

D378
C 34.35
1975

A STATE-WIDE COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PLAN FOR
ALABAMA JUNIOR COLLEGES: A STUDY

by

ARTHUR GENE CRAGO

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Area
of Administration and Higher Education
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

UNIVERSITY, ALABAMA

1975

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research for this study has involved many persons at all levels of education. To Dr. George Layton, President of Jefferson State Junior College, I acknowledge a debt of gratitude for his interest, time, and valuable advice in arranging the information into workable data.

It is with sincere appreciation that I thank Dr. David Masoner, whose patience and efforts assisted in completing this project, and Dr. John Seymour and Dr. Gary Stock, who gave their time, support, and advice during the initial phase of this research. Appreciation is also expressed to the other members of my committee: Dr. Robert T. Anderson, Dr. J. Vernon Blackburn, and Dr. Bernard Sloan.

Special gratitude is given to my parents, Arthur and Carrie Crago, for instilling in me the desire to advance in the educational field.

Finally, to my son, Chuck, and his wife, Marcia, for their encouragement--and to my wife, Maxine, for the sacrifice, love, understanding, and assistance during this educational pursuit, I dedicate the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Significance of the Problem	6
Review of the Literature	7
Definition of Terms	21
Limitations of the Study	23
Organization of the Study	23
II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	25
Preliminary Procedures	26
Respondents and Procedures	27
The Instrument	29
Reception of Questionnaire	32
III. FINDINGS	33
Preliminary Inquiry	33
Primary Instrument	34
Basic Institutional Data	35
Institutional size and type	35
Professional personnel	37
Student enrollment--cooperative education programs	38
Coordinator/student load	43
Title of chief personnel officer	44
Cooperative education options	44

Chapter	Page
Organizational Policies	44
Registration and scheduling	44
Advisory committees	45
Student contracts	45
Coordinator qualifications	46
Credit	46
State reports	47
Special recognition	47
State-wide Programs	47
Educational options	47
Benefits	48
Type of organization	48
Administrative operation and placement	48
Funding Patterns--Present and Future	49
Institutional cooperative education programs	49
Prospective state-wide program funding	50
Release time--state-wide organization	50
Business community--financial support	51
Present institutional funding	53
Future institutional funding	53
Cooperative education fees	53
Assistance from a State-wide Program	55
Areas of interest	55
Feedback of information to the respondents	55
 IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	 57
Analysis of Data	57
Summary of the Findings	65
Recommendations	68

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY	70
Purpose of the Study	70
Procedures	70
Conclusions	71
REFERENCE NOTES	73
REFERENCES	75
APPENDIX A PRELIMINARY LETTER	79
APPENDIX B LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT	81
APPENDIX C QUESTIONNAIRE	83
APPENDIX D COVER LETTER	90
APPENDIX E FOLLOW-UP LETTER	92

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Enrollment of Responding Institutions	36
2. Enrollment of 2-Year Colleges	37
3. Number of Cooperative Education Professional Personnel	38
4. Enrollment of Co-op Students by Institution .	39
5. Percentage of Student Population in Cooperative Education Programs	41
6. Ratio of Coordinator/Student Load	43
7. Future Funding	50
8. Prospective Financial Support of a State-wide Program	51
9. Release Time for a State-wide Program	52
10. Business Community Financial Support of State-wide Cooperative Education Programs .	52
11. Student Fee During Cooperative Education Assignment	54
12. Benefits from a State-wide Organization . . .	56

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Cooperative education is so named because it is dependent upon the cooperation of outside agencies and educators in combination to form a superior, total, educational program for the students (Wooldridge, Note 1). The cooperative education procedure is a system whereby the student receives practical experience by working with business and industry to reinforce what is learned in the classroom. In a program of this type, the student attends school for a specific length of time and then is placed on a job for a period of practical experience that is related to his area of study. The program has an interrelated experience between work and study, carefully planned and supervised, to provide optimum educational results for the student involved (Collins, 1970).

The University of Cincinnati introduced the idea of cooperative education as a formalized procedure in 1906. The original experiment was with the engineering

department of the University in conjunction with Cincinnati Milacron, a large manufacturing concern (Robinson, 1969). This type of learning situation proved successful and led to the development of other programs throughout the United States (Bonnell, 1964).

Miller asserted that career educational experience should be a part of the learning process as it gives some practical aspects to the educational development of the student. The objectives of this type experience are to give the student the opportunity to work with others in his field and to acquaint him with practical knowledge of the business world. It is theorized that this function in education provides a more well-rounded curriculum (Miller, 1973).

In 1961, there were 65 cooperative education programs in the United States. During the past decade, cooperative education grew very rapidly with 576 programs reported in 1974 (Cooperative Education Directory, 1974). Considering the rapid growth in this field, it appeared that there was a need for coordination of these programs on the national and state level.

Businesses that were involved in the cooperative education programs see it as an excellent method of

recruiting and training qualified students before graduation (Editorial Panorama, 1971). There was a feeling that the classroom situation left a gap between the classroom and the work situation. Some of the student's idealism may be brought into better focus through practical experience and can be a real benefit to him when he returns to the classroom. In addition, students bring a fresh inquisitiveness to their assignments that may challenge their supervisor (Saunders, 1971).

According to Dawson, the basic procedure of cooperative education has been alternating periods of work and study. In recent years many institutions, led by the community colleges and smaller 4-year colleges, have been altering this work sequence to suit their particular situation and locality. Educational systems have to move at least with, if not ahead of, a society which is changing from a predominantly industrial phase to one in which the emphasis is on broader aspects of productive life, such as human services, environmental improvement, civic participation, and cultural activities (Dawson, 1971).

Statement of the Problem

At the time of this study, a number of junior colleges in Alabama were in various stages of planning or implementing a cooperative education program. There was a lack of coordination to make this a joint effort on the part of the institutions involved and little leadership to assist in this program at the state level.

Wilson (1971) stressed the fact that departments of education and the federal government are strongly encouraging cooperative arrangements among colleges and universities. Such arrangements make for better economy and provide greater opportunities for more students. It was further stated that the vehicle of cooperation can be as simple as two institutions agreeing to offer particular courses to students but a state-wide network seemed more feasible (Knowles, 1972).

The project was discussed with the past president of the National Cooperative Education Association and enthusiasm was expressed regarding the study (Vandegrift, Note 2). The Director of Cooperative Education at Auburn University further stated that his office and files would be open at any time and that all assistance would be offered to further the study. Various institutions within

the state offered encouragement but there was no organized arrangement for the exchange of information.

In January, 1974, a meeting of cooperative education coordinators in Alabama was held to discuss forming a state-wide organization. Officers were elected and the researcher was requested to assume the responsibility of exploring problems confronting junior college programs.

This study will attempt to answer the following broad general questions: What types of information concerning cooperative education could be exchanged between colleges for more effective programs? Should there be a formal or informal type of organization? Could funds be obtained to defray the expense of a coordinated program? If so, how might these funds be obtained?

More precisely stated, the purposes of this study were as follows:

1. To survey cooperative education programs of other states and ascertain the types of functions that are considered desirable for a successful state-wide program.

2. To explore methods of obtaining funds for the operation of a state-wide program in Alabama.

3. To make recommendations, based on the research, that will give direction in organizing a state-wide program for Alabama Community Colleges in line with present state and institutional policies.

Significance of the Problem

The study may be of value in the following ways:

1. The data could be used as a guide for a state-wide cooperative education program in Alabama.

2. This study could have a positive effect on colleges and employers and increase job opportunities for more students.

3. By using the data for comparison purposes, some problems of individual institutions may be exposed, and these problems may be partially alleviated through aid from other interested institutions.

4. The information derived from various persons, agencies, and research could give good indications as to whether a formal or informal organization should be formed.

5. By presenting organized information regarding the cooperative education programs, more state agencies may be encouraged to participate in this area.

6. This study could uncover some possible methods of obtaining funds for individual programs and for a state-wide program.

