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The purposes of this study were (1) to describe and analyze the organization and content of nonprofit corporate curricula, (2) to describe and analyze the background and status of nonprofit corporate college faculty, and (3) to describe and analyze the demographics, educational background, and employment characteristics of students in nonprofit corporate colleges. Institutional demographics on student enrollment, number of graduates, admission policy, tuition cost, types of financial aid programs, student housing, and schedule of classes were gathered as well. Data were collected from survey instruments returned by 12 nonprofit corporate college administrators. The data were treated to produce frequencies and percentages.

The study revealed that the majority of nonprofit corporate colleges are specialized institutions which primarily offer graduate degree programs. Faculty are most likely full-time, non-tenured employees. White males between the ages of 25 and 40 constitute an overwhelming majority of the student population. Two major findings unrelated to the purposes of the study were revealed during this investigation. They are (1) the term corporate college
and the definition are sometimes misunderstood and (2) three corporate colleges identified last year have ceased operating as post-secondary degree-granting institutions.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Traditional colleges and universities no longer have a monopoly on higher education. "As colleges and universities strive to respond to the needs of nontraditional students they often find corporate educators have preceded them" (Nash & Hawthorne, 1987, p. 1). Business and industry in America have long been involved in the education of employees. Corporate classrooms opened their doors in the late nineteenth century to meet the demand for employees skilled in business and technology, a demand attributable to the rapid industrial explosion following the Civil War. However, the development and expansion of corporate college degree programs move corporate education beyond employee training and into an area formerly reserved for traditional colleges and universities.

Nash and Hawthorne (1987) have identified 26 corporate colleges, educational institutions which were established by organizations whose overall objective is not education. These colleges were classified into two categories: nonprofit institutions and profit (proprietary) institutions. Lynton (1984) concluded that although proprietary educational institutions are worthy of study, they pose a
different challenge to traditional colleges and universities. Only those institutions classified as nonprofit corporate colleges are included for examination in this study.

Eurich (1985) and Nash and Hawthorne (1987) have identified 23 nonprofit corporate colleges operating in 12 states, all of which have received or petitioned their home states for authority to grant collegiate degrees (see Appendix A). The institutions were initially established by individual business corporations, hospitals, and professional associations and clubs to provide educational support for members of their particular professions. Since their establishment, however, many of the institutions have expanded their missions and are serving a wider clientele.

The literature suggests that corporate colleges are viewed in a contradictory manner by higher education professionals. The uniqueness of traditional institutions of higher education seems to disappear when corporations grant degrees and when employees increasingly receive college credit for learning through life and work experiences outside the academy. Gold (1981) believes that it is not clear whether this circumstance ought to be taken as a welcome opportunity or as an emerging problem. Opponents view corporate colleges as potential competitors for revenues and the "new student population," a population consisting of adult full time working members of the labor
force. Proponents argue that corporate colleges will challenge and provide an opportunity for post-secondary institutions to learn new strategies for governance, management, and teaching.

Regardless of the perception, educators should benefit from a closer examination of the 23 nonprofit corporate colleges. While research has addressed the origin and sponsorship, the motivations for their initiation, and the general characteristics of these colleges, none has focused in depth on the curricula, faculty, and students of nonprofit corporate colleges.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is the characteristics of curricula, faculty, and students of nonprofit corporate colleges.

Purposes of Study

The purposes of this study are to:

1. describe and analyze the organization and content of nonprofit corporate college curricula,

2. describe and analyze the background and status of nonprofit corporate college faculty, and

3. describe and analyze the demographics, educational background, and employment characteristics of students in nonprofit corporate colleges.
Research Questions

The following questions have been formulated in order to achieve the purposes of the study.

1. How are nonprofit corporate college curricula organized?
2. What is the content of corporate curricula?
3. What is the academic background of the faculty?
4. What is the employment status of nonprofit corporate college faculty?
5. What type of scholarly research is conducted by nonprofit corporate college faculty?
6. What is the professional background of faculty in nonprofit corporate colleges?
7. What type of faculty evaluation process exists in nonprofit corporate colleges?
8. What is the criteria for faculty evaluation?
9. What are the demographics of the students who comprise nonprofit corporate college populations?
10. What are the employment characteristics of the students in nonprofit corporate colleges?
11. What are the institutional demographical characteristics of nonprofit corporate colleges?
12. What similarities and differences exist between institutional demographics of nonprofit corporate college curricula, faculty, and students?
Limitations

The scope of this study is limited to the nonprofit corporate colleges which have degree-granting authority; therefore, the findings of this study are limited to the participating institutions.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions are employed:

Corporate education refers to education offered by a business or industry for its own employees.

Corporate degree programs are corporate sponsored courses of study which are certified by the state to confer associate, bachelor, master, or doctoral degrees.

A corporate college is a degree-granting educational institution, for profit or nonprofit, started by an organization whose overall objective is not education.

Traditional colleges and universities are institutions of higher learning, either state supported or private, whose mission is teaching, research, and service.

Restrictive admission is a policy held by a corporate college that will only allow qualified students with specified work experience the right to apply for admission.

Nonrestrictive admission is a policy held by a corporate college that will allow any qualified student,
regardless of employment status, the right to apply for admission.

Background and Significance

Private and public employers are making a massive investment in the education and training of their employees. Samuels (1985) and Eurich (1985) indicated that 72% (or 46 million) of the 64 million participants in post-secondary education are learning through noncollegiate organizations. Moreover, since the mid-seventies, degree-granting institutions started by noncollegiate organizations have been appearing with increasing frequency (Baker, 1983; "Company Courses Go Collegiate," 1979; Craig & Evers, 1981; Eurich, 1985; Gold, 1981; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987). These institutions, known as corporate colleges, offer degree programs ranging from the two-year associate degree to the doctoral degree. State agencies and regional associations are recognizing and accrediting corporate colleges, a status previously granted to traditional colleges and universities ("Company Courses Go Collegiate," 1979; Eurich, 1985; Gold, 1981; Hawthorne, Libby, & Nash, 1983).

While corporate colleges differ in their origin and sponsorship, they were all started by organizations whose first purpose was not education. Corporations, professional associations, and trade associations have been responsible for the initiation of corporate colleges. Although several
corporate colleges initially developed degree programs for their employees, this characteristic is changing (Cross, 1985; Eurich, 1985; Hawthorne et al., 1983; Lusterman, 1977). Currently, the majority of corporate colleges operate with a "nonrestrictive admissions" policy. That is, they admit students from any college, university, or country who meet their admission requirements. Hence, the pool of available students is the same as that for traditional colleges and universities.

The growth of corporate colleges in the past ten years has been documented by previous research. Hawthorne, Libby and Nash (1983) were the first to report on the collective known as corporate colleges; their report identified 14 such institutions. A subsequent study by Eurich (1985) revealed four additional corporate colleges, thus bringing the total population to 18. The most recent literature released in 1987 concludes that 26 institutions classified as corporate colleges are in existence.

While literature in the area of corporate education abounds, literature specifically devoted to corporate degree programs is somewhat limited (Hawthorne et al., 1983; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987). Research in the area has addressed the origin and sponsorship, development, and motivations for initiating corporate colleges (Eurich, 1985; Hawthorne et al., 1983; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987). In addition, several
authors have examined selected corporate colleges in terms of the physical setting, admission policy, degree offerings, curriculum, method of instruction, and cost (Baker, 1983; Betters-Reed, 1982; Eurich, 1985; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987).

Baker (1983) concludes that the curricula of the three corporate colleges (DeVry Institute of Technology, GMI Engineering and Management Institute, and The Wang Institute of Graduate Studies) analyzed in her study are comparable to traditional college and university programs. Like traditional collegiate programs, these corporate college degree programs are characterized by similar entrance requirements, methods of instruction, scholastic standards, and course content. In addition, tuition costs are similar when compared to private institutions and are comparable or less expensive than tuition for out-of-state residents at public institutions.

Nash and Hawthorne (1987) argue that educators from both colleges and corporations will benefit from more thorough scrutiny of corporate college curricula; their organization and content; who the faculty are and where they come from; and the numbers and types of students they serve with regard to their demographic, educational, and employment backgrounds before entering corporate colleges. (p. 83)

Case studies conducted by Betters-Reed in 1982 on The Authur D. Little Management Education Institute, The
Massachusetts General Hospital Institute of Health Professions, and The Wang Institute of Graduate Studies trace the evolution and describe the general characteristics of each institution. Although the previous studies by Baker (1983) and Betters-Reed (1982) describe these characteristics for selected institutions, no study has examined these characteristics for all degree-granting nonprofit corporate colleges.

Organization of Study

This chapter states the problem, purposes, research questions, and basic assumptions of the study. Chapter II contains a review of literature on the evolution of corporate education, corporate curricula, providers of corporate education, a student profile, the emergence of corporate colleges, motivation for their establishment, and implications for higher education.

Chapter III describes the population of the study, the methods for data collection, and treatment of the data. Chapter IV presents the findings of this research. The final chapter includes a summary of the major findings, discussion, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

As reflected by the size and scope of corporate education, extensive employee education programs are in operation. Indeed, the power and potential of corporate education are too often overlooked by people in government, traditional education, and industry itself. They simply do not realize its size and impact (Chamberlin, 1965; Craig & Evers, 1981; Cross, 1985; Eurich, 1985; Gold, 1981; Hodgkinson, 1981). Therefore, it is appropriate to focus on one of the largest providers of adult education in America.

It is estimated that 40 billion dollars are spent annually on corporate education. This estimate is usually calculated based on the cost of instructors, course development, and tuition and facilities, rather than employee-student time and wages (Craig & Evers, 1981; Eurich, 1985). Several studies have suggested this figure is extremely conservative and would more likely reach 60 to 80 billion dollars if employee compensation time for training were taken into account (Craig & Evers, 1981; Eurich, 1985; Gilbert, 1976). Harold Hodgkinson (1981),
former Director of the National Institute of Education and the Professional Institute of American Management Associations, revealed that in 1981 the "size and value [of corporate education] were coming close to the net worth of the 3500 colleges and universities whose total investment is about 55 billion" (p. 1). Regardless of the exact dollar amount, business and industry employers are conducting a massive educational program and are providing the largest educational alternative to colleges and universities (Craig & Evers, 1981; Eurich, 1985; Gilbert, 1976; Lynton, 1984).

In addition to spending billions of dollars on in-house course work, business and industry employers in some instances are establishing their own independent degree programs. Corporations are no longer relying on colleges and universities to grant degrees in areas of interest to business and industry (Eurich, 1985; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987). These degree-granting institutions were first labeled "corporate colleges" by Hawthorne, Libby and Nash in 1983. According to the definition, "corporate colleges" are institutions which were initially established by a profit or nonprofit entity whose primary mission was something other than granting collegiate degrees and which offer post-secondary degrees. These include business, hospital, service, and manufacturing corporations, as well as professional associations and clubs formed to provide
educational support for members of a particular profession (Hawthorne, Libby, & Nash, 1983, p. 2).

