THE GOODRICH PROGRAM:

A Non-Traditional Approach to Non-Traditional Students

Prepared by:

Diane Gillespie
Philip Secret

INTRODUCTION

The Goodrich Scholarship Program was instituted at the University of Nebraska at Omaha in 1972 to provide effective educational opportunities to low-income students. An appropriation from the Nebraska State Legislature to the University of Nebraska at Omaha provided funds for "a program to get more economically-deprived young people in, and through the University of Nebraska at Omaha." Named after the Senator who introduced the legislation, the Program gives direct assistance to low income students in the form of tuition waivers, a special academic program of general education, and supportive services.

Like other programs for non-traditional[1] students created in institutions of higher education during the late 1960s and early 1970s, the Goodrich Program was designed to give students who had traditionally been denied access to higher education the skills and tools to gain a strong foothold in academia. In Accent on Learning (1976), Cross identified three different approaches taken by institutions of higher education to provide educational opportunities to non-traditional students. Generally, the Goodrich Program exemplifies the remedial model in that it seeks to bring its students into accord with the traditional academic values of higher education (Francis, 1977); however, as we shall note shortly, it is not a remedial program in the common use of the term. It differs from other programs in its fairly unique combination of various educational strategies and interventions designed specifically for the low-income student body it serves.

Certainly the Goodrich Program has evolved in response to the particular needs of its students, the university in which it is housed, and the community at large. Nevertheless, the success of the Program has implications for all those involved with programs which serve non-traditional students, and particularly

economically disadvantaged ones. It is the purpose of this paper to present three features of the Program which might be of relevance and importance to others working with non-traditional students in higher educational institutions. Specifically, we will argue that the role of the Goodrich faculty, the academically rigorous sequence of Goodrich courses, and selection of Goodrich students have important implications for programs serving non-traditional students. Before turning to these features, we will provide information about the structure and operation of the Program and give some evidence of its success.

A DESCRIPTION OF THE GOODRICH PROGRAM

A very general overview of the Goodrich Program would include the following features. The Program has 723 students, eight faculty members, a study skills specialist, a coordinator for student personnel, four graduate assistants, two work-study tutors, and a Director. Housed in the College of Public Affairs and Community Service, the Program functions administratively like a department; however, the Program does not offer a major. Each year the Program recruits, selects, and admits approximately 60 students into the Program. These students are free to major in any department throughout the university. During their freshman and sophomore years, all Goodrich students are required to take a total of twenty-four hours of Goodrich courses in the Humanities and Social Sciences; most of these courses count toward fulfilling divisional requirements for their majors. Faculty members teaching the Program's courses hold joint appointments in their correlative departments within the university; their main affliation, however, is with the Goodrich Program. Before describing the educational experiences provided to Goodrich students in more detail, it is necessary to explain the educational philosophy which guides the Program's operation.

Since its inception, the Goodrich Program has assumed that economically deprived students should not be restricted to remedial programs. If given close personal contact with faculty and remedial help where necessary, these students can pursue an academically rigorous course of study. According to Hubert Locke, the administrator who originally conceptualized the Program, this philosophy is based:

> 1) on the assumption that low-income students have the same capacity for academic achievement as that of middle- or upper-income students admitted to the university through regular processes; 2) on research findings (e.g., the Coleman study) which indicate that teacher expectation is the most critical single factor in the achievement or failure of low-income students; and 3) on the premise that an innovative, intellectually stimulating teaching-learning atmosphere can be created which will motivate low-income students to excel academically, complete degree programs, and prepare for meaningful vocations.

Coupled with these assumptions, it is important to note, is the Program's strong commitment to cultural diversity--a commitment that is actively promoted in the composition of its faculty and staff, student body, and curriculum offerings. In essence, the Program assumes the ability on the part of low-income students to succeed and excel academically, if exposed from the start of their college careers to rigorous intellectual stimulation, complemented by multicultural sensitivity and the necessary support services which will enable them to have confidence in themselves and their ability to succeed.

The Program does not create educational experiences that in any way shift or alter the predominant educational goals of the university at large; on the other hand, it does not assume that the "usual course of study" best facilitates retention of the non-traditional student. The Program's resources are not directed to all economically disadvantaged students expressing interest in college. Goodrich's faculty and staff believe that given certain indicators of academic potential, detected through non-traditional criteria, the Program

can intervene to prevent the high attrition rate characteristic of low-income students. As a result of this philosophy, the Program has a student body which is economically homogeneous, but racially and academically diverse.

