THE PRIORITY STATUS OF GOALS IN RURAL

VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES AS

PERCEIVED BY STUDENTS, FACULTY,

AND ADMINISTRATORS

by

William C. B. Berghaus

Dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty

of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute

and State University in partial

fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Community College Education

APPROVED:

William A. Keim, Co-Chairman	Marybelle C. Rockey Co-Chairman
Loyd D. Andrew	Marilyn Lichtman

Harold W. Stubblefield

August 1976

Blacksburg, Virginia

DEDICATION

This manuscript is dedicated to my wife   my

son   and to my parents   and

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Institutions of higher education are being pressured
to reexamine their "mission" or "purpose" in general and to
be specific in clarifying, prioritizing, and articulating
their goals. (Graubard, 1974). The pressures appear to be
related to several basic changes in the attitudes and
circumstances of many Americans. Among the changes
influencing institutions of higher education are:
(1) relatively depressed economic conditions, (2) the
emerging concept of higher education as a right of all
people rather than a privilege for a few, and (3) the
increasing acceptance of the concept that education is a
life-long process and the responsibility of institutions
of higher education. (Peterson, 1973; Gleazer, 1973;
Graubard, 1974).

Whatever the basic causes, there are widespread and
persistent demands for the clarification of institutional
goals and priorities in the field of higher education.
(Peterson, 1971; Carnegie Commission on Higher Education,
1972; Bushnell, 1973; Gleazer, 1973; Trivett, 1973). As
the pressure to clarify the goals of higher education
intensifies, the complexity of defining and describing the
abstract concept of goals for higher education continues to
be a problem. One reason for the continuing problem may be

the complexity of higher education in general. Most institutions of higher education frequently serve a variety of interrelated purposes and are therefore by nature extremely complex organizations.

Trivett (1973) developed a comprehensive description of goals which helps clarify the concept while at the same time implies the complexity. According to Trivett, goals for higher education: (1) are complex phenomenon, (2) are desired states which are not totally attainable, (3) represent public policy and indicate intended outcomes, (4) are responsive to societal fluctuations, and (5) exist at several levels within institutions.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study is based upon the problem that a comprehensive study of the priority status of institutional goals as perceived by students, faculty, and administrators in Virginia rural community colleges is needed.

Roueche is one of the large number of educational theorists and practitioners who is calling for an examination of goals and priorities in order to discover where an institution perceives itself to be going. Roueche reasons that the goals of an institution constitute its reason to exist. Consequently, educational leaders must periodically ask themselves questions such as: What is the relationship between goal aspirations and present levels of goal attainment?; Are the goals up to date?; If not, what changes are needed? (Roueche, 1970).

Nationally, relatively little research pertinent to the priority of community college goals had been available prior to 1973. Although numerous earlier studies dealt with the identification and importance of goals for higher education, it was not until the results of the 1973 Project Focus Study were available that nationally significant data on community college goals and priorities were described in a comprehensive manner.

One of the major objectives of the Project Focus Study was to poll community college constituent groups to determine their views on long-range goals and priorities to be served and to identify differences between desired goals and the present situation. Bushnell (1973) concluded that, in general, there appeared to be a relatively high degree of consensus among community-junior college administrators, faculty, and students on major goals. However, several differences were found to exist between groups. Among the areas of disagreement were goals relating to: (1) responding to community needs, (2) ensuring faculty participation in institutional decision making, (3) stressing the concept of personal development of students, and (4) emphasizing so called egalitarian concepts of the community college like the "open door admission's policy".

Although the community college movement was relatively slow in gaining acceptance in Virginia, the period of 1966 through 1973 witnessed dramatic growth in the establishment

of 23 community colleges across the state. As the Virginia
system began to mature, there appeared to be an increasing
emphasis upon community college goals and priorities as
evidenced by: (1) the Chancellor's announced intention
to establish a Management By Objectives (MBO) plan for the
state-wide system, and (2) the Joint Legislative Audit and
Review Commission's (JLARC, 1974) recommendation that the
Virginia Community College System work toward clarifying
the priorities of the System.

Previous studies on community college goals have
tended to reflect the perceptions of full-time constituent
groups. (Peterson, 1971; Bushnell, 1973). In Virginia the
characteristics of both the student body and teaching faculty
have changed dramatically over the past four to five years.
In 1971 there were more full-time than part-time students.
Currently, the opposite is true. In 1970 there were fewer
minority students and a greater number of students between
the ages of 18 and 22 than there are presently. In 1970 the
full-time faculty far outnumbered the part-time faculty. If
recent trends continue, part-time faculty will probably be
the majority within a year or two. (JLARC, 1974).

Thus, the rapid growth of the Community College System
in Virginia, the move toward implementing a Management By
Objectives plan throughout the state, and the trend toward
increased numbers of part-time students and faculty suggest
a need to examine institutional goals and priorities.

PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study was to identify and describe differences between students, faculty members, and administrators with respect to the perceived priority of institutional goals in rural community colleges in Virginia. The specific research objectives of the study were to:

1. Identify and compare student, faculty, and administrator differences in perception of the present priority status of community college goals.

2. Identify and compare student, faculty, and administrator differences in perception of the preferred priority status of community college goals.

3. Determine what differences exist between the three reference groups between present and preferred perceptions of the priority status of goals.

HYPOTHESES

The following general hypotheses, stated in the null form, have been formulated in response to the research objectives and to guide the analysis of data.

1. There are no significant differences between student, faculty, and administrator means for each of the present Educational Program Goals.

2. There are no significant differences between
student, faculty, and administrator means for each of the
present Operational Goals.

3. There are no significant differences between
student, faculty, and administrator means for each of the
preferred Educational Program Goals.

4. There are no significant differences between
student, faculty, and administrator means for each of the
preferred Operational Goals.

5. There are no significant differences between the
present and preferred means for each of the Educational
Program and Operational Goals for students.

6. There are no significant differences between the
present and preferred means for each of the Educational
Program and Operational Goals for faculty.

7. There are no significant differences between the
present and preferred means for each of the Educational
Program and Operational Goals for administrators.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Preliminary work toward developing a comprehensive
plan for installing Management By Objectives in the Virginia
Community College System was initiated by the Chancellor in
the Spring of 1975. The plan included a series of
implementation cycles. Each phase was designed to provide
various system and subsystem components with an opportunity

by which to influence both system-wide and institutional-
level goal statement development.

One element of the first phase was the development
of a preliminary list of system-wide goals and objectives.
Over a period of several months, a Task Force, comprised
of presidents, a provost, deans, division chairmen, faculty
members, and representatives of the Virginia State Depart-
ment of Community Colleges, developed the initial list of
Virginia Community College System goals and objectives.
Using the Task Force's list as a guideline, each Virginia
Community College president is responsible for developing
a set of institutional goals and objectives during 1976.
The goals and objectives that emerge from each institution
will eventually be used as one basis for the Chancellor's
annual evaluation of each college.

This study was designed to provide rural community
colleges within the Virginia Community College System with
one comprehensive information source from which to make
decisions relative to goals. Since institutional goals
frequently serve as one basis for organization planning and
policy development, the identification and comparison of
differences between students, faculty, and administrators
relative to institutional goal priorities may serve as an
information source which could be used by various components
within the community college to enhance existing planning
and policy development processes.

A number of factors have contributed toward the
emergence of persistent demands for changes in higher
education. Frequently, persons responsible for initiating
change lack the evidence and rationale which help assure
that institutional changes accomplish institutional
intentions. Martorana and Kuhns (1975) have recently
developed an "interactive forces" theory of change. They
suggest that the differences between aspiration toward a
particular goal and the present degree of perceived
attainment of the goal is a major force influencing
academic change. One aspect of this study was to identify
differences between community college students, faculty,
and administrators with respect to their perceptions of
community college goals.

From a broader perspective, competition for scarce
resources on national, state, and local levels appears to
be increasing. The public is demanding more and more
quantitative, descriptive information from public service
agencies. The need to articulate agency goals to
constituents and supporters is likely to become increasingly
important.

A search of the literature revealed that a
comprehensive analysis of rural community college goals
and priorities within the Virginia Community College System
has not yet been undertaken. In fact, there appears to be
a lack of research support for rural colleges in general.

A conference sponsored by the Southeastern Community College
Leadership Program on "New Responses to New Problems: The
Rural Community College" in the Spring of 1975 and an
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
monograph entitled, 100,000 and Under, published in 1968
indicate a lack of research attention to rural colleges.
A special session on "Rural Community Colleges: Status
and Prospects" conducted during the 1976 Annual Convention
of the American Association of Community and Junior
Colleges further emphasized this need. One significant
aspect of this dissertation is to respond to this research
void.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. The data collected for this study were limited
to selected reference groups including: (1) administrators
(presidents, deans, division chairmen, directors, and
coordinators), (2) a random sample of full-time and part-
time community college faculty, and (3) a random sample
of full-time and part-time students.

2. The data were collected from the following six
rural community colleges within the Virginia Community
College System:

Blue Ridge	Mountain Empire
Danville	Paul D. Camp
Lord Fairfax	Southwest Virginia

The six colleges were randomly selected and were considered
to be representative of a total population of sixteen rural

community colleges within the Virginia Community College
System.

Only a sample of rural Virginia Community Colleges
was included in the investigation on the basis that:
(1) national and state-wide studies are less appropriate
for local use; and (2) a research void on rural community
colleges in Virginia exists.

3. The goals selected for the study were limited to
a list of goals derived from the Virginia Community College
System Statement of Mission and Goals.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMINOLOGY

The following glossary provides definitions of terms
used in this study:

Administrator: A full-time community college
employee designated by the president of each college which
participated in the study as an administrator holding the
rank of President, Dean, Division Chairman, Director, or
Coordinator.

Faculty Member: Any employee designated by the
president of each of the community colleges as holding
faculty rank but not an administrative title.

Goal: A statement of a hoped for accomplishment derived
from the mission statement. A goal is a statement of intent
to achieve a desired state, to provide a service, or to
develop a service.

Present Goals: The currently existing institutional goals as perceived by the respondents in the study.

Preferred Goals: The ideal or "should be" goal state as viewed by the respondents in the study.

Institutional Goals: The stated goals as developed by the VCCS Task Force on Management By Objectives and authorized by the State Department of Community Colleges.

Educational Program Goals: A category of goals that deals with activities such as programs and course offerings.

Operational Goals: A category of goals which relates to the management policies or the operation of a college.

Goal Priority: The importance of a goal as measured by responses to the research questionnaire.

Perception: An estimate of how an individual views the relative priority of institutional goals according to the responses recorded on the questionnaire.

Rural College: Any Virginia Community College which is characterized by: (1) a multi-political subdivision service area population of less than 200,000 and (2) a total student headcount enrollment of less than 2,500 during the 1976 Winter Quarter.

Student: Any individual who is registered for at least one credit of college course work within the Virginia Community College System.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter was to review and
synthesize the literature related to community college goals
and to develop a conceptual framework for the examination
of goals in Virginia's rural community colleges. To
achieve this purpose, the materials were organized into the
following subsections: (1) The Concept of Organizational
Goals, (2) An Overview of the Historical Development of
Community College Goals, and (3) The Development of
Community College Goals in Virginia.

THE CONCEPT OF ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS

Organizational Theory and Goals

The emphasis of recent research supports the view
that goals are a central concept in the study of
organizations. Organizational behavior in a general way
can be seen as a function of an interrelationship
between the goals of the individual person and the goals
of the organization. (Etizoni, 1964; Hampton, Summer, and
Webber, 1973; Haynes, Massie, and Wallace, 1975).

Although the precise nature of this interrelationship
does not appear to be fully understood, a number of
theoretical models have been developed to describe the
phenomenon. Among these is the well-known "Getzels-Guba
Model", which attempts to describe the interrelationship

between the nomothetic or organizational dimension and the idiographic or personal dimension. In general, the model suggests that a balance between the nomothetic and ideographic dimension is desirable for the effective operation of an organization. (Morphet, Johns, and Reller, 1974).

There seems to be some disagreement among organization theorists regarding whether or not a state of high integration of individual goals with organization goals is possible to achieve and whether or not it is desirable even if attainable. The literature suggests that some degree of integration of individual and/or organizational goals would appear to be necessary for an organization to operate effectively. (Simon, 1964; Etizoni, 1964; Hampton, Summer, and Webber, 1973).

In this study it is important to distinguish personal from organizational goals. A personal goal is similar in many respects to the psychological concept of motive; that is, a personal goal is a future condition that an individual desires for himself. This may be distinguished from what an individual desires for the organization, which may or may not correspond to the organization's formal goals.

In general, it is probably safer to assume that an individual's goals for the organization will not coincide with the organization's formally stated goals. Frequently a kind of trade off between personal and organizational goals develops whereby the individual and organization are

mutually satisfied to some degree. (March/Simon, 1958;
Cyert/March, 1963; Etizoni, 1964; Gross/Grambsch, 1968).

Differences with respect to the major purposes of
the organization among individuals and/or subgroups of the
organization may result in what Haynes, Massie, and Wallace
(1975) describe as "dysfunctions". Dysfunctions may prompt
members of various subgroups to seek goals that are different
from those formally established by the organizational
heirarchy. As a result, a conflict may arise between formal
and informal interest groups. If certain subgroups are able
to influence the goals for the total organization, the
organization may then become an instrument for serving
special interests rather than a cohesive means for achieving
goals. (Haynes, Massie, and Wallace, 1975).

Selznick (1961) stated that an organization has need
for security, stable lines of authority and communication,
and stable informal relationships. He concluded that a
minimum level of organizational unity with respect to goals
is necessary to insure the continued existence of the
organization.

Consonance or perfect adjustment within an organization
is probably not attainable or even desirable. A practice
instituted to enhance adjustment in some respect often
disturbs it in others. Too much homogeneity of purpose tends
to reduce the flexibility that is necessary for an
organization to survive. On the other hand, some heterogeneity

in the organization is needed to cope with changes in its
environment and to maintain some degree of security,
continuity, and stability within the organization. (Simon,
1964; Etizoni, 1964; Hampton, Summer, and Webber, 1973).

In general individuals join together to form an
organization to accomplish purposes that they could not
effectively accomplish alone. However, when two or more
individuals join together, at some time differences of opinion
with respect to organizational goals are likely to develop
which may conflict. These differences may result in a
positive or negative influence on the achievement of the
goals for which the group was created. The literature seems
to suggest that part of the task of management is to work
with personnel in the organization to find the mesh which
will move the organization toward the accomplishment of its
goals while at the same time meet the needs of the individuals
within the organization. (Morphet, Johns, and Reller, 1974;
Haynes, Massie, and Wallace, 1975).

Mission Statements, Goals, and Objectives

Words like "mission", "goal", and "objective" appear
repeatedly in the literature of education. Frequently, the
terms are used interchangeably, as if they were synonymous.
This may partially account for much of the confusion and
ambiguity that typically accompanies discussion of already
complex conceptual abstractions. Within the past two decades,
scholars in the field of education such as Krathwohl, Bloom,

Masia (1956), Mager (1962), Gross and Grambsch (1968),
Peterson (1971), Trivett (1973), Farmer and Richman (1974),
and others have made significant contributions toward
clarifying and distinguishing between the concepts.

It may be useful at the outset to establish working
definitions of the terms-mission, goal, and objective, as
they will be used in this study. In general, the three
concepts may be thought of in terms of a hierarchy of
statements about an educational institution's intents and
aspirations. The concepts may be distinguished on the
basis of a number of characteristics including the
following: (1) the relative level of abstraction or
specificity, (2) the implied degree of attainability,
(3) the susceptibility of the statement of measurement,
(4) the relative degree of implied permanence, and (5) the
operational utility of the statement. (Trivett, 1973;
Farmer and Richman, 1974; Ryder, 1975; Tollefson, 1975).

The mission of an educational organization is
usually stated in highly abstract general terms. It is
typically a brief, broad statement of key elements of the
institution's philosophy of purpose and is ordinarily
characterized as having a sense of lasting permanence.
Usually, a mission statement is expressed as an ideal which:
(1) is not likely to be attained, (2) is normally comprehen-
sive in nature, and (3) implies multiple intents and
aspirations. (Trivett, 1973; Farmer and Richman, 1974).

Goals may be distinguished from mission statements
primarily by the degree of specificity and sense of
implied permanence. Goals are typically more specific
than the organizational mission but not as specific as
objectives. A goal is a statement of intent to achieve a
desired state, to provide a service, or to develop a
procedure. Goals are relatively permanent in nature and
suggest a distinct institutional direction. Goals are
usually more susceptible to measurement than a mission
statement because they are less ambiguously stated, they
are less abstract, and they focus on one key element of
the organization's mission. (Peterson, 1971; Ryder, 1975;
Creager, 1976).

In short goals may be thought of as occupying a critical
position within a hierarchy of an organization's intents.
Goals help translate the overall mission of the institution
into operational objectives; that is, they represent an
important intermediate link between an organization's general
mission and specific operational objectives. (Trivett, 1973;
Neil, 1975; Creager, 1976).

Objectives are frequently described in the literature
of education as specific statements of intents aimed toward
attaining goals. Objectives are usually susceptible to
quantitative measurement and indicate to what extent an end
will be attained. They are typically less permanent in nature
than goals and are readily applicable toward specifying

operational activity. (Mager, 1962; Peterson, 1971; Farmer and Richman, 1974).

Thus far conceptual distinctions between mission, goal, and objective statements have been described. Since goals are the primary concern of this study, further discussion in this section focuses specifically upon the concept of organizational goals.

Types of Goals

The concept of goals seems to acquire a variety of meanings depending upon the perspective of the writer. Outside the field of education Simon (1964), B. Gross (1968), and Perrow (1972), to name only a few, have made notable contributions toward clarifying and describing the concept.

Perrow (1972) from a sociological perspective of organizations, describes five types or levels of goals. He distinguishes the five categories as follows:

  1. Social goals. Referent: society in
      general. This category deals with
      large classes of organizations that
      fulfill societal needs.

  2. Output goals. Referent: the public
      in contact with the organization.
      This category deals with types of
      output defined in terms of consumer
      functions.

  3. System goals. Referent: the state
      or manner of functioning of the
      organization, independent of the
      goods or services it produces or
      its derived goals.

4. Product goals (or, more exactly, product
   characteristic goals). Referent: the
   characteristics of the goods or services
   produced.

5. Derived goals. Referent: the uses to
   which the organization puts the power
   it generates in pursuit of other goals.
   (pp. 442-443)

According to Perrow some goals could be classified into

one or more categories, but his purpose was to illustrate

the variety of goals organizations may pursue, not to

create an elaborate taxonomy of goals. Perrow indicates

that goals provide a key toward understanding organizational

behavior; they reflect the uniqueness of the organization;

and they are necessary to achieve a concerted organizational

effort.

Speaking from a management perspective, B. Gross (1968)

has identified seven general types of business related

goals. The categories are as follows:

1. Satisfaction of Interest: organizations
   exist to satisfy the interest (or needs,
   desires, or wants) of various people,
   both members and outsiders.

2. Output of Services or Goods: the
   output of an organization is composed
   of those products which it makes
   available for use by clients.

3. Efficiency or Profitability: when
   available inputs are perceived as
   scarce, attention is directed toward
   making efficient use of inputs
   relative to output.

4. Investment in Organizational Viability:
   the survival or growth of the
   organization.

5. Mobilization of Resources: to produce,
    organizations must mobilize resources.

6. Observance of Codes: rules imposed by
    law, morality, ethics, or influences
    of formal and/or informal groups.

7. Rationality: satisfactoriness in
    terms of desirability, feasibility,
    and consistency. (pp. 273-274)

B. Gross, building upon Simon's (1964) earlier work,
suggests that the above goal classification scheme is
appropriate for most business organizations. Both Simon
(1964) and B. Gross (1968) made important contributions
to the study of goals by suggesting that: (1) an
organization may pursue a multiple number of goals
simultaneously, and (2) organizational goals usually are
distinct but related to individual goals and motivations.

Similar in many respects to B. Gross' classification
scheme, Gross and Grambsch (1968) developed a structure
for categorizing university goals. According to their
formulation, goals may be classified under two major
headings: (1) Output Goals - subdivided into Student
Expressive, Student Instrumental, Research and Direct
Service Goals, and (2) Support Goals - subdivided into
Adaptation, Management, Motivation, and Position Goals.

Perhaps Gross and Grambsch's major contributions to
the study of goals were: (1) to develop the idea that
universities are complex organizations with multiple goals,
(2) to clarify and delineate the differences between output

and support goals, and (3) to clarify the differences and
to describe the relationships between personal and organi-
zational goals.

Peterson (1973) conducted a study of institutional
goals using a population which included public and private
colleges and universities and community colleges. The
theoretical framework of the instrument designed for the
study consisted of 20 "goal areas" divided into two general
categories. The first set was conceived of as "output"
goals (qualities of graduating students, research emphasis,
for example). Goals in the second general category were
referred to as "process" goals which are conceived as
relating to the educational process and campus climate.