This study is concerned with the characteristics of the curricula, faculty, and students of these nonprofit corporate colleges. In an effort to provide a greater understanding of the phenomenon of corporate colleges, it is appropriate to take a backward glance at the historical development and dimensions of corporate education. The review of literature discusses (a) the evolution of corporate education, (b) corporate curricula, (c) providers of corporate education, (d) a student profile, (e) the emergence of corporate colleges, (f) motivations for their establishment, and (g) implications for higher education.

The Evolution of Corporate Education

The Morrill Act of 1862 recognized a need for agricultural and mechanical skills and established 70 state colleges and universities, but this effort was not sufficient to meet the demands of business and industry (Craig & Evers, 1981; Gold, 1981; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987). In response, the first factory school was established in 1872 by Hoe and Company, manufacturers of printing presses, to meet the burgeoning need for manually skilled workers. Similar company schools were established by Westinghouse in 1888, General Electric in 1901, Baldwin Locomotive Work in 1901, and International Harvester Company in 1907. Steinmetz
(1976) observed that the establishment of company schools rapidly became common practice with companies such as Western Electric, Goodyear, Ford, and National Cash Register. The exact number of corporate schools established between 1872 and 1913 is not known; yet, a conservative estimate indicates that 200 such institutions were created (Baker, 1983; Henderschoot, 1913). Henderschoot (1913) points out that in 1913 there were sufficient numbers of schools and interested corporations to found a national association. The National Association of Corporation Schools, known today as the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD), is a professional organization whose members develop, conduct, and manage training programs for employees.

The responsibility for work-related education shifted from companies to colleges and universities during the 1920s. There is little documentation on corporate schools during this period, but there is some evidence that a small group of companies continued to offer courses to their employees (Blackerby, 1961; Coler, 1932). Several authors attribute this shift to the development of technical courses and vocational programs by the newly emerging junior colleges (Betters-Reed, 1982; Craig & Evers, 1981; Eurich, 1985). External events such as World War I and the increased complexity of business organizations and industries are also noted as reasons for this shift of responsibility for
education. World War I brought increased demands for newly trained workers and called attention to the "scarcity of managerial talent" (Clark & Sloan, 1958, p. 7). As a result, a large number of colleges and universities established business departments to meet the demand (Baker, 1983; Clark & Sloan, 1958; Lynton, 1984).

The economic jolt created by the Great Depression increased the need to retrain workers for new kinds of work (Davis, 1933). Davis (1935) indicates that the recognition of the continuing need to train employees so that they may be able to adjust when changes are necessary was a prevalent concern during this time. Education of workers was undertaken by several sectors other than business and industry. Labor unions, the federal government, and colleges and universities played significant roles in the education of employees prior to World War II (Davis, 1935; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987).

The post-World War II period, sometimes referred to as the second industrial revolution, generated considerable interest in the space, computer, and management consulting industries. Government and industry leaders recognized the need for highly skilled producers and highly skilled managers. Consequently, management as a concept of professional activity using a body of knowledge that could be organized and taught became a modern occupational
specialization distinction. Corporations such as Western Electric, International Business Machines (IBM), American Telephone and Telegraph (AT&T), International Harvester, and General Electric (GE) secured contracts with colleges and universities to buy faculty expertise, particularly for management and technical courses (Eurich, 1985; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987). Tremendous growth in corporate education and training for managers, factory operators, technical personnel, and clerical staff occurred in the 1950s. General Electric, for example, offered 1,500 courses in 1956, enrolling 32,000 employees at annual expenditures of $35 to $40 million (Eurich, 1985).

Accelerating technological changes during the 1960s and 1970s created numerous new positions and fields within business and industry. Management education became widespread during the 1970s, and colleges and universities were resources for corporate education. Programs offered by Harvard (the Advanced Management Program), Dartmouth, and Princeton led the way (Hawthorne, Libby & Nash, 1983). Jacobs and Phillips (1979) noted that for the most part colleges and universities were unable to keep pace with technological advancement and thus employers once again assumed a larger share of the training function.
The Corporate Curricula

The corporate curriculum has broadened considerably in recent years (Eurich, 1985). Early corporate classrooms focused on specific vocational training in the areas of manufacturing and engineering. Corporations are now concentrating on educating the total individual and his or her respective needs whether this involves remedial education or graduate course work. Eurich (1985) stated that the corporate curriculum increasingly parallels the work of the nation's colleges and universities. This is exemplified by the major areas of corporate instruction, including basic skills instruction, management and executive training, technical and scientific study, sales, service and customer training, and general education. There is a growing emphasis on general education and basic skills instruction. Corporations are also responding to business leaders' pleas for graduates with communication skills by offering courses traditionally taught by post-secondary institutions (Baker, 1983; Betters-Reed, 1982; Cross, 1985; Eurich, 1985; Gold, 1981; Lynton, 1981).

Henry and Raymond (1983) detail the serious concern of employers over employee deficiencies in mathematics, science, and speaking-listening skills in the Center for Public Resources (CPR) report, *Basic Skills in the U.S. Work Force*. Moreover, employers were worried about the impact of those deficiencies not only on employability but also on the
viability of retaining and promoting employees to higher levels of responsibility. In response to these concerns, businesses have found it necessary to offer courses in reading, writing, and arithmetic (Eurich, 1985; Lusterman, 1977; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987). The CPR study also noted that 75% of the 184 businesses that responded to the study offered some type of basic skills programs for their employees. The courses include algebra, basic arithmetic, reading and study skills development, speech, trigonometry, and writing (Eurich, 1985).

Management and executive training comprises the largest part of the corporate curricula (Eurich, 1985). Lusterman (1977) notes that in one survey over 50% of the companies offered courses in management development. The courses are scheduled at regular transition points in career development and are designated for the various levels of management, from the first-line manager to the corporate executive.

Eurich (1985) classifies management curricula into four general areas: managing time, managing people, managing money, and managing productions and operations. Topics such as time management and effective delegation and effective and efficient use of work hours are often part of the management curricula. Courses that focus on human development, or the management of people, frequently appear in corporate classrooms with titles such as Team Building, Effective Listening, Managing Conflict, and Problem Solving.
Processes. Basic accounting principles, computerized information systems, financial reporting and budgeting, and detailing company policies and practices emphasize the importance of managing funds. Finally, managing production and operations receives great attention in managerial training. Common course titles among diverse firms include Management Fundamentals, Management by Objectives, and Quality Training (Eurich, 1985; Lynton, 1984; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987).

Rapid changes in technology and the increased emphasis on processing information have contributed to a marked increase in technical and scientific study in the corporate classroom. Technical training runs the gamut from high school level subject matter to advanced post-doctoral courses. Courses in basic computer literacy as well as advanced engineering appear in the curriculum. Technical courses are predominant in manufacturing, industrial, and research companies; however, technical courses are appearing with increasing frequency in the classrooms of service companies. The banking industry, retailing, food merchandising, hotel services, insurance, and health care companies are educating employees in the areas of automation and information processing (Eurich, 1985; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987).

Sales, service, and customer training is another area of corporate study. Eurich (1985) suggests that training
for sales and services has long been a part of company education, but as the economy shifted toward information industries—particularly those driven by high technology—the nature and amount of training changed. Information industries in the areas of aerospace, computers, microelectronics, and telecommunications are in a constant state of flux. As new products and systems emerge, those involved in marketing inevitably require continuous training (Eurich, 1985, p. 74).

A wide variety of courses that cannot be classified as basic instruction, management, technical and scientific, or sales, service or customer related are also commonly available to employees. These courses comprise an area known as general education, which emphasizes personal growth and enrichment and career development of individuals. Courses in this area are generally available to hourly and salaried or professional personnel. Orientation courses, benefits and educational opportunities, pre-retirement programs, career counseling, and safety courses fall into this category (Eurich, 1985; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987).

Providers of Corporate Education

Corporate education is provided by several sectors, which include direct education by firms, outside consultants, and colleges and universities. Various industries spend their education dollars quite differently. The amount of
money allocated for in-house training as opposed to outside consultants is related to the size of the company. Several sources reported that the larger the company, the more likely education is provided by internal instructors and trainers. On the other hand, smaller companies do not have the resources to develop intensive in-house training programs and opt to use outside consultants and colleges and universities for the education of their employees (Eurich, 1985; Lusterman, 1977; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987).

The largest single provider of corporate education is the corporations themselves (Eurich, 1985; Lusterman, 1977; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987). A study by Lusterman (1977) found that 80% of the money spent for education and training was spent on in-house training. Lusterman (1977) concludes that two out of five companies have employees who devote most of their time to training. Moreover, it has been estimated that approximately 45,000 full-time or almost full-time trainers are employed by business today.

Outside consultants are also used in the education of employees. The use of outside consultants is directly related to the size of the company. For example, companies with 10,000 or more employees spend approximately 6% of the total training budget on outside courses, whereas companies with 2,500 employees or less spend 24% of the training budget on outside courses (Nash & Hawthorne, 1987; Lusterman, 1977).
Colleges and universities are a third provider of corporate education. More companies have tuition aid programs, which reimburse employees for expenses incurred for post-secondary education, than any other type of program. Yet, the use of these programs is relatively low. Consequently, the number of people attending in-house courses (generally offered during working hours) is much greater than those attending colleges and universities) (either during or after working hours) (Nash & Hawthorne, 1987; Lynton, 1984; Miner, 1977).

Student Profile

Employee participation in corporate education varies from company to company. It depends on factors such as company size and type and employee job function (Carnevale & Goldstein, 1983; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987). Carnevale and Goldstein (1983) report that manufacturing, trade, transportation, public utility, and construction have the greatest rate of employee participation in education and training.

One study suggests that white-collar employees, top-level executives, and nonmanagement employees participate in corporate education but to a lesser extent than management employees (Miner, 1977; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987; Quackenboss, 1969). Miner (1977) revealed that 47% of all first-line supervisors and 46% of all middle
managers participated in company-sponsored instruction. Top-level executive education is also prevalent; however, it is more likely to be conducted by colleges and universities.

A profile of the student-employee indicates the individual is most likely male, between the ages of 25 and 44. Furthermore, the more educated the employee is, the more likely he or she is to continue participating in corporate education (Carnevale & Goldstein, 1983; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987).

The Emergence of Corporate Colleges

Corporate education dates back to the late 1800s; however, only recently have corporations begun to grant degrees. Although several corporate colleges (American Graduate School of International Management, the College of Insurance, General Motors' Institute, the Institute of Textile Technology, and Northrop University) won their academic degree-granting status in the 1940s and 1950s, the remaining colleges in existence today received their degree-granting status since 1970. Thus, the majority of corporate degree programs have emerged over the past 20 years. Consequently, the majority of research conducted on these colleges has occurred within the past 10 years (Eurich, 1985; Hawthorne, Libby, & Nash, 1983; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987).
Corporate colleges have been established in various ways. Founders of corporate colleges include business, health, service and manufacturing corporations as well as professional associations and social clubs. GMI, the oldest example of a corporate college, was started by General Motors Corporation in the 1920s to provide education for automotive engineers. An Wang, of Wang Laboratories, founded the Wang Institute of Graduate Studies in 1981 to provide highly skilled software engineers to the computer industry. The Boston Architectural Center began as a social club and became a degree-granting institution in 1979 (Eurich, 1985; Hawthorne et al., 1983; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987).

