

12-1982

## A Follow-up Study of the Goodrich Scholarship Program, The University of Nebraska at Omaha

Wilda C. Stephenon  
*University of Nebraska at Omaha*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/cparpubarchives>

 Part of the [Demography, Population, and Ecology Commons](#), and the [Public Affairs Commons](#)

Please take our feedback survey at: [https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV\\_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE](https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE)

---

### Recommended Citation

Stephenon, Wilda C., "A Follow-up Study of the Goodrich Scholarship Program, The University of Nebraska at Omaha" (1982). *Publications Archives, 1963-2000*. 173.  
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/cparpubarchives/173>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Center for Public Affairs Research at DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Publications Archives, 1963-2000 by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact [unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu](mailto:unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu).

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF GRADUATES OF THE  
GOODRICH SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM  
THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA

Wilda C. Stephenson

College of Public Affairs and Community Service

December 1982



"In the fishing pond of social programs, Goodrich is a keeper!"  
--Goodrich graduate

## PREFACE

The research on which this manuscript is based was completed while the writer was on a faculty development leave during the 1980-1981 academic year. Since 1982 would mark the tenth anniversary of the Goodrich Scholarship Program, a follow-up study and evaluation of its impact on the graduates was deemed appropriate. In view of the success of the Goodrich Program, as its former director I recommend that the Goodrich faculty continue to maintain as a principal goal the interaction with students that communicates high expectation combined with concern and genuine interest. This goal will assist students to reap the rewards of heightened self-images and self-worth as they become self-sufficient and contributing members of society.

This study would not have been possible without the guidance and supervision of David Hinton. A number of other people were helpful. The questionnaire was developed in consultation with David Hinton and F.C. "Chuck" Powell. Tim Humberger served as data processor. I am indebted to Audrey Forrest for many hours of assistance and to Diane Gillespie who read and re-read parts of the manuscript. I appreciate the constructive criticism which Murray Frost gave and the valuable editing of the manuscript by Marian Meier. Special thanks to Cathy Young-Ratliff for graciously typing several preliminary drafts. Michelle Schmitz typed the final draft.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE. . . . .	i
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	iii
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS. . . . .	2
EVALUATIONS. . . . .	6
PURPOSE OF RESEARCH. . . . .	6
METHODOLOGY. . . . .	7
RESULTS OF SURVEY. . . . .	7
Undergraduate Majors. . . . .	8
Graduate Degrees. . . . .	11
Means of Financial Support. . . . .	11
Employment. . . . .	13
Job Satisfaction. . . . .	16
Salary Information. . . . .	16
Evaluation of the Goodrich Curriculum . . . . .	17
Evaluation of Goodrich Support Services and Faculty/Student Interaction. . . . .	19
Responses by Race, Sex, and Age . . . . .	21
Social, Civic, Volunteer Activities . . . . .	23
COMMENTS FROM RESPONDENTS. . . . .	24
Most Satisfying Experience. . . . .	24
Most Difficult Experience . . . . .	26
SUMMARY. . . . .	28
APPENDIX . . . . .	31

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS . . . . .	8
2. UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS . . . . .	9
3. MAJORS BY COLLEGE. . . . .	10
4. COMPARISON OF MAJORS BY RACE . . . . .	10
5. SOURCES OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT . . . . .	12
6. EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS OF GOODRICH GRADUATES . .	14
7. SATISFACTION WITH GOODRICH PROGRAM COURSES . . . . .	18
8. RELATIVE SATISFACTION WITH GOODRICH PROGRAM SERVICES AND FACULTY INTERACTION . . . . .	20

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF GRADUATES OF THE  
GOODRICH SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM  
THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA

Introduction

In 1972 the Goodrich Amendment to the state appropriation for the University of Nebraska at Omaha gave the University an "unparalleled opportunity" to develop further its educational offerings and services to students from low-income backgrounds. The intent of the amendment was to make funds available "for a program to get economically deprived young people in and through UNO." Named for State Senator Glenn Goodrich who introduced the legislation, the program was designed to provide an intellectually stimulating academic course of study augmented by whatever supportive services were needed. It would aid achievement rather than provide a remedial program to prepare students for regular academic work.

The proposed model was based on the assumption that low-income students have the same intellectual capacity for academic achievement as that of students admitted through regular processes. It also assumed the ability on the part of these students to succeed and excel academically, if exposed to a rigorous intellectual stimulation complemented by support services that would enable them to have confidence in themselves and their ability to succeed.

Though support services are a critical part of the program, the assumption should be avoided that "low income"

is a euphemism for educational or intellectual inferiority. Students are recruited who are "new" to higher education and often referred to as "non-traditional" students--persons who have not considered college in the past, sons and daughters of blue-collar workers, persons of diversified racial and ethnic backgrounds, and adult learners. These students may or may not have been successful in their high school studies. For most of them, the motivation for a college education is a better job and a better life rather than the sheer joy of learning.

#### Program Characteristics

The program, lodged in the College of Public Affairs and Community Service, has an interdisciplinary faculty of eight who make up the instructional component. The faculty are supported by a coordinator for academic support services and a coordinator for student personnel services. In addition, the program employs graduate assistants and work-study students.

The faculty are responsible for curriculum development, instruction, and maintenance of close personal relationships with students. This involves tutoring and counseling above and beyond that expected of faculty in the rest of the University. Faculty are sought who can demonstrate successful teaching experience with multi-ethnic and economically disadvantaged students. Of particular importance, faculty must possess a sensitivity to Goodrich students. Each

faculty member holds a courtesy appointment in another department within the University and usually teaches one course each semester in the department of his/her discipline. In terms of reappointment, promotion, and tenure, Goodrich faculty are subject to the same instruction, research, and service criteria as other University faculty.

The educational philosophy of the Goodrich Program is that mere access to the University is not enough, nor should economically deprived students be restricted to remedial classes. If given close personal contact with faculty and help where necessary, these students can successfully pursue rigorous intellectual activity. This philosophy is based on the belief that a stimulating teaching-learning atmosphere will motivate them to excel academically, complete degree programs, and prepare for meaningful vocations.

