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Abstract

The UW-Stevens Point, UW-Marshfield/Wood County, and UW-Marathon County campuses are cooperating to provide a Collaborative Degree Program (CDP) which allows students in Central Wisconsin to complete a baccalaureate degree by attending classes at any of these campuses. This study examined the history of the CDP and explored the experience of students in the CDP through in-depth interviews about their lived experiences. The goal of the study was to discover who is utilizing the CDP, why they choose to use it, and how they speak of the CDP to others.

The CDP students in this study identified themselves as time and place bound adults. Getting a college degree is important to them for personal, familial, and societal reasons. Because the CDP classes are offered in the evening, at their local campuses, they say the Collaborative Degree Program is the factor that allows them to complete a degree. Students are very appreciative of the CDP and made some suggestions for improvements. They want more interaction with professors. They want professors to see them as peers—adults with work and family commitments. They want administrators to offer a greater variety of courses and majors, and to keep technology use from interfering in communication processes. They also praise the advisors, professors, and the program, and highly recommend the CDP to adults who want to complete a bachelor’s degree.

By communicating with CDP students a current image of Central Wisconsin’s adult learners, lifelong learners, emerges, complete with descriptions of their hopes, dreams, and some blocks to achieving these dreams. These students appreciate this opportunity to reach their adult educational goals using the CDP’s face to face and interactive video class formats to complete a bachelor’s degree.
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Chapter One

Introduction

In 1997 a Collaborative Degree Program (CDP) welcomed “time and place bound” Central Wisconsin students into a baccalaureate completion program offered by UWSP in cooperation with the UW-Marshfield/Wood County (hereafter Marshfield) and the UW-Marathon County (hereafter Wausau) campuses. The primary audience for the CDP is Central Wisconsin residents who have completed an associate degree, but are time and place bound because of family and/or job responsibilities. It offers them the option of completing a bachelor’s degree with no more travel time or travel expense than they were able to afford to earn their associate degree.

The CDP In Brief

The CDP is a mixture of traditional classroom teaching and distance education (DE) technology. It appears to offer the “best of both worlds.” The Marshfield and Wausau campuses offer associate degrees and provide classrooms equipped for interactive video (ITV) delivery to be used for upper level CDP classes. UWSP professors teach for-credit upper level undergraduate classes in person. They present at, and are telecast live from, each campus site one-third of the time, and delivered to the other two campus sites in real time ITV. The four-year (bachelor’s) degree is available with a general degree major or a business administration major, each with multiple emphasis options and minors.

UWSP is a logical choice to join with the UW-Colleges in offering four-year degrees. It is centrally located in the state (in case CDP students wish to or need to come to the campus), and UWSP already has a special relationship with the UW-Colleges.
because their library catalogs are administered by UWSP’s library staff. When there are problems with library-related technology they get help from UWSP’s library staff.

UWSP has excellent technology resources and knowledgeable staff to service those resources. Some of those in use today include ETN, and both compressed ITV (two-way) and non-compressed (Wondernet, also two-way) real time video conferencing.

In addition, the CDP program is a part of the “Central Wisconsin Idea” (a local branch of the “Wisconsin Idea”). The CDP is intended to provide education to time and place bound people of Central Wisconsin (George, 2000A). The UW campuses have a responsibility to provide Wisconsin residents with quality educational opportunities as part of their mission. The System-imposed enrollment caps have limited the number of people who can attend and achieve degrees at university campuses across the state. The CDP is one means of circumventing that practice in these tax-payer supported institutions, and supporting the efforts of people who need the opportunity to complete a college degree by working towards it part-time.

**Goal of Study, Content of Chapters**

The goal of this study was to examine UWSP’s Collaborative Degree Program as seen through the eyes of a group of participating CDP students. Gathering interview data would allow the researcher to study student communications about the CDP, its professors and advisors, what students like and dislike about the program, and how they speak of it to others as reported by the subjects. Through in-depth interviews 16 CDP students were able to share their reasons for choosing to use the CDP, their experiences with the CDP, their advice for professors and administrators of the CDP (including some suggestions for changes), and their advice for potential CDP students.
The remainder of this first Chapter presents a Literature Review of collaborative/consortial/cooperative degree programs, and a brief history of the formation of UWSP's CDP.

Chapter two describes the methodology used in this study and the reasons the researcher chose qualitative methods of inquiry for this study to contribute information to possible development of grounded theory.

Chapter three details the results of the study, the processes used to examine the data from the interviews, and the themes which emerged from the analysis of the data.

Chapter four offers the researcher's analysis of the themes detailed in Chapter three and theories which arose from the investigative interviews of the CDP students. Considerations of other studies and how this one differs and is similar to other studies is included.

Chapter five offers ideas on the value of the study, the possible significance of the study's results, the limitations of this study, suggestions for future research, and afterthoughts of the researcher with speculation on potential theoretical possibilities.

**Literature Review**

The literature on Collaborative Degree Programs per se is not plentiful, though some does exist (George & Clark, 2001). However, there is some applicable published information because programs which are intended to accomplish the same goals may be termed collaborative, but may also be called "cooperative," or "consortial," or other similar terms. Whichever term is used, in each case the intent of these programs is the same. The intent is for two or more institutions to join together to provide services which cannot otherwise be offered to students in need of nontraditional, nonplace-
specific degrees. These students are here termed “time and place bound,” and other places are sometimes simply termed “nontraditional.” One current definition of a nontraditional student is found on the first page of the UWSP Nontraditional Student Spring 2003 bulletin.

You are a nontraditional student if: You are a veteran. You are married. You are a parent. You are 24 years old or older. You have taken more than a year and a half off school. You are the first generation in your family to attend college.

The literature on collaborative/consortial/cooperative degree programs which serve many of these nontraditional students seems to have been written to answer one or more of these three questions. How can a collaborative/consortial/cooperative degree program be created and run? Are collaborative degrees utilizing distance education working well? Who can be or will be interested in being served by a collaborative degree program using some distance education technology?

**How Can Such Programs Be Set Up and Run?**

Many studies of forming collaborative partnerships are written up as educational how-to “case studies” of what is being done by particular institutions or state university systems, and why the program is developing as it is (McKenzie, et al, 1999; WGU, 1998). A College Board PBS teleconference about collaborative degree programs, *Partnerships Between Two & Four Year Colleges* (1996), is an excellent overview of several such cases. It begins with participants discussing pros and cons of partnering between institutions, start up costs, and what degrees are being offered and why. Needs assessments often find workforce development a compelling reason to collaborate. Other
reasons often include sharing and retaining students within a program or system of institutions, meeting the increasing demand for easy access to higher education degrees by adult learners, and attempts to get grants for start-up and operating costs. Later operating costs can be shared between the institutional partners as the programs grow to support themselves (Oblinger & Kidwell, 2000; College Board PBS Adult Learning Services, 1996). Current technology has been paramount in enabling this nontraditional melding of institutions and programs as distance education continues to play an important part in allowing this kind of collaborative flexibility of class delivery.

There are often "partnerships" which allow more than one institution to share the costs involved in providing degree programs. While some of these working agreements may have sprung up informally, many have been carefully and deliberately crafted, with some involving entire state systems.

One good example of an entire state system collaborating with the use of DE technology is the Commonwealth of Virginia’s TELETECHNET, developed as a direct response to requests made from the business community to that state’s legislature for workforce development avenues. There was a need for higher education to be available to the people of the state of Virginia without the requirement that they travel to the location of the four-year and graduate degree granting institutions. Like Wisconsin, Virginia had a system of two-year colleges across the state. In response to workforce development needs more two-year campuses were developed and the entire system, monitored from Old Dominion University in Norfolk, began working as a cohesive unit. This plan allows sharing of expenses for the satellite system spread around the state, and because of the number of participating campuses (29 two-year campuses) in 1996 the
average TELETECHNET class had 60 students enrolled by utilizing their satellite transmitted DE (College Board PBS Adult Learning Services, 1996). Several baccalaureate programs are offered primarily via satellite transmission including: Engineering Technology (with civil, computer, and electrical options), Nursing (RN to BSN), Health Services Administration, Business Management, Human Services Counseling, Criminal Justice, Professional Communications, and teaching certification at the middle school level for math and science.

Telecommunications presentations are supplemented with internships within the student’s community, labs held on weekends, 10-day intensive classes during the summer at four-year universities, and a mobile classroom with heavy equipment for the engineering students.

Faculty from two-year colleges are offered free faculty development programs and may participate as adjunct faculty for some courses. Other courses are delivered via satellite from four-year institutions utilizing their own faculty.

Other states have coordinated their system of colleges with similar results. In Michigan, the Macomb Community College in Warren, Michigan was the instigator of cooperative agreements between themselves and five four-year institutions in the state. In 1996 the number of “partners” for this community college had grown to 13, with campus offices for each of them in a building funded and maintained for just that purpose. As a major player in the partnership, Macomb Community College’s annual operating budget was $5-6 million in 1996. While the first 60 credits of classes are taking place on this campus in traditional classrooms, the remaining credits are offered as a mix of DE presentations and cooperating faculty traveling to the campus.
New Jersey’s Thomas Edison College (a private institution specializing in adult education) has partnered with that state’s system of two-year colleges with the legislature’s support and approval (College Board PBS Adult Learning Services, 1996). There are also cooperative programs which have developed between private and public state community colleges across state lines, as with Regis University and the community colleges in Colorado and Wyoming. Many of Regis’s programs utilize qualified faculty from the community the college is located in, but some of their faculty also travel to the community college campuses in both states (College Board PBS Adult Learning Services, 1996). More recent efforts in two states are aimed at putting classes online for consortial degrees. Pennsylvania has 15 community colleges which joined to form a consortium to allow their residents to enroll in these courses from anywhere in the state (Carnevale, 2000). Colorado has agreed to join 28 campuses to offer online degrees which will be more easily available to rural residents (Carnevale, 2001A).

In a unique situation just developed in 2000, six universities from six different states are jointly offering an online master’s degree in family financial planning. Students enroll in any one of the six institutions (their choice) and take online classes offered from any or all of the participating universities (Carnevale, 2001B).

Even though there are programs which demonstrate collaborative degree programs can be created and do exist, the next question is do they work?

**Are Collaborative Degrees Utilizing Distance Education Working?**

A few studies have attempted to determine if students are learning as much in classes which utilize DE delivery as students learn in traditional classroom settings (Biner, Barone, & Welsh, 1997; Freddolino & Sutherland, 2000). Some studies were
done to determine if students in these special programs participate adequately (Poole, 2000) and get equivalent grades to students in traditional classroom settings (Baath, 1982). In each instance reviews are mixed, but there does seem to be some evidence for parity in amount learned and grades earned (Baath, 1982; Biner, Barone, & Welsh, 1997; Biner, Welsh, Barone, Summer, & Dean, 1997; Freddolino & Sutherland, 2000).

There are reasons for these studies (Simonson, 1997). DE students are less likely to persist in individual courses than the students who enroll in traditional classes (Carr, 2000). Many theories about why DE students have a higher attrition rate are advanced. Some administrators blame the technological equipment (Wheeler, 2000), the unfamiliarity and “newness” of the class situations (Yellen, 1997-98). It is also harder for many people to persist in new situations where they do not know what to expect. It is more difficult for professors to adapt courses to the technological demands and limitations of different presentation/technological modes than the face-to-face modes of classic teaching models (Carr, 2000). Certainly DE professors must invest much more time in communicating with students in courses where students cannot stay after class or drop by the professor’s office when they have a problem (Warasila & Lomaga, 2000).

DE students’ most common complaints are about the technology—feeling awkward about using it, glitches in attempts to use it, and its unfamiliarity (Viverais-Dresler & Kutschke, 1992). Yet when surveys were done with DE students who were further along in their programs, it seemed to be a matter of a learning curve (Gallagher & McCormick, 1999). Students say once they have adapted to the technology it becomes a habit.
A lack of perceived belonging or community can make the DE student's experience a lonely one, yet this does not have to be the case. In NOVA's advanced degree programs students find themselves to be a part of both professional and learning communities. These "communities" support members and allow them to work together on projects although they live in different countries (Hesser & Kontos, 1997).

Surveys of DE students about their perceptions of instructors, course delivery, efficacy of the courses, and satisfaction with DE courses are of great importance for this research (Pool, 1996). Most surveys found that even when students believed they would have preferred taking the course in a traditional classroom setting, they highly valued the convenience of the DE courses and would take other DE courses given the opportunity (Richards & Ridley, 1997).

DE students generally believed they learned about as much as they would have in a traditional classroom in their DE courses. Grades and achievement of DE students are equal to or greater than those of students in traditional classes (Magiera, 1995). The DE students tended to rate the instructors more favorably than the instructors rated themselves as far as interaction levels, use of visuals, and other measures of course delivery success (Inman & Kerwin, 1999; Zhang & Fulford, 1994).

The importance of producing and encouraging interaction between the instructor and students and between students and students in the DE course is well-recognized by researchers (Hassenplug & Harnish, 1998). An interesting, important, and repeated finding was that perceived interaction between other students and the instructor was more indicative of student satisfaction than actual interaction time (Biner, et al, 1997; Zhang &
The likelihood is that “vicarious learning” (Bandura, 1969) is of high importance in DE as it is in the traditional classroom.

While these studies appear to be academically correct, there is sometimes an unexpressed expectation or desire by the researcher to show that a program IS working, or that DE technology is not a good option and should not be used. Because there is no ethical way to assign random groups to different controlled situations, nor to match subject pairs so identical results would be more likely, the question of “success” remains one of degree rather than a “yes” or “no” answer. Even if participants answers to questions seem to say the programs are working, who would be interested in such a program when there are traditional classes being offered face to face at universities in every state?

Who Can Be/Will Be Interested in Being Served By a CDP Using DE Technology?

The DE student profile tends to be nontraditional age females, with dependents, working 20 or more hours per week. Adult DE students tend to be more accepting of distance technology than adolescent DE students. Adults also tend to experience less difficulty focusing on the DE presentation. These students’ reasons for taking DE courses are often job or career related (College Board PBS Adult Learning Services, 1996).

Some instructors who do research are strongly committed to screening DE candidates with tests or prerequisites (Warasila & Lomaga, 2000) to weed out students who are unprepared or not suited to the medium (Carr, 2000). This is not a punitive act, rather it attempts to prevent failure of students who seem unlikely to succeed in a particular course or in the DE environment. Other DE proponents herald it as the
ultimate in “student centered” learning (Berg, 1999; Long, et al, 1999; Phillips & Peters, 1999). Certainly convenience is high on the list of why students choose DE courses and degrees. In the effort to provide convenient and viable programs to DE students, there is a great deal of collaboration between institutions and the creation of “virtual communities” (Berg, 1999; Kowch & Schwier, 1997; Lally & Barrett; 1999; Lee, 1993; Mioduser, et al, 2000; Murphy, 2000; Oakes, 1998; Russell, 1999). Other writers focus on lifelong learning (Green, 1999).

Many of the students who take advantage of these programs are adults over 25 years of age coming back to school to enhance their abilities to get jobs, or to finish an interrupted degree (George & Clark, 2001). Many of these students already have the responsibilities of fulltime jobs and children. They frequently have little time for, or interest in, extracurricular campus activities. These students may come into such a program with considerable knowledge and background in their area of study. They may be more self-directed, results-oriented, and demanding than traditional aged college students (Taylor, 2001). They may also become impatient with classes which seem to them to waste their time or money and scheduling problems which seem to be institutional in nature.

Virginia’s student profile for TELETECHNET classes are working adults in their 30’s and 40’s who take an average of 2.2 courses per semester, are 86% very satisfied with their courses, with a 96% return rate. The second half of the four-year programs have usual completion times of two years plus one semester for nursing degrees, to four or five years for engineering degrees (College Board PBS Adult Learning Services, 1996).
This back to school trend may be driven by the tendency for employers to look for baccalaureate degreed candidates much as they used to prefer candidates with high school diplomas. In an economy which is more dependent on changing technologies and use of information resources than in former generations, people are less likely to be able to, or perhaps want to, stay in one job or career for a lifetime. As businesses change to computerized tasks and companies restructure or downsize, people who want reasonably good-paying jobs are forced to reassess their abilities and skills, what they have to offer an employer. Many people find that they need or want more training and better credentials, but they have to have jobs, and probably have families – responsibilities which already take much of their time and attention. As Gary Berg (1999, p. 24) says of the current situation in the United States:

First, demographic forces, economics, political, and lifestyle trends all show that there is an increasing need for non-traditional education.

Second, the single most important factor is the changing demographics of higher education leading to a great increase in the average age of students in higher education. One-third of all undergraduate-level and two-thirds of master's-level enrollments are part-time. Adult learners in increasing numbers will exist with the following characteristics: computer skilled, educated, employed in work which is primarily mental (knowledge workers), and accustomed to cooperative work.

These students need course access and delivery which will fit into their schedules. It may not be their primary focus as it might be for students just graduated from high school. If a university/college/school cannot provide what the student/consumer wants,
some other institution will. The population swell known as the "baby boomers" needs information, training, and degrees, and this need has created a big business opportunity. Sometimes it is difficult to tell whether an organization is a university or a business. For example, advertising on the web for the College for Professional Studies at http://www.kaplancollege.com/info/units offers several degrees including Criminal Justice and Legal Nurse Consulting via DE. In tiny though visible white on periwinkle is the acknowledgement "A Kaplan, Inc. Company. Kaplan, Inc. is a subsidiary of the Washington Post." (accessed 11/18/01).

Institutions of higher learning are paying attention to this trend of adults going back to college for multiple reasons. There are fewer traditional age college students to recruit. Businesses are willing, able, and eager to offer training and certificates of completion in many areas of expertise. It is part of the mission of universities and colleges to serve their publics with a high standard of excellence in teaching. These standards may not or may not be upheld by businesses with profit as the main motive. And the adult education market, sometimes termed lifelong learning, could make a difference in whether some institutions continue to function or succumb to the attrition of population decline after the baby boomer swell.

**Justification for This Study**

This study looks at the first bachelor's degree completion Collaborative Degree Program between UW campuses at Stevens Point, Marshfield, and Wausau in the Central Wisconsin region, to examine whether CDP students are happy with the program, and to find out if they believe that the CDP is still needed. The program began operation in the fall of 1997, making this the 5th year of its operation. Five years is often the length of
time when organizations “take stock” of what has happened to an initial plan. In addition to the passage of time, other changes have occurred and are occurring. Assistant Chancellor for Extension Marv Van Kekerix left the campus for another job. The CDP was “his baby” up until his departure. After Van Kekerix left, the CDP was run in conjunction with UWSP’s Extension program. Staff who were familiar with the program provided the continuity while responsibility for the program was passed around a bit. A new CDP administrator, Jerry Rous, was hired in 2001. The CDP is his major charge, so he will be responsible for its success or failure, its possible expansion, and maintaining or changing the CDP’s current image.

In addition to the timing considerations, there is not a lot of information published about the student perceptions and satisfaction with Collaborative Degree Programs. This study may well be one of very few in depth studies conducted from the student viewpoint until this time. As such, it could provide historically useful information for the institutions studied and for those interested in initiating a CDP for themselves.

This Time, This Collaborative Degree Program—Historical Information

Creation and Early Promotion of UWSP’s CDP

In looking for historical data about the Collaborative Degree Program between UW campuses in Stevens Point, Marshfield, and Wausau, two sources held the most information: the UWSP News Service and the CDP office itself. By relying on information from these sources, a fairly accurate historical picture of how the CDP came into being, what public relations and advertising were used in its promotion, and the interplay of news releases and external press stories since its inception can be constructed.
To discover what kind of continued public relations efforts were being used, some searches of local news media focused on Chancellor Tom George's "Chancellor's Corner" column in The Stevens Point Journal, presentations, news releases where George mentioned the CDP, graduation stories of CDP students in local newspapers, and other news releases from the UWSP News Service. CDP brochures, surveys of CDP students, and websites related to the CDP were also examined to determine, if possible, what image the CDP was promoting to its publics.

