

Critical changes for successful cooperative education

Miriam Weisz

RMIT University, Australia
miriam.weisz@rmit.edu.au

Sandra Smith

RMIT University, Australia
sandra.smith@rmit.edu.au

Abstract: *While an increase in funding for cooperative education in the United States has seen the growth in work integrated learning, the reduction of government funding support in Australia for work placements has had the unintended effect of threatening the academic integrity of work placement programs. The pedagogy around work integrated learning programs is based on experiential learning theory and can be described by Kolb's (1984) learning cycle. The key to learning, particularly deep level learning, through work integrated learning, however, rests on the students' ability to reflect on the work experiences, to integrate these experiences with their academic lessons and to conceptualise their learning so that they are able to ultimately bring together their work and their academic experiences to solve problems in unfamiliar environments. The role of academics in supporting student learning through work integrated learning has long been debated and while the evidence in the United States shows that programs that do not have the support and commitment from academics tend to fold, in Australia the commitment from academics to supporting student learning through work integrated learning is very variable. The change in the funding model for work integrated learning programs introduced in Australia by the Department of Education, Science and Technology (DEST) in 2005 could be seen as an incentive to strengthen the academic support in these programs. The impact of the changes has however, not necessarily had the desired outcome.*

This paper outlines the pedagogy underpinning work integrated learning, highlights the benefits of cooperative education to all stakeholders and examines one university's response to the change in DEST funding for work integrated learning programs. In the paper it is argued that despite the connection of work integrated learning to major performance indicators such as the Course Experience Questionnaire results, and despite the encouragement of the Australian government to promote learning through work integrated learning, academics are still resistant to the need to engage with the students in a way that will further promote deep level learning. The easy option is to push this responsibility to employers however in this paper approaches to bringing about attitudinal changes in academic staff will also be explored.

Keywords: *cooperative education, learning through work integrated learning, changing staff attitudes to improve cooperative education*

An introduction to cooperative education

Work integrated learning and work-based learning are terms “...used to describe a class of university programs that bring together universities and work organisations to create new learning opportunities in workplaces” (Boud, Solomon & Symes, 2001, p.4). Some examples of work integrated learning include work-based projects, unpaid work placements, apprenticeships and cooperative education programs.

Cooperative education involves university undergraduate students undertaking full-time paid and discipline-related employment as a structured part of their program of study. Cooperative education programs provide learning opportunities for students that enable them to integrate their work and their academic experiences. Such opportunities, provided that a number of conditions are met, can lead to deep level learning.

Insufficient resourcing of cooperative education programs by universities and ultimately the government places a major constraint on the programs’ potential effectiveness in bringing about the desired learning outcomes for students. This is particularly the case in Australia where universities are under enormous pressure of reduced government funding and the long-term sustainability of cooperative education programs is under threat.

Learning through cooperative education

The education philosophy and practice that underpin the learning in cooperative education, are consistent with the belief expressed by Dewey (1938, p. 25) that ‘all genuine education comes through experience’. Cooperative education has the potential to provide students with this opportunity of gaining experience in the workplace and of applying the theory learned in university to work place practice and problem solving. Because of their interactions with other people and their exposure to new experiences, cooperative education students also have opportunities to develop their generic skills. The term ‘generic skills’ is used here to describe skills that have the potential to be learned in one context and transferred to, or applied in others. These skills include interpersonal skills, communication skills and problem solving skills as distinct from skills that are related to a specific discipline area.

Kolb (1984) argued that while experience is a necessary condition, it is not a sufficient condition for learning. Students need to be able to receive feedback and to reflect on the outcomes of their work. They need to be able to conceptualize what they have learnt, and to test out these concepts in order to understand how to apply their learning to new circumstances to bring about successful outcomes, and to avoid previously made mistakes. In other words, students need to be prepared to ‘participate responsibly in’ and be actively engaged in the learning process (Rogers, 1969, pp. 157-166). It is through this involvement, reflection and conceptualization that students are able to translate their work experiences into learning outcomes and engage in deep level learning. This deep level learning occurs when experiences are integrated into the learner’s body of knowledge and understanding and connections are made to previous lessons (Ramsden, 1992). In contrast, the memorization of facts and the acquisition of unrelated pieces of information characterize surface learning (Ramsden, 1992).

