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A PROCESS FOR EVALUATING THE INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT
OF DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS
USING THE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM
AT OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY AS A CASE STUDY

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The evaluation of educational programs has developed along
different paths during the past twenty years. Numerous
techniques are available to assist the researcher in the
evaluation task. "In fact the literature is overflowing with
ways of conducting program evaluation research" (Honey, 1988:
1). It has been suggested that alternative approaches to
evaluation contribute to developing better insights, as well
as providing a rethinking of existing approaches to program
evaluation (Stufflebeam and Webster, 1980 in Deshler, 1984).
On the other hand, Wolfe (1979) argues that because of this
very proliferation, "confusion abounds" (18).

Although a controversy exists as to which approach to use,
one thing is clear. There is definitely a need for program
evaluations to yield useful results. There is an even
greater need for providing useful results in developmental education programs. As de los Santos (1982) reminds us "...the purpose of a developmental education program is to provide for the students the academic and personal skills that will help them to succeed in college." For students in developmental education programs, this is perhaps the last place for them to receive help. If the developmental education program is not doing its job, these students have nowhere else to turn.

The literature of developmental education programs, sometimes referred to as remedial or basic skills programs, reveals that program evaluation was a focus of much research in the 1970's. In a meta-analytic synthesis of findings, Kulik, Kulik and Shwalb (1983) found over 504 studies in their review of the literature. Whether or not programs should be evaluated is no longer the issue. Decision makers believe that evaluation can serve useful purposes. The dilemma has shifted from whether or not programs should be evaluated to how best to proceed. Program evaluations in general have been criticized for not producing useful results (Wilson 1984:143). In an attempt to assure useful results various researchers (Mines, Gressard, & Daniels, 1982; Wilson, 1984; Gordon & Wiest, 1988; Maring, Shea & Warner 1987; and Clowes, 1984) have suggested processes that can be used. Some of the procedures attempt to guide the evaluation, while others attempt to dominate it. Although no procedure for evaluation
is ideal, the following review of the literature will show that the processes suggested by all of the above researchers were unacceptable for the purpose of evaluating the instructional component of developmental education programs. Therefore, it became necessary to develop an evaluation process for the instructional component of developmental education programs that is both flexible and adaptable, and that provides usable results.

Purpose of the Study

The central purpose of this research was to develop a process for evaluating the instructional component of developmental education programs. The Educational Opportunities Program (EOP) at Oregon State University (OSU) was used as a case study.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study were:

1. To develop a process for evaluating the instructional component of developmental education programs.

2. To use the Educational Opportunities Program at Oregon State University as a case study.
Rationale of the Study

In 1980, Trillin wrote, "In an age of shrinking budgets and growing demands for accountability, the evaluation of academic programs hardly requires justification. However, the need for evaluation is particularly acute in college remedial programs" (262). Ten years later the need is even greater, as economic problems still plague those who are responsible for the allocation of state and federal funds. Developmental programs are often large and expensive, and they are often funded by government or foundation grants. Frequently, the programs employ non-traditional teaching methods that invite comparison to more traditional methods. "And perhaps most important, the viability of the entire curriculum may be determined by the effectiveness of the remedial program; only if the student body is properly prepared in basic skills can standards be maintained in later courses" (Trillin, 1980:262).

The fact that developmental education programs need to be evaluated is not the issue. The problem lies in what design might be used to produce consistency and to provide useful results. As Shea (1984) points out "... experts ... have reported information directed toward the need for establishing a more exacting position on evaluation ..." (4). Gordon and Wiest (1988) found "... little written about the initiation and implementation of program evaluation" when
attempting to conduct a program evaluation for student services. The literature search for this study revealed the same lack of information for evaluating the instructional component of developmental education programs as well. A process is needed to evaluate the instructional component of developmental education programs. This process must have been evaluated for effectiveness. It must allow for individual differences. It is the intent of this study to provide a process that is flexible and adaptable and that is based on sound theory. In an attempt to provide this theoretical base, the instructional component of the Educational Opportunities Program (EOP) at Oregon State University (OSU) was used as a case study. As a last step in the evaluation process, the process itself was assessed. This last step is crucial because "there is a tendency to confuse the issuance of an evaluation report with the completion of the evaluation process. Issuing a report is only one and certainly not the final stage in an evaluation process. Once the report has been prepared and distributed, the next task is to begin the difficult and sometimes lengthy undertaking of monitoring results" (Wilson, 1984: 154). This evaluation was accomplished through a careful analysis of each step in the process.
Limitations

The limitations of the development of the process were:

1. That the process for evaluating developmental education programs was limited to the instructional component of the program.
2. That the process was developed by one individual rather than several people, thereby limiting the range of conceptualization.
3. That the Educational Opportunities Program at Oregon State University is a dynamic, unique program and that the instructional component does not operate in isolation.
4. That the literature search was focused on those studies that included program participants' opinions.

The limitations of the case-study approach were:

1. That the case being studied may not be typical of many other cases.
2. That the investigator came to the case study with a unique set of assumptions.
The limitations of data collection in the case study were:

1. That the group survey of the program participants increases the probability that some questions may be misunderstood or answered incorrectly.

2. That the program participants' ideas of "usefulness" varied.

3. That the instructors interviewed may not have taught the courses at the time the respondents took them.

Definition of Terms

instrument -- the instrument developed to solicit program participants' judgments specifically for the instructional component of the EOP. Also referred to as the questionnaire.

model -- a standard or example for comparison or imitation; generally theoretical; guides the process.

framework -- a structure composed of the various parts or models joined together allowing for more flexibility; a skeletal structure to support or enclose; metamodel.

process -- a systematic series of actions to some end; a practical means to the end.
program participants -- those who have had contact with the developmental education program.

respondents -- those who returned the completed instrument sent to all program participants. Some had taken courses and some had not. Those who had taken courses are identified as "respondents who have taken courses."

sample size -- the number of respondents who have taken a specific course.

Review of Related Literature

When attempting to evaluate the instructional component of a developmental education program, the first, all-important question is, where do we start? It seems logical to begin with a review of the literature and an identification and clarification of the issues. Clarification of the issues is part of the first step in the process of evaluation, especially when the issues involve definition of terms and model selection.

Several questions guided the literature search on developmental education program evaluations. These questions included the following: What is a developmental education program? What is evaluation and what models are available for the evaluation process? Do these models provide for
participants' opinions, particularly in developmental programs, and, if so, are they useful in determining the value and/or effectiveness of those programs? And finally, how can the instructional component of developmental education programs be evaluated so that the results are useful?

The following review of related literature presents the issues surrounding program evaluation in general and developmental education program evaluation in particular. A definition of terms is offered. This review also includes the evaluation of frameworks, models, and processes that might be used to evaluate the instructional component of developmental education programs. In addition, operating principles designed to make evaluations more effective will be presented.

Toward a Definition of Terms

To complete the first step in developing a process for the evaluation of a developmental education program, the evaluator must define what makes a program developmental. There appears to be a controversy about the terms "developmental" and "remedial." Because each type of program has different goals, it is necessary to determine whether the program is actually "developmental." Determination of the goal of the program to be evaluated is crucial, because it
affects the direction the evaluation will take. Wolf (1978) points out that in evaluation, "What is of interest is the effectiveness of a program" (7). A program's effectiveness is dependent upon the goal of that program. The goal of a program determines what type of program it is.

Until the early 1980's, in an attempt to avoid the issue of definition, many programs simply used the terms interchangeably. Roueche and Kirk (1972) took the stand of defining "developmental" as "an educational program of special and extra services designed to remedy student deficiencies to a level where students can enter regular college credit courses." They went on to say, "The term 'remedial' is used interchangeably throughout th[ei]r report with the following words: guided, basic, compensatory, and developmental." This attempt to use the words interchangeably is not uncommon in the literature. It does, however, tend to dilute rather than clarify the issue.

The question still remains, "Do 'remedial' and 'developmental' mean the same thing?" Nist (1985) points out that distinguishing between developmental reading programs and remedial reading programs at the elementary level is not difficult. Developmental reading activities have as their main purpose bringing about improvement in reading skills. Reading is a developmental process. Even the International Reading Association's (IRA) Dictionary of Reading, 1981,
defines developmental reading as "reading instruction, except remedial ...." Although the references are to reading programs at the elementary level, elementary schools are currently using what is referred to as "Developmentally Appropriate Practices" for all mainstream classrooms.

When referring to college level reading programs these definitions offered by the IRA become murky. The IRA's definition of developmental dubbs "remedial reading instruction in ... college, a misuse of the term." Remedial reading is defined as "... developmental reading instruction set at a different pace and designed for an individual student or a selected group ...." These definitions only add to the confusion, because of their lack of clarity.

When looking at these same terms as they apply to developmental and remedial programs at the college level, there is still confusion. Nist (1985) wrote an article for the Journal of Developmental Education. (The journal itself changed its name from Journal of Developmental & Remedial Education in 1985.) Nist's article, "Developmental Versus Remedial: Confusion of Terms Exist in Higher Education Reading Programs," attempts to address this controversy. Nist does a thorough job of tracking the history of the change in terminology and its causes. Perhaps, as she states, public relations may have been an underlying cause in the change. Maxwell also points to this lack of
communication and the political implications involved. "Many public colleges are actually prohibited by their state legislatures from offering remedial courses, and so they term their skills programs 'developmental'" (Maxwell, 1980: 5). A consensus in the use of terms would facilitate communication and understanding between campuses; between those seeking funding and state legislators who do not wish to pay twice for the same services; and between professionals working in such programs and academicians who claim, "If you can't read, you don't belong in college."

Perhaps the most useful definitions come from a presentation at the annual conference of the American Education Research Association held in Chicago, Illinois in April, 1985. Fadale and Winter point out that programs often contain both remedial and developmental elements thus deterring any consensus. They go on to say, "A general sense exists that if some degree of consensus is not provided by the field, definition and interpretations could well be superimposed externally" (20). Based upon the review of the literature available and upon numerous discussions with colleagues, this researcher believes the following definitions best describe the current distinction made between developmental and remedial programs at the college level.

**Developmental**
A program is developmental if its major goal is improvement of academic skills to a level that
permits successful completion of mainstream career courses. These programs consist of ongoing process which lead to the acquisition of skills necessary to accomplish the tasks of learning. Developmental programs deal with students at any point of need and often extend beyond academic skills to include coping skills and decision making about life-direction and purpose. Such programs might use a variety of instructional and counseling strategies such as tutoring, advisement, modules and directed and independent study at learning centers.

Thus, developmental programs were defined as those efforts designed to elevate, in a relatively short period of time, academic skills to a level that allows successful completion of college-level career courses.

**Remedial**

A program is viewed as remedial when its major intent is assistance to students with deficiencies in academic skills which prohibit functioning in college level career courses or programs. The educational effort increases skill competencies to enable students to achieve a minimum entry level for beginning college-level career courses. Some perceive the competency level related not only to beginning technical courses, but also selected developmental courses.

Thus, remedial programs were viewed as instructional efforts designed to ameliorate deficiencies in academic skills to a level of satisfying minimum entry requirements of college career programs (Fadale & Winter, 1985:20).

Consideration of the goal of the program allows for a more accurate identification of that program and more useful results from the program evaluation. Identification of the program also provides the evaluator with guidance in the evaluation process.

Another term which appeared in the literature and has definitions that vary with time and with authors is
"evaluation." On the one hand, evaluation has been synonymous with student assessment, implying that a program's success or failure lies with the student, rather than the program (Grant and Hoeber, 1978 & Deshler, 1984). On the other hand, many feel that evaluation is a process involving specific steps to determine worth or value or effectiveness. Wolf (1979) agrees with this second perspective. In evaluation, "the major attributes studied are chosen because they represent educational values. Objectives are values. They define what we seek to develop in learners as a result of exposing them to a set of educational experiences .... Such outcomes are not merely of interest; they are educational values" (7).

Not only does the definition of educational evaluation vary with author but it also varies with time. Deshler (1984:6) refers to the history of educational evaluation as a river "... picking up force from many tributaries while wandering in various directions over a variety of terrains that affect what it appears to be at any particular time." This variation is reflected in the following sample of the definition of educational evaluation cited by Deshler:

"A process of determining to what extent educational objectives are actually being realized" (Tyler, 1950:69).
"A process to measure the effects of a program against the goals it set out to accomplish as a means of contributing to subsequent decision making about the program and improving future programming" (Weiss, 1972:4).

"The systematic collection of information about the activities and outcomes of actual programs in order for interested persons to make judgments about specific aspects of what the program is doing and effecting" (Patton, 1978:26).

All of these definitions imply or directly state that evaluation is a process and, as Boylan (1982:15) in Proceedings: Workshop on Improving Developmental/Remedial Education points out, "Evaluation means to place a value upon."

A common current flows in the historical river in defining educational evaluation. A process is involved and the goal is to describe the effects of "treatment," thereby determining the effectiveness of the program. If that program has as its goal "elevating, in a short time, academic skills to a level that allows successful completion of a college-level career course," (Fadale & Winter, 1985:20) then the evaluation of a developmental education program must focus on evaluating the effectiveness of that goal. As Ross and Roe (1978:22) point out, "... the bottom line in evaluating a developmental program is whether it enables underprepared students to acquire skills necessary to complete college." Therefore, the term "evaluation" will refer to the process of determining whether or not the major
goal of the instructional component of developmental education programs, "improvement of academic skills to a level that permits successful completion of mainstream career courses," is being met.

**Toward an Evaluation Model**

Not only are there various definitions reflecting various views on evaluation, but there are also various evaluation frameworks and models which have been offered as a means of assessing the effectiveness of educational programs in general (Wolf, 1978; Maxwell, 1980; Mines, Gressard and Daniels, 1982; Clowes, 1984; Gaff, 1985; Maring, Shea, and Warner, 1987; and Gordon and Wiest, 1988). Selecting an appropriate model with which to evaluate the instructional component of developmental education programs is also an important part of that first step.

this detailed coverage of evaluation in education was the most helpful. Wolf does indeed "... present a clear, coherent, and comprehensive view of educational evaluation" (1978:18). The view is not only sensible but practical. Wolf considers his view of educational evaluation as a framework rather than a model. According to Wolf (1978), his framework is an attempt "... to transcend, take account of, and, in some way, accommodate ..." some of the ways in which evaluation models in education differ. Wolf argues convincingly that evaluation models differ in the following ways: the major purpose of the educational endeavor, the background and training of the proponents of the various approaches, the nature of the discipline that is the focus of the evaluation, and the emphasis that each accords to different parts of the evaluation process. Wolf's framework allows for the inclusion of most of the various models. Rather than being a standard or an example to be copied by others who share the same basic assumptions, the framework provides a structure composed of the various parts or models joined together allowing for more flexibility. Wolf does acknowledge that "... the framework cannot be all-inclusive; some approaches are mutually exclusive and contradictory." He goes on to state, "When the purposes of evaluation differ, different parts of the framework will receive different emphasis" (21).
Wolf's framework includes five major classes of information, which he feels are required for a comprehensive program evaluation. These classes include the following:

- Initial Status of Learners
- Learner Performance After a Period of Instruction
- Execution of Treatment
- Costs
- Supplemental Information, including views and opinions of individuals and groups, learner performance not covered in program objectives, unintended effects of instruction

By providing the major classes of information sought, Wolf is avoiding "the possibility of neglecting any important class of information for determining the worth of a program. Thus, the framework allows for errors of commission—-for example, collecting information that will have little bearing on the determination of the merit of a program—-while avoiding errors of omission: failing to gather information that may be important" (21). Wolf does make it clear that the purpose of the evaluation will determine what class of information will be used to guide the evaluation. "It is recognized that some [classes of information] will be of little or no interest in a particular evaluation undertaking."
After determining from Wolf's framework what type of information is being sought in the evaluation endeavor, it then becomes necessary to develop a model that will provide the focus for the evaluation. Mines, Gressard and Daniels (1982) provide the evaluator with a "comprehensive conceptual framework" for evaluating and selecting an evaluation model. "The evaluator can select an appropriate evaluation model for a particular evaluation problem by answering the following six questions:

1. What is the purpose of the evaluation?
2. What question(s) does the evaluation intend to answer?
3. What are the conceptual assumptions the evaluator is willing to make?
4. For whom is the evaluation intended?
5. What is (are) the best available method(s) for finding answers to the questions asked?
6. Does the [evaluator] have the knowledge and technical capability to complete the evaluations?" (Mines, Gressard and Daniels, 1982:197).

This metamodel provides a structure from which the developmental education professional can identify the focus of the evaluation, thereby developing a model to precede the process. The model establishes "...the parameters that provide meaning and purpose to the evaluation. These parameters provide the restrictions inherent in each evaluation model and in the setting where the evaluation will occur" (Mines, Gressard & Daniels, 1982:197). Internal limitations, intrinsic to each model, pertain to the purpose of the evaluation, questions to be answered by the evaluation, and agreed-upon assumptions of the model. These
internal limitations restrict the applicability of a model. External limitations, defined by the setting or the evaluator, include the available data collection methods, the intended audience, and the expertise of the evaluator. External limitations restrict the practical usefulness of each model. "The selection of an appropriate evaluation model necessitates the consideration of applicability and the practical usefulness of each model" (Mines, Gressard and Daniels, 1982:197). Both internal and external restrictions provided part of the criteria by which the models available in the literature were evaluated. They also were used later in the evaluation of the specific model developed in this study for the evaluation of the instructional component of developmental education programs.

The framework of Wolf (1978) and the metamodel of Mines, Gressard and Daniels (1982) provide the researcher with a broad structure for proceeding in the process of evaluating the instructional component of a developmental education program. Wolf (1978) provides the major classes of information that can be sought. Mines, Gressard and Daniels (1982) provide a structure for evaluating and selecting an evaluation model.

Only models which consider the views and opinions of individuals and groups who are involved in the educational endeavor were selected as a potential standard for imitation
in this literature search. Since the major goal of developmental education programs is to enable underprepared students to acquire skills necessary to complete college, it is important to consider program participants' opinions in the development of a model for evaluating the instructional component of developmental education programs. As Maxwell (1980: X) points out "... college students should be treated as the adults they are. Not only should their interests and needs be considered in planning academic support services, but the program participants themselves should play a part in decisions about the types of services and the delivery systems to be provided."

Three potential models were uncovered. Only two of the models were actually developed for the evaluation of developmental education programs. The third was developed to evaluate student services. Although these models are not, nor could they be, as comprehensive as Wolf's framework or Mines, Gressard and Daniels' (1982) metamodel, they do reinforce the need for providing both quantitative and qualitative data, and they illuminate the evaluation process by providing additional guidelines and criteria not mentioned in the framework or metamodel. However, each model is limited in applicability and/or practicability.

One such model that reinforces the need for providing both quantitative and qualitative data is offered by Clowes
Clowes proposes a four-stage model of program evaluation which he suggests is appropriate for developmental programs. After a discussion of the standard features developmental program evaluations share with other academic programs, Clowes offers the following table to represent his model.

Table 1
Evaluation of Remedial/Developmental (R/D) Program
A Stage Model

First-Stage Evaluation: R/D Program phase
Activities within the R/D program itself are evaluated.

Second-Stage Evaluation: Interface phase
Students move from R/D program into the mainstream curriculum. This interface is assessed.

Third-Stage Evaluation: Normative phase
Students progress and faculty, staff, and administrative judgments are used to reassess the goals of the R/D program and of mainstream courses and curriculums.

Fourth-Stage Evaluation: Reassessing measures phase.
Revised goals have been negotiated; comparative studies are now appropriate to develop data for reassessing measures used in the first and second stages (Clowes, 1984:15).
Although this model does provide for both qualitative and quantitative data, it is not applicable. The model carries internal restrictions including the purpose for the evaluation and the consensual assumptions of the model. The purpose of the evaluation of the instructional component of developmental education programs should be to assess the goal of that component. The goal of the program is what identifies it as the type of program that it is; therefore, revising the goal is not feasible. The other internal restriction involves the dilemma of multiple purposes in evaluation. Wilson (1984) argues that "attempts to achieve several purposes at once dissipate energies and leave evaluators open to criticism almost every time" (145). The model suggested by Clowes incorporates formative, summative and political purposes for the evaluation, thereby leaving the model open for criticism. The model also makes an error of commission when it asks the evaluator to evaluate activities within the "R/D program" itself. In fact Clowes (1984) admits that this stage in the model is actually "not proper program evaluation" (27). Thus, the model is not focused nor is it applicable for the evaluation of the instructional component of developmental education programs.

