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Directed by: F. Thomas Clark, Ed.D.

This dissertation contains a description and analysis of the changes which have occurred in the freshman year experience at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, from 1968 to 1973. Particular emphasis is placed upon the type of individuals who became involved in projects to improve the freshman year experience, their personal motivations for becoming engaged in these efforts, a detailed description of these projects and an analysis of the institutional factors which facilitated and hindered the development, planning, implementation and, if applicable, termination of these projects.

The initial chapters include the background of the study, focusing on some general criticisms of the freshman year experience in higher education and the emerging concern for freshmen at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, and a summary of the literature of change in higher education and specific educational issues which relate to the first year of college. The third chapter contains a description of the sampling procedures and questionnaires used by this investigator to conduct the study.

The results of the study can be summarized as follows:

- a diverse group of people, including faculty, deans, department chairmen, student affairs personnel, and undergraduate and graduate students have been involved in projects to improve the freshman year experience.
these individuals were motivated to become involved in these projects primarily due to their personal or professional concern for freshmen rather than by the institution's reward system.

- a total of 73 projects were reported to this investigator; these projects are characterized by their diversity of purpose as well as scope. However, most of the programs do contain a substantial academic component.

- undergraduate students were the principal facilitative forces in the development, planning and implementation of these projects while funding and the institution's reward system were most frequently cited as the restraining forces in this institutional environment.

The final chapter consists of summary and conclusions drawn from the data, including, in perspective, the literature previously summarized. Some of the major conclusions of this dissertation are:

- that the projects and programs to improve the freshman year experience represent a "grass-roots" and ad hoc approach to institutional change.

- that though the projects reported are significant, they do fall short of any planned, coordinated effort to identify the problems of the first-year experience and then to propose comprehensive and systematic change.

- that undergraduates most often facilitated the development, planning and implementation of these projects.

- that the lack of funding and the institution's reward system were the critical factors restraining further change in the first-year experience.
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CHAPTER I
BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY AND
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Background of the Study

This study is based on the following propositions:

First, that the freshman year experience represents the most crucial year of higher education for many students.

Second, that there is an urgent and immediate need to significantly restructure the first-year college experience so that it more closely relates to the developmental needs and academic aspirations of entering students.

Third, that there have been some limited attempts to reform the first year of college, but there is scarcely any documentation available on such efforts.

And fourth, that there is a critical need for more in-depth analyses of the change process and factors which operate to facilitate or hinder the development and implementation of new first-year programs in institutions of higher education.

\footnote{For the purposes of this dissertation, I want to replace the term "freshman year" with the more appropriate phrase "the first year of college" or "first-year college experience." I do this for two reasons. First, due to the increasing fluidity and flexibility of the collegiate curriculum, more and more people will be choosing an alternative to the four-year degree. Some students will complete a degree in two years while others may take six or seven years. Thus, the freshman-senior sequence is inappropriate. Second, the term "freshman year" should be replaced because of its overt sexist implications.}
Criticism of the first-year experience in institutions of higher education

Many people who study higher education are extremely critical of the first-year educational experience for entering students. These criticisms range from lack of contact with faculty to boring, large lectures to an excessively high drop-out rate. It is helpful to examine some of these general criticisms in such a way as to provide a broader understanding of the present collegiate experience for these students.

It is most appropriate to begin with some general critiques of the first year. For example, Katz and Sanford (1962) assert that "it is in the freshman year that the failures of today's curricula are most glaring" (Sanford, p. 432). From the viewpoint of the authors of the Hazen Foundation Report, The Student in Higher Education (1968) (hereafter referred to as Hazen Report), "part of the problem of the freshman year now is that it confronts the student with academic values that are out of tune with his needs" (p. 45). Giardina et al. (1972) assert that "... the principal weakness in conventional freshman courses is their inflexibility and their relative indifference to the private world of each freshman's experience" (p. 357).

Frequently, such situations, as referred to above, develop because the students' values conflict with those of the academy. Many students attend college primarily because there are few viable and socially acceptable post-secondary alternatives. As a consequence, the students' expectations are not always congruent with those of academe.

A document published by the University of Massachusetts, The Report of the President's Committee on the Future University of Massachusetts (1971) (hereafter referred to as The Future University Report)
broadens this critique when it states that "the students who are going through the most difficult process of adjustment are the ones who are in the largest classes and receive the least attention" (p. 53). And, Marchese (1971) criticizes almost all the elements of the student's first-year experience when he states that "the entering freshman in a college often gets the largest classes, the least experienced and poorest paid faculty, the fewest academic options, the least advisement, the dullest subject matter, the least personal living arrangements, and the most personal rules" (preface).

Furthermore, many critical voices can be heard concerning the quality of the academic experience and the opportunities for significant contact between students and faculty. Basael (1972) gets to the crux of the issue when he declares that "in many schools freshmen do not even see a faculty member; they are taught by graduate students" (p. 523). Moreover, to quote again from the Hazen Report (1968), "... freshmen are kept out of seminars and seniors are put in seminars, despite the fact that both the needs and the style of most seventeen year olds are more suited to the seminar and if anybody is able to tolerate lecture halls, it should be the seniors" (p. 38).

Also, a report on the curriculum at Brown University, Freedom to Learn: A New Curriculum for Brown and Pembroke (1969), emphatically states that "courses that freshmen are required to take are all too often huge and featureless agglomerations of unmotivated students and indifferent instructors, barren of any great sense of intellectual commitment on either part, and likely to be felt as a burden by all involved" (p. 2).
A similar criticism of the first-year academic experience is made by Katz and Sanford (1962) for they claim that "... for many students the whole freshman year is taken up with the necessary evils and for most there are no courses which can be regarded as ends in themselves" (Sanford, pp. 432-433).

As a consequence, many times the student will not perceive any relationship between his courses and the personal problems which he must confront each day. Oftentimes a significant gap emerges between the goals of the student and the goals of the institution. As a result Peterson (1972) says that "some of them will begin by looking for counseling as soon as they arrive and a whole hell of a lot more of them will just grit their teeth and suffer alone" (p. 43).

Moreover, many students find that the first-year experience is unstimulating and, to be blunt, boring. Many quickly discover that the difference between high school and the academic aspects of the first year of college is nonexistent. Likewise, many students find that their classes are unexciting and that their teachers are uninterested in them. Swados (1971) asserts that students are "shocked at discovering how narrow is the gap between that hideously boring and impatience-making senior year and that routinized and get it over with college freshman year" (p. 28). He continues by saying that "what is shocking for the freshman is the discovery that the liberation from education as ritual into education as process is simply not taking place; once more it is to be postponed, pushed off" (p. 30). Also Susman (1968), in a report on the first-year academic programs at Rutgers College, concurs with
Swados (1971) and goes on to state emphatically that the first year is "fundamentally more of the same" (p. 29).

In a related criticism, there are numerous studies which appear to indicate that a student's commitment to academic values will decline from the point of entry into college. Both Wallace (1963) and King (1967) have conducted longitudinal studies which document the decrease in the percentage of students emphasizing academic and intellectual satisfactions over all other areas of their college experience (Feldman and Newcomb, p. 83). Davis and Coakley (1965) have reached a related conclusion based on their own studies. They have concluded that "... there is the worrisome possibility that somehow or other the academic side has not lived up to what the entering freshman had anticipated" (Feldman and Newcomb, p. 86).

Accompanying these problems, one also discovers that the drop-out rate for first-year students is disproportionately high. Birney, et al. (1960) assert that "... for most schools the drop-out and transfer rate is highest during the first year of college" (Feldman and Newcomb, p. 90). Baur (1965) and Trent and Kedsker (1967) have conducted similar studies which confirm these results (Feldman and Newcomb, p. 90). Interestingly enough, this high drop-out rate is not a recent phenomenon. McNally (1938) reports that the drop-out rate for freshman men in public institutions similar to Michigan State was 35.6 per cent (p. 54).

Finally, as more people become aware of the inappropriate nature of the learning environment for first-year students, they are beginning to focus their attention on the allocation of the college's resources for these students. Newell (1970) has uncovered some
fascinating statistics. According to her figures, the direct instructional salary costs per semester credit hour for one Michigan university in 1968 are $15.52 for 100 level courses, $18.26 for 200 level courses, $25.62 for 400 level courses and $29.63 for over 400 courses (p. 58).

As have been reviewed above, there are many valid criticisms of the academic programs provided for first-year college students. For the most part, colleges and universities devote little concern and minimal resources for the education of first-year students. Second, the student often finds that there is a conflict between his/her goals and those of the academy. Third, most students rarely have the opportunity for genuine and fulfilling contact with faculty and the intellectual life of the university. Finally, since much of the content of their courses tends to be uninteresting and their professors often unstimulating, many students see little difference between the first year of college and the last year of high school. Thus, as Ridlon (1961) concluded, the first year of college makes severe demands on even the best of students (p. 60) and even for those who do survive, the problem of adjusting to the first term of college can be a harrowing experience (p. 56).

The University of Massachusetts: an emerging concern for first-year students

Throughout the past five years at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, increasing numbers of people, including students, faculty and administrators, have become concerned with the problems first-year students must confront at a large public university. This interest in the personal as well as the intellectual growth of the entering student
has intensified during the past two years. During this entire period there were numerous efforts by diverse groups of individuals to examine the first-year experience which tend to demonstrate a heightened awareness and concern for these students.

In an effort to provide the proper perspective and context in which to understand the programs or projects to improve the first-year experience which have been implemented between 1968-1973, this researcher will highlight some of the developments which led to a greater understanding and sensitivity of the problems faced by first-year students on the University of Massachusetts, Amherst campus.

Project Ten (1968)—a living-learning residential dormitory established for freshmen and sophomores seeking an alternative to the traditional residence hall.

"April 10-11" (1969)—a two-day campus conference organized by students and faculty. Its purpose was to reassess and propose recommendations for the improvement of undergraduate education in general but the problems faced by first-year students surfaced as a prominent issue.

Long-Range Planning Report of the Faculty Senate (1970)—this report noted the need to reexamine the first-year experience at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, in its entirety, with specific emphasis on reassessing the effectiveness of the core requirements.

Undergraduate Education Conference (1970-1973)—an annual one-day conference sponsored by a group of concerned faculty to discuss critical issues pertaining to undergraduate education. The first-year experience received significant discussion during these sessions.
The Report of the President's Committee on the Future University of Massachusetts (1971)—the first public statement which both recognized the acute nature of the problems surrounding the first-year experience and also issued some policy recommendations.

A graduate seminar on the freshman year (Spring, 1972)—led by two concerned faculty members, this constituted an attempt to carefully examine the educational issues impinging on the first year of college, collect some data on specific aspects of the first-year experience at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, and then to utilize these findings to influence the appropriate University policy-makers.

Ad Hoc Faculty Senate Committee on the Freshman Year (Spring, 1972)—an outgrowth of The Future University Report, this committee, comprised of students, faculty and administrators, made various proposals to the Faculty Senate for the restructuring of the first-year experience.

Wednesday Morning Ad Hoc Task Force on Freshmen (Spring, 1972)—this group was comprised of concerned graduate students, faculty and administrators who were interested in sharing ideas and experiences, devising mechanisms and programs to improve the first year, and acting as a resource to the Ad Hoc Faculty Senate Committee on Freshmen.

Northfield Conference (Spring, 1972)—a large group of students, faculty and administrators met for a day to discuss ways to enhance the living-learning communities (dormitories) on campus. Much attention was focused on the problems which first-year students must face when they enter the University.

Southwest Internal Planning Conference (Spring, 1972)—a group of people gathered to discuss some vital issues affecting students in
the Southwest Residential College. The first-year experience was a high priority agenda item.

Nantucket Retreat (Spring, 1972)—a small group of senior administrators and students met for two days to discuss the possibility of developing and implementing some experimental programs for a significant number of first-year students in each new entering class.

All of these developments helped increase the awareness and concern for the problems facing first-year students at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. The work of these individuals and groups appears to have fostered an atmosphere which encouraged the development of projects to improve the first-year experience of University of Massachusetts, Amherst, students.

**Statement of the Problem**

The purpose of this investigation is to examine the phenomena of change within an institution of higher education. This investigator will study the change process by focusing on the changes which have occurred in the academic, residential, and/or extracurricular programs for first-year students at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, from 1968-1973.

The major goals of this investigation are the following:

1. to determine, in light of the increased awareness on the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, campus during the past five years of the importance of the first-year experience, the changes which have occurred in the academic, residential, and/or extracurricular programs for first-year students at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, from 1968-1973;
2. to determine which individuals, according to their position in the University, were involved in promoting these changes and their personal motivations for engaging in such efforts; and

3. to assess and analyze the key institutional factors which facilitated or hindered the development of these change efforts.

Significance of the Study

This investigation is significant for the following reasons:

1. Individuals and groups of individuals at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, have expended valuable time and energy trying to improve the first-year experience. It is important to examine systematically the results of their efforts.

2. Individuals and groups of individuals at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, and other colleges and universities may find this information useful in their efforts to improve the first-year experience as well as other aspects of undergraduate education.

3. This research may contribute to the limited data on the obstacles which must be overcome by those attempting change/innovation in higher education. Hefferlin (1970) has concluded that "reform in higher education is not plagued by a scarcity of ideas but rather by the difficulties encountered in implementing new ideas" (p. 5).
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Over the past ten years there has been an increasing amount of literature on the change process in higher education. This investigator intends to discuss the general literature on the change process in higher education as well as some educational issues which directly impinge on the first year of college.

This research tends to support the thesis that institutions of higher education are resistant to significant change and are likely to change only in an atmosphere of crisis or pressure politics. Moreover, due to specific institutional factors, it is especially difficult to reform the first-year college experience. Finally, this survey supports the proposition that the first year of college is the critical year for most college students and that many reforms are necessary to enable these students to overcome many of the problems which confront them during their initial year in college.

This review of the literature is restricted primarily to four-year colleges and universities. This researcher has not attempted to discuss the particular issues and problems which relate specifically to the two-year community and private colleges.
Change in Higher Education

Historical perspective on change in higher education

From an historical perspective, particularly the post-World War II era, but also inclusive of the three-hundred-year history of higher education in America, little significant change has occurred in the academic values, practices and policies of higher education. When change has occurred, it has most often been in terms of the growth and expansion of budgets, faculty, students and buildings. Of course, we have also witnessed the creation of black and women's studies programs, coeducational dormitories, the easing of requirements, and increased possibilities for independent study and experientially-based learning.

However, the critical point, to put it simply, is that the faculty's allegiance to the academic dogma has remained sacrosanct. Nisbet (1971), an eminent sociologist and critic of recent trends in higher education, defines the academic dogma in the following manner:

What is the dogma that the university is built on? Knowledge is important. Just that. Not "irrelevant knowledge"; not "practical knowledge"; not the kind of knowledge that enables one to wield power, achieve success, or influence others. Knowledge! (p. 24)

Generally, institutions of higher education have been described as not being responsive or adaptive to change. Corson (1966) asserts that "... it is generally agreed that the college or university is slow to accept change" (p. 8). Rudolph (1962), the noted historian of higher education, has the following to say on this issue:

Resistance to fundamental reform was ingrained in the American collegiate and university tradition, as over three hundred years of history demonstrated... Experimentation, which
was the life of the university, and innovation, which was its gift to society, were seldom tried upon the colleges and universities themselves. There timidity prevailed. (pp. 491-492)

When the Newman Commission released the much heralded Report on Higher Education (1971), it asserted that "the [higher education] system, with its massive inertia, resists fundamental change, rarely eliminates outmoded programs, ignores the differing needs of students, seldom questions its educational goals, and almost never creates new and different types of institutions" (preface).

Moreover, Kristol (1968), a perceptive observer of higher education, has recently asserted that "the university—with the possible exception of the post office—has been the least inventive (or even adaptive) of our social institutions since the end of World War II" (p. 50). In addition, Hechinger (1970), summarized the conclusions of Dwight Ladd's Change in Educational Policy: Self-Studies in Selected Colleges and Universities by saying that "after more than five years of labor, the university reform movement has brought forth mountains of committee reports but only little actual change" (p. 10).

Specifically, of all the aspects of higher education, the curriculum has been the area most resistant to change. On this matter, Veysey (1963), an eminent historian of higher education, has observed that "the central historical point that must be made about the American academic program of study ever since the turn of the twentieth century is their remarkably static pattern when viewed at the broadest perspective" (Reform on Campus, 1972, p. 28).

Furthermore, Hefferlin (1969), in a study of 110 institutions of higher education, has concluded that "... changing the curriculum is
like moving a graveyard. In both cases, for better or worse, the content is generally lifeless. Moreover, the physical problems pall before the issues of sanctity and privilege" (p. 18).

Yet, there are numerous observers of higher education who contend that these institutions change quite rapidly, in fact sometimes too rapidly. Hechinger (1968) quotes Jacques Barzun, a Columbia University professor and historian of higher education, as saying that "since 1945 the universities have been doing nothing but innovate" (p. 50). In a related issue, Nisbet (1971) takes the position that since World War II the infusion of massive federal research funds, the increasing significance of the institute, and the emergence of the "academic bourgeoisie" have created precipitous and detrimental changes within higher education.