Peterson's conceptualization of college and university
goals is similar in many respects to that used by Gross and
Grambsch. However, Peterson did not include some goal
areas such as faculty and administrative protection,
inducement, and special interest goals.

Bushnell, in a study reported in 1973, surveyed a
random sample of community college presidents, faculty, and
students on institutional goals. The conceptual framework
Bushnell used in studying community college goals was based
upon the work of Gross and Grambsch (1968) and Peterson
(1973). The findings of Bushnell's study are of
particular interest to this study and are reported in detail
later in this chapter.

Perhaps the most comprehensive formulation of college
and university goals to date was developed by Farmer and
Richman (1974). Building upon the work of Gross and
Grambsch (1968), Baldridge (1971), Peterson (1973), and
Cohen and March (1974), they developed a list of 31 goals
pursued by higher education institutions. The goals were
divided into five basic categories. Farmer and Richman
did not differentiate between outcome or process goals.
Instead, they treated all of the goals in their formulation
as results, outcomes, or outputs of institutions. Many of
the goals are related in terms of a correspondence between
ends and means.

The following scheme describes Farmer's and Richman's
system for categorizing and defining goals. In addition,
their estimate of the relative priority of each goal
based upon previous studies has been indicated in
parenthesis.

    A. Program Goals:

        1. Undergraduate education (2)
        2. Graduate education (5)
        3. Part-time and Continuing Education (26)
        4. Research (6)
        5. Athletics (7)

    B. Student Impact Goals:

        6. Intellectual development (11)
        7. Student scholarship, scientific
           research, and creative endeavor (12)
        8. Jobs, careers, and status (22)
        9. Individual personal development (15)
      10. Student activities and rights (19)
      11. Cultural and religious assimilation (18)

C. Faculty Oriented Goals:

12. Protect the faculty (1)
13. Faculty governance (14)
14. Faculty benefits and privileges (4)

D. Institution and Administration Goals:

15. Seek truth (16)
16. Admit students of high potential (13)
17. Social egalitarianism (24)
18. Innovation (21)
19. High institutional prestige and pride, good facilities, and a health climate (9)
20. Maintain high quality in a balanced way in all programs, taking into account institutional priorities (28)
21. Maintain top quality in most important programs (10)
22. Effective and efficient staffing of managerial and support staff positions (22)
23. Income, perquisites, prestige, and job protection for administrative personnel (7)
24. Democratic governance (20)
25. Operating efficiency (30)

E. Goals Related to Outside World:

26. Public service (23)
27. Serve as major cultural and information center for the community (25)
28. Social criticism and activism (29)
29. Outside validation of programs (8)
30. Ensure desired funds and other resources from external sources (3)
31. Accountability and goal attainment verification (27) (pp. 113-119)

Thus far at least three general conclusions may be drawn from the literature on the concept of goals. First, goals are complex abstractions which have been defined, classified, and described in a variety of ways depending upon the intent of the writer. Second, goals are an important aspect in the study of formal organizations. Third, most complex organizations such as a community

college usually pursue a variety of goals simultaneously.

Uses of Goals

To further clarify the various dimensions of the · concept of goals, a general description of some of the many uses that goals may serve seems appropriate. From a broad perspective goals may be used to help communicate and justify the role of an organization in society. In a narrower sense goals may serve as a set of guidelines which help focus attention upon internal organizational activity. In other words goals may provide a general framework and basis for setting patterns of organizational authority, channels of internal communication and decision making, and other structural relationships. In still another sense goals may serve as standards to assess the relative effectiveness of the organization. (Etzioni, 1964; Peterson, 1971; Perrow, 1972; Kast/Rosenzweig, 1974; Cross, 1974).

According to Peterson (1971) the three most practical uses of goals in higher education are: (1) to provide a basis for policy development, (2) to provide a general framework for decision making, and (3) to provide a basis for institutional planning.

Peterson states:

A conception of institutional goals may serve
as a basic element in a formulation of the
institution's policy, philosophy, or ideology.
Stated goals help tie together assumptions,
values, and hopes for the institution into a
coherent policy ... a policy-as-goals statement,

especially if democratically conceived and
widely understood in the college community,
should serve the entire community as a
framework for reaching decisions, solving
problems, allocating resources, and
accordingly ordering actions in certain
directions. The goals can be used as
standards for decision making by all
campus groups ... gaps between official
and operative and between organizational
and individual goals would be reduced ...
planning in higher education goes on at
many levels and consciousness of goals is
critical at all of them. (p. 4)

The importance of identifying and describing goals

in policy development, decision making, and planning has

widespread support both within education and in non-

educational settings. (Emery, 1969; Anthony, Deardon,

and Vancil, 1973; Hampton, Summer, and Webber, 1973; Knoell/

McIntyre, 1974; Haynes, Massie, Wallace, 1975; McFadden, 1975).

Bushnell (1973) has suggested another important

use of a concept of goals. He asserts that a periodic

assessment of the perceived differences between a college's

present and desired goals may lead to the identification of

existing or potential problems. He suggests that

recognition and awareness of goal priority differences is

an essential first step toward alleviating or eliminating

a problem.

Further evidence of the possible utility of a concept

of institutional goals has been suggested in a recently

formulated theory of academic change. Martorana and

Kuhns (1975) have suggested that the pressure to change

is almost universal in higher education today. They also
have observed that persons responsible for leadership,
direction, and improvement of the effectiveness of higher
education frequently lack the analytic evidence and well-
developed theoretical concepts which help assure that
institutional changes accomplish institutional intentions.

To provide persons involved in the processes of
change with a conceptual framework within which to plan,
project, and implement change, Martorana and Kuhns have
developed an Interactive Forces Theory of Change. In their
words the Interactive Forces Theory:

> .... aims to help innovators (change agents)
> objectively anticipate the relative
> strength of the various forces interacting
> on an innovation at each stage of its
> development and to use judgements about
> the strength of the forces as a guide in
> bringing to bear maximum effect of all
> positive forces while simultaneously
> minimizing the cumulative effect of
> negative forces. By anticipating the
> potential relative influence of pro and
> con forces, planners can simulate the
> chances for successful implementation of
> any proposed change, and identify those
> alternative paths which would lead most
> directly to a desired goal. (p. 177)

According to Martorana and Kuhns, at least three forces
interact to influence academic change in higher education.
These forces are: (1) personal, (2) extrapersonal, and
(3) goal hiatus.

Personal forces include: (1) decision makers (people
influential in the institution and its environment such as

presidents, deans, board officials, etc.), (2) implementors (administrators who carry out decisions, faculty, and other academic professionals), and (3) consumers (such as students, alumni, parents, and legislators).

When forces move beyond the influence of single individuals, they are transposed from personal to extra-personal forces. Extrapersonal forces include physical influences (such as facilities, land, and equipment) and intangible ones (such as policies, traditions, trends, and laws).

In Martorana and Kuhns' formulation the third major force influencing academic change is "goal hiatus". This refers to the discrepancy between the aspiration toward a particular institutional goal and the achievement of the goal. A goal hiatus between aspiration and achievement complements the personal and extrapersonal forces in that academic change is driven or energized by the result or effect of all interactive forces.

Martorana and Kuhns' theory of interactive forces emphasizes the primacy of the concept of "goal hiatus". Although a number of scholars have studied academic change, it appears that no one has explicitly emphasized the importance of the concept of goals as convincingly as Martorana and Kuhns. The efficacy of their work remains to be further tested in higher education.

AN OVERVIEW OF THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOALS

The community-junior college movement emerged toward
the end of the 1800's as an alternative to the lower-division
education programs of colleges and universities. A number
of educators during this period believed that the scope of
freshmen and sophomore work was basically different from
that of university work. Concurrently, a concern for
extending collegiate level education opportunities to a
broader base of college age youth was also developing as a
response to the increased number of persons aspiring toward
higher education. Thus, paradoxically, the community
college movement had its philosophical origin in both the
egalitarian concern to improve access to higher education
and the elitest notion that upper-division work should be
limited to those who seek scholarly specialization,
professional preparation, and/or pure research goals.
(Koos, 1925; Campbell, 1930; Eells, 1931; Fields, 1962).

A few earlier attempts were made to separate the
upper and lower divisions of the university, but it was not
until the opening of the University of Chicago in 1892
that the first real separation occurred. William Ramey
Harper, referred to by some as the Father of the Community
College Movement, separated the University of Chicago into
"Academic College" (the first two years) and the "University

College" (the last two years). Later these titles were changed to "Junior College" and "Senior College" respectively. One of Harper's intentions was to eliminate responsibility for the lower division from the university and to improve the access to higher education for students who would not likely complete the regular four-year college program.

While shifting of the first two years of university preparatory work "downward" significantly contributed to the development of the first junior colleges, the idea of extending high school experience "upward" was equally important. Many of the traditional goals and values of the public high school were incorporated into the philosophical basis of the first public community colleges. Ideas such as universal opportunity for public education, local control and support, and relevant curriculum designed to meet the needs of the individual and community were all borrowed from the tradition of the American high school. (Koos, 1925; Campbell, 1930; Eells, 1931; Fields, 1962).

A number of additional factors also seemed to shape the first community-junior colleges. By 1900 there was a dramatic increase in the number of people completing high school. This fact forced colleges and universities to gradually upgrade their admission requirement to cope with the increased demand for higher education. For many people opportunities for college work were either non-existent or too remote geographically. In addition, higher education

was too costly for the average person to afford. (Eells, 1931; Fields, 1962; Thornton, 1966).

In 1919 McDowell, based upon the results of his national study, listed the 11 most frequently given reasons for the organization of junior colleges.

Review of McDowell's study suggest that as far back as 1919 community-junior colleges were beginning to develop an identity as community-based institutions of higher education designed to offer both transfer and occupational programs.

By 1920 the community-junior college idea had taken root. The early years had stressed the transfer function. This is not surprising since most of the two-year institutions established during the period were private junior colleges. However, during the 1920's the emphasis upon transfer education was gradually becoming broadened.

Lange, during his tenure at the University of California, went further than most community-junior college advocates of his day by emphasizing the notion that community-junior colleges should not only provide transfer education opportunities but should also stress vocational training. Additional impetus to develop occupational programs came as a result of the Smith-Hughes Act and federally sponsored Vocational Education Legislation in the late 1920's. With the goal of vocational education recognized as a legitimate function of the community-junior college, the seed of what has become the modern concept of the comprehensive community

college was sown. (Bogue, 1950; Fields, 1962; Brick, 1964; Thornton, 1966).

Koos in 1925 after reviewing and analyzing the literature, described 21 purposes of the community-junior colleges. Koo's study reflects the primary interest of the early colleges in transfer education; but, it also suggests broader purposes and goals. One of the conclusions that Koos suggested in his study was that many of the claims that community-junior colleges were making about the comprehensive nature of their programs were not in fact being delivered.

Campbell (1930) examined catalogs of 343 junior colleges for the years 1928-1929 to determine the major purposes of junior colleges. One of the results of his study was the production of a list of the 35 most frequently mentioned two-year college goals.

Campbell's study was consistent with Koo's (1925) earlier findings and Eell's (1931) later description of junior college functions. All three studies emphasized the multiple goals of the emerging comprehensive community college concept.

The years of the Great Depression slowed the community-junior college movement somewhat but during this period the purposes of the two-year colleges became broadened. During World War II only a few new colleges were built, but the existing colleges accepted the

challenge for retraining and upgrading technical workers.
Following World War II returning veterans placed increasing
pressure on higher education to expand service. The two-
year colleges began to experience dramatic growth in
enrollments. Many new colleges were built. (Bogue, 1950;
Fields, 1962).

During the mid to late forties non-credit adult
education and student guidance and counseling began to
emerge as focal functions of many two-year colleges. With
this additional emphasis to the existing array of goals,
the prototype comprehensive community college, as we know
it today, began to gather momentum.

In 1946 President Truman established the President's
Commission on Higher Education to study and recommend
national goals for higher education. The report of the
Commission, entitled, Higher Education for American
Democracy, advocated a number of mandates for post-
secondary education. The report expressed the theme that
higher education should be more democratized and emphasized
the need to improve access to higher education. The
Commission specifically recommended: (1) that historical
economic barriers to higher education be reduced through
increased Federal funding, (2) that greater use be made
of local community colleges, (3) that adult education be
given greater recognition, and (4) finally, that the
historical elitest-orientation toward higher education be

transformed to a more egalitarian approach. (United States

President's Commission on Higher Education, 1947).

Reflecting the mandate of President Truman's

Commission, Bogue (1950) characterized the basic function

of community colleges as follows:

> By examination of life situations, of
> identifiable problems that need solution
> on national, state, and local levels, we
> arrive at conclusions regarding the basic
> functions of community colleges. They are
> guidance and counseling for all students
> and for the people of the community; general
> education for all students regardless of
> vocational objectives, technical, and
> other vocational training, and that on a
> continuing basis, for students who will not
> advance to upper-division collegiate
> studies; the further democratization of
> higher education by surmounting barriers
> of geography and family financial
> difficulties; the popularization of
> higher education by breaking down family
> traditions and creating greater personal
> interest and motivation; adult education
> and university-parallel studies for those
> students who should continue formal
> education. (p. 64)

Medsker (1960), Fields (1962), and others supported Bogue's

formulation of the comprehensive nature of public community

colleges. Fields (1962) described the essential characteristics

of community colleges as democratic, comprehensive, community

centered, and adaptable.

Thus, during the fifties the concept of the

comprehensive community college had developed and matured.

By the early 1960's people with diverse backgrounds,

aspirations, and abilities began flocking to the open door

campuses. Many authorities have described the phenomenal
growth and development of the community college movement
during the sixties as a decade that may well stand out as
the most significant period of growth in the history of
democratizing American higher education. (Medsker and
Tillery, 1971; Bushnell, 1973; Gleazer, 1973).

In 1971 a national study called Project Focus sponsored
by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
was conducted to survey goal perceptions of community
college students, faculty, and presidents. Each group was
asked to rate a list of goal items in terms of how much
emphasis was being placed on the goal at their institution
at the present time and in terms of what the institution's
goals should be during the coming decade.

The following results reflect the major findings of
the Project Focus Study:

1. A high degree of congruity was found in
    the rank ordering of the same set of goals
    by presidents and faculty.

2. "Serving the higher educational needs of
    youth from the surrounding community" and
    "helping students acquire the ability to
    adapt to new occupational requirements
    as technology and society change" both
    fell into the top third of the preferred
    goals across institutions as judged or

ranked by presidents and faculty.

3. Presidents emphasized "responding to community needs" more strongly than faculty.

4. Faculty placed greater stress than presidents on "the student's personal development".

5. Faculty rated "providing some form of education for any student regardless of his academic ability" as a high priority present goal while presidents rated the same goal as a low priority.

6. In general faculty evidenced less concern than presidents with institutional climate and administrative goals.

7. Faculty rated the "role of faculty in institutional decision making" as an extremely or quite important preferred priority. Presidents ranked faculty and student involvement in decision making in the lower third of their preferred priorities.

8. In general presidents appeared to prefer greater emphasis upon curricular and institutional evaluation than the

other two groups.

9. Among the president's lowest ranked goals
    (both present and preferred) were:
    (1) helping to formulate programs in
    a number of public policy areas and
    (2) attempting to solve the economic,
    political, and social needs of the
    surrounding community.

10. "Making financial assistance available to
    any student who wants to enroll in college"
    and "providing some form of education
    for any student regardless of his academic
    ability" were assigned a higher rank by
    students than either faculty or presidents.

11. Students ranked "formulation of public
    policy programs in such areas as pollution
    control, urban renewal, and health care"
    high on their list of preferred goals.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOALS
IN VIRGINIA

As of April 16, 1976, the Virginia Community College
System has been in operation for only ten years. The move
toward democratizing higher education in the Commonwealth
was late in coming in comparison to states such as
California, Illinois, and Florida, that pioneered the concept.

It was not until the late fifties that the first
major study concerned with the desirability and feasibility
of a statewide system of public two-year colleges was
authorized by the Virginia State Council of Higher Education.
The State Council in initiating the study was responding to
the mandate of the General Assembly to promote the
development of a coordinated system of higher education in
the state.

The 1959 study, directed by Martorana, was entitled,
Needs, Policies and Plans for 2-Year Colleges in Virginia.
One of the major conclusions of the study was that gaps
existed in the state's system of higher education. The gaps
were seen to occur primarily because access to institutions
of higher education was extremely limited in some areas of
the state. The study group believed that a decentralized
system of two-year colleges would not only broaden the
opportunities for higher education but would also be
economical for the state and for the student.

The Martorana Study further recommended that the two-
year colleges be comprehensive in nature and have a
commitment to serve their communities. It urged that the
program offerings should include: (1) college transfer
education, (2) occupational/technical education, (3) adult
education, (4) community service activities, and (5)
emphasis upon guidance and counseling services. Curiously,
the Martorana Study did not recommend the need to provide

students with opportunities to do developmental work, which by 1959 had become one of the characteristics of a comprehensive community college. (State Council of Higher Education, 1959).

Had the recommendations of the Martorana Study been implemented, a philosophical framework necessary to develop comprehensive community college goals would for the most part have existed. But, the study failed to bring about any immediate substantial changes in higher education and it failed markedly in its primary goal to bring about a network of publicly financed two-year colleges. Martorana claimed that the plan failed primarily because of opposition from the established four-year institutions. Whatever the reasons, it was evident that in 1959 the General Assembly was not ready to endorse the establishment of a statewide system of community colleges. (Vaughan, 1971).

Despite the failure to implement the Martorana Study, in 1962 the General Assembly created a Commission on Vocational and Technical Education. The commission, directed by D. French Slaughter, was to make a study and recommend a course of action for improving vocational and technical education in public, post-secondary institutions. In 1963 the Slaughter Commission recommended the expansion of the six existing vocational schools and the development of five new ones. In addition, the commission recommended that the state consider meeting a broader range of post-high

school educational needs through a system of comprehensive

community colleges. This last recommendation was to eventually

have a strong impact upon the development of the community

colleges in Virginia.

During the period of the early sixties a number of

other significant events were occurring that helped support

the growing interest in the community college idea. First,

the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce had conducted a

statewide survey which clearly documented increasing interest

and demand for a program of post-high school education. The

study showed that business and professional leaders in the

Commonwealth recognized the importance and desirability of

providing opportunities for occupational/technical and

adult education within commuting distance (30 miles or less)

of all the citizens of the Commonwealth. Second, the

Southern Regional Education Board through its Commission on

Goals for Higher Education in the South (1961), recommended

that each member state develop a strong system of two-year

community colleges. The commission expressed the belief

that community colleges are economical for both students

and taxpayers and are designed to be responsive to local

needs. Third, Governor Harrison, speaking on the role of

Higher Education in Virginia, saw the promise of community

colleges for meeting the educational needs of the state while

at the same time allowing the state to avoid the development

of huge universities. (Vaughan, 1971).

In 1964 Virginia's college enrollment numbered about
78,000 students. Projections of college enrollments
indicated that by 1970 some 120,000 students would seek
entrance to higher education. It appeared that higher
education in the Commonwealth was ready for a change, but
the difficult question for many to answer was, what kind of
change should be made?

One alternative was to expand the services of existing
institutions. In 1964 there were 11 publicly supported
two-year colleges or universities. The two-year branches
not only lacked occupational/technical programs and
adult education but also had highly selective admission
requirements. They were neither meeting the needs of
industry nor the needs of students who did not want a
transfer education program. Thus, the branches had to
broaden their offerings or the state would have to find
another alternative to meet the demands for higher education.

In 1964 there were nine vocational-technical schools
in Virginia. Most of the programs were at the high school
level while others were oriented toward high school graduates.
None of them offered two-year associate degrees. In general,
the vocational-technical schools appeared to be too few in
number, inappropriate in the level of offerings, and not
productive enough (in terms of numbers of graduates) to
meet the growing demands. (Vaughan, 1971).

In 1964 primarily as a consequence of the need for more occupational/technical education, the General Assembly passed an act creating the State Board of Technical Education as well as the Department of Technical Education. The organizational approach that the newly authorized technical colleges took was similar in many respects to that used in many comprehensive community colleges in other states. The Guide for the Establishment of Technical Colleges in Virginia defined a technical college as a non-resident, multi-purpose, and area-centered institution. Provisions for low cost adult education, college transfer courses, and developmental work were also indicated in the Guide.

With the development of the "comprehensive" technical colleges, it appeared that Virginia had settled upon the direction for expanded programs of post-high school education. It seemed that branch colleges under the control of established four-year colleges and universities and a system of technical colleges under the control of the State Department of Technical Education were to meet the needs of the Commonwealth. This, however, was not to be the case.

