National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Service
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Service des thèses canadiennes

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, tests publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

PERCEPTIONS OF ALBERTA POSTSECONDARY CONSORTIUM GOALS

by

(C)

Joan Patrick

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1988

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-45505-5

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Joan Patrick

NAME OF THESIS: Perceptions of Alberta Postsecondary Consortium Goals

DEGREE: Master of Education

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1988

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

Joan Patrick

Joan Patrick

Permanent Address:
11708 - 39 Avenue,
Edmonton, Alberta,
T6J 0M9

DATE: October 6, 1988

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Perceptions of Alberta Postsecondary Consortium Goals" submitted by Joan Patrick in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

.....
(supervisor)

.....James H Gaudall.....

.....

Date: October 6, 1988

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to measure and compare the goals of Alberta Advanced Education community consortia, as perceived by board members and regional advisory committee members. This was to be done through comparing their perceptions of how important goals currently are to how important the goals should be. These perceptions were also compared by consortium, position, time served in current capacity, and time in previous capacity.

A Consortium Goals Inventory (CGI) was developed for use as a survey instrument, based on the Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI). The CGI included thirteen outcome goal areas, nine process goal areas, twelve miscellaneous goal statements, and four questions pertaining to the respondent.

In April of 1988, the CGI questionnaire was sent to 91 potential respondents -- board members and regional advisory committee members of Alberta Advanced Education community consortia. Sixty-nine responses were received, representing a response rate of 75.8 percent.

Data were analyzed by frequency and distribution, and the Is and Should Be ratings of the respondents were analyzed by mean and standard deviation. There was a high degree of consensus among participants using any of the variables -- consortium, position, or time served in current capacity. Respondents perceived all goals to be

of higher future importance than they were currently rated.

The data analysis revealed that the outcome goals, ie., those goals that deal with the core of instructional content, were the least important to the respondents. Process goals, pertaining to the delivery of service, were more important than outcome goals. Miscellaneous goals were perceived to be of the highest importance on both Is and Should Be ratings.

Providing service to geographically removed students was perceived to be the most important current and future goal. Including citizens in planning, flexibility in program offerings, seeking alternative sources of government funding, and reputation in the academic public and local community were also highly rated goal areas. Work related training was perceived to be of greater importance than liberal arts oriented programs. Goals related to a more permanent consortium structure and status were not high priorities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank the board members and regional advisory committee members of Alberta Advanced Education community consortia who participated through sharing their perceptions of consortium goals.

The contributions of the thesis committee members are acknowledged with appreciation. As advisor to the author, Dr. A. G. Konrad provided encouragement and support at all stages of the study, and his efforts are noted with the utmost gratitude and respect.

The directors of the consortia provided information for the adaptation of the survey instrument, as well as current mailing lists. Alberta Advanced Education officials were helpful in clarifying a number of issues related to consortia in Alberta.

Mrs. C. Prokop of the University of Alberta assisted through handling of the computerized data analysis.

The author wishes to acknowledge the encouragement and support of Grant MacEwan Community College Management Studies faculty and staff throughout the study.

Finally, the author wishes to acknowledge the support and encouragement willingly given by her family and friends. Each person has played a unique role and will share in the joy of this thesis completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter — Page

1 INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....1

Introduction.....1

Statement of Purpose.....5

Problems.....5

Statement of Significance.....6

Definition of Terms.....7

Assumptions.....10

Delimitations.....11

Limitations.....11

Summary.....12

2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....13

Introduction.....13

Consortia--Structure and Purpose.....13

American Experience.....18

Canadian Experience.....20

Alberta Advanced Education Community Consortia.....24

History.....24

North Peace Adult Education Consortium.....24

Big Country Educational Consortium.....27

Chapter Page

Yellowhead Region Educational Consortium....31
Chinook Educational Consortium...34
Pembina Educational Consortium...36
Governance....40
Program Planning....41
Funding....41
Goal Research....42
3 METHODOLOGY....45
Population....45
Instrumentation....45
Panel of Experts....46
Pilot Study....54
Rating Scale....54
Respondent Profile Questions....53
Data Collection....55
Data Analysis....56
Summary....57
4 DATA ANALYSIS....58
Introduction....58
Respondent Profile....58
Goal Perceptions: Is and Should Be Ratings and Rankings....64
Goal Perceptions by Consortium: BCEC, CEC, NPAEC, PEC, and YREC....75
Goal Perceptions by Position....88

Chapter Page

Goal Perceptions by Years in Current Capacity....93

Summary....107

5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS....110

Summary....110

Purpose....110

Methodology....110

Data Analysis....111

Conclusions....116

Implications....119

Implications for AAECC Governance....119

Implications for Member Institutions....119

Implications for Graduate Education....120

Implications for Further Study....121

BIBLIOGRAPHY....123

APPENDIX....128

A Survey Instrument....128

B Correspondence....137

C Goal Abbreviations....139

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Frequency and Rate of Response by Consortium	59
2	Frequency and Rate of Response by Consortium and Position	60
3	Frequency and Rate of Response by Years in Current Capacity	61
4	Frequency and Rate of Response by Years in Previous Capacity	62
5	Repondents' Perceptions of Outcome Goals Ranked by "Is" and "Should be" Means	65
6	Respondents' Perceptions of Process Goals Ranked by "Is" and "Should be" Means	67
7	Respondents' Perceptions of Miscellaneous Goals Ranked by "Is" and "Should Be" Means	68
8	Respondents' Perceptions of Outcome and Process Goals Combined, Ranked by "Is" and "Should Be" Means	71
9	The Twenty Highest Goals Areas by all Respondents with all Goal Areas Combined, Ranked by Mean	73
10	Perceptions of Outcome Goals by Consortium with Means Unranked	77
11	Perceptions of Process Goals by Consortium with Means Unranked	78
12	Perceptions of Miscellaneous Goals by Consortium with Means Unranked	80
13	Ranking of all "Is" Goals by Consortium	81
14	Ranking of all "Should Be" Goals by Consortium	85

LIST OF TABLES - continued

Table		Page
15	Perceptions of Outcome Goals by Position with Means Unranked	89
16	Perceptions of Process Goals by Position with Means Unranked	91
17	Perceptions of Miscellaneous Goals by Position with Means Unranked	92
18	Ranking of all "Is" Goals by Position	94
19	Ranking of all "Should Be" Goals by Position	97
20	Perceptions of Miscellaneous Goals by Years in Current Capacity with Means Unranked	101
21	Ranking of all "Is" Goals by Years in Current Capacity	102
22	Ranking of all "Should Be" Goals by Years in Current Capacity	106

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Through the 1960s and 1970s postsecondary education in North America moved towards an open door policy. It was gradually accepted that adults should have access to the postsecondary educational opportunities and services provided by the public purse. With the acceptance of this concept in general, questions emerged regarding access to education for individuals not living within commuting distance of the services provided.

Rural and small urban centres in Alberta identified a need for access to educational opportunity at a reduced human cost. Participation in the existing postsecondary system required a certain level of emotional, familial and financial security not possible when traditional alternatives for postsecondary education required relocation to major urban centres for residents of outlying areas.

In the late 1970s, Alberta Advanced Education (then known as Advanced Education and Manpower) received a number of requests to establish and operate post-secondary institutions in rural or small urban communities. These requests coincided with Advanced

Education's development of a policy identifying a number of alternatives for the delivery of educational services across the province making the best use of existing educational resources. Educational consortia were proposed as one alternative for the delivery of postsecondary education to outlying communities at a reasonable cost. These consortia would consist of existing Alberta Advanced Education institutions and agencies cooperating to deliver postsecondary education in previously unserved areas.

Over the period of 1978 to 1982, five Alberta Advanced Education community consortia (AAECC) were formed. These consortia served the areas surrounding and including Peace River (North Peace Adult Education Consortium), Drumheller (Big Country Educational Consortium), Pincher Creek/Crowsnest Pass (Chinook Educational Consortium), Hinton (Yellowhead Region Educational Consortium), and Drayton Valley (Pembina Educational Consortium). Member institutions in each consortium were:

North Peace Adult Education Consortium (NPAEC)

- Fairview College
- Grande Prairie Regional College
- Alberta Vocational Centre - Grouard
- ACCESS Alberta
- Athabasca University
- The University of Alberta

Community Vocational Centre - Slave Lake

Big Country Educational Consortium (BCEC)

Olds College

Alberta Vocational Centre - Calgary

Southern Alberta Institute of Technology

Mount Royal College

Red Deer College

Medicine Hat College

Athabasca University

University of Calgary

Chinook Educational Consortium (CEC)

Lethbridge Community College

Southern Alberta Institute of Technology

Athabasca University

University of Lethbridge

Alberta Vocational Centre - Calgary

Yellowhead Region Educational Consortium (YREC)

Grant MacEwan Community College

Northern Alberta Institute of Technology

ACCESS Alberta

The University of Alberta

Alberta Forest Technology School

Alberta Vocational Centre - Edmonton

Grande Prairie Regional College

Athabasca University

Westerra Institute of Technology

Pembina Educational Consortium (PEC)

Alberta Vocational Centre - Edmonton
The University of Alberta
Athabasca University
Grant MacEwan Community College
Westerra Institute of Technology
ACCESS Alberta
Northern Alberta Institute of Technology

Although they existed under one mandate established by Alberta Advanced Education, the consortia responded to the unique needs of their communities through provision of a variety of services available from their particular member institutions, and thus developed differently. Each consortium sought to fill a niche within its community structure, in part by establishing goals at the community level rather than by taking them from the provincial government.

Consortia have struggled to become a viable arrangement to meet the educational needs of smaller urban and rural Alberta communities. Questions arise regarding the potential for unique and different directions for future growth. This is an appropriate time to measure which goals are perceived as current or future priorities for individual consortia, and how these goals differ from one consortium to another.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to measure and compare the organizational goals of the five (5) Alberta Advanced Education community consortia, as perceived by members of the boards of directors and regional advisory committees of each consortium.

Problems

Questions arising from this statement included the following:

1. What are the perceived goals of the respective consortia?
2. What should the goals of the consortia be?
3. Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of what the goals are and what they should be?
4. How do the goal perceptions vary from one consortium to another?
5. How do the goal perceptions vary between board members and regional advisory committee members?
6. How do goal perceptions vary based on the length of time the respondent has served in their current or previous capacity?

Statement of Significance

The outcome of this study will be of interest to postsecondary educators and administrators in Alberta as a valid measurement of the goals of consortia perceived by a group of key individuals.

Consortia have few models on which to base planning for future development. The findings of this study may provide useful information to Alberta Advanced Education on questions such as: Should consortia develop independently, or continue as part of a single initiative under which the development of one consortium is inherently linked to that of another? What should be their level of permanency? Which of Alberta's postsecondary institutions will face the greatest demands from consortia? In what program areas?

The individual consortia may make use of the findings of this study in providing direction for goal setting within each consortium, and within the larger context of the AAECC.

After a decade of planning and delivery of service, a review is in order to identify key areas of goal development for consortia in general and individual consortia in particular, and to provide current information on future goal directions.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study the following definition of terms will apply.

Consortium

> ...an arrangement whereby two or more institutions -- at least one of which is an institution of higher education -- agree to pursue between, or among them, a program for strengthening academic programs, improving administration, or providing other special needs (Moore, 1968, p. 175).

Alberta Advanced Education

Alberta Advanced Education is the provincial government department responsible for advanced, or postsecondary education. Until 1982, this department was known as Alberta Advanced Education and Manpower.

Alberta Advanced Education Community Consortia (AAECC)

The Alberta Advanced Education community consortia are "voluntary associations of postsecondary institutions and agencies who cooperate with each other and the local community to provide credit programs to the local residents" (Alberta Advanced Education, 1984a, p. 1). Five AAECC exist:

North Peace Adult Education Consortium (NPAEC)

Pembina Educational Consortium (PEC)

Chinook Educational Consortium (CEC)

Big Country Educational Consortium (BCEC)

Yellowhead Region Education Consortium (YREC)

Postsecondary education

Educational services delivered by postsecondary institutions funded by Alberta Advanced Education.

Board of directors

The governing body of a consortium, made up of individuals representing each member institution of a particular consortium, as well as members representing the communities the consortium serves (elected by the Regional Advisory Committee to sit on the consortium Board of Directors).

Regional advisory committee (RAC)

(also known as Local Advisory Committees) Members of the general public representing each of the communities a consortium serves. Regional Advisory Committee members are invited by the consortium administration to sit on the committee in cases where the committee is a sub-structure of the consortium. Where the RAC is also a registered non-profit society, the RAC members are the directors of the society elected by the general membership.

Consortium administration

Administrative staff members who work for the consortium itself, rather than for one of the member institutions. Consortium administrative staff are technically employees of the consortium's administrative agent.

Agent/administrative agent

One of the consortium's member institutions which has been appointed by Alberta Advanced Education to act as the legal agent on behalf of the consortium. All assets of each consortium are legally held in trust by the administrative agent. The administrative agent generally provides administrative services to the consortium to reduce duplication of services and costs.

Goals

The global statements of direction of the consortium. At present, written goal statements approved by Alberta Advanced Education for each consortium do not exist. Goal statements are informal, and are generally perceived rather than stated goals of each consortium.

Perceived goals

The global objectives of the consortium, as viewed and interpreted by members of the consortium board and

regional advisory committees.

Process goals

Those elements of postsecondary education that deal with how educational service is delivered rather than the educational outcome.

Outcome goals

Elements of postsecondary education that deal specifically with the objectives of specific educational programs and their core of studies.

Assumptions

Prior to commencing the study, the following assumptions were made:

1. The responses of each subject would be based on their personal perception of goals within the consortium with which they are directly involved.
2. There would be a variance between perceived current goals ("is" ranking) and what the respondents felt the goals should be ("should be" ranking).
3. The respondents would have the information and ability to rank the goal statements.

Delimitations

Population

For the purpose of this study, only those individuals who were recognised members of the board of directors of an Alberta Advanced Education community consortium, or a member of a regional advisory committee of an Alberta Advanced Education community consortium were be included in the study population.

Instrument

Data were collected through the use of a rating scale questionnaire designed to measure perceptions of goals within Alberta Advanced Education community consortia. The scale and model for question development were based on the Institutional Goals Inventory (Peterson and Uhl, 1977).

Limitations

1. The results of this study may only be applicable to consortia in Alberta.
2. The results are based totally on the perceptions of individuals, not the stated goals or written goals of the organizations, or other documentation.

Summary

Postsecondary education consortia have developed in Alberta over the last decade to provide services to Albertans in rural and small urban communities. This study measured and compared the organizational goals of the five Alberta Advanced Education community consortia based on the perceptions of board members and regional advisory committee members from each consortium.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Postsecondary consortia in Alberta emerged in the 1970s and 1980s as an alternative for the use of existing institutional and government resources and as an alternative to continually creating new independent institutions. Consortia have achieved viability in North America in light of fiscal restraint, shifting enrollments, and mounting pressure from government and the public to become more financially accountable. The current and future goals of consortia in Alberta should be viewed within the context of consortia development in North America and Canada, and at the provincial level. This will provide some insight into the varied goals and directions developed by Alberta Advanced Education community consortia in their unique environments.

Consortia -- Structure and Purpose

Structure

In any discussion of recognised consortia, a framework to identify formalized relationships between institutions becomes necessary. Konrad and Small (1986a, p.111) refer to collaboration between

institutions occurring at three levels, depending on the extent of formalization:

> ...informal agreements and ad-hoc arrangements which have been beneficial to both institutions result in formal arrangements. The highest level of collaboration is reached when a new structure or organization is created to manage the mutual interests of the institutions, such as an agency for needs analysis, production and marketing of materials for member institutions.

As discussed by Martin (1981) four possible catagories for consortia groupings exist:

1) Homogeneous institutions serving a specific purpose;
2) Heterogeneous institutions serving a specific purpose;
3) Homogeneous institutions serving a general purpose; and
4) Heterogeneous institutions serving a general purpose.

Neal (1984) recognises a similar taxonomy, with three major types of consortia groupings:

1) Ad hoc, or specific purpose;
2) National interest groupings; and
3) General purpose consortia both regional (often homogeneous in nature), and metropolitan (usually heterogeneous in nature).

Martin (1981), Neal (1984), and Patterson (1979) all recognise the distinction between consortia

established to serve a special purpose and those established to serve general educational purposes. The term "special purpose consortia" is often used interchangeably with "single purpose consortia," and may refer to a single program of library cooperation, computer networking, or joint international ventures (Patterson, 1979, p.14). By contrast Patterson (1979) defines general purpose consortia as those with two or more cooperative programs within a common structure. In the 1986 Consortium Directory (11th Edition, p. 4) the criteria were that the cooperative ventures must:

1) Exist as a voluntary formal organization;
2) Include 2 or more institutions;
3) Have a general purpose (more that one program);
4) Be administered by a professional director; and
5) Require continuing membership support.

Martin (1981, p. 37) notes that the general public conception of a consortium comes largely from the general purpose types, both homogeneous and heterogeneous, which offer a wide range of services to their members.

Purpose

Scott (1977, p.429) identified the main objectives for general purpose consortia having formed as:

1) To provide more services to students with minimal additional costs, such as cross registration and the swapping of specialized courses;

2) To eliminate program duplication with special reference to anticipated future duplication;

3) To share high cost resources, most commonly specialized faculty members, computers, and television systems;

4) To create new programs and services, especially those that were trendy and would attract grant funds; and

5) To maximize the advantages of size and diversity, with special references to joint fund raising, mass purchasing and political lobbying.

With the flow from creativity to accountability in postsecondary education in the late 1970s and early 1980s, it would be simple to define the purpose of consortia in terms of financial benefits. There are a number of consortia activities that tie directly into cost effectiveness of institutions. In Survival through Interdependence: Assessing the Benefits of Interinstitutional Cooperation, Patterson (1979) addresses specifically the cost benefits most frequently associated with consortia: cross registration, library and media cooperation, cooperative student services, group purchasing, cooperative non-traditional structures and distance learning systems, and cooperative academic programs. While based on varied measurement criteria and processes, cost benefits were felt to be substantial in each area.

Martin (1981), however, identifies an over-reliance on reducing costs as a major barrier to consortia meeting the needs of higher education. Martin (1981) notes that involvement in a consortium will not bring financial rescue to an institution unable to manage its finances as a single institution. Other barriers to consortia effectiveness are cited as inadequate attention to the whole range of interinstitutional cooperation, and mismatching of membership and mission in consortia. As noted below, the worst hazard identified by Martin (1981, p. 37) is the establishment and further evaluation of consortia without a clear set of expectations:

> Because the consortium is not a freestanding institution, it's founding principles must be uncommonly clear to all the leaders of it's membership. To be effective these principles must be higher priorities than the assertion that cooperation is intrinsically valuable, or the possibility that a granting agency will support a multicampus project, or the theory that money might be saved through interinstitutional action.

While noting that careful consideration of these principles is critical as a first step to planning, Martin (1981) feels it is too often neglected by the general purpose consortia, in part because of a mismatch of membership.

