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Since the end of World War II, the number of returning college students aged twenty-five years or older has increased so rapidly in American colleges and universities that college administrators, either through lack of interest and understanding or through failure to function as proactive change agents, have not kept pace with the needs of older student populations. In recent years, as enrollment among traditional younger students has declined, enrollment among mature returning students has grown to the extent that they presently constitute more than a third of all college and university students in the United States.

A survey of literature pertaining to Returning Student Services and Programs in colleges and universities of the United States reflected a general agreement among experts in the field that: (1) returning students have specific needs which are different from traditional students; (2) adult students generally return to higher education for expanded skills and knowledge as well as personal fulfillment; (3) barriers of time demands, outside responsibility, educational costs, lack of financial aid, and adequate orientation and
counseling prevent many adults from seeking higher education; 
(4) colleges and universities have a responsibility to pro-
vide special services and programs to adult students; and 
(5) some colleges and universities are responding to return-
ing students by developing services and programs to meet 
their specific needs.

In an effort to analyze the degree to which this emer-
ging segment of college and university life was being admin-
istered, funded, and served, the purposes of this study were 
to

1. Identify those public four-year institutions of 
higher education in the United States which have developed 
Services and Programs for Returning Students by use of a 
pilot survey;

2. Investigate identified Returning Student Services 
and Programs in the United States by use of a national 
survey/questionnaire.

The instrument, specifically designed for this study, 
was critiqued and evaluated by a panel of professionals in 
the field. The instrument surveyed the following four areas: 
(1) general background information from the respondents; 
(2) the kinds of services and programs offered to returning 
students; (3) the degree of effectiveness of orientation 
programs as determined by the programs' directors; and (4) 
financial support for planning, development, and implementa-
tion of Services and Programs for Returning Students.

Data from the instruments (a 77 per cent return of the surveyed population) were tabulated in the North Texas State University computer center, generally revealed that counseling services for returning students was inefficient, administrative offices for returning student services were either poorly managed or non-existent, financial support was severely lacking, faculty were not directly involved in special services and programs, and there was an obvious lack of consistency of programs from one campus to the next.

As a result of findings obtained in the study, the following recommendations are offered for consideration; (1) institutions of higher learning should place major emphasis upon development of Services and Programs for Returning Students; (2) colleges and universities should give greater priority to orientation program(s) for returning students; (3) returning students should be given credit for life experience and independent learning; (4) financial resources for returning student services should be standardized as line items in the institution's budget; (5) existing programs should be evaluated in order to determine their effectiveness; and (6) a follow-up study should be conducted in five years to provide statistical data for trend analysis.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Following World War II, the number of returning college students (defined as those aged twenty-five years or older whose education has been interrupted) in the United States has increased from one per cent of the total enrollment in four-year colleges and universities to 34 per cent in 1975. It was projected that by 1980 returning students will form 40 per cent of the total enrollment in the 1500 four-year post-secondary institutions. Further projections indicate that by the year 2000 higher education for adults will be the biggest business of American colleges and universities.

Analysis of these enrollment projections suggests the question as to what kinds of services should be provided for returning students. McCannon (6, p. 4) states that supportive services for adults are virtually nonexistent in most four-year colleges and universities. Some exceptions might be a few orientation and counseling programs which McCannon judges to be lacking in both design and evaluation.

Returning students frequently experience difficulty in adjusting to the demands of the academic setting. The additional financial obligation of education, change in lifestyle, and pressure to compete with younger students frequently add to the difficult role that adult students assume.
To assist returning students in entry/re-entry into college and the academic setting, services and programs must be provided on an expanded basis to meet the needs of returning students.

The Office of Services for Women and Returning Students and the Dean of Students Office at North Texas State University, Denton, have recently placed emphasis on examining services and programs for returning students on selected public four-year college and university campuses throughout the United States. It is significant that these collected data have been utilized in the development of workshops, programs, and services for returning students at North Texas State University.

Even though some Returning Student Services and Programs have been in existence in public four-year colleges and universities in the United States for the past decade, a review of the literature revealed that there has not been a comprehensive study published describing such services and programs. Therefore, in order to examine Returning Student Services and Programs, a survey/questionnaire instrument was designed. The instrument was based on descriptive characteristics and contained criteria designed to determine which programs offered comprehensive services to bring the student into the mainstream of campus activities. Those public four-year institutions with the largest enrollments were selected for further investigation.
Results of the investigation were used to provide guidelines for extended Services and Programs for Returning Students at North Texas State University specifically and to other four-year colleges and universities generally.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of the study was threefold: first, to identify Services and Programs for Returning Students in public four-year colleges and universities in the United States; second, to determine the kinds of services and programs that were available; and third, to assess the degree to which funding for services and programs is available.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of the study were to

1. Identify those public four-year institutions of higher education in the United States which have developed Services and Programs for Returning Students by use of a pilot survey (see Appendix A);

2. Investigate identified Returning Student Services and Programs in the United States by use of a national survey/questionnaire instrument (see Appendix C);

3. Determine the source, availability, and tenure of financial support for Returning Student Services and Programs through the use of the survey/questionnaire instrument.
Research Questions

In order to fulfill the purposes of the study, investigation was centered around the following questions:

1. What public four-year college and university campuses in the United States provided services for returning students?

2. What were the descriptive characteristics of the services and programs offered by identified institutions?

3. What evaluation methods were used by the programs' directors in determining the effectiveness of Returning Student Services and Programs?

Background and Significance

Colleges and universities which were running large operating deficits as their enrollments of younger students dropped have started looking to adult returning students as a means to maintain falling enrollments. The trend toward adult and continuing education will undoubtedly result in a dramatic change in the nature of the student body that many institutions of higher education must have if they wish to remain in operation. In the past two decades, adult and continuing education, viewed by many as an add-on program, was the first to be cut in times of limited budget. Birren (4, p. 1) of the University of California at Los Angeles, in an interview conducted by Graulich, stated that
Colleges in the past were so preoccupied with educating the results of the post-war baby boom that they weren't creative enough to do anything else. They thought the education of the young was the only obligation of an institution in higher learning.

Birren saw universities developing into "three-tiered" institutions, serving the traditional students, returning students, and retirees.

It has become apparent that the trend toward adult education, which has altered the face of four-year colleges and universities, began when veterans returned to begin or to complete their education at the end of World War II. Women, displaced from the work force by the men's return, also began entry/re-entry into colleges and universities in the early 1950's.

By 1970, the total number of adult students had risen to 22 per cent of the total college and university enrollment. In 1975, 3.7 million adults aged twenty-five or older registered for college, constituting 34 per cent of the total enrollment in the nation. Approximately one-third of the 1500 four-year colleges and universities were offering some form of adult education, a 10 per cent increase since 1970 (4, p. 1). Graulich points out that the Census Bureau estimated that by 1980 adults would form nearly one-half of the total enrollment in four-year colleges and universities (4, p. 1). Therefore, it has been understandable that educators described the trend toward adult and continuing education as "the graying of the campus" (4, p. 1).
The trend in adult education has developed toward career-oriented credit courses. High unemployment, the need to develop new skills, and self-enrichment undoubtedly are reasons adults have returned to school.

As adults returned to campus, services and programs designed to meet their specific needs should have been given higher priority. Progress toward providing Services and Programs for Returning Students has been slow, however, as shown in a survey by Turner (8, p. 8) which indicated that of 57 public institutions in Texas responding to a questionnaire, only two had provided Returning Student Services. One service was located at North Texas State University, the other at the University of Texas at Austin. Another school surveyed responded that a Continuing Education Center or Returning Student Center would be opened by the spring of 1977.

Although Returning Student Services and Programs have been a concern of some administrators, faculty, and students in many four-year colleges and universities for the past decade, the need to establish services and to develop programs designed specifically to meet the needs of returning students has been debated. An article by Scott and Holt (7, p. 339) indicated that there were diverse opinions about the needs of returning students among traditional students, returning students, and faculty at Ohio State University. Scott and Holt stated that an open-ended
questionnaire yielded the following comments concerned with
the Support '75 Project which offered special services for
returning women students:

Not everyone believes in "returnees" programs.
Ours was questioned by some college-age women ("Why all
the fuss about them?"); by a few older men students
("Why aren't you doing something for us?"); and by some
college staff ("If these women don't have such elemen-
tary facts, they don't belong on a campus") (7, p. 338).

Review of the literature suggested that when priority
was given to Returning Student Services and Programs, sup-
port occurred more frequently from the institution's admin-
istrative staff. Therefore, it was difficult to ascertain
whether support occurred due to the fact that higher priority
ascribed higher status to Returning Student Services and
Programs or whether the particular institution recognized
the need to develop more support services for older students.
It appeared that most institutions who recognized that older
students' needs were different from traditional students' needs established a permanent budget to develop and support Returning Student Services and Programs.

Permanent line-item funding for Returning Student Ser-
vices and Programs may indicate status as seen in Bertlesen's
study. Bertlesen (2, pp. 48-52) stated that fifteen out of
twenty-one of those centers surveyed with a budget of
$10,000 a year or less were listed as a temporary item in
the college budget. Nearly half of the centers reported an
annual budget for 1973-1974 of $10,000 or less; fourteen
centers were financed primarily by student government funds. Finally, one center attempted to operate on the income from center projects, while five relied on small donations and fees as the main source of revenue. It has been established that returning students have special needs that are different from traditional students (1, pp. 7-35), therefore requiring that permanent line-item funding be made available to develop support programs.

The status of such centers was of great importance because adults who return to school after an absence of a few to many years have responsibilities differing from those of traditional students. Returning students could have greater financial obligations, family responsibilities, and many times a greater demand on time. These reasons, along with a change in life style, pose difficult adjustments for adult students. McCannon (6, p. 12) stated,

For many adults who have not been in an academic setting for a number of years, there is often times an experience of difficulty in adjusting to the demands and rigors of the classroom.

A brief overview of the literature pointed out that supportive services for adults are virtually nonexistent in most colleges and universities today. Those that do exist in the form of orientation and counseling programs are not systemically designed nor sophisticatedly evaluated to determine effectiveness.

Hirsch (5, p. 4) stated that "by the year 2000, the biggest business in this nation will be the higher education of adults." Therefore, institutions of higher education must design innovative approaches to services and programs for
adult students. The Carnegie Commission (3, pp. 21, 22, 27), commenting on the needed evolution in higher education, recommended that "there should be a greater mixing of age groups on campus through providing more opportunities for older persons to take classes and to obtain needed financial support." The report further stated that "cultural and 'life-long learning' facilities and opportunities should be made available to the general public on an expanded basis." Development of services and programs to serve the needs of returning students has been severely handicapped due to lack of financial backing and support of policy-making bodies, administrators, faculty, and staff. A review of the literature revealed that proponents of Returning Student Services and Programs have proposed changes relevant to certain aspects of higher education. Changes such as credit for life experience and independent learning, extended day programs, more financial aid for returning students, more career orientation programs, and modified admissions requirements for returning students were a few examples.

In view of the facts stated previously, the focuses of the study were (1) to identify those public four-year institutions in the United States where services and programs were available to returning students; (2) to determine what kinds of services and programs were available to returning students; and (3) to evaluate the degree of effectiveness
achieved by existing services and programs, in the opinion of the directors.

