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ABSTRACT

Some Background Considerations to the Establishment of a Consortium of Four Intermountain States, in the Area of Independent Study

by

Suresh C. Kaushik, Doctor of Education

Utah State University, 1972

Major Professor: Dr. Robert A. Wininger
Department: Educational Administration

The growth of Independent Study divisions of the state-supported educational institutions of the area covered by the states of Utah, Nevada, Idaho and Wyoming, and the increasing demands for the establishment of new curricular offerings, coupled with these states' limited financial resources, make the exploration of possible cooperative offerings a rather crucial necessity.

The purpose of this study was to develop and appraise the climate for developing a consortium of the Independent Study divisions of Utah State University, University of Utah, University of Nevada, University of Idaho, and University of Wyoming. A systematic sequence of approach for accomplishing the stated objectives was developed and prospective problems faced in the implementation of the proposed model were identified.

The possibilities of developing the above mentioned consortium were explored through the following sequential approach:
Step 1. Conduct a review of related literature, with special emphasis on the processes involved in the development of consortia.

Step 2. Informally disseminate the objectives of the study among potential participants and, then, appraise their reactions.

Step 3. Conduct a thorough feasibility study through individual exploratory interviews with the potential participants.

Step 4. Extract and channel the expressed desires of the potential participants into a systematic approach to consortium development.

Step 5. Obtain feedback on the proposed systematic approach and recommendations.

Findings and Recommendations

The study resulted in the following set of guidelines for developing the philosophy, the organizational structure, the offerings, and the regulations and policies of the proposed consortium.

1. The proposed consortium should initially serve the needs of one clientelle—a clientele which is not presently being served by the offerings of any of the existing Independent Study divisions.

2. The institutions involved should agree upon jointly preparing five courses, the contents of the courses being such that they form a coherent cluster around a particular area of specialization.
3. The hardest problem to resolve will be that of finding an area of specialization in which all the participants are ready to cooperatively produce the five courses.

4. One institution should be responsible for preparing one course. The appropriate academic departments of all the participating institutions should be involved in deciding upon the course contents.

5. To avoid the problems of transfer of credits, outside instructors, and the like, each of the participating institutions should have copies of all the courses so as to be able to handle these five courses like its other offerings.

6. The courses offered through the consortium should incorporate extensive use of cassette tapes, slides and filmstrips. However, at least for the time being, no attempt should be made to involve the use of television, telephone, or mass media.

7. Although every effort should be made to recognize the individual differences among students, no special effort should be directed towards arranging for personal guidance and counseling.

8. The consideration of issues such as the grading system, the course fees, and the incentives such as scholarships or loans, should be left to the individual institutions.

9. The organizational structure of the consortium should consist of a Core Council, a Project Director, and an Advisory Council.
10. The location for the planning meetings should be rotated every time, and should be close to large airports, for travelling convenience of the participants.

11. Student representatives and community members should not be involved in the planning stage. Rather, these individuals should be involved in the process of course preparation.

12. As agreed upon by the individual participants, the cost of transportation to the planning meetings should be borne by the participant institutions. Also, a small amount of money should be committed by each of the institutions towards the planning and development of the proposed consortium.

13. The participating institutions need to put special efforts in changing the academic departments' attitude of apathy and non-involvement towards the Independent Study courses.

The study established the fact that the five institutions mentioned herein can and are willing to work together, to pool their resources and talents together, and to flourish together in the area of Independent Study. The guidelines developed through this study are instruments which can help in channeling the desire and willingness into reality.

(134 pages)
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

New patterns of institutional arrangements and organizational structure are emerging in continuing education today. Social movements are forcing continuing education to penetrate the central places of American society, as an instrument or organized knowledge applied to the solution of major problems (Blakely and Lappin, 1969).

The growing need for education at the university level, however, has hampered the original form of the education to an unimaginably large extent. In the area of Independent Study, for instance, the complexities of large institutions, the force of organized traditional structures, and the drive to maintain autonomous institutional identities, coupled with the generally limited resources, have left many of the colleges and universities in a 'locked-up' state in which they find themselves incapable of incorporating the newly available technology with the instructional programs and adapting the sequence of learning to individual life styles (Sloos, 1970).

Statement of the Problem

The traditional Independent Study\(^1\) programs offered through the institutions of higher education in the intermountain states are duplicated over small geographical regions and, the cost factors, based upon resources derived from populations served by the individual

\(^1\)See page 6 for definition.
institutions, have constantly prohibited any major step towards improvement of the present set-up. Despite their continuous quest for betterment, the Directors of the Independent Study divisions of the above mentioned category of institutions find a large proportion of their correspondence courses as needing further considerations of the teaching-learning concepts.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to offer a solution in the form of a model, for a consortium of the Independent Study divisions of the universities in the states of Utah, Nevada, Idaho, and Wyoming, to jointly conduct a portion of their program of courses. In addition to encompassing an overview of the problem of developing the climate for such a cooperative venture, a systematic sequence of approach for accomplishing the stated objective was developed. Prospective problems faced in the execution of the proposed model were identified, administrative and planning strategies for implementing the program developed, and matters pertaining to issues such as the facilitation of curriculum development and the incorporation of new technology were explored and discussed.

Need of the Study

As pointed out by Reller and Corbally (1967), "the great increase in the number of institutions engaged in higher education, the need to
plan for additional ones, the necessity of reaching some agreements on the spheres of activity of the respective institutions, the raising of normal schools to colleges and even to universities—all these developments have made it clear that continued independent action can only result in severe competition, unmet needs and chaos."

It has become increasingly apparent that the regular correspondence course programs are not always designed with the experiences, learning conditions and capabilities of adults in mind and that the time and sequence of learning experiences must be adapted to adult life (Whipple, 1969). There is an increasing awareness that the "learning at a distance," as Independent Study is often described, can be best promoted by the combination of various available media together with, where possible, the use of conventional face-to-face methods. The traditional correspondence courses are very impersonal in nature and demand a high degree of self-discipline on the part of the student (Gordon, 1971). Incorporation of newly developed audio-visual technology, such as the "MO-AV-PAK" projector-tape combination offered by the University of Missouri (Pulley, 1970), linking correspondence courses with other media such as the radio, the television, or the two-way telephone hook-up, and establishing a structure of local counseling and tutorial arrangements, among other things, can be a very effective means of overcoming some of the feelings of isolation and boredom inherent in independent study.

The practicality of the matter, however, is that implementation of the above mentioned developments and techniques takes both human
and financial resources. The growth of the educational institutions in the four intermountain states, and the increasing demands for the establishment of new curricular programs and offerings, coupled with the states' limited financial resources, make the situation more complicated than it seems at the surface. One logical solution seems to lie in the exploration of the possibilities of establishing programs such as the inter-institutional cooperation, in the form of consortia or other such arrangements. The summary following, taken from Martorana, Messersmith, and Nelson (1961), of reasons for promoting inter-institutional cooperation, IIC, is a case in point:

1. IIC, without limiting the independence of individual institutions, tends to promote the more effective and efficient utilization of limited or specialized resources.

2. IIC, without requiring expansion of offerings, makes it possible for universities to enrich those programs which otherwise might lack luster, challenge, or the opportunity for broad educational experiences.

3. IIC, without infringing on institutional budgetary affairs, can actually result in definite savings or at least promote the possibility of economics in future operational costs.

4. IIC, without restricting a college's area of influence, allows a group of colleges to expand their community service projects and thereby enhance their respective offerings.

5. IIC, without force or coercion, is capable of producing academic and cultural stimulation to the entire institutional program. As a result of this approach to problems, students, faculty, and administrators will have access to hitherto unused resources for increasing intellectual growth. (Martorana, Messersmith, and Nelson, 1961)
The coordination of efforts, whether within a university or between universities, is not an objective that can be attained by more administrative arrangements. Detailed analysis of issues, philosophies and processes need to be carefully done before any successful implementation takes place. This is where the present study comes into the picture.

**General Questions to Be Answered**

In any study of this nature, there is a wide variety of issues which need to be discussed and meditated upon before any conclusions can be reached. Through exploration, discussion, consultation, hypothesizing, and library research, the study attempted to develop a model which provides answers to the following questions:

1. What steps should be taken to provide general movement from informal beginnings to some organization of the planning effort?

2. What steps should be followed to proceed from the planning stage to the implementation stage?

3. What types of programs or services might be offered by the potential consortium?

4. What types of formal organizational structure and means of disseminating services should be developed for ongoing effectiveness of the consortium?

5. What should be the basis for development of financial arrangements for both planning and eventual consortium operation?
6. How should the needs and resources of each of the participating institutions be identified so as to obtain a maximum degree of involvement?

7. What efforts should be put forth by the proposed consortium so as to not only recognize the individual differences in students but also to meet on a much more selective basis than has been possible in the past?

Methodology

Systems approach constituted a major position of the project at hand. The methodology of the study was based upon the following steps:

1. Review of related literature with special emphasis on the process involved in the development of the consortium.

2. Informal dissemination of the objectives of the present study among potential participants and, then, an appraisal of their reactions.

3. A thorough feasibility study through individual exploratory interviews with the potential participants.

4. Extraction and channeling of the expressed desires of the potential participants into a systematic approach to consortium development.

In order to accomplish the stated objective, the writer consulted with representatives from the Independent Study divisions of five state-supported institutions of higher education in the states of Utah, Nevada, Idaho, and Wyoming (See Appendix A). The institutions involved were: Utah State University, University of Utah, University of
Nevada, University of Idaho, and University of Wyoming. Aside from the proximity factor, the reason for the involvement of these particular institutions stemmed from the past acquaintances and professional inter-relationships among their Directors of Independent Study Divisions. Also, a literature survey of techniques employed in consortium development was done. Following the above mentioned steps, and the outcome of the discussions and surveys, a model has been developed which attempts to answer the questions asked on pages 5 and 6 above.

As the development of the model progressed, its various stages were presented to appropriate authorities in the Independent Study divisions of the participating institutions, successively so as to provide continued suggestions for modification and recommendations for possible use of the model in the event the participating institutions decide to implement the model.

Limitations of the Study

The present study encompassed only the discussion of arrangements and planning required in order to make the model ready for implementation. It undertook to develop a philosophical-theoretical base for a desired arrangement; any developments leading towards its actual implementation, although desirable, are only incidental to the scope of the study.
Definition of Terms

The following terminology is used in the discussion that follows:

1. A "Consortium" is "an arrangement whereby two or more institutions--at least one of which is an institution of higher education--agree to pursue between, or among, them a program for strengthening academic programs, improving administration, or providing for other special needs." (Moore, 1967b) It is the "organization of a group ... for the purpose of planning or implementing programs or taking joint action ... (it) requires formalized arrangements and the commitment of time and resources ... and often calls for some mutual accommodation ... ." (Haygood, 1971)

2. The term "Independent Study" in this project is used in compliance with the recent approval of the Board of Directors of the National University Extension Association for changing the name of Correspondence Study to Independent Study. It is defined as the undertaking of a systematic course of study wholly or partially away from the setting of a teaching institution (Gordon, 1971).

Conclusion

This study proposes a role for inter-institutional cooperation among the Independent Study divisions of the universities serving the four intermountain states of Utah, Nevada, Idaho, and Wyoming, and
urges that such cooperation can be "cultivated and developed."

(Ertell, 1957) On the basis of the information provided therein, appropriate action may be taken by the institutions involved for implementing the recommended plans.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE--I

This chapter reviews the major issues in inter-institutional cooperation as pertaining to the Independent Study. Attention is drawn to various cooperative groups of colleges and universities, the operational dynamics of such groups, and the advantages and limitations of cooperative ventures. Also, reference is made to the present state of Independent Study, with a brief glance at the future trends in that field.

Consortia in higher education

The consortium movement in higher education, although a relatively new development, is by no means a rare phenomenon today. As pointed out by Johnson (1967), there are more than 1,300 different consortia in existence presently. Various writers have compiled listings of the presently existing consortia (Moore, 1967a; Patterson, 1971; and Burnett, 1970), and it would be futile to do the same in the present study. However, with the intention of presenting an overview of the field, a few exemplary consortia are listed below. It should be noted that, with the implementation of the Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, "the only federal aid to higher education program which has support of cooperation among institutions as a primary purpose," (Howard, 1967) the consortium movement found itself a strong motivational factor for flourishing. Furthermore, although founded
basically to promote interstate rather than inter-institutional co-operation, agencies like the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE), the New England Board of Higher Education (NEBHE), the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), the Union for Research and Experimentation in Higher Education (UREH), and the Midwest Association for Higher Education (MACHE), have been responsible for the past quarter of a century for developing many cooperative inter-institutional arrangements (Johnson, 1967).

Since World War II, corporate cooperative groups of institutions have been growing in numbers. In 1946, eleven Virginia institutions joined together to form the Richmond Area University Center (Ertell, 1957). Eleven large mid-western universities, including the "Big Ten," in 1958, formed a voluntary cooperative group called the Committee on Inter-institutional Cooperation (CIC), (Paltridge, 1969). In the same year, ten mid-western liberal arts colleges joined together to form the Associated Colleges of the Midwest (ACM). The College Center of the Finger Lakes, an aggregation of seven small colleges in south and central New York State (Bunnell and Johnson, 1965), and the Great Lakes Colleges Association, "a university made up of twelve member colleges geographically separated," (Martorana, Messersmith and Nelson, 1961), took birth in the year 1961.

There are many groups of colleges and universities throughout the country which operate on cooperative basis with a minimum of administrative machinery. Four colleges in Massachusetts joined together to make it easily possible for any student in any one of the four institutions to take for credit any course in any of the other institutions (Packard, 1959). In 1952, five Minnesota liberal arts colleges joined
a three-year program of inter-institutional cooperation "to bring to each campus an outstanding scholar in a specialized field of knowledge." (MICP, 1952) The cooperative arrangements between Vanderbilt University and George Peabody College have been in existence since 1936. As a result of an intensive survey of courses in humanities, science and social sciences and Peabody would offer professional education work in these fields (Martorana, Messersmith and Nelson, 1961). The cooperative arrangement between the University of Texas and the University of Chicago, wherein Texas constructed an astronomical observatory and Chicago staffs and operates it, is a typical example of cooperation over long distances.

In 1964, five universities in Washington, D. C. area—American University, Catholic University of America, George Washington University, Georgetown University, and Howard University—agreed upon forming a consortium of graduate study and research (West, 1965). Some of the other special-purpose cooperative groups in operation are: The Mid-America State Universities Association at Kansas City, the Association of Western Universities at Salt Lake City, the Associated Colleges of Saint Lawrence Valley, the Associated Mid-Florida Colleges, the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, and the Midwest Consortium for International Activities. Morphet and Jesser (1968) describe the case of the Commonwealth CAI Consortium wherein agencies as diverse as the School District of Pittsburgh, the School District of Philadelphia, the State Department of Public Instruction, and the Pennsylvania State University "agreed to pool their problems and
their talents" in the field of Computer Assisted Instruction. The Appalachia Education Cooperative, encompassing the states of West Virginia, and portions of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky, Virginia, and Tennessee, is an example of a cooperative enterprise based mainly upon the incorporation of extensive use of modern educational technology (Morphet and Jesser, 1968).

In the area of Continuing Education, an effort to cooperate on a regional basis has been initiated by six state universities of New England, under the title of 'New England Center for Continuing Education,' with initial funding from the Kellogg Foundation (Day, 1968). The Wayne State University--University of Michigan Extension Center in Detroit is an excellent illustration of inter-institutional cooperation in adult and continuing education (Jamrich, 1964).

Not all the cooperative operations get started because they receive any outside financial assistance. Howard's study (1967), revealed that less than one-fourth of the total existing consortia in higher education received federal aid, and only about fifty per cent of all consortia had any kind of extra-institutional support. His study also pointed out that a majority of the existing consortia is at the level of graduate study. As far as the area of Correspondence Study is concerned, this writer is unaware of any consortium efforts in that field specifically.