Neal (1984) and Patterson (1979) both view the primary purpose of consortia creation and existence as not fiscal but developmental in the educational sense.

Patterson (1976, p. 16) notes that consortia, like their member institutions, prefer to justify their value on their contributions to education and society, adding that few, if any, of today's educational organizations were founded with the primary purpose being to achieve cost effectiveness. As stated by Konrad and Small (1986b, p.74), the primary purpose of academic consortia is to strengthen educational offerings by more effectively allocating money, staff and facilities.

American Experience

The idea of institutional cooperation in American higher education has a long history (Jonathan Fife, Introduction to L.D.Patterson, 1979). There are instances of institutional cooperation between denominational colleges which formed the basis of early higher education. In the 19th century as mens' and womens' colleges were created (Harvard and Ratcliffe, Columbia and Barnard), a form of institutional cooperation led to the coeducational system known in higher education today.

In chronicling the history of the consortium movement in the United States, F.K. Paterson (1974) identifies the first consortium which may be considered a heterogeneous general purpose consortium as the Claremont Graduate School. Established in 1925, it was

developed through Pomona College under the Oxford model of a grouping of colleges. The second consortium followed four years later with the development of the Atlanta University Centre. Between 1929 and 1965, seventeen further consortia emerged; four by 1948, nine by 1958, and nineteen by 1965. The endorsement of Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 by the United States Congress provided financial support for the further establishment of interinstitutional cooperative efforts.

The landscape of American higher education has become so permeated with linkage systems that it is difficult to estimate with any precision the number that might now be in existence (Patterson, 1979, p.4). Individual, non-formal linkages reflecting all structures of consortia (homogeneous special purpose, heterogeneous special purpose, homogeneous general purpose, and heterogeneous general purpose) would figure in the thousands. However, an estimate taken from the Consortium Directory (11th Edition, 1986) identifies 133 general purpose groups.

Criteria for inclusion (as previously identified) are that each consortium must exist as a voluntary formal organization, include two or more members, have a general purpose, be administered by a professional director, and require continuing membership support. Under these criteria, the major activities most often

cited by these 133 general purpose consortia include:

- computing,
- continuing education,
- cross registration,
- joint academic programs and courses,
- joint centres,
- joint faculty/exchange,
- joint purchasing,
- library cooperatives,
- professional development,
- public relations,
- publications,
- school-college relations,
- seminars/workshops/conferences, and
- telecommunications.

Canadian Experience

The development of postsecondary educational systems in Canada (including consortia) has been greatly influenced by development of educational systems in the United States, just as social, cultural, economic and justice systems have been influenced. Proximity of the United States has shaped Canadian perspectives on higher education although many differences in population and culture have resulted in different outcomes. The scattered population of Canada, as well as the propensity to wait for or allow the government to provide education, has meant that the small two-year colleges that figure predominantly in the American higher education system are less common in Canada. Instead, Canadians have adjusted by moving to urban centres for their postsecondary needs.

In the 1970s and early 1980s, many areas previously unserved by postsecondary systems began to question the wisdom of all individuals moving to urban centres to continue their education. Thus in Canada, consortia were often born of not only a political decision not to build a proliferation of government funded institutions to serve smaller urban or rural areas, but also to seek a more effective and efficient use of existing postsecondary resources. Consortia were needed to serve all the purposes of their American counterparts, i.e., to minimise costs of services, to avoid duplication, to maximise output to the community, as well as to overcome the geographic barriers presented by a small population spread over a vast area.

Consortia as a mode of distance education is a concept discussed by Konrad and Small (1986a, p.114), where distance education is described as the moving of learning content from an institution to a learner across physical space. A consortium of institutions set up to support distance education could provide a number of benefits in areas deemed requisite to distance education (Konrad and Small, 1986a, p.114), i.e., (1) logistics, (2) academic support (3) technical support, (4) fiscal resources, (5) academic support, (6) community interfacing, (7) academic credibility, and (8) evaluation.

Heterogeneous, multi-purpose consortia, established

to meet the varied needs of a community (including being the primary delivery mechanism of credit programs) distant from the member institutions, face different concerns than special purpose consortia (more often not concerned directly with the delivery of academic programs), or consortia established to serve within an area geographically near its member institutions (Fox, 1978, p.110).

Although the use of the term "consortium" has been quite rare in Canada until recently, the concept of institutional collaboration for the purpose of providing service is well established (Konrad and Small, 1986b, p. 73). Harris (1976) identifies the University of Toronto providing a collaborative situation for colleges of dentistry, pharmacy, engineering, agriculture, and theology as early as 1887.

Konrad and Small (1986b) describe a number of similar arrangements with federations of institutions, noting that in a federation, institutions retain their identity, but become submerged as a whole, unlike consortia which have an independent identity separate from the member institutions.

Following a study in 1984, Konrad and Small (1986b) identify 53 institutions associated with 96 associations not unlike consortium arrangements. Twenty-five of these might be considered consortia in the true sense of the word. A study of these arrangements identified the

Association of Atlantic Universities as one of the earliest consortia, having originated in 1964. The consortia studied covered all of Canada with the exception of Saskatchewan; Ontario had eight, Alberta and British Columbia each had six, and Manitoba and the Atlantic provinces each had one. Major purposes in the establishment and ongoing operation of the Canadian consortia included cooperative planning for effective and efficient use of resources, joint use of facilities, and research.

Government played a major role in the establishment and financing of the majority of cases; contributions from member institutions, research contracts, student fees and publications also contributed to financing of many of the consortia. The majority of consortia were governed by a formal board, with an informal committee of executives from member institutions serving in other instances. Most consortia directors were responsible for implementation of policy. In discussion of the prospects of the consortia studied, Konrad and Small (1986b, p. 80) note that

> ...high or very high importance was attached to the following benefits by more than two thirds of the respondents:
>
> 1. The consortium enables an institution to provide an improved service.
> 2. Membership in a consortium allows a service to be provided that one institution could not provide alone.

Alberta Advanced Education Community Consortia

History

The Alberta Advanced Education community consortia emerged over a period of five years, between 1978 and 1982. Each had its unique antecedents given its local environment, but the culmination of these local endeavors coincided with Alberta Advanced Education's concern with creating numerous independent institutions of higher education. As a result, Alberta Advanced Education proposed educational consortia as one alternative for the delivery of postsecondary education. The antecedents to the development of each of the five Alberta Advanced Education community consortia are outlined below.

North Peace Adult Education Consortium

While the North Peace Adult Education Consortium (NPAEC) was the first Alberta Advanced Education consortium to develop, its forerunner in the North Peace region was a consortium established to serve the educational needs of the Peace River Correctional institute in 1976/77. As outlined by Konrad and Small (1982b, p.6);

> In April, 1978, the residents of the Peace River area expressed their concern at a public meeting regarding the lack of adult education opportunities. At this meeting Dr. Henry Anderson, president of Grand Prairie Regional College, was challenged to fulfill his

institution's regional mandate by expanding its Peace River operations.

In response, Dr. Anderson suggested that a consortium of postsecondary institutions would more effectively serve the educational needs of the area than could a single institution. A proposal was made by Dr. Anderson that Grande Prairie Regional College, Fairview College, Alberta Vocational Centre (AVC)-Grouard, and Athabasca University work together to provide educational services to the region under the umbrella organization of a consortium.

A group of local citizens of the North Peace region, working together as a Steering Committee, addressed the needs of the local area, and there resulted a list of the potential purposes of the consortium (Konrad & Small, 1982b, p.7):

1. To make accessible in a geographically isolated region more opportunities for adult education;
2. To meet the growing desire for continuing education among adults in [the] region and throughout the province;
3. To facilitate more active involvement of all educational institutions which [had] a mandate for [the] region;
4. To provide credit and non-credit courses with local regional emphasis;
5. To provide inservice training to people in jobs in the community;
6. To provide courses for recent high school graduates in an attempt to keep them in their home community;

7. To coordinate the educational activities of Peace River through a working committee and a coordinator;

8. To make [the] town a more attractive educational-cultural centre; and

9. To reiterate the belief that all adults have a right to education.

Konrad and Small (1982b, p. 8-9) chronicle an active period between 1978 and 1980 in the development of the NPAEC, including the hiring of an adult education coordinator, the establishment of a board of directors made up of the chief executive officers of the participating institutions, the funding of modular facilities by Alberta Advanced Education, and the naming of Fairview College as member responsible for establishment and maintenance of facilities.

In the summer of 1979, a formal consortium agreement drafted by Dr. Anderson as chairman of the board was signed by the potential member institutions of the NPAEC. It identified the four participating institutions, recognised the board of directors and regional advisory committee, and made Fairview college agent for facilities. The effective period of this agreement was 1979 to June 1984. The goals for the consortium established under this agreement were:

- To provide for the joint planning and coordination of advanced education services in the area described as the North Peace Region;

- To serve as a facility for the coordination

> and delivery of the advanced education services required to meet the needs of citizens in the region;
>
> - [To operate for] a term of not less than five years in order to determine fully the value of a regional educational planning and coordinating mechanism. (Consortium agreement, NPAEC, 1979).

ACCESS joined the consortium in 1980 and the University of Alberta in 1981. In January 1980 the North Peace Adult Education Centre facility officially opened (Konrad & Small, 1982b, p.10).

An indication of the provincial government's support for the consortium concept came in July 1980 as

> ...a major policy decision was announced by the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower concerning the establishment of a provincial network of consortia supported by government funding. The model was to be that of the North Peace Consortium. Furthermore, Advanced Education and Manpower would provide capital and operating funds for the North Peace Adult Education Consortium until the end of 1984 (Konrad & Small, 1982b, p.10).

Thus the Alberta Advanced Education community consortia were established, with the North Peace Adult Education Consortium as a model.

Big Country Educational Consortium

As documented by Mitchell and Small (1983, p.17), a "Committee for Drumheller College" was formed

> ...[in] answer to a perceived need to provide greater postsecondary educational opportunity to the region's youth and general citizen body, who were otherwise forced to leave for distant centres when pursuing further education and specialized training.

Local initiatives were, for the most part, responsible for the development of consortia in Alberta. In most cases, including Drumheller, this local initiative took the form of proposing that Alberta Advanced Education and Manpower build and support a new institution in their region.

Mitchell and Small (1983) discuss a period of needs assessment and verification by the Committee during 1978, and the development of a proposal to Alberta Advanced Education and Manpower. This proposal, requesting that a postsecondary institution be located in the Drumheller region, was presented to Alberta Advanced Education and Manpower Minister A.E Hohol in January 1979. In response, the committee was commended for its efforts and for its view that the educational programs in Drumheller should be based on immediate local need. However, Dr. Hohol, on behalf of the provincial government, suggested

> ...that considering the nature of the programming needs which had been identified for the area and, in light of the limited population of the Big Country region, the Committee might find it best to direct attention first to bringing in services to meet those needs "without imposing the additional complexity of broad administrative structure" (Mitchell & Small, 1983, p. 26).

Subsequent meetings between the Drumheller committee and Advanced Education officials over the period of March 1979 to June 1980 pursued alternative solutions to the delivery of educational services.

Local committee members were introduced to and embraced the concept of a consortium as the most logical and efficient manner in which to proceed. Thus the Drumheller committee had already agreed to pursue cooperative arrangements with existing postsecondary institutions when in June 1980 the provincial government announced the extension of educational services on a province-wide basis through the consortium approach.

From June 1980 to January 1981, the Drumheller committee and Alberta Advanced Education officials met and developed plans to further the consortium establishment. On July 18, 1980 representatives from Mount Royal College, University of Calgary, Red Deer College, Southern Alberta Institute of Technology (SAIT), AVC - Calgary, Olds College and Athabasca University, as well as regional advisory committee members and members of Alberta Advanced Education and Manpower met to officially form the Drumheller Region Postsecondary Consortium.

A structure for governance evolved with representation from each institution, the community and the provincial government, facilities were leased and a coordinator was hired for the Big Country Educational Consortium, as it was now called. Olds College was named as the administrative agent for the consortium. On December 3rd, 1980, the Big Country Educational Consortium held an information night at a Drumheller

junior high school and prepared the way for January offerings. The Big Country Educational Consortium was now in place and operative.

The Big Country Educational Consortium operated until January 1982 without formalized goal statements. At that time staff and regional advisory committee members met and drafted a statement of purpose for the Big Country Educational Consortium. In further discussion with Big Country Educational Consortium board members a revised official statement of purpose of the consortium was developed and, in June 1982, agreed upon by both the board of directors and the regional advisory committee.

Purpose: The Big Country Educational Consortium is a collaborative organization of member educational institutions and area residents having as a primary purpose to provide educational opportunities for adults in the non-metropolitan areas of south-east central Alberta.

Program: The priority for programming shall be based on local need assessment, to provide credit programs from member institutions of the Big Country Educational Consortium that will enable the area residents to receive a diploma, degree, certificate or credit and/or gain a credential for employment.

Support: The organization of the consortium shall provide a public service by facilitating inter-community and inter-agency co-operation in the area so long as resources can be made available.

Courses: To compliment this programming priority, the consortium shall identify and facilitate the provision of courses through the member institutions which would lead to employment or community

development skills for residents residing in communities of the consortium (Mitchell & Small, 1983, p. 54).

Yellowhead Region Educational Consortium

The development of the Yellowhead Region Educational Consortium was initiated by a group of local business people in Hinton in the fall of 1978. As discussed by Small (1983), the Hinton and District Chamber of Commerce established contact with Dr. Brent Pickard of Alberta Advanced Education and Manpower, and coordinated a meeting of local industry, business, and organized labour to discuss petitioning the Government of Alberta to build a vocational college in west central Alberta.

On January 21, 1979, the Yellowhead Regional College Committee was formed. In the period that followed, the committee pursued it's goal of a regional college by undertaking an education needs survey, meeting with representatives of industry, business, labour, and public education officials. In addition, briefs, proposals, and letters of support and concern were gathered from all those who might be affected by or involved in such a venture (Small, 1983c, p.11). On February 22, 1980, the committee, through the Hinton and District Chamber of Commerce submitted a proposal and timeline for a college in the area to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower.

The submission and follow-up of this proposal coincided with Alberta Advanced Education's development of the consortium approach to extend education services. On June 23, 1980, officials from Alberta Advanced Education and Manpower met with representatives of the Yellowhead Region College Committee to discuss the policy and its implications for establishing a consortium in the Yellowhead region. Reaction to the suggestion that a consortium be established prompted concern at a meeting of the Yellowhead Region College Committee when it met as a whole three days later. Concerns were expressed over the potential makeup of the board of such an organization; the concept that the board members would be representatives of the member institutions rather than local representatives was felt to indicate a lack of input and control by local citizens.

The Yellowhead Region College Committee countered the AAECC suggestion with a proposal that, while they were willing to see such an organization serve the immediate needs of the region, the board should be made up of regional representation, while the representatives of member institutions should sit as an advisory committee. In response, Alberta Advanced Education and Manpower proposed that the local advisory group and the government be represented on the board of the consortium in an ex-officio capacity. John Haar, the president of

Grant MacEwan Community College, proposed that there should be four local voting representatives on the board. This suggestion met with approval of all concerned, and became the basis of the board structure.

At an organizational meeting of the consortium on September 26, 1980, Grande Prairie Regional College, Grant MacEwan Community College, Alberta Vocational Centre (AVC) - Edmonton, University of Alberta, NAIT, Athabasca University, and the Alberta Forest Technology School agreed to become actively involved in the consortium in the Yellowhead region; Grant MacEwan Community College accepted the role of administrative agent for the consortium. A board of directors including representation from each institution and community involved was established, a chairperson selected, and a job description for a coordinator for the consortium was developed. Suitable classroom space was secured, and in February 1981, a coordinator of the Yellowhead Region Educational Consortium was selected.

The goals of the Yellowhead Region Educational Consortium were summarized by Small (1983c, p. 27) from an Operational Guidelines working document of 1982/83:

1. To provide learning opportunities to residents of the Yellowhead Region;
2. To be responsive to community educational needs;
3. To be an integral part of the communities involved;

4. To increase the opportunities for educational and training through a diversity of programs;

5. To provide adequate student services in all communities;

6. To assess community needs;

7. To work closely with major industries in identifying areas of cooperative program delivery and development;

8. To explore effective methods of delivery, including length, modes and places of delivery;

9. To emphasize decentralization of programs and facilities; and

10. To consider all aspects of transferability of credit so that there is maximum opportunity to move between courses and programs.

Chinook Educational Consortium

As chronicled by Small(1983a), antecedents to the establishment of the Chinook Educational Consortium are similar to those in other areas of Alberta requiring postsecondary education services. In 1978, a group of citizens of the Crowsnest Pass area met and expressed concern with the difficulty of access to educational opportunities, and out of this concern requested that the provincial government locate an institution in their area. Alberta Advanced Education and Manpower replied that the population could not support an independent institution, but that perhaps SAIT or Lethbridge Community College could be approached to provide service

via a satellite campus in the Crowsnest Pass.

While these institutions expressed interest in extending some services to the area, citizens of the Pass continued to make their concerns known to Alberta Advanced Education and Manpower; most notably, Judi McQueen, Further Education director for the Pass. Her concern stemmed from frustrations encountered in getting funding from Alberta Further Education to coordinate credit programs for the area. The first mention of the consortium concept as an answer to these concerns was made as Ms. McQueen met with Advanced Education and Manpower officials.

During the period of November 1978 to October 1980 community citizens met together and with Dr. B.W. Pickard of Advanced Education to explore alternatives for program delivery in their area. On October 16, 1980, a Postsecondary Consortium Planning Committee meeting was held in Blairmore. Local community members, institutional representatives, and government officials attended the meeting. The consortium concept was discussed, and a decision was made to draft a proposal for consideration by Advanced Education and Manpower. An Interim Steering Committee was established, and the following institutions were asked to become members of the consortium: SAIT, University of Lethbridge, Lethbridge Community College, and Athabasca University. Lethbridge Community College took on the role of

administrative agent. The formal organizational meeting was held on January 29, 1981, where the board of directors became official.

In the spring of 1981, a consortium coordinator was appointed, and at the June 18, 1981 meeting of the board, the Chinook Educational Consortium was officially named. As outlined by Small (1983a, p. 26) the Chinook Educational consortium objectives identified in 1982/83 were:

1. To provide a multi-institutional structure for the offering of credit courses, programs, and services for adults in the Pass/Pincher Creek community;

2. To provide the administrative services to facilitate the offering of courses, programs, and services in the designated community;

3. To provide instructional and office space in which educational services may be provided;

4. To develop awareness that postsecondary services and advisement are available within the community; and

5. To implement courses, programs and services which are feasible within the limitation of personnel, facilities, and budget.

Pembina Educational Consortium

The Pembina Educational Consortium was the fifth consortium to be established through the work of local residents and officials of Alberta Advanced Education and Manpower.

> The first indication of community initiative towards the obtaining of postsecondary credit programs for the Drayton Valley area appears in the Town of Drayton Valley General Municipal Plan. This document, adopted through a by-law passed on March 30, 1978 was based on a town survey done during the summer of 1976 (Small, 1983b, p.8).