Definitions of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions were used.

1. **Returning Student.**—A student who has had an interruption in the formal education process of a few to many years and is twenty-five years of age or older.

2. **Returning Student Center.**—A physical location where services and programs are developed to meet special needs of returning students.

3. **Traditional Student.**—A student who has entered college upon high school graduation and continues to attend, and is usually between eighteen and twenty-four years of age.

4. **Life-Long Learning.**—The process of learning which occurs throughout the life span.

5. **Retirees.**—Persons who have retired from occupations and are returning to formal education.

6. **Three-Tiered Institutions.**—Higher education institutions that serve traditional students, returning students, and retirees.

7. **Support Groups.**—Groups whose purpose is to offer individuals the opportunity to share common goals, interests, concerns, and aspirations. The groups may be social, academic, and/or career oriented.
Population

The subjects of the study were identified by a pilot survey of from one to six of the largest public four-year institutions in each state in the United States. One hundred thirty-six institutions were identified based on enrollment, and the Chief Student Personnel Officer on each campus was contacted for the purpose of providing the name of the person responsible for Returning Student Services and Programs (see Appendix A). Of the one hundred twenty-two who answered the pilot survey, sixty-nine responded that their institutions had Returning Student Services and Programs and identified the director. Subsequently, the sixty-nine institutions identified by the pilot survey were mailed the survey/questionnaire instrument (see Appendix B). Of the fifty-eight institutions that responded to the survey, fifty-four surveys were useable. Therefore, the study was limited to the fifty-four useable surveys that were returned.

The Instrument

A survey/questionnaire instrument was developed based on criteria stated previously. To determine the length of time required to answer the survey, the clarity of questions, and the significance of the data, ten North Texas State University administrators were asked to answer and critique the instrument. In order to establish the merits of the survey/questionnaire instrument, an expert panel of
professionals in the field were selected to serve as an evaluative jury (see Appendix B).

The survey/questionnaire instrument was constructed with the following four areas of concern: (1) to obtain general background information from the respondents; (2) to identify the kinds of services and programs offered to returning students; (3) to focus on the degree of effectiveness as determined by the programs' directors; and (4) to assess financial support for planning, development, and implementation of programs for returning students.

Summary

There is evidence of a trend on American college and university campuses toward an increased number of returning students enrolled for classes during the last three decades. This information comes during a period of decreased enrollment of traditional students and a new awareness that colleges and universities must develop an alternate student body if they wish to remain in operation. Recognizing the special needs of returning students, some colleges and universities in the United States have responded by developing Returning Student Services and Programs.

This study sought to provide information concerning the trend of services available to returning students on public four-year college and university campuses in the United States.
1. Baillie, David, "Non-Traditional Student Needs Assessment Project," a published survey of Non-Traditional Student Needs at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst Campus, University of Massachusetts Press, October, 1976.


CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Two approaches were employed in conducting a comprehensive study of literature relating to Services and Programs for Returning Students facilities in public four-year colleges and universities. The first approach consisted of two ERIC searches conducted through the Lockheed Retrieval Services using the descriptors "returning students," "returning student centers," "non-traditional students," "life-long learners," "student personnel services," "continuing students," "continuing education," and "re-entry." The second approach consisted of an extensive search of recent books, articles, reports, and other documents which discussed services for adult students who return to higher education after an absence from formal education for two or more years. Only in the last few years have efforts been made to assist returning adult students with services and programs provided to serve their special needs.

Although no comprehensive study of Services and Programs for Returning Students facilities in public four-year colleges and universities in the United States has been published, authorities in higher education do recognize the changing nature of student populations. They are aware of
the special needs and problems of the returning student and of the responsibility of American institutions of higher learning in regard to the returning student. In fact, some universities are responding to the problem by developing facilities for Services and Programs for Returning Students.

The Returning Student—His Reasons, Needs, and Problems

If the current predictions of the Census Bureau prove true, by 1980 almost one-half of the student population of American colleges and universities will be adult or returning students (12, p. 1). Adults are returning to higher education for a number of reasons. Carp, Peterson, and Roelfs note that two trends in education especially related to adults have developed during the past decade: adults have become more aware of the value of life-long learning, and educators have come to understand that learning need not be limited to classroom or campus (6, pp. 11-12). Mayeske quotes Gartner and Sunderland's observation that "the 'new' students of the 1970's and beyond are adults" who want the respect and status that credentialism brings (16, pp. 77-78). According to the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), many returning students enroll in specific courses to meet specialized needs, not to obtain a traditional four-year degree; thus older students are returning to college to upgrade job skills or to learn new job skills which will enable them
to transfer to new and better jobs (3, p. 14). Mayeske also
notes that Gartner and Sunderland confirm that there is an
increasing demand for higher education from adults who want
education for acquiring jobs, achieving job mobility, and for
enhancing creative personal development (16, pp. 77-78).

A 1973 survey of 1,207 adult students by Carp, Peterson,
and Roelfs indicates that while 42 per cent of the partici-
pants were studying hobbies and handicrafts, 35 per cent were
studying technical and vocational skills such as typing and
auto mechanics. The study also shows that 42 per cent of the
adults surveyed were engaged in part-time learning activities
(6, pp. 11-12). A decade prior to the survey, an estimated
24 per cent of all adults in this country were engaged in
some form of learning activity (6, p. 26). While knowledge
and personal fulfillment were the most frequently cited
reasons for a return to learning, "personal (economic) goals
--getting a new job or working toward a certificate or
license--were also relatively common reasons for learning"
(6, p. 41). However, a 1972 report from the Carnegie Com-
mission suggests that "degrees are more available to the
young than to the middle-aged and the old; to men--at a time
they can readily be used--than to women" (5, p. 10). Mayeske
reports that Gartner and Sunderland support that judgment when
they note that American educational institutions are in a
crisis due to the increasing demand for higher education from
adults (16, pp. 77-78).
Graulich indicates that the "new Clientele" of American colleges and universities are adult students with specific needs different from those of the traditional student (12, p. 1). Boyer confirms Graulich's estimation when he notes that a major challenge to higher education is the construction of new educational arrangements to meet changing social patterns. These patterns include "formal and informal learning throughout the adult working years" which simply means "recurrent education developed for specific groups of adults to meet specific needs" (4, pp. 6-11). The Carnegie Commission's 1970 report on equal opportunity in higher education concentrates on policies for the higher education of an increasingly diverse student body (7, p. 3).

Baillie enumerates the major needs of adults as compared to those of the traditional eighteen to twenty-two year old. He states that "institutions must develop environments which are more attractive to older students if they are to recruit students from this population, and serve them properly once they are enrolled" (2, p. i). Baillie's report, in the Non-Traditional Student Needs Assessment Project, identifies the individual and survival needs of older students at Amherst, needs which are different from those of their young counterparts. The study includes academics, counseling, child care, welfare, social interaction, past
and present financial consideration, and educational costs as critical areas of concern for returning students (2).

Elshof and Konek, commenting on the problems which returning students encounter, state that

Transition into university life can be planned for the returning student...and much alienation experienced can be eradicated for returning students whose inclusion into the university is systematically encouraged and structured (10, pp. 240-241).

Inclusion into the mainstream of university life is necessary in order for returning students to realize the full benefits of the university, including the development of their own potentials and aspirations.

Participants in the 1973 Carp, Peterson, and Roelfs survey were asked to identify potential barriers to their obtaining a higher education. The most frequently reported obstacle was financial cost, followed by "not enough time." Not wanting to go to school full-time, home responsibilities, and the amount of time required to complete a program were also considered barriers (6, pp. 45-49). In its eleventh annual report, Continuing Need, Continuing Response, Continuing Education, the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education reports that results of research and information obtained from professional educators and adult learners document specific areas of neglect. The report expresses the council's strong concern about the barriers that stop millions of adults from continuing their education (8).
Baillie's study of the needs of non-traditional students indicates that 44 per cent of the respondents "did not obtain, or found it hard to obtain, information about financial costs of education" and that "the majority of the respondents found their choice of institution of higher education limited because of costs" (2, pp. 27-28). Results of the survey further indicate that the older the student and the greater the financial need, the less financial support the university provides. Among older students, whose financial needs exceed those of traditional students because of increased outside responsibilities, the greatest financial burden exists in the category of the single female parent. It is important to note, however, that a comprehensive study to establish the relationship between age, sex, and financial need is necessary (2, pp. 30-42).

In addition to financial need, Baillie reports that older students also have problems in securing academic and career counseling. Seventy-one per cent of the participants in Baillie's study commented that they needed information regarding core requirements and major requirements for their programs. Seventy per cent of the respondents felt that they needed information regarding career opportunities in their major fields and other areas (2, p. 24).

Schlossberg comments that "stock-taking or reassessment often leads to anxiety and despair, particularly among people between thirty and sixty, since it often seems to be
their last chance" (19, p. 113). The returning student suffers because of an information void, not from role transformation. Many adults, unable to find answers on their own, need educational and career counseling geared especially toward their needs. If the educational system fails to provide counseling, a number of adults may be forced to make important decisions in a vacuum without the kind of help they require.

It is apparent that authorities in higher education are aware of the change which is occurring in student populations of institutions of higher learning across the nation. They are also sensitive to the needs and problems of adults who return to education after an absence. As the demand for post-secondary education increases, so too do the responsibilities of American colleges and universities become more pronounced. Authorities also seem aware of the shortcomings of the present model of higher education as well as of the ideal characteristics and structure of a new system which will respond to the needs of returning students.

The University--Its Responsibility and Responses

In their report to the Higher Education Panel of the American Council on Education, Atelsek and Gomberg conclude that

In a general sense, most colleges and universities are still focused on their traditional objective; preparing the young for 'life.' But on the periphery, ... older adults are beginning to benefit from the broadened attention to the concept of lifetime learning (1, p. 5).
According to Hesburgh, Miller, and Wharton, life-long learning education implies that the mission of higher education is to foster commitment among its students to aid them in developing self-learning motivation and skills; an increased awareness of the educational needs of older students; removal of barriers to educational opportunities; and "a responsibility to apply its appropriate knowledge, expertise, and research capacities to assist in solving problems central to lifelong education" (13, pp. 64-65). Hesburgh, Miller, and Wharton also observe that the educational needs of the older students are not being met by the existing formal education system. In responding to the demands being placed on higher education by the burgeoning adult student population with their particular needs, higher education must ultimately change itself. The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) foresees that the continuing enrollment of older students may have the greatest influence on higher education of all those factors which are causing changes to occur (3, p. 14). Mood declares that it is important for higher education to recognize educational changes which will ultimately benefit all students, regardless of many increasing variables including the age factor. These increasing variables lead to complex organizational changes that are necessary to develop the kinds of services and programs responsive to adult students' specific needs (18, pp. 95-110).
The National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education recommends that the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare support a national study. The objective should be recognition of the most effective and economical application of limited Federal resources in the development of continuing education and life-long learning opportunities for the American adult population. It was further recommended that future programs established for the adult learner should cover a wide range of community and individual educational needs. The Advisory Council concludes that "to achieve the goal of life-long learning for all our citizens requires the commitment of all our society to examine continuing needs, to develop continuing responses, to provide continuing education" (8, p. 35). Hesburgh, Miller, and Wharton note that an adequate educational system should include "formal and nonformal programs, credit and noncredit programs, on- and off-campus programs, and problem-focused public service programs" (13, p. 65). New programs will inevitably be required to provide specific programs for returning students and every attempt should be made to design and offer services that would be eligible for state subsidization. Hesburgh also suggested that universities "should develop the closest possible working relationship with community colleges" (13, p. 117).