Interorganizational dynamics of cooperation. No institution of higher learning exists by itself. In Wells' words, "The day has long since passed when a college or university can consider itself a fort of knowledge in a hostile frontier land of ignorance, jealousy guarding
unto itself its hoards of facts and ideas." (Wells, 1967) The university necessarily depends on other institutions of similar status and their personnel for the preparation of its professors, publication of textbooks, and other such programs (Cadbury, 1966). In a philosophical study of interorganizational relationships, Aiken and Hage (1967) have asserted that "organization affects and are affected by their environments." In their study, they make fundamental assumptions about the nature of institutional behavior. A few of those assumptions are abstracted below:

1. There is a strain towards maximizing organizational autonomy, and thus towards limiting the degree of organizational interdependence.

2. Participation in joint programs with other organizations is a mechanism for obtaining more resources from the environment.

3. The greater the degree of organizational complexity, the higher the degree of organization interdependency.

4. In entering into such joint arrangements, organizations attempt to maximize their gains while minimizing the cost to the organization. (Aiken and Hage, 1967)

Lancaster (1970), on the contrary, found "that the consortium (studies) was not organized in response to recognized interdependency, but was formed primarily to create interdependency."

Zalenznik and Moment (1964) pointed out that the cooperative programmes are first launched with respect to area which are marginal and peripheral to the already existing programs of the participating institutions. However, as noticed by Fitzroy (1957), with the passage
of time, "a cooperative dynamics is developed in which one cooperative program suggests another, until the administrators and faculty members of the affiliated institutions find themselves to a surprising degree thinking cooperatively." This follows the maxim: 'success breeds success,' one successful cooperation tending to encourage further cooperation efforts (Moore, 1967b).

In relationship to the development of consortium, Silverman (1969) formulated nine hypotheses, summarized below, regarding interorganizational relationships in higher education:

1. The more threatening the environment, the greater the impetus for the threatened organizations to join in a consortium.

2. The nature of consortium involvement (internal/external, peripheral/central) is dependent upon the nature and significance of the benefits from such interaction.

3. Colleges interacting in strength areas will increase the probabilities of reciprocation and mutual respect within the consortium context.

4. Interaction patterns are strongly related to the prestige ratings of the member organizations and representatives in a consortium.

5. The thrust of the director (idealist, high task activity) is related to the growth of a consortium.

6. Representatives on the boundaries of their respective organizations are more likely than non-boundary personnel to have "meaningful interaction" in a consortium.

7. The reward function will be less conflict-laden when the organizational representatives have heterogeneous or complementary operational goals, perspectives, expectations, or needs.

8. Problem-solving among organizational representatives is related to the homogeneity of their goals, needs, purposes, or perspectives.

9. Problem-solving activity is more likely among representatives of highly paradigmatic disciplines. (Silverman, 1969)
Katz and Kahn (1966), working with their basic hypotheses that universities as a system are 'open,' concluded that "there aren't the built-in barriers" and that this openness makes possible a variety of cooperative arrangements.

In an urban setting, Evans (1968) made some hypotheses regarding consortia and tested them. His hypotheses are summarized below:

1. The greater the number of problems and challenges facing each institution which are viewed as being solvable only by thorough cooperation, the greater the success of an urban consortium.

2. The institutions with control of the greatest resources will be the least willing to cooperate.

3. The greater the commitment of the member institutions to other organizations for their individual support and status, the more difficult will be the development of a strong program of joint projects.

4. The diversity of types of educational institutions can be both an asset and a liability.

5. The greater the ability of an urban consortium to start with several tangibles, pragmatic projects of benefit to each member and to the community, the more successful the consortium will be in developing a regular source of support plus funds for more experimental programs.

6. The greater the number of bridges between the consortium and community organizations, the greater the chances for success in making a meaningful contribution to the solution of urban problems.

7. The greater the commitment of each member's chief administrator to the consortium concept, the greater the probability of its success in maintaining its continuity of existence and in implementing projects. (Evans, 1968)

These hypotheses and others should not be overlooked by the administrators intending to develop future cooperative arrangements with other institutions. As a pre-requisite to such cooperation, they, along with their faculty, "must be able to examine their own
institutions closely, explore gaps, admit weaknesses, accept 'rivals,' develop mutual trust" (Martorana, Messersmith, and Nelson, 1961). As asserted by Howard (1967), "... far more relevant to the success of cooperative efforts than their formal structure is the willingness of the participating institutions' administrations, faculties, and student to modify traditional views and methods to meet their needs through consortiums." Their participation in the consortium represents a basic commitment by their institutions "to identify, explore, and cultivate areas in which mutual action can improve their collective impact." (Grupe, 1970) Furthermore, their commitment asserts their recognition and support of the fact that the "society's needs are not bounded by the constituency or the region of an institution's service. (Henry, 1958)

**Cooperation and institutional benefits**

The cooperative device is needed to reach beyond the individual professor and project, or even the individual institution, to focus larger aggregates of higher education on a higher order of commitment. Cooperation can mean the alignment of higher education away from enchantments with economics of various sorts and toward leadership in promoting change ... (Howard, 1967)

The above statement describes in a nutshell the various advantages sought for in cooperative ventures. In Johnson's words, "this limited instrument can be made to achieve almost any purpose the member colleges are agreed upon and determined to achieve. The major limitation is in the will ... ." (Johnson, 1966) Cooperative combinations of institutions of higher education are entered into for a variety of reasons. Jamrich (1964) listed four major factors which promote
the inter-institutional cooperation: educational adequacy and
effectiveness, economic considerations, factors of human resources,
and recent general upsurge in emphasis on research. According to him,
"cooperation among educational institutions starts a common market
in education." The movement towards cooperation has been described by
Henderson (1967) as involving one or more of the following objectives:
to attain political objectives; to foster a creed or accomplish a
mission; to obtain economic support; to coordinate programs, exchange
resources, and offer jointly supported services; and to foster the
development of new or less favored institutions.

Paul Hadley (1972), in an article titled, "To Consort or Not to
Consort," makes the observations abstracted below:

Realistically speaking, autonomy-minded entities are
brought together by some outside force ... Carrots in the form
of grants are held out by government or foundation planners
who see the possibility of solving major social, economic, or
educational problems through collective action ...

The motivation may, however, be internal ... . They (the
philosopher-administrators) see the possibility of engaging
in exciting innovations with a maximum of intellectual input
and a minimum of either academic or financial risk ...

The motivation may be simple and pragmatic. Two or
more institutions find that they can economize by combining
their service facilities ...

Cooperative programs, more or less formal in nature,
may grow out of scholarly or professional associations.
(Hadley, 1972)

According to Blocker (1966), the development of cooperative re-
lationships and effective line of communication between institutions
is unavoidable if we want to provide a meaningful continuity of edu-
cational experience. Theodore S. Distler (1963) commented: "For most
colleges the only solution that I can see is for them either to enter some kind of alliance with a university ... where one is within reach ... or to join a group of like-minded colleges in providing facilities that no one of them could provide for itself." Burnell and Johnson (1965) have described four major advantages of such cooperation groups.

In a nutshell, these advantages are:

1. To present a united front. The argumentation of strength by joint action is nowhere more apparent than in negotiations with outside parties like the government, foundations, universities, and other institutions.

2. To provide new opportunities. All kinds of cooperation possibilities give students better choices than they would otherwise enjoy and faculty members better opportunities for research or other creative work. Also, specialization can be made complimentary rather than duplicative.

3. To save. Whatever is to be spent can be more effectively and efficiently spent by sharing, by division of labor, and by avoiding duplication or wasteful competition.

4. To experiment and innovate. Making innovations through the associated endeavor of several colleges permits each to gain something from the strength of all or from some who act on behalf of all. (Burnell and Johnson, 1965)

The following is a list of favorable characteristics of consortia abstracted from an opinionnaire sent to administrators of various existing consortia by Raymond S. Moore in 1967.

1. Makes better use of specialized or unique facilities and/or staff.
2. Strengthens, enriches, or upgrades institutions concerned.
3. Makes possible programs or quality otherwise impracticable.
4. Broadens perspective of institutions.
5. Avoids unnecessary duplication by pooling of resources.
7. Provides additional incentives for students and teachers.
8. Enables small institutions to enjoy advantages or large ones.
9. Facilitates degree programs in interdisciplinary areas.
10. Coordinated approach better served region unit graduate courses.
11. Has proved to be an overall economy measure.
Stanley Wendburg (1962) pointed out that cooperation creates a "common market" of education between two or more states. According to him, "its objective is to remove the political boundary as a block to a border institution's service to a geographic region, particularly the student population living across the state line .... A further effect of this regional service concept for a border institution would be to eliminate a barren area (an area without a college or university in the state immediately next door)."

Probably it is these kinds of advantages and positive reactions regarding consortia in the field of higher education that prompted a national organization like the National University Extension Association to study the subject of consortia through its Council on Short-Term Educational Programs (Hadley, 1972).

Ernest Boyer's statement is a fitting conclusion for this section:

Of course, there are practical difficulties of maintaining "quality control," and "transfer of credits," etc., but, far out weighing such practical difficulties is the fact that all such efforts represent a movement towards a concept of higher learning that is far more in tune with the conditions and opportunities of contemporary life--a concept which recognizes that we have erected too high a barrier between the campus and the real world "out there." (Boyer, 1971)

Independent study: a status and trends appraisal. In his Convergence article, Isaac Sloos contends:

Society has become very complicated nowadays, demanding so much of people with respect to differentiated knowledge, the degree of knowledge, resourcefulness, and so on, that education by correspondence has become the most efficient method of education or post-education for those with practical need for furthering their knowledge and skills .... (Sloos, 1970)
The correspondence branch of continuing education has come a long way since its conception. "After a long probationary period in a second-class status, the correspondence school has come to be a popular, fullfledged member of the adult education family." (Pearse, 1967). Because of the built-in advantages of individualization, freedom and flexibility, correspondence study "offers real chances for the realization of the concept of an education and opportunities to learn that may last a lifetime." (Rebel, 1970) As David Mathieson (1971) put it, "properly used in conjunction with television and other media, programmed instruction, traditional classroom instruction or residential conferences, correspondence study contributes to instructional system of great flexibility, effectiveness, and economy."

**Historical perspective.** The Illinois Wesleyan University offered correspondence courses as early as 1874. Later, the University of Chicago correspondence programs, started in 1881, followed by other universities, led the Armed Forces to start the United States Marine Corps Institute in 1919 (Mathieson, 1971). As pointed out by Clark (1965), the commercial correspondence schools joined the race as early as 1890, with the initiation of the International Correspondence School by Thomas J. Foster. By 1930, the National University Extension Association (NUEA) started to work "toward establishing standard for correspondence study," thus raising the status of correspondence study at the university level to its present state. Today, more than five million students, predominantly men, a majority from those living in small towns and rural area more vocational-oriented,
and with income relative lower as compared to regular institution-attending students, are taking advantage of correspondence study programs offered through various institutions of higher learning (Rossi and Johnstone, 1965).

**Newer developments in Independent Study.** As observed by Pearse (1967), "innovation is becoming a part of the vocabulary among correspondence school administrators." The past two decades have seen an enormous activity in the direction of incorporating new instructional technologies and learning structures into the correspondence study programs. Mathieson (1971), points out two different directions being explored presently: (1) the use of broadcast, projected, audio, graphic, and manipulated media in correspondence study, and (2) group correspondence study "wherein students located in the same geographic locale meet, with a teacher periodically sent out from the correspondence institution, or, alternately meet at the correspondence institution itself for seminars."

Since 1961, the University of Oklahoma has been pioneering its Bachelors degree program in liberal studies, which combines home study, correspondence courses, and annual three-week residential seminar at the university. The New York State Education Department's external-degree program, through which degrees will be granted to anyone passing a set of comprehensive examinations, without any other requirements, is another uniquely new venture in the field (Boyer, 1971). The well-known 'University without walls,' and the U.S. Navy's 'Afloat College Education' are most innovative in their approach. The 'Open University' of England has caught everybody's attention. "This new
learning system, ... has degree granting authority and employs a coordinated mixture of instructional techniques including (a) television and radio programming; (b) correspondence and home study programs and kits; (c) face-to-face meeting with other students and with tutors in specially provided local study centers; and (d) short residential courses ... ." (Mathieson, 1971)

Sloos (1970), points out a correspondence school in the Netherlands which "works with thirty thousand different lesson units, organized in such a way that any unit can be withdrawn from circulation at any time to make place for an updated unit, so that updating is guaranteed ... ." Another technique of learning, through programmed instruction, has been tried in various correspondence institutions (Kempfer, 1965). Cooper describes the Nursing program in Wisconsin, wherein, in addition to their telephone network offerings, the University of Wisconsin Extension Division has prepared various 'mini' correspondence courses. Each 'mini' course unit consists of: objectives for the unit; a pre-test; a detailed study outline; materials supportive to the topic; and a post-test which allows the student to test her knowledge by herself after the course is completed (Cooper and Lutze, 1970).

The role of media and technology in correspondence education. Utah's Master Plan for Higher Education (1968), correctly asserted that "one of the hopeful directions currently under study, which may improve quality and eventually reduce costs, lies in the development and use of the newer educational technology." C. R. Carpenter (1967), in a faculty seminar, made this recommendation regarding incorporation of technology in Individualized institution:
Design and provide conditions for learning which are like or which simulate the future conditions in which the individuals under consideration will continue to learn during their whole life cycle. There is little prospect that the radio, telephone, television, and motion picture films will disappear as sources of information, instruction, and entertainment (Carpenter, 1967).

The Master Plan further recommends that "... the utilization of such technological advances as telelecture, the Victor Electronic Remote Blackboard, hardcopy transmission devices such as facsimile, slow-scan television and others should not be ignored."

Gary Gumbert, in a paper entitled "Inter-institutional Exchange and Media" gives a description of the existing communication media. The following partial inventory is taken from that source (Gumbert, 1967):

**COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI):** Utilizes electronic signals to exchange information between a computer and students. It is a form of programmed instruction which includes a specially programmed high-speed processor and student stations.

**ELECTROWRITER:** Transmits handwritten messages or diagrams to any number of distant viewing stations. The basic elements consists of two electrowriters interconnected via telephone. A projector that magnifies the images and a screen complete the visual components of the system. Generally, the electrowriter is used in conjunction with a two-way telephone hook-up for audio transmission.

**FACSIMILE:** (makes) possible to transmit graphic materials from one site to another. Using a telephone line system and special sending and receiving equipment, hard copy (permanently retainable) rather than screen images constitutes the end product or output. In this way a page of material can be transmitted and reproduced from one institution to another without physically transporting that page.
DATEPHONE: ... Utilizing telephone lines, a specially adapted telephone, and a computer or business machine, it is possible to link computers together ... .

RADIO: ... The 'Subsidiary Communications Authorization,' more commonly known as "piggyback FM channel," allows an additional signal to be transmitted on top of the normal FM signal ... . While the regular frequency module signal is used to broadcast a program, instructional materials can be transmitted via the piggyback channel to specially equipped receivers ... . It is possible to achieve two-way communication with the addition of the telephone connection ... .

SLOW-SCAN TELEVISION: ... involves the television transmission of still pictures using relatively inexpensive phone lines rather than the more expensive transmission equipment required for conventional television ... . A series of separate pictures are transmitted with this method, almost in a slide fashion ... . A camera transmits an image which is stored in a display tube for a period of six to eight minutes. This image can be erased and a new one displayed, either automatically or manually ... .

VIDEOFILE: ... is an automated storage and retrieval system which uses videotype to store documents ... . The materials can be presented either as images on a television screen or as printed copies ... . (Gumbert, 1967)

Gumbert goes on to describe other popular media such as the telelecture, the teletype, and the television. These and other media such as the films, graphics, audio recording, and print can be combined together to offer media packages enriching the course contents.