The chapter titled "Campus Case: UW-Stevens Point Makes the Case for Distance Learning" written by George and Clark (2001, pp. 198-200) from the book Public Relations and the Presidency: Strategies and Tactics for Effective Communications suggested the structure which is used in presenting the next segment.

**The Central Wisconsin Idea**

The CDP is one element of the Central Wisconsin Idea (CWI) which came into being and began to coalesce into its current form in 1999 as UWSP administrators and faculty examined ideas of how to make UWSP a "driving force," a connection for Central Wisconsin people and businesses, and a "catalyst for economic and workforce development..." (George & Clark, 2001, p. 198). The three goals for the CWI were defined.

1. to enhance economic development in central Wisconsin through collaborative programs that will link time-and place-bound adults with area educational institutions, businesses, and government and public agencies;
2. to provide area employees with skills in critical thinking, information technology, and oral and written communication; and

3. to help to staunch the flow of qualified UW graduates out of the state.

(George & Clark, 2001, p. 198).

Creation of the Partnership

The three central Wisconsin UW-System campuses at Stevens Point, Marshfield, and Wausau are all within an hour’s drive of each other, but of the three only UWSP can grant baccalaureate degrees. With the advent of DE technology, which allows online and interactive video (ITV) links, a partnership between the two-year campuses and UWSP was logical. As representatives from all three campuses talked with each other about the idea, the advantages for students were obvious.

The earliest dated material on the CDP is an untitled news release describing “Plans for a Regional Degree Program...” with several statements by UWSP’s then Interim Chancellor Howard Thoyre. The news release mentions surveys which are planned to gauge the levels of interest among people who work and/or attend college in central Wisconsin (Plans, 1996).

This initial investigation of the idea for the CDP is shown in primary materials dating from 1996 and 1997. In some primary materials an even earlier incarnation of the CWI was mentioned, that of former UWSP Chancellor Lee Sherman Dreyfus’s “Ruroplex” idea (George, 2000A). A proposal dated January 31, 1997 shows an interest in jointly developing the program with the active and informed participation of all three campuses. In the case of the two-year campuses, UW-Marshfield/Wood County’s Dean Carol McCart and UW-Marathon County’s Dean Dennis Massey were the primary
planning participants. For UWSP the Interim Chancellor Howard Thoyre and the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Extension, Marv Van Kekerix, and Interim Provost and Vice Chancellor, Bill Meyer, were the primary planning participants (Meyer, 1997). Together Massey, McCart, and Meyer authored the "Proposal for a Bachelor's Degree Granted by the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point and Offered Through a Collaborative Program Involving the University of Wisconsin Center-Marathon County the University of Wisconsin Center-Marshfield/Wood County the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point Presented for Review and Approval to the Collaborative Policy and Procedures Committee" dated January 31, 1997.

Prior to writing the above proposal, the three campuses had undertaken two surveys. One survey was distributed to major employers in the central Wisconsin area. The other survey was distributed to students at the two-year campuses. These two groups were considered the primary publics from which potential students for the CDP might come. By surveying both groups the majority of the potential publics had an opportunity for direct input on whether to initiate the program, the timing of when the classes should meet, and the areas of study which were most preferred.

Results of the surveys showed that there was strong interest in a bachelor's degree completion CDP from both employees of area businesses and students enrolled at the two-year campuses. More than 40% of both groups said they were "very interested" while an additional 32% said they were "somewhat interested." Of those who returned surveys, there was a pool of approximately 1,635 interested people (Massey, McCart, & Meyer, 1997, p. 5).
The pre-marketing steps also included meetings with potential partners and potential stakeholders, a wide range of individuals on the Stevens Point, Marshfield, and Wausau campuses, as well as many business organizations.

**Marketing of UWSP's CDP**

An undated paper from UWSP's News Service titled "The University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point Collaborative Degree Program: Your Time, Your Place" explains the early marketing plans and their implementation. Here the marketing objectives were listed and included: identifying the target audience, promoting enrollment while developing a market share, and convincing the target audience that the University of Wisconsin degree was worth more than one from private colleges already occupying the niche the CDP hoped to fill.

Implementation of the marketing plan was broad and thorough. It is described on pages 3 and 4 of this undated paper as

...accomplished using various promotional pieces which were implemented in the fall of 1997, including distribution of our "Grabber" and Program brochures (Exhibit B). Newspaper advertisements, public service announcements, personal visits, and telephone calls were placed in all three city locations. Informational open-houses were held at the Wausau and Marshfield campuses. Our most successful advertising endeavor was our poster; we sent posters with inquiry postcard tear-offs to 202 large employers in Wausau, Marshfield, and Stevens Point. During the following two weeks we received approximately 50 inquiries from potential students requesting more information. We followed this
favorable response by sending posters to another 146 area businesses, with fewer employees. Posters and brochures were also distributed to libraries, community centers, and employment offices in the area. Requests are answered with a student packet of program details… (The University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point Collaborative Degree Program: Your Time, Your Place, pp. 3-4)

The choice of an “image” to join all CDP materials together was UWSP’s cupola logo of the Old Main building. It appeared on all promotional materials used, bringing to mind all the associations with UWSP as a four-year campus with a history of academic excellence more than a century long.

An evaluation of the initial marketing program showed that it netted 60 registrations, a combined total for the first three courses offered in the fall of 1997. The goal had been 40 registrations. In addition, 50 students began taking preparatory classes at the two-year campuses so they could enroll in the CDP once the prerequisites to join the program were met. There were also 261 requests for more information.

Upon evaluation of the marketing plan’s progress, new plans were developed including displays and exhibits to use at UWSP’s annual Open House and job fairs, personal visits for presentations on the CDP and question and answer sessions at businesses, development of a web site, and making available a PowerPoint program for group presentations (The University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point Collaborative Degree Program: Your Time, Your Place, p. 5).
Continuing Promotion, Media Response

The CDP has been promoted by UWSP's Chancellor Tom George from its inception. He mentions it with some regularity in his Stevens Point Journal column “Chancellor’s Corner” (George, 2001; George, 2000A; George, 2000B), and in News Releases and speeches (Chancellor Says UWSP is Leader and Partner, 2001; Chancellor Welcomes Faculty and Staff, 2000). Usually when he speaks about the CWI the CDP is mentioned as one part of it, and often as an example of what has already been accomplished through partnership and collaboration.

The media response to the CDP has been good from the very beginning of airing the idea. Stories on it have appeared near the front-page and on first page news of local or state sections (Friesen, 1997; Ullman, 2001). Graduates of the CDP have been written about at graduation time, and in each such story information on how to contact CDP advisors and/or representatives is included. The tone of the articles seems slightly congratulatory, encouraging, and somewhat proud that the area has this program to offer. In fact, the positive media coverage of the CDP and the broader CWI was helpful in convincing the board of regents of the UW-System to fund the budget proposal for the CWI in 2000 (George & Clark, 2001). Media support translated as regional support from important partners and stakeholders. George and Clark credit having regional approval of the CDP in place before presenting the CWI to the regents as a large factor in the success of gaining UW-System backing.

Most Important Public

Currently the most important public for the CDP is its current students with future students a close second. Past students of the CDP have offered many comments in
interviews and offered comments for promotional use through surveys on student satisfaction regularly taken by CDP administration at UWSP.

**Provisional Conclusions**

While it is difficult to make infallible conclusions from any amount of information, it does seem that the CDP has been and is working with unique and convenient value for its participants and for its area communities. It allows Central Wisconsin residents to achieve a University of Wisconsin baccalaureate degree within a reasonable distance from their homes. It may be helping the area communities by discouraging the “brain drain” referred to by Chancellor George (2000A). Brain drain is caused by people moving away from their communities to pursue higher education. As the CDP expands to offer more major and minor options, people have more options to complete degrees without moving away from their community.

The public relations planning and implementation has been effective and well-thought-out. News media responded well to shared information on the program. This agreement on the value of the program benefited all shareholder publics. As more majors and minors are added to the CDP, it may be a precursor to an online DE program which could be even more convenient for its students.

Chapter Two will discuss the methodology used in this study and why qualitative means were chosen, the role of the researcher in this study, the interview questions used for the study, and the selection of subjects for the interviews done for this study.

**Research Questions**

The process of examining subjects’ communications about the program and their experience with the program is what makes this study unique. The research questions for
this study are open-ended with multiple opportunities for people to communicate their thoughts, feelings, and perceptions.

1. Who are the people who are utilizing UWSP’s CDP?

2. Why are these people utilizing this CDP?
   a. Why do they want a college degree?
   b. Why choose this CDP rather than a traditional degree program?

3. How do the people who utilize this CDP speak of it?
   a. Why will they continue/not continue to use it?
   b. How do they talk about it when speaking to others?

This thesis presents themes from students' shared communications of their experiences with UWSP's CDP, their shared visions of why they need a college degree, and their own words of what this program means to them.
Chapter Two

The concept of the Collaborative Degree Program is one which has been used in other places to provide a college education for adult students who live a distance from four year degree granting institutions. The success of these programs has been documented from the viewpoint of the institutions involved by case studies, from the viewpoint of the professors involved by surveys of students and by figuring up grades from sections of classes taught via distance education techniques compared to traditional classroom offerings of the same or similar courses. There have been some studies of student satisfaction using electronic or paper and pencil surveys. This study examines communications of students about their experiences in the UW-Stevens Point Collaborative Degree Program using an interview format with open-ended questions.

This chapter will explain the importance of the researcher’s role, the importance of the research methods and tools selected, the importance of the subjects interviewed, and the importance of the grounded theory analysis of the data from the interviews used in this study.

Role of the Researcher—Personal Experiences

My role as the researcher in this study is a distinct advantage (Creswell, 1994, p. 163) because of my experience with the situation, but that carries with it the danger of personal bias. This study consists of interviews with students who cannot travel to a four year campus because they have jobs, families, and other responsibilities which limit their discretionary time and flexibility of schedule. Because I was, or might have better considered myself, a time and place bound student myself, I can share a unique perspective with these subjects which many researchers would lack. While this permits
empathy with these subjects, I also know that I did not have the choice to use a CDP to complete my bachelor's degree, yet I did complete it. This fact gives me a more personal objectivity than most people would have to draw on in understanding different possible realities for resolution of the time and place bound problem.

In 1980 I had earned an Associate of Science degree, finished all of the credits I could transfer from the UW-Marshfield/Wood County to a four-year institution, and was faced with the choice of a long drive to UW-Eau Claire or a long drive to UW-Stevens Point to finish the bachelor's degree. The scales tipped in favor of UWSP when I placed first in the state on a civil service exam and was hired for a half-time job in the campus library. For the next eight years I would struggle to complete the BS in Psychology while working first half-time, then full-time, taking classes part time and commuting 2 hours per day. Before leaving the UW-Marshfield I had been editor of the student newspaper Insight and had written an editorial in response to news stories about the UW-System considering closing many of the two-year colleges. I suggested that instead of closing the two-year campuses it made much more sense to make it possible for people to earn four-year degrees at them through outreach from the four-year institutions. Seventeen years later—much too late for me—that option was put into practice in the form of the CDP.

When I began this study I recognized it was both for selfish reasons and because I wanted to learn about, and if possible help, the Collaborative Degree Program and the people it served. In retrospect, all of my reasons could be termed "selfish." In part, I may have been looking for a way to justify some of my life choices. In part, I may have been searching for a commonality of experience which would validate my efforts to continue to broaden my education in the face of some considerable inconveniences. In
part, I may have been wistful about what might have been different had the CDP been available to me when I needed it. Would my son have grown up a happier person if I had been with him two more hours per day? Would my marriage have ended sooner if I had had the time to examine it more closely rather than running up and down the road five or six days a week? Would I in fact have had a reasonably good job without a bachelor’s degree if I had chosen not to attempt the difficult task of earning a degree part-time, commuting, working full-time, and being part of a family? In the end, no study can answer these questions. Yet, the experiences I chose have given me a background against which I can uniquely understand the situation of many of the CDP students. And after working for many years in UWSP’s library, I used distance education (DE) in many of its forms to complete a Masters in Library and Information Science from the UW-Milwaukee. Having “looked at life from both sides now” (Judy Collins song) I’m still struggling with “life’s illusions” and can only hope others may continue to have easier choices to make when attempting to complete their education.

The danger in being too close to the subjects in this study is contamination of the subjects’ responses. However, in this study none of the subjects were previously known to me. They did not know of me before the contact requesting an interview.

The danger in having experience with a situation similar to those of some of the subjects is “reading into” the data and theorizing with preconceived ideas. To avoid this as much as possible I worked directly from the transcripts and used many direct quotes to illustrate points being made in support of the categories I identified from the data. While it may be impossible to guarantee that none of my previous experience has colored my
perceptions of “what is going on here,” I did make a concerted effort to stick to the
descriptions and perceptions as reported by the subjects.

Methodology

Qualitative versus Quantitative Research

The choice to use qualitative research methods for this study was made in an
effort to learn how the subjects interviewed communicated their “lived experience” of the
Collaborative Degree Program. Specifically, how did they communicate with professors,
advisors, and prospective CDP students? Was the program of value, and how did it and
the people they interacted and communicated with in the program affect their perception
of what it was like to be in the CDP? Was the experience worth continuing, and would
they do this again?

Quantitative data can provide many details to use as measures of finite concepts
which are pre-identified by the researcher. The goal with this study was to encourage
subjects to create a picture of a shared experience with each subject contributing details
in his or her own interpretation of reality. This was done to create a portrait of a group
reality with all of the depth provided by multiple reports of the same or similar view.
While a survey might offer a two-dimensional picture, the goal here was to allow the
building of layer upon layer of emotionally colored personal reports to provide a
perspective of the group reality of a three dimensional CDP experience. As Creswell
(1994, p. 162) states about qualitative research, “The focus of qualitative research is on
participants’ perceptions and experiences, and the way they make sense of their lives.”
For that reason quantitative research methods were not suitable for this study, though
they were helpful for many other researchers’ studies.
Many previous researchers had used quantitative style surveys to discover students' level of satisfaction with collaborative/consortial/cooperative degree programs and/or satisfaction with DE classes and the technology required to take the classes (Arbaugh, 2000; Biner, Barone, et al, 1997; Biner, Welsh, et al 1997; Luetke-Stahlman, 1995; Pool, 1996; Sussex, 1998; Wilkes & Burnham, 1991). They theorized that if a collaborative/consortial/cooperative program is working there should be proof of it. They have variously viewed "proof" as student grades being equivalent to grades of students in the same course in face to face instructional format, rate of completion of classes in the program, enrollments in subsequent courses in the program, and student satisfaction (with courses, professors, technology used, etc.). The tools used to gather these "proofs" were surveys, grade books, and enrollments. A brief look at some studies of student satisfaction with collaborative/consortial/cooperative classes, programs, and professors shows quantitative methods have produced some information which agrees with student perceptions in this study. Some examples follow.

Wright, Marsh, and Miller (2000) used a quantitative survey to determine there were no significant differences in knowledge gained, grades received, or student satisfaction between a group of students in an asynchronous online graduate technology class and a group of students in a synchronous graduate technology class.

Arbaugh (2000) utilized a seven point Likert scale to survey students in multiple internet-based MBA classes. Results showed that the flexibility of the courses and the level of interaction within the classes were good predictors of student satisfaction.
Richards and Ridley (1997) used a survey to confirm that students were satisfied with online computer-managed instruction because it solved their problems of time and scheduling barriers.

Lia-Hoagberg et al. (1999) used a Likert scale survey to show student satisfaction with ITV instruction averaged more than 4 on a scale of 1-5 where 5 is the highest level of satisfaction. Distance education students actually rated their satisfaction higher than students in the face to face classroom.

Carter (1997) used a questionnaire to measure student attitude about ITV compressed video courses. Conclusions from this study showed students approved of the ITV classes, needed to feel included in the class from remote sites, and were dissatisfied if the technology had many problems.

Paul Biner, Kimberly Welsh, Natalie Barone, Raymond Dean and occasional other researchers have collaborated on multiple studies of distance education students’ satisfaction (1997a, 1997b). They frequently used the TEQ which was specifically created to measure DE student satisfaction and uses a five-point Likert scale. One of the predictors of student satisfaction included class size at remote sites, meaning that smaller classes tended to be more satisfying for students (Biner et al., 1997b). These students also tended to get better grades than they had in previous courses. Biner et al. (1997a) found that the faster an instructor responded to students, the more satisfied the students were with the course. If instructors took a week or more to grade and return assignments there was lower student satisfaction. When materials were responded to in 5 or 6 days student satisfaction rose. Satisfaction with the technology used for the class tended to predict higher satisfaction with the course overall. And students tended to be more
satisfied if they were doing better work and getting better grades in the course than they had done in previous courses. Biner is a strong proponent of continuous attitude measurement of DE students as he feels the level of satisfaction is the best indicator of course satisfaction and continued enrollment in such programs.

Those studies with quantitative data produced useful statistics and measurements of many quantifiable questions. The goal of this study was to learn how CDP students' personal views of their reality might be similar to or different from the reality of others in the same program—UWSP's CDP. While quantifiable information is helpful in using demographic data to create a description of an “average” student or a student population, quantifiable data would not provide the “lived experience” information necessary for theory building (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Once a qualitative research method was chosen, the decision to use interviews with open-ended questions was the most economical or elegant means of gathering the needed information on these students' lived experiences and perceptions of their reality. As Charmaz (2002, p. 676) notes, “Qualitative interviewing provides an open-ended, in-depth exploration of an aspect of life about which the interviewee has substantial experience, often combined with considerable insight.” It was this insight which would provide in-depth lived experience responses necessary to avoid reliance on a preconceived list of multiple choice answers. The results needed to “emerge” from the data to be useful in the grounded theory development techniques used to code data. This could not happen with the use of presupposed or prescribed multiple choice answers as utilized by previous studies, nor by the use of the experiences of the researcher.
The gathering of 16 subjects’ unique interpretations of “what is going on here” allowed the painting of a group picture where each participant selected which details to communicate, the level of emphasis to place on different elements of their experiences, and the personal coloring of their responses with previous knowledge and experiences and emotions or feelings. The best way to accomplish these goals was by using in-depth interviews to allow the subjects to communicate openly. The data could then be examined with the grounded theory techniques for data coding as described by Strauss and Corbin (1998). Grounded theory methods of analysis of the interview transcripts allowed the researcher to discover common themes in subjects’ reports of their experiences, their goals and desires, and their belief in the importance of a college degree.

The open communication of patterns of experience and expression found in the subjects’ answers allowed the coding of the data into primary and secondary themes with one central theme running throughout (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). This was the method which would allow the CDP students the strongest “voice” in the interpretation of the data while still allowing the creation of primary and secondary themes to explain the reality which emerged from the data.

**The Sample Subjects**

The only way to get a definitive statement about UWSP’s CDP students is to contact all of them, which has currently only been done by survey. However, survey data would not provide the personal views needed for grounded theory methods of analysis. The realistic alternative was a series of in-depth interviews with 16 CDP students, which
provided a sample of about 10% of the lists of 142 students taking CDP classes (See Appendix J).

The students who agreed to be interviewed face to face were chosen in an unplanned order from a list of students who were enrolled in CDP classes for the 2000-2001 academic year. The sample group was a semi-stratified representative convenience sample. An attempt was made to provide some variety in the group of subjects by selecting students from all three campuses, of both sexes, and of a wide age range. This group included six Marshfield students, four Wausau students, and six Stevens Point students. There were nine women and seven men in the group.

Subjects were in different stages in their CDP completion. Serendipitously, there were a variety of stages in the progress of earning the degree represented. Two subjects (one male, one female) had recently graduated from the CDP. Three hoped to graduate within a semester or two of when they were interviewed. Eight people were well-acquainted with the program, but had more than two semesters of work left. Two were very new to the program, with a third person almost as new to it, and these three had many courses to complete before graduating.