Cross states that a problem in the "present model of education is that the academic disciplines form too narrow
a base on which to build a society" (9, p. 88). Many educators claim that higher education exists to serve the needs of society; therefore, services and programs designed to recognize individual differences and to provide more people an opportunity to make valuable and needed contributions should be developed. One step in the direction of providing for those needs would be professional counselors trained specifically with older students as their clientele. Those counselors should be prepared to administer diagnostic and competency tests to help clients define their educational needs and vocational aspirations more clearly. Many adults are unsure of what they really want from higher education and may anticipate changes in their lifestyle with apprehension and fear, while others might approach the changes with hope and eagerness.

According to Mayeske, Gartner and Sunderland, commenting on the demand placed on higher education to provide adult students with means for acquiring respect and status through new or improved jobs, predict that the increased demands will lead to the following changes in higher education: (1) expanded routes to higher level professional positions combining various degrees of work experience and education; (2) inclusion in higher training of many more job-related skills and work-oriented education; and (3) expansion of all types of recurrent and continuing education to enhance leisure enjoyment and status (16, p. 78). Furthermore, a variety of new programs for
employed adults will be designed to have education programs built into their jobs. Thus, "access to higher education across the full range of the population is likely to be the demand of the future" (10, p. 80).

Walton states that traditional institutions of higher education are serving only a small minority of potential adult learners. He recommends expanding the types of opportunities instead of extending traditional education (22, pp. 95-115).

One approach toward expanding educational opportunities to adults envisioned by the Carnegie Commission is "learning pavilions" where adults might gather on a regular and/or occasional basis to help each other in the learning process (5). The Carnegie Commission refers to the nontraditional learning process as a mixture of learning, work, and leisure from childhood through life until the declining years (7).

The Adult Continuing Education Task Force of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education enumerates shortcomings of the present educational credentials system and endorses fifteen recommendations for modifying the system to meet present-day needs. The panel calls on institutions of higher education to create alternate programs permitting students to demonstrate skills without time-bound and campus-bound instruction and learning. One of the fifteen recommendations spoke directly to older adult students by stating that institutions of higher learning need to
Consider the needs of mobile and older adult students, providing them with sufficient information, orientation, and counseling on the requirements for credentials and on the policies for the transfer of credit and for the award of credit for extra institutional learning (8, p. 9).

Kurland, also considering the needs of mobile and adult students, suggests that education should have a long-term strategy for their continuing education which is built upon the short-term changes already under way. Kurland further states that options in achieving one's career and personal goals should be increased to afford every adult the opportunity to find a suitable pattern of education. The developing of specific skills for an individual would be accommodated in short courses, while mastery of a discipline would be acquired through a structured sequence of courses (14, pp. 386-387).

John F. Kennedy University, established in 1960 in Orinda, California, is an example of the way in which universities are responding to adult demands, in that it was "designed specifically for people in their mid-life passages" (21, p. 6). The university, an accredited upper-division and post-graduate institution, enables adults to return to university studies on their own terms. Adults enroll at Kennedy for much the same reasons as returning students in other parts of the United States: career change, career advancement, and personal development. Kennedy's philosophy of community service, however, differentiates it from other
universities. Graduates of Kennedy are encouraged to return to their communities to become involved in helping people solve everyday problems. Most universities do not encourage their graduates to return to community service.

One liberal arts program at Kennedy, to be introduced in the fall of 1978, is designed to blend academic knowledge with the personal growth needs of its students. This new program will weave campus orientation with a series of courses on "The Quest for Personal Knowledge." Kennedy has recognized that adult students making mid-life changes have a real need for academic orientation and personal knowledge to smooth the transition from middle-life roles to university life. Fisher, President of Kennedy University, summed up what the university represents by stating,

Our vision is one of a first-quality university dedicated to community service, designed for mature adult students wishing to resume university-level education on their terms, and offering rigorous and innovative programs, all of which are humanistic, multicultural, interdisciplinary, and grounded in practice as well as theory (21, p. 7).

Amherst University which has also foreseen the changing student population, has begun planning for organizational changes to provide services for older students.

A paper, presented in 1975 by McCannon at the Adult Education Research Conference in St. Louis, describes supportive services for adult part-time students at Drake University in the areas of orientation and counseling. Orientation programs for returning students at Drake
University are geared to increase self-understanding, major developmental tasks of college students, development of self-appraisal and self-direction, and better emotional development. Statistical analysis of the control and treatment groups indicates the treatment group (those who participated in the orientation programs) had a significantly higher grade point average at the end of the first semester. It may be concluded that the orientation programs at Drake positively assisted returning students in the transition from job and family roles to the university setting and that similar programs could serve specific needs of adult returning students on other campuses (17).

Elshof and Konek state that institutions have pressed for "returnee" programs and supportive services tailored to local needs and resources (10, pp. 239-241). Although some "returnee" programs are being implemented, additional programs must be developed to meet the needs of returning students on all campuses in the nation. One such program, initiated by Scott and Holt of Ohio State University, was designed to help mature women return to the classroom. Scott and Holt indicate that administration, faculty, and staff were responsive when asked to participate in the program (20, pp. 338-339).

Educators in general have tended to disregard the importance of systematically designed and implemented evaluation of the effectiveness of Returning Student Services and Programs. Furthermore, existing standardized instruments
are predictably inappropriate as a means by which Returning Student Services and Programs might be evaluated because services and programs are not consistently uniform from one campus to another.

Little is mentioned in the literature concerning evaluation methods assigned to test the effectiveness of Returning Student Services and Programs. While Baillie (2) only alludes to the need for evaluation methods in the Amherst needs assessment project, McCannon (17) states that existing services have not been systematically evaluated to determine effectiveness. Thus, one is led to recognize the overwhelming evidence that Returning Student Services and Programs have not been evaluated systematically.

Recognizing and determining the need for more effective evaluation of Returning Student Services and Programs have been responsible for the establishment of one of the significant contributions of this study. It should be emphasized that a major component of this study was the formulation of a validated instrument designed to collect data specifically pertaining to the characteristics of Returning Student Services and Programs.

Summary

The evidence garnered from published books, reports, and articles has left little doubt that the authorities in the field have indicated strong agreement and support
concerning the need to develop and extend diverse and flexible services and programs for adult returning students. There is agreement that 1 returning adult students have specific needs which are different from traditional students; 2 adult students generally return to higher education for expanded skills and knowledge as well as personal fulfillment; 3 barriers of time demands, outside responsibility, educational costs, lack of financial aid, and adequate orientation and counseling prevent many adults from seeking higher education; 4 colleges and universities have a responsibility to make services and programs available to adult students; and 5 some colleges and universities are beginning to respond to returning students by developing services and programs to meet their specific needs.

As seen in the review of literature, the changes demanded by returning students are recognized by some educators. In order to facilitate changes, educational institutions must be ready for the challenge. Administrators will be affected by the changes and must be involved in determining the type of organization they wish to have. Sound organizational change must be preceded by valid research to insure the successful implementation of innovative services and programs to returning students. The first step would seem to be to determine which public institutions have developed services and programs for returning students, what kinds of programs are now provided, the nature and extent of
funding programs and the success of existing services and programs, in the opinion of the administrators and directors currently involved. Chapter III provides the basic design for this determination.
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CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The present study proposed an investigation of services and/or programs available to returning students on selected public four-year college and university campuses in the United States. Information was sought from the chief student personnel officer on each selected campus to verify the existence of Services and Programs for Returning Students and also to identify the person(s) directly responsible for such services and/or programs. Subsequently, information was sought from the person(s) responsible for Services and Programs for Returning Students by means of a survey/questionnaire developed to gather data from selected campuses. This chapter describes the national survey/questionnaire instrument that was developed, the sources used in the collection of the data, and the procedures for collecting and analyzing the data.

Description of the Instrument

Based upon a review of pertinent literature and upon information about existing services and/or programs at North Texas State University and selected schools, a questionnaire was constructed and revised. The questionnaire was to serve
as a survey instrument in order to gather demographic data as well as general and specific information about such items as staffing, orientation, faculty involvement, services offered, support groups, and program funding.

In order to determine the merits of the proposed national survey/questionnaire instrument, a panel of five experts in the field of student personnel and returning student services was asked to evaluate the instrument (see Appendix B). The panel was asked to judge the merits of the instrument with reference to relevancy of programs and clarity of questions and to make suggestions for additions and/or revisions. The suggestions received from the jury were incorporated in the preparation of the final instrument, "National Survey of Returning Students Services/Programs in Public Four-Year Colleges and Universities" (see Appendix B).

Procedures for the Collection of Data

Initial data were collected by means of a pilot survey mailed to the chief student personnel officer on each of the one hundred and thirty-six campuses of public four-year colleges and universities that were selected based on enrollment. The chief student personnel officer on each campus was identified by reference to the official Education Directory Colleges and Universities 1976-77 (1). The chief student personnel officer was asked to identify the person(s) responsible for Returning Student Services and Programs
(see Appendix A). Of the one hundred thirty-six inquiries mailed, eighty-nine responses were received within two weeks. A second mailing of forty-seven pilot surveys was made with a return of thirty-three. Thus a total of one hundred twenty-two responses from Chief Student Personnel Officers was received. Of the one hundred twenty-two responses, sixty-nine confirmed the existence of Services and Programs for Returning Students on their campuses and provided the names of the person(s) responsible for program coordination.

The directors thus identified were subsequently requested to complete the survey/questionnaire and return it in the envelope provided (see Appendix C). A return of thirty-five was received from the first mailing. A second request was mailed with a return of twenty-one instruments (see Appendix C). A final mailing to the fourteen remaining selected institutions had a return of two instruments. Of the sixty-nine identified, fifty-four (77 per cent) met the criteria for inclusion in that they had active programs designed to meet the needs of returning students.

Final tabulation of the data was begun four weeks following the November 1, 1977, mailing, which was the third and final effort to secure data from all the identified institutions.
Procedures for the Analysis of Data

Data were analyzed by the North Texas State University Computer Center, where they were treated according to Program ST-010 (Alpha-numeric Single Column Frequency Distribution) of the North Texas State University statistical library. The results of the statistical treatment of the data, all numbers indicating percentage, were reported in the following manner.

1. The demographic data were reported.

2. The data concerning general information of staffing, office hours, recruitment of returning students, credit for life experience, and office space were reported. Such data were placed in tables to identify general trends.

3. The data pertaining to orientation for returning students and the focus of orientation were reported and placed in tables to identify the extent of orientation.

4. The data pertaining to faculty involvement with Returning Student Services and Programs were reported and placed in tables to determine the extent of faculty involvement with the student personnel divisions' programs and services.

5. The data pertaining to specific services offered to returning students through the services and programs that were developed were reported and placed in tables to identify the extent of services for returning students.
6. The data pertaining to the establishment of support groups were reported and placed in tables to identify the availability of support groups to returning students.