And, Brown and Mayhew (1965) note that:

No central office is allowed to prescribe changes in curriculum or instruction, yet word of promising innovations spreads quickly and the innovations are adopted as if by fiat. During the 1940's and 1950's, for example, general education was in vogue; and in the 1960's independent study and overseas experience for students became popular. (p. 1)

Early in his study, even Hefferlin (1969), who is very critical of the lack of changes within institutions of higher education, admits that some changes have occurred:

Certainly over the past century and one half our colleges have been more faddish than most of us realize. They have come to accept not only science but chalk and blackboards, the performing arts, research laboratories, fraternity houses, seminars, circulating and open stacks, graduate study, contract research, lectures, overseas campuses, football, vocational education, academic majors and minors, and teach-ins: no small assortment of novelty. (p. 5)

In summary, most observers tend to conclude that institutions of higher education have resisted any fundamental changes in their academic
values and practices. Yet, there are others who argue that institutions are constantly changing and, in fact, have a tendency to change too quickly without fully evaluating the effects of these changes on the academic quality of the institution.

Yet, in this researcher's opinion, the changes, and certainly there have been many, have often been insignificant. Most innovations have been too timid, have been minor repairs, adjustments, and extensions to the existing system. They have not challenged the sacred values of the academic dogma and, as a consequence, the attitudes, policies, and practices of most institutions have remained relatively unchanged throughout the history of American higher education.

Patterns of change in higher education

Though institutions of higher education are extremely fond of studying every conceivable subject that exists, they are usually loathe to study themselves. Yet, by examining the results of the relatively few case studies of change in higher education that do exist, it is possible to see some of the patterns which emerge. Hefferlin (1969), who in this reviewer's opinion is one of the most perceptive observers of the change process in higher education, has concluded that "academic changes appear to take three general patterns: the creation of new institutions, the radical transformation of existing institutions, or the piecemeal alteration of institutional programs" (p. 22).

Sometimes change occurs as a result of the creation of institutions which introduce new concepts into higher education. As Hefferlin (1969) says:
In Europe, the Ecole Polytechnique, the Kaiser Wilhelm University, and the University of London broke old molds. In America so did Samuel Reed's normal school at Concord, Vermont, in 1823; Jefferson's University of Virginia and Stephen Van Rensselaer's School at Troy, New York, in 1824; the Agricultural College of the State of Michigan in 1855; Gilman's Johns Hopkins University in 1876; and what came to be the Joliet Junior College after 1902. The birth of new institutions such as these, however, is not the major means of change in higher education. They are necessary for emulation but are a minor part of the process. (p. 23)

Hefferlin (1969) continues by asserting that "a more frequent means of change occurs when old institutions are radically transformed, as were Brown in 1850, Antioch in 1921, St. John's in 1937, and Parsons in 1955, with the old program rejected and a new model substituted" (p. 23). Hefferlin cites the following example:

St. John's, for example, was on the verge of bankruptcy in 1937, with an endowment less than its debts of $300,000. It had lost its accreditation the year before because of an athletic scandal and its financial difficulties, and would have closed its doors in June except for the arrival of Stringfellow Barr from Chicago, who brought with him Scott Buchanan and 120 classics as the new curriculum. (p. 24)

Finally, Hefferlin (1969) has concluded that "the major process of academic change is that of accretion and attrition: the slow addition and subtraction of functions to existing institutions" (p. 24). He goes on to say the following:

Accretion and attrition are the most common means of academic change primarily because they are the most simple. Unlike radical reform, they are small-scale, undramatic, and often unpublicized. By accretion an institution merely encompasses a new program along with the old—a new occupational course, a research project, a new undergraduate tradition. And through attrition, other programs and functions are abandoned either because they become outdated—like compulsory chapel—or because they come to be performed by other institutions. (pp. 24-25)

Most often, the pattern which emerges does not necessitate a change in people's values or behavior. A recent Carnegie Commission
Report, *Reform on Campus* (1972), asserts that "the long history of attempts at academic reform testifies to the conclusion that structures, reward systems, technology and facilities can be changed much more readily than people" (p. 67). Simply put, it is easier to install a computer or build a dormitory than it is to change human behavior.

Ladd (1970), in his study of eleven colleges and universities, lends strong support to this thesis when he concludes that as a direct result of the self-studies "new power centers were created without—overtly at any rate—disturbing the old, to make an omelet without breaking any eggs" (p. 196). Many of these institutions indicated a strong interest in enhancing the student's intellectual as well as personal development. Yet, according to Ladd, no institution appears willing to confront the conflict between these goals and those of graduate education and research. So, rather than embark on a new set of priorities, these institutions prefer to build new programs while leaving the old ones intact. As a result, very few new programs are created.

Even when change does occur, though, various observers view the pattern of events as usually being precipitated by crises and/or pressure politics. As Ladd (1970) says, "the ability of our colleges and universities to respond to a need for change—except when faced with severe pressure or the threat of pressure—is frighteningly limited" (p. 9). Deutsch and Fashing (1971), in another case study of academic change, reinforce this thesis when they assert that "our evidence suggests that pressure politics are necessary for change. In most cases innovation follows from an expressed commitment to change in the face of pressure rather than as a consequence of self-study" (p. 273).
Finally, Clark (1962) makes a persuasive argument regarding this issue:

Many schools and colleges are unable to make a major change until confronted by crisis—near bankruptcy or an exodus of staff or an explosive split among key personnel. Crisis is the common condition under which old enterprises are reborn, allowed once more to begin anew with a sense of starting down an uncharted road. (p. 194)

Though this statement was uttered over a decade ago, it is still a very compelling and valid criticism of our institutions.

In summary, change usually occurs as a result of the piecemeal alteration of institutional programs, a process of attrition and accretion. Frequently, in this process new power centers are created thus avoiding the necessity for people to change their values or behavior. Moreover, when change does occur, it is likely to happen after pressure or the threat of pressure has been applied.

Sources of change in higher education

When searching for the sources of academic reform or change within an institution, two general observations can be stated. First, when changes do occur, usually there are multiple causative factors which contribute to the change process. Second, different observers, depending upon their biases and perspective, place varying degrees of importance on any particular factor.

Some observers place great emphasis on the impact of external societal forces on initiating change in higher education. Hefferlin (1969) contends that "the rate of educational change varies with that of social change" (p. 35). Consequently, he argues that external forces in the larger society have a significant effect on the curriculum of an
institution (p. 189). For example, the protests and turmoil over United States foreign policy in Vietnam seriously affected the students on campus. The students' concern about the war eventually led to demands for changes in the educational experiences available to them. After critically viewing the role of the United States in Vietnam, the students then applied this same critical analysis to institutions of higher education.

Byrnes (1965), Chairman of the History Department at Indiana University, supports Hefferlin's position. After studying and analyzing institutions of American higher education, he states that "... indeed, if we review the relatively few changes in curriculums over the past 30 years, we must admit that these revisions have been produced because of pressures from the outside. The college follows, it does not lead..." (p. 439). Moreover, Hefferlin (1969) predicts that:

Small improvements and alterations will most likely occur from within the institution. But the redirection or re-orientation of any institution must, of necessity, come from without... It is unrealistic in our judgment, as a result of this study, to expect a change of direction from within the university itself. (p. 70)

For others, adroit leadership is vital if change is to occur. Davis (1965) found that "the leadership style of the college president and the norms he encouraged were more highly related to innovation at two colleges... than were differences between the faculties either in terms of their knowledge of current educational experimentation or in terms of psychological conservatism" (Hefferlin, 1969, p. 194). McGreeley (1967) found that the Catholic colleges in his sample that had made the most significant changes recently were marked in particular by independent and intelligent administrative leadership (Hefferlin, 1969, p. 193).
Finally, Ladd (1970) asserts that his studies demonstrate that "strong, skillful leadership is virtually mandatory for the success of any serious effort at educational reform" (p. 205).

In addition, the faculty has also been a source of change in higher education. Since post-World War II, Nisbet (1971) asserts that the faculty has been responsible for many changes in higher education, including the development of institutes and other capitalistic enterprises, the rise in the importance of research over teaching, and the quest for greater affluence from government research grants. Moreover, there are numerous members of the faculty on every campus in the country who have formed alliances with students and administrators in an effort to improve the quality of undergraduate education.

And, students cannot be overlooked as a stimulus for reform though they are often the forgotten citizens of academe. As Rudolph (1966) says, throughout the history of American higher education, students have been "the most creative and imaginative force in the shaping of the American college and university" (Hefferlin, 1969, p. 147). Hefferlin (1969) reinforces Rudolph's theme by stating that "in the past they [students] have rebelled against outmoded curricula, taken the initiative for their own education through the extra curriculum, and pressed the colleges to add new knowledge to the classroom" (pp. 147-148). Certainly students have played a critical role in creating the conditions which have led to some substantive changes in higher education during the tumultuous decade of the 1960's.

Clearly, another source of change is the institution's ability to generate and control considerable financial resources. Sometimes this
money may come from the institution's budget or other times it is the result of the infusion of outside resources from foundations or wealthy contributors. On this matter, Ladd (1970) clarifies the issue quite succinctly by asserting that budgetary leverage is essential to changing anything of consequence (p. 195). Accordingly, without sufficient resources, it is impossible to reward change, a critical necessity if reform is to occur or new programs are to develop. Hefferlin (1969) concurs when he argues that "the first key to academic reform is that of resources. . . . A new program will be tolerated if it costs no money or brings its own support" (p. 39).

Finally, the fabric and characteristics of an institution often determine the extent of change that will occur. According to Hefferlin (1970), those institutions which changed the most were characterized by such factors as small size, financial instability, dependence on student tuition, high faculty turnover, and urban location. These factors tend to produce greater innovation (p. 5).

These factors of reform, such as powerful social forces, skilled and intelligent leadership, budgetary flexibility, and faculty and student advocacy, can be extremely potent forces toward change in higher education. However, a broader perspective on the change process is necessary. It can be gained by examining the forces which resist reform in higher education. Then, some comparative analyses can be drawn.

Resistances to change in higher education

Though there are numerous sources of change operating in the institutional environment at any time, the obstacles to reform are formidable
due to some attributes which are common to any complex organization as well as some unique characteristics within institutions of higher education. Hefferlin (1969) describes the resistances to change in any organization, including institutions of higher education, as the following:

1. organizations are inherently passive— they exist for the routinization of behavior [p. 10],

2. voluntary organizations attract members who agree with their activities [p. 10],

3. organizations tend toward institutionalization and ritualism [p. 11],

4. organizations that are livelihoods for people tend to come to exist only as livelihoods for those people [p. 12], and

5. the maintenance of institutional effectiveness is only one problem that organizations must face in order to survive; other problems, unrelated to the central purposes of the institution, often take precedence over it. (p. 12)

In addition, he describes the following resistances which are unique to institutions of higher education:

1. their purposes and support are basically conservative [p. 13],

2. within higher education institutional reputation is not based on innovation [p. 14],

3. faculty members have observed their vocation for years as students before joining it [pp. 14-15],

4. the ideology of the academic profession treats professors as independent professionals [p. 15],

5. academics are skeptical about the idea of efficiency in academic life, and [pp. 15-16],

6. academic institutions are deliberately structured to resist precipitant change. (p. 16)

Furthermore, Blau (1966) cites two other factors which inhibit change. First, he discusses the conflict in goals which exists between faculty and administrators. He makes the following statement:
The administrator's orientation toward constructing new buildings, attracting better students, and offering a wider variety of courses reflects his interest in enhancing the position of his university in competition with others. In contrast to the global commitments of administrators to the University, the major commitment of faculty members is to the advancement of knowledge in their discipline. (pp. 93-94)

This conflict is likely to impede efforts for academic reform because two principal groups, faculty and administrators, are working towards different goals. It is an inherent institutional problem based on the differing perspectives of these two constituencies.

Then, he describes the conflict between teaching and research, the two fundamental purposes of the University. He concludes that "teaching and research constitute different underlying purposes . . . the optimal environment for maturation and education is not necessarily optimal for original research" (pp. 96-97). Nisbet (1971), however, dissents from this view and affirms that there is an integral and necessary relationship between teaching and research. He strenuously warns, though, against huge government research grants which tend to be unrelated to teaching and corrupt the university.

Moreover, Sanford (1962) argues that the faculty quite frequently most strenuously resist efforts at reform. He delineates five specific reasons for this predicament:

1. Each is a specialist in his own narrow field
   It is thus his natural inclination to see the problems of liberal education in a limited perspective. (p. 20)

2. Faculty Organization
   . . . college and university faculties, typically, have organized themselves in such a way as to make deliberate and concerted change of any kind exceedingly difficult. (p. 20)
3. **Vested Interests of Faculty**

Faculties sometimes go so far in protecting their professional status, or in using their professional status to satisfy their desires for security and the advancement of their own interests, that they neglect the legitimate needs and aspirations of the society that supports higher learning. (p. 21)

4. **Isolation of Universities**

At the present time in America there seems to be an unhealthy alienation of the colleges and universities from the rest of society. . . . Our institutions of higher learning do not lead in the way that they should; often they seem at once too aloof and too ready to adapt themselves to contemporay pressures. (p. 21)

5. **Lack of Scientific Theoretical Base**

But one of the main barriers to reform in the colleges is the lack of a scientific basis for educational practice. . . . More fundamental than this is the lack of a generally accepted theory of individual human development in accordance with which colleges may state hypotheses pertaining to the relations of ends and means. (pp. 21-22)

It is this investigator's opinion that the forces promoting change are quite often insufficient to overcome the myriad resistances to reform. In fact, the burden of proof is always on those people who want to try something different while existing programs are infrequently evaluated. Hence, change comes slowly, if at all, and it demands great sacrifices and perseverance on the part of the innovators.

**Resistances to change in the freshman year**

In addition to examining the change process throughout the institution, it is useful to focus on the dynamics of the change process as it applies particularly to reform in the first-year experience. In addition to the resistances to change that have already been delineated, there are
other critical factors which are unique to the particular area of the
first-year college experience.

As Hefferlin (1970) has pointed out, many changes in higher edu-
cation occur as a result of the creation of parallel structures; however,
the first year must be changed by "bucking the line rather than making
end-runs" (p. 5). In this researcher's opinion, to significantly improve
the first-year experience it is necessary to alter various institutional
policies. Consequently, any significant reforms would necessarily affect
such areas as curriculum, academic advising, teacher improvement and
evaluation, summer orientation, and residence hall life and the reward
system. As such, it is not possible to simply create new structures or
execute an "end-run" by avoiding these vested interests. Rather, attempts
to improve the first-year experience usually necessitate confronting the
central values of the academy.

The authors of the Hazen Report (1968) grasped the significance
of this problem when they stated that "a revamping of the freshman pro-
gram would play hob with curricula, course work, grade point averages,
credits, credit hours, and tuition arrangements. . ." (p. 47). In ef-
fact, an effort to alter significantly the first-year program involves
confronting the central values of the institution and therefore a reorder-
ing of priorities is necessitated if the proposed changes are to come to
fruition.

Moreover, there are significant problems relating to the financing
of many new first-year programs. Ladd (1970) says the following about
the difficulty of implementing small seminars for first-year students:
They are uncommonly expensive when simply grafted onto existing programs. . . . Consequently, a freshman seminar program really calls for a reallocation of resources within the institution. Such a reallocation will only come after a widespread acceptance of the proposition that general and relatively personal instruction for freshmen is more important than specialized and personal instruction for upper-classmen. While most of the reports recommend freshman seminars, none really comes to grips with this issue. (p. 188)

To reinforce this thesis, Marchese (1971) argues that "one cannot devote greater economic resources to the education of freshmen without having an effect—usually in the form of less money—on some other level of the university" (p. 3). Of course, this is especially true in a period of shrinking budgets.

Furthermore, these financial difficulties are emphasized by the recent finding of a Carnegie Commission report, Reform on Campus (1972), which strongly recommends a reexamination of budgetary support for the teaching of lower-division as against upper-division students. A frequent relationship, they contend, is one to two (p. 49).

In this researcher's opinion, the obstacles to change in institutions of higher education are severe. If the additional specific resistances to change in the first-year college experience are also considered, the likelihood of creating change in this particular area is further diminished. As a consequence, the first-year experience should be viewed as an especially difficult area within which to create change.

Some Educational Issues Relevant to the First Year of College

In addition to the pertinent literature which refers to the change process in higher education and specifically the first year of
college, there is an abundance of useful literature which relates directly to educational issues which affect the student's first-year collegiate experience. In reviewing this aspect of the literature, this investigator will discuss some issues in the following areas: (1) the expectations of entering students, (2) the problems confronting entering students, (3) the critical importance of the first-year experience, (4) suggested goals for the first year of college, (5) a suitable learning environment, (6) recent innovations in first-year programs, and (7) some evaluations of alternative first-year programs.

The expectations of entering students

There is significant disagreement regarding the expectations of first-year students. Some theorize that students do not have strong expectations or preconceived notions of their college experience. On the other hand, others believe that students arrive with high expectations and strong academic values only to be disappointed and disillusioned by their first year of college.

First, there are various studies which tend to support the theory which asserts that students do not come to college with high expectations and a commitment to academic values. For example, Karlen (1969) says that "many bring with them resistance, indifference, or a show-me consumer attitude" (p. 49). In another study of entering students, Trent (1965-1966) reported that when asked what they expected of college, respondents usually had very little to say other than they expected to have to study harder and also have an opportunity to make friends (Newcomb and Feldman, p. 72).
And, Lehman and Dressel (1962) found that students entering Michigan State University had no clear-cut ideas regarding social life on campus (Feldman and Newcomb, p. 72). Moreover, Geer (1964) and Becker (1966) discovered that students' long-range perspectives were not very clear.