The cooperative education experience does not necessarily lead to deep level learning

Without the conscious reflection on how procedures are being carried out, how concepts are being formulated and understood, how organisational values impact upon decision making, and how individual practice is affected by social “rules”, the learner will remain a novice, lacking the ability to transfer what is known and understood within one discipline or field into others (Crebert, 1995, p. 4).

Whether or not cooperative education students experience deep level learning during their work placements is influenced by various factors. These include the learning opportunities provided by cooperative education employers or supervisors, the students' own commitment to and ability to learn, and the commitment and ability of university staff to support this learning (Van Gyn, 1994; Ricks, 1996).

Crebert (1995) discussed the importance of workplace supervisors understanding the learning objectives of cooperative education and of providing the cooperative education students with meaningful work experiences that offer the students appropriate challenges. She also stressed the importance of students knowing how to reflect on their experiences for learning to take place. Van Gyn (1996) also discussed this importance of reflective practice in cooperative education. In identifying best practice in cooperative education as well as other forms of work-integrated-learning in Australia, Atchison et al. (1999) recognized those programs where academic staff actively supported students in their learning and guided them in their reflection. Atchison et al. (1999) also acknowledged that a critical role for cooperative education program managers is to negotiate appropriate work placements with employers and to clearly establish the boundaries of responsibility for each of the cooperative education partners.

There are, however, some major challenges that need to be overcome before these practices become more widely adopted. Despite the estimates that many Australian universities offer cooperative education and other work integrated learning programs and that there is pressure to extend work place experience to all university programs (Reeders, 2000), there appears to be a lack of funding to support these programs adequately.

The benefits of cooperative education

Even within this context, the benefits to all stakeholders of cooperative education programs have been well documented.

The benefits of cooperative education to students

Academic benefits to students include increased disciplined thinking (Cates & Langford, 1999), improved motivation to learn and problem solving skills (Weisz, 2000), an ability to apply theory to practice (Van Gyn et al., 1997) and improved academic grades (Weisz, 2001).

The personal value of cooperative education can also be translated into increased self-esteem and confidence (Carrell & Rowe, 1993; Coll & Chapman, 2000; Weisz, 2000) as well as improved communication, interpersonal and professional skills (Cates & Langford, 1999; Eames et al. 1996; Weisz, 2000).

While some (Dubick, McNerney & Potts, 1996; Gardener, Nixon and Motschenbacher, 1992; Van Gyn & Ricks, 1997; Weisz, 2001) found that cooperative education graduates earned significantly higher salaries than non cooperative education graduates and that cooperative education was a significant factor in explaining these salary differences, it has also been found that significantly more cooperative education graduates are employed and employed full-time than non cooperative education graduates (Clarke & Zuhair, 1995; Rowe, 1992; Van Gyn & Ricks, 1997; Weisz, 2001) and that the job search time was significantly shorter for cooperative education graduates compared to non cooperative education graduates (Dubick, McNerney & Potts, 1996; Weisz, 2001).

The benefits of cooperative education to other stakeholders

It has been found (Weisz, 2001) that cooperative education programs have a significant impact on the achievement of relevant university goals such as improved academic progression rates and retention rates as well as high graduate employability.

Some studies into the benefits of cooperative education to employers have focused on discussing the benefits derived from employing cooperative education students (Braunstein, 1999; Cutt & Loken, 1995; Eames et al. 1996; Young, 1997). Others, (Eames et al., 1996; Eames & Kumar, 1997; Weisz, 2001) focussed on estimating the savings in graduate recruitment costs that can result from their involvement in cooperative education programs. Employers commented that this saving was so large as to 'show real financial benefits to organisations (of) ... a Cooperative education Programme' (Eames et al., 1996, p. 9). Weisz (2001) estimated that this saving could be as high as \$1.4m for companies involved in a cooperative education program with 800 students.