As noted earlier the Slaughter Commission in 1963 had recommended that in the long run the state should consider meeting the needs of post-high school education through a system of comprehensive community colleges. The 1964 session of the General Assembly had made provision for the appointment of the Virginia Higher Education Study

Commission. The Commission, which made its report to the
General Assembly in 1965, concluded that the most urgent
need in Virginia's program of higher education was the
development of a comprehensive community college system.
(Russel, 1965).

Thus, in 1966 following the recommendations of the
Slaughter Commission (1963) and the Higher Education Study
Commission (1965), the General Assembly passed legislation
calling for the establishment of a statewide system of
publicly supported community colleges. During the same
session the General Assembly repealed the legislation that
had created the Department of Technical Education and the
State Board of Technical Education. The law defined a
comprehensive community college as an institution of higher
education which offers instruction in one or more of the
following fields: (1) freshmen and sophomore courses in
arts and sciences acceptable for transfer in baccalaureate
degree programs, (2) diversified technical curricula
including programs leading to the associate degree,
(3) vocational and technical education leading directly to
employment, and (4) courses in general and continuing
education for adults in the above fields. The law provided
for the transfer of seven of the branch colleges and all
post-high school programs of the area vocational and
technical schools to the system of community colleges.
(Vaughan, 1971).

Governor Godwin (1966), in his policy address in 1966 to the General Assembly, defined the comprehensive community college as follows:

> (1) It is a varied and flexible institution,
> tailored to community needs and designed to
> serve every citizen within commuting distance,
> (2) it offers universal admission to high
> school graduates, weighs their potential
> through extensive guidance and testing, and
> directs them to their proper field of study,
> (3) it relieves the pressure on our four-
> year resident institutions at a fraction of
> their cost per student, (4) it substitutes
> informed choice for the guesswork that so
> often selects a college for the high
> school graduates, (5) it minimizes the
> heartache and provides new opportunity
> for the amazing number of four-year
> college freshmen who are unable to complete
> their first year despite the best admission
> machinery, and (6) it offers a second
> chance to high school graduates who have
> been refused admittance to the college
> of their choice, as well as to those
> who would have little chance of enrolling
> in any four-year college. (pp. 7-8)

In January 1967 a proposed master plan for the state-wide system of community colleges was published. The plan, prepared under the direction of consultant E. Rhodes, called for the establishment of 22 community colleges across the state. This would put one within commuting distance of every citizen in the state. (Rhodes, 1967).

In summary although the comprehensive community college philosophy was late in coming to Virginia, when it was finally accepted a decade of dramatic growth and development in higher education never before experienced in the Commonwealth was to follow. The Martorana Study in 1959, the Slaughter Commission report in 1963, and the Virginia Education Study Commission in 1964 were extremely influential forces that contributed to the evolution of the system. The 1966 General Assembly had clearly articulated the broad mission which the community college system was to fulfill.

The period of the late sixties and even the early seventies was a time of relative abundance in terms of financial resources available to develop the community college system. By 1975 most of the colleges proposed in Rhodes' master plan for the statewide system were in operation.

In the Spring of 1975 a Task Force appointed by the Chancellor began to develop a plan for installing a Management By Objectives (MBO) System in the Virginia Community College System. One aspect of the MBO approach is to define and clarify system-wide goals and objectives. By January of 1976 the Task Force had compiled a preliminary list of Virginia Community College System Goals and Objectives. This list represents a major system-wide attempt to amplify and clarify the original mission

statement mandated by the 1966 General Assembly.

The 42 goals that the Task Force developed were classified into two general categories -- Educational Program Goals and Operational Goals. The Educational Program Goals were defined as a category that deals with activities such as programs and course offerings. The Operational Goals were defined as a category of goals which relates to the management or operation of a college. A list of the Task Force's formulation of system goals which was subsequently authorized by the State Department of Community Colleges is included in Appendix A.

SUMMARY

The review of the literature was divided into three sections: (1) The Concept of Goals, (2) An Overview of The Historical Development of Community College Goals, and (3) The Development of Community College Goals in Virginia.

The literature supported the need for managers of complex organizations to integrate individual goals with organizational goals. However, there appeared to be some disagreement among organizational theorists with respect to whether or not a state of high integration of individual goals with organizational goals is feasible or even desirable.

A number of distinctions between mission, goals, and objective statements were described. The literature

supported the concept that goals represent an important intermediate link between an organization's general mission and specific operational objectives.

A number of approaches for classifying and describing various types of goals were discussed. Complex organizations, such as community colleges, were found to typically pursue a variety of goals simultaneously.

The practical uses of studying institutional goals were summarized as follows: (1) to provide a basis for policy development, (2) to provide a general framework for decision making, (3) to provide a basis for institutional planning, (4) to facilitate communication, (5) to help establish patterns of organizational authority and internal activity, (6) to establish broad guidelines by which to measure the relative effectiveness of an institution.

In higher education the goal studies by Gross and Grambsch, Peterson, Bushnell, and Farmer and Richman stand out in the literature. They have broken the ground for potentially a large number of related studies in the area of institutional goals and priorities.

A variety of studies on goal identification and examination was reported; however, most of these studies were conducted for the purpose of identifying goals. Little research was discovered that dealt with either: (1) identifying goal priority differences between groups within a community college setting or (2) identifying

institutional goals for rural community colleges.

In the review of community college goal research, only a few studies were identified and reported that dealt with goals within institutions. The emphasis of these studies was upon the necessity of goals in relation to the management of the institutions.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS, MATERIALS, AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this chapter was to describe the methods, materials, and procedures that were used in the study. The general research methodology was explained in the first section. Research questions were stated in the second section. A description of the instrumentation was presented in the third section. Sampling procedures and data collection techniques were explained in the fourth section. The analytical techniques that were used were discussed in the fifth section.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

To answer the research questions posed for this study, the survey method using a questionnaire was selected to determine the perceptions of the respondents toward the stated goals of the Virginia Community College System.

Van Dalen (1973) has described the objective of survey research as:

> .... the collection of detailed descriptions of existing phenomenon with the intent of employing the data to justify current conditions and practices or to make more intelligent plans for improving them. (p. 196)

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The data were analyzed to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the student, faculty, and administrator
perceptions of the present ("is") priority of community
college goals?

2. What are the student, faculty, and administrator
perceptions of the preferred ("should be") priority of
community college goals?

3. What differences exist between the three
reference groups between present and preferred perceptions
of the priority status of goals?

THE RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

To accomplish the objectives of the study, a Likert
type questionnaire was developed for use by all three
reference groups. A copy of the Virginia Community College
Goals Assessment Questionnaire is found in Appendix B.

The questionnaire was divided into two parts. Part I
was designed to gather information for the classification
of the respondents into reference groups. Part II was
designed to assess present and preferred perceptions of
the priority of institutional goals.

Part II of the questionnaire was derived from the
Virginia Community College System Statement of Mission,
Goals, and Objectives. The list of goals was modified
in basically two ways. First, the list was shortened to
facilitate the administration of the form to a relatively
large sample and to make the list less ominous appearing

to the respondents. Second, the list was simplified by combining similar goals into broader, more comprehensive statements. (A document which specifically indicates the goals that were combined for simplification is included in Appendix C).

To facilitate the interpretation of the results of the study and to maintain consistency with the Virginia Community College System Statement of Goals, the goals included in Part II were classified into two general categories -- Educational Program Goals and Operational Goals. Educational Program Goals relate to the primary activities of a college such as programs and course offerings. Operational Goals relate to the management or operation of a college.

Members of the three reference groups were asked to respond to goal statements by rating each goal in two ways: first, in terms of how much importance is being placed on the goal at their institution at the present time; and second, in terms of what the institution's goals should be. Responses to each goal statement (as perceived in terms of the present emphasis) could vary on a five-point scale from (1) "of no importance" to (5) "of extremely high importance". Likewise, responses to each goal statement (as perceived in terms of what the institution's goals should be) could vary according to the assessed degree of importance of the goal on a

five-point scale ranging from (1) "of no importance" to (5) "of extremely high importance".

Validity

A panel of expert judges, selected from the Task Force on Virginia Community College System Goals and Objectives, assessed the face validity of the survey instrument. Members of the Task Force were considered to be especially well qualified to judge the face validity of the instrument since they were directly involved in producing the Virginia Community College System Statement of Mission, Goals, and Objectives from which the questionnaire was derived. Revisions were made to the instrument based upon the recommendation of the panel of judges.

SAMPLING PROCEDURES AND DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES

After receiving official authorization and approval from the Virginia Community College System Council of Presidents to conduct the study, the presidents of the six selected rural colleges were asked (and all agreed) to authorize the participation of their college in the study. Each president assigned a member of his immediate staff to coordinate the distribution and collection of the questionnaires. The researcher met with the president and campus coordinator of each participating college to discuss the procedures for administering the questionnaires.

Each administrator and faculty member questionnaire was numerically coded for the purpose of recording who had completed the questionnaire. Student questionnaires were coded by class section.

A summary of the schedule for the collection of data is indicated below:

1. Visits to participating
   colleges.   Feb. 20 - Feb. 27, 1976

2. Collection of data by
   college coordinators.   Feb. 20 - March 15, 1976

3. Receipt of data from
   the participating
   colleges.   March 7 - March 22, 1976

The subjects for the study were drawn from a sample of six colleges randomly selected from a total population of sixteen rural community colleges in Virginia. All administrators and a sample of faculty and students from the following six rural community colleges in Virginia were surveyed: Blue Ridge Community College (BRCC), Danville Community College (DCC), Lord Fairfax Community College (LFCC), Mountain Empire Community College (MECC), Paul D. Camp Community College (PDCCC), and Southwest Virginia Community College (SVCC). There were a total of 77 administrators, 376 faculty, and 8,951 students in the six-college sample.

All of the 77 administrators in the six-college sample were surveyed. A summary of administrator returns from each college providing data for the study is shown in

table 1. The overall return rate for administrators was 91 percent.

A sub-sample of 95 randomly selected faculty, representing approximately 25 percent of the six-college sample, was surveyed. The faculty sub-sample was determined by applying the 25 percent figure to the total number of full-time and part-time faculty from the six participating colleges. After the number was determined, a table of random numbers was utilized to draw the random sample. Table 2 is a Summary of Faculty Responses from each college. The overall return rate for faculty was 96 percent.

The student sub-sample was obtained by drawing a 5 percent random cluster sample of the 1,120 credit course sections listed on the 1976 Winter Quarter Schedule of classes of the six participating colleges. A total of 56 course sections (5 percent of 1,120) was selected by utilizing a table of random numbers.

There was a total of 1,205 students enrolled for the 56 selected courses. This represented slightly over 13 percent of the total student enrollment for the six colleges combined.

Only those students who were in class at the time of the administration of the questionnaire were included in the study. No attempt was made to provide absentees with an opportunity to complete the questionnaire.

Table 3 is a Summary of Student Responses from each

Table 1

Summary of Administrator Returns From
Each College Providing Data
For the Study

College	Number of Questionnaires Distributed	Number Returned	Percent Returned
BRCC	11	9	82.0
DCC	15	14	93.0
LFCC	11	9	82.0
MECC	10	10	100.0
PDCCC	12	12	100.0
SVCC	18	16	89.0
Totals	77	70	90.9

Table 2

Summary of Faculty Returns From Each College
Providing Data For the Study

College	Total Number	Number of Faculty Selected	Number of Question- naires Returned	Percent Returned
BRCC	45	11	11	100.0
DCC	98	25	25	100.0
LFCC	60	15	13	93.3
MECC	48	12	11	91.6
PDCCC	54	14	13	92.8
SVCC	71	18	18	100.0
Totals	376	95	91	95.7

Table 3

Summary of Student Returns From Each College Providing Data For The Study

College	College Headcount	Course Sections Selected for Cluster Sample	Students Enrolled for Courses Selected	Percent Student Body Surveyed	Student Returns	Percent Questionnaires Returned
BRCC	1,686	10	162	9.6	110	67.0
DCC	2,068	17	360	17.4	237	66.0
LFCC	1,358	9	149	10.9	96	64.0
MECC	881	9	152	17.2	96	63.0
PDCCC	1,175	8	143	12.1	103	72.0
SVCC	1,783	13	239	13.4	179	75.0
Totals	8,951	56	1,205	13.4	821	68.0

college. As noted above, the student enrollment data

represent enrollments at the beginning of the 1976 Winter

Quarter. Some students may have withdrawn from the courses

prior to the administration of the questionnaire. The

overall return rate for students (based upon 821 returns

of the 1,205 questionnaires distributed) was 68 percent.

The number of participants in each group from each

college is shown in table 4.

TREATMENT OF THE DATA

The first two research questions were analyzed in

two ways. First, to describe and compare present and

preferred goal priorities for students, faculty, and

administrators, the goals were rank ordered from highest

to lowest mean values by group. In addition to rank

ordering the "is" and "should be" goals, a oneway analysis

of variance was performed on the data for each goal to

determine if there were statistically significant differences

between group means. The Student-Newman-Kuels procedure

was then used to specifically locate where the differences

between groups occurred.

The third research question was also analyzed in two

ways. Differences between groups in the priority of each

goal (in relation to the other goals) were examined in

terms of changes in the rank of the goal from present to

preferred priority. In addition a "t" test was performed

on the data for each goal for each group to determine if

58

Table 4

Number of Participants From Each College
Providing Data For the Study

College	Students	Faculty	Administrators	Total
BRCC	110	11	9	130
DCC	237	25	14	276
LFCC	96	13	9	118
MECC	96	11	10	117
PDCCC	103	13	12	128
SVCC	179	18	16	213
Totals	821	91	70	982

there were statistically significant differences between
present and preferred ratings.

For data analysis purposes, three computer programs
were selected from the <u>Statistical Package for the Social
Sciences</u> (1975). All of the programs were run through
the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University's
Computer Center. The computer programs selected included:
(1) Sub-program Frequencies: Oneway Frequency Distributions
with Descriptive Statistics; (2) Sub-program t-test:
Comparison of Sample Means; and (3) Sub-program Oneway:
Analysis of Variance.

SUMMARY

The design of the study was survey research. The
data were gathered through the use of the Virginia Community
College System Goals Assessment Questionnaire.

The subjects for the study were drawn from a sample
of six rural community colleges in Virginia. Seventy
administrators, 91 faculty, and 821 students participated
in the study.

The research questionnaire was developed for use by
all three reference groups. The questionnaire was derived
from the Virginia Community College System Statement of
Mission, Goals, and Objectives.

Members of the three reference groups were asked to
respond to the goal statements by rating each goal in
terms of its present and preferred importance. Responses

to each goal statement could vary on a five-point scale from (1) "of no importance" to (5) "of extremely high importance". A panel of expert judges established the face validity of the questionnaire.

Data collection was coordinated through the Office of the President of the six participating colleges. Survey response rates for each group were relatively high for administrators and faculty and moderate for students. A general description of the statistical treatment of the data was included. A more detailed explanation of the statistical techniques used in the study is described in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

The statistical analysis and findings reported in
this chapter were based upon the data obtained from the
administration of the Virginia Community College System
Goals Assessment Questionnaire. The frequencies of
responses to each goal statement by each of the three
reference groups are listed in Appendix D. These
responses were discussed in relation to the stated
objectives of the study under the following sections of
this chapter: (1) The Present ("is") Priority of
Community College Goals, (2) The Preferred ("should be")
Priority of Community College Goals, and (3) Analysis of
the Differences Between Present and Preferred Priorities
of Community College Goals.

In sections one and two the responses were analyzed
in two ways. First, the goals were rank ordered from
highest to lowest priority by group. The goal with the
highest mean value was considered the highest priority
while the goal with the lowest mean value was considered
the lowest priority. Using this procedure the relative
priority of goals for the three groups was compared.
Secondly, a oneway analysis of variance was performed to
determine if there were statistically significant

61

differences between the goal means for the three groups.
The Student-Newman-Kuels procedure was then used to obtain a
further indication of where the differences, if any,
actually occurred.

In the third section of this chapter the goals were
examined in terms of changes in rank order from perceptions
of present to preferred priority. Changes in the relative
priority of a goal for one group were compared to shifts in
goal priority for the other groups. In addition, a series of
"t" tests were performed to examine the goals in terms of
statistically significant differences between present and
preferred ratings of each goal by each group.

In each section of this chapter the goals were divided
into two general categories: (1) Educational Program Goals
and (2) Operational Goals. Within each of the two general
categories, the goals were classified as high (upper 25
percent), moderate (middle 50 percent), or low (lower 25
percent) priority depending upon the rank of the goal.
For the Educational Program Goals if the rank of a given
goal was one or two, the goal was classified as a high
priority. If the rank of a given goal was three, four, five,
or six, the goal was categorized as a moderate priority.
Goals ranked seven or eight were classified as a low priority.
For the Operational Goals if the rank of a given goal was
one, two, three, or four, it was classified as a high
priority. If the rank fell within the range of five through

12, it was categorized as a moderate priority. Goals ranked

13, 14, 15, or 16 were classified as a low priority.

Since the goal statements from the questionnaire are

frequently referred to throughout this chapter, summarizing

phrases are used in lieu of the complete statement. A list

of the summarizing phrases and the goal statements to which

the phrases refer can be found in Appendix E.

THE PRESENT ("is") PRIORITY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOALS

The first research objective was to identify and

compare student, faculty, and administrator differences in

perception of the present ("is") priority status of community

college goals.

Educational Program Goals

The general priority classification of the present

Educational Program Goals was summarized by groups in

table 5. The specific rank order of each goal was indicated

within the parentheses. Tables indicating the mean,

standard deviation, and rank for each of the goals by group

can be found in Appendix F.

Examination of table 5 indicated that "Occupational/

Technical Education" and "Career Education" were perceived

by all three reference groups as present high priority goals.

In contrast all groups perceived "Community Services" and

"Special Training" as present low priorities. "Transfer

Education", "Developmental Education", "Continuing Education",

Table 5

Present ("is") Perceptions of the Rank Order
Priority of Educational Program Goals By
Students, Faculty, and Administrators

	Goals	Students	Faculty	Admini-strators
1.	Occupational/ Technical Education	H(2)	H(1)	H(1)
2.	Transfer Education	M(3)	M(4)	M(4)
3.	Career Education	H(1)	H(2)	H(2)
4.	Developmental Education	M(6)	M(5)	M(6)
5.	Continuing Education	M(5)	M(3)	M(3)
6.	Community Services	L(8)	L(7)	L(7)
7.	Student Services	M(4)	M(6)	M(5)
8.	Special Training	L(7)	L(8)	L(8)

(H = High Priority; M = Moderate Priority;
L = Low Priority)

and "Student Services" were perceived by students, faculty, and administrators as present moderate priority Educational Program Goals.

An Analysis of Variance

To determine whether or not there were statistically significant differences between groups with respect to their perceptions of the importance of each of the present Educational Program Goals (as measured along a continuum of importance ranging from "of no importance" to "of extremely high importance") the following null hypothesis was formulated:

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences between student, faculty, and administrator means for each of the present Educational Program Goals.

A oneway analysis of variance was run to test the hypothesis for each of the goals. The results were summarized in table 6. (Detailed Analysis of Variance Tables for Each Goal can be found in Appendix G). For seven out of the eight present Educational Program Goals the null hypothesis was rejected.

The Student-Newman-Kuels procedure was used to obtain a further indication of where the differences, if any, actually occurred. This procedure is a Post Hoc statistical test designed to specifically locate where differences between more than two means occurred by grouping the means into homogeneous subsets. In other words if no statistically

Table 6

Analysis of Variance Between Groups

Present Educational Program Goals

Goal No.	Goal Phrase	Present ("is") Means			F Ratio
		Students	Faculty	Admin.	
1	Occupational/ Technical Education	3.84	4.13	4.63	30.14*
2	Transfer Education	3.64	3.72	4.25	15.02*
3	Career Education	3.88	4.04	4.57	20.70*
4	Developmental Education	3.38	3.70	3.81	9.73*
5	Continuing Education	3.46	3.74	4.26	22.86*
6	Community Services	3.12	3.17	3.61	7.59*
7	Student Services	3.58	3.59	4.05	7.64*
8	Special Training	3.33	3.16	3.31	1.15

(* Significant at the .01 level)

significant difference was found between two or more group means, the groups appeared in the same subset. However, if statistically significant differences existed between group means, the groups appeared in different subsets.

On the goals "Occupational/Technical Education" and "Continuing Education" three homogeneous subsets were found. This finding indicated that there were statistically significant differences between all three groups on both of the goals. Students indicated the lowest level of importance for both goals. Although faculty rated both goals of greater importance than students, the goal means for faculty were significantly lower than the administrator means on both goals.

Two homogeneous subsets were found for the goals "Transfer Education", "Career Education", "Community Services", and "Student Services". Students and faculty perceived each of the goals of significantly less importance than did administrators.