Subjects represented about five decades of ages. Ages of students varied from three in their late teens to early 20s to one person nearing retirement. Almost all of the interviewees (14) worked fulltime outside the home. Many of them reported working more than 40 to 45 hours per week on a regular and ongoing basis. One worked part-time, and one did not work outside the home.

Many subjects had responsibility for dependents. Three were single or divorced mothers with one or more children living at home. Five were single with no children.
One was married with no children living at home. Seven were married with one or more children living at home. One subject mentioned responsibility for an aging parent.

Everyone spoke of time constraints as an important factor in being interested in the CDP, and working fulltime was high on the list of things which required this attention to time. The greatest number of interviewees (13) considered their jobs to be "professional" or "middle management" or "a career" and believed their experiences in the world of work, what they sometimes termed "the real world," had added to their ability to succeed, their determination to get their degree, and their uniqueness in the college marketplace.

The researcher looked for individuals who were dissatisfied with the program to attempt to represent all views, but no one was able to think of people who were very dissatisfied with the program, even though students, administrative staff, and advisors were asked for help in locating even one very dissatisfied CDP student. Some people had some complaints, but none serious enough to deter them from continuing in the program. Two subjects knew people who had left the program, or taken a semester off, but the reasons they left were because of relocation, lack of money, family responsibilities, or health problems. No one the researcher had contact with seemed to know of anyone who had quit the CDP in anger or dissatisfaction.

With this background information stated, the primary and secondary themes which emerged from the data may be more understandable.

**Grounded Theory Rationale**

The intent behind this study was to get CDP students to communicate—to talk about themselves, about their personal experiences with the CDP, and about the value the
CDP has (and could have) for them. From this data it was possible to learn what characteristics CDP students share (who they are), why they are using the CDP (and why they want a college degree), and how they talk about the CDP (whether it is meeting their needs, whether it needs improvement, whether they would recommend it to others). The research activities and the questions used in the interviews were approved by the Human Subjects Review Board at UWSP. Subjects were given the necessary information to assure them of this, and each signed consent forms agreeing to allow their interview to be audio-taped to assure accurate collection of the data. To accomplish this data gathering the researcher used open-ended interview questions in a one on one, face to face setting. The list had 16 interview questions, but additional “probing” questions were asked to encourage subjects to elaborate when it seemed appropriate. (See Appendix A for interview questions and Appendix B for consent form.)

Once the interviews were completed and transcribed, the researcher read each one again in its entirety. Almost immediately there were some elements which were like a chorus of voices saying the same things. During the first reading the researcher compared answers question by question to allow the most obvious similarities to become apparent. There were patterns and themes which became apparent almost immediately. For example, the reasons for wanting a college degree varied by individual, but most subjects listed multiple reasons. (See Appendices F and G.) It was possible to group these reasons into three loosely related categories. These categories related to one of three motivations: internal motivations of personal value for education and personal advancement (such as self-esteem), familial values shared with or contrasted from others’ educational values (siblings, parents, and children), and practical or societal reasons
As the categories were developed and more clearly defined it was possible to see they were all related to the importance of a college degree to this population. After the emerging of categories and primary themes from the data during open coding, a second reading helped to refine and differentiate the categories from each other, and to define subcategories and secondary themes.

The second reading of the data promoted the differentiation from and linking of secondary themes to primary themes. This was assisted by microanalysis of key phrases found in any answer to any question within the interview transcriptions, and by trying out different descriptive labels for these ideas. During the creation of categories and subcategories it was interesting and helpful to try reversing the category with the subcategory to see what difference it would make to have one subordinate to or superordinate to the others. Diagrams of how themes were related to each other and memos of ideas which occurred to the researcher while examining the data were also helpful in creating and defining possible connections between each of the primary themes and secondary themes.

In these ways, and through axial coding (Strauss and Corbin, 1998) of the commonalities between the themes, it became apparent there was one central theme, UNIQUE, which ran through every aspect of the study. Without the “time and place bound” characteristics of CDP students they would not be a unique population. Closely joined to and intricately related through subcategories and secondary themes were two other major themes, IMPORTANCE and CDP=SPECIAL HELP. If a college degree was not important to this unique population most of them would probably not take CDP classes. If the CDP did not offer special help to this unique population most of these
subjects say they would not attempt to complete a degree. And, to come full circle, if this was not a unique population they would not need the CDP's special help.

These three primary themes, the central theme UNIQUE and the themes IMPORTANCE and CDP=SPECIAL HELP formed what could be termed the "triumvirate" of major basic themes for this study. The interaction of this triumvirate of major themes produced the remaining two major themes, DICHOTOMY OF THOUGHT and ADVICE. In other words, because CDP students are in uniquely constrained (time and place bound) realities, the importance of a college degree to them requires that they seek the special help of a CDP for them to be able to accomplish their goal of achieving a UW-System bachelor's degree. These interlocking major themes produce the remaining two major themes because the desire for the degree creates a seeking for alternatives for requirements and a seeking of more help than is currently available as part of the CDP. This leads to the DICHOTOMY of continued value of and gratitude for the CDP as it is, with thoughts about what else could be helpful to people in this constrained (time and place bound) reality. From this dichotomy of gratitude and desire for more help come ideas for professors and administrators to consider about how to meet CDP students' additional needs more effectively. The value of this program to these students is then translated into the ADVICE they give to others about considering and entering the program themselves. The value of the CDP is something they want others to discover and to experience for themselves.

During the axial coding phases sub-categories' and secondary themes' links became evident as analysis progressed with questions about why and under what conditions the major themes were most apparent, and how they were both differentiated
from and inextricably linked with each other. Several of the secondary themes show
links to multiple major themes, forming pathways of connectivity. For example,
subcategories under CDP=SPECIAL HELP cover help which is Available and
Unavailable. The help which is available coincides strongly with good things subjects
tell potential CDP students about why they should try the program.

Summary

The kinds of research done in the past on student satisfaction with
collaborative/consortial/cooperative programs has relied heavily on data gathered via
forced-choice survey style questionnaires. While survey style research has shown that
collaborative/consortial/cooperative programs are useful to students, the kind of in-depth
contributions of student experiences and beliefs are missing from that literature.

This study contributes a unique look at the “lived experience” of 16 of UWSP’s
CDP students. While nothing in this study can be used statistically to prove anything, it
does provide a beginning, a look at the total experience of some of the individuals who
have chosen to use the CDP to earn a bachelor’s degree, and perhaps to complete a
dream.

From the rudimentary beginnings of theories on what causes students to choose
UWSP’s Collaborative Degree Program to earn a bachelor’s degree, there might be some
ideas which could prove useful to others who may wish to conduct this kind of qualitative
research about this CDP program and other collaborative/consortial/cooperative programs
in regard to students’ “lived experience,” values, and desires within these programs.
Chapter three will build upon material from chapter two to discuss the findings, the themes discovered, and the process of arriving at these themes through grounded theory techniques used in the analysis of the data from this research.
Chapter Three

The Story Behind the Story

In Central Wisconsin, in towns with two-year UW-Colleges, there are people taking classes on campus and earning bachelor's degrees without traveling to the four-year degree granting UW institutions. A decade ago this was not possible. The Collaborative Degree Program through UW-Stevens Point offers adult students the opportunity to complete their baccalaureate degree without giving up their day jobs, without moving far from home and family, and without commuting for hours everyday.

What impact could this have on the people of Central Wisconsin? The impact on the population as a whole remains to be seen, and perhaps chronicled at some point by sociologists. However, the impact on individuals who are able to take advantage of this CDP opportunity can at least be hinted at by the input from 16 CDP students who agreed to be interviewed and tell their views of, and experience with, this program.

The results of their shared views about the program and its professors and advisors, their suggestions for how the program might be more helpful, and their encouragement for other potential CDP students form the basis for the results and themes discussed in this chapter.

The research questions for this study offered subjects the opportunity to share their reality and to speculate on how that reality could be changed, and also how useful that reality might be to others. The research questions are repeated here to more easily relate them to the results.

4. Who are the people who are utilizing UWSP's CDP?
5. Why are these people utilizing this CDP?
   a. Why do they want a college degree?
   b. Why choose this CDP rather than a traditional degree program?

6. How do the people who utilize this CDP speak of it?
   a. Why will they continue/not continue to use it?
   b. How do they talk about it when speaking to others?

There were five major themes which emerged from the data gathered from the 16 interviews (See Appendix E). The central theme, UNIQUE, was closely joined with two other major themes, IMPORTANCE and CDP=SPECIAL HELP by related subcategories. These first three, the triumvirate of “what is now” themes, describe the current shared reality talked about by the interviewees. They will be discussed first. (See Concept Map Appendix C.)

The remaining two primary themes, four and five, are interviewees’ suggestions as to what “might be.” Theme four, DICHOTOMY OF THOUGHT, delineates “wish lists” of suggestions directed to professors and administrators. Theme five, ADVICE, reports how interviewees talk, or would talk, about the program with potential CDP students. These results are reported after the triumvirate of “what is now” themes.

**Who are the People Who Are Utilizing UWSP’s CDP?**

The results of this study show there is a unique group of time and place bound adults who strongly desire a college degree, but need the convenience of upper level college classes at a time and a place which do not conflict with their many adult responsibilities. UWSP’s Collaborative Degree Program is an important option for these people, an option which has become labeled a “necessity” by the majority of the 16
interviewees participating in the program. The first major theme, UNIQUE, describes these “time and place bound Central Wisconsin adults who are not the typical traditional students.” This theme echoes through other themes and is the strong factor which ties everything together. It is closely related to the other major themes which emerged from the data. They reflect back to and are derived from this central most unifying primary theme, UNIQUE (Appendix E).

**UNIQUE—Talk About Time and Place Bound Students**

The subjects in this study are all time and place bound for one or more reasons. Fifteen of the 16 have jobs/careers and 12 have family responsibilities. Four of those 12 report babysitting problems. Thirteen of the 16 labeled themselves “nontraditional” and 10 said they are “not just out of high school” to indicate they are mature adults with responsibilities and commitments in the world outside the classroom. For example, one person stated,

[During group projects] You had to work with other people and it kind of gave you a little bit of a background on how some people live in the real world, and it’s different in this program because most of the people are adults, and work besides, and also they’ve had a lot of experience in life.

They’re not just right out of high school.

One subject spoke of his multiple commitments and how nontraditional CDP students approach their classes.

It’s hectic being a fulltime worker, a fulltime dad, and yet being a student.

This CDP...the way the nontraditional students approach it is really more like a master’s course. ...we relate to each other, we’re going through the
same struggles. We all have families, jobs, things that we need to do. It's a lot more meaningful for me to be a student right now and to be finishing my degree at age 32 than what it was when I was 18, 19 years old.

Seven subjects said if it were not for the CDP they would not be able to work towards their bachelor's degree. An additional seven subjects said the CDP was very helpful in their ability to work towards a degree. All of the Marshfield and Wausau subjects (10 of 10) said if they had to commute to UWSP they might not even try it, or it would take them much longer to complete the degree, if they succeeded at all. Four of the people from Marshfield and Wausau had actually tried commuting to UWSP and another one had attended classes at UW-Eau Claire, but all but one of them gave it up as too difficult. Only one traditional aged Wausau student said she might have to return to commuting to UWSP because some of the CDP classes had lower level Accounting class prerequisites she could not get through the CDP at the Wausau campus. Not surprisingly, none of the Stevens Point subjects stated that commuting would prevent them from getting their degree. Because they attend classes at UWSP, the location of CDP classes at Wausau and Marshfield is not an advantage for them.

**UNIQUE—Life Experience/Knowledge**

The CDP students see themselves as "different from" other college students in another important way. It is easy to use the current buzzword "nontraditional" to encompass many of the differences, and some of them do, but these people see themselves as different in some specific ways besides having jobs and families. Not one person claimed traditional college student status, though three of them could have by age at least. There was pride as they said they were a part of this special group, in a special
situation. One subject in her 40s described an important difference between CDP and traditional students. A subject in middle management shares the identity of the group views on how the CDP students are better prepared for coursework than traditional students.

Most of the CDP students are nontraditional. There is a greater maturity level, and the interaction is, I’m trying to think how to describe it...a lot more valuable? It’s more life-sharing...a deeper level of interaction.... Questions coming from nontraditional students are...very much related to life, and very practical. But, deep. With traditional students it’s more theoretical or more abstract...less experience to speak from. (M1)

The CDP students say they are better equipped to understand the class material, to understand what the professor wants. A subject in middle management shares a common view of CDP students about themselves. They believe they are better prepared for coursework than traditional students because of their life and work experience.

The schoolwork is actually easier than when we were 19 or 20. The time constraint with family, work, and everything else that’s going on, being out in the world and experiencing life you’re able to, I think, better understand what the professor is looking for. You can kind of figure out that’s the important part, and that’s the important part, and that’s the important part—concentrate on that, not just be a 19 year old and read all 700 pages and not understand any of it. It’s just easier to understand what the professor is looking for. (S14)
Another comment about the common identity of the CDP students is contributed by a fulltime working woman who speaks from her personal experience in the CDP classes.

Since the audience is basically different between regular students and CDP program, I find that I enjoy the CDP classes more. All of us are older, in a professional position, working. The emphasis is a bit different than when you’re in a class with people who are between 20 and 23. I mean, they just don’t have the experience or knowledge. (S10)

CDP students do not want to be mistaken for traditional students because of firsthand experience with rudeness and immature behavior of a few younger students.

One CDP student dreads taking classes where he is the only “adult” student.

I kind of dread going into a classroom full of 18 year olds where I’m the only one that’s an adult, or there is one other person [adult] there. I took a 100 class—all freshmen—and you get a lot of snide remarks and stuff from the back, you know, people who probably are just there for their freshman year to see what it’s like, and not back for their sophomore year. But, when I’m primarily surrounded with adults, it’s a good experience. (S8)

Another CDP student was appalled by the rude behavior of a few traditional students toward a professor. She made a disapproving face as she told about an experience she did not want to repeat.

I was in my last semester class, which was a sophomore level class, with actual college kids? It was not a pleasant experience. I was just appalled at how obnoxious, and how rude they were to the professor—just get up
and walk out of class when they decided they were tired of being there. I was...just appalled. (M16)

In general, CDP students prefer being in classes with each other more than with traditional students. This reflects a group identity which bridges between subjects of different ages and varied backgrounds.

Well...most of the people in the CDP, are professional or semi-professional people, are in [a job] probably 80% of the population would consider a successful career already...making a good income, they’ve got a house, a car, and they’ve got what most people want. They’re lower or even middle management people who know that they’ve hit the ceiling with the degree that they have.... CDP students want their education, I think more than a traditional student does. (M11)

This is an important part of their identification with each other, their unique identity which encompasses both their time and place bound status as well as their belief in their enhanced abilities to bring knowledge and experience to their college classes. This UNIQUE situation helps to make getting a college degree both challenging and of great importance to these subjects. Having to manage multiple priorities makes the things people choose to spend time on more important to them.

**IMPORTANCE—College Degree as a Necessity**

The second primary theme to emerge from the data described the IMPORTANCE of obtaining a college degree, seeing a “college degree as a necessity.” This was closely tied to the UNIQUE theme. For most of the interviewees a college degree is now
described as a necessity, perhaps because the CDP makes it seem possible. The importance of a college degree was reiterated by all 16 subjects. Reasons for the importance of a bachelor's degree fell into three categories: Personal, Familial, and Societal reasons. All of the interviewees had at least one category of reasons to get a bachelor's degree. Eight subjects had reasons in two categories. Seven subjects had reasons in all three categories.

**IMPORTANCE—Talk About Personal Reasons**

Within these three categories were sub-categories. Personal reasons included Self-Esteem, the Value of an Education, and Interrupted Degrees. Self-esteem was cited by half of all subjects (eight) as the source of important reasons for wanting a college degree. For example, one subject wanted to get a degree because friends had their degrees. This person's quote highlights this desire to enhance self-esteem by making comparisons with friends.

I wanted to better myself, to *feel* better about myself. I guess high school education isn't looked upon the way it used to be. I mean, anybody can graduate from high school these days, you know. Part of it was social, not as in social interaction, but all my friends were going to get their degrees, and I wanted to feel equal. (M4)

Another sub-category of personal reasons for wanting a college degree is simply valuing education. Five subjects cited the Value of an Education, valuing education for education's sake, and because no one could "take it away" once you had it. On the value of education for the sake of education, one subject talked about lifelong learning. "I guess it would be a very personal goal. Education was very important to life learning and
life education and I graduated [from high school] in 1977 so I’ve been back to school a number of times since then.” (M1)

Another subject explained that education is a big priority for her because it is a permanent life goal. Once achieved it cannot be taken away. “A college education is something they can’t ever take away from you. Once you have it, it’s yours, no matter what you do. You could become a criminal if you wanted to. If you have that piece of paper that says you have a college education, it’s yours.” (W3)

The third sub-category, Interrupted Degree, was cited as a personal reason to complete a college degree. Subjects used descriptors like “driving force” and “unfinished business” when discussing these reasons. Six subjects had begun a college degree program at an earlier time, but had been forced to leave before finishing because of reasons which fell within the Interrupted Degree sub-category. Interruption factors included the need to work for more money, marriage, pregnancy, and being too young to really know what to study.

One subject talked about a life event which interrupted her nearly completed college degree and her “driving force” desire to go back to complete it. “It’s always been a driving force. I went through almost my junior year, and I got pregnant.” (S9)

Another subject described an initial delay in beginning a college degree followed by a later interruption in the degree earning process. “Well, I had gone right after high school into the Marine Corps, and then from the Marine Corps I went to UWSP from 1977 to 1980 and I dropped out. It was like, I wanted to go back and complete something that I had quit on.” (S8)
This subject shared an honest assessment of youthful indecision contributing to a delay in completing a college education. “Out of high school I went to college a couple of years and couldn’t decide what I wanted to do, and I needed to work…. I just don’t think I was mature enough to find what I really wanted.” (M1)

Self-esteem sub-categories are mostly stated as straightforward, well-defined events or situations. Familial reasons are often complex, inter-generational relationships with emotional overtones and undertones. Pride in parents, siblings, self, partners, and children is sometimes evident and spoken, and sometimes just implied by the context.

**IMPORTANCE—Talk About Familial Reasons**

Familial reasons for wanting a college degree have to do with valuing family. Some comments indicated a need to keep up with other family members. Other comments indicated a desire to advance beyond what others in the family had achieved. Familial reasons for wanting a college degree has sub-categories of Parents, Siblings, Children, and Spouses. Familial reasons were usually about wanting to keep up with, or catch up with, a parent, spouse, or sibling(s). Alternatively, a degree was desired because a parent (or another family member) had not had a chance to get a degree. The other most notable goal was to influence one’s child (or another family member), to serve as an “inspiration” to them to get their own degree. Parental reasons (parent did or did not have a degree) were cited by six subjects. One of the subjects cited a desire to fulfill her parents’ unmet goals and dreams and also to keep up or catch up with her siblings.

My dad never finished his college degree. My mom has really been the education person in our family. She never graduated from high school.

All of us [children] have had some post-secondary classes. Two of my
siblings have graduated from college. Three of them graduated from tech
school. And I'm still working on mine. And I'm the oldest! (S9)

Sibling reasons were cited by four subjects. Some of them indicated they were
keeping score in a way—“this sibling does (does not) have a degree and I will have mine
soon too.” This sub-category did not always have a competitive connotation as some
wished to encourage their siblings and other family members by their achievement, by
showing it could be done. Often familial reasons were multi-generational, involving
siblings, parents, and the “next generation” in a real life complexity of reasons as voiced
by one recent graduate.

My siblings, my parents, nobody has a four year degree. I have a nephew
now who’s in college. I have three nieces who are just about to their 20’s
and two nieces who are, one’s 5 and one’s 2. Right now I’m the highlight
because I’m “the graduate.” I hate to say it because I love my father
dearly, but there is, you know, “I hope you’re not wasting your money!”

