes, the faculty of the university and the public were of the opinion that the students were ill-prepared, doubtfully competent, and poorly qualified.

The literature reveals that there is a majority sentiment that admission standards for extension students and regular university students should either be the same or equivalent with the possible substitution of maturity for the completion of secondary school (12, 19, 22, 27, 33, 41, 42, 43, 52, 64). Some of these authorities openly expressed this idea, while others, as in the cases of McCormick (41) and Weaver (64), implied that this should be the practice by equating the abilities of the extension students in their studies with the abilities of resident students, since the extension students had met the same admission requirements. Charters suggests that

the generally accepted principle is that a university will accept qualified students of any age. Any suggestion that adult programs should admit those any less qualified, in equivalent terms, than those in any other part of the university, pushes beyond the limits acceptable to the university as a whole (19, p. 85).

Godard (27) makes the suggestion that doubt about the
qualifications of extension students might be partially removed by using the same admissions officer for both the extension program and the regular resident program.

It is apparent that the word "equivalent" is the pivotal point when admission for adults who do not meet regular admission standards is considered. Moore (46) is of the opinion that experience and maturity sometimes result in more learning than occurs in the formal classroom, but Charters suggests that "the selection process becomes more complicated when actual adult experience is equated with the prognosis of intellectual ability" (19, p. 86). Perhaps the solution to the problem of equivalency lies in the example cited by Creese. He states that in Northwestern University, an irregularly prepared student may be admitted to designated curriculum and then may be "... officially transferred to regular standing if he maintains a prescribed, satisfactorily high standing" (22, p. 66).

The Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools is permissive in its accreditation policies on admission for all students. It states that students admitted for the first time should have completed an accredited secondary school program which provides a foundation appropriate for college study.

In some cases, an admissions agency might justifiably accept ... a more mature student who has received a reasonable equivalent of secondary preparation in an informal educational program (45, pp. 83-84).
The Association of Texas Colleges and Universities by its statement that "there shall be but one set of standards covering academic matters, and these shall be applied to the institution as a whole in all its academic program" (42, p. 66), would permit the substitution of maturity for other specific admission requirements in the extension program only if such practice is followed in the admission of regular day students.

A few authorities (12, 32, 33) indicate that the purpose of the student should be given consideration in the admissions process. Houle, for example, states that the "... universities have little to lose by removing these obstacles (admission requirements) from the path of the adult who simply wants to learn (32, p. 132); and Jordan (33) found in his survey that there was some opinion among faculty, students and school administrators that some adjustment should be made in admission requirements consistent with the purposes of the registrants.

McMahon disputes this idea, however, when he points out that "... qualification must be kept clearly distinct from objective. The significant point is not whether the student seeks credit but whether the student is qualified for college work" (44, p. 70). Probably the reasoning of Petersen (52), Woodburne (66) and others in defense of identical extension and resident course offering would support McMahon's contention.
The following criterion on admissions is derived from the foregoing literature:

Criterion 6. Extension students should meet the same admission requirements as resident students. Maturity or experience should be allowed to substitute for other admission requirements only if this practice is followed for regular campus students.

Administrative Organization

The literature concerned with the administration of extension activities reveals, almost without exception, a general agreement on administrative organization. The extension activities should be concentrated in a separate, distinct unit of the university and headed by a chief administrative officer. It was usually mentioned that the extension administrator was, or should be, responsible directly to the president. All the literature surveyed either advocated this organization or reported that it is widely in use (16, 26, 32, 35, 42, 43, 47, 52, 60, 61, 66).

Morton (47) reports that of the fifty-one universities that responded in his survey, forty-eight listed the extension service as a major division of their institution. In thirty-seven of these schools, the director of the extension division reported directly to the chief administrative officer of the university, in ten, the chief extension officer was directly responsible to a vice-president or dean.
of faculties; and in one institution was responsible directly to the State Board of Higher Education (47, p. 33). Sheats (61) states that in the few cases where the extension activities are carried on by the different schools and colleges within the university, the extension program has been in operation only a short time. The Association of Texas Colleges and Universities (42) states that

the administration of all supplemental programs shall be under the control of the central academic administration of the total institution. For purposes of efficient administration each institution shall appoint a director or directors for the various supplemental programs, who shall be responsible to the central administration (42, p. 66).

A number of reasons are advanced for the desirability of concentrating the extension activities in a single division. Petersen advances the idea that "it is desirable as a means of 'conservation of planning, funds, and energy,' since the 'elimination' of confusion makes for greater efficiency" (52, p. 34). Shannon (60) is in essential agreement with this view and lists in greater detail the functions in which duplication is avoided by centralization. Houle (32) and Broady (10) advance reasons that are a bit different from those of Petersen and Shannon. Houle believes that one of the major advantages of centralization is that it provides a better focus and balance of services "... in terms of needs and interests of the mature clientele...." (32, p. 76), and in this Broady concurs. McGrath (43) leans
even further in this direction than Houle or Broady and states that "... the administrative unit ... for such a program should have an identity of its own. Schools and divisions concerned with other matters will not usually give time, energy, and imagination required for the creation of satisfactory adult degree programs" (43, p. 95).

Morton (47) probably gives the most valid and comprehensive reasons for the establishment of extension activities within a separate division of the university. He states that if the resources of the university are to be channeled into adult education, the administrative unit responsible for such a program must be of equal status with the other major divisions in order to function effectively. In no other way could it act as coordinator without being subordinate to some particular segment of the university community. As a representative of any particular segment of the university, it would be practically useless as a means for extending the resources of the whole institution.

There is a lack of uniformity of terms in extension organizations and Shannon (60) feels that this is understandable as the universities themselves differ in organization. Shannon states that

... the typical college or university designates a chief extension administrative officer and puts him in charge of a special unit. The officer is variously called "dean," "director," "coordinator," or even "vice-president" of "extension," "university extension," "continuing education," "adult education," "public service," or "educational services."
His unit may be called a "division," "center," "office," "bureau," or "university college." Probably the most common nomenclature is "dean of the university extension division."

Sheats reports that some titles for the chief extension administrator are "Assistant to the President in Charge of Extension," "Dean of the University College," and "Vice-President of University Extention" (51, pp. 184-192).

Morton (47) states that, of the institutions reporting in his survey, the administrator of extension activities was in almost every case entitled "dean" or "director" of "university extension" with the use of the two terms about equally divided. Houle (32) and Sheats (62) agree that these are the two titles most in use.

The size and complexity of the administrative organization of the extension unit will vary with the variety of activities and with the size and population of the geographic area served by the unit (51). The most complex administrative organizations are those which have a unified system of higher education with a single extension division for all the public institutions in the state, as in Florida and Oregon (32). Regardless of the size of the operation, the internal organizational structure usually follows function with departments, or bureaus of correspondence, class instruction, world affairs, women's programs and other activities with which the division deals (60, 47, 62).
The following criterion on administrative organization of extension activities was derived from the foregoing literature:

Criterion 7. The extension activities of the university should be consolidated in a separate division with a chief administrative officer responsible directly to the president. Internal organization should follow function and the division should be divided into departments of correspondence, class instruction, and other activities in which the division is engaged.

Research and Exploratory Work

The statement by Weaver that in the field of extension "... we have vast amounts of presumption, tradition, and opinion, but a distressing paucity of verified measurement and fact" (64, p. 248), and the statement that "... people interested in Adult Education and Extension Services are generally long on administration and short on research" (56, p. 21), probably rather adequately sum up the general sentiment of the writers in the field of extension. At any rate, many of the authorities in the field believe that research and developmental work in the many facets of extension is an important need (8, 19, 20, 21, 29, 32, 41, 43, 44, 47, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 68).

One dean of extension (56) stated that he believed that no agency could do any job of importance without conducting
some research in connection with its activities. Sheats (52) indicates that possible reasons for the lack of a great deal of research, exploratory, and developmental activities in extension might be because of the wide diversity of practice and the pressures which cause extension administrators to deal with urgent, immediate problems rather than with the long-range, possibly more important questions. Creese (22) points out that research in extension would be profitable and that the Agricultural Extension Service has actually shown that research and developmental work in extension prove valuable to off-campus activities, but Graney (29) observes that much of the exploratory work that was pioneered by extension has later been adopted into the curriculum as a part of the regular university program. He cites summer schools as one example.

Essentially, the research and exploratory work advocated by most authorities may be divided into two main categories. Although there is some overlap, one area deals with what are basically administrative problems while the other is primarily concerned with extension student abilities, and achievement and instructional problems.

On the administrative level, Brady (8) and Conley (20) advocate community analysis which might include experimentation to find the most effective ways of determining community needs, ways of most effectively publicizing extension, and means of providing better library service through better use
of local libraries. In this connection, Sheats believes that one of the most valuable developments that research could achieve would be "... the development of data-collection instruments which will aid the administrator and organizer of extension programs and in calculating long-range trends and probabilities" (62, p. 502). McMahon (44) is of the opinion that another administrative problem that needs intensive, prolonged, and carefully controlled research is the area of admissions. Work needs to be done to determine what criteria are valid in the adult degree program.

The literature abounds with suggestions for research and experimentation in the area of student abilities and achievement and instructional problems. Interest appears to be especially intense in the comparative abilities and achievement of extension students and resident students. A number of writers (21, 41, 44, 47, 64, 68) advocate experimentation and research in this area. McCormick (41) points out that if enough information of this type were available, it should be an indication of the effectiveness of the academic administration of the extension program, while Weaver believes that information of this type should show the particular benefits of resident work, if any. He also states that there is a need to know "... if non-resident instruction produces less adequate results than resident instruction, how much less adequate" (64, p. 248). Some writers in extension have expressed the idea that the high rate of
extension dropouts may be caused by the "watering down" of extension courses by instructors who assume that extension students cannot do the same quantity and quality of work as resident students. Petersen surmises that a serious student "... having come for bread, ... will not be satisfied with pap" (52, p. 70) and will drop out of the class. It is in this light that Zahn recommends research into comparative abilities of the two groups. Findings in this area could prevent "... unnecessary simplification and 'watering down' of the subject matter and assignments in courses ..." (68, p. 98).

A topic of concern for research expressed by several authors (20, 21, 56, 63) is that of the development of better methods and techniques on instruction for adults. Another area that needs research and investigation, according to McGrath (43), is the high dropout rate among extension students, and others (19, 20) are concerned with extension student motivation.

One area where research is advocated by concerned persons (20, 56) is important to both major categories outlined above. Experimentation is needed to learn subject matter fields and the particular courses in which achievement by extension students is comparable to that of resident students, to enable the extension administrator to better plan the extension program. Those courses which proved to
so more adaptable to field work would be offered, while those
courses which were doubtful could be reserved for campus
study.

There appears to be a question as to who should do the
research for extension. Morton (47) and Brady (8) seem to
indicate that the problems should be probed by the profes-
sional research personnel, while Houle (32) and Sheats (61)
believe that extension administrators and teachers should
be involved in the work. According to Sheats, "A teacher
is most likely to change his ways of working with pupils when
he accumulates and interprets information about these pupils
because he wants to work more effectively with them . . . ."
(61, pp. 470-471). The premise that this is not an "either-
or" question is advanced by McMahon (44) and Shannon states
that "the need is clear: to make extension personnel more
effective fact-finders and stimulators, by exposing them to
theory-oriented research, and to make researchers more dis-
posed to assist in situational problems raised in extension's
fields" (60, p. 77). In this light, it is clear that there
is room for research at both levels.