As noted by Small (1983b), one of the conclusions of this survey was that young people in the Drayton Valley area should have the opportunity to specialize and continue their education after high school without having to leave the community. This concept was reinforced in the Town Municipal plan of 1978.

The desire for a postsecondary institution in Drayton Valley was followed up by a group of interested citizens who petitioned the government to consider a community college in the area. The Honorable J. Horsman, Minister of Alberta Advanced Education and Manpower replied that the population base was not sufficient for a publicly funded institution, and that the area should consider joining a consortium like that being formed in the Yellowhead region. The local citizens group corresponded with the Yellowhead Region Educational Consortium, with the intention of seeking inclusion in that consortiums service area. When the Yellowhead board expressed the concern that this would make the area unmanageable, and subsequently turned down the request by Drayton Valley, Alberta Advanced Education and Manpower suggested that Drayton Valley seek to form its own consortium.

A period of organizational activity followed, culminating in a formal organizational meeting on March 24, 1981. At this meeting representatives from the community, Advanced Education, and six institutions (AVC - Edmonton, Athabasca University, NAIT, Alberta Petroleum Industry Training Centre, Grant MacEwan Community College, and the University of Alberta) met to confirm their participation in a consortium. Grant MacEwan Community College was named as the administrative agent. A coordinator was appointed in July 1981, and a list of program priorities identified.

At a meeting on September 21, 1981, the regional advisory committee recommended that the Drayton Valley Region Educational Consortium be renamed the Pembina Educational Consortium, a recommendation that was approved at the board of directors meeting of November 12, 1981. The official opening of the Pembina Educational Consortium took place June 18, 1982.

> The major purpose of the Pembina Educational Consortium is to provide a range of needed higher education credit programs in the region. This is achieved through the co-operative effort of the Department of Advanced Education, the member institutions, and the Regional Advisory Committee (Small, 1983b, p.17).

Small identifies the following goals stated by the Pembina Educational Consortium (PEC) board as part of the 1982/83 program proposal.

1. PEC will provide, in the region, access to the same quality of credit learning opportunity

afforded those who live within reach of the member institution's campuses.

2. Recognising factors inherent in a rural, decentralized community, PEC will plan and deliver programmes independent of conventional, urban, campus-based assumptions regarding class size, scheduling and the location and accessability of instructors and resource materials.

3. The programmes offered through PEC will reflect the needs and aspirations of the citizens of the region, as represented by the Regional Advisory Committee (RAC). The RAC will act as a broker when necessary to see that any relevant learning resources are made available in the region.

4. The Consortium will provide appropriate programmes from the full range of post-secondary credit learning opportunities, through such delivery modes and innovative arrangements as may be necessary, recognizing the decentralized nature of the operation and the lifestyles and constraints of the generally mobile population in a primary resource industry area.

5. Programmes will be initiated with support services such as learning resources, counselling, testing, upgrading and remedial courses and workshops to assist adults to meet entrance requirements and to generally facilitate achievement.

6. PEC will create liaison with local industry to establish a rational basis for the planning of employment-related programmes and to facilitate student access to the workplace when required as part of a curriculum or lab experience.

7. PEC will develop and otherwise provide necessary facilities and resources for the conduct of programmes, based on principles of least cost with maximum flexibility and active cooperation with other local agencies and organizations engaged in the delivery of related services to adults (Small, 1983b, p. 17).

Governance

As identified in Community Consortia in Alberta (Alberta Advanced Education, 1984), each AAECC is served by a board of directors, a regional advisory committee, an administrative agent, and a coordinator.

The board of directors is comprised of the representatives of the member institutions or their designees, and members of the regional advisory committee as representatives of the local community. An official from Advanced Education and the coordinator for the consortium serve on the board in an ex-officio capacity. The board is responsible for terms of reference for the overall operation of the consortium, and for decision making regarding funds allocated to the consortium from any source.

The regional advisory committee (sometimes known as the local advisory committee) is made up of volunteers from each community the consortium serves. Generally comprised of 10 to 20 people, the RAC's role is to provide local guidance on philosophical, programming, budgetary and manpower issues to the board of directors.

One of the member institutions of each consortium serves as the administrative agent, administering financial and legal affairs on behalf of the board. The administrative agent is the legal owner of all capital and property of the consortium, and is directly accountable to the board of directors.

Each consortium has a coordinator (in some cases titled the director or executive director) who, with the consortium staff, facilitates program delivery in the consortium area. The coordinator is accountable to the board of directors.

Program Planning

Each AAECC is responsible on an annual basis for developing a Community Consortium Program Plan. The RAC together with the coordinator develops a list of needed programs and services. The coordinator is responsible for working with a program committee comprised of representatives from member institutions. Together the coordinator and the program committee determine the institution best suited to meet the identified needs, and make recommendations as to timing, sequencing, and operation of program delivery. The plan is reviewed by the RAC and priorized according to community demand and need. This priorized list is reviewed by the board of directors and submitted as a Community Consortia Program Plan to Alberta Advanced Education.

Funding

On receiving the Community Consortia Program Plans each year, Alberta Advanced Education provides funds from the Community Consortia Program Grant under the terms and conditions of the Program Coordination Poli-

An administrative grant is also provided to fund daily operations of the consortia; provide for lease hold improvements, administrative salaries, furnishings and other administrative costs.

Additional funding may come to each consortium from a variety of sources: Alberta Vocational Training Grants, Canadian Job Strategy grants, fundraising proceeds and tuition fees.

GOAL RESEARCH

In the review of consortia history in North America, it was noted that there are a variety of purposes that consortia serve. This would seem to be a previously unresearched area, necessitating the identification of an appropriate instrument to analyze and discuss the goals of any institution.

Peterson and Uhl (1977) developed the Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI) as a tool that an institution may use in the process of determining its goals, establishing priorities amongst diverse goals, and the degree of consensus amongst people involved in the institution. Peterson and Uhl (1977, p. 8) credit Gross and Grambsch (1968) with the most significant early effort to examine the nature and structure of university goals. Gross and Grambsch made use of a goal inventory dealing with

important the goal "is" and "should be." Peterson and Uhl (1977, p.12) also note that Bushnell (1971) made use of a preliminary Institutional Goals Inventory in a study of community colleges in the United States. In 1977, Peterson and Uhl developed the current instrument used under the title of Institutional Goals Inventory.

A number of Canadian institutions have made use of the IGI in order to determine on-campus priorities among varied constituent groups. The resultant findings have been used in the development of long range planning in most instances. McNeal (1982) identified studies by the University of Prince Edward Island, the University of Manitoba, the University of Ottawa, and McMaster University based on the IGI. Konrad and McNeal (1984) studied the goal perceptions of presidents and board chairmen of all Canadian universities using the IGI.

There is no documentation of the IGI or similar instruments used to study the goals of consortia, in Alberta or elsewhere. An adaptation of the IGI for use in the study of consortia goals must be based upon the recognition that consortia are fundamentally different from institutions. They will not only have different priorities than previously studied institutions, but consortia may have some additional goal areas unique to the delivery of educational services by a collaborative arrangement of institutions and agencies of postsecondary education.

Summary

Literature pertaining to the purpose and structure of consortia, and to the history of consortia in the United States and Canada was reviewed. Studies of the development of Alberta Advanced Education community consortia were examined and discussed. As well, an overview of literature on the development and use of the IGI was included in this review.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Population

All five Alberta Advanced Education community consortia (AAECC) were included in the study. These consortia are coordinated and funded by Alberta Advanced Education. The five Alberta Advanced Education Community Consortia in Alberta are:

Big Country Educational Consortium
Chinook Educational Consortium
North Peace Adult Education Consortium
Pembina Educational Consortium, and
Yellowhead Region Educational Consortium.

The members of the boards of directors and regional advisory committees for each consortium were included in the study. Including those individuals serving in both capacities, there were 91 possible respondents.

Instrumentation

The measurement of goal perceptions of consortia required the development or adaptation of an instrument for data collection. Consortia are fundamentally different from independent institutions of postsecondary education, and no instrument available addressed the

unique aspects of the goals in cooperative arrangements of postsecondary institutions.

The instrument used to measure goal perceptions of consortia board members and regional advisory committee members was adapted from the Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI) developed by Peterson and Uhl (1977). The IGI assesses the importance of institutional goals in higher education, based on the perceptions of various constituent groups. The theoretical framework of the original IGI consisted of twenty "goal areas," thirteen of which were outcome goals -- the substantive objectives of institutions, or the desired end results; and seven as process goals -- the educational process, climate or learning atmosphere.

The IGI consisted of 90 goal statements, 80 of which fell under the 20 goal areas above, and 10 miscellaneous goal statements which did not fall into the goal areas, but still were worthy of consideration. The IGI was designed to allow for the creation of additional goal statements to address local priorities.

Panel of Experts

In the adaptation of the IGI for use in measuring perceptions of consortium goals, the five AAECC coordinators and Advanced Education officials were asked to serve as a panel of experts. Prior to a regularly scheduled AAECC coordinators meeting in February 1988,

the original IGI areas and items were circulated to all coordinators and officials, with the request that time at the February meeting be allotted to a) identify items needing modification for a consortium goals inventory, and b) generate miscellaneous goal items of particular interest to consortia. At the February meeting, the panel of experts suggested changes to some of the specific goal items that would more appropriately address the goal of a consortium without loosing the intent of the item, and items for the miscellaneous goals were also generated. Given the number of miscellaneous items related to legal status as well as innovation, the suggestion was made that these headings be used as goal areas (with four inventory items each) rather than singular miscellaneous goal items. Following the meeting, the revisions to the goal inventory and the newly generated miscellaneous items were compiled and mailed to the AAECC coordinators and officials as the first draft of the Consortium Goals Inventory. At this time, the AAECC coordinators were also asked to recommend individuals to take part in a pilot test of the instrument. Each coordinator was telephoned for individual input on the CGI, and for their recommendations for the CGI pilot test. In March, 1988 the pilot draft of the CGI was circulated to AAECC coordinators and officials.

Thus, the IGI goal areas were retained with some

adaptation of the definitions and questionnaire items for each area. Terminology in each questionnaire item referring to independent institutions was replaced with terms specific to consortia. Two goal areas (Legal Status and Innovation) and twelve miscellaneous goal items were added in adapting the IGI for consortium use.

For the purposes of this study, and for the resultant Consortium Goals Inventory (CGI) (see Appendix A) the goal areas were:

Outcome Goals

1. Academic development. This goal has to do with acquisition of general and specialized knowledge, preparation of students for advanced scholarly study, and maintenance of high intellectual standards on the campus.
2. Intellectual orientation. This goal area relates to an attitude about learning and intellectual work. It means familiarity with research and problem-solving methods, the ability to synthesize knowledge from many sources, the capacity for self-directed learning, and a committment to life-long learning.
3. Individual personal development. This goal area means identification by students of personal goals and development of means of achieving them, enhancement of sense of self-worth and self-

confidence.

4. Humanism/altruism. This goal area reflects a respect for diverse cultures, commitment to working for world peace, consciousness of the important moral issues of the time, and concern about the welfare of people generally.

5. Cultural/aesthetic awareness. This goal area entails a heightened appreciation of a variety of art forms, required study in the humanities or arts, exposure to forms of non-western art, and encouragement of active participation in artistic activities.

6. Traditional religiousness. This goal area is intended to mean a religiousness that is orthodox, doctrinal, usually sectarian, and often fundamental -- in short, traditional rather than "secular" or "modern."

7. Vocational preparation. This goal area means offering specific occupational curriculums (as in accounting or nursing), programs geared to emerging career fields, opportunities for retraining or upgrading skills, and assistance to students in career planning.

8. Advanced training. This goal area can be most readily understood as simply the availability of postgraduate education. It means developing and maintaining a strong and comprehensive graduate

school, proving programs in the professions, and conducting advanced study in specialized problem areas.

9. Research. This goal involves doing contract studies for external agencies, conducting basic research in the natural and social sciences, seeking generally to extend the frontiers of knowledge through scientific research.

10. Meeting local needs. This goal area is defined as providing for continuous education for adults, serving as a cultural centre for the community, providing trained people for local employers, and facilitating student involvement in community service activities.

11. Public service. This goal area means working with governmental agencies in social and environmental policy formation, committing organizational resources to the solution of major social and environmental problems, training people from disadvantaged communities, and generally being responsive to regional and national priorities in planning educational programs.

12. Social egalitarianism. This goal has to do with open admissions and meaningful education for all admitted, providing educational experiences relevant to the evolving interests of minority groups and women, and offering remedial work in

basic skills.

13. Social criticism/activism. This goal area means providing criticisms of prevailing Canadian values, offering ideas for changing social institutions judged to be defective, helping students learn how to bring about change in Canadian society and being engaged, as an organization, in working for basic changes in Canadian society.

Process Goals

14. Freedom. This goal area is defined as protecting the rights of faculty to present controversial ideas in the classroom, not preventing students from hearing controversial points of view, placing no restrictions on off-campus political activities, by faculty or students, and ensuring faculty and students the freedom to choose their own lifestyles.

15. Democratic governance. This goal means decentralized decision making arrangements by which students, faculty, administrators, and governing board members can all be significantly involved in campus governance that is genuinely responsive to the concerns of everyone at the consortium.

16. Community/climate. This goal area is defined as maintaining a climate in which there is faculty commitment to the general welfare of the consortium, open and candid communication, open and amicable airing of differences, and mutual trust and respect among students, faculty and administrators.

17. Intellectual/aesthetic environment. This goal area means a rich program of cultural events, a campus climate that facilitates student free-time involvement in intellectual and cultural activities, an environment in which students and faculty can easily interact informally, and a reputation as an intellectually exciting campus.

18. Innovation. This goal area is defined as a climate in which a continuous innovation is a readily accepted way of life; it means establishing procedures for readily initiating curricular or instructional innovations; and more specifically, it means experimentation with new approaches to individualized instruction and to evaluating and grading student performance.

19. Off-campus learning. This goal area includes time away from campus in travel work-study, CUSO work, etc., study on several campuses during undergraduate programs, awarding of degrees for supervised study off campus, awarding degrees

entirely on the basis of performance on an examination.

20. Accountability/efficiency. This goal area is defined to use cost criteria in deciding among program alternatives, concern for program efficiency, accountability to funding sources for program effectiveness, and regular submission of evidence that the consortium is achieving stated goals.

21. Institutional cooperation. This goal refers to the need for institutions to work collaboratively to deliver the services and programs to the local communities.

22. Legal status. This goal area is defined as the work towards establishing consortia as separate legal entities, apart from the institutions of which they are comprised.

The CGI consists of 100 goal statements, 88 of which directly relate to the 22 goal areas listed above. The remaining 12 goal statements are miscellaneous goal statements, relating to areas of local importance with common interest to all consortia in Alberta. The goal statements were generated by the panel of experts include such topics as:

- basic literacy
- private funding
- academic reputation
- permanent campus
- planning
- government funding

- flexibility
- citizen planning
- delivery alternatives
- evaluation
- interpreting consortium to the community
- geographically removed students

Pilot Study

Based on the recommendations of the panel of experts, a CGI pilot test group was selected. Ten of the twelve individuals in the test group had previously served as a regional advisory committee or board member with an Alberta Advanced Education community consortium. The remaining two individuals served in administrative capacities with member institutions actively involved with consortia.

In March, 1988, the CGI was sent to the pilot test group, with the request that they complete the inventory, and comment on any areas where the CGI was unclear or deemed inappropriate. Nine of twelve pilot test CGIs were completed and returned. Respondents commented on spelling and punctuation, and one respondent commented that the CGI had taken a long time to complete. No substantive changes were suggested. Typographical errors were corrected and the CGI was printed for the total population of AAECC regional advisory committee and board members.

Rating Scale

Respondents were asked to address each goal statement in two ways: firstly, to rank the goal based on their perception of its current importance ("How important is the goal at the present time?") and secondly, to rank the goal based on their perception of how important the goal should be ("How important should the goal be?").

Respondents were asked to rank the goal statements using a five-point, Likert scale with the following guidelines:

1 - of no importance, or not applicable
2 - of low importance
3 - of medium importance
4 - of high importance
5 - of extremely high importance

Respondent Profile Questions

On the final page of the CGI respondents were asked to provide information regarding their involvement with consortia, including which consortium, position with consortium, length of time in that position, and length of time served in a previous position, if applicable.

Data Collection

On April 29, 1988, a total of 91 questionnaires were mailed to members of the boards of directors and regional advisory committees of all AAECC with a covering letter (see Appendix B). On May 16, a follow-up letter was sent to all potential respondents urging their participation through responding to the CGI. During the week of June 6 - 10, 1988, telephone calls were made to a number of the potential respondents. As of July 15, 1988, 69 of the questionnaires had been returned, representing a response of 75.8 percent.

Data Analysis

The CGI data were analyzed in the following ways:

- The respondent profile was examined;
- The scores and rank of the "is" and "should be" goals were identified; and
- The mean, standard deviation and rank were compared by region, position, and length of involvement.

The t-test was used to establish statistical significance between Is and Should Be goal perceptions at the .05 level, and the F-test was used to examine

differences among respondent groups at the .10 level. In analyzing the data, the mean was identified as the average score of perceived importance of the goal area, with a higher mean reflecting a higher perceived importance. The rank was established by ordering the means from highest to lowest. The standard deviation identifies the amount of variance of scores among respondents on a given goal. When analyzing the goal perceptions, tables were generally separated into groups: outcome goals, process goals, and miscellaneous goals.

Summary

The population studied included members of the boards of directors and regional advisory committees of Alberta Advanced Education community consortia. The data were collected by questionnaire over a three-month period (April to July 1988). A return rate of 75.8 percent was achieved, with good representation from each consortium and position. The findings of the study are summarized in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

Chapter 4 contains the findings of this study. The data are presented in five sections: the respondent profile, and the Is and Should Be scores and rankings by total population, by consortium, by position, and by years served in current capacity.