So that was another reason I had to finish this—to prove him wrong!

(laughter)  (M4)

Children and Spouse sub-categories were mentioned four times by subjects as
reasons to get a college degree. All four subjects mentioned children as a reason to get a
degree. Two mentioned Spouse achievement of a degree. This subject shares a
combination of child and spouse reasons.

I think even the bigger one [reason to get a degree] was when my daughter
was born. My wife has her college degree and I wanted my college degree
because some day I’d like to tell my daughter, “You WILL get your
college degree. Your mother and father have it.” A role model for my child. (M13)

No matter how many or how few family members were named, the interest in fulfilling personal and family dreams and potentials ran through answers of each sub-category in this Familial category.

**IMPORTANCE—Talk About Societal Reasons**

Societal reasons for getting a college degree focus on bettering subjects’ chances of success. For some, success is getting a better job or position. For others, success is creating the potential for advancement with somewhat vague “opening door” goals. For five subjects success was being able to move on to more advanced degree earning. Societal sub-categories of reasons included Job/Piece of Paper, Advanced Degree (going on for more education), and Opening Doors. Societal reasons for wanting a bachelor’s degree often focused on job potential, being hired for better or different jobs, or advancing in a job currently held. Some did say they just wanted “that piece of paper.”

Half of the subjects chose Job/Piece of Paper reasons for wanting a college degree. Their words show evidence of their expectations for bettering their job opportunities by earning a bachelor’s degree through the CDP (Appendices F and G).

One woman was very clear that the CDP was necessary to her plans to get better jobs by earning a degree. She had tried commuting to Stevens Point, but had to give it up since she couldn’t make a living while commuting. She describes why she began using the CDP to earn a bachelor’s degree. “In the beginning it was because I didn’t like the jobs I was able to get without one [a degree]. I wanted to be more than a waitress or a bartender.” (M4)
A slightly more general statement of why a college degree was a necessity came from someone with a job he was currently happy in, but who felt he would like to advance to some level of management in the future. “Managementwise I’m not going to get any higher than I am without at least my bachelor’s degree.” (M11)

The availability of CDP classes was very important to a third subject who was warned by his employer to get a degree or give up hope of advancement. He was doing his best to complete the program in the quickest way possible by taking some courses online, and others in the daytime. “Basically work has pretty much laid down if you don’t have your four year, you’re not getting promoted. Work is willing to pay for it. I’m willing to put in the time.” (S14)

The next set of quotes are somewhat job related, but also speak of the college degree as part of a contingency plan, Opening Doors for the future. The subjects’ words focus on some vague potential options which could be opened to CDP students who complete the program. One interviewee is making a big change in her life with the help of the CDP classes offered in her town. “I decided I want to change my focus, focus of what I want to be doing [as a career]. So, I’m going back to school. It was the option.” (M16)

Another subject has the hope of some doors opening as a result of getting her bachelor’s degree. She attends the CDP classes after work and has just enough time to reach the campus before classes start for the evening. She noted people at work are very interested in her progress toward completing her degree. “I do hope with getting a degree it would open some new doors.” (M1)
A single parent plans to provide for her family with the help of a college degree. She has both childcare and medical concerns which make the CDP a helpful option through timing of the classes—meeting once a week in the evening. “I feel that I have good skills, but I don’t have the education to back that up. When my child support and maintenance ends...I’ll have the skills to support myself.” (S6)

A few subjects mentioned their desire to pursue an Advanced Degree after completing their bachelor’s degree. Their focus is on achieving more advanced degrees on completion of a CDP degree. One subject already plans to get a master’s degree after finishing the CDP degree. The location and timing of the CDP classes is helping him earn the bachelor’s degree he needs to move on to the masters.

Getting my bachelor’s degree will for me be significant. I’ll be happy I got it, but my goal is farther than that. I know that someday I will probably have my master’s degree. I’ll probably work toward my MBA at some point. (M1)

Another subject considers going to graduate school using the CDP degree as a stepping stone, but has not decided all of the specifics yet. The CDP opportunity has given her a reason to look ahead to what else she can do in the future for further education.

I do [consider going on to graduate school]. I don’t know which area I would [study], that would be the thing I’d have to research, but I guess I do think of my degree as a kind of stepping stone. Maybe go to graduate school...just see what opens up, what I find that I like. (M1)

It is important to note that many subjects had multiple reasons in multiple categories, or multiple reasons within single sub-categories as to the IMPORTANCE of
getting a college degree. Almost every interviewee named reasons from more than one category—family and self-esteem, societal and family, or self-esteem and societal. Six subjects named reasons from all three categories. Fifty-one reasons were given by 16 subjects across all sub-categories of reasons a college degree was important to them. One thing that came through loud and clear was the significance each of these subjects places on earning a bachelor’s degree. This is obviously an identity-enhancing point of power for these people.

**CDP=SPECIAL HELP**

A third primary theme from the data, CDP=SPECIAL HELP, is that because CDP students are not traditional college students they “need special help” in working toward and attaining their bachelor’s degree (Appendix E). The reasons subjects utilize the CDP are their UNIQUE population characteristics, the IMPORTANCE to them of getting a college degree (for reasons discussed in the previous sections), and that the CDP is one avenue of SPECIAL HELP to these adult students. The CDP=SPECIAL HELP theme stresses the Importance of the CDP (secondary theme) and describes the CDP’s importance to people in Central Wisconsin who are time and place bound and who want to get a bachelor’s degree from the University of Wisconsin System. (This is closely linked to the primary theme IMPORTANCE as the CDP is seen as the vehicle for completion of the degree.) One evidence of the importance of the CDP to this group of students is every one of the 16 interviewees shared his or her opinion that the CDP was an important and wonderful tool. Two people pointed out the UW-System degree had more portability and “prestige” than some non-UW degrees. These people said there would be more possibility of acquiring advanced degrees later by achieving a UW-System degree.
This appreciation for the *Importance of the CDP* is a strong secondary theme which weaves between the CDP=SPECIAL HELP theme’s categories of *Access* and *Helpers*, and also runs through answers to multiple interview questions. For example, a woman who had tried driving to UW-Stevens Point to take classes had to give it up in order to make a living. She sums up the consensus of CDP subjects’ opinions on the *Importance of the CDP* as far as Access to working people.

Oh, that’s HUGE! A lot of the people who are in the Collaborative Degree Program are Clinic employees. Well, you work from 8 to 5. When are you going to drive to Point to go to classes? You’re not! Here you can get done, you go to class from 5 to 7, and you’re three miles from home. I mean, that is THE reason why I got my degree is because it was offered here at this campus which was four miles from here [her workplace]. There’s just no way I could have gotten a bachelor’s [degree] from Point or Eau Claire. I couldn’t have driven it. (M4)

The CDP=SPECIAL HELP primary theme is divided into *Access, Helpers,* and *Technology* secondary themes. *Access* subcategories are Access-Night Classes (time of day accessibility) and Access-Local Campus (proximity of location accessibility). Helpers to CDP students with time and place bound problems sub-categories are CDP Advisors and CDP Professors. Technology is recognized as necessary to the functioning of the CDP on both two-year campuses. Each of these is addressed separately in the text which follows.
As noted previously, accessibility is a described as a “huge” factor in helping these UNI奎UE time and place bound subjects earn a degree. The time and place bound elements of the subjects’ lives make the time and place elements of easy access a requirement for them. Fourteen of the 16 subjects work 40 to 45 hours every week. Add a family, a home to care for, and social requirements, and it is logical that these people need special help to access this program.

CDP students from all three campuses recognize the value of having classes offered in the evening. Access to Night Classes is mentioned as very important by 12 of 16 subjects. Marshfield and Wausau students are of course more likely to mention the value of having classes brought to a campus near them since UWSP is the four-year institution granting the degree. Access to classes at the Local Campus is mentioned as very important by all 10 (10 of 10) of the Wausau and Marshfield subjects. No Stevens Point subjects mentioned Access to a local campus because they are using the four-year site at UWSP, so the CDP does not change their commuting distance. Ten responses mention campus proximity and 12 responses mention time of classes as factors that make it possible for subjects to participate in the CDP courses. The following testimonials illustrate these values.

A fulltime worker and father expressed appreciation for the ability to access CDP classes in his town. He explained why he values the CDP’s local proximity when he said, “I don’t have to drive anywhere. I think the easiest thing about the program is knowing that it’s on a campus right here for me.” (M11)
Another fulltime worker and father who had previously tried commuting to Stevens Point classes said, “The fact that they’re bringing it to us, that we can stay in [city]. That’s the easiest part.” (M13)

A single working mother said the CDP’s accessibility was what made it possible for her to work towards her college degree. For her, the easiest part of the whole program was, “Bringing it to me instead of me having to go find it somewhere else. I couldn’t do it.” (W2)

A fulltime working professional woman shared and reiterated the above opinions when she said, “Well, the easiest part is not commuting when going to class. Going to evening class after work.” (M1)

This echoes the UNIQUE theme and illustrates subjects’ group identity. Every subject from Marshfield and Wausau shares the belief that not having to commute makes getting a degree possible. Three quarters of the subjects believe having classes at night makes getting a degree possible. Because both the local access and night class times are made possible by the CDP, they say they cannot get a degree without the CDP.

**CDP=SPECIAL HELP—Talk About the Value of CDP Helpers**

In addition to the accessibility of the CDP, the help provided by both Advisors and Professors was praised and valued. Fifteen of 16 subjects praised CDP Advisors saying they were very available for a great deal of Special Help. One topic almost everyone is appreciative about is the assistance provided by the CDP advisors of the program on all three campuses. It is clear these advisors are integral to the students’ understanding of the program’s functioning and are perceived by these subjects as necessary to their success in the program.
When CDP students were asked if there was someone who helped them if they had difficulties, the most frequent and almost exclusive response was their CDP advisor. Fifteen of 16 respondents named and praised their advisors.

Praise and Comments About CDP Advisors

Subjects praised the CDP advisors at length and in detail. They are described as integral to the success of the program and the CDP students. Reasons for their indispensability include: sharing knowledge about the program and the cycling of classes, saving CDP students' time by helping them select classes and registering them for those classes, and personally investing in the success of their CDP students.

Each of the four CDP advisors had people praising them and explaining the many services the advisors provided these UNIQUE time and place bound students. Advisor A has a personal investment in the success of the CDP students from his campus. Their appreciation for all he does for them is obvious in the following quote from a CDP student who recently graduated from the program. She does not think she could have completed her degree without his help selecting classes from the cycle, figuring out a plan for her to follow, and showing genuine concern and support for her and the other CDP students at his campus from his own personal experience.

He’d show up before [class] and just talk to people and see what’s going on. He took classes while working fulltime too and finished a degree, [so] he could relate to us. Honestly, I don’t think that program would have been as successful as it was in [city] if it wasn’t for [advisor A]. There were so many things that he [did], I mean he would get your degree progress report and say, “You have this, this, and this, that you can pick up
this semester. Otherwise you’re going to have to wait three semesters.”

You didn’t have to sit and figure it out on your own. He knew what was coming up in future semesters. He did so much of the work that honestly, I don’t know if we would have had time to do. I work 45 hours a week minimum, and I know a lot of other people do too. (M4)

Advisor B went far out of her way to assist a student from another campus. She drove more than 30 miles to advise a potential student who was interested in the CDP, but uncertain what it was and how it worked. Advisor B evaluated previously earned credits, informed the student about the cycle of classes, and advised her on how to proceed. The interviewee expressed gratitude to Advisor B for her willingness to listen and for her encouragement and said of her,

She drove down here to [city]. What she did was help me get a schedule set up. She took my past credits and told me what classes I’d need to take to fulfill requirements—really sat down and explained a lot of things to me about the sequence of the courses. (S6)

Advisor C was praised for her persistence in contacting administrative people to get previously earned credits accepted into the program. She also helps her CDP students find and select classes which fit their plan to graduate from the CDP and even registers the students for the classes so they do not have to come to campus during daytime hours when they work.

[Advisor C]’s been making it really easy for me to be able to finish. She’ll go out and try to find classes that I need so that I can finish. I don’t have all this time to sift through it and go through the timetables all the time
trying to find classes that will fit or that will work in all the different areas.

She's even talked to one of the deans for me (I started in 1978), to look at
some of the classes that I had taken and see how they fit with the new
catalog. She's helped me get exempt from a few things because of classes
I had taken. (S9)

Another CDP student who works fulltime and has a spouse and children is nearing
graduation. This subject’s quote agrees with the previous subject’s comments and
affirms the value of Advisor C’s work with these CDP students. “[Advisor C]’s been a
big help—answers my questions, she does the scheduling for me too. I just talk to her
and tell her the classes that I need and she suggests these classes that she registers [me]
for.” (S5)

Advisor A was also recognized and appreciated for his availability and
promptness in reminding CDP students of deadlines they needed to meet to stay active in
the program. A student from his campus commented on how very helpful that was to her.

He helps us choose as far as reminding us when the deadlines are. Very
available by e-mail or phone call. Haven’t had any trouble reaching him.

Problems with professors or classes—he seems to have a handle on it.

You know, helping us get our classes lined up too. He’s very, very
personally involved in wanting us to succeed in the program. I just can’t
say enough good things about [Advisor A]. (M1)

A fulltime working father said, “[Advisor A], our advisor, has just been
instrumental, not only for myself, but for others in the program. Quite honestly I
wouldn’t be finishing [the CDP program] without him!” (M13)
A single mother who works outside the home talked about Advisor D's willingness to help her. When there was a family member in an accident the same day the interviewee needed to take a final, she called Advisor D in a panic. In the following quote she describes the situation and the helpful advice and action Advisor D chose.

She was just really a truly good support system. Like last Tuesday was our final for Dr. [X] and I missed it. That's when my sister got in her car accident and [Advisor D] said, "Don't worry about it. Go and do what you need to." And then Wednesday morning I went down and took it [the exam]. Well, rather than sit there and wait for my next exam she let me take it, take my next final. It was so helpful! She was always thinking about [saving me trips from city]. (W2)

A fulltime working father nearing graduation said, "Usually I lean pretty heavily on [Advisor C], as far as coming up with creative ways to try to get some credits without taking the classes." (laughter) (S14)

The help and support offered by these advisors to the CDP students has triggered this outpouring of appreciation and gratitude from subjects from every one of the three campuses. Fifteen out of 16 subjects could not praise these people enough.

Praise and Comments About CDP Professors

Professors were praised by CDP interviewees from every campus. However, Stevens Point subjects were far less likely to see CDP professors as special helpers as they see CDP advisors. These are the same professors who teach the traditional classes on the UW-Stevens Point campus, so they are a part of "business as usual" for Stevens
Point CDP students. However, CDP students from each of the three campuses did offer praise for the professors teaching in the CDP program.

Professors were praised for being humorous, for being good teachers, for being available for questions, for using group projects, for requiring parts of large projects to be done on a timetable, for using technology skillfully, and for being careful about when and how criticism is delivered. Often subjects praised professors for more than one helpful attribute. A few representative quotes follow. The first quote is from a technologically savvy CDP interviewee commenting on two professors who use technology skillfully, spice their lectures with humor, and have high expectations of their students.

We’ve had a couple of faculty that seem, like, fantastic. [Professor V] was great. [Professor Z] is fantastic—they’re very entertaining. That’s important when you’re in a compressed video class for three hours. The teachers who are really good, really get involved, use different technology: the web, the document camera. They get the class involved. [Professor Z], I’ve taken every class he’s offered because I like his style. But he was challenging too. I probably only have like a C+ or a B- average in his classes. He’s difficult, but I enjoyed the class. And I’d rather have a B- in class and enjoy [it] and get knowledge than get an A in a class and not remember anything that I learned. (M11)

A perhaps different view of what is desirable in a professor’s class material is shared by another CDP interviewee when she says,

I think the professor that we had for Religious Studies was very understanding of adults. He seems very accommodating and tried to make
our load interesting, educational, but not as structured as a traditional class would have been. I feel like we really gave a lot in that class. I can’t say there was minimal work because we did have a [lot to cover], internets, publications, like that. But he did it in a way that hit the highlights. He didn’t inundate us with a lot of triviality. That was really a neat way to present it. (S6)

This subject complained about too much work in another course and thought that professor did not know how to “run a CDP class.”

A CDP interviewee who has some strong opinions about how professors should treat their students shared a heartfelt story which left her both appreciative of her professor’s tact and amused at some students on the receiving end of a gentle rebuke.

[Professor Y] was always concerned about the students. When we first started having that nice weather? People would sneak out of the course when the break would come. Some of the kids, students, would sneak out and go home. One day he looked up and there were three students sitting in our classroom in [city], his biggest class. So, the next time he’s in [city] he goes, “Now I didn’t want to say this over the air because I didn’t want to embarrass you guys, but when I took your scores from your quiz last week, you guys had the lowest quiz total. Now, I think it could be that on these really nice days you guys are sneaking out, it could be important. I don’t want to scold you. You guys are all college students, you all have lives…. I just thought I would let you know that.” The way he did it was
so funny. You could tell you were getting scolded, but it was beautiful
that day too. We all stayed to the end. (W2)

A student who is pleased by the availability of professors’ coursework on
computers, by the availability of professors to answer questions, and by the timetables set
up by one particular professor to ensure completion of a complex project is quoted here.
Professors that I’ve dealt with have made sure things were available on the
computer you could download. They made sure we had a break [and
were] available during that break, if we needed help. When we had an
entrepreneurship class, he [Professor Y] made sure that he gave us time in
class to work on it. He was there at the beginning of class if we had
questions. And little bits of it [a business plan] were due every week so
that we wouldn’t try to make a 20 page business plan, get it done in one
weekend. He helped [us] work through it and we had to hand little bits of
it in, and we’d talk about it in class. Very, very helpful. (S9)

There were other quotes which echoed these. Humor was seen as especially
helpful by students in keeping them interested in the class material, and in assisting them
to remember material to answer questions on exams through humorous stories professors
told in class. Respectful treatment of CDP students as adults with special responsibilities
and high expectations of themselves was valued by students in interpersonal
communications from professors.

**CDP=SPECIAL HELP--Technology**

Technology was mentioned by seven subjects, all from Marshfield and Wausau
campuses (seven of 10). Once again, it is important to note that the students from
Wausau and Marshfield were aware of and appreciative of the use of technology to bring CDP classes to them via Interactive Video (ITV) because that technology gave them access to the classes from UW-Stevens Point. Stevens Point subjects did not mention the Technology subcategory because their access to the UWSP campus is not dependent on ITV technology. Some general comments about the helpfulness of the technology and those who use it follow. One CDP subject who must commute even to reach the campus she uses was very aware of how closely the technology had to be monitored to keep things operating efficiently. "The tech support at [city] is great too. As soon as the system would start acting up, because it does—it's technology, they were paying such close attention [that] as soon as the TV froze up, they were on the phone calling." (W2)

Another technologically aware interviewee expressed appreciation of the CDP's availability, and also hopes that there might be some internet classes available soon through the CDP. "Oh, now that it's being available, technology. Technology has made it [possible to have CDP classes]." (W3)

Another CDP interviewee is grateful for the ITV which carries the CDP courses from one campus to the other two, but also is happy to utilize the e-mail and internet capabilities for other contact with professors. He said of professors' assignments, "Plus now with the internet, they just e-mail it to you. And if you have something you have to submit to them you can just e-mail it as an attachment. Between the internet and having it [the CDP program] at this location, it's made it very helpful." (W7)

The Special Help—Technology category is less recognized than the Helpers and Access categories since the technology could easily become part of the background. People interacting with people are much more noticeable than an electronic function.
And not having to drive 35 miles one way to access classes or take off work to come to classes in the daytime is much more important than watching things on a screen.

**From “What Is” to “What Might Be”**

This completes the examination of the first three primary themes on the CDP and the participating students found in the data from the interviews. These three themes describe what is currently going on, the people who are taking part in the program, and the conditions and situations they experience. The remaining two major themes and their associated categories are products of the interaction of the first three primary themes.