Generally, then, the Program can be described as an agency which intervenes between "non-traditional" students and a "traditional" institution. Financial assistance constitutes the baseline intervention. Beyond that, the Program offers academic courses and supportive services. The following chart illustrates the sequence of Goodrich courses and identifies the support servies available to students throughout their undergraduate years:

CHART OF THE GOODRICH PROGRAMS OVER 4 YEARS OF COLLEGE

First Year	Fall Semester	Goodrich sections of English Composition English 111	Goodrich sections of Critical Reasoning Philosophy 121	Goodrich Communication Lab 1 hr/week Fall Semester only	6 - 9 hours in courses outside the Goodrich Program	Goodrich Support Services
	Spring Semester	Perspectives on American Culture; 6 hour course in the Humanities offered by the Goodrich staff			6 - 9 hours in courses outside the Goodrich Program	*Study Skills Center
Second Year	Fall Semester	Research Techniques and Urban Problems I; a 6 hour course in the Social Sciences offered by the Goodrich staff			6 - 9 hours in courses outside the Goodrich Program	*Writing Lab
	Spring Semester	Research Techniques and Urban Problems II; a 6 hour course in the Social Sciences offered by the Goodrich staff			6 - 9 hours in courses outside the Goodrich Program	*Job Counselli
						*Personal Counselli
Third Year	Fall & Spring	12 - 15 hours in courses outside the Goodrich Program		Non-credit activities with Goodrich advisor for juniors		*Goodrich Student Organiza
Fourth Year	Fall & Spring	12 - 15 hours in courses outside the Goodrich Program		Non-credit activities with Goodrich advisor for seniors		*Tutoring

The nature of the Program's educational component can be illustrated best by a brief description of Goodrich courses. As outlined in the preceding chart, the sequence consists of courses in English composition and critical reasoning in the first semester of the freshman year; a humanities course focusing on contemporary American culture in the second semester of the freshman year; and a two-semester course in the social sciences in the sophomore year. These required courses constitute six credit hours per semester during the student's freshman and sophomore years. In the first half of the Fall semester, all incoming freshmen also take a one-hour, non-credit course called Communication Laboratory.

The English and philosophy courses required of first semster freshmen are designed to develop students' writing and reasoning skills. Some students who have already demonstrated a proficiency in writing are exempt from the English composition requirement. All students, however, are required to take Philosophy 121: Critical Reasoning. This course helps students learn to analyze and criticize arguments and theories, as they are typically presented in textbooks, articles, lectures, and speeches.

The requirement for the second semester of the freshman year is a six credit hour humanities course entitled "Perspectives on American Culture." This course explores, through a multi-cultural perspective, contemporary American society and some of the major ideologies which have shaped it. Materials used include films, novels and short stories, essays, and presentations of paintings and music. The purpose of the course is threefold: to enable students to understand how ideas are presented through these various media, to help them gain a perspective on the culture in which they live, and to appreciate artistic contributions made by different ethnic groups in American society.

The course, "Research Techniques and Urban Problems," is required for sophomore students in the Program. It is a two semester course (6 credit hours for each semester) that attempts to synthesize the knowledge and perspectives of various social sciences with the hope of providing sutdents a better understanding of how public policy decisions are made in our society, what their consequences are, and what options for change exist for them and their society.

The humanities and social science classes are two hours in length, held three days a week during the semester. One day a week is generally set aside for "small group tutorials" in which four to five students and a faculty member or graduate student have an opportunity to interact on a more intimate basis.

During the students' junior and senior year, there are no required Goodrich courses. Students still receive financial aid and can avail themselves of all support services offered by the Program; each student is assigned a counselor/advisor in the Program and meets with him/her periodically.

In addition to the academic component, the Goodrich Scholarship Program has established counseling services for its students. Since much in the literature indicates economically disadvantaged students, particularly minority students, do not avail themselves of traditional counseling services (Sue, 1977) and either have misconceptions or simply lack information about counseling and its benefits (Schauble et al., 1979), the Goodrich Program has built in a counseling component which provides activities that bring the students into contact with counselors. A Communication Lab, taught by the Program's counselor, involves all freshman students who meet weekly in small groups during the first semester. In this setting, students explore their own educational goals more fully. Other activities offered by the counselors include individual and group counseling, academic planning, career exploration, and workshops on various topics of personal interest to Goodrich students. Closely tied to counseling services are the Program's tutorial services.