Respondent Profile

Table 1 shows the total population, number of respondents from each consortium and the rate of response. The return of 69 out of 91 possible Consortium Goal Inventories (CGI) represents a response rate of 75.8 percent. Each of the three positions in the five consortia had a minimum response rate of 50 percent or higher, reflecting a representative sample of the total population. It should be noted that ten board members from institutions represent their institution on more than one consortium board. The respondents serving more than one consortium board are identified separately from the institutional board members that serve on only one

Table 1

Frequency and Rate of Response
by Consortium

Consortium	Total Population	Number of Respondents	Rate of Response
BCEC	17	12	70.6
CEC	24	19	79.1
NPAEC	14	18	77.7
PEC	10	7	70.0
YREC	12	9	75.0
PEC and YREC	5	4	80.0
NPAEC, PEC and YREC	2	2	100.0
NPAEC and YREC	1	1	100.0
BCEC and CEC	2	1	50.0
Total	91	69	75.8

Table 2

Frequency of Response -
Total Sample by Consortium and Position

	Institutional Board Members		Community Board Members		Regional Advisory Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
BCEC	5	62.5	4	80.0	3	75.0
CEC	2	66.6	2	100.0	15	78.9
NPAEC	4	80.0	7	100.0	3	50.0
PEC	0	00.0	2	66.6	5	83.3
YREC	2	100.0	3	75.0	4	66.6
PEC and YREC	4	80.0				
PEC, YREC, and NPAEC	2	100.0				
NPAEC and YREC	1	100.0				
BCEC and CEC	1	50.0				
Total	21	71.0	18	84.3	30	70.1

Table 3

Frequency of Response
by Years in Current Capacity

Number of Years in Current Capacity	Number of Respondents
Less than 1 year	8
1 year	10
2 years	22
3 years	6
4 years	8
5 years	4
6 years	6
7 years	5
Total	69

Table 4

Frequency of Response
by Years in Previous Capacity

Number of Years in Previous Capacity	Number of Respondents
Less than 1 year	3
1 year	2
2 years	4
3 years	2
4 years	2
5 years	1
6 years	0
7 years	0
8 years	1
No previous experience	54
Total	69

consortium board. Institutional board members serving NPAEC, PEC and YREC had the highest rate of response, while CEC had the highest actual number of respondents.

Table 2 shows the response by consortium and position. The highest rate of response came from the CEC Regional Advisory Committee. The highest rate of response by position came from the community board members, and the lowest from the institutional board members.

Table 3 identifies the frequency of response by years served in current capacity. The largest response group had served in their current capacity for two years, while the next largest response group had served one year. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents had served two years or less in their current capacity.

Table 4 identifies the number of years served in previous capacity, if applicable. Only 15 of 69 respondents (or 22%) had served in another capacity with a consortium. Due to this low number of people with previous experience, no further analyses were done using this variable.

In summary, Tables 1 to 4 identify how the 69 respondents were distributed by consortium, position, years in current capacity, and years in previous capacity.

Goal Perceptions:
Is and Should Be Ratings and Rankings

Tables 5 to 9 portray the perceptions of goals by Is and Should Be ratings for the total sample. The outcome, process, and miscellaneous goals are shown by rank, mean, and standard deviation first; then the outcome and process goals are combined and shown by rank, mean and standard deviation. Finally, all goal areas are combined, and the twenty highest ranking goals are shown by rank and mean.

Table 5 compares the rank, mean, and standard deviation of Is and Should Be scores on outcome goals. Vocational Preparation ranked as the top goal on both Is and Should Be scores. Goals 7 through 13 were also ranked the same for both Is and Should Be: Public Service (7), Humanism/Altuism (8), Advanced Training (9), Cultural/ Aesthetic Awareness (10), Social Criticism/Activism (11) (tied with Cultural/ Aesthetic Awareness on Is ratings), Research (12), and Traditional Religiousness (13). Within the rankings of two through six, one goal area (Social Egalitarianism [5]) stayed the same (although it was tied on the Is rankings). Individual Personal Development moved two ranks higher on the Should Be rankings, while Academic Development moved more than two ranks down on the Should Be rankings. The Is goal with the greatest standard deviation was Social Egalitarianism (.69), and the least was Traditional Religiousness (.32). The Should

Table 5

Respondents' Perceptions of Outcome Goals
Ranked by "Is" and "Should Be" Means

Is				Should Be			
Rank	Goal	Mean	SD	Rank	Goal	Mean	SD
1	Vocation Prep*	3.4	.66	1	Vocation Prep	4.2	.54
2	Local Needs	3.2	.53	2	Intellect Orient	3.8	.67
3.5	Intellect Orient	2.9	.64	3.5	Local Needs	3.7	.58
3.5	Academic Development	2.9	.65	3.5	Individual Development	3.7	.69
5.5	Social Egalitarian	2.8	.69	5	Social Egalitarian	3.5	.79
5.5	Individual Development	2.8	.66	6	Academic Development	3.4	.60
7	Public Service	2.5	.63	7	Public Service	3.1	.65
8.5	Humanism	1.9	.68	8	Humanism	2.7	.91
8.5	Advanced Training	1.9	.65	9	Advanced Training	2.3	.88
10.5	Cultural Awareness	1.7	.55	10	Cultural Awareness	2.2	.85
10.5	Social Activism	1.7	.57	11	Social Activism	2.1	.85
12	Research	1.5	.60	12	Research	1.7	.83
13	Traditional Religious	1.1	.32	13	Traditional Religious	1.2	.45

* See Appendix A for explanation of goal abbreviations

Be goal scores indicated the greatest standard deviation in the area of Humanistic/Altrusim (.91), and the least, again, in Traditional Religiousness (.45). Only the top two goals --Vocational Preparation and Meeting Local Needs -- were rated as being currently of medium (3.0) or higher importance, while seven goals appeared on the Should Be list rated at 3.0 or higher.

Table 6 shows the Is and Should Be ranking, mean, and standard deviation of process goals. The top and bottom ranked goal were the same for Is and Should Be; Community/ Climate (1) ranked the highest (although it was tied for the highest rank on the Should Be list with Institutional Cooperation), while Off-campus Learning (9) ranked the lowest (although it was tied on the Should Be list with Freedom). Legal Status (5) remained the same on both rankings. While no other goals maintained the same rank, none moved up or down by as much as two positions. On the Is list, the highest standard deviation was on the Legal Status goal (.91) and the lowest was on Intellectual/ Aesthetic Environment (.53). In the Should Be rankings, Legal Status (1.03) again had the highest standard deviation, while Accountability/Efficiency (.51) had the lowest. Four goals on the Is list rated as being of medium or higher importance, while all goals were rated 3.0 or higher on the Should Be list.

Table 7 shows the rank mean, and standard deviation of miscellaneous goals for both Is and Should Be

Table 6

Respondents' Perceptions of Process Goals
Ranked by "Is" and "Should Be" Means

Is				Should be			
Rank	Goal	Mean	SD	Rank	Goal	Mean	SD
1	Community/ Climate	3.5	.58	1.5	Community/ Climate	4.1	.59
2.5	Account/ Efficiency	3.4	.61	1.5	Institution Coop	4.1	.60
2.5	Institution Coop	3.4	.67	3	Democratic Governance	4.0	.68
4	Democratic Governance	3.2	.61	4	Account/ Efficiency	3.9	.51
5.5	Innovation	2.9	.62	5	Legal Status	3.6	1.03
5.5	Legal Status	2.9	.91	6	Innovation	3.5	.72
7	Freedom	2.7	.87	7	Intellect Environ	3.2	.69
8	Intellect Environ	2.4	.53	8.5	Freedom	3.0	.98
9	Off-campus Learning	2.4	.71	8.5	Off-campus Learning	3.0	.72

Table 7

Respondents' Perceptions of Miscellaneous Goals
Ranked by "Is" and "Should Be" Means

Is				Should be			
Rank	Goal	Mean	SD	Rank	Goal	Mean	SD
1	Geo Removed Students	3.9	.91	1	Geo Removed Students	4.7	.53
2	Flexibility	3.7	.88	2.5	Citizen Planning	4.4	.65
3	Citizen Planning	3.6	.84	2.5	Government Funding	4.4	.71
4.5	Academic Reputation	3.5	.92	4.5	Interpret Consortium	4.3	.66
4.5	Planning	3.5	.99	4.5	Flexibility	4.3	.71
6	Government Funding	3.4	.96	6	Academic Reputation	4.2	.85
7	Basic Literacy	3.4	1.06	7	Planning	4.1	.88
8.5	Delivery Altern	3.2	.88	8	Basic Literacy	4.0	.92
8.5	Interpret Consortium	3.2	.81	9.5	Delivery Altern	3.8	.87
10	Evaluation	3.0	.92	9.5	Evaluation	3.8	.94
11	Permanent Campus	2.7	1.21	11	Private Funding	3.4	1.42
12	Private Funding	2.6	1.26	12	Permanent Campus	3.0	1.50

perceptions. It should be noted that the means of the miscellaneous goals will, in part, be higher because the means reflect ratings of individual goal statements, rather than four statements collapsed into a goal area, as is the case with outcome and process goals. This will also account to some degree for the higher standard deviations. Only the top ranked goal (Geographically Removed Students) maintained the same position. Goals that moved two or more ranks higher on the Should Be list were Government Funding Alternatives and Interpreting the Consortium to Local Citizens. Goals that ranked two or more positions lower on the Should Be scale were Flexibility in Program Offerings and Short/Medium/Long Range Planning.

On the Is list, Private Funding Alternatives (1.26), Permanent Campus (1.21), and Basic Literacy (1.06) all had standard deviations above the 1.00 level, while Interpreting the Consortium to Local Citizens (.81) had the lowest standard deviation. On the Should be rankings, Permanent Campus (1.50) had the highest standard deviation (closely followed by Private Funding Alternatives with 1.42) and was the lowest goal, while Geographically Removed Students (.53) had the lowest standard deviation and ranked as the highest goal. Of the miscellaneous goals, only Permanent Campus and Private Funding Alternatives were rated as being of currently below medium importance, while all goals were of medium or higher

importance on the Should Be list. It should be noted that the standard deviation of miscellaneous goals was consistantly higher than the standard deviation of outcome or process goals.

Table 8 shows the ranking of Is and Should Be goals when outcome and process goals are combined. Goals ranked 14 (Public Service), and [redacted] 22 (Humanism/Altruism, Advanced Training, Cultural [redacted]ic Awareness, Social Criticism/Activism, Resea[redacted] Traditional Religiousness respectively) maintained the same position on both Is and Should Be rankings, although Humanism/Altruism and Advanced Training were ranked the same (17.5) on the Is rankings. There was considerable reordering among the top ten rankings from one list to the other.

It is interesting to note that the top ranked goal on the Is scale (Community/Climate) was a process goal, while on the Should Be rankings the top goal was an outcome goal (Vocational Preparation). On both the Is and Should Be rankings, Legal Status had the highest standard deviation, and Traditional Religiousness had the lowest.

Table 9 shows the twenty highest ranked goals when outcome, process, and miscellaneous goals are combined. On both the Is and Should Be rankings, ten of the twelve miscellaneous goals were included within the twenty highest ranked goals (Permanent Campus and Private Funding Alternatives being the only miscellaneous goals not

Table 8

Respondents' Perceptions of Outcome Goals and Process Goals Combined, Ranked by "Is" and "Should Be" Means

Is				Should be			
Rank	Goal	Mean	SD	Rank	Goal	Mean	SD
1	Community/ Climate (p)*	3.5	.58	1	Vocation Prep (o)*	4.2	.54
3	Account/ Efficiency (p)	3.4	.61	2.5	Community/ Climate (o)	4.1	.59
3	Institution Coop (p)	3.4	.67	2.5	Institution Coop (p)	4.1	.60
3	Vocation Prep (o)	3.4	.66	4	Democratic Governance (p)	4.0	.68
5.5	Democratic Governance (p)	3.2	.61	5	Account/ Efficiency (p)	3.9	.51
5.5	Local Needs (o)	3.2	.53	6	Intellect Orient (o)	3.8	.67
8.5	Innovation (p)	2.9	.62	7.5	Local Needs (o)	3.7	.58
8.5	Intellect Orient (o)	2.9	.64	7.5	Individual Development (o)	3.7	.69
8.5	Academic Development (o)	2.9	.65	9	Legal Status (p)	3.6	1.03
8.5	Legal Status (p)	2.9	.91	10.5	Innovation (p)	3.5	.72
11.5	Social Egalitarian (o)	2.8	.69	10.5	Social Egalitarian (o)	3.5	.79
11.5	Individual Development (o)	2.8	.66	12	Academic Development (o)	3.4	.60
13	Freedom (p)	2.7	.87	13	Intellect Environ (p)	3.2	.69

Table 8 - (continued)

Rank	Goal	Mean	SD	Rank	Goal	Mean	SD
14	Public Service (o)	2.5	.63	14	Public Service (o)	3.1	.65
15.5	Intellect Environ (p)	2.4	.53	15.5	Freedom (p)	3.0	.98
15.5	Off-campus Learning (p)	2.4	.71	15.5	Off-campus Learning (p)	3.0	.72
17.5	Humanism (o)	1.9	.68	17	Humanism (o)	2.7	.91
17.5	Advanced Training (o)	1.9	.65	18	Advanced Training (o)	2.3	.88
19.5	Cultural Awareness (o)	1.7	.55	19.5	Cultural Awareness (o)	2.2	.74
19.5	Social Activism (o)	1.70	.57	20	Social Activism (o)	2.1	.85
21	Research (o)	1.5	.60	21	Research (o)	1.7	.83
22	Traditional Religious (o)	1.1	.32	22	Traditional Religious (o)	1.2	.45

*(o) indicates and Outcome goal, and (p) indicates a Process goal.

Table 9

The Twenty Highest Goal Areas by all Respondents' with all Goal Areas Combined, Ranked by Mean

Is			Should be		
Rank	Goal	Mean	Rank	Goal	Mean
1	Geo Removed Students (m)*	3.9	1	Geo Removed Students (m)	4.7
2	Flexibility (m)	3.7	2.5	Citizen Planning (m)	4.4
3	Citizen Planning (m)	3.6	2.5	Government Funding (m)	4.4
4.5	Academic Reputation (m)	3.5	4.5	Interpret Consortium (m)	4.3
4.5	Community/ Climate (p)*	3.5	4.5	Flexibility (m)	4.3
7.5	Planning (m)	3.4	6.5	Vocation Prep (o)*	4.2
7.5	Government Funding (m)	3.4	6.5	Academic Reputation (m)	4.2
7.5	Account/ Efficiency (p)	3.4	9	Community/ Climate (p)	4.1
7.5	Basic Literacy (m)	3.4	9	Institution Coop (p)	4.1
10.5	Institution Coop (p)	3.3	9	Planning (m)	4.1
10.5	Vocation Prep (o)	3.3	11	Basic Literacy (m)	4.0
13.5	Delivery Altern (m)	3.2	12.5	Democratic Governance (p)	3.9
13.5	Interpret Consortium (m)	3.2	12.5	Account/ Efficiency (p)	3.9

Table 9 - (continued)

Rank	Goal	Mean	Rank	Goal	Mean
13.5	Democratic Governance (p)	3.2	15	Delivery Altern (m)	3.8
13.5	Local Needs (o)	3.2	15	Evaluation (m)	3.8
16	Evaluation (m)	3.0	15	Intellect Orient (o)	3.8
18.5	Innovation (p)	2.9	17.5	Local Needs (o)	3.7
18.5	Intellect Orient (b)	2.9	17.5	Individual Development (o)	3.7
18.5	Academic Development (o)	2.9	19	Legal Status (p)	3.6
18.5	Legal Statu	2.9	20	Social Egalitarianism (o)	3.5

* (m) indicates a Miscellaneous goal, (p) indicates a Process goal, and (o) indicates an Outcome goal.

included). The highest ranked Is goal was Geograhically Removed Students. Community/Climate -- tied for fourth rank -- was the highest ranked non-miscellaneous goal, and was one of six process goals within the top twenty ranked Is goals. Only four outcome goals were ranked within the top twenty Is goals when all goals were combined; Vocational Preparation was the highest ranked outcome goal and was tied for tenth rank.

Geographically Removed Students was the highest ranked Should Be goal when all goals were combined. Vocational Preparation (tied for sixth rank) was the highest ranked non-miscellaneous goal. Of the other four outcome goals included in the twenty highest ranked Should Be goals, none ranked higher than fifteenth. Community/Climate and Institutional Cooperation (tied with Planning for ninth rank) were the highest ranked of the five process goals among the top twenty ranked Should Be goals.

Goal Perceptions by Consortium: BCEC, CEC, NPAEC, PEC, and YREC

This section includes the data analysis grouped into five sub-groups, each representing the perceptions of respondents from one of the Alberta Advanced Education community consortia. Tables 10 to 12 show Is and Should Be means, unranked, for outcome, process and miscellaneous

goals by consortium. Table 13 shows the ranking of Is perceptions of all goals combined, and Table 14 shows the ranking of Should Be perceptions of all goals combined.

Table 10 shows unranked means for the Is and Should Be ratings of outcome goals. Comparison of mean scores reached statistical significance on only three outcome goals. Following letters identify groups significantly different at the 0.10 level. BCEC (a,b,c) rated Vocational Preparation Is significantly lower than NPAEC(a), PEC(b), and YREC(c). BCEC rated Social Egalitarianism significantly lower than PEC and YREC, and Social Criticism/Activism significantly higher than CEC scored it. There were no statistically significant differences among groups on the Should Be scores. Ten of thirteen goals showed no significant differences on either Is or Should Be ratings.

Table 11 shows perceptions of process goals by consortium with means unranked. NPAEC rated the Community/Climate Should Be goal higher than did three of the other consortia, and rated Innovation Should Be higher than did BCEC. CEC rated Accountability/Efficiency significantly lower than did NPAEC and YREC on the Should Be ratings. The only process goal that indicated a significant difference on the Is rating was Freedom; NPAEC rated this goal significantly higher than did CEC. No goal showed groups significantly different on both Is and Should Be ratings for the same goal. Five of nine goals

Table 10

Perceptions of Outcome Goals by Consortium with Means Unranked

Goal		BCEC	CEC	NPAEC	PEC	YREC
Academic Development	IS	2.7	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.9
	SB	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.2	3.5
Intellect Orient	IS	2.9	2.7	3.0	3.1	2.8
	SB	3.8	3.4	4.0	3.8	3.8
Individual Development	IS	2.7	2.4	2.8	3.0	2.9
	SB	3.8	3.3	3.8	3.5	3.7
Humanism	IS	1.8	1.7	1.9	1.7	2.1
	SB	3.0	2.4	2.6	2.3	2.9
Cultural Awareness	IS	1.7	1.6	1.8	1.6	1.8
	SB	2.3	2.1	2.3	2.0	2.6
Traditional Religious	IS	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.0	1.2
	SB	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.3
Vocation Prep	IS	2.8a,b,c*	3.2	3.5a	3.7b	3.7c
	SB	3.9	4.0	4.4	4.4	4.4
Advanced Training	IS	1.5	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.9
	SB	1.8	2.2	2.4	2.3	2.3
Research	IS	1.2	1.6	1.5	1.3	1.4
	SB	1.4	1.7	1.9	1.7	1.8
Local Needs	IS	3.0	3.0	3.3	3.1	3.2
	SB	3.7	3.5	3.9	3.7	3.8
Public Service	IS	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.3	2.6
	SB	3.1	2.9	3.2	2.9	3.1
Social Egalitarianism	IS	2.4a	2.6	3.1	2.9	3.2a
	SB	3.2	3.1	3.8	3.4	3.7
Social Activism	IS	2.0a	1.4a	1.8	1.6	1.7
	SB	2.3	1.9	2.2	1.9	2.2

* Matching letters represent statistical significance at the 0.10 level

Table 11

Perceptions of Process Goals by Consortium
with Means Unranked

Goal		BCEC	CEC	NPAEC	PEC	YREC
Freedom	IS	2.5	2.3a*	3.2a	2.5	3.0
	SB	2.7	2.7	3.5	2.9	3.4
Democratic Governance	IS	3.0	3.1	3.3	3.0	3.3
	SB	3.8	3.9	4.1	3.8	4.1
Community/ Climate	IS	3.4	3.3	3.7	3.3	3.6
	SB	3.9a	3.9b	4.5a,b,c	3.9c	4.3
Intellect Environ	IS	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.3	2.5
	SB	3.2	3.2	3.5	2.9	3.4
Innovation	IS	2.7	2.7	3.1	3.0	3.1
	SB	3.1a	3.3	3.8	3.8	3.7
Off-campus Learning	IS	2.1	2.6	2.3	2.4	2.3
	SB	2.6	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.9
Account/ Efficiency	IS	3.2	3.2	3.5	3.7	3.6
	SB	4.0	3.6a,b	4.2a	4.0	4.1b
Institution Coop	IS	3.0	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5
	SB	3.7	4.0	4.3	4.2	4.2
Legal Status	IS	2.3	2.8	3.1	2.9	3.1
	SB	3.1	3.5	4.1	3.4	3.7

* Matching letters represent statistical significance at the 0.10 level

showed no significant difference on either Is or Should Be ratings.