McGrath probably best sums up the need for research,
developmental and exploratory work by the local extension
division when he states that

While research projects are being designed and
executed, we need widespread innovation and
experimentation even if a controlled research
setting cannot be established. Many breakthroughs
have occurred in advancement of human welfare by imaginative and creative thinking outside the physical or statistical laboratory, indeed outside the elite company of scholars. Hence, I urge large scale experimentation with new content and new procedures in adult education, carefully controlled and measured when possible. But where the necessary conditions do not exist, I favor trying innovations, the worth of which will only be attested by the amateurish observations of those involved (43, p. 91).

The following criterion on research and exploratory work was derived from the foregoing literature:

Criterion 8. The Division of Extension should maintain a program of research, exploratory and developmental work, the scope of which should be determined by the number and variety of its activities and the size of its staff.

Establishing Areas of Importance for Investigation

The literature on extension was reviewed to determine areas of importance or concern in extension classes for an investigation by this study. If a consensus exists, it has been noted, but perhaps those areas in which considerable controversy exists need investigation even more. The main concern in establishing the areas to be investigated was that considerable opinion did exist in the literature on the subject. The practices in the extension classes offered by North Texas State University in these areas will be compared with the practice in the campus classes at North Texas. The thought that campus practices might not be ideal is perhaps answered by Petersen's (52) observation that it is utopian
to expect extension classes to be better than classes on the university campus.

The areas of importance for investigation have been determined to be (1) Student-Instructor Relationship; (2) Assignments, Supplemental Work and Research; (3) Interest of the Student and Time Devoted to Study; (4) Teaching Method; (5) Student Needs; (6) Student Abilities, Achievement and Grades.

**Area 1: Student-Instructor Relationships**

Some observers of extension classes believe that there is insufficient counseling and student guidance in extension work and that little opportunity exists for the formation of that sort of community of scholarship and inquiry that is so necessary a part of higher education (53, 64). Weaver states that one of the advantages of residence work over extension study is the "... sustained opportunities to associate with mature faculty scholars, to come to know them and be known by them at close and intimate range . . ." (64, p. 247).

One aspect of the student-instructor relationship that is stressed as being poor is that extension classes are usually held once a week and the instructor is not available to the student for individual counseling between class periods (27, 33, 41, 65). McCormick (41) felt that this fact offsets some of the advantages of extension work.
There is opinion, however, that there are certain advantages of extension classes that make up for the lack of instructor-availability between classes (33, 41). Jordan (33) found in his survey of extension classes for teachers, that there was less formality in off-campus classes, which promoted better student-instructor relationships, and that although the availability of off-campus advising and counseling was generally considered to be poor, off-campus instructors were considered warmer and more helpful to the in-service teachers. The fact that extension classes were usually smaller than on-campus classes, permitting the instructor to give more individual attention to the student, seemed to McCormick (41) to compensate for the lack of student-instructor contact between classes.

Petersen (52) and Bray (9), although admitting that the opportunities for individual counseling are inadequate for extension students, do not see this as any more handicap to the extension student than to the resident student. Bray states that

All of us . . . know that with our more sophisticated students, with those who have attended college in residence, these arguments on counseling and on lack of student-faculty contact often fall flat. These students can often draw embarrassing comparisons between the amount of counseling and faculty contact in residence and extension (9, p. 50).

Petersen (52) also believes that counseling in residence is usually as lacking as in off-campus courses and raises the
point that the mature persons in extension classes might resent required counseling.

Some ways to compensate for the lack of student-instructor contact have been suggested. Grumman (31) states that in some cases of in-service teacher extension classes, the instructor was employed by the school as a consultant and spent one day a week throughout the year in visitations and conferences. Sheats (62) suggests that better relationships might be created by the teacher expressing interest in absentees through phone calls and other follow-up procedures.

Instructor attitude toward extension classes and extension students was felt by some writers (4, 32, 40, 68) to be an obstacle to good student-instructor relationships. Houle states that "many members of the university faculties have little or no conception of the nature or importance of adult education . . . " (32, p. 164), and Zahn states that

 campus faculty members . . . often are of the opinion that . . . in university extension classes the students are ill-prepared, doubtfully competent, and poorly qualified. They believe the mental ability of extension students to be low compared to students in general, and necessarily lower than students on the day campuses of the university (68, p. 98).

One reason for some of the undesirable instructor attitude toward extension students, according to Benne (4), is the fact that they pose a threat to the instructor. He states that the extension students seek more specific help than campus students, having more questioning attitudes, and are
not so easily satisfied with generalities. He also adds that "... they (adults) come from social systems that, in the larger community, have higher prestige than that of the university. It is hardly surprising that they should be something of a continuing threat to the resident population (faculty)" (4, p. 414).

Some writers (4, 52) believe that the attitudes of extension students make good instructor-student relationship, if not difficult, at least different from those on campus with young people.

Adults are less malleable than adolescents; they tend to be more set in their ways, less inclined to assimilate new theories and abstractions. While such an attitude is often a serious limitation, it is also their great strength, for it disciplines any instructor who would move their minds with a jejune preoccupation with a fact or principle. They insist, to the perpetual vexation of teachers and to the eternal enrichment of subjects, upon wedging their own knowledge of things to generalizations of learning. Among adults who are likely to take courses, moreover, such a resistance to instructor-generalizations is likely to be based on at least as sound a general factual background as the average day undergraduate has mastered (52, p. 67).

In a survey of role expectations of extension students, Lacognata (36) discovered that extension students feel that instructors should cultivate a permissive or democratic atmosphere in the classroom, that the students should feel free to interrupt the instructor with questions, and that the instructors should be willing to consult with students on academic problems. Marcus (40), in his survey of the
attitudes of public school teachers toward extension courses, concludes that experience with extension tends to create more favorable attitudes toward these classes.

Summary

The foregoing survey of student-instructor relationship in extension classes reveals that some writers believe the extension student is handicapped by the lack of counseling by the instructor, while others believe that the resident student fares little better in this area. Even though the extension student usually meets only once a week, the instructor could provide adequate counseling by visiting the school one day a week as a consultant.

Some writers believe the extension student may possibly have an advantage by having better student-instructor relations than the resident student. There is some evidence that extension instructors tend to be more permissive and democratic in their classes than the resident instructor. If this is the case, is it an advantage or a disadvantage? Obviously this area is in need of further investigation before a final conclusion is reached.

Area 2: Assignments, Supplemental Work and Research

An important area in the evaluation of an extension class is that of assignments, supplemental work, and research. Creese (22) and Woodburne (66) believe that if the credits
earned by extension are to be applied to a degree from a regular residence division, the work required in the course should be the same as that required on campus or the equivalent. Shannon states that for this reason extension is under pressure "... to replicate as nearly as possible the pattern of residence instruction . . ." (60, p. 28).

Some authors doubt that the same quality and quantity of work can be done by extension students that is expected of resident students. Woodburne states that "one of the difficulties of extension teaching has been that raised by the differences of preparation of students, and the limitation of libraries and other facilities . . ." (66, p. 183). He believes that these factors reduce to a great extent, the possibility of dealing with a subject at the same level of rigor and competence as in a class taught on campus.

Zahn (68) indicates that because faculty members often believe the abilities of extension students to be less than those of regular students, there is a possibility that the assignments, supplemental work, and research will be "watered down."

Costin (21), although he found in his study that the achievement of extension students was equal to that of campus students, indicates that extension students may have more difficulty with assignments and supplemental work than regular students. He believes that "... because extension students are not attending school on a full-time basis, they
tend to be out of touch with academic study routines, and therefore may find the study process itself a much more difficult task than do campus students" (21, p. 120). Knowles states that adult students have less time available for learning activities than on-campus students . . . so that adult students typically cannot tolerate as heavy a load of homework . . . " (35, p. 255).

The idea is advanced by McCormick (41) that the very fact that extension students are adults may give them more time for outside work than full-time students, since extension students typically are enrolled in only one or two courses per semester as compared with the heavier load of campus students. Gordon (28) maintains that if the quality of extension courses is to be kept high, the students cannot be mere bystanders. He states that "a university is a community of scholars in which work of the mind goes on, and when students participate in the community, they should do some of the work" (28, p. 26). He further contends that the very fact that extension students are usually adults is one reason that more independent, outside work should be required. The adult student should be made to realize that " . . . educational coddling and spoonfeeding . . . ends when he enrolls in an adult education program. He is, after all, a responsible member of society" (28, p. 26). Houle agrees that the ability to do independent work is "perhaps the surest sign of a man with a sound education . . . " (32, p. 134).
Knowles states that in adult education customary classroom procedures, (and outside assignments are a part of customary procedure) . . . were increasingly displaced by group discussion, cooperative projects, role playing, case study, and other highly participatory techniques" (35, p. 89). Moore ridicules this approach to education and states that " . . . we may falsely believe that it makes obsolete the formal lecture (and) the required assignment, . . . supplanting these with discussion groups in which truths are somehow supposed to take wing miraculously from the mind of the least educated participant" (46, p. 69).

Benne, on the other hand, maintains that more supplemental work is sometimes required of the extension student than the resident student. He states that "the ritual defenses against contamination must be even stronger. . . . Reading lists may be longer and examinations more difficult in extramural work for credit" (4, p. 414). Lacognata (36), in a survey of extension role expectations, found, however, that these students believed that the instructor should not take such factors as student employment and other non-academic activities into account, apparently indicating that they believed that they should be doing the same amount of work as campus students.

Ordinarily associated with research and outside assignments is the university library, and it is in this area that much of the criticism of extension classes has come. That
the library is important is indicated by the fact that the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (45) and the Association of Texas Colleges and Universities (42) both require that adequate library resources be available before any course is offered by extension.

Attempts to meet the library needs of extension students have been varied. These attempts have ranged from the practice of instructors who carry boxes of books to the classes, to the use of local libraries. Some institutions maintain special extension libraries with books selected by extension instructors, although in a survey of graduate extension practices (48), only two of the forty-five institutions surveyed, reported that extension libraries alone were used for their extension courses. In fourteen of the institutions the university library was reported as being the principal source of library materials. The majority of the schools reported, however, that some combination of extension libraries, regular libraries, and local libraries were used.

An example of a way in which extension has tried to meet the library needs of its students is that of Indiana State College. An extensive book and periodical collection has been accumulated in the areas in which extension courses are most offered. This collection is kept separate from the regular library, and when needed, appropriate materials are transported to the public library nearest the off-campus
course site. The university materials are thus supplemented by the local library and possibly more important, the services of a trained librarian become available to the extension students (58). The University of Maryland in its extensive off-campus program uses a bookmobile with an assistant librarian and a library of 3,000 volumes made up from a bibliography compiled by faculty members who teach off-campus courses. For its overseas classes, each instructor takes a case of fifteen to twenty volumes for each course to be taught (48).