They thought of the university as a large place and were not sure how they would manage the problems it posed. They had little idea about scheduling of classes, and the large number of organizations and activities open to them on the campus. . . . They were unprepared for the wealth of competition for their time and the wealth of choice of curricular and extra-curricular functions. (Feldman and Newcomb, pp. 71-72)

Also, there is research that suggests that most freshmen do not have a significant commitment to intellectual values. Heist (1963) finds little evidence of very much intellectual commitment among entering freshmen and notes that they are not really prepared for demanding intellectual experience and intensive learning and relearning experiences (Feldman and Newcomb, p. 87). And, Peterson (1964) and Davis and Coakley (1965) found that in a study of 13,000 freshmen only 19 per cent endorsed an academic orientation (Feldman and Newcomb, p. 87).

Most of these people would probably agree with Feldman and Newcomb (1968). "The problem for most colleges is more one of creating and encouraging high levels of intellectual commitment on the part of entering students than one of meeting the demands of persons so committed" (p. 88).

For the most part, as evidenced by the above-cited research, there often exists a conflict between the values of the student and those of the faculty and the academy. It is fair to say that many students do not share their professor's faith and belief in the academic dogma and the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake.
On the other hand, many other observers of students in higher education believe very strongly that entering students arrive with high expectations. Becker (1966), Freedman (1956), Geer (1964) and Gordon (1966) have concluded that freshmen arriving on campus are eager, enthusiastic and serious about their future experiences at college; they have high personal expectations (Feldman and Newcomb, p. 82).

Specifically, Freedman (1956), in a study of freshmen at Vassar College, asserts that:

... freshmen arrive on campus typically filled with enthusiasm, with eager anticipation of the intellectual experience they are about to have. By the end of the year, 10% have dropped out and the remainder are ready for what in the Eastern colleges is known as the "sophomore slump." (p. 432)

This is an important study but it should be noted that Vassar is an elite, prestigious institution and therefore the expectations of these students may differ from the general student population. Their expectations are likely to be very different from students entering public colleges and universities.

In addition, a report published by Macalester College, Macalester Freshmen Expectations—A Rude Awakening (1971), concludes that freshmen experienced less:

1. opportunity for independent study than anticipated,
2. found few courses concerned with contemporary social problems,
3. fewer courses relevant to their lives in the classroom,
4. instructors followed the text, lectured to the class, assigned term papers, and used detailed notes more frequently than anticipated, and,
5. faculty did not get to know the student as well as hoped, did not relate the course to other fields of study, did
not explain why they conducted the class as they did, and
did not stray from what many labeled a traditional approach
to learning.

And, Berdie (1968) in a study of freshmen at the University of
Minnesota concludes that "some of the changes suggest that the University
is not as exciting or as friendly a place as students had anticipated" (p. 89).

Clearly, there is a disagreement among researchers concerning
the expectations of entering students. Most likely, the results will vary according to the type of institution and the quality of student it attracts. We may expect a great variation in the expectations of Vassar College students as compared to students enrolled in a state college in Vermont.

Yet, this investigator, on the basis of his personal experiences working with entering students, believes that a majority of students do come to college with high expectations. Unfortunately, most institutions fail to capitalize on this opportunity.

Problems confronting entering students

For most students the first year of college represents many ob-
stacles which must be successfully overcome. Much has been written about the problems which students confront and as such it is useful to highlight some of their principal problems in this new environment.

First, the transition from high school to college presents a
significant problem for many students. Erikson (1953) has concluded that:

A student suffers from an absence from home, academic requirements and expectations, and the presence of a student society and cul-
ture to which he must adapt himself. Consequently, it seems that
we are justified in thinking of his entrance into college as bringing about a developmental crisis. (Sanford, p. 266)

Similarly, Feldman and Newcomb (1968) have concluded the following:

In general terms the freshman is a novice in an unfamiliar social organization and is therefore confronted with the values, norms and role structures of a new social system and various subsystems. Such an experience usually involves desocialization (pressures to unlearn certain past values, attitudes, and behavior patterns) as well as socialization pressures to learn the new culture and participate in the new social structure. The uncertainties of this learning period often are compounded by the frustrations involved in moving from a system where one is an established member—the former high school and community ("transition")—to a system where one is only a novice. Therefore, regardless of the degree to which the new college environment matches what the entering freshman expected, he faces a variety of expected and unexpected academic, intellectual and social challenges. (p. 89)

In addition, for many students the impersonality of the institution represents an overwhelming obstacle. To quote from the Hazen Report (1968):

We know that the trauma of leaving home for the first time and entering the relatively impersonal milieu of the college can be severe for young people. But far from attempting to facilitate the transition from home to college we generally act so as to reinforce the freshman trauma. (p. 13)

Consequently, as Feldman and Newcomb (1968) contend, "... some freshmen may feel a new and disturbing sense of anonymity. Such frustrations are often compounded by threats to the student's self-image with respect to his intellectual and social abilities" (pp. 89-90). Peterson (1972) noted that approximately two million freshmen will have to "cope with loneliness, self-doubt and confusion" as the fall term begins (p. 27). Finally, many times academic problems pose insurmountable obstacles for entering students. As Riesman (1962) says, "the freshman is at the bottom
again and has to define himself or herself, as competent and adequate in a new milieu" (p. 44). From a slightly different perspective, Hall and Barger (1966) reported the following:

Many entering students at the University of Florida have come from small high schools in which they were considered outstanding in some way. At the University, they found that their status of relative superiority was no longer valid. Adjustments had to be made, some of which proved to be quite painful. (Feldman and Newcomb, p. 89)

Also to quote from a report on the Simmons College first-year program, Freshman Experiment in Educational Discovery (1972) (hereafter referred to as FEED Report), sometimes "students seriously underestimate their ability to meet the intellectual challenge of the academic experience, partly because they are insufficiently aware of this ability and partly because they lack the confidence to develop and release it" (p. 2).

Critical importance of the first year of college

Many experts in higher education believe quite strongly that the first year of college is the most important and critical one for the student. As the Hazen Report (1968) declares, "the freshman year is of critical importance because it is the time when the student's enthusiasm, curiosity and willingness to work can be snuffed out or reinforced" (p. 45).

From a similar perspective, The Future University Report (1971) says that "the freshman year introduces these students to university life. It is the single largest determinant of the quality of their university experience" (p. 52). Moreover, Ashby (1971) asserts that "universities are for students and the students who need the most attention are the
freshmen" (p. 49). Finally, as Feldman and Newcomb (1968) state, "the freshman year is important because of the student's openness to the influence of others" (pp. 295-304).

Yet, even within the first year, the first few weeks are of particular importance. It is in the first weeks that students confront limitless opportunities as well as severe challenges. Marchese (1971) argues that "the first weeks in school present the college with a frequent situation of real openness in students, of receptivity to the best the college can offer" (p. 1). In addition, Katz and Associates (1968) have concluded the following:

Our study has impressed us with the importance of the freshman year, particularly its early phases. The entering student faces many sudden challenges and threats: separation from home, sudden exposure to large groups of strangers who may seem threatening or superior, new academic demands. . . . It seems very desirable that colleges divert their best resources to the problem of the freshman. (pp. 432-433)

Furthermore, Sanford (1962) has concluded that "the strains of the first weeks of college are so great that there are set in motion maladaptive responses which may lead to leaving college in the first year" (p. 27).

Moreover, for students not particularly committed to intellectual experiences, the first weeks of college are of utmost importance. Heist (1963) emphasizes the importance of making early college experiences for these students "sufficiently dramatic and rewarding to 'catch' the student for the first time with the excitement of ideas and the wealth of unexplored knowledge, with the idea of living as a continuous learning experience, with some provocative exposition of meaning, of values, of fundamental questions that must be dealt with by all mankind" (Feldman and Newcomb, p. 88). And, a study done at Oberlin College, the Preliminary Report of
the Education Commission (1971), contends that "the opening weeks of college should provide first-year students with a challenging intellectual experience of a kind few of them will have encountered in high school" (p. 36).

In conclusion, the first few weeks of college are critical for many students. It is a time when students form important judgments about the institution and their fellow students. It can have a significant effect on the student's total undergraduate experience.

When an institution does not comprehend the importance of the first few weeks of college, the following situation, described by a student at George Washington University, is likely to occur: "This is the first day I can say I've liked it. This is the first time I can act without relying on other people. You know, I had forgotten the purpose that brought me here, to learn" ("Five-to-One," 1972).

Suggested goals for the first year of college

Since the first year of college represents a particularly critical time for the student, some spokesmen and some institutions have stated specific educational goals for meeting the unique needs of first-year students. It is useful, therefore, to survey the literature which describes some of these goals.

Various goals have been proposed for first-year programs. In general, there is an urgent need for most institutions to develop a more constructive and positive attitude toward first-year students. Specifically, some writers focus on the importance of the student's academic
development while others stress the necessity to create a bridge between academic and personological development.

First, for significant change to occur in first-year programs, institutions of higher education must quickly adopt new attitudes towards their first-year students. Marchese (1971) believes that the *sine qua non* is "an attitude which sees in each entrant a unique individual worthy of the best the institution has to offer" (p. 5).

Numerous proposals have been set forth for improving the first-year academic experience for entering students. Raushenbausch (1963), a former President of Sarah Lawrence College, has made the following proposal:

The problem is to make the freshman year one in which the world "opens right up," not just for the exceptionally able student in an honors program, but for all students capable of doing college work. I believe the first year of college should galvanize a student's desire for thinking and studying. (p. 54)

More recently, *The Future University Report* (1971) proposed that a first-year program seek to "(1) involve students in beginning to apply the various disciplines to specific problems; (2) to help them make reasonably well informed choices about their academic and career goals; and (3) to expose them to moral and social values implicit in the acquisition and utilization of knowledge" (p. 54).

Finally, Katz and Sanford (1962) have emphasized another set of goals for the first year of college which can usefully serve as guidelines for any new first-year program. They urge that "every effort should be made to capture the student's imagination, to give him a sense of what it means to become deeply involved in a discipline or subject,
to learn things that make a difference in his life, to be a member of a community that is devoted to the pursuit of truth" (Sanford, p. 433).

Furthermore, other proposals have been suggested which attempt to integrate intellectual and personological development. The Hazen Report (1968) urges the following goals:

The whole freshman year should be viewed as an orientation to learning rather than the first year of academic instruction. Freshman orientation should not be one week of adjustment to a college but a whole year of exposure to an entirely new and exciting activity—serious and systematic thought—and a year of integrating the pursuit of skill and knowledge with the search for identity and intimacy. (p. 61)

In a publication describing FEED (1972) to entering students, Simmons College concisely and eloquently put forth some goals for their first-year experimental program. "The first year of college should be exploratory in nature and provide an opportunity for active intellectual and personal growth, integrating the pursuit of knowledge with the search for identity" (p. 1). It should be noted that the goals set forth by the Hazen Report and the experimental program at Simmons College are extremely similar. They both share a concern for integrating the pursuit of knowledge with the search for identity.

The suggested goals for first-year programs seek to foster the student's intellectual as well as personal development. It is generally agreed that the first-year program needs to be more interesting and stimulating while providing for genuine contact with faculty. Furthermore, the first-year experience must relate more directly to the immediate problems and decisions confronting many of these students.
A learning environment for first-year students

Depending upon one's perspective and educational/pedagogical philosophy, there are numerous learning environments which can facilitate these goals and thereby create a more stimulating and challenging learning experience for first-year students. There are two specific learning environments which are most pertinent. One embodies a student-centered approach while the other is exploratory in nature.

In terms of a student-centered approach, the Hazen Report (1968) has issued the following recommendation:

The freshman year, which is the starting point of a student's higher educational experience, should focus on the interest of each student—what he or she thinks is important. It may be why professors run rats through mazes or how a pollster predicts an election, the meaning of the French Revolution or the reason engines tend to stall in damp weather. (p. 11)

On the other hand, a different proposal suggests that the student's first semester be exploratory in nature. Susman (1968) recommends an exploratory semester for entering students which would include a series of mini-courses in a variety of fields, conducted in small classes with excellent teachers on a pass-fail grading system (p. 30).

In developing or creating alternative learning environments for first-year students, it is also important to consider the developmental needs of these young people. Sanford (1962) asserts that "freshmen flourish best not when they are given no grades but when they are given searching and hard-hitting analyses of their performance accompanied by intelligible and realistic pictures of what they can become" (p. 264). It is necessary to critically assess first-year students' ability and academic goals.
Erikson (1953), in discussing the appropriate learning environment for young students, says that "the college environment is, or could be, highly favorable to the stabilization of the young person's self-conception and self-esteem; here he is afforded a continuous opportunity to test himself in various spheres of activity without his failures being catastrophic and without his successes leading to premature commitment" (Sanford, p. 266).

A learning environment for first-year students must also help facilitate their search for commitment. Riesman (1962) says that entering students need to develop a "sense of belonging" (p. 43). The Hazen Report (1968) is also very critical of higher education's lack of concern for this problem. Instead of helping students in this respect, "we stand idly by while young people search fruitlessly for propositions and commitments which will explain the chaos and confusion of life and, worse, we fail to indicate the possibility of a meaningful bridge between the private and the public conscience" (p. 14).

Another suggested element in the learning environment, which is often totally lacking for first-year students, is genuine contact with faculty. Riesman (1962) says that first-year students need to have "access to faculty" (p. 43). The creation of small classes for first-year students is one viable mechanism for developing this contact with faculty. In this regard, a report from Brown University, Freedom to Learn: A New Curriculum for Brown and Pembroke (1969), suggests establishing as many small and informal classes for freshmen as possible in order to facilitate "direct and stimulating contact with instructors who are enthusiastic about what they are teaching and how they teach it as
well as encourage constant and uninhibited communication among students
and between teachers and students" (p. 2).

Likewise, similar proposals have been suggested by the Hazen
Report (1968); Ladd (1970), Change in Educational Policy; Self-Studies
in Selected Colleges and Universities; and The Future University Report
(1971).

Clearly, for such proposals to be implemented, an institution
has to regard its first-year students as important and deserving of a
greater percentage of the institution's resources. The authors of The
Study of Education at Stanford: A Report to the University, Undergraduate
Education (1968) recognized this and included in their report the recom-
mendation that "a dramatic shift in the allocation of teaching resources
at the undergraduate level is necessary so that a greater proportion of
regular faculty members will come into contact with freshmen" (p. 12).

Recent innovations in freshman programs

Surveying recent studies of attempts to reform the first-year
experience, it appears that the proposals for change fall into the fol-
lowing categories—freshman seminars and small classes, changes in grad-
ing, improved advising, and living-learning residential arrangements for
first-year students.

Wells (1973) provides extensive documentation on the implementa-
tion of the freshman seminar as a pervasive innovation in first-year
programs. He says that one hundred and fifty institutions presently
offer freshman seminars for academic credit (pp. 30-31). He goes on to
say that "the purpose of the freshman seminars are to offer them [students]
personalized attention, facilitate the growth of their own interests, enable them to leave the anonymity of the lecture hall, and allow them to gain a sense of commitment and identity in the seminar room" (pp. 10-11).

Ladd (1970), in his survey of eleven institutions, discovered three general changes which, though less pervasive, are quite significant — smaller classes, usually with an emphasis on interdisciplinary or modes-of-thought courses; the use of pass-fail in first-year courses; and the alteration of the advising system whereby the faculty leader in the small seminar, or in some instances an upperclassman, becomes the freshman's advisor (p. 188).

Finally, Crosson and Hoffman (1972), doctoral students at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, contacted approximately one hundred institutions in an effort to document the different types of new programs being established for first-year students. These programs can be categorized as follows: (1) many institutions have developed experimental programs which, when successful, have become the base for a four-year experimental college or some type of radically different curriculum, (2) many institutions sponsor colloquia for credit, sometimes as a mechanism to initiate and design student-centered learning projects and to allow students to teach each other, and (3) residential colleges and "living learning" units have been created to improve the delivery of advising, counseling, and teaching services to these students.
Evaluations of alternative freshman year programs

Finally, though there have been numerous attempts to introduce alternative first-year programs into the curriculum of many colleges and universities, most programs have unfortunately never been evaluated; however, a few have been and what follows is an attempt to convey the results of some selected evaluations.

Most of the results of the evaluations have been extremely positive in tone. Morgan (1971), in a study of an experimental first-year program at Hiram College, concluded that freshmen were:

1. significantly less disillusioned and there was more end-of-freshman-year satisfaction with faculty, courses, advisors and graduation requirements,

2. freshmen became more liberal and socially concerned during the first new curriculum year than under the old, but this was not true in the second year,

3. "new curriculum" sophomores were higher than the control group on thinking introversion, theoretical orientation, complexity and autonomy (p. 2).

Furthermore, "the combined results of higher satisfaction with the academic program, stronger intellectual values, and no loss in traditional achievement make us feel that the Hiram curriculum has contributed to increased student development and more love for learning" (p. 27).

According to Morstain (1972), in a study of an experimental first-year program at the University of California, Davis, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. students seem to feel that they were more a part of the learning experience,

2. had purpose in studying other than the reward of a grade,

3. had achieved a means of organizing thoughts and selves.
In addition to the evaluation of programs, various special courses for freshmen have also undergone scrutiny. In an evaluation of the Harvard Freshman Seminars, it is reported that the freshman deans find in the seminar a more positive and rapid connection, by many students, with the University. And, 62 per cent of the students who did not take seminars as freshmen wish they had (School and Society, 1963, p. 208). Of course, it should be noted that this study occurred over a decade ago and may not accurately reflect present student sentiments and attitudes.