Engineering and technical instruction, business and management programs, and allied health programs comprise the curricula of corporate colleges (Hawthorne et al., 1983). While the spectrum of degrees offered range from the associate to the doctorate, in general corporate college degree programs focus on specific professional or vocational areas. For example, the Boston Architectural Center offers the Bachelor of Architecture degree. The Massachusetts General Hospital Institute of Health Professions specializes in graduate work in the areas of dietetics, nursing, physical therapy, and speech-language pathology (Eurich, 1985).

Corporations hire faculty on both full-time and part-time bases. Full-time corporate college faculty are
usually hired on a contractual basis, rather than a tenure policy. Therefore, the hours of work and salaries are comparable to those of the business world rather than higher education. Faculty members are encouraged to stay current in their respective fields in order to emphasize the practical application of knowledge along with the theoretical (Eurich, 1985; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987).

The clientele of corporate colleges has broadened over the last several decades. Initially, the colleges sought to educate the employees of their sponsoring organizations. For example, the GMI, operating in a night-school format, educated General Motors employees in engineering and management. Likewise, Northrop University was started in the 1940s as a division of Northrop Aircraft, Incorporated, to train its personnel for the growing aircraft industry (Eurich, 1985).

Two studies conducted in 1985 and 1987 by Eurich and Nash and Hawthorne, respectively, note that the majority of corporate colleges no longer have "restrictive admission policies"; instead, they have expanded their mission and accept students from any company or country as long as they meet admission requirements. This implies that the available pool of students is similar to that of traditional post-secondary institutions (Eurich, 1985; Hawthorne et al., 1983; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987).
In a case study of two nonprofit and one profit corporate colleges, Baker (1983) concludes that corporate degree programs are comparable to traditional college and university programs. The programs are characterized by similar entrance requirements, methods of instruction, scholastic standards, and course content. In addition, Eurich (1985) maintains that corporate college graduation requirements, residential arrangements, and costs closely parallel those of traditional colleges and universities.

Motivation for Corporate Colleges

Nash and Hawthorne (1987) state that "present corporate colleges were founded to meet a need not elsewhere addressed in post-secondary education" (p. 35). Motivating factors contributing to the establishment of corporate colleges, according to a number of authors, include the need for proprietary education, the need for practical application, lack of convenience in scheduling and administration, varying methods of instructional delivery, implications of accelerating technological change, dissatisfaction with recent college graduates, and the enhancement of company image (ACE, 1984; Baker, 1983; Betters-Reed, 1982; Brademas, 1984; Buettner, 1982; Chamberlin, 1965; Coler, 1932; Craig & Evers, 1981; Cross, 1985; DeMeester, 1981; Eddy and Kellow, 1977; Eurich, 1985; Gold, 1981; Harder, 1969; Hawthorne et al., 1983; Hollie, 1987; Kyle, 1981; Lapin, 1982; Lynton,
An obvious motivating factor leading to the establishment of corporate colleges is the need for education specialized for the company. Corporations must orient new employees to the corporate environment and the ways peculiar to the organization. Proprietary interests require training in management, sales practices, and product information. Many companies also develop in-house training for marketing products for competitive reasons (Coler, 1932; Craig & Evers, 1981; Eurich, 1985; Hawthorne et al., 1983; McQuigg, 1980).

Employees have sometimes found colleges and universities less than flexible in meeting their needs (ACE, 1984; Chamberlin, 1965; Eurich, 1985; Hawthorne et al., 1983; Moore, Settle, & Skinner, 1982). Moore, Settle, and Skinner (1982) point out that a common complaint about college and university instructional programs is that they offer too much theory, and too little practical application. This view is further supported by researchers who conclude that more corporations are developing their own management courses with specific corporate orientation and subscribing less to what some corporate leaders criticize as the too theoretical approach of business schools (ACE, 1984; Eddy & Kellow, 1977; Gold, 1981; Hawthorne et al., 1983; Lapin, 1982; Preer, 1984). American College, for example, designed
its corporate degree program to combine conceptual study and actual work—an approach that attempts to tackle the age-old problem of the integration of theory and practice. Eurich (1985) revealed that the inclusion of "real world" applications in an attempt to make learning more useful is probably the foremost priority of all of the corporate colleges.

Lack of convenience of scheduling and administration of traditional institutions of higher education is another motivation for the establishment of corporate colleges (ACE, 1984; Baker, 1983; Craig & Evers, 1981; Hawthorne et al., 1983; Moore et al., 1982). For example, Wang Institute of Graduate Studies was created because no college or university offered a master's degree in computer software engineering (Nash & Hawthorne, 1987). The routines of rigid daytime scheduling as opposed to evening and weekend classes eliminates the possibility of the majority of the adult work force attending traditional post-secondary institutions. Inflexible college operating procedures such as scheduling and registration inhibit access to instructional programs. Several authors have suggested that colleges should streamline the admission and registration process to minimize employee time away from the job (Brademas, 1984; Buettner, 1982; Lapin, 1982; Lynton, 1981; Moore et al., 1982; Preer, 1984).
Method of delivery and instruction are other contributing factors to the establishment of corporate colleges. The classrooms in the corporate educational environment surpass many universities in sophistication of their delivery system and method (Cross, 1985; Eurich, 1985). They are not campus bound; instead they are global. In some instances, a single institution may be educating students at home and abroad. General Motors Institute, for example, videotapes courses for its master's degree in manufacturing management and delivers the courses to any site where engineers are working (Baker, 1983). Another nontraditional mode of instruction that takes courses to the students is the American College's plan of national course work prepared and distributed by the central campus in Pennsylvania. Examinations are available through PLATO computerized systems at Control Data Learning Centers in metropolitan areas throughout the United States (Eurich, 1985, p. 101).

A frequently cited reason for corporate educational programs concerns the need for skilled workers in rapidly changing technological fields (Baker, 1983; Betters-Reed, 1982; Chamberlin, 1965; Cross, 1985; Eurich, 1985; Gold 1981; Harder, 1969; Hawthorne et al., 1983; Freer, 1984; Samuels, 1981). Moreover, there is increasing misalignment between the needs of employers and the availability of technically skilled workers. This premise is reflected by
Harder (1969) who stated that due to rapid technological changes and the number of unqualified persons entering the job market, "the main job of educating people to adjust to the changing job environment has landed in the lap of industry itself, where the changes are occurring" (p. 99). Several authors cite the inability of post-secondary institutions to respond quickly to the changing learning needs of business and industry as a reason for corporate involvement in education (Craig & Evers, 1981; McQuigg, 1980; Samuels, 1985). This problem was a factor in the creation of the degree program at Wang laboratories. The computer firm needed software specialists in engineering; and although this is one of the fastest growing industries in the country, there are insufficient college programs to meet the demand for these specialists (Baker, 1983, p. 25). In response to this need, Wang Institute of Graduate Studies was established to provide graduate education in software engineering (Baker, 1983; Betters-Reed, 1982; Eurich, 1985).

Another reason that employers have assumed a major responsibility as educators is dissatisfaction with recent college or high school graduates (Baker, 1983; Buettner, 1982; Craig & Evers, 1981; DeMeester, 1981; Hollie, 1987; Kyle, 1981; Lapin, 1982; Samuels, 1985). In describing the entry level workers in its report, "A Nation at Risk," the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983)
concluded that the problems of illiteracy, poor performance, and severe shortcomings in technical competence are widespread. The level of academic skills that was satisfactory a decade ago is inadequate today. The current work force as well as potential employees must be able to read at advanced levels, think critically and abstractly, solve problems, make decisions, and communicate effectively with co-workers. Several authors emphasize that basic academic skills are sadly lacking in employees of all levels; and in turn, businesses must reteach reading, writing, and mathematics to compensate for these inadequacies (Baker, 1983; Craig & Evers, 1981; Lapin, 1982; Samuels, 1985).

Hollie (1987) points out that businesses are often involved in projects because they look good ("Why Business is Barging into the Classroom," 1987). Hence, the image factor, a form of corporate self-interest, emerges as a final motivation. Dean Charles Wolfe, Jr. revealed that the Rand Graduate Institute of Policy Studies was established because it was good for the company image.

Implications for Higher Education

The literature suggests that business and industry will increasingly choose to create their own separate educational institutions (Eurich, 1985; Hawthorne et al., 1983; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987). Baker (1983) claims we are "seeing a rebirth of the corporation school,"
although perhaps a more sophisticated version. U. S. News and World Report (1983) suggested that in the next fifty years:

Industry, for one will become much more involved in education and job training. Hundreds of corporations will grant degrees, most often in high technology, science, and engineering, where state-of-the-art equipment and research will surpass that on most campuses. ("Education? By Computer Naturally," 1983, p. A5)

Although the number of corporate colleges is not sizable at this time, several authors suggest we are only seeing the "tip of the iceberg of corporate education" (Eurich, 1985; Hawthorne et al., 1983). It is not known whether the expansion of these institutions will have a positive, negative, or neutral effect on traditional colleges and universities. The projected proliferation of corporate colleges could affect higher education in two areas: enrollment and faculty (Eurich, 1985; Hawthorne et al., 1983; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987).

Based on current research (Hawthorne et al., 1983; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987), corporations will continue to seek degree programs in the areas of technology and computer science. If these corporations determine that traditional higher education programs will not satisfy their needs, and choose to develop their own degree programs, a decline in college enrollment may occur.

The expansion of corporate colleges may not only cut into the potential student population, but into the faculty
population as well. Corporations are increasingly luring professors away from the academy by providing salaries and benefits that surpass those of institutions of higher education. This is evident by the shortage of engineering faculty in traditional colleges (Hawthorne et al., 1983).

Indications are that employers will assume more and more responsibility for educating and training their employees (Craig & Evers, 1981; Eurich, 1985; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987). According to the literature, it would be of mutual benefit to traditional post-secondary education and corporate education to look more closely at the corporate college phenomenon (Eurich, 1985; Hawthorne, et al., 1983; Lynton, 1981; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987).

Summary

Chapter II reviews the literature associated with corporate education and corporate colleges. The specific areas of review are the evolution of corporate education, the corporate curricula, providers of corporate education, a student profile, the emergence of corporate colleges, motivation of corporate colleges, and implications for higher education.
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CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

This study was conducted to explore the characteristics of nonprofit corporate college curricula, faculty, and students. The purposes of this study are (a) to describe and analyze the organization and content of nonprofit corporate college curricula, (b) to describe and analyze the background and status of nonprofit corporate college faculty, and (c) to describe and analyze the demography, educational background, and employment characteristics of students enrolled in nonprofit corporate colleges. A survey was constructed to gather data from the 18 nonprofit corporate colleges in existence today. Included in this chapter are (a) a description of the population, (b) the development of the survey, (c) a description of the pilot study, (d) the data collection techniques, and (e) treatment of the data.

