

b
14-2-87

INDIANA UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
SENATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE B-2

NEW COURSE PROPOSAL

Department: Safety Sciences

Person to contact for further information: R. E. McClay

Course affected: SA 299 - Initial Experience in Cooperative Education
SA 399 - Subsequent Experience in Cooperative Education

Desired semester of change: Fall 1987

Approvals:

Department Curriculum Committee Chairperson: LSH

Department Chairperson: R. E. McClay

College Advisory Committee Chairperson: George B. Stinson

College Dean: Harold C. Wingard

A. DESCRIPTION OF ACADEMIC NEED

A1. Catalog Description: (PLEASE ATTACH)

A2. Course Syllabus: (PLEASE ATTACH)

A3. Need Fulfilled: The COOP experience allows the student to see first hand
the actual functions performed by the Safety Professional. This makes
subsequent course work more relevant and sharpens the students' perspective
on career options. Students learn how industrial organizations function
and the actual practice of hazard control.
The classroom is, and should be, the primary place where higher education
disseminates information to educate the student. However, the work place
cannot only be used to put this information into practice, but can allow
the students to learn in new ways. It can also bring maturity to the
student which will enable him/her to be a better student on campus. (We
have all had experiences with the older student who has been, or is, in
the work place and know that, although learning for him/her can be more
difficult, he/she usually is a better student).

- A4. Effect on other courses: This course will have no effect on any course now
offered by the Safety Sciences Department or any other Department.
- A5. Does this course follow traditional offerings in the department? No, it does
not follow the traditional format, it is instead a type of experiential
education carried out at an off-campus worksite.
- A6. Has this course been offered at IUP on a trial basis? Yes, and it has been
offered by the Safety Sciences Department (with the Provosts' approval) on a
trial basis. The list of past COOP students and locations in Attachment A
to this proposal and a course evaluation is included as Attachment B.
- A7. Is this a dual level course? No.
- A8. Do other universities offer this course? Yes, Northeastern University, Drexel,
Akron and other schools in the northeast U.S. offer COOP coursework on a
regular basis. Over two hundred thousand higher education students
participate in the national cooperative education programs each year.

A9. Is this course recommended or required by a professional society? No, however
potential employers of Safety Science graduates strongly endorse the COOP
course for Safety Science students.

B. INTERDISCIPLINARY IMPLICATIONS

B1. Will the course be offered by one instructor or will there be a team? One or
possibly more departmental COOP coordinators will administer the program
together with staff personal in the PLE office. The faculty member, other
other places referred to as the coop coordinator, will receive a load of
1/8 credit for each coop student being supervised that is not receiving credit.

B2. Are additional or corollary courses needed? No.

B3. What is the relationship of the content of this course to the content of
courses offered by other departments?

There is no relationship between the course and courses offered by other
Departments.

- B4. Is this course applicable in a program of the school of continuing education directed at other than full-time students?

Not applicable.

C. EVALUATION

- C1. What procedures are expected to be used to evaluate student progress? _____

The COOP on-site supervisor will fill out the attached evaluation form (See Attachment C) after each COOP experience. These are retained in the students' departmental file.

- C2. Variable credit? This course is not proposed for variable credit, the course is for zero credit.
-

D. IMPLEMENTATION

- D1. What resources are needed to teach this course? Initially, job development/ coordinators will be hired with grant funds (100%). Selection will be jointly made by the Co-op Ed office and the department they will service. The development/coordinators will be responsible for developing Cooperative Education job sites for students and advising, placing and evaluating students in their respective department assignments. Existing faculty Cooperative Education coordinators will be paid with grant funds and will be assigned coordinating duties as 25% of their regular load.
-
-
-
-
-

D1. (con't) Coordinators will be responsible for recruiting, advising students, assisting with and the placement of students. Finalizing, evaluating, and supervising the Cooperative Education experience will be done by Safety Sciences faculty in accordance with Paragraph B1.
The other resource needed will be the necessity for travel funds. Travel funds for the program will be covered in part by existing supplemental federal grants. These grants are awarded to institutions such as IUP who wish to initiate a co-op program within its curriculum. Travel will be for the purpose of developing work sites for use of coop students.