Table 12 shows perceptions of miscellaneous goals by consortium with means unranked. Private Funding Alternatives showed statistically different groups on both the Is and Should Be ratings; CEC scored it significantly lower than both PEC and YREC on the Is rating, and lower than YREC on the Should Be rating. Reputation in Academic Community was scored significantly lower by BCEC than by NPAEC and YREC on the Should Be rating, and Short Term/ Long Term Planning was scored significantly lower by CEC than by NPAEC on the Should Be rating. NPAEC scored Flexibility significantly higher than did CEC on the Should Be rating. Including Citizens in Planning was scored on the Is rating as significantly more important by YREC than by BCEC. Six of the twelve goals were not scored significantly different by two or more groups.

Table 13 shows the ranking of Is goal perceptions when all goal areas are combined. Goals rating equally important (tied in rank) are identified by vertical brackets. Geographically Removed Students ranked highest for three of five consortia. NPAEC rated Reputation in Academic Community and Including Citizens in Planning (tied) as the most important with Geographically Removed Students tied for sixth. PEC Rated Flexibility in Program Offerings and Including Citizens in Planning as the highest Is goals (tied) with Geographically Removed

Table 12

Perceptions of Miscellaneous Goals by Consortium, with Means Unranked

Goal		BCEC	CEC	NPAEC	PEC	YREC
Basic Literacy	IS	3.5	3.1	3.6	3.6	3.3
	SB	4.3	3.5	4.1	4.0	4.0
Private Funding	IS	2.5	2.0a,b*	2.8	3.2a	3.1b
	SB	3.2	2.7a	3.8	3.8	4.2a
Academic Reputation	IS	3.2	3.4	3.8	3.6	3.8
	SB	3.5a,b	4.2	4.5a	4.2	4.5b
Permanent Campus	IS	1.8a,b	3.1a	2.7	2.8	3.1b
	SB	2.2	3.4	3.2	2.5	2.6
Planning	IS	2.9	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.6
	SB	3.4a	4.2	4.5a	4.2	4.2
Government Funding	IS	3.0	3.7	3.1	3.4	3.6
	SB	3.9	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.5
Flexibility	IS	3.5	3.5	3.6	4.0	3.7
	SB	4.2	4.0a	4.6a	4.4	4.3
Citizen Planning	IS	3.1a	3.6	3.8	4.0	3.8a
	SB	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.4
Delivery Alternatives	IS	2.8	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.3
	SB	3.5	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.9
Evaluation	IS	3.1	2.8	2.7	3.0	3.2
	SB	3.5	3.5	4.2	3.7	4.1
Interpret Consortium	IS	3.0	2.8	2.7	3.0	3.2
	SB	4.1	4.3	4.6	4.3	4.3
Geo Removed Students	IS	3.7	4.1	3.5	3.8	4.1
	SB	4.5	4.5	4.8	4.7	4.8

* Matching letters represent statistical significance at th 0.10 level

Table 13

Ranking of all "Is" Goals
by Consortium

Rank	BCEC	CEC	NPAEC	PEC	YREC
1	Geo Removed Students(m)	Geo Removed Students(m)	Academic Reputation(m)	Flexibility (m)	Geo Removed Students(m)
2	Flexibility (m)	Government Funding (m)	Citizen Planning(m)	Citizen Planning(m)	Academic Reputation (m)
3	Basic Literacy(m)	Flexibility (m)	Community/ Climate(p)	Geo Removed Students(m)	Citizen Planning(m)
4	Community/ Climate(p)	Citizen Planning(m)	Basic Literacy (m)	Account/ Efficiency(p)	Flexibility (m)
5	Account/ Efficiency(p)	Planning(m)	Flexibility (m)	Vocation Prep(o)	Vocation Prep(o)
6	Academic Reputation(m)	Institution Coop(p)	Account/ Efficiency(p)	Basic Literacy(m)	Account/ Efficiency(p)
7	Citizen Planning(m)	Academic Reputation(m)	Planning(m)	Academic Reputation(m)	Planning(m)
8	Evaluation(m)	Interpret Consortium(m)	Geo Removed Students(m)	Planning(m)	Government Funding(m)
9	Institution Coop(p)	Community/ Climate(p)	Vocation Prep(o)	Institution Coop(p)	Community/ Climate(p)
10	Goverment Funding(m)	Delivery Altern(m)	Institution Coop(p)	Goverment Funding(m)	Institution Coop(p)
11	Interpret Consortium(m)	Account/ Efficiency(p)	Delivery Altern(m)	Interpret Consortium(m)	Interpret Consortium(m)
12	Local Needs(o)	Vocation Prep(o)	Local Needs(o)	Community/ Climate(p)	Basic Literacy(m)
13	Democratic Governance(p)	Basic Literacy(m)	Democratic Governance(p)	Private Funding(m)	Delivery Altern(m)
14	Planning(m)	Permanent Campus(m)	Freedom(p)	Delivery Altern(m)	Democratic Governance(p)

Table 13 - (continued)

Rank	BCEC	CEC	NPAEC	PEC	YREC
15	Intellect Orient(o)	Democratic Governance(p)	Legal Status(p)	Intellect Orient(o)	Evaluation(m)
16	Delivery Altern(m)	Local Needs(o)	Goverment Funding(m)	Local Needs(o)	Local Needs(o)
17	Vocation Prep(o)	Academic Development(o)	Social Egalitarian(o)	Evaluation(m)	Social Egalitarian(o)
18	Academic Development(o)	Legal Status(p)	Innovation(p)	Individual Development(o)	Legal Status(o)
19	Individual Development(o)	Evaluation(m)	Interpret Consortium(m)	Democratic Governance(p)	Private Funding(m)
20	Innovation(p)	Intellect Orient(o)	Intellect Orient(o)	Innovation(p)	Permanent Campus(m)
21	Private Funding(m)	Innovation(p)	Private Funding(m)	Legal Status(p)	Innovation(p)
22	Freedom(p)	Off-campus Learning(p)	Academic Development(o)	Social Egalitarian(o)	Freedom(p)
23	Public Service(o)	Social Egalitarian(o)	Individual Development(o)	Permanent Campus(m)	Academic Development(o)
24	Social Egalitarian(o)	Individual Development(o)	Permanent Campus(m)	Academic Development(o)	Individual Development(o)
25	Intellect Environ(p)	Public Service(o)	Evaluation(m)	Freedom(p)	Intellect Orient(o)
26	Legal Status(p)	Intellect Environ(p)	Intellect Environ(p)	Off-campus Learning(p)	Public Service(o)
27	Off-campus Learning(p)	Freedom(p)	Off-campus Learning(p)	Public Service(o)	Intellect Environ(p)
28	Social Activism(o)	Private Funding(m)	Humanism (o)	Intellect Environ(p)	Off-campus Learning(p)
29	Permanent Campus(m)	Advanced Training(o)	Cultural Awareness(o)	Advanced Training(o)	Humanism(o)

Table 13 - (continued)

Rank	BCEC	CEC	NPAEC	PEC	YREC
30	Humanism(o)	Humanism(o)	Advanced Training(o)	Humanism(o)	Advanced Training(o)
31	Cultural Awareness(o)	Cultural Awareness(o)	Advanced Training(o)	Cultural Awareness(o)	Cultural Awareness(o)
32	Advanced Training(o)	Research(o)	Social Activism(o)	Social Activism(o)	Social Activism(o)
33	Research(o)	Social Activism(o)	Research(o)	Research(o)	Research(o)
34	Traditional Religious(o)	Traditional Religious(o)	Traditional Religious(o)	Traditional Religious(o)	Traditional Religious(o)

Letters in parentheses indicate if goal is Miscellaneous, Outcome, or Process.
Tied ranks are indicated by brackets.

Students third. Miscellaneous goals were dominant in the top rankings; only one consortium ranked a goal other than a miscellaneous goal in the top three rankings. Community/Climate was the highest ranked process goal for three of the five consortia, and Vocational Preparation the highest ranked outcome goal for four of the five consortia. Traditional Religiousness ranked lowest for all five consortia, although it was tied with Research by [redacted]. The five lowest ranked goals were outcome goals for [redacted]nsortia.

[redacted]ble 14 shows the Should Be goal perceptions when [redacted]s are combined. All consortia ranked [redacted]ically Removed Students as the goal which Should [redacted]e most important. Only one consortium ranked a non-miscellaneous goal (Vocational Preparation) within the top three positions. Accountability/Efficiency, Institutional Cooperation, and Community/Climate were generally the highest ranked process goals, and Vocational Preparation was the highest ranked outcome goal by all consortium. The lowest ranked goal by all consortia was Traditional Religiousness, and outcome goals made up the lowest five ranks in four of five consortia; only BCEC included a process goal in the lowest ranked goals (Permanent Campus).

Table 14

Ranking of all "Should Be" Goals
by Consortium

Rank	BCEC	CEC	NPAEC	PEC	YREC
1	Geo Removed Students(m)	Geo Removed Students(m)	Geo Removed Students(m)	Geo Removed Students(m)	Geo Removed Students(m)
2	Citizen Planning(m)	Citizen Planning(m)	Flexibility (m)	Flexibility (m)	Academic Reputation(m)
3	Basic Literacy(m)	Goverment Funding(m)	Interpret Consortium(m)	Vocation Prep(o)	Goverment Funding(m)
4	Flexibility (m)	Interpret Consortium(m)	Academic Reputation(m)	Goverment Funding(m)	Citizen Planning(m)
5	Interpret Consortium(m)	Academic Reputation(m)	Planning(m)	Citizen Planning(m)	Vocation Prep(o)
6	Account/ Efficiency(p)	Planning(m)	Goverment Funding(m)	Interpret Consortium(m)	Flexibility (m)
7	Goverment Funding(m)	Flexibility (m)	Citizen Planning(m)	Institution Coop(p)	Interpret Consortium(m)
8	Vocation Prep(o)	Institution Coop(p)	Community/ Climate(p)	Academic Reputation(m)	Community/ Climate(p)
9	Community/ Climate(p)	Vocation Prep(o)	Vocation Prep(o)	Planning(m)	Institution Coop(p)
10	Intellect Orient(o)	Democratic Governance(p)	Institution Coop(p)	Account/ Efficiency(p)	Private Funding(m)
11	Individual Development(o)	Community/ Climate(p)	Account/ Efficiency(p)	Basic Literacy(m)	Planning(m)
12	Democratic Governance(p)	Account/ Efficiency(p)	Evaluation(m)	Delivery Altern(m)	Account/ Efficiency(p)
13	Institution Coop(p)	Legal Status(p)	Basic Literacy(m)	Community/ Climate(p)	Evaluation(m)

Table 14 - (continued)

Rank	BCEC	CEC	NPAEC	PEC	YREC
14	Local Needs(o)	Basic Literacy(m)	Democratic Governance(p)	Private Funding(m)	Democratic Governance(p)
15	Academic Reputation(m)	Delivery Altern(m)	Legal Status(p)	Intellect Orient(o)	Basic MLiteracy(m)
16	Delivery Altern(m)	Evaluation(m)	Delivery Altern(m)	Democratic Governance	Delivery Altern(m)
17	Evaluation(m)	Local Needs(o)	Intellect Orient(o)	Innovation(p)	Intellect Orient(o)
18	Academic Development(o)	Permanent Campus(m)	Local Needs(o)	Evaluation(m)	Local Needs(o)
19	Planning(m)	Intellect Orient(o)	Private Funding(m)	Local Needs(o)	Legal Status(p)
20	Private Funding(m)	Academic Development(o)	Individual Development(o)	Individual Development(o)	Individual Development(o)
21	Social Egalitarian(o)	Individual Development(o)	Social Egalitarian(o)	Legal Status(p)	Social Egalitarian(o)
22	Intellect Environ(p)	Innovation(p)	Innovation(p)	Social Egalitarian(o)	Innovation(p)
23	Legal Status(p)	Intellect Environ(p)	Freedom(p)	Academic Development(o)	Academic Development(o)
24	Public Service(o)	Off-campus Learning(p)	Intellect Environ(p)	Off-campus Learning(p)	Freedom(p)
25	Innovation(p)	Social Egalitarian(o)	Academic Development(o)	Intellect Environ(p)	Intellect Environ(p)
26	Humanism(o)	Public Service(o)	Public Service(o)	Public Service(o)	Public Service(o)
27	Freedom(p)	Private Funding(m)	Permanent Campus(m)	Freedom(p)	Off-campus Learning(p)
28	Off-campus Learning(p)	Freedom(p)	Off-campus Learning(p)	Permanent Campus(m)	Humanism(o)

Table 14 - (continued)

Rank	BCEC	CEC	NPAEC	PEC	YREC
29	Cultural Awareness(o)	Humanism(o)	Humanism(o)	Humanism(o)	Permanent Campus(m)
30	Social Activism(o)	Advanced Training(o)	Advanced Training(o)	Advanced Training(o)	Cultural Awareness(o)
31	Permanent Campus(m)	Cultural Awareness(o)	Cultural Awareness(o)	Cultural Awareness(o)	Advanced Training(o)
32	Advanced Training(o)	Social Activism(o)	Social Activism(o)	Social Activism(o)	Social Activism(o)
33	Research(o)	Research(o)	Research(o)	Research(o)	Research(o)
34	Traditional Religious(o)	Traditional Religious(o)	Traditional Religious(o)	Traditional Religious(o)	Traditional Religious(o)

Letters in parentheses indicate if goal is Micellaneous, Process, or Outcome.
Tied ranks are indicated by brackets.

Goal Perceptions by Position

Tables 15 to 17 show the perceptions of Is and Should Be goals with the data grouped by position: Institutional Board Member (IBM), Community Board Member (CBM) and Regional Advisory Committee Member (RAC). The outcome, process and miscellaneous goals are shown, unranked, with means for both Is and Should Be goals, and groups with statistical significance are identified. All Is goals are shown in Table 18, and the Should Be goals are shown in Table 19.

Table 15 shows perceptions of outcome goals by position means unranked. Five goal areas showed statistical significance on the Is ratings; CBMs scored both Intellectual Orientation and Meeting Local Needs significantly higher than did IBMs and RACs and rated Individual Personal Development higher than did RACs. Perceptions of how important Advanced Training Is and Research Is showed significant differences; IBMs rated both goals significantly lower than did RACs and rated Advanced Training significantly lower than did both CBMs and RACs. Meeting Local Needs was rated significantly higher by CBMs than by both other groups.

Only two goals showed significant differences on the Should Be ratings; Advanced Training was rated lower by IBMs than by both other groups, and Research was rated lower by IBMs than by RACs (paralleling the Is ratings).

Table 15

Perceptions of Outcome Goals by Position
with Means Unranked

Goal		Institutional Board Members	Community Board Members	Regional Advisory Committee
Academic Development	IS	2.7	3.0	2.9
	SB	3.2	3.3	3.5
Intellect Orient	IS	2.9a*	3.4a,b	2.7b
	SB	3.6	4.0	3.7
Individual Development	IS	2.9	3.1a	2.5a
	SB	3.6	3.9	3.5
Humanism	IS	2.0	2.0	1.7
	SB	2.7	2.6	2.7
Cultural Awareness	IS	1.9	1.6	1.7
	SB	2.2	2.0	2.4
Traditional Religious	IS	1.1	1.0	1.2
	SB	1.1	1.2	1.4
Vocation Prep	IS	3.4	3.5	3.1
	SB	4.1	4.4	4.2
Advanced Training	IS	1.5a,b	2.0a	2.0b
	SB	1.7a,b	2.4a	2.6b
Research	IS	1.2a	1.4	1.6a
	SB	1.3a	1.7	2.1a
Local Needs	IS	3.1a	3.5a,b	3.0b
	SB	3.6	4.0	3.7
Public Service	IS	2.4	2.7	2.7
	SB	2.9	3.2	3.1
Social Egalitarian	IS	2.9	3.1	2.6
	SB	3.4	3.6	3.4
Social Activism	IS	1.8	1.7	1.6
	SB	2.0	2.1	2.2

* Matching letters represent statistical significance at the 0.10 level

Eight goals showed no statistically significant differences between groups on either Is or Should Be ratings.

Table 16 shows perceptions of process goals by position with means unranked: Only one goal showed differences on the Is ratings; CBMs rated Innovation significantly higher than did RACs. IBMs rated Accountability significantly higher than did RACs in terms of Should Be ratings. Legal Status Should Be was rated significantly lower by IBMs than by both other groups. Six of nine goals showed no significant differences between groups on either Is or Should Be ratings.

Table 17 identifies perceptions of miscellaneous goals by position with means unranked. Two goals showed significant differences on Is ratings; Private Funding Alternatives was rated higher by CBMs than by RACs, and Flexibility in Program Offerings was rated higher by CBMs than by both other groups. IBMs rated three Should Be goals significantly lower than did other groups; Reputation in Academic Community was rated lower by IBMs than CBMs, and Permanenet Campus and Government Funding Alternatives were rated significantly lower by IBMs than by both other groups. No goals showed significant differences on both Is and Should Be ratings, and seven of twelve goals showed no significant differences on either Is or Should Be ratings.