The Population

At present, there is no nationwide higher education directory which specifically denotes corporate colleges. Three studies (Hawthorne, Libby, & Nash, 1983; Eurich, 1985; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987) supplied rosters of operating
corporate colleges. Hawthorne, Libby, and Nash (1983) first identified 14 corporate colleges. Two years later, a study by Eurich (1985) found four additional degree-granting institutions which were established by corporations, bringing the new total to 18. The latest research on corporate colleges, by Nash and Hawthorne (1987), updated the previous rosters and concluded that a total of 26 corporate colleges were in operation.

Corporate colleges can be subdivided into two types: those that were established as nonprofit educational endeavors and those proprietary institutions that were established or purchased as profit making enterprises (Nash & Hawthorne, 1987). While both types are worthy of study, proprietary institutions present a different challenge to traditional institutions of higher education than nonprofit colleges. It is perceived that the bulk of proprietary schools offer specialized programs similar to those offered by community colleges (Nash & Hawthorne, 1987; Lynton, 1984). For that reason, only nonprofit corporate colleges were included for examination in this study. A list of the 23 nonprofit corporate colleges adapted from the Eurich (1985) and Nash and Hawthorne (1987) reports is included in Appendix A.

These 23 nonprofit corporate colleges were contacted by telephone in order to identify the individuals responsible
for the academic affairs of the institution. It was assumed
that the academic affairs administrator would be an
appropriate respondent because this officer is usually
responsible for gathering data about the curricula, faculty,
and students. A telephone conversation with one of the
academic affairs officers revealed that one branch of a
nonprofit corporate college is now operating as a separate
entity. Therefore, the inclusion of this college brings the
total population of nonprofit corporate colleges to 24.

Six of the nonprofit corporate colleges could not be
reached by telephone. Because all of the corporate colleges
in the study have degree-granting authority, or have
petitioned their state for it, telephone contact was made
to the respective State Departments of Higher Education to
determine the status of the institutions. This inquiry
revealed that these six institutions no longer meet the
definition of a corporate college for one of the following
reasons: (a) the college does not currently have degree-
granting privileges, or (b) the college has ceased operations.
Consequently, these six corporate colleges were omitted from
the actual study. A total of 18 nonprofit corporate
colleges were used as the population of this study (see
Appendix B). The surveys were sent to the 18 individuals
identified through the telephone contacts.
Design of the Survey Instrument

The instrument (Appendix C) used in this study was developed to carry out the purposes as outlined in Chapter I. It was designed to obtain data about corporate college curricula, faculty, and students.

The survey instrument was divided into four sections. The first section (Institutional Demographics) contains a combination of eleven statements and questions seeking information about the demographic characteristics of the corporate college. Twelve questions relating to the organization and content of curricula are presented in the section entitled Curriculum. The section labeled Faculty consists of twelve items relating to the academic background, employment status, scholarship, and professional background of faculty. The final section (Students) contains seven items about the age, sex, race, and educational and employment background of corporate college students. The instrument includes an opportunity for participants to make additional comments on the topics of the survey.

A mailed survey was selected for this study because of the broad geographical distribution and time restrictions, although mailed instruments often have a low response rate. Several authors suggest an average response rate to the mailed survey is approximately 30% (Forcese & Richer, 1973; Grosof & Sardy, 1985; Rossi, Wright, & Anderson, 1983).
Fundamentally, the participant's cooperation is a function of his interest in the subject. Similarly, a participant's cooperation depends on how important he judges the research to be and how important his role in the research appears to be (Forcese & Richer, 1973, p. 168). The following suggestions for maximizing the return of mailed instruments as outlined by Forcese and Richer (1973) were used: (1) a stamped, self-addressed envelope was included to minimize respondent inconvenience to the participant, (2) a cover letter detailing the importance of the research and asking cooperation was used to generate interest, and (3) an intensive follow-up campaign, which used follow-up letters, postcards, and telephone calls was initiated within 10 days of the first mailing.

To evaluate the content and determine the validity of the instrument, a selected group of individuals in higher education, educational research, and business and industry reviewed the preliminary instrument. The group consisted of two higher education professionals, one educational researcher, and one administrator in a corporate environment. Each member was provided a statement of the problem, purposes of the study, and research questions. A content validity guide adapted from Wiseman and Aron (1970) provided a base for evaluating design and clarity (see Appendix D). Any item considered ambiguous or inappropriate by a majority of the panel was revised or eliminated.
Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted in order to validate the content of the instrument. Instruments were sent to two degree-granting corporate colleges; however, they were not included in the actual study because they are proprietary colleges. DeVry Institute of Technology and National Education Center, the two institutions used in the pilot study, were selected from the latest roster of corporate colleges identified by Nash and Hawthorne (1987). Each institution currently has degree-granting privileges authorized by their respective state.

The pilot study was conducted in the same manner as the actual study; thus, all correspondence and follow-up procedures were identical for both groups. Telephone contact was made to each proprietary college prior to the administration of the survey instrument to identify the appropriate participant. The identified participants included a Dean of Academic Affairs and a Department Chairperson.

A cover letter (Appendix E), survey (Appendix C), and a stamped self-addressed envelope were then sent to the designated participants in mid-March. The cover letter detailed the purposes of study and asked that each individual respond within two weeks. Reminder postcards (Appendix F) were mailed to the two pilot institutions approximately one
week after the initial mailing. One institution responded by the established deadline. A follow-up call was made to the nonrespondent two days after the established deadline. The nonrespondent indicated that the survey would be returned, but was delayed because of prior commitments. The second pilot survey instrument was received 10 days after the established deadline.

The purpose of the pilot study was to determine if the participants understood the survey items. If the respondents did not answer or provide feedback on an item, it was revised or excluded from the instrument. No changes were made to the survey instrument due to the pilot study. Pilot study responses are neither included nor reported in the analyses of data.

Data Collection Techniques

The survey (Appendix C), cover letter (Appendix D) and stamped, self-addressed envelope were mailed to the 18 participants in early April. The purpose of the study, a request for cooperation, and the suggested two-week deadline were specified in the cover letter (Appendix D). Approximately seven days after the mailing, reminder postcards (Appendix F) were sent requesting the completion and return of the survey. Follow-up calls were made to the nonrespondents one week after the established deadline to determine the status of the surveys. A second cover letter
(Appendix G) and survey were sent to nonrespondents one week after the established deadline.

Treatment of Data

The intent of this research is to describe the demography, curricula, faculty, and students of nonprofit corporate colleges. Frequencies, percentages, and modes were calculated for each demographical (nominal) variable. Frequencies, percentages, and ranges were calculated for ordinal and interval data.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter is to identify the research methods and procedures used in this descriptive study. Eighteen nonprofit corporate college administrators were identified as participants. Each individual was asked to respond to a survey instrument which sought information about curricula, faculty, and students. The instrument was validated by a panel of experts in higher education, corporate education, and two proprietary corporate colleges. The surveys were sent to the 18 nonprofit corporate colleges that were being investigated in this study. Summary statistics such as frequencies, percentages, ranges, means, and modes were calculated.
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CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter analyzes the data collected from the survey instruments returned by the administrators of the nonprofit corporate colleges. The findings are a result of the 12 research questions identified in Chapter I designed to determine and describe the characteristics of nonprofit corporate college curricula, faculty, and students. Institutional demographical data were gathered as well.

The survey instrument (Appendix C) was first reviewed for content validity by a group of experts in higher education and corporate education. A pilot survey was sent to two degree-granting proprietary corporate colleges in order to determine the validity of the instrument. Pilot study responses are neither included nor reported in the analysis of data.

During Spring, 1988, surveys were sent to 18 administrators of nonprofit corporate colleges. Approximately seven days after the mailing, reminder postcards were sent to the population to request their completion and return of the survey instrument. Those administrators who had not replied within three weeks of the data collection
phase were contacted by telephone to determine their willingness to participate in the study and to encourage their response. Subsequently, a second survey and follow-up letter were mailed to all nonrespondents. Data were analyzed according to frequencies and percentages.

This presentation of data is divided into several sections, including a profile of the respondents and answers to the twelve questions formulated to investigate curricula, faculty, and students of the nonprofit colleges. The chapter concludes with a discussion and summary of major findings.

Respondents

The participants of this study were assured complete anonymity; therefore, specific references to nonprofit corporate colleges are not made. Eighteen nonprofit corporate colleges identified by Eurich (1985) and Nash and Hawthorne (1987) were used as the population for this study. Fifteen of the 18 nonprofit corporate college administrators returned the questionnaire within the allotted time. Three of the 15 respondents stated that they did not meet the definition of a corporate college used in this study, so they did not complete the survey. Three other subjects failed to return the surveys by the established deadline.

The 12 respondents who completed the survey represented 6 types of administrators. They include 4 Deans of Academic
Affairs, 3 Vice Presidents, 2 Deans, 1 Provost, 1 President, and 1 Acting President.

Organization of Curricula

Research question one seeks to determine the organization of nonprofit corporate college curricula. Five statements included in the curriculum section of the survey focus on the educational levels of degree programs, number of degree programs, credit requirements, characteristics of curriculum review committees and the predominant method of instruction.

Educational Level of Degree Program

The survey solicited information about the educational level of degree programs. The frequency of levels of degree programs and their proportion of the total number of programs are reported in Table 1.

The majority (58%) of nonprofit corporate colleges reported the master's degree program as the most prevalent level of degree program. Professional designation programs offered by 17% of the colleges included certificate programs in finance and insurance. Postdoctoral and first professional degree programs are the least prevalent educational level of degree program.

Number of degree programs. The survey also asked the respondents to specify the number of degree programs. A
Table 1

Frequency and Percentage of Degree Offerings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoctorate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Designation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Professional Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

summary of the number of degree programs by educational level is presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Number of Degree Programs by Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One degree program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one degree program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The values represent the frequency of colleges.
Results indicated that a majority (58%), or seven colleges, offered a single degree program. Four (33%) of the colleges offered degree programs at the graduate level.

Credit requirements. The survey also asked for the minimum number of credits required to complete a degree program. The minimum number of credits required for the associate, bachelor, master, and doctoral degree programs based on the academic calendars (quarter, semester, or trimester) used by the institutions is presented in Table 3.

Table 3
Minimum Number of Credits by Level of Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Degree</th>
<th>Minimum Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>60-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>120-180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>65-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The minimum number of credits for an associate's degree ranged from 60-75 semester credits or 63 trimester credits. The bachelor's degree requirements ranged from
120-180 semester credits or 123 trimester credits. The minimum number of credits required for the master's degree ranged from 40-54 semester credits or 65-90 quarter credits. The single doctoral degree program reported 26 quarter credits as a minimum requirement.

