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The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between the Special Services Program at the University of Florida and Black student retention, grade point averages, graduation and economic success. The areas investigated in this study to determine this relationship included: 1) academic services and activities in which the students participated, 2) grade point averages received during each term, 3) retention rates, 4) graduation rates, 5) influence of peer counselors; and 6) economic status of participants. A total of 210 students, consisting of two randomly selected groups of 150 students and 60 students, respectively, was included in the sample of this study.
The Questionnaire Evaluating Special Services Programs (QESSP) was the instrument used in this study. The QESSP consists of a cover page with administrative directions and 41 items designed to solicit demographic information, responses about satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the Special Services Program, and evaluative comments regarding the Program's services and activities.

Some key findings of this study were: 1) the Special Services Program is effective in providing services and activities to its participants, 2) the activities and services provided by the Program are not being used by all of its participants, 3) the retention efforts of the Special Services Program have significantly increased the University's retention of Black students, 4) the attrition rate of Black freshmen in the Special Services Program is significantly lower than the rate for all freshmen from the total student body, 5) the graduation rate of Special Services students is not as high or equal to the graduation rate of the total student body, 6) overall, peer counselors are effective providers of counseling services, 7) the Special Services Program improves the potential spending power of the Special Services students.

The data suggest that the Program is effective and that it has been a major factor contributing to increases in the retention and graduation rates of Black students at the University of Florida.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The education of Blacks or the lack of it has affected the social, cultural, and economic progress of Blacks in Florida and throughout the United States (Perkins 1981). Recognizing the need to extend higher education opportunities to Black students, an Affirmative Action Order, number 11246, was issued in 1965 by President Lyndon B. Johnson to eliminate discrimination and provide equal educational opportunities for Blacks.

Institutions of higher education responded in various ways to eliminate the barriers to higher education for Blacks and other minority students. Harvard University, in 1966, took several positive steps to increase opportunities for Blacks on its campus, including the recruitment of large numbers of Black students. Because of Harvard's teaching and research reputation and its elitist position, the institution did not experience a substantial yearly increase in the number of enrolled Black students (Flemming, Gill, and Swinton 1978).
Oberlin College, a predominantly White private Liberal Arts College located in Ohio, made a conscious effort to diversify its student body by actively seeking and recruiting Black students. The Black Oberlin student retention rate is as high as the college average because of the support systems put into operation. Standards at Oberlin were not lowered, but special tutoring programs were made available for students who needed them. Although 50 percent of the students who used these special services were Black in 1978, the program was designed to aid all students with deficiencies in reading, writing, mathematics, and other courses in which they were having difficulty. The philosophy behind Oberlin's Special Services Program is not to lower standards but to bring deficient students at least up to the average (Flemming, Gill, and Swinton 1978).

At Florida State University, a program called "Horizon Unlimited" was created in 1966 to increase the Black student representation on that campus. By utilizing a Florida Board of Regents' policy, which states that 10 percent of the freshman class need not meet admission requirements, the University was authorized to enroll Blacks who did not meet minimum standards for admission. Consequently, the University, through the Horizon Unlimited Program and the Board of Regents' policy, substantially increased the number of Black students on its campus (Flemming, Gill, and Swinton 1978).
The University of Florida responded to the call to educate Black youths by creating the "Critical Freshman Year Program" in 1970. This program was designed to assist Black students academically by rendering to them services such as tutoring and counseling. The Florida Board of Regents' 10 percent policy for students who did not meet the minimum standards for admission was also used to increase the Black student population on the University of Florida campus.

Black students enrolled in many institutions often found it difficult to complete their courses of study. The revolving door situation was too often the pattern of Black student participation. Recognizing the need to assist these Black students and the institutions of higher education, the United States Congress amended the Higher Education Act of 1965 to create the Special Services Program in 1970. Services under this program were designed to assist students from low-income families. These students had academic potential but lacked adequate secondary school preparation to enter, continue or resume programs of postsecondary education.

The main goal of the Special Services Program is to increase the retention and graduation rates of low-income students. The Special Services authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965 included the following:
a) Counseling, tutoring, summer and remedial programs.
b) Career guidance, placement and other services to encourage or facilitate the students' continuance in higher education.
c) Identification, encouragement or counseling of students for graduate or professional schools.

Instead of acknowledging inadequacies of their programs, some administrators of the special programs have prepared reports which have been more of a defense of the program and of the students than evaluation (Cross 1976). The Special Services Program at the University of Florida has been administered primarily on the basis of such reports. The Special Services Program has been operating for more than a decade without an objective analysis of its effectiveness. The program has been planned and modified primarily on the basis of administrative experiences and not evaluative data. This study focuses on the federally funded program, Special Services, that is designed to provide support services such as counseling, tutoring and academic advisement.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between the Special Services Program at the University of Florida and Black student retention, grade
success. The questions examined in this study were as follows:

1. How effective are the academic services and activities of the Special Services Program as perceived by Black students at the University of Florida?

2. What are the grade point averages of Black students in the Special Services Program at the University of Florida?

3. What are the retention rates of the Black students in the Special Services Program at the University of Florida.

4. What are the graduation rates of the Black students in the Special Services Program at the University of Florida?

5. What influence does the peer counselor component have on the academic performance of Black students in the Special Services Program at the University of Florida?

6. What is the economic status after graduation of Black students who participated in the Special Services Program at the University of Florida?

Specifically, this study investigated and reported on the types of academic services and activities in the Special Services Program that are most effective for its students.
Rationale of the Study

Institutions of higher education similar to the University of Florida are expected to continue responding to the needs of their Black students and to increase their Black student enrollment. Like most predominantly White institutions of higher education, the University of Florida has shown a growing sensitivity to the problems of equal educational opportunities for Black students. This growing commitment to the solution of their problems is readily apparent in the number of programs available to Black students at the University of Florida and similar institutions nationwide.

In spite of this growing commitment and desire of the University of Florida as administrators to provide academic support programs for its Black students, it is easy to see that the implementation of these programs is not a result of evaluative data. Government grants, court orders, humanistic feelings and politics appear to influence most of the decisions to design and implement the academic supports programs for Blacks at many of this nation's institutions of higher education.

The University of Florida, like other universities in the United States, needs to re-examine its efforts and the effect of those efforts to provide academic support for its
Black students. A cursory examination of the Special Services Programs in the southeastern United States reveals a need for the improvement and augmentation of their efforts to retain Black students at many of the institutions like the University of Florida.

Retention of Black students and their graduation from these institutions are major goals of the Special Services Program. Significant improvements in the Special Services Program could directly affect the recruitment, retention, and graduation of Black students. Increases in Black student retention rates also could help the institution comply with its state commitment to equal access and equal opportunity in public higher education.

In spite of this commitment, the University of Florida is tightening its admission policies by raising its entrance requirements. The high cost of education and the current reductions in state and federal aid will cause many institutions like the University of Florida to reconsider their present equal access admissions policies and consider ways to become more cost effective.

The effectiveness of the Special Services Program in terms of retaining and facilitating the graduation of Black students is a focus of this study and is of significance in
these times of limited funding for education. McGrath (1982) has reported that few detailed studies exist about the actual cost of Special Programs in higher education and their effectiveness. This situation is true at the University of Florida, which has had a Special Services Program for over 10 years, but for which no longitudinal evaluation has been conducted.

In order to provide adequate support systems for Black students, staff involved in the Special Services Program should have more specific information about the factors that influence successful completion of academic programs by Black students. The absence of evaluative data regarding this program makes it almost impossible to determine if the University of Florida has been meeting the needs and solving the problems of its Black students.

Evaluative data obtained through this study should enable other institutions of higher education to evaluate the current support systems on their campuses that operate in conjunction with Special Services Programs. These data could be used to modify or delete services that are not effective. Evaluative data from local and national studies could be the basis for making program changes or designing and implementing present and future supportive services programs.
A data base upon which to build a more responsive Special Services Program will help to insure the best possible development of Black students, who represent important human resources for Florida and the nation. Studies such as this one can be used to develop a delivery system or model that will improve the quality of the services and activities rendered to present and future Special Services students at institutions of higher education. The development and design of such a model have general applicability both statewide and nationally because of the similarity of Special Services Programs in scope and objectives.

There have been only two national studies conducted to evaluate Special Services Programs and their effectiveness or impact. One study was conducted by Educational Testing Service and Research Triangle in 1971 and the other study was conducted by System Development Corporation in 1979 (Coulson, Bradford, and Kaye 1981). The investigators of the 1971 study of Special Services Programs did not find any clear and consistent evidence that the program related to the success of the students involved (Davis, Burkheimer, and Borders-Patterson 1975). The investigators of the second study in 1979 found some evidence of beneficial program impact on the students (Coulson, Bradford, and Kaye 1981).
To what extent do such programs affect the academic success of students? What is the cost effectiveness of such programs? What benefits do students derive from such programs? Are such programs still needed at the University of Florida? Questions such as these require answers based on carefully evaluated data. The support for Special Services Programs is uncertain in many of the institutions in which they exist. All too often universities and colleges make little effort to accommodate these programs within their operating procedures. The status of these programs also is uncertain because the nation seems to be turning away from expanding educational opportunities to all parts of its population (Gordon 1977).

Longitudinal studies of counseling programs rarely appear in the literature. This situation seems to be due to the difficulties in planning and carrying out long-term studies. The rarity of research papers on longitudinal evaluation studies at American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA) conventions suggests that most counselors are not conducting such evaluation studies. At the 1982 APGA convention in Detroit, there were five and seven individuals, respectively, in attendance at the sessions dealing with longitudinal studies and evaluations (Barclay 1982).

Rothney (1982) reports that the titles of research conducted by most counselors do not include words such as
evaluation, longitudinal evaluation, accountability, assessment, effect or effectiveness and results. He found that less than two percent of the listed programs at the 1982 APGA Convention included such words in the titles of their presentations.

Research studies identified exclusively as studies of Special Services Programs are rarely found in the literature. Using as a guide the key word "Special" in a search of the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) for research studies of federally funded Special Services Programs, this researcher found a total of 13 studies with the word "Special" in their titles from the period 1971 to 1981. Only three out of 13 could be identified as research studies of federally funded Special Services Programs.

The scarcity of national and local studies of Special Services Programs indicates a definite need for this study. Such a study could benefit the University of Florida greatly as a basis for making decisions about supportive services for specially admitted students.
Definition of Terms

**Compensatory Program**—A program designed to make up for the debilitating consequences of discrimination and poverty (Frost and Rowland 1971).

**Developmental Program**—A program designed to achieve skills or attitudes and is not necessarily a prerequisite for another program (Cross 1976).

**Expanded Educational Opportunities Programs (EEOP)**—A state funded program designed to assist Black students at the University of Florida.

**Regular Admit Student**—A Student who has met the admission standards for enrolling at the University of Florida.

**Remedial Program**—A program designed to correct educational deficiencies before a student may enter a course or program (Cross 1976).

**Special Admit Student**—A student who does not meet the admission standards for enrolling at the University of Florida.

**Special Services Program**—A federally funded program designed to provide academic supportive services to low-income students and increase their retention and graduation rates in postsecondary institutions (Federal Register, Vol. 41, No. 95, Fri., May 14, 1976).
Special Academic Services and Activities—Those services and activities provided to Special Services students such as instruction in reading, writing, study skills, mathematics and other subjects; personal counseling; academic advice and assistance in course selection; tutorial services; and activities designed to acquaint students with career options available to them (Federal Register, Vol. 47, No. 42, Wed., March 3, 1982).

Organization of the Study

Chapter II of this study contains a review of pertinent literature. The research method, research questions, subjects, population, instrument, data collection, and data analysis are described in Chapter III. The findings resulting from the analysis and evaluation of the data are presented in Chapter IV. A brief summary of the study, discussion of the findings, conclusions, implications and recommendations for further research are presented in Chapter V.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Philosophical assumptions underlying Special Services Programs and theories that are related to the education of Blacks and other minorities are first discussed in this chapter. Research studies pertaining to Black students, along with implications of these studies, follow. Finally, there is an overview of the Special Services Program at the University of Florida, together with the program's peer counseling component.

Research studies identified exclusively as studies of the Special Services Programs in the State of Florida are few. Those which have been made are difficult to identify since investigators often do not name the specific programs but use such terms as compensatory programs, educational opportunities programs, or special educational program. For example, one study which was conducted by a director of a Special Services Program was described as a disadvantaged student program.

The various labels used to refer to Special Services Programs pose a problem for persons seeking to find research
reports on such programs. As explained by Sowell 1972), any attempt to produce quality education for Blacks must begin by finding out what has been done and with what results. According to Sowell, therein lies another problem for Special Services researchers. On most campuses this question of what has been done for Blacks has scarcely been asked, much less answered (Sowell 1972). Despite these problems, it is still important to consider the studies which have been made so far and their results.

### Philosophical Assumptions and Theories

The drive for civil rights in the 1960's, President Johnson's War on Poverty, and the Higher Education Act of 1965 were major factors responsible for an emphasis on equal access for minorities to educational opportunities and Special Services Programs (Cross 1976 and Franklin 1980). The main philosophical assumption of these programs was that Black students with educational deficiencies can profit from special assistance through traditional educational mechanisms such as counseling, tutoring, and remedial instruction, rendered in a facilitative manner (Davis, Burkheimer, and Borders-Patterson 1975). Franklin (1980) also reports that programmatic initiatives for equal access to education provides the best hope for breaking the cycle of poverty and isolation for the nation's minorities.
One of the motivating factors in the initiation of these and similar programs resulted from the involvement of the relationships between college students and faculty in the civil rights movements. Students and faculty who participated in these movements in the South were amazed by the plight of the poor and underprivileged and urged their institutions to offer their educational expertise to aid these groups with special needs (Abert 1979).

In the literature, conflicting views may be found on the benefit of special educational programs for Black students. Similarly, conflicting views have been offered to explain why minority groups have difficulty with traditional educational programs. At least two groups have debated these issues.

**Heredity Theories**

In one camp of the controversy is Shuey (1958), who argued that Blacks do not possess as much capacity for learning as do Whites. Shuey, a psychologist, espoused genetics as the basis for learning difficulties of Blacks and not their impoverished environment. In the same camp a decade later, Jensen (1969) argued that federally funded compensatory education efforts were unsuccessful because they were aimed at changing what cannot be changed appreciably. Jensen also felt that the reported deficiencies of
disadvantaged students were due to genetic factors rather than environmental factors.

Elkind (1969) agreed with Jensen and others, noting further that the intellectual development of children cannot be accelerated by compensatory schoolings. Evans and Dubois (1972) took the position that such students should not be in college. They also agreed with the prior researchers and stated that underachievers are individuals with limited intellectual capacity. The arguments presented by this group of researchers place the blame for educational deficiencies on individual capabilities and the genetically inferior ethnic group, but not on the environment.

Environment Theories

However, there are other researchers who believe that the environment can produce educational deficiencies in a person. Hunt (1969) contends that the environment affects a person's behavior and that a child who is subjected to an enriched environment with reinforcements can develop adequate intellectual skills. The overwhelming opinion of many psychologists is that the educational differences observed between Black and White children are largely the result of environmental factors and not genetic factors (Pettigrew 1966).
Baratz and Baratz (1970) criticize both the genetic and environmental explanations for race difference in intelligence and academic achievement. They suggest that the main reason for the differences is the inappropriateness of most school programs for Black children.

Valentine (1972) rejects both genetic and environmental theories on intelligence and academic achievement. He argues that the genetics theory cannot be proven but that the environmental theory, which may be sound, needs to be extended. Valentine subscribed to the theory that all individuals are uniquely creative and continually developing.

Gordon and Green (1976) state that even if genetic factors influence mental functions, schooling and other environmental factors cannot be ignored. These writers further state that no matter what factors are responsible for the development of the intellect, human development requires diversity of facilitative treatments and adequate resources.

Although the heredity versus environment controversy has not been completely resolved, most authorities agree that environment influences learning in important ways. Consequently, there has been a shift from discussions of whether or not Blacks can make it in college to how they can be helped in college (Cross 1976).
Theories of Learning

Prior to the arrival of large numbers of Black students at the University of Florida, some thought was given to the question of how Black students could be helped with their academic courses. Administrative and counseling personnel sensitive to the needs of Black students were hired and academic programs were implemented to help the Black students who lacked adequate skills for successful matriculation at the University of Florida.

From 1971 to the present, most Black students who were admitted to the Special Services Program at the University of Florida were from deprived educational backgrounds. Ausubel (1964) provides some relevant evidence for countering the effects of cultural deprivation on the learning patterns of Blacks. He hypothesizes that an optional learning environment could stimulate intellectual development. However, he notes that some students' learning patterns may be irreversible as a result of a consistently deprived environment during their early formative years. Ausubel (1965), further states that adequate attention to the cognitive readiness for learning and the use of appropriate instructional materials create an optional learning environment for Black students.

Bloom (1971) theorizes that more than 90 percent of the students in schools can learn what the schools have to teach
them if given the proper instruction and adequate time for studying. Bloom's theory of learning is one of learning for mastery. The basis for Bloom's theory lies in allowing students sufficient time to master a subject or a course. This condition might mean extending the time for the course, subject, or term. Bloom's theory provides a basis for establishing programs and courses to meet the special needs of the individual. Individual differences, even within subcultures, must be taken into consideration when learning theories are applied to any group.

Wittmer and Myrick (1974) reported on the theory and practices of facilitative teaching and recommended at least 100 facilitative procedures for enhancing students' learning. These researchers state that individuals learn best when: (1) the learning is meaningful to the learner; (2) it is voluntary and not forced upon the learner; (3) the learning is the result of self-initiation; (4) the learning is self-evaluated and it is the learner who is deciding if what is being taught is of any value; and (5) the materials and techniques have an affective base.

Wittmer and Myrick (1974) also reported that teachers are key individuals in the process of facilitating learning. Teachers need to be aware of their own feelings in order to provide the psychological openness for understanding their students. These researchers go on to say that teachers
cannot facilitate learning by prescribing similar goals for all students or adhering to inflexible classroom plans.

Klausmeier (1980) reported that learning theories, with few exceptions, ignore both individual differences and rates of learning among students. Klausmeier further stated that some learning theories have not taken into consideration the developmental differences in either the internal or external conditions of learning.

Research Concerning Special Programs

The research discussed in this section includes studies of Special Services Programs and Compensatory Education Programs in Higher Education. The focus of these studies was on the purposes of the Special Services Programs and their effectiveness.

Special and Compensatory Programs

In a study of Special and Compensatory Education Programs in Ohio, Williams (1978) found that private and public institutions of higher education differed considerably in their concepts of providing assistance to disadvantaged students. The study involved 22 institutions: 11 were public and 11 were private. Programs directors at each of the institutions were asked to complete an inventory that included the following subject areas: (1) Program rationale and objectives; (2) recruitment and selection of students;
(3) program implementation to include academic adjustment, special assistance with studies, financial assistance, counseling services and physical facilities; (4) faculty; and (5) evaluation of the program. The main purpose of this study was to examine the growth and development of special and compensatory education programs in a select group of public and private four-year institutions in Ohio during the time period of 1969-1970 to 1973-1974.

Williams found that directors from both private and public institutions felt that the most important purpose of their programs was to provide educational support for persons who were socially, economically, and academically deficient. The private institutions identified two other purposes that were important to their programs: (1) to assist culturally or ethnically different students in becoming acclimated to the college or university community; and (2) to foster positive attitudes within disadvantaged students about education, self, and their potential for success.

Williams' study also showed that public institutions were more inclined to make changes or modifications in established procedures to facilitate the success of the students than were private institutions. For example, private institutions did not support the overall use of academic adjustment services; they did not see the need for
special faculty or special facilities for compensatory programs. Finally, the private colleges did not support the use of an evaluation process for special or compensatory programs.

After reviewing the data from the private and public institutions, making site visits and conducting interviews, Williams recommended the following:

1. That institutions insure the continuous development of sound and effective special or compensatory programs.
2. That institutions serve both the disadvantaged student as well as the traditional student.
3. That institutions devise a general model for a comprehensive curriculum.
4. That credit for all remedial or compensatory education courses count toward graduation.
5. That instruction accommodate individual differences and permit students to learn and proceed at their own paces.
6. That more effective use of instructional resources for special programs, such as faculty, media centers and facilities, be made.
7. That grading policies and practices be nonpunitiv.
8. That only competent instructors who actively seek to teach disadvantaged students be involved in special or compensatory programs.

9. That efforts be made to alleviate the abrupt transition from special compensatory education to regular or traditional college curricula.

Williams did not indicate how these recommendations should be undertaken.

Retention

During the 1979-1980 school year at the University of Florida, a report prepared by the Affirmative Action Officer revealed, that the Black students' drop-out rate was twice that of White students. In the Fall of 1980, the drop-out rate for White students was 10 percent and the drop-out rate for Black students was 20.83 percent.