The Goodrich Scholarship Program is also characterized by the following features:

1. Direct assistance is provided to Goodrich students in the form of tuition waivers.

Financial need statements are processed through the UNO Financial Aids Office to ensure that persons with substantial financial need are considered for scholarships in the Goodrich Program. The Financial Aids Office is notified of the successful applicants and incorporates the Goodrich award into the student's financial package and administers the funding.

2. A general education sequence of humanities and social science is required of all Goodrich students during the freshman and sophomore years.



The rationale for this component is that many students from low-income backgrounds have been disillusioned by traditional styles of learning and that a stimulating and exciting curriculum utilizing innovative teaching strategies may restore enthusiasm for the educational process. The low student-faculty ratio makes possible interaction that serves to facilitate students' progress and promotes intellectual and personal development.

The humanities course is taught from the cultural perspectives of a multi-ethnic team and introduces themes from contemporary American culture. Students have an opportunity to apply skills acquired in the English and critical reasoning classes.

"Research Techniques and Urban Problems" is the social science sequence required of all sophomore students in the Goodrich Program. The two-semester course, six credit hours each semester, introduces students to the tools of social science research and attempts to show how the social sciences can be relevant to problems facing the urban community. This course utilizes scientific inquiry and public policy analysis.

3. Students are required to take English during the freshman year.

Freshmen are placed according to results of the English Diagnostic Test. A Goodrich instructor approved by the English department teaches the course.

4. A critical reasoning course also is required of all Goodrich freshmen.

The course serves to enhance students' abilities to analyze arguments and to draw inferences from theories.

5. Critical to the success of the program is the close involvement of faculty with students and careful attention to their problems and progress.

A variety of teaching techniques is utilized. These include large group instruction to small group discussions, simulations, guest lectures, research projects, and field trips. The multi-ethnic approach to the courses and the diverse student body and faculty provide for a rich exchange of ideas rarely possible in most classes on the campus. Each of the colleges at UNO has approved the Goodrich courses for general education credit.

6. A study skills center and writing lab provide assistance with course work as well as with the improvement of verbal and written communication.

Many students would find succeeding academically difficult without the intensive support services provided. In addition to providing needed academic support services, the study skills center serves as a place where students can gather--often resulting in mutual support.

7. The Goodrich office of student personnel was created to assist in solving the many problems of survival that confront the economically disadvantaged.

This office provides individual and group counseling to help students in working through difficult situations. In addition, a communications laboratory was designed which requires freshman students to explore attitudes and career goals in small peer groups. A variety of workshops dealing with subjects such as money management, nutrition, legal

rights, and problems of single parents also is offered. Social activities are also planned through this office by students.

8. A Goodrich advisory committee consisting of faculty from the campus at large, Goodrich alumni and students, and community representatives provides input to the director.

The committee has been especially useful in providing ideas from a broad representation of people concerned with the education of low-income students.

#### Evaluations

In the program's first nine years of operation, two formal external evaluations were conducted. The first, conducted by an ad hoc committee appointed by the Provost, submitted its evaluation in January, 1977. This report evaluated the goals of the program, assessed its quality, and submitted recommendations for improvement and future development.

The Goodrich faculty recognized the importance of continuing evaluation and contracted with an outside scholar, Dr. Bruce Francis of the State University of New York at Buffalo, to evaluate the impact of the program on students and the effectiveness of the program goals. This evaluation, entitled "To Break the Chain," was completed in December, 1977 and addressed the various facets of the program in addition to making recommendations for the future.

#### Purpose of Research

The purpose of this research was to do a follow-up study of Goodrich graduates to obtain data concerning their

Goodrich experience, their present employment status, and their impressions of the program in general. Since the format of most Goodrich classes differs from others at UNO, attitudes of Goodrich students toward their most satisfying and most difficult experiences were sought. For most Goodrich students, preparation for a meaningful vocation was an important goal; hence, this study also sought to ascertain satisfaction of the respondents toward their employment.

#### Methodology

The first graduates received their bachelor's degrees in December, 1975--three and one-half years after the start of the program. A total of 128 students participating in the Goodrich Program had received the baccalaureate degree by December, 1980.

Of the 128 graduates, addresses were available for 120. A letter of introduction was sent March 24, 1981 informing each of the survey. On March 27, a letter with the questionnaire was mailed. On April 10, 1981 a second letter with another copy of the questionnaire was mailed. Six of these were returned as not deliverable. The third mailing, a postcard requesting that any outstanding questionnaires be returned, was sent a week later. A total of 86 of the 114 (or 75 percent) completed and returned questionnaires.

#### Results of Survey

As Table 1 shows, just over half (54 percent) of the respondents were white. Blacks comprised 38 percent of the sample.

TABLE 1

## DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

Item	Number	Percent
Age		
22-24	29	33.7
25-27	44	51.2
28-30	2	2.3
31+	<u>11</u>	<u>12.8</u>
Total	86	100.0
Mean	= 26	
Median	= 25	
Range	= 22 - 39	
Sex		
Male	21	24.4
Female	<u>65</u>	<u>75.6</u>
Total	86	100.0
Race		
Asian American	1	1.1
Black	33	38.4
Hispanic	4	4.7
Native American	1	1.1
White	<u>47</u>	<u>54.7</u>
Total	86	100.0

Virtually all of the respondents (92 percent) received their bachelor's degrees from the University of Nebraska at Omaha (UNO). Two received degrees from the University of Nebraska Medical Center. One each received degrees from South Dakota State and from Humboldt State College in California, and three did not indicate the institution awarding their degrees.

#### Undergraduate Majors

The largest number (25 percent) of the respondents majored in some area of education. Of these, 12 were in

elementary education, nine were in special education, three were in physical education, and one was in library science. Business accounted for 15 percent of the graduates. Majors in the applied social sciences (e.g., criminal justice, public administration, social work, and urban studies) accounted for 20 percent. See Tables 2 and 3 for further detail.