To the extent that both groups fell into one homogeneous subset, faculty and administrators were in agreement concerning how important the goal "Developmental Education" is presently perceived. Both groups assigned a statistically significant greater level of importance to this goal than did students. "Developmental Education" was the only present Educational Program Goal on which faculty and administrators together differed significantly from students.

There was only one subset found for the goal "Special Training". Thus, there were no statistically significant differences between groups on this goal.

For the present Educational Program Goals it was discovered that there were statistically significant differences between groups on all goals except one. Students and faculty differed significantly from administrators on "Transfer Education", "Career Education", "Community Services", and "Student Services". Faculty and administrators differed with students on the goal "Developmental Education". There were statistically significant differences between all three groups on the goals "Occupational/Technical Education" and "Continuing Education". No significant differences were found between groups on the goal "Special Training".

Operational Goals

The general priority classification of the present Operational Goals was summarized by group in table 7. The specific rank order of each goal was indicated within the parentheses. Tables indicating the mean, standard deviation, and rank for each of the goals by group can be found in Appendix F.

Examination of table 7 indicated that the goals "Low Tuition" and "Open Door Admissions" were perceived by all groups as present high priority Operational Goals.

Table 7

Present ("is") Perceptions of the Priority of
Operational Goals by Students, Faculty,
and Administrators

Goals	Students	Faculty	Admini-strators
1. Needs Assessment	M(8)	M(8)	M(5)
2. Low Tuition	H(1)	H(4)	H(2)
3. Management By Goals/Objectives	M(6)	M(10)	M(10)
4. Personnel Selection	M(7)	H(3)	M(8)
5. Staff Development	L(15)	L(16)	L(16)
6. Evaluation	M(12)	M(11)	L(13)
7. Participatory Decision Making	L(16)	L(15)	M(12)
8. Define Expectations	L(13)	L(13)	L(15)
9. Due Process	L(14)	M(12)	M(11)
10. Academic Freedom	M(10)	M(9)	M(6)
11. Affirmative Action	M(5)	M(6)	H(3)
12. Maintenance of Facilities	H(3)	M(7)	H(4)
13. Information Systems	M(11)	L(14)	L(14)
14. Learning Resources	H(2)	M(5)	M(9)
15. Accreditation	M(9)	H(1)	M(7)
16. Open Door Admissions	H(4)	H(2)	H(1)

(H = High Priority; M = Moderate Priority;
L = Low Priority)

"Maintenance of Facilities" was perceived as a high priority by students and administrators but as a moderate priority by faculty.

Four present Operational Goals were ranked as a high priority by one of the three groups but as a moderate priority by the other two groups. Faculty were the only group to rank "Personnel Selection" and "Accreditation" as present high priorities while students were the only group to rank "Learning Resources" as a high priority. Administrators were the only group to rank "Affirmative Action" as a present high priority.

The goals "Staff Development" and "Define Expectations" were rated as low present priorities by all three groups.

Faculty and administrators perceived the goal pertinent to "Information Systems" as a low priority in relation to other goals. Students perceived "Information Systems" as a present moderate priority.

Students and faculty appeared to agree that "Participatory Decision Making" was a present low priority goal. In contrast this goal falls within the moderate priority classification for administrators.

Administrators were the only group that perceived "Evaluation" as a low priority goal. Students and faculty ranked this goal among their present moderate priorities.

Students were the only group that perceived "Due Process" as a low priority. Faculty and administrators

ranked "Due Process" as a moderate priority Operational Goal.

All three reference groups perceived "Needs Assessment", "Management By Goals/Objectives", and "Academic Freedom" as present moderate priority Operational Goals.

An Analysis of Variance

To determine if there were significant differences between groups with respect to their perceptions of the importance of each of the present Operational Goals (as measured along a continuum of importance ranging from "of no importance" to "of extremely high importance") the following null hypothesis was formulated:

Hypothesis 2:   There are no significant differences between student, faculty, and administrator means for each of the present Operational Goals.

A oneway analysis of variance was run to test the hypothesis for each of the goals. The results were summarized in table 8. (Detailed Analysis of Variance Tables for Each Goal can be found in Appendix G). For 11 out of the 16 present Operational Goals the null hypothesis was rejected.

The Student-Newman-Kuels procedure was used to obtain a further indication of where the differences, if any, actually occurred. When this was performed, it was discovered that for 11 out of the 16 present Operational Goals more than one homogeneous subset of groups was found.

On the goals "Needs Assessment", "Personnel Selection",

Table 8

Analysis of Variance Between Groups

Present Operational Goals

Goal No.	Goal Phrase	Present ("is") Means Students	Faculty	Admin.	F Ratio
1	Needs Assessment	3.58	3.84	4.12	13.77*
2	Low Tuition	3.90	4.00	4.20	3.02**
3	Management By Goals/Objectives	3.62	3.77	3.95	5.59*
4	Personnel Selection	3.60	4.01	4.04	12.89*
5	Staff Development	3.38	3.20	3.33	1.36
6	Evaluation	3.48	3.63	3.70	2.85
7	Participatory Decision Making	3.31	3.29	3.72	5.50*
8	Define Expectations	3.45	3.52	3.42	.28
9	Due Process	3.44	3.56	3.82	5.31*
10	Academic Freedom	3.55	3.82	4.07	10.68*
11	Affirmative Action	3.63	3.89	4.14	13.05*
12	Maintenance of Facilities	3.75	3.88	4.13	6.33*
13	Information Systems	3.50	3.44	3.44	.30
14	Learning Resources	3.82	3.93	4.00	1.77
15	Accreditation	3.57	4.11	4.06	22.13*
16	Open Door Admissions	3.68	4.03	4.39	21.78*

(* Significant at the .01 level)

(** Significant at the .05 level)

"Academic Freedom", "Affirmative Action", and "Accreditation" two homogeneous subsets were found. In each instance students assigned significantly less importance to the goals than did faculty and administrators.

Two homogeneous subsets were also found on the goals "Low Tuition", "Management By Goals/Objectives", "Due Process", and "Maintenance of Facilities". Faculty appeared in both subsets for each of the goals indicating that there was no statistically significant difference between faculty and the other two groups. The significant differences were found to lie between students and administrators. Administrators assigned greater importance to each of the goals than did students.

There was only one homogeneous subset found on the goals "Staff Development", "Evaluation", "Define Expectations", "Information Systems", and "Learning Resources". Thus, there were no statistically significant differences between groups on these goals.

On the goal "Participatory Decision Making" two homogeneous subsets were found. To the extent that both groups fell into one homogeneous subset, faculty and students were in agreement concerning the importance of this goal. Administrators assigned a greater level of importance to this goal than did faculty and students.

Three homogeneous subsets were found on the goal "Open Door Admissions". This finding indicated that there

were significant differences between all three groups on this goal. Students rated the goal the lowest in terms of importance while administrators assigned a greater level of importance to the goal than did faculty.

For the present Operational Goals no statistically significant difference between groups was found on the goals pertaining to "Staff Development", "Evaluation", "Define Expectations", "Information Systems", and "Learning Resources". Faculty and administrators differed significantly from students on the goals related to "Needs Assessment", "Personnel Selection", "Academic Freedom", "Affirmative Action", and "Accreditation". Students differed significantly from administrators (with faculty not statistically differing from either group) on the goals pertaining to "Low Tuition", "Management By Goals/Objectives", "Due Process", and "Maintenance of Facilities". Faculty and students differed significantly with administrators on the goal related to "Participatory Decision Making". All groups differed significantly on the goal related to "Open Door Admissions".

THE PREFERRED ("should be") PRIORITY OF COMMUNITY
COLLEGE GOALS

The second research objective was to identify and compare student, faculty, and administrator differences in perception of the preferred ("should be") priority status of community college goals. The analysis of the

preferred goals follows the same general pattern that was
used for the analysis of the present goals.

Educational Program Goals

The general priority classification of the preferred
Educational Program Goals was summarized by group in
table 9. The specific rank order of each goal was indicated
within the parenthesis. Tables indicating the mean,
standard deviation, and priority rank for each of the
preferred goals by group are to be found in Appendix F.

Examination of table 9 indicated that "Occupational/
Technical Education" was the only Educational Program Goal
which was perceived by all three groups as a preferred high
priority. Faculty and administrators perceived "Career
Education" as a preferred high priority goal while students
rated the goal as a moderate priority. Students differed
from faculty and administrators on the goal "Student
Services". Students perceived the goal as a preferred
high priority rather than a moderate priority.

In contrast all groups perceived "Community Services"
as a preferred low priority Educational Program Goal.
Faculty and administrators ranked "Special Training" as a
preferred low priority while students differed from the
other two groups in ranking this goal as a preferred moderate
priority. Students perceived "Continuing Education" as
a preferred low priority. Administrators and faculty

Table 9

Preferred ("should be") Perceptions of the Priority
of Educational Program Goals by Students,
Faculty, and Administrators

	Goals	Students	Faculty	Administrators
1.	Occupational/ Technical Education	H(2)	H(2)	H(1)
2.	Transfer Education	M(4)	M(5)	M(6)
3.	Career Education	M(3)	H(1)	H(2)
4.	Developmental Education	M(6)	M(4)	M(4)
5.	Continuing Education	L(7)	M(6)	M(5)
6.	Community Services	L(8)	L(7)	L(7)
7.	Student Services	H(1)	M(3)	M(3)
8.	Special Training	M(5)	L(8)	L(8)

(H = High Priority; M = Moderate Priority;
L = Low Priority)

ranked "Continuing Education" as a preferred moderate priority goal.

All three groups perceived "Transfer Education" and "Developmental Education" as preferred moderate priorities.

An Analysis of Variance

To determine if there were statistically significant differences between groups with respect to their perceptions of the importance of each of the preferred Educational Program Goals (as measured along a continuum of importance ranging from "of no importance" to "of extremely high importance") the following null hypothesis was formulated:

> Hypothesis 3: There are no significant differences between student, faculty, and administrator means for each of the preferred Educational Program Goals.

A oneway analysis of variance was run to test the hypothesis for each of the goals. The results were summarized in table 10. (Detailed Analysis of Variance Tables for Each Goal can be found in Appendix G). For seven out of the eight preferred Educational Program Goals the null hypothesis was rejected.

The Student-Newman-Kuels procedure was used to obtain a further indication of where the differences, if any, actually occurred. When this was performed, it was discovered that for seven out of eight of the preferred Educational Program Goals more than one homogeneous subset

Table 10

Analysis of Variance Between Groups

Preferred Educational Program Goals

Goal No.	Goal Phrase	Preferred ("should be") Means			F Ratio
		Students	Faculty	Admin.	
1	Occupational/ Technical Education	4.45	4.29	4.71	6.47*
2	Transfer Education	4.29	4.06	4.25	3.11**
3	Career Education	4.34	4.36	4.68	5.72*
4	Developmental Education	3.97	4.09	4.48	10.13*
5	Continuing Education	3.96	4.03	4.44	8.41*
6	Community Services	3.92	3.79	4.13	2.37
7	Student Services	4.46	4.25	4.60	4.73*
8	Special Training	4.22	3.85	3.92	9.80*

(* Significant at the .01 level)

(** Significant at the .05 level)

of groups was found.

On the goals "Occupational/Technical Education", "Career Education", "Developmental Education", and "Continuing Education" two homogeneous subsets were found. Administrators differed significantly from students and faculty by perceiving each of the goals of greater preferred importance than the other two groups.

Two homogeneous subsets were found for the goal "Transfer Education". Administrators appeared in both subsets which indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between administrators and the other two groups. Students perceived this goal of significantly greater importance than faculty.

Only one subset was found for the goal "Community Services". Thus, there were no statistically significant differences between groups on this goal.

On the goal "Student Services" two homogeneous subsets were found. Administrators and students fell into the same subset which indicated that both groups differed significantly from faculty in perceiving "Student Services" of greater preferred importance.

Two homogeneous subsets were found on the goal "Special Training". Students assigned significantly greater preferred importance to this goal than did faculty and administrators.

Thus, on the goals "Occupational/Technical Education",

"Career Education", "Developmental Education", and
"Continuing Education" faculty and students differed
significantly from administrators; faculty differed
significantly from students (with administrators not
differing significantly from either group) on the goal
"Transfer Education"; faculty differed significantly
from students and administrators on the goal "Student
Services"; faculty and administrators differed significantly
from students on the goal "Special Training"; and no
statistically significant difference was found between
groups on the goal "Community Services".

Operational Goals

The general priority classification of the preferred
Operational Goals was summarized by group in table 11.
The specific rank order of each goal was indicated within
the parenthesis. Tables indicating the mean, standard
deviation, and rank for each of the goals by group can
be found in Appendix F.

Examination of table 11 indicated that "Personnel
Selection" was the only preferred Operational Goal that was
perceived as a high priority by each of the three reference
groups.

Faculty and administrators perceived "Needs Assessment"
as a preferred high priority in relation to other goals
since they ranked the goal as a number one and two preferred
priority respectively. Students rated "Needs Assessment"

Table 11

Preferred ("should be") Perceptions of the Priority
of Operational Goals by Students, Faculty,
and Administrators

	Goals	Students	Faculty	Administrators
1.	Needs Assessment	M(6)	H(4)	H(1)
2.	Low Tuition	H(1)	M(8)	H(4)
3.	Management By Goals/ Objectives	M(8)	M(7)	H(3)
4.	Personnel Selection	H(4)	H(1)	H(2)
5.	Staff Development	M(10)	M(11)	M(11)
6.	Evaluation	L(13)	M(9)	M(6)
7.	Participatory Decision Making	M(9)	M(12)	M(12)
8.	Define Expectations	L(15)	L(13)	M(9)
9.	Due Process	L(14)	H(4)	M(10)
10.	Academic Freedom	M(5)	M(5)	L(14)
11.	Affirmative Action	M(7)	L(14)	L(13)
12.	Maintenance of Facilities	H(2)	H(3)	M(5)
13.	Information Systems	L(16)	L(16)	L(16)
14.	Learning Resources	H(3)	M(6)	M(7)
15.	Accreditation	M(11)	M(10)	L(15)
16.	Open Door Admissions	M(12)	L(15)	M(8)

(H = High Priority; M = Moderate Priority; L = Low
Priority)

as a preferred moderate priority.

"Low Tuition" was perceived as a high priority by administrators and students. Faculty differed from both groups by assigning the goal a moderate priority rank of eight.

"Maintenance of Facilities" was perceived as a preferred high priority Operational Goal by students and faculty. Administrators ranked the goal as a moderate priority.

The goal "Due Process" appeared in a different priority classification for each group. Faculty assigned a high priority, administrators a moderate priority, and students a low priority to this goal.

Further examination of table 11 indicated that the only goal which all groups perceived as a preferred low priority was "Information Systems". This was the only goal which received exactly the same priority rank by all three groups.

The goal related to "Affirmative Action" was perceived as preferred low priority by both administrators and faculty. Students assigned a moderate priority rank of seven to the goal.

Administrators differed from students and faculty by ranking "Define Expectations" as a moderate rather than a low priority. Yet, for "Academic Freedom" and "Accreditation" faculty and students perceived both of

these goals as preferred moderate priorities; whereas, administrators perceived both of the goals as low priorities.

"Staff Development" and "Participatory Decision Making" were perceived by all three groups as preferred moderate priorities. Faculty and administrators perceived "Learning Resources" and "Evaluation" as preferred moderate priorities; whereas, students perceived "Learning Resources" as a high priority and "Evaluation" as a low priority.

"Management By Goals/Objectives" was perceived by students and faculty as a preferred moderate priority. Administrators perceived this goal as a high priority.

Administrators and students perceived "Open Door Admissions" as a preferred moderate priority; whereas, faculty ranked the goal fifteenth which falls within the low priority category.

An Analysis of Variance

To determine if there were significant differences between groups with respect to their perceptions of the importance of each of the preferred Operational Goals (as measured along a continuum of importance ranging from "of no importance" to "of extremely high importance") the following null hypothesis was formulated:

Hypothesis 4: There are no significant differences between student, faculty, and administrator means for each of the preferred Operational Goals.

A oneway analysis of variance was run to test the hypothesis for each of the goals. The results were summarized in table 12. (Detailed Analysis of Variance Tables for each goal can be found in Appendix G). For 11 out of the 16 preferred Operational Goals the null hypothesis was rejected.

The Student-Newman-Kuels procedure was used to obtain a further indication of where the differences, if any, actually occurred. When this was performed, it was discovered that for 11 out of the 16 preferred Operational Goals more than one homogeneous subset of groups was found.

For the goals "Needs Assessment", "Management By Goals/Objectives", and "Define Expectations" two homogeneous subsets were found. Administrators differed significantly from students and faculty by assigning greater importance to each of these goals.

Two homogeneous subsets were also found on the goals "Low Tuition" and "Affirmative Action". On both goals students and administrators differed significantly from faculty by rating the goals of greater importance than did faculty.

Two homogeneous subsets were found on the goals "Personnel Selection" and "Evaluation". Faculty appeared in both subsets for both of these goals which indicated that there were no statistically significant differences

85

Table 12

Analysis of Variance Between Groups

Preferred Operational Goals

Goal No.	Goal Phrase	Preferred ("should be") Means			F Ratio
		Students	Faculty	Admin.	
1	Needs Assessment	4.32	4.40	4.72	8.25*
2	Low Tuition	4.50	4.20	4.52	5.32*
3	Management By Goals/Objectives	4.17	4.21	4.56	7.63*
4	Personnel Selection	4.37	4.42	4.62	3.21**
5	Staff Development	4.12	4.08	4.34	2.38
6	Evaluation	4.09	4.18	4.41	4.55**
7	Participatory Decision Making	4.15	4.07	4.29	1.29
8	Define Expectations	4.07	3.98	4.36	4.11**
9	Due Process	4.08	4.29	4.35	4.32**
10	Academic Freedom	4.33	4.26	4.19	.96
11	Affirmative Action	4.21	3.85	4.28	7.15*
12	Maintenance of Facilities	4.45	4.33	4.43	1.07
13	Information Systems	4.06	3.82	4.07	3.50**
14	Learning Resources	4.44	4.22	4.39	3.65**
15	Accreditation	4.11	4.14	4.18	.20
16	Open Door Admissions	4.10	3.83	4.37	5.97*

(* Significant at the .01 level)

(** Significant at the .05 level)

between faculty and the other two reference groups.
Administrators assigned greater importance to both of the
goals than did students.

One homogeneous subset was found on the goals
"Staff Development", "Participatory Decision Making",
"Academic Freedom", "Maintenance of Facilities", and
"Accreditation". Thus, there were no statistically
significant differences between groups on these
goals.

On the goals "Information Systems" and "Learning
Resources" two homogeneous subsets were found. Administrators
appeared in both subsets for each of the goals which
indicated that there were no statistically significant
differences between administrators and the other two
reference groups. Students assigned a greater level of
importance to both of the goals than did faculty.

Three homogeneous subsets were found on the goal
"Open Door Admissions". This finding indicated that
there were significant differences between all three groups.
Faculty rated "Open Door Admissions" the lowest in terms
of importance while administrators assigned a significantly
greater level of importance to the goal than did students.

Thus, on the goals "Needs Assessment", "Management By
Goals/Objectives", and "Define Expectations" students and
faculty differed significantly with administrators; faculty

differed significantly with students and administrators on the goals "Low Tuition" and "Affirmative Action"; students differed with administrators (with faculty not differing, significantly from either group) on the goals "Personnel Selection" and "Evaluation"; faculty differed significantly with students (with administrators not differing from either group) on the goals "Information Systems" and "Learning Resources"; all three groups differed significantly on the goal "Open Door Admissions"; students differed significantly with administrators and faculty on the goal "Due Process"; and no statistically significant differences were found between groups on the five goals "Staff Development", "Participatory Decision Making", "Academic Freedom", "Maintenance of Facilities", and "Accreditation".

ANALYSIS OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PRESENT AND PREFERRED PRIORITIES OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOALS

The third research question was designed to examine what differences exist between groups between the present ("is") and preferred ("should be") perceptions of the priority of goals.

To answer this question the goals were examined in two ways. First, differences within groups in the priority of each goal (in relation to the other goals) were analyzed in terms of changes in rank of the goal from present to

preferred priority. The direction of change in priority rank within a reference group was then compared with the direction of change in priority rank of the same goal with the other groups.

Since the shifts in priority may not represent equal changes within or between groups, the symbols "0", "+", and "-" are used in tables 13 and 17 to indicate the general direction of change in priority between present and preferred ranks. The symbol "0" indicates that there was no change in the priority rank of the goal. A plus "+" sign indicates that the goal moved from a given present priority to a higher preferred rank. The minus "-" symbol indicates that the goal moved from a given present status to a lower preferred priority.

The goals were also examined in terms of statistically significant differences between the present and preferred means for each group. To determine if significant differences existed, a "t" test was performed on each goal for each group.

In this section the goals were discussed under the general categories of Educational Program Goals and Operational Goals.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM GOALS

Differences Between Groups in Priority Ranks

Differences between present and preferred priorities for each of the Educational Program Goals were summarized by group in table 13.