The Writing Lab and Study Skills Center focuses on writing, reading, vocabulary, spelling, and the various study skills needed to succeed in college. During the regular school semester, students may set up one-time or continuing appointments in the Writing Lab, or they may come to the Lab without an appointment. Each tutoring session, scheduled to last one hour, provides an opportunity for the student to work on a specific individual skill problem. Additionally, the lab provides tutoring in various academic subjects. Some small group sessions are planned to assist students in developing study skills, such as taking notes during lectures, reading textbooks, and taking exams. During the summer, the Writing Lab/Study Skills Center staff offers a non-credit, preparatory study skills course to income freshmen. In this course, students learn how to take lecture notes and study textbooks and work on writing, reading, vocabulary, and spelling.

In summary, financial assistance, a sequence of academic courses, and supportive services constitute the Program's major efforts to retain the non-traditional student. The Goodrich Program has undergone two reviews--one internal, one external. These reviews have been favorable and indicate the three-pronged approach the Program has taken has been successful. These reviews suggest two separate and important impacts that the Program has had on its students. First, the Program graduated, during its first five years, 37.5% of the students it accepted. Table 1 provides enrollment and graduation figures. The percent of Goodrich students graduating during these years exceeds that of the university average (by approximately 10%), but what is more significant is the fact that the Program's graduation figures generally equate those of the larger university, the academic risk factors associated with non-traditional students notwithstanding.

TABLE 1

Enrollment/Graduation Status for Goodrich Students
(as Projected to May 1980)

Year	Number Enrolled	Number Graduated	Number Enrolled in Fall term 1979-1980	Number Not Enrolled in Fall term 1979-1980
1972-73	108	39	-	69
1973-74	70	27	1	42
1974-75	50	19	7	24
1975-76	62	24	2	36
a/Subtotal	290 (100%)	109 (37.5%)	10 (3.5%)	171 (59%)

a/Reflects five-year enrollment period. Goodrich Program provides tuition for five years.

Other evidence about the Program indicates that it positively affects Goodrich students' attitudes. In an evaluation study of the Program, Francis (1977) administesred an alienation questionnaire to all Goodrich students and to a selected sample of non-Goodrich students. Of the twenty-four items on the questionnaire, Goodrich and non-Goodrich students differed significantly ($p \leq .05$) on seven.[2] He concluded, "A distinct picture emerges of Goodrich students as less alienated and with more of a sense of control and confidence" (p. 18). Finally, an initial review of the results of a study of Goodrich graduates (Stephenson, in progress) indicated that an overwhelming majority of Goodrich graduates rated their experiences in the Program as satisfying. Thus, the results of studies such as these suggest that the Program is making a significant educational impact on its non-traditional study body.

We have provided a general description of the Goodrich Program and given evidence of its success. While replication of all facets of the Program may not be feasible at other institutions, certain of its features have important implications for those who work with non-traditional students. Specifically,

we will discuss the role of the faculty in the Program, the curriculum and its educational function, and the selection process. The supportive services in the Program, it should be noted, constitute an essential factor in its success; however, since most programs for non-traditional students offer counseling and tutoring, we have chosen to focus on those features of the Program which may not be characteristic of other programs.

SPECIAL FEATURES OF THE GOODRICH PROGRAM

From its inception, the Goodrich Program has emphasized the importance of a faculty who actively participate in the education of Goodrich students. The faculty play a key role in the total operation of the Program. In addition to supporting and advising the Director in the overall development, planning and evaluation of the Program, they take part in the recruitment, selection, orientation, and supervision of Goodrich students. Historically, the faculty have worked together in two teaching teams--one in humanities and one in social sciences. These teams develop and deliver the general education courses taught in the Program. Since the Program's philosophy assumes that low-income students can pursue a rigorous course of study, faculty hold high expectations of students and design courses in ways which will challenge their students academically.

The faculty teach courses in which all Goodrich freshmen and sophomore students are enrolled, so a natural source for faculty-student interaction emerges in the classroom. In addition to six hours of weekly classroom contact, Goodrich faculty make themselves readily available to Goodrich students outside of the classroom. Such contact results in a familiarity between faculty and student that extends far beyond that in the traditional classroom setting. Faculty know which students are absent from class and which ones are struggling

academically. The Goodrich faculty member uses this information to take action and intervene, if appropriate. The familiarity between faculty and students, then, becomes invaluable in retaining students in school.