From the “what is” now to the wishes and hopes of “what might be” a fourth primary theme arises. The three major themes discussed thus far, UNIQUE, IMPORTANCE, and CDP=SPECIAL HELP work together to produce the fourth major theme, DICHOTOMY OF THOUGHT. The “flip side of the coin” must be considered now. The information reported so far has shown the strength of students’ appreciation for and need of the CDP program. The need for non-CDP courses, respect, interaction, and technology improvements by time and place bound student is part of the resulting DICHOTOMY OF THOUGHT. There are aspects of need expressed which interviewees wish could be considered and met through the CDP. However, logically some of these needs may need to be met through some other, unspecified means.

**DICHOTOMY OF THOUGHT—CDP is Good, But Can It Be Better?**

Although the CDP is advertised as a Bachelor’s degree which can be completed once the Associate degree is achieved, several subjects expressed a “wish” that there could be additional assistance in completing coursework which they needed which was not part of the CDP offerings. More than one person expressed the desire for General
Degree Requirements to be offered at night so that people in the CDP could complete the degree without attending daytime classes. In addition to GDR classes, prerequisites for CDP courses in Economics and Accounting were also on this list. And a desire to complete non-CDP major and minor requirements at night was repeatedly expressed by some people, especially those who were not new to the program. One person mentioned that because CDP students are taxpayers, the university should provide whatever these people need to complete their degree (See Appendix H).

There are wishes which would influence how professors teach to CDP students as well as wishes on which professors are allowed to teach CDP courses. There are wishes on what courses are offered when, and requests for courses not part of the CDP program. There are wishes for different formats for courses, and suggestions which might be seen as diluting the value of the degree. Taken out of context, these suggestions could be misread as totally critical of the CDP and those who present the CDP classes. That would be a mistake. Again, every one of the 16 subjects praised the program and said they would “do it again” given the choice to make at the current time. It is important to recognize this as a “wish list” of things which “might be” as subjects begin to imagine what could make the CDP even more valuable to them.

The most striking examples of DICHOTOMY OF THOUGHT were found in some of the suggestions offered in response to a request for advice to administrators (See Appendix H). Students’ awareness of and perceptions of administrators of the CDP vary considerably. Some students gave advice which indicated their belief that the administrators could control professors and change policies for the UW-Stevens Point campus. Others were unaware that the professors are not running the program on their
own. Some students were supportive of attempts to correct technology problems as they arose. Others voiced the opinion that if the program is to grow and attract more students it is only common sense to invest in whatever it takes to make the technology as close to flawless as possible—and to make sure professors are well-schooled in using all of the technology available for use in the CDP. The wish list which relates to teaching and professors is presented before the wish list intended for administrators.

**Dichotomy of Thought—Wishlist for Professors**

The CDP students were excited about the opportunity to complete their bachelor’s degree at a local campus, the availability of multiple forms of help, and the chance to fulfill their dreams of having a bachelor’s degree. However, there were also points of some frustration, some desire for differences in teaching techniques/teaching style, some hoped for changes in professors’ attitudes toward the program and its students, and some suggestions for other evening offerings students say are needed for them to utilize the CDP to their greatest advantage. While they encourage others to join them in the CDP, they do have some thoughts on how things could be improved. They suggested changes to both Professors and Administrators (categories of DICHOTOMY OF THOUGHT).

Sub-categories of Professors include Respect CDP Nontrads, Teaching to Peers, Professor Patience, Consult Veteran CDP Professors, Professor Technical Problems, More Interaction, Less PowerPoint, Less Group Work, and Less Coursework.

The Respect CDP Nontrads sub-category relates directly back to the primary theme UNIQUE and its secondary theme *Life Experience/Knowledge*. The two sub-categories Nontraditional/Mature and Much to Offer are echoed in the Respect CDP Nontrads as the subjects once again state their need to be seen and validated as mature.
adults with many responsibilities and with much to offer. Seven of the subjects requested that professors have more Respect for CDP Nontraditional students. This was closely related to their concern over the rudeness of some nontraditional students as reported by some of the CDP subjects who had unpleasant experiences with being in class with traditional students. The personal group identity of the CDP students is that they are serious about their studies. They want to understand the course material, not just get through the course to accumulate credits. They are constrained by many adult responsibilities which are sometimes unavoidably more important financially or for their family than making it to one class period. And they expect to be treated as peers of the professors who teach them. If a professor must miss a class because of serious illness or unavoidable circumstances, students must understand. These people want that same understanding for themselves from the professors. One fulltime worker who is very serious about earning her degree encouraged the professors to recognize the kind of people they are teaching in the CDP.

One piece of advice is, don’t treat your students like traditional students. Have more respect for them...we are motivated to be there. [But] if we can’t be there, there is a definite reason that we’re not there and we’re going to do everything we can to get the information. (M1)

CDP subjects point out that they are mature adults who value the opportunity to use the CDP, but have many responsibilities. However, they choose to take college courses instead of spending their time and money elsewhere, they pay their own tuition, and they want to make it to every class session. If they miss a class, it is because they have childcare problems, work responsibilities, a traffic accident, or are extremely ill.
This request for recognition that professors are Teaching to Peers is articulated by a parent who works fulltime in a management position.

It’s kind of interesting. I think the professors learn as much as the students do. By that I mean, they’re so used to teaching to a traditional student audience, and just about every professor we’ve had so far has made some comment about “It’s so nice dealing with adults.” Basically those are our peers, you know? The professors that come in with the idea that they’re going to just lecture, just teach, really they get an eye-opening experience because they realize that, “Hey, these people are here to work with me, and we learn it from each other.” It's a lot better relationship than I ever had with a professor when I was a traditional student. (M13)

Three subjects also suggested professors who were new to the CDP Ask Veteran CDP Professors what to expect, how to use the technology, and how to treat the students in the CDP. One of them expressed it like this.

They need to maybe talk to other professors that [have] done the classes. I think other professors can share that, “Hey, you’re not teaching to a bunch of 18 year old kids, you’re talking to people that have been out there, that are in the business world, that understand real world activities.” (M11)

More Interaction was requested by six of the 16 interviewees. Although the CDP classrooms are technologically rich, they are still three classrooms separated both by physical distance and by the time it takes for sound to travel between them. A close corollary to the request for more interaction was the request by three of the 16 subjects for Less PowerPoint use. The youngest interviewees who commented on this situation
seemed most critical. A direct and specific request was made by an interviewee from the midrange of subject ages. She said, "Try to create a more interactive atmosphere." (W3)

A slightly older interviewee tried to be more encouraging and expressed understanding for the difficulties professors face. "We want to interact with you, we really do! And I know it's hard in that format." (S14)

One of the youngest of the subjects to comment on the interaction issue had some of the sharpest comments. His comment was very similar to one from another subject who is a traditional student age. He said,

The use of Power Point is way overdone. We think of it as lazy, lack of preparation, or lack of enthusiasm. When you've got the PowerPoint in front of you AND they've got it up there, it's like, well wait a minute. All you're doing is reading to me, slide fall! It seems like a waste when we could be doing more of the corresponding back and forth. It cuts out the interaction. (W15)

Professor Technical Problems (a lack of familiarity with the technology) were mentioned by nine of the 16 subjects. Subjects recognized the amount of patience needed to work with such a technologically diverse environment, and were aware of the learning curve phenomenon which professors often have to experience in this situation. The following quotes are from that group of suggestions. Interestingly, again the age of the interviewee seemed to influence the degree of criticism in the statement. The first quote is from an older student, one who had taken many CDP classes.

I think they do a fine job. To tell you the truth, sometimes they can give the appearance that they're a little bit disorganized, but that's just because
of the technology and all the glitches. Some of them should practice a little bit more instead of waiting till the first class before they get used to that technology. You can tell they forget to do certain things at the right time, like put a screen up or whatever. (S8)

A representative interviewee from the midrange of ages was also more understanding than the youngest who offered comments. “You could tell some of them weren’t used to the video. That does take some getting used to when you’re talking and then somebody’s interrupting you from, from outer space.” (S14)

The subjects closest to traditional aged students seemed least understanding of professors’ frustration over technical difficulties. As one very young subject put it, If it’s a program that you choose to participate in as the educator or as a student, you have to be willing to be patient with the technology. If you can’t have the patience then you might as well continue on with the traditional education system, traditional education atmosphere, because it’s technology. (W2)

Advice for Professors to have Patience with the technological glitches, the delay in microphone transmissions, and the delay in hearing questions from students was mentioned by one subject from each campus. One interviewee from the midrange of ages said of the problem with time delayed sound, “Just be patient I guess, with the questions. That’s the hardest thing because they’re used to seeing students....” (S14)

One of the youngest subjects had a difficult time with one instance of impatience when everything seemed to be going wrong for the professor. She told this story to encourage professors to have patience, even with themselves.
One UNfavorite moment was, one of the professors had a student ask a question, and I don’t believe the professor knew she was on the air, but she was on the actual personal cam, professor cam. And she was so frustrated, because she was so sick and she was trying to get all of this information in and really she should probably have just taken the night off. But she was trying to cram all this information in, coughing. She looked really peaked too. The professor got so annoyed. She just went off on a tangent…. It really didn’t make you want to ask anymore questions in her class for the rest of the semester. (W2)

The final “complaints” were from a minority of subjects. Two subjects requested Less Group Work because it was difficult to keep up their part in group projects and they worried about letting other students down. They worried that some other student(s) might have to do more of the work than they did. Three subjects said some professors try to cram too much into a course and suggested professors recognize that some things will remain undone and to plan what to leave out.

These subjects’ suggestions for professors show their major concerns are validation of their identity as mature, knowledgeable adults, interaction in the classes, and preventing the technology from interfering in the learning process.

**Dichotomy of Thought—Wishlist for Administrators**

Some of the advice for administrators also had to do with technology, but subjects spoke most strongly about their courses and when they might be offered. Concerns about course availability focused on the following requests: GDR classes at night, non-CDP prerequisite classes at night, and more rapid course recycling of some CDP required
courses. A few subjects suggested other ideas such as online or Saturday classes, controlling professors and campus policies, some unusual credit options, and no extra course fee for the CDP classes. Because the question was open-ended some of the suggestions were both unusual and only offered by one or a few interviewees.

Sub-categories for the Administrators category can be viewed in their entirety in Appendix H and include: Microphone Problems, Technology Upgrade, MRCR, More Course Options, Keep Advertising, Prerequisite Night Classes, GDR Night Classes, Online Classes, Control Professors, Control Campus Policies, Transfer More Credits from two-year campus classes, Saturday Classes, Life Experience Credits, and CDP Extra Expense.

Two of these were technology sub-categories, Microphone Problems and Technology Upgrade. Seven of 16 subjects mentioned people had trouble initially working the microphones—forgetting to push the button and feeling self-conscious about being heard and seen at other campuses. This is most common when students are new to classes. Two subjects who were concerned for “new” CDP students suggested a single generic microphone might encourage students to interact because they would not have to press a button to be heard. As one subject put it,

What I miss about ITV is the lack of interaction….it’s not conducive to group discussion, and I think it’s the button issue. So, if the class had a generic or general microphone it might make it easier so they wouldn’t have to press a lot. (W3)

However, subjects who have been with the program for a bit longer said new students adapt quickly and they described a learning curve with the use of the microphone
becoming automatic and not problematic. One woman laughed as she told the story of taking a traditional class and finding she was reaching for the button to push and saying, "This is S from [city]" because she was so accustomed to the CDP courses.

A Technology Upgrade was suggested by five subjects who felt it would assist in getting and keeping students in the classes. One subject knew a person (someone she was encouraging to use the CDP) who had audited a class where there were many more technical difficulties than usual. She was sad and shook her head as she said,

I'd like them to beef up the technology and do whatever they can to make it smooth, free-flowing, easier for the professors....I had a friend in the last class who was just auditing, and we had so many technical problems I think that she probably won't be back...probably not.... (M1)

These technology problems are of concern to the interviewees because they value the CDP and want it to continue to benefit themselves and others in similar situations. These comments are serious attempts to help administrators zero in on potential difficulties for participants in the program.

The CDP interviewees began the program with different amounts of prior coursework. The CDP courses are only one set of required courses which must be completed. If a student lacks GDRs or prerequisites for CDP courses, that coursework must be completed to finish the program and the degree. These non-CDP courses can be very challenging to access. Many of these courses are rarely if ever offered as night classes, so CDP students may find it necessary to get them another way. Other ways may include daytime courses, online classes, correspondence courses, and traveling to UW-Stevens Point.
One subject had to find a different employer before she could get flex time to take the necessary daytime classes. Another interviewee works a fulltime job with a rotating schedule. He must “swap” work time with others on a regular basis, usually working three of four weekends per month so he can attend classes. With a wife and children at home this cuts out a great deal of family time. He usually can only take one class per semester, so he has not set a firm date when he expects to graduate.

Another subject who needed GDRs took daytime classes, online courses, and was in the process of getting “portfolio credits” from another UW campus. He was nearing graduation at the time of his interview and said he had already “called in all his favors at work,” so he was really hoping the portfolio credits would transfer into the CDP so he could complete the coursework and graduate.

Three subjects specifically asked for GDR Night Classes and three subjects specifically asked for Prerequisite Night Classes required for the CDP classes. One GDR class named was Communication 101, which is in fact offered in late afternoon or early evening many semesters. But other GDR requests were more generic. As one interviewee shared, taking daytime classes was a considerable inconvenience to her work schedule. She was passionate about the desire for evening GDRs and said,

A lot of us have some GDR’s that we haven’t completed, and trying to get GDR’s in the evening is like pulling teeth. And I’m a taxpayer, and I pay for tuition, and I expect to be able to get what I need. I mean, they’ve started such a wonderful program, so it’s like, keep going. (S10)

The people requesting night classes for GDRs and prerequisite classes to the CDP courses had been in the program for long enough to recognize some of the roadblocks
which arise for these UNIQUE time and place bound students. They were very familiar with which courses caused CDP students problems in completing their degrees. Classes mentioned most often were from lower level courses in Accounting, Economics, and Calculus. As one subject hoping to graduate within a year noted,

I would give them the advice that to finish [there are] courses that we need, such as Economics 210, Economics 211, Accounting 210, Accounting 211, Math 109, and a stats class. Which are just as needed with the Business major, Economics minor, but overall those are not offered at night. And I can see that as being a big roadblock on account that if these courses are not offered at night frequently, many of them are prerequisites for the upper 300 level Business classes. (S5)

These interviewees were very serious as they talked about this advice. They brought their experiences with the CDP and their compassion for the difficulties they saw other students experiencing to their carefully considered suggestions. They had a strong intent to help administrators to continue and to improve the CDP.

Closely related to the concerns over getting GDR and prerequisite courses at night was the request to have more opportunities to complete some of the required CDP courses. Because these people are working fulltime and have family responsibilities, most of the interviewees will not be completing their degree in two years as they might be able to if they were traditional students taking a traditional course load. Because of the cyclical nature of the class scheduling there are often problems for students in getting the particular course they need in a particular semester. Subjects recognized and commented on how difficult it must be for the CDP to get all the courses everyone would
like offered when the program is relatively small. However, six of 16 subjects requested MRCR (More Rapid Course Recycling) so it would be easier to get the courses needed to graduate faster. The closer interviewees were to graduating, the more they recognized the importance of this. As one subject explained it,

As far as CDP administration, the only difference that I see is that it’s [the cycling of the classes] geared to a full time student. There are generally 3 or 4 classes offered per semester, which if you don’t take, they won’t be around for another 2 years. So, unless you’re going to school full time, you end up getting out of the cycle. (M11)

However, students in mid-degree were likely to have concerns and problems with the CDP class prerequisites and the cyclical course offerings too. One traditional aged subject was facing the decision of waiting for a long time for required CDP courses to come around again on the cycle or driving to UW-Stevens Point. She was still undecided at the time of the interview.

For example, since I started the CDP program last semester, if I want to graduate in May I would still have to take two semesters at Point in order to make up credits that I can’t get through CDP. I would have to wait for them to come through the system. Two of the CDP courses that are being offered, this summer and in Fall, I can’t take because I haven’t had accounting. (W2)

Even students just beginning the CDP recognize the importance of catching the courses in the correct sequence. As one recently enrolled subject explained,
I had one frustrating experience where I had planned on taking a class in fall that it was decided late spring it was going to be cancelled. It got cancelled on the cyclical thing. That just messed up my whole [plan] because I had plotted out a few years in advance, and I need to take this before I can take that. (M16)

She was lucky that semester because a Health Psychology course became available through CDP which she was very interested in as an elective. She is hoping the Psychology minor may become available as a result of expansion of the CDP’s offerings.

Other interviewees are also hoping the CDP can be broadened allowing for other majors and minors. Five of 16 subjects encouraged administrators to offer a greater variety of courses and other majors through the CDP. As a fairly new CDP student suggested, “Keep looking at what other options are available, offering different things….offering a minor in psychology. Continue to expand on that, on those aspects.” (M16)

In an attempt to help the CDP use continue and grow, three subjects encouraged administrators to keep advertising the CDP. One of them expressed the very common opinion that the CDP students are the best advertisements of all, but it could be a good idea to continue traditional advertising campaigns. He said,

I guess the only thing that I can recommend is, just keep advertising. I think you’re going to get a lot of positive word of mouth out of this program, because there are a lot of us nontraditional students, middle management type people who are going to be talking to, maybe
subordinates, maybe it's peers, that are going to be saying, "Hey, why don't you look into this? It's an awesome, awesome program." (M13)

The high value placed on the CDP by the interviewees was one of the most common threads running through the interviews, as highlighted in the CDP=SPECIAL HELP primary theme.

The remaining suggestions were made by a minority of subjects. Two single parents requested online classes to avoid problems with unreliable childcare and childcare expense. They wanted to have online courses so they could work on them at any time, including the middle of the night. One single parent requested Saturday classes for the same reason (childcare) plus having classes which ran all day on Saturdays for a few weeks would allow classes to be finished by the time winter weather set in. She said it would be "gift credits" not to have to come to campus so many times during winter weather each semester.

Although these suggestions were offered in an attempt to further, or perhaps speed, the degree earning process, it did seem like the more unusual requests or suggestions were made by people under the most stress. One person whose employer had informed him that he would complete his bachelor's degree or lose ground at work expressed the opinion that a lot of earning a college degree was a business proposition for the university since they were being paid for the credits, so it made sense to him to have options (portfolio or life experience credits) where people could be granted more credits by paying for them. The interviewee seemed unaware of the potential criticism of diluting the worth of the degree by implementing such a suggestion.
Two interviewees suggested professors be screened or specially trained in using the technology before being *allowed* to teach CDP courses. One of the young subjects was concerned about the professors’ potential distress when she said in part, “Maybe to have a screening of professors to see if they would be capable of teaching a CDP course? I think it’s important the professors know what technology they’re working with....”

(W2)

This and the following person’s comment are examples of the belief that administrators have more power over policies and faculty than they do. This subject had much to say as he declaimed,

> The one criticism I’d have of the CDP is that [at] times the faculty who teach the classes are the ones that absolutely should not be teaching the classes—faculty that are brand new, either to the UW-Stevens Point in general, and definitely the CDP, very traditional type instructors and don’t realize that the audience they’re teaching to is different. Some people feel like “I’m not in junior high school” or “I’m not 20 years old.” It’s a class with people who have things to do, and they chose to be here. CDP class is probably one of the only classes I’ve ever been in where I bet a 100% of the students are there 99% of the time. They’re paying—money I chose to [spend] here rather than buy a new car, or move into a bigger house. So, when teachers, I guess I shouldn’t say degrade, but that’s what it feels like, when they take attendance for participation—I say they reserve to take participation at the end of class to make sure you didn’t leave. You
have to think about the audience you’re teaching to, because that’s not
very motivational. (M11)

In another instance of “administrator power” wishes, one interviewee wanted
UW-Stevens Point honors guidelines changed. He has worked very hard at the CDP
classes while working fulltime and caring for a family. His grade point is high enough to
graduate with honors, but something is preventing him from this recognition of some of
the hardest work he has ever done as a student. He shares his frustration in the following
comment.