In a report prepared by the United States Bureau of Census in 1974 on school enrollment, it was found that Blacks and other minorities had attrition rates much higher than White students, particularly in traditionally White institutions (Franklin 1980). The College Board, in a report on financing low-income and minority students in higher education, found that a student from the bottom income quartile has less than one-third the chance of completing a college program than a student in the top income quartile (Franklin 1980).
In a 1978 study that was originally planned for eight predominantly White universities, located in each of the four geographical regions of the United States, the statistics on attrition of Black students was disturbing (The National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities 1980). The institutions participating in this study were identified only by geographical region and whether they were public or private to protect their identity. As a result of a Southern public institution declining to participate in the study, only seven institutions were studied. The refusal came too late to select another Southern public institution.

The National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities which conducted this study found that, at the Midwestern private and Midwestern public institution, the Black attrition rate was about 43 percent. Considering the fact that Midwestern private institutions are very selective in their admissions policies, this failure rate for Black students is high. The Western public institution had a reported Black freshman failure rate of 31 percent. No data were available for the Western private institution.

A 28 percent attrition rate for Black students enrolled in the Eastern public institution of this study was obtained from the Equal Opportunity Program at that institution. The
researchers reported that the university could not provide attrition data on its Black students. Students at that institution believed that the attrition rate was at least twice the reported figure. The attrition rate for Blacks at the Eastern public and private institutions was reported as negligible. At the private institution, 50 percent of the Black student population was doing honors work, compared with 80 percent of the White population. The Southern private institution participating in this 1978 study reported a 20 percent attrition rate of Black students.

Statistical information on the attrition and retention of Black students enrolled in higher educational institutions must be made readily available so that educators can identify problems and seek strategies for retention of Black students. The researchers of this study found that the existence of special programs on the campuses of the White institutions seemed to have little impact on Black retention at the seven universities. It was reported that attrition was a major problem at the Eastern public, Midwestern public and Western public colleges despite the special academic and financial assistance offered to the Blacks at those institutions. The Midwestern private institution, which provides financial assistance, also had a major attrition problem with its Black students. The Southern private institution
which makes available both academic and financial assistance was reported to have a modest Black student attrition problem. The Eastern private institution, which admits the best of the Black students, had no attrition problem. Financial assistance and special seminars were provided by the Eastern private institution for its Black students.

The researchers reported that many of the university policy makers who participated in this study seemed to believe that raising admission standards and favoring Black students from private schools are the best ways to reduce the higher attrition rates.

The data obtained from this study showed that attrition statistics for Black students varied significantly among the seven universities. However the researchers reported that the underlying causes of Black attrition appeared to be found in the poor quality of life on campus for the Black students. For example, Black students perceived themselves as being in a hostile environment. The data also showed that the universities offered too few support systems to help Black students cope with racial, cultural and academic problems. There was a scarcity of Black role models, inadequate financial aid and an almost total absence of trained Black counselors on all of the campuses investigated.

The researchers of this study concluded that university policies and programs need substantial changes if Black
students are to gain increased access to predominantly White institutions and enjoy opportunities for academic success. These researchers recommended that special financial aid and academic assistance programs should be expanded along with efforts to provide orientation and counseling facilities and more Black role models for students. The researchers of this Committee on Black Higher Education concluded that only when these changes are made will there be a realistic prospect of increased admission, retention and graduation from college for America's Black youth.

Centra (1970), in a study of Black students at predominantly White colleges, compared the background characteristics, activities, goals, and perceptions of Black students with those of their White counterparts. A questionnaire on student and college characteristics was administered to 249 Black students at 83 predominantly White institutions. A comparison group of 249 White students was selected from the same 83 institutions. The White students were matched with the Black students on the basis of sex and major field of study.

The results revealed that there were large differences in the socioeconomic backgrounds of the Black and White students. The White students were found to be heavily involved in organized campus-based activities while the Black students selected activities aimed at improving society in
general and those aimed at improving the status of Blacks in particular. Centra (1970) also found that more Black students than White students planned to attend graduate or professional school.

Boyd (1977), in a study to refute the myth that Black students are only able to attend highly selective colleges because of special admission policies, found that Black students not only are successful at these schools, but have a strong interest in graduate education.

Turner (1980) has reported that the greatest factor affecting retention of Black students is the degree of institutional commitment to retention efforts. Previous studies and reports (Williams, 1969; Etzioni, 1971; and Davis, 1974) have stated that institutional commitment was a necessary component for Special Services and similar programs to be effective in their operations and in the retention of students.

West (1975) studied the retention of minority students in a program for the disadvantaged at Central Florida Community College and found that there was a 38 percent retention and graduation rate for Black students at that community college. West reported that the study was conducted over a three-year period and that the students were taught by an open-ended, nonpunitive, humanistic, instructional technique. The program also provided individualized
counseling and tutoring, as well as group tutoring. The documented educational outcomes, as reported by West, a Special Services Director, are rarely found in the literature.

National Studies

Since 1971, the first year of the Special Services Programs, only two national studies designed to evaluate the effectiveness of Special Services Programs have been contracted for and financed by the United States Office of Education. The first national study of Special Services Programs was conducted jointly by the Educational Testing Services and the Research Triangle under a contract from the Office of Education. Davis, Burkheimer and Borders-Patterson (1975) reported that 190 programs were studied to determine their effectiveness as reflected by the progress, satisfaction, goals, and perceptions of the programs' participants.

The findings of the first national study of Special Services Programs failed to show either negative or positive effects of Special Services Programs for disadvantaged students. Davis, Burkheimer, and Borders-Patterson (1975) explained that their findings were inconclusive because individual programs differed in a variety of ways. Differences in ethnic groups, variations within the groups, prevailing climates of morale at institutions, programs
offered, standards, retention and attrition rates were some of the areas in which the programs were unique. The fact that these programs were in existence for a short period of time might have contributed to the inconclusive findings of the researchers. These programs were studied in 1971, the second year of operation for most of them. A study of other well established special educational opportunity programs might have yielded more definite findings.

Even with the inconclusiveness of this study, the researchers did make some recommendations for future action. The first recommendation, directed to institutions of higher education, was to establish effective programs. The second recommendation, directed to the federal government, was to improve guidelines for the awarding of Special Services grants, and the management and monitoring of these programs. The third recommendation was directed to all concerned, to conduct more research to determine the effects of Special Services Programs.

Vernetson (1981), a University of Florida researcher who developed guidelines for disadvantaged programs, also suggests that more research is needed to investigate the effects of programs for disadvantaged college students.

The second national study of Special Services Programs was conducted by the System Development Corporation, under a
contract with the U. S. Department of Education, during the 1979-80 academic school year.

Coulson, Bradford and Kaye (1980) reported some of the most notable findings:

1. There is some evidence of beneficial program impact on participating students. This evidence is manifested in the form of increased retention rates and the students' successful academic progress.

2. Students receiving a full range of program services, such as counseling, academic advisement and special courses, are more likely to persist through their freshman year than are students receiving few or no services from the Special Services Program.

3. Students receiving more counseling, academic advisement, and other support services are likely to attempt and to complete more course units.

4. Students receiving a full range of academic support services have lower grade point averages than students receiving fewer services. This situation might be due to a selection effect rather than a negative effect of services. For example, projects tend to concentrate academic support services on students with poorer entry skills and more obvious learning deficiencies.

5. In institutions where personnel expressed greater acceptance and regard for the students, it was more likely that students would attempt and complete more courses. The researchers were not sure whether the institutional personnel were an effect or a cause of the increased number of courses attempted and completed by the Special Services students.

6. Students receiving more financial aid were more likely to persist through their freshman year, and tended to attempt and complete more course units. They also obtained higher grades. (Pp. 8-18 to 8-19)
This study focused on a nationally representative sample of 58 Special Services Projects at colleges and universities within the contiguous 48 states. Vocational and technical schools with Special Services Programs or Projects designed exclusively for the physically handicapped were excluded from the study. Two hundred students from each of the 58 projects comprised the sample, yielding a total of 11,600 student participants.

Two sets of student outcome measures were examined to determine the effects of student participation on Special Services. One set was taken from transcripts, including the students' persistence (whether the students were still enrolled at the end of the 1979-80 school years); the students' intensity of effort (how many courses the students attempted); the students' progress (how many courses the students completed); and the students' performance (grade point average).

The second set of outcome measures was taken from student surveys, which included measures of changes in the students' educational aspirations and expectations, changes in the students' job expectations, changes in the students' self-perceived skill levels and changes in the students' self-perceived education-related problems.
The outcome measures in the second set did not reveal any consistent or interpretive relationships with participation data or program characteristics, so only transcript-derived outcome measures were presented. The relationship among persistence, intensity, progress and the various supportive services provided to students was positive. No particular service was observed as being more significant than another in contributing to this positive relationship. An analysis of the data showed that students receiving the full range of services had predictable odds of persisting 2.26 times more than students who received no services.

The grade point averages of the students participating and receiving full services were lower than the averages of students who received fewer services. The researchers indicated that this was not a negative finding, but it might suggest that the students receiving full services might have had a greater need for those services.

Research of the programs and strategies that facilitate the success of Black students in higher educational institutions continues today just as it did in the sixties and seventies. Verification of the effectiveness of Special Services Programs may not rest with a single study but with a combination of studies. National studies, such as those presented here, in conjunction with local studies, might
provide more evidence and clues for implementation of effective programs and strategies for facilitating the successful learning of Black students.

**Ford Foundation Study**

Boyd (1974) conducted a national study to answer questions on such topics as the recruitment and admission of Black students, relationships between Black and White students and the responsiveness of institutions to the needs of Blacks. This nationwide survey involving 785 Black students and 94 faculty and administrators was conducted at 40 institutions during the 1972-73 school year. It showed that, while institutions provided for lower entrance requirements and lower performance standards for Black students, few offered programs that could help Black students adjust socially and academically to the institution.

As a result of this national survey of Black students enrolled in predominantly White institutions, Boyd (1974) reported that Black students considered some of the academic policies for facilitating access of Blacks to institutions of higher education to have serious negative effects.

Boyd (1974) found that significant but insufficient progress had been made toward equal opportunities in the institutions studied. Although there were colleges where race relations were extremely strained, Boyd (1974) found that segregation did not persist as an official sanction of
the institution. He found that students and staff reflected the social conditions in the country and divided along racial lines because they were more comfortable with this division. However, Boyd (1974) did report that many of the predominantly White institutions were unprepared and in many cases unwilling to meet the needs of their Black students. Boyd's data indicated that some colleges had not made it clear that they were willing to work to overcome gaps in their preparation for helping Blacks.

Boyd reported that Black students were still able to obtain their education and degree even though experiencing discrimination, being stereotyped as special admit students, being advised by institutional officials not to try certain academic disciplines and sometimes being neglected by faculty and staff. He stated that most of the Black students wanted to go on to graduate school even though it was likely that they would have the same kind of obstacle course to run there.

Most of the students who participated in Boyd's (1974) study were within the accepted admissions criteria for the colleges where they were enrolled. The overall pattern of success was attributed to being qualified and the fact that most of the Black students took education seriously enough to overcome the barriers to their educational pursuits. Boyd's (1974) data dismissed the demeaning and damaging
rhetoric that Black students are getting a free ride through college. His data about loans and jobs showed that, if Black students were getting a free ride, it was provided by their own families.

Information from this study concerning students' satisfaction with their overall college experiences suggests that colleges should emphasize matching the preparation, ability, interests, and style of each prospective Black student with the academic reputation, requirements and style of the college.

Boyd's presentation of his data was simple and direct. He avoided using complex statistical techniques, which he feels tend to be understood only by those with statistical backgrounds. However, he did present much of the raw data in the appendix of his study for those who wanted to draw their own conclusions. Analysis of these data reveals some insights and recommendations for use as reference points in removing barriers which Black students face in predominantly White institutions. The recommendations offered by Boyd are as follows:

1. Colleges should attempt to be more responsive to the needs of Blacks.
2. Financial aid should be maintained at current levels or increased.
3. Continued financial aid should be assured.
4. The emphasis on loans in the aid packages should be decreased for those whose family income is less than $5,000.

5. The number of Black students in predominantly White institutions should continue to increase.

6. The number of Black staff members in predominantly White institutions should increase dramatically.

7. Colleges should guard against increased hostility toward Blacks as their numbers increase.

8. Colleges should recruit Black students of diverse backgrounds and interests rather than concentrating their attention on those with multiple educational deficiencies.

9. Colleges should include the study of Blacks in their curricula, either through specific courses on the topic or through revision of existing courses.

10. Colleges should provide academic support to Black students who need it.

11. Colleges should be sure that any special help is designed to help Black students meet existing standards rather than to foster tolerance for a kind of second-class academic citizenship.

12. Colleges should encourage Black students to pursue a variety of majors.

13. Colleges should provide realistic advice about a broad range of career options and the educational experiences which lead to them.

14. Colleges should involve Whites as well as Blacks in advising and counseling Black students.

15. Colleges should maintain channels of communication with more than a few spokesmen among their Black students.

16. Colleges should plan ahead in dealing with Blacks rather than drift from crisis to crisis.

17. Young Blacks should shop around carefully before enrolling in a college.
18. Black students should struggle primarily for changes which will be most meaningful to their educational experience, even if colleges resist these changes strongly while making other less important changes. (Pp. 67-73)

Boyd was careful to point out that not all of the above recommendations apply to all colleges or provide "how to do it" instructions. Effective implementation of changes on any campus must be based on information about that campus and its students and comparative information about groups of similar colleges and students.

Special Programs at the University of Florida

It was not until the late sixties that Blacks began to enroll at the University of Florida in large numbers. In the summer of 1970, an experimental program designed to provide supportive services such as tutoring, counseling, academic advisement and social programs was implemented to determine if the program would contribute to the academic and personal success of the students.

Apparently, the experiment was a success. Cranney and Larsen (1972) reported that out of the 191 Black students admitted during the summer of 1970, all but 13 were still enrolled in 1971 and that seven of the dropouts had transferred to other colleges. Van Gelder (1973) also reported on this group of students and found that 62 percent of them
were progressing satisfactorily after three terms at the University of Florida.

This experimental program, that was state funded and called the "Critical Freshman Year Program," had its name changed to the "Expanded Educational Opportunities Program" during the 1970-71 school year. In July 1971, the University of Florida, with a $50,000 grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), established the present Special Services Program for low-income students from all ethnic groups.

The Expanded Educational Opportunities Program was phased out in 1973, leaving the Special Services Program with the responsibility for serving the academic and social needs of the Black and White students assigned to the Program.

Over the past ten years (1971-1981), the Special Services Program has gone through four changes in organizational structure and has changed leadership four times. With the change in leadership came the change in leadership style that occurred four times during the period 1971-1974. Since 1971, the Special Services Program has operated as a consolidated unit with the Upward Bound Program, a preparatory program for high school youth. The staffs from these two distinct federal programs were consolidated, but the goals, funds and supplies remained separated. The overall
objective of the Special Services Program during this 10-year span has been to provide the students with supportive services to facilitate their retention and subsequent graduation from this institution.

Program Elements

The Special Services project at the University of Florida has been providing services consistent with the goals and objectives of the U. S. Department of Education. Specifically, the services and activities provided are

1. Selecting eligible participants from a pool consisting of students admitted to the University under the Board of Regents 10 percent special admission policy, who have participated in other federal programs, such as Upward Bound or Talent Search or who may lack adequate secondary school preparation;

2. Providing a needs assessment of each selected participant to determine the academic or other educational deficiencies which need particular attention to enable the participant to graduate from the University;

3. Providing personal, career and academic guidance and counseling in those areas affecting student performance;

4. Arranging for remedial and other services such as special classes, tutoring and educational and cultural activities which enable the participant to complete with sufficient academic and personal skills at the University, yet without creating a long-range dependency on the project;

5. Developing and encouraging the use of special curricular and instructional methods which enable participants to complete required course work in a reasonable period of time;
6. Documenting participant performance and progress while enrolled in the project; and

7. Acting as a referral agent for the participants, to enable them to deal correctly and efficiently with situations involving financial aid, housing, academic matters, and educational and career planning.

Peer Counseling

A review of the objectives of the Special Services Program at the University of Florida shows that the program is heavily oriented toward providing counseling services. This situation may result from the fact that the University does not provide a structured and coordinated approach to teaching remedial courses. However, remedial education is becoming a topic of major concern as more and more students are leaving high school without adequate reading, writing, and mathematics skills requisite for successful academic survival in college.

Through the use of peer counselors, the program has provided substantial counseling and referral services for its students. These students have been an essential component of the Special Services counseling program since its beginning. These peer counselors have been predominantly undergraduate students who have had no formal training prior to being hired. The professional staff provides formal and ongoing training for them. Weekly meetings in the form of staff development sessions are conducted by the counseling coordinator or the director for peer counselor training.
The following topics are covered in training and development sessions: 1) counseling theories; 2) communication skills and training; 3) human relations training; 4) values clarification; 5) problem-solving and feedback exchange; and 6) writing skills for the maintenance of weekly counseling logs.

Peer counselors function as extensions of the Special Services counseling component. They provide the full-time staff feedback from the students who are located all over the campus and the Gainesville community. Peer counselors are required to make weekly contact with their assigned case load of students and to report their findings to the full-time staff counselor. With peer counselors seeking out their clients to ascertain their needs, the full-time counselor can determine priorities for intervening in situations too complex for peer counselors.

Research by Zunker and Brown (1966) found that peer counselors can be as effective as professional counselors. Carkhuff (1969) and Durlak (1970) have demonstrated in their research that peer counselors can successfully function as providers of counseling services. Sussman (1977) found in his research of peer counselors that they are effective at improving grades of students.

As effective and successful providers of counseling services, peer counselors might be an intervening variable
that is contributing to the success of Black students in higher educational institutions. The lack of information about the effectiveness of peer counselors with the Black student population suggests the need for research in this area.

**Summary**

The Civil Rights movement of the 1960's called attention to the need for improvement of educational opportunities for Blacks and other minorities. Several questions have been raised about how such improvements are to be accomplished. The value of Special Services Programs, the key mechanism for improving the quality of education for Blacks, has been questioned by some educators. In terms of the academic potential of Black students, there is a theory that heredity determines intelligence, a theory which leads to the conclusion that Special Services Programs do not have a useful purpose. In contrast to this view, there is a theory that attributes intelligence primarily to environmental influences. This latter view has been used repeatedly to support the implementation of Special Services Programs in higher education.

The controversy over heredity versus environment as a significant factor which contributes to the intelligence and academic achievement of Black students has been shifted in
recent years from whether or not they can make it to how can they be helped (Cross 1976). How an individual can be helped is dependent upon how that individual learns. Application of the learning theories presented in this chapter might facilitate Black students in their learning and also help to improve their academic performance, retention and graduation rates. As reported by most researchers, individual differences and developmental differences must be taken into account in assisting with the learning process of Black students.

Research concerning special programs has provided some useful guidelines for program administrators. For example, Williams' (1978) recommendations have value as both general institutional guidelines and more specific academic program guidelines. West's (1975) report on retention rates of Special Services students is also useful to administrators, but more for documenting problems than for resolving them. Some directions for program changes are found in the national studies which have been conducted to evaluate the Special Services Programs.

Both the national and local evaluation studies reviewed in this chapter gave some general recommendations for improving Special Services Programs, such as

1. Institutions should insure the continuous development of sound and effective special or compensatory programs.
2. Institutions should accommodate individual differences and permit students to learn and proceed at their own pace.

3. Institutions should conduct more research to determine the effects of the programs.

The national study by Coulson, Bradford, and Kaye (1980) reported specific examples of increased retention rates and successful academic progress as evidence of beneficial program impact on Special Services students. This impact on students participating in the Special Services Program was attributed to supportive services, such as academic advisement, tutoring and counseling.

At the University of Florida, the Special Services Program emphasizes a peer counseling component which has provided substantial counseling and referral services for its students. Researchers, such as Zunker and Brown (1966), Carkhuff (1969), and Durlak (1979), have found that peer counselors are effective and successful providers of counseling services.

The literature suggests that there is a relationship between the effectiveness of the Special Services Program and the support rendered to it by the host institution. Even though controversy exists about the benefits of these programs and their affect on Black students, it does appear...
that the programs are helping the students experience academic success. However, more research is needed to determine the effectiveness of Special Services Programs.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of the Special Services Program at the University of Florida in the retention and graduation of its participants. The flexibility of this study's research design provided the researcher with an economical and efficient method of collecting and analyzing the data for this study. Chapter III includes a discussion of the research design, the research questions, the characteristics of the population studied, the method used to select the subjects, the instrument used in this study, the pilot testing of the instrument and the determination of the reliability and validity of the instrument. Finally, this chapter contains the procedures used in collecting and analyzing the data of this study.

Research Design

The correlational research design, a category of descriptive research, was utilized for this study. Using the correlational design, the researcher examined the following five dependent variables:
1. Program participation (academic services and activities in which the students participated);
2. Performance (grade point average);
3. Persistence (retention rates);
4. Progress (graduation rates); and
5. Prominence (economic status of participants).