There may also be other benefits of recruiting cooperative education graduates such as lower labour turnover rates, better productivity, faster progression through the organization and the ability for employers to give cooperative education graduates, compared to non cooperative education graduates, more responsible positions (Hurd & Hendy, 1997).

Little is discussed about the macroeconomic benefits that accrue from cooperative education programs. Jacobs (1997, p. 157) focussed on measuring increased productivity that arises because "cooperative education provides opportunities and incentives that 'ordinary' education cannot provide". He also argued that cooperative education leads to a more independent labour force that in turn can lead to a reduction in social and welfare spending. Weisz (2001) found this to be the case and estimated that the expected saving to the government in social welfare payments (that includes student study allowances and unemployment benefits) was over \$4m for a cohort of 800 students while the total funding by the government for this cohort was only \$1.4m.

Conflicting challenges faced by academics

Despite these benefits and the attractiveness of these programs to students, many cooperative education programs in Australia are struggling to attract adequate funding, to sustain academic credibility and to engage academic staff in the activities required to support learning through cooperative education.

Academic staff involved in cooperative education programs have reported that they feel that their workload is high and is undervalued, and that their programs are not adequately funded (Atchison et al. 1999). This means that cooperative education managers may not have the time to check all work placements thoroughly enough to ensure that the appropriate learning opportunities are being provided for students. There may also not be time to inform workplace supervisors of their responsibilities and the learning objectives of the program. This, added to labour market pressures that can make finding work placements difficult, means that some placements do not support students' learning as well as they should.

Insufficient resourcing of cooperative education programs may also mean that there is inadequate preparation for academic mentors whose role it is to support student learning in the work place (Atchison et al. 1999). These mentors have often had to supervise large numbers of students without the appropriate time allocation. Furthermore, academics have reported that they feel that their work in mentoring cooperative education students is not recognized nor is it rewarded through the process of academic promotions (Weisz, 1995). This means that the commitment by academics to cooperative education often takes a relatively low priority in their work planning (Weisz, 1995) and that the learning in cooperative education and other work integrated learning programs, is often left to chance (Reeders et al. 1999).

It has, however, been determined that many students do adopt a deep approach to learning during cooperative education (Weisz et al. 2001) despite the lack of academic support. While many academics hold the belief that students in the workplace pick up skills and knowledge just by being in the workplace

and that learning occurs through osmosis (Martin, 1997). Martin explains that students learn from their employer or supervisor who may also support them in reinterpreting and transforming the theory in the light of their practical experiences.

In 2003, the Australian Government recognised a separation between “workplace experiences” and “learning and performance in the workplace” (Higher Education Support Act, 2003). The Act examined the role of universities and introduced funding changes that reinforces the role of universities in supporting student learning in the workplace.

A cooperative education case study

DEST criteria

The Higher Education Support Act 2003 specifies among many things the requirements that must be met in order for work to be considered ‘*work experience in industry*’. The Act specifies that work experience in industry means:

- that is done as a part of, or in connection with, a course of study undertaken with a higher education provider; and
- in respect of which student learning and performance is not directed by the provider

The change to the guidelines under this Act meant that from January 1, 2005, no student contribution amount or tuition fee can be charged by a higher education provider for a designated unit of work experience in industry. Hence, work experience in industry cannot be counted as load and cannot attract funding under the Commonwealth Grants Scheme. However, the Government did determine that if a Higher Education provider did ‘*provide support*’ then a tuition fee could be charged. The provision of support was specified by the Act to include ongoing contact with students, management of assessment of student learning and performance during the placement and management of the standard of learning and performance to be achieved by the student.

The change in the Act meant that funding that was previously granted to Universities for placing students in industry that amounted to 0.2 of an equivalent full time student unit would cease. The Act then allowed for higher education provider to charge a tuition fee for supporting the learning in the student placement.