Characteristics of Curriculum Review Committee

The survey solicited information about curriculum review committees. Members of this committee include faculty, college administrators, industry consultants, and students (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. Percentage of colleges with faculty, student, administrator, and industry consultant representation on the curriculum review committee.
Twelve colleges (100%) reported that faculty serve on the curriculum review committee. Over one-half of the colleges indicated that students and administrators serve on these committees.

The reported size of the committee varied from 5 to 22 members. Two-thirds of the colleges reported a curriculum review committee composed of 10 or fewer members.

The colleges reported that the curriculum review committee meets on an on-going basis, monthly, on a semester basis, or as needed. On-going or monthly meetings were reported as the most prevalent schedules, occurring in 10 of the 12 colleges (84%).

**Method of Instruction**

The respondents were asked to indicate the predominant method of instruction used in degree-granting programs. Figure 2 shows the percentage and instructional methods reported by the 12 nonprofit corporate colleges.

The most predominant method of instruction reported by six colleges (50%) is classroom lecture. The other half of the respondents reported combinations of classroom and computer-assisted instruction, classroom and clinical, and classroom and self-paced as the predominant methods.

**Content of Curricula**

Research question two seeks to determine the content of nonprofit corporate college curricula. Two items
Figure 2. Percentage of colleges with classroom, classroom and computer-assisted instruction, classroom and clinical, and classroom and self-paced instruction as the predominant methods of instruction.

relating to the content of degree programs and general education requirements were included in the curriculum section of the survey.

Area of emphasis of degree programs. The respondents were asked to indicate the areas of emphasis of their degree programs. These areas are depicted in Table 4.

As shown in Table 4, there are 10 areas of emphasis of degree programs in nonprofit corporate colleges, almost as many as there are colleges. The most frequently reported area of emphasis was management.
### Table 4

**Frequency of Area of Emphasis of Degree Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Emphasis</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General education requirements.** The survey asked the respondents to specify the total number of general education requirements. Data regarding the frequency and percentage reporting general education requirements are shown in Table 5.

Seven colleges (58%) require students to complete general education credits as a part of their degree program while five colleges (42%) do not have mandatory general education requirements.
Table 5
General Education Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory general education requirement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No general education requirement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were also asked to indicate the areas that comprise the general education requirements, which are shown in Table 6.

Table 6
Number of General Education Credits by Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>Health/PE</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. NR indicates no response was given.
Table 6—continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Social/Behavioral Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. NR indicates no response was given.

Two colleges did not reveal the areas of the general education requirement, nor did they specify the number of credits. In summary, the number of general education units for the areas of mathematics and science ranged from 3 to 23 credits, credits in social and behavioral sciences ranged from 6 to 15, credits in communications ranged from 1 to 9, only one credit in health and physical education was required, and the number of general education credits for the humanities ranged from 3 to 18.
Characteristics of Faculty

Research questions three and four concern the characteristics of the faculty in nonprofit corporate colleges. Respondents were asked to indicate the number of faculty who hold a doctor's degree, master's degree, or bachelor's degree as the highest degree earned. Respondents were also asked to specify the number of faculty without postsecondary degrees. Research question four seeks to determine the employment status of faculty in nonprofit corporate colleges in addition to number of faculty and terms of employment.

Academic Background of Faculty

Ten of the 12 colleges responded to question three. Figure 3 shows the distribution of degrees held by faculty in the 10 responding colleges.

![Figure 3](image)

*Figure 3. Percentage of highest degree earned by faculty.*
The findings revealed that the majority (96%) of faculty in nonprofit corporate colleges hold a postsecondary degree. The master's degree was reported as the highest degree earned by a majority (49%) of faculty.

Employment Status of Faculty

Respondents were asked to specify the number of faculty employed. All 12 colleges responded to this item. Overall, the 12 nonprofit corporate colleges employ a total of 944 full-time and part-time faculty. Seventy-five percent of the colleges employ 100 or fewer faculty members. The employment status of faculty is shown in Table 7.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Employment</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time by college</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time by college, full-time by corporation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time by college only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside consultant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional architects and engineers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Six colleges (50%) reported that the majority of faculty are employed full-time by the college. One quarter of the colleges indicated that the majority of faculty are employed part-time by the college, in addition to working full-time for a corporation.

Information was also secured on the terms of employment of faculty. Ten of the 12 respondents (83%) do not have a tenure policy. Consequently, the majority of faculty are hired on other terms.

Respondents were asked to specify terms of employment for the majority of faculty. The distribution of terms of faculty employment is shown in Figure 4.

![Figure 4](image)

**Figure 4.** Percentage of colleges hiring faculty on limited-term appointment, course-by-course basis, tenure track, and other conditions.
Results indicate that two-thirds of the colleges hire the majority of faculty on either a limited-term appointment (e.g., one-year contract) or on a course-by-course basis. Tenure policies were the least prevalent term of faculty employment.

Faculty Research

Research question five seeks to determine what type of scholarly research is conducted by faculty in nonprofit corporate colleges. Two statements relating to faculty scholarship including research and publication are included in the faculty section of the survey.

Respondents were asked if the faculty engage in research and publication activities and if the research is subsidized by a corporate sponsor. An overwhelming majority of the colleges (92%) reported that faculty engage in scholarly activities such as research and publication. Seventy-three percent of these colleges indicated that the research is not subsidized by a corporate sponsor.

The study sought to determine if any grant-funded research has been conducted during the last 12 months and asked the respondent to indicate general sources of funding. Seven (58%) of the 12 colleges said that there has not been any grant-funded research conducted at the institution during the past 12 months. Three of the five colleges which have conducted grant-funded research revealed several
sources of funding, including the Department of Energy, the Federal Government, the Ford Foundation, the Sloan Foundation, and Professional Associations. The two remaining colleges did not report their sources of funding because of confidentiality reasons.

Professional Teaching Experience of Faculty

The professional teaching experience of faculty in nonprofit corporate colleges was sought in research question six of this study. Respondents were asked to estimate the percentage of faculty with previous teaching experience. The proportion of faculty with previous teaching experience is presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Proportion of Faculty with Previous Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Faculty with Previous Teaching Experience</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority (50%) of the colleges revealed that between 76-100% of the faculty have previous teaching experience. One-third of the colleges estimated that as few as 10-25% of the faculty have teaching experience.

**Faculty Evaluation Process**

Research question seven concerns the process of evaluation of faculty in nonprofit corporate colleges. Respondents were asked to indicate all methods used in the faculty evaluation process. Figure 5 shows the percentage of nonprofit corporate colleges with student evaluation, supervisor evaluation, self-evaluation, peer evaluation, and other types of evaluation used in the faculty evaluation process.

![Bar chart showing the percentage of colleges with different evaluation methods: Student (n=9, 75%), Supervisor (n=8, 67%), Self (n=8, 50%), Peer (n=3, 25%), Department Review (n=1, 8%).]

Figure 5. Percentage of colleges with student evaluation, supervisor evaluation, self-evaluation, peer evaluation and other types used in the faculty evaluation process.
The findings indicated that two-thirds or more of the nonprofit corporate colleges ask students and supervisors to participate in faculty evaluation. A peer review is a less prevalent type of faculty evaluation.

Criteria for faculty evaluation. Research question eight seeks to determine the criteria for faculty evaluation. The final two statements in the faculty section ask the respondent to specify what criteria is used in faculty evaluation and to rank the importance of these criteria.

The respondents revealed three main criteria for the evaluation of faculty: teaching, research, and service. One hundred percent of the colleges reported teaching as a criterion for faculty evaluation, 67% reported research as a criterion, and 42% said service is a deciding factor. Clinical expertise, curriculum development, industry activity, participation in professional groups and professional development were also noted as less important factors in faculty evaluation. The majority (75%), or nine colleges, combine two or more types of criteria for the evaluation of faculty.

Importance of faculty evaluation criteria. Respondents were also asked to rank the importance of the criteria used in faculty evaluation. Of the nine institutions with more than a single criterion for faculty evaluation, five (50%)
indicated that teaching is the top priority. Three colleges (25%) reported service as the second most important criterion in faculty evaluation. Professional development and curriculum development were noted as criteria; however, they were reported as a lower priority in faculty evaluation.

Characteristics of Students

Research question nine concerns the characteristics of students in nonprofit corporate colleges. Four statements focusing on the distribution of students according to sex, age, and race as well as the student-to-faculty ratio are included in the student section of the survey.

Enrollment of Students

Nonprofit corporate colleges presently enroll 37,797 students. Eighty-six percent of these students (n = 32,581) are male, and 14% (n = 5,218) are female.

Age of students. The percentage of students according to the average age of the student population is displayed in Figure 6. Demographical data on the average age of students were collected for 11 of the 12 colleges.

The majority (58%) of students in nonprofit corporate colleges are between the ages of 25 and 40, whereas a minority (8%) of students are age 40 and over.
Figure 6. Percentage of students according to average age.

Race of students. The percentage of students by race is presented in Figure 7. The college with the largest student population (30,000) failed to respond to this item on the survey.

Figure 7. Percentage of students by race.
The findings revealed that an overwhelming majority (89%) of nonprofit corporate college students are White. American Indian/Native Alaskan are the least represented race in the colleges, comprising only 1% of the total student population.

**Student-faculty ratio.** Ten colleges reported the student-to-faculty ratio. The highest student-faculty ratio was 28 students for every 1 professor, whereas the lowest student-faculty ratio was 1 student for each professor. The average student-to-faculty ratio was 13:1. Two colleges failed to respond to this item.

**Employment of Students**

Research question ten seeks to determine the employment characteristics of students participating in nonprofit corporate college degree programs. The final statements in the student section of the survey focused on these characteristics.

Respondents were asked to estimate the proportion of students with work experience in an industry related to their degree offerings. Estimated proportions ranged from 30-100%. The majority (92%) of the colleges estimated that between 50-100% of the students have worked in an industry related to the degree offerings of the colleges.

The proportion of students who are currently employed by corporations that sponsor corporate colleges was also
sought. Eight colleges were affiliated with a corporate sponsor, and had students working for that sponsor. Two colleges (25%) estimated that as many as 76-100% of the students were employees of the sponsoring organization, although the majority (63%), or eight colleges, indicated that only 1-25% of the students were employed by a sponsoring corporation.

Characteristics of Nonprofit Corporate Colleges

Research question eleven seeks to determine the institutional demography of nonprofit corporate colleges. Respondents were asked to provide demographical information about student enrollment, admission policies, type of academic calendar, tuition costs, financial aid programs, student housing, and schedule of classes. These demographical characteristics are presented in this section.

Enrollment Characteristics

The respondents were asked to specify the current student enrollment. A summary of current student enrollment is shown in Table 9.