And, Giardina, et al. (1972) have concluded that the experience of a special freshman year course at Bowling Green University "argues convincingly for a course which meets freshmen where they are in their intellectual development and seeks to respond to them as they are rather than to some archetype of what freshmen are supposed to be" (p. 356). Marcuson (1970), after assessing three special freshman courses at Beloit, Hiram, and Wilmington Colleges, has concluded that "small discussion groups are more favorably received by contemporary college students than are large lecture classes, where they must assume a passive role instead of being active participants" (p. 14).

On the other hand, this investigator did discover one extremely negative evaluation of an alternative first-year program. Karlen (1969) describes Antioch's first-year program as "chaos and massive change which was very disruptive to faculty and students alike" (p. 51). Quite possibly, these negative comments reflect the totally unstructured nature of the Antioch program. Unlike the other experiments mentioned, the lack of structure in the Antioch program may have precipitated serious problems for both students and faculty.
Also, there have been some student evaluations of these programs. For example, Morstain (1972) notes the following comment from a woman student:

In my regular classes, most of my energy was involved in keeping up with the readings, keeping up with the lectures, getting a midterm in, cramming for finals. . . . For the first time, when I got into my project in Malcolm (the experimental dorm) I really did something on my own that was worthwhile. I learned so much more, did so much more reading, and I put more work into it and enjoyed it. . . . (p. 11)

From another perspective, Karlen (1969) says that many students were "proud to be living up to adult expectations of independence" (p. 50). Also the report published by Macalester College (1971) states that students complained that "some seminars turned into a lecture course or the instructor was ineffective in leading group discussion" (p. 12).

Yet, it appears the majority of freshman programs are effective and enthusiastically received. Certainly, there are some problems but they appear to be outweighed by the advantages of such programs. Hopefully, more programs will devote the time and energy necessary to accurately evaluate their efforts so that more institutions can benefit from these experiments. In addition, the available data tend to indicate that the student-centered approach is most successful. Furthermore, the Antioch program should serve as a warning not to remove all the structures and rules at once.

**Summary**

The focus of the Review of the Literature was on the dynamics of institutional change in higher education as well as particular educational issues which impinge on the first-year college experience, a critical year for many students.
In terms of surveying the literature on the change process in higher education, this reviewer found The Dynamics of Academic Reform by J. B. Lon Heffelrin to be, by far, the most useful source of pertinent information. On educational policy issues relevant to the first-year college experience, the principal sources were The Impact of College on Students by Kenneth Feldman and Theodore Newcomb, The Hazen Report, and The American College edited by Nevitt Sanford.

On the basis of all the research reviewed, the following trends or generalizations are evident:

Change in Higher Education

- change in higher education, not unlike other societal institutions, occurs slowly;

- though there are many forces initiating reform, such as faculty, students, powerful social forces, outside agencies, and skilled administrative leadership, there are also many institutional forces resisting change, particularly the faculty's abiding faith in the academic dogma;

- when change does occur, it usually happens in an atmosphere of crisis or pressure politics;

- rarely does this change challenge the fundamental values of the institution; and

- change, rather than resulting in the radical transformation of an institution, is usually characterized by the slow process of accretion and attrition.

The First Year of College

- the first year of college is the most critical for many students;

- it is also one of the most difficult areas in which to create change;

- first-year student expectations differ usually according to the unique qualities of the institution;
the suggested goals for first-year programs seem to point to more personal instruction and attention for entering students with an emphasis on the integration of both intellectual and personal development; and

most experimental first-year programs appear to be highly effective; in particular, the student-centered approach seems to be the one chosen most often.

It is toward the further elaboration and relevance of some of these issues that this research project is directed.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Research Site

This research was conducted at the Amherst campus of the University of Massachusetts, a large multi-campus public university. The University was founded in Amherst in 1863 under the Morrill Land Grant Act. When the institution opened its doors to fifty-six students in 1867, it was known as Massachusetts Agricultural College. In 1931, with a student enrollment of approximately 1,000, its name was changed to the Massachusetts State College. Sixteen years later, in 1947, it officially became the University of Massachusetts. Today the student enrollment on the Amherst campus exceeds 22,000. Moreover, the faculty has expanded to over 1,450 and the annual operating budget for the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, is approximately $55 million.

To provide a sense of the enormous changes and growth of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, it is useful to cite two interpretations of the institution at two different junctures in its history. Cary (1962), a professor of history, stated that "students and others who knew it before 1931 recall a small college in a rural setting dedicated to the improvement of farming and rural life" (preface). And, he goes on to say that in 1961, the new president of the University, John Lederle, clearly understanding the changes which had occurred during the past thirty years, made the following statement in his inaugural address:
As a university, we have not only a responsibility to transmit knowledge, but a responsibility through research to advance the frontiers of knowledge. . . . I have come to feel that what we have here is potentially a giant. I do not mean a bricks and mortar giant, but a great public center for excellence in higher education in this region. (pp. 197-198)

Hence, President Lederle's "feeling" proved accurate, for this institution has been transformed from a small, rural college to a three-campus university system. Now, in the early 1970's, the University of Massachusetts is beginning to be recognized as a distinguished public university.

**Rationale for Site Selection**

For several reasons, this researcher selected this site for his study. First and foremost, this researcher has been both an undergraduate and graduate student at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, and thus possessed a certain familiarity and fondness for it. Second, this investigator has been personally involved with other students, faculty and administrators in various efforts during the past three and one-half years to improve the first-year experience. As such, during the course of the past year many people have encouraged me to undertake this study and it seemed important to me to attempt to determine the effectiveness of the various efforts to change the first-year experience.

Furthermore, this site seemed particularly appropriate since approximately one and one-half years ago a distinguished committee, appointed by the new president of the University, Robert Wood, issued a long-range planning report (*The Future University Report*)\(^1\) which discussed

\(^1\)This investigator served as a consultant to the President's Committee on the Future University of Massachusetts. His efforts focused on
the importance of the first-year experience and recommended that the University's programs for entering students should be improved. The Report stated that:

We are well aware of the difficulties involved in improving the freshman year. It will cost money—in smaller class size, intensified advising, and more skill development work. That money will either have to be taken from other areas or obtained from the legislature. We know there is a long history of failed efforts at freshman year reform in various universities. Nonetheless, the present situation presents a number of difficulties, and an effort at significant changes should be attempted. (p. 56)

It was for the above reasons that this researcher selected this site for his study.

Sample

For this study, an attempt was made to obtain a total sample of the specific population. To accomplish this purpose, this investigator mailed questionnaires (see Appendices A and B) to two different groups of people. The first group included people who had been identified as presently having an interest in improving the first-year experience while the second group consisted of people, who by virtue of their responsibilities and position at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, may have been involved in similar efforts. The total size of the sample was 226.

A questionnaire was sent to 42 people who had been identified by me and other knowledgeable sources (members of my dissertation committee, two other faculty members, and two graduate students) as having demonstrated an interest or involvement in efforts to improve the first-year experience. For the most part, this group comprised people who had been making recommendations for the improvement of undergraduate education on the Amherst campus.
involved with the Ad Hoc Faculty Senate Committee on the Freshman Year, the Wednesday Morning Ad Hoc Task Force on Freshmen, other people identified by these groups, though not directly associated with them, and a few students on the Student Senate's Academic Matters Sub-committee on Freshmen.

In addition, in an attempt to identify other possible "advocates" for first-year students, a similar questionnaire was sent to 184 other University personnel. This group included all senior academic officers and their assistants, heads of residence/residence directors, student affairs staff, and residential area staff. Included in this group were deans and department chairmen. However, they received a different questionnaire.¹

The Instruments

Since the review of the literature indicated there were no existing questionnaires which would be appropriate for this study, new instruments had to be designed. This was done by the investigator with the advice and assistance of the members of his thesis committee as well as a few faculty and graduate students at the University.

However, during the course of constructing the first instrument (see Appendix A), this investigator did discover a dissertation by Wells (1973) which proved to be especially helpful in the design of Questions

¹A special questionnaire was constructed for deans and department chairmen. The purpose of this questionnaire was to elicit information concerning their school, college, or department's efforts to improve the first-year experience during the past five years. See Appendix B.
10, 11, and 12. Since Wells referred to a useful model designed by Hefferlin (1969), this researcher also consulted Hefferlin (pp. 213-214). The result was a slight modification and alteration in Question 9.

The first instrument was field tested twice. During the first test, it became clear that the questions were too general and that the classification and analysis of data obtained from the open-ended questions would be an overwhelming task. The questionnaire was then significantly modified and field tested again, using the same individuals. The respondents reacted extremely positive to the revised questionnaire.

Each person received a two-part questionnaire. Part One of the questionnaire elicited some general biographical information as well as one question concerning the respondent's involvement in any attempt to improve or change the first-year experience at the University. Those people who responded affirmatively to being involved in a first-year project were then instructed to fill out Part Two which requested specific data on each first-year project, not to exceed two.

The questionnaire was designed to ascertain four types of information—background and biographical data on the respondents, their personal reasons for becoming involved in one or more first-year projects, specific information about each project reported, and the institutional change factors which facilitated or hindered these projects (see Appendix A).

The second instrument (see Appendix B) was constructed primarily with the aid of Professor Robert H. Wuerthner and Patricia Crosson, a fellow doctoral student. This instrument did not undergo the same formal field testing procedures. Each dean and department chairman received a
two-part questionnaire. The first part of this one was identical to the first questionnaire. However, the second part requested that the respondent indicate any school, college or departmental programs which have been implemented to improve courses, advising or special program offerings for first-year students.

**Administration of the Instruments**

Both questionnaires, with covering letters (see Appendix C), were mailed on March 19, 1973. Approximately two weeks later a postcard (see Appendix D) was sent to all people who had not yet returned the questionnaire.

**Computer Programs for Data Analyses**

All of the closed-end data was analyzed by utilizing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer programs (Nie, et al., 1970). The open-ended data was analyzed by this researcher in consultation with his thesis committee.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Total Sample

A total of 226 people received a questionnaire concerning their involvement in efforts to improve the first-year experience. The following groups comprised this figure of 226—faculty, administrators (deans, department chairmen, and other academic officers), student affairs personnel (dean of students' staff, heads of residence, and residential area staff), and students (undergraduate and graduate students).

Before presenting the data gathered in this study, this investigator wants to caution the reader on his/her interpretation of this information. Since this was not a random sample and since only 51 per cent of the people responded to the questionnaire, there is reason to be circumspect before drawing any definitive conclusions based on this data.

Table 1 presents a breakdown of the total sample. According to the type and sex of the respondent, the data indicates the number of individuals in the total sample, the total number of respondents and the percentage of respondents. Furthermore, it includes the total number of people employed in each category, by sex, throughout the University.

Table 1 indicates that 51 per cent (116) of the total sample (226) responded to the questionnaire. The largest number of respondents (38) was in the category of administrators, followed by student affairs personnel (32), faculty (28), and students (18). In addition, the total breakdown of the respondents, according to sex, was 78 per cent (90) male
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Respondent</th>
<th>Total in University</th>
<th>Total No. Sent</th>
<th>Total No. of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M  F</td>
<td>M  F</td>
<td>M  F</td>
<td>M  F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1,120 210</td>
<td>40 6</td>
<td>24 4</td>
<td>86 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>8 1</td>
<td>7 1</td>
<td>4 1</td>
<td>80 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairmen</td>
<td>42 3</td>
<td>42 3</td>
<td>24 1</td>
<td>96 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Academic Administrators</td>
<td>10 4</td>
<td>10 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>50 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60 8</td>
<td>59 8</td>
<td>32 6</td>
<td>84 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Students' Staff</td>
<td>7 4</td>
<td>7 4</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>50 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of Residence</td>
<td>23 31</td>
<td>23 31</td>
<td>11 10</td>
<td>52 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Areas Staff</td>
<td>21 8</td>
<td>16 3</td>
<td>6 1</td>
<td>83 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51 43</td>
<td>46 38</td>
<td>19 13</td>
<td>59 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Students</td>
<td>9,810 7,613</td>
<td>3 —</td>
<td>2 —</td>
<td>100 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>3,516 1,727</td>
<td>20 6</td>
<td>13 3</td>
<td>81 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,326 9,340</td>
<td>23 6</td>
<td>15 3</td>
<td>67 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals in Each Category By Sex</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>168 58</td>
<td>90 26</td>
<td>78 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Includes Chancellor, Vice-Chancellors, Provost's Office, and special program administrators.
and 22 per cent (26) female. However, it is important to note that the number of women respondents, though consistently less than men, is generally reflective of the total population of women throughout the university.

**Organization of the Data**

The respondents were divided into three groups according to the extent of their involvement in projects or programs to improve the first-year experience for students at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, from 1968 through spring semester of 1973. Each respondent, depending upon his/her response to the following question, was classified into either group a, b, or c.

**II. Your Personal Involvement in Changing/Improving the Freshman Year Experience at the UM/A**

1. During the period 1968-1973, have you ever been involved in an effort, successful or unsuccessful, to change or improve any aspect of the academic, residential and/or extracurricular experience for freshman students at the UM/A? (Please check one below)

   - a. ____ Have made no attempt at changing/improving the freshman year experience.

   - b. ____ Have been interested in changing/improving the freshman year experience but I never reached the planning, proposal or implementation stage. If so, please explain in brief the nature of your interest.

   - c. ____ Have been actively involved in implementing a program/project to change/improve the freshman year experience.
Table 2 presents some background information on the total number of people who responded to this researcher's questionnaire.

Involvement in efforts to improve the first-year experience

The largest group of respondents, 64 per cent (72), indicated that they had been involved in one or more projects or programs to improve the first-year experience. Another 18 per cent (21) expressed an interest in enhancing the university experience for entering students, though they had not actually been involved in attempting to implement a project or program. Finally, 19 per cent (22) stated that they had not been involved in any effort to improve the first-year experience.

Sex

Seventy-eight per cent (90) of the respondents were men and 22 per cent (26) were women. The men tended to be faculty members or deans/department chairmen while the majority of the women were student affairs personnel or graduate students. Yet, to insure that this data is not misinterpreted, it is necessary to view this information from the perspective of the overall population of women employed in key positions throughout this University. As presented in Table 1, women comprise only 19 per cent (210) of the entire faculty. Moreover, though there are 54 deans and department chairmen, only 7 per cent (4) are women. Finally, the largest concentration of women is among the student affairs personnel.
### TABLE 2

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>DEANS &amp; DEPT. CHAIRMEN</th>
<th>OTHER ACAD. ADMIN.</th>
<th>STUDENT AFFAIRS PERSONNEL</th>
<th>UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS</th>
<th>GRADUATE STUDENTS</th>
<th>TOTAL RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N   %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N   %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INVOLVEMENT IN FIRST-YEAR PROJECTS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6 21</td>
<td>8 28</td>
<td>3 37</td>
<td>3 10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2 13</td>
<td>22 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>5 18</td>
<td>4 14</td>
<td>2 25</td>
<td>6 19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4 25</td>
<td>21 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>17 61</td>
<td>18 58</td>
<td>3 38</td>
<td>22 71</td>
<td>2 100</td>
<td>10 62</td>
<td>72 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEX:</strong> Male</td>
<td>24 86</td>
<td>28 93</td>
<td>4 50</td>
<td>19 60</td>
<td>2 100</td>
<td>13 81</td>
<td>90 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4 14</td>
<td>2 7</td>
<td>4 50</td>
<td>13 40</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3 19</td>
<td>26 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE:</strong> Under 25</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>8 30</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6 86</td>
<td>20 61</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12 75</td>
<td>46 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>10 37</td>
<td>11 36</td>
<td>1 14</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 6</td>
<td>25 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>7 26</td>
<td>12 40</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 6</td>
<td>21 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>2 7</td>
<td>7 24</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEGREE:</strong> Bachelor</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2 29</td>
<td>14 44</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4 29</td>
<td>21 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>4 15</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>5 71</td>
<td>14 44</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10 71</td>
<td>34 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>22 81</td>
<td>28 97</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>54 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RANK:</strong> Assistant</td>
<td>9 33</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 100</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>11 41</td>
<td>5 23</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>7 26</td>
<td>22 77</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>29 53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TENURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N  %</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-25</td>
<td>17 61</td>
<td>26 87</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>43 37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATORS</th>
<th>STUDENT AFFAIRS PERSONNEL</th>
<th>UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS</th>
<th>GRADUATE STUDENTS</th>
<th>TOTAL RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>DEANS &amp; DEPT. CHAIRMAN N %</td>
<td>OTHER ACAD. ADMIN. N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE/SCHOOL AFFILIATION:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities &amp; Fine Arts</td>
<td>5 19</td>
<td>5 17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>8 31</td>
<td>3 10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences &amp; Mathematics</td>
<td>3 12</td>
<td>4 14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3 12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>4 14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>2 7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>2 8</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Natural Resources</td>
<td>3 12</td>
<td>5 17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS PER TYPE OF RESPONDENT</td>
<td>28 24</td>
<td>30 26</td>
<td>8 7</td>
<td>32 28</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>16 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Age

The great majority of respondents, 80 per cent (92), were between the ages of 25-54. There was an equal distribution of respondents throughout the 25-34, 35-44, and 45-54 age groups. Another 10 per cent (12) of the respondents were under 25 and an equal number were over 55 years of age. Of the younger people, those under 35 years of age, 76 per cent (44) were student affairs personnel, graduate students or undergraduates. Moreover, 88 per cent (28) of the people over 44 years of age were primarily faculty or deans and department chairmen.