Another model appearing in the literature that emphasizes the collection of both qualitative and quantitative data is offered by Maring, Shea and Warner (1987). This model was developed specifically to evaluate reading and study skills.
centers. Reading and study skills centers can be classified as developmental education programs depending upon the goal of the centers. Maring, Shea and Warner suggest that the model can be "transported" to other similar centers. They recommend a seven step process.

Step 1: Select an experienced evaluation consultant
Step 2: Classify students into treatment and control groups
Step 3: Make a data card for each student
Step 4: Treatment of GPA data
Step 5: Treatment of retention data
Step 6: Soft data indicators

This process appears to be what Maring, Shea & Warner call a "basic evaluation model"; however, both the internal and external restrictions of the model make it nonapplicable and unpracticable for the evaluation of the instructional component of developmental education programs. The model is limited internally by the questions the evaluator hopes to answer and by the purpose for the evaluation. Maring, Shea and Warner (1987) make a reference to "evaluation of effectiveness" but do not narrow the focus of their evaluation process by establishing the questions that they hope to answer. The intended audience and, therefore, the
purpose of the evaluation are alluded to very generally. Maring, Shea and Warner (1987) imply that by following their "basic evaluation model," directors and staff members can answer such questions as: "Can you show that your program is worth the money we are paying for it? Are you really making a difference on this campus?" (402). Both are valid questions to ask about developmental education programs; however, each would require a different model because the intended audience and the methodology would be different. Again this model attempts to address multiple purposes and "...leaves the evaluators open to criticism ..." (Wilson, 1984:145). The model offered by Maring, Shea and Warner is also restricted externally because of the vagueness in the establishment of the intended audience. One final criticism of the model involves what Wilson (1984) identifies as the issue of evaluating process effectiveness. Presenting results is not the final step in the evaluation process. As Wilson (1984) notes "Once the report has been prepared and distributed, the next task is to begin the difficult and sometimes lengthy undertaking of monitoring results" (154). Maring, Shea and Warner do not mention the monitoring of results; therefore, the model might not provide useful results.

A third model involving participants' opinions that appears in the literature is offered by Gordon and Wiest (1988:14) (see Table 2). This model, used in the evaluation of student
Table 2
Evaluation of Programs and Services Committee Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Consensual Assumption</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Typical Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students, faculty, and staff</td>
<td>Improved programs, effectiveness, and understanding</td>
<td>Evaluation criteria</td>
<td>Survey questionnaires</td>
<td>Is the program effective? Would a student use this program? What does the program look like to different people?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
services at a mid-size, land grant institution in the
Southwest, is perhaps one of the most focused models offered
in the literature. The model is based on the five common
dimensions of evaluation offered by House's (1978) Taxonomy
of Major Evaluation Models. These dimensions include major
audience, outcomes, assumptions, methodology, and questions
to be answered. The model developed by Gordon and Wiest
(1988) did not include audience, but added the dimension of
participants. This was done because the Evaluation of
Programs and Services Committee Model incorporated several of
the models outlined in the taxonomy. It did not include only
a decision-making model. The selection of their model was
related to the evaluation task; therefore, it was
particularly focused. The evaluation committee had been
charged with "... evaluating the current status of the
Division [of Student Services] and individual departments and
determining internal Recommendations for the Vice Chancellor
regarding future directions" (113). It was also focused
because it had been decided by the committee that surveys and
interviews met with the greatest degree of success. The
model was the most applicable and feasible model available
with which to evaluate the instructional component of
developmental education programs. It would also provide
usable results because the issue of evaluating process
effectiveness was addressed.
Not only did the literature search reveal several models that might be used in the evaluation process, but also it uncovered several factors that should be considered when conducting program evaluations in general. Wilson (1984) identified five issues that directly affect evaluation results. Gordon and Wiest (1988) state these in the form of steps to be followed when developing an evaluation model to insure that program evaluations provide useful results.

1. Identify a single purpose for the evaluation. Select one goal, not multiple goals, e.g., program improvement, reallocation of resources, or review of requirements.

2. Identify criteria on which to base the evaluation, e.g., program quality, program value, effective use of resources. The criteria should provide a general direction in designing the evaluation itself but should not be restrictive.

3. Resist scheduling evaluations on a definite time cycle. Evaluation should be done when a need exists.

4. Recognize that evaluation results are an important component in the decision-making process, but not the only component.

5. Be responsive to the needs of decision-makers. Present timely, relevant oral reports, keeping them simple, succinct, and frequent, and share
critical information immediately (Gordon and Wiest, 1988: 113).

As Gordon and Wiest (1988) note, "when these steps are followed, there is a much higher likelihood that evaluation results will be timely and in a form that will be most useful to decision-makers" (113). Maxwell (1980) also is concerned with timeliness of results, relevance of the results to the decisions to be made and comprehensibility. These are identified as criteria of quality.

Wolf (1979) notes several conditions that must be met when information is being elicited from participants in the educational program. First, the kind of information sought needs to be carefully specified. Secondly, one or more questions about each aspect of the enterprise for which information is sought should be formulated. The questions should be tried out informally using a small but variable sample of individuals belonging to the groups from which information is being sought. In an informal interview situation it should be possible to obtain an indication as to whether the respondents understand the questions and can supply clear, responsive answers.

It should be noted that other similar evaluations (Roueche and Kirk, 1972; Morante, Faskow and Menditto, 1984; Zaritsky and Brewer, 1984; Briggs and Davis, 1985) were found in the
literature; however, none of these proved to be useful for the evaluation of the instructional component of developmental education programs. All but one are final reports found in Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC). These program evaluations were not attempting to provide a model nor did they provide a rationale for the methodology. They were reporting the results of their respective evaluations. All of the evaluations were conducted on the whole developmental education program in an attempt to determine the effectiveness of the program.

Although no comparison can be made between these programs using the data presented in the related evaluations, it is interesting to note that all of the program evaluations mentioned did indicate that "special programs devised for high-risk students have had basically positive effects on these students" (Kulik, Kulik, and Schwalb, 1983:407).

Because the models that were available were not applicable or not practicable or would not yield usable results, it became necessary to develop a model for evaluating the instructional component of developmental education programs.

**An Evaluation Model**

The Evaluation of the Instructional Component of a Developmental Education Program Model (see Table 3) draws
### Table 3

**Evaluation of the Instructional Component of Developmental Education Programs Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Consensual Assumptions</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Typical Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory staff</td>
<td>Students &amp; Faculty</td>
<td>Improved usefulness of the instructional component of developmental education programs</td>
<td>Specific goals, Evaluation criteria</td>
<td>Survey questionnaires &amp; interviews</td>
<td>Are the courses effective? Which courses were most helpful? What other courses would be useful?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from the review of the related literature in the following ways. From Wolf (1978) a conceptual framework incorporating both qualitative and quantitative data provided the general outline for the evaluation process. The framework presented the five major classes of information from which an evaluator could select. The framework also allowed for focus on what is important to the evaluator, thus eliminating the possibility of errors of commission or omission. The metamodel presented by Mines, Gressard and Daniels (1982) provided the questions to be answered in order to focus the evaluation and development of the model. Mines, Gressard and Daniels also identified the restrictions that occur when the parameters of a model have been established. Wilson's discussion of critical issues in program evaluation provided a methodology by which a model could be developed. The model of Clowes (1984) contributed to the development of the model by providing a rationale for focusing on the usefulness of courses to subsequent university coursework. "The true test of a remedial [developmental] program occurs when its students move into the mainstream curriculum and begin to function there" (Clowes, 1984: 26-27). Maring, Shea and Warner (1987) contributed to the development of a model by providing a justification for soft data indicators as well as an exclusion of hard data indicators such as treatment/control groups. This was not the intention of their model; however, they do argue convincingly for the lack of ethics involved in such a methodology. Maring, Shea and
Warner's (1987) "Step 7" provided an example of the type of information that might be included in what they refer to as the "executive summary." Gordon and Wiest's (1988) "Critical Steps in Developing Program Evaluation for Student Services" was the most helpful in the development of the current model. The model format and the five dimensions of evaluation included in the their model are incorporated in the current model. As decisions are to be made, consideration of audience provides the sixth dimension of the current model. Inclusion of the audience as a dimension also draws from the criteria of quality offered by Maxwell (1980) and the steps that will be timely and useful as suggested by Gordon & Wiest (1988). House's (1978) decision-making model included in the literature review by Gordon & Wiest dictate that the specific goal of the courses of a developmental education program should be part of the evaluation criteria and that the methodology to be used should be survey questionaires and faculty interviews. The methodology and typical questions reflect the conditions that must be met when information is being elicited from program participants as suggested by Wolf (1979). Thus, the dimensions of audience, participants, outcomes, consensual assumptions, methodology and typical questions form the basis for the Evaluation of the Instructional Component of a Developmental Education Program Model.
CHAPTER TWO

RESEARCH METHODS

Design of the Study

The purpose of this research was to develop a process for evaluating the instructional component of developmental educations programs. The procedure was as follows:

1. Review the literature regarding program evaluation and developmental education programs in higher education.

2. Develop a process, including a model, for evaluating the instructional component of developmental education programs.

3. Conduct a case study at the Educational Opportunities Program at Oregon State University.
   A. Describe the developmental education program, specifically the instructional component.
   B. Interview the instructional staff.
   C. Develop and administer the instrument to be administered to program participants. Establish validity and reliability.
   D. Analyze the data.
   E. Report the findings to the supervisory staff.

4. Evaluate process effectiveness.
Case Study Methodology

Case studies by definition involve an intensive investigation of a single object of social inquiry, such as a classroom (Biddle & Anderson, 1986 & Borg & Gall, 1989). The case study used in this research involved the instructional component of a single developmental education program. The major advantage of the case study according to Biddle & Anderson (1986) is "that by immersing oneself in the dynamics of a single social entity one is able to uncover events or processes that one might miss with more superficial methods" (238). For example, the researcher who uses standardized techniques for determining the usefulness of developmental courses to subsequent university courses through comparison of grade point averages (GPA) may miss the other variables that contribute to the increase or decrease in a student GPA. The GPA might decrease because of personal or financial problems, rather than lack of skills. The GPA might increase because of the type of courses in which the student is enrolled or the number of credit hours the student is taking. This does not mean that formal measurements are not appropriate in case studies. GPA or test results or even mean scores on course rankings might be used to solidify interpretations of other data such as respondents' comments or instructors' comments. But alternative methods allow the investigator to adopt the method to the task of discovery,
rather than imposing methodology based upon an investigator's preconceptions.

Two problems have been identified with case studies. One problem involves limited generalizability; the other involves objectivity. The problem with generalizability is associated with locating an event or a group that is typical of many other cases. The basic premise behind case studies is that an example of a class of events or group of individuals can be located that is typical of many other cases. Of course, there is no way of knowing how typical the selected case really is; drawing any generalizations can be hazardous. If the generalization takes the form of an hypothesis that is to be tested by multiple-case studies involving replications of the single case study, the problem can be greatly reduced (Borg & Gall, 1989 and Biddle & Anderson, 1986).

However, replication can also be a problem with the case-study approach. Case studies are not objective. Two researchers would not necessarily generate the same insights if they studied the same case. Different researchers come to the case study with "...a unique background that includes related experiences, ideological commitments, and interests in certain issues and concepts" (Biddle & Anderson, 1986: 238). One researcher conducting a case study on the instructional component might focus upon how useful developmental courses are to subsequent university coursework
in terms of academic skills; whereas, another researcher might wish to focus upon the usefulness of developmental courses to subsequent university coursework in terms of self concept. Still another might wish to determine the effect cultural background has upon the usefulness of developmental courses to subsequent university coursework. Biddle & Anderson (1986) caution the case researcher to be sensitive to the "... assumptions that govern his or her decisions" and to make them "... explicit in the report written about the study" (238).

Data Collection Process

The first step in the process of evaluating the instructional component of developmental education programs involves reviewing the literature regarding program evaluation and developmental education programs in higher education. It is necessary that the researcher become aware of the literature available so decisions might be made concerning the type of program they are evaluating and how they wish to proceed. A review of the literature also allows the researcher to become aware of his/her own assumptions and biases regarding program evaluation.

The second step in the process of evaluating the instructional component of developmental education programs
involves the collection of data pertinent to the evaluation. The data should include a description of the program, especially the instructional component; instructional staff interviews and program participants' views and opinions.

Program Description

The data should include information on the program, including the history, administrative structure, funding sources, facilities, program philosophy, recruiting efforts, information on graduates, and evaluation procedures. Information on the program might be available through in-house documents and college bulletins. Those who have been involved in the program for a long period of time can be helpful in supplementing the knowledge base. Information on the instructional component of the program should include course descriptions, information on the instructional staff, and methods and materials used in courses. Information on the instructional component of the program might come from course syllabuses and interviews with staff. It is necessary to describe the program because there is no standard developmental education program. Each program is unique.

Instructional Staff Interviews

The data to be collected from the instructional staff interviews not only provide demographic information about the
staff, they also contributes to the descriptions of the methods and materials used in the courses. Interview questions should be developed before the interview and solicit information pertinent to the evaluation. The instructional staff should be asked demographic information such as teaching status, length of employment in the developmental education program, course(s) taught, degrees held, and teaching experience. The instructional staff should also be asked specifically about the individual course(s) that they have taught or are currently teaching for the program. They should be asked if they developed the course(s) or followed a format previously established. They should be asked about their teaching styles and method of delivery. They should be asked their perception of the primary goal of the course(s) they teach. This question is particularly important as their perceptions of the goal of the course(s) will be reflected in how they approach the course. This perception by the staff will affect program participants' perceptions. The staff should also be asked about coordination of their courses to subsequent university courses and to other courses within the developmental education program. Again, this question is pertinent to the evaluation because if coordination is not intentional, it will reflect upon the usefulness of the courses to subsequent university coursework. The instructional staff should be asked how and/or why they became involved in developmental education. The answer to this question provides insight into
the staff's commitment to the instructional goal of the program. A copy of possible interview questions is included in Appendix F.

Program Participants' Views and Opinions

Data should be collected from the program participants, since the program participants themselves are the only ones who can judge their perceptions of the usefulness of the developmental program's courses to subsequent university coursework. The population to be surveyed should be juniors, seniors and recent graduates. Freshmen and sophomores should not be targeted because they have not really had the opportunity to determine the usefulness of developmental program courses to subsequent university coursework. Information collected from program participants who have graduated more than a year or two prior to the evaluation might not be pertinent to the current study because of the changes in the staff and in the courses that might have already occurred in the program. Names and addresses for program participants might be obtained from university data sheets or from permanent records available from the developmental program.
The Instrument

To collect data from program participants it is necessary to develop an instrument that will solicit the desired information and that reflects the courses offered by that specific program, due to the unique nature of the curriculum. The instrument should include a list of course numbers and titles offered in the developmental program. Program participants can then identify those courses they had taken and rank them in terms of usefulness on a 4-point Likert-type scale: 4 = very useful, 3 = somewhat useful, 2 = useful, 1 = not too useful. A 4-point Likert type scale, rather than a 5-point scale requires that the respondent not take a middle stance. The choice of "not useful" should not be included as it will yield a "0" rating and will create a problem in the statistical analysis. Not taking the course also yields a "0" rating. Not only should program participants be asked to rank courses, but they should also be asked to provide demographic information such as academic classification, years at the university, major school or college, ethnic group, and age. The collection of demographic data allows for a description of the respondents as well as future cross-referencing with rankings of courses. Two open-ended questions, such as "What other classes would have been helpful?" and "Is there anything else [they] would like to say about [their] experience with classes provided by [the developmental education program]?, should be included to
allow program participants the freedom to respond to anything they felt was pertinent. The instrument is to be used to solicit program participants' view and opinions of the instructional component of developmental educational program.

Content Validity

To insure that the instrument used to solicit program participants' opinions and views produces useable results, validity and reliability have to be established. To establish validity of the instrument a panel of experts should be consulted. The panel might consist of an expert from the university's survey research center or a statistician, faculty from the university and other universities who are involved in developmental education either as theorists or as practitioners, and at least one member of the staff of the developmental education program that is to be evaluated. The panel should be asked to review the instrument for content, clarity, format, and comprehensiveness. After revisions have been made based on the panel of experts' suggestions, the instrument should be field tested by a representative sample of the population for whom the instrument is intended. After further revisions the instrument should be mailed to the target population. Reliability can be established through the data collected from the respondents.
Reliability of the Instrument

Reliability of the instrument sent to program participants can be established using the procedure developed by Hoyt and Stunkard (1952) and employed later in studies which sought to collect similar data (Halfin and Courtney, 1970; Lindahl, 1971; Miller, 1971; Stamps, 1979; Behroozian, 1981; Samahito, 1984; Akyeampong, 1986).

An estimate of the internal consistency of the scores which is judgmentally assigned by the respondents utilizes analysis of variance, providing for a rather straightforward solution to the problem of establishing the reliability coefficient for unrestricted scoring items. For the example below, k courses are included in the instrument. This results in one matrix, with n respondents, k courses, and one response per cell. Schematically, the matrix for the reliability calculation is shown as follows:
A two-way analysis of variance produces sums of square values for respondents and courses; the residual sum of squares is obtained by subtraction. The estimate of reliability is obtained by the following formula:

$$r = \frac{\text{Mean Square Respondents Minus Mean Square Error}}{\text{Mean Square Respondents}}$$

Past research studies which have utilized the equal appearing interval scale for data collection in such analyses have
resulted in reliabilities exceeding +0.90 (Behroozian, 1981; Samahito, 1984; Soukup, 1984; and Burton, 1984).

Mailing

In making the decision to use a mailed questionnaire, a number of advantages as well as disadvantages have to be considered. Data collection is less expensive than the personal interview or telephone method. Mailing can be geared to the most appropriate time frame for respondents and can be completed and returned at the convenience of the person providing the responses. Anonymity can be built into the system very easily.

The major disadvantage is the low rate of return. The estimated average percentage rate of return for social science types of questionnaires is around 72%. All too often, the rate is as low as twenty percent (Courtney, 1982). This vexing problem can be corrected. According to Courtney (1982) procedural options may positively influence the rate of return for mailed instruments. The instrument should be mailed early in the term in consideration of later-in-the-term time constraints. The cover letter, personally directed, should be on the program's letterhead and be signed by the director of the program as well as the instruction coordinator and the evaluator. It must assure confidentiality. A self-addressed, stamped envelop must be
enclosed. Two weeks after the initial mailing, a postcard should be sent to remind program participants to return the questionnaire as soon as possible. Both the cover letter and the postcard used in the case study are in Appendix B.

The Dillman's Total Design Method (TDM) of mail and telephone surveys should also be utilized in the development of the instrument. The TDM, according to Dillman (1978, p. 2) "... is nothing more than the identification of each aspect of the survey process that may affect response quantity or quality and shaping them in a way that will encourage good response." Dillman suggests that the following three areas of question construction should be given careful consideration to obtain the needed information for achieving the objectives of the evaluation: (1) the kind of information sought, (2) the question structure, and (3) the actual choice of words. Clear and concise instructions, aesthetic appearance of the questionnaire, and careful placement of different kinds of questions also can motivate respondents. Dillman cited the average response rate of 74% achieved for 48 TDM surveys and 80% - 90% response rates achieved in other studies as evidence of the effectiveness of the methodology.

The Dependent Variables

The dependent variables for the analysis of the data collected from the instrument are response scores on each of
the course evaluations. Responses are obtained for each course in terms of usefulness on the 4-point Likert-type scale. Responses are based upon the individual respondent's judgments of the usefulness of the course(s).

Data Analysis

The frequency of each response on the 4-point Likert-type scale is calculated for each course. The frequency is then plotted on histograms. Mean, standard deviation and standard error of the mean are calculated for each course.

The sequence courses are analyzed to determine how many respondents placed at the beginning or middle of the sequence actually finished the sequence. These data are then analyzed to determine the ranking -- 4 = very useful, 3 = somewhat useful, 2 = useful, and 1 = not too useful -- of the courses by respondents. Completing the sequence is also an indicator of whether or not the respondents found the course(s) useful.