Although attempts have been made to provide library materials for extension classes, they have apparently not generally been too successful. A number of writers believe that in most cases library facilities and reference materials for extension classes are inadequate (18, 40, 48, 53, 64). Carter (18) reports that in a survey of 785 graduate students, 44.3 per cent felt that library facilities were inadequate, 22 per cent were undecided, and 33.6 per cent believed them to be adequate. Jordan (33), who gives one of the highest ratings encountered in the literature, states that library and instructional materials for extension classes are considered fair. It is also noted that "... even if the library is adequate, the distance students commute limits their use of it" (48, p. 56).

Pierson, in her study for the Conference of Deans of Southern Graduate Schools, believes that even though attempts
are made to provide library resources "... the extension student has very little real opportunity to undertake research under these circumstances ..." (53, p. 128). She states, however, that the best defense for graduate extension class can be made in the field of education.

The students enrolled are most often teachers in service and often have the public school and classroom as laboratories. It is sometimes claimed, and sometimes with responsibility, that this available resource is of greater value than the university library to the student of educational problems. It is claimed, therefore, that for such students graduate work through extension is in a good sense field work, and that research efforts undertaken can be, and have been, safeguarded by the observance of high standards of work and achievement (53, p. 128).

Summary

One of the major criticisms of extension work as revealed by the foregoing survey of the literature is the lack of adequate library facilities. Most of the writers point out that the extension student cannot do either the quantity or quality of work the resident student can without the use of a library. And since the extension student is out of the academic atmosphere, he is further handicapped in doing scholarly research.

Some writers believe the extension student cannot carry as heavy an academic load as the resident student because he does not have the use of an adequate library and because he has other interest demanding his time. However, other
writers believe the extension student has more time for research than the resident student because he is only carrying one or two courses and is more mature than the resident student. Yet other writers believe that in some areas, such as graduate education, the library is not as important because the student is doing field work by using the classroom as a laboratory. Also, it has been the trend to displace the customary classroom procedures by group discussion, cooperative projects, and other participation techniques. To answer this question of how adequately the library needs of extension programs students are met, will require further investigation.

Area 3: Interest of the Student and Time Devoted to Study

Considerable disagreement is expressed in the literature as to whether the extension student can devote the necessary interest and time to his studies to make such studies a serious endeavor. A study by Carter (13) reveals that almost all extramural students hold full-time jobs in addition to their course work and Burns (16) adds that besides job demands, adult education courses must also compete with family responsibilities, the movie houses and the cocktail bar.

A number of writers express doubt that the adult student, in view of these distractions, can have the interest and devote the time to study that the full-time campus student
can (21, 32, 40, 52, 53, 64). Costin states that "because of certain practical difficulties which face most extension students . . . one could argue that it is unrealistic to expect them to achieve as well as campus students in a given course" (21, p. 120). In addition to the fact that job and family responsibilities restrict the number of actual hours available to the student for study, he believes that "... they are more likely to be so fatigued in the evening as to reduce considerably their effective use of studying time and classroom participation" (21, p. 120). Marcus (40), in his survey, confirms the fact that extension students do suffer from some physical fatigue.

Petersen believes that the one significant deficiency of adult students is that for them, education is a part time, secondary activity. Besides the factors of little study time and fatigue, their interest may be dulled by the fact that "their education is usually spread over many years, often with long gaps and little continuity from one course to the next" (52, p. 67). Pierson (53) agrees that the interest of the extension student and the time that he may devote to study may be restricted by the fact that such classes are a secondary activity. She states, for example, that the "teacher-in-service, who is at the same time enrolled in extension classes, may have his intellectual interest in the course limited by his professional duties, from which fact both activities may suffer" (53, p. 129).
Weaver found that many of the institutions included in his study believed that, especially in graduate work, it was difficult for a student to hold a full-time job and live up to his promise as a scholar.

Graduate work is in itself a rigorous occupation, demanding concentration and singleness of purpose. To remove a person from the academic environment and then to divide his attention between a full-time job and part-time graduate study is viewed as creating a situation from which true maturity in scholarship cannot be expected to emerge (64, p. 247).

There is a school of thought, however, that, although adult students are limited by a lack of study time, their interest and motivation are actually higher than that of regular undergraduate students. This line of reasoning maintains that adult students, by the very fact of their maturity and responsibilities, have acquired a different motivation and that they recognize specific needs that the regular campus students do not. The reasoning also is that adults are not captive students, coerced by parental pressures and that the fact that they are in class of their own volition indicates higher motivation (7, 10, 12, 21, 22, 43, 60).

Bower (7) points out that the fact that the adult student is not a captive in the classroom, but is spending his own money, would indicate that he is a serious searcher after substance. Broady (60) agrees that the adult student is not a captive in the classroom and for this reason, the
techniques and generalities used in the teaching of adolescents will not be acceptable to him. Brown (12) believes that with maturity there has come a different kind of motivation and stability that materially improves the chances for success.

Shannon maintains that even the limited study time argument no longer holds the validity that it once did, but that Americans are becoming a leisure class and that education "becomes the touchstone for determining what the quality of that leisure will be" (60, p. 105). Greese adds that "men and women study because they wish to fill an actual need" (22, p. 12).

Costin (21) is in partial agreement with ideas mentioned above in that he believes that maturity enables the adult student to persist more strongly than the campus student in their course work in spite of the difficulties that confront them. However, he disagrees about motivation and suggests that adult student motives are probably quite similar to those of regular campus students.

McCormick (41) expresses the idea that the extension student may actually have more study time than the campus student. He states that the extension student is carrying only a partial load, usually three to six semester hours, and suggests that this might be one reason that some studies have found that extension grades are usually higher than resident grades in the same courses. He believes that it is
possible for the extension student to devote more time and interest to his classes than can resident students whose interests and time are divided among several courses.

An especially provocative idea is advanced by Charters when he states that

it is reasonable to assume that the longer people work in any one day, the more tired they become. It is also true that while many people are scheduled for an eight-hour day or a forty-hour week, businessmen have meetings, legislators continue sessions, professors write, community leaders operate, and university students are supposed to study (19, p. 85).

This thought seems to suggest that there is no more reason to suspect the quality of work done by adult students after a day's work than there is to suspect the quality of the after-hours work of the groups mentioned.

Another group of writers believe that there is very little difference in the motivation of regular campus students and extension students and that the adult students are actually captive audiences in almost the same way as adolescents (6, 21, 22, 52). Petersen (52) points out that the motives of extension students are very often vocational and uses teachers who seek more education to qualify for higher salaries as examples. He also adds that many other groups are enrolled in extension classes in order to obtain promotion or salary increases. Crease mentions the fact that one reason that most students desire credit in an extension course is that it is accepted "as the university's hallmark
of sterling ware, and anticipating that sometime they may have occasion to exchange it for a diploma" (22, p. 159).

In his summation, Weaver (64) asks the thought-provoking question as to how extension students, who work full-time and carry a partial academic load are different from resident students who carry a full load and work either full or part-time. The answer to this question should go far toward settling the controversy about limited time and divided interests.

Summary

There is some question that the extension student can devote enough time to his studies to make it a serious endeavor. The part-time student has various interests pulling at him other than course work. This makes extension work a secondary interest delegating it to a position of secondary achievement. Also, since almost all extension students work full time physical fatigue becomes a factor. The part-time student needs to make the most of his limited study time which he cannot do if he is fatigued. However, some writers believe that even though the extension student is limited by a lack of study time, his interest and motivation is greater than the resident student. The very fact that the extension student is a mature student filling a need and not a captive student indicates higher motivation. There is also the possibility that the extension student has
more study time than the resident student because he is carrying only a partial load while the resident student's interest is divided among several courses. Also, many people are scheduled for a eight hour day but continue beyond this while still producing quality work.

In the final analysis there is the question: what is the difference between a full time worker carrying a partial load and a full time student working either full or part time?

Area 4: Teaching Methods

Considerable opinion exists that methods used in extension teaching should differ, especially in undergraduate courses, from those methods used on-campus (7, 10, 16, 19, 20, 30, 32, 35, 45, 60, 62). Underlying this thinking is the fact that extension students are usually quite a bit older than resident students. Carter, for example, found in a survey of 3,535 extension students that the average age of the graduate student was 36 years and the undergraduate student was 32 years (10, pp. 223-224).

When reasons beyond the fact of age difference were given for the use of different methods with extension students, several bases are advanced. The writers mentioned that the experience and maturity that the extension student brings with him to the class makes unnecessary much of the introductory and preliminary material that the instructor
would ordinarily use with resident undergraduates. "These persons bring to adult classes better preparation for advanced instruction. They have sufficient experience in learning and in life to make them critical of the content and processes of education" (43, p. 90). Bower believes that the accumulated experiences of the adult student makes them "... shrewder in gauging whether they are getting what they want or need from the instructor than undergraduates" (7, p. 61). He believes that they make applications faster, once they have basic principles in mind, than resident undergraduates and that the job of teaching these adults calls for special skills and techniques and special understanding of their problems and attitudes. Shannon (60), and Charters (19) and Broady (10) all agree that the maturity and experience of the extension student make different teaching methods desirable. Another basis for the advocacy of different teaching methods for extension students, is the idea that extension students have a different motivation and different needs to be satisfied than resident students (7, 10, 60, 62). McGrath (43) contends that the use of identical methods with extension students and resident students is responsible for the large number of dropouts in adult education.

Shannon believes adult motivation may be used "... by involving him in assessing needs, formulating objectives, designing and conducting learning activities, and evaluating
outcomes" (60, p. 67). He states that teaching techniques that have come to be used by involving adult experience include "... case problem-solving, role playing, laboratory exercises, various forms of group discussions, and community projects" (60, p. 87). In reporting on methods being used with adult students, Knowles (35) reports that group discussion, cooperative projects, role playing, case study and other highly participatory techniques are increasingly displacing the lecture and recitation method of classroom instruction.

However, Gordon (28) and Moore (46) strongly believe that the highly participatory techniques should not replace traditional methods. Gordon states that

no discussion; audio-visual device, entertainment, provision of a non-threatening learning situation ... or all of them together can replace a teacher who knows more about the subject than the students. Some faculty are very poor teachers indeed; but most of them can do considerably more for students' knowledge, understanding, and insight--and at the university level--than students alone could do by individual or collective effort (28, p. 25).

Houle believes that success in extension teaching is due to the flexibility of the instructor. He states that

... is a matter of common observation that the professors who are the outstanding teachers on the campus are the most successful teachers of adults, precisely because they have never depended on the sanctions and routine which support their less able colleagues (32, p. 57).

There is some sentiment that methods should differ in graduate courses for teachers offered by extension and those
taught in residence. Pierson (55) believes that graduate courses by extension in professional teacher education are more justified than graduate courses in any other field, because of the fact that these classes can be oriented directly toward the problems faced by the in-service teacher. Marcus (40), in his survey of the attitudes of teachers toward extension courses, found that both public school teachers and college instructors believe that both content and approach to content should be modified when courses are offered to teachers in service. Blew (6) recommends a crash program for bringing public school teachers up to date through the use of extension classes. He states that the methods used in the extension classes for teachers must be different from those used in resident courses because of the ratio of public school teachers involved to the number of instructors available.