Van Dalen (1973), in explaining the characteristics of correlational research, states that, because of the complexity and nature of social phenomena, an educator cannot always select, control, and manipulate the factors as in an experimental research design. Therefore, Van Dalen suggests the utilization of the correlational research design when variables do not lend themselves to the experimental method and controlled manipulation.

In studies of causation, many researchers prefer to use the experimental research design to select and control the factors necessary to study cause-effect relations. However, researchers cannot manipulate socioeconomic status, home environments or personalities, all of which would influence the subjects of a study. Utilization of the experimental research design in these instances would be impractical (Van Dalen 1973). Best (1970) also expressed similar views regarding correlational research.
The six research questions for this study were

1. How effective are the academic services and activities of the Special Services Program as perceived by Black students at the University of Florida?

2. What are the grade point averages of Black students in the Special Services Program at the University of Florida?

3. What are the retention rates of the Black students in the Special Services Program at the University of Florida?

4. What are the graduation rates of the Black students in the Special Services Program at the University of Florida?

5. What influence does the peer counselor component have on the academic performance of Black students in the Special Services Program at the University of Florida?

6. What is the economic status of Black students who participated in the Special Services Program at the University of Florida?

Population

The population for this study was comprised of individuals from a variety of backgrounds, with the majority coming from deprived economic and educational backgrounds. Some of the individuals comprising the population of interest are from limited-English-speaking families, such as Vietnamese, Chinese, Haitians and Latin Americans. However,
these individuals were not included in the study; only Blacks were studied. The ethnic breakdown of the population is 90 percent Black, with a 10 percent representation from other ethnic groups. Females outnumber the males in the population by a ratio of three females for each male. The average age of the population is 18 years at the time of initial enrollment and 23 years at time of graduation.

All members of the population were admitted to the University of Florida under special admission guidelines because they did not meet the standards for regular admission. They were all first-time-in-college students who were required to enter the University of Florida during the summer session and to participate in the Special Services Program. All members of the population were admitted into the University of Florida with at least a "C" average in core high school courses.

Selection of Subjects

Subjects for the sample were chosen from among approximately 750 students who were enrolled in the University of Florida's Special Services Program during the years 1974-75, 1975-76, 1976-77, 1977-78, and 1978-79. The names and addresses of the subjects were obtained from the files in the
Special Services Office. Using the stratified random sampling technique in conjunction with a table of random numbers, the researcher selected two groups of students (150 students and 60 students, respectively), totalling 210 subjects for the sample.

The stratified random selection process was used to select the 60 students who represented each of the five-year periods of this study. Thirty graduates and 30 nongraduates, totalling 60 subjects, were administered the evaluation instrument and had their transcripts analyzed. The other group of 150 subjects only had their transcripts analyzed.

Instrumentation

The instrument used in this study was designed and developed by the researcher after reviewing several of the instruments used by Special Services directors to evaluate their programs. The instruments used by Boyd (1974), Davis, Burkheimer and Borders-Patterson (1975), and Coulson, Bradford, and Kaye (1981) were influential in helping the researcher to design and develop the instrument for this study.

A panel of experts, consisting of Special Services directors from Central Florida Community College, Edward
Waters College, Florida A & M University, Florida State University, Hillsborough Community College, and Jacksonville University, was initially consulted for advice on the construction of this instrument (Appendix A). Since all Special Services Programs are operating under the same set of federal guidelines and are attempting to accomplish the same goals, the help of these experts was invaluable in constructing this instrument.

The items in the instrument were formulated based on those conditions, services and activities which, if optimally rendered, would produce successful experiences for the students of Special Services Programs. The specific conditions, services and activities to be evaluated were obtained from the federal guidelines for operating the Special Services Programs and from the stated objectives of each program.

The instrument, called the Questionnaire Evaluating Special Services Programs (QESSP), consists of a cover page with administrative directions and 41 items. The 41 items in the questionnaire were designed to

1. Solicit demographic information (Items 1-9);
2. Solicit responses about satisfactions or dissatisfactions with the Special Services Program (Items 10-19); and
3. Solicit the respondent's evaluation of the following services or activities: Orientation, peer
counseling, professional counseling, academic advisement, instruction, special classes, tutoring, special activities, referrals and the staff characteristics (Items 20-41).

Pilot Study

Based on the recommendations of the panel of experts, the evaluation instrument was developed and tested. A pilot study of the instrument was conducted at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro by the Director of Special Services at that institution. The instrument was administered to 71 Special Services students and the Director reported that all items on the instrument were answered by the students. The findings from this pilot study indicated that the items were clearly understood, relevant to Special Services Programs, and easy to answer. The overall reaction to the instrument, as reported by the Director at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, was favorable.

After the pilot study was completed, the researcher made several modifications of the instrument after consultation with three of the original panel experts and the director who conducted the pilot study. These modifications included rewording portions of the administrative instructions, specifying the special courses and grouping related items.
Reliability

The test-retest procedure was used to determine the reliability of this instrument. During the first administration of the instrument, the researcher administered the instrument to 20 Special Services students at the University of Florida who were enrolled during the 1982 summer term. After a two-week interval, it was administered again to the same group of students but only 15 out of the original 20 were available for the second administration of the instrument.

The researcher compared each item response recorded by the 15 subjects on the second administration of the instrument with each item response that they recorded during the first administration of the instrument. The researcher compared each item to determine a percent of agreement between the first administration and the second administration of the instrument.

The reliability was determined by dividing the items agreed upon by the total number of agreements and disagreements. Using this common method for computing reliability (Huck, Cormier and Bounds, 1974, p. 335), the researcher found the instrument to have a reliability of .87.
Validity

The content validity of the Questionnaire Evaluating Special Services Programs (QESSP) was determined by a second panel of experts from the following institutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alcorn State University</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bayamon Central University</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Greenville Technical College</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Howard University</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Kent State University</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Miami University</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. State University of New York at Buffalo</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. University of Florida</td>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. University of North Carolina-Charlotte</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. University of Tennessee at Chattanooga</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These experts were provided with a copy of the initial instrument and were asked to assess its capability for evaluating a Special Services Program. Specifically, they were asked to check each item to determine if it would produce
responses that could be used to evaluate any Special Services Program. This panel of experts, consisting of 11 Special Services directors and four immediate supervisors of the directors, had two days to review the instrument and present written or verbal comments to the researcher.

The content validity of the instrument was determined, with 100 percent of the experts in agreement that the instrument was capable of effectively evaluating a Special Services Program. However, two of the 15 experts suggested that the location of counseling items and other related items be grouped in closer proximity to each other. One of the experts also suggested that the items related to stigmatization be reworded to insure clarity and understanding. The changes recommended by these three experts were incorporated into the instrument.

**Procedures**

Having randomly selected the names of the subjects for this study from the files located in the Special Services office, the researcher contacted the Alumni Affairs Office to ascertain and update the addresses of some of the subjects. The researcher also contacted currently enrolled students, faculty and any other persons who could provide the researcher with a current and accurate address for the
subjects. After obtaining the correct addresses, the researcher prepared a letter requesting the participation of the randomly selected subjects in the study (Appendix B). These letters were either hand-delivered by the researcher or mailed. The letter also included an informed consent form (Appendix B) and the evaluation instrument (Appendix C).

A follow-up letter was mailed if the consent form and evaluation instrument were not received within two weeks from the mail-out date (Appendix D). However, the researcher found that it was more convenient and faster to follow-up by telephone. The primary subjects were given two weeks from the mail-out date to return the consent form and the instrument. After that period of time passed, the researcher selected an alternate subject.

After obtaining the consent forms, the researcher requested copies of the subject's transcripts from the University of Florida Registrar's Office and began collecting data from their transcripts. The researcher reviewed each subject's transcript for each term that the subject was enrolled until graduation, suspension or voluntary withdrawal from the University of Florida.

Specifically, the subjects' transcripts were visually and manually checked to determine if they remained enrolled until graduation, the number of years required to graduate
from the University of Florida, the number of courses attempted, the number of courses completed and the grade point average at graduation. For the nongraduates, the researcher also collected data on the number of courses attempted and completed and the grade point averages at the time of withdrawal from this institution or as of August 9, 1983.

In summary, the data gathered from the transcripts were used to determine the subjects' retention and graduation rates and grade point averages. The evaluation instrument was used to collect data on the academic services and activities utilized by the Special Services students. The instrument was also used to determine the economic status of the subjects after participating in the Special Services Program.

**Data Analysis**

The analysis of all data for this study was performed manually by the researcher except for the data used to determine the economic impact of this program on its participants. The researcher analyzed the data so as to answer research questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 1, and 6, in that order, respectively.

By manually analyzing the subjects' transcripts, the researcher was able to observe trends and patterns more
readily while recording the grade point average of each subject and mean grade point averages of all the subjects. The data were analyzed to determine what the grade point averages were individually and collectively for each term over a six-to-eight-year period (Research Question #2).

In the process of analyzing the data to answer research question #2, the researcher also ascertained the enrollment status of each subject for each term of their enrollment to determine the collective retention rates (Research Question #3).

The transcripts were also analyzed to determine the number of terms that were required for the subjects to graduate from the University of Florida (Research Question #4).

Data from items 17-19, 21 and 26 of the instrument were analyzed for information about the influence of peer counselors on the academic performances of the subjects. The relationship between peer counselor effectiveness as perceived by the subjects and the amount of contact with the peer counselors was also investigated (Research Question #5).

Data from the evaluation instrument, specifically Items 20-41, were checked closely for subjects' responses regarding academic services and activities that they perceived as most effective (Research Question #1).
Data provided by Items 8 and 9 of the evaluation instrument yielded information regarding the economic value of the Special Services Program to the subjects. These data were analyzed by a computer program called the Program Impact Assessment System, developed by Dr. John Nickens and prepared by the Office of Instructional Research at the University of Florida. The computer program determined the economic value of the Special Services Program for each subject by adjusting the subject's yearly earnings to produce a present value of earnings. In determining the economic value of the Special Services students, the computer program considered the factors of inflation, age, and earnings (Research Question #6).

Data from Items 1-7 and 10-16 of the evaluation instrument were analyzed to provide a profile of the subjects and to identify any patterns and factors which might suggest the effectiveness of the Special Services Program.

The information obtained was recorded and summarized to provide answers to the appropriate research questions. Measures of central tendency and variability, simple correlations and relationships and graphic representations of data were used to report the results.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

This study was designed to determine the effectiveness of the Special Services Program at the University of Florida in the retention and graduation of its participants. The population for this study consisted of those students who participated in the Special Services Program during the 1974-1978 school years. A total of 150 randomly selected student transcripts was used to answer the research questions pertaining to grade point averages, graduation and retention rates. Sixty students were randomly selected and administered the Questionnaire Evaluating Special Services Programs (QESSP) to answer the research questions pertaining to the effectiveness of the program, peer counseling influence and economic status of former participants. This chapter reports the researcher's findings, which includes information regarding each of the six research questions.

Research Question #1

How effective are the academic services and activities of the Special Services Program as perceived by Black students at the University of Florida?
In order to answer the first research question, the researcher analyzed Items 1-7 and 10-16 of the Questionnaire Evaluating Special Services Programs (QESSP) that solicited responses from 60 randomly selected students who initially enrolled during the summer terms between 1974 and 1978. The sample of 60 students contained 30 graduates of the University of Florida and 30 nongraduates.

The analysis of the items on the QESSP and the findings of the researcher are presented in the same numerical order as they appear on the QESSP. The responses of the graduates and nongraduates are presented, illustrated and discussed separately, beginning with the graduates.

An Analysis of Responses of Randomly Selected Special Services Graduates to Items 1-7 and 10-16 on the QESSP

The first item on the QESSP inquired about the sex and marital status of the Special Services graduates. The data show that 9 of the 30 graduates (30 percent) are married; the remaining 21 (70 percent) are single.

Item 2 asked the students to describe themselves. The researcher found that all of the students in this study were Black, of United States origin. Blacks of Hispanic and Caribbean origins have participated in the Special Services Program, but none were included in the random selection.
In Item 3, the students were asked to indicate the highest degree that they now hold. The researcher confirmed that 30 students had received bachelor's degrees; 2 students had completed requirements for the master's degree; 1 student was graduated from law school; and 1 student is in the last year of medical school, expecting to graduate in June of 1984.

Information concerning institutions that the students had attended was solicited by Item 4. The researcher found that the students listed seven institutions that they had attended or planned to attend after graduating from the University of Florida. The other institutions are as follows: Florida International University; Howard University; Jacksonville University; University of Arizona; University of Central Florida; University of North Florida; and the University of Oklahoma. These students indicated that they had not received a degree from the above institutions.

Item 5 asked the students if they were currently enrolled in any of the institutions listed in Item 4 and, if not, whether they planned to re-enroll. Seven students indicated that they are currently enrolled, with five of the seven being enrolled at the University of Florida. Five students who are not enrolled plan to re-enroll at the University of Florida, but ten others plan to re-enroll at
other institutions. Additionally, seven students indicated they do not plan to re-enroll at any institution.

Item 6 solicited data concerning the year in which the student enrolled at the University of Florida. All 30 students entered the University of Florida between the years 1974 and 1978. Item 7 asked if they were former Upward Bound or Talent Search participants. The respondents indicated that eight of them were former Upward Bound students and two were former Talent Search students. The federally funded Upward Bound and Talent Search Projects provided the University of Florida's Special Services Program with 30 percent of its students during the years between 1974 and 1978.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 created the Upward Bound and Talent Search Programs, which had as their purposes the development of academic skills, motivation for academic success and the identification of low-income youth with academic potential. The Talent Search Program identifies low-income youth who have academic potential and encourages them to complete their secondary education and to subsequently enroll in postsecondary institutions. The Upward Bound Program is a pre-college preparatory activity that develops academic skills and motivation for success in students attending secondary school and eventually in a postsecondary institution.
The University of Florida has an Upward Bound Program but not a Talent Search Program. The Upward Bound Program is to provide an opportunity for potentially capable low-income students in Alachua County from academically and/or environmentally deprived backgrounds to develop motivational, personal and academic competencies necessary to pursue and succeed in higher education.

When asked in Item 10 to rate their academic preparation before coming to the University of Florida, 3 students (10 percent) rated their preparation as being excellent; 19 students (63.3 percent) rated their preparation as being good; and 8 students (26.7 percent) rated their academic preparation as being fair.

When asked in Item 11 to rate their academic preparation at the University of Florida, 20 students (66.7 percent) rated their preparation as good; 7 (23.3 percent) rated their preparation as being excellent; and 3 (10 percent) rated their preparation as being fair.

The three most important reasons that the respondents listed in Item 12 for deciding to enroll at the University of Florida were (1) the academic reputation of the University, (2) it was close to home, and (3) the financial aid awarded. These three reasons are listed in the order of most number one responses. The Special Services Program ranked fourth.
In the analysis of Item 13, which gathered data concerning feelings, the researcher found that 43.3 percent of the graduates associated positive feelings with their participation in the Special Services Program. A majority of the graduates (53.3 percent) associated both positive and negative feelings with their participation in the Special Services Program. One graduate did not respond to the question.

The following comments were made by the graduates in describing their feelings associated with their participation in the Special Services Program:

1. Even though I was benefited from the counseling and educational assistance of the Special Services staff, I've had to deal with feeling like an admission exception.

2. Almost even-handed ambivalence, being Black in an astronomical white climate, feelings were somewhat negative. I was in the "Special Services" Program very much my first two quarters, and afterwards rapidly moved from the "S.S." courses (curriculum). Due to adversive and hostile categorizing as a 2nd-rate (class) student, pride and self-esteem, morale was cut.

3. Positive in the sense it gave me a chance to go to the school of my choice. A bit negative sometimes when people told you it wouldn't be the same when you enter the mainstream of regular classes.

4. Staff was interested in the student learning and obtaining their degree.
5. Positive--Due to the support and encouragement being given. Negative--Reinforced the idea of not being able to succeed in the highly competitive environment under normal conditions (not being able to retake tests).


7. Many of the White instructors exhibited racist attitudes to the students. The inferiority complex given students by those professors help cause the withdrawal of many of these students.

8. Negative derived from the stigma placed on S/S students. Positive from the dedication from the faculty and staff.

9. Positive in the sense that Blacks were able to see more Blacks. Negative in the sense that the program supposedly catered to less intelligent persons. The program had a spill-over effect on me. That is, from my doing well in the program, this gave me confidence that I could do well in professional school. The program is definitely needed, at least for a year or so for the incoming student.

10. Positive being admitted to the University; given an opportunity. Negative image of not being smart enough to get in under "regular admission."

11. Definitely positive; only negative feelings associated with the Program were from outsiders who didn't know what the Program was all about.

12. There were some people whose influence and concern brought about good results and yet some people's attitude toward me was cold and insensitive. Some made me feel dumb and incompetent. The ones that did more to help me were the instructors and tutors at the Special Services Building (Learning Center). They deserve gold ribbons.
Several educational experiences were positive because of the Special Services Program.

I felt like I was considered as a person who could not compete with the majority.

Program provided excellent assistance in academic counseling.

I noticed positive feelings from many of my peers concerning the program. Only once did I experience any negative feelings--from my 1st quarter English professor.

Academic and personal advising were readily available. The program was extremely informative of the academic and business systems of the University of Florida.

Cared about. Concerned with you as a person and achieving the best possible goals.

Positive--you got to know people. Negative--professors stereotyped classes.

Positive in that the Program really does a lot for incoming freshmen. Negative in the sense that the program can become a crutch at times. Academics must be stressed more. Make it clear that having a good time is part of college but academics are #1.

Positive--gave me an opportunity to obtain my education. Negative--some teachers treated me as if I were dumb. They also talked to me as if they were apologizing that I was Black.

I think the benefits of the program were positive, but being at an all White university and being in an all Black class initially did not mix with me.

I think the academic preparation received through Upward Bound greatly enhanced my academic success.
24. I was given motivation through the members of Special Services.

25. The feelings were positive because the Special Services Program enables me to gradually be broken into the academic system at the University of Florida.

In summary, the graduates appear to have been appreciative of the Special Services Program, but not the University as a whole. They expressed some negative effects of being Black in a White environment. Half of the graduates said that they experienced negative feelings as a result of nonsupportive or noncaring attitudes of professors. Five graduates explicitly said that the professors exhibited racist attitudes, they stereotyped the class, treated the students as if they were dumb and incompetent, and made them feel inferior. Many of the graduates said that they had experienced positive feelings as a result of the actions taken by the Special Services staff to assist them.

Should the Special Services Program be continued was the question asked in Item 14 on the QESSP. Twenty-eight (93.3 percent) of the graduates said that the program should be continued; two graduates (6.7 percent) were not sure. An analysis of Item 15, which asked the students to describe their experiences from participation in the Special Services Program, revealed that the students experienced more positive than negative feelings toward themselves and their education. The students overwhelmingly felt that the
Special Services Program increased their motivation to study and made them more determined to graduate.

The following comments generally reveal positive experiences:

1. Made me more cognizant of the need of Blacks to be better prepared for college admission requirements.

2. Allowed me to enter college even though I didn't achieve the required score on the SAT for college entrance.

3. Gave me the start I needed to realize I could later make it without the Program.

4. I was/am very grateful to the Special Services administrative staff because it was this staff which gave me the opportunity to "prove" myself at a major university—after bombing out on the SAT (not in the right frame of mind the day I took it). The Special Services staff saw the potential in me. I wanted to prove to them and myself that I could survive at the University of Florida.

5. Helped me adjust to the University of Florida at a good pace.

The students were asked to describe the effectiveness of the Special Services Program in Item 16. Their overall reaction to the Special Services Program was positive. Ten students (33.3 percent) described it as extremely effective; 7 students (23.3 percent) as very effective; and the remaining 13 (43.3 percent) as effective.
Summary of Responses by Special Services Graduates

From the analysis of Items 1-7 and 10-16, the researcher found that the Special Services graduates expressed strong positive satisfaction with the Program. One of their three major reasons for enrolling at the University of Florida was that they were informed by friends of the help provided by the Special Services Program.

It should be noted that the students were not completely satisfied with everything associated with the Program. The students reported both positive and negative feelings concerning their participation in the Special Services Program. However, when asked if they thought that the Special Services Program should be continued, 93.3 percent indicated yes and 6.7 percent were not sure.

Following, in Table 1, is a summary of student responses regarding services, activities, or staff actions rendered or arranged for by the Special Services Program. The students were asked to indicate whether or not they received the service, participated in the activity or experienced the staff action by marking yes or no in the columns. If they marked yes, they were to indicate their perceptions of the effectiveness of the service, activity or staff action in helping them while at this institution. If
their response was no, no further evaluation was appropriate. Table 1 indicates the number and type of responses given by the graduates of the Special Services Program.

Analysis of Graduates' Responses to Items 20-41 of the QESSP

The researcher's analysis of the participation columns, Items 20-41, of the QESSP, revealed that 57.5 percent of the graduates indicated use of the services or participation in the activities of the Special Services Program. Since it is not mandatory that students utilize program services or activities, 42.5 percent chose not to do so.