Review of the Literature

In a study under the auspices of the National Commission for Cooperative Education (Tyler, Note 3), the following conclusions were drawn regarding cooperative education as an important instructional asset:

1. By coordinating work experience with the classroom experience, theory and practice are more closely related.

2. The coordination of work and study increases the student's motivation and enables him to see more relevance between the classroom and real life situations.

3. For many students work experience contributes to a greater sense of responsibility, greater dependence upon their own judgment, and a more rapid development of maturity.

4. The work experiences involve the student with co-workers who come from a variety of backgrounds. This could help students develop a deeper understanding of other people and greater skills in human relations. This

study by Tyler found that this is a valuable contributing factor to the cooperative education program.

5. Cooperative education provides the student with an opportunity to explore occupations in which he is interested and to determine the potential and qualifications required in his field. This also gives the student an opportunity to test his aptitudes more fully than is normally possible on the campus.

6. From the standpoint of the state and the nation, with its increasing need for well educated people in science, engineering, business, and other professions, cooperative education has value in making higher education possible and attractive to more young people.

7. As the cooperative education coordinators communicate with personnel in business and industry, and as students rotate between college and work, faculty are more able to keep abreast of the needs of the business community. This increased awareness should have an impact in such areas as curriculum planning and new methods of teaching.

In addition to the above stated factors, cooperative education furnishes contacts useful in later occupational placement. For many it gives a headstart in salary

and position when they enter full-time employment (Tyler, Note 3). Business and industrial leaders have been active in urging more colleges and universities to adopt cooperative education. The Ford Foundation and other large corporations have supported cooperative education by furnishing financial resources to the National Commission for Cooperative Education (Dawson, 1971).

Over 100,000 students were involved in cooperative education programs in 1971, and earned over \$220,000,000 during the work phases of their programs (Dawson, 1971). Some colleges, such as Wilberforce College in Ohio and Northeastern University in Boston, had programs in which all students were enrolled in a cooperative education sequence. Most colleges, however, have utilized cooperative education as an elective program (Wilson & Lyons, 1961).

In recent years, the United States Government has become involved in this phase of education. Some authors looked upon the Morrell Act of 1862 as the origin of the cooperative education type of study, but the first formal act by the government was the Vocational Act of 1963, whereby the federal government provided part of the salaries for coordinators of industrial-educational

activities (Burt, 1969). Federal backing of cooperative education dates to 1965 with the passage of the Higher Education Act. By 1968, 12 institutions were funded with \$200,000. These funds were appropriated under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965. In 1968, Title IV was amended to Title IV-D for planning, implementation, expansion, and strengthening programs in cooperative education (Wilson, 1971). By the fiscal year 1973, \$10,000,000 had been appropriated for this program with over 1,100 institutions submitting proposals.

Heerman (1973) expressed the view that comprehensive cooperative education, designed for the unique philosophical, functional, and organizational perimeters of the community college, was the single best hope for intensifying the "community" aspects of their programs. Cooperative education and community college educators endeavored to allocate their resources in order to provide this type of education.

Heerman (1973) further stated that there were six considerations that community college educators must study if they were to be successful in this area:

1. To fashion a type of cooperative education

program suited to that distinctive educational mission of the community college.

2. To foster a revitalized concept and full cooperation of the employer in relation to the entire educational mission of community colleges.

3. To gain commitment of college administrators and cooperative education personnel towards expanding cooperative education to all areas of the academic program.

4. To implement a methodology in cooperative education which fosters a student or product orientation as opposed to the process orientation.

5. To carry out a systematic research effort to measure the success with which the cooperative effort supplies educational values to the student.

6. To give careful thought to cooperative education's pertinent relationship to the philosophy of the community college concept.

The Carnegie (1971) report stressed that colleges should break the present pattern of attendance, eliminating the lock-step process. Students entering college should have experiences outside formal education which would strengthen their motivation and increase their ability

to choose relevant courses of instruction (Carnegie, 1971). Through programs such as cooperative education, it has been found that these experiences can be utilized to give students a total concept of the educational procedure.

Educational institutions have not been inventive in relating studies to experience or thought to action. The result could be frustration, apathy, or even revulsion on the part of good students. There is an excitement, an important feedback, that comes from actually seeing and experiencing the relevance of intellectual exercise (Perkins, 1972). The business community has for many years seen the relevance of relating the theory to the practice. For this reason most businesses have a training program for students after they have obtained a 4-year degree. Educational institutions can learn from their experiences and expand their operations in this direction.

New directions in educational philosophies contend that all kinds of experiences are of equal educational value, and that recognition of the value of off-campus learning does not necessarily debase the value of academic credit. In reply to the conventional doubts of this type of study, one might reply that science education only

became effective with the institution of laboratories for experiential education, and that medical education came to depend to an equal degree on clinical experience (Ritterbush, 1972).

By involving the community, an increased use of college facilities can be realized. In most cases, the co-op concept has excellent community support, and such support may assist the college in obtaining new or retaining present resources (Sullins, Note 4). The favorable feedback to colleges by the employers at all levels has been much greater than expected.

According to Lynch (Note 5), the National Education Association now supported work experience and cooperative education programs. Even the prestigious Phi Delta Kappa organization was giving this whole area of work and work ethics a second look, which indicated a major change in attitudes among educators. Lynch stated that a recent report from the American Council on Education said it even better:

We feel that all students before terminating their formal education--whether such education be terminated during high school, during post-secondary vocational or academic education, college, or at the conclusion of an advanced graduate degree--should be employed in an

occupational area related to their interests and abilities and that such employment ought to be planned and supervised by the educational institution and the business/industrial sector of society. (Note 5)

Stull (Note 6) stated there were two basic approaches that must be considered if a cooperative education program were to become an effective part of the program. These are:

1. Working with employers to develop individually tailored in-firm training programs/activities for cooperative education students.

2. Utilizing learning objectives (stated in behavioral or measurable terms) for cooperative education students.

Stull further stated the first of these two approaches required that the cooperative education coordinator be able to adapt or modify existing in-firm training programs to the college's cooperative education program, or that he develop, in consort with the employer, an on-the-job training program suitable to the needs of the cooperative education students. Many large national firms have extensive in-firm programs already established and operational which parallel cooperative education programs. Most small firms, however, do not have any

form of in-firm formalized training programs. The cooperative education coordinator must, under these conditions, become the facilitating factor in the development of a program appropriate to the needs of the firm and the student.

The second approach, as stated by Stull, is basically an individualized program in which the student, the employer, and the coordinator establish behaviorally stated goals. The coordinator's role is primarily one of assisting the student and the employer to arrive at stated objectives which are valuable, realistic, and measurable. By having these objectives stated, the evaluation at the end of the work quarter can then be based on them to ascertain the effectiveness of the program and the extent to which the student accomplished the goal.

According to a study by Callahan and Gilmore (1974), industry has long been concerned because students were often trained on obsolete equipment. On the other hand, colleges can not afford to upgrade expensive equipment frequently. Cooperative education programs have addressed themselves to this valid concern by having its students gain experience on the most up-to-date equipment in industry. For example, engineering students have

received classroom instruction and laboratory experience on campus, followed by a semester of work at the National Aeronautics Space Administration (NASA) facilities. Here they have been able to work with a variety of aircraft and fuels in the most advanced facilities in the world.

A study by Tyler (1960) of the educational effectiveness of cooperative education was financed by the Edison Foundation. The conclusion drawn from the study was that there would be increased needs in the years ahead for well educated people in science, technology, business, and other professions. The first recommendation of the study was to extend cooperation education since this program increases student motivation, helps the student to find more meaning in his school studies, attracts more able young people into higher education, and enables more of them to go to college. This program is especially attractive to the lower socioeconomic level student, since with this program he can earn money to help with his college expenses. The shift from the classroom during one term to a work situation during another term was felt by the student to be an advantage and not a disadvantage. The study found that business and

industry were very strongly in favor of enlarging this aspect of education.

A recent development in education has been the implementation of the first-year teacher pilot programs which were established to assist beginning teachers to become more successful during their early years of classroom experience (Brown, 1973). Since this pilot program was considered effective in improving teachers who are new in the field, it appears that another step would be to use cooperative education students who are majoring in education in the classrooms. This could be in conjunction with the teacher-aide program which has already been established in this state.