7. The data pertaining to funding for Services and Programs for Returning Students, funding on a permanent or temporary basis, and the basis of funding were reported and placed in graphs to identify the extent and source of funding for Returning Student Services and Programs.

Summary

Fifty-four Returning Student Services and Programs Directors from across the United States provided data for this study by completing the "National Survey of Returning Student Services and Programs in Public Four-Year Colleges and Universities Questionnaire," which was designed to compile information concerning the development of Services and Programs for Returning Students in American colleges and universities. The collected data were analyzed by the North Texas State University Computer Center and reported in tabular form in Chapter IV.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

In this chapter, the statistical findings of this study are presented (figures have been rounded off and do not always total 100 per cent) under seven headings in order to promote clarity and to facilitate data analysis of the items included in the survey instrument. The initial section, entitled "The Demographic Data," describes the population sample by referring to information concerning the names and locations of institutions, respondents' names, titles, and the division/department affiliations; institutions; enrollments as the summer of 1976, fall of 1976, and spring of 1977; returning student information (i.e., male, female, graduate, and undergraduate); years Returning Students Services/Programs were established (i.e., on a part-time basis, full-time basis); and the population that Returning Student Services/Programs serve (i.e., men only, women only, and both men and women).

The second section, "General Information," relates data which records staffing, office space, regular office hours, returning student recruitment, credit for life experience, and regular returning student orientation session information.
"Orientation for Returning Students," the third section under which the statistical findings are grouped, includes information concerning returning student orientation sessions scheduled during the year, duration and coordination of orientation, staff member participation in Returning Student Orientation, focus of orientation, percentage of returning students attending, and an evaluation of orientation sessions and their effectiveness.

"Faculty Involvement," which comprises the fourth group of data, concerns frequency/percentage of: faculty involvement on a periodic, continuing, or voluntary basis; faculty participation through short-term courses, as sponsor(s), one-time programs, and involvement in other capacities.

The "Services" section contains information relative to the types of services that returning students discovered through the programs and fees, if any, charged for such services. This section indicates, as well, the extent of services and programs offered to returning students.

"Support Groups," the sixth section, determines if support groups have been established to meet the special needs of returning students; accordingly, the kinds of services that the group(s) provided is shown.

The final section, "Funding," establishes information concerning the existence of permanent or temporary operating budgets in addition to the bases and percentages of support from the different funding sources.
The Demographic Data

Respondents were asked to supply the name and location of their institutions, their own names and titles of responsibility, and the division or department affiliations. Appendix D (p.106) includes a list of the fifty-four respondents utilized in the study. In addition, a map of the United States, which indicates the locations of institutions providing Returning Student Services and/or Programs, is shown in Appendix D (p. 113).

Semester Enrollment Figures

The Directors of Returning Student Services and/or Programs were asked to indicate their institution's student enrollment as of the summer of 1976, fall of 1976, and spring of 1977; enrollments are reported in Table I.

Thirty-seven, or 69 per cent of the fifty-four institutions surveyed, responded with summer of 1976 enrollment figures. Forty-five, or 83 per cent, responded with fall of 1976 enrollment figures, while forty-eight, or 89 per cent, indicated spring of 1977 enrollment figures.

Thirty per cent of the respondents indicated that their institution's enrollment for the summer of 1976 was 4,999 students or less, while 35 per cent indicated that enrollment was between 5,000 and 9,999. Twenty-two per cent indicated that their enrollment was between 10,000 to 14,999, and only five institutions, or 14 per cent, indicated
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Reported</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer of 1976 Enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4,999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 9,999</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 14,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 and Over</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reported</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Unreported</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall of 1976 Enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 9,999</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 14,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 and Over</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reported</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Unreported</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring of 1977 Enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 9,999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 14,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 and Over</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reported</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Unreported</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that enrollment figures averaged 15,000 and over. Seventeen, or 31 per cent, of the fifty-four institutions did not indicate summer of 1976 enrollment figures.

Seventeen per cent of the fifty-four institutions surveyed failed to indicate fall of 1976 enrollment figures while none of the schools indicated a fall enrollment in the zero to 4,999 range. Twenty-nine per cent of the reported enrollment figures for this period were in the 5,000 to 9,999 category, and six, or 13 per cent, indicated enrollments from 10,000 to 14,999. Twenty-six, or 58 per cent of the respondents indicated their fall of 1976 enrollment to be 15,000 or over.

Only six, or 11 per cent, of the fifty-four institutions surveyed failed to report spring of 1977 enrollment figures. Of those institutions, one, or two per cent of the reporting forty-eight, indicated enrollment of 4,999 or less. Fourteen, or 29 per cent, indicated an enrollment of from 5,000 to 9,999 for this period while six, or 13 per cent, of the forty-eight responded with enrollment figures of from 10,000 to 14,999. Another twenty-seven, or 56 per cent, indicated enrollment figures to be 15,000 or more for the period.

Returning Student Information

Twenty, or 36 per cent of the fifty-four institutions surveyed, indicated that from five to 35 per cent of their
student populations were defined as returning students. Fifteen, or 27 per cent, reported returning students at the graduate level and nineteen, or 35 per cent, indicated returning students at the undergraduate level.

Table II includes percentages for fall 1976 enrollment of male, female, graduate, and undergraduate returning student populations. All participating institutions were combined to provide American college and university enrollment trend information.

### TABLE II

**SEX AND CLASSIFICATION INFORMATION FOR RETURNING STUDENTS, FALL OF 1976**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Number of Responding Institutions</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Number of Responding Institutions</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fourteen, or 28 per cent, failed to report their enrollment of male/female students; twenty, or 36 per cent, did not indicate the graduate/undergraduate percentage in student enrollments.

As indicated in Table III, Returning Student Services and Programs for the institutions utilized in this study were established on either a full-time or part-time basis for designated time periods. Nine institutions did not respond to this question, while two, or four per cent, indicated the establishment of such services and programs having full-time staff and serving both men and women prior to 1960.

From 1960 to the mid-1970's, growth appeared to be rapid in the establishment of services for returning students. One, or two per cent, indicated the establishment of such services, for women only, in 1964. Another, two per cent, followed in 1966, serving both men and women. Two, or four per cent, established services in 1968, while two, or four per cent, established services in 1969. Only one, or two per cent, established services in 1970. Two institutions, or four per cent, established services in 1971, as well as three, or seven per cent, in 1972. In 1973, six, or 13 per cent, established returning student services.

Data for 1974, 1975, and 1976 indicated that growth occurred in the establishment of Returning Student Services and Programs, accounting for a 16 per cent figure for each
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Not Reported</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Men Only</th>
<th>Women Only</th>
<th>Both Men and Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Totals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the three years. Data for 1977 included the first six months of the year; four, or nine per cent, institutions responding established services that year. Three-fourths of Returning Student Services and Programs surveyed served both men and women and were operating on a full-time basis by 1977.

General Information

Table IV contains information regarding staff member(s) participation in Returning Student Services and Programs, the initial item included in the survey instrument. Thirteen, or 24 per cent, indicated the employment of full-time staff member(s); fourteen, or 26 per cent, indicated the employment of part-time staff; three, or six per cent, indicated the aid of volunteer staff. The remaining twenty-four institutions surveyed, or 44 per cent, indicated a combination of full-time, part-time, and volunteer staffs.

### TABLE IV

**TIME COMMITMENT OF PROGRAM STAFF MEMBER(S)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of Part/Full Time, Volunteer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data presented in Table V indicates the replies of directors of Returning Student Services and Programs to a question concerning the institution's provision of specific office space for such programs. Forty-three, or 80 per cent, of the respondents specified that office space was provided while eleven, or 20 per cent, indicated that specific office space was not allocated for Returning Student Services and Programs.

TABLE V

PROVISION OF OFFICE SPACE FOR RETURNING STUDENT SERVICES/PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each director who answered positively to office space provision next responded to an item concerning regular office maintenance. As indicated in Table VI, forty, or 93 per cent of those who answered "Yes," indicated that their services were operational for specific office hours. Only three, or seven per cent, answered "No" to this item.
TABLE VI  
OFFICE HOUR MAINTENANCE FOR RETURNING STUDENT SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table VII, participants were asked if their institutions actively recruited returning students. Thirty-three, or 61 per cent, responded "Yes" whereas twenty-one, or 39 per cent, responded "No."

TABLE VII  
INSTITUTIONAL RECRUITMENT OF RETURNING STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table VIII, item five of the survey instrument, "Does your institution offer credit for life experience or independent learning (i.e., CLEP, etc.)?" elicited fifty-four responses, 100 per cent of the
respondents. Forty-four, or 81 per cent, indicated "Yes" while ten, or 19 per cent, answered "No."

TABLE VIII
RESPONSES CONCERNING CREDIT AWARDED FOR LIFE EXPERIENCE OR INDEPENDENT LEARNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item six of the survey instrument concerned regular orientation session(s) for returning students; data for this item are recorded in Table IX. Thirty-one, or 57 per cent, indicated that their institutions afforded regular orientation session(s) for returning students. Nine, or 17 per cent, responded "No" to the item, while fourteen, or 26 per cent of the respondents, indicated that returning student orientation session(s) were "Limited."

Orientation Information

Forty-one, or 76 per cent of those surveyed, answered survey items seven through fourteen, which concerned returning student orientation session(s).
TABLE IX

PERCENTAGE OF INSTITUTIONS OFFERING REGULAR ORIENTATION SESSION(S) FOR RETURNING STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table X, twenty-one, or 51 per cent of those responding to questions seven through fourteen, indicated that fall student orientation sessions were offered

TABLE X

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF INSTITUTIONS OFFERING RETURNING STUDENT ORIENTATION SESSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Responding*</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Enrollment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals do not equal 41 or 100 per cent because more than one answer was possible.
and thirteen, or 32 per cent, indicated that spring returning student orientation sessions were scheduled. Only four, or 10 per cent, indicated that returning student orientation sessions were offered in the summer. Fifteen, or 37 per cent of those responding, offered returning student orientation sessions each semester, while thirteen, or 24 per cent of the institutions surveyed, did not offer special returning student session(s).

Table XI contains frequency and percentage information responses concerning the duration of returning student orientation programs. Twenty-nine, or 71 per cent, indicated that the duration was a "Short Period"; four, or 10 per cent, indicated that returning student orientation was "One or two days"; eight, or 20 per cent, specified "Other." In order to clarify "Other," the following comments were made by Directors of Returning Student Services and Programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short Period</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or Two Days</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A three-hour period offered twice during the day—one evening and one morning; Individual advisement with periodic specialized orientations and seminars; A series of four two-hour sessions spread over four weeks; A one-semester NEWSTART course is offered each semester; Two monthly meetings, three hours each, held in the morning and evening; Once a month for four months; Short sessions as well as ongoing sessions; and Part of regular orientation.