Various writers have described the advantages and disadvantages of using the new technology in instruction. The following is a summary of the strengths of audio-visual media, taken from the list provided by Robert D. Keiffer (1968).

1. The audio-visual media serves as an effective means of presenting all kinds of factual material.

2. They make meaning clear by bringing the learner closer to reality than through the use of words alone.
3. They make learning more permanent because of their ability not only to present information more clearly and succinctly but because they recreate life-like situations and involve the students with the learning process.

4. They leave a definite effect upon attitudes and behavioral responses because of their tremendous impact upon the emotions, drives, and goals of the individual.

5. They gain and hold attention, which directs the learner to the basic objectives of the instructional period. (Keiffer, 1958)

Mathieson (1971), pointed out the following strong points in favor of Broadcast Media:

1. Broadcast media and correspondence study, in judicious combination, can bring individualized instruction to a mass audience.

2. Broadcast media offers to correspondence study not only the intrinsic advantages of sight and sound but they also provide an additional measure of pacing discipline, and motivation.

3. Correspondence study offers to broadcast media an opportunity to provide for individual differences, an avenue for two-way communication between student and teacher, a means for direction of a total learning experience and a procedure for student reaction.

4. The combination of broadcast media and correspondence study should not be a mere coupling of two methods of teaching, but through experimental development and integration should result in a completely new instructional procedure. (Mathieson, 1971)

Cooperation for effective utilization of technology in Independent Study. Morphet and Jesser (1968) point out two anomalies of modern education: the 'institutionalized textbook' and the 'individualized instructor-managed materials.' They recommend strongly for institutions to resist those, and to learn more in the direction of inter-institutional cooperation. Their plan for sharing facilities for
"producing, organizing, distributing, and using instructional materials of superior quality" is summarized below:

1. Develop neutral instructional parks ... a place for cooperative work ... .

2. Plan and finance jointly programs of instructional materials production and testing, using the dependable knowledge already available on processes of learning and teaching and the uses of a wide spectrum of educational technologies. These programs should be conducted by professional people in their subject matter areas ... . The professional people representing institutions which will use the instructional materials will be supported by psychologists, writers, media specialists, artists, and persons with other specialized skills and training ... .

3. ... The emphasis should not be on recording and presenting a teacher. The materials should provide for intensive persisting involvement and active responses by learners and means for them to know the results of their learning efforts. Here the designing of instructional materials becomes the main task.

4. Design the material so that complete courses are not produced for use in colleges and universities. Rather the core-of-course or a core-of-curriculum should be recorded in appropriate media and with the best modes and combinations of modes of communication.

5. Provide adequate funding ... . The cost of production and proving-ground testing of instructional material will be for greater than current investments in instructional materials. The great advantages of inter-institutional cooperation accrue from the increased uses of precision-produced material ... . (Morphet and Jesser, 1968)

Conclusion

The Independent Study divisions of the universities in the intermountain states, as in the other parts of the country, face the tremendous challenge of keeping up with the changing social and economic conditions of the region they serve. Inter-institutional cooperation in planning, in sharing instructional facilities and faculty resources,
and in other instructional activities makes it possible for the institutions to present a unified front for negotiations with outside parties, thereby providing new opportunities for students and faculty to save by avoiding wasteful competition to experiment, and to innovate. Such inter-institutional practices seem to place the educational needs above the need to comply with some "antiquated" set of regulations regarding credits, grades, transfer, and tuition charges. The extent to which such efforts will be successful in meeting the challenge of the times is unquestionable.
CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE--II

Principles of Consortium Development

The literature of the past fifteen years is full of instances of cooperation and the descriptions about the same. However, the recorded literature fails to provide any significant insight into the process involved behind bringing about such cooperation. In short, the emphasis seems to be on the output, without due treatment given to the subject of input. The only significant pieces of work dealing with the process of input, as related to consortium formation, which this writer is aware of, are those of Fritz Grupe (1970) and Edgar L. Sagan (1969a). Of course, many other writers have accorded minor treatment to this issue in the context of other major topics.

Major conflicts in inter-institutional cooperation

Cooperative planning is easier to call for than to accomplish (Grupe, 1970). Describing some of the problems which cooperative ventures are frequently faced with, Paul Hadley (1972) mentions the following causes for success or failure of a consortium: worship of institutional autonomy; interpersonal problems that arise among the participants because of lack of direct participation in decision making, attitude about status and prestige, and insufficient faculty
incentives and rewards; the tendency of one institution to manage a consortium for its partners; lack of representation of the community on its planning board; and, of course, economic reasons. On this topic, Raymond S. Moore (1967b), commented that "fears, suspicions, apprehension, lack of information or misinformation about cooperation are still sharply limiting its effectiveness in most schools today ...

It is often feared that the central organizations of the consortium may acquire power and status greater than that of the participating institutions individually, and, thus, may infringe upon the activities of the individual institutions. Patterson (1971) challenged such fears on the following grounds:

1. Voluntary participation forecloses required conformity.
2. Proclaimed institutional individuality is frequently more rhetorical than real.
3. Conformity in certain procedures does not necessarily require conformity in all matters.
4. Cooperative planning and development can be used to provide greater, not less, freedom and opportunity for diversity, experimentation, and pilot programs.
5. The relinquishing of certain prerogatives for the good of a large cause can result in greater individual institutional opportunities.
6. Cooperation can provide greater institutional stability.
7. Cooperation can diminish the detrimental effect of specific program failures. (Patterson, 1971)

The above mentioned fear of outside interference in university affairs is further challenged by Christopher Jencks, as reported by Morris Keeton in his article (Keeton, 1968). Stressing that outside
interference is rather good for the institutions, he makes the following observation:

If the conventional wisdom about non-intervention is correct, the American university should have compiled a distinguished record on the teaching side and rather a mediocre record in research. In point of fact, this has not happened. The combination of external financing and individual initiative has encouraged a certain amount of charlatanism and quite a lot of nonsense on the research side, but there has also been an extraordinary amount of brilliant work, a readiness to move into new fields, try new ideas, and respond to real problems. In teaching, on the other hand, collective responsibility and the comparative absence of external financial pressure, far from ensuring a generally high quality of classroom performance, have led to stagnation. (Keeton, 1968)

Contending that "no amount of good will, or best intentions, or nice guys can avoid conflict in an organization that is serious about cooperation," Lancaster (1970) stated that conflict in an interorganization like the consortium can serve a positive function—that of defining boundaries, generating search behavior, and providing a sense of independence. The importance of this positive function should be especially emphasized while dealing with limitations such as those described by Johnson (1967). Such limitations are abstracted as follows:

1. Consortia deals with what is inherently peripherical ... Therefore, it is hard for the consortia to deal with what the faculty is most interested in or what seems vital to academic personnel ... .

2. Communications become inherently difficult because of organization, geography, motivation, outstanding commitments, and traditions. Another compounded difficulty then arises because the remedy calls for unusual attention to consensuses-making machinery and to mechanisms both for representation and for the tapping of creativity, out of all propositions to the motivation felt by the members ... .
3. Another limitation is institutional self-interest. Although it may be submerged for general association, it can rise to the surface again on specific program suggestions ...

4. ... The difficulty of making organizational and representational machinery congruent with tasks and expectations.

5. The finances and overheads of the central office (can create conflict invariably) ...

(Johnson, 1967)

Lancaster (1970), identified four central problem areas which the most common consortia conflicts seem to cluster around. Those areas are:

1. Role and scope of the central office. This includes uncomfortableness regarding location of the central offices, and the tension over seemingly growing power of the central office to get more grants through it.

2. Problem of distribution of limited resources of an inter-organization, including the concerns that many of the funded projects tend to deal with administrative functions and that the funds never get down to the faculty or student level.

3. Problem of heterogeneity of member institutions attempting to seek common goals. A sense of "considerable divergence between where we are going and where they are going," and a felt pressure to cooperate in spite of differences.

4. Conflict over administrative procedure and management as the consortium develops. This encompasses resentment by some member institutions over "any tendency on the part of the central staff to assume authority without consulting the colleges or the executive committee." Also, the delicate matter of sending representatives from
the consortium to meet with campus personnel directly and "not be responsible to the respective college president" is a part of this conflict area.

Grupe (1970) pointed out one of the most dominant problems consortium developers are faced with. According to him, "In competition with daily routines and pressures, joint ventures can easily take second place to institutional priorities. The distance between approval in principle and acceptance in action is agonizingly great ... (Furthermore), lacking judicious measures of realism, groups of colleges and universities forming consortium may, therefore, experience undue dissatisfaction when many of the ideas they had for projects are discarded and progress is slower than anticipated." West (1965) elaborates on this problem further by stating that at all levels "it is sometimes difficult for the participants to draw a sharp line between their interest within the framework of cooperation and their interest as president, dean, department head, professor, registrar, etc. . . ."

The conflicts and limitations stated above need to be recognized, and efforts need to be put in to resolve those, before a cooperative venture is ready to provide any fruitful outcome.

Developmental processes for consortium formation

As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, only a few writers have presented ideas on the process of developing a consortium. Martorana, Messersmith, and Nelson (1961), after reviewing various
existing inter-institutional programs in higher education, arrived at the following tentative principles which should be kept in mind while developing a cooperative project:

1. Using such possible stimuli as geographical proximity or involvement in like education programs or services, institutional leaders should make a determination of the colleges or universities which may feasibly establish a cooperative arrangement.

2. A meeting of representatives of all interested colleges or agencies should be held as early as possible to explore areas of possible cooperation; is not so important as inclusive representation at where the initiative for this meeting originated it.

3. Expression of willingness to share the college's resources as well as to share the resources of others should be recorded.

4. Plans for the introduction of any contemplated cooperative arrangement be formulated tentatively and re-examined in later meetings of representatives in the institution.

5. Lines of communication should be open to all institutions in the new venture; communications within institutions likely to be participants should be encouraged, particularly in regard to the preliminary development of the program.

6. The roles, responsibilities, and commitments of each participating institution must be clearly delineated.

7. All participants must be kept abreast of the progress of the program.

8. While the possibility of failure should be recognized throughout the venture, strive to dispel every such possibility.

9. Following the inauguration and development of the first cooperative effort, there should be constant objective, concrete, and complete appraisal of the arrangements in all of its aspects.

10. From experience gained in the first venture, possibilities of and principles for embarking on additional programs of inter-institutional cooperation which offer promise of improving and advancing the total higher education program should be developed. (Martorana, Messersmith, and Nelson, 1961)
It is not necessary to start with big schemes, as "cooperation is much more likely to proceed from the specific to the general than from the general to the specific." (Eckelberry, 1954) The push for such inter-university programs should come from the administration rather than from the faculty, because "faculty members as entrepreneurs are likely to give first attention to initiating their own research programs in the pursuit of their own research interests ... ." (Katz, 1967) Grupe (1970), stresses that Presidential involvement and support is essential to the development of a consortium. Above all, an absolute essential of consortium formation is "the conviction on the part of governors, administrative officers, legislators, and public policy groups that the spending of some money in the state next door on a cooperative basis may achieve a necessary and significant gain for both sides involved." (Wendberg, 1962). The role of public in the development of a cooperative project should not be undermined either (Beal, 1958 and Dutton, 1970). The final outcome of the cooperative planning must be subject to scrutiny of the clientele, and the universities among themselves must not have their exclusive say in judging their own product (Sproule, 1971).

The most important person in the planning stage of any consortium is the Project Director or Assistant, a person who conducts background research, assists in project administration, and puts together the collected data and materials for analysis (Hoopes et al, 1971). One of the major problems the Project Director is faced with is that of stimulating and motivating the staffs and faculties of the participating institutions, and of making them aware of the
potentialities of the consortium (Howard, 1967). The individual assuming the role of a Project Director for the consortium has to be a leader who believes in authority "based on the power of suggestion and persuasion" rather than one who leans towards the traditional hierarchical leadership (Patterson, 1967). His role is that of being a change agent (Burns, 1969). He needs to possess a high degree of versatility, an expertise in "playing it by ear," and special competence in utilizing the faculty competence of the participating institutions for the good of the consortium (Howard, 1967 and Patterson, 1969). He must be able to grasp the overall situation existing at various institutions and to secure a complete identification of his functions at an early stage. Howard (1967), stressed the need of answering questions such as the following, regarding the Project Director's position:

Will he be expected to suggest, or to assist in determining board policy or will he merely execute such policy?

Will he be expected to be a program operator or simply a catalyst, or both?

Will he be expected to identify possible areas for cooperative undertakings and to assist in securing financial support for such undertakings?

To what extent will he be called upon to give advice and suggestions to the board and other institutional representatives, including faculty members, involved in specific cooperative projects, and to give direction to the projects themselves? ... (Howard, 1967)

Fritz Grupe, in an extensive study designed to develop a generalized procedural sequence of guidelines for establishing a collegiate cooperative center, arrived at the steps summarized below which should be followed:
Exploratory Phase:

Step 1 The idea of establishing a cooperative center may be conceived of a president willing to initiate and maintain a movement to establish one.

Step 2 An informal attempt may be made to assess and obtain support for creating a cooperative center and to identify potential member institutions.

Step 3 Formal notification might be made to selected institutions of the intention to discuss possible cooperative programs and possible formation of a cooperative center.

Step 4 A meeting or series of meetings of presidents or authorized representatives may be held to discuss the feasibility and desirability of pursuing cooperative goals by establishing a cooperative center.

Planning Phase

Step 5 A committee of presidents and other institutional representatives may be appointed to prepare plans for organizing the cooperative center. The committee's functions would be:
   to identify basic goals of the center,
   to develop tentative program plans,
   to accumulate basic relevant data on the feasibility of establishing a center,
   to develop tentative articles of incorporation, tentative budget,
   to promote the value of a cooperative center.

Step 6 Informal attempts must be made to obtain institutional commitments of financial support.

Step 7 Copies of the articles of incorporation and by-laws may be submitted to the presidents for final review and approval.

Step 8 The presidentially approved recommendations to establish the center may be submitted to the several institutional boards of trustees for the commitment of institutional academic and financial support.

Step 9 A procedure for selecting an executive officer should be arranged and implemented.
Step 10 Efforts to locate suitable facilities for housing the center must be undertaken.

Step 11 A board of trustees (or incorporators) should be formed to submit the articles of incorporation to the proper state agency for approval.

Step 12 Formal petitions for incorporation should be finalized and submitted for state approval.

Implementation Phase

Step 13 Upon notification of incorporation, a meeting of the board of trustees should be held to conclude if possible:
- acceptance of the by-laws,
- appointment of an executive officer,
- selection of an office facility,
- acceptance of institutional fees,
- approval of a tentative budget,
- initiation of procedures to obtain tax exemption status.

Step 14 The executive officer should activate the cooperation center by:
- preparing a list of administrators and academic committees,
- holding exploratory meetings,
- becoming oriented to the campuses,
- developing channels of communication,
- identifying and implementing initial programs,
- publicizing actions taken.

Step 15 If available, the board of trustees or the executive officer should solicit funds from external sources.

Evidently, before the above mentioned procedure can be followed, there needs to be some finances available for initial explorations. Describing the development of Center for Inter-institutional Cooperation (CIC), Salwak (1966) stresses the importance of initial "seed grants" which have "frequently meant the difference between meeting and not meeting, and thus between new programs and not new programs."
It is of utmost importance to involve all the potential participants from the very beginning. If the institutions to be involved in or to be affected do not have a hand in shaping the program, they will tend to look upon the program "as someone else's or as belonging to the central organization." (Patterson, 1967).

Regarding the question of a centralized administration of the consortium, there are both advantages and disadvantages of a centralized administration. Patterson (1967), presents both views, summarized as follows:

Proponents of centralized administration of cooperative groups argue that:

1. The sensitivity and complexity of interinstitutional cooperation merit professional administrative leadership. Staff who devote full time to developing this expertise will administer programs more efficiently and effectively than institutional administrators who are delegated numerous responsibilities that are often unrelated to their normal duties.