Respondents' comments are analyzed by classifying each response in its own category. These data are reported as anecdotal information.
Process Effectiveness Evaluation

The final step in any program evaluation is to evaluate process effectiveness. This step is very important to the overall process yet is often overlooked. The review of the literature revealed no program evaluations that went beyond the reporting stage. Reporting the results of the program evaluation is not to be confused with the evaluation of the process. As Wilson (1984) notes, "There is a tendency to confuse the issuance of an evaluation report with the completion of the evaluation process. Issuing a report is only one and certainly not the final stage in an evaluation process. Once the report has been prepared and distributed, the next task is to begin the difficult and sometimes very lengthy undertaking of monitoring results" (154).

The criterion used to evaluate process effectiveness should reflect the desired outcome of the process. For example, if the outcome of an evaluation of the instructional component of a developmental education program is improved usefulness of that program, then the criterion would be whether or not the process did improve the usefulness of the program. In other words, did the evaluation meet the original goals of the evaluator? Enabling the program to function better can take the form of direct or indirect actions within the program. Wilson (1984) discusses direct actions that result from the evaluation as well as subtle and latent actions.
Immediate and direct actions with observable, systemic consequences in developmental programs might involve changes in curriculum, methods and/or materials. Courses might be revised, methodology might be adjusted, courses might be deleted or added depending upon the views and opinions of the program participants involved in the evaluation. More subtle and latent actions, referred to as "residual effects" because they were not the principle focus of the evaluation, might provide the stimulus for change. Participating in a program evaluation could increase communication and clarify goals.

Summary: The Process

This study was designed to develop a process for evaluating the instructional component of developmental education programs. The process includes the following steps:

1. Review the literature.
2. Develop a model to guide the evaluation.
3. Describe the program to be evaluated.
4. Interview the instructional staff.
5. Identify the population from among the program participants from whom opinions and views are to be elicited.
6. Develop the instrument with which to elicit the opinions and views.
7. Establish the validity and reliability of the instrument.

8. Mail the instrument

9. Analyze the data.

10. Report the findings to administrative and program staff.

11. Evaluate process effectiveness.
CHAPTER THREE

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS:

A CASE STUDY
OF THE
EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM
AT
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

Program Description

Historical Background

The Educational Opportunities Program sprang from the turmoil of the times, but once stabilized has remained fairly constant. In the late 1960's, during the civil unrest which occurred in other places in the United States, the state of Oregon "...felt the need to take positive action to increase opportunities of all kinds for minority persons and the poor" (EOP, 1984). In 1968, the Chancellor of the Oregon State System of Higher Education announced that "institutions of higher education could admit a number of freshman students, up to 3 percent of the previous year's freshman class, who did not meet regular admission requirements." These students were identified as special admits. At OSU this was implemented through a program named Experimental Modification of Admissions Requirement (EMAR).
In 1969, a walk-out by Black students at Oregon State University was triggered by alleged discriminatory treatment of a Black athlete by the football coach. In the same year, the Faculty Senate of Oregon State University amended the guidelines for administering EMAR, directing recruiting efforts toward economically disadvantaged students, and established the Office of Minority and Special Services Program (M&SSP). The new M&SSP description stated that its mission was to "broaden the educational opportunities of disadvantaged and minority students."

In 1971, the name of the program became the Educational Opportunities Program (EOP). The general philosophy and organization of the program has remained constant from 1969 until the present. The purpose of the EOP was first stated publicly in the 1971-72 OSU Bulletin. "[OSU's EOP] is designed to provide special assistance to a selected number of Black Americans, Mexican-Americans, American Indians, and certain White Americans who may or may not meet regular university admission requirements but are recognized as having the potential to compete successfully in a college degree program. In order to equalize and enhance the chances of success for these students, the university adjusts certain of its institutional policies and procedures and augments the services it extends to regular students to assist them in overcoming their initial handicaps" (30). The 1990-91 OSU
Bulletin states, "Oregon State University's Educational Opportunities Program is designed to provide special assistance to those individuals who have traditionally been denied equal access to education. EOP serves students who meet the standard University admission requirements and it serves those who do not meet these requirements but are recognized as having the potential to successfully complete a college degree program" (34).

In 1972, EMAR became the Modification of Admissions Requirement (MAR), and the ceiling for the number of special admits was increased to 5% of the previous year's freshman class. This cemented the ability of the University to bring in students who do not meet regular admission requirements. However, the admissions requirements for the University change continuously. Currently, regular admission to Oregon State University requires a high school GPA of 3.00, or an average score of 58 for the five tests of the GED, satisfactory completion of 14 units of college preparatory work, SAT or ACT scores (no specific scores are required), and graduation from an accredited high school. An alternative to admission as a freshman is available -- high school grades combined with SAT or ACT scores which predict a 3.00 college GPA. A student must ask for consideration for special admission when the high school GPA is below a 3.00, the college preparatory work is not complete, or the GED score is below 58.
The following table displays the number of students who applied for admission through EOP, the number who were accepted and the number who matriculated Fall, 1990.

Table 4
EOP Admissions
Fall, 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Applied</th>
<th></th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th></th>
<th>Matriculated</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Admit</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Transfer</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-Admit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Transfer</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>364</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>230</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>165</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrative Structure

The supervisory staff of the EOP includes a director, counselor coordinator, and instruction coordinator. The EOP staff also includes instructors, counselors, recruiters, support staff and graduate teaching assistants (GTA's). The Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs is responsible for the administration of the program. Guidance and scrutiny of the program has been provided through the
Special Services Committee of the OSU Faculty Senate from its inception until the present time. The Committee consists of both OSU faculty members and OSU students. The EOP Director is an ex-officio member of the Special Services Committee.

**Funding Sources**

The State System of Higher Education is the prime financial resource providing EOP with a recurring budget like other departments and units on campus. The OSU Foundation, various OSU colleges, and private philanthropies such as the Danforth Foundation have provided special purpose funds.

Two federally-funded programs are under the umbrella of EOP. In 1980, the first federal grant was received from the United States Department of Education. The four-year grant established the Special Services Program for Disadvantaged Students (SSP). This program is designed to serve students who are low-income, first generation to college, or physically handicapped, including learning disabled. SSP has received continuous funding since that time. In 1982, the first College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) was funded by the United States Department of Education. Funding has been inconsistent, yet CAMP has persisted and is currently in its ninth year of operation at OSU. CAMP is designed to provide assistance for the freshman year to students from migrant and seasonal farm labor backgrounds.
The Facility

The EOP is housed in the center of the OSU campus and occupies over half of the third floor of Waldo Hall. Waldo Hall is conveniently located across the street from the OSU Memorial Union on the west and the Kerr Library on the east. The face of the building proudly displays the year of its construction, "1908." The third floor is accessible by stairway or by a recently installed elevator. The majority of the rooms are occupied by staff. Each office, with the exception of those of the supervisory staff and the clerical staff, houses one full time faculty and one part-time GTA. New instructors are paired with experienced instructors; new counselor/advisors are paired with experienced counselor/advisors. The decision to pair a full time staff with a GTA allows for a mentoring-type relationship. The computer lab, tutoring room, testing room, and student lounge are also located on the third floor. These rooms are frequently occupied with students going about the business of learning. Two classrooms, one on the third floor and one on the first floor, are available. The beginning level developmental courses, such as WR 112, WR 113, ED 199R, SED 199M, and SED 199N, are given first priority when room assignments are made. This allows incoming freshmen a greater sense of security and closeness to the program.
Numerous bulletin boards line the hallway of the third floor. The bulletin boards are used to either provide information or display student work. Such information as upcoming events or course offerings, job announcements, and graduate school flyers are updated frequently. Computer graphics drawn by EOP students, motivational poems and thoughts, and current newspaper articles fill the other boards. The faces of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and Cesar Chavez look out at the passers-by to remind them of the dedication and generosity of these great leaders. Painted symbols and pictures relevant to the students brighten up the student lounge. All three murals were painted by the same student in 1989.

An observer coming to the third floor of Waldo Hall for the first time can readily see what Soifer, et al., (1990:5) refers to as the "dynamic interaction" that goes on between learners and the material and between learners and other learners, and even between instructors and other instructors. A quick look into the computer lab reveals students working on the computers, completing assignments for various courses. Frequently, one student can be found working with another student to solve a computer problem or asking for the spelling of a word. Often a staff member is involved in the interaction. Across the hall is the tutoring center. Textbooks, calculators and papers cover the tables, and students are working together to solve problems. A look down the hallway reveals students working independently at tables.
The entire atmosphere is one of learning and sharing -- the dynamic interaction.

Program Philosophy

An in-house pamphlet (1984) succinctly states the program's philosophy. "The [EOP]'s basic guideline has been the strong commitment to using a cross-cultural approach for all activities, services, staff assignments and benefits available to students. The EOP staff has always firmly supported this cross-cultural emphasis. A second major commitment has been to the achievement of academic success for all enrolled students. Although the program has continually offered encouragement and help whenever possible to ethnic student union cultural activities, the main focus continues to be academic assistance and encouragement to all EOP students." To provide the opportunity for success, a full range of academic assistance and personal support is available for all EOP students. These support services are under continual review by the staff and have been expanded in response to student needs.

Recruiting Efforts

The recruitment of students has been a primary activity of the EOP. Through networking, EOP has been able to steadily
increase the number of minority students entering Oregon State University.

Counseling/Advising

Every EOP student is assigned to an individual program counselor/advisor primarily on the basis of academic interest and need rather than the single factor of ethnic group membership. However, free choice of counselor/advisors is possible for any student upon request. EOP counselor/advisors are the prime resource for any problem or question a student might have. EOP counselor/advisors help program participants choose courses, choose a major, assess academic progress, and locate appropriate assistance.

Instruction

Courses

Courses for university credit in mathematics, writing, reading, study methods, personal development, computer literacy, peer counseling, multi-cultural awareness, African American issues and an orientation to co-operative education are currently being offered in cooperation with several academic departments on campus. Course descriptions are in Appendix D. The EOP's Cooperative Education Program provides assistance with internships, resume writing, and job
placement. Individual tutoring is available through the EOP Learning Center. Drop-in writing and math labs are available to all EOP students. Tutors are also used to maintain the computer lab. The tutors provide support and individual assistance for the developmental courses in the EOP and further assistance when needed in subsequent university coursework.

Staff

The staff of EOP have various responsibilities, including teaching, counseling/advising, and supervising. The instructional staff consists of faculty, graduate teaching assistants (GTA) and tutors. Only two of the full-time faculty have teaching assignments only. The other faculty are either part-time only or teach but have other assignments within the program. From time to time GTA's teach, depending on their skills and interests. Otherwise, they advise or tutor. Tutors might work for a single term or for the academic year.

The hiring process for the instructional staff appears to follow no set procedure, although affirmative action guidelines are followed. Generally, the instructional coordinator and/or the director of an umbrella program that is hiring will review the applicants' folders. Those applicants who are selected are invited to interview with the
The EOP has an unstated policy of allowing any interested staff to participate in the hiring process. The interview process is loosely structured. Generally, the overall feeling is to select a person who will be dedicated to the students and to the program. Experience in multicultural environments takes precedence over experience in a mono-cultural classroom. It is the general feeling that learning to be a good teacher does not take as much time as learning to be culturally aware. These characteristics take priority over other such criteria as type of degree held or even specific teaching approaches.

The hiring of tutors is done by the learning center coordinator. Tutors are required to have earned an "A" or "B" grade in the course(s) for which they are tutoring. Preference is given to EOP students who wish to tutor. Available funds are also a consideration. During the 1990-91 academic year, 42 students tutored for credit, 29 for work study, 11 for straight wage, and 3 volunteered. Two GTA'S were hired as tutors. Table 5 shows the number of tutors requested versus the number filled during the 1990-91 school year.
Table 5

EOP Tutor Requests
1990-91

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>n requested</th>
<th>n filled</th>
<th>% filled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The request for tutors is high during fall term because new program participants are not aware of the writing and math labs.

The instructional staff is evaluated through end-of-term course evaluations, self-evaluations and peer observations. Two forms are used for course evaluations. One was developed by the University and the other was developed by EOP. The EOP course evaluation has been revised several times. The latest revision was completed by the instructional staff. The intent was to condense the form and to reflect the specific concerns of the instructional staff, such as sensitivity to cultural needs. The course evaluations allow students to respond to the instructor and the course. The entire staff is asked to complete self evaluations at the end of the year. These forms are
completed by the staff member, discussed with the immediate supervisor and with the director of the program. The supervisory staff, including the instructional coordinator, are also evaluated by the staff at the end of the year. Peer observations are also a part of the evaluation process. Staff select other staff to come to the classroom and later they meet to discuss what has been recorded in the observation. A form was developed to guide the process; however, the observations and reporting remain informal. Evaluation forms are included in Appendix E.

Staff development involves all-staff inservices, workshops, instructor meetings, and recruitment and preparation of peer tutors. Ideas about motivating students, selecting textbooks, evaluating teachers, handling discipline problems, such as absenteeism, are constantly being discussed both formally and informally. At the beginning of the academic year the entire staff, except tutors, participates in an overnight inservice. These inservices might be held at the coast or in a remote camp. The purpose of these inservices is to combine work and play which foster communication and build trust. For example, the last overnight inservice took place at the coast. Cabins were rented at a church camp. A guest speaker was invited from the College of Business to present a workshop on motivation in organizations. The majority of the staff took advantage of the lake and canoes later in the afternoon.
Staff inservices held during the work day also occur at the end of each term. Such topics as motivation, conflict, stress, and racism have been covered. Instructor meetings are held approximately once a month. Sometimes they are arranged for all instructors. At other times, meetings are arranged to address issues directly related to a specific group, such as language teachers or team teachers. The learning center coordinator is included in teacher meetings. Tutors are required to attend a training meeting at the beginning of the academic year. Tutors who are hired later are given information individually.

More informal interactions occur frequently. It is not uncommon to find staff in other staff offices discussing work-related matters or just laughing and joking. Staff communicate with other staff not only about curriculum issues such as textbook selection, but also about student progress and tutoring needs. The instructional staff who teach reading, writing, math, and computer literacy make it a point to talk with their respective tutors. Discussions might involve expectations of tutors in the tutoring process or individual student needs.

Formal and informal written communication is also common. Writing is used to keep the staff appraised of student progress, particularly at mid-term. Notes are left in mail
boxes. Notices of conferences and articles of interest are circulated among the staff. Notice of problems and changes in the computer lab are posted. Tutors hours are posted and also circulated among the staff. Written communication is a part of the dynamic interaction between teachers and other teachers.

Methods and Materials

For purposes of consolidation, the descriptions of the courses offered in the EOP will be grouped into five categories -- reading, writing, mathematics, other developmental and other non-developmental. The reading, writing, and mathematics courses are developmental except for the last course in each sequence -- LS 199E, WR 121A, and MTH 100A. Although study skills, mind mapping, personal development and computer literacy are considered to be developmental, they are not offered as a sequence, nor are students given placement tests in these areas. The other courses -- peer counseling, African-American Issues, Multi-Cultural Awareness, and Co-Op Education Orientation -- have been developed to meet the special needs of the EOP's participants. They are not considered developmental.

Entering students are given the Descriptive Tests of Language Skills (DTLS) and the Descriptive Tests of Mathematics Skills (DTMS). Reliability was established using internal-
consistency estimates and alternate-form estimates. Validity of the tests is not available. A writing sample is also collected. The results of these placement tests combined with past academic records are used to place students in their beginning coursework. Although the placement tests are mandatory, placement in the courses based on the results is not. Students are strongly urged to follow the placement advice; however, occasionally a student will change his/her schedule without the knowledge of their EOP counselor. If aware of the student's reluctance, the counselor will often take the student to the instructor. The student can preview the course syllabuses or the texts. In the case of mathematics, the student can take the final exam for the course in question. Students are encouraged to take subsequent university coursework when they feel they are ready or when the counselor/advisor feels they are ready. Although students take subsequent university coursework, they still have access to services, such as the writing, mathematics and computer labs, counselors/advisors, tutors, etc.

Reading

Placement in the reading sequence is determined by the scaled score on the DTLS Reading Comprehension test. "This test consists of 45 questions, administered in 45 minutes. The test contains individual questions and sets of questions
based on reading passages. The test is designed to measure how well the student can identify word or phrase meanings through the context in which they are presented, understand literal and interpretive meaning, and understand the writer's assumptions, opinions, and tone" (DTLS, 1989:2). The reliability coefficient on the pilot study was .88 and on the equating study was .77.

Students who score less than a scaled score of 20 on this test are advised to take a reading course. According to the placements made in Fall, 1990, no consistent distinction was made between placement in ED 199R -- Developmental Reading and Ed 199S -- College Reading. Of the 143 students who took the placement test, 54 were advised to take Ed 199R and 33 were advised to take Ed 199S. LS 199E is not a course for which placement is advised. Of the 54 advised to take ED 199R, thirty (56%) actually appeared on the final class list for Fall, 1990. Of the 33 advised to take ED 199S, only nine (27%) appeared on the final class list for Fall, 1990. Two students who were advised to take Ed 199S took Ed 199R, and one who was advised to take Ed 199R took Ed 199S for Fall, 1990. One student who was not advised to take any reading courses took Ed 199S for Fall, 1990. It is possible that students who were advised to take reading courses took the course during another term because of scheduling conflicts. It is also possible student resistance was involved. Occasionally students who are not freshmen will take the
courses. The unstated policy among the language teachers is that if students feel they do not need the language courses, it is better to encourage them to take non-EOP courses. If they can succeed without the developmental language courses, then they obviously did not need them. If they feel it is necessary, they can take the courses at a later time.

The reading courses are the only courses that have had the same instructor for the sequence and for the period of time covered in the participants’ responses to the survey. The textbooks for all the reading courses are selected by the reading instructor. The textbooks are the focal points of the courses. Grading in all three courses is based on a point system. In ED 199R, every Friday is devoted to forty minutes of Sustained Silent Reading. A textbook is also used to introduce reading skills and to provide guided practice. Grades are based on essays and responses to the novels and exercises from the textbook. In the other two reading courses students are expected to read the chapters before coming to class and further explanation and discussion complement the text. Guided practice is often incorporated in the courses. Cooperative learning groups, teacher modeling and teaching for transfer are the primary methods used in the courses.

Grades in these courses are based on exercises from the textbook as well as tests. Both courses require using drill
and practice computer programs. In LS 199E, grades are also taken from critical analysis of self-selected articles. No final exams are given in any of the reading courses. All three courses have the same attendance policy. Unexcused absences result in the subtraction of points from the final grade. ED 199R and ED 199S are pass/no pass courses; students must earn 70% of the total points to receive a "P." LS 199E is graded; 90% of the total points equal "A", 80%, "B", etc.

Writing

Placement in the writing sequence is determined by the scaled score of the DTLS Sentence Structure test and Conventions of Written English test and by placement essays. The test of sentence structure "...consists of 30 questions, administered in 30 minutes. The questions are designed to determine how much the student knows about how the parts of a sentence fit together and about ways to make the meaning of a sentence clear" (DTLS, 1989:2). The reliability coefficient on the pilot study was .86 and on the equating study was .79. The test on usage "...consists of 40 questions, administered in 35 minutes. It is designed to determine how much the student knows about using standard forms of written English, connecting ideas appropriately, and maintaining consistency in writing. The reliability coefficient on the pilot study was .88 and on the equating study was .84.
According to an in-house document, students whose average scaled score from both tests is between 0 and 13 are placed in WR 112 or 113 -- Standard Written English; between 15-19, WR 115 -- Introduction to Expository Writing; and 20+ in WR 121 -- English Composition. The placement essay is used as a discriminator. "Results of [the] writing sample will be used to place students either higher or lower than classes recommended by the above scores." However, in Fall, 1990, the writing sample was used for placement, although the scaled scores were recorded for both tests. The placement essays are read by at least two writing instructors. Recommendations are placed on the back of the sample so the second reader does not make a decision based upon the previous reader's recommendation. If the two readers do not agree on placement, a third reader's recommendation is required.