According to Table XII, which concerns the frequency and percentage of responses relative to coordination of orientation session(s) for returning students, thirteen, or 32 per cent, indicated the Director of Returning Student Services and Programs coordinated the orientation session(s) while three, or seven per cent, were coordinated by Returning Student Advisors. Two, or five per cent, were coordinated by the Dean of Admissions; only one, or two per cent, was coordinated by the Dean of Students. Coordination efforts of the "Staff from the Orientation Offices" was indicated by eight, or 20 per cent, of the respondents. Fourteen, or 34 per cent, indicated the "Other" category. "Other" responses indicating responsibility for coordination of Returning Student Orientations were "A joint effort"; "All of the Above"; "Special Project Staff"; "Support Group Officers, their advisors, and Assistant Dean of Students"; "NEWSTART Coordinator"; "Dean of Women's Staff"; "Program Coordinator, Continuing Education"; "Lifelong Learning
The frequency and percentage of responses concerning staff member(s) participating in Returning Student Orientation, exhibited in Table XIII, shows that twelve, or 29 percent, indicated the Director of Returning Services and
Programs participated in Returning Student Orientation whereas eight, or 20 per cent, Returning Student Advisors participated. Four, or 10 per cent of those responding, indicated participation by the Dean of Students.

**TABLE XIII**

**STAFF MEMBER PARTICIPATION IN RETURNING STUDENT ORIENTATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Members</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Responding*</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director, Returning Students Services and Programs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning Student Advisor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff from Orientation Offices</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>.</strong></td>
<td><strong>.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals do not equal 41 or 100 per cent because more than one answer was possible.

Six, or 15 per cent, involved faculty, and seventeen, or 41 per cent, indicated the participation of Orientation Staff Officers. Twenty-four, or 59 per cent, noted the
"Other" category, which included the following categories: Older Student; University Services representatives; High School, Junior College, and Transfer Student Relations; Assistant Dean of Students; Entire Student Government Staff and Student Government Officers; Representatives from all Student Services Areas (i.e., Financial Aid, Student Employment, Campus Police, Counseling and Testing Center, Placement, Health Care, Library, and School of Arts and Sciences); Academic Advisor; Other Returning Students; Graduate Advisor; Staff from Admissions Office; Advisor to Student Organizations; Summer Staff Counselors; Director of Women's Programs; Registrar; Life-long Learning Coordinator; NEUSTART Coordinator; Counseling Psychologists; and Special Project Staff.

The frequency and percentage of responses, shown in Table XIV, concerning the focus of Returning Student Orientation indicate that forty, or 98 per cent, noted "Registration Information" as a portion of the orientation focus while thirty-nine, or 95 per cent, included "Counseling and Testing." Thirty-eight, or 92 per cent, indicated that "Academic Information" was provided during orientation while thirty-two, or 78 per cent, focused on "Financial Aid Information." "Career Information" ranked as the fifth highest category as indicated by twenty-seven, or 66 per cent, response. Twenty-six, or 63 per cent, indicated that "Self-Development Short-Term Course" information was offered whereas twenty-one, or 51 per cent, focused on "Student
Employment" and "Housing." Seventeen, or 41 per cent of the respondents, noted the "Other" category which included such categories as "Student Organizations and Activities"; "Study Skills"; Resource Centers"; "Pre-Registration"; "Tours of Campus"; "Personal Adjustment as a Returning Student"; "Health Services"; "University Services"; "Family Focus"; "Credit Evaluation"; "Correspondence Courses";

TABLE XIV
FOCUS OF RETURNING STUDENT ORIENTATION SESSION(S)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Responding*</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration Information</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling and Testing</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Information</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Information</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Development Courses</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Employment</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals do not equal 41 or 100 per cent because more than one answer was possible.
"Returning Student Organizations"; "Meeting with other returning students from previous semesters"; "Parking"; and "Day-Care, and Commuter Information."

Participant responses to the approximate percentage of entering returning student orientation attendance is reported in Table XV. Thirteen, or 32 per cent, indicated that under 10 per cent of the returning students attended orientation while seven, or 17 per cent, indicated that from 10 to 30 per cent attended. Three, or seven per cent, indicated a

<p>| TABLE XV |
| RETURNING STUDENT ORIENTATION ATTENDANCE |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Student Attendance</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 10%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% to 30%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% to 50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% to 70%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 70%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Unavailable</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 to 50 per cent attendance. Only one response, or two per cent, indicated attendance of from 50 to 70 per cent of returning students. Two responses, or five per cent, indicated that over 70 per cent of the returning students
attended returning student orientations. Fifteen, or 37 per cent of the respondents, indicated that the information was unavailable.

Thirty-four, or 83 per cent of those institutions which had returning student orientations, indicated that their offices evaluated the results at the conclusion of the orientation sessions. As indicated in Table XVI, seven, or 17 per cent, responded "No" to this item of the instrument.

Of the thirty-four, or 83 per cent, who responded "Yes" to the returning student orientation evaluation item, three, or nine per cent, failed to report on the effectiveness of the programs, as indicated in Table XVII. Nine, or 29 per cent of the respondents, indicated that administrative evaluation rated returning student orientation as "Excellent."

**TABLE XVI**

**EVALUATION OF RETURNING STUDENT ORIENTATION PROGRAMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighteen, or 58 per cent of the responses, evaluated the programs as "Good," while four, or 13 per cent, issued a rating of "Fair." None of the respondents indicated that
administrative evaluations of returning student orientation were "Poor."

TABLE XVII
EFFECTIVENESS OF RETURNING STUDENT ORIENTATION PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Responding*</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Three, or 8.82 per cent of those institutions who had returning student orientations did not answer item 14.

Faculty Involvement

Table XVIII includes the frequency and percentage information concerning faculty participation in Returning Student Services and Programs. Ten, or 19 per cent, indicated faculty participation, and thirty-one, or 57 per cent, indicated only a small percentage of faculty involvement; thirteen, or 24 per cent of the respondents indicated "No" to this item of the instrument.
TABLE XVIII

FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN RETURNING STUDENT SERVICES AND PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Per Cent of Time</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XIX includes the percentage and frequency information on faculty participation with Returning Student Services and Programs. Of the forty-one, 76 per cent of responses relative to faculty participation with Returning Student Services and Programs, twenty-eight, or 68 per cent of the faculty participated on a "Voluntary Basis."

TABLE XIX

FACULTY PARTICIPATION WITH RETURNING STUDENT SERVICES AND PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Responding*</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Periodic Basis</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Basis</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Basis</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals do not equal 41 or 100 per cent because more than one answer was possible.
Eighteen, or 44 per cent of the faculty, participated on a "Periodic Basis" whereas only nine, or 22 per cent, indicated faculty participation on a "Continuing Basis."

Table XX includes the type of frequency and percentage of faculty involvement with Returning Students Services and Programs. Twelve, or 29 per cent of the respondents, indicated faculty involvement in "Short-Term Courses" as well as involvement in the capacity of "Sponsors" to Returning Student Support Groups. The majority of faculty involvement occurred with "One-Time Programs," which indicated twenty-seven, or a 66 per cent response. Nineteen, or 46 per cent, indicated faculty involvement by noting the "Other" category, which included: "Academic and Career Advising"; "Special Resources"; and "Study Skills Courses for Adult Students."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Responding*</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term Courses</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Sponsor(s)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Time Programs</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals do not equal 41 or 100 per cent because more than one answer was possible.
As indicated in Table XXI, the most frequently offered service to returning students through the Returning Students Services and Programs was "Academic Information," which recorded forty-seven, or 89 per cent, responses. Forty-six, or 87 per cent of the respondents, indicated "Personnel Counseling" as the second most frequently offered service, noting forty-five, or 85 per cent; "Educational Information" was the third service most frequently offered to returning students. "Financial Aid Information" shows forty-three,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Responding*</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Information</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Counseling</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Information</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid Information</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Information</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Materials</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Development</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Information</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals do not equal 53 or 100 per cent because more than one answer was possible.
or 81 per cent responses while "Career Information" indicated forty-two, or 79 per cent. Forty, or 75 per cent of the respondents, indicated that another service offered to returning students was the availability of "Resource Materials." "Self-Development Short-Term Courses" was indicated by thirty-eight, or 72 per cent of the respondents, whereas thirty-three, or 62 per cent, of the respondents included "Employment Information" as a service offered to returning students. Eighteen, or 34 per cent, of the respondents indicated the "Other" category, which included "Pre-Registration"; "Support and Study Skills Group"; "Interest Testing and CLEP Information"; "Admissions and Transfer Programs"; "Referrals to Area Health Agencies"; and "Child Care Information."

Services

According to data presented in Table XXII, fifty-one, or 94 per cent of the fifty-four respondents, reported services to be "Free of Cost to Students." Twelve, or 22 per cent of the respondents, indicated services rendered "At a minimal charge." Only one, or two per cent of the respondents, indicated "Other" as a possible category; explanations were not given for this response. More than one response was issued by ten of the respondents, for some services were free while other services required minimal fees.
TABLE XXII
COST OF SERVICES TO RETURNING STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Responding*</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free to Student</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Charge to Student</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals do not equal 54 or 100 per cent because more than one answer was possible.

Support Groups

The data in Table XXIII indicate the number of support groups that had been established for returning students.

TABLE XXIII
SUPPORT GROUPS FOR RETURNING STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Groups Established Response</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forty-eight, or 89 per cent, of the respondents indicated that support groups for Returning Students had been established while only six, or 11 per cent, of the respondents had not established support groups.
The data in Table XXIV indicate support group focus responses of the forty-eight institutions who have established such services for returning students. Of the forty-eight institutions which had established support groups, twenty-five, or 52 per cent, were noted as "Social" in nature, thirteen, or 27 per cent, were noted as "Academic," and thirty-two, or 67 per cent, were noted as "Special Interest." Nine respondents, or 19 per cent, noted the "Other" category, which included "Vocational"; "Development of Support Teams in All Areas of University Life"; "Women in Non-Traditional Fields"; "Life Style Planning"; and "Personal Support from Peers to Help Returning Students Cope."

### TABLE XXIV

FOCUS OF SUPPORT GROUPS FOR RETURNING STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Group Focus</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Responding*</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Interest</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals do not equal 48 or 100 per cent because more than one answer was possible.*
Funding

Table XXV contains information concerning an annual operating budget. Thirty-three, or 61 per cent of the fifty-four respondents, indicated that Returning Student Services and Programs received an annual operating budget, while twenty-one, or 39 per cent of the fifty-four, indicated that they did not receive an annual operating budget. A few respondents indicated that Returning Student Services and Programs were offered as part of the total Department/Division's operational responsibilities to students.