A study of the cooperative education program at the Langley Research Center (Jarrell, 1970) showed that cooperative education students had the following distinctions:

1. An initial advantage in promotion.
2. Earned a higher graduate degree more often.
3. Had a strikingly lower turnover rate after becoming a permanent employee.
4. Received more awards.

In a report by Moore (1968) from the U.S. Government Printing Office, it was stated that educators in America have always been interested in institutional organization, but in the past the emphasis has been on a particular function and not with the institution as a whole. In the last few years, new types of partnerships or consortia have emerged with the emphasis being placed upon total educational programs. These arrangements emerged for the purpose of promoting educational improvement through increased managerial effectiveness. This report further stated that cooperative arrangements should emphasize excellence and efficiency. There are four common objectives and advantages, which are:

1. To present a united front. In many cases organizations such as Alabama Education Association and National Education Association can accomplish a great deal working as a united group. Unification has appeal in that it amplifies and unites independent voices and thereby commands much greater attention.

2. To provide new opportunities. When a number of institutions are involved in working toward a common goal each institution can use its specialty to assist others. This dove-tailing effect can be effective and

beneficial for the students and the institutions involved.

3. To save. Much emphasis is being placed upon improving the services and the efficiency of institutions of higher education by lessening duplications or wasteful competition.

4. To experiment and innovate. Education is being forced into becoming a primary leader in the methodology of instruction. It is possible to learn from other institutions and individuals and to enlarge upon what they have been doing on behalf of the student and education in general. Each institution can also serve as a potential stimulus to other member institutions.

According to the Carnegie Commission Reports (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1971), outside experiences relating to the classroom experience are of importance. By joining the theory with the practical, both become more meaningful for the individual. It was also stated in this report that it was unfair to the student to separate him from the world of reality or the world of work, as this removes him from many of his fellow citizens. It was found that many institutions were not giving enough options to the student and were

not giving formal recognition for the work accomplished outside the classroom. The authors of this report maintained that education should be an integral part of the life of the student and not an isolated sector separated from the world in which he lives.

According to Hughes (1970), an educational cooperative is not an arrangement which is imposed upon an institution but is an arrangement that is created by the institutions. It can exist as a voluntary system for the exchange of information. Each institution maintains its independence and autonomy, yet at the same time acts as a catalyst for innovation and improvement in education.

In reviewing the Health, Education, and Welfare list of funded schools, it was found that most Alabama junior college cooperative education programs were funded under the Higher Education Act of 1965, which was amended in 1968 to include Title IV, Part D, for training and research in cooperative education. According to the procedures manual for this program, the maximum time of federal funding is 3 years. It was essential that long-range planning to obtain funds take place to assure the

continuance of the programs at the end of the 3-year period.

The state of Florida had "front-end" funding for cooperative education programs at the four-year college level (Lucas, Note 7). The legislative action did not include special funding for community college programs.

New Jersey, at the time of this research, had a bill before the state legislature for direct funding of cooperative education programs at all levels (Pratt, Note 8).

There was a need to study the possibilities of direct funding for cooperative education in this state. Rules, regulations, and procedures were studied and discussed so that long-range planning could be initiated (Layton, Note 9).

Definition of Terms

1. Co-op--a term meaning the cooperative education concept which could be used when referring to a student, program, or job.

2. Alternating Plan--a study-work schedule whereby the student is in a classroom situation as a full-time student and then on a work assignment.

3. Parallel Plan--a study-work schedule whereby the student will attend school and work in a career related job during the same term, such as a half-day in school and a half-day working. Sometimes referred to as extended day schedule.

4. Extended Day Schedule--see Parallel Plan.

5. Cooperative Education--any arrangement involving an educational institution, a business, and a student.

6. State-wide Cooperative Education Program--any coordinated effort by the institutions of a state to further the goals of individual cooperative education programs.

7. Add-on-credit--credit given for work experience that is separate from the academic credit needed for graduation.

8. Equivalent Credit--synonym for add-on-credit.

9. Academic Credit--credit given for work experience that is counted as required credits for graduation.

10. Coordinator--an institutional staff member that works with students, businesses, and the institution

to arrange suitable study-work slots and periods for the student.

11. Front-end Funding--funding at the state level for special programs.

12. Slot--positions with businesses or industries that are filled by a cooperative education student.

Limitations of the Study

This program will be limited as follows:

1. This study should not be considered as producing a complete guide for establishing a state-wide program.

2. Since only one state had an established state-wide program and this only at the university level, there has been a necessity to rely to a great extent on personal responses of individuals.

3. Needs, procedures, regulations, and laws vary from state to state; hence, an organization in Alabama can not and should not be a duplicate of another organization.

Organization of the Study

This study consists of five chapters.

Chapter I serves as an introduction to the study,

statement of the problem, significance of the problem, review of the literature, definition of terms, limitations of the study, and the organization of the study.

Chapter II reports the design and approach taken to obtain information necessary for the completion of the study.

Chapter III presents the findings and the analysis of the collected data.

Chapter IV is the discussion, conclusions, and recommendations derived from the research.

Chapter V contains the summary.

CHAPTER II

Research Methodology

The first step to ascertaining previous developments in state-wide cooperative education associations was to survey programs in the various states. Many institutions, especially 4-year schools, have had a cooperative education program for many years but each has worked within its individual institutional structures without any organized effort to cooperate in other programs. The recent rapid growth of this program has demanded, or at least encouraged, that there be intercommunication among programs.

The community colleges have been in more need of a coordinated effort in cooperative education since most 4-year schools have had the program in operation for many years and problems such as funding, evaluation, granting of credit, and administrative procedures are well established. Since the funding patterns and administrative procedures were different, the community colleges

were not able to proceed in the same path that had been established by the senior colleges. Therefore, guidance from these sources was limited.

Preliminary Procedures

To determine if any state had an established working state program, letters of inquiry were sent to 44 states that had operational cooperative education programs (Appendix A). These letters were not sent to all states as some of the western, sparsely populated states had only one or two small programs. The correspondence was with schools that had prominent cooperative education programs as these institutions would offer the most leadership if a state organization were in operation. The programs were selected with the assistance of the National Cooperative Education Association office, the Journal of Cooperative Education, and the Handbook of Cooperative Education (Chase, 1972). The researcher contacted national officers and individuals who were leaders in the field and their help was utilized. There were 33 responses to the preliminary letter.

Inquiries were also made of the Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) office in Washington, D.C., and the

Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) Clearing House for Junior Colleges in California.

Respondents and Procedures

Information was obtained that would be helpful in establishing an effective state-wide program for Alabama. It was the desire of the researcher that this be a practical study that could be used as a guide for future procedures for the community colleges of this state. A sensitive approach in doing the research could prove advantageous in future planning.

Discussions were held with leaders in the Alabama community college system to obtain advice on proper procedures. It was their opinion that a detailed questionnaire be used and it was further suggested that this instrument be sent to prominent program directors and leaders outside the state of Alabama. It was believed that this would add credibility and prestige to the research when state organizational procedures are initiated.

The National Cooperative Education Association was interested and active in assisting persons involved in studies that would further the cooperative education

concept. The study had the sanction and endorsement of that organization (Appendix B), as the findings might be of value to other states that were considering state-wide programs. This organization was especially interested in information that would assist and give guidance to the community college sector of cooperative education.

A detailed questionnaire was prepared for dissemination to 50 individuals with the most outstanding programs in the southeastern section of the United States. Community colleges, 4-year colleges and universities, and prominent educational leaders were included in the research to obtain a broad base of information.

Individual items on the instrument were discussed with Alabama community college leaders to determine if they were legitimate questions and would be of primary importance in future planning.

To aid in determining the utilitarianism of the instrument, the pilot technique was used to involve persons in three other states. The participants were representative of the various levels of authority and responsibility and included a state cooperative education director, a university coordinator, and a community college coordinator. The responses to the pilot were

favorable and the respondents believed that the items were pertinent and appropriate to obtain a broad base of information for this study and for making recommendations to appropriate state officials. Suggestions made by the pilot personnel were incorporated in the final copy of the instrument.