Table 13

The Direction of Change from Present to Preferred Priority Status of
Educational Program Goals By Group

Goal	Students			Faculty			Administrators		
	Present Rank	Preferred Rank	Change	Present Rank	Preferred Rank	Change	Present Rank	Preferred Rank	Change
1. Occupational/Technical Education	2	2	0	1	2	-	1	1	0
2. Transfer Education	3	4	-	4	5	-	4	6	-
3. Career Education	1	3	-	2	1	+	2	2	0
4. Developmental Education	6	6	0	5	4	+	6	4	+
5. Continuing Education	5	7	-	3	6	-	3	5	-
6. Community Services	8	8	0	7	7	0	7	7	0
7. Student Services	4	1	+	6	3	+	5	3	+
8. Special Training	7	5	+	8	8	0	8	8	0

For the goal "Occupational/Technical Education" students and administrators showed no change in priority rank between present and preferred perceptions. On both dimensions administrators ranked the goal as a number one priority while students ranked the goal as a number two priority. In contrast faculty ranked the goal as a higher present than preferred priority.

For the goals "Transfer Education" and "Continuing Education" differences were found between the present and preferred priority rank within each group. All three groups ranked the goals as higher present than preferred priorities.

For the goal "Career Education" a difference was found between the present and preferred priority ranks for students and faculty but not for administrators. Students ranked the goal as a higher present than preferred priority. In contrast faculty ranked the goal as a higher preferred than present priority. Administrators ranked the goal as a number two priority on both the "is" and "should be" dimensions.

A difference between the present and preferred ranks on the goal "Developmental Education" was found for faculty and administrators but not for students. Both faculty and administrators ranked the preferred priority of this goal higher than the present priority. Students ranked the goal as a sixth priority on both dimensions.

Within each group no difference was found between the present and preferred priority ranks of the "Community Services" goal. Students ranked the goal as an eighth priority on both dimensions while faculty and administrators rated the goal as a seventh priority on both the "is" and "should be" dimensions.

The "Student Services" goal received a higher preferred than present priority rank by each reference group. Students ranked the goal as a fourth present and first preferred priority. Faculty rated the present priority of the goal sixth while administrators rated the goal as a fifth present priority. Both faculty and administrators rated "Student Services" as a preferred third priority.

A difference between the present and preferred ranks was found for students but not for faculty and administrators on the goal "Special Training". Students ranked the present priority seventh and the preferred priority fifth. Faculty and administrators ranked both the "is" and "should be" priority of the goal eighth.

Differences Between Present and Preferred Means

To determine whether or not there was a statistically significant difference between the present and preferred means on each goal for each reference group the following general hypotheses were formulated:

Hypothesis 5: There are no significant differences

between the present and preferred
means for each of the Educational
Program and Operational Goals for
students.

Hypothesis 6:   There are no significant differences
between the present and preferred
means for each of the Educational
Program and Operational Goals for
faculty.

Hypothesis 7:   There are no significant differences
between the present and preferred
means for each of the Educational
Program and Operational Goals for
administrators.

To test the hypotheses for each of the Educational
Program Goals, a series of "t" tests were performed. The
results of the "t" tests for the Educational Program Goals
were summarized in tables 14, 15, and 16. The results of
the "t" tests for the Operational Goals are reported later
in this chapter.

It should be noted that respondents who did not
complete both the "is" and "should be" sections of the
Virginia Community College System Goals Assessment
Questionnaire for a given goal statement were omitted from
the calculation of "t" values. Therefore, the means and
standard deviations for the data reported in tables 14, 15,

Table 14

Differences Between the Present and Preferred Means of the
Educational Program Goals for Students

Educational Program Goals	Means Present	Preferred	Standard Deviations Present	Preferred	"t" Values
1. Occupational/Technical Education	3.80	4.44	.83	.69	-18.83*
2. Transfer Education	3.60	4.33	.90	.78	-17.56*
3. Career Education	3.85	4.32	.85	.76	-13.48*
4. Developmental Education	3.37	3.98	.93	.91	-15.35*
5. Continuing Education	3.43	3.97	.97	.93	-12.54*
6. Community Services	3.10	3.97	.99	.93	-18.32*
7. Student Services	3.56	4.49	.95	.68	-21.54*
8. Special Training	3.29	4.24	.97	.86	-21.51*

(* Significant at the .01 level)

Table 15

Differences Between the Present and Preferred Means of the
Educational Program Goals for Faculty

Educational Program Goals	Means		Standard Deviations		"t" Values
	Present	Preferred	Present	Preferred	
1. Occupational/Technical Education	4.03	4.34	.87	.88	-3.42*
2. Transfer Education	3.73	4.00	.86	.88	-2.59*
3. Career Education	3.95	4.39	.90	.77	-4.94*
4. Developmental Education	3.73	4.07	.93	.98	-2.72*
5. Continuing Education	3.76	3.98	.81	.81	-2.29**
6. Community Services	3.03	3.66	.82	.78	-5.47*
7. Student Services	3.53	4.25	.85	.80	-6.03*
8. Special Training	2.98	3.74	1.03	.95	-5.89*

(* Significant at the .01 level)

(** Significant at the .05 level)

94

Table 16

Differences Between the Present and Preferred Means of the
Educational Program Goals for Administrators

Educational Program Goals	Means Present	Preferred	Standard Deviations Present	Preferred	"t" Values
1. Occupational/Technical Education	4.59	4.69	.67	.59	-2.19**
2. Transfer Education	4.27	4.28	.73	.81	-0.38
3. Career Education	4.55	4.67	.70	.62	-1.73
4. Developmental Education	3.77	4.47	.91	.72	-6.23*
5. Continuing Education	4.23	4.42	.79	.74	-2.65*
6. Community Services	3.55	4.08	.89	.85	-4.23*
7. Student Services	4.10	4.62	.71	.64	-6.45*
8. Special Training	3.27	3.91	1.06	.97	-5.47*

(* Significant at the .01 level)

(** Significant at the .05 level)

16, 18, 19, and 20 are slightly different from the data reported in the other tables in this study.

With the exception of administrator ratings of the goals "Transfer Education" and "Career Education", tables 14, 15, and 16 indicated that a statistically significant difference between the "is" and "should be" mean was found on each goal for each reference group. In all but the two instances cited above, the preferred mean was significantly higher than the present mean.

OPERATIONAL GOALS

Differences Between Groups in Priority Ranks

Differences between present and preferred priorities for each of the Operational Goals were summarized by group in table 17.

For the goals "Needs Assessment", "Personnel Selection", and "Staff Development" a difference was found between the present and preferred priority ranks for each group. All three groups ranked the goals as a higher preferred than present priority.

A difference between the "is" and "should be" ranks was found for faculty and administrators but not for students on the goal "Low Tuition". Students rated the goal as a number one priority on both dimensions. In contrast faculty and administrators ranked the goal as a lower preferred than present priority.

Table 17

The Direction of Change from Present to Preferred Priority Status of
Operational Goals By Group

Goal	Students			Faculty			Administrators		
	Present Rank	Preferred Rank	Change	Present Rank	Preferred Rank	Change	Present Rank	Preferred Rank	Change
1. Needs Assessment	8	6	+	8	2	+	5	1	+
2. Low Tuition	1	1	0	4	8	−	2	4	−
3. Management By Goals/ Objectives	6	8	−	10	7	+	10	3	+
4. Personnel Selection	7	4	+	3	1	+	8	2	+
5. Staff Development	15	10	+	16	11	+	16	11	+
6. Evaluation	12	13	−	11	9	+	13	6	+
7. Participatory Decision Making	16	9	+	15	12	+	12	12	0
8. Define Expectations	13	15	−	13	13	0	15	9	+
9. Due Process	14	14	0	12	4	+	11	10	+

Table 17 (continued)

Goal	Students			Faculty			Administrators		
	Present Rank	Preferred Rank	Change	Present Rank	Preferred Rank	Change	Present Rank	Preferred Rank	Change
10. Academic Freedom	10	5	+	9	5	+	6	14	-
11. Affirmative Action	5	7	-	6	14	-	3	13	-
12. Maintenance of Facilities	3	2	+	7	3	+	4	5	-
13. Information Systems	11	16	-	14	16	-	14	16	-
14. Learning Resources	2	3	-	5	6	-	9	7	+
15. Accreditation	9	11	-	1	10	-	7	15	-
16. Open Door Admissions	4	12	-	2	15	-	1	8	-

For the goals "Management By Goals/Objectives" and "Evaluation" a difference between the present and preferred priority was found within each group. Students ranked both of the goals as higher present than preferred priorities while faculty and administrators rated the goals as higher preferred than present priorities.

For all three groups a difference between "is" and "should be" ranks was found on the goals "Affirmative Action", "Information Systems", "Accreditation", and "Open Door Admissions". Each group ranked each of the goals as a lower preferred than present priority.

On the goal "Participatory Decision Making" a difference between present and preferred ranks was found for students and faculty but not for administrators. Students and faculty ranked the goal as a higher preferred than present priority while administrators rated the goal as a twelfth priority on both dimensions.

A difference between present and preferred ranks on the goal "Define Expectations" was found for students and administrators but not for faculty. Students ranked the goal as a higher present than preferred priority while administrators indicated a lower present than preferred priority. Faculty ranked "Define Expectations" as a thirteenth priority on both dimensions.

Administrators and faculty but not students indicated

a difference between "is" and "should be" ranks on the goal "Due Process". Administrators and faculty ranked the goal as a higher preferred than present priority. Students rated the goal as a fourteenth priority on both dimensions.

On the goals "Academic Freedom" and "Maintenance of Facilities" all three groups indicated a difference between present and preferred ranks. Students and faculty ranked the goals as higher preferred than present priorities. In contrast administrators rated the goals a lower preferred than present priorities.

All three groups indicated a difference between "is" and "should be" ranks on the goal "Learning Resources". Students and faculty ranked the goal as a lower preferred than present priority while administrators indicated a higher preferred than present priority.

Differences Between Present and Preferred Means

To determine whether or not there was a statistically significant difference between the present and preferred means on each goal for each reference group, the following general hypotheses were formulated:

Hypothesis 5: There are no significant differences between the present and preferred means for each of the Educational Program and Operational Goals for students.

Hypothesis 6: There are no significant differences between the present and preferred means for each of the Educational Program and Operational Goals for faculty.

Hypothesis 7: There are no significant differences between the present and preferred means for each of the Educational Program and Operational Goals for administrators.

To test the hypotheses for each of the Operational Goals, a series of "t" tests were performed. The results of the "t" tests for the Operational Goals were summarized in tables 18, 19, and 20.

For students a statistically significant difference was found between the present and preferred means on each goal. Student responses indicated significantly higher "should be" means than "is" means in each instance.

For faculty a statistically significant difference was found between the present and preferred means on 14 out of the 16 Operational Goals. In all but one instance (where a statistically significant difference was found), faculty responses indicated significantly higher "should be" than "is" means. The one exception to this general tendency was on the goal "Open Door Admissions". On this goal faculty indicated a significantly greater present than preferred mean. The goals on which faculty did not indicate a

Table 18

Differences Between the Present and Preferred Means of the
Operational Goals for Students

Operational Goals	Means		Standard Deviations		"t"
	Present	Preferred	Present	Preferred	Values
1. Needs Assessment	3.54	4.31	.88	.77	-20.25*
2. Low Tuition	3.84	4.52	1.01	.77	-14.43*
3. Management By Goals/ Objectives	3.59	4.18	.83	.78	-16.28*
4. Personnel Selection	3.57	4.41	.95	.75	-19.81*
5. Staff Development	3.35	4.13	.93	.81	-19.41*
6. Evaluation	3.47	4.09	.80	.83	-15.94*
7. Participatory Decision Making	3.27	4.21	.96	.81	-19.90*
8. Define Expectations	3.42	4.07	.87	.85	-17.50*
9. Due Process	3.41	4.04	.94	.96	-14.50*
10. Academic Freedom	3.49	4.31	1.04	.88	-16.87*
11. Affirmative Action	3.61	4.19	.86	.83	-15.10*
12. Maintenance of Facilities	3.67	4.43	.89	.68	-19.30*
13. Information Systems	3.44	4.07	.86	.83	-17.14*
14. Learning Resources	3.78	4.44	.87	.73	-17.15*
15. Accreditation	3.55	4.12	.83	.86	-15.40*
16. Open Door Admissions	3.66	4.11	.89	.92	-10.42*

(* Significant at the .01 level)

Table 19

Differences Between The Present and Preferred Means of the
Operational Goals For Faculty

Operational Goals	Means Present	Preferred	Standard Deviations Present	Preferred	"t" Values
1. Needs Assessment	3.79	4.34	.91	.82	-5.52
2. Low Tuition	3.90	4.09	.99	.97	-2.26*
3. Management By Goals/ Objectives	3.74	4.14	1.03	.89	-3.87*
4. Personnel Selection	3.93	4.34	.87	.78	-4.12*
5. Staff Development	3.12	4.04	1.03	.97	-5.98*
6. Evaluation	3.50	4.11	.84	.10	-5.27*
7. Participatory Decision Making	3.12	4.04	1.02	.83	-5.92*
8. Define Expectations	3.44	3.95	.87	1.00	-4.50*
9. Due Process	3.46	4.22	.98	.90	-5.89*
10. Academic Freedom	3.71	4.15	.88	.91	-3.38*
11. Affirmative Action	3.88	3.74	.78	1.13	+0.88
12. Maintenance of Facilities	3.82	4.26	.90	.78	-3.95*
13. Information Systems	3.31	3.68	.77	.89	-3.58*
14. Learning Resources	3.88	4.14	.84	.78	-2.81*
15. Accreditation	4.07	4.03	.67	.78	+0.62
16. Open Door Admissions	3.93	3.74	.82	1.01	+2.11**

(* Significant at the .01 level)

(** Significant at the .05 level)

Table 20

Differences Between the Present and Preferred Means of the
Operational Goals for Administrators

Operational Goals	Means		Standard Deviations		"t"
	Present	Preferred	Present	Preferred	Values
1. Needs Assessment	4.16	4.71	.81	.61	-5.55*
2. Low Tuition	4.22	4.55	.91	.79	-3.80*
3. Management By Goals/ Objectives	3.90	4.54	.98	.72	-4.57*
4. Personnel Selection	4.13	4.59	.73	.67	-5.00*
5. Staff Development	3.40	4.33	.93	.73	-6.73*
6. Evaluation	3.77	4.42	.87	.70	-5.47*
7. Participatory Decision Making	3.72	4.28	.96	.72	-4.51*
8. Define Expectations	3.45	4.35	.85	.78	-7.80*
9. Due Process	3.79	4.33	.90	.75	-4.46*
10. Academic Freedom	4.08	4.18	.89	.81	-1.14
11. Affirmative Action	4.10	4.27	.88	1.01	-1.43
12. Maintenance of Facilities	4.11	4.47	.74	.72	-4.49*
13. Information Systems	3.44	4.03	.89	.90	-5.22*
14. Learning Resources	4.00	4.37	.87	.82	-3.65*
15. Accreditation	4.05	4.13	.83	.95	-1.22
16. Open Door Admissions	4.42	4.35	.83	.99	0.78

(* Significant at the .01 level)

significant difference between means were "Affirmative Action" and "Accreditation".

For administrators a statistically significant difference was found between the "is" and "should be" mean on 12 out of the 16 Operational Goals. In all cases (where a statistically significant difference was found), administrator responses indicated a significantly higher preferred than present mean. The goals on which administrators did not indicate a significant difference between "is" and "should be" means were "Academic Freedom", "Affirmative Action", "Accreditation", and "Open Door Admissions".

SUMMARY

When the Educational Program Goals were analyzed in terms of the priority rank of each goal (in relation to the other goals), "Occupational/Technical Education" and "Career Education" were perceived by all three reference groups as present high priority goals. In contrast, all groups perceived "Community Services" and "Special Training" as present low priorities. "Transfer Education", "Developmental Education", "Continuing Education", and "Student Services" were perceived by students, faculty, and administrators as present moderate priority Educational Program Goals.

When the goals were analyzed in terms of differences between groups with respect to their perceptions of

the importance of each goal (as measured along a continuum
of importance), it was discovered that there were
statistically significant differences between groups on all
of the present Educational Program Goals except one. Students
and faculty differed significantly from administrators on
"Transfer Education", "Career Education", "Community
Services", and "Student Services". Faculty and
administrators differed with students on the goal
"Developmental Education". There were statistically
significant differences between all three groups on the
goals "Occupational/Technical Education" and "Continuing
Education". No significant differences were found between
groups on the goal "Special Training".

When the Operational Goals were analyzed in terms of
the priority rank of each goal (in relation to the other
goals), "Low Tuition" and "Open Door Admissions" were
perceived by all three groups as present high priorities.
In contrast, "Staff Development" and "Define Expectations"
were rated as low present priorities by all three groups.
"Needs Assessment", "Management By Goals/Objectives", and
"Academic Freedom" were perceived as present moderate
priorities by all groups.

Differences between groups were found in the general
priority classification of the following present Operational
Goals: "Personnel Selection", "Evaluation", "Participatory
Decision Making", "Due Process", "Affirmative Action",

"Maintenance of Facilities", "Information Systems",
"Learning Resources", and "Accreditation".

When the goals were analyzed in terms of differences
between groups with respect to their perceptions of the
importance of each goal (as measured along a continuum of
importance), it was discovered that there were statistically
significant differences between groups on 11 out of the 16
present Operational Goals. Faculty and administrators
differed significantly from students on the goals related
to "Needs Assessment", "Personnel Selection", "Academic
Freedom", "Affirmative Action", and "Accreditation".
Students differed significantly from administrators (with
faculty not differing from either group) on the goals
pertaining to "Low Tuition", "Management By Goals/Objectives",
"Due Process", and "Maintenance of Facilities". Faculty
and students differed significantly with administrators on
the goal related to "Participatory Decision Making". All
groups differed significantly on the goal related to
"Open Door Admissions". No statistically significant
difference between groups was found on the goals "Staff
Development", "Evaluation", "Define Expectations",
"Information Systems", and "Learning Resources".

When the goals were analyzed in terms of the priority
rank of each goal (in relation to the other goals),
"Occupational/Technical Education" was the only preferred
Educational Program Goal which was perceived by all three

groups as a high priority.

In contrast, "Community Services" was the only goal perceived as a preferred low priority by all three groups. All three groups perceived "Transfer Education" and "Developmental Education" as preferred moderate priorities. Differences between groups were found in the general priority classification of the goals "Career Education", "Continuing Education", "Student Services", and "Special Training".

When the goals were analyzed in terms of differences between groups with respect to their perceptions of the importance of each goal (as measured along a continuum of importance), it was discovered that there were statistically significant differences between groups on seven out of the eight preferred Educational Program Goals. Faculty and students differed significantly from administrators on the goals "Occupational/Technical Education", "Career Education", "Developmental Education", and "Continuing Education". Faculty differed significantly from students (with administrators not differing significantly from either group) on the goal "Transfer Education". Faculty differed significantly from students and administrators on the goal "Student Services". Faculty and administrators differed significantly from students on the goal "Special Training". No statistically significant difference between groups was found on the goal "Community Services".

When the goals were analyzed in terms of the priority rank of each goal (in relation to the other goals), "Personnel Selection" was the only preferred Operational Goal that was perceived as a high priority by all three reference groups. In contrast, "Information Systems" was the only Operational Goal that was perceived as a preferred low priority by all groups. "Staff Development" and "Participatory Decision Making" were perceived as preferred moderate priorities by each of the three reference groups.

Differences between groups were found in the priority classification of the following preferred Operational Goals: "Needs Assessment", "Low Tuition", "Management By Goals/Objectives", "Evaluation", "Define Expectations", "Due Process", "Academic Freedom", "Affirmative Action", "Maintenance of Facilities", "Learning Resources", "Accreditation", and "Open Door Admissions".

When the goals were analyzed in terms of differences between groups with respect to their perceptions of the importance of each goal (as measured along a continuum of importance), it was discovered that there were statistically significant differences between groups on 11 out of the 16 preferred Operational Goals.

On the goals "Needs Assessment", "Management By Goals/ Objectives", and "Define Expectations" students and faculty differed significantly with administrators. Faculty differed

significantly with students and administrators on the goals
"Low Tuition" and "Affirmative Action". Students differed
with administrators (with faculty not differing significantly
from either group) on the goals "Personnel Selection" and
"Evaluation". Faculty differed significantly with students
(with administrators not differing from either group) on
the goals "Information Systems" and "Learning Resources".
Students differed with administrators and faculty on the
goal "Due Process". All three groups differed significantly
on the goal "Open Door Admissions". However, no statistically
significant differences were found between groups on the
five goals "Staff Development", "Participatory Decision
Making", "Academic Freedom", "Maintenance of Facilities",
and "Accreditation".