TABLE XXV

ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET OF RETURNING STUDENT CENTER AND PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Budget</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XXVI includes information concerning the permanent or temporary allotment of annual budget funds for Returning Student Centers and Services. Seventy per cent of the thirty-three institutions which had annual operating budgets indicated that the budgets were "Permanent," while 30 per cent indicated that funds were "Temporary."
TABLE XXVI

ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGETS, PERMANENT OR TEMPORARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Institutions Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure I notes funding sources for Returning Student Services and Programs operating expenses. Eighty-nine percent of the fifty-four institutions surveyed responded to survey item twenty-four. Forty-two per cent of the forty-eight respondents indicated the use of "University Line Item" funding, while thirty, or 63 per cent of the respondents, indicated the use of "Department/Division" funding. Only two, or four per cent of the responses, indicated funding from "Federal Grant" sources, while only one, or four per cent indicated "State Grant" funding sources. Four, or eight per cent of the respondents, indicated funding from "Local Grant" sources. Fourteen, or 29 per cent, indicated funding as a result of "Registration Fees," while ten, or 21 per cent, indicated funding from "Student Service Fees." Five, or 10 per cent of the respondents, noted funding from "Donation/Contributions" sources as well as funding from "Other" sources. Figure I also provides an explanation of "Other" funding sources.
### Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A - University Line Item</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - Department/Division</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - Federal Grant</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - State Grant</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E - Local Grant</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F - Registration Fees</td>
<td>29.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Student Service Fees</td>
<td>20.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H - Donations/Contributions</td>
<td>10.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I - Other*</td>
<td>10.42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continuing Education Division; Alumni Association; Student Government Association; Professional Staff Involved with Returning Student Services and Programs as Part of Other Duties; Fund for the "Improvement of Post-Secondary Education"

Fig. 1--Source of Returning Student Services and Programs funding
Figures two through eight provide a breakdown of Returning Student Services and Programs funding sources. Specifically, Figure two provides data concerning line-item funding.

A - one received 15% from this source.
B - four received 50% from this source.
C - one received 60% from this source.
D - one received 70% from this source.
E - one received 75% from this source.
F - two received 90% from this source.
G - four received 100% from this source.

Six who responded "Yes" did not indicate the percentage of funding received from university line-item.

Fig. 2--University line-item funding
Figure three provides data concerning department/division funding.

A - two received 10% of total funding from this source.
B - one received 15% of total funding from this source.
C - two received 20% of total funding from this source.
D - five received 50% funding from this source.
E - one received 60% funding from this source.
F - one received 98% funding from this source.
G - ten received 100% funding from this source.

Eight of the responses did not indicate the percentage of funding received from "Department/Division" category.

Fig. 3—Department/division funding

Figure four provides data concerning Federal Grant funding.
Fig. 4—Federal grant funding

Only one, or four per cent of those institutions reporting funding sources, admitted funding as a result of a "State Grant"; only five per cent of the annual budget, however, was attributed to funds received from the state.

As indicated in Figure five, four, or eight per cent of the respondents, indicated funding from the "Local Grant."

Fig. 5—Local grant funding

A - one received 5% funding from this source.
B - one received 60% funding from this source.
C - one received 80% funding from this source.
D - one received 100% funding from this source.
As indicated in Figure six, fourteen, or 29 per cent of the respondents, indicated funding as a result of "Registration Fees." Six, or 43 per cent of the fourteen responses, were not reported in per cent of funding support.

Fig. 6—Registration fees as funding

As indicated in Figure seven, ten, or 21 per cent of the respondents, indicated funding support as a result of "Student Services Fees." Four, or 40 per cent of those responding to this item, did not report funding support percentage.
A - one received 2% funding from this source.
B - one received 15% funding from this source.
C - one received 20% funding from this source.
D - one received 50% funding from this source.
E - one received 60% funding from this source.
F - one received 95% funding from this source.
Four failed to report the percentage of funding received from Student Services Fees.

Fig. 7--Student services fees funding

The data found in Figure eight indicates the responses relative to "Donations/Contributions" funding. One failed to report the percentage of funding received from "Donations/Contributions."
A - one received 5% funding from this source.
B - one received 10% funding from this source.
C - one received 50% funding from this source.
D - one received 100% funding from this source.

Fig. 8--Donations/contributions

Ten per cent of the respondents indicated funding resultant from "Other" sources, which included "Continuing Education Division"; "Alumni Association"; "Student Government Association"; "Professional Staff Involved in Returning Student Services and Programs (as part of their other duties)"; and "Fund for the 'Improvement of Post-Secondary Education'." Three of the five respondents did not indicate support percentages. One, or 20 per cent of the respondents, indicated one per cent of its support as "Other"; 20 per cent indicated that two per cent of its funding came from "Other" sources.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

A review of the related literature reveals acknowledgment on the part of college and university administrators and educators of the need for special services and programs for returning students. Few Returning Student Services and Programs exist, however, which offer support for this rapidly growing student population in the public four-year colleges and universities in the United States. In addition, those existing special Services and Programs for Returning Students lack adequate funding from within the institutions of higher education. As a result, the study was designed to provide descriptive information concerning Returning Student Services and Programs in four-year public colleges and universities in the United States.

The major purposes of this study are (1) to identify those public four-year institutions of higher education in the United States which have already developed Services and Programs for Returning Students (see Appendix A); (2) to investigate those existing Returning Student Services and Programs facilities in the United States; (3) to determine the directors' opinions of the effectiveness of services and programs.
offered to returning student populations; and (4) to assess the extent and bases of funding sources.

To fulfill the purposes of this study, a survey/questionnaire was developed (see Appendix B). A panel of five judges who are experts in the field of returning student services were asked to evaluate the instrument in order to establish relevancy and clarity of questions as well as to suggest additions, deletions, or revisions (see Appendix B). The final version of the instrument was designed to elicit descriptive data pertaining to Returning Student Services and Programs existing in public four-year colleges and universities in the United States. The seven sections included in the survey/questionnaire consisted of items relative to (1) Demographic Data; (2) General Information; (3) Orientation Information; (4) Faculty Information; (5) Services; (6) Support Groups; and (7) Funding.

A pilot survey was mailed to the Chief Student Personnel Officer on one hundred and thirty-six public four-year college and university campuses. The one hundred and thirty-six institutions were selected based on enrollment as reported in the official Education Directory Colleges and Universities 1976-77 (1) and included from one to six institutions from each of the fifty states. The purpose of the pilot survey was to determine (1) those institutions which offered Services and Programs to Returning Students and (2) the person(s) responsible for directing or
coordinating Returning Student Services and Programs (see Appendix A). Of the one hundred twenty-two responses to the pilot survey, sixty-nine chief student personnel officers confirmed that Returning Student Services and Programs had been established on their campuses. The chief student personnel officers also provided the names of person(s) responsible for program coordination.

Each identified Director of Returning Student Services and Programs was contacted by mail with a request to complete the National Survey/Questionnaire and return by mail. Fifty-four, or 78 per cent, of the identified directors returned usable questionnaires by December 1, 1977, which followed the third mailing of November 1, 1977.

Findings

An analysis of the data reveals the following information.

(1) More than sixty per cent of the respondents indicated that at least one-third of their student enrollment could be defined as returning students, i.e., students twenty-five years of age and older.

(2) Of the population of returning students, 50 per cent were male students and 50 per cent were female students.

(3) Only two Directors of Returning Student Services and Programs indicated that their centers were established before 1960, while 50 per cent reported establishment of centers during the ten years preceding 1977.
(4) One-fourth of the centers were staffed by full-time directors, one-fourth were staffed by part-time employees, and 50 per cent were staffed by a combination of full-time, part-time, and volunteer employees.

(5) Eighty per cent of the respondents indicated that specific office space was provided for Returning Student Services and Programs.

(6) Ninety-three per cent of the respondents indicated that regular office hours for Returning Student Services and Programs were maintained.

(7) Sixty-two per cent of the respondents indicated that institutional recruitment of returning students was practiced.

(8) Eighty-two per cent of the respondents indicated that some credit was awarded to students for life experience and/or independent learning.

(9) Regular orientation session(s) for returning students were offered by 83 per cent of the institutions surveyed. Thirty-seven per cent indicated Returning Student Orientation(s) were offered during every enrollment period while over 50 per cent held Returning Student Orientation in the fall of each year.

(10) More than 70 per cent of the institutions surveyed held Returning Student Orientation(s) from one hour to one-half day, and only 10 per cent had one or two full days for Returning Student Orientation(s).
(11) Thirty-two per cent of the respondents reported that orientation session(s) were coordinated jointly by the Director and other administrative personnel. Twenty per cent indicated that Returning Student Orientation was coordinated by the Orientation Staff Offices of the institutions.

(12) Twenty-nine per cent of the respondents stated that the Director of Returning Student Services and Programs participated in the orientation programs, while 59 per cent of the respondents indicated participation of two or more institutional representatives in orientation programs.

(13) Ninety-eight per cent of the respondents reported that registration information was included in the campus orientation programs, while 95 per cent included information on counseling and testing. Ninety-two per cent provided academic information for returning students, and 78 per cent included financial aid information. Sixty-six per cent provided career information, while 63 per cent supplied information on self-development courses. More than half of those responding covered information on student employment and housing information.

(14) Forty-nine per cent of the respondents indicated that less than 30 per cent of the returning students attended Returning Student Orientation(s). Only seven per cent reported attendance of over 50 per cent. Thirty-seven
of the respondents indicated that information on attendance was unavailable.

(15) Eighty-three per cent of the respondents reported that Returning Student Orientation(s) were evaluated based on effectiveness. Twenty-nine per cent were rated excellent; 58 per cent were rated good; and 13 per cent were rated fair.

(16) Nineteen per cent of the respondents indicated that the faculty participated in Returning Student Services and Programs, while 57 per cent indicated that only a small percentage of the faculty's time was spent with Returning Student Services and Programs.

(17) In addition, 22 per cent of the respondents indicated that faculty participation was on a continuing basis.

(18) Over 60 per cent of faculty involvement with Returning Student Services and Programs were relative to one-time programs, while approximately 30 per cent of the faculty acted as sponsor(s) to interest groups and in short-term courses.

(19) Over 80 per cent of the directors stated that the services offered to returning students through the Returning Student Services and Programs Office included areas relative to academic, personal, educational, and financial aid counseling. Between 70 and 80 per cent reported that their services included career information, self-development short-term courses, and resource materials. Over 60 per cent of the institutions included employment information.
(20) Over 90 per cent of the respondents reported that
the majority of services to returning students through the
Returning Student Services and Programs Office were free of
charge.

(21) Twenty-two per cent of the respondents indicated
there was a minimal charge to returning students for special
services such as short-term courses.

(22) Eighty-nine per cent of the respondents indicated
that support groups for returning students had been estab-
lished. Such support groups included the social (52 per
cent), the academic (27 per cent), special interests (67
per cent), and other (19 per cent) aspects.

(23) Over 60 per cent of the respondents indicated that
they had an annual operating budget, 70 per cent of these
being permanent.

(24) Over 60 per cent of the directors surveyed indi-
cated Department/Division funding, with ten receiving 100
per cent funding of this nature.

(25) Over 40 per cent of the directors indicated the
use of some university line-item funding, but only four
institutions surveyed received 100 per cent line item fund-
ing.

(26) Approximately 30 per cent of the institutions
received funds from registration fees for short-term courses.

(27) Student Services fees accounted for 20 per cent of
the respondents' funding sources.
(28) Only one respondent acknowledged receipt of 100 per cent funding from federal grant sources while one received five per cent of the total budget from federal grant sources, and one received five per cent of total funding from state grant sources.

(29) One respondent stated that total funding resulted from local grant sources while one respondent received 80 per cent funding from local grant sources.

(30) Donations and contributions funded 10 per cent of those responding institutions with one institution receiving complete support and one receiving one-half of their funding from donations and contribution sources.

(31) Ten per cent of the directors surveyed indicated a combination of one or more funding sources with "Other" sources as part of the total budget. Less than five per cent of the total budget was attributed to "Other" sources.