University response

Under the RMIT Business Program structure, the cooperative education year attracts 96 credit points that is equivalent to two semesters’ full time load. RMIT is committed to the cooperative education program and wished to see a way forward to accommodate the change to the Higher Education Support Act. The program structure allowed an opportunity to structure the credit point allocation slightly differently so that each semester was not allocated a straight 48 credit point block but rather a 36 credit point block assigned to the work experience in industry units and a 12 credit point allocation to a course titled Work Integrated Learning. The understanding was that the 12 credit point work integrated learning course would provide the learning support under the guidelines of the Act and this would attract the student or higher education contribution fee. A direct student fee would replace the government funding. The major focus was on preserving the cooperative education programs and how the university would provide learning support was not addressed at this level.

Portfolio response

The Business portfolio (Faculty) determined that the two work integrated learning HECS-based courses would take into account work already undertaken by students and staff prior to the cooperative education year. Students currently undergo a preparation program involving resume development and interview skills in the second year of their undergraduate studies. However, the portfolio also recognised that the two new courses provided an opportunity for greater interaction between the student's program of study and their activities in the workplace via a range of tasks including:

- individual learning contracts and portfolios to showcase achievements
- small group discussions in either face to face or in online mode
- structured development of a workplace project with appropriate academic mentoring.

The Portfolio response highlighted the need for a greater academic presence *while the student is on placement* and suggested that this needed to be taken into account for academic workplans for the following year. This was in keeping with the literature evidence that confirms the importance of university staff to support learning (Van Gyn, 1994; Ricks, 1996) Reference course guides were prepared to include reflective learning outcomes (Van Gyn, 1996) and the addition of online and/or small group facilitated discussion support whilst on placement. A significant communications exercise was developed and implemented to inform all stakeholders of the changes. The portfolio also took on the responsibility of developing online materials to assist Schools to take advantage of the increased teaching and learning opportunities. This was undertaken acknowledging the resource difficulties in some Schools and the recognition that the flexibility of online materials may suit students whilst on placement.

School/Program response

There are around 500 students across the seven programs currently undertaking the compulsory cooperative education program each year. Interestingly this is only about 60% of the total full-time student cohort (Attachment one). This figure is even lower if part-time students are included as although the cooperative education program is compulsory in RMIT Business, many students are exempt from the process due to their previous work experience. Even though the University and the Portfolio have a consistent commitment to the compulsory nature of cooperative education and the inclusion of work integrated learning in the curriculum, the cooperative education program is a boutique program.

Preparation for the work placement in the cooperative education program in each School commences in second year for students in the form of preparatory classes covering workplace etiquette, resume building and interview skills. Schools organise employer fairs to assist communication between all parties as ideally many students' places are organised well before the conclusion of the academic year. As Schools have already invested resources into this preparation, many academic and administrative staff at School level felt that the HECS fee should cover part of this phase.

The third year of these 4-year degrees, is the cooperative education year and students have either commenced their placement in January or July. Students are currently visited once or twice throughout the year by an academic and the visit has two objectives: one to see how the student has adjusted to the company and the second to review a topic for their Business topic assignment which must be completed as part of their assessment for the year. Cooperative education coordinators who are administrative staff mostly deal with any other matters that may arise.

It has been found that 60% of students completing cooperative education remain with their cooperative education employer and return to their studies part-time (Weisz, 2001). In their return to study, however, there is no transition or acknowledgement of their learning in the workplace. It has been found that

many of these students report a return to a surface approach to learning even though they do adopt a deep approach to learning when they are asked to integrate their work and academic experiences (Weisz et al. 2001).

Implementation of changes

The change in the funding model meant that each School was required to re-examine the student course guide and learning outcomes for the cooperative education program. The Schools' starting point was the reference course guide developed at Portfolio level which highlighted learning contracts and reflection as well as discussion groups as part of the assessment in addition to the more traditional Business topic assignment. Online learning modules were prepared after significant consultation with employers, staff and students involved in the cooperative education program. These modules were designed to assist students in their learning and required an online facilitator to capture the variation in its students experience in order to encourage deeper level learning. These modules were designed to support the additional learning objectives required by the reference course guides. The modules were of interest to all Schools. Although there was acknowledgement from all Schools that the reflective learning while on placement was important, academic staff felt that to facilitate or include this type of learning was beyond the scope of what the School could provide. The first response from most Schools was to use the HECS funding from students to assist the preparation program that was in place that was coordinated by administrative staff. Hence, although three out of four Schools are using the online learning modules in Semester one, 2005, only two Schools will allocate an online learning facilitator. The online facilitator in one School has established regular online discussion topics with students and a second facilitator has established virtual student learning teams as part of the ongoing support. The fourth and remaining School will use the cooperative education preparation component as the learning content and has left the course guide substantially unchanged. One School has already reduced the allocation of time for academic workplace visits for the 2005 year and two Schools have fractional sessional staff in place to provide the visits. These visits do not include support for reflective learning but rather keep to the traditional objectives of supervising the business topic assignment and to see that the student is performing satisfactorily as an employee.