2. Cooperative programs that provide specialized personnel and/or resources will be utilized more fully by all of the participating institutions if lodged with a "neutral" agency in a central location.

3. When a particular institution's needs and requests exceed the resources available, a centralized staff functioning from a neutral office will more nearly ensure an equitable sharing of the program's offerings.

4. Programs centralized geographically frequently are more effectively and economically administered.

5. Centralized staffing will more likely ensure adequate preparation before and follow-through after an activity.

6. Interinstitutional confidence in new program developing may be enhanced and facilitated by a central staff who, again, are more likely to be considered neutral in regard to each participating institution.
Proponents of decentralized operation may argue:

1. Expertise should be developed on the campuses rather than in a central office.
2. Cooperative programs should relate directly to other programs on the campus rather than be independent—a result of removal of an off-campus location.
3. Decentralized programs take greater advantage of institutional initiatives.
4. Costs for operating cooperative programs are more easily borne on the campuses.

Decentralized cooperation presents fewer problems when the participating institutions are in close geographical proximity. (Patterson, 1967)

Edgar L. Sagan (1969b) undertook the task of identifying various activities which need to be completed, and of outlining a systematic sequence of approach to the development of various consortia. He arrived at nineteen objectives, abstracted as follows, to be achieved through the planning process involved in consortium development:

1. Establishment of an incorporated formal organization.
2. Formation of a consortium governing board to establish the general direction policies of the organization.
3. Formation of a committee structure of the governing board to develop and supervise various policies and functions requiring their level of attention.
4. Development of a set of basic operational policies to guide the ongoing functions of the consortium.
5. Provision for the availability of legal services for incorporation procedures and other ongoing legal needs.
6. The employment of an executive officer who would direct and supervise the ongoing operation of the consortium.
7. The provision of permanent office facilities for the administrative staff of the consortium.

8. The employment of a supporting staff for the executive officer.

9. Establishment of a Faculty Council to promote interinstitutional communication, screen program proposals, and recommended policies to the governing board.

10. Establishing of—a Student Advisory Committee to promote consortium—student communication and recommend program/service and administrative improvements.

11. Establishment of a Long Range Planning Group to study, recommend, and help implement future directions and activities the consortium should eventually pursue.

12. Establishment of an information/communication/publicity system.

13. Designation of a treasurer or financial officer.


15. Collection of dues from each member institution, signifying the expression of commitment to the consortium.

16. Determination of faculty resources and competencies to facilitate the evaluation of strengths and weaknesses for potential program areas.

17. Implementation of basic statistical studies to facilitate the development and evaluation of program/service systems.
18. Development of externally and locally funded operational cooperative programs or services.

19. Initiation of plans for the evaluation of program efficiency and effectiveness.

Although Sagan's work is based mainly upon after-the-fact observation of existing consortia, the importance of achieving these objectives is rather crucial to the yet-to-be-formed consortia as well.

**Conclusion**

The contents of this chapter are summarized by Grupe (1970) in the statement: "But a more serious mistake is often made when it is assumed that goals for a consortium can easily be identified and quickly translated into operational programs." The various factors identified in the text above are crucial to the development of any kind of cooperative program, and ample time and energies must be devoted to their consideration, if the venture is to serve any useful purpose.
In order to develop and appraise the climate for a cooperative effort in any discipline, it becomes rather crucial to be able to identify what it is that the group of potential participants is really willing to cooperate or not cooperate in. Their reactions, gut-level feelings, perceptions, and genuine concern for mutual exchange of ideas prove to be the foundation stones of the venture. Reliance, then, upon formal questionnaires, written responses, and persuasion based upon sense of academic benefits tend to produce fruitful results only to the extent of having something on paper.

The basic motivation for the study, as far as this writer is concerned, was based upon his desire to be able to propose a practicable plan which should evolve from the above mentioned level of participation among the potential participants. Thus, a sense of openness of mind towards ideas expressed to him became a paramount factor characterizing his role in the study.

Purpose and Population to be Served

The purpose of this study was to develop a theoretical-philosophical base for the development of a consortium of the divisions of Independent Study of the state-supported institutions of higher
learning in the intermountain states of Utah, Idaho, Nevada, and Wyoming for jointly offering a portion of their course offerings. More specifically, the institutions to be involved were: Utah State University, University of Utah, University of Idaho, University of Nevada, and the University of Wyoming. The representatives of these institutions had expressed their desire to explore the possibilities of such a venture during their informal conversations at the annual conference of a professional association to which all of them belong.

**Methodology**

The writer undertook the task of exploring the above mentioned possibilities, by following the below mentioned sequential approach:

**Step 1.** Conduct a review of related literature, with special emphasis on the processes involved in the development of consortia.

**Step 2.** Informally disseminate the objectives of the study among potential participants and, then, appraise their reactions.

**Step 3.** Conduct a thorough feasibility study through individual exploratory interviews with the potential participants.

**Step 4.** Extract and channel the expressed desires of the potential participants into a systematic approach to consortium development.

**Step 5.** Obtain feedback on the proposed systematic approach and other related matters.
As the same individuals were involved throughout the study, it was felt that the last three steps were consolidated together and treated as one major process.

**Step 1**

The literature was reviewed with two basic purposes in mind: (1) that of broadening the background and understandings about the field of Independent Study by the writer, as far as the present trends and practices are concerned, and (2) that of identifying the approaches for consortia development, and the problems faced during such ventures, as suggested by various authors. The works of Grupe (1970), and Sagan (1969a) provided the writer with the basic guidelines to be followed. Since the present study was meant to be of a practical nature, and the conditions in the field of Independent Study being different than those in regular curriculum, it was felt that neither of the approaches suggested by the above mentioned authors could be rigidly followed, thus making it essential to arrive at new procedural guidelines which would incorporate the suggestions of these authors as well.

**Step 2**

The informal dissemination of the objectives of the study was partially done with the help of the Director of Independent Study at Utah State University, hereafter referred to as the Initiating Director. During the informal conversations in between the sessions of the annual conference of the National University Extension Association, held at Columbia, South Carolina, in May, 1972, he, with
the initial input and encouragement from the University of Wyoming representative, conveyed the idea of the overall project to the Directors of Independent Study of the University of Utah and University of Nevada. Also, a written list of questions prepared by the writer, attached in Appendix C was presented to them for their deliberations.

During and after the stated conference, the Initiating Director did subjective assessment of how the idea was received by the above mentioned representatives. Strongly convinced that the contacted individuals were basically supportive and that they definitely wanted to at least further explore the idea, he contacted the same representatives from University of Utah, University of Nevada, and University of Wyoming for arranging individual conferences of the writer with them. At that time, the decision for also involving the University of Idaho was made, partially because of its geographical proximity and partially because of the Initiating Director's past professional relationships with the Director of Independent Study of the said institution. Idaho being on a statewide system of Correspondence Study, the Director for the State's Board of Continuing Education was also contacted for this purpose.

Step 3

For the purpose of conducting the feasibility study, it was felt desirable to have exploratory interviews, open-ended and informal in nature, with the potential participants individually, rather than to try to have a joint meeting of the representatives. One factor underlying this decision, aside from the practical limitation of time and
finances, was the intention of the Initiating Director and of the writer to achieve an awareness of the potentially vulnerable issues and of the lines of thoughts of the individual representatives in an atmosphere comprising of non-threatening, non-committing, and informal surroundings. The potential participants' home institutions were the ideal choice for such exchange of ideas. Because of the limitation of money, however, the second choice had to be resorted to in the case of the University of Idaho and the University of Wyoming. In these cases, the interviews were scheduled at times when the representatives were due to arrive at locations relatively closer to Logan in connection with other official business matters. Thus, even though the University of Idaho is located at Moscow, the exploratory interview was conducted in Boise, Idaho. The representative from the University of Wyoming, along with the Initiating Director, arranged an overnight stopover at Denver, Colorado, on their way back from a professional conference, and the writer joined them at that location for conducting the interview.

The exploratory interview with each of the institutional representatives was conducted through questions which fell under three separate categories:

1. Questions which provided the writer with an awareness of what already exists at each of the potentially participant Independent Study divisions.

2. Questions which sought to explore what types of cooperative arrangements would be feasible under the existing circumstances.
3. Questions to help identify various steps and procedures which need to be followed for planning and implementation of the expressed cooperative arrangement(s).

The questions asked under category one were such as the ones mentioned below:

What is the organizational structure of the Independent Study division of your institution?

How many courses do you offer; in what fields; what is the criterion for offering a certain course?

What is the total budget for your division, and what proportion of funds goes to instruction, administration?

What is the role of media and technology in your present offerings?

What grading system, credit arrangements, etc., do you have?

How is the faculty chosen for course preparation; how are they reimbursed; what is the role of individual departments in course offerings?

What arrangements do you have for individual counseling; feedback, student and community participation?

What are the strong and weak points of your program?

In addition to providing the writer with an overall background of the present operation of the participating institutions, this line of questioning was meant to help make the interview situation more unstrained, open, and relaxed. Of course, questions to which answers could be obtained by looking through the University catalogs were
avoided during the interview so as to make maximum productive use of
the time available. Based upon the responses to such questions, a
table comparing the present setup of each of the five Independent
Study divisions was developed (Table 1), which could be used as the
background material by the participant Directors when they are ready
to deliberate upon agreeing on a certain area of cooperation.

Category two included questions which sought to explore what
types of cooperative arrangement or arrangements would be feasible
under the existing circumstances. Such questions were of the type:

Do you see any need for proceeding in the direction of inter-
institutional cooperation?

Do you feel that a cooperative approach will be welcomed by
your university, public, and the legislature? Can you foresee any
segment which will oppose such a move? What kind of problems do you
foresee?

From what you have learned about the idea, what direction do you
perceive the cooperative venture could take?

What publics, do you think, should be served through the con-
sortium, if formed? What areas of cooperation should it initially
get involved with?

Should the consortium offer a degree program or a certificate
of completion, etc.?

Do you know of any rules or laws which will not permit such inter-
state cooperation using the state's resources?

For the planning of the consortium, will you be willing to invest
in some "seed money" or defray a part of the costs of planning?
Table 1. Comparison of the present set-up of the participating Independent Study Divisions (ISK)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Budget and Status</td>
<td>$87,000 Self-supporting (except Dir. salary)</td>
<td>$55,000 Self-supporting</td>
<td>$160,000 Self-supporting**</td>
<td>$64,000 Self-supporting</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Course Offerings</td>
<td>119 col. courses 4 non-credit 0 high school</td>
<td>89 col. courses 4 non-credit 27 high school</td>
<td>202 col. courses 5 non-credit 26 high school</td>
<td>174 col. courses 0 non-credit 23 high school</td>
<td>125 col. courses 0 non-credit 57 high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Feed</td>
<td>$19/semester hr No high school</td>
<td>$19/semester hr $36/half unit</td>
<td>$11/quarter hr $20/half unit</td>
<td>$11/quarter hr $20/half unit</td>
<td>$14/semester hr $20/half unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credits applicable towards Bach. Degree</td>
<td>15 Semester hrs</td>
<td>32 Semester hrs</td>
<td>45 Quarter hrs</td>
<td>45 Quarter hrs</td>
<td>24 Semester hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading System</td>
<td>All letter grade</td>
<td>All letter grade</td>
<td>Both Pass/Fail and letter grade (teacher's op)</td>
<td>Both Pass/Fail and letter grade (teacher's op)</td>
<td>All letter grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In order of hierarchy
**Institution making some profit
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Design</strong></td>
<td>A few courses use slides</td>
<td>2-3 courses use phonograph or phonograph records.</td>
<td>Several courses use tapes or slides</td>
<td>10-12 courses use cassettes and slides</td>
<td>All written mode. No media involved, except in Lang. courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Numbering</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System</strong></td>
<td>1-49 1st year Assoc. degree courses</td>
<td>100-299 Lower Division</td>
<td>1-99 Non-credit</td>
<td>1-49 Non-credit</td>
<td>300-499 &quot;Beg.&quot; (Fresh, Soph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-99 2nd year Assoc. degree courses</td>
<td>300-499 Upper Division</td>
<td>100-199 Lower Div. (Fresh &amp; Soph)</td>
<td>50-99 Non-credit</td>
<td>500-599 &quot;Inter.&quot; (Soph, Jr, Sr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100-199 Fresh.</td>
<td></td>
<td>201-299 Honors, Lower Div.</td>
<td>100-279 Lower Div. (Fresh &amp; Soph)</td>
<td>600-799 &quot;Adv.&quot; (Jr, Sr, Grad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200-299 Soph.</td>
<td></td>
<td>301-399 Upper Div. (Jr. &amp; Sr)</td>
<td>280-299 Lower Div. Indiv. Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300-399 Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td>401-499 Honors, Upper Division</td>
<td>300-479 Upper Div. (Jr &amp; Sr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>601-700 Grad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Should the consortium get involved with only one area or many?

Should it move in the direction of consolidating all the existing Independent Study programs into one operation?

What role, do you think, should be played by the media and technology in the consortium offerings?

What are your feelings on the grading system, course-numbering, and credit systems for the consortium?

What can the consortium put forth in terms of individual counseling, feedback, student and community involvement, etc.?

What external sources of grant, etc., should be tapped for the funding of the consortium?

How should the university departments be involved in the planning of the consortium?

Is there anything the consortium could learn from the commercial correspondence schools, or other such sources, in terms of learning-teaching considerations?

How should the faculties be reimbursed for their services, and what registration procedures, etc., should be followed by the consortium for course offerings?

Answers to questions such as the above were meant to provide enough insight into the line of thought of the individual participants. The questions were designed so as to develop a philosophical base for the cooperative model. In addition, these questions focused upon the needs and desires of the individual institutions, thus providing a clue to the type of approach which need to be followed for developing a consortium that would be of considerable benefit to each of the participating institutions.
The questions under category three tended to be more specific and technical in nature. The writer put emphasis on pin-pointing procedural details and steps which need to be pursued for the planning and implementing of the proposed cooperative arrangement. The responses to the questions under this category were to become the backbone of the Systems Model for the planning and implementation of the proposed consortium.

Step 4

Based upon the responses obtained through the feasibility study, as outlined in Step 3 above, the writer developed a descriptive model of the proposed consortium. The model enlists philosophy and operational details of a cooperative arrangement which the potential participants had expressed a desire for and which pools together the thoughts held by the individual participants regarding such an arrangement.

Also, to facilitate the deliberations upon actually implementing the model, in case the participants ever decide to do so, a Systems Flow-Chart was developed, encompassing the sequence of steps which need to be followed for planning and implementation by making the participants aware of the time estimates involved in the overall process. Incidentally, no attempt is made in this study to explain the fundamentals of Systems Analysis and PERT networks, and, thus, an understanding of these terms by the reader is automatically assumed.
Step 5

The descriptive model and the Systems Flow-Chart developed in Step 4 were put to an examination by the potential participants. A rotational order for the evaluation was followed such that each of the evaluating participants was able to evaluate a stage of the model which had evolved out of the writer's exploratory interviews with the participants preceding him. This arrangement, in addition to providing economics of time, helped towards continuous modification of the model as it was being developed.

Conclusion

The main thrust of the present study lies upon developing an interpersonal dynamics, through the exploratory interviews, which would be conducive to a climate favorable to the growth of the consortium idea. By involving the potential participants in planning from the infancy stage of the proposed consortium the writer attempted to present an arrangement which could be labelled genuinely as the brain-child of the whole group rather than of a particular individual or institution. Inasmuch as the above objective was pursued, the exact statement of questions asked, and the resolving of some specific and technical issues, were rather secondary to the objective in mind.