TABLE 2  
UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS

Category	Number*	Percent
Art	3	3.5
Biology/chemistry	4	4.7
Black studies	2	2.4
Business	13	15.3
Criminal justice	6	7.0
Education	25	29.4
Engineering	3	3.5
Home economics	4	4.7
International studies	2	2.4
Journalism	1	1.2
Mathematics	1	1.2
Nursing/medical technology	3	3.5
Political science	3	3.5
Public administration	4	4.7
Psychology	4	4.7
Social work	5	5.9
Urban studies	<u>2</u>	<u>2.4</u>
Total	85	100.0**

\*Excludes one "no response"

\*\*Percentages rounded to total 100%.

One respondent did not give an undergraduate major. Also, the specializations in business, education, and engineering were grouped under their respective colleges.

A further classification of the undergraduate majors by sex and race indicated some significant differences. For

TABLE 3  
MAJORS BY COLLEGE

College	Number *	Percent
Arts and Sciences	17	20.0
Business	13	15.3
Education	25	29.4
Fine Arts	3	3.5
Engineering	3	3.5
Home Economics	4	4.7
Medical Center	3	3.5
Public Affairs and Community Service	<u>17</u>	<u>20.0</u>
Total	85	99.9

\*Excludes one "no response"

example, 26 percent of the female respondents majored in education versus 10 percent of the males, and 28 percent of the males compared to 11 percent of the females majored in business.

Four areas of study (see Table 4) accounted for slightly over half (51.5 percent) of the blacks. The percentage of whites majoring in these four areas was somewhat larger (59.5 percent).

TABLE 4  
COMPARISON OF MAJORS BY RACE

Area	Blacks		Whites	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Education	6	18.2	16	34.0
Business	4	12.1	9	19.1
Social Work	3	9.1	1	2.1
Criminal Justice	<u>4</u>	<u>12.1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4.3</u>
Total	17	51.5	28	59.5

### Graduate Degrees

Many of the respondents did not end their formal educations at the bachelor's degree level. Eleven reported having received advanced degrees. Five respondents had received the master of science degree, two the master of business administration, and one each the master of social work and the master of arts. One respondent had received the doctor of jurisprudence degree and one an associate of arts degree in journalism. Nine of the advanced degrees were received by women. Analysis by race showed that three blacks had received master's degrees and one the doctor of jurisprudence. Six master's degrees were received by white respondents.

In addition, 40.7 percent of the respondents reported being enrolled in an institution of higher education. Eight were enrolled on a full-time basis--three men and five women. Analysis by race revealed that 13 (38.2 percent) of the graduate students were black, 19 (55.9 percent) were white, and two (5.9 percent) were Hispanic. The proportion of black graduates and white graduates who continued their education beyond the bachelor's degree was about the same (39.3 percent and 40.4 percent, respectively). This included individuals enrolled in medical school and law school.

### Means of Financial Support

Since all Goodrich scholarships are awarded to individuals who can demonstrate substantial financial need, a question was included to determine sources of financial support. Specifically, each respondent was asked to check



their primary sources of financial support prior to entering college. Financial support from parents ranked first (33 percent). This was followed by jobs (29 percent), jobs and parents combined (28 percent), and public assistance (8 percent). Other sources comprised the remaining 2 percent.

One-third of the males as well as females reported receiving financial support from parents. Those who depended on jobs for support included 47.6 percent of the males and 23.0 percent of the females. Of the women 10.8 percent received public assistance.

Racial analysis of financial support showed that six (18 percent) black respondents compared with 20 (42 percent) of the white respondents depended on parents. Eleven (33 percent) of the black respondents and 11 (23.4 percent) of the white respondents worked. Public assistance provided support for six (18 percent) of the black respondents. Further detail is provided in Table 5.

TABLE 5  
SOURCES OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT

	Number	Parents	Job	Parents and Job	Public Assistance	Other
Sex						
Male	21	33.3	47.6	19.1	-	-
Female	65	32.3	23.0	30.8	10.8	3.1
Race						
Black	33	18.2	33.3	27.3	18.2	3.0
White	47	42.6	23.4	31.9	-	2.1
Other	<u>6</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>16.7</u>	<u>-</u>
Total	86	32.6%	29.1%	27.9%	8.1%	2.3%

## Employment

The goal of many Goodrich students is qualifying for a better job by obtaining a college education. Of the 85 respondents who reported their employment situations, 68 (80 percent) were working full time. Ten (12 percent) were employed part time, and 8 percent were unemployed. Two of the seven unemployed were actively seeking jobs. The employment characteristics of the graduates are presented in Table 6. Almost all (90 percent) of the males in the study were employed full time while 77 percent (50 of 65) of the females responding were employed full time.

Of the 32 black respondents, 26 (79 percent) were employed full time, four (12 percent) part time, and two (6 percent) were unemployed. No significant difference was found between employment rates for whites compared to blacks.

Most of the graduates (75.6 percent) were working in a field related to their major areas of study; 84 percent of the males responding were working in the areas of their majors compared to 73 percent of the females. The rate was lower for black respondents (63 percent). This compared with 84 percent of the white respondents reporting employment related to their major areas of study. The three Hispanic respondents all stated that their employment was related to their areas of preparation.