The one thing that I do have a little bit of a gripe with—and it’s not the
CDP it’s UW-Stevens Point—is the fact that if you go to the CDP
program you can’t graduate with honors. As a person graduating in May
with a 3.85 it really torques me that I can’t graduate with a rope around
my neck. (M13)

(That particular phrasing is interesting in itself as the common image of a “rope
around the neck” is being hanged rather than being honored.)

One man requested that Life Experience Credits be granted for creating a
portfolio of material from work experience.

Probably the one piece of advice would be about the experiential learning.
We’ve been in the business [world], for quite awhile. To have to take a
Communication 101 class, for 2 credits, in my humble opinion, is a little
ridiculous. They need to develop a method to allow some of those credits
to be granted. It’s a business, and some of it has to do with dollars. Some
other campuses [have], portfolio development class, you sign up for it.
You pay for 3 credits. You can certainly get more than 3 credits, but I think it’s based on a 3 credit tuition. And, everybody’s happy! (I’m) happy as a student because I’m going to get some credits, that I think are silly credits. And the college is happy cause they’re getting some money, and nobody’s slighted.

He further suggested that people should be able to “test out” of courses like Communication 101. (UWSP does in fact have both a test-out and a portfolio style option for not taking Communication101, and has testing out of some courses such as English 101 and lower level math courses. The person objected to not having a test out procedure for Communication 101, but evidently simply did not know about it.) This was representative of two suggestions to grant life experience credits, or resume credits, or portfolio credits.

One final area of requests for change had to do with costs. Two people did express a desire not to have to pay more for CDP courses than their traditional student counterparts do for on campus courses. This statement was accompanied by an immediate disclaimer or apology acknowledging that there were CDP expenses involved in the technology. But there were also comments about not using campus facilities like traditional students do, not using the health services since they have their own healthcare through work, and having to purchase textbooks rather than being able to use the text rental function. Expense and unusual credit options were brought up by a minority of people and far fewer people expressed those concerns than those on class availability.

While there were many suggestions for possible changes or improvements to the CDP, the interviewees maintain strong opinions about how helpful the CDP is to them.
They followed this advice up with strong opinions and ADVICE FOR POTENTIAL CDP STUDENTS, the final primary theme, which once again clearly shows the value they feel for the opportunity the CDP provides for them.

**ADVICE For Potential CDP Students**

While there are many improvements and adjustments suggested by the interviewees, they are adamant in affirming the CDP’s worth. Every single one of the 16 said if they had the choice to make again they would begin the CDP program again, using words like “definitely” and “absolutely.” One woman even cheerfully volunteered to be an advertisement for the program (See Appendix I).

**Advice for Potential CDP Students—Encouragement**

Words of encouragement for potential CDP students far outnumbered cautions shared with the interviewer. Sub-categories for this Encouragement category were Would Do It Again, Help Available-Advisors, Help Available-Students, Access-Proximity, Access-Evening Class, UW-System Degree, Self-Esteem, Don’t Fear It, and Small Class Size.

*All 16 subjects liked the CDP well enough they said they Would Do It Again if they had the choice to make again.* Thirteen subjects encouraged potential students to ask for help because Help is Available from Advisors, while 10 said Help is Available from fellow Students. Nine (9 of 10) of the subjects (all four Wausau and five of six Marshfield subjects) mentioned the Access in Proximity at the two-year campuses near their homes and jobs. None of the subjects from Stevens Point mentioned proximity since UWSP is the four-year campus granting the degree. Eleven of the subjects said Access to Evening Classes was a reason for potential students to use the CDP.
The rest of the encouragement sub-categories were mentioned by a minority of subjects. Three subjects said the UW-System Degree was an especially prestigious degree. Two of the subjects said Self-Esteem would be gained in addition to the degree. Two subjects urged potential students not to fear the CDP. One student commented that the small class size allowed her to get more from her classes than from large lectures.

When asked for advice they might give to potential CDP students the answers were mostly very encouraging. All 16 people encouraged others to look into the program. The greatest number (23) of encouraging comments focused on help being available to the potential CDP students. Six people said they recommended the program for various individual reasons besides the help available. Five people said, “Just try it!” with the belief it would work for people interested in further education. The five cautionary statements were logical and seemed to fit the information previously shared by interviewees. Some of the actual comments follow.

Help is Available

The most common comment, made by 13 of 16 people, was that help was available for potential CDP students. The following comment was made by one subject, but is representative of the others who voiced the same opinion. “I would tell them to contact [advisor]. He’s a wonderful resource and good at that job. And I would definitely be there for a resource if they ever had any questions, you know—who are the good professors to take?”
Recommend it Because...

CDP students are eager to share the program with others. They have many good things to say about the program. The next person quoted is a graduate of the program. She looks back at the options she explored to obtain a degree.

**Proximity**—“The easiest part is that they have brought the education to us. When I started going back to school I actually was commuting over to Stevens Point, and it gets to be tough—winters are just terrible. I quite honestly would never have made it through and finished or worked towards my degree without having the CDP program.”

Another potential commuter student reiterated the worth of the CDP being at a local campus when she said,

**Time**—“I do recommend the Collaborative Degree Program just because the time crunch isn’t like that for commuting.”

A more traditional aged subject compared the CDP to large lecture classes she experienced in her previous undergraduate classes. She says,

**Interaction**—“Class sizes are small with more interaction than a huge lecture hall.”

**Self-esteem**—Another devoted fan of the CDP encourages potential students with her observations of how fulfilling it is to “make the journey” of getting the degree in addition to having it once it is conferred.

Do not be afraid! Do you know how much it would mean to you if you did this? It’s not even about the degree. It’s more about how you’re going to feel about yourself doing it. Each semester you complete, you’ve hit
another goal. The feeling you get and the self-esteem you receive from it would be the biggest reason I would tell someone to go.

Just Try It!

Interviewees are so happy to be in the program even when they can only take a class or two at a time. One fulltime worker and parent smiled and advised, “Make a little plan and just give it a try.”

A fulltime worker and family man is unable to see the date he will graduate because he can only take one class per semester. The prerequisite and GDR courses affect when he can take CDP courses, so he plans a little at a time, just as far ahead as he can tell for sure which classes will be offered. He encourages potential students not to get bogged down in the enormity of all that must be accomplished. “Don’t look at how long it’s going to take, just hop in and do it. Like the football coaches say, just take one game at a time. Just take it a class at a time.” He says others with work and family responsibilities have to recognize they must be “in it for the long haul” to get to the end of the degree.

Advice for Potential CDP Students—Cautions

There are very real circumstances that potential CDP students must be aware of if they are to successfully complete a bachelor’s degree through the CDP. The Cautions category has sub-categories called Time Commitment, Technology Use, Rotation Cycle, Obey Professors, and Get Work Done. Three of 16 subjects caution that the CDP requires a significant Time Commitment. Four of 16 subjects cautioned that potential students must be aware they face significant Technology Use in the CDP. Three subjects
warned potential students to get classes the first time they came around so they would not have to wait for the Rotation Cycle to bring the classes back around.

Traditional aged students seemed most concerned about how to avoid getting behind or lost in classes. One traditional aged student said potential CDP students should Obey the Professors to avoid getting lost in the course. Another traditional aged student said they must be responsible and Get the Work Done.

Caution!

When asked if there was anything they would caution potential CDP students about, some subjects provided answers which were properly cautionary. One very technosavvy CDP student expressed an unusual degree of caution in his following statement. “You have to be ready to use and understand technology. If you’re one of those people who says, ‘I don’t need e-mail,’ the CDP is definitely not for you.” That is a much stronger statement than others made. Most believe the technology is easy to adapt to for use in the CDP classes.

Most of the interviewees recognized their own time constraints, but did not state a belief that others would have problems with time to the extent that it would affect their ability to complete the degree. Many did, however, agree that attention to the rotation cycle was very necessary. Both of the elements are mentioned in the following quote. “You’ve got to be sure you’re committed, especially timewise. Be sure you’re getting classes when you need them because they do come in that rotation.” And, finally, the caution to potential CDP students to “be responsible” was shared by a traditional age subject. “You have to be responsible for yourself and get the work done.”
Summary

These people place a high value on the CDP. They praise it. They encourage others to try it. They are very appreciative of the access (proximity and timing) to classes and the help CDP advisors provide. Naturally they want the program to continue and to expand to offer more of what they need. So, they offer suggestions to professors and administrators on what might be improved or done differently. However, even if all of their needs are not being met by the CDP, they will not stop utilizing the program.

So here is a unique group of people, constrained by being time and place bound, yet determined to earn a UW-System bachelor’s degree. Their motivation to obtain this degree is rooted in their desire to be better educated, to be more capable of advancing in a career, and to better their families. These unique, adult learners are very grateful for the opportunity to earn a UW-System degree through the CDP. They recognize the help the CDP makes available to Central Wisconsin adults. They are vocal in their praise of the CDP, their advisors, their professors, and the CDP administrators. And as responsible adults and savvy consumers they have ideas on how the program can be improved as well as concerns that their goal for a UW-System degree is met as quickly as possible.

Recognizing the CDP’s worth and the advantages it provides people in their adult situations, they want it to continue, to grow, and to be even more successful. They highly recommend it to potential students, even offering to serve as mentors and advertisements for the program.

Detractors from the program were looked for through direct questioning, asking the advisors for referrals, and asking those who were interviewed if they knew anyone who had dropped out of the program or expressed dissatisfaction with the program. No
one knew a person who was expressing real dissatisfaction with the program itself, or who had dropped out of the program because of unhappiness with it. The wish list complaints and preferences in this chapter represent expressed the greatest dissatisfaction and gratitude from the subjects.
Chapter Four

Prequel

Before UWSP's Collaborative Degree Program existed, would-be nontraditional students in Central Wisconsin had other choices. A few were sent to college by their employer as an investment in their future with the company. Some people could ask their employers for "flex" time to attend classes during normal work hours. If that was not allowed, they could quit their jobs and attend college while their children were in school, or have someone else provide childcare while they were attending college classes. Some people could have someone else support them while they attended college. Others could and did borrow money, sometimes going far into debt while completing a college degree. And there were degrees which could be earned online from many businesses or providers, such as the University of Phoenix online.

Some past images of nontraditional students were: adults who still lived with their parents, suburban housewives, divorcees getting an education before their alimony and child support ran out, or veterans going to college on the GI Bill. In many cases the return to, or initiation of, pursuing a college education was a period of overload where people forsook a "normal" life to do "academic penance," live in poverty, and lose touch with family activities, hoping it would all be worth it in the end. It was in many ways a socially unacceptable choice for most adults with families to support. Some nontraditional students are still pursuing a degree this same stressful way. Others have discovered another option, a better way.

This research takes a look at one better way for nontraditional students to earn a college degree by interviewing current students in UWSP’s Collaborative Degree
Program. While the program is not limited to nontraditional students, the sample subjects all turned out to be nontraditional students for one or more reasons. So, the answer to the first research question, "Who are the people who are utilizing UWSP's CDP?" is Central Wisconsin's nontraditional students.

**The CDP Option, a Better Way for Central Wisconsin Nontrads**

This leads then to the question, are the CDP students simply nontraditional students taking advantage of the CDP to reach their goals in a more reasonable fashion than quitting their jobs, leaving their families, and/or moving to a city where four-year degree-granting institutions are available? The answer is yes. These CDP students fit the current definition of a nontraditional student as defined by the UWSP Nontraditional Student Office. The first page of their Spring 2003 bulletin says,

- You are a nontraditional student if: You are a veteran. You are married.
- You are a parent. You are 24 years old or older. You have taken more than a year and a half off school. You are the first generation in your family to attend college.

Of the 16 interviewees all have one or more characteristics that identify them as nontraditional students. UWSP's CDP provides another, better option for Central Wisconsin's nontraditional students. By choosing this option people can continue to have a relatively normal life while working toward a UW-System degree. They can support themselves and can continue to interact with their families—getting children off to school, sharing supper—by not spending hours on a long commute. By continuing to earn as they learn, the need to go into debt to take classes is reduced, if not eliminated.
Image of The CDP Nontrads

This CDP option for nontraditional students is definitely altering the image of the nontraditional student. The earning of a college degree still demands class and study time commitment and the investment of considerable amounts of money. However, the disruption of a normal working day, a usual life path, is lessened because commuting time is reduced or eliminated. Therefore, a CDP nontraditional student has potentially less damaging disruption to both work and family life. "Academic penance" becomes an acceptable degree of disruption rather than an attempt at sainthood with its accompanying social stigma of irresponsibility towards one's family.

The current "identity" of the CDP students is a group perception, a group construct. When they speak of themselves they say "we," and when they suggest things to professors or administrators of the CDP they talk about how it will affect other students in the program. They describe themselves in ways that emphasize their similarities, and even subjects without children are sure to mention how hard it is for the other CDP students who have a job and children and all the accompanying constraints and responsibilities. They see themselves as "career" oriented, even though some work in jobs which are not in middle management as some claim is the case for "the CDP students." The strong perception that they could not earn a degree if it were not for the CDP program is very real to them. While they may simply choose not to try to earn a degree some other way, the perception that the CDP has somehow made earning a degree possible where before it was impossible is again, a construct, a particular view of reality.

Given that, there are sufficient reasons for subjects to believe they could not/would not earn a degree without the special help the CDP provides, both through
access and through help in entering and remaining in the program. This perception has some basis in fact. All but one subject works outside the home. All but two subjects work 40 or more hours per week. Three quarters of the subjects have family responsibilities. To think it would be an easy matter for them to drop the normal activities of their lives is to not have been in their situation. This is some of the factual, physically demonstrable identity which holds these subjects in their work and life patterns. They have no special options to provide a living and childcare for them. They must remain responsible adults and keep the promises they made. The other identity descriptors are less tangible, but not less real.

CDP students also describe themselves as “not just out of high school,” “mature,” and having “much to offer” by virtue of life and work experience. They believe their desire for and ability to achieve a college education surpasses that of “traditional” students. Some researchers agree with this perception. Manos and Kasambira (1998) reported nontraditional students present many more opportunities for sharing of life experience and are more challenging in classrooms in teacher preparation programs. Dr. Elizabeth Buchanan of UW-Milwaukee’s School of Information Science program has been working with both nontraditional and traditional students in classes offered through distance education online. She has a freely stated opinion (2003) that many traditional students are not mature enough to handle the DE online courses that nontraditional students are able to utilize. This maturity and ability to handle college level courses would not simply be demonstrated in online environments. It would be a situation independent characteristic which would operate in any class the subjects might attend.
Three of the CDP students interviewed for this study were close to nontraditional student age. Those three youngest subjects interviewed for this study shared statements which may confirm the opinions of Buchanan and the more mature CDP nontraditional students that nontraditional college students have a better chance of doing well in courses offered outside the traditional classroom situation. For example, these three youngest subjects expressed a higher level of reactivity to things older students either mentioned in passing or did not mention at all. One student from Marshfield and one student from Wausau were unhappy with the overuse of PowerPoint. One described professors who read from PowerPoint as “lazy” and wondered aloud if the PowerPoint they use comes with the textbook or if they make the presentation themselves. He described the situation as “slide fall.” The second student said she was bothered by being given both handouts of the PowerPoint slides and seeing the PowerPoint on the screen as it made it hard for her to concentrate. She said if the professor would lecture without the PowerPoint she could be more attentive. Whether the use of PowerPoint was good or poor use of that presentation technique, the people who said it was a problem were the youngest subjects.

The youngest of all the 16 CDP students interviewed was the only person to even mention two emotion-provoking events which she said made a big impact on her view of professors. In the first instance she was very unhappy with a professor who responded with impatience to another student’s question. The professor was trying to catch up on material missed when she was too ill to have class. The response affected the subject so much that she did not want to ask a question in that class for the rest of the semester. She also thought this isolated incident would be well known to everyone who was affiliated with the CDP. She did not name the professor, but stated several times that professors
needed to have patience, and suggested professors should not be allowed to teach in the CDP unless they were pre-trained so they knew what to expect before using the technology.

Fortunately, the second event was a happy experience which left her laughing and feeling very positive toward the second professor. In this incident some of the students were “sneaking out early” from the CDP class at one campus and the professor waited to speak with them about it until he was presenting in person at that campus. He was diplomatic in speaking with the students, telling them he knew they were adults and had many responsibilities, but pointed out that their quiz scores showed they were missing important information. She had not been “sneaking out” and said the way the professor addressed the problem was very low key, but definitely got the point across. In fact, no other student had mentioned this incident either.

The apparent lack of resilience of these three subjects in these situations may simply be the lack of life experience. In this study, the older the subject responding to perceived problems in the CDP or problematic teaching methods by CDP professors, the more likely the statements will be accepting and polite. The youngest subjects were most bothered by possible problems. The intermediate aged subjects made moderate statements. And the subjects with the highest age levels were most accepting of human mistakes, technology problems, and necessary adaptations.

As a PhD candidate Buchanan (1999) did her dissertation on the progress of an online class and the interactions of the class members, using that and her own experiences teaching and assisting others in teaching online classes to form her pedagogical definitions and beliefs. Her success in this teaching genre and her continued
publication on the topic lend support to the CDP subjects’ statements that they have more ability to succeed in college now than they did when they were traditional students. The desire for an identity separate from (and in their perception of a higher order than) the traditional college students is not surprising given this understanding of the situation.

This “us” versus “them” perception is part of the CDP students’ identity package by default, by definition (Burke, 1989). The experience of seeing traditional students act in a rude manner makes them want to be differentiated from that group. The strong awareness of the many commitments they have to family, work, and other normal responsibilities of adult life makes them, again, say they are different from the traditional student group. They see that traditional college student group as having fewer adult responsibilities, with less time required of them in the earning of a living and family commitments, and with the “luxury” of putting college first.

These CDP students see themselves as having the same responsibilities as their professors do, and they want the same respect they have for their professors. They see themselves as peers of the professors, not subordinates. Just because they are learning from the professors does not make them less worthwhile as persons. They believe they have experience and knowledge to offer which is valuable to the class, to the other students, and to any of the professors who choose to hear it and learn from them.

Many of the CDP students have jobs where they are answerable to both supervisors and supervisees. The kind of respect which is expected of them in the business world shapes what they expect to receive in the academic world. When they feel disrespected by attendance policies or by inferences that they missed class for less than adequate reasons, they are not comfortable with the image of themselves as being
like traditional students who might miss a class because they went out drinking or stayed up late to party.

CDP students see themselves as responsible adults who choose to be in the program for reasons which go beyond any parental edict or expectation. They see their education as an investment of time, money, and energy that could quite easily go elsewhere to their own and their family's benefit. They want to be valued in direct proportion to how much they value the opportunity to earn a UW-System degree. They want to be admired for having the tenacity to come to college and put in the time and effort to earn a degree while juggling so many other responsibilities. They feel their efforts come at a higher price than the traditional students are expected to pay, so they say they value their opportunity to use the CDP more than a traditional student might. And they have more demanding expectations of the professors and the program than a traditional student might. They do not look at this as just a way to earn the credits. They want usable, practical knowledge to take away from the course, not just a good grade.

**Why Utilize the CDP?**

**Why They Want a College Degree**

Whatever the sociological constructs of American society, with lengthening of productive work life, birth control, and a standard of living for the middle class at a good level, the reasons CDP subjects give for wanting a college degree are all about progressing to some level of betterment. Whether reasons were “personal,” “familial,” “societal,” or a combination of categories, they were clear in the subjects’ minds. There was no hesitation in responses about why they wanted a college degree.
In the Personal reasons for wanting a college degree, there are voiced regrets about interruptions in the degree earning process and/or not starting a degree “right out of high school.” The subjects often point out that they are not right out of high school. They are acutely aware of it. Their increase in self-esteem grows with mastery of course after course. The level of happiness with the degree and with the self crescendos as graduation gets nearer and nearer.