To determine what differences between groups existed
between "is" and "should be" perceptions the institutional
goal priorities were examined in two ways. First,
differences within groups in the priority of each goal (in
relation to the other goals) were analyzed in terms of
changes in rank of the goal from present to preferred
priority. The direction of change in priority rank within
a reference group was then compared with the direction of
change in priority rank of the same goal with the other
groups. Secondly, the goals were examined in terms of
statistically significant differences between the "is"
and "should be" means for each group.

When the Educational Program Goals were analyzed
in terms of differences between groups in priority rankings,
all three groups ranked "Transfer Education" and "Continuing
Education" as higher present than preferred priorities.
In contrast, all three groups ranked "Student Services"
as a higher preferred than present priority. There was
no change in the priority rank of the goal "Community
Services" between "is" and "should be" perceptions by each
of the three reference groups. There were differences
between groups in the direction of change between present
and preferred priority on the goals "Occupational/Technical
Education", "Career Education", "Developmental Education",
and "Special Training".

When the Educational Program Goals were analyzed in
terms of statistically significant differences between
present and preferred group means, in all but two instances
each group rated the preferred mean significantly higher
than the present mean. The two exceptions were for
administrator ratings of the goals "Transfer Education"
and "Career Education". For both of these goals
administrators indicated that there was no significant
difference between the present and preferred means.

When the Operational Goals were analyzed in terms of
differences between groups in priority rankings all three
groups ranked "Needs Assessment", "Personnel Selection",
and "Staff Development" as higher preferred than present
priorities. In contrast, all three groups ranked

"Affirmative Action", "Information Systems", "Accreditation", and "Open Door Admissions" as lower preferred than present priorities. There were differences between groups in the direction of change between present and preferred priority on the goals "Low Tuition", "Management By Goals/Objectives", "Evaluation", "Participatory Decision Making", "Define Expectations", "Due Process", "Academic Freedom", "Maintenance of Facilities", and "Learning Resources".

When the Operational Goals were analyzed in terms of statistically significant differences between present and preferred group means, the following results were found:

1. For students a statistically significant difference was found between the present and preferred means on each goal. Student responses indicated significantly higher "should be" means than "is" means in each instance.

2. For faculty a statistically significant difference was found between the present and preferred means on 14 out of the 16 Operational Goals. In all but one instance (where a statistically significant difference was found), faculty responses indicated significantly higher "should be" than "is" means. The one exception to this general tendency was on the goal "Open Door Admissions". On this goal faculty indicated a significantly greater present than preferred mean. The goals on which faculty did not indicate a significant difference between means were "Affirmative

Action" and "Accreditation".

   3. For administrators a statistically significant
difference was found between the "is" and "should be"
mean on 12 out of the 16 Operational Goals. In all cases
(where a statistically significant difference was found),
administrator responses indicated a significantly higher
preferred than present mean. The goals on which
administrators did not indicate a significant difference
between "is" and "should be" means were "Academic Freedom",
"Affirmative Action", "Accreditation", and "Open Door
Admissions".

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS,

AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to examine the
priority status of institutional goals as perceived by
students, faculty, and administrators in Virginia rural
community colleges. In addition, the study was designed to
determine what differences exist between the groups in
their perceptions of the present and preferred priority of
the goals.

A questionnaire, based upon the Virginia Community
College System stated goals, was developed to gather
answers pertinent to the research. A random sample of
821 students, 91 faculty, and all 70 administrators from six
rural community colleges in Virginia responded to the
questionnaire. The number of responses represented return
rates of 68 percent, 96 percent, and 91 percent for
students, faculty, and administrators respectively.

Each respondent was asked to rate each goal in terms
of its present ("is") and preferred ("should be") importance
along a continuum. Responses could vary along a five-point
scale from a rating of one ("of no importance") to five
("of extremely high importance").

The first two research questions were analyzed in two ways. First, to describe and compare present and preferred goal priorities for the three reference groups, the goals were rank ordered from highest to lowest mean values. In addition to rank ordering the "is" and "should be" goals, a oneway analysis of variance was performed on the data for each goal to determine if there were statistically signifi- cant differences between group means. The Student-Newman- Kuels procedure was then used to specifically locate where the differences between groups occurred.

The third research question was designed to examine what differences existed between groups between the present and preferred perceptions. The goals were again examined in two ways. Differences between groups in the priority of each goal (in relation to the other goals) were examined in terms of changes in the rank of the goal from present to preferred priority. In addition a "t" test was performed on the data for each goal for each group to determine if there were statistically significant differences between present and preferred ratings.

In this study, the institutional goals were classified into two general categories: (1) Educational Program Goals and (2) Operational Goals. The Educational Program Goals were defined as a category of goals that deal with activities such as programs and course offerings. Operational Goals were defined as a category of goals which relate to

the management policies or the operation of the college.

The major findings of this study are summarized below under the following general areas: (1) The Present ("is") Priority of Community College Goals, (2) The Preferred ("should be") Priority of Community College Goals, and (3) Analysis of the Differences Between Present and Preferred Priorities of Community College Goals.

The Present ("is") Priority of Community College Goals

"Occupational/Technical Education" and "Career Education" were perceived by all three reference groups as present high priority Educational Program Goals. In contrast, all three groups perceived "Community Services" and "Special Training" as present low priorities.

"Low Tuition" and "Open Door Admissions" were perceived by all three groups as present high priority Operational Goals. In contrast, "Staff Development" and "Define Expectations" were rated as low present priorities by all three groups.

There were statistically significant differences between groups on seven out of the eight present Educational Program Goals and on 11 out of the 16 Operational Goals.

The Preferred ("should be") Priority of Community College Goals

"Occupational/Technical Education" was the only

preferred Educational Program Goal which was perceived by all three groups as a high priority. In contrast, "Community Services" was the only goal perceived as a preferred low priority by all three groups.

"Personnel Selection" was the only preferred Operational Goal that was perceived as a high priority by all three reference groups. In contrast, "Information Systems" was the only Operational Goal that was perceived as a preferred low priority by all groups.

There were statistically significant differences between groups on seven out of the eight preferred Educational Program Goals and on 11 out of the 16 preferred Operational Goals.

Analysis of Differences Between the Present and Preferred Priorities of Community College Goals

When the Educational Program Goals were analyzed in terms of differences between groups in priority rankings, all three groups ranked "Transfer Education" and "Continuing Education" as higher present than preferred priorities. In contrast, all three groups ranked "Student Services" as a higher preferred than present priority. There were differences between groups in the direction of change between present and preferred priority on the goals "Occupational/Technical Education", "Career Education", Developmental Education", and "Special Training".

When the Educational Program Goals were analyzed
in terms of statistically significant differences between
present and preferred group means, in all but two instances
each group rated the preferred mean significantly higher
than the present mean. The two exceptions were for
administrator ratings of the goals "Transfer Education"
and "Career Education". For both of these goals
administrators indicated that there was no significant
difference between the present and preferred means.

When the Operational Goals were analyzed in terms of
differences between groups in priority rankings, all three
groups ranked "Needs Assessment", "Personnel Selection",
and "Staff Development" as higher preferred than present
priorities. In contrast, all three groups ranked
"Affirmative Action", "Information Systems", "Accreditation",
and "Open Door Admissions" as lower preferred than present
priorities. There were differences between groups in the
direction of change between present and preferred priority
on the goals "Low Tuition", "Management By Goals/Objectives",
"Evaluation", "Participatory Decision Making", "Define
Expectations", "Due Process", "Academic Freedom",
"Maintenance of Facilities", and "Learning Resources".

The Operational Goals were analyzed in terms of
statistically significant differences between present and
preferred group means. The major results of the analysis
are described below.

For students a statistically significant difference was found between the present and preferred means on each goal. Student responses indicated significantly higher "should be" means than "is" means in each instance.

For faculty a statistically significant difference was found between the present and preferred means on 14 out of the 16 Operational Goals. In all but one instance (where a statistically significant difference was found), faculty responses indicated significantly higher "should be" than "is" means. The one exception to this general tendency was on the goal "Open Door Admissions". On this goal faculty indicated a significantly greater present than preferred mean. The goals on which faculty did not indicate a significant difference between means were "Affirmative Action" and "Accreditation".

For administrators a statistically significant difference was found between the "is" and "should be" mean on 12 out of the 16 Operational Goals. In all cases (where a statistically significant difference was found), administrator responses indicated a significantly higher preferred than present mean. The goals on which administrators did not indicate a significant difference between "is" and "should be" means were "Academic Freedom", "Affirmative Action", "Accreditation", and "Open Door Admissions".

CONCLUSIONS

1. In general rural Virginia community college students, faculty, and administrators differed in their perceptions of the present and preferred priority status of the Educational Program and Operational Goals. Based upon this general finding, this study indicates a lack of widespread support for the priority of the institutional goals as developed by the Virginia Community College System.

2. All three reference groups indicated that nearly all of the goals should be of greater importance than they were perceived to be at the time of the study. This general finding supports the conclusion that goals are desired states which are not totally attainable.

3. To the extent that goal hiatus, as one component of Martorana and Kuhns Interactive Forces Theory accurately explains academic change, it appears that several goal priorities for the rural colleges within the Virginia Community College System are in a position to be rearranged.

In general there was support among Virginia rural community college students, faculty, and administrators that the goals "Transfer Education", "Continuing Education", "Affirmative Action", "Information Systems", "Accreditation", and "Open Door Admissions" should be lower priority goals than they were perceived to be at the time of the study. In contrast, there was support among the three groups that the goals "Student Services",

"Needs Assessment", "Personnel Selection", and "Staff
Development" should be higher priority goals than they
were perceived to be at the time of the study.

IMPLICATIONS

A review of the literature suggested that the
concept of goals is considered an important aspect of
social organizations. Although "perfect" agreement on
the priority of goals in complex organizations was described
as rarely (if ever) attainable and difficult to measure,
the literature supported the desirability of a high
degree of goal consensus among subgroups within a social
organization. (Peterson, 1971; Trivett, 1973; Farmer and
Richman, 1974). Differences between subgroups with respect
to the major priorities of the organization could result
in the reduced effectiveness of individuals within the
organization in their progress toward the attainment of
institutional goals. The results of this study suggest
that there are a number of differences among students,
faculty, and administrators with respect to the priority
status of the Virginia Community College System stated
goals.

Management theory suggest that the successful
application of a management-by-objectives system is at
least partially based upon the idea that when members
from all levels of an organization are involved in the
process of goal setting, they will be more likely to work

together as a team toward achieving the goals. The

successful achievement of goals is dependent to a large

extent upon the solidarity of support for the goals.

(Haynes, Massie, and Wallace, 1975).

In developing the Management By Objectives approach

toward articulating system goals, the Virginia Community

College System had as one of its purposes the reinforcement

of the original goal statement of the system. In addition

the Virginia Community College System apparently was

attempting to provide a basis for goal agreement among

internal groups. The lack of agreement upon goal

priorities between students, faculty, and administrators

suggest that greater emphasis upon achieving goal consensus

within the system is needed. Perhaps extending the data base

beyond the scope of primarily administrators to include

a representative number of students and faculty in the

future refinement and implementation stages of the

Management By Objectives plan would improve the solidarity

of support for the goal priorities.

According to Martorana and Kuhns (1975) Interactive

Forces Theory, three factors interact to influence

academic change. One of the factors described in their

formulation is called goal hiatus. Goal hiatus is the

difference between the perceived present and preferred

priority of a goal in relation to other goals. When

evidence suggest that a given goal is preferred as a

higher (or lower) priority, a positive (or negative) force which may influence academic change is assumed to be operating.

Although the results of this study suggest a large number of possible inferences, four specific implications seemed to be especially pertinent for individuals associated with rural Virginia community colleges. As noted earlier in this chapter, there was support among students, faculty, and administrators for upgrading the relative priority status of a number of community college goals including "Student Services", "Needs Assessment", and "Staff Development". Perhaps with the leadership of rural community college presidents, local community college boards, the State Department of Community Colleges, the State Board of Community Colleges, and other individuals and groups, who are influential in setting system priorities, various means could be identified to upgrade these major goal areas. Obtaining an adequate financial base seems to be the most obvious means toward supporting these desired goals.

The results of this study indicated that rural Virginia community college students, faculty, and administrators all agreed that the "Open Door Admissions" policy should be of less importance than it was perceived to be at the time of the study. Perhaps the three reference groups are suggesting that the concept of open

admissions should be reconsidered and that the traditional
community college policy of accepting all students over the
age of eighteen regardless of their previous academic
preparation for college work should be modified. Although
this advocacy appears to be contradictory to the
egalitarian philosophy of the community college movement,
perhaps years of experience in working with a highly
diversified student population has been found to be an
unrealistic expectation.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

In view of the findings of this study, several
problems have been identified which suggest the need for
further investigation beyond this study.

1. Further research should be conducted to
determine the extent to which the goal perceptions
expressed by respondents to goal inventories are
stereotyped by groups.

2. Further research should be conducted to
determine why the "Open Door Admissions" policy is
apparently being challenged by students, faculty, and
administrators.

3. Since several differences in the priority
assigned goals were found to exist among students, faculty,
and administrators, further research should be conducted
to determine to what extent institutional goals affect
the day-to-day functioning, effectiveness, organizational

structure, and decision-making process of the rural community college.

4. This study should be replicated after a period of one or two years in an effort to evaluate if differences between reference groups with respect to the stated goals of the Virginia Community College System continue to exist.

5. This study should be adapted for administration to additional community college constituent groups such as classified staff, local and state boards, and state legislators in an effort to evaluate goal differences among and between these groups.

6. This study should be replicated in urban and suburban areas to ascertain whether or not the findings can be generalized beyond rural community colleges in Virginia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of Junior Colleges. 100,000 and Under:
    Occupational Education in the Rural Community Junior
    College. Washington, D. C., 1968.

Anthony, R. N., J. Dearden, R. F. Vancil, eds. Management
    Control Systems. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin,
    Inc., 1973.

Baldridge, J. V. Power and Conflict in the University.
    New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1971.

Bloom, B. S., ed. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The
    Classification of Educational Goals: Handbook I:
    Cognitive Domain. New York: David McKay Co., 1956.

Bogue, J. P. The Community College. New York: McGraw-Hill,
    1950.

Brick, M. Form and Focus for the Junior College Movement.
    New York: Bureau of Publications, Teacher's College,
    Columbia University, 1964.

Bushnell, D. S. Organizing For Change: New Priorities For
    Community Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

_____, and D. Rappaport. Planned Change in Education.
    New York: Harcourt, Brace, Javanovick, 1971.

Campbell, D. S. A Critical Study of the Purposes of the
    Junior College. Nashville: George Peabody College for
    Teachers, 1930.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Reform On Campus.
    New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Creager, Cheryl W. "An Analysis of the Perceptions of
    Institutional Goal Priorities of College-Wide and
    Campus Administrators Among the Five Multi-Campus
    Community Colleges of the Virginia Community College
    System". Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.
    Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University,
    Blacksburg, Virginia, 1976.

Cohen, M. and J. March. Leadership and Ambiguity: The
    American College President. New York: McGraw-Hill,
    1974.

Cross, K. P. "What Do You Know About the Goals of Community
    Colleges?". Community and Junior College Journal, Vol.
    44,(April 1974), pp. 34-35.

Cyert, R. and J. G. March. A Behavioral Theory of the Firm.
     Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Eells, W. C. The Junior College. Cambridge: The Riverside
     Press, 1931.

Emery, J. C. Organizational Planning and Control Systems:
     Theory and Technology. Londy: Collier-Macmillan Ltd.,
     1969.

Etzioni, A. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.,
     Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Farmer, R. N. and B. M. Richman. Leadership, Goals, and
     Power in Higher Education. Washington, D. C., Jossey-
     Bass, 1974.

Fields, R. R. The Community College Movement. New York:
     McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Gleazer, E. J. Project Focus: A Forecast Study of Community
     Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Godwin, M. E., Jr. "Address of Mills E. Godwin, Jr., Governor
     to the General Assembly, Monday, January 17, 1966".
     Richmond, Virginia: Commonwealth of Virginia,
     Department of Purchases and Supply, 1966.

Graubard, S. R. "Thoughts On Higher Educational Purposes
     and Goals: A Memorandum". Daedalus. Fall, 1974,
     (1), 1-11.

Gross, B. M. Organizations and Their Managing. New York:
     The Free Press, 1968.

Gross, E. and P. V. Grambsch. University Goals and Academic
     Power. Washington, D. C.: American Council on
     Education, 1968.

Hampton, D. R., C. E. Summer, and R. A. Webber. Organizational
     Behavior and the Practice of Management. Glenview, Ill.:
     Scott, Foresman, and Co., 1973.

Haynes, W. W., J. L. Massie, and M. J. Wallace, Jr.,
     Management Analysis, Concepts, and Cases. Englewood
     Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission. Program
     Evaluation: The Virginia Community College System.
     Richmond, Virginia: The Virginia General Assembly,
     1974.

128

Kast, F. E. and J. E. Rosenzweig. Organization and Management: A Systems Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Krathwohl, D. R., B. S. Bloom, and B. B. Masia. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals: Handbook II: Affective Domain. New York: David McKay Co., 1956.

Knoell, D. and C. McIntryre. Planning Colleges for the Community. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Koos, L. V. The Junior College Movement. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1925.

Mager, R. F. Preparing Instructional Objectives. California: Fearon Publishers/Lear Siegler, Inc., 1962.

March, J. G. and H. Simon. Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

Martorana, S. V. and E. Kuhns. Managing Academic Change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

McFadden, D. N., ed. Usher Redesign Model. Columbus, Ohio: Battelle Center for Improved Education, 1975.

McManis Associates, Inc. Management By Objectives Manuel. Richmond, Virginia: Virginia Community College System, 1975.

Medsker, L. L. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

_____, and D. Tillery. Breaking the Access Barriers: A Profile of Two-Year Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Morphet, E. L., R. L. Johns, and T. L. Reller. Educational Organization and Administration: Concepts, Practices, and Issues. 3rd Edition. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Niel, Margaret J. "Institutional Research, Development and Evaluation in Michigan Community-Junior Colleges". Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1975.

Nie, H. N., C. H. Hull, J. G. Jenkins, K. Steinbrenner, D. H. Bent. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. 2nd Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Perrow, C. "Organizational Goals". In K. Azumi and J. Hage,
    Organizational Systems: A Text Reader in the Sociology
    of Organizations. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and
    Co., 1972.

Peterson, R. E. The Crisis of Purpose: Definition and
    Uses of Institutional Goals. (ERIC Clearinghouse on
    Higher Education, Report Number 6). Washington, D. C.:
    Reprinted by permission of the ERIC Clearinghouse on
    Higher Education. The George Washington University,
    1971.

_____, Goals for California Higher Education: A Survey
    of the College Communities. California: Educational
    Testing Service and California State Legislature, 1973.

Rhodes, Eric. A Proposed Master Plan for a State-Wide
    System of Community College Education in Virginia.
    Richmond, Virginia: State Department of Community
    Colleges, 1967.

Roueche, John. Accountability for Student Learning. (A
    paper presented to the 1970 Convention of the Oklahoma
    Association of Community and Junior Colleges).

Russel, J. D. Report of the Higher Education Study
    Commission. Richmond, Virginia: Commonwealth of
    Virginia, State Council of Higher Education, 1965.

Ryder, Ronda W. "The Relative Priority of Goals for the
    State-Wide System of Community Colleges in Florida".
    Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. The Florida State
    University, Tallahassee, Florida, 1975.

Selznick, P. "Foundations of the Theory of Organizations".
    In A. Etizioni, Complex Organizations, A Sociological
    Reader. New York: Holt and Winston, 1961.

Simon, H. A. "On the Concept of Organizational Goals".
    Administrative Science Quarterly, (June, 1964), 1-22.

State Council of Higher Education. Needs, Policies, and
    Plans for Two-Year Colleges in Virginia. Richmond,
    Virginia: Commonwealth of Virginia, 1959.

Thornton, J. W., Jr. The Community-Junior College. New
    York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Tollefson, Terrence A. "An Assessment of Goals and Major
    Policies of the North Carolina Community College
    System As A Basis for Long-Range Planning". Unpublished
    Doctoral Dissertation. The University of Michigan,
    Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1975.

Trivett, D. A. Goals for Higher Education: Definitions and Directions. (ERIC Higher Education Research Report Number 6). Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1973.

United States President's Commission on Higher Education. Higher Education for American Democracy. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1947.

Van Dalen, D. B. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Vaughan, G. B. Some Philosophical and Practical Concepts for Broadening the Base of Higher Education in Virginia. (ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper Number 19). Los Angelos: Graduate School of Education and the University Library, University of California, 1971.