Further analysis of the effectiveness columns, Items 20-41, shows that 42 percent evaluated the services, activities, and staff as extremely effective; 23 percent evaluated them as very effective; 31 percent evaluated them as effective; 3 percent evaluated them as not effective; and 1 percent evaluated the services activities and staff as extremely ineffective.
TABLE 1. GRADUATES' RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE EVALUATING SPECIAL SERVICES PROGRAMS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA (N = 30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you receive the service or participate in the activity?</th>
<th>How effective was it in helping you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation session to campus, classes, instructors, facilities and support services available.</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Counselor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Peer counseling on:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Personal concerns</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Academic concerns</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Social concerns</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Financial aid</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

Did you receive the service or participate in the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Counselor</th>
<th>How effective was it in helping you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Counseling by the full-time professional Special Services Counselor on:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Personal Concerns</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Academic Concerns</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Social Concerns</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Financial aid</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you receive the service or participate in the activity?</th>
<th>How effective was it in helping you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Help from Special Services Academic Advisors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Choosing courses</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Planning program of study</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Special Teaching Procedures:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Small units of instruction</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Retaking tests to improve grades</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you receive the service or participate in the activity?</th>
<th>How effective was it in helping you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Taught by Graduate Assistants</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Taught by full-time professors</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instruction (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. Special academic and support courses designed for Special Services students:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Behavioral Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)**

Was the service or activity effective in helping you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you receive the service or participate in the activity?</th>
<th>How effective was it in helping you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Classes (continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Mathematics</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Physical Science</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Biological Science</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Social Science</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Humanities</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Tutoring by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Peer Counselor(s)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Fraternities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sororities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Clubs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you receive the service or participate in the activity?</th>
<th>How effective was it in helping you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutors (continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Learning Center (Teaching Center)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Group sessions on coping with or adjusting to this institution</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Special sessions conducted by Financial Aid Personnel</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you receive the service or participate in the activity?</td>
<td>How effective was it in helping you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Special sessions conducted by Career Resource (Placement Personnel)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Sessions on developing good study skills</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Sessions on reduction of test anxiety</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Awards ceremony and academic recognition</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you receive the service or participate in the activity?</th>
<th>How effective was it in helping you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Referrals

33. Referrals to other support services or agencies for help in dealing with problems:
   a. Counseling Center
   b. Financial Aid Office
   c. Housing Office
   d. Placement Center (at Reitz Union)
   e. Student Services (at Tigert Hall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Counseling Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Financial Aid Office</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Housing Office</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Placement Center (at Reitz Union)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Student Services (at Tigert Hall)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Qualities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Concerned,</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courteous and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caring attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(full-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Encouragement</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by the staff for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you to do well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Genuine,</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitude of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you receive the service or participate in the activity?</th>
<th>How effective was it in helping you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes No Extremely Effec- Very Effec- Not Effec- Extremely Ineffec-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tive tive tive tive tive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 9 7 3 4 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Qualities (continued)</td>
<td>3 25 1 1 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Dynamic nature of staff in being your spokesman or mediator</td>
<td>2 20 0 0 0 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Cold, insensitive attitude of the staff</td>
<td>1 25 0 0 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Staff's disinterest in your concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Staff served as a negative role model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Qualities (continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Staff served as a positive role model</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An Analysis of Responses of Randomly Selected Special Services Non-graduates to Item 1-7 and 10-16 on the QESSP

An analysis of Item 1 indicated that eight (26.7 percent) of these 30 students reported that they are married; 21 (70 percent) are single; and 1 (3.3 percent) is divorced. All of the students responding to Item 2 described themselves as being Black, of United States origin.

"Indicate the highest degree you now hold," was asked in Item 3. The high school diploma is the highest degree held by 13 (43.3 percent) of these students. Fifteen (50 percent) indicated that their highest degree is the Associate of Arts. However, 2 students (6.7 percent) have obtained bachelor's degrees from Florida A & M University and Savannah State College, respectively.

The institutions listed as requested in Item 4, including the University of Florida, are

1. Bethune-Cockman College
2. Cameron University (Oklahoma)
3. Daytona Beach Community College
4. Florida A & M University
5. Hillsborough Community College
6. Santa Fe Community College
7. Savannah State College
8. University of Maryland
9. University of North Florida
10. University of South Florida
11. University of Texas at El Paso
When asked in Item 5 if they were currently enrolled, out of the 24 respondents, 12 (50 percent) indicated that they were still enrolled at an institution other than the University of Florida. However, 12 others (50 percent) indicated that they were not enrolled. Eight of the 24 students plan to re-enroll at the University of Florida, while 6 others plan to enroll at another institution. Three students indicated that they do not plan to enroll at any institution. Seven students did not indicate their plans for enrollment. In Item 6, the students indicated the year that they enrolled at the University of Florida. All students entered the University of Florida between 1974 and 1978.

"Are you a former Upward Bound or Talent Search student?" was the question asked in Item 7. The analysis shows that 10 former Upward Bound students and one Talent Search student were nongraduates. Specifically, 36.7 percent of the students in the study who did not graduate from the University of Florida were former Upward Bound and Talent Search students. The two students who received their bachelor's degrees from other institutions were former Upward Bound students.

Item 10 on the QESSP concerning academic preparation before coming to the University of Florida reveals that 19
(63.3 percent) of the nongraduates rated their academic preparation before coming to the University of Florida as good, while 6 students (20 percent) rated their academic preparation as fair. There were 3 students (10 percent) who reported their academic preparation as excellent; 1 (3.3 percent) rated it as poor; and 1 (3.3 percent) did not rate it. In Item 11, when asked about their academic preparation at the University of Florida, 6.7 percent rated it as excellent; 53.3 percent rated it as good; 30 percent rated it as fair; and 10 percent rated it as poor.

The three most important reasons indicated in Item 12 for deciding to enroll at the University of Florida were (1) it was close to home, (2) the financial aid awarded, and (3) the Special Services Program. The researcher arrived at this finding by locating the three reasons with the most number one responses.

The researcher's analysis of Item 13 concerning the students' feelings regarding their association with the Special Services Program reveals that 20 of the 30 students (70 percent) felt that there were positive feelings associated with their participation in the Special Services Program. However, 10 students (30 percent) reported both positive and negative feelings.
The following comments were made by 24 of the 30 students describing their feelings regarding participation in the Special Services Program:

1. Very motivational and academically stimulating.

2. The Program gave me the added confidence I needed to attend the University of Florida.

3. In the beginning, there seemed to be a lot of concern and good advice was found easily. Later, it became harder to do the scheduling of classes and my need for employment.

4. I felt as though I was wanted and needed in this Program.

5. It was all positive, because if it were not for the Program, I would not have had the opportunity to attend the University.

6. Without the Program, I would not have been able to attend a college of the U of F standard.

7. Some teachers were unfair in their dealing with me.

8. My feelings are positive towards the Special Services Program because it acquainted me with a lifestyle that might have passed me by. This Program also made it easy to enter other universities.

9. All workers were very helpful, assisted in tutoring of classes, selection of classes, etc.

10. It was there when I needed help.

11. I think that the counselors could have been more helpful and available.
12. I feel like there was help if I needed help. You get out what you put into the Program. There is quality help available for those who want it.

13. I knew that all the academic help that I needed would be given to me if I were to run into any problems.

14. Developed confidence in my ability to make it in college.

15. Positive—because there was someone there to help me during the hard times.

16. Positive in that it helped me get started.

17. Positive—I felt that it helped me to adjust to the college academic and social life and gave me a good foundation to begin regular college courses. Negative—I did not feel like a normal student until I began to take regular college courses. It seemed as though we were slow students taking remedial courses. Some of the courses were too easy and no challenge was given in order for the student to develop one's mind. One would get dependent on the chance to retake exams, the constant babysitting by some instructors and the thought that you can always drop the course.

18. I felt that the Special Services Program presented me with an opportunity to adapt to the academic and social expectations of a big university setting.

19. There were positive feelings in that there were tutors there for your use but on the other hand we were referred to as the "other" students.

20. Warm, kind, sincere and very amicable.

21. I felt that they were concerned about me as an individual person, and one of the family.
22. The classes gave me a sense of unity among Blacks.

23. Positive—knowing that I could attend the University of Florida. Negative—knowing that the only way that I would ever get in was through the Special Services Program. Knowing that I was not up to the basic standards of a college student.

24. There was some preparation and help but not enough help when needed.

Most of the students acknowledged their appreciation for the Special Services Program. They said that the Program made it possible for them to attend the University of Florida. Three students indicated that they were not treated like the regular admission students. They felt that they were treated unfairly by some instructors, looked down upon by many of the students, or were made to feel as though they were slow students taking remedial courses.

The researcher found that 96.7 percent of the students thought that the Special Services Program should be continued. However, there was one student (3.3 percent) who was not sure about continuing the Special Services Program.

An analysis of Item 15 revealed that the Special Services Program caused the students to experience more positive than negative feelings toward themselves and their education. According to students' responses, the Special Services Program increased their motivation to study, made them more determined to graduate, made them feel better
about themselves, and facilitated their developing feelings of confidence and independence.

However, there were a few students who felt that the Program made them dependent, decreased their motivation to study, and reduced their sense of confidence in themselves.

Three pertinent student comments noted are

1. It did increase my motivation to study; however, not enough, because of me and things affecting my life at that time.

2. A better feeling of working with people.

3. The Program does not allow a Black student to be in the mainstream of the University. Less stress, and when you get there, it's a real surprise.

The students' responses to Item 16 indicated that their overall reaction to the Special Services Program was positive. Seven students described the Program as extremely effective. Eight students said it was very effective. Fifteen of the students, half of the group, reacted to the Special Services Program as effective. These results are tabulated in Table 2.

Analysis of Nongraduates' Responses to Items 20-41 of the QESSP

Analysis of Items 20-41 of the QESSP revealed that 51.6 percent of the nongraduates indicated that they utilized the services or participated in the activities of the Special
Services Program. It is not mandatory that students utilize the services or participate in the activities, so 48.4 percent decided not to do so.

Further analysis of the nongraduates' responses shows that 27.5 percent of them evaluated the services, activities and staff of the Special Services Program as extremely effective; 33.9 percent, very effective, 33.5 percent, effective; 4.2 percent not effective; and 1 percent, extremely ineffective.

After finding that the students were generally appreciative and satisfied with the services and activities of the Special Services Program, the researcher's next task was to measure the academic progress of the students while enrolled at the University of Florida. Statistical data extracted from the students' transcripts were used to compute grade point averages and measure academic progress.
TABLE 2. NONGRADUATES' RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE EVALUATING SPECIAL SERVICES PROGRAMS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA (N = 30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you receive the service or participate in the activity?</th>
<th>How effective was it in helping you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation session to campus, classes, instructors, facilities and support services available.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Counselor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Peer counseling on:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Personal concerns</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Academic concerns</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Social concerns</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Financial aid</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you receive the service or participate in the activity?</th>
<th>How effective was it in helping you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Counselor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Counseling by the full-time professional Special</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services Counselor on:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Personal Concerns</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Academic Concerns</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Social Concerns</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Financial aid</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you receive the service or participate in the activity?</th>
<th>How effective was it in helping you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Help from Special Services Academic Advisors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Choosing courses</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Planning program of study</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Special Teaching Procedures:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Small units of instruction</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Retaking tests to improve grades</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you receive the service or participate in the activity?</th>
<th>How effective was it in helping you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction (continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Taught by Graduate Assistants</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Taught by full-time professors</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special Classes

25. Special academic and support courses designed for Special Services students:
   a. Reading                                                | 14   | 10 | 3                    | 5               | 6          | 0             | 0                      |
   b. Writing                                                | 18   | 5  | 4                    | 7               | 6          | 1             | 0                      |
   c. Behavioral Studies                                     | 20   | 4  | 4                    | 8               | 7          | 1             | 0                      |
   d. English                                                | 25   | 1  | 6                    | 11              | 7          | 1             | 0                      |
TABLE 2 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you receive the service or participate in the activity?</th>
<th>How effective was it in helping you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Classes (continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Mathematics</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Physical Science</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Biological Science</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Social Science</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Humanities</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tutors

26. Tutoring by:

a. Peer Counselor(s)                                       | 11   | 12  | 1                   | 7              | 3         | 0             | 0                     |
<p>| b. Fraternities                                           | 4    | 16  | 1                   | 2              | 1         | 0             | 0                     |
| c. Sororities                                             | 1    | 18  | 0                   | 1              | 0         | 0             | 0                     |
| d. Clubs                                                 | 0    | 18  | 0                   | 0              | 0         | 0             | 0                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you receive the service or participate in the activity?</th>
<th>How effective was it in helping you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutors (continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Learning Center (Teaching Center)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Group sessions on coping with or adjusting to this institution</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Special sessions conducted by Financial Aid Personnel</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you receive the service or participate in the activity?</td>
<td>How effective was it in helping you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Special sessions conducted by Career Resource (Placement Personnel)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Sessions on developing good study skills</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Sessions on reduction of test anxiety</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Awards ceremony and academic recognition</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you receive the service or participate in the activity?</th>
<th>How effective was it in helping you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Referrals**

33. Referrals to other support services or agencies for help in dealing with problems:

- a. Counseling Center  
  - Yes: 12  
  - No: 12  
  - Extremely Effective: 1  
  - Very Effective: 4  
  - Effective: 7  
  - Not Effective: 0  
  - Extremely Ineffective: 0

- b. Financial Aid Office  
  - Yes: 23  
  - No: 4  
  - Extremely Effective: 5  
  - Very Effective: 4  
  - Effective: 13  
  - Not Effective: 1  
  - Extremely Ineffective: 0

- c. Housing Office  
  - Yes: 17  
  - No: 10  
  - Extremely Effective: 4  
  - Very Effective: 5  
  - Effective: 7  
  - Not Effective: 1  
  - Extremely Ineffective: 0

- d. Placement Center (at Reitz Union)  
  - Yes: 11  
  - No: 16  
  - Extremely Effective: 1  
  - Very Effective: 1  
  - Effective: 9  
  - Not Effective: 0  
  - Extremely Ineffective: 0

- e. Student Services (at Tigert Hall)  
  - Yes: 20  
  - No: 7  
  - Extremely Effective: 8  
  - Very Effective: 2  
  - Effective: 9  
  - Not Effective: 1  
  - Extremely Ineffective: 0
### TABLE 2 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you receive the service or participate in the activity?</th>
<th>How effective was it in helping you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Qualities</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Concerned, courteous and caring attitude of the staff</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(full-time professional staff)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Encouragement by the staff for you to do well</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Genuine, warm and friendly attitude of the staff</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you receive the service or participate in the activity?</th>
<th>How effective was it in helping you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Dynamic nature of staff in being your spokesman or mediator</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Cold, insensitive attitude of the staff</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Staff's disinterest in your concerns</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Staff served as a negative role model</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you receive the service or participate in the activity?</td>
<td>How effective was it in helping you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Qualities (continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Staff served as a positive role model</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question #2

What are the grade point averages of Black students in the Special Services Program at the University of Florida?

In obtaining the answer to this question, the researcher computed the grade point averages for each of the 150 students in the sample. This was accomplished by extracting from the transcripts the grade points and hours carried each term by each of the 150 students and dividing the grade points by the hours carried to obtain the grade point average. A work sheet was used to record the students' grade point averages in columns.

The extreme right column of the work sheet designated the term and was numbered 1 through 31. Each student was identified by code at the top of each column of the work sheet. The 1983 Summer B Term was the last term for which the transcripts were obtained from the Registrar's Office.

By transcribing all data from the transcripts to the work sheets, the researcher could readily observe the terms in which the students were enrolled, not enrolled, withdrew or graduated. The work sheet was also used to record the number of courses that the students attempted and completed while enrolled.

After the grade point averages were computed and recorded on the work sheets, the researcher calculated the
mean grade point average for each term and a mean cumulative grade point average for each year. Tables 3 through 7 reflect the grade point averages of the study participants selected on a random basis. Mean grade point averages for all University of Florida students, which include the Special Services students, are presented in Table 8 for comparison between the two groups.

Analysis of 1974 Transcripts of Randomly Selected Special Services Students to Obtain Their Grade Point Averages

An analysis of the term grade point averages presented in Table 3 for the study population shows that mean grade point averages for terms 7, 9, 11, 17, 24 and 25 were below 2.0 grade points. In all other terms, the students' mean grade point averages were 2.00 or higher. However, the mean grade point average for all seven years did not drop below 2.00 grade points.

Analysis of 1975 Transcripts of Randomly Selected Special Services Students to Obtain Their Grade Point Averages

An inspection of the grade point averages in Table 4 reveals that the Special Services students in this group maintained above average grade point averages for all terms except terms 4, 5, 10, 11, 20, 21, 28 and 30. This group of students experienced two years of below average grade point
averages. They occurred during the third and eighth years of their enrollment.

**Analysis of 1976 Transcripts of Randomly Selected Special Services Students to Obtain Their Grade Point Averages**

An analysis of the grade point averages in Table 5 indicates that the Special Services students in this group were better academically than the previous two groups. This group performed poorly during terms 22 and 26, with a poor overall performance during the seventh year. The students in this group maintained a higher grade point average in their first term than any Special Services group in this study. They also had a higher grade point average during their first term than that of the total student body, which was 2.90 grade points to 2.59 for the total student body.

**Analysis of 1977 Transcripts of Randomly Selected Special Services Students to Obtain Their Grade Point Averages**

An inspection of Table 6 to report on the grade point averages for this group of students indicates that they maintained grade point averages of 2.00 or higher for 16 consecutive terms. During terms 17 and 22, their grade point averages declined to 1.69 and 1.76, respectively. Their mean grade point average for the fifth year was also below 2.00 grade points. Overall, this group of students
maintained a yearly mean grade point average above 2.00 grade points for four consecutive years. During the fifth year, their yearly mean grade points dropped to 1.96, but in the sixth and sevenths years, it rose above 2.00 grade points.

Analysis of 1978 Transcripts of Randomly Selected Special Services Students to Obtain Their Grade Point Averages

An inspection of Table 7 indicates that this group of Special Services students maintained yearly mean grade point averages ranging from 2.16 to 2.47. Only during terms 16 and 19 did they earn less than a 2.00 grade point average.
### TABLE 3. MEAN GRADE POINT AVERAGES PER TERM AND PER YEAR FOR SELECTED SPECIAL SERVICES STUDENTS WHO INITIALLY ENROLLED DURING THE SUMMER OF 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Summer 1974</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fall 1974</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Winter 1975</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spring 1975</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.51

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Summer 1975</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fall 1975</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Winter 1976</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Spring 1976</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Summer 1976</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fall 1976</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Winter 1977</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Spring 1977</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Summer 1977</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fall 1977</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Winter 1978</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Spring 1978</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fourth Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Summer 1978</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Fall 1978</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Winter 1979</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Spring 1979</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifth Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.12
### TABLE 3 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Summer 1979</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Fall 1979</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Winter 1980</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Spring 1980</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sixth Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Summer 1980</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Fall 1980</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Winter 1981</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Spring 1976</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Seventh Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.25**
### TABLE 4. MEAN GRADE POINT AVERAGES PER TERM AND PER YEAR FOR SELECTED SPECIAL SERVICES STUDENTS WHO INITIALLY ENROLLED DURING THE SUMMER OF 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Summer 1975</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fall 1975</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Winter 1976</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spring 1976</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**First Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.20**

| 5    | Summer 1976 | 1.94                     | 11                     |
| 6    | Fall 1976   | 2.22                     | 16                     |
| 7    | Winter 1977 | 2.08                     | 16                     |
| 8    | Spring 1977 | 2.23                     | 14                     |

**Second Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.12**

| 9    | Summer 1977 | 2.24                     | 7                      |
| 10   | Fall 1977   | 1.80                     | 14                     |
| 11   | Winter 1978 | 1.83                     | 15                     |
| 12   | Spring 1978 | 2.02                     | 13                     |

**Third Year Mean Grade Point Average = 1.97**

| 13   | Summer 1978 | 2.45                     | 7                      |
| 14   | Fall 1978   | 2.43                     | 13                     |
| 15   | Winter 1979 | 2.42                     | 16                     |
| 16   | Spring 1979 | 2.24                     | 14                     |

**Fourth Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.39**

| 17   | Summer 1979 | 2.15                     | 7                      |
| 18   | Fall 1979   | 2.19                     | 9                      |
| 19   | Winter 1980 | 2.58                     | 7                      |
| 20   | Spring 1980 | 1.95                     | 7                      |

**Fifth Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.22**
TABLE 4 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Summer 1980</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Fall 1980</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Winter 1981</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Spring 1981</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixth Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.63

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Summer 1981</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Fall 1981</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Spring 1982</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventh Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.17<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Summer A 1982</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Summer B 1982</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Fall 1982</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Spring 1983</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighth Year Mean Grade Point Average = 1.71