D2. How many sections? Not applicable.

D3. How often will the course be offered? Students will be able to complete a COOP work experience during the Spring, Summer or Fall terms.

D4. How many students will be accommodated? As many as apply, qualify and are selected, up to the number of available coop job sites.

6A

ATTACHMENT D

Course Description for COOP Course Proposal

SA 299 - Initial Experience in Cooperative Education - 0 sh.

Prerequisites: Approval of academic advisor, COOP Coordinator and Departmental Chairperson.

The initial experience in a program designed to combine classroom theory with practical application through job related experiences. The course is open to SA majors and minors usually in their sophomore year. Students are employed by organizations outside western Pennsylvania where there is an ongoing hazard control program under the direction of an experienced safety professional. The student is required to be in good academic standing and to serve a minimum of two alternating work experiences, only one of which may be a summer experience.

SA 399 - Subsequent Experience in Cooperative Education - 0 sh.

Prerequisites: SA 299

A second experience in a program designed to combine classroom theory with practical application through job related experiences. The course is open to SA majors and minors usually in their junior or senior year. Students are employed by organizations outside western Pennsylvania where there is an ongoing hazard control program under the direction of an experienced safety professional. The student is required to be in good academic standing and to serve a minimum of two alternating work experiences, only one of which may be a summer experience.

SAFETY SCIENCES DEPARTMENT
COOP STUDENTS AND LOCATIONS

63

FALL 1983Hallman, Jeff
Kebort, Kim
Simmers, DennisSITEPhiladelphia Electric Co.
Allied Corporation
IBMLOCATIONPhiladelphia, PA
Morristown, NJ
Kingston, NYSPRING 1984Hoffman, Julie
Mikan, John
O'Neill, BrianIBM
IBM
Philadelphia Electric Co.Raleigh, NC
Kingston, NY
Philadelphia, PASUMMER 1984Bartha, Donna
Cover, Tania
Hallman, Jeff
McDermott, James
O'Neill, BrianIBM
IBM
Philadelphia Naval Shipyard
Philadelphia Naval Shipyard
Philadelphia Electric Co.Kingston, NY
Raleigh, NC
Philadelphia, PA
Philadelphia, PA
Philadelphia, PAFALL 1984Halligan, Tom
Mouser, John
Simmers, DennisPhiladelphia Electric Co.
IBM
IBMPhiladelphia, PA
Triangle Park, NC
Kingston, NYSPRING 1985

Patterson, Mark

IBM

Kingston, NY

SUMMER 1985Hoffman, Julie
Nairn, Doug
O'Neill, Brian
Shaffer, BartIBM
IBM
McNeal Pharmaceuticals
Wakefern FoodsRaleigh, NC
Kingston, NY
Spring House, PA
Elizabeth, NYFALL 1985Cover, Tania
O'Neill, BrianIBM
McNeal PharmaceuticalsRaleigh, NC
Spring House, PASPRING 1986Bence, Greg
Pell, DougIBM
Philadelphia Electric Co.Kingston, NY
Philadelphia, PASUMMER 1986Bence, Greg
Holman, BradIBM
Philadelphia Electric Co.Kingston, NY
Philadelphia, PAFALL 1986Kovach, Elizabeth
Nairn, DougCN Flag
IBMNiantic, CN
Charlotte, NC

REPORT ON SAFETY SCIENCES COOP PROGRAM EVALUATION

In the Spring of 1983, the Safety Sciences Department at IUP was encouraged by Safety Professionals at IBM Inc., Kingston, NY, to pursue the development of a COOP Program. The Department was also encouraged by the office of Professional Laboratory Experiences at IUP, which funded two faculty trips to the eastern seaboard for the purpose of recruiting COOP sites. By the start of the Fall term 1983, three (3) COOP sites had agreed to the hiring of COOP students and had each select one student to complete a COOP during the Fall term. The placement of COOP students has continued each semester until the present time, and these placements are summarized in attachment 1.