The respondents were asked to give their job titles. Almost one-fourth of the respondents were employed in the

TABLE 6

## EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS OF GOODRICH GRADUATES

	Total		Male		Female		Black		White		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Employed												
Full time	68	79	19	90	49	75	26	79	37	79	4	67
Part time	10	12	-	-	10	15	4	12	5	11	1	17
Full time, but seeking employment	1	1	-	-	1	2	-	-	1	2	-	-
Unemployed seeking job												
Yes	2	2	-	-	2	3	-	-	1	2	-	-
No	5	6	2	10	3	5	2	6	3	6	1	17
No response	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>101</b>
Work related to major												
Yes	59	76	16	84	43	73	19	63	36	84	4	80
No	19	24	3	16	16	27	11	37	7	16	1	20
No response	8	-	2	-	6	-	3	-	4	-	1	-
Employment												
Public	40	51	8	42	32	53	19	61	18	42	3	60
Private	38	48	11	58	27	45	11	35	25	58	2	40
Other	1	1	-	-	1	2	1	3	-	-	-	-
No response	7	-	2	-	5	-	2	-	4	-	1	-
Satisfaction with job												
Very satisfied	28	35	6	32	22	37	8	26	18	42	2	40
Satisfied/ somewhat satisfied	37	47	11	58	26	43	15	48	19	44	3	60
Dissatisfied/ somewhat dissatisfied	9	11	1	5	8	13	4	13	5	12	-	-
Very dissatisfied	5	6	1	5	4	7	4	13	1	2	-	-
No response	7	-	2	-	5	-	2	-	4	-	1	-

Note: Percentages do not always total 100 due to rounding.

field of education, 14 percent in the human services, 12 percent in management, and 9 percent each in technical and clerical positions. Since job titles can be misleading, respondents were asked to give a brief description of their duties. One criterion of success may be the employee's level of performance. The brief descriptions that follow indicate that some graduates of the Goodrich Program hold managerial, administrative, technical, and instructional positions:

Systems Analyst- "Program computers for accounting and administrative function."

Coordinator of Highway Supportive Services Program- "Provide on-the-job training for minorities and disadvantaged individuals in highway construction." A link between private contractors and the State Department of Roads.

Structural-Geotechnical Engineer- "Responsible for design and analysis of various projects including construction administration/inspection."

Planning Analyst III- "Gather, record, maintain, and assist in preparation of data for the various studies involved in cost of services and rate design activities."

Training and EEO Coordinator- "Develop training programs as well as coordinate training workshop activities. Also monitor affirmative action programs."

Marketing Analyst- "Monitor existing traffic movements of coal and coal-related commodities as well as forecast future patterns."

Executive Analyst II- "Analyze and recommend to the governor funding for state agencies and aid review legislation and recommend policy on it; review federal grants, etc."

Staff Attorney- "Interview clients, prepare for litigation, if necessary; litigation; supervise paralegals."

Commercial Banking Trainee- "Analyze the industry and the financial statements of a particular field; provide

credit (short and long term money) for working capital, buying equipment, etc. Also provide new credit money."

Respondents were asked to classify the organizations for which they worked. Of those reporting, over half (51 percent) were employed by the city, state, or federal government. The private sector employed 48 percent. Analysis showed that more women (53 percent) and racial/ethnic respondents (61 percent) were employed in the public sector than their counterparts. This compared with 42 percent of the males and 42 percent of the whites employed in the public sector.

#### Job Satisfaction

The majority of the respondents were satisfied with their jobs. Over one-third (35 percent) reported being very satisfied with their jobs, while 47 percent reported being satisfied or somewhat satisfied. The remainder were either dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied (11 percent) or very dissatisfied (6 percent) with their positions.

Of the black respondents, 26 percent were very satisfied versus 42 percent of the white respondents.

#### Salary Information

Respondents were asked to state their current salaries. Eighteen percent earned \$1,450 and over per month. Over 28 percent of those responding earned between \$1,101 and \$1,400 per month. Fourteen percent of the respondents earned between \$951 and \$1,100 monthly; 40 percent earned \$950 or less monthly. However, 12 percent of the respondents only worked part time.

### Evaluation of the Goodrich Curriculum

The Goodrich curriculum was especially designed by the Goodrich Program faculty with the goal of making a qualitative difference in the educational experience of the non-traditional student. Respondents were asked to evaluate their satisfaction with the Goodrich Program curriculum in terms of:

- (1) preparation for a career
- (2) preparation for other courses
- (3) preparation for life skills.

Table 7 presents the responses for the questions related to the Goodrich curriculum. Four courses were evaluated by the students:

- (1) English 101 - For first-semester freshmen Goodrich students. The three-hour course is taught by Goodrich faculty approved by the English department.
- (2) Perspectives on American Culture - A humanities course that emphasizes a multi-cultural approach to American society. This six-hour course is a freshman level course team-taught by a multi-racial faculty.
- (3) Critical Reasoning - A first-semester freshman level course designed to introduce students to logic and argumentation. This is a three-hour course.
- (4) Research Techniques and Urban Problems - A social science sequence for sophomore students. This six-hour course is team taught by a multi-racial faculty and introduces students to urban problems, public policy analysis, and social science research.

As Table 7 shows, the overall response was very favorable. Very satisfied responses ranged from 26 percent to 31 percent while the satisfied/somewhat satisfied responses ranged from 62 percent to 65 percent. No significant

TABLE 7  
SATISFACTION WITH GOODRICH PROGRAM COURSES

Topic	(n)	Percentage			
		Very Satisfied	Satisfied/ Somewhat Satisfied	Dissatisfied/ Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Goodrich Humanities Courses					
English					
Preparation for:					
Career	55	29.1	63.6	7.3	-
Other courses	59	33.9	61.0	5.1	-
Life skills	57	29.8	64.9	5.3	-
-----					
Perspectives on American Culture					
Preparation for:					
Career	71	21.1	70.4	8.5	-
Other courses	70	21.4	70.0	8.6	-
Life skills	77	26.0	65.0	7.7	1.3
-----					
Critical Reasoning					
Preparation for:					
Career	65	30.8	60.0	7.7	1.5
Other courses	65	33.8	55.4	9.3	1.5
Life skills	65	30.8	61.6	7.6	-
-----					
Goodrich Social Science					
Research Techniques and Urban Problems					
Preparation for:					
Career	78	21.8	67.9	7.7	2.6
Other courses	81	28.4	61.7	8.7	1.2
Life skills	84	28.6	63.1	5.9	2.4

differences were found in the level of satisfaction among the four courses in terms of preparation for life skills.