Degree

Slightly less than one-half of the people who responded to this item, 47 per cent (54), have earned a doctorate while 29 per cent (34) have a master's degree and another 18 per cent (21) a bachelor's degree. In terms of the distribution of these degrees according to the type of respondent, a large majority of the faculty, 81 per cent (22), and deans and department chairmen, 97 per cent (28), possess a doctorate compared to only 12 per cent (4) of the student affairs personnel.

Rank

Primarily, this category applies only for faculty and administrators who hold an academic rank. However, one student affairs personnel does have a faculty appointment at the rank of assistant professor.

Eighteen per cent (10) of the faculty and administrators responding to this item were assistant professors while a significantly larger group, 82 per cent (45), were senior faculty at the level of associate
or full professor. In terms of the faculty, 33 per cent (9) were assistant professors while 100 per cent (27) of the deans and department chairmen were either associate or full professors.

Tenure

In this category, pertaining only to faculty and administrators, the data indicate that 37 per cent (43) of all the respondents are tenured. Of the deans and department chairmen responding, 87 per cent (26) have tenure compared to only 61 per cent (17) of the faculty.

School/College Affiliation

This category includes faculty, administrators, and graduate students. The largest number of respondents, 23 per cent (15), are affiliated with the School of Education, followed by the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, 17 per cent (11) and the College of Humanities and Fine Arts, 15 per cent (10).

Summary of Background Information on Total Number of Respondents

Most of the people responding to the questionnaire tend to be between the ages of 25-54 and predominantly male, though clearly reflective of the overall distribution of jobs throughout the University. In addition, slightly less than one-half of the people have earned a doctorate and these are almost exclusively faculty and administrators.

Moreover, a significant majority of the faculty are senior professors. Though most of the faculty and deans and department chairmen are tenured, only slightly more than one-third of all the respondents
have tenure. The largest number of the respondents, inclusive only of faculty, administrators, and graduate students, are associated with the School of Education, the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, and the College of Humanities and Fine Arts.

Background Information on the Respondents Who Have Been Involved in a Project or Program to Improve the First-Year Experience

Table 3 presents background information on the respondents who have been involved in a project or program to enhance the first-year experience for entering students. An analysis of these "innovators,"¹ according to their position in the University, indicates that the student affairs personnel comprise the largest group, 30 per cent (22), of people involved in these projects. Administrators account for 24 per cent (18) of those involved and 86 per cent (18) of this category of innovators were deans and department chairmen. Finally, the faculty accounted for 24 per cent (17), graduate students 14 per cent (10), and undergraduates 3 per cent (2).

Sex and age

Of the innovators, 79 per cent (57) were men and 21 per cent (15) women. These figures accurately reflect the male-female ratio at the University.

The vast majority, 74 per cent (53), are between the ages of 25-54, though 17 per cent (12) are under 25 while another 10 per cent (7)

¹An innovation is the introduction of something new; something that deviates from the established doctrine or practice; something that differs from existing forms (Webster's Third New International Dictionary).
# TABLE 3

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS INVOLVED IN A PROJECT TO IMPROVE THE FIRST-YEAR EXPERIENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</th>
<th>TYPE OF RESPONDENT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATORS</td>
<td>STUDENT AFFAIRS PERSONNEL</td>
<td>UNDER-GRADUATE STUDENTS</td>
<td>GRADUATE STUDENTS</td>
<td>TOTAL RESPONSES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEX:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DEANS &amp; DEPT. CHAIRMAN</td>
<td>OTHER ACAD. ADMIN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15 88</td>
<td>16 89</td>
<td>1 33</td>
<td>15 32</td>
<td>2 100</td>
<td>8 80</td>
<td>57 79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2 12</td>
<td>2 11</td>
<td>2 67</td>
<td>7 68</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 20</td>
<td>15 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 100</td>
<td>5 22</td>
<td>2 100</td>
<td>2 20</td>
<td>12 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>6 35</td>
<td>6 33</td>
<td>2 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 70</td>
<td>27 37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>4 24</td>
<td>7 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 10</td>
<td>14 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>6 35</td>
<td>5 28</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>1 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEGREE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>3 18</td>
<td>1 6</td>
<td>3 100</td>
<td>11 50</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 71</td>
<td>23 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>14 82</td>
<td>17 94</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RANK:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>6 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>5 31</td>
<td>3 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>5 31</td>
<td>14 82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TENURE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 53</td>
<td>16 89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATORS</td>
<td>TYPE OF RESPONDENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>DEANS &amp; DEPT. CHAIRMEN</td>
<td>OTHER ACAD. ADMIN.</td>
<td>STUDENT AFFAIRS PERSONNEL</td>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS</td>
<td>GRADUATE STUDENTS</td>
<td>TOTAL RESPONSES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE/SCHOOL AFFILIATION:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities &amp; Fine Arts</td>
<td>2  2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4  10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>6  1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7  18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences &amp; Mathematics</td>
<td>1  3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4  10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2  —</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6  100  9  22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>—  2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>1  3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4  10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3  8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>1  1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>—  —</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Natural Resources</td>
<td>2  3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5  12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS</td>
<td>17  24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30  2  3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER TYPE OF RESPONDENT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
are over 55. Sixty-six per cent (19) of the young "innovators," those under 35 years of age, are student affairs personnel.

**Degree**

Fifty per cent (34) of the innovators who responded to this item have an earned doctorate while 33 per cent (23) have a master's degree and 17 per cent (12) a bachelor's degree. Yet, in terms of a breakdown according to the type of respondent, 91 per cent (31) of the doctorates belong to faculty or deans and department chairmen.

**Rank**

Considering all the people who hold an academic appointment, including administrators, faculty, and deans and department chairmen, 21 per cent (7) are junior faculty at the assistant professor level while the large majority, 79 per cent (27) are associate or full professors. In terms of the respondents who hold only a faculty appointment 62 per cent (10) are associate or full professors compared to 100 per cent of deans and department chairmen.

**Tenure**

Thirty-five per cent (25) of the innovators have tenure. Only 53 per cent (9) of the faculty have tenure, while the corresponding figure for deans and department chairmen is 89 per cent (16).

**College/school affiliation**

The innovators can be found in many of the schools and colleges. Yet, the largest number of people are from the School of Education, 22
per cent (9), and the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, 18 per cent (7). Most of the other innovators are evenly distributed throughout the University.

**Summary of the Background Characteristics of the "innovators"

In the main, the innovators are men, reflecting the disproportionate number of men to women throughout the University. Also, they tend to be between the ages of 25-54, though approximately 20 per cent are under 25 years of age. Almost one-half have earned their doctorates, though these individuals are almost exclusively faculty members or deans and department chairmen. Moreover, a majority of the faculty, deans and department chairmen are senior professors who have tenure. The innovators are not located exclusively in any one school or college, although the largest number of innovators are affiliated with the School of Education (9) and the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (7). However, 67 per cent (6) of the "innovators" at the School of Education were graduate students while in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences 100 per cent of the "innovators" were faculty.

**Background Information on the Respondents Who Have Expressed an Interest in Improving the First-Year Experience, Though Having No Active Involvement in a Project or Program**

Table 4 presents some background information on the individuals who have indicated an interest in improving the first-year experience though not yet involved in a particular project or program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</th>
<th>TYPE OF RESPONDENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deans &amp; Dept. Chairmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEX:</strong></td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE:</strong></td>
<td>Under 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEGREE:</strong></td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RANK:</strong></td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TENURE</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</td>
<td>TYPE OF RESPONDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE/SCHOOL AFFILIATION:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities &amp; Fine Arts</td>
<td>3 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences &amp; Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Natural Resources</td>
<td>1 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS PER TYPE OF RESPONDENT</td>
<td>5 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sex and age

Seventy-five per cent (18) of these people are men and 25 per cent (6) are women. Of the women, it is worth noting that 83 per cent (5) are student affairs personnel. In terms of their age, almost three-quarters of the people, 72 per cent (16), are between 25-54 while 14 per cent (3) are under 25 years of age and the same number are over 55.

Degree

Slightly less than one-half of the people, 47 per cent (9), who responded to this item indicated that they have earned a doctorate while approximately 53 per cent (10) say that they have only a bachelor's or master's degree. In terms of the relationship between the degree and the type of respondent, 89 per cent (8) of the doctorates belong to faculty members, deans and department chairmen.

Rank/Tenure/College or School Affiliation

Seventy-eight per cent (7) of the faculty and administrators hold an appointment as either an associate or full professor. Moreover, 89 per cent (8) of the faculty and administrators have tenure. And, people who expressed an interest in improving the freshman year experience can be found in various schools and colleges throughout the University.

In brief, 75 per cent of these respondents who expressed an interest in improving the first-year experience of students at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, but who have not been actively involved in doing so were male and a significant majority of all these respondents tend to
be between the ages of 25-54. Almost one-half possess doctorates, while 78 per cent are senior professors and 89 per cent have tenure.

### Background Information on the Respondents Who Were Not Involved in a Project or Program to Improve the First-Year Experience

Table 5 presents some background information on the people who were not involved in any effort to enhance the first-year program for entering students.

#### Sex and age

Of these respondents, 77 per cent (17) were men and 23 per cent (5) were women. A very significant number, 38 per cent (8) were under 25 years of age while the majority, 57 per cent (12) were between 25-54.

#### Degree

Almost three-fifths, 58 per cent (11), have earned a doctorate and all eleven doctorates belong to deans, department chairmen and faculty.

#### Rank/Tenure/College or School Affiliation

Ninety-two per cent (12) are senior faculty while 71 per cent (10) of all faculty and department chairmen have tenure.

### Comparison of Respondents According to Their Involvement, Interest or Non-Involvement

A comparison of the respondents in terms of the variables, sex, age, degree, rank, tenure and college or school affiliation, indicates that there is no difference between the innovators and the other individuals.
TABLE 5
BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON RESPONDENTS WHO WERE NOT INVOLVED IN A PROJECT TO IMPROVE THE FIRST-YEAR EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</th>
<th>TYPE OF RESPONDENT</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATORS</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>DEANS &amp; DEPT. CHAIRMAN</td>
<td>OTHER ACAD. ADMIN.</td>
<td>STUDENT AFFAIRS PERSONNEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEGREE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANK:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENURE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</td>
<td>TYPE OF RESPONDENT</td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>DEANS &amp; DEPT. CHAIRMAN</td>
<td>OTHER ACAD. ADMIN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE/SCHOOL AFFILIATION:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities &amp; Fine Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences &amp; Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</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>Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Natural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS PER TYPE OF RESPONDENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now that the background information on these groups of respondents has been presented, it is useful to examine some of the data which relate only to people who have been involved in a project or program to improve the first-year experience. This data falls into the following three categories: personal factors influencing a person to become involved in a project, a description of the nature and purpose of these first-year projects, and the critical institutional change factors which impinge on the development, planning, implementation and, if applicable, termination of these projects.¹

Critical Factors Influencing People to Become Involved in Attempts to Improve the First-Year Experience

The following question was included in order to identify the factors which influence people to become involved in a project to improve the first year of college.

8. Personal Factors: What factors influenced your decision to become interested in this particular change effort? Please rank order (#1 being the highest) the three factors which influenced your decision to take an active role in attempting to change or improve this aspect of the freshman year experience for students at the UM/A.

- Whitmore Administration
- College or School Administration/Residential Area Head
- Department Chairman/Immediate Supervisor
- Colleagues/Peers
- Personal and/or Professional Concern and Interest in Freshman Students
- Reward System (I would be rewarded for my efforts; merit, promotion, etc.)

¹Since deans and department chairmen received a different questionnaire, their projects will be described in the section, "College, School and Department Efforts to Improve the First-Year Experience."
Table 6 presents the personal factors (rank order #1) which influenced these individuals to become involved in a first-year project. Of the seventy-two people involved in these efforts, 76 per cent (55) stated they became involved due primarily to their personal or professional concern and interest in first-year students. None of the other factors listed in Question 8 could be considered as a significant reason for becoming involved in an innovative first-year project or program. Moreover, as this information indicates, the results remain essentially the same regardless of the position the person occupied at the University.

When these people were asked to indicate the factors which were most important in influencing their decision, rank order #2 (see Table 7), 22 per cent (14) indicated that personal or professional concern for first-year students had been a principal motivator. In addition, a similar number said that support and/or pressure from students influenced their decision. It should be noted that the student affairs personnel accounted for 64 per cent (9) of this group.

So, a total of 96 per cent (69) of the innovators indicated that personal or professional concern for first-year students constituted a primary or secondary factor influencing their decision to become involved.
TABLE 6
PERSONAL FACTORS INFLUENCING AN INDIVIDUAL'S DECISION TO BECOME INVOLVED IN AN EFFORT TO IMPROVE THE FIRST-YEAR EXPERIENCE (RANK ORDER #1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONAL FACTORS</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>OTHER ACADEMIC ADMIN.</th>
<th>STUDENT AFFAIRS PERSONNEL</th>
<th>UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS</th>
<th>GRADUATE STUDENTS</th>
<th>TOTAL RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitmore Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or School Administration/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Area Head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairman/Immediate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and/or Pressure from Students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues/Peers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and/or Professional Concern</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or Professional Concern and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in Freshman Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future University Report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Experience with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar Efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

73
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONAL FACTORS</th>
<th>TYPE OF RESPONDENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitmore Administration</td>
<td>2 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or School Administration/Residential Area Head</td>
<td>2 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairman/Immediate Supervisor</td>
<td>2 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and/or Pressure from Students</td>
<td>3 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues/Peers</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and/or Professional Concern and Interest in Freshman Students</td>
<td>5 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward System</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future University Report</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Experience with Similar Efforts</td>
<td>4 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>20 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in a particular project. This data remains unchanged regardless of the type of respondent. In addition, though to a considerably lesser degree, support and/or pressure from students did play an important role in determining the involvement of a significant number of the student affairs personnel.

**Description of Projects/Programs to Improve the First-Year Experience**

The innovators were asked to describe in brief the nature and purpose of their project, its scope, focus and current status. In an effort to illustrate the diversity of these projects which have been initiated during the past five years, the following is a summary description of some representative programs reported to this investigator (see Appendix E for a complete description of all projects):

**Description of projects**

**University-wide**

A new alternative freshman year academic program in Global Survival Studies has been planned for approximately 100 students beginning in the fall, 1973. The program will be interdisciplinary and problem-centered and will focus on five broad areas of worldwide concern: war, peace and alternative systems of world order; population; environmental deterioration and economic development; availability and distribution of world resources; and cross-cultural communication and conflict.

Organized an ad hoc group of individuals within the University who were interested in improving the freshman year experience, the group's
purposes were to share ideas, suggest changes for the freshman year, and act as a resource group to the Faculty Senate's Ad Hoc Committee on the Freshman Year.

College or school

New experimental course for School of Business Administration freshmen which attempts to counteract the lack of identification experienced by SBA students in their first two years, acquaint them early in academic program with SBA's educational opportunities, and involve them intellectually with various issues in the contemporary Business–Society Relationship.

Developed a series of modular courses for freshman engineering students to provide an orientation for them as well as explore and define what engineers do.

Department

Special 1-to 3-credit seminars were developed for freshmen with a special interest in mathematics.

Redesign and revamp the entire Psychology 101 program to allow for greater options and diversity for freshmen.

Courses

Taught a freshman seminar whose aim was to examine sociological principles by focusing on the student's initial experience with the University.
A one-semester experimental course offered to and designed especially for freshman women who were elementary education majors in the School of Education; its intent was to help these women develop a more positive self-concept and raise self-awareness.

Residential areas

The Sylvan Area academic program attempts to reach the freshmen who enter the area by providing space and funds for University course offerings such as CASIAC 102 and Psychology 190 while also planning special future involvement in student government.

Improved residence hall counseling and academic advising for freshmen in Orchard Hill; also increased opportunities for more independent study and field work.

Dormitory

Project Ten is an academic inquiry program to exempt freshman students from requirements and to give them a more challenging and flexible curriculum than is otherwise available on campus.

Special residence hall program was developed which was aimed at improving the freshman experience by facilitating the students' transition from high school to college.

Status of projects

The following question was included in order to ascertain the current status of the projects reported:
2. Present status of this project/program (please check one):
   ___ planning stage
   ___ proposal submitted
   ___ has been implemented. If so, date of implementation:
   ___ has been implemented and evaluated.
   ___ no longer in existence. If so, dates in existence:
   ___ to ___
   ___ other description of status: __________________________

The innovators\(^1\) were requested to indicate the current status of their project. First, the data indicate that 73 projects were reported. Seventy-four per cent (58) of these projects have already been implemented. Eleven per cent (8) of them have subsequently been phased out or terminated. Also, it has been impossible to implement 9 per cent (7) of them. In addition, in terms of the future there are eight additional projects for which proposals have already been submitted. Finally, the vast majority of projects, 89 per cent (65), have been initiated since 1972.

Scope of projects

7. Actual or Potential Scope of Your Project/Program. Please check the item below which best describes the scope of your project/program:
   ___ University-wide       ___ Course/Class

\(^1\)This information on the projects and programs does not include the efforts of department chairmen and deans. Since they received a different questionnaire the data provided by them will be discussed in the next section.
Respondents were asked to determine the range or scope of their project. Table 8 indicates that many of the programs were directed at either first-year students in one dormitory, 35 per cent (23), or the entire first-year class at the University, 24 per cent (16). Also the data demonstrate that a large number, 48 per cent (34), of the projects were located in student dormitories.