Of the 98 students who completed the placement essay, 32 were advised to take WR 112 and 33 were advised to take WR 113. Of the 32 advised to take WR 112, twenty-four (75%) appeared on the final class list for Fall, 1990. Of the 33 advised to take WR 113, fourteen (42%) appeared on the final class list for Fall, 1990. One student who was placed in WR 112 took WR 113. Again, it is possible that students postponed taking writing due to scheduling conflicts.
The writing courses are taught by at least four different instructors. Two different sections of a course might have two different instructors. All but one of the writing instructors have taught all of the different writing courses. Selection of textbooks for the courses is made by individual instructors. Two of the instructors coordinate their courses, even if they teach different courses. One instructor has typically not used a text. The two who coordinate frequently teach WR 112 and 113. The same text is used for both courses. This reduces the expense for the students and allows for more detailed coverage of the material. The same two instructors teach different sections of WR 121A. Both instructors used the same text and supplement with handouts of essays. The other instructor of WR 121A selects her text (an anthology) completely independent of the other instructors. The two instructors who coordinate courses and texts also use similar classroom strategies -- peer editing, cooperative learning groups, informal discussions, some lecture, in-class practice and a lot of feedback. One instructor uses conferencing as the basis for her writing course. All the writing instructors are concerned with individual attention. The students are expected and often required to use tutors in the writing lab. Grades in all of the writing courses are based on a point system, with the bulk of the points assigned to essays. Journal writing and freewrites are also used to establish points for grading. Attendance is also a part of the grade,
although different instructors handle the problems differently -- some deduct points and some award points. Late papers in all classes are not accepted. All writing courses are "A" - "F" graded.

Mathematics

Placement in the math sequence is determined by the scaled score on the DTMS Arithmetic Skills test and Elementary Algebra Skills test. The arithmetic test "...consists of 35 questions, administered in 30 minutes. It is designed to measure [the students'] knowledge of operations with whole numbers; operations with fractions; operations with decimals; ratio, proportion, and percent; and [the students] ability to apply arithmetic skills in solving word problems" (DTMS, 1989:2). The reliability coefficient on the pilot study was .84 and on the equating study was .85. The algebra test "...consists of 35 questions, administered in 30 minutes. It measures [the students] knowledge of operations with real numbers; operations with algebraic expressions; solutions of equations and inequalities; and the ability to apply algebraic operations and to interpret data" (DTMS, 1989:2). The reliability coefficient on the pilot study was .80 and on the equating study was .85.

According to an in-house document, students whose average scaled score from both tests is between 0 and 13 are placed
in SED 199M -- College Arithmetic, between 14-17, SED 199N -- Beginning Algebra and 18+ in Math 100 -- Intermediate Algebra. The discriminator is the algebra score of 14+ which places the student in the next higher class or 0-13 which places the student in the next lower class. Not all EOP students are required to take the DTMS. Some of the students take the university math placement test and are placed according to those scores. Of the 103 students who took the EOP math placement tests, 36 were advised to take SED 199M. Twenty-three (64%) actually appeared on the final class list. Of the 38 who were advised to take SED 199N, seventeen (45%) appeared on the final class list. Eight of those advised to take SED 199M, took SED 199N and one advised to take Math 100A took SED 199N.

The math courses are taught by one primary instructor who teaches both SED 199N and MTH 100A. Various other instructors have taught SED 199M. The primary math instructor is the resource for the other instructors. Like the reading instructor, the primary math instructor has been with the EOP for eight years. The primary math instructor has been responsible for the selection of textbooks for all the math courses taught in EOP. Although the MTH 100A text is dictated by the math department, the EOP math instructor was on the textbook selection committee. A similar methodology is used by all the math instructors. The teachers give a step-by-step explanation of the particular
process, making sure that students understand by constant questioning. One instructor uses colored chalk to indicate the changes from the previous step. The text is used to provide additional explanations and practice problems. Students are encouraged to see the math tutors, and the instructors are also available for individual help. Grades in the math courses are based on a point system. Tests, including a final examination, make up the greatest number of points. Homework is also considered in the point system. Students are allowed to retake any test on which they score below a certain number of points; however, they can only receive a limited number of points -- no greater than a "B". Extra points are awarded for having no unexcused absences during the term; points are subtracted for each unexcused absence. All math courses are "A" - "F" graded.

Other Developmental

ED 103X - Study Skills, ED 199D - Mind Mapping, ED 199M - Advanced Mind Mapping, PSY 111A - Personal Development and ED 199C - Computer Literacy, might be considered developmental; however, placement tests are not given. Students are advised to take the study skills course if there is a discrepancy between their SAT scores and their previous grades. The mind mapping course is recommended for learning disabled students. The personal development course is suggested based on counselor assessments during advising or if early contact
with the admissions specialist or financial aid specialist indicates that a student might benefit from the course. Students self-select the computer course.

Methods of Study have been taught by various instructors, although the same text and basic outline have been consistent. Team teaching has been used in the past several years under the guidance of the instructional coordinator. The development of good study habits is the focus of the course. The mind mapping courses are taught by the instructor who developed the courses. The courses are designed "...to help students acquire a new method of note-taking..." The personal development course has traditionally been taught by a staff member with a degree in counseling. The course is designed "...to help students increase knowledge and self-understanding by exploring their own feelings and those of others." A discussion/interaction format is used in the course and students are required to "actively and enthusiastically participate in the discussions and exercises." The computer course is taught by several instructors, although the content and requirements are coordinated. A hands-on approach is used. Students are required to complete the exercises in the text. Class time is used to work on the exercises; the instructors provide guidance. Lab monitors are used during class time and staff the lab throughout the day to provide additional assistance. Texts are required for all of these courses. Grades are
based on a point system. The points are earned through assignments, midterms and final exams. Attendance is expected; students are both awarded points for perfect attendance and penalized for unexcused absences. The courses are "A" - "F" graded.

Non-Developmental Courses

Several courses offered through the EOP provide the program participants with a unique experience. The peer counseling courses, LS 306A and LS 306B, were developed to provide interested program participants with the skills needed to assist other students. LS 306A is offered in the spring and emphasizes some of the elementary principles of counseling theory. LS 306B is offered as a project-type course in the fall; the students enrolled in this course lead group activities at the New Student Retreat and are required to work with new program participants throughout the rest of the term. These two courses are graded pass/no pass.

The African-American Issues course is a seminar course and is team taught. Guest speakers give presentations on various topics, students view documentary films and attend activities related to Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday and Black History month. The grade for the course is contracted. To earn a specific grade, specific requirements must be met. The course is "A" - "F" graded.
The Multi-Cultural Awareness course is taught by the instructor who developed the course and uses a discussion-type format. "This course, which deals with cross-cultural communication and awareness, gives primary emphasis to American ethnic minorities and their cultures." Guest speakers and reading materials representative of a variety of cultural views provide the content of the course. To earn a specific grade, specific requirements must be met. The course is "A" - "F" graded.

Information on Graduates

The program began with forty-eight students in 1969 and now has an enrollment of over 620. As of June of 1989, 636 students have graduated from Oregon State University through the EOP. These graduates represent all ethnic groups and all majors at the university.
Table 6
EOP Graduation Chart

YEAR
1971 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90

GRADUATES
0 9 18 27 36 45 54 63 72 81 90
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>362</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8
EOP Graduates
as of Spring, 1990,
By Ethnic Group and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>362</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(EOP 1989-90 Annual, 23)

Evaluation Procedures

The Subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Special Services Committee submitted the report, "Purpose, Objective, and Evaluation Criteria of EOP," to the Faculty Senate of Oregon State University in February, 1971. The Subcommittee suggested that ideally "the primary objective of this program would be to provide an educational program for qualified minority students that produces the maximum increase in value of human capital in the ethnic groups represented per dollar of program costs" (Subcommittee Report, 1971:11). The committee also recognized the EOP is not a private business; a profit and loss statement and an income statement cannot be
provided to assess the quality of the program. The subcommittee did, however, suggest several methods for evaluating the program. One method suggested was to compare program retention rates to university retention rates. Another method was to compare high school GPA to university graduation GPA and to compare these changes in GPA to non-program participants. Furthermore, the subcommittee strongly urged the collection of appraisal data that comes directly from the program participants themselves.

In keeping with this original charge "...that the students have an on-going and organized mode of expressing their views of the program," courses offered in the EOP are routinely evaluated using student ratings at the end of each term. In 1984, a follow-up survey of graduates was completed to determine the degree of satisfaction with the courses and services provided by EOP. An informal in-house evaluation similar to the 1984 study was conducted the following year; however, the results of these studies are not available.

The program has been reviewed periodically by the Special Services Committee. In 1983, in a report to the Faculty Senate on the EOP, committee members "...recommended that the Faculty Senate reaffirm its endorsement of this important program." Evidence of the success of the program was summarized and several problem areas were identified. This report included data concerning the EOP graduation rate
compared to the university graduation rate. It also included data on the academic progress of special admit students in the state system. Other data included current enrollment and graduation rates in various colleges at OSU, employment data, support services available, ratings by the Department of Education on SSP and CAMP, and informal interviews with students enrolled in EOP. One of the problem areas mentioned involved budget restrictions and limitations on funds. With the exception of one position, all staff are locked into the uncertainty of fixed-term status. The second problem identified was persistent misperceptions concerning the nature and scope of EOP held by many faculty members and students on campus. A final problem involved the influx of Southeast Asian students. The first and second problems which existed at the time of the report (1983) still exist at the time of this writing. The third problem has been resolved.

**Instructional Staff Interviews**

Eleven of the instructors in the EOP were available to be interviewed to determine the extent of preplanning to incorporate into their course(s) the goal of the instructional component of the EOP. A list of questions was developed to guide the interview. The questions were then field tested on two of the instructors to insure the
questions were clear. Instructors were then given a copy of the questions and asked to respond in writing. This allowed them time to think about their answers and insured the interviewer would not misinscribe their answers. A copy of the questions used to interview the instructional staff of the EOP are in Appendix F.

Instructors were first asked how and/or why they became involved in developmental education. Secondly, they were asked if they had developed the course(s) they teach themselves or if they were following a format established by a department requirement or by a previous instructor. In the third question the instructors were asked about the primary goal of the course(s) they teach. Next they were asked whether they attempt to coordinate their course(s) with other EOP courses or other non-EOP courses. Finally, the instructors were asked if there is anything built into their course(s) that allows students to be successful in their subsequent university coursework.

When asked how and/or why the instructors had become involved in developmental education the responses were as diverse as the instructors themselves. Some answers were brief and others were longer stories. After a long answer, one staff member summed up by stating, "by accident." Several of the instructional staff became involved because the program serves minority students. In fact one minority instructor
commented, "I don't want to see students make the same mistakes that slowed me down in college." Another staff member told a longer story. She had worked at the Job Corps and "...became aware of brilliant minds which had not been adequately nurtured in the school system." Many of these were minority women and since her experience at OSU had been similar (she is also a minority), she made a commitment "...to developmental education and multicultural communication." Another staff member who is not a minority also has made a similar commitment. "My sense of desire to help those who can use a boost -- to help people who are underrepresented in society. It's a personal thing, I guess." Another non-minority staff member basically agreed. "Working with at-risk students has always been my focus in teaching, even in the 1970's in the public school system. I came to EOP thinking I could help. I wound up learning more from my students than I could ever teach them." One staff member summed up succinctly with, "Philosophical bias!" It is the basic belief of the entire instructional staff that everyone deserves equal educational opportunities.

In response to the second question regarding the development of the course(s), answers ranged from "The Math class curriculum is more or less dictated by very specific guidelines from the Math department" to "I always develop my own courses...." Except for mathematics, the instructors generally follow the format from a previous instructor for a
term or two until they become comfortable enough to modify the courses. Several courses such as ED 199D - Mind Mapping and Ed 199W - Multi-Cultural Awareness have been taught only by the instructor who initially developed the course.

When asked about the primary goal of the course(s) they teach, the response was exemplified by "[it] depends on the course." The math instructors all responded that the goal of the course(s) was to prepare for math department courses. In the lower level courses, one instructor said the goal was "[t]o enable students to break out of their psychological fear of mathematics." In the writing courses the instructors felt the goal of the courses was to "provide students with writing skills that can sustain them through college and in work environments." The instructors who teach courses other than mathematics or writing responded similarly. One instructor summed up the responses when she stated, "My primary obligation is to effectively support the students' learning experience by offering information/subjects that allow students to think for themselves in critical and creative ways."

All but one of the instructors interviewed attempts to coordinate their course(s) with other EOP courses. The writing courses form a sequence that leads to the university requirement as does the math courses. The writing instructors meet frequently and discuss the content of their
courses to ensure consistency and cohesiveness. As mathematics is sequential, the mathematics instructors coordinate to ensure that one course leads to another. Other courses, such as ED 199C - Introduction to Computers and ED 406C - African American Issues, are coordinated to non-EOP courses. Sometimes EOP and non-EOP instructors are invited to EOP courses. Several EOP instructors review syllabuses for non-EOP courses and meet with non-EOP instructors to remain current with non-EOP course demands. This is especially the case in the reading and writing courses.

When asked what, if anything, was built into their course(s) to ensure student success in subsequent university coursework, the answers varied depending with the course(s) taught. Some did not respond as they felt their course(s) were not intended to assist students in subsequent coursework. Others answered the question literally by identifying specific skills included in their course(s) that would be useful in subsequent coursework. For example, one instructor felt that stressing the importance of revision would assist students in subsequent coursework. Another felt that requiring library research and term paper writing would assist students in subsequent coursework. Still others identified more general ideas they indirectly incorporated into their course(s). One instructor felt that "recognizing and adjusting their study habits and time management problems" would assist students. Taking responsibility and
making choices was felt to be important to stress by a fourth instructor. Another felt "...a little hard work learning the basics can make life easier for them in the long-run." The most indepth answer was given by the instructor of the personal development course. She stated, "With the increased awareness and sharing of experiences related to the content of the courses, students can gain a sense of self-assurance and maturity. The participatory activities and class discussions can increase their level of participation in other classes. Their self-esteem can be effected positively knowing they can make positive contributions from their perspective cultural backgrounds."

Program Participants' Views and Opinions

The Population

The Educational Opportunities Program consists of individuals who have traditionally been denied equal access to education. EOP students include: minority, low-income, older-than-average, single parent, rural, first generation, and disabled. The program participant population targeted for the evaluation consisted of all juniors, seniors, and recent graduates who were officially associated with the EOP. The names of the juniors and seniors were taken from the EOP Master List, Fall, 1990. The names of recent
graduates were taken from the EOP 1988-89 Annual and the EOP 1989-90 Annual. Recent graduates consisted of those students who had remained on the EOP Master List and who had graduated from OSU within the last two years. All program participants involved in the evaluation remained anonymous to encourage them to reveal detailed information regarding their courses.

The Fall term enrollment for 1990 totals 704. Of these 704, 130 were classified by OSU as juniors and 158 as seniors. Thirty-four of the 130 juniors and 27 of the 158 seniors were special admits. In 1989, 73 program participants graduated and in 1990, 81 program participants graduated for a total of 154. Of these 154 graduates, 30 were special admits. A total of 442 program participants were targeted for the evaluation of the instructional component of the EOP.

The Instrument

The questionnaire developed for this evaluation focused upon the courses offered in EOP. The course offerings listed on the instrument were taken from "Course Descriptions for EOP and Associated Classes", 1989. (See Appendix D) Two open-ended questions allowed respondents to include comments concerning their experience with courses in EOP and to make suggestions for other courses they felt might be useful. After a first draft, Ms. Pam Bodenroeder of the OSU Survey Research Center reviewed the instrument and suggested
revisions. This second draft of the instrument was then sent to a panel of experts and subsequently field tested by a representative sample of the population for whom the instrument was intended. Dr. Wayne Courtney, the statistician for the College of Education, made additional suggestions for revision. The final draft was then mailed to the population.

Content Validity

After revising the first draft of the instrument based on the suggested formatting changes suggested by Bodenroeder, content validity was established by a panel of ten experts (see Appendix A) as well as by field testing the instrument on a sample not included in the study. The panel was selected on the basis of their expertise in developmental education or in survey instruments. The panel reviewed the second draft of the instrument (see Appendix C) for content, clarity, format, and comprehensiveness. Critical comments from these experts were used to again revise the questionnaire. (See Appendix I) Suggested revisions included the addition of an open-ended question asking what other courses would have been helpful. A category of "Other" was added as a choice under ethnic groups. It was also suggested that "Not at all Useful" be changed to "Not Too Useful." If the choice remained "Not at all Useful," the number translation would have to be "0" and this would create
problems in the later statistical analysis. A response of "No" also produces a "0."

The next phase in the development of the instrument involved field testing on a small representative sample not included in the study. Questionnaires were sent to 30 juniors and seniors in the EOP who were enrolled Summer term, 1990. They were asked to complete the questionnaire and critique the content, clarity, format and comprehensiveness. Fifteen questionnaires were returned to the researcher with suggestions for revision. After consideration of these suggestions and the suggestions from the panel of experts, the final draft of the instrument was ready to be mailed.

Mailing

Four hundred forty-two questionnaires were mailed. The instrument was mailed early in the term in consideration of later-in-the-term time constraints. The cover letter, personally directed, was on EOP letterhead and was signed by the director, instruction coordinator and the evaluator. The letter assured confidentiality. A self-addressed, stamped envelop was enclosed. A follow-up card was mailed to each respondent after two weeks to remind them of the importance of the study and their involvement in it. Both the cover letter and the post card are in Appendix B.
Of the 442 questionnaires mailed, forty-nine were returned to sender due to incorrect addresses. A total of 113 questionnaires were completed and returned. Those who returned the completed questionnaires became the respondents in this evaluation, regardless of whether or not they had taken any courses in the EOP. Of those 113, thirty-seven respondents indicated they had not taken any courses in the EOP, leaving seventy-six who indicated they had taken courses in the EOP and who were included in the two-way analysis of variance and the analysis of respondents' judgments. All 113 respondents were included in the analysis of respondents' comments. The return rate represented 29% of the population surveyed. Considering the expected return rate for mailed questionnaires is all too often as low as 20% (Courtney, 1982), it can be assumed that the measures suggested by Courtney (1982) and Dillman (1978) which were implemented in this study were at least helpful in increasing the return rate.

Reliability

Reliability was established using the Hoyt-Stunkard method. A two-way analysis of variance was used to establish an estimate of the internal consistency of the scores which were judgmentally assigned by the respondents.
A twenty-two item questionnaire with Likert-type scales was used in this evaluation. Each item was a course offered in the EOP. Respondents indicated whether or not they had taken the course, and if so, they evaluated the course in terms of usefulness: 1 = very useful, 2 = somewhat useful, 3 useful, and 4 not too useful. Respondents included in the two-way analysis of variance were those who had taken at least one course.

An estimate of the internal consistency of the scores which were judgmentally assigned by the respondents utilized analysis of variance. The nature of the data caused difficulty in the assessment of the reliability of the instrument. Missing values precluded the use of the entire matrix when the Hoyt-Stunkard method was employed, thereby restricting the available data to a very small sample of items and respondents. When the restricted matrix was employed for the assessment of reliability using analysis of variance, the resulting correlation was +.35, indicating a low reliability for that data which fit the requirements for Hoyt-Stunkard calculations. See Appendix H for the reliability computation results. "Reliability coefficients have positive values ranging somewhere above .80 on the scale, although in some instances lower coefficients may be considered as being acceptable. Ideally, the correlation for an instrument should be in the .90's in order to provide the consistency which we would like to find in collected data"
(Courtney, 1982: 82). However, Anderson, Ball, Murphy and Associates (1975:238) state that although "...a test with a low reliability may be a poor instrument for drawing conclusions about individuals, it may be adequate for drawing conclusions about groups." If conclusions were to be drawn about individuals, the instrument used in this study would not be acceptable; however, conclusions were made about the group. The instrument used would likely provide consistent results if used on a different population of program participants.

The attribute of reliability is such that its magnitude is very sensitive to the numbers of scores which are included in its calculation. The larger the number of items, the higher the reliability. For the present analysis, the available data matrix restricted the model's ability to produce a higher coefficient of reliability. (Courtney, 1991)

Data Analysis

The data collected for the respondents was analyzed according to the demographics including academic classification, years of attendance at OSU, major school or college, ethnic group and age. Respondents judgments were analyzed by mean ranking and sample size of each item for all courses. The sequence courses, mathematics, writing and reading, were analyzed
according to the number who reported taking several courses in the sequence.