Conclusions

The most apparent aspect of this study is that very few services have been organized to meet the needs of returning students of public four-year college and university campuses in the United States. This is evidenced by the fact that of all the institutions studied, less than one-half had any services designed to facilitate the adjustment of the returning adult student to campus life. Of these, only a few institutions possessed comprehensive programs and services which would address specific needs of the returnees.
Lack of institutional support, even in those institutions which provide some services, is illustrated by the lack of allocation of physical plant facilities and the absence of full-time personnel. Furthermore, many of the persons who have major responsibility for the planning and implementation of the programs are designated as part-time or even volunteer workers. In addition, many of the full-time staff directors indicated that only a portion of their duties are devoted to Returning Student Services and Programs.

Since faculty involvement tends to be on the basis of short-term or participatory one-time programs, returning students find it difficult to take advantage of the sessions due to conflicting outside responsibilities. It is apparent that even though little or no fee is involved in student participation in the majority of the services, returning students do not fully utilize the limited programs and services that are provided.

It is also evidenced by the study that knowledge of the programs and services offered to returning students is limited among the faculty and staff of the institutions. Thus, efforts to contact returnees are limited by a lack of information pertaining to the location, personnel involved, and services offered to the returning student. This is also evidenced by the fact that, in some Returning Student Orientation Programs, only a small percentage of the returning
students participate. It is further noted that while most traditional student orientation programs last several days, Returning Student Orientation Programs are often held for less than one-half day periods in the majority of the institutions.

The majority of Returning Student Services and Programs surveyed reported existing support groups of a social, academic, or special interest nature. These findings indicate that returning students share common goals, interests, concerns, and aspirations with other returning students.

Of those institutions that participated in the survey, less than one-half indicated the existence of permanent operating budgets. Only four institutions provide line item funding for Returning Student Services and Programs, which indicates that the majority of the institutions do not recognize financially the returning student as an important segment of the student body. Since at least one-third of the student enrollment in those institutions surveyed are categorized as returning students, it appears essential that universities recognize the importance of this vital portion of a student body.

Although the federal government has placed emphasis on the importance of life-long learning, only limited governmentally generated funds seem to be utilized by institutions of higher education for the support and development of returnees' programs. Only one institution of those
surveyed utilizes total governmental funding for Returning Student Services and Programs while another institution receives only five per cent of its total budget from federal grant sources.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are offered for consideration based upon the data obtained in the study and the review of related professional literature.

(1) Institutions of higher education should place an increased emphasis upon the development of Services and Programs for Returning Students because (a) the enrollment of adult students is rapidly increasing and (b) adult student needs are different from those of the traditional student.

(2) Such institutions should emphasize returning student recruitment because of diminishing enrollments of traditional students.

(3) These institutions should give higher priority to returning student orientation programs as the orientation process aids both the student and the university in the students' assimilation into campus life (i.e., health services, facilities, campus parking regulations, student activities, etc.).

(4) Consideration should be given to the granting of credit for life experience and independent learning because this would permit students to accelerate their educative programs.
(5) The development of financial resources for Returning Student Services and Programs in the institutional budget should become standardized or regularized as line items, for irregular and frequently scattered sources of income impede assurance of the continuity and development of Returning Student Services and Programs.

(6) Further studies of an evaluative nature need to be conducted in order that the effectiveness of Returning Student Services and Programs be determined as present evaluative means have been proved inadequate.

(7) A follow-up study should be conducted in five years to provide data for a statistical trend analysis of Returning Student Services and Programs in the United States. Such a study could facilitate long-range planning and provide information to make such planning reliable, meaningful, and relative to returning student needs as well as to the universities looking for alternative student populations.
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APPENDIX A

LETTERS TO CHIEF STUDENT PERSONNEL OFFICERS
AND POST CARD FOR PILOT SURVEY

Letter to Chief Student Personnel Officer
in Pilot Survey
June 13, 1977

Dear Colleague:

Would you give us some assistance? We are hoping to survey those four-year colleges and universities in the United States who have developed Services and/or Programs for Returning Students on their campuses.

Since your institution has one of the largest enrollments in your state we are asking you to share information on Returning Student Services and/or Programs that have been developed on your campus.

To facilitate your reply we are enclosing a brief post card which we would like you to return to us by June 23.

We appreciate your support and cooperation.

Sincerely,

June Casey, Director
Services for Returning Students

P.S. For the purpose of the survey a returning student is defined as one who has had an interruption in formal education of a few to many years and is 25 years of age or older, male or female

JC: nc

Encl.
APPENDIX A (con't.).

Post Card Sent to Chief Student Personnel Officer
to Identify Director of Returning Student
Services and Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF INSTITUTION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DO YOU HAVE SERVICES AND/OR PROGRAMS FOR RETURNING STUDENTS ON YOUR CAMPUS?

YES_____ NO_____

IF YOU DO HAVE SUCH A PROGRAM, WHO IS DIRECTLY RESPONSIBLE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF SERVICES AND/OR PROGRAMS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second Letter to Chief Student Personnel Officers to Identify Returning Student Services and Programs

June 24, 1977

Dear Colleague:

June 13 a letter and return post card was mailed to your campus requesting assistance in identifying the person to contact regarding returning student services and programs that may have been developed to serve students 25 years of age and older who are enrolled in your institution.

To date a reply has not been received and I wondered if hectic summer schedules and responsibilities have delayed return. I am still interested in attaining the information from your campus.

To facilitate your reply a second post card is enclosed for your convenience which I would appreciate your returning by July 1.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

June Casey, Director
Services for Returning Students

P.S. For the purpose of the survey a returning student is defined as one who has had an interruption in formal education of a few to many years and is 25 years of age or older, male or female.
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Follow-Up Letter to Chief Student Personnel Officers
July 29, 1977

Dear Colleague:

I wanted to take this opportunity to thank you for the assistance you gave me last month in identifying the person on your campus directly involved with Returning Student Services and Programs.

The individual that you identified will receive the survey instrument that has been developed and validated within the next two weeks.

As I mentioned to you in the last letter, this will be a national survey of public four-year colleges and universities in the United States who have developed Services and/or Programs for Returning Students. The information derived from this survey will be made available to you and your institution upon completion of the study.

I appreciate your support and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ives June Casey, Director
Services for Returning Students

IJC:vl
APPENDIX B

LIST OF PANEL MEMBERS, LETTERS, AND PROPOSED QUESTIONNAIRE

Panel Members for National Survey Instrument

Mrs. Frances A. Plotsky
Program Specialist
Office of Continuing Education
Main Building 2502
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas 78712

Dr. Marjorie Dole
Coordinator of Adult Re-Entry Counseling Services
California State University
1250 Bellflower Blvd.
Long Beach, California 90840

Mildred B. Erickson, Ph.D.
Assistant Dean
Lifelong Education Services
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Joseph J. Corry, Director
Continuing Education Programs
University of Wisconsin
c/o Bascom Hall
500 Lincoln Drive
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Jo Roebuck-Pearson, Coordinator
Nontraditional Student Programs
Dean of Students Office
Administration 200
Brookings, South Dakota
First Letter to Panel Members

July 13, 1977

Dear Panel Member:

In a recent survey of the literature I find that you are a leader in the field of returning student education and would like for you to serve as a panel member in judging the enclosed proposed national survey instrument. The validated instrument will be sent to selected major four-year colleges and universities in the United States who have developed Services and Programs for Returning Students.

Would you take a few moments to read the proposed instrument and make a candid evaluation of the questions that are now included? Are they relevant and do they provide an overview of the Services and Programs now in existence? Are the questions clear? What have I omitted? Please add any additional questions that you feel would be pertinent information to the survey.

I really appreciate your time and cooperation.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ives June Casey, Director
Services for Returning Students

IJC:lg

Encl.
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NATIONAL SURVEY OF RETURNING STUDENT SERVICES/PROGRAMS IN PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES

NAME & LOCATION OF INSTITUTION

RESPONDENT'S NAME & TITLE

DIVISION/DEPARTMENT AFFILIATION

INSTITUTION ENROLLMENT: SUMMER 76_ FALL 76___ SPRING 77___

PERCENTAGE FALL 76 ENROLLMENT RETURNING STUDENTS: MALE  FEMALE  INFO  UNAV

GRADUATE  UNDERGRADUATE  INFO  UNAV

WHAT YEAR WERE RETURNING STUDENT SERVICES/PROGRAMS ESTABLISHED?

ON A PART-TIME BASIS  ON A FULL-TIME BASIS

RETURNING STUDENT SERVICES/PROGRAMS SERVE: MEN ONLY  WOMEN ONLY

BOTH MEN AND WOMEN

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Staff member(s) participating in returning student services and programs:

   _1. full time  2. part time  3. volunteer  4. combination

2. Does your institution provide specific office space for returning student services and/or programs?

3. If yes, does the office maintain regular office hours?

4. Does your institution actively recruit returning students?

5. Does your institution offer credit for life experience or independent learning (i.e., CLEP, etc.)?

6. Does your institution offer regular orientation session(s) for returning students?

   _1. Yes  2. No  3. Limited (Please explain)
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ORIENTATION INFORMATION

IF YOUR INSTITUTION DOES PROVIDE REGULAR ORIENTATION SESSION(S) TO RETURNING STUDENTS, PLEASE ANSWER QUESTIONS 7 THROUGH 14. IF NOT, SKIP TO QUESTION 15.

7. Orientation session(s) for returning students are held in:
   1. Fall
   2. Spring
   3. Summer
   4. Every Enrollment

8. The duration of returning student orientation is:
   1. Short Period
   2. One or Two Days
   3. Other (Please Specify)

9. Orientation session(s) are coordinated by:
   1. Director, Returning Student Services
   2. Returning Student Advisor
   3. Dean of Admissions
   4. Dean of Students
   5. Staff from Orientation Offices
   6. Other (Please Specify)

10. Please indicate the staff member(s) participating in returning student orientation:
    1. Director, Returning Student Services
    2. Returning Student Advisor
    3. Dean of Students
    4. Faculty
    5. Staff from Orientation Offices
    6. Other (Please Specify)

PLEASE INDICATE THE FOCUS OF RETURNING STUDENT ORIENTATION. MARK AS MANY AS APPLICABLE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11a. Registration Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b. Academic Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11c. Career Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11d. Counseling and Testing Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11e. Self-Development Short-Term Course Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11f. Financial Aid Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11g. Student Employment Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11h. Housing Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11i. Other (Please Specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Approximate percentage of entering returning students attending orientation:
    1. Under 10%     4. 50 to 70%
    2. 10 to 30%     5. Over 70%
    3. 30 to 50%     6. Information Unavailable
APPENDIX B (cont.)