Table 18 identifies perceptions (ranked by mean) of

Table 16

Perceptions of Process Goals by Position with Means Unranked

Goal		Institutional Board Members	Community Board Members	Regional Advisory Committee
Freedom	IS	2.8	2.9	2.5
	SB	3.3	3.0	2.9
Democratic Governance	IS	3.2	3.3	3.1
	SB	3.8	4.0	4.0
Community/ Climate	IS	3.6	3.7	3.4
	SB	4.1	4.3	4.1
Intellect Environ	IS	2.5	2.5	2.4
	SB	3.2	3.2	3.3
Innovation	IS	2.9	3.2a*	2.7a
	SB	3.4	3.8	3.5
Off-campus Learning	IS	2.2	2.4	2.6
	SB	2.7	3.0	3.2
Account/ Efficiency	IS	3.5	3.6	3.3
	SB	4.1a	3.9	3.7a
Institution Coop	IS	3.4	3.5	3.2
	SB	4.0	4.3	4.1
Legal Status	IS	2.7	3.0	3.0
	SB	2.8a,b	4.3a	3.8b

* Matching letters represent statistical significance at the 0.10 level

Table 17

Perceptions of Miscellaneous Goals by Position
with Means Unranked

Goal		Institutional Board Members	Community Board Members	Regional Advisory Committee
Basic	IS	3.3	3.7	3.3
Literacy	SB	4.0	4.0	4.0
Private	IS	2.6	3.1a*	2.3a
Funding	SB	3.4	3.7	3.2
Academic	IS	3.5	3.8	3.3
Reputation	SB	3.8a	4.5a	4.3
Permanent	IS	2.6	2.3	3.0
Campus	SB	2.0a,b	3.0a	3.7b
Planning	IS	3.2	3.9	3.4
	SB	4.0	4.3	4.0
Government	IS	3.1	3.6	3.6
Funding	SB	4.0a,b	4.6a	4.5b
Flexibility	IS	3.3a	4.1a	3.7
	SB	4.1	4.6	4.2
Citizen	IS	3.7	3.6	3.6
Planning	SB	4.3	4.4	4.4
Delivery	IS	3.1	3.4	3.1
Altern	SB	3.6	3.8	3.9
Evaluation	IS	3.1	3.1	2.7
	SB	4.0	3.9	3.6
Interpret	IS	3.3	3.2	3.2
Consortium	SB	4.1	4.4	4.4
Geo Removed	IS	3.8	4.3	3.9
Students	SB	4.6	4.9	4.6

* Matching letters represent statistical significance at the 0.10 level

how important all Is goals combined are currently. All groups rated Geographically Removed Students as the top goal. Miscellaneous goals figured prominently in the top rankings. Community/Climate was the process goal ranked highest by all three groups, and Vocation Preparation was the highest ranked outcome goal. All three groups also agreed on the lowest ranked goal (Traditional Religiousness).

Table 19 shows the ranking of all Should Be goals combined. Geographically Removed Students was ranked highest among all three groups. Although miscellaneous goals figured prominently among the high rankings, Institutional Board Members included more process and outcome goals than did the other two groups. Vocational Preparation was the highest ranked outcome goal, and Community/Climate the highest ranked process goal, by all groups. The groups also showed consensus among the bottom two goals--Research (33) and Traditional Religiousness (34). Only one non-outcome goal was included in the lowest six rankings; Institutional Board Members ranked Permanent Campus as the fourth lowest goal.

Goal Perceptions by Years in Current Capacity

Data from groupings by years served were analyzed by means for outcome and process goals. It is interesting to note that there were no statistically significant

Table 18

Ranking of all "Is" Goals by Position

Rank	Institutional Board Members	Community Board Members	Regional Advisory Committee
1	Geo Removed Students(m)	Geo Removed Students(m)	Geo Removed Students(m)
2	Citizen Planning(m)	Flexibility(m)	Flexibility(m)
3	Community/ Climate(p)	Planning(m)	Government Funding(m)
4	Account/ Efficiency(p)	Academic Reputation(m)	Citizens Planning(m)
5	Academic Reputation(m)	Community/ Community(p)	Community/ Climate(p)
6	Vocation Prep(o)	Basic Literacy(m)	Academic Reputation(m)
7	Institution Coop(p)	Account/ Efficiency(p)	Planning(m)
8	Basic Literacy(m)	Government Funding(m)	Account/ Efficiency(p)
9	Flexibility(m)	Citizen Planning(m)	Basic Literacy(m)
10	Interpret Consortium(m)	Vocation Prep(o)	Vocation Prep(o)
11	Democratic Governance(p)	Local Needs(o)	Institution Coop(p)
12	Planning(m)	Institution Coop(p)	Delivery Altern(m)
13	Local Needs(o)	Intellect Orient(o)	Interpret Consortium(m)

Table 18 - (continued)

Rank	Institutional Board Members	Community Board Members	Regional Advisory Committee
14	Government Funding(m)	Delivery Altern(m)	Democratic Governance(p)
15	Delivery Altern(m)	Democratic Governance(p)	Local Needs(o)
16	Evaluation(m)	Innovation(p)	Legal Status(p)
17	Individual Development(o)	Private Funding(m)	Permanent Campus(m)
18	Social Egalitarian(o)	Interpret Consortium(m)	Academic Development(o)
19	Innovation(p)	Individual Development(o)	Innovation(p)
20	Freedom(p)	Social Egalitarian(o)	Evaluation(m)
21	Intellect Orient(o)	Evaluation(m)	Intellect Orient(o)
22	Academic Development(o)	Academic Development(o)	Social Egalitarian(o)
23	Legal Status(p)	Legal Status(p)	Off-campus Learning(p)
24	Private Funding(m)	Freedom(p)	Individual Development(o)
25	Permanent Campus(m)	Public Service(o)	Freedom(p)
26	Intellect Environ(p)	Intellect Environ(p)	Public Service(o)
27	Public Service(o)	Off-campus Learning(p)	Intellect Environ(p)

Table 18 - (continued)

Rank	Institutional Board Members	Community Board Members	Regional Advisory Committee
28	Off-campus Learning(p)	Permanent Campus(m)	Private Funding(m)
29	Humanism(o)	Humanism(o)	Advanced Training(o)
30	Cultural Awareness(o)	Advanced Training(o)	Humanism(o)
31	Social Activism(o)	Social Activism(o)	Humanism(o)
32	Advanced Training(o)	Cultural Awareness(o)	Research(o)
33	Research(o)	Research(o)	Social Activism(o)
34	Traditional Religious(o)	Traditional Religious(o)	Traditional Religious(o)

Letters in parentheses indicate if goal is Miscellaneous, Process, or Outcome. Tied ranks are indicated by brackets.

Table 19

Ranking of all "Should Be" Goals by Position

Rank	Institutional Board Members	Community Board Members	Regional Advisory Committee
1	Geo Removed Students(m)	Geo Removed Students(m)	Geo Removed Students(m)
2	Citizen Planning(m)	Government Funding(m)	Government Funding(m)
3	Vocation Prep(o)	Flexibility(m)	Citizen Planning(m)
4	Community/ Climate(p)	Academic Reputation(m)	Interpret Consortium(m)
5	Account/ Efficiency(p)	Vocation Prep(o)	Academic Reputation(m)
6	Flexibility(m)	Citizen Planning(m)	Vocation Prep(o)
7	Interpret Consortium(m)	Interpret Consortium(m)	Flexibility(m)
8	Institution Coop(p)	Community/ Climate(p)	Community/ Climate(p)
9	Basic Literacy(m)	Institution Coop(p)	Institution Coop(p)
10	Planning(m)	Legal Status(p)	Democratic Governance(p)
11	Government Funding(m)	Planning(m)	Basic Literacy(m)
12	Evaluation(m)	Intellect Orient(o)	Planning(m)
13	Democratic Governance(p)	Local Needs(o)	Delivery Altern(m)

Table 19 - (continued)

Rank	Institutional Board Members	Community Board Members	Regional Advisory Committee
14	Academic Reputation(m)	Democratic Governance(p)	Legal Status(p)
15	Intellect Orient(o)	Basic Literacy(m)	Intellect Orient(o)
16	Individual Development(o)	Individual Development(o)	Local Needs(o)
17	Local Needs(o)	Account/ Efficiency(p)	Account/ Efficiency(p)
18	Delivery Altern(m)	Evaluation(m)	Permanent Campus(m)
19	Social Egalitarian(o)	Innovation(p)	Evaluation(m)
20	Innovation(p)	Delivery Altern(m)	Academic Development(o)
21	Private Funding(m)	Private Funding(m)	Individual Development(o)
22	Freedom(p)	Social Egalitarian(o)	Innovation(p)
23	Academic Development(o)	Academic Development(o)	Social Egalitarian(o)
24	Intellect Environ(p)	Public Service(o)	Intellect Environ(p)
25	Public Service(o)	Intellect Environ(p)	Off-campus Learning(p)
26	Legal Status(p)	Freedom(p)	Private Funding(m)
27	Humanism(o)	Off-campus Learning(p)	Public Service(o)

Table 19 - (continued)

Rank	Institutional Board Members	Community Board Members	Regional Advisory Committee
28	Off-campus Learning(p)	Permanent Campus(m)	Freedom(p)
29	Cultural Awareness(o)	Humanism(o)	Humanism(o)
30	Social Activism(o)	Advanced Training(o)	Advanced Training(o)
31	Permanent Campus(m)	Social Activism(o)	Cultural Awareness(o)
32	Advanced Training(o)	Cultural Awareness(o)	Social Activism(o)
33	Research(o)	Research(o)	Research(o)
34	Traditional Religious(o)	Traditional Religious(o)	Traditional Religious(o)

Letters in parentheses indicate if goal is Miscellaneous, Process, or Outcome. Tied ranks are indicated by brackets.

differences among groups on any of the goals on either Is or Should Be ratings.

Tables 20 to 22 present the data with respondents grouped by years served in current capacity with a consortium. Table 20 shows perceptions of miscellaneous goals with means unranked. Table 21 shows the Is goal rankings when all goals are combined, and Table 22 shows the Should Be goal rankings when all goals are combined.

Table 20 shows perceptions of miscellaneous goals with means unranked. Should Be ratings for the goal of a Permanent Campus were significantly lower for respondents with five or more years service than for respondents in the two years and the less than one year groups. Respondents with two years service scored Systematic Evaluation Is ratings significantly lower than did respondents with less than one year or more than five years service, and they scored Interpreting the Consortium to Local Citizens Is ratings significantly lower than did respondents with one year or more than five years experience. No goal showed differences on both Is and Should Be ratings, and nine of twelve goals showed no significant differences on either Is or Should Be ratings.

Table 21 identifies the ranked Is goals when all goals are combined. Geographically Removed Students was the top ranked goal for three of five groups. Respondents with less than one year service ranked Flexibility in

Table 20

Perceptions of Miscellaneous Goals by Years in Current Capacity with Means Unranked

Goal		Less than 1 year	1 year	2 years	3 to 4 years	More than 5 years
Basic Literacy	IS	3.5	3.4	3.2	3.8	3.3
	SB	3.8	3.8	4.1	4.3	3.7
Private Funding	IS	2.8	2.2	2.5	2.7	3.1
	SB	2.9	3.1	3.9	3.5	3.1
Academic Reputation	IS	4.1	3.6	3.3	3.6	3.5
	SB	4.6	4.1	4.4	4.1	3.8
Permanent Campus	IS	3.0	2.5	2.8	2.7	2.6
	SB	4.0a*	3.2	3.4b	2.8	2.0a,b
Planning	IS	4.1	3.6	3.0	3.5	3.7
	SB	4.8	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.9
Citizen Planning	IS	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.7
	SB	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.1
Delivery Altern	IS	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.4	3.5
	SB	3.8	3.8	3.7	4.1	3.7
Evaluation	IS	3.5a	2.9	2.3a,b	3.1	3.4b
	SB	4.3	3.3	3.6	3.9	3.9
Interpret Consortium	IS	3.6	3.6a	2.8a,b	3.2	3.5b
	SB	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.3	4.1
Geo Removed Students	IS	4.0	3.9	3.7	4.2	4.1
	SB	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.8	4.5
Government Funding	IS	3.6	3.5	3.0	3.5	3.7
	SB	4.4	4.3	4.6	4.2	4.2
Flexibility	IS	4.3	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.6
	SB	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0

* Matching letters represent statistical significance at the 0.10 level.

Table 21

Ranking of all "Is" Goals
by Years in Current Capacity

Rank	Less than 1 Year	1 Year	2 Years	3 & 4 Years	5 or More Years
1	Flexibility(m)	Flexibility(m)	Geo Removed Students(m)	Geo Removed Students(m)	Geo Removed Students(m)
2	Academic Reputation(m)	Geo Removed Students(m)	Community/ Climate(p)	Basic Literacy(m)	Planning(m)
3	Planning(m)	Account/ Efficiency(p)	Flexibility(m)	Citizen Planning(m)	Goverment Funding(m)
4	Citizen Planning(m)	Academic Reputation(m)	Citizen Planning(m)	Academic Reputation(m)	Citizens Planning(m)
5	Geo Removed Students(m)	Planning(m)	Academic Reputation(m)	Community/ Climate(p)	Account/ Efficiency(p)
6	Community/ Climate(p)	Interpret Consortium(m)	Vocation Prep(o)	Planning(m)	Institution Coop(o)
7	Account/ Efficiency(p)	Community/ Climate(p)	Account/ Efficiency(p)	Goverment Funding(m)	Flexibility (m)
8	Institution Coop(p)	Institution Coop(p)	Basic Literacy(m)	Flexibility(m)	Vocation Prep(o)
9	Goverment Funding(m)	Goverment Funding(m)	Local Needs(o)	Account/ Efficiency(p)	Community/ Climate(p)
10	Interpret Consortium(m)	Citizen Planning(m)	Institution Coop(p)	Delivery Altern(m)	Academic Reputation(m)
11	Vocation Prep(o)	Vocation Prep(o)	Planning(m)	Vocation Prep(o)	Develop Altern(m)
12	Basic Literacy(m)	Basic Literacy(m)	Goverment Funding(m)	Democratic Governance(p)	Interpret Consortium(m)
13	Delivery Altern(m)	Academic Development(o)	Delivery Altern(m)	Local Needs(o)	Evaluation (m)
14	Evaluation(m)	Local Needs(o)	Social Egalitarian(o)	Institution Coop(p)	Democratic Governance(p)

Table 21 - (continued)

Rank	Less Than 1 Year	1 Year	2 Years	3 & 4 Years	5 or More Years
15	Democratic Governance(p)	Democratic Governance(p)	Democratic Governance(p)	Interpret Consortium(m)	Basic Literacy(m)
16	Legal Status(p)	Delivery Altern(m)	Academic Development(o)	Evaluation(m)	Local Needs(o)
17	Intellect Orient(o)	Intellect Orient(o)	Intellect Orient(o)	Freedom(p)	Legal Status(p)
18	Local Needs(o)	Social Egalitarian(o)	Innovation(p)	Academic Development(o)	Private Funding(m)
19	Innovation(p)	Innovation(p)	Permanent Campus(m)	Intellect Orient(o)	Innovation(p)
20	Academic Development(o)	Evaluation(m)	Interpret Consortium(m)	Social Egalitarian(o)	Individual Development(o)
21	Permanent Campus(m)	Off-campus Learning(p)	Individual Development(o)	Innovation(p)	Social Egalitarian(o)
22	Social Egalitarian(o)	Individual Development(o)	Legal Status(p)	Legal Status(p)	Intellect Orient(o)
23	Intellect Environ(p)	Legal Status(p)	Freedom(p)	Individual Development(o)	Freedom(p)
24	Individual Development(o)	Intellect Environ(p)	Private Funding(m)	Private Funding(m)	Academic Development(o)
25	Public Service(o)	Permanent Campus(m)	Off-campus Learning(p)	Permanent Campus(m)	Permanent Campus(m)
26	Off-campus Learning(p)	Public Service(o)	Evaluation(m)	Public Service(o)	Intellect Environ(p)
27	Individual Development(o)	Freedom(p)	Public Service(o)	Intellect Environ(p)	Public Service(o)
28	Private Funding(m)	Private Funding(m)	Intellect Environ(p)	Humanism(o)	Off-campus Learning(p)

Table 21 - (continued)

Rank	Less Than 1 Year	1 Year	2 Years	3 & 4 Years	5 or More Years
29	Advanced Training(o)	Advanced Training(o)	Humanism(o)	Off-campus Learning(p)	Humanism(o)
30	Cultural Awareness(o)	Humanism(o)	Humanism(o)	Cultural Awareness(o)	Cultural Awareness(o)
31	Research(o)	Social Activism(o)	Cultural Awareness(o)	Advanced Training(o)	Advanced Training(o)
32	Humanism(o)	Cultural Awareness(o)	Social Activism(o)	Social Activism(o)	Social Activism(o)
33	Social Activism(o)	Research(o)	Research(o)	Research(o)	Research(o)
34	Traditional Religious(o)	Traditional Religious(o)	Traditional Religious(o)	Traditional Religious(o)	Traditional Religious(o)

Letters in parentheses indicate if goal is Miscellaneous, Process, or Outcome.
Tied ranks are indicated by brackets.

Program Offerings, Reputation in Academic Community, and Short/ Medium/Long Term Planning (tied) higher than Geographically Removed Students, while respondents with one year service ranked Flexibility in Program Offerings first, and Geographically Removed Students second. Community/Climate was the highest ranked process goal for all groups except that with five or more years service; the process goals of Accountability/Efficiency and Institutional Cooperation were ranked above Community/Climate by the five or more years group. Vocational Preparation was the highest ranked outcome goal for all groups. Outcome goals were predominant among the bottom five rankings, and Traditional Religiousness was ranked last by all groups.