The nature of the COOP Program established for trial purposes by the Safety Sciences Department conformed to the needs of the Department and IBM, one of the largest Corporate Sponsors of COOP Programs in the country. Students obligated themselves for two semesters of COOP activity with no academic credit attached. The COOP students were paid for their services. Safety Science COOP students were placed in positions within the safety organization of industrial firms and under the supervision of professional safety managers. They were evaluated only by their site supervisors.

Eleven (11) different Safety Science majors, sophmores and juniors, have, to date, been placed at COOP sites; one student has completed COOP periods at two separate sites and another is now completing his second period at the same site where he was first placed. The evaluations and the informal reports provided by the site supervisors have indicated satisfaction with the performance of these students. The students in turn have provided a very positive reaction to their COOP experiences.

A more formal evaluation of the COOP experiences was recently conducted using the instrument shown in attachment 2. Each student who has served at a COOP site participated, however, the student who worked at two separate sites, evaluated these separately. This provided 12 sources of data for consideration. The returns were unanimous in claiming the COOP as a very positive learning experience:

- All students indicated that the experience substantially complimented and reinforced classroom learning.
- All students indicated that they would be better prepared to enter their chosen profession because of the COOP experience.
- All students indicated that the COOP experience was something which they could recommend to students in this and other majors.
- All students indicated that they would again volunteer to participate in a COOP experience if given the chance.
- All students indicated that they received adequate direction and supervision at the COOP site.

Students were also questioned about the problems which they experienced in leaving IUP, relocating, and returning to IUP. The summary of problems experienced, (Attachment 3) shows that the problems were significant but not critical. The students also provided good insight into how these problems could be minimized. The problems of greatest significance fall into two (2) categories:

---Problems associated with late placements at the site.

---Problems associated with housing at the COOP site.

The other problems were more random, but should be and can be effectively addressed.

Our inexperience with COOP Program set-ups has caused some of the arrangements to be finalized late and the students to be more rushed into relocating than should be the case. A more long-term approach is being put into effect and should minimize the related problems.

We have not apparently been enough involved with providing COOP students with housing information and assistance in finding housing at the COOP site. A more active role here for the IUP SA-COOP Program Coordinator will provide this needed assistance.

Faculty loading for COOP Coordination has not been provided out of teaching contracts in the Safety Sciences Department to date. Since no contractual loading formula exists for COOP Faculty loading, it seems desirable to maintain the zero credit feature of the COOP experience until a suitable formula can be negotiated between IUP administration and APSU. We believe that small pilot COOP Programs can be developed in many academic departments to establish feasibility and the value of the learning experience before academic credits are assigned.

SUMMARY

SAFETY SCIENCES COOP PLACEMENTS 1983-84

<u>COOP SITE</u>	<u>FALL 1983</u>	<u>SPRING 1984</u>	<u>SUMMER 1984</u>	<u>FALL 1984</u>
Allied Chemical Co. Morristown, NJ	Kim Kebort	-----	-----	-----
IBM Kingston, NY	Dennis Simmers	John Mikan	Donna Bartha	Dennis Simmers
IBM Raleigh, NC	-----	Julie Hoffman	Tania Cover	John Mouser
Philadelphia Electric Co. Philadelphia, PA	Jeff Hallman	Brian O'Neill	Brian O'Neill	Thomas Halligan
Philadelphia Naval Shipyard Philadelphia, PA	-----	-----	James McDermott Jeff Hallman	-----