The 12 nonprofit corporate colleges collectively enroll 37,797 students. The majority of nonprofit corporate colleges (58%) currently have enrollments of 500 or fewer students.
Table 9

Frequency and Percentage Size of Enrollment Intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Intervals</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-499</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1499</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-1999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2499</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500-2999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000-3499</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500-3999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000-4999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of graduates. Responses on the total number of graduates were obtained from 10 of the 12 colleges. These data are reported in Table 10.

Table 10 indicates that the majority of the colleges (64%) have 4,000 or fewer graduates.

Number of graduates during the last academic year. Respondents indicated the number of students who graduated during the previous academic year. The largest graduating class for 1986-87 was 2,139, whereas the smallest number of
Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-3999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000-5999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000-7999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000-9999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

graduates was 6. The majority (83%), or 10 colleges, graduated 200 or fewer students last year.

Admission Policies

Undergraduate admission requirements. The respondents were asked to indicate all requirements for admission into an undergraduate degree program. A summary of the requirements is presented in Table 11.

The majority (67%) of the six colleges with undergraduate degree programs have more than one requirement for admission. One-half of the colleges reported that an individual must have either a high school degree or equivalent and a satisfactory score on the American College
Table 11

Undergraduate Admission Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or equivalent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or equivalent and satisfactory ACT or SAT score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma, top 10% of graduating class and satisfactory ACT or SAT score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ACT = American College Testing Assessment, SAT = Scholastic Aptitude Test.

Graduate admission requirements. Eight colleges indicated that they offer graduate degree programs. The requirements for admission into the various programs are exhibited in Table 12.

Graduate admission policies varied widely among the colleges. Less restrictive admission policies required an undergraduate degree in any field with a specific grade-point average. More stringent policies required an undergraduate degree in any field in addition to a satisfactory score on a standardized admission test,
Table 12

Graduate Admission Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UG degree in any field with specified GPA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG degree in related field with specified GPA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG degree in any field, specified GPA and satisfactory GMAT/GRE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG degree in a related field specified GPA, and satisfactory GMAT/GRE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG degree in any field and specified work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG degree in a related field and approval of academic committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG degree in any field, satisfactory GRE/GMAT, specified work experience, and demonstrated competency in statistics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree or equivalent work experience (doctoral program)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. UG = undergraduate, GPA = grade-point average, GMAT = Graduate Management Admissions Test, and GRE = Graduate Record Examination.

specified work experience, and a demonstrated competency on a statistics examination. The majority (88%) of the colleges had multiple requirements for admission.
Type of Academic Calendar

The type of academic plan which the institution used was also reported. There are three types of academic calendars: the quarter, semester, and the trimester calendar. Twenty-five percent or three colleges used a trimester calendar, and another 25% used a quarter calendar.

Tuition Costs per Academic Year

Information on the average tuition costs for an academic year was reported for 10 of the 12 colleges. This information is displayed in Table 13.

Table 13

Average Tuition Costs per Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition Cost (Dollars)</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-499</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-9999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-14,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-19,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five of the 10 responding colleges (50%) reported average tuition costs between $500 and $999. Extremely low
tuition costs of $499 or less per academic year were reported by four of the colleges (40%).

Financial Aid Available to Students

One-third of the 11 responding colleges do not offer financial aid assistance to students. The survey solicited information about the types of financial aid available to students. This information is displayed in Figure 8.

**Figure 8.** Proportion of colleges offering national loan programs, grant programs, state loan programs, and fellowships.

Over one-half of the respondents offer both national loan and scholarship programs. Fellowship programs were the least reported type of financial assistance.
Student Housing

Whether student housing was offered and the number of students currently residing on campus was sought from the respondents. Seven colleges (58%) do not offer housing for students, and five colleges (42%) reported that they have student housing. The number of students currently residing on the five colleges with student housing ranged from 50 to 450. Eighty percent of these colleges have 120 or fewer students residing in student housing facilities.

Schedules of Classes

Classes are reported to be held during the day for six (50%) of the colleges surveyed. Three colleges (25%) indicated that the majority of the courses were offered during the evening. Two colleges (17%) reported that the classes were divided equally between day and evening hours. A response of "not applicable" was reported for one college because of the self-study nature of the degree program.

Similarities and Differences Between Institutional Demographics and Curricula, Faculty, and Students

Research question twelve seeks to determine the similarities and differences between institutional demographics and nonprofit corporate college curricula, faculty, and students. Based upon the findings in this chapter for the first eleven research questions, the
following relationships were noted. The similarities and differences for each of the three areas are presented in this section.

Curricula

1. Nonprofit corporate colleges do not offer a single type of degree program; they include a variety of disciplines.

2. Nonprofit corporate colleges with graduate degree programs in financial planning and insurance tend to accept undergraduate degrees in any field as part of their admission policy.

3. Nonprofit corporate colleges offer financial aid in the form of national and state loan programs, grant programs, and scholarships for the associate's and bachelor's degree.

4. Nonprofit corporate colleges with graduate degree programs do not offer financial aid programs or offer limited programs such as fellowship and stipend programs.

5. Nonprofit corporate colleges with business programs (business education and management) have more consultants from industry on the curriculum review committee.

6. There are no similarities between current enrollment and area of emphasis of degree program.

7. There are no similarities between level of degree offering (associate, bachelor, master, and doctorate) and area of emphasis of degree program.
8. There are no similarities between the area of emphasis of degree program and admission policy. Admission policies vary widely among nonprofit corporate colleges.

9. There are no similarities between minimum credit requirements for degree programs and number of mandatory general education requirements.

10. There are no similarities between schedule of class offerings and level of degree program. Associate programs are offered both day and evening as are graduate programs.

Faculty

1. Nonprofit corporate colleges with business education, financial planning, and insurance degree programs reported that the majority of faculty are full-time employees of a corporation and part-time employees of the college.

2. Nonprofit corporate colleges with degree programs in the health sciences and engineering reported that faculty conduct grant-funded research.

3. Nonprofit corporate colleges with health sciences degree programs use participation in professional associations as a criterion for evaluating faculty.

Students

1. Health science degree programs reported a higher student-faculty ratio.

2. Health science degree programs reported a higher proportion of female than male students.
3. Insurance and financial planning degree programs which offer designation or certificate programs reported the largest proportion of students with work experience in the industry.

4. Nonprofit corporate colleges with student housing facilities offer more types of financial aid programs.

Summary of Major Findings

The following is a summary of the major findings of this study.

1. The term corporate college and the definition (Hawthorne, Libby & Nash, 1983) are sometimes misunderstood. Two areas of misinterpretation are (1) the word corporate implies only corporate-sponsored colleges, although several were started by professional associations, and (2) the definition explaining the mission and status of the sponsoring organization was confused with the mission of the educational institution.

2. Three nonprofit corporate colleges identified by Nash and Hawthorne (1987) have ceased operating as post-secondary degree-granting institutions.

Curricula

1. A majority (58%) of nonprofit corporate colleges offer a single graduate degree program.

2. Nonprofit corporate college degree programs are offered in a variety of disciplines, including management,
business education, engineering (chemical, mechanical, industrial, and manufacturing systems), financial planning, health sciences (nursing, paramedics, physical therapy, and respiratory care), insurance, architecture, banking, liberal arts, public policy, and textile technology.

3. Minimum credit requirements for each degree (associate, bachelor, master, and doctorate) vary among the twelve colleges.

4. Two-thirds of nonprofit corporate colleges have a curriculum review committee of 10 or fewer members who meet on a regular basis. The members of the committee include faculty, students, college administrators, and industry consultants. Faculty serve on 100% of the committees, students (67%), college administrators (50%), and industry consultants (25%).

5. One-half of the colleges indicate that classroom lecture is the predominant method of instruction. The other half reported combinations of classroom and computer-assisted instruction, classroom and clinical, or classroom and self-paced instruction.

6. General education credits are required by a majority (58%) of nonprofit colleges and include course work in the areas of communications, health and physical education, humanities, mathematics, science, and behavioral and social science. The range of credits required for each
area is communications (1-9), health and physical education (1), humanities (3-18), mathematics (3-23), science (3-23), and behavioral and social science (6-15).

Faculty

1. A majority (96%) of nonprofit corporate college faculty have earned a post-secondary degree. The master's degree was reported as the highest degree earned by a majority (49%) of faculty.

2. One-half of the nonprofit corporate colleges hire faculty on a full-time basis. Twenty-five percent of the colleges indicated that the majority of faculty are employed part-time by the college, in addition to working full-time for a corporation.

3. A majority (83%) of nonprofit corporate colleges do not have a tenure policy, and instead hire faculty on either a limited-term appointment (e.g., one-year contract) or a course-by-course basis.

4. Faculty do engage in scholarly activities such as research and publication in 92% of nonprofit corporate colleges. Only 27% of these colleges receive corporate funding for these activities.

5. A majority (58%), or seven colleges, indicated that the faculty has not conducted any grant-funded research during the last year. Sources of funding for the five colleges that have conducted grant-funded research include
the Department of Energy, the federal government, and the Ford and Sloan Foundations.

6. Ten of the 12 nonprofit corporate colleges (83%) use a combination of two or more methods for evaluating faculty. Over two-thirds of the colleges ask students and supervisors to participate in the evaluation process. Criteria for the evaluation included teaching, research, service, clinical expertise, curriculum development, industry activity, participation in professional groups, and professional development. Teaching was ranked as the foremost criterion for evaluation by 50% of the responding colleges, while service was ranked second by 25% of the colleges.

Students

1. Nonprofit corporate colleges currently enroll 37,797 students, 30,000 of whom are enrolled in one institution. An overwhelming majority (86%) of the students are male. Only health science degree programs reported a higher proportion of female than male students. The average age of the student as reported by the colleges is between 25 and 40 years old. The racial groups represented in the nonprofit student population include White (89%), Black (5%), Asian (3%), Hispanic (3%), and American Indian/Native Alaskan (1%).
2. All of the 12 nonprofit corporate colleges (100%) indicated that some portion of their student population have work experience in an industry related to their degree programs. The responses ranged from 30% to 100%. A majority (67%) of nonprofit colleges are affiliated with a corporate sponsor and have students working for that corporation.

3. There are three types of academic calendars used by nonprofit corporate colleges: the quarter, the semester, and the trimester calendar. Fifty percent of nonprofit corporate colleges follow a semester calendar. In terms of schedule of classes, 50% of the colleges indicated that the majority of classes are held during the day.

4. Two-thirds of nonprofit corporate colleges offer one or more of the following financial aid programs: scholarship programs, national loan programs, grant programs, state loan programs, and fellowships. Nonprofit corporate colleges with graduate degree programs do not offer financial aid or offer a limited program such as the fellowship.