APPENDIX A

VCCS STATEMENT OF MISSION AND GOALS

APPENDIX A

Statement of the Virginia Community College System
Mission and Goals

VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM MISSION

The mission of the Virginia Community College System is
to function within the total educational community, in those
areas assigned to it by law, to assure that all individuals
in the Commonwealth of Virginia are given a continuing
opportunity for the development and extension of their
skills and knowledge.

Principal emphasis is placed on occupational-technical
education with commensurate emphasis on counseling and
guidance. Transfer programs are an integral part of the
mission and continuing education is a vital service to the
total mission.

The Virginia Community College System provides trained
manpower through a cooperative effort with industry, business,
professions, government, and other educational institutions.

The mission shall be accomplished primarily through the
operation of comprehensive community colleges throughout
the Commonwealth, supported by the State Department of
Community Colleges. Individual colleges shall offer programs
of instruction, extending beyond the associate degree level,
designed to respond to the needs of the Commonwealth and
to the particular needs of the citizens of the regions in
which they are located.

APPENDIX A (continued)

Goals Statements

Virginia Community College System Goals Statements

I. Educational Program Goals

    The Virginia Community College System shall, through
    individual comprehensive community colleges and the
    Special Training Division of the State Department of
    Community Colleges provide educational opportunities
    to individuals within and beyond the typical college
    age. The System has the responsibility for effectively
    and efficiently meeting the educational and training
    needs of those citizens of the Commonwealth for
    whom it was designed to serve. Each college shall
    have a specific geographic region for which it is
    primarily responsible.

    A. The educational program goals of the VCCS are:

        1. To offer Associate in Applied Science Degree
            Programs to prepare individuals for careers
            as technicians and paraprofessional workers.

        2. To offer Associate in Arts and Associate in
            Science Degree Programs designed to prepare
            individuals for transfer, as upper-division
            students, to baccalaureate degree programs
            in four-year colleges.

        3. To offer Diploma and Certificate Programs
            designed to prepare individuals for careers
            as technicians and skilled workers.

        4. To offer Developmental Programs designed to
            assist individuals in meeting educational
            requirements to prepare them to benefit
            from other instructional programs.

        5. To offer Continuing Education Programs
            designed to provide educational opportunities
            for individuals who wish to continue and expand
            their learning experiences. Such programs
            may include credit and non-credit courses,
            seminars, and workshops.

APPENDIX A (continued)

6. To offer Community Services which shall
    provide cultural and educational
    opportunities which are in addition to
    other programs of the college. Where
    available, facilities and other resources
    may be provided to other educational
    institutions or other qualified organizations.

7. To offer Student Development Services which,
    through counseling and guidance, shall be
    designed to primarily assist with decisions
    regarding occupational, educational, and
    personal goals, and to facilitate their
    educational progress.

8. To offer Special Training Programs where
    specific employment opportunities are
    available in new or expanding businesses,
    industries, and professions. Such progress
    shall be operated in coordination with
    the individual comprehensive community colleges.

II.   Educational Impact Goals

B.   Educational Impact Goals is a category of goals
      that deals with the impact of the educational
      process among students. These statements relate
      to the type of change or effect colleges hope to
      have on students and lead to a measurement of the
      educational impact of a college on the student.

      NOTE: The Educational Impact Goals will be
      developed as part of the second cycle of M.B.O.

III. Operational Goals

      The State Board of Community Colleges is appointed by the
      Governor of the Commonwealth and is the governing board
      for the Virginia Community College System. Each college
      has a College Board, appointed by the political subdivisions
      served by the college, which is advisory to the State
      Board and which has such authority and responsibility as
      may be delegated to it by the State Board. The Virginia
      Community College System shall provide the necessary
      organization and resources to implement its Educational
      Program Goals.

APPENDIX A (continued)

C. GENERAL -- The General goals of the VCCS are as
    follows:

    1. A goal to develop programs, courses, and
        services based on the assessed needs of
        individuals and the needs of industry,
        business, professions and government in
        the Commonwealth.

    2. To offer programs and services at the
        lowest possible cost in order not to
        exclude citizens of the Commonwealth
        from needed educational opportunities due
        to cost.

    3. To manage the VCCS through the use of
        clearly stated goals and objectives with
        full accountability to the colleges and
        the systems' constituents.

D. ORGANIZATION -- The Organizational goals of the VCCS
    are as follows:

    1. To establish an effective organizational
        structure in the State Department of Community
        Colleges which supports the programs of the
        System and the community colleges.

    2. To establish an organizational structure
        within each community college which provides
        for the effective operation of the college.
        Such structure shall be fully defined and
        communicated to all college personnel and
        the State Board.

    3. To define an effective organizational structure
        for the VCCS and clearly communicate it to all
        personnel.

E. MANAGEMENT -- The Management team of the Virginia
    Community College System includes the Chancellor,
    Vice Chancellor, Division Directors, and the
    Presidents of the respective colleges. The
    college management teams include the Presidents,
    Provosts, Deans, Directors, Coordinators, Division
    Chairmen, and Business Managers.

APPENDIX A (continued)

The Management goals of the VCCS are as follows:

1. To define system and institutional expectations
    for each member of the management team to
    facilitate the selection of individuals who are
    professionally competent and who have goals
    consistent with those of the System and the
    college.

2. To provide a program of professional development
    to provide for growth and development of
    individuals composing management teams.

3. To provide programs of evaluation and retention
    including appropriate salaries and benefits.

4. To involve members of the management team in
    the development of policies and procedures, and
    to clearly define the role and scope of this
    involvement.

5. To provide protection from arbitrary actions by
    senior administrators and from undue outside
    pressures.

F. FACULTY -- Faculty, as used herein, includes all
    personnel holding faculty rank not included in the
    section on Management.

    The goals of the VCCS regarding Faculty are as follows:

1. To define system and institutional expectations
    for each member of the faculty to facilitate
    the selection of individuals who are professionally
    competent and who have goals consistent with
    those of the System and the college.

2. To provide a program of professional development
    to assure that faculty members are kept abreast
    of the latest developments in their respective
    disciplines, instructional methodology, and
    developments in community college education.

3. To develop programs of evaluation and retention
    including appropriate salaries and benefits
    related thereto.

4. To involve faculty in the development of
    institutional and system policies and procedures
    and to define clearly the scope of their role
    in this area.

APPENDIX A (continued)

5. To defend academic freedom and due process
   and protect faculty from arbitrary administrative
   actions and undue outside pressures.

G. SUPPORT STAFF -- The Support Staff includes classified
   employees of the colleges and the staff of the State
   Department of Community Colleges, not previously
   included within the definition of Management or
   Faculty.

   The VCCS goals relative to the Support Staff are
   as follows:

   1. To define system and institutional expectations
      for each member of the support staff to
      facilitate the selection of individuals who are
      professionally competent and who have goals
      consistent with those of the System and the
      college.

   2. To provide a program of development to maintain
      and improve the competencies of the members of
      the support staff.

   3. To provide evaluation and retention policies
      including appropriate salaries and benefits
      related thereto.

   4. To protect support staff members from arbitrary
      administrative actions and undue outside
      pressures.

H. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY -- Regarding Equal Opportunity the
   VCCS has the following goals:

   1. To provide educational services to all citizens
      of the Commonwealth without regard to race, sex,
      national origin, religious preference, marital
      status, or any other matters not directly related
      to the individual's ability to benefit from
      the educational programs.

   2. To avoid any discrimination in its employment
      practices on the basis of race, sex, national
      origin, religious preference, marital status, or
      any other matter not directly related to the
      qualifications of the individual to perform the
      duties of the job.

3. To develop recruiting practices that encourage persons from minority groups presently underrepresented in the management, faculty, or staff of the System to apply for positions for which they are qualified.

I. FINANCIAL RESOURCES -- Regarding Financial Resources, the VCCS has the following goals:

1. To prepare and justify budget requests that accurately reflect the needs of the individual colleges and the System.

2. To allocate available financial resources to implement most effectively and efficiently the Educational Goals of the Virginia Community College System.

3. To manage available resources so that maximum benefits are achieved.

4. To be accountable for the utilization of all financial resources.

J. LEARNING RESOURCES -- Learning Resources include libraries, audio-visual equipment and materials, and learning laboratory facilities. VCCS goals related to Learning Resources are:

1. To provide learning resources facilities at each campus in order to assist in creating an effective learning environment.

2. To develop learning resources which support the programs of the college.

3. To promote and encourage the utilization of appropriate learning resources by students, faculty, staff, and the general public.

K. PHYSICAL PLANT -- For the Physical Plant area the VCCS has the following goals:

1. To provide facilities and equipment to create desirable learning environments for the System's programs.

APPENDIX A (continued)

2. To maintain and protect facilities and equipment
    so as to assure maximum benefit from their use.

3. To encourage appropriate utilization of college
    facilities by outside agencies and community
    groups.

L. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT -- The VCCS Research and
    Development goals are as follows:

1. To maintain a program of information to support
    evaluation and management of institutional
    and System performance.

APPENDIX B

Virginia Community College System Goal
Assessment Questionnaire

Virginia Community College System Goals Assessment Questionnaire

Part I

A.   Please indicate your name and the name of your community college in the space provided below. (This questionnaire will be regarded as confidential)

Name: _____
       (First)   (Middle Initial)   (Last)

Name of your community college: _____

B.   Please indicate below if you are a student, faculty member, or administrator. (Then, please complete the additional information requested)

    1. _____Student: If you are a student, please check the box that best describes your registration status.

        /___/ A. I am currently registered for 1 to 11 credits.

        /___/ B. I am currently registered for 12 or more credits.

    2. _____Faculty: If you are a faculty member, please check the box that best describes your credit hour teaching load.

        /___/ A. I am currently teaching 9 or more credit hours per week.

        /___/ B. I am currently teaching 8 or less credit hours per week.

    3. _____Administrator: If you hold an administrative position, please indicate within which administrative group you are classified.

        /___/ A. President or Dean.   /___/ B. Division Chairman, Director, or Coordinator

        /___/ C. Other: Please specify: _____

Community College Goals Inventory

=====================================

Part II

Each Virginia Community College is in the process of developing a revised and updated statement of its mission, goals, and objectives. Colleges may serve a number of goals, some of which may be regarded as more important than others. What do you consider to be the purpose of your community college? How important are these goals? Many of the more frequently mentioned goals of a community college are listed below. The goals have been classified as "Educational Program" and "Operational" goals.

INSTRUCTIONS: THE INVENTORY CONSISTS OF 24 STATEMENTS OF POSSIBLE INSTITUTIONAL GOALS. YOU ARE ASKED TO RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT IN TWO WAYS. FIRST, HOW IMPORTANT IS THE GOAL AT THIS INSTITUTION AT THE PRESENT TIME; THEN, IN YOUR JUDGEMENT, HOW IMPORTANT SHOULD THE GOAL BE AT THIS INSTITUTION? CONSIDER THE INSTITUTION AS A WHOLE IN MAKING YOUR JUDGEMENTS. IN GIVING "SHOULD BE" RESPONSES, DO NOT BE RESTRAINED BY YOUR BELIEFS ABOUT WHETHER THE GOAL, REALISTICALLY, CAN BE ATTAINED ON THE CAMPUS. PLEASE TRY TO RESPOND TO EVERY GOAL STATEMENT IN THE INVENTORY BY CIRCLING THE NUMBER AFTER YOUR "IS" RATING AND AFTER YOUR "SHOULD BE" RATING FOR EACH GOAL.

RATING KEY: 1 = of no importance
               2 = of low importance
               3 = of medium importance
               4 = of high importance
               5 = of extremely high importance

Educational Program Goals

---

1. to prepare individuals for careers (jobs) as   is presently   1   2   3   4   5
    technicians and/or paraprofessional workers   --------------------------------
    through a variety of formal associate of   should be   1   2   3   4   5
    applied science degree programs.

2. to prepare individuals for transfer as upper-   is presently   1   2   3   4   5
    division students to four-year colleges and   --------------------------------
    universities through a variety of associate   should be   1   2   3   4   5
    of arts and associate of science degree
    programs.

3. to prepare individuals for careers as   is presently   1   2   3   4   5
    technicians and skilled workers through   --------------------------------
    a variety of one- to two-year certificate   should be   1   2   3   4   5
    and diploma programs.

4. to provide developmental (remedial)   is presently   1   2   3   4   5
    education to prepare students to benefit   --------------------------------
    from other instructional programs.   should be   1   2   3   4   5

5. to provide Continuing Education   is presently   1   2   3   4   5
    opportunities including credit and   --------------------------------
    non-credit courses, seminars, and   should be   1   2   3   4   5
    workshops for individuals who do not
    presently wish to enter into a formal
    degree, diploma, or certificate program.

6. to provide a variety of community service functions in addition to the other programs of the college including recreational/cultural activities and the use of college facilities by qualified groups and individuals.

is presently	1	2	3	4	5
should be	1	2	3	4	5

7. to provide a variety of student services including academic advisement, personal counseling, recreational activities, financial assistance administration, and job placement.

is presently	1	2	3	4	5
should be	1	2	3	4	5

8. to assist the State Department of Community College in developing and implementing special training programs where specific employment opportunities are available in new and expanding businesses, industries, and professions.

is presently	1	2	3	4	5
should be	1	2	3	4	5

Operational Goals

1. to provide educational programs, courses, and services based upon the assessed needs of the community.

is presently	1	2	3	4	5
should be	1	2	3	4	5

2. to keep tuition and fee charges as low as possible.

is presently	1	2	3	4	5
should be	1	2	3	4	5

144

3. to manage the college based upon established   is presently   1   2   3   4   5
    goals and objectives in an effective and   -----------------------------------
    efficient manner including the preparation   should be   1   2   3   4   5
    and justification of budgets and the
    allocation of financial (and other) resources.

4. to select personnel at all levels within   is presently   1   2   3   4   5
    the college who possess the necessary   -----------------------------------
    competencies and who have goals consistent   should be   1   2   3   4   5
    with those of the college and system.

5. to provide appropriate programs of staff   is presently   1   2   3   4   5
    development for all college personnel.   -----------------------------------
                                                    should be   1   2   3   4   5

6. to provide programs of evaluation and   is presently   1   2   3   4   5
    retention including appropriate salaries   -----------------------------------
    and benefits for all college personnel.   should be   1   2   3   4   5

7. to involve all appropriate segments   is presently   1   2   3   4   5
    of the college in the policy and   -----------------------------------
    decision-making process.

8. to define the institutional expectations   is presently   1   2   3   4   5
    for all college personnel.   -----------------------------------
                                                    should be   1   2   3   4   5

9. to protect all college personnel from   is presently   1   2   3   4   5
    arbitrary and/or capricious administrative   -----------------------------------
    actions and from undue internal/external   should be   1   2   3   4   5
    pressures.

			1	2	3	4	5
10.	to defend academic freedom.	is presently	1	2	3	4	5
		should be	1	2	3	4	5
11.	to provide equal opportunity and meet Affirmative Action mandates in the delivery of educational services, in employment practices, and through recruitment procedures.	is presently	1	2	3	4	5
		should be	1	2	3	4	5
12.	to provide, maintain, and protect facilities and equipment to help create a desirable learning environment and to insure maximum benefit from their use.	is presently	1	2	3	4	5
		should be	1	2	3	4	5
13.	to develop and maintain a program of information to support evaluation and management of institutional and system performance.	is presently	1	2	3	4	5
		should be	1	2	3	4	5
14.	to provide learning resources equipment and facilities which support the educational programs of the college and help create an effective learning environment.	is presently	1	2	3	4	5
		should be	1	2	3	4	5
15.	to ensure the favorable appraisal of those who validate the quality of programs offered by the college including the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges.	is presently	1	2	3	4	5
		should be	1	2	3	4	5

16. to have as a chief characteristic   is presently   1   2   3   4   5
     "accessibility" and non-selectivity
     with regard to admission's policies.   should be   1   2   3   4   5

APPENDIX C

Modifications to the Virginia Community
College System Statement of Mission and
Goals for the Research Questionnaire

148

Appendix C

The VCCS Task Force's preliminary goals were modified as indicated below. The code in parenthesis immediately following each goal statement listed below refers to the original goal statement(s) in Appendix A from which the goal was derived.

I. Educational Program Goals

1. To prepare individuals for careers (jobs) as technicians and/or paraprofessional workers through a variety of formal associate of applied science degree programs. (A.1)

2. To prepare individuals for transfer as upper-division students to four-year colleges and universities through a variety of associate of arts and associate of science degree programs. (A.2)

3. To prepare individuals for careers as technicians and skilled workers through a variety of one-to two-year certificate and diploma programs. (A.3)

4. To provide developmental (remedial) education to prepare students to benefit from other instructional programs. (A.4)

5. To provide Continuing Education opportunities including credit and non-credit courses, seminars, and workshops for individuals who do not presently wish to enter into a formal degree, diploma, or certificate program. (A.5)

Appendix C (continued)

6. To provide a variety of community service functions in addition to the other programs of the college including recreational/cultural activities and the use of college facilities by qualified groups and individuals. (A.6, K.3)

7. To provide a variety of student services including academic advisement, personal counseling, recreational activities, financial assistance administration, and job placement. (A.7)

8. To assist the State Department of Community Colleges in developing and implementing special training programs where specific employment opportunities are available in new or expanding business, industries, and professions. (A.8)

II. Operational Goals

1. To provide educational programs, courses, and services based upon the assessed needs of the community. (C.1)

2. To keep tuition and fee charges as low as possible. (C.2)

3. To manage the college based upon established goals and objectives in an effective and efficient manner including the preparation and justification of budgets and the allocation of financial (and other) resources. (C.3, D.1, D.2, D.3, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4)

4. To select personnel at all levels within the

Appendix C (continued)

college who possess the necessary competencies and who have goals consistent with those of the college and system. (E.1, F.1, G.1)

5. To provide appropriate programs of staff development for all college personnel. (E.2, F.2, G.2)

6. To provide programs of evaluation and retention including appropriate salaries and benefits for all college personnel. (E.3, F.3, G.3)

7. To involve all appropriate segments of the college in the policy and decision-making process. (E.4, F.4)

8. To define the institutional expectations for all college personnel. (E.1, F.1, G.1)

9. To protect all college personnel from arbitrary and/or capricious administrative actions and from undue internal/external pressures. (E.5, F.5, G.4)

10. To defend academic freedom and due process. (F.5)

11. To provide equal opportunity for Affirmative Action mandates in the delivery of educational services, in employment practices, and through recruiting procedures. (H.1, H.2, H.3)

12. To provide, maintain, and protect facilities and equipment to help create a desirable learning environment and to insure maximum benefit from their use. (K.1, K.2)

13. To develop and maintain a program of information to support evaluation and management of institutional and

Appendix C (continued)

system performance. (L.1)

14. To provide learning resources equipment and
facilities which support the educational programs of the
college and help create an effective learning environment.
(J.1, J.2, J.3)

15. To ensure the favorable appraisal of those who
validate the quality of programs offered by the college
including the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges.
(Inferred from 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4)

16. To have as a chief characteristic "accessibility"
and non-selectivity with regard to admission's policies.
(Inferred from Mission Statement)

APPENDIX D

Frequency of Response to the Questionnaire
By Goal for Students, Faculty, and
Administrators

Table 1

Frequency of Response By Goal For Students

Goal No.	Goal Phrase		Response Frequency					Total Response
			1	2	3	4	5	
Educational Program Goals								
1	Occupational/Technical Education							
		is	14	31	202	376	179	802
		should be	7	4	45	296	422	774
2	Transfer Education							
		is	12	62	265	301	144	784
		should be	9	14	81	303	363	770
3	Career Education							
		is	8	37	201	349	209	804
		should be	5	19	58	306	385	773
4	Developmental Education							
		is	25	88	316	245	96	770
		should be	12	30	171	304	247	764
5	Continuing Education							
		is	23	99	273	250	126	771
		should be	15	36	146	322	239	758
6	Community Services							
		is	44	165	289	220	66	784
		should be	23	38	160	315	245	781

Goal No.	Goal Phrase		Response Frequency					Total Response
			1	2	3	4	5	
7	Student Services							
		is	18	93	236	292	147	786
		should be	5	10	50	270	450	785
8	Special Training							
		is	29	101	310	230	93	763
		should be	11	20	95	305	341	772

Operational Goals

Goal No.	Goal Phrase		1	2	3	4	5	Total Response
1	Needs Assessment							
		is	14	67	269	309	120	779
		should be	7	18	77	289	384	775
2	Low Tuition							
		is	20	48	187	265	266	786
		should be	10	10	63	194	507	784
3	Management By Goals/ Objectives							
		is	10	42	281	312	109	754
		should be	7	6	129	317	290	749
4	Personnel Selection							
		is	21	72	241	299	141	774
		should be	10	12	72	267	415	776