While different categories of respondents were involved in the university-wide projects, the projects located in the dormitories tend to directly involve the student affairs personnel, 58 per cent (14), more than any other group. Moreover, 54 per cent (14) of the projects involving student affairs personnel were located in a dormitory.

Furthermore, Table 9 presents additional data which examine the distribution throughout the University of these residentially-based programs. Approximately 57 per cent (20) of these projects were located in the Southwest Residential College. This is by far the largest number of projects yet it should be remembered that this situation reflects the fact that slightly more than one-half of the on-campus student population resides in this residential area. Also, the data demonstrate that Southwest is the only area which has been able to involve faculty in these projects to improve the first-year experience. The Global Survival
### TABLE 8

**SCOPE OF THE PROJECTS TO IMPROVE THE FIRST-YEAR EXPERIENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCOPE OF PROJECTS</th>
<th>TYPE OF RESPONDENT</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>OTHER ACAD. ADMIN.</th>
<th>STUDENT AFFAIRS PERSONNEL</th>
<th>UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS</th>
<th>GRADUATE STUDENTS</th>
<th>TOTAL RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-wide</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/School/Division</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormitory</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTIAL AREAS</td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>OTHER ACAD. ADMIN.</td>
<td>STUDENT AFFAIRS PERSONNEL</td>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS</td>
<td>GRADUATE STUDENTS</td>
<td>TOTAL RESPONSES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 100</td>
<td>2 9</td>
<td>1 17</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>5 100</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 45</td>
<td>4 66</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 14</td>
<td>1 17</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>5 14</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>22 63</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>6 17</td>
<td>35 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Studies Program, located in Central Area, is the one exception.

**Focus of the projects**

The following question was asked in an effort to assess the specific focus of these projects:

6. Focus of your project/program. Please check the item below which best describes the primary focus of your project/program. Please check one:

- academic
- residential (living experience)
- academic and residential
- student development
- other: _______________________________________
- additional comments: __________________________

Respondents were asked to indicate the specific focus of their project. Table 10 presents data which indicate that 82 per cent (60) of the programs have an academic component (students receive academic credit for their work), 18 per cent (13) do not.

A further breakdown indicates that the largest clustering of projects, 37 per cent (27), were academic and residential (a project with an academic component which is also located in a student residence area). Of the two next largest groups, one had strictly an academic focus, 21 per cent (15), and the other an academic/student development perspective (academic component with an emphasis on the personal growth and development of the student). Moreover, an analysis according to the type of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS OF PROJECTS</th>
<th>TYPE OF RESPONDENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHER ACAD. ADMIN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>8 35 2 33 3 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>4 18 1 17 15 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic/Residential</td>
<td>1 4 1 17 1 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic/Student Development &amp; Other</td>
<td>7 30 2 33 3 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOCUS OF THE PROJECTS TO IMPROVE THE FIRST-YEAR EXPERIENCE
respondent yields the fact that 91 per cent (20) of the projects involving faculty had an academic component.

Thus, the information provided by the innovators on their projects is quite interesting. A total of 73 projects were reported and 74 per cent of these have been implemented. Moreover, a large majority of all these projects have been initiated since 1972.

In terms of the scope of the projects, almost 50 per cent were located in a student residence area while another 25 per cent were directed at the entire entering class. In addition, most of the projects had an academic focus though often located in a residence area.

College, School and Department Efforts to Improve the First-Year Experience

As indicated earlier in this study, the department chairmen and deans received a different questionnaire than the other individuals and, as a result, it is necessary to examine their responses separately and from another perspective. All deans and department chairmen were asked the following questions:

III. As a department chairman, it will be extremely useful if you can provide the following information on your department's efforts to change/improve the freshman year academic experience:

A. What special efforts, programs and resources is your department presently providing freshman students? Explain in brief and include the names of faculty members involved:

1. Curriculum
   a. Introductory Courses
b. Independent Study


c. Special Programs


d. Others (please explain in brief)


2. Advising (special emphasis on advising freshman students)


3. Other (please explain in brief)


B. Please identify and list other members of your department who have been working to improve the freshman year academic experience on this campus during the period 1968-1973


IV. Additional Comments

I would appreciate your comments about any aspect of your department's efforts to change/improve the freshman year experience which were not covered by the above questions.

All of the efforts by departments, schools or colleges to improve the first-year experience are described in Appendix E. So, this is simply an effort to present an overview of some of the programs which were reported to this investigator. The following are some representative examples of these efforts:
Curriculum

Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering has been planning curriculum changes and developing a freshman engineering course; many of the faculty are involved with the freshman modules for the Introductory Engineering Course.

The Anthropology Department has been encouraging freshmen to undertake independent study courses; an honors freshman course is being developed; and a new format for introductory Anthropology is being designed to include different faculty speakers each week.

Curriculum and advising

In the Department of Veterinary and Animal Sciences primary concern has been focused on curricular changes and improved advising systems and procedures for both freshmen and transfer students from community colleges; also a modular credit program which allows first-year students to work with animals has been initiated.

Advising

Head of Botany Department meets with all new students in an effort to provide an orientation as well as let them know about the channels of communication; in addition, each class has its own adviser.

Other

Have contacted all high school science teachers in the state requesting the names of prospective UMass students with an interest in science; have sent them information concerning the Physics Department and
have urged the students and their teachers to visit the department; hopefully this procedure can reduce the difficulties in making the transition from high school to college.

A total of 18 deans and department chairmen reported that their department or school was engaged in efforts to improve the first-year experience for entering students. In the main these efforts to enhance the first-year experience generally relate to the following areas—revising introductory courses, creating new courses more akin to the immediate interests of the students, creating more realistic opportunities for significant contact between faculty and students and developing more effective advising systems for entering students.

The Change Process and Its Relationship to the Development, Planning, Implementation and Termination of First-Year Projects

The purpose of the following four questions is to assess the nature of the institutional change process and its effect on the development, planning, implementation, and termination of these first-year projects. This represents an effort to identify some of the key institutional factors which facilitated or hindered these projects during the various stages of their development.

Development of programs

In order to analyze the development of these programs the following question was included:

9. Which of the following individuals or groups played the most important role in the development of your program to date (please rank order, #1 being the most important,
the three individuals or groups that have played the most important role in the establishment of your program:

- Whitmore Administration
- Foundation Officials
- College or School Administration/Residential Area Head
- Faculty Committee
- Undergraduate Students
- Department Chairman/Immediate Supervisor
- Graduate Students
- Other (Please explain): ______________________

Additional Comments: ______________________

Table 11 presents the respondents' assessment of the primary groups or individuals which played the most important role in the initial development of the project (rank order #1). As the data indicate, all of the factors, with the exception of department chairmen/immediate supervisor and foundation officials, seem to have contributed to the development of numerous first-year projects. Yet, it should be pointed out that undergraduates were the one group of individuals identified most frequently, 27 per cent (18). In this instance, student affairs personnel comprised 50 per cent (9) of the respondents who indicated the crucial involvement of undergraduates.

Table 12 indicates the respondents' evaluation of the groups or individuals which were second most important in the initial development of their project (rank order #2). According to the data provided, undergraduate students (21 per cent), college/school administrators or residential area heads (18 per cent) and department chairmen/immediate supervisor (18 per cent) were selected most frequently by the respondents.
### Table 11

**Individuals or Groups Who Played the Most Important Role in the Development of First-Year Projects (Rank Order #1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Influencing the Development of First-Year Projects</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Other Acad. Admin.</th>
<th>Student Affairs Personnel</th>
<th>Undergraduate Students</th>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whitmore Administration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/School Administration or Residential Area Head</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairman/Immediate Supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Officials</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Committee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTORS INFLUENCING THE DEVELOPMENT OF FIRST-YEAR PROJECTS</td>
<td>TYPE OF RESPONDENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>OTHER ACAD. ADMIN.</td>
<td>STUDENT AFFAIRS PERSONNEL</td>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS</td>
<td>GRADUATE STUDENTS</td>
<td>TOTAL RESPONSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitmore Administration</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>1 25</td>
<td>3 16</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>1 9</td>
<td>6 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/School Administration or Residential Area Head</td>
<td>4 20</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>5 26</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>2 19</td>
<td>11 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairman/ Immediate Supervisor</td>
<td>7 35</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>3 16</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>1 9</td>
<td>11 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Officials</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>1 9</td>
<td>3 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Committee</td>
<td>3 15</td>
<td>1 25</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>1 100</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>6 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Students</td>
<td>3 15</td>
<td>2 50</td>
<td>5 26</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>3 27</td>
<td>13 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>6 31</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>3 27</td>
<td>9 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>20 33</td>
<td>4 7</td>
<td>25 41</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>11 17</td>
<td>61 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So, based upon the data presented in Tables 11 and 12, all of the factors, with the exception of foundation officials,1 seem to have contributed to the development of various first-year projects. And though no one factor emerges as being the most critical, undergraduates did tend to be the group most often identified by the respondents.

Critical factors which facilitated or hindered the projects during the planning and implementation stage

The following question was included in an effort to analyze the change process during the planning and implementation stages:

10. Evaluation of Your Project/Program.

Indicate, by checking the items below, which factors facilitated or hindered your project during the planning stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitated</th>
<th>Hindered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward System (Merit, promotion, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairman/Immediate Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or School Administrator/Residential Area Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitmore Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Political Climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The Global Survival Studies Program is the one exception which has benefited from foundation support.
Respondents were asked to indicate the factors which constructively or adversely affected their projects during the planning and implementation stage. In terms of the planning stage, Table 13 presents some data which suggest that the principal hindrances were lack of funding and the reward system. In this case, 69 per cent (34) stated that funding adversely affected their project while only 31 per cent (15) believed that it facilitated the planning of their project. Of all the respondents, faculty and student affairs personnel most frequently cited funding as a serious obstacle.

In terms of the reward system,\(^1\) 50 per cent (15) cited this factor as a hindrance while the other half viewed it as a facilitative factor. However, only the student affairs personnel stated that the reward system more frequently facilitated than hindered their projects. Hence, it is the faculty members who did not feel that they would be rewarded for their efforts.

\(^1\)If the reward system is viewed as a hindrance, it means that people do not expect to be rewarded for their work in a particular project. Instead, the institution encourages efforts in other areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS</th>
<th>TYPE OF RESPONDENT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>OTHER ACAD. ADMIN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>12 80 2 67 15 68 1 50 4 57 34 69</td>
<td>3 20 1 33 7 32 1 50 3 43 15 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Interest</td>
<td>16 100 2 100 22 96 3 100 8 100 51 98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward System</td>
<td>6 67 1 50 4 36 1 4 4 80 15 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairman/</td>
<td>1 9 1 25 1 6 1 50 3 33 6 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Supervisor</td>
<td>10 91 16 94 1 50 6 67 40 87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS</td>
<td>TYPE OF RESPONDENT</td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Hindering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Facilitating</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitmore Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Hindering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Facilitating</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Political Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Hindering</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Facilitating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Officials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Hindering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Facilitating</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Hindering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Facilitating</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Hindering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Facilitating</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 13—Continued
TABLE 13—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS</th>
<th>TYPE OF RESPONDENT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>UNDER-</td>
<td>GRADUATE</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>ACAD.</td>
<td>AFFAIRS</td>
<td>GRADUATE</td>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADMIN.</td>
<td>PERSONNEL</td>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindering</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of the factors which facilitated these projects, all of them, with the exception of funding, the reward system and foundation officials, appear to have consistently promoted these projects. In particular, support from undergraduates and colleagues was identified most often.

As for the implementation stage, the identical question was asked and Table 14 demonstrates that both the restraining and facilitating factors remain basically unchanged as the projects moved from one stage to the next. However, 74 per cent (20) cite the reward system as a hindrance compared to only 50 per cent (15) in the planning stage.

Throughout the planning and implementation stages, the respondents cite the lack of funding and the reward system as their primary obstacles. On the other hand, though, with the exception of these two factors plus foundation officials, rarely mentioned as either a facilitator or hindrance, all of the other factors, particularly support from undergraduates and colleagues, appear to have constructively facilitated these projects.

Critical factors in the phasing out or termination of the projects

The following question was included in an effort to determine the factors which contributed to the termination of first-year projects.

12. If your project/program is no longer in existence or is being phased out, check each of the factors listed below that have contributed to the phasing out or the termination of the program/project—Lack of support due to:

___Funding

___Student Interest
### Table 14

Institutional Factors Facilitating or Hindering First-Year Projects During the Implementation Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Factors</th>
<th>Type of Respondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindering</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindering</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindering</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairman/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/School Administration or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Area Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS</td>
<td>TYPE OF RESPONDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitmore Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Political Climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS</td>
<td>TYPE OF RESPONDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindering</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15 indicates the factors most responsible for the phasing out or termination of any first-year projects. Though only eight of seventy-three (11 per cent) projects were reported to have been phased out, in each case the respondents point to the lack of funding and the reward system as the primary factors contributing to the termination of their project.

Thus, though analyzing institutional change is extremely complex, the data collected on the change process and its relationship to four stages in the development of these projects, initial development, planning, implementation, and termination, indicates that:

1. Throughout these stages all of the factors, with the exception of foundation officials, were viewed as facilitating the development of these projects; in particular support from undergraduates and colleagues was cited most frequently.

2. During the planning and implementation stages, lack of funding and the reward system surface as the primary obstacles to the successful development of these projects; in fact, as the projects move from the planning to implementation stage the reward system appears to become an even more significant restraining force.
TABLE 15

INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO PHASING OUT/TERMINATION OF FIRST-YEAR PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS</th>
<th>TYPE OF RESPONDENT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FACULTY N %</td>
<td>OTHER ACAD. ADMIN. N %</td>
<td>STUDENT AFFAIRS PERSONNEL N %</td>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS N %</td>
<td>GRADUATE STUDENTS N %</td>
<td>TOTAL RESPONSES N %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>6 27</td>
<td>2 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Interest</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>1 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward System</td>
<td>6 27</td>
<td>2 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairman/Immediate Supervisor</td>
<td>2 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>2 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitmore Administration</td>
<td>3 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Campus Political Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/School Administration or Residential Area Head</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Obsolescence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 50</td>
<td>50 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>2 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 50</td>
<td>50 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. And, in the instance of projects which have been terminated or phased out, lack of funding and the reward system are the contributing factors listed in each situation.

Summary of the Analyses

A diverse group of people, including faculty, deans, department chairmen, student affairs personnel, and undergraduate and graduate students, have been involved in efforts to improve the first-year experience for entering students. These individuals are not located exclusively in any one school or college. However, the two largest groups of people are associated with the School of Education and the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. A large majority of the innovators, with an academic appointment, already have tenure. Moreover, 75 per cent of the "innovators" were motivated to become involved in these efforts primarily by a personal or professional concern for first-year students.\(^1\)

In addition, the data indicate that of the 73 projects reported, 74 per cent (58) have been implemented, 11 per cent (8) have subsequently been phased out, another 9 per cent (7) have never been implemented, and 8 proposals have recently been submitted for future consideration. The projects are characterized by their diversity of purpose and scope, though most of the programs have an academic component.

Finally, in terms of the institutional change process, two points need to be stressed. First, throughout the entire change process, undergraduates were the principal facilitative force. Second, lack of funding and the reward system were cited most frequently as the forces impeding further change in the first-year experience.

\(^1\)Unfortunately, it is difficult to differentiate between a personal and professional concern. But this investigator, as a result of the data on the reward system, believes that these individuals were motivated for the most part by their personal concern for first-year students.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The principal purpose of this investigation was to examine the phenomena of change within an institution of higher education. This objective was pursued by focusing on one particular aspect of the institutional change process, specifically the changes which have occurred in the academic, residential, and/or extracurricular programs for first-year students at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, from 1968 through the spring semester, 1973.

In pursuing this principal purpose, three major goals were put forth:

1. to determine the types of projects which have been proposed or implemented during the past five years to enhance the first-year experience for students;
2. to determine the types of individuals who were involved in implementing these projects and their reasons for engaging in such efforts; and
3. to assess and analyze the institutional factors which facilitated or hindered the development, planning, and implementation of these projects.

The sample for this study consisted of 226 faculty, deans, department chairmen, other academic administrators, student affairs personnel, and undergraduate and graduate students. This sample was drawn with the hope of identifying as many people as possible who may have been involved in efforts to improve the first-year experience.
The data were collected during the spring semester of the 1973 academic year. Two different questionnaires, one for deans and department chairmen and another for faculty, other academic administrators, student affairs personnel, and undergraduate and graduate students were used to collect the data. The questionnaires included open-ended and closed-end questions. Programs from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) were used for all frequency counts and cross tabulations.

Conclusions

The innovators

Clearly, it can be said that a diverse group of people, including faculty, deans, department chairmen, other academic administrators, student affairs personnel, and undergraduate and graduate students, have been involved in efforts to improve the first-year experience at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, during the past five years. Most of the innovators are men, reflecting the disproportionate number of men compared to women throughout the University. Also, the innovators tend to be evenly distributed between the ages of 25-54, though slightly less than 20 per cent are under 25 years of age. These men and women are not located exclusively in any one school or college; however, the largest group of people are affiliated with the School of Education and the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences.

Furthermore, one-half of these individuals have earned their doctorates. The people who have earned a doctorate are almost exclusively faculty, deans, or department chairmen. Moreover, a majority of
the faculty, deans and department chairmen are senior professors who have tenure.

**Personal motivations of the innovators**

More than 75 per cent of these people became involved in an effort to enhance the first-year experience primarily because of a personal or professional concern for first-year students. Less than 10 per cent indicated that extrinsic factors, such as the reward system (salary increases, promotion and tenure), motivated them to participate in these efforts. Perhaps this is because a large majority of the innovative faculty, deans, and department chairmen have tenure.