COOP STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE SUMMARY

1. Location (s) where COOP experience was gained Five different locations
were visited by participants in this evaluation.
2. Date of COOP experience: From _____ To _____
From _____ To _____
3. Anticipated graduation date _____ --
4. Did your COOP experience substantially complement and reinforce classroom learning in your major? Yes 12 No-- 0 Uncertain 0
5. Was the COOP experience a learning experience that you could recommend to other students in your major? Yes 12 No 0 Uncertain 0
6. Was the COOP experience a learning experience that you could recommend to students in other majors? Yes 12 No 0 Uncertain 0
7. Did you receive adequate direction and supervision at your COOP location? Yes 12 No 0 Uncertain 0
8. Will you be better prepared to enter your chosen profession because of your COOP experience? Yes 12 No 0 Uncertain 0
9. If you had it to do over, would you again volunteer to complete a COOP experience? Yes 12 No 0 Uncertain 0
10. Which choice below best describes the problems you experienced in leaving your classes at IUP to begin your COOP experience (check one).

<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
No real prob- lems were experienced	Problems minor and easily overcome	Moderate prob- lems experi- enced, easily overcome	Major problems which were overcome	Problems which could not be overcome

11. Which choice below best describes the problems you experienced in getting established at your COOP location (check one).

<u>0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
No real prob- lems were experienced	Problems were minor and were easily over- come	Moderate prob- lems were ex- perienced and overcome	Major prob- lems were overcome	Problems which could not be overcome

12. Which choice below best describes the problems your experienced in re-
turning to IUP to resume classes (check one).

<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
No real prob- lems were experienced	Problems were minor and were easily overcome	Moderate prob- were experi- enced and over- come	Major prob- lems were overcome	Problems which could not be overcome

2*
NA

*These COOP Students are still working at their first COOP site.

13. Briefly summarize your COOP experience and the benefits you gained from it.

14. Briefly explain the problems you've experienced in the COOP program and recommend ways in which these could be avoided.

NAME _____

DATE _____

Attachment B

SUMMARY
OF PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY COOP STUDENTS

Late Notification of selection by COOP site.	<u>5 out of 12</u>
Difficulty in leaving IUP Housing Arrangement.	<u>3 out of 12</u>
Difficulty in locating Housing at COOP site.	<u>7 out of 12</u>
Difficulty in Registering for classes upon return to IUP.	<u>1 out of 12</u>
Inadequate Orientation by COOP site.	1 out of 12
Problems in Maintaining Financial and Arrangements.	<u>1 out of 12</u>
Difficulty in the Selection Process.	<u>1 out of 12</u>

3/65

COOPERATIVE EDUCATION EVALUATION FORM

COOP's Name _____

Date _____

Name of firm _____

The following scale is to be completed by the supervisor of the student named above. Students are rated only against their contemporaries, and this rating is not meant to be used as a comparison with experienced professionals.

1. KNOWLEDGE OF OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lacks knowledge of basic concepts and principles.			Has <u>minimum</u> knowledge of basic concepts and principles.			Has attained <u>satisfactory</u> level of knowledge and principles.			Check <u>ONE</u> block <u>only</u> on each line below.
									Has a full understanding of all important concepts and principles.
									No opportunity to observe.

COMMENTS - Describe any particular strength or deficiency you have noticed in this area _____

Explain what the COOP should do to maintain this strength or improve in this area _____

2. PERFORMANCE (APPLICATION OF KNOWLEDGE)

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Fails to utilize appropriate standards methodology. Has many problems.			Minimum utilization of appropriate hazard methodology. Has frequent problems.			Usually utilizes appropriate evaluation methodology. Has typical problems.			Utilizes appropriate evaluation methodology. Has very few problems.
									Outstanding - has achieved a level of performance rarely seen in student interns.
									No opportunity to observe.