Demographics

Academic Classification

Two-fifths (40.8%) of the respondents were seniors and one-fourth (25.0%) were graduates. Although no sophomores were included in the study, the classification sophomore was included on the questionnaire in the event that a respondent thought he or she was classified as such. Academic classification was based on the number of hours completed as indicated on the student data sheets (Fall, 1990) provided by the OSU computer center. No respondent indicated he or she was a sophomore. Only 4.0% indicated they were post baccalaureate. One respondent did not indicate his/her academic classification. These data are reported in Table 9.
Table 9
Academic Classification of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Classification</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Bac</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>04.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years of Attendance at OSU

Three-fifths (60.3%) of the respondents attended OSU two to four years. Almost one-fourth attended more than four years. Only 17% attended for less than two years. These data are reported in Table 10.

Table 10
Years of Attendance at OSU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance Category</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than two years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two to three years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three to four years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than four years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major School or College

Over one-third (34.2%) of the respondents indicated they were in the College of Liberal Arts. Three colleges, Engineering, Science, and Home Economics, were each represented by one-tenth of the respondents. Four other colleges, Education, Health and Human Performance, Agriculture, and Pharmacy, had 3.9% of the respondents in each. One respondent indicated a double major in two different colleges.

Table 11
Major School or College of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Performance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ethnic Group

Table 12 presents the breakdown of the respondents by ethnic group. The smallest group self-identified as Native American (4.0%). The largest group of respondents identified themselves ethnically as Caucasian (43.4%). One respondent self-identified as Caucasian, but also wrote Lithuanian in parentheses after the category. One-fourth (25.0%) of the respondents represented the next largest ethnic category, Asian-American. In the category of Other, four respondents wrote Asian. In the category of Hispanic, 7.9% of the respondents self-identified as such; however, in the category of Other, one respondent specified he/she was Mexican. Another respondent marked himself/herself as Hispanic and specified in parenthesis the he/she was Mexican. Two respondents did not mark any category at all.

Table 12

Ethnic Group of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Choice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Age

Almost one-third (30.3%) of the respondents indicated they were between the ages of twenty-three and twenty-five. The other respondents were fairly equally distributed between the twenty to twenty-two, twenty-six to thirty, thirty-one to forty and over forty categories. Each category had approximately one-fifth of the respondents. No respondents were under twenty. These data are reported in Table 13.

Table 13
Age of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents' Judgments of all Twenty-Two Courses

In addition to the demographic portion of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to judge the usefulness of EOP courses to subsequent OSU coursework. The dependent variables for the study were response scores on each of 22 course
Table 14. Results of calculation of mean, standard deviation and standard error of the mean for each course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Title of Course</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>WR 112 - Standard Written English</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>WR 113 - Standard Written English</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>WR 115 - Introduction to Expository Writing</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>WR 121A - English Composition (EOP Section Only)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ED 199R - Special Studies/Developmental Reading</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ED 199S - Special Studies/College Reading</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LS 199E - Critical Reading and Thinking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SED 199M - College Arithmetic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SED 199N - Beginning Algebra</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>MTH 100A - Intermediate Algebra</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ED 103X - Methods of Study</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ED 199D - Mind Mapping</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ED 199M - Advanced Mind Mapping</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ED 199C - Introduction to Computers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>PSY 111A - Personal Development</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>LS 306A - Project: Peer Counseling Techniques</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>LS 306B - Project: Peer Counseling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ED 199W - Multi-Cultural Awareness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ED 406C - African-American Issues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>LS 406 - Project: Co-op Ed Orientation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ED 199A - Special Studies/Tutoring</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ED 406B - Project: Tutoring</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 = Very useful  
       2 = Somewhat useful  
       3 = Useful  
       4 = Not too useful
Table 15: Sample size and order of usefulness as judged by respondents for each course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Ranking Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Title of Course</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LS 199E - Critical Reading and Thinking</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>LS 406 - Project: Co-op Ed Orientation</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SED 199M - College Arithmetic</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>SED 199N - Beginning Algebra</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ED 199M - Advanced Mind Mapping</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>ED 199D - Mind Mapping</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MTH 100A - Intermediate Algebra</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ED 199S - Special Studies/College Reading</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>WR 121A - English Composition (EOP Section Only)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>ED 199C - Introduction to Computers</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>ED 199A - Special Studies/Tutoring</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>ED 406C - African-American Issues</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>LS 306A - Project: Peer Counseling Techniques</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WR 115 - Introduction to Expository Writing</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ED 103X - Methods of Study</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>WR 113 - Standard Written English</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>PSY 111A - Personal Development</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WR 112 - Standard Written English</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>ED 199W - Multi-Cultural Awareness</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>LS 306B - Project: Peer Counseling</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ED 199R - Special Studies/Developmental Reading</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>ED 406B - Project: Tutoring</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 = Very useful  
       2 = Somewhat useful  
       3 = Useful  
       4 = Not too useful
Table 16: Ranking of courses in order of sample size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
<th>Mean Ranking</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Title of Course</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MTH 100A - Intermediate Algebra</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>SED 199N - Beginning Algebra</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ED 103X - Method of Study</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WR 115 - Introduction to Expository Writing</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>WR 113 - Standard Written English</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WR 112 - Standard Written English</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>WR 121A - English Composition (EOP Section Only)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>ED 199D - Mind Mapping</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>ED 199C - Introduction to Computers</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SED 199M - College Arithmetic</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ED 199R - Special Studies/Developmental Reading</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>PSY 111A - Personal Development</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>LS 406 - Project: Co-op Ed Orientation</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ED 199S - Special Studies/College Reading</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>ED 199W - Multi-Cultural Awareness</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>ED 199A - Special Studies/Tutoring</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>LS 306A - Project: Peer Counseling Techniques</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LS 198E - Critical Reading and Thinking</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>ED 406C - African-American Issues</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>ED 406B - Project: Tutoring</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ED 199M - Advanced Mind Mapping</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>LS 306B - Project: Peer Counseling</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  
1 = Very useful  
2 = Somewhat useful  
3 = Useful  
4 = Not too useful
evaluations. Responses were obtained for each course in terms of usefulness on a 4-point Likert type scale: 1 = not too useful, 2 = useful, 3 = somewhat useful, and 4 = very useful. The mean, standard deviation and standard error of the mean were calculated for each of the 22 courses. Table 14 reports the sample size and the results of calculation of mean, standard deviation and standard error of the mean for each of the 22 courses. Table 15 depicts the sample size and order of usefulness as judged by respondents for each of the 22 courses. Courses are listed according to mean ranking. The means range between 1.2 and 2.4. Seventeen courses were judged to be very useful and the other five courses were judged to be somewhat useful. Table 16 reports the data in order of number and percent of respondents for each course. The number of respondents in each course ranged from 39 (34.5%) in MTH 100A - Intermediate Algebra to only 3 (0.27%) in ED 199M - Advanced Mind Mapping. Frequency histograms are included in Appendix G.

Mean Ranking

From the aggregate means of the total respondents, LS 199E - Critical Reading and Thinking was ranked first with a mean of 1.2. The next three courses in order of mean ranking were: LS 406 - Project: Co-Op Ed Orientation, reporting a mean of 1.25; SED 199M - College Arithmetic, 1.27 mean; SED - Beginning Algebra, 1.29 mean. The mean ratings between 1.33

Five courses were judged to be somewhat useful: WR 112 - Standard Written English was given a mean rating of 2.0; ED 199W - Multi-Cultural Awareness had a mean rating of 2.29; LS 306B - Project: Peer Counseling, 2.33 mean; ED 199R - Special Studies/Developmental Reading, 2.4 mean; and Ed 406B - Project: Tutoring, 2.4 mean.

Sample Size of Each Item

Looking at the number of respondents for each course paints a different picture in terms of ranking. The seven largest number of respondents were reported in MTH 100A - Intermediate Algebra with 39 (34.5%) respondents; SED 199N - Beginning Algebra with 31 (27.4%) respondents; ED 103X - Method of Study with 28 (24.8%) respondents; WR 115 - Introduction to Expository Writing with 27 (23.9%) respondents, WR 113 - Standard Written English with 19
(16.8%) respondents, WR 112 - Standard Written English with 18 (15.9%) respondents, and WR 121A - English Composition (EOP Section Only) with 18 (15.9%) respondents, are all courses that are or lead to a university requirement with the exception of ED 103X - Methods of Study. MTH 100A - Intermediate Algebra and WR 121A - English Composition are required for graduation from OSU.

ED 199D - Mind Mapping had 14 (12.4%) respondents. The other twelve courses had 10% or less of the respondents in the following order: ED 199C - Introduction to Computers, 12 (10.6%) respondents, SED 199M - College Arithmetic 11 (09.7%) respondents, ED 199R - Special Studies/Developmental Reading, 10 (08.9%) respondents, PSY 111A - Personal Development, 8 (07.1%) respondents, LS 406 - Project: Co-op Ed Orientation 8 (07.1%) respondents, ED 199S - Special Studies/College Reading, 7 (06.2%) respondents, ED 199W - Multi-Cultural Awareness, 7 (06.2%) respondents, ED 199A - Special Studies/Tutoring, 6 (05.3%) respondents, LS 306A - Project: Peer Counseling Techniques, 6 (05.3%) respondents, LS 199E - Critical Reading and Thinking, 5 (04.4%) respondents, ED 406C - African-American Issues, 5 (04.4%) respondents, ED 406 - Project: Tutoring, 5 (04.4%) respondents, and ED 199M - Advanced Mind Mapping 3 (2.7%) respondents.
Although the mean rating indicates that all 22 courses were somewhat useful or very useful to respondents, there are implications in the number of respondents for each course. These implications will be discussed later in the chapter.

The Sequence Courses

The data were also analyzed according to the respondents who reported taking several courses in the mathematics, writing, and reading sequences. Table 17 displays the respondents' judgments of sequence courses in which they had enrolled based on placement.

Mathematics In the mathematics sequence, SED 199M - College Arithmetic is the lowest level; MTH 100A - Intermediate Algebra is the highest level and is a university requirement for all students. Thirty-one respondents indicated enrollment in two out of three courses in the sequence. Eleven began the sequence in SED 199M and twenty began the sequence in SED 199N. Nine of the eleven who began in SED 199N completed the sequence; one skipped SED 199N and enrolled in MTH 100A; another enrolled in SED 199N and SED 199M and did not enroll in MTH 100A. All twenty respondents who began in SED 199M completed the sequence.

In SED 199M, ten (91%) of the eleven who had enrolled in the sequence judged the course to be "very useful." Of these
Table 17: Respondents' judgments of sequence courses in which they had enrolled based on placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Took the course</th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Not too Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics -- 31 respondents indicated enrollment in 2 out of 3 courses in the sequence (11 placed in SED 199M and 21 placed in SED 199N)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10 91%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 9%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SED 199M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26 87%</td>
<td>2 7%</td>
<td>2 7%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*MTH 100A</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25 83%</td>
<td>3 10%</td>
<td>2 7%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing -- 14 respondents indicated enrollment in 3 out of 4 courses in the sequence (13 placed in Wr 112 and 1 placed in Wr 113)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6 46%</td>
<td>4 31%</td>
<td>3 23%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wr 112</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6 50%</td>
<td>5 42%</td>
<td>1 8%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wr 113</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6 50%</td>
<td>4 33%</td>
<td>2 17%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Wr 121A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7 70%</td>
<td>1 10%</td>
<td>2 20%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading -- 6 respondents indicated enrollment in 2 out of 3 courses in the sequence (5 placed in Ed 199R and 1 placed in Ed 199S)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 80%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 199R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 33%</td>
<td>1 33%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 199E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 80%</td>
<td>1 20%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*University requirement
ten, seven continued the sequence to completion judging all three courses to be "very useful." The one respondent who skipped SED 199N judged both SED 199M and MTH 100A to be "very useful." None of the respondents who had enrolled in the sequence judged SED 199M to be "not too useful."

In SED 199N, twenty-six (87%) of the thirty who indicated enrollment in the sequence judged the course to be "very useful." Only one of the respondents who had enrolled in SED 199M and SED 199N did not complete the sequence, although both SED 199N and SED 199M were judged to be "very useful." None of the respondents who had enrolled in the sequence judged SED 199N to be "not too useful."

In MTH 100A, twenty-five (83%) of the thirty respondents who had enrolled as part of the sequence judged the course to be "very useful." No one who had enrolled in the sequence judged MTH 100A to be "not too useful."

Other data taken from the respondents' judgments that are not displayed on Table 17 included one respondent who enrolled in SED 199N only, ranking the course as "somewhat useful." None of the respondents indicated taking SED 199M only.

**Writing** In the writing sequence, WR 112 - Standard Written English is the lowest level; WR 121A - English Composition is the highest level and is a university requirement for all
students. Fourteen respondents indicated enrollment in three out of four courses in the sequence. Thirteen began the sequence in WR 112 and one began the sequence in WR 113. Of the thirteen who began the sequence in WR 112, five completed the sequence; four completed all but the WR 121A; two skipped WR 113 and two skipped WR 115. The one respondent who began the sequence in WR 113 completed the sequence.

In WR 112, six (46%) of the thirteen who began the sequence judged the course to be "very useful." Of these six, two continued the sequence to completion judging all four courses to be "very useful." One respondent who began the sequence in WR 112 skipped WR 113 and went on to take WR 115 and WR 121A, ranking all three courses as "very useful." Another who also began in WR 112 skipped WR 113 and went on to take WR 115 and WR 121A. This respondent judged WR 112 and WR 115 as "useful" and WR 121A as "very useful." Still another respondent who began the sequence with WR 112 skipped WR 115 and went on to complete the sequence judging all three courses taken to be "very useful." A fourth respondent who also began in WR 112 and skipped WR 115 judged the three courses taken to be "useful." None of the respondents who had enrolled in the sequence judged WR 112 to be "not too useful."

In WR 113, six (50%) of the twelve respondents who had enrolled in the sequence judged the course to be "very
useful" and one of these respondents continued the sequence to completion ranking all three courses as "very useful." None of the respondents who had enrolled in the sequence judged WR 113 to be "not too useful."

In WR 115, six (50%) of the twelve respondents who had enrolled in the sequence judged the course to be "very useful." None of the respondents who had enrolled in the sequence judged WR 115 to be "not too useful."

In WR 121A, six (70%) of the ten respondents who had enrolled in the sequence judged the course to be "very useful." Of the four who did not complete the sequence, one had judged the other three courses to be "very useful"; the other three's judgments ranged between "very useful" through "useful." None of the ten respondents who had enrolled in the sequence judged WR 121A to be "not too useful."

Other data taken from the respondents' judgments that are not displayed on Table 17 included four respondents who enrolled in WR 112 and did not continue the sequence. Of these four, one judged WR 112 to be "somewhat useful", two as "useful", and one as "not too useful." One respondent enrolled in WR 113 only; the course was judged to be "very useful."

Reading In the reading sequence, ED 199R - Special Studies/Developmental Reading is the lowest level; LS 199E -
Critical Reading and Thinking is the highest level. None of the courses are or lead to university requirements. Six respondents indicated enrollment in two out of three courses in the sequence. Five began the sequence in ED 199R and one began the sequence in ED 199S. One respondent completed the sequence; three skipped ED 199S; one enrolled in ED 199R & Ed 199S and did not complete the sequence.

In ED 199R, four (80%) of the five who began the sequence judged the course to be "very useful." One respondent continued the sequence to completion judging all three courses to be "very useful." Three respondents who had enrolled in Ed 199R did not enroll in Ed 199S, but did enroll in LS 199E. Of these three, two judged both Ed 199R and LS 199E to be "very useful." One respondent who had enrolled in the sequence judged ED 199R to be "not too useful."

In Ed 199S, one (33%) of the three respondents who had enrolled in the sequence judged the course to be "very useful." The same respondent who judged Ed 199R to be "not too useful" also judged Ed 199S to be "not too useful". This respondent did not enroll in LS 199E.

In LS 199E, four (80%) of the five respondents who enrolled in the sequence judged the course to be "very useful". None of the five respondents who enrolled in the sequence judged LS 199E to be "not too useful."
Other data taken from the respondents' judgments that are not displayed on Table 17 included five respondents who enrolled in Ed 199R and did not continue the sequence. Of these five, one judged the course to be "very useful"; one to be "useful" and three to be "not too useful." Four respondents enrolled in ED 199S only and all four found the course to be "very useful."

Respondents' Comments

Rating courses was one way of soliciting program participants' opinions/judgments. Another more candid way was to ask open-ended questions. The instrument asked program participants two open-ended questions. The first question asked program participants to identify other courses that would have been helpful. The second question asked if there was anything else they would like to say about their experiences with courses provided by the EOP. The responses illuminated the picture already painted by the ratings from the Likert-type scale and from the number of respondents who enrolled in and completed sequence courses. From the patterns that emerged, responses were grouped into the following: suggestions for additional courses, suggestions for improving courses already offered, comments about the instructional component of the program, and comments about
the program as a whole. All of the respondents' comments are included in this section and been cited verbatim.

Course Suggestions

When respondents were asked to identify other courses that would be helpful, several courses were suggested more than once. A speech course was recommended by several respondents.

I think an EOP speech class would be very helpful for a lot of students - in terms of both personal skill building and the fostering of multi-cultural communication.

Informative speaking

Speech 112 or 113

Introductory science courses as well as various other math courses were also recommended.

Introductory classes for the colleges (ie bus, science, etc.) that we have chosen.

Organic chemistry -- 200 level for Agricultural respondents; level 300 not needed for many of the agricultural major options.

Calculus

Higher math classes would be very helpful

The math instruction provided by EOP was an excellent foundation. Suggestion: it would be helpful to include mathematical notation and jargon as an integral part of the math courses. As someone who was required to take several math classes beyond Math 120, an introduction to math lingo would have been helpful. Examples: let x be..., , , , , associative, communtative, identity. Overall, the math instruction at EOP is far superior to that of the Math Dept.
Classes on chemistry, calculus, accounting

Even respondents who did not take courses in EOP but did respond to the questionnaire suggested more math or science courses.

More science courses for beginning students.

Terminology in Sci courses and Math. The texts, generally are meager in explanations.

A course beyond Introduction to Computers was recommended by two respondents.

More on computers

Maybe an advanced computer class, working with and learning all the types of computers that are used on campus.

Language courses were recommended by many respondents. One respondent suggested a "Spanish class" and several others suggested courses in reading and writing the English language.


Another reading class to help with all the reading and help on what information is most important for humanities and social science classes. Like a class to take at the same time with some humanity type class.

Another respondent, who indicated he/she had not taken any courses commented:

The only EOP class I took was Eng 111 in the Fall of 1986. I found that class helpful in getting my feet wet at the college level.

Eng 111 is not offered by EOP. It is possible the respondent mis-remembered the course number. One respondent, who perhaps misunderstood the question stated "writing classes"
would have been helpful. It is possible this respondent might have wished that a writing courses had been taken. Four writing courses are already offered. Another respondent also felt the two courses, Peer Counseling Techniques and Peer Counseling, would have been helpful. Both courses are already offered. Again, a misunderstanding of the question might have affected the answer.

A project course not listed on the questionnaire was a parent support group that existed for two years. One respondent commented on the need for such a course.

I would like to see EOP expand and develop (support) it's parent support group. The best way, in my opinion would be to develop a parent co-op program similar to the nationally recognized program at LBCC. This program should be shoved through the planning that is happening right now for the Day Care facility under development at OSU. In case you are unaware of who to contact at LBCC - Bobby Weber is the person to talk to.

Although I did not take a lot of courses through EOP the ones I did take were useful to me. The project courses in Alcohol Studies, and single parent support group made a difference in terms of expanding my support network.

Another project course that was not included on the questionnaire was the student government course. One respondent commented about it.

Student government -- this class give me the motivation to keep work and study to become helpful in this society. Not just another bureaucratic person who talk to much and nice but don't say any ... and not do much.

Several respondents who had transferred to OSU suggested courses they had taken from other sources besides EOP.
I am a transfer student. There is a class that helped me great dealt how to cope with the new environment: Transfer student (HIED 202X)

These classes all would have been satisfactory in preparing for the required courses at OSU. I transferred from a community college, so I had taken similar classes to help me through writing, psychology, and science courses. I would recommend students to use the study and tutoring sessions. They were very helpful.

The usefulness of tutoring sessions was also mentioned by another respondent.

The tutoring of my writings and chemistry were very helpful to me.