Although many of the authorities in adult education believe that teaching methods are of vital importance, Morton, in what is probably the most comprehensive survey of university extension that has been made to date, found that "the leaders in two-thirds of the institutions reporting . . . stated specifically that in their opinions teaching methods were not the most important factors in the success or failure of educational services for adults" (47, p. 127). They ranked methods as fourth in importance, behind the personal qualities of the instructor, competency in subject
matter of the instructor, and selection by the instructor of relevant course material.

Summary

A survey of the literature has shown that the extension student is quite a bit older than the resident student and because of this some writers believe a different teaching method should be used from that used with resident classes. These writers believe that much of the introductory material is unnecessary because of the extension student's accumulated experiences. His experiences better prepare the student for advanced instruction and make him more critical of the instruction given to him. These authors further state the adult motivation can be used to involve the extension student in learning activities such as case problem-solving and role playing. However, some writers believe that participatory techniques should not replace the traditional methods and there is still a need for a flexible well trained instructor. To clarify these points a considerable amount of research is needed in this area.

Area 5: Student Needs

It has been pointed out by Knowles (35) that the basis for the development of adult education programs, both basic and university level, has been largely that of need-meeting. Grattan (30) states that education has no terminal point at which the needs of life are fully met. He believes that
ideally, the person who has completed his formal schooling will be imbued with a sense of the importance of elaborating his education and will possess the skills necessary to continue his education on his own. Unfortunately, however, experience has shown that as far as adults generally are concerned, little reliance can be placed upon self-education. "Many adults find it more profitable to satisfy their need for education in association with their fellows. . . . They turn to adult education of one or another variety" (30, p. 16).

Before actual enrollment in an extension course, Sheats (62) notes that two preconditions must exist. The adult student must be aware that education can help solve his problems and he must equate education with success and happiness. Verbalized responses by adult students are not entirely reliable for identifying the needs that actually cause students to enroll in adult education classes. Apparently it is sometimes deemed more socially acceptable to give improvement of skills as the reason for enrollment rather than a salary raise, which is the actual reason.

Shannon states that extension students may essentially be grouped into three main categories according to their needs. There are the "goal oriented," who have fairly clear-cut economic, professional, or academic needs; the "activity-oriented" who take classes because they find a fulfillment of their needs in the circumstances of learning rather than in the content, and the "learning oriented" who seek knowledge
for its own sake. "These are not pure types, of course; there are many mutations" (56, p. 38). Regardless of the category into which the student falls,

\[ \ldots \text{it can be said that two basic facts seem to underlie university extension participation:} \]
\[ (1) \text{it is not a chance event in a person's life but is determined by his needs;} \]
\[ (2) \text{he looks to education as an aid in realizing his aspirations (66, p. 38).} \]

Several authorities believe, and several surveys show that the satisfaction of vocational and professional needs is the main reason for the enrollment of adults in university extension courses (6, 10, 20, 22, 36, 39, 47). Morton (47) found that four out of every five persons used university extension services to improve their vocational efficiency or in order to improve their incomes. Only about one in five indicated that they enrolled to improve their general education, or for recreational or avocational purposes. Creese agrees with this and states that "the vocational theme runs plainly through the history of what universities have done in the extension of teaching. . . ." and that "almost without exception the managers of extension teaching testify that the most common motivation behind serious study is an occupational motive" (22, p. 157-158).

The fact that "felt needs" are often mentioned implies to Petersen (52) that there are "unfelt needs" and that these needs should be met by university extension. These "unfelt needs" are not necessarily incompatible with "felt
needs” and may be satisfied in the same course. For example, a teacher may have a “felt need” to take a course to qualify for a higher salary schedule, while an “unfelt need” may exist for the improvement of instruction in mathematics. An industrial worker may have a “felt need” to take a course to qualify for promotion and an “unfelt need” for better report writing may exist. It is the duty of the university to ferret out these “unfelt needs” and meet them. It may also be that while the “felt needs” are of a vocational nature, “unfelt needs” of a civic or cultural nature may be provided for by the same course.

A survey by Carter reveals some of the needs of both graduate and undergraduate extension students. The graduate students listed, in order of importance, the following needs which caused them to enroll in extension courses: improvement of performance, advanced degree, advancement, personal satisfaction, better citizenship, teacher’s certificate, and social satisfaction. Undergraduate students listed, in order of importance, personal satisfaction, improvement of performance, advancement, advanced degree, teacher’s certificate, better citizenship, social satisfaction, and ministry requirements (16, p. 229). Bower (7) outlines a number of needs, other than those of a vocational nature, which exist in the average adult extension class. Although these may not be realized by the student, an attempt should be made by the university to meet them. Among the most outstanding of these
are communication skills, an understanding of the scientific method and the natural world, knowledge of contemporary society including political organization and problems, and an understanding of philosophy.

Many reasons are given as to why the meeting of these adult needs is the responsibility of the university. Most of these reasons are discussed in the section of this paper dealing with "community service." However, several additional reasons are advanced for the responsibility of the university in meeting the needs of adults who already have some higher education. Conley (20) suggests that the university should provide for those students who already have some skills in an area, but who wish further development. He also feels that most persons, including those who hold advanced degrees, have gaps in their education. Perhaps the most compelling argument for continuing education is advanced by Sheats (61). He believes that with the explosion of knowledge, most persons in the professions and in vocational work soon become outdated. These are the persons who carry the problems of the nation and world today and will carry them for the next twenty years. We cannot afford to wait to apply this new knowledge until new generations can be educated and move into positions of leadership. The leaders of today must be brought up to date.

An area in which the continuing education aspect of education is especially important is that of the in-service
teacher. Blee (60), Jordan (35), and Marcus (46) believe that courses for in-service teachers can probably be most effective when brought into the community where the teacher works. Marcus (46) suggests that as a result of off-campus classes, students generally indicated that when teaching they use more community resources, more pupil participation in school planning, and more modern teaching techniques. Blee states in this connection that

... there are arguments for making programs available in the community in which the teachers are employed. Not only are such programs more readily available to the teachers, but the chances that the instructional program can and will capitalize on the practical and theoretical problems of the school system will be greatly increased. This permits such programs to make the maximum contribution to meeting the needs of the school systems and greatly increases the chances that the continuing education of the teachers will in fact change their behavior in the classroom (6, p. 163).

Both Sheets (62) and Petersen (52) contend that the rate of dropouts from adult education programs decrease as adult interests and needs are satisfied. Petersen states that

... the irregular attendance, the high dropout rate ... are not—what they are too often taken to be—compelling arguments to reduce the academic level. It may be that some participants had a felt need for high standards and therefore quit a program conceived in the philosophy that no adult can become seriously involved with truly intellectual questions (52, p. 20).

Summary

As it has been pointed out in the foregoing survey of the literature, adult education has been developed to meet
the needs of the community. Some of the writers list economic, professional, or academic needs; those who take classes to fulfill their need to learn, and those who seek knowledge for its own sake as reason for adults taking extension classes. It is believed that the satisfaction of vocational and professional needs are the main reason for enrollment in adult education. Some writers believe that the student also has "unfelt needs," which may be satisfied at the same time a "felt need," such as professional advancement, is satisfied. An "unfelt need," the improvement of mathematics instruction is also being satisfied. Whatever the needs of the community are, most writers believe the university should make every effort to satisfy them and considerable research is needed in this area to find these needs.

Area 6: Student Abilities, Achievement and Grades

Campus faculty members and the general public often are of the opinion that the quality of extension students is inferior to that of campus students. Zahn states that "they believe the mental ability of extension students to be low compared to students in general and necessarily lower than students on the day campus of the university" (68, p. 98). A number of writers disagree with this view and maintain that extension students, who are usually adults, compare favorably in ability to learn with regular resident students (11, 16, 36, 44, 51, 52).
Burns (10) notes that while scientific studies show that the peak of learning ability is reached prior to the age of thirty, they also show that the deterioration in learning ability beyond that age is so gradual that at least well beyond the age of fifty, the ability to learn far exceeds the limits attempted by most individuals. Sheats cites several studies to show that the abilities of extension students are equal to those of resident students and states that "although manual dexterity declines with advancing age, general learning ability remains fairly constant in the mature years" (61, p. 459). Grattan adds that "given correct teaching methods and a favorable environment, adults can learn, if not quite as rapidly as adolescents, nevertheless just as thoroughly and in many instances with greater satisfaction" (30, p. 13). Brouillette observes that adults, however, must train themselves to continue learning and that "it may be difficult to teach an old dog new tricks, but man is neither dog nor spider. If he so wills it, he continues to learn until the last . . . ." (11, p. 133).

McMahon (44) cites a study in which a number of extension students and resident Freshman students were compared as to ability. There was no significant difference in mean scores of the two groups on the American Council of Education Psychological examinations. A significant difference was noted on the vocabulary and comprehension sections of the Cooperative Reading Comprehension examinations in favor of
the extension students. He states that apparently adults have the mental ability to do satisfactory college work and that "if the adult has the ability, then low standards (in extension work)—if they exist—must be attributable to other factors, factors which may be controlled" (44, p. 61).

The belief that achievement by extension students is inferior to that of resident students apparently is usually either stated orally or implied. Nowhere in the literature reviewed in this study was such a statement found. However, several instances were found, in which the authors defended extension students against this accusation. Bray, for example, states that the tendency is to regard extension work as inferior to residence work, but believes that if this is true, it is due to the attitude of the instructors and/or department heads. He states that "since it is so regarded, the result is that it sometimes is inferior work" (9, p. 62). Gordon agrees with this idea and feels that it should "... be made clear to students that they are expected to do scholarly work. Too often, students do not work hard simply because it is not expected of them" (23, p. 26).

Instructor attitude, it is believed by Nolte (48) sometimes affects the achievement of extension students. He believes that many instructors frown on extension teaching and only accept such work when they need money to supplement their salary for a specific purpose.
Both Jordan (33) and Herzog (46) found in their survey of extension classes in professional education that both college instructors and in-service teachers believed that the quality of instruction and student scholarship were only slightly different from that of on-campus courses. Petersen cites a study in which undergraduate extension students were matched for sex, high school scholastic records, and number of college credits completed, with undergraduate resident students. Three-hour tests were administered in history and social studies, fine arts, and science and mathematics. Achievement by extension students proved to be equal or superior to that of the resident students (52, p. 67).

McGrath (43) supports this contention and Dugan states that based on the limited data concerning the achievement of extension class students in the same courses taught by the same instructors, it may be concluded that extension students do at least as well as campus students (28, p. 44).

Apparently, a direct way to validate or terminate much of the criticism of extension classes, according to McMahon (44), would be the administration of a large number of standardized tests within institutions and among a number of universities, to extension students and resident students in the same programs. Brown believes that the successful passing of college courses is in itself an inadequate criterion of extension student achievement and suggests that "perhaps the next step will be in a series of comprehensive examinations to show . . . that attainment is equivalent to that of the usual college student" (12, p. 110).
Conflicting opinion exists as to the grades made by extension students. Jordan (40) and Marcus (40) found in their surveys that there was very little difference in the grades made in extension classes and in on-campus classes and McGrath (49) states that in a number of studies of undergraduate classes where extension and resident students were enrolled in common courses, the grades received by extension students were comparable to grades received by resident students.