The Instrument

A questionnaire (Appendix C) was prepared, tested, and mailed to persons who could furnish information pertinent to the study. The instrument was prepared, designed, and printed to get maximum response. Clarity and simplicity of the response items were given primary consideration as this was considered essential for maximum response.

For reasons of explanation, a cover letter (Appendix D) was attached to each questionnaire. The letter stated the importance of the study for all levels of cooperative education and stated that the research had the endorsement of the National Cooperative Education Association.

A second letter was sent 3 weeks after the initial mailing to those persons who had not responded. A second

questionnaire was sent with the follow-up letter (Appendix E).

The questionnaire was composed of five basic categories with a number of questions under each heading. The first section served to obtain basic data regarding the institution of the respondent. Information was also obtained in regard to certain policies in force at the institution.

The second section concerned current organizational procedures being utilized in the operation of the individual cooperative education programs. The areas of inquiry included: class scheduling, types of credit granted, qualification of the cooperative education director, and the type of special recognition given the co-op student.

The third section included questions regarding state-wide cooperative education programs. For some of the respondents the answers were of an opinion nature as most had no such program in operation in their state. Areas surveyed were: value of a state-wide program, type of structure for such a program, and the placement of leadership for the program.

The fourth section consisted of questions on funding for individual programs and state programs. Specifically, information was sought on: sources of funding support, released time concept, present funding patterns, future funding patterns, and funds derived from students on the cooperative education programs.

The fifth and final section provided an opportunity for the respondents to express their opinions regarding state-wide programs. This was accomplished by listing areas of concern and asking the respondent to rank (1, 2, or 3) them in the order that would be most applicable to a state system.

There were 42 items on the questionnaire with options for individual comments. The selection of items was determined from the review of the literature, knowledge of problems confronting cooperative education programs, and discussions with local educational leaders.

Many cooperative education personnel were interested in the results of this survey as an aid in their organizational efforts. Assurance was given that the respondents and national office would be furnished with the results and conclusions of this questionnaire.

Reception of Questionnaire

Sharing of knowledge is of paramount importance in any educational study. Procedures for receiving the questionnaires were established to assure that the respondents received the results of the instrument without delay. As each returned questionnaire was received by the researcher, an envelope was typed and filed. In this way, no person or institution would be neglected and the results could be returned immediately upon receipt and tabulation of the instrument items by the researcher.

CHAPTER III

Findings

Preliminary Inquiry

This chapter includes the findings and analysis of the preliminary letter of inquiry and the findings of the primary instrument.

The results of the letter of inquiry regarding state-wide programs showed that one state, Florida, had a firmly established cooperative education organization. A state director, who was located in the capital city, was employed for that organization.

New Jersey had a consortium of a few colleges and was in the process of making it a comprehensive grouping involving all institutions in the state.

Pennsylvania, Tennessee, North Carolina, North Dakota, and Illinois were in various stages of planning during the 1974-75 school year.

However, none of the states, including Florida, was placing emphasis on the community college segment of education.

Primary Instrument

The items utilized in the questionnaire were derived from personal knowledge of the researcher concerning problems confronting Alabama junior colleges. Discussions were held with cooperative education colleges and other state educators. Additional information was derived from correspondence and conversations with cooperative education leaders at the national level.

Upon receipt of the questionnaires that were submitted to a pilot group, the final instrument was prepared. The suggestions made by the pilot respondents were considered in the preparation of the final instrument.

Fifty questionnaires were sent to cooperative education personnel with 37 responses (74%).

There are five major parts or categories in this chapter. The headings of these sections are: (a) institutional data derived from the colleges involved in the research, (b) basic organizational policies in force at these institutions, (c) analysis of opinions on state-wide organizations, (d) a study of funding patterns--present and future--of cooperative education, and (3) comparison of opinions on how a state-wide system

could assist in this program. This order follows the pattern of the primary research instrument. (See Appendix C.)

Basic Institutional Data

Institutional size and type. Facts and opinions were obtained from persons representing various sizes of colleges. The enrollment of the largest institution represented was 44,000 and the smallest was 148. The mean enrollment of the institutions was 8,914.

The questionnaires were sent to 4-year institutions and 2-year community colleges. Fifty-three percent of the institutional respondents were employed at 4-year colleges and 47% at community colleges. Responses totaled 37, with 19 from 4-year institutions and 17 from community colleges. One respondent was a state coordinator and was not reflected in the institutional data.

Table 1 represents a breakdown of the total enrollment of the responding institutions. Approximately one-half (50.1%) of the institutions had student body enrollments of more than 3,000 and less than 12,000.

TABLE 1
Enrollment of Responding Institutions

Enrollment	Institution	Percent
0 - 3,000	10	27.7
3,001 - 6,000	5	13.9
6,001 - 9,000	7	19.5
9,001 - 12,000	6	16.7
Over 12,000	8	22.2
Total	36 ^a	100.0

^aState coordinator not included in these data.

A total of 47.2% of the usable responses was from community colleges. Their enrollment is shown in Table 2. Over one-third (35.4%) of the colleges had enrollments of less than 3,000 students. The largest enrollment was 21,000 and the smallest was 148 students. Six institutions or 35.2% had enrollments of between 3,001 and 9,000. The mean enrollment of the 2-year institutions was 7,302.

Colleges that were primarily urban comprised 61.2% of the returned questionnaires. Those that were rural in character comprised 38.8%.

TABLE 2
Enrollment of 2-Year Colleges

Enrollment	Institution	Percent
0 - 3,000	6	35.4
3,001 - 6,000	3	17.6
6,001 - 9,000	3	17.6
9,001 - 12,000	0	0.0
Over 12,001	5	29.4
Total	17	100.0

Basic institutional control was public in nature with 32 of the respondents from public institutions (88.9%) and 11.1% from private, church related institutions.

Professional personnel. The number of professional personnel in cooperative education programs varied. One institution had 14 professionals and three had 11 or more. Fourteen (38.9%) had two professionals on the cooperative education staff. The mean number of professional personnel in the responding institutions was 1.5 persons. (See Table 3.)

TABLE 3

Number of Cooperative Education Professional Personnel

Number of Personnel	Institutions	Percent
1	10	27.7
2	14	38.9
3	4	11.1
4	4	11.1
5	1	2.8
11	1	2.8
12	1	2.8
14	1	2.8
Total	36 ^a	100.0

^aState coordinator not included in these data.

Student enrollment--cooperative education programs.

Student enrollment in cooperative education programs varied (Table 4). Over one-half (52.8%) of the institutions had more than 101 students involved in the program. One institution had 4,800 students in cooperative education. The smallest number enrolled in the program was 3.

The mean cooperative education enrollment was 336 participants.

TABLE 4
Enrollment of Co-op Students by Institution

Co-op Students	Number of Institutions	Percent
0 - 10	2	5.6
11 - 20	3	8.3
21 - 30	1	2.8
31 - 40	3	8.3
41 - 50	3	8.3
51 - 60	2	5.6
61 - 70	0	0.0
71 - 80	3	8.3
81 - 90	0	0.0
91 - 100	0	0.0
101 and up	19	52.8
Total	36 ^a	100.0

^aState coordinator not included in these data.

There were 12,462 students utilizing the cooperative education program in the responding institutions. Twelve colleges (33.3%) had fewer than 50 students in the program. (See Table 4.)

As reflected in Table 5, the institutions surveyed showed no correlation between the student body enrollment and participation in the cooperative education programs. One institution showed that 4,800 students (or 48% of the student body) were active in the co-op program. The smallest percentage of participation (.06%) was in an institution of 12,500 students. Five colleges had more than 10% participation while eight colleges had less than 1% of the students involved in the program.

The mean number of students enrolled in cooperative education at the colleges surveyed was 336. Comparing the total enrollment of all surveyed institutions (320,884) with the enrollment in all of the cooperative education programs (12,101), it was observed that 3.8% of the students were active in the program.