Table 22 shows the ranking of all goals combined by Should Be perceptions. Geographically Removed Students was the goal ranked highest by all groups, although respondents with one year experience ranked Interpreting the Consortium to Local Citizens as equally important, and respondents with two years service ranked Including Citizens in Planning and Government Funding Alternatives as tied with Geographically Removed Students. Respondents with less than one year and one years service ranked Institutional Cooperation as the highest process goal, while respondents in the three other groups ranked Community/Climate as the most important process goal. Vocational Preparation was the highest ranked outcome goal

Table 22

Ranking of all "Should Be" Goals
by Years in Current Capacity

Rank	Less than 1 Year	1 Year	2 Years	3 & 4 Years	5 or More Years
1	Geo Removed Students(m)	Geo Removed Students(m)	Geo Removed Students(m)	Geo Removed Students(m)	Geo Removed Students(m)
2	Planning(m)	Interpret Consortium(m)	Citizen Planning(m)	Basic Literacy(m)	Goverment Funding(m)
3	Academic Reputation(m)	Flexibility(m)	Government Funding(m)	Citizen Planning(m)	Vocation Prep(o)
4	Interpret Consortium(m)	Citizen Planning(m)	Flexibility(m)	Interpret Consortium(m)	Citizen Planning(m)
5	Goverment Funding(m)	Government Funding(m)	Academic Reputation(m)	Vocation Prep(o)	Interpret Consortium(m)
6	Citizen Planning(m)	Institution Coop(p)	Vocation Prep(o)	Community/ Climate	Institution Coop(p)
7	Flexibility(m)	Vocation Prep(o)	Community/ Climate(p)	Goverment Funding(m)	Flexibility(m)
8	Evaluation(m)	Academic Reputation(m)	Institution Coop(p)	Academic Reputation(m)	Community/ Climate(p)
9	Institution Coop(p)	Planning(m)	Interpret Consortium(m)	Delivery Altern(m)	Account/ Efficiency(p)
10	Vocation Prep(o)	Community/ Climate(p)	Democratic Governance(p)	Intellect Orient(o)	Planning(m)
11	Community/ Climate(p)	Account/ Efficiency(p)	Basic Literacy(m)	Account/ Efficiency(p)	Evaluation(m)
12	Legal Status(p)	Democratic Governance(p)	Planning(m)	Institution Coop(p)	Democratic Governance(p)
13	Permanent Campus(m)	Basic Literacy(m)	Legal Status(p)	Democratic Governance(p)	Academic Reputation(m)

Table 22 (continued)

Rank	Less than 1 year	1 Year	2 Years	3 & 4 Years	5 or More Years
14	Account/ Efficiency(p)	Delivery Altern(m)	Private Funding(m)	Flexibility(m)	Individual Development(o)
15	Delivery Altern(m)	Intellect Orient(o)	Intellect Orient(o)	Local Needs(o)	Delivery Altern(m)
16	Basic Literacy(m)	Local Needs(o)	Individual Development(o)	Planning(m)	Basic Literacy(m)
17	Intellect Orient(o)	Social Egalitarian(o)	Local Needs(o)	Evaluation(m)	Intellect Orient(o)
18	Local Needs(o)	Individual Development(o)	Account/ Efficiency(p)	Academic Development(o)	Local Needs(o)
19	Democratic Governance(p)	Innovation(p)	Delivery Altern(m)	Individual Development(o)	Innovation(p)
20	Individual Development(o)	Academic Development(o)	Social Egalitarian(o)	Innovation(p)	Legal Status(p)
21	Social Egalitarian(o)	Legal Status(p)	Innovation(p)	Legal Status(p)	Social Egalitarian(o)
22	Innovation(p)	Off-campus Learning(p)	Evaluation(m)	Private Funding(m)	Academic Development(o)
23	Intellect Environ(p)	Evaluation(m)	Academic Development(o)	Social Egalitarian(o)	Private Funding(m)
24	Academic Development(o)	Permanent Campus(m)	Intellect Environ(p)	Intellect Environ(p)	Freedom(p)
25	Public Service(o)	Intellect Environ(p)	Legal Status(p)	Public Service(o)	Intellect Environ(p)
26	Off-campus Learning(p)	Private Funding(m)	Off-campus Learning(p)	Freedom(p)	Public Service(o)
27	Freedom(p)	Public Service(o)	Freedom(p)	Humanism(o)	Off-campus Learning(p)

Table 22 (continued)

Rank	Less than 1 year	1 Year	2 Years	3 & 4 Years	5 or More Years
28	Private Funding(m)	Freedom(p)	Public Service(o)	Off-campus Learning(p)	Humanism(o)
29	Humanism(o)	Humanism(o)	Humanism(o)	Permanent Campus(m)	Cultural Awareness(o)
30	Cultural Awareness(o)	Social Activism(o)	Advanced Training(o)	Cultural Awareness(o)	Social Activism(o)
31	Advanced Training(o)	Advanced Training(o)	Cultural Awareness(o)	Advanced Training(o)	Permanent Campus(m)
32	Social Activism(o)	Cultural Awareness(o)	Social Activism(o)	Social Activism(o)	Advanced Training(o)
33	Research(o)	Research(o)	Research(o)	Research(o)	Research(o)
34	Traditional Religious(o)	Traditional Religious(o)	Traditional Religious(o)	Traditional Religious(o)	Traditional Religious(o)

Letters in parentheses indicate if goal is Miscellaneous, Process, or Outcome. Tied ranks are indicated by brackets.

by all groups. Only one group ranked a non-outcome goal among the bottom five rankings; respondents with five or more years service ranked Permanent Campus tied with Social Criticism/Activism in thirtieth position. All groups agreed on the bottom two rankings: Research and Traditional Religiousness.

Summary

This chapter has provided an analysis of the data collected from AAECC Institutional Board Members, Community Board Members, and Regional Advisory Committee Members. The findings were identified in 22 tables in five sections. The respondent profile was analyzed, and the goal perceptions, both Is and Should Be, were analyzed by total population, consortium, position and years in current capacity. Chapter 5 contatins a discussion of conclusions and implications of this study of consortium goals.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to measure and compare the organizational goals of the five Alberta Advanced Education community consortia, as perceived by the boards of directors and regional advisory committee members of each consortium.

Methodology

A Consortium Goals Inventory (CGI) was developed based on Peterson and Uhls' (1977) Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI). While recognising the differences between independent institutions and educational consortia, the IGI provided an appropriate instrument on which a goal inventory for consortia could be based. Adaptations were made to adjust the terminology from references to postsecondary institutions to consortia, and to add goals and goal areas specific to consortia.

A total of 91 CGIs were mailed to board members and regional advisory committee members in April, 1988. Respondents were asked to rate each of the 100 goal items on a scale of importance from 1 (of no importance, or not applicable) to 5 (of extremely high importance),

based on their perception of how important the goal "is" and how important it "should be." Four questions were included to identify the respondents by consortium, position, length of time in current position with consortium, and length of time in a previous position with a consortium, if applicable. As of July 15, 1988 (the closing date for data collection), 69 responses had been received, representing a response rate of 75.8 percent.

Data Analysis

Respondent profile. When the frequency and rate of response was grouped by consortium, it was noted that all consortia had a response rate of 50 percent or higher, with the highest rate of response coming from the Chinook Educational Consortium. When grouped by position, the community board members had the highest rate of response, and the regional advisory committee members the lowest. Almost 60 percent of the respondents had served in their current capacity with the consortium two years or less, and only 21.7 percent had served in a previous capacity.

Findings. The major finding of this study was that the goal statements that were generated at the local level by consortia directors (the miscellaneous goals) were consistently the highest rated, while process goals, and particularly outcome goals rated much lower.

All miscellaneous goals were rated by the total population as being currently of medium or higher importance with only two exceptions (Permanent Campus and Private Funding). Geographically Removed Students was the highest rated of the miscellaneous goals on both Is and Should Be ratings. This is consistent with literature on the creation of the AAECC -- the provision of service to areas with little or no postsecondary presence was a major factor in the development of the consortium system in Alberta. It would seem that providing educational service (whatever the nature of the content) is and should be of high importance among AAECC. Citizen Planning was also highly rated on Is and Should Be scores, indicating a continued need for local representation in consortium governance. Flexibility, or the ability to change and adjust program offerings as needed with minimal upheaval, rated high on both Is and Should Be. This might coincide with the low rating of Permanent Campus and the potential for program planning done to support permanent facilities rather than to meet more appropriate community needs. Delivery Alternatives, Evaluation, Permanent Campus, and Private Funding all scored low on both Is and Should Be ratings.

While the consortia would undoubtedly be involved in any alternate delivery methods proposed by member institutions, the low rating of development of Delivery

Alternatives may be due to a belief that this item is in the realm of instructional/curriculum development and therefore more significant as a goal to (and the responsibility of) member institutions than to the consortia themselves. It is interesting to note the relatively low rating of Evaluation in relation to that of Planning -- usually considered to be part of the same process.

The process goals generally rated lower than miscellaneous goals, but were seen to be of higher importance than the outcome goals. Four of nine process goals rated of medium importance or higher on the Is ratings, while all process goals rated of medium or higher importance on the Should Be ratings. Community/Climate rated highest on both Is and Should Be ratings. Creating a climate with positive communication, commitment, trust and respect must certainly present itself as one of the greater challenges facing consortia. A positive Community/ Climate might be seen as prerequisite to meeting other process and outcome goals in any institution, but of particular importance and difficulty in an organization with the diversity of members of an Alberta Advanced Education community consortium.

Institutional Cooperation was tied with Community/Climate at the top of the Should Be rating. As with Geographically Removed Students (miscellaneous

goal), this would seem to be a cornerstone of consortium creation, except that it might be recognised as the means to achieving a goal rather than a goal in itself for consortia. It is interesting to note the lack of importance ascribed to Off-campus Learning -- achieving only medium importance on the Should Be ratings. One might suspect that independent or off-campus learning was too often the only opportunity available to rural Albertans in the past, and that board and regional advisory committee members recognised a greater need for an on-campus experience than for off-campus opportunities.

Legal Status was one of two goal areas (along with Institutional Cooperation) added in adapting the IGI for consortium use. It was tied for fifth place on Is and in fifth place on the Should Be list. This goal showed the highest standard deviation on both Is and Should Be lists of all process goals. The board members from institutions rated Legal Status between low and medium importance on both lists, while both other groups rated it of medium importance currently. Regional advisory committee members rated it between medium and high importance and community board members between high and very high importance on the Should Be ratings. It would seem, then, that some degree of permanence is still a major issue among community members involved with consortia -- a viewpoint not shared by institutional

representatives on consortia boards.

Only two of thirteen outcome goals rated of medium importance or higher on the Is ratings, while only seven of thirteen rated of medium importance on the Should Be scores, and only one goal rated as being of high importance. Vocational Preparation was rated highest among the outcome goals on both Is and Should Be, while two of the more traditional goal areas -- Advanced Training and Research -- rated below medium importance on both Is and Should Be ratings. Academic Development, another traditional goal of postsecondary education, rated higher than Individual Personal Development on the Is scores, but these ranks were reversed on the Should Be ratings. The low ratings of Humanism/Altruism, Advanced Training, Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness, Social Criticism/Activism, Research and Traditional Religiousness on both Is and Should Be would indicate less orientation towards liberal arts education than towards more practical skills education.

When outcome and process goals were combined and ranked, process goals were dominant, with six of nine and five of nine goals appearing in the top eleven rankings on Is and Should Be respectively. This compares to only five of thirteen and six of thirteen outcome goals appearing in the upper half of the Is and Should Be rankings, respectively.

A second major finding of this study was the high

degree of consensus among respondents. When analyzed by any variable, no significant differences were found on 13 of 34 goals. When any list of goals was analyzed by a variable, there were less goals with significant differences than without. This level of agreement among members of all governance groups should auger well for continued institutional and community cooperation within Alberta Advanced Education community consortia, and among all consortia working together.

Another finding of this study was that respondents felt all goals should be of higher importance than they are currently. All goals were rated higher on Should Be than on Is -- only one goal (Legal Status) did not have statistically significant (positive) variance. It would seem that regardless of the ranking of a goal, board members and regional advisory committee members believe that the consortia can place more emphasis on all goal areas.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on the findings of this study:

1. Goals that address the unique elements of consortia were higher priority goals among board members and regional advisory committee members than were more traditional outcome or

process goals. Providing service to geographically removed students, including citizens along with consortia members in planning and decision making, seeking alternative sources of government funding, maintaining a high degree of flexibility in program offerings, and seeking reputable status among academic institutions and within local communities were, and will continue to be, priority goals among AAECC.

2. The process of providing educational service was generally perceived to be of greater importance than the content taught, or the outcome of the teaching. Of particular importance was fostering an open and positive working relationship among diverse staff working at a consortium, as well as among consortium member institutions.
3. Work related skill training and basic reading, writing and arithmetic comprehension were perceived to be more important than student personal development or graduate education.
4. Goals relating to a more permanent consortium structure and status were not high priorities.
5. While there was increased importance in seeking additional government sources of funding, developing a funding base from the

private sector was of low importance.

6. There was generally a high degree of consensus among institutional board members, community board members, and regional advisory committee members.
7. Regional differences among consortia did not seem to translate into goal differences -- consortia members generally agreed on the importance of goal areas.
8. Length of time served with a consortium did not significantly affect goal perceptions.
9. Institutional board members, community board members, and regional advisory committee members agreed that more importance should be placed on all goal areas.

In summary, institutional board members, community board members, and regional advisory committees of Alberta Advanced Education community consortia agreed that providing educational service to regions without existing independent postsecondary institutions is the primary goal of consortia. The service must continue to be highly flexible, and must allow for citizen involvement in the planning process. The concept of educational consortia must be heightened among academic institutions, and within the communities served by consortia.

Implications

The findings of this study provide information that will be significant to the future of educational consortia in Alberta. The implications of these findings are discussed below.

Implications for AAECC Governance

In the perceptions of board members and regional advisory committee members, consortia must continue to operate like consortia -- that is, to use a flexible, responsive strategy to meet the educational needs of Albertans in rural and small urban areas. Direction of a region's consortium must continue to be shared between member institutions and local citizens. Consortia must develop a climate of open communication and foster commitment from member institutions and individual staff called upon to work in an environment of diverse institutions. The benefits of this arrangement for students, staff, and institutions must be communicated to the academic community and to the general public in order to establish consortia as a real and viable alternative for postsecondary education.

Implications for Member Institutions

Member institutions of AAECC must continue to

challenge historical competitiveness and territoriality, and work cooperatively to provide service outside their campus walls. Institutions will need to recognise the emphasis placed by consortia on work related training initiatives, in preference to more traditional choices for higher education, i.e. liberal arts programs. Institutions with vocational programs will be called upon by consortia to deliver educational services, while those institutions with a more liberal arts orientation may be pressured to consider program development in work related training alternatives. Discussion of current and future goals of consortia will assist institutions in evaluating their own relationship with a consortium, and the impact consortium membership will have on institutional resources. Member institutions will be called upon to meet the outcome goals of the communities served by consortia, while the consortium itself remains more attentive to the process goal areas.

Implications for Graduate Education

Consortium administrators will need to be increasingly skilled in the management of a highly dynamic organization with a diversity of membership. Skills must be developed in promoting communication and flexible decision making, negotiating and securing new funding sources, attending to the quality of educational experience for students distanced from their choice of

institution, and in listening to and taking direction from all constituent groups in governance of the consortium. Administrators will be required to provide leadership in creating a positive climate for these skills to take hold and to reap benefits for all involved -- students, community, and institutions.

Implications for Further Study

While the findings of this study have answered some of the questions regarding consortium goals, new questions emerge that require further study.

1. How would constituent groups other than board members and regional advisory committees, ie., consortia directors and staff, institutional staff, faculty and students, and members of the general public served by consortia rate consortia goals?
2. How would the perceived goals of consortia compare with goals from the variety of member institutions, i.e., community colleges, technical institutes, universities, and other educational agency members? How similar or different are consortium goals in relation to each type of member institution?
3. How consistent are the activities of a consortium with the perceived importance of goals for each area? Would financial

documents, program plans, and statistical information emphasize the same goals as do the board and regional advisory committee member perceptions?

4. Why are both Flexibility and Planning rated relatively highly and perceived to be of greater importance in the future? In what areas can more short, medium, and long term planning be done by consortia while still having increased flexibility in services offered?

5. Are there goal areas which are of high importance, but which were rated as less important because they were specific to the instructional component offered by a member institution, and therefore not seen as a relevant goal for a consortium?

6. How can the relatively low rating of many of the instructional content goal areas be explained?

7. Why was accessing alternative sources of government funding perceived as being so important, while private funding alternatives rated so low?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alberta Advanced Education. (1986). An Analysis of Community Consortium Case Histories. Edmonton, Alberta: Program Planning and Development.

Alberta Advanced Education. (1984a). Community Consortia in Alberta. Edmonton: Alberta Advanced Education Program Planning and Development.

Alberta Advanced Education. (1984b). Community Consortia Seminar Proceedings. Edmonton: Alberta Advanced Education Program Planning and Development.

Alberta Advanced Education. (1984c). Guidelines and Procedures for Community Consortia. Edmonton: Alberta Advanced Education Program Planning and Development.

Baus, Frederick, & LaRocco, Teresa. (1986). Consortium Directory (11th Ed.). Washington: Council for Interinstitutional Leadership.

Beder, Hal. (1984). Realizing the Potential of Interorganizational Cooperation. New Directions for Higher learning, 23.

Behm, Robert. (1983). Community College-University Cooperation and Its' Benefits. ERIC Document Reproduction Number ED 238484.

Bushnell, D.S. (1973). Organizing for Change: New Priorities for Community Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill. (cited in Peterson and Uhl, 1977).

Dennison, John D. (1980). The Canadian Community College. Canadian Journal of Higher Education, EJ # 300227.

Dennison, John D., & Gallagher, Paul. (1986). Canada's Community Colleges, Vancouver: UBC Press.

Dennison, John D., Harris, Robert. (1984). Governing Boards in Postsecondary Education. Canadian Journal of Higher Education. 14(2), 13-31.

Fife, Johnathon. (1979). (cited in introduction to L.D. Patterson).

Fox, James W. (1978). The Consortium in Higher Education: A Second Look. The Journal of Educational Administration, 16(2), 219-225.

Glass, J.C., & Allen, E.D. (1979). Consortia: Guidelines and Research Needs. Canadian Journal of University and Continuing Education, 5, 36-39.

Gross, E., & Grambsch, P.V. (1968). University Goals and Academic Power. Washington D.C.: American Council on Education. (cited in Peterson and Uhl, 1977).

Harris, R.S. (1976). A History of Higher Education in Canada, 1663-1960. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Konrad, A.G. & McNeal, J. (1984). Goals in Canadian Universities. Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 14(1), 31-40.

Konrad, Abram G., & Small, James M. (1986a). Consortia In Canadian Distance Education. In Ian Mugridge and David Kaufman (Editors), Distance Education in Canada, (pp. 111-120). London: Croon Helm.

Konrad, Abram G., & Small, James M. (1986b). Consortia in Higher Education. Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 16(2), 73-85.

Konrad, Abram G., & Small, James M. (1982a). Consortia in Postsecondary Education -- State of the Art Review. Edmonton, Alberta: Centre for the Study of Postsecondary Education, University of Alberta.

Konrad, Abram G. & Small, James M. (1982b). North Peace Adult Education Consortium. Edmonton, Alberta: Centre for the Study of Postsecondary Education, University of Alberta.

Martin, D.M. (1981). The Academic Consortium: Limitations and Possibilities. Educational Record, Winter, 36-39.

Mitchell, Donna, & Small, James M. (1983). Big Country Educational Consortium. Edmonton: Centre for the Study of Postsecondary Education, University of Alberta.

Moore, Ann H., Settle, Theodore J., & Skinner, Patricia A. (1982). Strengthening College/Company Cooperation -- An Ohio Perspective. ERIC Document Reproduction Number ED 2300078.

Moore, R.S. (1968). A Guide to Higher Education Consortiums 1965-1966. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

McNeal, Joanne. (1982). Canadian University Goals: Perceptions of Presidents and Board Chairmen. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Neal, Donn C. (1984). New Roles for Consortia. Planning for Higher Education, 12(2), 23-31.

Neal, Donn C. (1987). To Link and Learn: The Future of Metropolitan Consortia, Educational Record, 68(2), 44-47.

North Peace Adult Education Consortium Regional Advisory Committee. (1987). The Delivery of Post-Secondary Education in the North Peace Region. Unpublished Report.

Patterson, F.K. (1974) Colleges in Consort. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Patterson, L.D. (1979). Costing College Cooperation: A Report on the Costs and Benefits of Interinstitutional Programs with Consortium Case Studies and Guidelines. Eric Document Reproduction Number ED 180340.

Patterson, L.D. (1979). Survival Through Interdependence: Assessing the Costs and Benefits of Interinstitutional Cooperation. Washington: American Association for Higher Education. Eric Document Reproduction Number ED 143299.