Several other writers (27, 41, 52, 53) contend that grades made by extension students are usually higher than those made by resident students. Codard (27) states that one of the complaints made of extension classes is the excessive number of high grades that are sometimes given and Shannon adds that "extension teachers are known as easy markers" (60, p. 86). In several studies cited by Petersen (52), he states that in every case the grades in extension were higher than residence grades. He comments that from this finding one might conclude (1) that, indeed, extension students do better work, or (2) that instructors find extension teaching more stimulating and consequently do a better job of teaching, or (3) most plausibly, that grading in extension is more lenient. Several other studies confirm this last possibility (52, pp. 92-93).

He believes that extension instructors grade from a half to a full grade higher than they grade campus students.
In a comparison of extension and resident grades made by undergraduate engineering students, McCormick (41) found that the grades of extension students, based on a grading scale of 100 per cent, averaged 5.8 points higher than the grades of resident students. He offers three possible explanations for this finding: (1) the course load of the extension student is usually less than that of the regular student which might allow him to devote more time to his subjects, (2) the extension classes are usually smaller, which might allow the instructor to devote more individual attention to the student, or (3) there may be a different philosophy among instructors as to the grading of extension students and resident students.

Summary

As indicated by the literature, most writers believe the extension student is equal to the resident student in learning ability. However, there is considerable agreement that the adult must make more of an effort to continue to learn. Several studies have failed to reveal any significant difference between the mental ability of the resident student and extension student, and in some cases, the extension student scored higher than the resident student. Although most writers do not state that the extension student is inferior to the resident student, it is implied and additional research is needed before a conclusion can be reached.
Conflicting opinion exists as to the grades made by extension students. Some writers found that there was very little difference in the grades made in extension classes and in on-campus classes. Other writers contend that grades made by extension students are usually higher than those made by resident students. They contend that the extension instructor grades from a half to a full grade higher than the resident instructor. Other writers believe the extension student scores higher than the resident student because his course load is less, extension classes are smaller, and a different philosophy among instructors as to the grading of extension students and resident students. Here again additional research is needed to reach an answer.
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CHAPTER III

EVALUATION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES
GOVERNING THE EXTENSION SERVICE AT
NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY

History

An extension program was developed at North Texas State University in 1924 under the Presidency of Robert L. Marquis (3, p. 1). The State Legislature was continually strengthening the laws governing teacher employment and certification, placing more emphasis on college training from teacher institutions. Many teachers who had not earned a degree needed a way to complete their college program without leaving their position and turned to extension for the answer to their problem.

North Texas State attempted to meet this demand by offering extension courses for area teachers. In 1925 Dr. J. E. Blair became the first director of the extension service, and since that time there have been five directors: Dr. C. C. Williams from 1943 to 1945, Dr. V. Y. Craig from 1945 to 1947, Miss Bettie W. Priddy from 1947 to 1963, Dr. R. B. Toulouse from 1963 to 1966, and Dr. Witt Blair from 1966 to 1968 (2).
A great increase in demand for extension courses followed the change in the state Teachers Salary Schedule in 1949, which provided a salary increment upon completion of the master's degree as well as a continuation of annual increments for twenty-six years (1, p. 632). In 1963 because the major part of the demand for extension work was graduate education courses, the extension service was administered under the supervision of the Graduate School.

By 1966 a new office was created because of the demand for extension courses in a variety of areas, undergraduate as well as graduate. Dr. Witt Blair was appointed director of Teacher Placement, Extension, and Correspondence. For the first time the extension service became a primary rather than a secondary responsibility of a director.

The purpose guiding the administration of extension service at North Texas State University has been to maintain standards commensurate with the regular residence work. The results can be seen in the evaluation report of the Association of Colleges and Universities of 1967. This report declared that North Texas State Extension Service met all the standards and far exceeded most. The University was commended on the quality of its administrative practices responsible for maintaining such high standards. The history of the Extension Service reflects quality administrative practices from the beginning in 1924.
Evaluation

As stated in the first chapter, in order to evaluate the extension service of North Texas State University, the criteria established in Chapter II would be restated and the practices of the extension service would be compared with the criteria. Extension records were searched and the Director of Extension was interviewed to find the administrative policies of the extension department.

Financial Basis

Criterion 1. The Extension Service should not be considered a money-making project. Instructors should receive extra pay for extension teaching and the instructor's salary should be based upon some basis other than the number of students enrolled in the course.

The extension service at North Texas is not considered a money-making project; however, it is largely self-supporting, and usually operates at a small profit. Although it was not designed nor intended to make a profit, it has done so, and under the present system should continue to do so. Shown in Table I are the expenses and income for extension during the fall semester of 1967. The extension service budget is based on estimated extension income, therefore, each extension class must support itself from the student's tuition, which is thirty-nine dollars per three hour course. The number of students required to finance a class depends upon the
distance from campus the instructor must travel and the amount of any room rent that may be charged.

TABLE I
EXTENSION EXPENSES AND INCOME, FALL 1967

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expense</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition received</td>
<td>$31,178.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional expense</td>
<td>$21,438.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary for office staff</td>
<td>6,287.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,725.14</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,178.76</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,453.66</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instructor is paid a flat fee of $640.00 plus expenses regardless of his professional rank or class size. The average distance traveled is forty miles; so usually twenty-two students will pay for a class.

The major weakness under this criterion is the lack of additional budget support from the university. Without budget support the extension service is not in the true sense a service, because many courses cannot be offered. With an adequate budget, additional faculty members could be hired to provide additional services to raise the extension service on a level with resident service. In addition to providing more service, budget support would allow pre-planning of classes, thus avoiding last minute confusion. Also, it would assure better representation in extension
because students would be assured of having an extension class and would not have to depend entirely on resident courses.

**Articulation**

Criterion 2. The planning of extension courses and the maintenance of high standards should be the responsibility of the whole institution. Especially close cooperation should exist between the Division of Extension and the various disciplines within the institution, with the Division of Extension primarily concerned with administration and the subject-matter department primarily concerned with setting and maintaining standards.

The director of extension at North Texas State is also the director of teacher placement and is directly responsible to the president. He has the complete administrative authority and responsibility of extension planning, and all matters pertaining to extension must be approved by him. Extension policy, including teacher qualifications and the use of such courses that may be used toward a degree, is determined by the Faculty Council or Graduate Council. These councils determine all matters, both resident and off-campus, concerning curriculum and degree requirements. These are elected councils representing the whole institution.

Close cooperation between the director and the heads of the different disciplines is carried out in the planning
of extension classes. The request for an extension class is received by the extension office which, in turn, contacts the department head to request an instructor. The department head is then free to choose any instructor he feels is qualified to serve under the requirements of the university. It is the duty of the department head to see that the instructor maintains the same high standards in extension teaching as he does in residence. The administration of the extension course then falls to the extension department.

North Texas Extension Service meets criterion two in all respects and there are no recommendations proposed in this area.

Teaching Personnel

Criterion 3. Extension instructors should be full-time faculty members of the university. Persons who are not a part of the regular faculty should not be used as instructors except in cases where special competencies are needed. The instructor's off-campus load should be limited by policy and the instructor should accept the assignment of a class without coercion.

Before an instructor is given an extension class he is usually a full-time faculty member and teaching the same course, or qualified to teach it, on campus that he is to teach by extension. The only exception to this rule is that a limited number of part-time instructors may be used in
extension with special permission from the president and the
director of extension. This is usually done in business
courses because of the limited number of instructors avail-
able in this area and because of the demand for freshman and
sophomore courses. For example, in the fall semester of
1967, one part-time business instructor was allowed to con-
duct an extension class after his qualifications had been
checked by the President and the Extension Director through
a personal interview.

Extension classes are considered a part of the instruc-
tor's class load; therefore, an instructor cannot teach more
than twelve hours on campus if he has an extension class.
Some departments have less than a fifteen hour load; in this
case an extension class must be included in the department
load limit. Also, the present policy of the university is
that under no condition will an instructor be required to
teach an extension class.

Under criterion three North Texas meets all requirements
with the exception of using all full time faculty members
for extension classes. According to the accreditation re-
quirement of the Association of Texas Colleges and Universities,
an extension service cannot have more than 50 per cent part
time instructors. North Texas has never had more than 5 per
cent part time instructors on its extension staff. In the
fall of 1967, twenty-five extension instructors were employed
with one part time instructor.
Course Offering

Criterion 4. Extension courses should be selected from those regularly announced in the college catalog. Only those courses should be offered for which adequate facilities required by the course are available in sufficient quantity and quality at the off-campus site.

Extension courses offered by North Texas State University are those regularly taught on campus. When the director of extension receives a demand for an extension class, he makes a request of the appropriate department head for a qualified instructor who is teaching the course on campus and is willing to take the extension course. If this is not possible, then an alternate choice would be to ask an instructor who is qualified but not teaching the same course on campus. If this cannot be done, then the course is not offered. Since the instructor is usually teaching the same course on campus, extension students receive the same instruction as resident students. There are instances when extension courses are revised for special conditions but basically the same material is taught. To date course requirements or the material have not been changed for certain segments of the population.

Physical facilities are considered in course selection, as in the case of library extension work, which must be offered in a library with adequate facilities. Public school libraries are usually not considered adequate for university library extension courses.
Courses that require laboratory sessions are also not offered by extension unless adequate facilities are available. This would be the case in most of the sciences, industrial arts, and some physical education classes. An example will illustrate. An industrial leader wanted an extension class in chemistry taught by extension and was willing to establish an adequate laboratory. Even then the class was postponed for two years because his first effort to establish the laboratory was not considered adequate by the head of the chemistry department. However, in most instances extension demands are not difficult to place in adequate facilities.

Under criterion four North Texas meets all the required conditions and no recommendations are offered.

Student Needs

Criterion 5. The university should feel an obligation to provide extension classes to meet the needs of the public to the full extent that its resources will allow. Some organized and effective method should be employed to determine the needs of the community and an adequate system of publicity for course offerings should be used.

Policy to date has been to attempt to arrange to offer courses specifically requested by groups or individuals. When such a demand has been received, the extension office, through the department head, has determined the availability
and willingness of a qualified teacher. If such a teacher was not available, the inquiry has been rejected. The university has considered extension work to be an auxiliary service available only after residence responsibilities have been met.

The rapid growth of North Texas State, the difficulty of knowing extension demands in advance, plus the fact that no funds are made available by the state for extension service have resulted in the policy described above. Not only are state funds not made available, but the state comptroller has prohibited the use of state funds for the promotion of off-campus courses. (This prohibition applies equally to campus offerings.)

In view of the above policy and restrictions, the institution has made no effort to determine the needs of the area it serves as a basis for enlarging its off-campus responsibilities. Extension offerings are thus limited to those requests for courses that come from groups or institutions that initiate the demand.