It further appeared that the smaller institutions had greater participation in cooperative education than did the larger colleges. In institutions of less than 10,000 enrollment, 4.2% of the student body was engaged

TABLE 5

Percentage of Student Population in Cooperative
Education Programs

Institutional Enrollment	Number of Students in the Co-op Program	Percentage
148	15	10.1
700	75	10.7
820	15	1.9
1,201	50	4.2
1,365	35	2.6
1,383	606	43.8
1,500	25	1.7
2,170	75	3.5
2,375	3	0.12
2,865	18	0.63
3,100	130	4.2
3,253	439	13.5
4,108	100	2.4
4,200	367	8.7
4,925	200	4.1
7,000	48	0.69
7,049	400	5.7
7,139	130	1.9

TABLE 5--Continued

Institutional Enrollment	Number of Students in the Co-op Program	Percentage
7,200	257	3.6
7,800	54	0.7
8,746	156	1.8
9,500	200	2.1
10,000	4,800	48.0
10,000	75	0.8
10,500	363	3.5
11,066	56	0.5
12,500	550	4.4
12,500	8	0.06
15,000	268	1.8
15,000	163	1.1
15,521	40	0.3
17,250	600	3.5
18,000	250	1.4
20,000	600	4.0
21,000	480	2.3
44,000	450	1.1
Total	320,884	12,101

in cooperative education and in institutions of less than 5,000 students the percentage of participation was 7.5. This could be affected by the length of time the program has been in operation or by the location of the college. (See Table 5.)

Coordinator/student load. It will be observed in Table 6 that 13 institutions or 36.1% had a ratio of 80-100 students per coordinator. The average coordinator/student load for the responding institutions was 88 students for each coordinator.

TABLE 6

Ratio of Coordinator/Student Load

Ratio	Institution	Percent
1 - 20	7	19.4
21 - 40	6	16.7
41 - 60	6	16.7
61 - 80	4	11.1
81 - 100	13	36.1
Total	36 ^a	100.0

^aState coordinator not included in these data.

Title of chief personnel officer. Eighty percent of the institutions used the title of "Director" for the person in charge of the program. This can be a significant factor in most states as the salary level is often based on the title or the rank afforded the title. Fourteen percent used the title of "Coordinator" for this person and 6% showed other titles were used. One responded that the title of "Professor" was used in this position.

Cooperative education options. It was the opinion of the respondents (91.6%) that to be of greatest assistance to the students an option of cooperative education assignments should be available. Two (8.4%) persons did not respond to this item. All (100%) of the responding community colleges used both the alternating and the parallel programs, while 57.8% of the 4-year colleges restricted the student to an alternating sequence and 42.2% used both parallel and alternating methods.

Organizational Policies

Registration and scheduling. The student on an alternating program may have problems with scheduling, as some courses of study are of a sequential nature and are

not offered during every term. Fifty-five percent of the institutions surveyed had special procedures. Sequential classes were arranged by 66.6% of the colleges to meet the demands of the students. Six institutions noted that special classes could not be arranged due to the small enrollment of the institution. The size of the institution influenced registration procedures.

Advisory committees. In the opinion of the respondents, it is desirable to have advisory committees to assist in coordination of the various aspects of the program. Eighty percent responded that a faculty advisory committee was utilized and 20% responded that this committee was not in operation. Nineteen institutions (52%) stated that committees composed of businessmen were operated at the community level and 17 (48%) did not involve businessmen in committee work. Only 5 or 13.8% had students on these committees.

Student contracts. To assure that students were conscientious about continuing in a cooperative education program, many institutions required that students sign a contract to this effect. Fifty-five percent made use of the contract to assure continuity of the program for the benefit of the student and the employer. The other

responding institutions (45%) did not utilize a contract for the co-op students.

Coordinator qualifications. Indications from the research reflect that educational requirements were important factors in the selection of coordinators. Seventy-eight percent stated that at least a master's degree was necessary to hold this position. Practical business or industrial experience, combined with educational requirements, was considered necessary or at least desirable. Eight institutions (22%) indicated that a bachelor's degree was the minimum requirement for the position.

Credit. Of primary importance to the study, according to the respondents, was the granting of credit for work experience in the business world. Eighty-three percent awarded academic credit for the work periods with the credit showing on the transcript of the student, while 17% did not grant academic credit.

The survey further showed that the decision to grant credit, the type, and amount of credit, should be at the discretion of the institution and should not be action at the state level. This opinion was stated by 63% of the respondents. Thirty-seven percent stated that credit granting should be standardized within the state.

State reports. Students on field work assignments were counted in reports to the state departments of education. All (100%) reported these students in the full-time equivalent figures with the range from 1/2 to full equivalent per co-op student. These figures were from the responding public institutions.

Special recognition. Students who completed a satisfactory off-campus work learning sequence were, in many cases, presented with a certificate to this effect. Sixty-one percent reported that such recognition was given and 39% stated that special recognition was not included in their program. The number of work periods necessary for this certificate varied according to institutional requirements. In many cases the certificate was awarded by mutual agreement between the community college and the 4-year institution to which the student transferred.

State-wide Programs

Educational options. Without exception, the respondents believed that educational options should be available to junior/community college students and that cooperative education is one such option.

Benefits. The respondents were asked how beneficial a state-wide organization would be for their individual programs. Sixty-two percent stated that such an organization could be very beneficial while 30% stated that this could be of some benefit. Eight percent felt that such an organization would be of no help to their programs. Eighty-five percent were of the opinion that assistance could be given through a unified public relations effort by a state-wide organization and 15% believed that this could be accomplished by individual colleges.

Type of organization. A formal state-wide cooperative education organization would, in the opinion of many of the respondents, be of greater efficiency for all concerned. Thirty-four percent believed that an informal organization without elected officers or regular meetings could be as effective, while 66% favored a formal organization.

Administrative operation and placement. The state coordinator concept was utilized in the state of Florida. Thirty-six percent felt that the state coordinator concept is desirable, and 64% stated that in their opinion a committee of institutional cooperative education persons

should be utilized. Most respondents expressed the view that administrative duties could be handled by cooperative education personnel within the various colleges.

Fifty-eight percent of the respondents indicated that the state organization should be housed on a centrally located campus. Thirty percent were of the opinion that the state capitol should be utilized for the organization. No preference was expressed by the other respondents (12%).

Funding Patterns--Present and Future

Institutional cooperative education programs.

Beginning in 1968 many programs were funded under Title IV of the Higher Education Act. It was viewed by the respondents as a desirable feature, but the funding should be shifted to the local or state level. Table 7 shows that 73% believed that this step should be taken. Since cooperative education programs cross state lines, 10.8% stated that funding resources should be at both levels. The remainder of the respondents (16.2%) were of the opinion that funds should be available at the national level.

TABLE 7
Future Funding

Source	Number of Responses	Percent
State resources	27	73.0
Federal resources	6	16.2
Federal and state resources	4	10.8
Total	37	100.0

Prospective state-wide program funding. Any endeavor should have funds and personnel available to accomplish a task. Many respondents were not in a position to give a definite "yes" or "no" answer but, as seen in Table 8, there were 10 (27.1%) that were positive that their institutions would assist financially. Nineteen (51.3%) stated that there would probably be institutional assistance. A "no" answer was given by eight (21.7%) respondents.

Release time--state-wide organization. When asked whether they thought their institutions would grant release time, many responses were in the "probably"

column. However, more answered "yes" that their institutions would grant time from regular duties to assist in establishing a state-wide cooperative education organization. As observed in Table 9, the "yes" responses were 54.1% and "probably" responses were 40.5%. Only two (5.4%) stated "no" to this question.

TABLE 8

Prospective Financial Support of a State-wide Program

Responses	Number	Percent
Yes	10	27.1
No	8	21.6
Probably	19	51.3
Total	37	100.0

Business community--financial support. Cooperative education is heavily involved with the business community. Table 10 reflects that 67.5% of the respondents supported encouraging financial assistance from this sector of the community. Twenty-seven percent believed that the business community should not become financially

involved in cooperative education programs. No opinion was expressed by 5.5%.