According to the results of a study of Goodrich graduates (Stephenson, in progress), Goodrich students do find their interaction with faculty different from their interactions with other faculty on campus. The following table indicates Goodrich graduates' satisfaction with their interaction with Goodrich and non-Goodrich faculty:

TABLE 2

Relative Satisfaction of Goodrich Graduates with Faculty Interaction

Faculty/Student Interaction	(n)	Very Satisfied
With Goodrich Humanities Faculty	78	57.7%
With Goodrich Social Sciences Faculty	82	52.4%
With Non-Goodrich Faculty	82	14.6%

These results suggest that a majority of students find, during the first two years of college, that the Goodrich faculty become involved with them in ways more satisfactory than non-Goodrich faculty. Such close interaction allows for faculty attention to students' course work, their problems, and their general progress in college.

Another factor that promotes faculty-student interaction lies in the team teaching approach. Goodrich students are exposed, throughout their first few years of college, to a group of faculty which is diversified in terms of race, age, sex, temperament and style, and academic viewpoint and area of expertise. Thus students are exposed to a number of different role models, all of whom are committed to the students' educational growth. Such diversity

becomes instrumental in meeting the educational needs of such a varied student body, especially in light of recent research on learning through modeling. (Bandura, 1977). Although such diversity among faculty exists, the faculty have identified (Francis, 1977) four characteristics critical for becoming and being effective with Goodrich students: a command of teaching techniques appropriate for non-traditional students, a feeling of responsibility for student success, interpersonal communication skills, and experience with minority and disadvantaged students.

There are several implications of the Goodrich Program's use of faculty for other programs dealing with non-traditional students. Although counselors and tutors serve as absolutely essential resources for retaining the non-traditional student, provision of these resources alone may not be sufficient. A group of faculty members, directly involved in educating non-traditional students and committed to excellence in teaching, may be the determining factor in retaining such students. Additionally, the Program's faculty assume students can perform academically; they do not expect "deficiencies" in or lower-quality work from their students. Given weekly contact, the faculty can more naturally establish contact with a student and observe the student's academic performance over time. The most important result of faculty-student interaction is that the faculty member can usually identify when a student experiences difficulty and inervene so that the student neither drops out nor flunks outs. Thus the faculty become more than teachers; they become advocates for the student and facilitators for their personal and academic growth.

The Goodrich faculty, then, hold fairly traditional expectations of their students; their involvement and interaction with the students, however, go beyond the traditional model. In general, this same approach characterizes the Program's curricular offerings (briefly described in Section Two). On

the other hand, the courses are demanding academically. Throughout the sequence of Goodrich courses, students read only college-level material, take all types of examinations, make oral presentations, write themes and research papers, and participate in class discussions. On the other hand, the content of the courses and teaching methods employed in its delivery differ from traditional general education courses. The use of teaching methods which encourage interaction and the multicultural emphasis in all the courses creates a non-traditional learning environment.

While the close interaction between faculty and students makes intervention with individual students possible, Goodrich courses provide an opportunity for the students to form a supportive community in which they establish relationships with others who have similar educational goals. At a predominantly white institution such as the University of Nebraska at Omaha, such a supportive community becomes extremely important for the retention of minority students. Generally, courses encourage discussion of contemporary issues from a multicultural perspective and promote cross-cultural communication. As stated in the report (1977) of an Ad Hoc Committee which evaluated the Program:

> The General education courses are designed to introduce students to a comprehensive exploration of the problems and issues of contemporary American society and to develop in students the requisite skills for undertaking an independent, rigorous, critical analysis of those problems and issues. (p. 13)

It is important to note, however, that tutoring services supplement the course work.

For those working with non-traditional students in other institutions, the most relevant aspects of the Program's educational component may not be the specific content of the courses (as that changes from year to year) or its multi-cultural emphasis (as that has been widely recognized as important). What may be unique in the Program's approach is the provision of rigorous

academic course work rather than, as is often the case, provision of only remedial courses or tutoring services. That the Program's courses challenge students academically was confirmed in the Ad Hoc Committee's report (1977):

> Goodrich Program courses, in some areas, appear more demanding than courses these students might have chosen to fufill requirements for a degree in the College of Arts and Sciences. Examinations clearly show students are held responsible for the ideas presented by the many outside resource people brought in to supplement the courses. (p. 14)

In his evaluation report, Francis (1977) concluded, "[The Goodrich curriculum] meets the highest standards of academic quality and yet is so designed as to be relevant to the student's social concerns" (p. 65).