North Texas State University has not developed resources that would meet the needs of the area in organized classes or other types of services such as seminars or workshops. It fails to meet the above criterion except that portion of the criterion included in the phrase "that its resources allow." When resources have been made available, the institution has responded. The Pupil Appraisal Center, which
provides diagnostic and therapeutic service, is an example of a program provided by the university through federal funds when there was money available.

Admissions

Criterion 6. Extension students should meet the same admission requirements as resident students. Maturity or experience should be allowed to substitute for other admission requirements only if this practice is followed for regular campus students.

For admission to extension classes the student must meet the same requirements as the resident student. The extension student must provide a copy of his transcript or letter of acceptance to the admission director, who evaluates his records the same as he would the resident student. The student must be a high school graduate, college transfer in good standing, or be over twenty-one years of age to enter the university. Each student must complete registration forms provided by the extension instructor, who then gives them to the assistant director of extension. The assistant director checks to see that each form is complete before giving them to the admission director for his evaluation. Furthermore, each student must have the approval of the graduate dean or undergraduate dean to receive credit for the course he has registered for. For example, a student must have advanced standing before he can be given credit
for an advanced course. Also, he must have the necessary
prerequisites before taking a course. There have been a few
exceptions to this rule under special conditions when a
student needed a course for professional reasons rather than
for degree credit.

North Texas State University meets criterion six in
every aspect and no recommendations are indicated.

Administrative Organization

Criterion 7. The extension activities of the university
should be consolidated in a separate division with a chief
administrative officer responsible directly to the president.
Internal organization should follow function and the division
should be divided into departments of correspondence, class
instruction, and other activities in which the division is
engaged.

As stated in criterion two, the extension director is
the chief administrative officer and he is responsible
directly to the president. His complete title is Director
of Teacher Placement, Extension, and Correspondence, with
each function divided into separate units. Policies guiding
the administration of the extension department are the
ultimate responsibility of the President's office and the
Board of Regents. The Director of Extension is responsible
to the president and, functioning within the policy, works
with department heads.
Under the director there is an assistant director of extension and a full time secretary. It is the duty of the assistant director, along with the director, to receive the request for extension courses. Upon request for a course, the assistant director contacts the appropriate department heads to secure instructors, and arranges for meeting places for the extension courses. Also, with the help of the secretary, the assistant director takes care of all the necessary record keeping such as finances and student personnel statistical records. With the small number of extension classes now being offered, this function can be easily done with the existing personnel.

The extension department is on equal status with other departments of the university and is given equal consideration. North Texas meets criterion seven in all aspects; consequently no recommendations are suggested.

Research and Exploratory Work

Criterion 8. The Division of Extension should maintain a program of research, exploratory and developmental work, the scope of which should be determined by the number and variety of its activities and the size of its staff.

Complete and accurate records are maintained for each month and the yearly report is reviewed regularly by the president and extension director. It is the duty of the assistant director, as stated in criterion seven, to keep
financial and student personnel records. Therefore, a complete statistical record is compiled each semester giving the total number of students from each area of the community, cost of the program, income, instructors used from each academic area, and other information. With this information decisions are made on the immediate and long range plans for extension service.

Although North Texas State does not carry on research concerning community needs, because of the limitation placed on it as listed in criterion five, complete utilization of its staff is made by the extension department. Since the state does not provide money for an extension faculty or funds for publicity of extension classes, the size of the teaching staff is small. Under the present system extension cannot enjoy a great deal of growth, but North Texas should continue to search for a way to provide service to the community. There is still a great deal of room for improvement in this area.
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CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF STUDENT AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATIONS OF EXTENSION COURSES

The data obtained by questionnaires designed to obtain a comparison of extension classes with resident classes by students and instructors have been analyzed. The assumption that extension students receive significantly higher grades than resident students has been tested. The data will be divided into three areas: (1) student evaluation; (2) instructor evaluation; and (3) grade comparisons. The percentage of students taking their first graduate education course by extension will also be reported in this chapter.

Student Evaluation

Of the 100 questionnaires mailed to students, 70 per cent were returned (see Appendix A). The first mailing brought a 40 per cent return, a second mailing, three weeks after the first mailing, brought an additional 20 per cent return. Another 10 per cent was secured by personal visits to students in the Dallas-Fort Worth area, making a total of 70 per cent returned.

The following tables compare extension and resident classes in each area listed on the questionnaire which is a five-point rating scale. Each statement could be scored a
possible 5.00 mean rating with the score 3.00 equal to resident work. The students could rate each statement with one of the following statements: (1) much below residence; (2) somewhat below residence; (3) about the same as residence; (4) slightly superior to residence; and (5) greatly superior to residence.

The mean rating for student-instructor relationship was 3.04, based on a five-point rating scale. Mean ratings for items in this area are shown in Table II. The most significant advantage of extension as compared to resident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The class atmosphere</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student's effort to achieve</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The amount of individual attention</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The instructor's attitude toward the importance of the extension class</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Counseling and guidance time devoted to the student</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean rating of category 3.04

classes was class atmosphere, with 94 per cent of the students rating it equal or superior to resident work. The student's effort to achieve and the amount of individual attention given were rated by 85 per cent of the students as
equal to or superior to resident, and counseling and guidance time was rated by 55 per cent of the students equal to or superior to resident classes.

As shown in Table III, the mean rating for the quality of the teaching method was 3.13, based on a five point rating scale. The opportunity for student participation

TABLE III
QUALITY OF EXTENSION TEACHING METHOD AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The opportunity for the student to participate in class discussion</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The quality of the teaching method or presentation by the instructor</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The course content and material as presented by the instructor</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The use of teaching aids by the instructor</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean rating of category</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

has a mean rating of 3.57 which is the highest rating of all the statements rated, with 95 per cent of the students rating it 3.00 or above (3.00 is equal to resident work). The quality of teaching method was rated 3.00 or above by 93 per cent of the students; course content and material was rated 3.00 or above by 87 per cent of the students; and the use of teaching aids was rated 3.00 or above by 66 per cent of the students.
The mean rating for interest of the student and time devoted to study was 3.00, based on a five point rating scale. Items in this area are shown in Table IV. Statement one,

Table IV
INTEREST OF THE STUDENT AND TIME DEVOTED TO STUDY AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student's interest</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student's physical condition</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The available study time for the course</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student's outside interest that conflicted with course work</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean rating of category</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The student's interest, was rated 3.00 or better by 83 per cent of the students. Statement two, the student's physical condition, had a mean rating of 2.94, with 70 per cent of the students rating it 3.00 or better. However, statement three, available study time, has a mean rating of 2.94, with 70 per cent of the students rating it 3.00 or better. Statement three has fewer ratings of 4.00 and 5.00 than statement two, yet a larger number of students rated it equal to residence classes than did statement two. The same is true of statement four, the student's outside interest, which had a mean rating of 2.86, with 76 per cent of the students rating it 3.00 or better.
Items in the area of meeting student needs are shown in Table V. The mean rating for student needs was 3.24 based on a five-point rating scale. This was the highest rating any area received from the students. Statement one, "The course met the professional needs of the student as required by the student's employer", was rated 3.00 or better by 94 per cent of the students. Statement two, helping students to make improvements, was rated 3.00 or better by 96 per cent of the students; statement three, knowledge and information gained, was rated 3.00 or better by 93 per cent of the students; and statement four, student's gain in confidence, was rated 3.00 or better by 91 per cent of the students.

### Table V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The course met the professional needs of the student</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The course helped the student to make changes and improvements in his teaching method</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The knowledge and information gained from the extension class</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student's gain in confidence and competence</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The course met the local professional needs of the student as required by the student's employer</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The student's gain in needed skills</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean rating of category | 3.24
Statement five, meeting local professional needs, was rated 3.00 or better by 94 per cent of the students, but had a lower mean rating than statements one through four. Statement five was rated 3.00 by 60 per cent of the students and very few points were scored above 3.00 accounting for the low mean rating and high percentage rating it received.

Statement six, student's gain in needed skills was rated 3.00 or better by 93 per cent of the students.

The mean rating of assignment, supplemental work, and research was 2.58, based on a five point rating scale. Items in this area are shown in Table VI. Statement one, the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The quality of the work required by the instructor</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The time available for learning activities</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The academic atmosphere</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The quantity of work required by the instructor</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The opportunity for independent work and research</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Library and other study material available to the student other than material provided by the instructor</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The available library resources provided the student</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table VI**

ASSIGNMENT, SUPPLEMENTAL WORK AND RESEARCH
quality of work required, was rated 3.00 or better by 60 per cent of the students. The time available for learning was rated 3.00 or better by 61 per cent, the academic atmosphere was rated 3.00 or better by 74 per cent, the quality of work required was rated 3.00 or better by 85 per cent, and the opportunity for independent work and research, was rated 3.00 or better by 56 per cent of the students. Statement six, library and material available, and statement seven, available library resources, were rated 3.00 or better by 33 and 35 per cent of the students. This was by far the lowest percentage given any statement.

As shown in Table VII, the mean rating for all areas was 2.59, based on a five point rating scale. Extension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-Instructor Relationship</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Method</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest of the Student and Time Devoted to Study</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Needs</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments, Supplemental Work and Research</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

scored above 3.00 in three areas, but was rated very low in assignments, supplemental work and research which caused extension classes to score below 3.00 for all areas. Teaching method was the most significant advantage of extension.
as rated by the students with assignments, supplemental work
and research the most significant weakness.

Instructor Evaluation

The instructors completed the identical questionnaire
that was given to the students but with an additional area
on student's abilities, achievement and grades. Twenty-four
instructors were asked to complete the questionnaire. Based
on a five point rating scale each statement could be scored
a possible 5.00 mean rating with the score 3.00 equal to
resident work.

Items pertaining to student-instructor relationship
are shown in Table VIII. The mean rating for student-
instructor relationship is 2.67 based on a five point rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The class atmosphere</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student's effort to achieve</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The amount of individual attention</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The instructor's attitude toward the importance of the extension class</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Counseling and guidance time devoted to the student</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean rating of category</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
scale. Statement one, the class atmosphere, is rated 3.60 or better by 46 per cent of the instructors as compared to 94 per cent of the students. The students rated class atmosphere as its most significant advantage of extension over resident classes. Statement two, the student's effort to achieve, is rated 3.00 or better by 73 per cent of the instructors as compared to 63 per cent of the students.

This is the closest agreement on any statement in this area by the instructors and students. Statement three, individual attention, is rated 3.00 or better by the instructors while only 70 per cent of the students believed they considered extension as important as resident classes. The instructors and students rated statement five, counseling and guidance time, low. Only 42 per cent of the instructors rated it 3.00 or above as compared to 73 per cent of the students.