Fifty-nine respondents choose not to respond to the question. Either the question was left blank or words such as "none" or "n/a" were used to answer the question. One respondent replied:

You have good classes! None, that I can think of!

General Suggestions

Suggestions for course improvement were offered by several respondents. Three felt that EOP courses should be more demanding.

Be more strict in writing classes with students and teachers.

Need to have more EOP classes and require stricter grading requirements. Try not to give high grades for little work completed. Make students meet deadlines for assignments due.

Teachers should be more stricter in class requirements. Often times students are being given too many breaks. In addition, students need to learn discipline right at
the beginning. This is for the respect of the teachers, other students, and themselves.

General Comments

**Instruction** When answering the question which asks if there is anything else the respondents would like to say about their experience with EOP, comments were directed at the curriculum and the instructors. The appreciation is best summarized by the following:

The EOP classes I took were very helpful. The instructors are able to give students attention because the classes are smaller than university classes. EOP classes also help minority freshmen adapt to the predominately white college environment. Students who take advantage of the classes provided by EOP, will have a more successful college experience. The classes provide students with essential knowledge and/or skills.

Many respondents used the word "helpful" when referring to the courses and teachers in the EOP. The following comments reflect this idea.

They have been very interesting and helpful. My class for incoming transfer students was helpful in getting me back into the groove. My mind mapping class is very good.

The classes were helpful and all the staff in EOP were wonderful. I hope you guys keep up the good work and thanks. I just wish that there are more classes (different field) courses available.

I feel that the EOP program was quite useful in preparing me for college courses, in addition to being helpful with studies afterward.

Instructors are helpful.

The courses I took through the EOP program were quite helpful and encouraging. I would recommend EOP to any
student needing extra support from counselors and instructors.

The class on getting into Graduate School was a definite plus -- extremely helpful.

EOP is a great place to start toward education. Counselors and teachers have been very helpful toward my education. One thing I would like to say is to thank those who helped me. I would like to see more higher level of classes in EOP.

Instructors were willing and cared for the students. The classes that I took were very helpful for me.

The classes offer by EOP, somehow is helpful. It gives you a way to success at school. It helps to balance my term GPA, too.

The instructors were always very encouraging and helpful.

The classes I took were very helpful (to say the least) I feel EOP is one of OSU's great assets. Although I only had taken 2 EOP courses, the instructors (for both classes) were sensitive to the needs of my class yet offered as much challenge as any other OSU course.

The instructors were excellent; wish there were more dedicated instructors in other departments. Without Math 100A many of the courses would have been impossible. I took Math 100A for audit only - because it had been too many years since I had completed the course in 1972.

The instructors were quite fair and understanding in dealing with various students abilities and testing. The tutor sessions were also an enormous help understand classroom material, as well as provide incentive. Overall, becoming a member of the EOP not only provided much needed assistance with academics, but also produced a leveling experience very important to anyone!

Another aspect of the courses that respondents frequently commented about was the individual attention and the small course sizes.

Classes are great -- individual help and small size are a big plus!
The one on one teaching methods in EOP classes are very helpful. More university classes should offer this kind of help to students. They should realize that not everyone learns at the same speed or in the same manner.

As an O.T.A. it was advantageous to take some of the college required classes (Algebra, WR 121) in smaller groups. This allowed me the chance for more understanding of the subjects and relinquished my fear of coming back to school.

I liked the smaller class size. The instructors were excellent.

They were great! I liked the small class size and personal attention. Margaret Fox is an excellent teacher. Ataa Akeayampong deserves a gold medal for her teaching, advising, counseling, persevering, and tolerance.

Individual instructors or courses were singled out as particularly special.

I took Intro to Student Government last year with Geri Martin and it was a valuable class that gave me the motivation to get involved in OSU on more than just an academic level.

Yes. The sincere teaching expertise I've received, namely Cath Kendrick, is some of the best, ever. Also, everyone associated with EOP (faculty) are genuine, and have helped me greatly. Mucho thanks.

Ms. Catherine Kendrick is an excellent instructor. I took both her beginning and Intermediate Algebra classes. Ms. Kendrick sets very high standards for students taking her classes, but she does everything in her power to see that students achieve. She is always prepared for her classes, is very detailed in her explanations, and is always available for questions.

She is in her office during her office hours. She encourages students to come in to see her when they have problems, even suggests they call her at home. The most important quality, Cath Kendrick displays is her sense of fairness and sensitivity to students who are afraid of math. She never makes students feel "stupid" or "dumb". Ms. Kendrick is an excellent instructor. Don't lose her!

I learned a lot in mind mapping that will be applicable in my life.
During the academic years at OSU I was and still am a self motivated hard working individual. The experience with the course, Methods of Study, enable me to polish up some weaknesses, which later allowed me to approach the classes more assertively and become more inquisitive. Thank you, Ataa.

Several general comments were offered.

Fun and friendly.

I'm not done taking EOP classes yet.

They are easier and fun. As a minority, I was in the same phase or level with other students.

Their great!

What an excellent experience for incoming freshmen students. Helps to better develop study habits.

One respondent reflects upon the opportunity missed, but still appreciated the general assistance from the program.

I wish I would've arrived earlier in my college career and had the opportunity and privilege to have shared in these early courses -- but I find they are too little, too late for what I needed or still need. The verbal support and assistance (via open offers) are I think, essential to my success in the future. I've never had them before and just to know they are there is great.

Program Only one of the 113 respondents who returned the questionnaire responded negatively to the program. The respondent stated,

It was a waste of my time, I feel EOP is a waste of federal funds. I try to get help but I guess you have to be a minority.

However, the general feeling toward the program was much more positive. Not only did the respondents find the courses and instructors helpful, but they also commented about the help
they received from the tutoring services as well as financial aid and counseling services.

The staff was very friendly and understanding. This really motivate me toward my education. I especially enjoyed the tutoring provided for my writing and chemistry. They were very helpful to me.

Although I have yet to take a class at EOP I can see that the classes are smaller, thereby affording more individual attention and guidance to students. And everyone at EOP seems to have a "WE care" attitude! EOP has been a great help to me in the area of finances, my personal finances that is. Without the help and advise of Sheila Roberts, I don't think I would have made it to my senior year. Although the whole crew is warm, friendly and helpful at EOP. I only have one small "bone to pick"! When I was an Education Major, my EOP tutor did not show up half of the time to help me with the "new Math". Still would like to take a computer course at EOP but haven't been able to work it in yet.

EOP has been very helpful in every way possible with the problems I have had. I thank they very much for [what] they have done! Thanks!

Although I have taken few classes w/in EOP, I appreciate the assistance of my EOP advisor in selecting my regular university classes.

As an older-than-average - and therefore, "nontraditional" - student at OSU, EOP was on of the most supportive environments I found. The best things about EOP are: 1. the counselors are pro-students, 2. so many counselor/advocates for so many diverse populations are on one floor, under one roof - so that tends to encourage co-alition building.

EOP was a good stepping stone to help me make it in the university The staff were really encouraging.

Some respondents who did not take EOP courses commented about the other services offered.

I did not take any classes through EOP, but was helped immensely from moral support and counseling. Thanks.

I never enrolled in any EOP classes, I used EOP to get a nonresident tuition waiver as a minority in financial
need. I always found EOP personnel to be eager to help me with any problem I had. Overall you are probably the most sincere group of educators at OSU. The door was always open. Thank you.

I didn't take any class at EOP but I'm one of the beneficiaries from your tutors and I appreciate it very much.

I appreciate EOP being on campus. I am not very involved but I know many people that are. Thank You.

A request for assistance was offered by one respondent who felt that EOP should raise the awareness of faculty in the OSU community concerning the needs of students with learning disabilities. The respondent suggested EOP try to inform to teachers and staff about the different disabilities. I am having difficulties with some teachers and staff [in subsequent courses] in their understanding of my disability.

Many respondents mentioned individual people, besides instructors, they felt were particularly helpful.

I had a good time learning from and with quality people. I do miss it. Special regards and thanks to my counselor; LaVerne Woods. Please pass the word on to him.

I have found the counselor very encouraging and supportive throughout my 3 years at OSU. If it weren't for Sheila Roberts I would have given up higher education years ago. I strongly believe that the counseling program is one of the best attributes of EOP.

I am very grateful for the financial assistance EOP gave me for my undergraduate education. Although funding or assistance wasn't available for me from EOP for my graduate work, I am thankful for the encouragement Mr. Larry Griggs gave me to pursue this advanced degree.

Not only did respondents find the courses, staff, and program in general very helpful, but also felt the program had kept
them in school -- perhaps the single most important goal of the EOP.

These classes were very good for me. It is great to be in the classes that give individual attention to each student. Both these classes helped me get over fears of doing new things. In addition, there is a community feeling given by EOP staff and faculty, and the other students. That is something hard to find in a system as large as OSU. You kept me in school. Thank you!

There is a lot to say about EOP in which the classes are wonderful. The atmosphere and the help all in all EOP is my shelter. Without the EOP program or support I couldn't be at the position I am right now. Because no other programs compare to EOP. EOP program is the best of all the programs in the OSU. A student can be somebody to her/his choice as long as her/his works hard. Thanks to EOP gave the opportunity to me when I needed it. And I remain hopeful in continuing assistance I might ask in my future. As a student myself EOP pays attention to the students. Thank you for allowing me to be part of EOP.

Without the great Math teachers and classes, I couldn't have graduated! Thanks again

Great If EOP was not around, I wouldn't be at OSU.

I would like to say that is EOP had not been there for me when I began OSU, I wouldn't be finishing my education today! Thanks - EOP - you deserve more support than you get from this institution. Thanks.

I returned to school after a 25 year absence from this environment. Taking classes from EOP helped to ease the transition. Successful completion of the classes gave me the confidence I needed to continue with my education. I also felt I had the full support of my teachers.

One comment that perhaps best summarized the overall feeling of the respondents and that reflects the primary goal of the Educational Opportunities Program follows:

The people from EOP really helped me a lot, without them I wouldn't have graduated from OSU. ¡Que Dios los bendiga!
Summary of the Evaluation

The data from the interviews with the instructional staff were analyzed to determine the extent to which courses were developed and maintained to meet the overall goal of the instructional component of the EOP. How/why the instructors became involved in developmental education was described. The instructors' views of the primary goal of the EOP's courses were included. How course(s) are tailored to assist students in meeting the requirements of subsequent university coursework was presented. The goal of the EOP's courses is to provide students with the opportunity for success in subsequent university coursework and, through the instructors' commitment to that goal and through their intentional coordination and contact with non-EOP courses, the goals of individual courses agree with the overall goal of the instructional component of the EOP.

Data were collected from 113 respondents. Seventy-six indicated they had taken one or more courses in the EOP. The response rate was 29% of the population surveyed. Two-fifths of the respondents were classified academically as seniors. Three-fifths of the respondents had attended OSU for two to
four years. Over one-third of the respondents indicated they were in the College of Liberal Arts. A little more than two-fifths of the respondents self-identified as Caucasian. Almost one-third indicated they were between the ages of twenty-three and twenty-five.

A two-way analysis of variance was calculated on the twenty-two item questionnaire to establish the reliability of the instrument. The resulting correlation was +.35.

Respondents were asked to judge each item on a 4-point Likert-type scale: 1 = very useful, 2 = somewhat useful, 3 = useful and 4 = not too useful. The mean, standard deviation and standard error of the mean were calculated for each of the twenty-two items. The mean for each of the courses ranged from 1.2 to 2.4.

The judgments of respondents who had enrolled in several courses in the mathematics, reading and writing sequence were analyzed. Completion of the sequence was also considered, as well as those who took only one course in the sequence and did not continue.

Respondents' comments were analyzed and grouped according to the emerging patterns. Respondents suggested other courses which would have been helpful. Suggestions were also offered for course improvement. They also commented about their
experience with courses as well as the EOP in general. The overall opinion of the respondents was that EOP courses are useful to subsequent OSU coursework.

Conclusions

Based on the judgments of the respondents in this evaluation, it can be concluded that program participants do find the Educational Opportunities Program courses useful to subsequent Oregon State University coursework. Several other related conclusions can be drawn from the respondents' judgments and from their comments.

Respondents' Judgments

The mean scores reflected the fact that the respondents, on the average, found all the EOP courses useful to subsequent OSU coursework. Each sample for seventeen of the twenty courses showed a mean of between 1.2 and 1.88, thereby signifying that respondents judged these course as between very useful and somewhat useful. The other five courses had mean scores between 2.0 and 2.4, rating them as between somewhat useful and useful. No courses were rated lower than a 2.4.

The standard deviations and standard errors of the mean for each course were also calculated. This information, upon
further analysis, revealed some interesting information. According to Courtney (1984:88), "when the sample size is small, there will be great spread in variability; with large samples, the variability will be less, with a more likely chance that the scores will cluster tightly around the center of the distribution." As was expected, classes with large sample sizes did have smaller resulting standard errors. Item #3, WR 115A with a sample size of 27, item #9, SED 199N with a sample size of 31, and item #10, MTH 100A with a sample size of 39, showed more clustering around the mean score. Item #3 had a standard deviation of .78 and a standard error of .15. Item #9 had a standard deviation of .69 and a standard error of .12. Item #10 had a standard deviation of .74 and a standard error of .12. The exception was item #11, ED 103X, with a sample size of 28, which showed a wider spread of variability (1.03), although the resulting standard error was .19.

Twelve classes had less than ten respondents in each sample. Of these ten, five had a standard error above .40. These five included item #5, ED 199R, item #6, ED 199S, item #18, ED 199W, item #19, ED 406C, and item #20, LS 406. As Courtney (1984:91) points out, "if the standard error is large, the results may not be meaningful at all in terms of estimating the true population values." The other five classes with a sample size of less than ten and somewhat lower standard errors ranging from .20 to .35, showed wider
spreads of variability. Item #7 had a particularly interesting result. The sample size was only five, but the standard deviation was .44, the lowest standard deviation of all twenty-two items. The standard error was only .20. This item was mean ranked as #1 with a mean of 1.2.

Respondents' Comments

The open-ended questions on the questionnaire revealed some interesting thoughts, not only about the instructional component of the EOP, but also about the program in general. Several possible courses were suggested as a means to further assist respondents in subsequent university coursework. One such course was suggested three times – a speech course. A course, such as Introduction to Public Speaking, offered in the EOP would provide program participants with an audience comprised of their peers and an instructor who is sensitive to their needs. Such a course would allow students a broader range of topics with which the audience could relate and a comfort level that would ease speech anxiety.

Science and/or math courses were also suggested. Several of eight respondents who suggested these courses requested higher level courses. This would take the place of general university requirements or specific major requirements. This is not recommended by this researcher because it would be a duplication of already existing courses and would
require an instructor with a high level of knowledge in each subject matter. However, it would be feasible to offer introductory courses that would focus on the general vocabulary of a specific content area such as general science or business. The course would be considered a pre-entry level course. In fact, such a course, Introduction to Economics, has been offered in the past. The course was a pre-entry level course. The focus of the course was vocabulary and basic concepts.

One respondent felt a Spanish course would be helpful. Considering the population of EOP is made up of a number of Hispanics who range in Spanish language skills from listening comprehension only to fully fluent, it would be beneficial for EOP to offer a course that would consider the needs of the Spanish language speakers. Many of these students have social language skills, but do not have academic language skills in their first language. Such a course offered in the EOP would provide these students with academic language skills without negating their dialects.

Reading in the Social Sciences was suggested. This course was taught, but the difficulties in making the instruction concrete and relevant caused the course to take a different direction. It could be an effective course if it could be team taught with an instructor from the social sciences.
A parent support group was also suggested twice. This group formed three years ago in response to the influx of young, single mothers and returning students who were also parents. The group first took a structured focus, but as the group solidified it was felt that the facilitator (an EOP instructor) should turn the group over to the members. The group is still in existence on a very informal level. As new young students arrive, they are introduced to the group. The older parents are served by another organization on campus.

Introduction to student government and graduate school seminar were also suggested as useful courses. These courses are currently being offered in the EOP. Various courses, beyond the core curriculum are offered as the need arises and as the skills of the staff allow. Such courses demonstrate the flexibility of the program.

Computer courses beyond the one already offered within the EOP was suggested by two respondents. This is not recommended because it is felt that, like science and math courses, once program participants have been brought to the same level as other entering freshmen, it is important to mainstream them. There are various courses already offered in other colleges that meet this need for advanced computer classes. A class for transfer students was suggested; however, this would also be a duplication of services, as it is already available through another department on campus.
Suggestions not only were made regarding courses that would be useful to subsequent university coursework, but also were made regarding improvement of courses already offered. Three respondents suggested that EOP courses should be more demanding. They suggested stricter requirements. Another respondent respected one of the instructors for having high expectations and several other respondents comment on the challenge of several EOP courses. This conflict of ideas results in the variety of teaching styles and a different idea as to what constitutes helpful. Several instructors are not as demanding in their requirements as are others. This matter has been discussed in both instructor and counselor meetings. The program does not feel it can infringe on the right of the teacher to decide how to organize a course. This problem is not unique to EOP.

The open-ended question which asked if there was anything else the respondents would like to say about their experience with courses in the EOP generated numerous positive responses. It was very apparent that respondents were not only satisfied with the courses and found them useful to subsequent university coursework, but they also found staff members, both teachers and advisers, to be very helpful. Comments about courses being smaller and staff caring about and supporting the respondents were by far the most common. Various staff members were mentioned by name. Perhaps the most important point made by various respondents was that
they had stayed in school or graduated because of the EOP. It can be concluded from these comments that program participants respond to instructors who treat them fairly and take a personal interest in their successes. Smaller class sizes and individual attention are of primary importance to the EOP if students are to continue to be successful in subsequent university coursework.

Recommendations

Based on the results of this study, the following suggestions for further study and action are advanced.

Further Action

1. Several courses should be considered for addition to the curriculum, including a speech course, an introductory course for the sciences, a Spanish course, and a reading course to assist program participants with reading the social sciences.

2. The 22 courses which comprise the core curriculum of the EOP should be maintained.

3. The tutoring program should be maintained.

4. EOP courses should maintain small classes to facilitate individual attention.

5. Instructional staff should continue to take individual needs of the program participants into
consideration while maintaining a challenging atmosphere.

6. EOP should remain flexible in offering special interest classes as the need arises, such as alcohol studies, the parent support group, student government, and the graduate school seminar.

Further Study

1. A follow-up evaluation should be conducted as needed to continue to monitor respondents' judgment of the usefulness of EOP courses to subsequent OSU coursework. Including sophomores and a follow-up phone call would produce a larger response.

2. A follow-up questionnaire should be sent to those program participants who are no longer at OSU but are still attending a four-year institution and to those students who are no longer attending a four-year institution. This would also give a broader picture of the usefulness of EOP courses.

3. Retention rates of students within the EOP should be analyzed and compared to OSU retention rates.

4. High school GPA compared to university graduation GPA for EOP students should be analyzed and compared to non-program participants to give a more comprehensive evaluation of the instructional component of the program.
CHAPTER FOUR

SUMMARY AND PROCESS EVALUATION

Summary

The central purpose of this research was to develop a process for evaluating the instructional component of developmental education programs. The Educational Opportunities Program at Oregon State University was used as a case study.

A review of the related literature revealed a need for developing a process for evaluating the instructional component of developmental education programs. The definitions of the terms "developmental," "remedial" and "evaluation" were established. A model for evaluating the instructional component of developmental education programs was developed from the existing framework of Wolf (1978), the metamodel of Mines, Gressard and Daniels (1982) and the three models (Clowes, 1984; Maring, Shea & Warner, 1987; and Gordon & Wiest, 1988) already available for program evaluations. The development of the current model followed the steps for developing a model offered by Gordon & Wiest (1988). The conditions that must be met when eliciting information from participants in an educational program were incorporated in the current model and later in the process.
A process was developed for evaluating the instructional component of developmental education programs. The process includes the following steps:

1. Review the literature.
2. Develop a model to guide the evaluation.
3. Describe the program to be evaluated.
4. Interview the instructional staff.
5. Identify the population from among the program participants from whom opinions and views are to be elicited.
6. Develop the instrument with which to elicit the opinions and views.
7. Establish the validity and reliability of the instrument.
8. Mail the instrument.
9. Analyze the data.
10. Report the findings to the administrative and program staff.
11. Evaluate process effectiveness.