**Description of programs**

Seventy-three projects or programs to improve the first-year experience were reported. Concerning the current status of these projects, 74 per cent (57) have already been implemented, 11 per cent (8) have subsequently been phased out or terminated, and 9 per cent (7) have never been implemented. In addition, eight proposals have already been submitted for future projects. Very few of the projects reported have been carefully evaluated and this must become a high priority in the future.

The projects are characterized by their diversity of purpose as well as scope, though it can be said that most of the programs included an academic component. Moreover, these programs received minimal amounts, if any, of the University's resources and thus are dependent on the personal commitment and altruistic nature of their advocates.
The change process and its relationship to first-year programs at the University of Massachusetts

In terms of the general process of institutional change, this researcher has concluded that the programs represent a "grass-roots" and ad hoc approach to changing the first-year experience. One sees many spontaneous and unrelated attempts to make adjustments and improvements in the educational experience for first-year students. Though some of the programs are significant, they do fall short of any planned, coordinated effort to identify the fundamental problems and then to implement appropriate solutions. To date, there is no institutional commitment to restructure the first-year experience at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

In terms of the specific stages of the change process, the development, planning, implementation, and, if applicable, termination of these projects, the following can be concluded:

1. During the initial development of these projects, undergraduates and faculty committees were the most, though not the only, instrumental catalytic agents.

2. Throughout the planning and implementation stages, undergraduates as well as faculty and administrators were the groups which most often facilitated the development of these projects.

3. The principal restraining forces during the planning and implementation stages were lack of funding and the reward system. The importance of the reward system as a hindrance increased as the projects progressed from the planning to the implementation stage.

4. And, finally, lack of funding and the reward system are the primary factors cited in each case (8) where a particular project was terminated or phased out.
Discussion

The innovators

There are a number of interesting aspects worthy of further discussion which relate to the type of individuals who have been involved in these efforts to improve the first-year experience. In general, it can be said that an unusual combination of people appear to share an awareness regarding the need to enhance the first-year experience at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. It is significant, in this researcher's opinion, that two usually disparate and opposing groups, faculty, deans, and department chairmen and the student affairs personnel, have each chosen, in their own way, to focus on the problems facing first-year students.

For example, as the review of the literature indicates, much has been written about the faculty's (to include deans and department chairmen, to be sure) role in inhibiting and frustrating change in institutions of higher education. Though Sanford (1962) and Blau (1966) enumerate some cogent and persuasive arguments which explain, in part, the faculty's resistance to change, the data collected by this investigator indicate that faculty, deans, and department chairmen all have made concerted efforts to constructively change aspects of the first-year program for entering students. However, it should be noted that the Faculty Senate did not act on the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Freshman Year and this can be construed as inhibiting change. Yet, inasmuch as this data, to a certain extent, conflicts with Sanford (1962) and Blau (1966), it does point out the hazards in treating the faculty, or any other group, as a monolith.
In terms of the student affairs personnel, their involvement in these efforts, in this researcher's view, is much less surprising. It seems that there are two principal reasons which explain their participation in these efforts. First, as a result of their professional responsibilities, they tend to have frequent contact with entering students and thus they often become more acutely aware of the problems affecting these students. Also, since student affairs personnel are usually younger than their faculty counterparts, it is easier for them to identify with the students' dilemmas.

Though the data indicate considerable involvement from faculty, deans, department chairmen, and student affairs personnel, none of the senior academic officers (Chancellor, Vice-Chancellors, or Provosts) indicated any involvement in efforts to improve the first-year experience. Though none of these individuals responded to the questionnaire, it should not automatically be interpreted that they have not been concerned or involved in these efforts. Although the University has not contributed substantial financial resources to support new first-year programs, it should be remembered that the new Chancellor of the Amherst campus spent considerable time establishing a firm relationship with the new President of the University. It is possible that this year he will devote his energies to implementing some of the important proposals in The Future University Report. Regardless, the role of senior administrators needs to be researched more extensively, particularly the factors surrounding the decision by the Provost's Office not to appoint a Dean of Freshman Studies as recommended by the Faculty Senate Committee on the Freshman Year.
Moreover, in terms of the personal factors which motivated these individuals to originally become involved in these efforts, some further elaboration is desirable. According to the data, over 75 per cent of the innovators were motivated by personal or professional concern for entering students, rather than by salary increases, promotion and tenure. It is possible that this category, personal or professional concern for students, was too broad and all-encompassing. The fact that 73 projects were reported indicates the increasing concern and awareness of the problems facing entering students and thus in this researcher's opinion demonstrates the personal concern of University personnel and the apparent lack of visible institutional support for these projects.

In addition, this theory may be further substantiated by the fact that a large majority of the innovators (only including faculty, deans, and department chairmen) already have tenure. If the institution is not supporting new programs in the area of the first-year experience, it is fair to assume that untenured faculty would be reluctant to divert their energies to an issue which does not directly enhance their professional status and visibility. At the present time, when there is an apparent policy to limit the number of tenured members of the faculty, it is predictable that, for the most part, only secure and well-established faculty members will choose to become involved in efforts to improve the first-year experience.

The Change Process and Its Relationship to Efforts to Improve the First-Year Experience

Hefferlin (1969) describes three different ways in which change occurs in institutions of higher education—piecemeal alterations in
programs, a radical transformation of the existing institution, or the creation of a new institution. In general, it is this researcher's opinion that the changes which have occurred in the first-year experience at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 1968-1973, can accurately be categorized as piecemeal alterations or minor improvisations in the traditional program for first-year students.

Though this investigator is struck by the diversity in purpose and scope of these projects to enhance the first-year experience, it is evident that, for the most part, the "innovators" identified in this study have been developing programs to meet the particular and immediate needs of the students with whom they have frequent contact. The intricate nature of the change process and the specific difficulties involved in changing the first year of college may make the process of piecemeal change the most pragmatic and effective strategy.

For example, there are many forces operating within the institution to impede significant reform in this area. First, there exists a basic conflict between the purposes of the institution and the goals of the student. In this researcher's opinion this University is oriented toward research and graduate study, not innovative, student-centered undergraduate education. Specifically, the faculty have different interests than the students. They were trained primarily to do research, not teaching or advising, and they are rewarded for working with graduate students and upperclassmen as well as advancing the frontiers of knowledge in their discipline. Second, for significant, comprehensive change to occur this University would have to drastically reorder its priorities. At the present the most resources are allocated for the fewest students.
(graduate students and upperclassmen) while the largest number of students (freshmen and sophomores) receive a much smaller share of the resources. It is unlikely that this University will attempt to initiate such changes since it means transferring resources from the most important area, as viewed by the University, to the least important. No administrator enjoys reordering priorities and certainly not when it is certain to upset more people than it will satisfy.

Yet, though fully cognizant of the inherent difficulties in significantly restructuring the first-year experience, this researcher contends that there exists an urgent need for a coordinated effort, supported with human and financial resources, to develop strategies and proposals for dealing with the diverse areas which impinge on the first-year experience. This coordinated effort should focus on such issues as the advising system, residence hall life, the effectiveness of introductory courses, and the reward system.

Furthermore, evaluation of first-year programs must become an integral part of this process. In an effort to suggest some general guidelines, each program should consider the following:

- definition of purposes (goals)
- type of students the program serves
- the strategies to implement and operationalize its goals
- evaluation of the project in terms of the original goals.

In addition to the general process of change with regard to first-year programs, this researcher made a concerted effort to identify the specific institutional change factors which facilitated and hindered the development, planning and implementation of these projects.
Unfortunately, due in part to the complexity of the institutional change process, none of the results are definitive. However, some interesting patterns did emerge.

For instance, the data tend to indicate that undergraduates and faculty were important in facilitating the initial development of these projects. With reference to undergraduates, this is not surprising since during the past decade students have often been the catalytic agents in precipitating many of the recent reforms in higher education.

On the other hand, faculty committees, contrary to the findings of Sanford (1962) and Hefferlin (1969), who label them as inhibitors of change, were frequently cited as being principally involved in the initial development of numerous projects. It is possible that this phenomenon may be explained by the fact that this institution is a relatively new state university which is more flexible and adaptive than, for example, the University of Wisconsin. Therefore, this University may be attracting faculty who have a significant interest in reforming undergraduate education as well as doing research and teaching graduate students.

Furthermore, contrary to the findings of Hefferlin (1969), these first-year projects, with the principal exception of the Global Survival Studies Program, were not supported by funding from foundations or other outside sources. In fact, judging from the descriptions of many respondents, most of the programs relied almost exclusively on the personal commitment and energies of its supporters, plus resources from on-going programs, rather than any significant financial stimulus.
The evidence gathered regarding the planning and implementation stages seems to indicate that lack of funding and the reward system were the most frequent forces restraining change. This data confirms the previous studies of Hefferlin (1969), Ladd (1970), and Fashing and Deutsch (1971). Particularly in a period of economic stringency, these results are not surprising. However, in more subtle ways such as the allocation of teaching assistantships and released time for faculty, the University has indirectly supported some of these projects.

Yet, this fact does have serious implications for the future of these projects. It is possible that people will soon begin to reevaluate the efficacy of spending their energy on projects which do not appear to be important institutional priorities. If the efforts to enhance the first-year experience are to expand, it is critical for the institution to establish the improvement of the first-year experience as an important priority. Otherwise, people are likely to turn their energies to other areas where resources and support will be forthcoming.

Finally, in this researcher's opinion, the absence of adroit leadership and political pressure precluded the possibility of significantly reforming the first-year experience. On the first issue, Davis (1965), McGreeley (1967) and Ladd (1970) argue forcefully that skilled leadership is the sine qua non to effect significant change in higher education. Yet, though many people were involved in these efforts to improve the first-year experience, very few visible and powerful individuals were willing to take the responsibility for orchestrating these efforts at institutional reform.
In terms of the apparent need to apply political pressure upon the key decision-makers, Clark (1962), Ladd (1970) and Fashing and Deutsch (1971) have stated emphatically that institutions of higher education usually implement changes only in response to the political pressure or the threat of a crisis. Yet, in this investigator's opinion, some of the key advocates for change acted as if the Provost's Office and other administrators would be overwhelmed by the absolute logic and "rightness" of their proposals. Thus, by omission rather than commission, the politics and strategies of the change process were not given sufficient consideration. Persistence, endurance and sophisticated political maneuvering are essential to this process.

In order for change to occur in such areas as introductory courses, "core" requirements, the reward system, the advising system, residence areas, and summer counseling, it is imperative for the innovators to become allies, to consolidate and broaden their strength, to create a critical mass of people who can overcome the forces restraining change, and, most importantly, to be willing and able to exercise the political pressure necessary to move a reluctant administration.

**Implications for Future Research**

The instruments and methodology of this study did enable this researcher to identify the following:

1. the types of projects or programs which have been implemented or proposed during the past five years in an effort to improve the first-year experience;

2. the kinds of individuals who have been principally involved in these efforts; and
3. the primary change factors which facilitated or hindered the development, planning and implementation and, if applicable, termination of these projects.

These kinds of data are extremely useful to an institution of higher education which is seeking ways to provide more stimulating and engaging educational experiences for entering students. This catalogue of innovative projects can also act as a stimulus for potential reforms on other campuses. Most important, since the first year of college is a particularly difficult area in which to initiate change, it is necessary to fully understand the relationship between the institutional change process and the development of innovative projects for first-year students. As such, the data collected on the change process can be extremely useful to the advocates interested in enhancing the first-year experience.

In general, this researcher would recommend that the following considerations be thoughtfully and carefully evaluated if a follow-up is planned to this exploratory study:

1. An investigation should begin with the status of current first-year projects, particularly focusing on the evaluation of present projects and the specific obstacles which may have contributed to the phasing out or termination of other projects.

2. The role of students should be more carefully examined as it relates to the development of first-year programs.

3. An in-depth investigation of the events surrounding the report of the Ad Hoc Faculty Senate Committee on the Freshman Year should be initiated. In particular, the decision by the Provost's Office not to appoint a Dean of Freshman Studies as recommended by the ad hoc committee.

4. A complete report and assessment of department and college/school efforts to enhance the first-year experience for entering students should be compiled.
5. In an effort to gain a more precise view of the change process and its relationship to first-year programs, it is recommended that interviews be arranged with various key people in the institution. This will allow the researcher to probe into the nuances and subtleties of the institutional change process which are not always reflected in responses to a questionnaire. This additional type of data collection should result in a more comprehensive analysis of the change process.

Specifically, the questionnaires should be reevaluated and the following recommendations carefully considered:

1. A postcard should be sent to the total target population requesting each person to indicate involvement or non-involvement in a first-year program; then a questionnaire should be sent only to those people who respond affirmatively to the initial postcard.

2. Respondents should be asked to describe the focus and purpose of their particular project or program and then raters should classify these open-ended responses.

3. Eliminate the use of rank-ordering on the questions relating to personal motivations for involvement in the development of these programs.

4. The distinction between the planning and implementation stage should be deleted unless the distinction between these two stages can be conveyed to the respondents.

5. Respondents should indicate the three most important factors which affected their program during the planning or implementation stage rather than check all of the factors which apply.

These, then, are the major findings and recommendations of this study. Clearly, much more work needs to be done to develop more precise ways to document the institutional change process in higher education. Hopefully, this study will be useful to future researchers who seek to find answers to these important and complex questions.
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APPENDIX A

AN ANALYSIS OF PROJECTS/PROGRAMS TO CHANGE/IMPROVE
THE FRESHMAN YEAR EXPERIENCE
1968-1973

Allen J. Davis
Principal Investigator

I. Background Information

1. Your Name __________________________________________

2. Your Office Phone ______________________________________

3. Your age (please check one)
   _ under 25        _ 45-54
   _ 25-34           _ over 55
   _ 35-44

4. Highest degree earned ____________________________________
   a. If you hold an advanced degree, what was your major
      field of study? ________________________________________

5. Work experience at UM/A
   a. Present rank/position: ________________________________
   b. Present academic department/administrative unit: ______
      ________________________________
      Number of years in present rank/position ________
      Other positions held at UM/A, if any:

      Rank/Position  Dept/Unit  Dates
      ________________________________
      ________________________________
      ________________________________

6. If you hold an academic appointment, what is your status?
   ___________________ Tenured  ___________________ Untenured
II. Your Personal Involvement in Changing/Improving the Freshman Year Experience at the UM/A

1. During the period 1968-1973, have you ever been involved in an effort, successful or unsuccessful, to change or improve any aspect of the academic, residential and/or extracurricular experience for freshman students at the UM/A? (Please check one below)

a. Have made no attempt at changing/improving the freshman year experience.

b. Have been interested in changing/improving the freshman year experience but I never reached the planning, proposal or implementation stage. If so, please explain in brief the nature of your interest.

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

c. Have been actively involved in implementing a program/project to change/improve the freshman year experience.

*If you checked c., please continue with Part III of the questionnaire.

**If you checked a or b, please place this questionnaire in the envelope provided and return it to me, Allen J. Davis. THANK YOU.

III. Your Involvement with Specific Project(s) to Change/Improve the Freshman Year Experience at UM/A

Attached are two sets of Data Sheets. For each project or program to improve or change the freshman year in which you have been involved, fill out a Data Sheet. Please select the projects or programs which you consider most important.

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

I have been involved in more than two projects or programs to improve the freshman year experience at UM/A. (Yes, No)

If you should have any printed material on your project/program, I would appreciate it if you would enclose a copy with your questionnaire. Thank you for your cooperation.
DATA SHEET

Project/Program to Change/Improve the Freshman Year Experience, 1968-1973

Your name: ________________________________

IV. Description of Your Attempted Effort at Changing an Aspect of the Freshman Experience.

1. Please describe the nature and purpose of your attempt at improvement or change in the freshman year. (Specific questions about your program are asked below): ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________

2. Present status of this project/program (please check one):
   _____ planning stage
   _____ proposal submitted
   _____ has been implemented. If so, date of implementation: ________
   _____ has been implemented and evaluated.
   _____ no longer in existence. If so, dates in existence: ________ to ________
   _____ other description of status: __________________________

3. Approximately how many freshmen did/does the project/program serve directly? ________
   a. Could it serve more students if additional resources were available? ________

4. To implement your project/program, has/will it require an additional allocation of resources? _____Yes _____No

5. If you have (will) receive additional resources ($, staff, equipment) for this project, what was the amount and their source? (i.e., Provost's Office, NIMH grant . . . )

   Amount ($, staff, equipment) ________________________________
   Source ________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
6. Focus of your project/program. Please check the item below which best describes the primary focus of your project/program. Please check one:

___ academic
___ residential (living experience)
___ academic and residential
___ student development
___ other: ___________________________
___ additional comments: ___________________________

7. Actual or Potential Scope of Your Project/Program. Please check the item below which best describes the scope of your project/program:

___ University-wide
___ College/School/Division
___ Course/Class
___ Department
___ Residential Area (Central, NE, OH, SW, Sylvan) circle one
___ Individual Dormitory
___ Other (please explain in brief): ___________________________

Additional Comments: ___________________________

8. Personal Factors: What factors influenced your decision to become interested in this particular change effort? Please rank order (#1 being the highest) the three factors which influenced your decision to take an active role in attempting to change or improve this aspect of the freshman year experience for students at the UM/A.