Table IX shows items pertaining to quality of extension teaching method as perceived by instructors. The mean rating for the quality of teaching method is 2.93 based on a five point rating scale. Statement one, the opportunity for student participation, received the highest mean rating, 3.57, of any statement with 93 per cent of the students rating it 3.00 or better. Only 83 per cent of the instructors rated it 3.00 or above giving it a mean rating of 2.33 which is considerably lower than the student's rating. Statement two, quality of teaching method, was rated almost identically by both groups. It is rated 3.00 or better by
TABLE IX
QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION TEACHING METHOD
AS PERCEIVED BY INSTRUCTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The opportunity for the student to participate in class discussion</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The quality of the teaching method or presentation by the instructor</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The course content and material as presented by the instructor</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The use of teaching aids by the instructor</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

92 per cent of the instructors and by 93 per cent of the students. The students had a wider range and gave it a higher mean rating of 3.11 than the instructors who gave it a rating of 2.92. Statement three, course content and material, is rated 3.00 or above by 100 per cent of the instructors. This is compared to only 87 per cent of the students who rated it 3.00 or better. Statement three is the only statement to receive 100 per cent of the people rating it 3.00 or better. Statement four, the use of teaching aids, is rated 3.00 or better by 58 per cent of the instructors which is close to agreement with 66 per cent of the students rating it 3.00 or better.

The mean rating for interest of the student and time devoted to study was 2.49 based on a five point rating scale.
Items pertaining to this area are shown in Table X. Statement one, the student's interest, was rated 3.00 or better by 63 per cent of the instructors. The students rated their interest much higher than the instructors did, as 88 per cent of them rated it 3.00 or better. Statement two, the student's physical condition, was rated 3.00 or better by 46 per cent of the instructors as compared to 70 per cent of the students. The instructors rated statement three, the available time for study, and statement four, the student's outside interest that conflicted with course work, 3.00 or better by 54 per cent. The students rated statement three and four 3.00 or better by 74 and 76 per cent.

Items pertaining to student needs are shown in Table XI. The mean rating for student needs was 3.08, based on a five point rating scale. Statement one, meeting professional
TABLE II

ASSESSMENT STUDENT NEEDS AS PERCEIVED BY INSTRUCTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The course met the professional needs of the student</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The course helped the student to make changes and improvements in his</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teaching method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The knowledge and information gained from the extension class</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student's gain in confidence and competence</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The course met the local professional needs of the student as required</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by the student's employer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The student's gain in needed skills</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean rating of category</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

needs, was rated 3.00 or better by 79 per cent of the instructors as compared to 94 per cent of the students. The instructors that gave statement one a 3.00 or better rating tended to rate it on the high side of the scale, resulting in it having a high mean rating of 3.26. Statement two, helping students to make improvements, was rated 3.00 or better by 92 per cent of the instructors. This is compared with 96 per cent of the students who rated it 3.00 or better. The mean rating of 3.50 was the highest rating given by the instructors. Statement three, knowledge and information gained, was rated 3.00 or better by 67 per cent of the instructors. This is considerably lower than the student's
rating, where 93 per cent said they gained as much or more knowledge and information in extension as they did in residence. Statement four, students' gain in confidence, was rated 3.00 or better by 71 per cent of the instructors as compared to 93 per cent of the students. Statement five, meeting local professional needs, was rated 3.00 or better by 75 per cent of the instructors as compared to 93 per cent of the students. Statement six, student's gain in needed skills, was rated 3.00 or better by 65 per cent of the instructors as compared to 93 per cent of the students. The instructors gave this statement a higher mean rating than the students, as more of them scored it above 3.00.

The mean rating of assignment, supplemental work and research, is 2.13 based on a five point rating scale. Items pertaining to this area are shown in Table XII. Statement one, the quality of work required, is rated 3.00 or better by 67 per cent of the instructors as compared to 89 per cent of the students. The time available for learning is rated 3.00 or better by 50 per cent of the instructors and the academic atmosphere was rated 3.00 or better by 71 per cent. This was compared to the student's rating of 81 and 74 per cent. The students and instructors were close to agreement on the academic atmosphere, with only 3 per cent separating them. Statement four, the quality of work required, was rated 3.00 or better by 50 per cent of the instructors as compared to 65 per cent of the students. Statement five,
TABLE XII
ASSIGNMENTS, SUPPLEMENTAL WORK AND RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The quality of the work required by the instructor</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The time available for learning activities</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The academic atmosphere</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The quantity of work required by the instructor</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The opportunity for independent work and research</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Library and other study material available to the student other than material provided by the instructor</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The available library resources provided the student</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The opportunity for independent work and research was rated 3.00 or better by 42 per cent of the instructors as compared to 56 per cent of the students. Library and other study material available to the student and the available library resources were rated 3.00 or better by 17 and 3 per cent of the instructors. This is compared to 33 and 26 per cent of the students rating them 3.00 or better. Statements six and seven received the lowest rating of all areas by the instructors and students.

Only instructors were asked to complete the items shown in Table XIII since it is concerned with the student's
ability and achievement. The mean rating for student's abilities, achievement and grades is 3.07. Statement one, percentage of students passing, was rated 3.00 or better by 92 per cent of the instructors. The student's ability and the student's grade were rated 3.00 or better by 83 per cent of the instructors. Statement four, the student's ability, was rated 3.00 or better by 83 per cent of the instructors.

Table XIV presents a summary of all areas of importance. The mean rating for all areas for the instructor's evaluation was 2.74 based on a five point rating scale. The instructor consistently rated all areas lower than the student. The students gave extension an average mean rating of 3.00

Mean, standard deviation, Fisher's F, and level of significance for the grades received by the students in extension and resilience classes are shown in Table XV.
TABLE XIV
SUMMARY OF ALL AREAS OF IMPORTANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-Instructor Relationship</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Method</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest of the Student and Time Devoted to Study</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Needs</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments, Supplemental Work and Research</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student's Abilities, Achievement and Grades</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Rating of Category</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE XV
MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, FISHER t, AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR STUDENT'S GRADES IN EXTENSION AND RESIDENCE CLASSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(N = 100) Grades</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Fisher's t</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant difference was found between the grades received by the students in extension and those same students in residence classes. To be significant at the .05 level, a t score of 1.960 was needed.

A study of Table XVI shows that 27 per cent of the students involved in the study took their first graduate education course by extension.
TABLE XVI

PERCENTAGE OF GRADUATE STUDENTS TAKING FIRST GRADUATE COURSE BY EXTENSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(N = 207) Students</th>
<th>Number of students taking graduate course by extension</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of the Problem

This study involved a primary and secondary problem. The primary problem was to develop a plan for evaluating university extension programs through a review of the literature and standards for accreditation. The plan includes a set of criteria for evaluating the administration and policies of an extension program, and the establishment of areas of importance for evaluating the instructional efficiency of an extension program. To demonstrate the usefulness of the plan through an evaluation of the extension service at North Texas State University and to suggest changes, if needed, on the basis of the evaluation was the secondary problem. Included in the evaluation of the extension service at North Texas are (1) the study of the development of the extension service at North Texas, to describe the service and policies at present; and to compare the present practices with the criteria developed from the literature; (2) analysis of strengths and weaknesses of the extension courses in graduate professional education as evaluated by instructors and students; (3) the comparison of extension and residence grades made in graduate professional education by the same students;
(4) the analysis of the number of graduate students who took their first graduate course by extension; and (5) the recommending of changes for the strengthening of the extension service.

Conclusions

This study has demonstrated that a plan for evaluating university extension programs can be developed from the literature. The documentation for this statement is found in Chapter II. As the authoritative writing in this field is limited, it was possible to examine all the material for the past twenty years. The usual indices were used to locate all of the published articles in the periodical literature that dealt directly with this problem. The books that have been published directly in this field were examined. In addition, those books in higher education that were likely to have included material concerning extension programs were studied. From a thorough review and analysis of this material there emerged a consistent pattern of concerns and problems. Because these concerns and problems were repeated throughout the literature, they were grouped under headings which were then reworded into statements of criteria. Each criterion included had the support of all the major writers who concerned themselves with this problem.

Another source for validating the criteria was to examine the accreditation regulations and policies of the
Texas Association of Colleges and Universities and the
Southern Association of Colleges and Universities. This
examination further substantiated the criteria in that the
accreditation regulations emphasized the same major points
found in the periodical literature and the books that were
examined. The criteria developed came under the following
major headings: (1) Financial Basis, (2) Accreditation,
(3) Teacher Personnel, (4) Course Offerings, (5) Student
Needs, (6) Admissions, (7) Administrative Organization, and
(8) Research and Exploratory Work.

The study of the literature revealed other areas of
importance that could not readily be included in a set of
criteria for evaluating an extension program. These areas
of importance had chiefly to do with the effectiveness of
extension instruction and the relationship of extension
instruction to college degree requirements. It is believed
that the evaluation of a university extension program would
require both the application of the criteria plus the in-
clusion of the so-called areas of importance to give a more
complete picture of the effectiveness of an extension pro-
gram. The following paragraphs will summarize and make
recommendations in the application of the criteria and the
areas of importance to the program at North Texas State
University.
Financial Support. — The extension service at North Texas State University meets the criterion on financial support in most areas. The instructors receive additional pay for extension teaching, their salary is based on a flat fee rather than the number of students enrolled, and the extension service is not considered a money making project. The extension service does not meet the criterion on financial support in that it must be self-supporting without budget help. If the extension service is to be a true service, it is recommended that it receive the same budget support that residence classes enjoy. Without proper financial support the extension service cannot hope to provide the service it should.

Articulation. — The extension service at North Texas State University meets the criterion on articulation in most areas. The Graduate Council, which is composed of elected members representing the whole institution, determines what courses may be offered by extension. It is the duty of the department heads to select instructors for the various extension classes and see that high standards are maintained. The director of extension is responsible directly to the president of the university, and is concerned with the administration of the extension service. The major weakness of the extension service at North Texas State University in this area is communication.
criterion asks for close cooperation between department heads and the extension department which is done. But, the lack of communication sometimes hinders cooperation. Written policies are needed to increase communication between the different departments which would increase close cooperation.

**Teacher Personnel.**—North Texas State University uses full time instructors for extension teaching when possible. There has never been more than 5 per cent part time instructors used in any semester. However, in the field of business, part time instructors have been used with permission from the president and director of extension. Also, a part time instructor must be teaching the course to be offered by extension on campus and have a master's degree in that subject area. The residence class load of the instructor must not exceed twelve hours and sometimes less if there is a departmental rule requiring less than twelve hours. Although North Texas State has never used more than 5 per cent part time instructors on its staff, it is recommended that only full time instructors be used for extension teaching. Extension students are handicapped by not having the full facilities of the university at their disposal and should have the finest instructors available. This is especially true since the extension students' sole contact with the university is with the instructor. North Texas State University has no public relations program directed toward obtaining participation in extension services.
Course offering.--Extension courses to be offered by North Texas State University are those regularly taught on campus and adequate facilities must be available before they are offered. Under this criterion very few laboratory courses have been offered by extension. North Texas State meets all of the requirements under this criterion and no recommendations are offered.

Student needs.--North Texas State University is currently offering only those courses that are brought to their attention by groups or institutions. Little or no effort is being made to study the existing or future needs of the students in the community. However, without adequate funds available, North Texas is providing most of the service possible. It is recommended that every effort should be made to find the funds for a study of the students' needs and a means of publicizing the courses to be offered. Much more can and should be done in this area.