5. A majority of nonprofit corporate colleges (58%) do not offer student housing.

Discussion

Fifteen of the 18 nonprofit corporate college administrators responded to this study. Three of these
administrators declined to participate in the study for the following reasons: (1) one felt his college did not meet the definition of a corporate college because the institution was established by an organization whose major mission was education; (2) one stated that the institution was not a corporate college, but a private, nonprofit degree-granting institution; and (3) one misunderstood the definition and replied that the college is a degree-granting institution whose mission is education. These statements indicate that the term "corporate college" and the definition are not clearly understood. Moreover, the comments reported on the returned surveys and telephone discussions with several of these administrators indicate that they seemed adamant about not classifying their college as a corporate college.

Hawthorne, Libby and Nash (1983) defined a corporate college as an institution offering post-secondary degrees which was initially established by an entity, profit or nonprofit, whose primary mission was something other than granting collegiate degrees. There appears to be two areas of misinterpretation of the term corporate college: (1) the word "corporate" implies only corporate-sponsored colleges, although several of these were started by professional associations such as the American Institute of Banking and the Midwest Management Association, and (2) the Hawthorne, Libby and Nash (1983) definition explaining the mission and
status of the sponsoring organization is confused with the actual mission of the educational institution.

Additional problems arise when the term corporate college is used to describe corporate education and training in general, not corporate sponsored degree programs. For example, a recent article entitled "A Case for Corporate Colleges" (Gordon, 1988) discusses the pros and cons of management core curricula in companies such as General Electric, General Telephone and Electronics, The Hartford Insurance Group, and International Business Machines Corporation. According to previous research, none of these companies have sponsored or currently offer degree programs.

Also of interest is the fact that several of the corporate colleges listed in the Nash and Hawthorne (1987) report no longer offer degrees or have ceased operation. Telephone communication with Kathleen Kelly of the Illinois Department of Higher Education revealed that the Chrysler Institute of Engineering, the Industrial Management Institute, and McDonald's Hamburger University are no longer operating as degree-granting institutions.

The lack of response by the remaining three colleges could be attributed to (a) a lack of time available to these administrators to devote to this study, (b) the fact that this study was not a top priority for the administrators, (c) a misunderstanding of the definition, or (d) a reluctance to be classified as a corporate college.
One purpose of this study was to describe and analyze the organization and content of nonprofit corporate college curricula. Findings support research conducted by Nash and Hawthorne (1987) which showed that corporate colleges offer graduate degree programs more frequently than undergraduate degree programs. In addition, nonprofit corporate colleges tend to offer specialized degree programs (e.g., architecture, finance, and insurance) rather than global programs in business, education, or liberal arts. Likewise, the majority of nonprofit corporate colleges offer a single degree program. Admission requirements for these degree programs are similar to admission requirements for traditional colleges and universities. Requirements include a high school diploma or equivalent and satisfactory standardized test score for undergraduate degree programs, and an undergraduate degree for admission into graduate degree programs. Only in rare instances are students required to have specified work experiences to gain admission into these colleges. Nonprofit corporate colleges, like traditional colleges and universities, establish general education requirements that vary with the type of program.

The second purpose of this study was to describe and analyze the background and status of nonprofit corporate college faculty. The findings reveal that the majority of nonprofit corporate college faculty are full-time, non-tenured employees, which differs from traditional colleges
and universities. Two-thirds of the faculty are hired on a contractual basis or on a limited-term appointment.

The results indicate that a majority (92%) of nonprofit corporate college faculty engage in research and publication; however, this activity does not appear to be a major criterion in the evaluation of faculty. Although the colleges were initially established by a corporation, few of them currently receive funding for research from these sponsors. The separation of these colleges from their original corporate sponsors and the current independent operating status of the institutions could explain this lack of funding.

The final purpose of this study was to describe and analyze the demographics, educational background, and employment characteristics of students in nonprofit corporate colleges. The findings reveal that an overwhelming majority (86%) of the student population is male, which is not typical of the traditional college and university population. A possible explanation is that the majority of corporate employees receiving education are male (Lusterman, 1977). Only the degree programs in the fields of health sciences reported having a majority of females in the student population, perhaps emphasizing the fact that nursing and allied health fields have traditionally been considered areas of study appropriate for females.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, DISCUSSION,
CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Introduction

The purposes of this study were (a) to describe and analyze the organization and content of nonprofit corporate curricula, (b) to describe and analyze the background and status of faculty in nonprofit corporate colleges, and (c) to describe and analyze the demographics, educational background, and employment characteristics of students in nonprofit corporate colleges. Institutional demographics on student enrollment, number of graduates, admission policy, tuition cost, types of financial programs, student housing, and schedule of classes were gathered as well. Data were collected from survey instruments returned by 12 nonprofit corporate college administrators. The data were treated to produce frequencies and percentages.

Summary of Major Findings

The following is a summary of the major findings of this study.

1. The term corporate college and the definition (Hawthorne, Libby, & Nash, 1983) are sometimes misunderstood.
Two areas of misinterpretation are (a) the word corporate implies only corporate-sponsored colleges, although several were started by professional associations, and (b) the definition explaining the mission and status of the sponsoring organization is becoming confused with the actual mission of the educational institution.

2. Three corporate colleges reported in existence in a report by Nash and Hawthorne (1987) have since ceased operation as post-secondary degree-granting institutions.

Curricula

1. A majority (58%) of nonprofit corporate colleges offer a single graduate degree program.

2. The areas of emphasis of nonprofit corporate college degree programs include management, business education, engineering (chemical, mechanical, industrial, and manufacturing systems), financial planning, health sciences (nursing, paramedics, physical therapy, and respiratory care), insurance, architecture, banking, liberal arts, public policy, and textile technology.

3. Minimum credit requirements for each level of a degree (associate, bachelor, master, and doctorate) vary among the 12 colleges.

4. Two-thirds of nonprofit corporate colleges have a curriculum review committee composed of 10 or fewer members who meet on a regular basis. The members of the committee
include faculty, students, college administrators, and industry consultants. Faculty serve on 100% of the committees, students (67%), college administrators (50%), and industry consultants (25%).

5. One-half of the nonprofit corporate colleges indicate that classroom lecture is the most predominant method of instruction. The other half of the colleges reported combinations of classroom and computer-assisted instruction (CAI), classroom and clinical, and classroom and self-paced instruction.

6. General education credits are required by a majority (58%) of nonprofit colleges and include course work in the areas of communications, health and physical education, humanities, mathematics, science, and behavioral and social science. The range of credits for each area is communications (1-9), health and physical education (1), humanities (3-18), mathematics (3-23), science (3-23), and behavioral and social science (6-15).

Faculty

1. A majority (96%) of nonprofit corporate college faculty have earned a post-secondary degree. The master's degree was reported as the highest degree earned by a majority (49%) of the faculty.

2. One-half of the nonprofit corporate colleges hire faculty on a full-time basis. Twenty-five percent of the
colleges indicated that the majority of the faculty are employed part-time by the college, in addition to working full-time for a corporation.

3. A majority (83%) of nonprofit corporate colleges do not have a tenure policy, and instead hire faculty on either a limited-term appointment (e.g., one-year contract) or on a course-by-course basis.

4. Faculty engage in scholarly activities such as research and publication in 92% of nonprofit corporate colleges. Only 27% of these colleges receive corporate funding for the activities.

5. A majority (58%), or seven colleges, indicated that the faculty has not conducted any grant-funded research during the last year. Sources of funding for the five colleges that have conducted grant-funded research include the Department of Energy, the federal government, and the Ford and Sloan Foundations.

6. Ten of the 12 nonprofit corporate colleges (83%) use a combination of two or more methods to evaluate faculty. Over two-thirds of these colleges ask students and supervisors to participate in the evaluation process. Criteria for the evaluation included teaching, research, service, clinical expertise, curriculum development, industry activity, participation in professional groups, and professional development. Teaching was ranked as the
top priority for evaluation in 50% of the responding colleges, while service was ranked second in 25% of the colleges.

Students

1. Nonprofit corporate colleges currently enroll 37,797 students, 30,000 of whom are enrolled in one institution. An overwhelming majority (86%) of the students are male. Only health science degree programs reported a higher proportion of female than male students. The average age of the students as reported by the colleges is between 25 and 40 years old. The racial groups represented in the nonprofit student population include White (89%), Black (5%), Asian (3%), Hispanic (3%), and American Indian/ Native Alaskan (1%).

2. All of the 12 nonprofit corporate colleges (100%) indicated that some portion of their student population have work experience in an industry related to their degree programs. The responses ranged from 30% to 100%. A majority (67%) of nonprofit colleges are affiliated with a corporate sponsor and have students working for that corporation.

3. Three types of academic calendars are used in nonprofit corporate colleges: the quarter, the semester, and the trimester calendar. Fifty percent of nonprofit corporate colleges follow a semester calendar. In terms
of schedule of classes, 50% of the colleges indicated that the majority of classes are held during the day.

4. Two-thirds of nonprofit corporate colleges offer one or more of the following financial aid programs: scholarship programs, national loan programs, grant programs, state loan programs, and fellowships. Nonprofit corporate colleges with graduate degree programs do not offer financial aid programs or offer limited programs such as fellowships.

5. A majority of nonprofit corporate colleges (58%) do not offer student housing.

Discussion

Two major findings unrelated to the purposes of the study were revealed during this investigation. They are that (1) the Hawthorne, Libby and Nash (1983) definition of a corporate college is sometimes misunderstood and that (2) three corporate colleges which were reported to be in existence in 1987 have ceased operating as degree-granting institutions.

There appears to be two areas of misinterpretation of the term corporate college: (a) the word "corporate" implies only corporate-sponsored colleges, although several of these were established by professional associations such as the American Institute of Banking and the American Management Association, and (b) the Hawthorne, Libby and Nash (1983) definition explaining the mission and status
of the sponsoring organization was mistakenly identified with the actual mission of the educational institution.

Additional problems arise when the term corporate college is used to describe corporate education in general, not corporate-sponsored degree programs. In "A Case for Corporate Colleges" Gordon (1988) uses the term "corporate college," but his article does not discuss corporate-sponsored degree programs as they are defined by Hawthorne, Libby and Nash (1983).

Conclusions

Based on the findings from this study, the following conclusions appear to be warranted.

1. Additional classification of the term corporate college and its definition are needed.

2. Although the number of corporate colleges is expected to increase (Eurich, 1985; Hawthorne et al., 1983; Nash & Hawthorne, 1987), it appears that the number could actually decrease due to the cessation of degree-granting privileges to several existing corporate colleges.

3. It appears that the nonprofit corporate colleges are specialized institutions which primarily offer graduate degree programs.

4. Nontraditional methods of instruction such as computer-assisted instruction (CAI) and self-paced
instruction appear to be prevalent in nonprofit corporate colleges.

5. Tenure does not appear to be a major issue in nonprofit corporate colleges.

6. Research does not appear to be a major criterion in the evaluation of faculty at nonprofit corporate colleges.

7. Nonprofit corporate colleges appear to be catering to younger, corporate, White, male students.

Recommendations

The following recommendations for future research are suggested based upon the findings and conclusions of this study.

1. Additional classification of the term corporate college and the definition should be addressed to avoid misinterpretation.