COMMENTS - Describe any particular strength or deficiency you have noticed in this area _____

Explain what the COOP should do to maintain this strength or or improve in this area _____

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

3. COMMUNICATION SKILLS

a. Written Language

Unable to express ideas clearly - ungrammatical.	Has difficulty expressing himself/herself. Sometimes ungrammatical. Can't formulate his/her ideas well.	Usually expresses himself/herself clearly and correctly - has some difficulty with more complex ideas.	Well organized and able to express himself/herself clearly and concisely on most matters.	Outstanding ability to organize to observe. and communicate ideas of varying complexities.	No opportunity to observe.
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

COMMENTS - Describe any particular strength or deficiency you have noticed in this area

Explain what the COOP should do to maintain this strength or improve in this area

b. Oral Language

Poor pronunciation. Poor voice quality. Ungrammatical. Limited vocabulary.	Often mispronounces. Can't formulate ideas well. Doesn't project voice. Sometimes ungrammatical.	Acceptable speech pattern.	Uses effective oral language in all situations. Has good vocabulary.	Outstanding ability to express himself/herself in all situations.	No opportunity to observe.
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

COMMENTS - Describe any particular strength or deficiency you have noticed in this area

Explain what the COOP should do to maintain this strength or improve in this area

- | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| ☐ 1 | ☐ 2 | ☐ 3 | ☐ 4 | ☐ 5 | ☐ 6 | ☐ 7 | ☐ 8 | ☐ 9 | ☐ 10 |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|

PERSONALITY

Does not get along with others.

Has difficulty in getting along with others.

Has an understanding of good personal relations and satisfactorily achieves a workable relationship with others.

Relates well and has above average ability to achieve good working relations with others.

Outstanding ability to cooperate and obtain cooperation from others. No opportunity to observe.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

COMMENTS - Describe any particular strength or deficiency you have noticed in this area _____

Explain what the COOP should do to maintain this strength or improve in this area _____

5. PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDE

Shows no interest in the profession. Takes no attempt to meet minimum standards.

Shows little interest in the profession. Has difficulty achieving minimum standards. Is defensive when criticized.

Has some interest in the profession. Achieves minimum standards consistently. Accepts criticism.

Shows a definite interest in the profession. Will work beyond minimum requirements. Accepts criticism graciously.

Has a keen and sustaining interest in the profession. Eager to work beyond requirements. Invites criticism and accepts it gratefully. No opportunity to observe.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

COMMENTS - Describe any particular strength or deficiency you have noticed in this area _____

Explain what the COOP should do to maintain this strength or improve in this area _____

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
6. TIME UTILIZATION									
Excessive time is wasted needlessly.	Some time is wasted needlessly because of inadequate planning. Deadlines missed but work done within reasonable time thereafter.	Makes acceptable efforts at allocating time. Most work gets done as well as conditions permit.	Well organized. Plans time usage in most instances. Able to get work done as well as conditions permit.	Highly organized individual. Plans time usage on a prioritized basis. Little wasted time or effort. Gets work done promptly.	No opportunity to observe.				
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

COMMENTS - Describe any particular strength or deficiency you have noticed in the area _____

Explain what the COOP should do to maintain this strength or improve in this area _____

7. ABILITY TO SEE THE NEED FOR AND RECOMMEND NEW PROGRAMS FOR IMPROVED HAZARD CONTROLS

Was unable to recognize the need for improved programs.	Recognized the need for some improvements but had few ideas on how to implement them.	Recognized the need for some improvements. Had ideas for new programs and hazard controls but these were frequently unworkable or totally inappropriate.	Good ability to see program needs. Ideas for hazard controls and programs generally good but not always practical or appropriate.	Was very perceptive in recognizing needs. Had novel and well thought out ideas for new programs and hazard controls.	No opportunity to observe.
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

COMMENTS - Describe any particular strength or deficiency you have noticed in the area _____

Explain what the COOP should do to maintain this strength or improve in this area _____

8. Was the COOP Program administered in a way satisfactory to you? (Comment below on how administration could improve)

___ YES ___ NO

9. Would your organization be willing to participate again in the future?

___ YES ___ NO

OTHER COMMENTS

(Please elaborate where you feel that the above scale does not adequately reflect COOP performance.)

Safety Sciences Department
2A Uhler Hall
INDIANA UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
Indiana, PA 15705

Signed

Position

Address