TABLE 9
Release Time for a State-wide Program

Responses	Number	Percent
Yes	20	54.1
No	2	5.4
Probably	15	40.5
Total	37	100.0

TABLE 10
Business Community Financial Support of State-wide
Cooperative Education Programs

Responses	Number	Percent
Yes	25	67.5
No	10	27.0
No opinion	2	5.5
Total	37	100.0

Present institutional funding. The institutions involved in the study showed that funding patterns were divided about equally between federal and state sources for support. A total of 16 (44.4%) were federally funded and 15 (41.6%) were state funded. Fourteen percent were being funded jointly from federal and state sources.

Future institutional funding. The respondents were asked from what sources funds for the cooperative education program should be available after federal funds were expended. It was the opinion of 17 respondents (46%) that funding should come from the state. Thirteen (35.1%) indicated that the institution should be responsible for funding, while seven respondents (18.9%) expressed no opinion.

Cooperative education fees. It was found that most institutions charged a fee to the student during the work quarter to assist with the operational budget. A wide range of fees was charged and is reflected in Table 11. The smallest amount charged was \$10.00 per work term and the highest charge was \$152.00. Three institutions charged on the basis of credit hours and eight made no charge for participation in the program. The average flat fee charged to the student was \$75.29 per work term. The fee

charged to the student was under \$100.00 in 56.8% of the responding institutions.

TABLE 11

Student Fee During Cooperative Education Assignment

Fee	Number of Institutions	Percent
\$10 - \$20	5	13.5
\$21 - \$40	6	16.2
\$41 - \$60	3	8.1
\$61 - \$80	3	8.1
\$81 - \$100	4	10.9
\$120	1	2.7
\$152	1	2.7
\$6.00 per credit hour	2	5.4
\$9.00 per credit hour	1	2.7
No fee charged	8	21.6
No response	3	8.1
Total	37	100.0

Assistance from a State-wide Program

Areas of interest. The respondents were asked to rank a series of possible areas in which a state-wide program would be of assistance to their individual programs. Table 12 indicates the importance that they placed on each item. It will be noted that the areas in which greatest emphasis should be placed are those concerning expansion of opportunities for students, emphasis on community needs, and job openings. These three items received 40 responses as being first in importance.

Six of those responding noted that all of the items should receive equal attention. Three persons did not participate in this section of the research.

Feedback of information to the respondents. All of the respondents requested that the information obtained from the survey be forwarded to them. Procedures were established to assure that this would be accomplished without delay.

TABLE 12

Benefits from a State-wide Organization

Item	Ranked No. 1	Ranked No. 2	Ranked No. 3
Exchange of general information on business community needs	13	14	7
Job slots--state	11	10	13
Job slots--national	5	8	21
Sources of available funds	5	11	18
More comprehensive community service	6	16	12
Expansion of student opportunities	16	10	8
Greater accountability	8	13	13
Credit granting emphasis	5	11	18
Uniform state reporting service	4	17	13
Total	73	110	123

CHAPTER IV

Analysis of Data, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Analysis of Data

The purpose of the study was to collect, organize, and present data regarding a state-wide cooperative education organization with the goal of initiating a cooperative education program for the junior colleges in Alabama. To complete this study it was necessary to collect concrete information in addition to opinions of leaders in the field.

There was interest indicated in an organization for cooperative education at the state level by letters and notes attached to the returned data. The replies from the preliminary letters of inquiry indicated that little research had been undertaken in the area of state-wide organization for cooperative education and leadership was needed to arrive at logical procedures for implementing this type of organization.

Cooperation between the 2-year and 4-year institutional programs had been operational to some extent. Transfer procedures had been established between the institutions involved and many individual cases were solved as they occurred. Chase (1972) expressed the opinion that organized procedures should be established to give students every advantage for success during the transfer procedure.

Heerman (1973) reiterated that funding patterns needed to be altered as federal support was limited to a 3-year period. Most of the respondents expressed the opinion that the individual states should assume this responsibility.

The survey reflected that some 2-year colleges were located in rural towns that had limited businesses and industries in which to place co-op students. The distance between institutions and co-op employers created a difficult situation for the success of a cooperative education program.

An analysis of the Cooperative Education Directory (1973) reflected that the number of students participating in cooperative education programs was directly related to two factors--the total enrollment of the institution and

the length of time that the cooperative education program had been in operation.

Heerman (1973) stated that much time and expense was involved in planning, organizing, and inaugurating a co-op program. Contacts must be made and maintained with prospective co-op employers and students needed to be informed and recruited for the program. This was a continuous process and an ongoing aspect of the coordinator if there was to be growth and success.

Most colleges that utilized cooperative education had the program as an option for the students, and only a small percentage of the enrollment was involved in the program (see Table 5, page 41). Some institutions, such as Northeastern University in Boston, were organized as cooperative education colleges with most of the students involved with co-op experience being a requirement for graduation (Auld, 1972). Other educational institutions having options open to students were quite varied and curriculum related work experience was available only as an option. The total length of time that a student was enrolled in college was not extended greatly.

If a program is to be of maximum benefit to the student, consideration, planning, and emphasis should be

placed on the coordinator/student ratio. The coordinator should visit each student at least one time during each field training period. According to Wooldridge and Knowles (1972), 100 students was the figure generally accepted as the maximum for each coordinator if efficiency was to be maintained. This coincides closely with the information received from the respondents involved in the research. With one-half of the students in the field during each term, 50 off-campus trips would be a minimum number of visits required.

Wilson (1971) stated that the type of institution exerted influence on the coordinator/student ratio. Most community colleges had a lower coordinator/student ratio than 4-year colleges. Factors that affected the ratio were locality, terminal and transfer programs, the open-door concept, and articulation procedures with 4-year institutions.

The title of the person in charge of a cooperative education program should be consistent throughout the state. The federal government and most states that were surveyed consider this position on the "Director" level. The junior colleges of Alabama had a salary scale commensurate with the administrative position of director.

Approximately one-half of the cooperative education programs were administratively organized under the leadership of the academic dean or vice-president in charge of academic affairs (Wilson, 1971). For the program to be effective, the support of the academic area was necessary because most of the internal activities of the cooperative education program were structured from an academic viewpoint. Placement of the programs in the institutions' organizational structure should be standardized in the state to clarify administrative procedures at all levels.

According to Lynch (Note 5), the concept of cooperative education, as identified by members of the college community (students, faculty, and administrators), revealed diverse viewpoints and feelings. The biases are not all sympathetic to the concept, and, indeed, some actively involved in opposition. Cooperative education personnel must be cognizant of these opinions and through patience, explanation, and persuasion, work for greater support for the program. The initiative of the personnel involved in cooperative education is more important than placement of the responsibility in the organizational hierarchy.

In all the institutions surveyed, credit for work experience was granted and placed on the college transcript. Academic credit was designated since cooperative education was considered educational experience in an off-campus situation. This coincided with the findings and recommendations of Pettebone (1971). The students were reported to the state department in the "head count" and "full time equivalent" figures since they were registered students during each of the terms--either in the classroom or on a field experience.

Consortiums in many areas of education have proven to be successful and worthwhile (Moore, 1968). A state-wide cooperative education organization would function in the same manner and would be of benefit to most institutions. The need for adequate public relations and promotion of cooperative education at all levels was desirable and necessary for successful programs. Such activities could be broadened through a state-wide organization. The opinions given on the questionnaire and the studies by Moore supported this finding.

Greater efficiency in a state-wide program could be possible if the person involved in institutional programs exercised management control over the operation.

The research reflected that released time and some institutional funds were needed to inaugurate a state plan.

Cooperative education programs should not be judged on the number of students enrolled, but on the quality of work assignments experienced by the students. At the institutions surveyed, there was not a mandatory percentage or a definite number of students required to be enrolled in the programs. Cooperative education was geared to the individual educational needs of students who were interested in this experience.

Cooperative education made it possible for the business community and the educational institution to provide a superior type of program. Advisory committees, representative of the business community, provided information on current needs and furnished information on business projections for future planning. Feedback was obtained from the committee to assist in curriculum planning and/or expansion.

Faculty members of institutions were involved with the program to assure that cooperation and standards were maintained. The exchange of information between the business representatives and the academic advisors

assisted in maintaining a varied program for the students and promoted public relations.