The Educational Opportunities Program at Oregon State University was used as a case study. The program was described, especially the instructional component; the instructional staff was interviewed; and the program participants' views and opinions were elicited using an instrument that had been developed to reflect the unique
curriculum in this particular program. The data were then analyzed, conclusions were drawn and recommendations were reported to the supervisory staff and the instructional staff.

**Process Evaluation**

The final step in the process involves the evaluation of process effectiveness. To do so, each step in the process is assessed to determine its overall effectiveness, observations and recommendations for future evaluations are identified. The more global implications of the findings of this study are discussed. Several questions guided the process evaluation. Was the evaluation process effective? Were the original assumptions made by the evaluator accurate assumptions? Did the evaluation meet the original goals of the evaluator? Did this particular evaluation process have an impact on curriculum? Staff? Students? One key idea surfaced as a result of the evaluation of the process. When the purpose of evaluation is improved usefulness of the program, being involved in the process is more fruitful than the product.

The first step in the process involved reviewing the literature. The assumption was made that the review of the literature would yield standard, clear-cut results. It was
assumed that the distinction was clear between "developmental" and "remedial" programs. A review of the literature proved this assumption to be erroneous. Although there is a need for clarity, there still appears to be some confusion about the distinction. It was also assumed that a standard procedure would be in place for evaluating developmental education programs. This also proved untrue. The review of the literature revealed how little is available in the research data base concerning developmental education in general. Even more surprising was the lack of an effective, proven model for conducting the evaluation of the instructional component of developmental education programs. This limited research data base causes one to speculate about what is happening in the field of research, specifically research directed at developmental education programs. Are the educators in developmental education programs too busy to conduct research on their own programs? Could they be reviewing programs but not having time to formalize the process and publish results? How are they sure that their programs are meeting the goals of the program? Are programs changing to meet the needs of their students, and if so, upon what are these decisions based?

Describing the program to be evaluated was the next step in the process. Each developmental education program is unique. Each has its own history, administrative structure, funding sources, facility, philosophy, recruiting efforts,
counseling/advising staff, and evaluation procedures. This particular step proved to be very useful. The assumption was made that describing the program would simply provide background information on this specific program. In actuality, it caused the staff members involved in providing the information to look at data already available from a different perspective. Researching background information about the program with the help of staff members reminded all involved of the goal of the program. Although the data were available, no one had looked at how many students who began OSU with special admission status actually graduated. Because of the investigation into the placement process and the resulting analysis of sequence courses, a committee met to discuss this procedure. This step was extremely valuable to the overall process, yielding data that proved to be very helpful in obtaining the original goal of the evaluation—improved usefulness. Future researchers might wish to approach this step more as a discovery of the interworkings of their individual programs than reporting information about their programs to outside audiences. Regardless of the length of time the researchers have been with the program and perhaps because of that time, it is fruitful to look at the already existing data from a more objective view. The more complex the program, the more useful the discovery process. Being involved in the process of evaluation allows the evaluator a more detailed view of the overall program and can be extremely informative to those involved.
Interviewing the instructional staff, the fourth step in the process, provided a rich data base of information about instruction. The original intent of this step was to determine if courses were developed with subsequent university courses in mind and to report this information about the program as part of the program description. However, interviewing the staff actually produced a few unexpected results. Because of the interviews, instructors indicated that they became more focused on the primary goal of the developmental courses. Language instructors discovered applicable methodologies used in math courses, and math instructors discovered ways to incorporate writing in their math courses. As an indirect result of this evaluation, an inservice about writing across the curriculum was held. The interviews also provided a richer perspective from which to view the existing literature on developmental education programs. In this research it was discovered that the instructional staff had not initially made the conscious choice to become involved in developmental education. Although the reasons and situations that brought them to developmental education varied, it became apparent that the instructional staff was satisfied with the outcome. Although these data were not the focus of the evaluation, they do indirectly impact on the program and the usefulness of developmental courses.
Being a member of the staff provided a unique perspective, perhaps even a privileged edge. It allowed this researcher to ask more directed, detailed questions of the staff. Because of the length of time this evaluator had been with the program, she was aware of the changes that had been made over time. Perhaps more importantly, this researcher already had background knowledge about the courses in the EOP and was able to ask more focused questions than an outside researcher might. The trust level of those interviewed was perhaps higher because the evaluator also had to be interviewed. The purpose of the evaluation was made clear to all involved, and it was made clear that there were no hidden agendas. Those interviewed would also be able to make their point without having to go into as much detail with an outsider. This was particularly true with the language instructors. Again, it was assumed that describing the courses and staff was the intent of the interviews; however, being involved in the process proved to be more useful than the product.

The next three steps in the process involved the eliciting of the views and opinions of the program participants. Although these were thought to be the original goal of the evaluation, they actually did not produce the most useful results. Originally, the product appeared to be more important than the process. The reverse proved to be true.
Identifying the population from among the program participants from whom opinions and views were to be elicited was the next step. It was assumed that juniors, seniors and first and second year graduates should be identified as the population for this research. Although this did provide a satisfactory return rate overall (29%), it created several problems in the statistical analysis, especially with the ANOVA used to establish the reliability of the instrument and in the analysis of individual courses. Eliciting the opinions and views of sophomores and all graduates would increase the population and perhaps provide for a larger return rate, thus reducing the problems created in the statistical analysis. On the other hand, including sophomores might not be useful because they have not really had the opportunity to experience a broad range of courses or delve into their chosen majors. Including graduates who have been out of school more than two years might also be undesirable because of the length of time they have been away from school and because of the difficulty in locating them. Future evaluators will have to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of attempting to increase the population.

Developing the instrument and establishing reliability and validity were the next steps in the evaluation process. The instrument used in this evaluation was intended to be flexible. Each developmental education program offers a unique curriculum. Course offerings would vary; however,
they could be substituted into the existing instrument. Substitutions would need to be made to the list of major schools or colleges to reflect the institutions' offerings as well. It would be advisable to include a response that would allow respondents to rank the course as "Not Useful." The way the instrument is currently formatted eliminated the option to rank the course as having no use and the selection choices are weighted in favor of the program. This was not intentional. The current formatting made this unavoidable.

Another problem surfaced regarding identifying respondents' ethnic groups. From the outset the issue of ethnic identification created a great deal of discussion among staff members, the panel of experts who reviewed the instrument for validity and ultimately the program participants who responded. The question of what to call a particular ethnic group is often at the heart of any political discussion between and among people of color. Self-identification makes it very difficult to satisfy all respondents. The grouping used was the same as the grouping used by the program itself, since the staff represents each grouping. "Other" was offered as a choice in an attempt to allow for any variation. This was perhaps a mistake. Ethnic identity is not static. It changes to suit the needs of the people involved. It also changes from generation to generation. For the most part the staff members represent a different generation than the program participants. It is, therefore, recommended that
ethnic group choices be changed to reflect the current trend. Perhaps making the choice completely open-ended would reduce the problem; however, it could create a problem with any statistical analysis. Again, the future evaluator would have to weigh the advantages and disadvantages before proceeding.

Mailing the instrument was the next step in the process. Although specific guidelines have been established and are readily available in the literature, these guidelines are perhaps not as useful as they appear to be. Certainly, the instrument should be mailed at a time when current college addresses are available. However, considering the mobile nature of college students generally, and developmental education students in particular, these guidelines did not prove to be completely reliable. In this study, surveys continued to come in up to two months after the deadline. It is recommended that a longer period of time be given respondents. A follow-up phone call would have produced a larger response.

One question that surfaced from this research that future evaluators need to keep in mind involved the cultural considerations of those being surveyed. Do people from various cultural backgrounds respond differently to surveys and questionnaires? This researcher suspects, and other staff members agree, that the response rate with this particular population would not have been as high as it was
if the survey had not come directly from the EOP. Nowhere in
the literature reviewed was there mention of cultural
consideration when conducting mail surveys. Research in this
area needs to be conducted to insure that data collected
through mail surveys are valid and reliable.

Again, being a member of the program proved to be helpful in
eliciting opinions and views from the program participants.
The program participants' trust level was higher because of
the familiarity with the evaluator. When an inside evaluator
is seeking program participants' views and opinions in the
evaluation process, the response rate would be higher because
program participants are given a voice in the direction the
program will take. An outside evaluator would not have been
as successful in obtaining the requested information.

Analyzing the data was the next step in the process. This
step included the analysis of demographics, respondents'
judgments of all courses, and respondents' comments. An
analysis of the demographics of the respondents gave
interesting information about who responded to the survey;
however, it did not really provide any useful information.
It might have been more helpful if a comparison had been made
between ethnic group and judgment of courses, especially in
the evaluation of the EOP. The data for analysis would be
available from the current survey. Identifying a pattern of
use and usefulness between ethnic group and courses might
have provided information that would have stimulated change either within courses or within the curriculum itself. For example, although many Asian students are placed in WR 112, they do not complete the sequence. A comparison between Asian respondents and rankings and/or comments on WR 112 might provide information by which the course could be restructured to meet these students' perceived needs. It also might have been helpful to know which courses older-than-average or learning disabled students found useful or not useful as well. A category would have to be added to the survey to identify learning disabled students.

Analysis of respondents' judgments provided helpful information in that it identified those courses that were judged to be "very useful", "somewhat useful", "useful", and "not too useful" by respondents. It was assumed that this would be the heart of the evaluation and would stimulate the most amount of change. This did not prove to be true. Although staff were interested to know that their courses were ranked as "very useful", "somewhat useful", "useful" or "not too useful", they were more interested in finding out why they were ranked as they were. Unfortunately, this information was not available. Although respondents were asked about other courses that might have been helpful and were given the opportunity to comment about anything else they would like to say, there was not sufficient information to determine why a particular course was ranked as "very
useful" or "not too useful." Attitude surveys do provide quantitative data and could be useful to outside evaluators who are attempting to determine the opinions of program participants, but for an inside evaluation that is attempting to improve usefulness of courses, these data were not particularly helpful. This particular problem had not been foreseen at the beginning of this evaluation. Future evaluation must consider this particular point carefully. Modifying the survey itself to allow for comments about each course might yield more useful results.

Analyzing the respondents' judgments of the sequence courses provided more helpful information, although it still was not known why the respondents ranked the courses as they did. It allowed this researcher to add another variable -- taking the next course in the sequence -- to the data. Taking another course in the sequence could be a good indicator of the usefulness of the first course when compared to ranking. However, a respondent's decision not to take the next course in the sequence does not necessarily mean he/she did not find it useful. Other variables might play into the decision, such as a scheduling conflict.

Analysis of respondents' comments elicited a great deal of interesting information; however, a large portion of it was not related directly to the instructional component of the program. It did reaffirm the fact that the instructional
component does not operate in isolation. It also provided some clues as to what respondents felt made the courses within the EOP useful. Rather than including all of the responses, it might have been more helpful to classify responses into categories. These data could then be reported in frequency and percentage form. This analysis would be beneficial in that the evaluator could report exactly how many respondents found certain characteristics of a course useful. For example, how many students felt that smaller class size made a course more useful could be determined.

Reporting the findings to the administrative and program staff was an important part of the evaluation process; however, it should not be considered the last step in the process. The administrative and program staff can make valuable contributions throughout the process. At the beginning of the process, staff can provide information about the program itself and help to determine the path the evaluation should take. At the end of the process, they can make suggestions about future evaluations. For example, comparative analysis of ethnic group and respondents' judgments was suggested. Forming a committee to investigate why respondents ranked the courses as they did was also suggested.

Assuming that immediate and direct actions are a reflection of the effectiveness of an evaluation, this evaluation did
result in such actions. It reinforced the plan already in progress for developing one new course. Another new course will be developed as suggested by the recommendations. A possible third new course is being discussed. It will be necessary, however, to re-evaluate the instructional component of the program after the courses have been in place for several years to determine the usefulness of these new courses.

Beyond the assumption of effectiveness of evaluation resulting in immediate and direct actions, is the idea that evaluation effectiveness can be measured by more subtle changes in the program. Because of the evaluation, communication about the goals of courses and how the courses might be made more useful to program participants has increased. This type of communication among staff members is very important because it allows for a more cohesive curriculum for students. A second residual effect was the reassessment of specific courses taught by those involved in the evaluation process. Involvement in the evaluation process was the strongest stimulus for change. A third residual effect of the evaluation was the fact that those involved in the evaluation and those who read the report have a more accurate picture of the program. A new staff member attended the presentation of findings and found the information very helpful in obtaining an overview of the
program. Other returning staff have reported a clearer understanding of the program as a whole.

The process developed in this study to evaluate the instructional component of developmental education programs did prove to be effective. It is important to note that the purpose and the outcome are closely related and should be given careful consideration by future evaluators. Although the literature does point out the need to consider the purpose in program evaluation, it cannot be stressed too much. If the purpose is program improvement and change, then the evaluation should be viewed more as staff development. In this case, being involved in the process is more important than the product. The evaluation should be done internally and involve more than a collection of data. In other cases, when data are being collected with the purpose of convincing an external audience such as funding agencies, then the process must be different because the purpose and outcome are different. The product becomes more important than the process. Future evaluations must carefully consider purpose, audience and outcome before proceeding further in the evaluation of the instructional components of developmental education programs.
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APPENDIX B

CORRESPONDENCE
August 1, 1990

Dear

I am writing regarding the enclosed survey. Your name has been suggested as a professional in the field who might be able to serve as a member of a Delphi Panel. I am currently working on my thesis for a PhD in Education. I am also a full-time instructor in the Educational Opportunity Program at Oregon State University. As you may already know EOP is a program that recruits and retains non-traditional students. The EOP also provides an instructional component. The purpose of my thesis is to determine the degree of usefulness of the EOP courses to subsequent university coursework. A cover letter, informing students of the purpose of the study and that their responses will be anonymous, will be written by the director of the EOP.

Program evaluation is a crucial part of any program, and it is the intent of this study to provide feedback to the staff regarding students' perceptions of the usefulness of the EOP courses to subsequent university coursework. By identifying the strengths, it is believed that the program can build upon those strengths in order to build an even stronger program. As the EOP instructional component is unique, it has become necessary to develop an instrument that has been tailored specifically to the program's course offerings.

However, it is still necessary to establish the validity and reliability of the instrument. To establish content validity, the instrument can be reviewed by a Delphi Panel. I am specifically interested in feedback on content, clarity and format. Your expertise in this matter is needed. Please feel free to write any comments and suggestions which you feel will add to the validity of the instrument.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (503) 737-3628. Your time and consideration in this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Margaret W. Fox
Instructor
July 21, 1990
Dear

I am in need of your help. I am developing a survey to evaluate the usefulness of the Educational Opportunities Program's courses to subsequent university coursework. I hope to send out the revised survey in Fall, 1990, to upper division students. However, as in many types of writing, I need feedback on the enclosed survey.

I am interested in knowing if you find any of the directions or questions on the survey confusing. Do you think I should include something that is not on the survey? Have I made any typing errors? In other words, what can I do to make it clearer and of more use to the evaluation process? Feel free to write your suggestions, revisions, criticisms, ideas directly on the survey.

I appreciate your time in this matter as I consider it to be an important endeavor. Your input can help make the evaluation process more valid and ultimately, your feedback and responses can identify areas of strengths within our curriculum.

As time is important here, please return this survey by August 7, 1990. You may either drop it by the main EOP office or by return mail to the address above.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Margaret W. Fox
Instructor
October 15, 1990

We, at the EOP, hope this letter finds you in good health.

We are in the process of evaluating the effectiveness of the instructional component of our program. One of the best ways of doing this is to find out how you, our juniors, seniors, and recent graduates, fared in your upper division courses, and to include your impressions of our instructional services.

Now that you are familiar with the expectations of those upper division courses, you may have insights about the usefulness of our EOP courses to your subsequent university coursework. Your responses to the questionnaire will enable us to evaluate our curriculum for current and future students. Your participation is important!

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only. This is so that we may check your name off of the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire.

Please spare a few minutes of your time to complete and mail the questionnaire at your earliest convenience. We are enclosing a self-addressed stamped envelop for your return of the completed questionnaire.

We would be happy to answer any questions that you might have. Please call (503) 737-3628.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Lawrence F. Griggs
EOP Director

Ataa Akyeampong
Instruction Coordinator

Margaret W. Fox
Data Coordinator
Follow-up Card

November 15, 1990

Recently, a questionnaire seeking your perceptions of the usefulness of our EOP courses to your subsequent university coursework was mailed to you.

If you have already completed and returned it to us, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Because we wish to evaluate our curriculum for current and future students, your impressions are important.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it got misplaced, please call me right now, collect (503-737-3628) and I will get another one in the mail to you today.

Sincerely,

Margaret W. Fox
Data Coordinator
TO: Instructional Staff

From: Margaret

RE: Attached Interview Questions

As you may already know, I am working on an evaluation of the instructional component of EOP. I have already surveyed our juniors, seniors, and recent graduates concerning their judgments of the usefulness of EOP courses to subsequent OSU coursework.

As a part of this evaluation, I also need to describe the facilities, as well as the instructional staff. Therefore, I am asking for your help. Please answer the attached interview questions as completely as possible. Please return the completed interview questions no later than Friday, May 24. If you prefer, we can meet and discuss your answers. This is intended to be an informal interview.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation in this evaluation. Results of the student survey as well as the entire evaluation will be made available as soon as it is completed.
APPENDIX C

INSTRUMENT
SECOND DRAFT
EOP STUDENT FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

1. The following is a list of classes provided by EOP. For each item, please indicate whether or not you have taken the class and for those classes you have taken also indicate if you feel it was very useful to you in your subsequent university coursework, somewhat useful, not too useful or not at all useful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Take Class?</th>
<th>If yes, was it: (Circle one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[NO]</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[VERY USEFUL] [USEFUL] [SOMETHING] [NOT TOO USEFUL] [NOT AT ALL USEFUL]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. ENGLISH/WRITING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Description</th>
<th>Take?</th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Not Too Useful</th>
<th>Not at All Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WR 112 - Standard Written English</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 113 - Standard Written English</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 115 - Introduction to Expository Writing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 121A - English Composition (EOP Section Only)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. READING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Description</th>
<th>Take?</th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Not Too Useful</th>
<th>Not at All Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED 199R - Special Studies/Developmental Reading</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 199S - Special Studies/College Reading</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 199E - Critical Reading and Thinking</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. MATHEMATICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Description</th>
<th>Take?</th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Not Too Useful</th>
<th>Not at All Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SED 199M - College Arithmetic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SED 199N - Beginning Algebra</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH 100A - Intermediate Algebra</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(PLEASE TURN THE PAGE)
### IV. GENERAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Take Class?</th>
<th>If yes, was it: (Circle one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Circle)</td>
<td>VERY SOMEWHAT NOT TOO NOT AT ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USEFUL</td>
<td>USEFUL USEFUL USEFUL USEFUL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| a. ED 103X - Methods of Study (formerly Univ 100X) | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b. ED 199D - Mind Mapping | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c. ED 199M - Advanced Mind Mapping | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| d. ED 199C - Introduction to Computers | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| e. Psy 111A - Personal Development | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| f. LS 306A - Project: Peer Counseling Techniques | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| g. LS 306B - Project: Peer Counseling | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| h. ED 199W - Multi-Cultural Awareness | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| i. ED 406C - African-American Issues | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| j. LS 406 - Project: Co-op Ed Orientation | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| k. ED 199A - Special Studies/Tutoring | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| l. ED 406B - Project: Tutoring | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

2. What is your academic classification at OSU?

1. SOPHOMORE
2. JUNIOR
3. SENIOR
4. POST BAC
   -5 GRADUATE

   --- 2A. What is the degree(s) you have received from OSU - BS, BA, BFA, PhD, etc)

   DEGREE(S) ____________________

(OPEN ON THE NEXT PAGE)
3. How many years, altogether, have you attended OSU? (Circle one number)

1 LESS THAN 2 YEARS
2 TWO TO THREE YEARS
3 THREE TO FOUR YEARS
4 MORE THAN FOUR YEARS

4. Please indicate your major school or college at OSU. (Circle one number)

01 LIBERAL ARTS
02 ENGINEERING
03 BUSINESS
04 SCIENCE
05 EDUCATION
06 HOME ECONOMICS
07 HEALTH AND HUMAN PERFORMANCE
08 AGRICULTURE
09 FORESTRY
10 PHARMACY
11 OTHER (Specify ________________________)

5. With which of the following ethnic groups do you identify? (Circle one number)

1 BLACK
2 CAUCASIAN
3 NATIVE AMERICAN
4 ASIAN-AMERICAN
5 HISPANIC

6. And, what is your age? (Circle one number)

1 UNDER 20
2 20 TO 22
3 23 TO 25
4 26 TO 30
5 31 TO 40
6 OVER 40

(PLEASE TURN THE PAGE)
7. Is there anything else you would like to say about your experience with classes provided by EOP?

(THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION)
APPENDIX D

COURSE DESCRIPTIONS
Educational Opportunities Program classes are designed to assist each student in developing the academic skills necessary to be competitive at Oregon State University. All classes are limited in size and the course material is adapted to individual needs wherever appropriate. Based on placement tests, recommendations are made for enrollment in those EOP classes expected to be most helpful to the student. Enrollment in EOP classes is subject to approval by the instructor and the Academic Coordinator. All classes carry university credit toward graduation as indicated.

WR 112 Standard Written English - 3 credits graded

Designed for students with other than standard English as their first language or dialect. The aim of this course is to develop ease in the use of standard English for university work. It stresses the importance of both the student's first language or dialect and "standard English" as tools for success at the university. The course may concentrate on control of English grammar, syntax, or other areas of concern depending on the students' needs.

WR 113 Standard Written English - 3 credits graded

Stresses the development of well-structured paragraphs. Designed especially for students who need organizational skills in writing for the university classroom. Assists students in the development of well-organized papers in a variety of modes.

WR 115 Introduction to Expository Writing - 3 credits graded

Review of the elements of composition. Students work closely with instructor in order to improve in areas of concern. Deals with methods of exposition and style. Provides extensive writing practice and prepares the student to take the required university composition course WR 121. Does not replace WR 121.

WR 121A English Composition - 3 credits graded

Introduction to the methods of exposition: effective organization; fundamentals of paragraph development; the rhetorical forms of discourse (description, narration, exposition, etc.) WR 121 is the university requirement in English composition.
ED 199R  Special Studies/ Developmental Reading - 3 credits non-graded

A course designed for students who have difficulty with reading for meaning. Fostering self-confidence and a positive attitude toward reading are major focal points as well. This course is based on the research that supports the idea that the more you read the better a reader and writer you become. A celebration of differences is woven throughout the course.

ED 199S  Special Studies/College Reading - 3 credits non-graded

This course is designed to enable students to develop strategies for reading efficiently and flexibly in college. It is primarily a "how to" course for learning information from textbooks.

LS 199E  Critical Reading and Thinking - 3 credits graded

Designed to assist students to further develop reading skills and to emphasize the areas of critical reading and thinking. All students have the ability to think critically; the intent of this course is to direct this ability toward an academic way of thought. Competent writing is a secondary focus.

ED 103X  Methods of Study - 3 credits graded

Designed to assist students in developing good study habits, successful note-taking skills, examination expertise, use of the library and other campus resources. General orientation to the university and what is expected of students here.

SED 199M  College Arithmetic - 4 credits graded

An intensive review of the basic arithmetic operations including sections on percents, geometry and signed numbers. Math anxiety and ways to overcome it will be discussed. Recommended for the student who has been away from mathematics for several years.

Prerequisite:  appropriate placement score.
SED 199N Beginning Algebra - 4 credits graded

Designed to develop basic algebraic skills. Thoroughly covers linear equations in one variable and word problems dealing with them. Introductory material on graphing, polynomials, and factoring. Intended to prepare the student for MTH 100A. Prerequisite: passing grade in SED 199M or appropriate placement score.

MTH 100A Intermediate Algebra - 3 credits graded

Graphing systems of linear equations, quadratic equations, operations on rational expressions and fractional equations, graphing quadratics and systems of quadratic equations, fractional exponents, radicals and radical equations. Emphasis on applications of the above topics in various academic fields. Prerequisite: passing grade in SED 199N or appropriate placement score.

PSY 111A Personal Development - 3 credits non-graded

This course is designed to help students develop and increase knowledge and self-understanding by exploring their own feelings and those of others. Emphasis is placed on raising awareness of values, attitudes, motivations, interactions, and issues related to their current college experience. The class is taught using a discussion/interaction format and is highly recommended for freshmen.

ED 199C Introduction to Computers - 3 credits graded

This course is designed to introduce inexperienced users to computers, specifically the Apple IIGS. The focus will be on application: word processing, using the spelling and grammar checker, database, spreadsheet, and utilities. The purpose is to familiarize students with the uses and capabilities of computers for university studies.

ED 199D Mind Mapping - 3 credits graded

This course assists students who have alternate learning styles. It teaches a method of note-taking and organizing thought different from the traditional linear method of outlining and deals with concepts in a more holistic manner. Especially designed for student who have found traditional methods of organization frustrating.
ED 199M Advanced Mind Mapping – 3 credits graded

Develops further the ideas taught in Mind Mapping. Students adapt the method to content in other courses. Students map all their current courses with the assistance of the instructor.

LS 306A Project: Peer Counseling Techniques – 3 credits non-graded

This class is intended as an introduction to the counseling process and skills. Students will learn elementary principles of counseling and basic skills for good peer counseling. The class is open to students who show maturity and an interest in developing counseling skills.

LS 306B Project: Peer Counseling – 3 credits non-graded

This course offers field experience in peer counseling. The students serve as group leaders and peer counselors to increase understanding of some of their own thought processes and behaviors and their relationship to others. Open only to sophomores or above with instructor's approval.
Prerequisite: LS 306A.

ED 199W Multi-Cultural Awareness – 3 credits graded

Cross cultural communication and cultural awareness on both the theoretical and practical levels are the bases for this course. Students observe and attempt to understand alternate world views and the difficulties in communicating across cultural boundaries. Primary emphasis is on American ethnic minorities.

ED 406C African-American Issues – 3 credits graded

This class is a review of issues concerning African-Americans. Topics discussed include the following: the history of African-Americans, Civil Rights, social issues, economic issues, gender issues, education, careers.

LS 406 Projects/Co-op Ed Orientation – 3 credits graded

Designed to supply juniors and seniors with an awareness of employer/employee relations, interview techniques, resume, cover letter, and career decisions.
ED 199A  Special Studies:  Tutoring

Specially selected student volunteers meet individually with EOP students who need academic assistance with course work. Times arranged individually. This section for freshmen and sophomores.

ED 406B  Project:  Tutoring

As described above. Limited to juniors and seniors.
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APPENDIX E

IN-HOUSE EVALUATION FORMS
Oregon State University
Student Assessment of Teaching

Instructor's Name: [Blank]
Department: [Blank]
Course Number/Title: [Blank]
Section #: [Blank]
Date: [Blank]

This questionnaire gives you an opportunity to express your views of this course and the way it has been taught.

Section I: Information for Evaluating Teaching and for Improving Instruction. (Items 1-12)

(please fill-in the appropriate response, mark only one circle per question)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO BASIS FOR OPINION</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Course objectives and requirements were clearly presented to me.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Instructor was well prepared and organized.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Instructor explained the material clearly.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Instructor was sensitive to my/the class' ability to understand the material.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Instructor stimulated enthusiasm for the subject matter of the course.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Instructor provided scheduled office hours or was readily available for consultation with me.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The Instructor was fair and impartial in dealing with me.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The Instructor encouraged me to think for myself.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The examinations were relevant to the reading assignments and to the material presented in class.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The Instructor used good communication skills.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. As a result of having this Instructor, I have learned a significant number of new ideas and/or skills.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. All things considered, I was favorably impressed by this instructor.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section II: Demographics (Items 13-19)

Please fill-in one response circle for each of the following items which best describes your situation.

13. The reason you are enrolled in this course:
   - O It is required.
   - O It is an elective.

14. Grade you expect to receive in this course:
   - O A
   - O B
   - O C
   - O D
   - O F
   - O SAT/Pass
   - O UNSAT/No Pass
   - O Audit
   - O Other

15. Class status:
   - O Freshman
   - O Sophomore
   - O Junior
   - O Senior
   - O Graduate Student
   - O Other

16. Is this course in your major?
   - O Yes
   - O No

17. Percent of this class you attended:
   - O 0-20%
   - O 21-40%
   - O 41-60%
   - O 61-80%
   - O 81-100%

18. Overall grade point average:
   - O 0-1.49
   - O 1.50-1.99
   - O 2.00-2.49
   - O 2.50-2.99
   - O 3.00-3.49
   - O 3.50-4.00
   - O 1st Quarter Freshman

19. Sex:
   - O Male
   - O Female
## STUDENT ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

Educational Opportunities Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTOR'S NAME</th>
<th>COURSE NUMBER/TITLE</th>
<th>SECTION #</th>
<th>TERM (Circle one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Circle the number that represents your objective judgement of the course. Please include written comments on positive and negative aspects of the course. Your response is confidential. A summary of all student evaluations will be given to the instructor after your grades have been reported to the registrar.

1. Instructor's interest and enthusiasm for the course.
   - Poor
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5

2. Presentation of the course material.
   - Boring
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5

3. Instructor's openness to student's questions and ideas.
   - Unaware
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5

4. Use of examples/illustrations to clarify the material.
   - No Examples
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5

5. Instructor's helpfulness when students are having difficulty.
   - Not Helpful
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5

6. Instructor's sensitivity to students' cultural backgrounds, feelings and concerns.
   - Unaware
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5

7. Appropriateness of the assignments/readings for the course.
   - Not appropriate
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5

8. Effectiveness of class discussions to clarify the material.
   - Not helpful
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5

OVER
PLEASE COMMENT ON THE STRENGTHS OF THE COURSE AND/OR INSTRUCTOR.

HOW MIGHT THIS COURSE BE IMPROVED?
STAFF EVALUATION FORM

Person being evaluated: ____________________________  Position held: ____________________________

Evaluated by: ____________________________  Date: ____________________________

Rating Scale

N/A - Does not apply or insufficient information.
5 - Excellent: Usually goes beyond what is expected, outstanding.
4 - Above Average: Often goes beyond what is expected.
3 - Average: Is generally satisfactory and competent - meets basic requirements.
2 - Below Average: Often does not meet basic requirements - needs to improve.
1 - Poor: Needs substantial help to meet requirements.

COMMUNICATION AND GENERAL SKILLS REQUIRED BY ALL EMPLOYEES

The person being evaluated:

___ a) maintains working rapport with other staff
___ b) is approachable when other staff member(s) would like to discuss a concern
___ c) responds to other staff members' concerns
___ d) shows respect for other staff members' points of view
___ e) effectively communicates relevant information and materials to appropriate staff members and students
___ f) maintains confidentiality when appropriate
___ g) treats all staff members and students impartially; i.e., free from discrimination based on race, age, religion, sex, color, national origin, sexual orientation, veteran's status, or disability.

Comments:

revised 05/25/90
INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS

The person being evaluated:

a) is interested and enthusiastic about the subject

b) presents subject matter clearly

c) effectively communicates information and its relevance

d) is well-prepared and organized in the classroom

e) stimulates the students to think in critical and creative ways

f) stimulates interest and enthusiasm about the subject matter in the student

g) encourages and facilitates student responsibility for learning

h) is clear and unambiguous about goals and expectations

i) is fair and impartial with students

j) is available during office hours to discuss students' concerns or has made other arrangements

k) creates an atmosphere both inside and outside the classroom in which the student feels comfortable in asking questions, obtaining assistance, and in expressing disagreement and ideas

l) is sensitive to cultural differences in learning styles

m) plans and provides instructional activities for the Program(s)

n) plans for instruction; arranging for the proper instructional materials and facilities to be available

o) plans and implements enrichment activities for students

Comments:

revised 5/21/90
COUNSELING SKILLS

The person being evaluated:

a) is able to assess student needs and desires
b) takes appropriate action in response to student needs and desires
c) effectively communicates relevant information and materials to students
d) assists students in setting realistic standards and goals
e) maintains appropriate contact with students throughout the term
f) is available during scheduled office hours or has made other arrangements
g) maintains confidentiality of students

Comments:

revised 5/21/90
EXTRA-PROGRAM ACTIVITIES AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

The person being evaluated:

1. has participated in the following professional and educational organizations:

2. has participated in the following professional or community activities:

3. in the above listed Program(s) or activities, has made the following contributions:

4. has demonstrated an awareness of the current trends and necessary skills related to the staff member's areas of responsibility in the following areas:

5. List any honors, awards or recognitions received during the past year. Attach copies of any letters, articles or other material which may be pertinent to this evaluation.

revised 5/21/90
SUPERVISORY EVALUATION FORM

Person being evaluated: ________________________________ Position held: ________________________________

Rating Scale

N/A - Does not apply or insufficient information.
5 - Excellent: Usually goes beyond what is expected, outstanding.
4 - Above Average: Often goes beyond what is expected.
3 - Average: Is generally satisfactory and competent - meets basic requirements.
2 - Below Average: Often does not meet basic requirements - needs to improve.
1 - Poor: Needs substantial help to meet requirements.

STUDENT SERVICES

The person being evaluated:

____ a) has rapport with and concern for students
____ b) is able to assess student needs and desires
____ c) takes appropriate action in response to student needs and desires
____ d) effectively communicates relevant information and materials to students
____ e) assists students in setting realistic standards and goals
____ f) is sensitive to cultural differences

Comments:

revised 5/21/90
COMMUNICATION SKILLS

The person being evaluated:

- a) maintains rapport with staff
- b) is approachable when staff member(s) would like to discuss a concern
- c) responds to staff members' concerns
- d) shows respect for staff members' points of view
- e) maintains confidentiality when appropriate
- f) facilitates communication among staff members
- g) is clear and unambiguous about goals and expectations
- h) clearly and effectively conveys information and directions to staff
- i) is available or can be reached within a reasonable time for job related concerns
- j) treats all staff members and students impartially; i.e., free from discrimination based on race, age, religion, sex, color, national origin, sexual orientation, veteran's status, or disability.

Comments:

LEADERSHIP SKILLS

The person being evaluated:

- a) inspires confidence
- b) has earned respect
- c) is dependable and conscientious in fulfilling obligations
- d) anticipates program(s) needs and actively pursues methods of improving the program(s)
- e) is well informed on the scope of knowledge required for assigned responsibilities
- f) is aware of the current trends in the profession related to the staff members' areas of responsibility and relays pertinent information to staff

revised 05/25/90
Leadership Skills - continued...

__g__) provides effective instruction (formal or informal) to improve the professional competence of staff members

__h__) trains or provides opportunities for staff members to learn to handle some supervisory functions

__i__) challenges staff to grow by encouraging participation in activities not directly related to daily responsibilities

Comments:

Please write any additional comments in the following section:

revised 05/24/90
PEER OBSERVATION/FEEDBACK
Educational Opportunities Program

- Preparedness for class:

- Organization of course material:

- Enthusiasm for subject:

- Presentation (tone of voice, clarity, opening, closing):

- Explanation of relevance of material:

- Effective use of audio-visual aids:

- Strategies used to get students to think critically:

- Student interaction opportunities (eg: questions), amount of time, and participation:

(over)
- Awareness of student needs (learning styles, difficulties, challenges, cultural orientation, etc.):

- Amount of positive reinforcers:

- Question/Answer response time:

- Classroom management skills:

- Strengths of class:

- Weaknesses of class:

- Recommendations/suggestions for improvement:

- Other Comments:
APPENDIX F

INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
Instructional Staff Interview

1. What is your teaching status?
   Faculty ____ FTE ____
   GTA ____ FTE ____
   Percent of FTE that is instruction ____

2. How long have you been teaching courses in EOP? ____

3. What class(es) are you teaching or have you taught in EOP?

4. What degree(s) do you have?
   BA/BS ____ In what field(s)? ________________
   MS/MED/MS ____ In what field(s)? ________________
   PHD ____ In what field(s)? ________________

5. Had you taught before you began teaching in EOP?
   No ____    Yes ____
   If yes, for how long, ________________________________
   in what subject(s)? ________________________________
   at what level(s)? ________________________________

6. What course(s), if any, have you taken in teacher education?

7. Did you develop the course(s) you teach yourself, or are you basically following a format established by a department requirement or by a previous instructor?
8. If you inherited the course(s) from another instructor,
   a. have you modified the course(s) to match you own teaching style?
      No _____ Yes _____
      If so, how?

   b. have you adjusted the content of the course(s)?
      No _____ Yes _____
      If so, how?

9. How would you describe your teaching style? What method of delivery do you find most effective?

10. What do you think is the primary goal of the course(s) you teach?
11. Is there anything built into your course that allows students to be successful,
   a. in your course? No ____  Yes ____
      If so, what?
   b. in their subsequent university coursework?
      No ____  Yes ____
      If so what?

12. Do you attempt to coordinate your course(s) with,
   a. other EOP courses? No ____  Yes ____
      If so, which course, in what way(s), how often, and with whom?
   b. other non-EOP courses? No ____  Yes ____
      If so, which course, in what way(s), how often, and with whom?
13. What professional journals do you read regularly?

What conferences have you attended recently?

14. How and/or why did you get involved in developmental education?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION
APPENDIX G

FREQUENCY HISTOGRAMS
CLASS 21 -- ED 199A

CLASS 22 -- ED 406B
APPENDIX H

RESULTS OF ANOVA
Table 18
Results of ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation Level</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Sign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Effects</td>
<td>5.9166667</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.5378788</td>
<td>1.461</td>
<td>.2103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>1.4166667</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4722222</td>
<td>1.283</td>
<td>.3028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>8.8333333</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.3680556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Corr.)</td>
<td>14.750000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Coefficient

\[ r = \frac{\text{Mean square of respondents} - \text{Mean square of residual}}{\text{Mean square of respondents}} \]

\[ r = \frac{.5625000 - .3680556}{.5625000} = \frac{.19444}{.56250} \]

\[ r = .34568 = .34 \]
APPENDIX I

RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO INSTRUMENT
1. The following is a list of classes provided by EOP. For each item, please indicate whether or not you have taken the class and for those classes you have taken also indicate if you feel it was very useful to you in your subsequent university coursework, somewhat useful, not too useful or not at all useful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Take Class?</th>
<th>If yes, was it:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Circle)</td>
<td>(Circle one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART I**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. WR 112 - Standard Written English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. WR 113 - Standard Written English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. WR 115 - Introduction to Expository Writing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. WR 121A - English Composition (EOP Section Only)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART II**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ED 199R - Special Studies/Developmental Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ED 199S - Special Studies/College Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. LS 199E - Critical Reading and Thinking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART III**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. SED 199M - College Arithmetic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. SED 199N - Beginning Algebra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. MTH 100A - Intermediate Algebra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please turn the page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Take Class? (Circle)</th>
<th>If yes, was it: (Circle one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO  YES</td>
<td>USEFUL  USEFUL  USEFUL  USEFUL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART IV**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What other classes would have been helpful?

(GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE)
3. What is your academic classification at OSU?

1. SOPHOMORE
2. JUNIOR
3. SENIOR
4. POST BAC
-5. GRADUATE

----- 2A. What is the degree(s) you have received from OSU - BS, BA, BFA, PhD, etc)

DEGREE(S) ____________________

4. How many years, altogether, have you attended OSU? (Circle one number)

1. LESS THAN 2 YEARS
2. TWO TO THREE YEARS
3. THREE TO FOUR YEARS
4. MORE THAN FOUR YEARS

5. Please indicate your major school or college at OSU. (Circle one number)

01. LIBERAL ARTS
02. ENGINEERING
03. BUSINESS
04. SCIENCE
05. EDUCATION
06. HOME ECONOMICS
07. HEALTH AND HUMAN PERFORMANCE
08. AGRICULTURE
09. FORESTRY
10. PHARMACY
11. OTHER (Specify _________________________)

5. With which of the following ethnic groups do you identify? (Circle one number)

1. ASIAN-AMERICAN
2. BLACK
3. CAUCASIAN
4. HISPANIC
5. NATIVE AMERICAN
6. OTHER (Specify _________________________)

(PLEASE TURN THE PAGE)
7. And, what is your age? (Circle one number)

1 UNDER 20
2 20 TO 22
3 23 TO 25
4 26 TO 30
5 31 TO 40
6 OVER 40

8. Is there anything else you would like to say about your experience with classes provided by EOP?