Administrative organization.--The extension service of North Texas State University is consolidated in a separate division with a chief administrative officer responsible directly to the president. Internal organization follows the function and the divisions are divided into departments of correspondence, class instruction, and other activities in which the division is engaged. The extension service is of equal status with other departments with an adequate staff.
to handle the administrative needs of the department under the present system. North Texas meets this criterion in all aspects and recommendations are not required.

Research and exploratory work.--Complete and accurate records are maintained for monthly and yearly reports. These reports are reviewed regularly by the president and the extension director. From these statistical reports the president and director decide the scope of the extension program. However, very little research or exploratory work is being done about long range planning or meeting the communities' needs. Limitation of funds placed on the extension service by the state restricts research but North Texas should continue to search for a way to provide service to the community. Much improvement in this area is needed.

An analysis of the students' and instructors' evaluation of the extension service at North Texas State University was presented in Chapter IV. Also, a comparison of the grades, made by the same students, in extension and residence classes was tested. The number of students taking their first graduate education course by extension was also analyzed in Chapter IV. In comparing the students' evaluation with the instructors' the most striking contrast was that the students rated extension much higher than did the instructors. The students seem to feel that they are getting much more from extension classes than the instructors feel
they are giving them. The major strength of extension, as related by the instructors' rating, is the ability and attitude of the instructor.

As indicated earlier, the evaluation of an extension program would not be complete by applying the criteria to the program. It was noted that the criteria dealt primarily with the policy and administration of the program. Equally important was the attempt to determine the effectiveness of extension instruction. The previously referred areas of importance were reduced to a questionnaire form to be submitted to recent students in extension courses and the instructors of such courses. To validate such questionnaires, the areas of importance were submitted to the extension directors of six other Texas institutions in order to determine their agreement as to the importance of the items included in the questionnaire. The items in the questionnaire were then given a rating or weight to be used in the analysis of the students' and instructors' responses. The following paragraphs summarize and give recommendations as a result of the analysis of the students' and instructors' responses.

**Student-instructor relationship.**—The amount of counseling and guidance time devoted to the extension student was rated low by the instructors and students. This area appears to be a major weakness of extension classes because
the extension instructor is not available for consultation. It is doubtful that the resident graduate student receives any more counseling than the extension graduate student but the instructor is available to the resident student. It has been suggested in the literature that the extension instructor could come early to class and remain after class for counseling with students as a means of providing a solution for this problem (1). This does not seem unreasonable, as the resident instructor is expected to keep office hours for this purpose. It is recommended that the extension instructor encourage his students to make appointments for counseling sessions when they wish to.

With the exception of class atmosphere the students rated most statements near a mean rating of 3.00. They gave class atmosphere a mean rating of 3.50, which is very high. The instructors were less generous, giving it a rating of 2.46. Since the instructors were consistently lower on all their ratings, this difference is not as great as it seems; however, it is very low and hard to explain. It would seem the class atmosphere would be determined by the people who were in the class, but it still leaves some questions open in this area.

Teaching method.--The instructors and students were in agreement that the use of teaching aids was a weakness of extension classes. The students rated it just below a mean
rating of 3.00, with a 2.82 rating. The instructors rated it much lower, with a mean rating of 2.63. The solution to this problem is not an easy one as it is not always practical to carry teaching aids from the university to neighboring communities. However, with planning, teaching aids can be used. Most of the graduate classes being taught are done so in public schools with teaching aids available if the instructor would make an arrangement with the principal for their use. Where teaching aids would enrich the course, the instructor should be able to provide them with some planning and a little extra effort.

The instructors rated the course content and material as presented by them the strongest point in this area. They seem to believe they are giving the same or better material to extension students that they do the residence students. The students did not rate this statement as high as the instructors, but they did feel the course content and material presented were equal to residence courses. The students felt the strongest point in this area was the opportunity for class participation. They gave this statement a 3.57 mean rating, which was the highest rating given to any area by them.

Interest of the student and time devoted to study.-- Outside interest that conflicted with course work was rated as a weakness in this area. This problem has confronted
teachers from the beginning of time and there does not seem to be any simple solution for it. At best it is very diffi-
cult for the part time student to work eight hours at his profession, then devote three additional hours to an outside interest. This is especially true if his reason for taking the course was for board credit. It would seem that the instructor could lessen this problem by doing the best possible job in presenting his course to fit the needs of the students and doing it in such a way as to keep them interested.

The students felt their interest in extension courses was stronger than in residence, as they gave this statement a mean rating of 3.33. This is compared to a mean rating of 2.50 given to it by the instructors. This was considerably lower than the 3.50 rating of the student, but still, it is the second highest rating given by the instructors in this area.

Student needs.—This area received the highest total mean rating from the instructors and the students. It would seem that regardless of the weakness of extension it still meets the students' needs as well as or better than residence work. The students consistently rated every statement in this areas above a 3.00 mean rating. The highest rating they gave any statement in this area was a 3.33 for meeting the professional needs of the student. The instructors did not
rate all the statements above a 3.00 mean rating, but their overall rating of this area was 3.08. The instructors did feel that the courses offered by extension helped the student to make changes and improvements in his teaching method as they gave it a mean rating of 3.50, the highest rating they gave to any statement.

Assignment, supplemental work, and research.—With the exception of the quality of the work required by the instructor, this entire area was rated low by the instructors and students. The following areas were rated low by the instructors and the students: (1) the quality of work required by the instructor; (2) the opportunity for independent work and research; (3) library and other material available to the student other than material provided by the instructor; and (4) the available library resources provided the student. The weakness in this area is centered around the library, without which the instructor does not seem to feel he can assign as much outside work. Without the use of the university library and trained librarians, it is impossible for the extension student to do quality research and independent work as the residence student can. There are ways to help lessen the problem such as bookmobiles, special extension section in the library for the instructor to carry to the student, and others, but it would seem this problem is here to stay for the time being (2). Additional study is needed in this area before any recommendation can be made.
Student's abilities, achievement and grades.—Only the instructors were asked to complete this area and they gave it a mean rating of 3.07 overall. The lowest rating given was 2.83 mean rating for student's achievement. No major weaknesses were listed in this area.

Summary rating of all areas.—The students gave all areas in extension a mean rating of 3.00 as compared to an overall rating of 2.74 given by the instructors. This difference in rating would be consistent with the way instructors rated extension, as they were consistently lower with almost all their ratings.

One hundred students who had taken at least six hours of graduate education courses in residence and six hours of graduate education courses in extension were selected and their grade point average was computed. A Fisher's $t$ test for the significance of the difference between the means of related groups was computed and a $t$ table consulted to determine the level of significance. No significant difference was found between the grades received by the students in extension and residence classes.

A check of student permanent records was made of all students enrolled in extension courses in graduate professional education courses during the 1964-65 and 1965-66 school year to determine the students with residence work at North Texas State University who took their first graduate
level course by extension. It was found that 27 per cent of the 207 graduate students took their first graduate course by extension. Very little conclusion can be drawn from this information without further research.

Summary of Recommendations for Extension Service at North Texas State University

1. The extension service at North Texas State should have the same budget support as other services.

2. Communication should be improved between the extension service and the department heads.

3. Methods for accepting and acting on the extension teachers' recommendations and feedback is needed.

4. Only full time instructors should be used for extension teaching.

5. Programs in public relations and research are needed to study and meet student's needs.

6. Long range planning is recommended for expanding the extension service to meet expanding community needs.

7. A method is needed to increase the library service to extension students. Additional research is needed in this area.
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY


INSTRUCTIONS Please mark the appropriate square after each statement. Mark only one square for each statement.

**Student-Instructor Relationships**

1. The instructor's attitude toward the importance of the extension class was
2. Counseling and guidance time devoted to the student was
3. The student's effort to achieve at his maximum ability was
4. The class atmosphere was
5. The amount of individual attention given to the student was

**Teaching Method**

1. The course content and materials as presented by the instructor was
2. The quality of the teaching method or presentation by the instructor was
3. The opportunity for the student to participate in class discussion was
4. The use of teaching aids by the instructor was

**Interest of the Student and Time Devoted to Study**

1. The student's interest was (motivation)
2. The student's outside interest that conflicted with course work was
3. The available study time for the student was
4. The student's physical condition (alert or fatigued) was
Instructions: Please mark the appropriate square after each statement. Mark only one square for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completion Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much below residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat below residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same as residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly superior to residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greatly superior to residence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Needs

1. The course met the local professional needs of the student as required by the student's employer
2. The student's gain in confidence and competence was
3. The knowledge and information gained from the extension class was
4. The course met the professional needs of the student
5. The student's gain in needed skills was
6. The course helped the student to make changes and improvements in his teaching method was

### Assignments, Supplemental Work and Research

1. The quality of the work required by the instructor was
2. The available library resources provided the student was
3. The opportunity for independent work and research was
4. Library and other study material available to the student other than material provided by the instructor was
5. The time available for learning activities was
6. The academic atmosphere was (college setting vs. non-college setting)
7. The quantity of work required by the instructor was
INSTRUCTIONS Please mark the appropriate square after each statement.
Mark only one square for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Abilities, Achievement and Grades</th>
<th>Much below residence</th>
<th>Somewhat below residence</th>
<th>About the same as residence</th>
<th>Slightly superior to residence</th>
<th>Greatly superior to residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The student's achievement was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The student's grade was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The percent of students passing the course was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The student's ability was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Dr. Jacob H. Millikin  
Director of Extension  
Texas Technological College  
Lubbock, Texas

Dear Dr. Millikin:

You are one of only six extension directors in the State of Texas that is being asked to rate a questionnaire that will be mailed to extension instructors and former students of North Texas State University. The purpose of this questionnaire is to help evaluate the extension service of North Texas so that we may improve our service to the community.

Since only six extension directors are being asked to rate the questionnaire, it is very important that each director complete the questionnaire. In the event that you have any questions concerning the questionnaire, please call collect for Mr. Charles Powell at area code 817-387-4511, extension 219, Denton, Texas. If you should have further questions that cannot be answered by telephone, I will be happy to visit you at your convenience.

I would appreciate a reply by February 20, 1968, if at all possible. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Charles Powell  
Assistant Director of Extension
APPENDIX C

Mrs. Jane Jones  
1234 West Street  
Dallas, Texas

Dear Mrs. Jones:

You are being asked to complete a questionnaire concerning the Extension service at North Texas State University for the purpose of evaluating the present program. Through your effort, we hope to improve our service to you in the future. We believe you will find the questionnaire simple to complete, requiring very little of your time. For your convenience, you will find a stamped, self-addressed envelope to return the questionnaire.

Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Charles Powell  
Assistant Director of Extension
Mr. John Jones  
3331 Arcadia Trail  
Dallas, Texas  

Dear Mr. Jones:

The purpose of this letter is to thank you for completing the questionnaire you received from this office. Also, if you have not completed the questionnaire, would you please do so. Since we are asking only a few students who have completed at least six hours of extension course work and six hours of residence work, it is important we secure a large return percentage.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated in helping us improve our service to you.

Sincerely,

Charles Powell  
Assistant Director of Extension
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