A student contract for on-the-job training was considered a "gentlemen's agreement" rather than a legal binding document and was not used generally by the institutions for placing students.

Thornton (1966) stated that in most states the junior/community college system was a fairly new educational level. There was a need for more publicity regarding the cooperative education program and also publicizing the institution as a whole. The institutions, by joining together, were able to obtain publicity and thus strengthen the individual programs. Unity of purpose was established and confusion in the business community was lessened (Heerman, 1974).

Personnel employed in the co-op field could organize a state-wide association without an allocation of additional funds. By distributing the work and responsibility, it would be necessary for each person to devote very little time to the organization to make it successful. In the opinion of the researcher, the reduction in duplication of effort would more than offset the time devoted to the state organization.

The researcher found that many businesses assisted the student financially during their academic course work on campus. This gave an added incentive to the student. The business community gave banquets and sponsored programs for students and coordinators. Some businesses contributed funds for the printing of brochures for special functions. Financial assistance from the business community was encouraged and utilized by individual institutions. Such involvement was encouraged and should be expanded in the future.

The off-campus educational learning experiences were an integral part of the education of the students involved. The experience complemented the academic courses in which students participated (Editorial Panorama, 1971). A fee was charged for this off-campus term as much effort was required by the institution in obtaining the position for the student. Most students paid for their academic terms and were willing to pay for the off-campus term.

Summary of the Findings

The data analyzed by the researcher reflected the following conclusions:

1. State-wide organized effort in cooperative education was limited in number in the United States.
2. There was interest in planning for state-wide cooperative education programs but little research had been conducted in this area.
3. Arrangement for alternate funding was needed if many cooperative education programs were to survive in the future.
4. The cooperative education option should be available to more students.
5. Student/coordinator ratios were varied from college to college.
6. Most institutions used the title "Director" for the person in charge of the program.
7. To add prestige and workability, the program should be the responsibility of the person in charge of academic affairs.
8. Enrollment of the institution was not a measure of the success of a cooperative education program.
9. Availability of educational options was desirable for all students, especially at the junior/community college level.

10. Advisory committees were utilized at various levels to add efficiency to the co-op programs.

11. Registration and scheduling were given special consideration by some of the institutions.

12. Student contracts were not a necessary part of the cooperative education programs.

13. Academic credit was awarded for off-campus educational experiences.

14. In most states off-campus work experience students were counted as fulltime equivalent students on state reports.

15. A state-wide cooperative education program for junior colleges was needed for unity of purpose and better public relations.

16. Control and guidance of the state-wide organization by institutional or cooperative education personnel provided effective relationships.

17. Funding should be shifted to internal and state sources.

18. A state-wide program should be organized without additional funding.

19. The business community should be encouraged to financially support a state-wide program.

20. A cooperative education fee should be required for the off-campus work period.

21. A state-wide organization is desired to benefit the institution, the student, and the business community.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made as a result of the major findings and conclusions of the study:

1. Junior colleges in Alabama should consider giving credit for work experience that is related to the students' major area of study.

2. A committee of junior college cooperative education personnel should investigate funds at the state level. This action should be conducted with the assistance and support of the Junior College Council of Presidents.

3. Students who are on a work sequence of a cooperative education program should be reported to the State Department of Education as full-time equivalent students.

4. Tuition, commensurate with the academic credit

granted, should be charged during cooperative education work sequences.

5. For maximum efficiency, advisory committees composed of students, faculty, and businessmen should be formed.

6. A vigorous public relations campaign for cooperative education should be developed on a state-wide level and directed to students, educators, and legislators.

CHAPTER V

Summary

This chapter includes a summary of the study and is presented in three major sections: purpose of the study, statement of procedures, and major conclusions.

Purpose of the Study

The study was conducted to obtain information that could be of assistance in organizing a state-wide cooperative education association with emphasis on strengthening programs in the junior colleges.

Procedures

A review of related literature was conducted concerning cooperative education programs in the south-east. A preliminary survey was made to ascertain what states had state-wide associations.

The study had the endorsement of the National Cooperative Education Association. Little research had been conducted on state-wide organizations.

A final instrument was prepared, tested, and mailed to 50 institutions with ongoing cooperative education programs.

The questionnaire included five major sections: (a) institutional statistics, (b) cooperative education organizational procedures, (c) state-wide programs, (d) funding--present and future, and (e) areas in which a state organization could be of assistance to institutional programs.

Upon receipt of 74% of the completed questionnaires, the data were analyzed and tables were prepared to represent the research findings.

Conclusions

The conclusions and major findings of the research were:

1. Research concerning state-wide cooperative education associations was limited. Individual programs were expanding but little coordinated effort was inaugurated.

2. There was a need for state organizations, especially for the junior colleges that have recently entered the educational spectrum.

3. Funding from sources other than the federal government needed to be obtained if many programs are to continue operations.

REFERENCE NOTES

Reference Notes

1. Wooldridge, R. A. Cooperative education. Paper presented at the National Cooperative Education Conference, Tampa, Florida, April 1969.
2. Vandergrift, F. Personal communication, November 10, 1973.
3. Tyler, R. W. (Chairman). Recommendations for the committee of the study of cooperative education. A study from the center for advanced study in behavioral sciences. Paper presented at the National Cooperative Education Conference, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, March 1971.
4. Sullins, W. R. Why cooperative education in community colleges? Paper presented at the Mid-Atlantic Center for Cooperative Education, April 1974.
5. Lynch, R. Standards for cooperative education. Speech presented at the Mid-Atlantic Center for Cooperative Education Community College Institute, April 1974.
6. Stull, W. A. Working with employers to develop training programs. Speech presented at the VPI Workshop, Blacksburg, Virginia, April 1974.
7. Lucas, A. Personal communication, September 12, 1974.
8. Pratt, G. L. Personal communication, October 1, 1974.
9. Layton, G. Personal communication, 1974.

REFERENCES

References

- Auld, R. B. Comments. In D. C. Hunt (Ed.), 50 views of cooperative education. Detroit: Midwest Center for Cooperative Education, 1972.
- Bonnell, A. T. The academic soundness of cooperative education. Journal of Cooperative Education, 1964, 1, 19-27.
- Burt, S. M. Industry and vocational-technical education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.
- Brown, L. First-year teacher pilot program implementation guide. Montgomery: Alabama State Department of Education, 1973.
- Callahan, L., & Gilmore, V. Cooperative education. Community and Junior College Journal, 1974, 44, 5.
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Less time more options: Education beyond the high school. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Chase, J. A. Baccalaureate programs. In A. S. Knowles (Ed.), Handbook of cooperative education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.
- Collins, S. A. Yearbook of cooperative education. Philadelphia: Drexel University Press, 1970.
- Collins, S. A. Cooperative education--promises and pitfalls. Journal of Cooperative Education, 1973, 2, 6-9.
- Cooperative education directory. Publication manual of the National Cooperative Education Association. Philadelphia: Drexel University Press, 1974.

- Dawson, J. D. New directions for cooperative education. Philadelphia: National Commission on Cooperative Education, 1971.
- Editorial Panorama, earn and learn program scores with employers. Nation's Business, 1971, 2, 16.
- Heerman, B. Cooperative education in community colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.
- Heerman, B. Pitfalls to cooperative education in community colleges: An energy crisis is no good thing. Journal of Cooperative Education, 1974, 2, 1.
- Hughes, L. W. Educational cooperatives. Putting research into educational practice (PREP Report No. 23). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.
- Jarrell, D. W. An evaluation of the Langley Research Center. NASA Langley Research Center Bulletin, 1970.
- Knowles, A. S. (Ed.). Handbook of cooperative education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.
- Miller, G. H. Recruiting employers. In D. C. Hunt (Ed.), 50 views of cooperative education. Detroit: Midwest Center for Cooperative Education, 1973.
- Moore, R. S. Consortiums in American higher education: 1965-66. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.
- Perkins, J. S. Prefatory comment. In P. S. Ritterbush (Ed.), Let the entire community become our university. Washington, D.C.: Acropolis, 1972.
- Pettebone, E. R. Co-op as a basis for credit. Journal of Cooperative Education, 1971, 1, 8-10.
- Ritterbush, P. C. Let the entire community become our university. Washington, D.C.: Acropolis, 1972.