Peterson, Richard E., & Uhl, Norman P. (1977). Formulating College and University Goals: A Guide for Using the Institutional Goals Inventory. Princeton, New Jersey:ETS.

Rowell, J.R. (1975). Consortium Activities in Higher Education. ERIC Document Reproduction Number ED 105921.

Scott, Harry V. (1977). Consortia in Higher Education: A Sober Reflection. Educational Record, Fall, 429-433.

Small, James M. (1983a). Chinook Educational Consortium. Edmonton: Centre for the Study of Postsecondary Education, University of Alberta.

Small, James M. (1983b). Pembina Educational Consortium. Edmonton: Centre for the Study of Postsecondary Education, University of Alberta.

Small, James M. (1983c). Yellowhead Region Educational Consortium. Edmonton: Centre for the Study of Postsecondary Education, University of Alberta.

Weiss, Marvin W. (1985). The Role of Small/Rural Community Colleges within Their Service Areas. ERIC Document Reproduction Number ED 261852.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

CONSORTIUM GOAL INVENTORY

DIRECTIONS

The consortium goal inventory consists of 100 statements of possible consortium goals. Using the answer key shown in the examples below, you are asked to respond to each statement in two different ways:

First - How important is the goal at the consortium at the present time?

and Second - In your judgment, how important should the goal be?

EXAMPLES

1 = of extremely high importance
2 = of high importance
3 = of medium importance
4 = of low importance
5 = of no importance
or not applicable

A. To require a common core of learning experiences for all students

	1	2	3	4	5
is					●
should be			●		

In this example, the respondent believes the goal "to require a common core of learning experiences for all students," is presently of extremely high importance, but thinks that it should be of medium importance.

B. To give alumni a larger and more direct role in the work of the consortium

	1	2	3	4	5
is	●				
should be					●

In this example, respondent sees the goal "to give alumni a larger and more direct role in the work of the consortium" as presently being of low importance, but thinks that it should be of high importance.

DIRECTIONS

- When making is and should be responses, note that the "CONSORTIUM GOALS INVENTORY" does not refer to the specific mechanics of how the program/service is or should be delivered, but simply refers to the goal of program/service delivery.
- Unless otherwise directed, consider the consortium as as whole when making your judgments.
- In giving should be responses, do not be restrained by your beliefs about whether the goal, realistically, can be attained at the consortium.
- Please try to respond to every goal statement on the inventory, by darkening one entire circle for is and one entire circle for should be.
- Please use any soft lead pencil.
- Please darken the entire circle. Do not use check marks or X's.

Please respond to these goal statements by blackening one oval after is and one after should be.		of no importance or not applicable	of low importance	of medium importance	of high importance	of extremely importance		Do not write in this space
								1-4
1. to help students acquire a depth of knowledge in at least one academic discipline.	is	①	②	③	④	⑤		5
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤		6
2. to teach students methods of scholarly inquiry, scientific research, and/or problem definition and solution.	is	①	②	③	④	⑤		7
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤		8
3. to help students identify their own personal goals and develop means of achieving them.	is	①	②	③	④	⑤		9
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤		10
4. to ensure that students acquire a basic knowledge in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences.	is	①	②	③	④	⑤		11
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤		12
5. to increase the desire and ability of students to undertake self directed learning	is	①	②	③	④	⑤		13
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤		14
6. to prepare students for advanced work at the post secondary level	is	①	②	③	④	⑤		15
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤		16
7. to develop the students' ability to synthesize knowledge from a variety of sources	is	①	②	③	④	⑤		17
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤		18
8. to help students develop a sense of self-worth, self-confidence, and capacity to have impact on events	is	①	②	③	④	⑤		19
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤		20
9. to hold students throughout the consortium to high standards of intellectual performance	is	①	②	③	④	⑤		21
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤		22
10. to instill in students a lifelong commitment to learning	is	①	②	③	④	⑤		23
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤		24
11. to help students achieve deeper levels of self-understanding	is	①	②	③	④	⑤		25
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤		26
12. to ensure that students that complete a program have achieved some level of reading, writing and mathematics competency	is	①	②	③	④	⑤		27
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤		28
13. to help students be open, honest, and trusting in t their relationships to others	is	①	②	③	④	⑤		29
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤		30
14. to encourage students to become conscious of the important moral issues of our time	is	①	②	③	④	⑤		31
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤		32
15. to increase students' sensitivity to art and artistic expression	is	①	②	③	④	⑤		33
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤		34
16. to educate students in a particular religious heritage	is	①	②	③	④	⑤		35
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤		36
17. to help students understand and respect people from diverse backgrounds and cultures	is	①	②	③	④	⑤		37
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤		38

	Please respond to these goal statements by blackening one oval after is and one after should be.		of no importance or not applicable	of low importance	of medium importance	of high importance	of extremely high importance		Do not write in this space
	to require students to complete some amount of course work in the humanities or arts	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		39
		should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		40
19.	to help students become aware of the potentialities of a full-time religious vocation	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		41
		should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		42
20.	to encourage students to become committed to working for world peace	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		43
		should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		44
21.	to encourage students to express themselves artistically, e.g., in music, painting, film-making	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		45
		should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		46
22.	to develop students' ability to understand and defend a theological position	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		47
		should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		48
23.	to encourage students to make concern about the welfare of all people a central part of their lives	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		49
		should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		50
24.	to acquaint students with forms of artistic or literary expression in non-western countries	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		51
		should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		52
25.	to help students develop a dedication to serving God in everyday life	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		53
		should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		54
26.	to provide opportunities for students to prepare for specific occupational careers, e.g., accounting, engineering, nursing	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		55
		should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		56
27.	to develop what would generally be regarded as a strong and comprehensive graduate program	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		57
		should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		58
28.	to perform contract research for government, business, or industry	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		59
		should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		60
29.	to provide opportunities for continuing education for adults in local area, e.g., on a part-time basis	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		61
		should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		62
30.	to develop educational programs geared to new and emerging career fields	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		63
		should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		64
31.	to prepare students in one or more of the "traditional" professions, e.g. law, medicine, architecture	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		65
		should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		66
32.	to offer graduate programs in such "newer" professions as engineering, education, social work	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		67
		should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		68
33.	to serve as a cultural centre in the community served by the consortium	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		69
		should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		70
34.	to conduct basic research in the natural sciences	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		71
		should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖		72

Please respond to these goal statements by blackening one oval after it and one after should be.		of no importance or not applicable	of low importance	of medium importance	of high importance	of extremely importance	Do not write in this space
35. to conduct basic research in the social sciences	is	1	2	3	4	5	5
	should be	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. to provide retraining opportunities for individuals whose job skills have become out of date	is	1	2	3	4	5	7
	should be	1	2	3	4	5	8
37. to contribute, through research, to the general advancement of knowledge	is	1	2	3	4	5	9
	should be	1	2	3	4	5	10
38. to assist students in deciding upon a vocational career	is	1	2	3	4	5	11
	should be	1	2	3	4	5	12
39. to provide skilled people for local-area business, industry, and government	is	1	2	3	4	5	13
	should be	1	2	3	4	5	14
40. to facilitate involvement of students in neighborhood and community service activities	is	1	2	3	4	5	15
	should be	1	2	3	4	5	16
41. to conduct advanced study in specialized problem areas, e.g., through research institutes, centres, or graduate programs	is	1	2	3	4	5	17
	should be	1	2	3	4	5	18
42. to provide eductional experiences relevant to the evolving interests of women in Canada	is	1	2	3	4	5	19
	should be	1	2	3	4	5	20
43. to provide critical evaluation of prevailing practices and values in Canadian society	is	1	2	3	4	5	21
	should be	1	2	3	4	5	22
44. to help people from disadvantaged communities acquire knowledge and skills they can use in improving conditions in their own communities	is	1	2	3	4	5	23
	should be	1	2	3	4	5	24
45. to move to or maintain a policy of essentially open admissions, and then to develop meaningful educational experiences for all who are admitted	is	1	2	3	4	5	25
	should be	1	2	3	4	5	26
46. to serve as a source of ideas and recommendations for changing social institutions judged to be unjust or otherwise defective	is	1	2	3	4	5	27
	should be	1	2	3	4	5	28
47. to work with government agencies in designing new social and environmental programs	is	1	2	3	4	5	29
	should be	1	2	3	4	5	30
48. to offer developmental or remedial programs in basic skills (reading, writing, mathematics)	is	1	2	3	4	5	31
	should be	1	2	3	4	5	32
49. to help students learn how to bring about change in Canadian society	is	1	2	3	4	5	33
	should be	1	2	3	4	5	34
50. to focus resources of the consortium on the solution of major social and environmental problems	is	1	2	3	4	5	35
	should be	1	2	3	4	5	36
51. to be responsive to regional and national priorities when considering programs for the consortium	is	1	2	3	4	5	37
	should be	1	2	3	4	5	38

Please respond to these goal statements by blackening one oval after is and one after should be		of no importance or not applicable	of low importance	of medium importance	of high importance	of extremely high importance		Do not write in this space
52. to provide educational experiences relevant to the evolving interests of minority groups	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	39
	should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	40
53. to be engaged, as a consortium, in working for basic changes in Canadian society	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	41
	should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	42
54. to ensure that students are not prevented from hearing controversial points of view	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	43
	should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	44
55. to create a system of governance that is genuinely responsive to the concerns of all people at the consortium	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	45
	should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	46
56. to maintain a climate in which instructor and staff commitment to the goals of the consortium is as strong as commitment to professional careers	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	47
	should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	48
57. to ensure the freedom of students to choose their own lifestyle (living arrangements, personal appearance, etc.)	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	49
	should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	50
58. to develop arrangements by which students, instructors, local advisory committee members, and board members can be significantly involved in consortium governance	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	51
	should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	52
59. to maintain a climate in which communication through the consortium structure is open and candid	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	53
	should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	54
60. to place no restrictions on off-campus political activities by instructors or students	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	55
	should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	56
61. to decentralize decision making in the consortium to the greatest extent possible	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	57
	should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	58
62. to maintain a climate in which differences of opinion can be aired openly and amicably	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	59
	should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	60
63. to protect the right of the instructors to present unpopular or controversial ideas in the classroom	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	61
	should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	62
64. to assure individuals the opportunity to participate or be represented in making any decisions that affect them	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	63
	should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	64
65. to maintain a climate of mutual trust and respect among students, instructors, and administrators	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	65
	should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	66
66. to create a climate such that students spend much of their free time in intellectual and cultural activities	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	67
	should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	68
67. to build a consortium climate in which continuous educational innovation is accepted as a way of life	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	69
	should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	70
68. to encourage students to pursue academic credit for such activities as a year of study abroad, in work-study programs, in CUSO, etc	is	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	71
	should be	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	72

Please respond to these goal statements by blackening one oval after is and one after should be.		of no importance or not applicable	of low importance	of medium importance	of high importance	of extremely importance	Do not write in this space
69. to create a climate in which students and instructors may easily come together for informal discussion of ideas and mutual interests	is	①	②	③	④	⑤	5
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤	6
70. to experiment with different methods of evaluating and grading student performance	is	①	②	③	④	⑤	7
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤	8
71. to establish or maintain private funding alternatives	is	①	②	③	④	⑤	9
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤	10
72. to participate in a network of colleges through which students, according to plan, may study on several campuses during their ungraduate years	is	①	②	③	④	⑤	11
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤	12
73. to sponsor each year a rich program of cultural events - lectures, concerts, art exhibits, and the like	is	①	②	③	④	⑤	13
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤	14
74. to experiment with new approaches to individualized instruction such as computer managed learning, tutorials, and flexible scheduling.	is	①	②	③	④	⑤	15
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤	16
75. to award certification of course/program completion for supervised study done away from a campus, e.g., through tutorial centres, computer managed learning, or field work	is	①	②	③	④	⑤	17
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤	18
76. to create a consortium known widely as an intellectually exciting and stimulation place	is	①	②	③	④	⑤	19
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤	20
77. to create procedures by which curricular or instructional innovations may be readily initiated	is	①	②	③	④	⑤	21
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤	22
78. to award certification to some individuals solely on the basis of their performance on an acceptable examination (with no supervised study necessary)	is	①	②	③	④	⑤	23
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤	24
79. to apply cost criteria in deciding among alternative academic and nonacademic programs	is	①	②	③	④	⑤	25
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤	26
80. to maintain or work towards a high degree of inter-institutional cooperation	is	①	②	③	④	⑤	27
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤	28
81. to provide regular evidence that the consortium is actually achieving its stated goals	is	①	②	③	④	⑤	29
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤	30
82. to establish or maintain a high degree of transferability of course/program credit among institutions	is	①	②	③	④	⑤	31
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤	32
83. to be concerned about the efficiency with which consortium operations are conducted.	is	①	②	③	④	⑤	33
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤	34
84. to establish the legal status of consortia as post secondary institutions in Alberta	is	①	②	③	④	⑤	35
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤	36
85. to develop or maintain a process whereby consortia receive funding under the same conditions as provincial postsecondary institutions	is	①	②	③	④	⑤	37
	should be	①	②	③	④	⑤	38

Please respond to these goal statements by blackening one oval after is and one after should be.		of no importance or not applicable	of low importance	of medium importance	of high importance	of extremely high importance	Do not write in this space
86. to establish or maintain a process of public selection of consortia board members	is	○	○	○	○	○	39
	should be	○	○	○	○	○	40
87. to be accountable to funding sources for the effectiveness of consortium programs	is	○	○	○	○	○	41
	should be	○	○	○	○	○	42
88. to maintain or work to achieve a reputable standing for the consortium within the academic community	is	○	○	○	○	○	43
	should be	○	○	○	○	○	44
89. to establish or maintain a process of public selection of local advisory committee members	is	○	○	○	○	○	45
	should be	○	○	○	○	○	46
90. to facilitate the regular meeting of program staff from all member institutions of the consortium	is	○	○	○	○	○	47
	should be	○	○	○	○	○	48
91. to establish a permanent campus for post-secondary education in the area served by the consortium	is	○	○	○	○	○	49
	should be	○	○	○	○	○	50
92. to be organized for continuous short-, medium-, and long range planning for the total consortium	is	○	○	○	○	○	51
	should be	○	○	○	○	○	52
93. to achieve consensus among the people and institutions involved about the goals of the consortium	is	○	○	○	○	○	53
	should be	○	○	○	○	○	54
94. to include local citizens in planning programs that will affect the local community	is	○	○	○	○	○	55
	should be	○	○	○	○	○	56
95. to take part in the development of educational delivery alternatives on a provincial basis	is	○	○	○	○	○	57
	should be	○	○	○	○	○	58
96. to create a climate in which a systematic evaluation of programs is accepted as a way of life	is	○	○	○	○	○	59
	should be	○	○	○	○	○	60
97. to interpret the nature, purpose, and work of the consortium to citizens in the community	is	○	○	○	○	○	61
	should be	○	○	○	○	○	62
98. to provide opportunity for post secondary education to students geographically removed from existing institutions	is	○	○	○	○	○	63
	should be	○	○	○	○	○	64
99. to work with all levels of government in the establishment of program funding alternatives	is	○	○	○	○	○	65
	should be	○	○	○	○	○	66
100. to develop or maintain a high degree of flexibility in program offerings from one year to the next	is	○	○	○	○	○	67
	should be	○	○	○	○	○	68

RESPONDENT PROFILE QUESTIONS

101. Mark the consortium that you are involved with. Mark more than one if applicable.

- Big Country Educational Consortium ○
- Chinook Educational Consortium ○
- North Peace Adult Education Consortium ○
- Pembina Educational Consortium ○
- Yellowhead Region Educational Consortium ○

69

102. Mark the position that describes your role in the consortium. Mark more than one if applicable.

- Board member representing a member institution ○
- Board member representing a community ○
- Local advisory committee member ○

70

103. Mark the years you have served in your current capacity with the consortium.

- Less than 1 year ○
- 1 year ○
- 2 years ○
- 3 years ○
- 4 years ○
- 5 years ○
- 6 years ○
- 7 years ○

71

104. If you previously served in a different capacity with the consortium, mark the length of time you served in that capacity

- Less than 1 year ○
- 1 year ○
- 2 years ○
- 3 years ○
- 4 years ○
- 5 years ○
- 6 years ○
- 7 years ○
- 8 years ○

72

Thankyou for your time and cooperation in completing the Consortium Goals Inventory

Please use attached envelope for return mail, or mail to:

Joan Patrick
11223 - 125 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5M - 0M6

APPENDIX B

CORRESPONDENCE

April 29, 1988

To: Boards of Directors,
Regional Advisory Committee Members,
Alberta Advanced Education Community Consortia

I am writing to ask that you complete and return the attached Consortium Goals Inventory (CGI). I am asking all Board of Director members and Regional Advisory Committee members of Alberta Advanced Education Community Consortia to participate in this study.

All returns will be treated confidentially and data will be reported in summary form only. Your participation will allow me to compile a profile of current goals, as well as identify trends in what consortia goals should be, as perceived by boards and advisory committees. This data will serve as the basis for my thesis in Educational Administration at The University of Alberta.

I will be pleased to send you a summary of the findings of this study when completed. Please complete and return the inventory in the enclosed envelope by May 13, 1988. I appreciate your assistance in this project.

Sincerely yours,

Joan Patrick
11223 - 125 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5M 0M6

APPENDIX C

LIST OF GOALS AND GOAL ABBREVIATIONS

LIST OF GOALS AND GOAL ABBREVIATIONS USED IN TABLES

GOAL	ABBREVIATION
OUTCOME GOALS	
Academic Development	Academic Development
Intellectual Orientation	Intellect Orient
Individual Personal Development	Individual Development
Humanism/ Altruism	Humanism
Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	Cultural Awareness
Traditional Religiousness	Traditional Religious
Vocational Preparation	Vocation Prep
Advanced Training	Advanced Training
Research	Research
Meeting Local Needs	Local Needs
Public Service	Public Service
Social Egalitarianism	Social Egalitarian
Social Criticism/ Activism	Social Activism

PROCESS GOALS	
Freedom	Freedom
Democratic Governance	Democratic Governance
Community/ Climate	Community/ Climate
Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	Intellect Environ
Innovation	Innovation
Off-campus Learning	Off-campus Learning
Accountability/ Efficiency	Accountability/ Efficiency
Institutional Cooperation	Institution Coop
Legal Status	Legal Status
MISCELLANEOUS GOALS	
Basic Literacy	Basic Literacy
Private Funding Alternatives	Private Funding
Permanent Campus	Permanent Campus
Short/Medium/Long Range Planning	Planning
Government Funding Alternatives	Government Funding
Flexibility in Program Offerings	Flexibility
Including Local Citizens in Planning	Citizen Planning

Development of Delivery Alternatives	Delivery Altern
Systematic Evaluation	Evaluation
Interpreting the Consortium to the Community	Interpret Consortium
Reputation in the Academic Community	Academic Reputation
Providing Service to Geographically Removed Students	Geo Removed Students