The experience of the Goodrich Program has been that given an academic challenge, low-income students perform well, if not above average, in Goodrich classes. The average of Goodrich students' grade point averages in Goodrich courses during the Spring semester of 1980 will serve as an example. The average grade achieved by Goodrich students in the Humanities course was 2.68 (on a 4.0 scale) and in the Social Sciences, 2.45 (on a 4.0 scale). The following table gives these figures as well as the average of the grades these students achieved in non-Goodrich courses.

TABLE 3

Grading Analysis by Course

Student Classification		Humanities	Social Sciences	Non-Goodrich Courses
Freshmen	(n = 58)	2.68	--	2.37
Sophomore	(n = 68)	--	2.45	2.04

These figures indicate that Goodrich students, as a whole, performed above average in Goodrich courses. That the average of their grades in non-Goodrich

was lower may indicate that they do not experience the same kind of support in other courses that they do in Goodrich courses.

The Program's responsibility to its students lies in its provision of well-thoughtout courses, supportive services, and available faculty. In the teaching of the courses, however, the faculty strongly encourage student responsibility for their academic work. A tutorial group, consisting of approximately five students, meets weekly with a freshman faculty member fo discuss materials from the large classes. In the sophomore classes, graduate assistants meet frequently with small groups of students. As the Ad Hoc Committee report (1977) noted about these tutorial sessions, "It is difficult to hide unpreparedness in a small class where students must become involved" (p. 14). While other teaching strategies have been altered, tutorial sessions have been utilized consistently and remain the most important strategy for monitoring students' academic progress. The faculty use a wide range of instructional strategies in the delivery of the courses, but those strategies that produce interaction between faculty and student and/or student and student often predominate.

The totality of the Goodrich experience does not meet the personal and academic needs of all low-income students. As the Program has developed we have identified the students we can best serve; and so, over the years, the selection process has become more and more refined. This process and the rationale behind it have important implications for other programs designed for non-traditional students. It is to this feature of the Program that we now turn.

The Goodrich Program has been an experiment in higher education which is based on the premise that the traditional indicators of college success are not, in and of themselves, the only factors which are accurate predictors of college success. The Program conceded that standardized aptitude tests such as Scholastic Aptitude Tests and American College Tests (SAT/ACT) and high

school grade point averages may be good predictors of college success at extreme ends. That is, a student who obtained an extremely high composite score on the ACT or who earned an extremely high accumulative GPA during his or her high school studies would in all probability be successful in college. On the other hand, it was conceded that a student who scored extremely low on these measures would in all probability have difficulties in college. However, the philosophy of the Program is that it could help many students to succeed in college who, given traditional predictors, would not be expected to do so.

The Program identified a number of major prerequisites that these students should possess. The two most important of these were intrinsic motivation and determination. The selection process reflects the importance of these factors.

No student is eligible for a Goodrich Scholarship who cannot demonstrate an adequate financial need. The need is determined by the university financial aids office in the same manner that such need is determined for all students who are in quest of tax-based financial assistance.

In selecting among its eligible candidates, the Program considers a number of factors other than past academic performance. An eligible student may receive from zero to five points based on his or her financial status. Subsequently, the selection process includes the following elements of consideration. An eligible candidate may receive a score between zero and twenty-one points for his or her high school academic record. This score is awarded after an objective examination of the candidate's class standing, SAT/ACT scores and accumulative GPA. Each candidate also receives a score between zero and twenty points based on his or her writing sample. These samples are graded by the Program's English instructors who independently grade the samples and subsequently agree on a final score.

Each candidate is interviewed by a team of three persons selected from the Goodrich faculty and staff. Each interviewer rates the candidate between zero and four points on the following five items:

(1) Ability to establish and work for goals

(2) Ability to respond to problem or difficult situations

(3) The candidates perceptions of their academic strengths

(4) Personal commitment to education

(5) Future orientation

Each candidate is then assigned a total score for each of the above items. This score is determined by taking the average rating of the interviewers. In addition to the foregoing, four other criteria are used in the selection process. Each candidate is assigned a score from zero to ten points based on an average of the interviewer's grading of the candidate's motivation and multicultural experiences. Each candidate receives a score based on his or her letters of recommendation. These form letters of recommendation are scored by the faculty. Finally, each candidate receives an affirmative action score between zero and twenty points. This score reflects a point scale based on sex and race.