Bringing about successful change

There are dangers of program failure that are associated with reducing the academic engagement with cooperative education programs. In the USA while an increase in Federal Government funding led to a proliferation of cooperative education programs, many of these did not receive sustained support and ultimately failed (Sovilla & Varty, 2004). It was found that when staff do not integrate cooperative education into the academic programs in a way that achieve curriculum objectives that the programs' welfare is at stake. Furthermore, this situation is exacerbated if there is a lack of institutional support. Hence successful cooperative education requires radical change.

It changes institutional regulations, redefines the institution's curriculum, reconfigures learning relationships and introduces new practices (Portwood, 2001, p.84)

The need in Australia for this radical change has grown with the increased emphasis on student-centred learning, the demand by students for learning that is practical, relevant and engaging and the use of comparative university performance measures such as the results of the Course Experience Questionnaire and the Graduate Destination Survey.

Cooperative education has been shown to improve Graduate Destination Survey outcomes (Weisz, 2001) and to encourage students to adopt a deep approach to learning (Weisz et al. 2001). Students who adopt a deep approach to learning are also more likely than surface learners to report positive perceptions of the teaching environment, especially on the Course Experience Questionnaire, Good Teaching Scale (Prosser & Trigwell, 1999).

This supports the need to increase the student learning support during and after co-op but this, however, is difficult to achieve in a resource starved environment. Yet the benefits of cooperative education to employers and to the government remain largely untapped and provide a potential revenue source to universities in recognition for their financial contributions to these sectors.

This may provide a more conducive environment but real change won't occur unless we can bring about real change in approaches to teaching that support student-centred, deep level learning. Weisz et.al. (2001) found that despite the objective of many staff to engage their students in deep level learning, the approaches to teaching that they used were more consistent with surface learning. This is equally applicable to academic staff involved in cooperative education programs.

So for real change we need institutional change, senior management commitment, access to increased cooperative education funding through the introduction of self-funded programs and a change in academic staff teaching attitudes and practice perhaps brought about by engaging more academic staff in their own reflective practice.