A self-explanatory systems flow-chart for the Exploratory stage (Grupe, 1970) of the present study is presented next, and the following chapter elaborates upon the outcome of the methodology followed and described herein.
Figure 1. Exploratory phase.
Decision
All Directors Willing to participate?

yes

No

Delete these unwilling to participate

Reactions of Dir., Utah State U.

Get reactions of Dir., Utah State U.

Reactions of Wyoming, Nevada, Utah, and Idaho

Reactions to the proposal and questions

Travel to Reno and get reactions of Dir., U. of Nevada

Travel to Salt Lake and get reactions of Dir., U. of Utah

Reactions of and evaluation by Utah St. U.

Get reactions of Dir., Utah State U.

Reactions of and evaluation by U. of Idaho

Travel to Boise and get reactions of Dir., U. of Idaho

Reactions of and evaluation by U. of Wyoming

Travel to Denver and get reactions of Dir., U. of Wyoming

Reactions of Wyoming, Nevada, Utah

Reactions of U. of Nevada and U. of Utah

Make appointments with those willing to participate*

Telephone, Correspondence

*Those found willing to participate were: Directors, USU, U of U, U of Nevada, U of Idaho, and U of Wyoming.
CHAPTER V
RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As described in the preceding chapter, the exploratory inter­views with the Directors and/or Coordinators of the Independent Study divisions of the participating institutions were based upon questions under three broad categories. The following is an analysis of the open-ended responses to these questions, and the recommendation based upon the same.

Category I: Responses Pertaining to the Present Set-Up of the Participating Independent Study Division

The purpose of asking questions which fell under this category was two-fold:

1. To get an awareness of what already exists at each of the Independent Study Divisions of the universities participating in the explorations; thus enabling one to identify their operational similarities and dissimilarities.

2. By starting the exploratory interviews with such questions, to make the interview situation more relaxed, open and in­formal.

The questions to which answers could be obtained by looking at the Independent Study catalogs were, generally, avoided during the inter­view. Thus, more of the questions asked were those which could be answered by only those intimately involved in the operation of the divisions in question.
Table 1 summarizes the responses to some of the questions which fell under this category. Based upon all the responses received, the following observations are made regarding the present set-up of the Independent Study divisions of the institutions participating in this study:

**Similarities**

1. None of the participating institutions allows correspondence credit to be applicable towards a graduate degree.

2. Most of the courses offered through these institutions use the textbook and written mode in course design. Only a few experimental or language courses employ media.

3. All of the participating Independent Study divisions are self supporting.

4. All of the participating institutions require that the instructors and contents of courses offered through correspondence be first approved by the related academic departments.

5. All of the participating institutions provide incentives to their instructors for grading assignments within a set time limit, and, penalties for delay.

**Dissimilarities**

1. The organizational structure of the Independent Study division varies with the institution. Three of the five participating institutions serve as the sole state-supported agencies, within their respective states, for offering courses through correspondence.
2. The policy of offering non-credit or high school courses through correspondence varies with the institution. Two out of the five institutions do not offer any non-credit courses, whereas, one institution does not involve itself with offering any high school level courses.

3. Three of the five institutions operate on the semester hour credit system, whereas, the other two use the quarter hour system. Accordingly, the usual number of lessons and assignments per credit hour varies.

4. The fees per equivalent credit hour vary among the institutions.

5. Three of the five participating institutions adhere strictly to the letter grade system, whereas the other two employ both, the letter grade and the pass/fail grading system.

6. The number of equivalent credit hours applicable towards the Bachelor's degree varies among the institutions.

7. The course numbering system, although similar in concept, differs with respect to student classification.

The above background about the participating institutions, supplemented by the list of course offerings (see Appendix E), may serve a useful purpose in the deliberations leading towards the agreements upon the specialized area for course offerings through the proposed consortium.
Category II: Responses to Questions Exploring the Feasible Cooperative Arrangements

The questions asked under this category were meant to provide insight into the line of thought of the individual participants. The responses offered various alternatives and provided a philosophical base for the model to be proposed later on in this study. The following few pages express the participants' reactions on selected issues, and the inferences drawn from such responses.

Issue: Philosophy and purpose

Responses

The offerings of the consortium should be geared towards a student who cannot go to night school or other such facilities, to one who can only study externally, and who does not have access to the usually available means. (GD)²

Add new clientele and not build upon the already existing programs. Since the idea of a central university, although economically sensible, is almost impracticable for at least 20 years, we should at least attempt to cooperate wherever we can. (NT)

We should start crossing state boundaries and attempt to save money for the taxpayers. We are currently at the crossroads. Continuing education divisions are in need of a reappraisal. I doubt that it is necessary to duplicate Independent Study courses at every institution. Unless Continuing Education leaders develop new, innovative methods for offering programs we could lose our position of leadership. Through this proposed consortium, we should be trying to develop the equivalent of a renaissance in the area of Independent Study. (LAD)

² See Appendix B for explanation of initials.
We need to do a lot of selling. Correspondence Division is a thin little sister of the regular programs anyway. We are still a second-class citizen ... . (JB)

All the institutions should concentrate on one public and its needs, and develop the courses for that. (GD)

Concentrate on one public as a beginning. (NT)

Wyoming representatives have expressed a need to prepare courses designed to provide child development training for rural teachers. Federal monies should be available. Other academic areas should be considered as the consortium develops. (LAD)

The Consortium should concentrate on a group of courses, inter-related so as to offer a concentrated specialization in an area. Offering a certificate for this training (of, say, 5 courses) would be desirable. (GD)

The idea of offering a Certificate would certainly help on promotion. It would be delightful to have that. (NT)

Of course, preparing one course together in the beginning would be easiest to handle, but, this does not make much of a reason for the regional cooperative center! It makes more sense, if we are going to cooperate, that we offer a series of courses, in a special area.

Just offering a certificate of completion from the Continuing Education Division has no special meaning. But, if we could collaborate with some outside agency which requires a certain number of courses for their certification, etc., then, we could offer a cluster of courses together which would partially satisfy the requirements for certification of that agency. (JB)

The idea of offering a certificate for a group of courses is good. (SA)

Recommendations

The proposed consortium should initially serve the needs of one clientele--a clientele which is not presently being served by the offerings of any of the existing correspondence divisions. The offerings through the consortium should be such that they supplement and not duplicate the present offerings of any of the participating institutions.
The institutions should agree upon jointly preparing five courses, the contents of the courses being such that they form a coherent cluster around a particular area of specialization. Upon completion of the cluster, a student should be awarded a certificate by the consortium.

Issue: Identification of clientele

Responses

Analyze the various course offerings of the participating institutions and see in which area we could work together. (CT)

Our preference is on: area of training community officials, e.g., Law Enforcement; area of involving mature women in political arena; area of child care; small business development; Non-traditional Study ... Get your Federal Projects Director's advice on picking a certain area. (GD)

Possible areas for cooperation are: Nursery School teachers' education; Elementary teachers' education; Minority Education; Childhood Education for Parents; Training of housewives coming back to school; Law Enforcement; Management Training. (NT)

We should look into areas such as: Police Science; Criminology; Pharmacy; Consumer Education or Consumer Fraud; Home Economics; Reading; Languages; Nutrition ... Looking at our local situation, it would be rather difficult to get started in the areas like Child Development and Kindergarten Education ... . (JB)

Some areas for consideration could be: Women's Liberation; Politics; Drug Abuse; Recreation, etc. ... (SA)

The major problem that I see is that of agreeing upon an area of specialization. (SA)

Recommendations

It is rather difficult to point out, at this stage, an area of specialization upon which all the participants are ready to cooperate.
This, evidently, would be one of the hardest problems to resolve, and more background research needs to be done by individual participants at their respective campuses to determine their needs. The following suggestions were brought forward:

1. Before any joint meeting of the Directors takes place, have them informally survey their respective campuses.

2. Before any joint meeting, the Directors should write letters to the county Extension agents or other such representatives for their help in the identification of needs.

3. An analysis of the present offerings of the participating institutions be done so as to determine which areas could be developed.

The writer undertook to do a preliminary survey of the present offerings of the participating Independent Study Divisions. The lists of courses offered are attached in Appendix E. The following is the writer's appraisal of possible choices of the area:

Consumer Education and Fraud: Except for one course in Consumer Problems and Personal Finance (Home Ec. 510) at the University of Wyoming, none of the participating institutions offer any courses in this area. At the present time, it seems this area has much potential of drawing large audiences.

Law Enforcement, Criminology: Utah State University offers one correspondence course in Criminology and one in Juvenile Delinquency. The University of Nevada offers one course in Criminology. This area could be easily developed, and a broader appeal be built around it by incorporating the areas of Psychology, Sociology, Business, etc. Of course, this would have a rather limited audience.
Small Business Management: Although there are plenty of courses which all of the institutions offer in the general area of Business, and in Corporation Business, at present, none of the five participating institutions offer any courses especially designed for this type of audience.

Women's Education (Involvement in politics; Liberation; Role in Social Change, etc.): At this time there are no courses offered through any of the participating institutions which deal with this area. With sufficient publicity, this area could draw enormously large audiences from throughout the intermountain states.

Nutrition: University of Idaho offers one course, the University of Utah—one, the University of Nevada—two, Utah State University—two, and the University of Wyoming—four. Thus, it seems that it would be rather difficult to get started in this area with much enthusiasm among the participants.

Child Development: The following courses are offered through the correspondence divisions: University of Idaho—one course in Child Development; Utah State University—one course in Early Childhood; University of Utah—one course in Psychology of Infancy and Early Childhood; University of Nevada—one course in Infant and Early Childhood Development; University of Wyoming—one course in Child Psychology, and two courses in Later Childhood and Adolescence. It appears at the surface that the present offerings are sufficient enough to satisfy the needs of the public.
Teacher Education (Non-traditional Study; Nursery Teachers' Education; Elementary Teachers' Education, etc.): With the surplus of a large number of Education courses offered through the Correspondence Divisions, offering of courses in this area may be questionable.

Recreation: Utah State University offers at least one course, and the University of Utah at least three, which are specifically related to recreation.

Drug Abuse: The University of Utah offers two courses in this area.

Pharmacy: No specific courses offered presently. However, may draw limited audience.

Minority Education: The University of Nevada offers a course in Ethnic and Race Relations; and the University of Idaho offers one on the same topic. Also very limited enrollment in this part of the nation.

Without any doubts, there is a need for more deliberations on this topic. The participants were strongly against any attempt to buy the already prepared courses, from any institution, for the completion of the proposed 'cluster' of courses. Thus, if possible, an area should be chosen which does not comprise of any courses which are already offered through any one of the participating institutions.

Issue: Course development

Responses

By pick-and-choose, or negotiations, or whatever, each institution should choose one course out of the agreed upon concentration area, and then proceed with the development of that course independently.
After the development of a course, it should have to be evaluated by the members of the Advisory Committee. If it meets the criteria previously established, then the course should be ready for offering. Otherwise, the institution should take it back and modify it further.

Thus, finally, all the 4-5 courses should have acceptable standards of quality. (GD)

The plan is basically good. However, once the course is chosen by an institution, the preparing faculty will have to be voted upon by the department at one university. That is the policy. (NT)

Maybe, a series of "trade-offs"—unconditional trade-offs—would be good in terms of 'one-course-one-institution' preparation. (CT)

There are two ways of financing the course preparation: (1) Let each one of us, as contribution, prepare one course solely from the resources of our institution. We find that amount spent on all courses is about the same, so there should be no quarrel about that. This plan is advantageous also because sometimes it is easier to make the payment to one of your own institution's faculty member.

Of course, there will be a difference in quality of thus produced courses. But, as mentioned earlier, the quality could be assured by evaluation by the Advisory Council.

(2) Set up a common, bigger budget. Each institution, under this arrangement, will put an equal amount into the pot, and then with guidance from the Advisory Council, the Project Director will undertake the business of getting all the agreed upon courses produced, either from a central location or on contract basis from some institution, depending upon the qualifications of course preparers.

Costwise, it would be cheaper to do it this way, but, psychologically, the cost spent would seem too much. For instance, I can't visualize spending $30,000 or so on course preparation. But, when it is built in the other expenditures (as in the first agreement), psychologically, it won't be that alarming.

Of course, our instructors do not have to be from our own institution. (GD)

We should "buy" the course from whichever institution prepares it. Too much back-and-forth processing is difficult. (JB)
This should be discussed and agreed upon in the Core meeting. Of course, courses should be jointly prepared, or some other financial arrangement should be worked out so that it is an ongoing thing, and there is a cross-fertilization of the five campuses. "Buying" courses from other institutions has no innovativeness. This is available to us right now! (NT)

Ideally, production of one course by pooling talent of all institutions will be good, but, to sell it to institutions, the idea of a cluster and one-institution-one-course would be easier. (NT)

There is a strong need for going through all the departments. How can a school endorse a credit if they don't know what is in it?

It is not unusual that altogether different courses at different institutions, while examined, would overlap in content. Especially for that reason, each department's involvement during the preparation of the course become important. (SA)

Recommendations

Every attempt should be made to share the responsibility of preparing the courses such that each participating institution has the primary responsibility of preparing one course. The appropriate departments of all institutions must be involved in deciding upon the course content. Before choosing a particular instructor to prepare a course, he must be approved by the related departments of all the institutions.

Standards for acceptability of the courses prepared must be established beforehand, and, once the course preparation is complete, every course must be evaluated by the departments as well as the Directors.

A workable plan would be to have the instructors preparing the courses, about halfway through the preparation, send the courses being
prepared to the departments of other universities for their input and suggestions.

**Issue: Course registration process**

**Responses**

There are three alternatives:

1. After the courses are prepared, they are divided one each among the institutions. Then, each one of us won't register students for all courses; we'll just redirect the students to appropriate institutions.

2. After the courses are prepared, if, say, a Utah State instructor prepared a course, then any student from anywhere will register under Utah State, and our institution will just transfer the credits thus taken.

3. The student enrolls at his own institution, but the instructor is from the expert institution. The record-keeping is done at the home institution.

The third alternative is preferred. (GD)

Register at one's own institution for all the courses, and let the institution handle it like any other course.

The first two alternatives (one-institution-one-course) will be tidier, but, transfer of credits will be a problem. (NT)

The easiest way to do this is by giving copies of the five courses to each institution and then let them handle it the way they want to. Once the courses are prepared, then we just offer those like any other course.

Of course, if it has to be done some other way, then, transfer of credit at our institution is no problem. (JB)

Each institution should have copies of all the five courses. Let it handle the courses like any other course. Because, otherwise, the problem is that there is a difference of quarter hour and semester hour among the universities, which could create problems in terms of transfer of credits, number of assignments, etc. Once the courses are prepared, give it to the institutions, and then let them adopt the course ... . (SA)

Once the courses are prepared give them to all the institutions and let them handle it. (HP)
Recommendations

After the completion of the five courses, and satisfactory evaluation, copies of the courses should be distributed among the institutions such that every institution has all the courses with it. Thus, problems of transfer of credit, outside instructor, etc. would be eliminated.

Issue: The role of media in course offering

Responses

Some outstanding things are available in the market. But, a student could respond back on cassette, and the teacher could reply back on cassette. Maybe, if nothing else, show a slide with the instructor's picture, at the beginning of the course. This provides intimacy. I don't think "telelecture" is feasible unless there are 3-4-5 students in a community. Closed-circuit T.V. is not in Nevada yet. (GD)

Standard of the course is the important thing, and not media for media's sake. Money restricts it. We have to look at so many factors. Local school districts have usual slide-projections, etc., we could share it with them. That is no problem. If we had closed-circuit T.V.'s all over the region, it would be great, but we don't! Maybe, we should explore the possibilities further. (NT)

We can use some of it. We don't have any experiences yet in offering courses through E.T.V. in the state of Idaho. So, we'll just have to wait on that ....

Regarding telephone lines, we don't have the WATS lines here. Otherwise, it would be expensive.

Regarding cassette, slides, etc., we have to get involved with it, we simply don't have any choice. If we don't, then we'll lose the complete grasp of this field. Other agencies are almost ready to take over.