In the Family category, there are vestiges of “family honor,” pride in family accomplishments, and either goals to keep the family at a previously attained level of educational achievement, or often to raise the level of education attained for the whole family group. Comparisons between self and others in the family grouping are important markers in subjects’ views of what educational levels “should be” in the family identity package.

Societal accomplishments have more to do with current and future generation of income and opportunities, both for work and for further degrees. Goals here can be as specific as remaining in a job-ladder progression at a current employer or as nebulous and amorphous as having some “door opening” or “stepping stone” experience at some undefined future moment.

In each category the mystique of education, the lure of being a bigger and better person, of some better life, some better opportunity is evident. This is reminiscent of stories left to posterity by pioneers moving west to find better opportunities. Some knew they were going to a specific place for a specific job. Others went simply because there was a new place and an unknown opportunity which might become their chance to be a
whole new person, their chance to make a name for themselves and their families, their chance at a better life in a whole new world.

**CDP=Special Help Access**

One of the biggest reasons people are using the CDP is that it provides classes at a time and place capable of being accessed without people having to renege on promises and adult responsibilities. (While the CDP was rated very highly by students who use it, there were some statements that it did have to come second to family responsibilities.) Accessibility makes it possible for people who want a college degree, but are too responsible to others to make a clean break with societal expectations, to achieve both goals. Time management is more predictable when weather conditions do not affect commuting time more than a few minutes per trip. Evening classes allow the workday to remain intact, keeping interference with work responsibilities to a minimum. For most people this situation is more easily adapted to than commuting to daytime classes. Most simply consider that option unworkable, out of the question.

Validation of the CDP subjects’ statements about commuting making it extremely difficult or impossible to earn a degree is offered through the experience of two of the CDP subjects who tried commuting to Stevens Point from one of the other cities in this study. One person was single, simply trying to support herself until she could graduate from college and get a better job. She had to quit attending college because she could not support herself while commuting to daytime classes at UWSP. Another person was married with a fulltime job, trying to commute to evening and late afternoon classes. He noted that it was not too bad when the fall semester began, but once it started snowing
and was dark by the time he headed to Stevens Point for class, the time the driving took was so onerous he did not attempt another semester of commuting.

**CDP Helpers and Co-Conspirators**

Another very important reason people utilize the CDP is the help offered by the advisors. Having a CDP plan to follow and a CDP advisor to guide these students and to explain the plan can make the difference between their failure and success, the difference between their distress and happiness. When 15 of 16 people refer to the same link in the public service chain as this important, there has got to be something behind this praise beyond coincidence.

Having close contact with professors is also a deciding factor for many CDP students. They prefer interaction and face to face contact with the professors. Their opinions matter to these students. Only two subjects suggested online courses would be an option they might prefer, and that was because of childcare concerns and expenses. One subject who had taken an online class never wanted to take another one. He said it was much more work than attending classes and doing homework in the traditional or in the CDP setting.

There is a current image the CDP students have of themselves which most of the subjects identify as representative of everyone in the group. This is, of course, not entirely accurate. Subjects tend to assume others are like them. The people who describe CDP students as “middle management” are in middle management themselves. People who describe CDP students as parents, however, may not be parents themselves, but seem to think most CDP students are parents. Most CDP students identify the group as “nontraditional,” and there are traditional aged students in the program.
There are some differences in how the campus groups view themselves and the CDP. Part of this may be related to the cultural climate at a particular campus. These subjects are attending the smallest campus of the three (Marshfield, Stevens Point, and Wausau) with the fewest students enrolled, 643 this semester. The Marshfield campus is a commuter campus (students do not live on campus). However, area residents still use it as a focus for education, entertainment, and a cultural resource for the people of Marshfield and the surrounding area. For example, the campus provides theater access for the Campus-Community Players, a strong community based group which provides students the opportunity to do some acting and theater work. The campus is partly funded by Wood County, making it more of a locally “owned” campus than UW-Stevens Point. Many of the Marshfield residents work at the clinic and hospital, and the community is proud of its image as a leader in the medical field.

The Marshfield subjects expressed the most gratitude for the CDP and voiced the most concern that they might be (and should not be) mistaken for traditional students. They also expressed the most concern over work and career matters, both in the reasons for wanting a college degree and when talking about their real distress when they had to miss a class or be late to one. The availability of the program at a campus in Marshfield gives them high hopes for their future. Every Marshfield subject mentioned proximity—having the classes in Marshfield—as the factor which allows them to earn a college degree. This group was most grateful for what they have now through the CDP. In part this may reflect the recognition that their campus is smaller than the two others.

The Stevens Point campus offers both bachelor’s and master’s degrees, and is the degree granting institution which is responsible for the quality of the CDP program, even
though it is offered in collaboration with the other two campuses. While it too is a focus for cultural as well as educational activities in its own community and the surrounding area, it is less dependent on county resources than either of the other two campuses. About two thirds of its students live on campus in dormitory housing. The current enrollment is 8,025. It has national recognition for a number of its programs, and some international conferences are held there annually.

Stevens Point subjects see the CDP as a natural outgrowth of taxpayer needs. Because this is the campus offering the degree, proximity was not mentioned as a factor in the program’s value for them. This group spoke especially about the value of evening classes because this allows them to continue working at their daytime jobs while earning their degree. Stevens Point subjects speak of their ability to cope with college classes, time management, and understanding what the professor wants in more matter of fact terms than the Marshfield group. It was only logical to them that sharing classes with other working adults would be more worthwhile than attending classes with traditional students. They had the most suggestions for making non-CDP classes available at night to assist nontraditional students in earning their CDP degree.

The Wausau campus is primarily a commuter campus with some of its students coming from far north in the state, but it does have a 160 bed dormitory. Its current enrollment is 1,292. Wausau is larger than Marshfield and has more sources of political influence that Marshfield does.

Wausau subjects were less cohesive in opinions expressed, except that all of them mentioned proximity, having CDP classes at the local campus as very important in being able to earn a college degree. Identification with others was present, but in more general
terms. For example, one subject spoke of herself and the other CDP students as "busy people." Another said when CDP students talk with each other they might talk about professors, but more often talked about clothes. A third said others in the CDP were not using the program logically because they took classes they thought would be easy or fun, and then complained when the courses would not count toward their degree in the way they expected. The fourth Wausau subject identified others as a group which he was interacting with, but he said he did not really fit the profile. He did in fact begin the CDP as a traditional aged participant in the CDP to avoid driving to Stevens Point to complete his degree. Wausau subjects mentioned non-CDP students taking the same classes and the only statements from them about major differences between traditional and nontraditional students were about adult responsibilities like jobs and childcare. They seemed less likely to define the group identity as knowledgeable, mature workers. The Wausau subjects were also the only ones who talked about students cutting class, and seemed to take it for granted that this would happen.

Fewer Wausau CDP students agreed to be interviewed. Of those who agreed to be interviewed, more of them were late or simply did not show up at the agreed on place and time. These subjects seemed more isolated, less of a self-recognized group than either of the other two campuses. They spoke more often in single terms, what "I" would like to see rather than what "we" would find beneficial. This lack of group recognition could be because there are large numbers of traditional students taking the CDP classes at the Wausau campus. That would make it easier to overlook the nontraditional or CDP common identity as it would be diluted by the influx of many traditional students.
Most of the 16 CDP subjects share the concept that there is a CDP group identity, though some have a more detailed view of this identity than others. There is value for students in the common identity of the CDP group. They feel a part of some “special group” which shares goals, hardships, and experiences. There is someone to commiserate with who has “been there, done that” and can really relate to their circumstances—circumstances often very different from those experienced by traditional students. Their expectations of themselves, the professors, and the CDP are often high, perhaps higher than is convenient. Yet, these subjects say their happiness over having the CDP program to assist them in reaching their dream of a college degree is more highly than the programs which are in place for traditional students.

Interestingly, even if these high expectations go unmet, there will probably be a continued interest in and utilization of the CDP because these students recognize how valuable it is to them. No matter how many suggestions for changes and improvements a subject made, each of them said they would do this program again.

**Talk About the CDP is Not Cheap**

No matter how many suggestions CDP subjects offered for change or improvement to professors and administrators, one thing is abundantly clear. They value this program. They want the program to continue, to expand, and they dare to even think that someday there could be a UW-System master’s program offered in a similar manner. These people are sold. They have bought the concept of the CDP and will not willingly give it up.

They are not merely sold on the program for themselves, they want their co-workers, their relatives, people with children, people with “busy schedules,” “people like
me” to come to the CDP and utilize the program to earn their own degree. They want more majors, more elective classes, more non-CDP classes to be offered at the same campus and evening class time, just as the CDP courses are now offered in the evening at the “campus around the corner.” These people want UW-System bachelor’s degrees and will probably continue to use the CDP even if it is not exactly what they would choose if they were not time and place bound.

People who utilize the CDP or have graduated from the program know they are the best advertisements that can be had. Some offer their services to create promotional material. Some offer to talk with prospective students. Others speak to people they know and say, “Just try it.” “Make a little plan and give it a try.” “Just take one course at a time.” They say they have the proof that it works for them and they believe it will work for others.

**Nontraditional, CDP, What Does This Mean?**

While no sample this small can be used as anything but an intriguing possibility for further study, what can be done is to relate this in-depth study to other information about nontraditional students and programs which they find helpful.

The nontraditional student population at the University of Wisconsin Stevens Point has been becoming more distinct and growing in size for many years now. In recognition of this, there is a Nontraditional Student Office on campus with part time coordinators who contact students over the age of 24 to offer support, peer counseling, and fellowship.

In 1994 Greg Diekroger, MA, based his thesis on Nontraditional Student Perceptions About Student Activity Programming at the University of Wisconsin -
Stevens Point. At that time the nontraditional population was 17 percent of students on the campus. In 1996 it was 19 percent of the student enrollment. In the Fall semester of 2002 it had dropped to 14 percent (Ekholm, 2003).

The nationwide trend been more marked and has gained much attention. Nontraditional college enrollment was estimated at 50 percent of students enrolled across the United States in 1996 (Aslanian 1996). Some universities like Arizona State University West and Grand Canyon University are specifically aiming to capture the nontraditional student market (Balzer 1996). Lisa Mayer’s article “Heading Back to School: It’s Not If Anymore, But When?” reiterates the often-heard point of the need for training nontraditional students to meet the economic job market in our increasingly information-rich, technologically based society (Mayer 1998).

It seems apparent that some differences exist in the college-level educational motivations, goals, and responses of nontraditional students compared to traditional students. It seems even more important to nontraditional students to be satisfied with college than for traditional students. Dissatisfaction in the nontraditional student is more likely to cause them to drop out before graduation (Donohue and Wong 1997).

Because of these differences in the larger population of nontraditional and traditional students, it could be extrapolated that UWSP’s CDP has found a niche, has provided a unique service in the Central Wisconsin area, which nontraditional students are eager to access and happy to support.
Chapter Five
Sequel

Perhaps one day there will be interactive holographic college classes being “tuned in to” in every home in America, with lifelong learning an accepted activity much as TV watching is now. There might be real “learning channels” where only education for credit is played in interactive formats all day and all night upon request, and an individual’s examinations for advancing to the next stage of the process are digitized, stored, and presented for grading and assessment holographically at the professor’s convenience.

Collaborative learning might be the future morphology of chat rooms and online newsgroups. People of like minds or interests could put their heads together over the same holographic electronic media rather than sitting through conference call meetings where everyone waits for the other people to talk first.

In today’s terms, the use of distance education techniques to share college classes across multiple university settings is only one step in the direction of accessible, credible, lifelong learning. The need for ever more learning to do many of today’s jobs, technologically oriented or not, is being recognized whether it is being stated or not. How and where people will get this needed education will be decided in part by what organizations offer access and affordability to those who need it. If the University of Phoenix and other such “college” and “university” businesses run by publishers and for-profit groups continue to proliferate, the likelihood of not-for-profit colleges and universities like the University of Wisconsin surviving and thriving is diminished.
University systems need to take a broad view of who their students and potential students are, and what their needs for education and access are. UW-Stevens Point's Collaborative Degree Program is one program addressing such needs, offering accessible education to Central Wisconsin's adults so they can achieve a bachelor's degree at campuses close to their homes and places of work. This could be the start of something which should be limited only by budgets and imagination.

This chapter will cover some of the limitations of this study, some of the advice offered to professors, administrators, and potential students, current CDP status, and a few "afterthoughts" now that the study is done.

**Limitations and Future Directions for Study**

The biggest limitation to this study is the lack of contact with even one subject who was dissatisfied with the CDP to the point of leaving the program. Whether such a person exists is unclear, but none of the advisors and none of the 16 interviewees knew anyone who was unhappy with the CDP. Two of the subjects knew people who had left the program, but it was because of moving away, because of family problems, or because of illness. Within the limitations of the study's size, the lack of disagreement makes the study seem unbalanced because of the predominantly positive communications of the study's subjects.

An interesting, if somewhat difficult future study option would be to interview all of the students who identified themselves as planning to graduate from the CDP. By using the entire population there might be a greater likelihood of finding dissatisfied students since everyone would be subjects. Such a study, while cumbersome, could also be productive because of the ability to compare the groups majoring in the General
Studies and the Business Administration degree emphases. There might be "between groups" differences in reasons to earn a college degree, or differences in advice to administrators and professors who teach in the CDP. While this would only be a "snapshot" in time, if done in five or ten year increments it might provide a very complete history of the degree program’s progress. Practically speaking, this would more than likely be done by survey collection of data as has usually been the case. That information could of course be helpful, but the depth and detail available from the open communication possible in interviews would be lost.

A few subjects mentioned that when some CDP students are having trouble getting classes they need, or if they are not doing as well as they would like in some of the business classes, that they switch from the Business Administration emphasis to the General Studies emphasis to complete the degree faster. If another study is done, it could be helpful to ask questions designed to find out how often this happens and whether there could be advice to students about how to succeed in the Business Administration emphasis so they do not find themselves with this concern, with this choice to make.

Another direction for further study would be to compare veteran CDP professors’ perceptions of what teaching techniques work well in the CDP classes with CDP student perceptions of what works for them. The kinds of communication needed in this teaching environment may be the same as is needed in the face to face traditional teaching environment, or it may be different.
Advice for Faculty and Administrators and Potential CDP Students

Faculty

Several points which CDP subjects made could be helpful for faculty to take under advisement. One important point is preparing professors to use the technology through some kind of training series where they get to practice several times with a "mock" audience of a few people at another location and all of the various equipment they intend to use (if they are not already familiar with the ITV situation). By arranging for them to practice and videotape their training runs, the professors would know what they look like, how each medium works and appears to the students, and what to expect as far as time delays when students use the microphone buttons. (The time delayed microphone use is where the "mock" audience comes into play.) While some of this can be learned by training talks and videos or DVDs made by other users, there is nothing that can replace actual practice with the equipment.

Another worthwhile suggestion is to encourage veteran CDP professors to share with each other what they believe is especially effective in working with the CDP students. There were professors who got "rave reviews" on their presentation and teaching style from people at different campuses. There were others who got less than rave reviews. While some of this is likely to be personal preference on the part of the audience, there may be tools or techniques which can be used to good effect with this specific group of mainly nontraditional students.

Nontraditional students have some characteristics that are documented in the literature and easy to spot in mixed groups of traditional and nontraditional students. They often tend to dominate conversations in a well-intentioned manner. In particular,
they tend to think they know a lot because of their life and work experience. Often this is true, but it may not be what the class needs to focus on, and/or there may not be time to listen to it. While some of these characteristics may be problematic, they can sometimes be used to the advantage of the class by placing additional responsibility on these students who wish to share. When people have what they believe is relevant experience and want to share it with others it might be wise to set up a website or bulletin board where they can post information if there is not enough class time to allow them to share as much as they would like to with the other class members (or for any other reason, including disinterest by the group or the professor). By allowing and even encouraging students to use this means of communication and interaction, the professor is seen as encouraging interaction and yet can make use of the class time to cover the lecture material as planned. This can even result in some competitive or cooperative electronic interchanges between students where the professor can participate or simply allow this to go on without comment. This can be a spur to challenge other students to “do more,” “do better,” and just think about the topic in terms of real life use. If allowed to, some nontraditional students will create their own cooperative learning groups with good results and minimal direction from the professor. By making it electronic others can participate at will, or be allowed to bypass the input entirely. The professor can then decide to bring certain topics into the classroom or allow “benign neglect” to operate while not limiting anyone’s input. Nontraditional students tend to want to be “hands on” (or “mouth on”) and often want to learn more than the professor teaches. While this can be a distraction, by choosing a specific way for them to contribute, the results of
encouraging their input can be positive for them and can sometimes be used to advantage in a class.

The request for more respect for CDP students is one which should be honored whenever possible. Most of the nontraditional students attending CDP classes work full time, have families, and cope with all of the usual adult responsibilities professors do. Some of them deal with life and death situations while assisting in operating rooms. Some deal with subordinates and supervisors in their workplace and are used to meeting job requirements and deadlines for business responsibilities, like negotiating contracts and putting together tradeshows. Their families and their work may sometimes require them to miss a class even though they do not want this to happen. If professors can remember that these students have the same expectations placed on them that professors have in their own lives it might be easier to understand how this could happen. Keeping up with their classes and assignments is added responsibility which they choose to take on to better themselves. Attendance is important to the majority of these students, important enough that missing a class already causes them distress.

The professor could choose to have a video of each class made in case a student has to be absent because of family or work emergencies. This would of course be shared only at the discretion of the professor, rather than as an automatic privilege for the students. The equipment in use for the classes makes the taping of the lectures a viable option. But the decision to do so rests with the professor, of course.

Administrators

CDP administrators will not be able to satisfy all of the requests CDP subjects make, especially since some of them conflict. (One person asks for daytime classes,
another says only night classes are needed, while a third wants weekend or Saturday class.) However, if the administrators can encourage the campus to offer some night classes which are prerequisites to required CDP courses it would assist CDP students to complete their degree more quickly. Alternatively, if advisors could offer a short list of pre-approved alternative means to obtain these courses, or acceptable substitutes for them, from some other institutions (whether via online coursework, or correspondence, or other means) this could also be helpful to the CDP students. Some of these students are looking at the CDP as the only means to access all of their needs. Others are more practical and look for alternatives which can be brought into the CDP program to fulfill prerequisites and required courses they cannot access at the best time for their degree progress. Assisting CDP students in recognizing alternatives could benefit them and the CDP. There could be less stress for both by supplying information on alternatives the students can use while not requiring more expense for the CDP budget.

As far as a more rapid repeat of some of the core required classes which people mentioned as difficult to get, this may have been addressed already. Most of the problems seemed to be with business and economics classes like Business 380 which now is being offered every other semester as a CDP course as shown in the timetables for the past two years. If there are other courses which CDP students report are difficult to access, the department offering the course might choose to look at the option of offering a section of these classes through the CDP and asking their traditional students to access the section there. This would help the traditional students to become more aware of the kinds of telecommunications practices used in higher education every day while
providing more opportunities for CDP students to complete the degree in a reasonable timeframe.

On an interpersonal note, the CDP could take a look at offering some kind of special “CDP only” certificate of achievement (other than the diploma) for persistence in the face of adult responsibilities. Or perhaps there could be a small purple rosette or a simple loop of ribbon given to the CDP students to wear at graduation. Many of these people want the recognition that they have struggled to get to (get back to) college and have sacrificed family time and money which could have been used to better themselves in other ways, and lived through the stress of being a fully functioning adult while plugging away at earning their degree. Some small memento that they could wear at graduation to alert others in their group to their shared identity might be one way to acknowledge them without taking time for a fan fare.