References

- Atchison, M., Pollock, S., Reeders, E. & Rizzetti, J. (1999). *Guide to WIL*. Melbourne, RMIT.
- Boud, D., Solomon, N. & Symes, C. (2001). New practices for new times. In D. Boud & N. Solomon (Eds.), *Work-based learning: A new higher education?* (pp. 3-17). The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press, Buckingham, UK.
- Braunstein, L. (1999). *Employer Benefits and Attitudes Towards Postsecondary Co-operative Education*, Co-operative Education Association Inc. Washington, DC.
- Carrell, S. & Rowe, P. (1993). The effects of cooperative education on student adaptation to university, *Journal of Cooperative Education* XXIX(1), 33-40.
- Cates, C. L. & Langford, D. R. (1999). Documenting communication and thinking skills through co-op student reports. *Journal of Cooperative Education* XXXIV(3), 7-17.
- Clarke, C. & Zuhair, S. (1995). The effect of co-operative education on graduate employment prospects, *9th World Conference on Co-operative Education*, Jamaica.
- Coll, R. K. & Chapman, R. (2000). Advantages and disadvantages of international co-op placements: The student's perspective. *Journal of Cooperative Education* XXXV(2-3), 95-105.
- Commonwealth of Australia (2004). *Higher Education Support Act 2003: Administrative guidelines (Draft only)*.
- Crebert, G. (1995). Links between higher education and industry; workplace-based learning programs in Australia: practices and issues, Keynote address, Workplace-based learning conference, Dunchurch, Rugby, UK, 3-4 April.
- Cutt, J. & Loken, M. (1995). The nature of evidence in assessing cooperative education, *Journal of Cooperative Education* XXX(3), 24-38.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education* MacMillan, New York.
- Dubick, R., McNerney, R. & Potts, B. (1996). Career success and student satisfaction: A study of computer science cooperative education graduates, *Journal of Cooperative Education* XXXII(1), 66-74.
- Eames, C. & Kumar, M. (1997). The economic value and educational benefits of co-operative education to employers, *10th World Conference on Co-operative Education*, South Africa.
- Eames, C., Kumar, M., Rowe, W. & Hitchcock, M. (1996) The economic value and educational benefits of co-operative education in New Zealand, *Australian Cooperative Education Society Second Pacific Conference*, Australia
- Gardener, P., Nixon, D. & Motschenbacher, G. (1992). Starting salary outcomes for cooperative education graduates, *Journal of Cooperative Education* XXVII(3), 16-26.
- Hurd, J. & Hendy, M. (1997). What we know about co-op employers' perceptions of cooperative education: A synthesis of research in the United States and Canada, *Journal of Cooperative Education* XXXII(2), 55-62.
- Jacobs, H. (1997). Co-operative education a macroeconomic policy instrument for South Africa, *10th World Conference on Co-operative Education*, Cape Town, South Africa.
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential Learning*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs
- Loken, M., Cutt, J. & Lumsden, B. 1996, Accountability and assessment in experiential education, *Journal of Cooperative Education* XXXI(2-3), 140-153.
- Martin, E. (1997) *The effectiveness of different models of work-based university education*. Retrieved 2 June 2005 from <http://www.dest.gov.au/archive/highered/eippubs/eip9619/front.htm>.

- Portwood, D. (2001) Making it work institutionally. In D. Boud & N. Solomon (Eds.) *Work-based learning: A new higher education?* (pp. 74-85). Buckingham, UK: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Prosser, M. & Trigwell, K. (1999). *Understanding learning and teaching: The experience in Higher Education*. Buckingham, Philadelphia, PA: Society for research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Ramsden, P. (1992). *Learning to teach in higher education*. London:Routledge.
- Reeders, E., with Atchison, M., Pollack, S., & Rizzetti, J. (1999). Structured work experience: Habit, cargo cult or Cinderella? Paper presented at the Practicum Colloquium, Flinders University, SA, 24-26 November.
- Reeders, E. (2000). Scholarly practice in workbased learning: fitting the glass slipper. *Higher Education Research and Development* 19(2).
- Ricks, F. (1996) Principles for structuring cooperative education programs. *Journal of Cooperative Education* XXX1(2-3), 8-22.
- Rogers, C. (1969). *Freedom to Learn*. Merrill, Columbus.
- Rowe, P. (1992) A comparison of cooperative education graduates with two cohorts of regular graduates. *Journal of Cooperative Education* XXVII (3), 7-15.
- Sovilla, E. S. & Varty, J. (2004). Cooperative education in the USA, past and present: Some lessons learned. In R. Coll & C. Eames (Eds.) *International handbook for cooperative education* (pp. 3-16). Boston, MA: WACE Inc.
- Van Gyn, G. (1994). The educational orientation of cooperative education: A critical variable in effectiveness, *Journal of Cooperative Education* XXX(1), 17-25.
- Van Gyn, G. (1996). Reflective Practice: The needs of professions and the promise of cooperative education, *Journal of Cooperative Education* XXX1(2-3), 103-132.
- Van Gyn, G., Branton, G., Cutt, J., Loken, M., & Ricks, F. (1996) An investigation of entry level characteristics between co-op and non co-op students, *Journal of Cooperative Education* XXXII (1), 15-28.
- Van Gyn, G., G., Cutt, J., Loken, M., & Ricks, F. (1997). Investigating the educational benefits of cooperative education: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Cooperative Education* XXXII (2), 70-85
- Van Gyn, G. & Ricks, F. (1997). Co-operative education and work success: An investigation of work place performance factors, 10th World Conference on Co-operative Education, Conference Proceedings, South Africa
- Weisz, M. (1995). How to motivate and train academic supervisors: Find the missing link to the partnerships in co-operative education, 9th World Conference on Co-operative Education, Conference Proceedings, Jamaica.
- Weisz, M. (2000). Developing a measure of student attributes. *Journal of Cooperative Education* XXXV(2-3), 33-40.
- Weisz, M. (2001). *The added benefits of a cooperative education program*. DBA thesis, RMIT, Melbourne.
- Weisz, M., Atchison, A., Eakins, P., Gowland, D., Reeders, E., Rizzetti, J. & Smith, S. (2001). Student staff partnerships in approaches to teaching and learning, *Journal of Higher Education Research and Development* 24, 195-205
- Young, J. (1997). Comparative international study of co-operative education employers: The value of employing co-op students, 10th World Conference on Co-operative Education, South Africa.