___ Whitmore Administration
___ College or School Administration/Residential Area Head
___ Department Chairman/Immediate Supervisor
___ Support and/or Pressure from Students
___ Other (please explain in brief): ___________________________

___ Colleagues/Peers
___ Personal and/or Professional Concern and Interest in Freshman Students
___ Reward System (I would be rewarded for my efforts; merit, promotion, etc.)
___ Future University Report
___ Previous Experience with Similar Efforts

Additional Comments: ___________________________
9. Which of the following individuals or groups played the most important role in the development of your program to date (please rank order, #1 being the most important, the three individuals or groups that have played the most important role in the establishment of your program):

- Whitmore Administration
- College or School Administration/Residential Area Head
- Department Chairman/Immediate Supervisor
- Other (please explain):

Additional Comments: ____________________________________________________________

10. Evaluation of Your Project/Program.

Indicate, by checking the items below, which factors facilitated or hindered your project during the planning stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitated</th>
<th>Hindered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward System (Merit, Promotion, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairman/Immediate Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or School Administrator/Residential Area Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitmore Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Political Climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please explain briefly):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments: ____________________________________________________________
11. Indicate, by checking the items below, which factors facilitated or hindered your project during the implementation stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitated</th>
<th>Hindered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward System (Merit, Promotion, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairman/Immediate Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or School Administrator/Residential Area Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitmore Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Political Climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please explain briefly):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. If your project/program is no longer in existence or is being phased out, check each of the factors listed below that have contributed to the phasing out or the termination of the program/project—Lack of support due to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Student Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Interest</td>
<td>Reward System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward System</td>
<td>Department Chairman/Immediate Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairman/Immediate Supervisor</td>
<td>Colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>Whitmore Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitmore Administration</td>
<td>Change in Campus Political Climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Campus Political Climate</td>
<td>College or School Administrator/Residential Area Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or School Administrator/Residential Area Head</td>
<td>Planned Obsolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Obsolescence</td>
<td>Other (please explain briefly):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Additional Comments. I would appreciate your comments about any aspects of your project/program which were not covered by the above questions:

Many thanks for your assistance with this project.

Allen J. Davis
APPENDIX B

AN ANALYSIS OF PROJECTS/PROGRAMS TO CHANGE/IMPROVE THE FRESHMAN YEAR EXPERIENCE, 1968-1973

Allen J. Davis
Principal Investigator

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Your Name ____________________________________________

2. Your Office Phone ________ 3. Your Age (Please Check One)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Highest Degree Earned __________________________________

   a. If you hold an advanced degree, what was your major field of study? ________________________________

5. Work Experience at UM/A

   a. Present rank/position: ____________________________

   b. Present academic department/administrative unit: ____________________________

   Number of years in present rank/position: ____________________________

   Other positions held at UM/A, if any:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank/Position</th>
<th>Dept/Unit</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. If you hold an academic appointment, what is your status?

   _______ Tenured   _______ Untenured

II. Your Personal Involvement in Changing/Improving the Freshman Year Experience at the UM/A

1. During the period 1968-1973, have you ever been involved in an effort, successful or unsuccessful, to change or improve any aspect of the academic, residential and/or extracurricular experience for freshman students at the UM/A? (please check one below)

   a. _______ Have made no attempt at changing/improving the freshman year experience.
b. Have been interested in changing/improving the freshman year experience but I never reached the planning, proposal or implementation stage. If so, please explain in brief the nature of your interest.

c. Have been actively involved in implementing a program/project to change/improve the freshman year experience. If so, please explain in brief the nature of your program/project:

III. As a department chairman, it will be extremely useful if you can provide the following information on your department's efforts to change/improve the freshman year academic experience:

A. What special efforts, programs and resources is your department presently providing freshman students?

Explain in brief and include the names of faculty members involved:

1. Curriculum
   a. Introductory Courses

   b. Independent Study

   c. Special Programs

   d. Others (please explain in brief)

2. Advising (special emphasis on advising freshman students)
3. Other (please explain in brief)

B. Please identify and list other members of your department who have been working to improve the freshman year academic experience on this campus during the period 1968-1973.

IV. Additional Comments

I would appreciate your comments about any aspect of your department's efforts to change/improve the freshman year experience which were not covered by the above questions. (Please use the back of this sheet if necessary):

Many thanks for your assistance with this project,

Allen J. Davis
Dear Member of the University Community:

During the past five years, numerous individuals have contributed a considerable amount of time and energy attempting to improve the academic, residential and/or extracurricular experience of freshman students at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. You have been identified as one of the individuals who may have been involved in some of these efforts to improve the freshman experience.

At this time, there exists a general impression that various changes have occurred on our campus as a result of these diligent efforts, but to date there has not been any documentation to support this impression. I believe that if this information about the projects and programs to improve the freshman year experience were available, more effective programs for our future freshmen could be developed. Consequently, as part of my doctoral dissertation, I am attempting to identify and document the changes in the freshman experience which have been proposed and initiated since 1968.

Enclosed is a short questionnaire which I would like you to fill out and return to me in the envelope provided. I think that the types of questions I ask will be of interest to you as well as to me. All of the information will be considered strictly confidential and it shall be coded so that I will be the only one who can identify an individual with his/her responses. This information will be used solely for the educational purposes cited.

Many thanks for your cooperation. I look forward to your responses.

Sincerely,

Allen J. Davis
Doctoral Candidate
Center for Higher Education
School of Education
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002
April 6, 1973

A REMINDER

Dear Member of the University Community:

Two weeks ago I mailed you a questionnaire concerning your efforts to improve the freshman year experience at this university during the past five years. Responses to this questionnaire will hopefully provide information which will benefit future freshman students and programs.

I would greatly appreciate it if you would please take a few minutes to fill it out if you have not already done so. It is important to the results of the study for me to receive as many responses as possible even if you have not been actively involved working with freshmen.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Allen J. Davis
APPENDIX E

A DESCRIPTION OF FRESHMAN YEAR PROJECTS/PROGRAMS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS, AMHERST, 1968-1973 AS REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS

(PROJECTS IMPLEMENTED)

University-Wide

1972

Member of Ad Hoc Faculty Senate Committee on the Freshman Year; in response to the Future University Report, this Committee was established to study and propose changes for the improvement of the first-year experience.

Patricia Crosson

Organized an ad hoc group of individuals within the university who were interested in improving the freshman year experience; the group's purposes were to share ideas, suggest changes in the present first-year experience, and act as a resource to the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the Freshman Year.

Robert Wuerthner

Worked with the ad hoc group comprised of students, faculty and administrators to improve the overall first-year experience for entering students.

Ernie Buck

Extended and detailed involvement in the planning of freshman rhetoric courses.

Jay Savereid

Member of Summer Counseling Advisory Team; participated in general orientation as well as training counselors in health issues so that they are better equipped to help first-year students.

Jane Zapka

Initiated a Tutor-Counselor Program for CCEBS students which involved advanced students helping freshmen cope with the University environment.

Cass Turner

1971

Involved in efforts to improve freshman summer orientation by gaining more student input, carefully assessing the needs of freshmen and implementing black/white "understanding" workshops.

Salle Hamilton & Eleanor Bossi
Provided support services to enhance the academic achievement and development of the mature minority students.

Sharon Jarrett

Colleges/Schools

1973

Particular emphasis and concern in freshman counseling and orientation in the School of Business Administration (SBA); an experimental pre-business orientation course has recently been initiated.

Wendell Smith

New experimental course for SBA freshmen which attempts to counteract the lack of identification experienced by SBA students in their first two years, acquaint them early in their academic program with SBA's educational opportunities, and involve them intellectually with various issues in the contemporary Business-Society Relationship.

Mary Barber

School of Home Economics has initiated a Freshman Orientation Seminar for the purposes of examining the changing role of women and career opportunities indigenous to Home Economics.

Helen Vaznaian & W. R. Mellen

1972

Clarifying counseling procedures for self-directed learning; introducing goal-specification process to Education majors during summer counseling.

Linda Reisser

Help develop a viable advising program for freshmen specifically interested in education as a major, including more staff, tighter organization and more advisor-student contact.

Bob Miltz & Linda Reisser

Improve academic counseling for freshmen in the College of Arts and Sciences.

J. Shaw

Have introduced in the College of Food and Natural Resources special freshman courses which will sustain the interest of students and allow them to quickly become involved in departmental courses.

Ernie Buck
1969

Developed a program for nursing freshmen that will help them to adjust to the freshman year at UM and to gain experience in interpersonal skills.

Alvin Winder

Worked closely with freshman engineering students at the low end of the "normal" standards spectrum in order to show that, with appropriate support, they can improve their achievement level and become competitive with the "normal" student.

Joseph Marcus

Initiated a series of modular courses for freshman engineering students to provide an orientation for them as well as to explore and define what engineers do.

Joseph Marcus

1973

Developed special 1- to 3-credit seminars for freshmen with a special interest in mathematics.

Robert McGuigan

1972

Prepared a Guide to Undergraduate Studies to introduce freshman majors to the field of Anthropology, the Department, and career opportunities.

Donald Proulx

A new approach and design for freshman European History.

Robert McNeal

Anthropology Department has been encouraging freshmen to undertake independent study courses; an honors freshman course is being developed; and a new format for introductory Anthropology is being designed to include different faculty speakers each week.

Richard Woodbury

Hispanic Language Department appointed a freshman advisor last year, Sarah MacLeod.

Harold Boudreau

Developed a more interesting introductory course in elementary geology, "Face of the Earth," for freshmen.

Joseph Hartshorn
Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering has been planning curriculum changes and developing a freshman engineering course; many of the faculty is involved with the freshman modules for the Introductory Engineering Course.

J. Edward Sunderland

The Physics Department has contacted all high school science teachers in the state requesting the names of prospective UMass students with an interest in science; have sent them information concerning the Physics Department and have urged the students and their teachers to visit the department; hopefully this procedure can reduce the difficulties in making the transition from high school to college.

L. F. Cook

Zoology Department has created special sections of its introductory course for CCEBS students.

Harold Rausch

In the Slavic Language Department, all summer counseling activity is aimed at entering freshmen.

Maurice Levin

Developed a student advising system within the Department of Veterinary and Animal Sciences.

Anthony Borton

In the Department of Veterinary and Animal Sciences primary concern has been focused on curricular changes and improved advising systems and procedures for both freshmen and transfer students from community colleges; also a modular credit program has been implemented which allows first-year students to work with animals.

Tom Fox

The Art Department is creating certain basic courses which will be offered as part of the department’s Formulation Year for Freshmen; advising, guidance and counseling for incoming students, including evaluation of portfolios, will become an important part of the program.

Arnold Friedman

1971

Improved the quality of the freshman experience for incoming students by providing an excellent foundations experience in Art and a strong sense of community with freshman art majors.

Paul Berube

Acquainted incoming freshmen with an understanding of marketing program and career opportunities in marketing.

Jack Wolf
Special efforts to provide first-year women physical education majors with information concerning the opportunities available to them; special presentations and materials are provided for these students.

Betty Spears

Developed a course for entering freshmen majoring in Human Development so that they would be in contact with the department from the start and so that we could ease their transition into college life.

Ellis Olim

Involved with developing a comprehensive, systematic and personal undergraduate counseling and advising system in the Government Department from initial contact at summer orientation throughout college experience; ultimately superseded by CASIAC.

Herbert Steeper

Pre-1971

Major revision and modification of Chemistry 101, 102 to better meet the needs of non-science students.

George Richason

Redesign and revamp the entire Psychology 101 program to allow for greater options and diversity for entering students.

Alan Kamil

All introductory courses in the Government Department have been restructured.

Glen Gordan

Head of Botany Department meets with all new students in an effort to provide an orientation as well as let them know about the channels of communication; in addition each class has its own adviser.

Otto Stein

1972

An undergraduate internship in student development which was primarily focused on meeting the developmental and educational needs of freshmen, including facilitating the transition from high school to college, enhancing interpersonal relationships and skills, and providing encouragement for self-directed learning.

Ted Slovin

Designed a series of freshman seminars intended to involve freshmen with issues and instructors more deeply than normal freshman courses.

Jim Shaw
A one-semester experimental course offered to and designed especially for freshman women who were all declared elementary education majors in the School of Education. Its intent was to help develop a more positive self-concept and raise self-awareness.

Dorothy Lloyd

Initiated a special freshman course in Food Science titled "The Struggle for Food."

F. J. Francis & Fergus Clydesdale

Taught a freshman seminar whose aim was to examine sociological principles by focusing on the freshman's initial experience with the University.

T. O. Wilkinson

Special introductory course for freshmen titled "Kids, Schools and the School of Education.

Bob Miltz

Residential Areas

1973

Organized and led workshops in the Sylvan area counseling center aimed at helping freshmen cope with the problems confronting them at the University.

Parney Hagerman

Taught a course in Southwest primarily for freshmen titled "How Can I Learn at the University"; it is an attempt to help students understand the processes of learning and to become self-directed learners in the University community.

Phil Chanin

The Sylvan Area academic program attempts to reach the first-year students who enter the area by providing space and funds for university course offerings such as CASIAC 102 and Psychology 190 while also planning special colloquia to introduce students to the area and encourage future involvement in student government.

Mark Hallenbeck

Improved residence hall counseling and academic advising for freshmen in Orchard Hill; also increased opportunities for more independent study and field work.

Jim West
Organized a series of freshman seminars throughout the Southwest Residential Area; the central theme of the seminars centered on biography and autobiography and attempted to combine cognitive and affective learning.

James Leheny

Dormitory

1973

Special residence hall program aimed at improving the freshman experience by facilitating the students' transition from high school to college.

Parney Hagerman

1972

Special project which allowed freshmen to live alone on one floor in a residence hall without upperclassmen; specific courses and programs were then created for these freshmen.

Peter Brown

1971

Developed a freshman seminar program for Project 10 in an effort to aid students in their adjustment to a large university.

Charles Adams

1970

Taught a freshman seminar in Project 10 titled "Coming of Age in America"; its purpose was to combine the student's personal and cognitive growth.

Larry Hawkins
Taught a Project 10 seminar with the purpose of integrating cognitive and affective learning.

Betty Savereid

Taught a freshman seminar in Project 10.

John Foster

Personal counseling efforts in dormitory directed at the problems which incoming freshmen confront.

Steve Soderlind

Taught a freshman seminar "Coming of Age in America"; an effort to help freshmen explore intellectual issues as well as personal problems affecting them during their first year at the University.

Phil Chanin

1970

Set up a series of interrelated courses for freshmen centered around the theme of ecology.

James Leheny

A residence hall program which begins in September and is specifically aimed at incoming freshmen. Its basic intent is to provide a thorough orientation for the student.

Tim Brennan

1968

Collaborated with United Christian Foundation in an effort to implement a pilot project in-house orientation program for Patterson and Washington Middle; it was an attempt to introduce students to dorm living and open their minds to new ideas; it was followed by a one-credit colloquium, "The New Morality."

Dot Burke

As a faculty fellow, I offered freshman courses to small groups of students in a residence hall.

Herbert Steeper
Student Senate Task Force on the Freshman Year; identify the problems and propose some solutions.

Tom Spriggs

Crosspath is a program which will allow freshmen as well as other students to spend time on a number of campuses around the country during one given year.

Neil McBride

A new alternative freshman academic program in Global Survival Studies has been planned for approximately 100 students beginning in the Fall, 1973. The program will be interdisciplinary and problem-centered and will focus on five broad areas of world-wide concern: war, peace and alternative systems of world order; population; environmental deterioration and economic development; availability and distribution of world resources; and cross-cultural communication and conflict.

David Schimmel
Steve Guild
Margie Lenn
Pat Crosson
Larry Marcus

A major curriculum change in the School of Nursing will soon designate the freshman and sophomore years as pre-nursing.

Lillian Goodman

Two survey courses for Human Nutrition majors have been proposed so that freshmen can have some contact with nutrition in their first year; the subject matter will concern nutritional problems that exist in the United States and world-wide as well as how a career in nutrition can be relevant.

Peter Pellett

Attempting to revamp the introductory course system by modifying the Introductory Anthropology Course and adding a new general course for non-majors.

Donald Proulx

The Math Department is in the process of designing a group of elementary, introductory courses for freshmen and non-specialists.

Robert McGuigan

Head of Residence and Student Staff are designing an extended orientation month for incoming students (freshmen and transfers) in one dormitory to include colloquia, workshops, and informal social gatherings.

Kathy Hopkins
1973

Proposed an interdisciplinary topic-oriented program to include academic, public service and self-growth components; it aimed to develop self-initiated, self-directed learners; decided to merge this program with Global Survival Studies Group and then to locate the Global Survival Program in the Central Area.

Larry Marcus

1972

Proposal for a multi-disciplinary program of freshman study, to include "base courses" in social sciences and humanities and natural and physical sciences; it proposed to bring in experts from various departments at the University.

Don Chamberlan & Neil McBride

Proposed an interdisciplinary academic program for freshmen, to be located in a dormitory, centered around the theme of 20th-century American Civilization; it was to be implemented in Butterfield House.

Anne Mundy

Proposed a program which would have the education process respond more directly to freshman needs, diversify educational options, integrate education with House and Area development, and experiment with new educational methods.

Jack Richardson

Freshman year proposal which recommended placing freshmen, not seniors, in the smallest classes.

Cass Turner

Unsuccessfully attempted to initiate various ideas in the undergraduate advising office which would facilitate providing accurate information to first-year students about the School of Education.

David Anderson

Engaged in effort to change the Rhetoric program by replacing it with skills laboratories.

Larry Ladd
Hoc Faculty Senate Committee Report on the Freshman Year. Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts, 1972.
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