<sup>a</sup>University of Florida converted to semester system beginning Fall, 1981, with a two-term Summer Semester.
TABLE 5. MEAN GRADE POINT AVERAGES PER TERM AND PER YEAR FOR RANDOMLY SELECTED SPECIAL SERVICES STUDENTS WHO INITIALLY ENROLLED DURING THE SUMMER OF 1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Summer 1976</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fall 1976</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Winter 1977</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spring 1977</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Summer 1977</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fall 1977</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Winter 1978</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Spring 1978</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Summer 1978</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fall 1978</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Winter 1979</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Spring 1979</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Summer 1979</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fall 1979</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Winter 1980</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Spring 1980</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fourth Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.71

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Summer 1980</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Fall 1980</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Winter 1981</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Spring 1981</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifth Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.51
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Summer 1981</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Fall 1981</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Spring 1982</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixth Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.13<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Summer 1982</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Fall 1982</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Spring 1983</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventh Year Mean Grade Point Average = 1.89

<sup>a</sup>University of Florida converted to semester system beginning Fall, 1981, with a two-term Summer Semester.
TABLE 6. MEAN GRADE POINT AVERAGES PER TERM AND PER YEAR FOR RANDOMLY SELECTED SPECIAL SERVICES STUDENTS WHO INITIALLY ENROLLED DURING THE SUMMER OF 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Summer 1977</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fall 1977</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Winter 1978</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spring 1978</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Summer 1978</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fall 1978</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Winter 1979</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Spring 1979</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Summer 1979</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fall 1979</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Winter 1980</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Spring 1980</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Summer 1980</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fall 1980</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Winter 1981</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Spring 1981</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fourth Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Summer 1981</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Fall 1981</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Spring 1982</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifth Year Mean Grade Point Average = 1.96a
### TABLE 6 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Summer A 1982</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Summer B 1982</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Summer C 1982</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Fall 1982</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Spring 1983</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sixth Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Summer A 1983</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Summer B 1983</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Summer C 1983</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Seventh Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.17**

---

*a* University of Florida converted to the semester system beginning with Fall, 1981, with a two-term Summer Semester.
### TABLE 7. MEAN GRADE POINT AVERAGES PER TERM AND PER YEAR FOR RANDOMLY SELECTED SPECIAL SERVICES STUDENTS WHO INITIALLY ENROLLED DURING THE SUMMER OF 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Summer 1978</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fall 1978</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Winter 1979</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spring 1979</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Summer 1979</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fall 1979</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Winter 1980</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Spring 1980</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Summer 1980</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fall 1980</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Winter 1981</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Spring 1981</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Summer 1981</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fall 1981</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Spring 1982</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Summer A 1982</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Summer B 1982</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Summer C 1982</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fall 1982</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Spring 1983</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.36

Second Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.38

Third Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.36

Fourth Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.35

Fifth Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.47
TABLE 7 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Summer A 1983</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Summer B 1983</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Summer C 1983</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixth Year Mean Grade Point Average = 2.16

aUniversity of Florida converted to the semester system beginning with Fall, 1981, with a two-term Summer Semester.
# TABLE 8. MEAN GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF ALL UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA STUDENTS 1974 - 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1974</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>6,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1974</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>21,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 1975</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>20,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1975</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>19,629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Mean for Academic Year 1974-1975 = 2.74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1975</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>8,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1975</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>21,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 1976</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>20,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1976</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>19,501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Mean for Academic Year 1975-1976 = 2.67

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1976</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>8,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1976</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>20,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 1977</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>19,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1977</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>17,565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Mean for Academic Year 1976-1977 = 2.64

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1977</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>8,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1977</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>21,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 1978</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>20,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1978</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>19,164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Mean for Academic Year 1977-1978 = 2.65

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1978</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>6,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1978</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>23,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 1979</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>22,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1979</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>20,986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Mean for Academic Year 1978-1979 = 2.71
TABLE 8 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1979</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>11,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1979</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>24,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 1980</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>23,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1980</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>22,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Mean for Academic Year 1979-1980 = 2.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1980</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>12,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1980</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>25,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 1981</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>24,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1981</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>23,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Mean for Academic Year 1980-1981 = 2.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1981</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>12,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1981</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>25,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1982</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>24,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Mean for Academic Year 1981-1982 = 2.00&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer A 1982</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>11,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer B and C 1982</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>9,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1982</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>26,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1983</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>24,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Mean for Academic Year 1982-1983 = 2.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term/Year</th>
<th>Term Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer A 1983</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>11,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer B and C 1983</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>5,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Mean for Summer 1983 = 2.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>University of Florida converted to semester system beginning Fall, 1981, with a two-term Summer Semester.
Table 9 describes yearly grade point averages earned by the Special Services students. During the year of their initial enrollment, the grade point averages for all groups ranged from 2.15 to 2.55. The class of 1976 achieved the highest grade point average of all the groups in their initial year. This same class also achieved the highest grade point average for all groups during any of the years of the study, 2.71 during the fourth year.

The researcher found that the grade point averages for all groups during their first and second years were in the range of 2.09 to 2.55. This is a significant finding in that the students are provided the supportive services of the Program primarily during their first and second years of enrollment at the University of Florida.

TABLE 9. GRADE POINT AVERAGES FOR RANDOMLY SELECTED SPECIAL STUDENTS DURING THE PERIOD 1974-1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Entered University of Florida</th>
<th>Year of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the process of analyzing the data from the transcripts to answer the second research question, the researcher observed differences in the variety and number of courses in which the students were enrolled. Table 10 illustrates the kind of courses in which the Special Services students were enrolled during their first terms at the University of Florida. Each student carried an average of 11 credits from the courses listed.

The classes in which the students were enrolled for credit during their first term in 1974 did not significantly differ during the 1975, 1976, 1977, or 1978 school years. However, the number of courses taken increased and, in 1977, reading and writing courses for credit were included in the courses taken by Special Services students during their first terms of enrollment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Course Credit (Quarter Hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer 1974</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BES</td>
<td>Creative and Critical Thinking</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>Fundamental Math</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>Freshman English</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>The Physical Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>American Institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer 1975</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BES</td>
<td>Special Topics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>Fundamental Math</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>Freshman English</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>The Physical Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>American Institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Algebra and Trigonometry</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer 1976</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BES</td>
<td>Creative and Critical Thinking</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>Fundamental Math</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>Freshman English</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>The Physical Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>American Institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Algebra and Trigonometry</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Prefix</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Course Credit (Quarter Hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer 1977</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BES</td>
<td>Special Topics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>The Physical Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>Writing Laboratory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>Expository Writing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>American Institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Precalculus - Algebra</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer 1978</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BES</td>
<td>Special Topics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>The Physical Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>Reading Content Area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>Writing Laboratory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>Expository Writing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>American Institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Basic Algebra</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Basic Concepts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question #3

What are the retention rates of the Black students in the Special Services Program at the University of Florida?

Retention rates were determined by analyzing the transcripts of the 150 randomly selected students in this study to ascertain whether or not they were enrolled during any term after their initial enrollment. Retention data were obtained from the work sheets used to record grade point averages. If no grade point average was recorded in a particular term, it was assumed that the student was not enrolled for that term.

The work sheet provided a graphic representation of retention rates of the students under study for any term and year of possible enrollment. These retention rates were expressed as percentages enrolled or not enrolled. They were calculated by dividing the total number of Special Services students enrolled during each term by the number initially in their beginning group.

Retention rates are listed in Tables 11 through 18. These tables include the number of students enrolled or not enrolled during each term of the five years studied. For the Fall terms, the attrition rate for the total University students was significantly greater than that for the randomly selected Special Services students of this study (see
Tables 11 and 12). These tables indicate that none of the Special Services students was suspended or did not register, but there was one who withdrew.

**Analysis of Class Enrolling in 1974**

Table 13 shows that after eight terms (2 years), 79 percent of the Special Services students were still enrolled. After 16 terms (4 years), 53 percent of the students remained enrolled. The number and percentage of students not enrolled after 16 terms was affected by the fact that some of these students graduated.

During the Winter Term of 1977, 3 student (11 percent) from the class of Special Services students who enrolled in the 1974 Summer Term graduated. Also, during the 1977 Winter Term, 10 students (36 percent) were not enrolled for personal, academic, financial, or other unknown reasons.

**Analysis of Class Enrolling in 1975**

Table 14 indicates that after 8 terms (2 years), 58 percent of the randomly selected Special Services students who entered the University of Florida during the 1975 Summer Term were enrolled. After 16 terms (4 years), the percentage of students still enrolled remained at 58 percent.

During the 1979 Summer Term, 3 students (13 percent) graduated; 14 students (58 percent) were also not enrolled
for personal, academic, or financial reasons. It is also possible that 58 percent of the students were not enrolled because it was the summer term. The table reflects a high percentage of students not enrolled during the summer terms.

Analysis of Class Enrolling 1976

An inspection of Table 15 shows that in the eighth term (2 years), 82 percent of the Special Services students were still enrolled. In the sixteenth term (4 years), 70 percent of the students remained enrolled. The first student to graduate from this group did so in 12 terms (3 years). Also during this twelfth term, 18 percent of the students who initially enrolled during the 1976 Summer Term were not enrolled for reasons other than graduation.

Analysis of Class Enrolling in 1977

Table 16 reports that in 8 terms (2 years), 87 percent of the Special Services students were still enrolled after their initial enrollment during the 1977 Summer Term. During the sixteenth term (4 years), 75 percent of the students remained enrolled, with 8 percent having graduated and 17 percent not enrolled for reasons other than graduation.
Analysis of Class Enrolling in 1978

An inspection of Table 17 shows that in 8 terms (2 years), 87 percent of the Special Services students who enrolled at the University of Florida during the 1978 Summer Term were still enrolled. By the sixteenth term (4 years), 38 percent of the students were enrolled for the "A" term; 30.7 percent were enrolled for the "B" term; and 7.6 percent were enrolled for the "C" term. The combined enrollment for the sixteenth term was 76.3 percent.

Summary

During the years between 1974 and 1978, the retention rates for the randomly selected Special Services students ranged from 58 percent to 87 percent during the first two years of their initial enrollment. Over the five-year period of this study, the Special Services Program retained 78.5 percent of these students during their first two years. The retention rates for four years after these students' initial enrollment ranged from 53 percent to 76.3 percent, with an average retention rate of 66.5 percent for the five groups of randomly selected students who enrolled during the 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977 and 1978 Summer Terms.
TABLE 11. **FRESHMAN ATTRITION OF TOTAL UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA STUDENTS,**
**FALL TERMS, 1974 THROUGH 1978**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>3,554</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>2,879</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>2,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrew</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not register</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Registrar, University of Florida.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Num-ber</td>
<td>Per-cent</td>
<td>Num-ber</td>
<td>Per-cent</td>
<td>Num-ber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrew</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not register</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 13.
RETENTION RECORDS OF RANDOMLY SELECTED SPECIAL SERVICES
STUDENTS FROM THE CLASS WHICH ENROLLED IN 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Enrolled Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Graduated Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>109.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>120.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>131.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>142.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>153.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>164.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>175.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21a</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>25&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>29&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Summer Term
TABLE 14. RETENTION RECORDS OF RANDOMLY SELECTED SPECIAL SERVICES STUDENTS FROM THE CLASS WHICH ENROLLED IN 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolled Number</th>
<th>Enrolled Percent</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Reason Number</th>
<th>Unknown Reason Number</th>
<th>Graduated Reason Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>13a</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>16a</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21a</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Not Enrolled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reason Number</td>
<td>Unknown Number</td>
<td>Graduated Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>25a</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>28a</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>29a</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aSummer Term
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolled Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Not Enrolled</th>
<th>Reason Unknown Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Graduated Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>13a</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>17a</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21a</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Reason Number</td>
<td>Unknown Number</td>
<td>Graduated Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>25^a</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Summer Term
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolled Number</th>
<th>Enrolled Percent</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Not Enrolled Reason Unknown Number</th>
<th>Unknown Percent</th>
<th>Graduated Number</th>
<th>Graduated Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>13a</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>17a</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Not Enrolled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>20&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Reason Unknown Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>20&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>23&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>23&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>23&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduated Number |
--- |
9 | 38.0 |
-- | ----- |
10 | 42.0 |
11 | 46.0 |
13 | 54.0 |
-- | ----- |

^Summer Term
<sup>a</sup>Summer Term
<sup>b</sup>Summer Term A
<sup>c</sup>Summer Term B
<sup>d</sup>Summer Term C
TABLE 17. RETENTION RECORDS OF RANDOMLY SELECTED SPECIAL SERVICES STUDENTS FROM THE CLASS WHICH ENROLLED IN 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolled Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Reason Unknown Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Graduated Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>15&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>16&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>16&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>16&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 17 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolled Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Not Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>18\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>19\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>19\textsuperscript{d}</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Summer Term
\textsuperscript{b}Summer A
\textsuperscript{c}Summer B
\textsuperscript{d}Summer C
Table 18. Special Services Retention Rates for the Period Between 1974 and 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Initial Enrollment</th>
<th>After Two Years (Percent)</th>
<th>After Four Years (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Mean Retention Rates for Period Between 1974 and 1978

78.5 66.5
Research Question #4

What are the graduation rates of Black students in the Special Services Program at the University of Florida?

Analysis of the 150 randomly selected transcripts provided the graduation rates of Black students in the Special Services Program who initially enrolled at the University of Florida during the years 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977 and 1978. Tables 19 through 30 indicate the number of terms enrolled before graduation, the number of years since the student's initial enrollment, the number of graduates, the percent of the original class that graduated, the average number of courses completed out of the number of courses attempted, and the type of degrees earned. United States Armed Services commissions were included in the tables when this information was provided by the students.

Transcript Analysis of Randomly Selected Special Services Students Who Enrolled in 1974 to Determine Their Graduation Rates

The first three graduates from the 1974 group of Special Services students completed requirements for their undergraduate degrees in 3.5 years. All three students were enrolled continuously without the usual summer break taken by most of their peers. One other student graduated in 3.75
years without a break in enrollment. The additional time was required by an internship. All together, 19 (66 percent) of the students from this group graduated. The length of time to graduate ranged from 3.5 years to 7.0 years from their initial enrollment date (Table 24).

**Degrees Earned**

The types of degrees earned by this group of graduates were as follows: Eight received Bachelor of Science degrees; ten received Bachelor of Arts degrees; and one received a Bachelor of Music Education degree. The majors of these graduates were in the areas of Marketing (2), Criminal Justice (3), Banking and Finance (1), Psychology (2), Recreation (1), Finance (1), Pharmacy (1), Broadcasting (2), Sociology (3), Music Education (1), History (1), and Political Science (1).

Two of these graduates continued their education and were awarded Specialist in Education degrees in Counselor Education. One of the graduates, the Pharmacy major, is presently in Medical School and is expected to receive the Doctor of Medicine degree in June of 1984 from the University of Florida's College of Medicine.
Courses Attempted and Completed

The graduates of the randomly selected group of Special Services students who enrolled in 1974 completed 93.2 percent of the courses they attempted while pursuing their undergraduate degrees; the nongraduates completed 78.1 percent of their courses. However, one graduate was found who completed only 79 percent of the courses attempted.

TABLE 19. COURSES COMPLETED OUT OF THE NUMBER OF COURSES ATTEMPTED BY A RANDOMLY SELECTED GROUP OF SPECIAL SERVICES STUDENTS WHO ENROLLED IN 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Status</th>
<th>Average Number of Courses Completed</th>
<th>Average Number of Courses Attempted</th>
<th>Percent of Courses Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates (n = 19)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraduates (n = 9)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transcript Analysis of Randomly Selected Special Services Students Who Enrolled in 1975 to Determine Their Graduation Rates

This analysis revealed that 11 students (46 percent) graduated out of the 24 students studied who enrolled during the 1975 Summer Term. The time required for these graduates to complete their undergraduate degree requirements ranged from 16 terms (4 years) to 31 terms (8 years). One student remained continuously enrolled until graduation by carrying 11 credit hours per term for four years.

One student from this group lacks one course for graduation. This student is a professional athlete who has been unable to enroll at the University when a particular required course is offered. One of the eleven students has been admitted to the Graduate School at the University of Florida; a second is currently enrolled in graduate school at the University of Wisconsin.

Five of the 11 students received Bachelor of Arts degrees and 6 received Bachelor of Science degrees. Their majors were in the following areas: Political Science (2), Advertising (2), Economics (1), Marketing (1), Broadcasting (2), Sociology (2), and Public Relations (1) (Table 25).
Courses Attempted and Completed

The graduates of the randomly selected group of Special Services students who enrolled in 1975 completed 92.9 percent of the courses that they attempted. The nongraduates completed 84.4 percent of their courses. Three of the nongraduates completed 92.2 percent, 92.9 percent, and 94.4 percent of their courses, respectively. Only one of the graduates completed less than 90 percent of the courses attempted. The other graduates completed 90.6 percent to 100.0 percent of their courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Status</th>
<th>Average Number of Courses Completed</th>
<th>Average Number of Courses Attempted</th>
<th>Percent of Courses Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates (n = 11)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraduates (n = 13)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transcript Analysis of Randomly Selected Special Services Students Who Enrolled in 1976 to Determine Their Graduation Rates

An analysis of the transcripts of the students who enrolled in the Summer of 1976 reveals that 26 of the 34 students (76 percent) graduated from the University of Florida. The period of time taken to obtain their undergraduate degrees ranged from 12 terms (3 years) to 26 terms (7 years). A total of 10 students from this group graduated in four years or less.

One student who obtained the bachelor's degree in three years enrolled in the Graduate School at the University of Florida and was awarded a master's degree 1.5 years later. Within a period of 4.5 years, this student had completed the undergraduate requirements with a 3.26 cumulative grade point average and the graduate degree requirements with a 3.53 cumulative grade point average.

Two other students from this group completed their graduate and professional degree requirements within a seven-year period from their initial enrollment at the University of Florida. One of these students was awarded a master's degree and the other a Juris Doctor degree (Table 26).
Degrees Received

Of the students in this group, 15 received Bachelor of Arts degrees, and 11 received Bachelor of Science degrees. The major fields of study for these degree recipients included Special Education (3), English (1), Broadcasting (2), Political Science (2), Speech (2), Sociology (2), Marketing (4), Psychology (3), Management (1), History (1), Criminal Justice (1), Physical Education (1), Health Education (1), Chemical Engineering (1), and Industrial and Systems Engineering (1).

The number and types of majors in this group of students vary greatly from the previous two groups of Special Services students. More students from the 1976 group graduated in four years or less than was the case for the two earlier groups in this study.

Courses Attempted and Completed

The graduates of the randomly selected group of Special Services students who enrolled in 1976 completed 96.6 percent of the courses that they attempted while pursuing their degrees; the nongraduates completed 82.4 percent of their courses. Nine of the graduates each completed 100 percent of the courses that they attempted. Two of the nongraduates completed 90.6 percent and 97 percent of their courses, respectively.
TABLE 21. COURSES COMPLETED OUT OF THE NUMBER OF COURSES ATTEMPTED BY A RANDOMLY SELECTED GROUP OF SPECIAL SERVICES STUDENTS WHO ENROLLED IN 1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Status</th>
<th>Average Number of Courses Completed</th>
<th>Average Number of Courses Attempted</th>
<th>Percent of Courses Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates (n = 26)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraduates (n = 8)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transcript Analysis of Randomly Selected Special Services Students Who Enrolled in 1977 to Determine Their Graduation Rates

An analysis of the transcripts of this randomly selected group of students who began their enrollment during the Summer of 1977 revealed that 13 out of the 24 students (54 percent) graduated. The number of years from their initial enrollment to graduation ranged from 3.5 years to 6.0 years.

Three of the graduates from this group (17 percent), graduated in less than four years. The first of these graduates completed all requirements for the bachelor's degree in 3.5 years (Table 27).

Degrees Earned

The types of degrees earned by this group of Special Services students included 7 Bachelor of Arts and 6 Bachelor
of Science degrees. Two of the degree recipients were commissioned in the United States Army as Second Lieutenants, one of whom is a female.

The major fields of study of these 13 graduates were Special Education (2), Public Relations (1), Health Education (2), Advertising (1), Psychology (2), Criminal Justice (2), Nursing (1), Recreation (1), and Speech (1).

Courses Attempted and Completed

The graduates of the randomly selected group of Special Services students who enrolled in 1977 completed 93.2 percent of their courses; the nongraduates completed 86.5 percent of their courses. Two of the graduates each completed 100 percent of their courses. Three of the non-graduates completed over 90 percent of their courses.
TABLE 22. COURSES COMPLETED OUT OF THE NUMBER OF COURSES ATTEMPTED BY A PANDOMLY SELECTED GROUP OF SPECIAL SERVICES STUDENTS WHO ENROLLED IN 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Status</th>
<th>Average Number of Courses Completed</th>
<th>Average Number of Courses Attempted</th>
<th>Percent of Courses Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraduates</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transcript Analysis of Randomly Selected Special Services Students Who Enrolled in 1978 to Determine Their Graduation Rates

From the transcripts of this randomly selected group of students who initially enrolled during the 1978 Summer Term, the researcher found that 8 (34 percent) of the 23 who graduated completed their degree requirements in four years or less. The other 15 students completed their degree requirements in 4.33 to 5.33 years. These 23 graduates represent 59 percent of the total number of students in this group.