Generally, people have cassette recorders, etc., or they can buy one. Let the students worry about buying it. But, yes, we should use these media. (JB)
If T.V. were a common media of communication, it would be a thing to try. But, right now, we have no means of doing it. ...

Cassettes, slides, etc., are no problem. I think it will be a good thing. Of course, there is the problem of keeping track of them; and of keeping them in good working condition. If media is to be a part of correspondence courses, the correspondence office must have somebody at hand who knows how to take care of the technical equipment. (SA)

Recommendations

The courses offered through the consortium should incorporate an extensive use of cassette tapes, slides and filmstrips. Arrangements should be made for repairing, taking care of the technical equipment thus used.

At least for the time being, no attempt should be made to consider the involvement of television, telephone, or other such means in the consortium programs.

Issue: Individual counseling

Responses

Ideally, it would be good to provide some counseling. But, all of our students do not come from Utah or Nevada, geographically. Moreover, it costs money. So, I don't think we should get involved with that. Moreover, it would hinder the flexibility the course instructors would have. (GD)

It will probably be good not to worry about it for the time being. As far as involving counselors from public schools is concerned, it is hard enough for them to do their own school counseling, to talk of external counseling! It would be almost impossible to involve them. (NT)

I don't see how we can get into that. The 'center' might provide individual counseling, but, it is going to be hard.

The school counselors have only a marginal amount of training. So, I would hate to depend on that kind of an arrangement. (JB)

I don't see any particular need for our getting into this area. The high school students who take our courses do so under the guidance of their school counselors. The people who take
our courses for state requirements, etc., or for personal enrichment, already know what they want. We really don't get very many students who don't know what they want.

Of course, the Correspondence Division is not allowed to tell what they should take, anyway. We can tell them what we offer. (SA)

Recommendations:

Although every effort should be made to recognize the individual differences among students, no special effort should be put forth, at this stage, to work out any arrangements for individual guidance and counseling.

Issue: Grading system

Inference

There was a consensus among the participants not to worry about grading, and, under the already suggested arrangement for course registration, let the institutions themselves resolve the issue.

Issue: Course fees

Inference

Since the course fees already vary among the participating institutions, here again, the consensus was that leave this issue for the individual institutions to handle.

Issue: Regionwide loans, scholarships or other incentives for enrollment

Inference

All the participants expressed the desirability of such a service. However, the consensus was that the present resources of the institutions prohibit it, and that this should be written into the grant proposals to be submitted to various outside agencies.
Category III: Responses to Questions Pertaining to the Planning and Implementation Processes

The questions asked under this category dealt specifically with the factors which need to be deliberated upon while planning for the proposed cooperative arrangement. The following is an analysis of the responses obtained:

Issue: Steps in planning and organizational structure

Responses

Provide the participant institutions all the background information well before they are asked to come to any meeting. Urge them to do their home work well before the meeting, so we can get down to the business in the meetings. (NT)

If the departments have a say in the planning stage, there is more chance of being accepted ... after all, we are only agents for the departments, and so, I think we definitely need to get their ideas and involvement before we can go any farther ... . Before we come to the meeting, provide us with all the written literature regarding the project so we can feel the departments out informally. (JB)

In order to be able to reach a decision regarding areas of specialization, maybe, the directors should send letters to county agents, etc., before their first meeting, so they would have had input and suggestions on a statewide level before they go to the meeting ... . (SA)

As far as public and students are concerned, they should be involved at the level of course preparation. (NT)

If we try to involve the public or students in the planning stage, maybe we are exposing ourselves without having any concrete things with us. We'd need to have something to present before we think of involving them. Otherwise, we are asking them to react to nothing. (GD)

There would have to be a central facility, with a Project Director, etc. There would have to be a Core Council, consisting of one representative from each of the participating institutions (say, the Director of Independent Study). After the area of concentration has been agreed upon by the Core Council, an Advisory Committee, consisting of the Directors of Independent
Study from each of the institutions and at least one representative (preferably, Department Chairman) from the departments related to the agreed upon area of concentration from each of the institutions. The Advisory Committee shall serve as the liaison between the institutions and the consortium, and the Project Director will execute the policies agreed upon by the members of the Advisory Committee. (GD)

The prepared courses will have to be approved and evaluated by the appropriate University departments rather than the Advisory Council. (NT)

I can't see any central facility, although ideal, unless we have some outside grant. Of course, a central person will have to be there—a Project Director, to guide and coordinate ... . (NT)

The central facility is a possibility. Of course, a project director is needed to keep the project going ... . (JB)

The central administration (Advisory Council) should not have any student or public representation. But, you could have advisory committees consisting of prospective students and public specifically created for suggestions in course development. The Project Director or the course-preparing departments could directly work with such ad hoc committees while the course is under preparation. (GD)

The Presidential involvement and endorsement in continuing education at Utah State has meant very much to the University, and, I think, other universities should try to get endorsement of their highest offices. (LD)

Recommendations

Based upon responses such as the ones above, and through cross-questioning, hypothesizing, propositioning and other such means, the following conclusions are drawn regarding the organizational structure and sequential steps for planning of the proposed consortium:

A 'Core Council,' consisting of the five directors of the participating Independent Study Divisions, should be formed. A 'Project Director,' with at least half time responsibility towards the present
project, should be hired. The Project Director could very well be a doctoral student, from one of the participating institutions, who has enough time to put into the coordination efforts of the five divisions. An 'Advisory Council' should be formed, consisting of the five Directors of Independent Study divisions and at least one representative from the related academic department of each of the five institutions. The representatives, preferably, should be either the Department Chairmen or the individuals who will be intimately involved in the production of the courses agreed upon by the group.

The major steps in the 'Planning Stage' should be:

1. Once the Project Director is appointed by the Initiating Director (subject to the later approval of the Core Council), he should contact the individual Directors and work out a suitable time and place for the Core Council meeting.

2. The Project Director should send copies of this report and other pertinent materials to the members of the Core Council for their information before the meeting.

3. Before the Core Council meeting, the individual Directors should conduct informal surveys at their campus to feel out the possible areas of cooperation which should be discussed in the meeting. Other means of student and public involvement, as suggested elsewhere in the study, should also be utilized.

4. In the Core Council meeting, the members should arrive at agreements on the area of concentration for the courses, on the finances, procedures and the philosophy of the
proposed consortium. Recommendations made in this study could serve as general guidelines for the agreements.

5. After the Core Council meeting, the individual Directors should pursue their respective departments' involvement in the project. If there is any major problems, the Project Director should try to assist in resolving conflicts.

6. Once the academic departments are involved in the project, the Project Director should be informed of the individuals who are willing to participate in the Advisory Council meeting. The Project Director, then, should make appropriate arrangements for the meeting.

7. The Advisory Committee meeting should result in agreements upon who is going to prepare which course; the course contents should be agreed upon; and issues such as the publicity, registration procedures, course evaluation should be resolved.

8. After the Advisory Committee meeting, the Project Director should compile a manual of the policies established through the above two meetings.

9. The Directors should contact their institutional Presidents and try to obtain institutional support and backing to the consortium.

The 'Implementation Stage' should consist of the following steps:

1. After a decision has been reached regarding course instructors, the Project Director should keep in touch with them occasionally and obtain informal progress reports on the courses under preparation.
2. After the instructors have had time to deliberate upon the detailed course outlines, they should submit those to the Project Director so he can distribute the outlines among the participant institutions for publicity.

3. The Directors should identify potential students and community representatives and send the outline to them for their feedback and input in the course preparation.

4. About halfway through the course preparation, the instructors should submit the courses under preparation to the academic department of their own institution for input and suggestions. If the department suggests any modifications, the instructor should do so accordingly.

5. After the half-prepared course has gone through the local departments it should be sent to the academic departments of each of the other participating institutions for their input and suggestions, and modifications be done as advised.

6. Based upon the inputs provided by the local as well as the departments of the other institutions, and taking into consideration the feedback provided by the potential students and the community representatives, the instructors should complete the preparation of the courses.

7. The Project Director should make appropriate arrangements for either an Advisory Committee meeting or a joint telephone conference of all the Advisory Committee members so that the prepared courses may be reviewed jointly.
8. If the prepared courses meet approval of the Advisory Committee members, the Project Director should make arrangements for getting five copies of each of the courses. The courses, then, should be handed over to the participating Independent Study Divisions, who, in turn, are ready to offer the courses in accordance with the rules and regulations of their respective institutions.

A sequential arrangement of the steps suggested above is presented in the systems flow charts attached on pages 78, 79, 80, and 81. Also, an estimation of the time involved in the implementation of each step is attempted by the writer, which forms the basis for the PERT diagram included in Appendix D. It is estimated that, unless the project faces some major unanticipated problems, the courses can be ready for offering, and the Implementation Stage be completed within a period of forty-nine weeks.

Issue: Time estimates for completion

Responses

It is not going to be a fast process. I don't think we could have any courses ready to offer next summer. By Fall 1973, yes. (JB)

After the first meeting, say, in September or October, it will still take quite a time preparing and evaluating the courses. There is no way that everything could be ready for implementation before September 1973. (CD)

The faster we get it, the better it is. Fall quarter is hard to get staff people, however, we should start in early September, so as to be able to make impact on departments. We could have the course preparation underway after Christmas time. (NT)
Figure 2. Planning phase
1. Agreement on area of concentration
2. on finances
3. on procedures
4. on philosophy, etc.

Core Council* meets to discuss and formulate general policies

Directors inform and involve appropriate departments at their institutions

Directors face Opposition from their Depts.?

YES

Was agreement on preparing one course initially?

YES

Was agreement on preparing a cluster of courses?

YES

Directors inform P.D. of Department Chairman or other representative from their institutions.

Directors inform P.D. of opposition and possible solutions thereof, if any.

NO

STOP

P.D. contacts other Directors and works out a possible solution.

P.D. consults Directors and representatives, and makes arrangement for Advisory Council** meeting

Information about representatives provided by Directors

Directors inform P.D. of staff members from their institutions to be involved in course preparation

*Core Council consists of the five Directors and the Project Director

**Advisory Council consists of the five Directors, Project Director and the Departmental representatives from each of the participating institutions.
Figure 3. Implementation phase
Directors identify representatives from public and potential students

Directors send the course outlines and instructors' address to the representatives and ask for feedback and input in preparation.

P.D. does regionwide and statewide publicity through major radio and TV networks

Public & student involvement

P.D. contacts course instructors to find out if any problems in course preparation.

Halfway through course preparation, instructors contacts facilities at other institutions to incorporate their ideas in course preparations

And problems in courses' preparation

P.D. contacts appropriate persons and solves the problem

NO

YES

P.D., in consultation with all concerned arranges Advisory Committee meeting and informs everybody

Advisory Committee (or Core Council) evaluates the final courses and take appropriate action

Directors take courses to their institutions. Courses ready for offering.

Final evaluation of the prepared courses
I don't see how we can have preparation of courses started before January, 1973. All these meetings take a long time. (SA)

Recommendations

These views support the time estimates arrived at by the writer. Thus, the project needs to get underway soon if the participants desire to implement it. Also, since there are many steps which need to be a patient but continuous effort involved.

Issue: Financial arrangements and grants for planning

Responses

The best thing to do would be to talk to the Federal Projects Director at one of the institutions, and, with his help, identify areas where there is a possibility of grant. (GD)

Try USOE, Career Education, Headstart, Nursery School Funds, etc. (NT)

There may be a possibility of getting financial support from foundations, Xerox, etc. (LD)

If there is some way we can finance our meetings and come up with a viable plan, then we can expect to get outside money. But, I don't think we could apply anywhere without having worked on it, which, of course, does cost money. (JB)

For planning stage, after the first Core Council meeting each institution should set aside a budget of, say, $2,000 each to contribute towards the planning. Any university will donate the office space. Plus, each institution should pay its own transportation, etc., for attending the meetings. I'd say our institution's support would be geared to about, say, $2,000. If we are talking of the development of this project (1-2 thousand dollars), I don't see any problem; at least from my point of view. (GD)

I can't see paying for a full-time person or so, but somehow, we should be able to finance the initial meetings. Maybe we can pay an 'advance' against a course. Moreover, all of us should pay our own expenses to the meeting. Oh, yes, we do have to put in some money planning it. (NT)
Most of my planned budget is very specifically earmarked. There is not very much lee-way. I think we could finance the costs of the trips but, I don't know if we could commit any additional funds. I can, of course, see the need for some planning money ... . Especially, because of the one-year moratorium in our state on new and innovative programs, there is no way we could finance anything more than the costs of the trips. (JB, CT)

Recommendations

All the participants agreed that there is a need for some planning money to start with. They also agreed to defray their own cost of transportation for the planning meetings. Except for the University of Idaho representatives, all the participants showed willingness to commit certain funds of around $1,000 each, for the planning stage of the project. Of course, all of them suggested to explore the possibilities of outside grants, and it was expressed that the Federal Projects Director be contacted in this connection.

The writer undertook to contact the Director of Program Developments at Utah State University. Based upon the outcome of that interview, it is recommended that the institutions participating in the study should not wait until after the planning is completed. In fact, a proposal for funding should be sent in right after, or even before, the first Core Council meeting takes place.

The following are excerpts taken from the above mentioned interview with the Director of Program Developments. It is believed that these suggestions will be of benefit while attempting to seek outside funding for the project.

My personal feeling is that there is money available for this type of project. National Science Foundation, National Endowment for Humanities, etc., will back it up. You may get
a little bit from all of them! ... Office of Education, Carnegie Foundation, and Rockefeller Foundation, they are all interested in this kind of cooperative effort ... . There are many many agencies which would come out to help.

I recommend very strongly that, while writing the proposal, you don't worry about which agency you are trying to get the money from. You write what you want to do, in fair details, and then give it to someone with experience in this area, and then let him worry about where he should send copies of the proposal. This way you will have a lot better proposal than the one you'll get trying to write for one particular agency in mind ... .

If you have already got all the details worked out, they are going to say—what do you need the money for? I have seen grant proposals turned down with comment like—"We don't see why you need us. Looks like you already have the answers!" ... You do write in a positive way. But, you don't answer all the questions. Point out that you have the desire to cooperate, and, maybe, include letters from the Presidents of the potentially participants' institutions, endorsing the tentative commitment. And point out that you have problems and issues yet to resolve, and this is what you need the money for ... . (Director, Program Development, Utah State University)

**Issue: Preferences for the consortium office, meeting location, and coordinator**

**Responses**

No preference. It might possibly be rotated. I can't think of any reason why we won't accept Logan, or Dr. Drury. Regarding meetings, maybe we can have a meeting in conjunction with the Pacific NUEA meeting this Fall ... . Calling a meeting especially for this purpose will be good too. (JB)

Any place would be fine. I do want to make it clear that we are not insisting on locating the office at Utah State University; and let us be very candid about that. This must be a joint, shared project. Yes, we will be willing to assume responsibility and help to initiate the consortium. (LD)

Not really. Salt Lake City would probably be a good location for meeting. And, Dr. Drury, who initiated this idea, could be coordinating it. I would be always ready to help wherever needed ... . (CD)
Salt Lake City would probably be better as a central location for meeting, but, it does not really matter. Also, it may be good to visit other institutions so as to involve the reluctant people. Also, by alternating, say every fifth time, somebody could save travel money. Lloyd Drury would be good. I'll be most delighted to cooperate. (NT)

Recommendations

The location for the meetings should be rotated every time. The places should be close to large airports so as to make travel easier for the participants.