- Robinson, B. B. Some reflections on early cooperative education. Journal of Cooperative Education, 1969, 1, 5.
- Saunders, M. An employer speaks out. Journal of Cooperative Education, 1971, 2, 15-17.
- Thornton, J. W., Jr. The community college. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1966.
- Tyler, R. W. The study of cooperative education. New York: Thomas Alva Edison Foundation, 1960.
- Wilson, J. W. Federal funding for cooperative education: Report and suggestions. Journal of Cooperative Education, 1971, 2, 43-49.
- Wilson, J. W., & Lyons, E. H. Work-study college programs: Appraisal and report of the study of cooperative education. New York: Harper & Row, 1961.
- Wooldridge, R. A., & Knowles, A. S. The adoption of cooperative education. In A. S. Knowles (Ed.), Handbook on cooperative education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

APPENDIX A

PRELIMINARY LETTER

Dear _____:

I would appreciate it very much if you would answer some questions for me regarding state-wide cooperative education programs.

1. Does your state have such a program?
_____yes _____no
2. If yes, what type of organizational pattern?
_____formal _____informal
3. Do you know of any other states that have this program organized and in the operational stage?
_____yes _____no

If yes, please list below.

4. Would it be helpful to you to have the information obtained from this letter?
_____yes _____no

This is a preliminary survey and the follow-up will be a detailed questionnaire. I will be glad to furnish the results of the findings to you if you so request.

Please return this letter to me as soon as possible in the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope. Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Gene Crago

Enclosure

APPENDIX B

LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT

October 22, 1974

Mr. Gene Crago, Coordinator
Cooperative Education and Job Placement
Jefferson State Junior College
2601 Carson Road
Birmingham, Alabama 35215

Dear Gene:

I am most happy to hear of your study entitled "A State-Wide Cooperative Education Plan for Junior Colleges in Alabama: A Feasibility Study" and wish you much success with it.

The Cooperative Education Association has a great interest in any research or promotion which is done in the field of cooperative education, and therefore, heartily endorses you in this effort. Actually, we receive many requests from individuals for information concerning what is happening in the field and it seems to me that your study would be a valuable addition to the body of knowledge which is already accumulated.

In view of this, I would very much like to know the results of your effort when it is completed, so that such information might be available to others.

May I wish you much success in your venture.

Very truly yours,

S. B. Collins
Executive Secretary

SBC:avh

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire

Instructions: Please answer these questions taking into consideration the philosophy and structure of community/junior colleges. Return the original to: Gene Crago, Cooperative Education Office, Jefferson State Junior College, 2601 Carson Road, Birmingham, Alabama 35215.

PART I: Basic Institutional Data

1. Name, address, and institution of respondent.
2. Head Count enrollment of institution (fall term)
_____.
3. () Urban () Rural
4. Institutional control: () public
() private non-sectarian
() private church related
5. Number of "professional" personnel in your cooperative education program _____.
6. Approximate number of students in your cooperative education program _____.
7. What is the title of the person in charge of the program?
() director
() coordinator
() other: _____.
8. What is the ratio of students per professional co-op advisor? _____.
9. What types of co-op do you have available for your students:
() parallel
() alternating
() other: _____.

PART II: Organizational Procedures

1. Since cooperative education students may be on-campus one quarter and off-campus the next, is special scheduling of classes, where practical, organized for them?

yes no

Are special registration procedures established for them?

yes no

2. To assist the cooperative educational personnel in planning, advisory committees have been established at what levels?

administrative

faculty

business

none

other: _____.

3. Do you require a student on the co-op program to sign a contract or agreement with the institution?

yes no

4. What educational background is required for a person to be employed as a co-op coordinator?

bachelor's

master's

doctor's

other (please specify): _____.

5. Where does work experience appear on the record of the student?

transcript

auxilliary transcript

neither

other: _____.

6. What type of credit do your students receive for an off-campus learning experience?

academic

equivalent credit

other: _____.

7. When a student is on an off-campus learning experience, on state reports is he or she included in enrollment figures?
 yes no

If yes, how is he or she counted?

- head count
 credit hours only (FTE)
 other: _____.
8. Criteria for granting of credit should be:
 standardized within the state
 institutional decision only
 other: _____.
9. Is a certificate, or other recognition, given to students who have experienced an off-campus learning situation?
 yes
 no
 other: _____.

PART III: State-wide Programs

1. Should a field experience or work experience be an educational option for students in a community/junior college?
 yes no
2. Who should be responsible for funding educational options for these students?
 institution
 community
 state
 other: _____.
3. To what extent do you feel that a state-wide cooperative education organization would be beneficial for your institution?
 very
 some
 little

4. Could a state-wide organization be of assistance to your program by improving the co-op image through a public relation campaign?
 yes no
5. In your opinion, what type of organization on a state level would achieve the greatest efficiency for all concerned?
 informal
 formal
 other: _____.

If you have specific suggestions, please note them on the back of the questionnaire.

6. A state-wide cooperative education organization should be operated through:
 state coordinator
 committee of co-op
 other personnel: _____.
7. To be beneficial to all institutions, where should the main operation of a state-wide organization be placed?
 state capital
 centrally located institution
 other: _____.

PART IV: Funding

1. Funding of institutional cooperative education programs should be at what level?
 local
 federal
 state
 other: _____.
2. Do you believe that your institution would be willing to allocate a nominal amount of funds to assist in operating a state-wide plan?
 yes
 no
 probably

3. Do you believe that your institution would be willing to grant release time for a person to assist in this type of program?
 yes
 no
 probably
4. Would you be receptive to the idea of encouraging the business community in your area to lend financial support for this program?
 yes no
5. Is your Cooperative Education Program funded primarily by:
 federal
 state
 institutional
 other: _____.
6. If federally funded, from what source will funds probably be obtained after the federal funds are expended?
 state level
 institutional
 other: _____.
7. What fee is charged the co-op student when on a full-time assignment?
 \$ _____.

PART V: Areas of Interest

1. A state-wide cooperative education system might be of benefit in what areas? (Rank 1, 2, 3, in order of importance.)
- a. Exchange of information on the needs of the business community
- b. Co-op job opening information within the state
- c. Co-op job opening information nationwide

- () d. Current information on available operational funds
- () e. More complete service to the business communities
- () f. Broader opportunities for all students regardless of locality
- () g. Greater accountability through coordinated effort
- () h. Emphasis on granting of credit
- () i. Uniform reporting system (work-load) within the state

PART VI:

Check if you would like to have the information obtained from this questionnaire.

- () yes () no

Comments and suggestions:

APPENDIX D

COVER LETTER

We are conducting a study to determine the feasibility of a state-wide cooperative education organization at the community college level. This study has the backing of the National Cooperative Education Association. We are now in the process of gathering base information to assist us in our task. Your institution is one of a select group from which we are soliciting information. Would you please complete the attached questionnaire which should take less than five minutes of your time?

We have enclosed two (2) copies of the questionnaire, one to be returned in the stamped, self-addressed envelope and the other for your files. We will be happy to share the results of the survey if you will check the last item on the instrument.

Thank you for your cooperation. It would be greatly appreciated if you would return this as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Gene Crago, Director
Cooperative Education

GC/as

Enclosures

APPENDIX E

FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Dear _____:

A few weeks ago a questionnaire was sent to your institution for the purpose of obtaining a broad base of information for long-range planning for cooperative education. As yet we have not received a response.

There is a growing need for planning in the field of cooperative education. The urgency of this is due to the time limit of federal funding and the newness of the program in many institutions--especially the two-year college. Cooperation on a state level could assist in this planning for all concerned.

The enclosed questionnaire should take less than five minutes of your time. If you would complete and return this, it could be of great aid to this planning. Enclosed is a self-addressed, stamped envelope.

Your assistance and input would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Gene Crago

GC/as

Enclosures