#### Evaluation of Goodrich Support Services and Faculty/Student Interaction

The Goodrich Program maintains a support system consisting of a study skills center and writing lab as well as a

student personnel office. The study skills center and writing lab assist students in developing those skills needed to be successful in college. Students may make individual appointments with student tutors or faculty for assistance or participate in small group sessions for improving test taking, note taking, and listening skills. Assistance is also given in outlining lectures, reading notes, and organization of reports and term papers. Some students manage to complete high school without having developed good writing and reporting skills. The writing lab is of particular value to these students. The student personnel center provides individual and group counseling, a communications laboratory required of all freshmen, career guidance, advising, and the planning of social activities for all Goodrich students.

These support services were classified into two units:

- (1) Academic support, consisting of tutoring, study skills, and writing lab
- (2) Student personnel services, consisting of counseling, communication lab, and social activities (see Table 8).

The responses were most favorable for the academic support services, with very satisfied responses ranging from 49 percent to 57 percent. The responses for student personnel services also were positive but somewhat lower. The very satisfied responses ranged from 36 percent for social activities to 49 percent for counseling. (See Table 8.)

In terms of faculty and student interaction, the satisfaction rates varied considerably. More than 50 percent were



TABLE 8

## RELATIVE SATISFACTION WITH GOODRICH PROGRAM SERVICES AND FACULTY INTERACTION

Topic	(n)	Percentage			
		Very Satisfied	Satisfied/ Somewhat Satisfied	Dissatisfied/ Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Support Services					
Academic support:					
Tutoring	57	49.1	45.6	3.5	1.8
Study skills	58	50.0	48.3	1.7	-
Writing lab	58	56.9	41.4	1.7	-
Student Personnel:					
Counseling	71	49.3	45.1	5.6	-
Communication lab	51	39.2	52.9	7.9	-
Social activities	70	35.7	54.3	10.0	-
Faculty/Student Interaction with faculty from:					
Goodrich:					
Humanities	78	57.7	39.7	2.6	-
Social science	82	52.4	41.5	4.9	1.2
Students	84	42.9	51.2	5.9	-
Major area	83	32.5	55.5	10.8	1.2
Non-Goodrich:					
Faculty	82	14.6	74.4	11.0	-
Students	83	24.1	69.9	6.0	-
Goodrich after 2nd year	76	27.6	64.5	7.9	-

and sophomore years. This dropped to 28 percent for the junior and senior years, a period in which the Goodrich faculty serve as advisors when needed but when Goodrich courses are not offered. These responses were significantly higher than the 15 percent very satisfied response for

faculty serve as advisors when needed but when Goodrich courses are not offered. These responses were significantly higher than the 15 percent very satisfied response for non-Goodrich faculty. A further analysis did show, however, the satisfaction with faculty in the students' major areas was significantly higher than non-Goodrich faculty overall (32 percent very satisfied versus 15 percent very satisfied, respectively).

Similarly, interaction with other Goodrich students was judged more satisfactory than interaction with non-Goodrich students (43 percent very satisfied versus 24 percent very satisfied, respectively).

#### Responses by Race, Sex, and Age

Cross tabulations of attitudes toward Goodrich Program course offerings, support services, and faculty-student interactions by race, sex, and age generally yielded few statistically significant differences. Where exceptions were found, the more positive response rates tended to come from: (1) blacks, (b) females, and/or (c) older students--those students often found among "non-traditional" student populations and for whom the program was designed. Specifically, the following statistically significant differences were found:

(1) Black students were more positive toward:

- o Perspectives on American Culture  
(preparation for life skills)

( $\chi^2 = 10.6$ ,  $df = 6$ ,  $sig. = .10$ )

- o Critical Reasoning  
(preparation for career)  
( $\chi^2 = 14.5$ ,  $df = 6$ ,  $sig. = .02$ )
- Critical Reasoning  
(preparation for other courses)  
( $\chi^2 = 10.7$ ,  $df = 6$ ,  $sig. = .10$ )
- o Critical Reasoning  
(preparation for life skills)  
( $\chi^2 = 8.0$ ,  $df = 4$ ,  $sig. = .09$ )
- o Social Activities  
( $\chi^2 = 8.8$ ,  $df = 4$ ,  $sig. = .07$ )
- (2) White students were more positive toward:
  - o Interaction with non-Goodrich students  
( $\chi^2 = 11.7$ ,  $df = 4$ ,  $sig. = .02$ )
- (3) Female students were more positive toward:
  - o English  
(preparation for career)  
( $\chi^2 = 4.7$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $sig. = .10$ )
  - o Support services  
(study skills)  
( $\chi^2 = 5.2$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $sig. = .07$ )
  - o Support services  
(counseling)  
( $\chi^2 = 4.8$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $sig. = .09$ )
  - o Social Activities  
( $\chi^2 = 4.6$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $sig. = .10$ )
  - o Interaction with Goodrich students  
( $\chi^2 = 10.0$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $sig. = .01$ )
- (4) Older students (those over 30 at last birthday) were more positive toward:
  - o Goodrich Social Science  
(preparation for other courses)

( $\chi^2 = 11.3$ ,  $df = 4$ ,  $sig. = .08$ )

o Interaction with Goodrich faculty after sophomore year

( $\chi^2 = 8.4$ ,  $df = 4$ ,  $sig. = 0.08$ )

### Social, Civic, Volunteer Activities

Since participation and leadership in community activities is one of the non-traditional measures used in the Goodrich selection process, respondents were asked to list their primary social, civic, and/or volunteer activities and offices held. The respondents continued to make professional and community service contributions through membership and offices held in a variety of organizations. Almost three-fourths (73 percent) of the respondents were involved in 155 civic, cultural, social, community, and religious activities. Involvement in civic activities headed the list followed closely by involvement in professional activities. Religious activities were mentioned 38 times; social and cultural activities were listed a total of 32 times. A measure of the graduates' contributions is reflected in some of the offices held:

- a. President-elect, Nebraska Association for Non-White Concerns
- b. Member, Board of Directors, South Omaha Neighborhood Association
- c. Former president, Boardwalk Condo Association
- d. District representative, Nebraska Coaches Association
- e. Member, Board of Education, Parish School
- f. Past vice-president of nominating committee, United Way
- g. Board of Directors, YMCA
- h. Member, Advisory Board, Landmarks, Inc.
- i. Awards Committee chairperson, American Society of Interior Design
- j. Parish liturgist
- k. Secretary, Papillion Education Association

- l. Sponsor, high school literary magazine
- m. Archdiocesan parish council representative
- n. Subgroup president, Omaha Jaycees
- o. Treasurer, Boys Club Professional Association.