Three of these students graduated in 3.5 years, one of whom received high honors. These three students did not take a break in their enrollment and were continuously enrolled for 14 terms. One of the three early graduates is
presently enrolled in the Graduate School at the University of Florida. Two other graduates are also enrolled at the University of Florida, one with postbaccalaureate status, and the other in the College of Law (Table 28).

**Degrees Earned**

The Bachelor of Science degree was awarded to 14 of the 23 graduates. The remaining 9 graduates received the Bachelor of Arts degree. The Bachelor of Science degree recipients majored in Management (2), Recreation (3), Marketing (3), Microbiology and Cell Science (1), Health Education (2), Electrical Engineering (2), and Finance (1). The Bachelor of Arts degree recipients majored in the areas of Sociology (1), Political Science (2), Criminal Justice (1), Speech (2), Special Education (2), and Psychology (1).

**Courses Attempted and Completed**

The graduates of the randomly selected group of Special Services students who enrolled in 1978 completed 94.9 percent of the courses that they attempted while pursuing their undergraduate degrees at the University of Florida. The nongraduates completed 87.8 percent of their courses. However, one nongraduate was found to have completed 100 percent of the courses attempted. There were two graduates who also completed 100 percent of their courses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Status</th>
<th>Average Number of Courses Completed</th>
<th>Average Number of Courses Attempted</th>
<th>Percent of Courses Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates (n = 23)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>94.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraduates (n = 16)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Major Fields of Study

The randomly selected Special Services students who first enrolled during the summers between 1974 and 1978 earned their undergraduate degrees from only 10 of the 14 schools and colleges at the University of Florida. Table 31 shows the types of degrees, majors, the number of degree recipients from each of the entering groups and the school or college that awarded the degree.

Of the total number of graduates, 42.4 percent received their degrees from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences; 17.4 percent from the College of Business Administration; 12 percent from the College of Journalism and Communications; 12 percent from the College of Physical Education, Health and Recreation; 7.6 percent from the College of Education;
4.3 percent from the College of Engineering; and 1.1 percent from the Colleges of Agriculture, Fine Arts, Nursing, and Pharmacy, respectively. The data show that students from this group did not receive degrees in Accounting, Architecture, Building Construction or Forestry.

Summary

The fourth research question was answered after a detailed analysis of the transcripts of each of the 150 randomly selected students who first enrolled between the years 1974 and 1978. Briefly, the answer is that 92 of these 150 Special Services students (61 percent) graduated from the University of Florida.

Nine percent of the students in this study graduated in less than 4 years. The greatest number of these Special Services students, 46 percent, graduated in 3 to 5 years. Within a period of 6 years following their initial entry into the University of Florida, 55 percent of the students in this study had graduated. However, there were 5.8 percent of the students in this study who took 6 to 8 years to graduate.
TABLE 24. ANALYSIS OF THE NUMBER OF TERMS FROM INITIAL ENROLLMENT TO GRADUATION FOR RANDOMLY SELECTED BLACK STUDENTS IN THE SPECIAL SERVICES PROGRAM AND THE TYPE OF DEGREE BY THE CLASS WHICH ENROLLED IN 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Terms Enrolled Prior to Graduation</th>
<th>Years Since Initial Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Percent of Class Graduating</th>
<th>Type of Degree Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3^b</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (Major: Marketing; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1^b</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (Major: Banking and Finance; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2. Bachelor of Arts (Major: Criminal Justice; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3. Bachelor of Arts (Major: Criminal Justice; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Terms Enrolled Prior to Graduation</td>
<td>Years Since Initial Enrollment</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td>Percent of Class Graduating</td>
<td>Type of Degree Earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Major: Criminal Justice; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 3.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Major: Psychology; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.78); also awarded a Specialist in Education degree (Major: Student Personnel in Higher Education; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 3.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Science in Recreation (Major: Recreation; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Terms&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Enrolled Prior to Graduation</td>
<td>Years Since Initial Enrollment</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td>Percent of Class Graduating</td>
<td>Type of Degree Earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (Major: Finance; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2. Bachelor of Science in Broadcasting (Major: Broadcasting; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.43);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Number of terms includes all terms enrolled prior to graduation, including those in which no courses were attempted,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Terms Enrolled Prior to Graduation</th>
<th>Years Since Initial Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Percent of Class Graduating</th>
<th>Type of Degree Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Commissioned a Second Lieutenant in the United States Army</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Bachelor of Science in Broadcasting (Major: Broadcasting; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.11)

1. Bachelor of Arts (Major: Sociology; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.05)

2. Bachelor of Music Education (Major: Music Education; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.14)
### TABLE 24 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Terms(^a) Enrolled Prior to Graduation</th>
<th>Years Since Initial Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Percent of Class Graduating</th>
<th>Type of Degree Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3. Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (Major: Marketing; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Arts (Major: History; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Number of terms refers to the number of terms a student has enrolled prior to graduation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Terms(^a) Enrolled Prior to Graduation</th>
<th>Years Since Initial Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Percent of Class Graduating</th>
<th>Type of Degree Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Arts (Major: Psychology; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Arts (Major: Sociology; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bachelor of Arts (Major: Political Science; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Term refers to the quarter system, which represents 11 weeks of lecture and 2 or more hours per week of laboratory.

\(^b\)Subjects graduated in less than four years without a break in their enrollment.

\(^c\)Subjects graduated in four years.
TABLE 25. ANALYSIS OF THE NUMBER OF TERMS FROM INITIAL ENROLLMENT TO GRADUATION FOR RANDOMLY SELECTED BLACK STUDENTS IN THE SPECIAL SERVICES PROGRAM AND THE TYPE OF DEGREE BY THE CLASS WHICH ENROLLED IN 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Terms Enrolled Prior to Graduation</th>
<th>Years Since Initial Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Percent of Class Graduating</th>
<th>Type of Degree Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Major: Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science; Cumulative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade Point Average = 2.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bachelor of Science in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advertising (Major:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advertising; Cumula-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tive Grade Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average = 2.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Major: Economics;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative Grade Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average = 2.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Science in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business Administra-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tion (Major: Market-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ing; Cumulative Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Point Average = 2.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Terms&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Enrolled Prior to Graduation</td>
<td>Years Since Initial Enrollment</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td>Percent of Class Graduating</td>
<td>Type of Degree Earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2. Bachelor of Science in Broadcasting (Major: Broadcasting; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Arts (Major: Sociology; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bachelor of Science in Advertising (Major: Advertising; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Science in Journalism (Major: Public Relations; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Terms&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Enrolled Prior to Graduation</td>
<td>Years Since Initial Enrollment</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td>Percent of Class Graduating</td>
<td>Type of Degree Earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2. Bachelor of Arts (Major: Political Science; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Arts (Major: Sociology; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Science in Broadcasting (Major: Broadcasting; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Term refers to the quarter system; as of August, 1981, the University of Florida changed its calendar to the semester system, which represents 16 weeks of instruction. The Summer Semester has two six-week sessions. The 26th term is the beginning of the semester system for this group of students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Terms&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Enrolled Prior to Graduation</th>
<th>Years Since Initial Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Percent of Class Graduating</th>
<th>Type of Degree Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Arts in Education, with Honors (Major: Special Education; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 3.26); also received Master of Education (Major: Specific Learning Disabilities; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 3.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2. Bachelor of Science in Broadcasting (Major: Broadcasting; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Terms&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Enrolled Prior to Graduation</td>
<td>Years Since Initial Enrollment</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td>Percent of Class Graduating</td>
<td>Type of Degree Earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Major: Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science; Cumulative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade Point Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= 3.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Bachelor of Arts
(Major: Speech; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.43)

2. Bachelor of Arts
(Major: Sociology; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.33)

3. Bachelor of Arts
(Major: Speech; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.60)
### TABLE 26 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Terms&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Enrolled Prior to Graduation</th>
<th>Years Since Initial Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Percent of Class Graduating</th>
<th>Type of Degree Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4. Bachelor of Arts (Major: Sociology; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (Major: Marketing; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Bachelor of Arts (Major: Psychology; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (Major: Marketing; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Terms&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Enrolled Prior to Graduation</td>
<td>Years Since Initial Enrollment</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td>Percent of Class Graduating</td>
<td>Type of Degree Earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2. Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (Major: Management; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Bachelor of Arts (Major: Political Science; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 3.32); also received Juris Doctor degree May 7, 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Bachelor of Arts (Major: History; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Terms(^a) Enrolled Prior to Graduation</td>
<td>Years Since Initial Enrollment</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td>Percent of Class Graduating</td>
<td>Type of Degree Earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Arts (\text{Major: Criminal Justice; Cumulative Grade Point Average} = 2.43); also received Master of Arts (\text{Major: Political Science; Cumulative Grade Point Average} = 3.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bachelor of Arts in Education (\text{Major: Special Education; Cumulative Grade Point Average} = 3.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Bachelor of Arts (\text{Major: Psychology; Cumulative Grade Point Average} = 2.65)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Table cont. e 26
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Terms(^a) Enrolled Prior to Graduation</th>
<th>Years Since Initial Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Percent of Class Graduating</th>
<th>Type of Degree Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Arts (Major: Psychology; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Science in Physical Education (Major: Physical Education; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Science in Health Education (Major: Health Education; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Terms a Enrolled Prior to Graduation</td>
<td>Years Since Initial Enrollment</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td>Percent of Class Graduating</td>
<td>Type of Degree Earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2. Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (Major: Marketing; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Science in Broadcasting (Major: Broadcasting; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (Major: Marketing; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Bachelor of Science in Chemical Engineering (Major: Chemical Engineering; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 26 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Terms a Enrolled Prior to Graduation</th>
<th>Years Since Initial Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Percent of Class Graduating</th>
<th>Type of Degree Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Arts in Education (Major: Special Education; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Science in Industrial and Systems Engineering (Major: Industrial and Systems Engineering; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.38)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aTerm refers to the quarter system for terms 1 through 21, which represents 11 weeks of lecture and 2 or more hours per week of laboratory. Beginning with term 22, the University of Florida converted to the semester system. A semester consists of sixteen weeks of instruction, with a summer session consisting of two six-week sessions and one overall twelve-week summer session (known as Summer A, Summer B, and Summer C terms).
TABLE 27. ANALYSIS OF THE NUMBER OF TERMS FROM INITIAL ENROLLMENT TO GRADUATION FOR RANDOMLY SELECTED BLACK STUDENTS IN THE SPECIAL SERVICES PROGRAM AND THE TYPE OF DEGREE BY THE CLASS WHICH ENROLLED IN 1977.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Terms Enrolled Prior to Graduation</th>
<th>Years Since Initial Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Percent of Class Graduating</th>
<th>Type of Degree Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Arts in Education (Major: Special Education; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2. Bachelor Arts in Education (Major: Special Education; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Science in Health Education (Major: Health Education; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Terms(^a) Enrolled Prior to Graduation</td>
<td>Years Since Initial Enrollment</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td>Percent of Class Graduating</td>
<td>Type of Degree Earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2. Bachelor of Science in Advertising (Major: Advertising; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.94; also commissioned into the United States Army as a Second Lieutenant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3. Bachelor of Arts (Major: Psychology; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Arts (Major: Criminal Justice; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 3.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Terms Enrolled Prior to Graduation</td>
<td>Years Since Initial Enrollment</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td>Percent of Class Graduating</td>
<td>Type of Degree Earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Arts (Major: Psychology; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2. Bachelor of Science in Nursing (Major: Nursing; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Science in Health Education (Major: Health Education; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Science in Recreation (Major: Recreation; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 27 (CONTINUED)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Terms&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Enrolled Prior to Graduation</th>
<th>Years Since Initial Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Percent of Class Graduating</th>
<th>Type of Degree Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Arts (Major: Speech; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bachelor of Arts (Major: Criminal Justice; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.09); also commissioned into the United States Army as a Second Lieutenant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Term refers to the quarter system; as of August, 1981, the University of Florida changed its calendar to the semester system, which represents 16 weeks of instruction. The Summer Semester has two six-week sessions. The 18th term is the beginning of the semester system for this group of students.
### Table 28. Analysis of the Number of Terms from Initial Enrollment to Graduation for Randomly Selected Black Students in the Special Services Program and the Type of Degree by the Class Which Enrolled in 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Terms Enrolled Prior to Graduation</th>
<th>Years Since Initial Enrollment</th>
<th>Percent of Class Graduating</th>
<th>Type of Degree Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Major: Psychology;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative Grade Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average = 2.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in Education, with High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Honors (Major: Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education; Cumulative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade Point Average =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3. Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in Recreation (Major:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation; Cumulative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade Point Average =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The number of terms enrolled prior to graduation is 14, the years since initial enrollment is 3.50, and the percent of class graduating is 8.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Terms Enrolled Prior to Graduation</th>
<th>Years Since Initial Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Percent of Class Graduating</th>
<th>Type of Degree Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (Major: Marketing; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bachelor of Arts  (Major: Political Science; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (Major: Finance; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Bachelor of Arts (Major: Speech; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Terms Enrolled Prior to Graduation</td>
<td>Years Since Initial Enrollment</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td>Percent of Class Graduating</td>
<td>Type of Degree Earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5. Bachelor of Arts in Education (Major: Special Education; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 3.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Arts (Major: Speech; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bachelor of Arts (Major: Criminal Justice; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (Major: Management; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Terms(^a) Enrolled Prior to Graduation</td>
<td>Years Since Initial Enrollment</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td>Percent of Class Graduating</td>
<td>Type of Degree Earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1. Bachelor of Science in Health Education (Major: Health Education; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bachelor of Arts (Major: Political Science; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering (Major: Electrical Engineering; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Bachelor of Arts (Major: Sociology; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 28 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Terms(^a) Enrolled Prior to Graduation</th>
<th>Years Since Initial Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Percent of Class Graduating</th>
<th>Type of Degree Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (Major: Marketing; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.62)

2. Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering (Major: Electrical Engineering; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 3.24)

3. Bachelor of Science in Health Education (Major: Health Education; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.24)
### TABLE 28 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Terms&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Enrolled Prior to Graduation</th>
<th>Years Since Initial Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Percent of Class Graduating</th>
<th>Type of Degree Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Bachelor of Science in Agriculture (Major: Microbiology and Cell Science; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.43)

1. Bachelor of Science in Recreation (Major: Recreation; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.33)

2. Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (Major: Marketing; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.01)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Terms(^a) Enrolled Prior to Graduation</th>
<th>Years Since Initial Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Percent of Class Graduating</th>
<th>Type of Degree Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3. Bachelor of Science in Recreation (Major: Recreation; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (Major: Management; Cumulative Grade Point Average = 2.01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Term refers to the quarter system; as of August, 1981, the University of Florida changed its calendar to the semester system, which represents 16 weeks of instruction. The Summer Semester has two six-week sessions. The 14th term is the beginning of the semester system for this group of students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science/Advertising</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science/Banking and Finance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science/Broadcasting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts/Criminal Justice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts/Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science/Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science/Electrical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science/Industrial and Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts/English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science/Finance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science/Health Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Education, Health and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts/History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science/Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science/Marketing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science/Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science/Microbiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science/Cell Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science/Music Education/Music Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science/Nursing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science/Pharmacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science/Physical Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts/Political Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts/Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts/Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science/Recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Sociology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Education/ Special Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Speech</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Degrees</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Initial Enrollment</td>
<td>Number of Randomly Selected Students From Each Year</td>
<td>Number of Graduates Since Initial Enrollment</td>
<td>Percent Graduated (Through August, 1983)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIVE-YEAR TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 30. NUMBER OF RANDOMLY SELECTED SPECIAL SERVICES STUDENTS WHO GRADUATED, BY YEAR OF INITIAL ENROLLMENT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time to Graduate (in Years)</th>
<th>Total Number of Students in the Study</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Graduation Rate (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00-3.75</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00-4.75</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00-5.75</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00-6.75</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00-7.75</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00-</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>61.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question #5

What influence does the peer counselor component have on the academic performance of Black students in the Special Services Program at the University of Florida?

In the Special Services Program, peer counselors function as extensions of the full-time counseling staff. For the staff, they provide feedback from the students who are assigned to them. Peer counselors are expected to make weekly contacts with their assigned case load of 10 to 15 students, and to report their findings to the staff counselor.

Items 17, 18, 19, 21, and 26a of the Questionnaire Evaluating Special Services Programs (QESSP) were analyzed for data pertaining to the influences of the peer counselors on the academic performances of randomly selected Special Services students. An analysis of the data from the QESSP pertaining to peer counselors is presented both for the graduates and nongraduates of the Special Services Program. The researcher presents an analysis of the responses to questions about peer counselor effectiveness for the graduates first, followed by the analysis of the nongraduates' responses.
Analysis of the Peer Counselors' Effectiveness as Perceived by Randomly Selected Graduates of the Special Services Program

"How would you describe the effect of your peer counselor in contributing to your academic performance?" was the question asked in Item 17 on the QESSP. Twenty-five (83 percent) of the graduates responded that the contributions of their peer counselors to their academic performance were effective to extremely effective. However, 4 (14 percent) of the graduates responded negatively and rated their peer counselors' contributions to their academic performance as not effective. One graduate (3 percent) described the peer counselor as extremely ineffective. Overall, 83 percent of the students described their peer counselor as effective, while 17 percent reported that they were ineffective in contributing to their academic performance.

The frequency of the peer counselors' contact with the students was solicited by Item 18. The data indicated that 26.7 percent of the graduates were contacted weekly by their peer counselors; 40 percent, twice a week; 13.3 percent, monthly; and 20 percent reported that they were seldom contacted by their peer counselors. Overall, 67 percent of the students were in communication with their peer counselors once or twice a week.
"How would you describe the overall effectiveness of the peer counselor?" was asked on Item 19. The graduates described the overall effectiveness of their peer counselors in providing them with helpful experiences to make the transition from high school as: extremely effective, 16.7 percent; very effective, 20 percent; effective, 43.3 percent; not effective, 16.7 percent; and 3.3 percent described the peer counselor as extremely ineffective.

The students rated the peer counselors in Item 21 on the effectiveness of their counseling on personal, academic and social concerns. They were also rated on financial aid counseling.

**Personal Concerns**

Item 21 of the QESSP indicates that 56.6 percent of the graduates received counseling from peer counselors on their personal concerns. Seven graduates (41.2 percent) rated their peer counselor as extremely effective in this area; 3 graduates (17.6 percent) rated them very effective; 6 graduates (35.3 percent) thought that they were effective; and 1 graduate (5.9 percent) rated them as not effective.

**Academic Concerns**

Twenty-six of 30 graduates indicated that they had received counseling from peer counselors about academic concerns. Of these 26, 13 (50 percent) reported that the peer counselors were extremely effective in this area; 5 (19.2
percent), very effective; and 7 (26.9 percent), effective. One graduate (3.8 percent) felt that the peer counselor was not effective in counseling on academic concerns.

Social Concerns

Sixteen of 30 graduates reported that they had received help from peer counselors in social concerns. Specifically, 6 graduates (37.5 percent) thought that this counseling was extremely effective; 4 (25 percent), very effective; 4 (25 percent), effective; and 2 (12.5 percent), not effective.

Financial Aid

Twenty-four of 30 graduates reported that they had received counseling from the peer counselors on financial aid matters. Only positive comments were made. An extremely effective rating was given by 12 (50 percent) of the graduates; a very effective rating was given by 8 (33.3 percent) of the graduates; and 4 (16.7 percent) rated this area as effective. Only 4 negative responses were made about the peer counselors' effectiveness in counseling concerning personal, academic, social and financial aid matters. Item 21 on the QESSP indicates that, in general, the graduates felt that their peer counselors performed effectively in providing them personal, academic, social and financial aid counseling.
Tutoring

According to Item 26a, 11 of 30 graduates received tutoring assistance from the peer counselors. Four of the 11 students (36.4 percent) rated the peer counselors in this area as extremely effective; 3 (27.2 percent), very effective; and 4 (36.4 percent) as effective.

Summary

The majority of the graduates indicated that they perceived the peer counselors as effective providers of counseling services. Peer counselors, as tutors, were rated extremely effective to effective, even though they were only used by less than one-half of the students.

Analysis of Peer Counselors' Effectiveness as Perceived by Randomly Selected Nongraduates of the Special Services Program

Item 17 asked the students to describe the effects of their peer counselor on their academic performance. In describing the peer counselors' contributions to their academic performance, 23 of the 30 nongraduates were positive in their comments. Specifically, 7 students (23.3 percent) said that the peer counselors were extremely effective; 7 (23.3 percent) indicated very effective; and 9 (30 percent) reported them as effective. On the other hand, 7 (23.3 percent) of the nongraduates were negative in rating
their peer counselors in this area. Three (10 percent) indicated that their peer counselors were not effective, while 4 (13.3 percent) rated them as extremely ineffective. Overall, 77 percent of these students saw their peer counselors as having contributed effectively to their academic performance. However, 23 percent held a contrary point of view.

In the analysis of Item 18, which solicited data on peer counselor contacts, the data show that most nongraduates were contacted weekly by their peer counselors. One student (3 percent) indicated that the peer counselor made daily contacts; 14 (47 percent) weekly; 6 (20 percent) twice a week; 3 (10 percent) monthly; and 6 (20 percent) very seldom. Overall, 70 percent of these students were contacted by their peer counselors once a week, twice a week, or daily.