Potential CDP Students

Students who are considering getting a degree through the CDP certainly have the approval and encouragement of the current CDP students. This could not be made any plainer than the statements from all 16 of these enthusiastic CDP supporters. All of the cautions offered are things to be considered by any student embarking on a college education. It does take time, commitment, and a willingness to use technology to make it through a college degree program. It is necessary to get into classes when they are offered to avoid delays in completing the degree. But the overwhelming “Yes, we would do this again” from these subjects is a testament to the help of their advisors, the determination of the individual students, and the worth of the CDP program to them and other potential CDP students. A sense of accomplishment, a boost in self-esteem, and a
UW-System bachelor's degree are all benefits of using the CDP to achieve a bachelor's degree.

**Update on Current CDP Status**

Jerry Rous, Administrator of the Collaborative Degree Program, said there have been changes in the program just within the past year. Requests for more course options and other emphases are both under consideration and in the process of being implemented. The most current news is that a CDP Web and Digital Media Development (WDMD) major has been approved by the UW-System Board of Regents. This will be a combination of CIS, Business, and Communication courses. Classes for this will be offered at UW-Stevens Point and UW-Marshfield/Wood County campuses starting in the Fall semester of 2003. In addition, more Psychology classes are being added to the CDP offerings.

The suggestion by subjects to offer CDP coursework at additional locations is being considered. Rous hopes to continue and increase marketing of the CDP both through word of mouth by satisfied students and through the efforts of CDP advisors at each campus. The subjects who offered to be of assistance in advertising the program and in connecting with potential CDP students could be utilized to good effect here.

**Some Possible Implications of This Study**

While this study is too small to make substantive theories from, it may be one indication of directions educational communication is taking. If students in the CDP are in fact learning the same information and earning the same grades (which are the same as the learning and earning of grades by students in the traditional classroom), then the implication is that distance education is an acceptable method of communicating.
educational materials. The greater acceptance of distance education modes of communication could provide an additional channel of information leading to broader public education. While this might not be a medium of communication equally suited to all disciplines, there are many people who want a college education which does not include learning to perform surgery or to perform on a stage.

**Speculation on Future Educational Possibilities**

There is a group of American adults who did not go to college right out of high school. Reasons for not attending college at that usual time vary, but I believe in large part it is because they did not understand the implications in lack of earning power and lack of job mobility as a result of not getting a bachelor's degree. Some of these people did not have family members who attended college, and therefore did not understand the importance of achieving a college degree. Some may have rushed into marriage and family responsibilities. Others may have accepted employment as a necessity, or a preference, in a perceived need to make a living or to contribute to the family rather than extend their education and risk piling up debts in the process. Some did not receive adequate preparation in high school to know what they would be interested in learning so they could choose a career.

Of these people, many come from lower to middle class families who could not afford to put their children through college, whose work ethic was strong, and who expected their children to follow in their footsteps. Those footsteps have often led to dead-end jobs and limited ability to get good-paying jobs though the people are as intelligent and capable as people who have better jobs.
The time and place bound situation leaves most of these adult college students with fewer options and more constraints than many of the people just leaving high school. The lack of timely and appropriate information and the choice to follow their own family tradition of not going to college has put them in a difficult situation. Their responsibilities and work ethic shape their perceptions of what is possible to earn a college degree. Work and family are facts of life which must come first. Education is a dream they hope to fulfill.

There are many financial as well as educational institutions offering degrees to these adults. While they may choose to utilize businesses to achieve a degree, the educational function is already established in the university system within this state. Is it not logical to have these long-established educational bastions continue to educate all who can perform the course work to earn a bachelor’s degree? In other countries technology is used to offer college courses via audio only and the professor never or rarely sees their students, either face to face or audiovisually. Perhaps the Central Wisconsin Idea will assist in reducing limitations in thinking about what is acceptable educational practice in the process of helping these people, people who both need and want a college education.

Change comes slowly to a culture, yet substantive change is needed in American education. Beginning in elementary schools students need more math and at least one foreign language, preferably Spanish, to be taught to help our children to become world citizens. By the time they reach high school, students should be receiving multiple on the job experiences and counseling as to what coursework will lead them to the job they think they will want, including a general fall back plan for a second career choice. Public
education needs to, and probably eventually will, provide the bachelor’s degree for anyone who wants it, and later the bachelor’s degree will become a culturally accepted requirement for most of the population. UW-Stevens Point’s CDP is but one step in the direction of furthering this much-needed accessibility metamorphosis in higher education.

**Personal Afterthoughts**

For a long time it seemed like this study would never be completed. Timelines were drawn up and exceeded. Goals were set and missed. Questions began to resurface. Why was this a suitable topic for study? Who would ever read this or care that it had been written? Would this ever matter to one person let alone a department, a campus, or a group utilizing a program? In all likelihood, probably it would not. However, the final goal had to be met whether it ever mattered to anyone else or not. To come this far and give up without the degree was unacceptable.

The “why me” question was the only one easily answered. Because I had “been there,” and not had the means to “do that” in a reasonable manner. Meaning, because I had wanted a college degree and had no reasonable means of maintaining the status quo in the family without commuting for hours every weekday, I could understand the constraints the subjects of this study experienced. I had also “been there” and “done that” differently. The travel for the bachelor’s degree was combined with traveling to a job. The later travel for a master’s degree was actually a longer drive, but I traveled it less because I could use online classes for many of the courses. In both instances I would have welcomed a Collaborative Degree Program to use.

Is the CDP a worthwhile program? Many people believe that it is. I would certainly have liked the opportunity to use such a program when I was working toward
my bachelor’s degree. From my perspective, and the perspective of the CDP subjects, this program should be valued, not only valued, but expanded, especially in such times of limited budgets and political controversy.

If the ultimate goal of the UW-System is to provide education for Wisconsin students and the adult population is considered part of its students, then the CDP should be recognized as a desirable option. On the other hand, if the students to be served by the UW-System are only the people between 18 and 23, then perhaps it should not be expanded much more since more of the people between 18 and 23 may be flexible enough to move to a dormitory at a four year degree granting institution without endangering careers or family members’ health and happiness.

The need for adult education will not just go away. People are living longer and the Social Security previous generations counted on is not likely to continue indefinitely. The UW-Stevens Point has made efforts to assist adult students, at both graduate and undergraduate levels. The CDP may well be its best effort yet at accommodating the undergraduate adult student. It seems like the most reasonable choice for the many Central Wisconsin adults who need additional education.
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Appendix A

Collaborative Degree Program Interview Questions

1. What made you (makes you) want to get a college degree?

2. What is (was) it like to be in a DE course/program?

3. Could you tell me about any studying you do (did) with others in your program/major? How important was (is) that?

4. How did you (do you) talk about the program with other students? – (follow up if not covered) specifically about what it is like to be in a DE program?

5. What was (is) the hardest part of getting (working toward) the degree?

6. Do you remember ever thinking (ever think) you might not finish your degree? (IF yes, follow up with – can you tell me what that was like?)

7. Was (Is) there someone in the Collaborative Degree Program who really helped (helps) you through those times? (IF yes) Can you tell me about that?

8. What was (is) the easiest part of getting (working toward) the degree?

9. Do you have a favorite memory, a favorite story, from your “college days” that you would share with me? (IF necessary follow up with – and what would that be?)

10. Can you tell me about anything that changed because you got (are working on) a college degree?

11. Could you tell me whether you would do it (start this) again, knowing what you know now?

12. What advice might you give others if they are interested in the Collaborative Degree Program?

13. What advice might you have for the CDP professors or administrators?
Appendix B

Informed Consent to Participate in Human Subject Research

Colleen Angel, a graduate student in the Communication Department at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point, would appreciate your participation in a research study designed to determine the effects of participating in the Collaborative Degree Program. This interview/questionnaire should take up no more than 40 minutes of your time. However, if you need more time it will be given. You are asked to allow this interview to be audiotaped for transcription after the interview.

While some of this information could be obtained by a questionnaire, I feel that an interview is more personal and allows you to share your experiences with me more fully. This will be helpful in utilizing your contribution to this study for the most benefit to future students in the Collaborative Degree Program.

I anticipate no risk to you as a result of your participation in this study other than the use of the time to complete the interview. You could, however, experience some discomfort if you have had a problem with any part of the Collaborative Degree Program and your completing the interview causes you to remember this. If you should experience some discomfort as a result of remembering problems related to your experience of the Collaborative Degree Program, you may wish to contact Dr. Sharon Gahnz at UW-Stevens Point’s Counselling Center (715 346-3553) so she can assist you in finding help with any such distress. You may also talk with the advisor on the campus you attend(ed).

While there may be no immediate benefit to you as a result of your participation in this study other than the use of the time to complete the interview, it is hoped that I may gain valuable information about how students view the Collaborative Degree Program, how it affects their lives, and how it might be better able to serve their needs. I am not directly able to change anything you request be changed in the Collaborative Degree Program, but (with your permission shown by signing this form) I will share your opinions with the administrative staff of the Collaborative Degree Program. This information could help them to better evaluate the current program because of experiences you are willing to share, and for suggestions for change coming from you and other participants in the study of the Collaborative Degree Program.

The information that you give me in the interview will be used for my thesis, and perhaps for publication and/or presentation later. If you prefer to be an anonymous interviewee, I will not release any information that could identify you. If you wish to be identified as a participant, I will allow you to read and edit any information which can be identified as yours and which is used from your interview. All completed interview tapes and notes will be kept in a locked file cabinet in my office and will not be available to anyone but myself, or, if you request that it be shared with the Collaborative Degree Program, it will be made available only to the administrative staff of the Collaborative Degree Program. Once the study is complete the information will be destroyed.

If you want to withdraw from the study at any time you may do so without penalty. The information on you up to that point would be destroyed. Simply notify me.

Once the study is completed, I would be happy to share the results with you. In the meantime, if you have any questions, please ask me or contact:

Colleen Angel, University Library, or my advisor,
Dr. Chris Sadler, Communication Department
University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point
Stevens Point, WI 54481 (715) 346-4448

If you have any complaints about your treatment as a participant in this study, please call or write:
Dr. Sandra Holmes, Chair
Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects
Department of Psychology
University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point
Stevens Point, WI 54481
(715) 346-3952

Although Dr. Holmes will ask your name, all complaints are kept in confidence.

Please go on to read the information on the second page. It requires your informed consent shown by your signature.
If you are willing to participate in a taped interview, either in person or by phone, please sign here. Your signature shows that you understand the content of this Informed Consent form and that you agree to participate in this study. If you do not give permission to be taped, I will honor that decision.

I agree you may tape this interview.

Name: __________________________ Date: __________________

Thank you for your permission to use the interview information in my thesis and future presentations and publications. Thank you for your kindness in sharing your story with me.

Please PRINT Name: __________________________ Phone: __________________

Address: ____________________________________________

City: __________________________ State: _______ Zip: ______

E-mail address: __________________________

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this project.

This research project has been approved by the UWSP Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects.
Appendix C

CONCEPT MAP OF FIVE PRIMARY THEMES

TRIUMVIRATE OF PRIMARY THEMES

UNIQUE
(Central Primary Theme) What IS

IMPORTANCE of College Degree
(Primary Theme) What IS

CDP=SPECIAL HELP
(Primary Theme) What IS

Interact to create the remaining two Primary Themes

DICHOTOMY OF THOUGHT
(Primary Theme—Conjunction of Unique, Importance, CDP=Special Help) What Might Be

ADVICE For Potential CDP Students
(Primary Theme—Conjunction of Unique, Importance, CDP=Special Help) What Might Be
Appendix D Primary and Secondary Themes

TRIUMVIRATE OF PRIMARY THEMES

UNIQUE (Central Theme) - Time and Place Bound Adults in Central Wisconsin have:
  Responsibilities (Secondary Theme)
  - Job/Career Responsibilities
  - Family Responsibilities/Babysitter Problems

Life Experience (Secondary Theme)
  - Nontraditional, maturity
  - Much to offer, work/life experience
  - CDP Essential/Very Helpful

IMPORTANCE of College Degree (Primary Theme)
  CDP=SPECIAL HELP (Primary Theme)
  Access (Secondary Theme)
  - Local campus
  - Self-esteem

Learning
  Access—Night classes
  Value education/Lifelong

Helpers (Secondary Theme)
  - Advisors
  - Parent/Sibling/Child/Spouse,
  - Professors — Keep/Catch up, Advance, Inspire

Technology

Societal/Practical Goals (Secondary Theme)
  - Job, Advancement, Piece of paper
  - Further study/Advanced degrees
  - Open doors, Stepping stone

Triumvirate of Primary Themes interact to create remaining two Primary Themes

DICHOTOMY OF THOUGHT (Primary Theme—Conjunction of Unique, Importance, CDP=Special Help)

Wish List for Professors (Secondary Theme) Wish List for Administrator (Sec Theme)
  - More interaction/Less PowerPoint
  - Professor attitude change/Prof technical problems
  - Respect CDP nontrads
  - Professor patience with technology
  - Teaching to peers
  - Consult with veteran CDP professors
  - Less group work/Less coursework

ADVICE For Potential CDP Students (Primary Theme)

Encouragement (Secondary Theme) Caution (Secondary Theme)
  - We would all do this again
  - Help is available—just ask
  - You have to use technology
  - Authors, fellow students
  - Get the classes you need ASAP

Recommend because...
  - Access—proximity: campus near you
  - Access—time: evening classes
  - Access—courses
  - Self-esteem—gain more than a degree/“Do not be afraid!”
  - UW-System degree
  - You have to be responsible
  - Obey professors
  - and get the work done
### Appendix E

**UNIQUE Time and Place Bound Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategories</th>
<th>Wausau</th>
<th>Marshfield</th>
<th>Stevens Pt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs/Careers</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td>6 of 6</td>
<td>5 of 6</td>
<td>15 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Responsibility</td>
<td>3 of 4</td>
<td>4 of 6</td>
<td>5 of 6</td>
<td>12 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nontraditional/Mature</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
<td>5 of 6</td>
<td>3 of 6</td>
<td>10 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much to Offer</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td>5 of 6</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>8 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babysitter Problems</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>4 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDP Essential</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
<td>3 of 6</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>7 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDP Very Helpful</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
<td>3 of 6</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>7 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CDP=SPECIAL HELP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategories</th>
<th>Wausau</th>
<th>Marshfield</th>
<th>Stevens Pt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helpers-Advisors</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td>6 of 6</td>
<td>5 of 6</td>
<td>15 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpers-Professors</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
<td>4 of 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access-Night Classes</td>
<td>3 of 4</td>
<td>5 of 6</td>
<td>4 of 6</td>
<td>12 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access-Local Campus</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td>6 of 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>3 of 4</td>
<td>4 of 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

IMPORTANCE of College Degree Personal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategories</th>
<th>Wausau</th>
<th>Marshfield</th>
<th>Stevens Pt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>4 of 6</td>
<td>8 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Education</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>5 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrupt Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>4 of 6</td>
<td>6 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPORTANCE of College Degree Familial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategories</th>
<th>Wausau</th>
<th>Marshfield</th>
<th>Stevens Pt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parental</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
<td>3 of 6</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>6 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>4 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>4 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>2 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPORTANCE of College Degree Societal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategories</th>
<th>Wausau</th>
<th>Marshfield</th>
<th>Stevens Pt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job/Piece Paper</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td>5 of 6</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>8 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Degree</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td>3 of 6</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>5 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Doors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>3 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix G

### IMPORTANCE of College Degree Male/Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Familial</th>
<th>Societal</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Median 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>four 3's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>four 2's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>one 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       | 8       | 7       | 6       | 21    |

**IMPORTANCE of College Degree by Campus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Familial</th>
<th>Societal</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marshfield</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshfield</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshfield</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Median 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshfield</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshfield</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>three 3's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshfield</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>three 2's</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       | 5       | 4       | 6       | 15    |

| Wausau      | f        | f        | 2       |       | 1.8   |
| Wausau      | m        | m        | 2       |       |       |
| Wausau      | m        | m        | 2       | Median 2 |
| Wausau      | f        |          | 1       |       | three 2's |

|       | 4       | 3       | 0       | 7     | one 1 |

| St Point    | f        | f        | f        | 3     | 2.2   |
| St Point    | f        | f        | f        | 3     |       |
| St Point    | f        | f        | 2        |       | Median 2 |
| St Point    | m        | m        | 2        |       |       |
| St Point    | m        | m        | 2        |       | two 3's |
| St Point    | m        |          | 1       |       | three 2's |

|       | 6       | 3       | 4       | 13    | one 1 |

### IMPORTANCE of College Degree by Gender/Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Familial</th>
<th>Societal</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marshfield</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshfield</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshfield</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Median 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshfield</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshfield</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>three 3's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshfield</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>three 2's</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       | 5       | 4       | 6       | 15    |

| Wausau | f        | f        | 2       |       | 1.8   |
| Wausau | m        | m        | 2       |       |       |
| Wausau | m        | m        | 2       | Median 2 |
| Wausau | f        |          | 1       |       | three 2's |

|       | 4       | 3       | 0       | 7     | one 1 |

| St Point | f        | f        | f        | 3     | 2.2   |
| St Point | f        | f        | f        | 3     |       |
| St Point | f        | f        | 2        |       | Median 2 |
| St Point | m        | m        | 2        |       |       |
| St Point | m        | m        | 2        |       | two 3's |
| St Point | m        |          | 1       |       | three 2's |

|       | 6       | 3       | 4       | 13    | one 1 |
Appendix H

DICHOTOMY OF THOUGHT Wishlist for Professors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategories</th>
<th>Wausau</th>
<th>Marshfield</th>
<th>Stevens Pt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Tech Problems</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
<td>4 of 6</td>
<td>3 of 6</td>
<td>9 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Interaction</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>6 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less PowerPoint</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>3 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect CDP Nontrads</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
<td>4 of 6</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>7 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching to Peers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Patience Techno</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>3 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Veteran Professors</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>3 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Group Work</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>2 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Coursework</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>3 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DICHOTOMY OF THOUGHT Wishlist for Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategories</th>
<th>Wausau</th>
<th>Marshfield</th>
<th>Stevens Pt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Microphone Problems</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>3 of 6</td>
<td>7 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Upgrade</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>5 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRCR-Course Recycling</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>6 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer More Course Options</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>5 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep Advertising</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>3 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Classes</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>2 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night Class Prerequisites</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>3 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDR Night Classes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 of 6</td>
<td>3 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday Classes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>1 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Experience Credits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>1 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Professors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Campus Policies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDP Extra Expense</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DICHOTOMY OF THOUGHT by Subcategory and Campus
### Appendix I

**ADVICE For Potential CDP Students Encouragement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategories</th>
<th>Wausau</th>
<th>Marshfield</th>
<th>Stevens Pt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would All Do It Again</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td>6 of 6</td>
<td>6 of 6</td>
<td>16 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Available-Advisors</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td>4 of 6</td>
<td>5 of 6</td>
<td>13 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Available-Students</td>
<td>3 of 4</td>
<td>4 of 6</td>
<td>3 of 6</td>
<td>10 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access-Proximity</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td>5 of 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access-Evening Class</td>
<td>3 of 4</td>
<td>4 of 6</td>
<td>4 of 6</td>
<td>11 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW System Degree</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>3 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>2 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Fear It</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>2 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction/Small Class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADVICE For Potential CDP Students Cautions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategories</th>
<th>Wausau</th>
<th>Marshfield</th>
<th>Stevens Pt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Commitment</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>3 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Use</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td>3 of 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotation Cycle</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obey Professors</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get Work Done</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J
USE OF CDP by Major and Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majors</th>
<th>Wausau</th>
<th>Marshfield</th>
<th>Stevens Pt.</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Stud Grads</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Grads</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current CDP Majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majors</th>
<th>Wausau</th>
<th>Marshfield</th>
<th>Stevens Pt.</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

USE OF CDP Classes by Other Majors and Unknown CDP Majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majors</th>
<th>NonCDP</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>CDP</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>