13. Does your office evaluate orientation sessions?
   1. Yes  2. No

14. In administrative evaluation, how effective are returning student orientation sessions?
   1. Excellent  2. Good  3. Fair  4. Poor

FACULTY INVOLVEMENT

15. Does the faculty actively participate in returning student services and programs?
   1. Yes  2. No  3. Yes, but only a small percent of the faculty

16. Faculty involvement with returning students services/programs is on:
   1. Periodic Basis  2. Continuing Basis  3. Voluntary Basis

17. Faculty involved with returning student services/programs in:
   1. Short-Term Courses  2. As sponsor(s) to Interest Group(s)  3. One-Time Programs  4. Other (Please Specify)

SERVICES

PLEASE INDICATE SERVICES OFFERED TO RETURNING STUDENTS THROUGH YOUR OFFICE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18a. Financial Aid Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18b. Career Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18c. Academic Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18d. Employment Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18e. Educational Information, (ie. brochures, catalogues, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18f. Self-Development Short-Term Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18g. Personal Counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18h. Resource Materials, (ie. Journals, Newsletters, Books, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18i. Other (Please Specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Services to returning students are:
   1. Free of cost to student
   2. At a minimal fee (as for short-term courses)
   3. Other (Please Specify)
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SUPPORT GROUPS

A SUPPORT GROUP IS DEFINED AS AN ORGANIZATION WHOSE PURPOSE IS TO OFFER INDIVIDUALS THE OPPORTUNITY TO SHARE COMMON GOALS, INTERESTS, CONCERNS, AND ASPIRATIONS. THE GROUP(S) MAY BE SOCIAL, ACADEMIC, CAREER ORIENTED, ETC.

20. Have support groups been established on your campus for returning students?
   1. Yes  2. No

21. If yes, are support groups primarily:

FUNDING

22. Do your returning student services and programs receive an annual operating budget?
   1. Yes  2. No

23. If yes, is the funding:
   1. Permanent  2. Temporary

PLEASE INDICATE THE BASIS AND PERCENTAGE FOR RETURNING STUDENT SERVICES/PROGRAMS CURRENT OPERATING EXPENSES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24a. University Line Item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24b. Department/Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24c. Federal Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24d. State Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24e. Local Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24f. Registration Fees For Short-Term Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24g. Student Services Fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24h. Donation or Contributions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24i. Other (Please Specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional information, comments, suggestions, recommendations and observations would be appreciated. Thank you for your cooperation in the survey and if you would like to receive a copy of the results, please check below.

RETURN TO: June Casey, Director
Services For Returning Students
P. O. Box 695, N. T. Station
Denton, Texas 76203

Yes, please send a copy of survey results.
Follow-Up Letter to Panel Members

August 5, 1977

Dear Panel Member:

I want to thank you for serving as a panel member in judging the merits of the National Survey Instrument of Returning Student Services/Programs in Public Four-Year Colleges and Universities in the United States. You will be receiving the instrument shortly as part of the survey.

I have enclosed a copy of the survey/questionnaire for your files in the event that you would like to have a copy for your records. I do appreciate the suggestions that you made and I have incorporated them into the cover letter and the instrument itself. Unfortunately, due to the necessity of cutting down on available space, I could not go into more depth in asking for additional information. The original instrument was 21 pages long so you can understand the dilemma of what to omit and knowing that every question included must be relative in terms of good research.

Again, I want to thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ives June Casey, Director
Services for Returning Students

IJC:so

Encl.
APPENDIX C

LETTERS TO DIRECTORS OF IDENTIFIED RETURNING STUDENT SERVICES AND PROGRAMS

First Letter to Directors of Identified Returning Student Services and Programs

August 8, 1977

Dear Colleague:

An inquiry sent to the Chief Student Personnel Officer at your institution June 13, 1977, has assisted me in identifying you as the person responsible for offering Services/Programs to Returning Students. My purpose for contacting you at this time is to ask that you participate in a national survey of public four-year colleges and universities in the United States. If you do not have this responsibility, would you forward this information to the person on your campus who does? Thanks.

Since your institutions has one of the largest enrollments in your state and you have developed Services and/or Programs for Returning Students, I am requesting that you share information on the short form attached and return to our office by August 19, 1977. To facilitate your reply I am enclosing a self-addressed envelope.

For the purposes of the survey a returning student is defined as one who has had an interruption in formal education of a few to many years and is 25 years of age or older, male or female.

Results of the survey will be made available to you should you wish to have a copy. We appreciate your support and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ives June Casey, Director
Services for Returning Students
APPENDIX C (con't.)

Second Letter to Directors of Identified Returning Student Services and Programs

August 17, 1977

Dear Colleague:

Would you give us some assistance? We are attempting to locate the person on your campus who is responsible for Returning Student Services and Programs for the purpose of a National Survey in Public Four-Year Colleges and Universities. If you do not have this responsibility, would you forward this information to the person on your campus who does? Thanks.

The National Survey Instrument was mailed to your campus August 5, 1977, and to date we have not received any information. If our letters have crossed in the mail, please disregard the enclosed instrument. If you have not received any information, would you please take a few minutes to complete the instrument and return to us in the enclosed self-addressed envelope by August 24th?

We sincerely appreciate your support and cooperation.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ives June Casey, Director
Services for Returning Students

P.S. For the purpose of the survey a returning student is defined as one who has had an interruption in formal education of a few to many years and is 25 years of age or older, male or female.

IJC: vj

Encl.
Dear Colleague:

Would you give us some assistance? We are attempting to locate the person on your campus who is responsible for Returning Student Services and Programs for the purpose of a National Survey of Public Four-Year Colleges and Universities. If you do not have this responsibility, would you forward this information to the person on your campus who does? Thank you.

The first survey instrument was mailed to your campus August 5, 1977, with a follow-up on August 17, 1977. To date we have not received any information. If you have not received the survey, would you please take a few minutes to complete the attached instrument and return it in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope by November 15, 1977?

We sincerely appreciate your support and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ives June Casey, Program Specialist
University Center for Community Services

P.S. For the purposes of the survey a returning student is defined as one who has had an interruption in formal education of a few to many years and is 25 years of age or older, male or female.
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LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN NATIONAL SURVEY OF RETURNING STUDENT SERVICES AND PROGRAMS, AND MAP ILLUSTRATING DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS

Participants in National Survey of Returning Student Services and Programs—1977

Dr. Christine Wilkinson
Director of Admissions
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona

Glenda K. Guyton
Programs Associate, Student Affairs
The University of Alabama
Tuscaloosa, Alabama

Maralyce Conter, Director
Continuing Education
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

Barbara Taegel, Acting Dean of Students
Office of the Dean of Students
University of Arkansas at Little Rock
Little Rock, Arkansas

William A. Merget, Career Counselor
Career Development and Placement Center
California State University
Los Angeles, California

Dr. Marjorie Dole, Director
Adult Reentry Counselor
University Counseling Center
California State University
Long Beach, California
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Phyllis Sutphen, Re-Entry Advisor
Office of Student Programs and Services
San Jose State University
San Jose, California

Dick Ricketts
Assistant Director of Admissions
Metropolitan State College
Denver, Colorado

Dr. Donald L. Greene, Director
Office of Freshman Admissions & Orientation
University of the District of Columbia
Washington, D.C.

Richard W. Sline
Assistant Dean of Students
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware

Kathleen Robichaud
Assistant Director, Program Management
Center for Professional Development and Public Service
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

Lee Leavengood
Pre-Admission Adv. Mature Students
New Student Relations
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida

Betty L. Hembrough, Assistant Dean
Student Services
Campus Affairs
University of Illinois at Urbana
Champaign, Illinois

Carolyn A. Bartlett
Continuing Education Community Coordinator
Office of Admissions and Records
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois
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Dr. Susan El-Shamy, Assistant Director
Adult Counseling Program
Continuing Studies
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Cecelia Zissis
Dean of Students Office
Purdue University
West Lafayette, Indiana

Kay Holmberg, Counselor
Adult Student Program Supervisor
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

JoAnn Cummings, Counselor & Coordinator
Program for Adult Students
Student Services--Counseling Services
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

John D. Steffen, Director
Non-Traditional Study
Continuing Education
Kansas State University
Topeka, Kansas

Julie Gordon, Assistant Dean of Women
Student Affairs
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

David Baillie, Director
Counseling Assistance for Older Students
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

Phyllis F. Walsh, Advisor
Student Life
Towson State University
Baltimore, Maryland

Jean W. Campbell, Director
Center for Continuing Education
Office of Academic Affairs
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan
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James B. Previs, University Coordinator
Student Support Services
Student Affairs
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Mike Romeo, Jr., Adult Counselor
Special Academic Department
University of Southern Mississippi
Hattiesburg, Mississippi

Joan Pearlman, Co-Director
Continuing Education—Extension
University of Missouri
St. Louis, Missouri

Judy Geisler, Assistant Dean of Students
Student Affairs Division
Southwest Missouri State University
Springfield, Missouri

Marjorie J. Wikoff, Counselor
College of Arts & Sciences
University of Nebraska at Omaha
Omaha, Nebraska

Cecelia St. John
Assistant Dean of Students
Office of Student Services
University of Nevada
Reno, Nevada

Patricia Luna, Assistant Coordinator
Women's Center Division Student Affairs
University of New Mexico--Main Campus
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Yvonne Wise, Program Coordinator
International Programs
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico

Bill Bryan, Dean for Student Development
Division of Student Affairs
University of North Dakota
Grand Forks, North Dakota
Dr. Les Pavek  
Vice President for Student Affairs  
North Dakota State University  
Fargo, North Dakota  

Dr. Marjorie Muntz, Assistant Director  
Community Education  
University of Cincinnati  
Cincinnati, Ohio  

Kay Schatzinger, Assistant Director  
Advising and Orientation  
Student Academic Services  
Kent State University  
Kent, Ohio  

Chris Purcell, Assistant Director  
Center for Student Development  
University of Oklahoma  
Norman, Oklahoma  

W.J. Brennan, Assistant Dean of Students  
Office of Student Services  
Oregon State University  
Corvallis, Oregon  

Jane Farrand, Coordinator  
Lifelong Learning  
Student Personnel Services  
University of Oregon  
Eugene, Oregon  

Lee Transier, Director  
Center for Continuing Education  
Temple University  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  

Betty L. Moore, General Counselor  
Student Assistance Center/Student Affairs  
Pennsylvania State University  
University Park, Pennsylvania  

Dean Steele Grow  
School of General Studies  
University of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
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Fran Danowski, Administrative Assistant and
Advisor to Students Older Than Average
University of Rhode Island
Kingston, Rhode Island

William E. Swigart, Director
Continuing Education
Academic Affairs
Rhode Island College
Providence, Rhode Island

Arthur S. West, Director of Admission
Admissions Office of the Provost
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina

Jo Roebuck-Pearson, Coordinator
Nontraditional Students Program
Student Services
South Dakota State University
Brookings, South Dakota

Debbie Moerly, Director
Orientation
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

Ethel Hudson, Program Coordinator
Continuing Education--Extended Programs
Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee

Frances A. Plotsky, Program Specialist
Division of Continuing Education
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas

Ives June Casey, Director
Services for Women & Returning Students
North Texas State University
Denton, Texas

Mary Botkin, Assistant to Dean of Students
Office of Dean of Students
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, Texas
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Mary Jo Tulippe, Counselor
Counseling Center
Weber State University
Ogden, Utah

C.E. Mathews, Associate Director
Admissions
Western Washington University
Bellingham, Washington

Margaret P. Geisler, Associate Director
Continuing Education Programs
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin
Fig. 9--Distribution of institutions participating in study of Returning Students Services and Programs, December, 1977
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