In the final analysis each Program candidate receives an overall score and candidates are subsequently ranked according to their respective scores. The Program then awards its allocated scholarships to those candidates who have received the highest scores.

Clearly, the Program's criteria for selecting candidates are not based solely on traditional indicators of past academic performance such as ACT/SAT scores and GPA. To shed some light on the Program's assumption that these traditional indicators may not be accurate predictors of college success, we randomly selected one year of the Goodrich Program to do a seminal examination

of whether ACT/SAT scores are good predictors of college success and attrition rate. Missing data decreased a sample size of 50 students to only 31. Hence, cell size causes us to look at our findings with some skepticism. Yet, the results are interesting and suggestive of further research.

Table 4 summarizes our findings with respect to associations between composite ACT[3] scores and accumulative GPA[4] after two years of college. The Table shows that there is a fairly strong statistically significant association between these two variables. It is important to note, however, that only 29 percent of those students who scored in the defined low range on the ACT had low grade point averages after their fourth semester of college. Seventy-one percent of the students in this range were able to earn accumulative GPA's of 2.0 or above on a 0-4.0 scale. Moreover, 42 percent of the students who scored in the defined medium range on the ACT test were able to earn high accumulative GPA's.

TABLE 4

GPA by ACT 1976

	ACT			
GPA	Low %	Medium %	High %	
Low	29	0	20	
Medium	71	58	60	
High	0	42	20	.3
Tau b[1]				

[1]A positive tau b correlation indicates a positive association between ACT and GPA.

*Significant $\leq$ .05.

N = 31

Table 5 presents our correlation findings with respect to ACT and Attrition.[5] Although we assumed that those students who were more academically prepared for college, in terms of ACT/SAT scores, would be more likely to return to college after their first year than those who were less prepared, our correlations do not substantiate this hypothesis. The data here suggests that there is no substantive or statistically significant association between SAT and the likelihood that one will return to college.

Moreover, when we assigned points to the variable "return to college," our analysis suggest that ACT score range is not a good predictor of whether or not one will drop out of college. Those in the low medium and high ACT range were about equally likely to return to college.[6]

TABLE 5

Attrition By ACT 1976

	ACT			
Attrition	Low	Medium	High	
Yes	26	25	20	
No	74	75	80	
Tau B[1]				.04

[1]A positive tau b correlation indicates a positive association between ACT and attrition.

N= 31

It would appear based on this brief analysis that there is evidence to support the Program's assumption that SAT/ACT scores and GPA are not necessarily accurate predictors of college success.

CONCLUSION

The Goodrich Program represents a concerted effort on the part of the University of Nebraska at Omaha and the Nebraska State Legislature to increase educational opportunities for economically disadvantaged students, students who might otherwise be denied access to a college education. Because of racism and/or socioeconomic deprivation, low-income students often enter college with inadequate academic preparation of traditional college bound students. In their educational experiences, low-income students can become alienated from an educational sytem which historically has served the needs of and reflected the values of the upper and upper-middle classes (cf: Katz, 1975; Lazerson, 1971; Tyack, 1974; Weinberg, 1977 for historical analyses of American education institutions and their relation to class structure). The Goodrich Program recognizes both the inadequate academic preparation of many low-income students and the alienation they may feel from educational institutions in general.

The Program believes that placing low-income students in remedial courses alone further fuels the students' feelings of alienation from the educational process. Rather, the Program contends that the educational experiences provided low-income students must be enriched and challenging enough so that the student becomes involved intellectually. Moreover, the Program maintains that given enriched educational experiences and a supportive environment, the low-income student will be able to remedy whatever academic deficiencies he or she may have. Thus the Program provides tutoring and counseling; but these services, ideally, supplement the Program's main thrust--its academic curriculum.