2. A similar study could be conducted with profit-making corporate colleges to determine if similarities exist between the two types of colleges.

3. Research addressing the reasons for the closure or change in degree-granting status of corporate colleges should be conducted.

4. General research in the area of corporate-sponsored degree programs is needed.
5. A request for copies of the college catalog and, when available, an institutional self-study could assist in the analysis and interpretation of data.
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## TWENTY-THREE NONPROFIT CORPORATE COLLEGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location(s)</th>
<th>Degrees Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American College</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Graduate School of International Management</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur D. Little Management Education Institute</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Clarkston College of Nursing</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Architectural Center</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysler Institute of Engineering</td>
<td>MI, IL, MO</td>
<td>Master's &amp; Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIBAR Systems Institute</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health Sciences</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Insurance</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Associate &amp; Bachelor's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMI Engineering and Management Institute</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Management Institute</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Health Professions</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Management Competency</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
<td>Degrees Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Paper Chemistry</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Master's, Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Textile Technology</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Master's, Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald's Hamburger University</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England Institute of Banking (formerly known as the American Institute of Banking)</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Technological University</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northrop University</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Associate, Bachelor's, Master's, JD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia College of Textiles and Sciences</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Associate, Bachelor's, MBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rand Graduate Institute of Policy Studies</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Associates</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Human Resource Development</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Institute of Graduate Studies</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Master's</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EIGHTEEN NONPROFIT CORPORATE COLLEGES
USED AS POPULATION IN STUDY

American College
American Graduate School of International Management
Arthur D. Little Management Education Institute
Bishop Clarkson Memorial Hospital College of Nursing
Boston Architectural Center
Chicagoland Institute of Banking
Community Hospital of Roanoke Valley College of Health Sciences
College of Insurance
GMI Engineering and Management Institute
MGH Institute of Health Sciences
Institute of Paper Chemistry
Institute of Textile Technology
National Technological University
New England Institute of Banking
Northrop University
Philadelphia College of Textiles and Sciences
Rand Graduate Institute of Policy Studies
University Associates Graduate School of Human Resource Development
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SURVEY OF CORPORATE COLLEGES

Directions: Indicate your response to each statement by placing a check in the space provided or filling in the blank where appropriate. Check only one response unless otherwise directed.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND PARTICIPATION

INSTITUTIONAL DEMOGRAPHICS

1. Name of the Institution: ________________________________

2. Current Student Enrollment: ______________

3. Are all students enrolled in a degree program?
   Yes
   No

4. Approximately how many students have graduated from your institution?

5. How many students did you graduate during the last academic year?

6(a). What is your UNDERGRADUATE admission policy?
   (Mark all that apply)
   Open to any individual with a high school diploma or equivalent
   Individual must have a high school diploma/equivalent and specified SAT/ACT score
   Individual must have specified work experience
   N/A (do not offer undergraduate degrees)
   Other, specify ________________________________

6(b). What is your admission policy for GRADUATE PROGRAMS (check all that apply)
   Undergraduate degree in a related field with a specified cumulative GPA
   Undergraduate degree in any field with a specified cumulative GPA
   Satisfactory GRE/GMAT score
   Specified work experience
   N/A (do not offer graduate degree programs)
   Other, specify ________________________________

7. What type of plan is your academic year based?
   Semester
   Quarter
   Tri-mester
   Other, specify ________________________________

8. Average tuition cost for a full-time student for an academic year: $_______

9. What type of financial aid is available for students?
   National loan programs
   State loan programs
   Grant programs
   Scholarships
   None
   Other, specify ________________________________

10(a). Does your institution offer student housing?
   Yes
   No

(b). If Yes, how many students live on-campus? _______

11. The majority of your classes are offered during the:
   Day
   Evening
   Weekend
   N/A (including self-paced/learner controlled)

CURRICULUM

12. Indicate the area of emphasis of your degree programs:
   (Mark all that apply)
   Business education
   Computer programming
   Computer Science (hardware)
   Engineering, specify areas ________________________________
   Management
   Liberal arts, specify areas ________________________________
   Other, specify ________________________________
13. At what educational levels are your degree programs? (Mark all that apply)
   - Two-year or associate degree
   - Four-year college level (baccalaureate)
   - Graduate (masters)
   - Postgraduate (doctorate)
   - Other, specify

14(a). Does your institution offer more than one degree program?
   - Yes
   - No

(b). If Yes, specify the number of degree programs:
   - Undergraduate
   - Graduate

15. What is the minimum number of credits required to complete your degree programs? (Answer all that apply)
   - Associate
   - Bachelor
   - Master's
   - Doctorate

16(a). How many mandatory general education credits are required for your degree program?
   (Specify number)

(b). Indicate the credit hours that comprise the general education requirement:
   - Communications (oral and/or written)
   - Health/Physical Education
   - Humanities (art, literature, music, philosophy)
   - Mathematics (including computer science)
   - Sciences (Chemistry, Physics)
   - Social/Behavioral Sciences (economics, government, history, psychology, sociology)
   - None
   - Other, specify

17(a). Does your institution have a Curriculum Review Committee?
   - Yes
   - No

(b). If Yes, how many members serve on the committee?
   (Specify number)

(c). If Yes, who are the members of the committee? (Mark all that apply)
   - Faculty
   - College Administrators (i.e., President, VP, Dean)
   - Industry Consultants
   - Students
   - Other, specify

(d). How often does the committee meet?
   - On-going
   - Semesterly
   - Quarterly
   - Annually
   - Other, specify

18. Indicate the predominant method of instruction used in your degree-granting programs?
   - Classroom instruction (lecture or laboratory)
   - Computer assisted Instruction (CAI)
   - Combination of classroom and CAI
   - Self-paced instruction/learner controlled instruction
   - Other, specify

FACULTY

19. Approximately how many faculty do you employ? (Include full and part-time) ______

20. The majority of the faculty are:
   - Employed full-time by the college
   - Employed full-time by a corporation, part-time by the college
   - Outside consultants
   - Other, specify

21. What is the student-faculty ratio for your institution? (e.g., Twenty students to every one professor, 20:1) ______

22. Indicate the number of faculty holding the following as their highest degree earned:
   - Doctorate degree
   - Master's degree
   - Bachelor's degree
   - No postsecondary degree
23. Approximately what percentage of your faculty have previous college teaching experience?

- 1-25%
- 26-50%
- 51-75%
- 76-100%
- None

24. Is there a tenure policy at your institution?

- Yes
- No

25. The majority of faculty are hired on what terms?

- Tenure track
- Limited term appointment (e.g. one year contract)
- Course by course basis
- Other, specify ______________________

26(a). Does the faculty engage in scholarly activities such as research and publication?

- Yes
- No

(b). If Yes, is the research subsidized by a corporate sponsor?

- Yes
- No

27(a). Within the last twelve months, has there been any grant-funded research conducted at your institution?

- Yes
- No

(b). If Yes, indicate general sources:

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

28. What type of faculty evaluation process do you have? (Mark all that apply)

- Self-evaluation
- Peer evaluation
- Supervisor evaluation
- Student evaluation
- None at this time
- Other, specify ______________________

29. What is the criteria for faculty evaluation?

- Teaching
- Research (i.e. publications, grants)
- Service (i.e. community involvement)
- Other, specify ______________________

30. Which of these areas are most important to the faculty evaluation process in your institution? (Rank 1-highest, 4-lowest). Please specify the percentage or weight assigned to each in the blank on the right.

- Teaching (% ___)
- Research (% ___)
- Service (% ___)
- Other, specify ___ (___)

STUDENTS

31. What percentage of your current enrollment is:

- Male
- Female

32. The average age of your students are:

- 18-24
- 25-40
- 40 and over

33. What percentage of your current enrollment is:

- American Indian/Native Alaskan
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Black
- Hispanic
- White

34. Estimate the proportion of students that have experience in the industry relative to your curriculum offerings: ________ (specify number)

35. If your school is affiliated with a corporate sponsor, what proportion of students are current employees of that corporation?

- 1-25%
- 26-50%
- 51-75%
- 76-100%
- N/A

Additional comments are welcome:
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1. Is the question useful? Does it get at the desired information?

2. Is it probable that respondents will have the information necessary to answer the question?

3. Is the question free from bias, or is it loaded such that the respondent might react with prejudice he would not otherwise experience?

4. Is the question so personal or private that the respondent will be reluctant to give an honest answer?

5. Is the wording of the question clear? Does it contain difficult words that the average respondent may not understand?

6. Is the order of the question both logical and helpful in keeping the respondent answering; that is, do the questions flow from easy to difficult?
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ORIGINAL COVER LETTER

Name
Title
Institution
Address
City, ST Zip Code

Dear "__________":

You are an administrator of a "corporate college, a member of an increasingly important segment of post-secondary education. In the 1987 Association for the Study of Higher Education Report Formal Recognition of Employer-Sponsored Instruction, Nash and Hawthorne define a corporate college as "a degree-granting institution established by an entity whose major mission is something other than education."

As a doctoral candidate in Higher Education Administration at North Texas State University, I am conducting a study, the purpose of which is to determine the characteristics of corporate college curricula, faculty, and students. The results of this survey will be of value to educators in both academia and in business and industry.

I ask for your time and participation in completing the attached survey. A stamped self-addressed envelope has been provided for your convenience. All data obtained from the survey will be reported with complete anonymity.

For institutions which are regionally accredited or are candidates for accreditation, the institutional self-study would be an excellent resource for the survey.

Again, please be assured that all information gathered through this process will be confidential. Please return the survey by XXXX. If you have any questions about any aspect of this study, please contact me at the address or telephone noted above. Thank you for taking the time to help; I will be looking forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Karen Parker
attachment
Dear

You should have received a copy of my cover letter and survey regarding Corporate Colleges. I hope that you will take the time to provide the necessary information. A response from you in the very near future will be helpful in the completion of my study.

Sincerely,

Karen Parker
NTSU Graduate Student
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FOLLOW-UP COVER LETTER

Date

Name
Title
Institution
Address
City, State Zip Code

Dear ________:

Approximately three weeks ago you received a survey of corporate colleges, seeking data on your institution's curricula, faculty, and students. Your response to this survey is crucial to the accuracy of the findings in this study.

As noted earlier, a corporate college is "a degree-granting educational institution which was established by an organization the major mission of which is something other than education." The sponsoring organizations may be a business, industry, health service organization, or professional association. The corporate college need not still be associated with the original sponsor to be considered a corporate college for this study. Even independent institutions are considered corporate colleges if they were originally sponsored by organizations like those described above.

If your response has been mailed, please accept my appreciation. If you have not had the time to complete the survey, I ask that you please do so now.

In the event the original survey and cover letter were not received, or were misplaced or lost, a second is enclosed. In addition, a stamped, self-addressed envelope is included for your reply.

Again, be assured of strict confidentiality. Thank you immensely for your time and participation. I am looking forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Karen Parker
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