Attachment: cooperative education(coop)/Professional Skills Program (PSP)/Exemption students

Program	Total Eligible	Coop		International		PSP	
Accounting	198	102	52.0%			6	3.0%
Eco/Fin	122	49	40.0%			10	8.0%
BIS	81	71	87.5%			7	8.5%
T&L	65	37	57.0%			2	3.0%
IB	27	22	81.5%			5	18.5%
Marketing	30	13	43.5%			5	16.5%
TOTAL	523	294	65.0%			35	5.0%
Accounting	72	22	30.5%			9	12.5%
Eco/Fin	61	18	29.5%			7	11.5%
BIS	56	37	66.0%			10	18.0%
T&L	17	4	23.5%			8	47.0%
IB	8	4	50.0%			4	50.0%
Marketing	61	38	62.5%			4	6.5%
TOTAL	275	123	63.0%			42	10.0%
Accounting	194	84	43.5%	13	15.5%	13	7.0%
Eco/Fin	136	65	48.0%	9	14.0%	13	9.5%
BIS	108	89	82.5%	16	18.0%	12	11.0%
T&L	35	17	48.5%	2	11.5%	6	17.0%
IB	24	17	71.0%	5	30.0%	3	12.5%
Marketing	49	41	84.0%	3	6.5%	3	6.0%
TOTAL	546	313	65.5%			50	7.0%

International		Other					
		Exemptions Granted		Moved to later program		Withdrawn from course	
1	17.0%	33	17.0%	52	26.0%	5	2.0%
8	80.0%	41	33.5%	20	16.5%	2	2.0%
6	86.0%	3	4.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
2	100.0%	25	38.5%	0	0.0%	1	1.5%
3	60.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1	20.0%	3	10.0%	6	20.0%	3	10.0%
21	60.0%	105	16.5%	78	11.5%	11	2.0%
4	45.0%	31	43.0%	8	11.0%	2	3.0%
5	72.0%	32	52.5%	4	6.5%	0	0.0%
8	80.0%	9	16.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
8	100.0%	5	29.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
3	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1	25.0%	3	5.0%	16	26.0%	0	0.0%
29	71.0%	80	20.0%	28	6.5%	2	0.5%
3	23.0%	41	21.0%	52	27.0%	4	1.5%
6	46.0%	52	38.0%	4	3.0%	2	1.5%
6	50.0%	7	6.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4	67.0%	12	34.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
2	67.0%	4	16.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
2	67.0%	5	10.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
23	46.0%	121	18.5%	56	8.0%	6	1.0%

Copyright © 2005 Miriam Weisz and Sandra Smith: The authors assign to HERDSA and educational non-profit institutions a non-exclusive licence to use this document for personal use and in courses of instruction provided that the article is used in full and this copyright statement is reproduced. The authors also grant a non-exclusive licence to HERDSA to publish this document in full on the World Wide Web (prime site and mirrors) on CD-ROM and in printed form within the HERDSA 2005 conference proceedings. Any other usage is prohibited without the express permission of the authors.