In addition to the educational philosophy that undergirds the academic curriculum of the Program, we have discussed two other features of the Program which, taken in combination with the academic component, may make the Program's

approach to the education of the non-traditional student unique. First, Goodrich faculty hold high expectations of Goodrich students academically but go beyond the traditional role of the college teacher through interacting with their students in such a way that problems which might otherwise lead to a student's dropping out are detected and, when possible, solved. The interaction between faculty and students (as well as between student and student) produce a supportive, academic community; and this support, we have found, sustains the students in their non-Goodrich courses where instructors and students may not readily become acquainted.

Finally, the Program has recognized that the educational experiences it provides students will not necessarily meet the needs of all low-income students. The Program, for example, encourages social interaction which some students may not desire. Traditional predictors of college success, such as ACT scores or high school grades, receive less emphasis than do other, more non-traditional ones. The Program determines motivation and academic potential, for example, by looking at students' past accomplishments (not necessarily academic), their future educational and career goals, and their desire to participate in a multicultural educational setting.

In conclusion, many of the educational strategies implemented by the Goodrich Program parallel those of other programs for economically disadvantaged students at other institutions of higher education. From their survey of academic programs for disadvantaged students, for example, Mares and Levine (1975) concluded that "higher education programs for disadvantaged students tend to depend on traditional academic approaches, but at the same time they put great stress on responding to pupils' needs for personal understanding and encouragement" (p. 176). Several contributors in New Directions for Higher Education: Increasing Basic Skills by Developmental Studies (1977) suggest instructional strategies

directly applicable to the educational needs of many Goodrich students and utilized by the Goodrich faculty (cf: Spann, pp. 23-40; B.W. Mink, pp. 51-64; O.G. Mink, pp. 77-92). In many respects, then, the Goodrich Program is similar to other programs for economically disadvantaged students in higher education; however, we believe the combination of features of the Program which we have described constitute a non-traditional approach to the non-traditional student.

[1]The term "non-traditional student" as used in this paper refers to students who are not the traditionally average college student in terms of sex, age, socioeconomic status. Our Program has not only served proportionately more females, older persons, and persons from low socioeconomic status and backgrounds but has also sought to serve public assistance recipients, those incarcerated on educational release and those who may not posses various traditional indicators of college success such as above-average test scores and high school grade point averages.

[2]Those seven items showed that:

1. Non-Goodrich students feel more strongly that it is wishful thinking to believe one can really influence what happens in the University. (Item 2)

2. Non-Goodrich students feel less an integral part of the University Community. (Item 6)

3. Non-Goodrich students feel more that things have become so complicated within the University that they really do not understand just what is going on.

4. Non-Goodrich students feel more that they don't have as many friends as they would like at the University.

5. Non-Goodrich students feel more helpless in the face of what is happening within the University.

6. Non-Goodrich students feel more that the forces affecting them within the University are so complex and confusing that they find it difficult to make effective decisions.

7. Non-Goodrich students feel more that their experience at the University has been devoid of meaningful relationships.

[3]An ACT score of 1 through 15; 16 through 24 and; 25 through 30 were defined as low, medium and high respectively.

[4]GPA scores of 0 through 1.99; 2 through 3.50 and; 3.6 through 4.0 were defined as low, medium and high respectively.

[5]Attrition here is defined to mean a person who did not return to college after their first year.

[6]This analysis of variance is not reported in a Table. The respective averages for the three ACT groups (see reference number 1, Supra) were 1.74, 1.75 and 1.80.

References

Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate the Goodrich Program, Final Report, 1977.

Bandura, A. Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.

Cross, K. Accent on learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1976.

Francis, B.J. The Goodrich Scholarship Program: An evaluation, 1977.

Katz, M.B. Class, bureaucracy, and schools, expanded edition. New York: Praeger Publishers, Inc., 1975.

Lazerson, M. Origins of the urban school: Public education in Massachusetts 1870-1915. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Mares, K.R. & Levine, D.N. Survey of academic programs for disadvantaged students in higher education. Research in Higher Education, 1975, 3, 169-176.

Roueche, J.E. (Ed.) Increasing basic skills by developmental studies: New Directions for Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Schauble, P.G.; Parker, W.M.; Probert, B.S.; Altmaier, E.M. Taking counseling to minority students: The classroom as delivery vehicle. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1979, 26, 176-180.

Stephenson, W. A follow-up study of Goodrich graduates, in progress.

Sue, D.W. Counseling the culturally different: A conceptual analysis. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1977, 24, 422-425.

Tyack, D.B. The one best system. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Weinberg, M. A chance to learn: The history of race and education in the United States. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1977.