The students were asked in Item 19 to describe the overall effectiveness of their peer counselors. The data analyzed from Item 19 reveal that the peer counselors were considered effective by the large majority of these students. However, some described their peer counselors as ineffective. Specifically, 5 students (17 percent) described their peer counselors as extremely effective in this area; 9 (30 percent) as very effective; and 9 (30 percent) as effective. Six nongraduates (20 percent) indicated that
their peer counselors were not effective and 1 (3 percent) rated the peer counselor as extremely ineffective.

When these students were asked in Item 21 to rate their peer counselor's effectiveness in dealing with personal, academic and social concerns, along with financial aid counseling, the data reveal the following:

**Personal Concerns**

The data indicate that 10 of the nongraduating students received personal counseling from the peer counselors and 17 did not. Those students who received counseling related to their personal concerns, 30 percent, said that it was extremely effective; 50 percent said it was very effective, and 20 percent said it was effective.

**Academic Concerns**

Peer counseling on academic concerns was reported on by 22 of the nongraduating students. Three (14 percent) stated that assistance in this area was extremely effective; 10 (45 percent) very effective; 7 (32 percent) effective; and 2 (9 percent) not effective.

**Social Concerns**

A total of 13 students received help in the area of social concerns by peer counselors. Four (31 percent) reported that their peer counselors were extremely effective; 5 (38 percent) very effective; 3 (23 percent) effective; 1 (8 percent) not effective.
Financial Aid

It appears from Item 21 that peer counselors provided 20 nongraduates with assistance regarding financial aid matters. Nineteen of these students thought that their peer counselors were effective, while 1 thought that they were not effective.

Only 4 nongraduating students indicated that their peer counselors were not effective in helping them on academic, social or financial aid matters. Overall, those students who utilized the services of the peer counselors clearly indicated positive reactions to the peer counselors who assisted them in personal, academic, social and financial matters.

Tutoring

The analysis of Item 26a on the QESSP indicates that the peer counselors are effective tutors. One student (9 percent) rated the peer counselor as an extremely effective tutor; 7 (64 percent) rated them as very effective; and 3 (27 percent) said that the peer counselors were effective.

Summary

The analysis of Items 17, 18, 19, 21, and 26a reveals that the nongraduating students also perceived the peer counselors as effective providers of counseling and tutoring services. Their ratings of the peer counselors were not as
high as those reported by the graduates and they did not utilize the services of the peer counselors as often as the graduates.
Research Question #6

What is the economic status of Black students who participated in the Special Services Program at the University of Florida?

In analyzing the transcripts of randomly selected Black students who participated in the Special Services Program from 1974 to 1978, the researcher found that approximately 18 (19 percent) graduated each year. A question which needs to be raised and answered is whether or not the Special Services Program is worth what it is costing the Federal Government and the University of Florida.

The analysis of responses to Item 8 on the QESSP concerning the type of work and title of the job held revealed that 83.3 percent of the graduates are employed full-time, 3.3 percent are employed part-time, and 13.3 percent are not employed. The 13.3 percent (4 students) who are unemployed are students at the University of Florida. The type of work and title of the job identified by the graduates who are working are listed in Table 32.

The nongraduates' responses to Item 8 indicated that 60 percent of the students are employed full-time, 10 percent are employed part-time and 30 percent are not employed. The type of work and title of the jobs identified by the non-graduates are shown in Table 33. The data solicited by Item
9 of the QESSP were used in the analysis to determine the potential earning power of the students and the economic value of the Special Services Program.

To assess the economic value of the Program to the Federal Government and the University of Florida, and to determine the economic status of the randomly selected students who participated in it, a computer analysis was conducted. This analysis was accomplished by using a computer program called the Program Impact Assessment System that was designed and developed by Dr. John Nickens at the University of Florida.

The analysis shows that the present value of each graduate in the first year of employment following graduation in the first year of employment following graduation was $13,546.00, while the average nongraduate's income during the first year after leaving the University of Florida was $10,383.00. The present value indicates the potential earnings of former Special Services students. Assessment of the economic value of the Special Services Program shows that the present yearly value of the Program is $406,380.00, if the students graduated, and $311,490.00, if they did not graduate. These present values of the Special Services Program were obtained by multiplying the first-year present value of each group, graduates and nongraduates, by the number in the groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Work</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Postal Clerk</td>
<td>U.S. Postal Service Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Counseling (3)</td>
<td>Behavioral Specialist; Treatment and Rehabilitative Specialist; Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. U.S. Army Officer (2)</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Auditing</td>
<td>Staff Auditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. College Admissions</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Insurance (2)</td>
<td>Agency Manager; Salesman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Layout Artist</td>
<td>Proofreader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Therapy</td>
<td>Rehabilitation Therapist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Law</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Police Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Marketing</td>
<td>Systems Design Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Teaching (6)</td>
<td>Full-time Teacher (5); Part-time Teacher (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Retailing</td>
<td>Sales Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Human Services</td>
<td>Residential Service Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Health Services</td>
<td>Health Service Representative II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Engineering (2)</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Work</td>
<td>Job Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Electrical Drafting (2)</td>
<td>Drafter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fast Food Restaurant (2)</td>
<td>Manager; Assistant Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parcel Delivery (U.P.S.)</td>
<td>Driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sales</td>
<td>Retail Sales Clerk; Area Supervisor; Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Engineering</td>
<td>Engineer Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Postman</td>
<td>U.S. Post Office Carrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. U.S. Army</td>
<td>Helicopter Pilot/OH 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Internal Revenue</td>
<td>Internal Revenue Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Corrections (2)</td>
<td>Correctional Officer I; Rehabilitation and Treatment Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Teaching</td>
<td>Substitute Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Child Care</td>
<td>Child Care Worker I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Janitorial</td>
<td>Janitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Data Processing (2)</td>
<td>Computer Programmer; Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Food and Beverages</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Restaurant</td>
<td>Waitress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis also shows that the graduates and non-graduates have the potential of spending $15,190.00 and $9,732.00, respectively, during the first year of their employment. The potential spending power of these two groups was determined by an impact multiplier in the computer program and other considerations, such as inflation, age, earnings and interest rates.

The researcher found that the Special Services Program's impact on society is valued at $455,700.00 during the first year of the graduated students' employment. The Program is valued at $291,960.00 for the nongraduated students during the first year of their employment. The Program's impact was determined by multiplying the potential spending power of the groups by the number in each group.

Procedure for Making Analysis of Special Services Program's Value

The present value of the randomly selected Special Services graduates and nongraduates was computed by adjusting each year's earnings to the present value. For example, the average yearly salary for the graduates was $15,308.00 in 1982. Using a discount rate of .13, the present value of the $15,308.00 was determined to be $13,546.00. The discount rate was multiplied by the current value and the product was then subtracted from the current value to arrive at
the present value of the salary. The present value for the
onnull
nongraduates' salary was computed in the same manner, using
nonnull
the same discount rate. Present value indicates potential
nonnull
earnings and current values indicates actual earnings.
nonnull
The 1982 yearly incomes reported by the graduates
nonnull
reveals that 3 (11.5 percent) were earning less than
nonnull
$6,000.00; 3 (11.5 percent), $9,000.00-$11,999.00; 10 (38.4
nonnull
percent), $12,000.00-$14,000.00; 2 (7.4 percent),
nonnull
$15,000.00-$17,999.00; 2 (7.4 percent), $18,000.00-
nonnull
$20,999.00; 3 (11.5 percent), earning $21,000.00-$23,999.00;
nonnull
1 (3.8 percent), $24,000.00-$26,000.00; and 2 (7.4 percent),
nonnull
earning more than $27,000.00 per year.
nonnull

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Number of Graduates in Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $6,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,000 - $8,999</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9,000 - $11,999</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000 - $14,999</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $17,999</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18,000 - $20,999</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$21,000 - $23,999</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$24,000 - $26,999</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $27,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The average yearly salary was used in the analysis. This was determined by computing the mid-range salary and multiplying it by the number of salaries reported in that range, which resulted in the weighted salary for that range. The weighted salaries were added and divided by the total reported salaries, which resulted in the average yearly salary for the graduates. The same procedure was used to determine the average yearly salary for the nongraduates.

### TABLE 34. THE WEIGHTED AVERAGE YEARLY SALARIES FOR RANDOMLY SELECTED GRADUATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Mid-Range</th>
<th>Multiplied by Number in Range</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>Weighted Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,500</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTALS           | 26^a                        | $398,000 |

^aFour students who were enrolled at the University of Florida did not report their yearly incomes.
The following formula was used to obtain the average yearly salary of the randomly selected graduates:

\[
\frac{\text{Total Weighted Salaries}}{N} = \text{Average Yearly Salary}
\]

or

\[
\frac{\$398,000}{26} = \$15,308.
\]

The 1982 yearly incomes reported by the nongraduates revealed that 11 (36.6 percent) were earning less than $6,000.00; 3 (10 percent), $6,000.00-$8,999.00; 4 (13.3 percent), $9,000.00-$11,999.00; 1 (3.3 percent), $12,000.00-$14,999.00; 5 (16.6 percent), $15,000.00-$17,999.00; 4 (13.3 percent), $21,000.00-$23,999.00; 1 (3.3 percent), $24,000.00-$26,999.00; and 1 (3.3 percent), more than $27,000.00. These earnings are shown in Table 35. Weighted average yearly salaries are described in Table 36.
### TABLE 35. THE 1982 YEARLY INCOMES REPORTED BY RANDOMLY SELECTED NONGRADUATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Number of Graduates in Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $6,000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,000 - $8,999</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9,000 - $11,999</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000 - $14,999</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $17,999</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18,000 - $20,999</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$21,000 - $23,999</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$24,000 - $26,999</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $27,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### TABLE 36. THE WEIGHTED AVERAGE YEARLY SALARIES FOR RANDOMLY SELECTED NONGRADUATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Mid-Range</th>
<th>Multiplied by Number in Range</th>
<th>Weighted Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>$49,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>82,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,500</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>25,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>26,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>$352,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following formula was used to obtain the average yearly salary of the randomly selected nongraduates:

\[
\frac{\text{Total Weighted Salaries}}{N} = \text{Average Yearly Salary}
\]

or

\[
\frac{352,000}{30} = 11,733.
\]

The students' potential earnings are the sum of the adjusted earnings for each year. The sum of the adjusted earnings was determined using a computer with input data, such as the impact multiplier, the inflation rate and the present rate of interest.

Student data needed for the computer analysis were the number of graduates per year, their average beginning salary, their average salary before entering the University of Florida, the average maximum salary of the students and the average age of the students at graduation. Other data needed that were obtained from the literature or resource agencies included the average age of retirement, the impact multiplier, the inflation rate, the survivor rate to retirement age, the productivity factor, and the present value of discount (interest). These data are presented in Table 37.
TABLE 37. STUDENT DATA FOR COMPUTER ANALYSIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Services</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
<th>Nongraduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completers per year</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average beginning yearly salary (in dollars)</td>
<td>15,307</td>
<td>11,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average salary before training (in dollars) (estimated based on minimum wages)</td>
<td>5,360</td>
<td>5,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average maximum salary for occupation (in dollars)</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>23,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of completers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of retirement for occupation</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact multiplier</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation rate</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivor rate to retirement age</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age productivity factor</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of present value discount</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

The analysis of the data shows that the randomly selected graduates earned more than the randomly selected nongraduates. However, there were 6 (20 percent) of the nongraduates who reported salaries ranging from $21,000.00 to more than $27,000.00 yearly; 6 (23 percent) of the graduates also reported salaries in that range. Of the nongraduates, 11 (37 percent) reported their earnings as less than $6,000.00 yearly, while only 3 (11 percent) of the graduates placed themselves in that range.
The economic value of the Program was determined to be $682,660.00. This figure represents the potential spending power of the two groups during their first year of employment, $747,660.00, minus $65,000.00 per year, the average cost of operating the Program. The Program's students represent a positive effect to the economy whereby these students are contributing to it by being employed and paying taxes rather than taking from it as recipients of State and Federal aid.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between a Special Services Program and Black students' retention, grade point averages, graduation and economic success. Relevant data were obtained by two methods: first a detailed review of the academic records of 150 of the students selected on a random basis who were enrolled in the Special Services Program at the University of Florida during the five-year period between 1974 and 1978.

The second method was a study of student reactions to major elements of the Program, gathered by means of the Questionnaire Evaluating Special Services Programs (QESSP) developed by the researcher. Sixty students were selected on a random basis from 750 students who were enrolled during the five years between the Summer of 1974 and the Summer of 1978 at the University of Florida. Thus, subjects of this study included a total of 210 students. Data were analyzed on a manual basis by the researcher.

This chapter consists of four sections. The first section includes a discussion of the data used to obtain
answers to the research questions listed in Chapter I. The second section presents the conclusions reached on the basis of the data reported in Chapter IV. The third reviews the implications suggested by the data; and the fourth makes recommendations for improvements of Special Services Programs and for further research.

**Discussion**

The findings of this study are discussed according to the six research questions upon which it was based.

**Academic Services and Activities**

The basic philosophical assumption for the creation of Special Services Programs is that Black students and other minorities with educational deficiencies can benefit from special academic assistance. The results of this study indicate that Special Services students do profit from such educational aids as counseling, tutoring and specialized instruction. This result supports the findings of Davis, Burkheimer, and Borders-Patterson (1975) who also studied Special Services Programs.

However, this researcher found that a large number of students did not utilize the services and activities of the Program; further, that Special Services graduates used these services and activities at a higher rate than did the non-graduates. Both graduates and nongraduates perceived these
services and activities as effective. At the same time, graduates tended to be more positive in their evaluations.

Several points of special interest may be drawn from the graduates' reactions to the services and activities available to them.

1. Ninety percent attended the campus orientation sessions and their ratings were positive.

2. These students were more likely to discuss personal and social concerns with their peer counselors than with the professional counselors at the Special Services Office. Even though the number of students discussing their academic and financial aid concerns with the professional counselor increased, the peer counselors were still consulted more than the professional counselor on these matters.

3. The academic advisors did not receive as many extremely effective ratings as did the peer counselors or the professional counselor for helping with the students' academic concerns. The academic advisors were not seen as effective as the peer counselors.

4. The special teaching procedures of presenting special courses in small units of instruction were helpful and rated as effective by the students. Retaking tests to improve their grades was rated extremely effective by most of the students. Courses taught by full-time professors were preferred by the students and were rated higher than those courses taught by graduate students.

5. The basic skills reading class was the least attended of the nine special classes designed for Special Services students. It was also not rated as high as the others.
6. Most of the tutoring received by the students was obtained through the Learning Center (Teaching Center). The peer counselors were active and effective providers of tutorial services; about one-half of the students utilized them in this role.

7. Special activities such as the Financial Aid workshop conducted by Financial Aid personnel, the awards ceremony, and academic recognition assemblies were attended by larger numbers of students than was the case for sessions dealing with reduction of test anxiety or coping with or adjusting to the University of Florida.

8. When the students were referred to other support services or helping agencies for help in dealing with problems, they were more likely to go to the Financial Aid Office or Student Services than to the Counseling Center. There was a noticeable lack of participation in the activities of the Counseling Center.

9. The students expressed a favorable reaction to the Special Services staff for their concerned, courteous, caring, genuine, warm and friendly attitudes. The staff were regarded as positive role models, helpful to the students.

The nongraduates' reactions to the services and activities of the Program produced these special points:

1. Eighty-seven percent of the nongraduates attended the campus orientation. They did not rate it as high as did the graduates.

2. About half of these students utilized the services of the peer counselors and the professional counselor for help with personal and social concerns. These students utilized counseling services more for help with academic and financial aid concerns.
3. Academic advisors were seen by most of these students, who rated advisor effectiveness about the same as that of the peer and professional counselors.

4. Special teaching procedures, wherein instruction was presented in small units, appeared to be helpful. Retaking of tests to improve grades was viewed as effective by most of these students. However, they preferred to be taught by full-time professors rather than graduate assistants.

5. More students attended the English and Social Sciences classes than any of the other seven Special Services classes.

6. Most of these students received their tutoring through the Learning Center (Teaching Center). The peer counselors were active providers of tutoring for these students.

7. Special activities were not utilized by almost half of these students. They did not fully participate in sessions on coping with and adjusting to the University of Florida or the reduction of test anxiety.

8. When these students were referred to other support services or agencies for help in dealing with problems, they were more likely to go to the Financial Aid Office or Student Services than go to the Placement Center or the Counseling Center. There was a noticeable lack of participation at the Placement Center (Career Resources) and the Counseling Center.
9. These students expressed a favorable reaction towards the staff for having concerned, courteous, caring, genuine, warm and friendly attitudes. Many of these students did not view the staff as being dynamic spokesmen for them but they did view them as positive role models.

According to the data, 57.5 percent of the graduates and 51.6 percent of the nongraduates reported that they made use of academic services and activities provided through the Special Services Program. Those who participated rated these services and activities as effective. Factors which influenced participation may well have been individual student motivation to seek help and the perceived relevance of such help to academic progress.

**Grade Point Averages**

The grade point averages earned by the students in this study indicate that many Black students who do not meet the minimum admission criteria can achieve grade point averages which not only satisfy but exceed graduation requirements. The students in this study gained their best grade point averages during their first and second years of enrollment, while directly involved in the Special Services Program. Their mean grade point averages for those two years ranged from 2.00 to 2.55, which compared favorably with all students' averages.

The Special Services class which enrolled in 1976 achieved the highest grade point average of all the Special
Services groups in this study. This class had a higher mean grade point average than did the entire student body during the first term of enrollment; specifically, 2.90 for Special Services students and 2.59 for all students. The mean grade point average for the class of 1976 during their first year was 2.55; and this average compared with 2.64 for the entire student body.

Why these students who enrolled in the Special Services Program in the Summer of 1976 produced such a record is unknown. Several factors might have contributed to these results: the recruiting efforts of the minority recruiter in the Admissions Office; the scrutiny and evaluation of the students' high school transcripts by the Special Admissions Subcommittee in attempting to select those special admission students with the highest potential; and the supporting services and motivational activities provided by the Special Services Program.

Retention Rates

The high retention rates of Black students enrolled in the Special Services Program, coupled with their grade point averages, provide additional evidence of their ability to succeed in college. Results of this research refute arguments of Evans and Dubois (1972) and other educators who have suggested that Black students lack the capacity for
learning and, therefore, should not be enrolled in higher education institutions.

The researcher agrees with Hunt (1969a, 1969b) that Black students who are given the opportunity to participate in an enriched environment can develop their intellectual skills. Special Services Programs are intended to help provide such an enriched environment. Also, they assist students in their social and cultural development which can encourage them to remain at a university or college. Over the five-year period covered by this research, the Special Services Program retained 78.5 percent of its students through two years of enrollment of those who were admitted to the Program during the 1974-1978 years, 66.5 percent remained enrolled through their fourth year of attendance.

Graduation Rates

The data analyzed by this researcher indicate that Black Special Services students who enrolled during 1974-1978 graduated from the University in impressive numbers. Several factors appear to be involved: providing these students with assistance to counteract the effects of cultural differences; arranging for courses taught by concerned, sensitive and understanding teachers; giving the students sufficient time to master a subject; and emphasizing facilitative teaching.
Over the five-year period of this research, 92 (61 percent) of the Black Special Services students graduated from among the 150 randomly selected for this study. The length of time taken by the students to graduate varied from three to eight years. These graduates completed approximately 94 percent of the courses that they attempted while pursuing their undergraduate degrees.

The degrees of these graduates were obtained from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences in a greater concentration than from any of the other schools and colleges at the University of Florida. None of the students, for example, was awarded a degree in Accounting, Architecture, Building Construction or Forestry. Several of these students continued their education by enrolling in graduate and professional schools; some have received advanced degrees.

For example, one student was awarded a master's degree in Special Education, two have obtained Specialist in Education degrees in Counselor Education, one will receive the Doctor of Medicine degree in June of 1984, one now has a Juris Doctor degree, with one other student presently enrolled in Law School. The data also show that four more students are presently pursuing graduate degrees.
Peer Counselors

Data from this research support points of view that peer counselors are effective in influencing favorably the academic performance of Black students. These data are especially useful because little information is available in the literature regarding the impact of peer counselors on the academic performance of Black students. Favorable reports regarding peer counselors in general have been made by Zunker and Brown (1966), Carkhuff (1969), and Durlak (1970).

About 50 percent of the graduates and nongraduates stated that they availed themselves of the services of the peer counselors as tutors. Of this number, 96.1 percent of the graduates and 91.0 percent of the nongraduates described the peer counselor as having an effective to extremely effective influence on their academic performance.