The volunteer contributions of the graduates were significant, and their impact on the community locally, regionally, and nationally, will no doubt increase over time.

### Comments from Respondents

#### Most Satisfying Experience

Respondents were asked to make comments concerning their most satisfying experience during their undergraduate years. These comments were categorized into ten groups. (See Appendix B.) By a large majority, the most satisfying experience was the faculty and staff support and communication. A sample of some of the comments and feelings best describe the attitudes of the respondents.

#### Faculty and Staff Support

". . . the support received from the Goodrich faculty. When classes were very difficult, they had given me some constructive suggestions, and their support helped me through the classes with greater ease."

". . . the experience of an incoming freshman not feeling alone. Having people in the Goodrich Program making or helping you to feel at ease with the University situation."

"As a whole, my experience and interactions with Goodrich were very satisfying. I appreciated, I suppose, most of all the support system in the program. The moral support given to the students is unbelievable. I don't think I could find as much support from any other institution. The patience and concern was another aspect of the program which I appreciated. I don't know who initially chose the faculty, but they were outstanding!"

#### Exposure to Other Cultures

". . . learning to relate and communicate with people from different ethnic and economic backgrounds and realizing that most of my prejudices were false. This

has greatly changed my outlook on life and will definitely be a plus for me when I practice medicine."

". . . the opportunity to attend classes with people from a variety of backgrounds, have instructors with various backgrounds and experiences, and to be exposed to the various aspects of our unique American culture changed my thinking and my way of looking at the world dramatically. There is no doubt in my mind that I am a more open-minded, humanistic person today because of my experience in the Goodrich Program."

". . . the overall program and how it broadened my thinking on many things. I see this more now as I am growing each day from my experiences in life. I was exposed to many different types of people and situations which I feel enriched my life. I might not have known it back then, but I feel it now. I look back on the Goodrich Program as a very enriching experience."

#### Communication with Students

"The most satisfying experience is reflected in the long-lasting personal and professional relationships I hold with several Goodrich students and employees to this day."

". . . enjoyed the closeness of the class members and the informal atmosphere with the teachers."

"The best part was meeting and interacting with a variety of people from different backgrounds."

#### Field Trips

"My most satisfying experience was when the group went to visit the Amish Colonies. That was a worthwhile trip."

"The trip to Washington, D.C. in 1973. (Remember those golden years!)."

#### Participation in the Program

". . . grateful to be able to participate in the Goodrich Program. Without it I wouldn't have a degree today. My career is very rewarding, and I can honestly say I have had much success in my teaching. Again, I am very grateful for my education. Thank you!"

". . . enjoyed the time I spent in the program, grew to love the people, program and the aura associated with

them. In the 'fishing pond of social programs,' Goodrich is a keeper! The most satisfying experience . . . was meeting the most helpful scholars in any academic setting and being able to have some of the 'good stuff' rub off on me."

#### The Goodrich Courses

". . . the class, "Perspectives on American Culture," in its entirety. The class itself was most enjoyable and it enabled me to apply the topics of study in other courses at the University."

. . . not only in gaining knowledge, but the practical use of the knowledge for everyday. The Social Science classes I had were better than any classes I've had while attending UNO."

#### Most Difficult Experience

The graduates were also asked to comment on their most difficult experience. Some of the responses are presented below. (Also see Appendix C.)

#### Value Conflict with Professor and/or Stress

"The only incident I recall was an instructor that didn't present the material in an objective manner. He didn't allow the students the opportunity to formulate their own opinions about what was being discussed. He gave the impression that his view was the only accepted view."

"The required courses took too much time. At times, especially my first year, I felt that my values were threatened by strong criticism from a faculty member and other students in my discussion group. Much pressure was placed upon us to interact more within the program. I know of one student who left the program and gave up the scholarship because of this uncomfortable situation. The two years of required courses was a struggling experience for myself and I know a few other students felt the same way. It seemed the more the program pressured involvement, the less I cared to have any."

". . . with 'certain' instructors who projected a pompous and pseudo-intellectual attitude toward the students. Some I felt were on an 'ego-trip' and even though I had grown up and was behaving as a grownup, I was being treated as a child who would behave irresponsibly if given the opportunity."

### Inadequate Preparation for the Program

"The main difficulty centered around my inability to apply the principles and attributes of paragraph writing into substantial and meaningful results. This difficulty extended throughout the entire 'thesis' section but was finally overcome near the end of the semester. . . . Although this was my most difficult experience, the knowledge and skills acquired ('benefits') truly outweighed any difficulties ('costs') encountered."

". . . trying to develop good study habits and completing assignments on time. Through the program my self-esteem and confidence improved remarkably, and I found it easier to talk with my professors regarding my progress in class."

### Racial Differences

". . . coping with an almost artificial environment with students of different races and backgrounds all together in one place. I had come from a very sheltered background and found it difficult to adjust until after I had been in classes for some time."

". . . my sophomore year. The classes seemed to grow more polarized on ethnic, racial, religious, and even economic lines (social science classes). I felt the stratification occurred partly because the faculty exacerbated differences and misconceptions rather than really helping to interpret them."

"In coming from an all black school my most difficult experience was being a single black student in a class of whites and being able to overcome the feelings of insecurity."