Issue: Students and community involvement in planning

Responses

There is no need of an opinionaire. If the course is developed in law enforcement, send copies of the course outline and a letter to law enforcement agencies in the area, or classroom teachers' association, etc., and get their opinions regarding the offerings. This should give a pretty good idea about the course utility. (CD)

Realistically speaking, this judgement about the courses will have to be a subjective thing. Maybe, send questionnaires to those people who will be directly affected by the offerings. Of course, when the courses are written, public and potential students should be involved. Also, at the conclusion of a course, students could be asked to respond to a questionnaire. (NT)

Send surveys to former students of Correspondence Study, for their opinions. Maybe, it will be a waste of time to survey a population which has never participated or shown interest. (CT)

We do need to do a survey of the state. Maybe, we could do it by sending letters to the county agents or other such representatives, inasmuch as we are part of the state Extension. (SA)

Recommendations

The writer sensed a strong feeling on the part of the participating Directors, for not involving the outside representatives in planning. Rather, most of them felt that the potential students or
Audiences should be involved in the process of course preparation. The techniques of involving these representatives have already been explained earlier in this study.

**Issue: Identification of obstacles and sources of resistance**

**Responses**

I have been very fortunate that we have had very fine support. Even in joining a private corporation like Xerox, they (the university officials) said, let us try it, it can't hurt. (GD)

Frankly, I don't see any resistance areas. Spending money on an outside source will not be much problem, because, most of our students are out-of-state. That is the only way we can survive! Of course, we'll have to face the departments at every step . . . We have to be able to work around their provincialism. (NT)

No problem. We have, in fact, already set up a precedent in spending money on outside source. We bought a course from the University of Utah last year. We stressed that we are getting service which we cannot offer here; and that has to be our guideline in this case too. (CT)

Any contract with an outside agency has to go through our Research Administration. Generally, if it is a desirable project, it would be approved, but, there is another potential problem area. (NT)

The major problem will be that of involving the departments. Of course, there are various reasons for that: They have worked hard to develop their own programs. They, evidently, wouldn't give an inch, and wouldn't want to settle for something less that what they already have . . . The departments are generally very sensitive about one professor teaching a course prepared by somebody else. We would have to find a department that is fairly new and wants to develop, and which feels that the consortium could provide them with something worthwhile. Identifying such a department would be hard! (JB)

Some professors would not want to compete with an instructor at another institution who is very competent or outstanding in his field. This is a very real problem, and we have to live with it. (LD)
I don't see any problems in sharing. We have not had much problem with the departments not cooperating. ... The only problem that I can see is one of agreeing upon the course contents and area of specialization. (SA)

To handle the problem of departmental apathy, I am ready to experiment. It is very likely that if we convey to them that we have someone available to prepare a course, they may be more interested in the Independent Study Division, which they ordinarily neglect. (LD)

The problem of overlapping of the course contents is a big one, and it can be solved only through departmental involvement at every level possible. (SA)

Recommendations

As is clear from the above responses, the major problem about which all the participating Directors of Independent Study are concerned is that of academic departments' attitude of apathy and non-involvement towards the correspondence courses. It is strongly recommended that all efforts be made at every possible opportunity to change such attitude to one of positive acceptance towards the idea of consortium. This can be best done by informing the departments of every development in this direction, rather than by hiding or avoiding it.

Evaluation

The recommendations made on various issues discussed above constitute the description of the proposed model of cooperation among the participating Independent Study divisions. As indicated earlier, the growth of these sets of recommendations, and thus, of the model, was gradual. As its development progressed, the various stages of the model were presented to the individuals being interviewed for
their criticisms and suggestions. The opinions thus received were, then and there, incorporated into the model, thus modifying over its previous form. A successive continuation of this process led to the final set of recommendations, which have been elaborated upon in this chapter. This holds true of the Systems flow chart as well.

Because of following this approach of built-in successive evaluation, it was felt unnecessary to conduct any formal evaluation of the product described herein. Nevertheless, a few selected comments regarding the above described product are in order:

I basically agree with the outline and recommendations. (GD)

The plan is well thought-out. (NT)

I think the idea has merit and it would be economically feasible. The plan is realistic. (JB)

During the planning stage, capitalize on the idea of 'newness of the program. ... Also, use positive language throughout ... (GD)

I think the plan is good. I agree with it fully. I'll try to explain it to (the Coordinator of Independent Study) and see what he thinks. (HP)

In the planning stage at least, we need to give some real serious thought before we present any idea of moving towards a degree-granting program or so. I'd caution presenting such ideas too heavily to other institutions, lest they feel it too much "way out." (GD)

To get four or five specialists from various departments to work back-and-forth may become a big problem. The mechanical part of it--lessons going in and out--bothers me. (JB)

We would have to be sure that the whole philosophy of the program and an overall picture of the course design are presented at the first meeting. Otherwise, the courses produced by different institutions will overlap. (NT)

I can't quite see us down to the step where 'Directors face opposition' (in the Flow-Chart). I don't want to face opposition from the departments. I would rather avoid it
before we get there. Somehow, before we come to the meeting, we need to do some legwork individually with our departments. Otherwise, all of us will be there in the meeting, cold. But, then, the question is, which departments do we contact before we come to the meeting? Here we are, administrators, deciding upon an area! (JB)

Probably it would be good to survey our own campuses before we come to the meeting. ... If the time weren't any consideration, then I would be enthusiastic about it. (Nevertheless) I am interested in saving dollars for the taxpayer and providing service to students. And the plan (as presented here) is good. (JB)

Overall, the writer received a favorable response from all the individuals who were involved in the feasibility study. Excepting one instance, wherein the individual directly working at the basic operational level of the Independent Study program could not be contacted for the exploratory interview, the reaction to the various stages of the model was enthusiastic, and definitely positive. The writer feels that the basic motive behind the exploratory interviews—that of creating a conducive climate through involvement—was very well served. This feasibility study establishes the fact that the five institutions mentioned in this study can and are willing to work together, to pool their resources and talents together, and to flourish together in the area of Independent Study. The guidelines provided through this study are instruments which can help in channeling this desire and willingness into reality.
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Appendix B

Names of the Participants involved in the Feasibility Study, and explanation of initials
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GD</td>
<td>Miss Grace Donehower</td>
<td>University of Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>Miss Norrine Tempest</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP</td>
<td>Dr. Hilton Powers</td>
<td>University of Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Dr. Lloyd Drury</td>
<td>Utah State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Mrs. Shirley Andreason</td>
<td>Utah State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Dr. Clifford Trump</td>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JB</td>
<td>Dr. James Black</td>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Questions for Initial Exploration, as

Disseminated among the Participants

Attending N.U.E.A. Conference
Questions for Initial Exploration

1. Exactly what is known about the population of students for whom this program will be developed?

2. What are the objectives to be fulfilled (achieved) by the proposed program?

3. What will be the philosophy of the "center" designed to execute the program?

4. What will the relationship of the "center" be with the Correspondence Divisions, and to the parent-institutions?

5. How shall the problems of jealousy and "alienation because of provincialism" be resolved?

6. What types of programs and experiences will be offered by the "centers"?

7. How will the program be conducted and supervised?

8. How will the program be financed, and the "income" shared among the participating institutions?

9. How will it be publicized among the masses and given an extensive coverage?

10. What will be the pattern and form of communication between the learners and the "center"?

---

1 The word "center" in this list refers to any arrangement agreed upon for conducting the program.
11. How will a student avail of the opportunity, in terms of registration procedures, etc.?

12. What will be the basis for providing and determining credit hours?

13. How will the participating institutions be pursued and convinced to accept the credits offered through such a cooperative program?

14. After reviewing the development in commercial correspondence schools, what methodology and learning theories will be followed by the "center"?

15. What will be the legal base of the center? How will the states' regulations support or hinder its existence?

16. To facilitate the implementation of the program, what kinds of individuals will be involved in the discussion of objectives, and in the preparation of instructional materials?

17. What will be the organization structure of the "center"?

18. What will be the procedures for involving a particular university department in the preparation of instructional material?

19. What role will be played by Instructional Audio-Visual materials, and how will these be prepared and provided to the students?

20. Will the program try to provide the student with instruction supplemented by related practical work in industry or business, etc.?

21. What steps will be followed to proceed from the planning stage to implementation stage of the project?

22. How will the individual differences in students not only be recognized in a new format but also met on a much more selective basis than has been possible in the past?
23. What role shall be played by the "center" in promoting experimentation by regular university faculty?

24. How will the program provide supplemental individual help to an enrolled student, other than and in addition to its help provided through the mail?

25. What role shall be played by the mass media in the curricular offerings of the program?
Appendix D

PERT Analysis and Diagram for the

Consortium Development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event No.</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Time (wk)</th>
<th>Time (wk)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Proposal ready, questions prepared</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Informal contacts made and support of idea assessed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Individual Directors interviewed and proposal evaluated by them</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Federal Projects Director visited and ideas regarding agents obtained</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Final proposal (report) and recommendations sent to Dir. &amp; visited</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Core Council meeting called, attended, and policies formulated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Directors worked on involving appropriate depart. at their inst., and instructors identified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Final report written and recommendations made</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Advisory Council called, met, and detailed policies formed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Advisory Council report (Policy Manual) compiled and sent to the Directors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>END</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*te* = Estimated time for completion of each event.
Appendix E

Courses Presently Offered Through the Independent Study Divisions of the Participating Institutions
### UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO

#### College Correspondence Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Course Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 Principles of Accounting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 Principles of Accounting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231 Intermediate Accounting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232 Intermediate Accounting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Economics:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Agricultural Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208 Farm Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219 Marketing Farm Products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451 Land Resources Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Education:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348 Extension Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351 Principles of Voc. Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225 Aboriginal North American Indian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322 Racial and Ethnic Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacteriology:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254 Public Health &amp; Hygiene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351 General Genetics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442 Biological Evolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323 Principles of Advert.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365 Business Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 Investments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461 Real Estate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466 Business Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251 Principles of Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252 Principles of Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403 Money and Banking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 Principles of Sec. Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165 Curriculum Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 The Child and Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337 Sec. Social Studies Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338 Methods &amp; Materials in Lang. Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Elem. Elect. Theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Engineering Graphics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 Engineering Graphics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 Digital Comp. Prog.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Science:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210 Mechanics I (Statics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 Mechanics II (Dynamics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320 Fluid Mechanics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340 Mechanics of Materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 English Comp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 Lang. &amp; Literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267 Survey of Eng. Lit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367 Survey of Eng. Lit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476 American Folklore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University of Idaho

Foreign Languages:
161 Elementary Russian

Guidance:
420 Principles & Pract. in Guidance

History:
101 Hist. of Civilization
102 Hist. of Civilization
111 Intro. to U.S. Hist.
112 Intro. to U.S. Hist.
271 History of England
272 History of England
423 Ida. & Pacific N.W.

Home Economics:
334 Child Development
340 Family Relations
470 Problems in Nutrition

Mathematics:
135 Number System & Its Structure
136 Number System & Its Structure

140 College Algebra
141 Analytic Trig.
180 Analytic Geo. & Cal. I.

Museology:
301 Intro. to Museology

Philosophy:
201 Ethics
309 Hist. of Ancient Phil.
310 Hist. of Modern Phil.

Physical Education:
147 Hist. of Phys. Ed.
252 Elem. School P.E.
371 Principles of P.E.

Political Science:
101 American Government
102 American Government
152 Politics & Pollution
275 American St. Gov't
276 American Local Gov't
285 Systems of Parliamentary Democracy

Psychology:
100 Intro. to Psych.
205 Develop. Psych.
206 Develop. Psych.
420 Principles of Pract. in Guidance
421 Educational Psych.

Sociology:
111 Intro. to Soc.
130 Social Problems
310 Rural Sociology
320 The Family
321 The Community
322 Racial & Ethnic Relations
330 Sociology of Youth

Special Education
375 Ed. of Except. Chld.

High School Courses: (all 1/2 units)
2 courses in Business
9 courses in English
6 courses in Mathematics
1 course in Russian
4 courses in Science
5 courses in Social Sci.

Non-Credit Courses:

2 Real Estate Law
3a Real Estates App. I
3b Real Estates App. II
A citizenship course

Notes:

A non-credit real estate certificate program is offered in cooperation with the Idaho Real Estate commission and the Idaho Association of Realtors.

The courses offered partially fulfill the requirements for Real Estate Salesman and Broker's licenses.

Total

89 College Credit Courses
4 Non-Credit Courses
27 High School Courses
**UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING**

College Correspondence Courses

### Agriculture:
- **Animal Science:**
  - 511 Principles of Livestock Feeding
  - 522 Livestock Prod. & Man.
  - 546 Dairy Cattle Manag.

### Crops:
- 301 Princ. of Field Crop Production

### Entomology:
- 555 Ag. Entomology

### Food Science:
- 550 Elements
- 552 Fluid Food Prod.
- 567 Food Processing

### Home Economics:
- 322 Fund. of Garment Construction
- 361 Nutrition
- 510 Consumer Prob. & Pers. Finance
- 542 Found. of Marriage
- 580 Interior Design
- 584 Child Development
- 640 Later Chld. & Adoles.
- 681 Home Management

### Arts and Sciences:
- **Art:**
  - 380 Intro. of World Art: Pre-Hist. to 19th Cent.
  - 381 Intro. of World Art: 19th Cent. to 20th Cent.

### Biology:
- 600 Genetics

### Botany:
- 302 General Botany
- 310 Elementary Forestry

### English:
- 300 Fresh. English
- 301 Fresh. English
- 521 Eng. Lit. from Chaucer to Mid-Eighteenth Cent.
- 521 Eng. Lit. from Mid-Eighteenth Cent. to Pres.
- 522 Am. Lit. from Col. through Melville

### Geography:
- 300 Intro. to Geo.
- 302 Intro. to Cult. Geo.

### History:
- 310 Hist. of Civil.
- 360 Hist. of Wy. & the West

### Journalism:
- 500 Intro. to Mass Media
- 511 Journ. Writing
- 533 Article Writing
- 599 Hist. of Am. Journ.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Languages:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Yr. French</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Yr. French</td>
<td>302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Yr. French</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Yr. German</td>
<td>302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Yr. German</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Yr. Spanish</td>
<td>302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Yr. Spanish</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro. Math. Analysis</td>
<td>302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro. Math. Analysis</td>
<td>302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of Arith.</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of Arith.</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro. Calc.</td>
<td>316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro. Multivariable</td>
<td>316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem. Linear Alge. &amp;</td>
<td>501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory I--Written</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory I--Written</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Science:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov't of the U.S. &amp;</td>
<td>305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov't of the U.S. &amp;</td>
<td>306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internat'l Relations</td>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychology:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Psych.</td>
<td>302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Child</td>
<td>530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional Children</td>
<td>531</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociology:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speech and Theatre:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com. Theory</td>
<td>304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro. to Mass Media</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commun. in Organ.</td>
<td>525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commerce and Industry:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem. Accounting</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem. Accounting</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fin. &amp; Admin. Acc.</td>
<td>606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Administration:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus. Law I</td>
<td>631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economics:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princ. of Econ.</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princ. of Econ.</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro. to Money &amp; Fin.</td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Finance</td>
<td>625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princ. of Real Est.</td>
<td>661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princ. of Insur.</td>
<td>671</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Insurance</td>
<td>676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus. Organ. &amp; Fin.</td>
<td>521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marketing:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Organ. &amp; Fin.</td>
<td>521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statistics:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund. of Stat.</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher &amp; Sec. School</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>Admin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont. Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-Visual Instr.</td>
<td>676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Education:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. Type.</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beg. Shorthand</td>
<td>321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indexing &amp; fil.</td>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606 Meth. of Teach. in Sec. Schools</td>
<td>Civil Engineering:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644 Middle School</td>
<td>680 Hydrology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707 Educ. Trends in Elem.</td>
<td>Engineering Science:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>791 Short Course in Trends in Mod. Elem. Math.</td>
<td>301 Graphics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundations:</th>
<th>High School Courses: (1/2 unit ea)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300 Orientation to Teach.</td>
<td>8 Courses in Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>696 Issues in Contemp. Ed.</td>
<td>9 Courses in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704 Ed. Sociology</td>
<td>5 Courses in Home Ec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706 Ed. Tests and Meas.</td>
<td>1 Course in Human Relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Science:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>338 Lib. &amp; Librarianship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414 Lit. for Child.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514 Lib./Media Mater. for Teenager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637 Select. of Inst. Mat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638 Admin. of School Lib. Media Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640 Cat. and Class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Education:</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>380 Pers. &amp; Commun. Health</td>
<td>125 College Credit Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 Non-credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57 High School Courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA

#### College Correspondence Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accounting:</th>
<th>20 Records and Accounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101 Elementary Acc. I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 Elementary Acc. II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Science:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 Beef Cattle Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 General Anthro.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 Intro. to Human Evol. &amp; Prehistory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 General Bio.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340 Principles of Genetics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Economic Dev. of West. Civil.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 Principles of Econ. I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202 Principles of Econ. II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 Survey of Econ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270 Human Growth &amp; Devl.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320 Princ. &amp; Meth. of El. Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 Basic Found. of Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210 Legal Found. of Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| English:                     |                          |
| 181 Vocabulary &amp; Meaning    |                          |
| 247 Intro. to the Novel     |                          |
| 253 Intro to Drama          |                          |
| 261 Intro to Poetry         |                          |
| Finance:                    |                          |
| 365 Corp. Finance           |                          |
| Foreign Languages:          |                          |
| French                      |                          |
| 101 1st yr. French I        |                          |
| 102 1st yr. French II       |                          |
| 203 2nd yr. French I        |                          |
| 204 2nd yr. French II       |                          |
| German                      |                          |
| 351 The French Novel I      |                          |
| 352 The French Novel II     |                          |
| 101 1st yr. German I        |                          |
| 102 1st yr. German II       |                          |
| 203 2nd yr. German I        |                          |
| 204 2nd yr. German II       |                          |
| Russian                     |                          |
| 101 1st yr. Russian I       |                          |
| 102 1st yr. Russian II      |                          |
| Spanish                     |                          |
| 101 1st yr. Spanish I       |                          |
| 102 1st yr. Spanish II      |                          |
| 203 2nd yr. Spanish I       |                          |
| 204 2nd yr. Spanish II      |                          |
| 305 Inter. Sp. Comp. &amp; Convers-I |                      |
| 306 Inter. Sp. Comp. &amp; Convers-II |                      |
| 357 Survey of Sp. Lit. I    |                          |
| 358 Survey of Sp. Lit. II   |                          |
| 359 Survey of Sp. Am. Lit. I|                          |
| 360 Survey of Sp. Am. Lit. II|                         |
| 377 Sp. Romant. &amp; Real. I   |                          |
| 378 Sp. Romant. &amp; Real. II  |                          |
| 391 20th Cent. Sp. Lit. I   |                          |
| 392 20th Cent. Sp. Lit. II  |                          |
| Geography:                  |                          |
| 106 World Cult, Geo.        |                          |
| History:                    |                          |
| 101 United States I          |                          |
| 102 United States II         |                          |
| 105 European Civil. I        |                          |
| 106 European Civil. II       |                          |
| 217 Nevada                   |                          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>University of Nevada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>College Algebra</em> 110</td>
<td>*Ed. Psych 321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Intro. to Finite Math.</em> 120</td>
<td>*Personality Dynamics 335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Analytical Geo.</em> 140</td>
<td>*Abnorm. Psycho. 441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Math. of Finance 210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Math. Statistics 220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Philosophy: 101</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Intro. to Phil.</em> 101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Ethnical Theories 221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Phil of Art 255</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*World Religions 261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Phil of Religion 262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Physical Education: 201</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Intro. to P.E.</em> 201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Rec. and Admin. 440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Political Science: 103</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Citic. for new Am. (0) CA</em> 201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Const. of Nev. (0) CB</em> 255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Princ. of Am Const. 103</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Gov't 312</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Gov't &amp; Pol. in Africa 312</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sociology: 101</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Princ. of Soc. 101</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Am. Society 202</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Marr. &amp; the Family 275</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Criminology 366</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ethnic &amp; Race Relations 379</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Zoology: 103</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>General Zoology 103</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Vertebrate Zoology 203</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Gen. Entomology 359</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>No special courses offered for high school students.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Total 119</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>College-credit courses 4</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Non-credit 0</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>High School 0</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

#### College-Correspondence Courses

**Accounting:**
- 16 C.P.A. Probl. Review
- 121 Elementary Acc.
- 122 Elementary Acc.
- 301 Management Acc.
- 502 Inter. Acc.
- 503 Inter. Acc.

**Anthropology:**
- 101 Intro to Cult. Anthro.
- 121 Class. Anthro.
- 301 Civil. of the Aztecs
- 304 Indians of N. Am.
- 305 Peoples of Africa
- 308 Civil. of the Maya
- 541 Prehist. of N. Am.
- 543 Arch. of the S.W.

**Art:**
- 101 Intro to Art
- 390 Art for Sec. Schools

**Biology:**
- 201 Intro. to Phys.
- 335 Human Genetics
- 350 Intro to Evol.
- 372 Conserv. of Nat. & Human Resources
- 570 Teach. of Bio.

**Civil Engineering:**
- 101 Engineering Draw.
- 103 Descript. Geo.

**Economics:**
- 101 Elem. Econ.
- 102 Elem. Econ.
- 105 Elem. Econ.
- 274 Econ. Hist. of U.S.
- 310 Labor Econ.
- 320 Money & Banking

**Education:**
- 543 Hist. of Early West. Education
- 544 Hist. of Am. Ed.
- 551 Aims of Am. Ed.
- 645 Dev. of Ed. in 20th Cent.
- 652 Conc. Probl. in Ed.

**Educational Administration:**
- 341 The Teachers & School Administration
- 530 Public School Fin.
- 634 School Law

**Educational Media:**
- 501 Psych. in El. Ed. -- the Learning Process
- 502 Psych. in Sec. Ed.
- 503 Ed. Meas.
- 553 Intro. to Reading Diagnosis

**Elementary Education:**
- 308 The School Health Prog.
- 502 Child Dev. & Curr.
- 503 Found. of El. Ed. III
- 508 Teach. Beginning Read.
- 512 Teach. Sci. in El. School
- 513 Soc. St. in El. School
- 514 Art for the El. School
- 516 Lit. for Child.
- 517 Meth. in Teach. Read.
- 518 Math. in the El. School
- 405 The Real No. System
- 519 Lant. Arts in El. Sch.
- 520 Kin.--Early Child. Ed.

**Secondary Education:**
- 308 The School Health Prog.
- 554 Teach. Read. in Sec. School Sub. Areas
- 573 Curr. & Meth. in High School Soc. St.
- 578 Meth. of Teach. Phys. Sci.
- 599 Sec. School. Theories & Practices
University of Utah

Special Education:
502 Intro. to Sp. Ed.

English:
101 Written Comp.
102 Written Comp.
250 Intro. to Lit.
507 Black Am. Lit.
511 Magazine Art. Writing
512 Mod. Eng. Grammar
517 Am. Folklore
581 Am. Lit.: From Emerson to Dickinson
584 Am. Lit Since 1945
680 Am. Lit.: From the Beginning to Romant.

Finance:
120 Per. Fin.
321 Fin. Manag.
324 Risk & Insurance
329 Money & Banking
366 Invest.
364 Real Estate Princ.

General Education:
101 The Intel. Trad. of the West
102 The Intel. Trad. of the West
103 The Intel. Trad. of the West

Geography:
101 Elements of Cult Geo.
355 Geo. of Mex. & Cent. America
376 Geo. of Africa, S. of the Sahara

Health, Physical Ed & Recreation:
101 Personal Health Probl.
308 School Health Prog.
343 Safety Ed.
548 Alcohol & Drugs
549 Drug Abuse & the Student
190 Intro to P.E. Problems
360 P.E. for El. Schools
361 Hist. of P.E.
142 Intro to Rec.
310 Urban Rec. Orga.
320 Meth. & Skills in Arts & Crafts
332 Rec. Program
333 Social Rec. Leadership
335 Hist. of Rec. in the U.S.

History:
102 Hist. of Civil.
128 World War II & Ensuring East West Conflict
170 Am. Civ.
340 Hist. of Eng.
501 Hist of Greece
502 Hist of Roman Repub.

Home Economics:
144 Prin. of Nutrition
314 Marr. & Family Rel.

Journalism:
301 Editing
350 Intro. to Advert.
371 Intro. to Report.
511 Mag. Art. Writing
522 Public Opin. & Propa.

Languages:
101 Class Mythology
115 Intro. to Lit.
121 Class. Arch.

Library Science
102 Use of Books & Lib.
326 Lib. Work with Child.
333 Select. of Lib. Mat.
340 Intro. to Cat. & Class
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Management
112 Calc.
113 Calc.
114 Calc.
405 The Real No. System

Metallurgy & Metallurgical Eng:
361 Elements of Metall.

Meteorology:
312 Phys. Climat.
361 Dynamic Meter.
362 Dynamic Meter.--Basic
363 Eq. of Motion

Music:
300 Role of Mus. in W. Cult.
327 Mus. of the East
371 Mus. in El. School
372 Mus. in Jr. High School

Nursing & Nursing Education:
100 Orient. to Nurs.
101 Inter. aspect of Nurs.

Philosophy:
101 Intro to Philos.

Statistics:
114 Calc.

Mathematics:
100 Prep. Alg.
101 Inter. Alg.
105 Coll. Alg.
106 Plane Trig.
111 Intro. to Cal.
Adult Education: (No Credit)
CPA Problem Review
Lit. of New Test.
Naturalization
Techniques of Good Study Hab.
Voc. Building

Correspondence course offered especially for fulfilling partial requirements to the Inst. Tech. Train.:
TC  1 Intro to Bus. Man.
TC 101 Eng. Draw.
TC 103 Descript.Geom
TC 101 Basic Comp. Concepts
TC 102 Elem. Comp. Prog.
TC 103 FORTRAN Prog.
TC 106 Eng. Fund.
TC 108 Tech. Reprt. Writing
TC 107 Slide Rule
TC 190 Fund. of Type
TC 141 Inter. Type
TC 161 Beg. Shorthand
TC 122 Tech. Reports
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High School Courses: (1/2 unit)
2 Courses Biology
2 Courses Business
3 Courses English
9 Courses Mathematics
2 Courses Science
8 Courses Social Studies
*A course offering one unit is counted here as 2 courses.

Total
202 College Credit Courses
5 Non-credit
26 High School Courses
# UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

## College Correspondence Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accounting:</th>
<th>167</th>
<th>Art Hist.</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>Gen. Econ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201 Intro. Acc.</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Art Hist.</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>Comp. Econ. Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202 Intro. Acc.</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Art Hist.</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>Econ. Hist. of U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 Intro. Acc.</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>Indiv. Proj.</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>Econ. Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Economics:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 Princ. of Ag. Econ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202 Princ. of Ag. Econ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510 Farm &amp; Ranch Man.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 Irrigation Pract.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Science:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 Feeds and Feeding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560 Beef Prod.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561 Swine Prod.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562 Sheep Prod.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Intro to Anthro.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 Peoples &amp; Cult. of the World</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Exploring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 Basic Designing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Basic Drawing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 Beg. Watercolor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 Beg. Lettering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 Beg. Adv. Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacteriology:</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Elem. Microbio.</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>Teach. of Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Prin. of Bio.</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Fresh. English</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>Teach. Social St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560 Fund. of Marketing</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Fresh. English</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>Teach. Math.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560 Personnel Admin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446 Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454 Retailing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458 Advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540 Corp. Fin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550 Fund. of Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560 Personnel Admin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351 Bus. Commun.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441 Sec. Proc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581 Man. Personal Fin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and Textiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224 Intro. to Textiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275 Home Furnishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374 Fashion Sketching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375 Fashion Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 Dairy Prod.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530 Milk Secretion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 Gen. Econ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515 Comp. Econ. Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511 Econ. Hist. of U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560 Personnel Admin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415 Teach. of Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420 Teach. Social St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430 Teach. Math.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English &amp; Journalism:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Fresh. English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 Fresh. English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 Fresh. English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 Pract. in Comp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 Elem. of Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 Intro. to Short Story</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 Intro. to Novel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 Read. in Myth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216 World Lit. Before 1650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217 World Lit. from 1650 to the Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251 Am. Lit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253 Mod. Am. Lit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260 Eng. Lit., Early Per.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261 Eng. Lit., Late Per.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 Tech. Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416 Child. Lit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Course Codes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>207 Geo. of Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>214 Geo. of Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>225 Geo. of Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>307 Geo. of Anglo-Amer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>314 Geo. of Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>325 Geo. of Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>580 Teach. of Geo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>101 Intro. Geology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Education</td>
<td>430 Safety Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>101 Compar. Civil.: Anc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103 Compar. Civil.: Mod.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107 Am. Civil.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>325 19th Cent. Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>301 Trad. East Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>362 Mod. in East Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>432 Civil War &amp; Reconst.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>525 Muscovite &amp; Imp. Rus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>526 Rus. Revol. &amp; Sov. Regime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial &amp; Technical Ed.</td>
<td>501 Occup. Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Media</td>
<td>100 Use of Lib. &amp; Learn. Res.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>433 Sec. School Lib. Admin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>121 Intro. to Mass Comm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>190 Insects Affect. Man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>191 Biol. of Honey Bees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Child Development</td>
<td>120 Marr. &amp; Am. Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150 Early Childhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Science</td>
<td>410 Prin. of Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>450 Regional Rec. Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>546 Pop. &amp; Resources Per.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>101 Intro to Col. Alg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105 Col. Alg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106 Plane Trig.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>241 Math. of Fin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>271 Intro. to Prob. Th.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>272 &amp; Stat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition &amp; Food Sciences</td>
<td>122 Prin. of Nutr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>485 Recent. Prog. in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hum. Nutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>101 Intro to Prob. of Phil.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>210 Deduct. Logic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>201 Nature &amp; Punct. of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Play &amp; Rec.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>208 Body Dynamics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physiology:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 Human Phys.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plant Science:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Intro to Ag. Plant Sci.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440 Vegetable Prod.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450 Fruit Prod.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Science:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 Am. Nat'l Gov't &amp; Pol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 Am. State &amp; Local Gov't &amp; Politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440 Am. Foreign Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522 Sov. &amp; E. European Gov't Politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561 Organ. &amp; Mang. of Pub. Admin Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491 Read. &amp; Conf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychology:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Gen. Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 Human Dev.: Gen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320 School Guid. Serv.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366 Ed. Psych.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Health:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 Pers. Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 Envr. Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412 Comm. Disw Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413 Insect &amp; Rod. Vector Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414 Water-Borne Dis. Cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416 Foodborne Dis. Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation Education:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 Scoutmaster's Basic Training Exper.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Education:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 Found. Iss. in Sec. Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306 Prob. in Sec. School Teach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307 Hist. of Ed. Thought</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510 Improve of Read. in Sec. School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604 Meas. and Evaluation in Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Work:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 Field of Soc. Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327 Intro. to Field Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335 Child Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociology:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Intro. Soc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 Rural Soc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 Mod. Soc. Prob.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320 Pop. Probl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440 Criminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441 Juvenile Delinq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soil Science &amp; Biometeorology:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358 Intro. Soils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517 Weather &amp; Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Education:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 Ed. of Except. Child.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 Diag. &amp; Treat. of Learn. Difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 Behav. Man. in Spch. Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wildlife Resources:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| High School Courses: (1/2 unit)* |         |
| 2 Courses in Biology             |         |
| 6 Courses in English             |         |
| 2 Courses in Geography           |         |
| 1 Course in Health & Phys.       |         |
| 3 Courses in History             |         |
| 5 Courses in Mathematics         |         |
| 4 Courses in Social Sciences     |         |

*1 unit courses are counted here as 2 one-half unit courses.

| Total                          |         |
| 174 College Credit Courses     |         |
| 0 Non-credit                   |         |
| 23 High School Courses         |         |
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