Economic Status

The data collected from the QESSP indicate that the graduates included in this study earned $3,574.00 more per year than the nongraduates. The average maximum yearly salary was $26,500.00 for the graduates and $23,666.00 for the nongraduates. Analysis of these data reveal that 11 (37 percent) of the nongraduates were earning less than $6,000.00 yearly, while only 3 (11 percent) of the graduates reported yearly salaries in that low range.
The salary differential during the first year after college between Black students who graduated and those who did not supports the assertion that a college degree increases the potential for greater income for graduates. This differential also underscores the belief that education represents the best hope for Black youth to break through the bonds of poverty and make progress economically, socially, and culturally. Data from this study indicate that such a Special Services Program can influence in positive ways the economic progress of Black participants.

Since substantial numbers of Black students are still graduating from high schools with inadequate records and skills to satisfy the entrance requirements of many colleges and universities, this researcher sees a continued need for organized academic support, such as provided by Special Services Programs. The philosophical and moral justification for the initiation of such programs in the 1970's is equally relevant for the 1980's and possibly beyond.

The economic value of the Special Services Program was determined to be $682,660.00 per year. This dollar figure represents the potential spending power of the former Special Services students included in this study during their first year of employment. On this basis, the economic value of the Program is much greater than the annual
$50,000.00 grant that has been awarded by the Federal
government to operate the Program. Therefore, the Program
is indeed cost effective.

Conclusions

The following conclusions may be drawn from this study:

1. The academic services and activities provided by
the Special Services Program were considered effective by
both the graduates and nongraduates of the Program. At the
same time, only 57.5 percent of the graduates reported
making use of these services and activities, as compared
with 51.6 percent of the nongraduates.

2. The services and activities which attracted the
highest levels of participation included orientation to the
campus, financial aid workshops, awards ceremonies, and
academic recognition assemblies.

3. Certain services and activities were used minimally
by Black students. Such services and activities included
the Counseling Center, the Placement Center (Career
Resources), and those special courses or workshops concerned
with reading skills, test anxiety and adaptation to
University life.

4. The mean grade point averages earned by the Special
Services students in this study during their first and
second years at the University demonstrated that these
students are capable of succeeding in their academic work and competing with regularly admitted students. Special Services students' grade point averages were not as high as those for the total student body, except for the Special Services students admitted in the Summer of 1976. In this instance, their grade point averages exceeded the student body average during the first term of enrollment.

5. The retention rates for the randomly selected Black students enrolled in the Special Services Program during the period from 1974 to 1978 indicated their ability to survive in a higher education setting. During this period, 78.5 percent continued through their first two years of enrollment; 66.5 percent, through their fourth year of enrollment.

6. The graduation rates of the Black students in this study further demonstrated that they are capable of succeeding and surviving in higher education institutions. Overall, 61 percent of the 150 students in this study graduated and some continued their education in graduate and professional schools.

7. Peer counselors had positive influences on the academic performance of these Special Services students. As tutors, peer counselors were effective and the data suggest that they could function in a dual role as peer tutor-counselors.
8. The evidence was that the Program is cost effective. Based on the potential earning power of the students, $682,660.090 per year, the economic value of the Special Services Program is greater than the amount of money provided for its operation.

9. As reported by the Special Services students in this study, graduates earned more money than nongraduates during their initial year of employment.

10. There is a continued need for the Special Services Program. The responses from almost all of the students in this study, except three who were not sure, revealed that the Special Services Program should be continued.

**Implications**

The following implications are suggested by this study:

1. The fact that 42.5 percent of the graduates and 48.4 percent of the nongraduates did not use the services and activities of the Special Services Program might suggest the need to change the procedures, services or activities to improve student participation.

2. Many of these students, who did not meet the University of Florida's entrance requirements, were enabled by the Special Services Program to graduate. Some of the students graduated at an accelerated rate. This program
appears to have specific value in helping Black students to attend the University of Florida and to graduate.

3. As evidenced by the accelerated graduation of some of the Special Services students, it appears they might not need as many of the services and activities currently provided by the Program. Such students could be monitored much less than others who are not progressing academically as fast and as successfully.

4. With an improved training program for the peer counselors, they can become better and more proficient providers of counseling services. Peer counselors appear to be perceived as more effective tutors than part-time counselors. Therefore, the Special Services Program should consider utilizing the peer counselors as both tutors and counselors.

5. The fact that 20 percent of the graduates and also 20 percent of the nongraduates were seldom contacted by their peer counselors suggests: 1) modifications of their roles; 2) more supervision of their activities by the professional counselor; 3) a better system of making the peer counselors more accountable for contacting their students; 4) the need for the professional counselor to actively verify the contacts reported by the peer counselors; and 5) the assignment of a graduate student to
assist the professional counselor in following up on reported student contacts made by the peer counselors.

6. The special activities, services and courses offered or arranged for by the Special Services Program appeared to have a positive effect on the retention of the Special Services students. Specifically, the five-day orientation, the academic advisement and counseling during the Summer terms appeared to provide the encouragement and motivation for the students' initial success in their courses. These activities and services also contributed to the 78.5 percent retention rate after two years of enrollment. These features of the program should be continued.

7. The Questionnaire Evaluating Special Services Programs (QESSP) can be of significant value to providers of Special Services Programs. The QESSP has general applicability and is capable of evaluating any Special Services Program, when modified to describe the services and activities of the Program administering the instrument. The generalizability of the QESSP now provides Special Services Directors with an evaluation instrument that is easy to administer.

8. This study may suggest to Special Services directors and their staff additional means to stimulate increased retention and graduation rates of their Special Services students.
9. In view of the student statements made regarding classroom instructors and instructions, this study suggests that faculty provide classroom procedures that will encourage Black students. Dissemination of this study to faculty might be helpful for those who are uncertain about the academic capability of Black students.

10. The positive responses of the students towards the staff suggests that concerned, courteous, caring, genuine, warm and friendly staff improve the conditions for student receptivity toward services and activities provided by the Program.

11. The Special Services Program is one of the three most important reasons given by Black students deciding to enroll at the University of Florida. The Program seemed to encourage Black students to enroll at this institution.

12. Some of the former students were reluctant to participate in this study, suggesting negative feelings about the University of Florida. Such feelings might adversely affect the University's ability to encourage former Black students to participate in alumni activities, including minority recruitment. Accordingly, efforts should be made to find ways to alter this situation.
Recommendations for Improving the Special Services Program at the University of Florida

The following recommendations for improving Special Services Programs are offered:

1. Require Special Services students to enroll in the institution during the Summer term when fewer students are on campus and also when few distractive activities are planned.

2. Mandatory attendance in the activities and services provided by the Special Services Program should be required of all participants. Attendance records should be kept to determine which students are utilizing the Program's services and activities. Those students not utilizing the services and activities should be counseled immediately.

3. The Special Services staff should maintain responsibility for planning and implementing the delivery system that will provide supportive services to the students. Included in planning should be other campus support agencies since these students are the responsibility of the institution and not exclusively that of the Special Services Program.

4. Peer counselors should be trained and supervised by the professional staff to insure that they have the skills needed for effectively serving the students. The training of peer counselors should occur at least three weeks before
they are assigned their case load of students. Their training should also be continuous throughout each academic term. Weekly staff meetings can be used as in-service training sessions for the peer counselors. No peer counselors should be hired until they have been trained in the techniques of providing counseling services. Continued supervision of the peer counselors is essential, including direct full-time staff with the peer counselors and with the students being served.

5. Peer counselors should be utilized more as tutors rather than exclusively as counselors and their title should be changed to peer tutor-counselors.

6. Staff training and supervision of the full-time staff should be on a regular basis. Daily contacts with the staff and weekly staff meetings should be used by the Director for conducting training sessions and workshops. The staff should be encouraged to attend related training conducted by campus groups or professional organizations.

7. Only those instructors and support staff, such as key administrators, counselors, and academic advisors should be assigned to work with the Special Services Program. Such persons should have demonstrated that they are capable and/or desirous of helping this special group of students.
8. The students in the Special Services Program should be helped to feel a part of the total institution and encouraged to participate in its activities. In this important area, the assistance of institutional faculty, staff, and advisors of student organizations should be solicited.

9. The commitment of the Office of Financial Affairs to provide adequate financial aid awards and financial assistance to the students should be commended and continued.

10. In order to provide adequate role models for Black students in all of the schools and colleges of a university, the number of Black students, faculty and staff should represent the percentage of Blacks in the state.

11. The institution as a whole should work as a team to facilitate the successful matriculation, maximum retention and eventual graduation of the students in the Special Services Program.

Recommendations for Further Research

As a result of this study, the following recommendations for further research are offered:

1. This study should be replicated by Special Services Programs at other institutions to determine whether or not
similar conclusions are reached about the Program's effectiveness and whether location, type of institution, services, activities, facilities, staff and other factors contribute to the Program's effectiveness.

2. This study should also be replicated by the Special Services Program at the University of Florida for the period covering the 1979-1983 school years to obtain more extensive data about the students' progress and the Program's effectiveness.

This research has provided an abundance of statistical data, directions and ideas for improving the Special Services Program at the University of Florida. This study will also demonstrate to other Special Services Directors the need for research data from their Programs. The research methods and procedures provided by this study can be easily replicated.

The timeliness of this study should make an impact on the views and attitudes of educators and politicians concerning the value of such programs for Black students attending higher education institutions. The economic and implied social impact of Special Services Programs should encourage greater attention to further improving and strengthening them.
APPENDIX A

LETTER TO SPECIAL SERVICES DIRECTORS
Dear Colleague:

I am presently in the process of completing my requirements for the doctoral degree and I need your assistance in helping me to design a questionnaire to gather statistical data for the purpose of evaluating our Special Services Program and its effect on students.

Our Program has been in existence since 1971 and there has not been a longitudinal or comprehensive study of it or its effect on students.

Specifically, I would like to request that you provide me with a copy of your evaluation instrument or a list of questions that I can use to construct an evaluation questionnaire for this program.

Since our objectives are the same, even though we may accomplish them in a slightly different manner, I feel that your evaluation questions will be relevant to our Special Services Program.

I would appreciate a response as soon as possible. You may also call me collect at (904) 466-3320, if you would like to provide the questions to me over the telephone.

Sincerely yours,

G. W. Mingo, Director
Special Services
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611
APPENDIX B

LETTER TO SUBJECTS AND INFORMED CONSENT FORM
Dear:

I am conducting an evaluation of the Special Services Program at the University of Florida and the services that it has provided to students. Your assistance is needed in helping me to evaluate the effect this program has had on students during the period 1974 to 1978.

Our files indicate that you were once a participant in this program and you can make a great contribution to its evaluation by consenting to participate in this study by completing the attached questionnaire. Your cooperation will help make Special Services a better program for future students at the University of Florida.

The information in the questionnaire will be used for statistical purposes only. The results of the study will be used to improve the effectiveness of the program for future students. Your academic averages, graduation status, and information pertaining to your past academic performance will be needed to evaluate the program's effectiveness. In no way will you be identified.

Please answer all items to the best of your knowledge. Thank you for your help and prompt response.

Sincerely yours,

G. W. Mingo, Director
Special Services
University of Florida

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Please sign this form to indicate that you agree to participate in this study.

I, _______________________, agree to participate in this study and to the review of my academic records for the purpose of this study only.

(Signature) (Date)
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APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE EVALUATING SPECIAL SERVICES PROGRAMS (QESSP)
QUESTIONNAIRE EVALUATING SPECIAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

Please complete this evaluation by answering all items. There are no right or wrong answers. We are interested in your perceptions of the quantity and quality of the services and activities rendered by the Special Services Program while you were a participant. Your evaluation of those services and activities will help us in our evaluation of the total Special Services Program and in rendering better service to future participants.

The information that you will be providing will be used for statistical purposes only. You will not be identified by any of the responses that you make. To insure privacy of your responses, do not put your name on this evaluation.

RETURN THE EVALUATION IN THE ENCLOSED ADDRESSED AND STAMPED ENVELOPE.
QUESTIONNAIRE EVALUATING SPECIAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Are you?
   Male...[ ] married...[ ] single...[ ] divorced...
   Female...[ ] married...[ ] single...[ ] divorced...

2. How do you describe yourself?  
   (Check only one box)
   Black, of United States origin..........................[ ]
   Black, of Hispanic origin...............................[ ]
   Black, of Caribbean origin.............................[ ]
   Other (Specify)____________________________________[ ]

3. Indicate the highest degree you now hold:
   H.S. ASSOCIATE BACHELOR'S PROFESSIONAL SPECIALIST  DOCTOR'S
   DIPLOMA  [ ] ASSOCIATE [ ] BACHELOR'S [ ] PROFESSIONAL [ ] SPECIALIST [ ] DOCTOR'S [ ]

4. List institutions attended, including this one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF INSTITUTION</th>
<th>DATES OF ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>DEGREE EARNED AND YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Are you currently enrolled in any of the above institutions? Yes [ ] No [ ]
   If no, do you plan to re-enroll? Yes, this institution [ ]
   Yes, another institution [ ] No [ ]

6. Circle the year that you entered the University of Florida.
   1981  1982

7. Are you a former Upward Bound or Talent Search student?
   U.B. [ ]  T.S. [ ]  NONE [ ]

8. Are you currently working? (other than work study)
   Yes, full time [ ] Yes, part time [ ] No [ ] Homemaker [ ]
   Please identify the type of work and the title of the job in which you are now working
   "Type of work"  "Title"
9. What is your present yearly income? (Check One)
   - Less than $6,000.
   - $6,000...$8,999.
   - $9,000...$11,999.
   - $12,000...$14,999.
   - $15,000...$17,999.
   - $18,000...$20,999.
   - $21,000...$23,999.
   - $24,000...$26,999.
   - More than $27,000.

10. How would you rate your academic preparation before coming to the University of Florida
   a. Excellent.
   b. Good.
   c. Fair.
   d. Poor.

11. How would you rate your academic preparation at the University of Florida
   a. Excellent.
   b. Good.
   c. Fair.
   d. Poor.

12. In order of importance number the 3 reasons (1,2,3) for deciding to enroll at the University of Florida
   a. Close to home.
   b. Scholarship.
   c. Financial Aid.
   d. Academic reputation.
   e. Low cost.
   f. Size of the school.
   g. Informed by friends of the help provided by the Special Services Program.
   h. Specific Academic Programs.
   i. Knew someone at the University of Florida.
   j. Family influence.
   k. Social Life.
   l. Athletic teams.
   m. Alumni influence.
   n. Other.

13. Do you feel that there were positive or negative feelings associated with your participation in the Special Services Program?
   Positive □ Both □ Negative □
   Describe the feeling(s)
14. Do you think the Special Services Program should be continued?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Not Sure [ ]

15. Did your participation in the Special Services Program cause you to experience any of the things described below? Check as many as you wish
   a. Increased motivation to study.
   b. Determination to graduate.
   c. Less confident about myself.
   d. More confident about myself.
   e. Dependency on Program.
   f. Independence to work on own.
   g. Decreased motivation to study.
   h. Decreased interest in graduating.
   i. Assisted my maturational process.
   j. Did not feel good about myself.
   k. Felt better about myself.
   l. Other [ ]

16. How would you describe your overall reaction to the Special Services Program?
   a. Extremely effective.
   b. Very effective.
   c. Effective.
   d. Not effective.
   e. Extremely ineffective.

17. How would you describe the effect of your peer counselor in contributing to your academic performances?
   a. Extremely effective.
   b. Very effective.
   c. Effective.
   d. Not effective.
   e. Extremely ineffective.

18. How often did your peer counselor contact you?
   a. Daily.
   b. Weekly.
   c. Twice a week.
   d. Monthly.
   e. Very seldom.
   f. Never.

19. How would you describe the overall effectiveness of your peer counselor in providing you with helpful experiences to make the transition from High School to college?
   a. Extremely effective.
   b. Very effective.
   c. Effective.
   d. Not effective.
   e. Extremely ineffective.
### QUESTIONNAIRE EVALUATING SPECIAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

Listed below are services, activities, or staff actions rendered or arranged for by the Special Services Program. Indicate whether or not you received the service, participated in the activity or experienced the action by marking yes or no in the columns. If you mark yes, then indicate your evaluation of the effectiveness of the service, activity or staff action in helping you while at this institution. If your response is no, do not evaluate the effectiveness since you did not receive the service, activity, or staff action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you receive the service or participate in the activity?</th>
<th>How effective was it in helping you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIENTATION</th>
<th>20. Orientation Session to campus, classes, instructors, facilities &amp; support services available</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Extremely Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Extremely Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL COUNSELOR</td>
<td>22. Counseling by the full time professional Special Services Counselor on: a. Personal Concerns b. Academic Concerns c. Social Concerns d. Financial Aid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Extremely Effective</td>
<td>Very Effective</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Not Effective</td>
<td>Extremely Ineffective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC ADVISOR</td>
<td>23. Help from Special Services Academic Advisors: a. Choosing courses b. Planning program of study</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Extremely Effective</td>
<td>Very Effective</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Not Effective</td>
<td>Extremely Ineffective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCTION</td>
<td>24. Special Teaching Procedures: a. Small units of instruction b. Retaking tests to improve grades c. Taught by Graduate Assistants d. Taught by Full time professors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Extremely Effective</td>
<td>Very Effective</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Not Effective</td>
<td>Extremely Ineffective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did you receive the service or participate in the activity? | How effective was it in helping you? |
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | No | Extremely Effective | Very Effective | Effective | Not Effective | Extremely Ineffective |

**SPECIAL CLASSES**

25. Special academic & support courses designed for Special Services students:
   a. Reading
   b. Writing
   c. Behavioral Studies
   d. English
   e. Mathematics
   f. Physical Science
   g. Biological Science
   h. Social Science
   i. Humanities

26. Tutoring by:
   a. Peer counselor(s)
   b. Fraternities
   c. Sororities
   d. Clubs
   e. Learning Center (Teaching Center)

27. Group Sessions on coping with or adjusting to this institution

28. Special Sessions conducted by Financial Aid Personnel

29. Special Sessions conducted by Career Resource (placement personnel)

30. Sessions on developing good study skills

31. Sessions on reduction of test anxiety

32. Awards ceremony & academic recognition
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you receive the service or participate in the activity?</th>
<th>How effective was it in helping you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Referrals to other support services or agencies for help in dealing with problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Counseling Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Financial Aid Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Housing Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Placement Center (at Reitz Union)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Student Services (at Tigert Hall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Concerned, courteous and caring attitude of the staff (full time professional staff)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Encouragement by the staff for you to do well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Genuine, warm and friendly attitude of the staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Dynamic nature of staff in being your spokesman or mediator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Cold, insensitive attitude of the staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Staff's disinterest in your concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Staff served as a negative role model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Staff served as a positive role model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP LETTER
Dear:

I am writing to ask if you have received my letter regarding your participation in the evaluation of our Special Services Program. Your participation in this study is essential and very much needed. By completing and returning the Informed Consent Form and the Questionnaire you will be contributing greatly to the improvement of services and activities of the Special Services Program.

If you have already submitted your consent form and questionnaire, please disregard this letter. If you have not done so, please complete them and send them to me before ____________ , 1983.

Sincerely,

G. W. Mingo, Director
Special Services
University of Florida

GWM/
BIBLIOGRAPHY


244


BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

The author of this dissertation, Gwenuel Wilfred Mingo, was born in Key West, Florida, to the parents of Reynold Mingo and Mary Sawyer Mingo Roberts. He began his formal schooling at Douglass High School in Key West, Florida, from first grade to eighth grade. In 1955, he moved to Tampa, Florida, attended and graduated from Booker T. Washington Junior High School. In 1956, his tenth-grade year, he attended Middleton Senior High School in Tampa, but he returned to Key West in 1957 and attended Douglass High School in the eleventh grade. Another move was made back to Tampa in 1958 where he returned to Middleton Senior High School to complete high school.

The author was encouraged by Mr. J. B. Green, his agriculture teacher, to apply for admission to Florida A and M University. In 1963, he was awarded a Bachelor of Science degree in agriculture science and was commissioned into the United States Army as a second lieutenant in the Field Artillery.

While in the Army, the author had a wide variety of military and civilian experiences. He was a military
science instructor at Lincoln University in Missouri and while at that institution, he was awarded the Master of Education degree in counselor education.

After seven years of military service, the author resigned his commission and left the Army with the rank of Captain. His travel experience includes visits to Austria, Switzerland, Italy, Monaco, France, Spain, Morocco, Luxembourg, Canada, Mexico, Vietnam, Thailand, Japan, Cuba, Hawaii, Nassau, and Berlin. The author and his wife resided in Bad Kissingen, Germany, for three years while he was assigned to a field artillery unit in that resort town.

The author has been working at the University of Florida since September, 1971. His first position was in the Division of Housing where he worked as a Residence Life Coordinator. He left the Housing organization in April of 1974 to assume his present position as Director of the Division of Student Support and Special Programs.

The author is married to the former Cynthia E. Killings of Tallahassee, Florida. They have two children, Anne Marie and Gerald.
I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Harold C. Riker, Chairman
Professor of Counselor Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Roderick McDavis
Professor of Counselor Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

John M. Nickens
Professor of Educational Administration and Supervision

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Department of Counselor Education in the College of Education and to the Graduate School, and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

April 1984

Dean for Graduate Studies
and Research