". . . being a 'white middle class student' the subject matter of 'Perspectives on American Culture' often put me on the other side of the fence. This, however, made me review my views concerning minorities and made me a better person and friend."

". . . learning first hand that racial strife still exists."

". . . when it came time to graduate and attend another learning institution, I realized how important and different the excellence of the Goodrich faculty was from that of another school. I have the feeling that the faculty and staff of other institutions, for the most part, really don't care about minority students."



### Excessive Hours Required by Goodrich

"I accumulated many unnecessary hours due to the humanities courses required of Goodrich not being usable for a B.S. in Civil Engineering."

"The 6 hour requirement of the second year seems to become a burden, and an obstacle to taking more courses in the major chosen area of study."

### Summary

The follow-up study sought to determine the employment status of graduates who had participated in the Goodrich Scholarship Program and their attitudes toward it.

Over 75 percent of those surveyed completed questionnaires. Their ages ranged from 22 to 29 years with a median age of 25. Over 75 percent of the respondents were female, although only 57 percent of the 128 total graduates were. Almost 55 percent of those completing the questionnaires were white, 38 percent were black, 5 percent were Hispanic, and 1 percent Native American.

The undergraduate majors represented a wide range of interests; however, 29 percent of the graduates had majors in some area of education. Sixteen (34 percent) white graduates had majors in education compared to six (18 percent) of the blacks. Twenty percent of the graduates had majors in the College of Arts and Sciences and 20 percent in the College of Public Affairs and Community Service. Fifteen percent had degrees from the College of Business.

Eighty percent of the study participants were employed full time and 12 percent part time. Of the seven respondents who were unemployed, five indicated that they were enrolled in school full time, and only two were actively seeking

employment. Most of the graduates (76 percent) were working in fields related to their major areas. The graduates were about equally divided between employment in the public and private sectors; however, 58 percent of the whites were in the private sector compared to 35 percent of the blacks.

The job descriptions and salary levels of the graduates indicated that many of them were holding responsible positions. While the majority of the graduates were satisfied with their employment, five were very dissatisfied. Men surpassed the women in earnings according to salary figures given. Almost 40 percent of the men were earning \$1,450 per month and over compared with 11 percent of the women.

Women and racial/ethnic respondents entered the human services field most frequently. Here salaries are not commensurate with those of employees in the technical and managerial areas.

One of the non-traditional indicators the Goodrich Program uses to determine students' ability to succeed in college is their participation in community affairs. That these graduates continued to make a contribution in leadership roles in the community is borne out by this study. They reported involvement and leadership in 155 civic, cultural, and political activities.

Comments of the graduates about the Goodrich Program were positive. The most satisfying experience mentioned by the graduates was the interaction, support, and encouragement of the Goodrich faculty and staff. While racial differences

caused the most difficult experiences for some of the students, many indicated that the multi-ethnic nature of the curriculum and faculty/staff were positive aspects of the program.

In conclusion, the Goodrich Program has served to facilitate a college education for persons who otherwise might not have had the opportunity. All the evidence in this study points to the fact that students were successful because of the quality of interaction they perceived with the Goodrich faculty.

APPENDIX

## Classification of Job Titles of Goodrich Graduates

<u>Title</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Education	20	23.3
Social/Community Service	12	14.0
Management	10	11.6
Technical	8	9.3
Clerical	8	9.3
Service	6	7.0
Medical/Health Related	2	2.3
Protective Services	2	2.3
Legal	2	2.3
Sales	1	1.2
Administrative	1	1.2
Full-time Graduate Students	5	5.8
No Response	9	10.5
	<u>86</u>	<u>100.0</u>

## Categorized Responses to Open-Ended Question

Most Satisfying Experience

<u>Items</u>	<u>Number Responses</u>	<u>Percent Responses</u>
1. Faculty and staff support and communication	47	34.3
2. Exposure to other cultures	21	15.3
3. Communication with students	20	14.6
4. Field trips	15	10.9
5. The Goodrich courses	9	6.6
6. Participation in the program	8	5.8
7. Financial support	7	5.1
8. Exposure to own culture	3	2.2
9. Guest lecturers	3	2.2
10. Broad understanding of American society	2	1.5
11. Social activities	2	1.5
	<u>137</u>	<u>100.0</u>

## Categorized Responses to Open-ended Question

Most Difficult Experience

<u>Items</u>	<u>Number Responses</u>	<u>Percent Responses</u>
1. Racial differences and distrust of other groups	10	14.9
2. Value conflicts with professor/stress	9	13.4
3. Inadequate preparation for the Goodrich Program	8	11.9
4. Excessive Goodrich hours	6	9.0
5. Problems outside Goodrich Program	5	7.4
6. Diminishing contact with Goodrich faculty/staff	3	4.5
7. Dissatisfaction with guest lecturers	3	4.5
8. Locating satisfactory employment	3	4.5
9. Unfair grading by Goodrich professor	1	1.5
10. Immaturity	1	1.5
11. Excessive work load	1	1.5
12. Demands of Goodrich curriculum	1	1.5
13. Lack of discipline (in classes)	1	1.5
14. None listed	5	7.4
	<u>67</u>	<u>100.0</u>

GOODRICH SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM  
FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

Directions: Please check appropriate response for each item.

I. GENERAL

1. May I have your age at your last birthday? \_\_\_\_\_
2. Sex: 1. Male \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Female \_\_\_\_\_
3. Racial Identity:
  1. Asian American \_\_\_\_\_
  2. Black \_\_\_\_\_
  3. Hispanic \_\_\_\_\_
  4. Native American (Indian) \_\_\_\_\_
  5. White \_\_\_\_\_
  6. Other (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

II. EDUCATION

4. Did you receive your Bachelor's degree? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
- If "No" please go to Question 5.  
If "Yes" please indicate the institution awarding the degree \_\_\_\_\_

---

a. In what year did you receive your Bachelor's Degree?

- |               |               |               |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| 1. 1975 _____ | 3. 1977 _____ | 5. 1979 _____ |
| 2. 1976 _____ | 4. 1978 _____ | 6. 1980 _____ |

b. What was your major while an undergraduate? \_\_\_\_\_

---

c. If you have received a degree beyond the Bachelor's, please answer the following:

1. Degree \_\_\_\_\_
2. Year Received \_\_\_\_\_
3. College or University \_\_\_\_\_

5. Are you presently enrolled in an educational institution?

1. Yes \_\_\_\_\_
2. No \_\_\_\_\_
3. Full-time \_\_\_\_\_
4. Part-time \_\_\_\_\_



6. Do you feel that you are better off for having had the college experience?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ 2. No \_\_\_\_\_

III. EMPLOYMENT

7. What were your means of financial support before coming to college?

1. Parent(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Public Assistance \_\_\_\_\_  
2. Job \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Other (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

8. Are you presently employed?

1. Yes, full-time \_\_\_\_\_ 3. No \_\_\_\_\_ (If no, are you actively seeking employment?)  
2. Yes, part-time \_\_\_\_\_ (1) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (2) No \_\_\_\_\_  
Please go to Question 9.

If employed, are you employed in a field related to your area of concentration?

1. Yes \_\_\_\_\_ 2. No \_\_\_\_\_

• Please give your occupation title \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

• Please give a brief description of your responsibilities \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

• Please indicate the type of organization for which you work:

1. Public Sector (City, State or Federal) \_\_\_\_\_  
2. Private Sector \_\_\_\_\_  
3. Self-employed \_\_\_\_\_

• Which of the following categories represents your attitude toward your present employment?

1. Very satisfied \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Somewhat dissatisfied \_\_\_\_\_  
2. Satisfied \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Dissatisfied \_\_\_\_\_  
3. Somewhat satisfied \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Very dissatisfied \_\_\_\_\_

• What is your current salary? \_\_\_\_\_

Iv. SOCIAL, CIVIC, VOLUNTEER ACTIVITIES

9. List your primary social, civic, and/or volunteer activities and any office you may hold in them:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

IV. CURRICULUM

Please rate your satisfaction with the following aspects of your Goodrich and University experience at UNO.

	1 Very Satisfied	2 Satisfied	3 Somewhat Satisfied	4 Somewhat Dissatisfied	5 Dissatisfied	6 Very Dissatisfied	7 Not Applicable
<u>GOODRICH HUMANITIES COURSES</u>							
"English" (By Goodrich Professor)							
Preparation for career							
Preparation for other courses							
Preparation for life skills							
"Perspectives on American Culture"							
Preparation for career							
Preparation for other courses							
Preparation for life skills							
"Critical Reasoning"							
Preparation for career							
Preparation for other courses							
Preparation for life skills							
<u>GOODRICH SOCIAL SCIENCE COURSE</u>							
Preparation for career							
Preparation for other courses							
Preparation for life skills							
<u>SUPPORT SERVICES</u>							
Academic Support Services							
Tutoring							
Study Skills							
Writing Lab							
Student Personnel							
Communication Lab							
Counseling							
Social Activities							
<u>INTERACTION</u>							
With Goodrich Humanities Faculty (1st year)							
With Goodrich Social Science Faculty (2nd)							
With Goodrich Students							
With Faculty from Major Area							

IV. CURRICULUM (cont.)

Please rate your satisfaction with the following aspects of your Goodrich and University experience at UNO.

	1 Very Satisfied	2 Satisfied	3 Somewhat Satisfied	4 Somewhat Dissatisfied	5 Dissatisfied	6 Very Dissatisfied	7 Not Applicable
<u>INTERACTION (cont.)</u>							
With Other Non-Goodrich Faculty							
With Non-Goodrich Students							
With Goodrich Faculty after Soph. year							

Continue to Page 6 -- Use this space for additional comments. Thank you!

Please comment on your most satisfying experience within the Goodrich Program.

Please comment on your most difficult experience.

First Mailing

Appendix E

March 24, 1981

Mr. John Doe  
1123 Maple Street  
Anytown, Nebraska 68000

Dear John:

In three days, you will receive a questionnaire concerning your employment experiences and your evaluation of the Goodrich Scholarship Program. I hope that you will take the time to complete the questionnaire and return it to me. It is designed to assist the Goodrich faculty and staff in reviewing the program.

Your responses will be of tremendous assistance to us, and I assure you that they will be kept in strictest confidence.

Your cooperation is needed.

Sincerely,

Wilda C. Stephenson  
Director

Second Mailing

March 27, 1981

Mr. John Doe  
1123 Maple Street  
Anytown, Nebraska 68000

Dear John:

Enclosed you will find the questionnaire which I wrote you about several days ago. As a participant in the Goodrich Program at some time during your college career, you are uniquely qualified to respond to questions about your experience in the program and your present employment status.

Now that the program is in its ninth year of existence, it is important for us to know where our graduates are and how they feel about their involvement in the Goodrich Program. You are the only one who can give us the kind of information we are seeking.

Would you please take a few minutes and complete this survey and return it to us in the enclosed self-addressed envelope by April 3.

Your anonymity will be preserved throughout this survey.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Wilda C. Stephenson  
Director

Enclosure:  
Survey Form  
Self-addressed Envelope

Third Mailing

Appendix G

April 10, 1981

Mr. John Doe  
1123 Maple Street  
Anytown, Nebraska 68000

Dear John:

Several days ago we sent you a questionnaire concerning your employment and your assessment of the Goodrich Scholarship Program. Your responses on the enclosed questionnaire will provide us with valuable information as we seek to make a realistic review of what former Goodrich students are doing and how they feel about their experience in the program.

Since you are the only one who can provide us with this information, I hope that you will take a few minutes now to respond to the questionnaire and return it in the self-addressed envelope enclosed.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Wilda C. Stephenson  
Director

Enclosure:  
Survey Form  
Self-addressed Envelope