Goal No.	Goal Phrase		Response Frequency 1	2	3	4	5	Total Response
5	Staff Development							
		is	23	87	300	257	81	748
		should be	10	12	135	316	285	758
6	Evaluation							
		is	13	49	306	262	79	709
		should be	8	20	139	300	272	739
7	Participatory Decision Making							
		is	34	90	306	223	85	738
		should be	11	18	116	300	300	745
8	Define Expectations							
		is	15	68	305	246	91	725
		should be	8	23	130	312	252	725
9	Due Process							
		is	24	78	281	241	103	727
		should be	17	22	137	271	291	738
10	Academic Freedom							
		is	32	73	239	284	138	766
		should be	17	14	77	249	414	771
11	Affirmative Action							
		is	11	49	272	291	129	752
		should be	9	17	106	297	333	762

Goal No.	Goal Phrase		Response Frequency					Total Response
			1	2	3	4	5	
12	Maintenance of Facilities							
		is	8	42	250	306	169	775
		should be	3	7	59	267	430	766
13	Information Systems							
		is	13	63	300	279	95	750
		should be	6	19	139	325	261	750
14	Learning Resources							
		is	5	45	232	295	199	776
		should be	5	14	50	260	434	763
15	Accreditation							
		is	13	47	275	290	100	725
		should be	10	16	135	280	281	722
16	Open Door Admissions							
		is	18	55	226	295	153	747
		should be	19	16	137	268	306	746

Table 2

Frequency of Response By Goal for Faculty

Goal No.	Goal Phrase		Response Frequency					Total Response
			1	2	3	4	5	

Educational Program Goals

Goal No.	Goal Phrase		1	2	3	4	5	Total Response
1	Occupational/Technical Education							
		is	–	5	11	41	33	90
		should be	2	2	9	30	45	88
2	Transfer Education							
		is	–	5	31	35	17	88
		should be	–	4	14	43	28	89
3	Career Education							
		is	–	5	15	38	29	87
		should be	2	–	8	32	46	88
4	Developmental Education							
		is	2	3	36	24	22	87
		should be	1	3	18	30	35	87
5	Continuing Education							
		is	1	3	32	35	18	89
		should be	1	1	18	41	26	87
6	Community Services							
		is	–	21	42	17	10	90
		should be	–	2	32	36	18	88

Goal No.	Goal Phrase		Response Frequency					Total Response
			1	2	3	4	5	
7	Student Services							
		is	-	11	23	43	10	87
		should be	1	3	8	36	39	87
8	Special Training							
		is	5	16	33	22	9	85
		should be	1	4	25	34	23	87

Operational Goals

Goal No.	Goal Phrase		1	2	3	4	5	Total Response
1	Needs Assessment							
		is	1	7	21	35	24	88
		should be	1	1	7	31	48	88
2	Low Tuition							
		is	2	1	25	26	33	87
		should be	1	4	15	24	44	88
3	Management By Goals/ Objectives							
		is	2	7	17	31	20	77
		should be	2	1	8	38	34	83
4	Personnel Selection							
		is	-	5	14	41	25	85
		should be	1	-	7	32	47	87

Goal No.	Goal Phrase		Response Frequency 1	2	3	4	5	Total Response
5	Staff Development							
		is	5	15	28	28	7	83
		should be	1	5	12	36	32	86
6	Evaluation							
		is	2	7	25	33	15	82
		should be	1	1	13	35	33	83
7	Participatory Decision Making							
		is	5	14	27	29	10	85
		should be	2	3	13	37	31	86
8	Define Expectations							
		is	2	6	31	36	9	84
		should be	3	3	17	33	31	87
9	Due Process							
		is	2	8	28	31	14	83
		should be	1	1	13	26	43	84
10	Academic Freedom							
		is	1	3	25	39	19	87
		should be	2	–	12	31	41	86
11	Affirmative Action							
		is	–	2	25	39	20	86
		should be	5	4	19	30	29	87

Goal No.	Goal Phrase		Response Frequency					Total Response
			1	2	3	4	5	
12	Maintenance of Facilities							
		is	1	4	25	32	27	89
		should be	1	–	8	39	41	89
13	Information Systems							
		is	1	7	34	30	7	79
		should be	1	4	23	34	20	82
14	Learning Resources							
		is	–	6	16	46	22	90
		should be	–	2	13	37	36	88
15	Accreditation							
		is	–	1	11	46	22	80
		should be	–	2	13	39	29	83
16	Open Door Admissions							
		is	1	20	38	26	6	91
		should be	4	4	18	35	24	85

Table 3

Frequency of Response By Goal For Administrators

Goal No.	Goal Phrase	Response Frequency					Total Response
		1	2	3	4	5	

Educational Program Goals

Goal No.	Goal Phrase	1	2	3	4	5	Total Response
1	Occupational/Technical Education						
	is	–	1	3	17	49	70
	should be	–	1	1	15	52	69
2	Transfer Education						
	is	–	1	9	30	29	69
	should be	–	3	8	26	31	68
3	Career Education						
	is	–	1	4	19	46	70
	should be	–	1	2	15	51	69
4	Developmental Education						
	is	–	4	24	23	19	70
	should be	–	1	6	21	41	69
5	Continuing Education						
	is	–	1	12	24	32	69
	should be	–	1	7	21	39	68
6	Community Services						
	is	1	4	28	25	12	70
	should be	–	2	15	24	28	69

Goal No.	Goal Phrase		Response Frequency 1	2	3	4	5	Total Response
7	Student Services							
		is	–	2	12	35	20	69
		should be	–	1	3	18	46	68
8	Special Training							
		is	2	16	21	20	11	70
		should be	1	5	14	27	22	69

Operational Goals

Goal No.	Goal Phrase		1	2	3	4	5	Total Response
1	Needs Assessment							
		is	–	3	13	26	28	70
		should be	–	1	2	12	54	69
2	Low Tuition							
		is	2	2	8	25	32	69
		should be	2	–	6	13	48	69
3	Management By Goals/ Objectives							
		is	1	4	14	29	22	70
		should be	–	2	2	20	45	69
4	Personnel Selection							
		is	–	2	13	35	20	70
		should be	1	2	2	22	46	69

Goal No.	Goal Phrase		Response Frequency 1	2	3	4	5	Total Response
5	Staff Development							
		is	1	16	14	35	3	69
		should be	1	–	3	35	30	69
6	Evaluation							
		is	1	3	23	29	12	68
		should be	–	1	6	25	36	68
7	Participatory Decision Making							
		is	1	6	16	34	12	69
		should be	–	1	6	33	28	68
8	Define Expectations							
		is	1	8	27	28	6	70
		should be	1	–	6	28	34	69
9	Due Process							
		is	2	2	16	35	14	70
		should be	1	1	5	28	34	69
10	Academic Freedom							
		is	2	–	11	34	22	69
		should be	1	1	8	32	26	68
11	Affirmative Action							
		is	–	3	12	27	28	70
		should be	2	2	7	21	37	69

Goal No.	Goal Phrase		Response Frequency 1	2	3	4	5	Total Response
12	Maintenance of Facilities							
		is	1	–	8	39	20	68
		should be	1	–	2	30	34	67
13	Information Systems							
		is	2	5	28	25	7	67
		should be	2	–	12	29	23	66
14	Learning Resources							
		is	1	–	19	27	22	69
		should be	1	–	8	21	38	68
15	Accreditation							
		is	1	2	11	31	22	67
		should be	1	2	12	20	31	66
16	Open Door Admissions							
		is	1	2	5	21	39	68
		should be	1	4	5	16	41	67

165

APPENDIX E

Summarizing Phrases Used To Identify Goal
Statements

Appendix E

Summarizing Phrases Used To Identify Goal Statements

Goal No.	Goal Statements	Summarizing Phrase
Educational Program Goals		
1	to prepare individuals for careers (jobs) as technicians and/or paraprofessional workers through a variety of formal associate of applied science degree programs.	Occupational/Technical Education
2	to prepare individuals for transfer as upper-division students to four-year colleges and universities through a variety of associate of arts and associate of science degree programs.	Transfer Education
3	to prepare individuals for careers as technicians and skilled workers through a variety of one- to two-year certificate and diploma programs.	Career Education
4	to provide developmental (remedial) education to prepare students to benefit from other instructional programs.	Developmental Education
5	to provide Continuing Education opportunities including credit and non-credit courses, seminars, and workshops for individuals who do not presently wish to enter into a formal degree, diploma, or certificate program.	Continuing Education

Goal No.	Goal Statements	Summarizing Phrase
6	to provide a variety of community service functions in addition to the other programs of the college including recreational/ cultural activities and the use of the college facilities by qualified groups and individuals.	Community Services
7	to provide a variety of student services including academic advisement, personal counseling, recreational activities, financial assistance administration, and job placement.	Student Services
8	to assist the State Department of Community Colleges in developing and implementing special training programs where specific employment opportunities are available in new and expanding businesses, industries, and professions.	Special Training

Operational Goals

1	to provide educational programs, courses, and services based upon the assessed needs of the community.	Needs Assessment
2	to keep tuition and fee charges as low as possible.	Low Tuition

Goal No.	Goal Statements	Summarizing Phrase
3	to manage the college based upon established goals and objectives in an effective and efficient manner including the preparation and justification of budgets and the allocation of financial (and other) resources.	Management By Goals/ Objectives
4	to select personnel at all levels within the college who possess the necessary competencies and who have goals consistent with those of the college and system.	Personnel Selection
5	to provide appropriate programs of staff development for all college personnel.	Staff Development
6	to provide programs of evaluation and retention including appropriate salaries and benefits for all college personnel.	Evaluation
7	to involve all appropriate segments of the college in the policy and decision-making process.	Participatory Decision Making
8	to define the institutional expectations for all college personnel.	Define Expectations
9	to protect all college personnel from arbitrary and/or capricious administrative actions and from undue internal/external pressures.	Due Process

Goal No.	Goal Statements	Summarizing Phrase
10	to defend academic freedom	Academic Freedom
11	to provide equal opportunity and meet affirmative action mandates in the delivery of educational services, in employment practices, and through recruiting procedures.	Affirmative Action
12	to provide, maintain, and protect facilities and equipment to help create a desirable learning environment and to ensure maximum benefit from their use.	Maintenance of Facilities
13	to develop and maintain a program of information to support evaluation and management of institutional and system performance.	Information Systems
14	to provide learning resources equipment and facilities which support the educational programs of the college and help create an effective learning environment.	Learning Resources
15	to ensure favorable appraisal of those who validate the quality of programs offered by the college including the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges.	Accreditation
16	to have as a chief characteristic "accessibility" and non-selectivity with regard to admission's policies.	Open Door Admissions

170

APPENDIX F

Rankings of Goals By Group

Appendix F

Student Ranking of Goals

Rank Ordered Means of the Present and Preferred
Priority Status of Goals

Educational Program Goals	Present			Preferred		
	Rank	Mean	S.D.	Rank	Mean	S.D.
1. Career Education	1	3.88	.87	3	4.34	.79
2. Occupational/Technical Education	2	3.84	.87	2	4.45	.71
3. Transfer Education	3	3.64	.92	4	4.29	.81
4. Student Services	4	3.58	.99	1	4.46	.72
5. Continuing Education	5	3.46	1.00	7	3.96	.93
6. Developmental Education	6	3.38	.95	6	3.97	.92
7. Special Training	7	3.33	.98	5	4.22	.86
8. Community Services	8	3.12	1.01	8	3.92	.98

Appendix F (continued)

Faculty Ranking of Goals

Rank Ordered Means of the Present and Preferred
Priority Status of Goals

Educational Program Goals	Present			Preferred		
	Rank	Mean	S.D.	Rank	Mean	S.D.
1. Occupational/Technical Education	1	4.13	.83	2	4.29	.91
2. Career Education	2	4.04	.86	1	4.36	.83
3. Continuing Education	3	3.74	.86	6	4.03	.81
4. Transfer Education	4	3.72	.84	5	4.06	.80
5. Developmental Education	5	3.70	.96	4	4.09	.92
6. Student Services	6	3.59	.85	3	4.25	.85
7. Community Services	7	3.17	.91	7	3.79	.79
8. Special Training	8	3.16	1.04	8	3.85	.90

Appendix F (continued)

Administrator Ranking of Goals

Rank Ordered Means of the Present and Preferred
Priority Status of Goals

Educational Program Goals	Present			Preferred		
	Rank	Mean	S.D.	Rank	Mean	S.D.
1. Occupational/Technical Education	1	4.63	.64	1	4.71	.57
2. Career Education	2	4.57	.67	2	4.68	.60
3. Continuing Education	3	4.26	.79	5	4.44	.74
4. Transfer Education	4	4.25	.74	6	4.25	.83
5. Student Services	5	4.05	.76	3	4.60	.65
6. Developmental Education	6	3.81	.91	4	4.48	.72
7. Community Services	7	3.61	.88	7	4.13	.85
8. Special Training	8	3.31	1.08	8	3.92	.97

Appendix F (continued)

Student Ranking of Goals

Rank Ordered Means of the Present and Preferred
Priority Status of Goals

Operational Goals	Present			Preferred		
	Rank	Mean	S.D.	Rank	Mean	S.D.
1. Low Tuition	1	3.90	1.02	1	4.50	.80
2. Learning Resources	2	3.82	.90	3	4.44	.75
3. Maintenance of Facilities	3	3.75	.89	2	4.45	.71
4. Open Door Admissions	4	3.68	.95	12	4.10	.94
5. Affirmative Action	5	3.63	.89	7	4.21	.85
6. Management By Goals/ Objectives	6	3.62	.84	8	4.17	.80
7. Personnel Selection	7	3.60	.97	4	4.37	.81
8. Needs Assessment	8	3.58	.74	6	4.32	.81
9. Accreditation	9	3.57	.87	11	4.11	.88
10. Academic Freedom	10	3.55	.78	5	4.33	.89
11. Information Systems	11	3.50	.88	16	4.06	.83
12. Evaluation	12	3.48	.85	13	4.09	.86
13. Define Expectations	13	3.45	.90	15	4.07	.86
14. Due Process	14	3.44	.97	14	4.08	.94
15. Staff Development	15	3.38	.93	10	4.12	.83
16. Participatory Decision Making	16	3.31	.98	9	4.15	.87

Appendix F (continued)

Faculty Ranking of Goals

Rank Ordered Means of the Present and Preferred
Priority Status of Goals

Operational Goals	Present			Preferred		
	Rank	Mean	S.D.	Rank	Mean	S.D.
1. Accreditation	1	4.11	.67	10	4.14	.76
2. Open Door Admissions	2	4.03	.80	15	3.83	1.04*
3. Personnel Selection	3	4.01	.83	1	4.42	.74
4. Low Tuition	4	4.00	.96	8	4.20	.96
5. Learning Resources	5	3.93	.83	6	4.22	.78
6. Affirmative Action	6	3.89	.78	14	3.85	1.11*
7. Maintenance of Facilities	7	3.88	.93	3	4.33	.73
8. Needs Assessment	8	3.84	.95	2	4.40	.78
9. Academic Freedom	9	3.82	.85	5	4.26	.87
10. Management By Goals/ Objectives	10	3.77	1.02	7	4.21	.85
11. Evaluation	11	3.63	.96	9	4.18	.82
12. Due Process	12	3.56	.96	4	4.29	.86
13. Define Expectations	13	3.52	.87	13	3.98	1.00
14. Information Systems	14	3.44	.82	16	3.82	.90
15. Participatory Decision Making	15	3.29	1.06	12	4.07	.93
16. Staff Development	16	3.20	1.03	11	4.08	.92

Appendix F (continued)

Administrator Ranking of Goals

Rank Ordered Means of the Present and Preferred
Priority Status of Goals

Operational Goals	Present			Preferred		
	Rank	Mean	S.D.	Rank	Mean	S.D.
1. Open Door Admissions	1	4.39	.86	8	4.37	.96
2. Low Tuition	2	4.20	.96	4	4.52	.88
3. Affirmative Action	3	4.14	.85	13	4.28	.97
4. Maintenance of Facilities	4	4.13	.73	5	4.43	.70
5. Needs Assessment	5	4.12	.86	1	4.72	.59
6. Academic Freedom	6	4.07	.86	14	4.19	.81
7. Accreditation	7	4.06	.86	15	4.18	.94
8. Personnel Selection	8	4.04	.77	2	4.62	.64
9. Learning Resources	9	4.00	.85	7	4.39	.81
10. Management By Goals/ Objectives	10	3.95	.93	3	4.56	.69
11. Due Process	11	3.82	.89	10	4.35	.80
12. Participatory Decision Making	12	3.72	.90	12	4.29	.69
13. Evaluation	13	3.70	.86	6	4.41	.71
14. Information Systems	14	3.44	.89	16	4.07	.90
15. Define Expectations	15	3.42	.86	9	4.36	.76
16. Staff Development	16	3.33	.93	11	4.34	.70

APPENDIX G

Analysis of Variance Tables By Goal

Appendix G

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLES BY GOAL

GOAL   1 : OCCUPATIONAL/TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	44.14	22.07	30.14	0.00
Within Groups	958	701.61	0.73		
Total	960	745.75			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	6.75	3.37	6.47	0.00
Within Groups	927	483.85	0.52		
Total	929	490.60			

GOAL   2 : TRANSFER EDUCATION

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	24.46	12.23	15.02	0.00
Within Groups	937	762.91	0.81		
Total	939	787.37			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	4.16	2.08	3.11	0.04
Within Groups	923	618.34	0.66		
Total	925	622.51			

Appendix G (continued)

GOAL   3 :   CAREER EDUCATION

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	30.92	15.46	20.70	0.00
Within Groups	957	714.87	0.74		
Total	959	745.80			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	7.04	3.52	5.72	0.00
Within Groups	927	570.74	0.61		
Total	929	577.78			

GOAL   4 :   DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	17.65	8.82	9.73	0.00
Within Groups	923	837.56	0.90		
Total	925	855.21			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	16.66	8.33	10.13	0.00
Within Groups	916	752.91	0.82		
Total	918	769.57			

Appendix G (continued)

GOAL   5:   CONTINUING EDUCATION

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	43.87	21.93	22.86	0.00
Within Groups	925	887.84	0.95		
Total	927	931.72			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	14.00	7.00	8.41	0.00
Within Groups	909	756.90	0.83		
Total	911	770.91			

GOAL   6 : COMMUNITY SERVICES

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	15.13	7.56	7.59	0.00
Within Groups	940	937.71	0.99		
Total	942	952.85			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	4.38	2.19	2.37	0.09
Within Groups	934	863.53	0.92		
Total	936	867.92			

Appendix G (continued)

GOAL 7 : STUDENT SERVICES

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	14.32	7.16	7.64	0.00
Within Groups	938	879.48	0.93		
Total	940	893.80			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	5.10	2.55	4.73	0.00
Within Groups	936	505.72	0.54		
Total	938	510.83			

GOAL 8 : SPECIAL TRAINING

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	2.27	1.13	1.15	0.31
Within Groups	914	905.10	0.99		
Total	916	907.38			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	15.08	7.54	9.80	0.00
Within Groups	924	711.33	0.76		
Total	926	726.41			

Appendix G (continued)

GOAL 1 : NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	22.92	11.46	13.77	0.00
Within Groups	933	777.01	0.83		
Total	935	799.94			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	10.51	5.25	8.25	0.00
Within Groups	928	591.94	0.63		
Total	930	602.46			

GOAL 2 : LOW TUITION

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	6.17	3.08	3.02	0.04
Within Groups	938	960.60	1.02		
Total	940	966.78			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	7.20	3.60	5.32	0.00
Within Groups	937	635.28	0.67		
Total	939	642.49			

Appendix G (continued)

GOAL   3 :   MANAGEMENT BY GOALS/OBJECTIVES

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	8.46	4.23	5.59	0.00
Within Groups	897	679.49	0.75		
Total	899	687.96			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	9.82	4.91	7.63	0.00
Within Groups	897	577.15	0.64		
Total	899	586.97			

GOAL   4 :   PERSONNEL SELECTION

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	23.27	11.63	12.89	0.00
Within Groups	925	835.14	0.90		
Total	927	858.41			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	4.09	2.04	3.21	0.04
Within Groups	928	592.44	0.63		
Total	930	596.54			

Appendix G (continued)

GOAL   5 :   STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	2.42	1.21	1.36	0.25
Within Groups	896	797.35	0.88		
Total	898	799.78			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	3.40	1.70	2.38	0.09
Within Groups	909	651.91	0.71		
Total	911	655.32			

GOAL   6 :   EVALUATION

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	4.23	2.11	2.85	0.05
Within Groups	855	636.00	0.74		
Total	857	640.24			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	6.64	3.32	4.55	0.01
Within Groups	886	646.50	0.72		
Total	888	653.14			

Appendix G (continued)

GOAL 7 : PARTICIPATORY DECISION MAKING

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	10.71	5.35	5.50	0.00
Within Groups	888	865.12	0.97		
Total	890	875.84			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	1.93	0.96	1.29	0.27
Within Groups	895	674.92	0.75		
Total	897	676.86			

GOAL 8 : DEFINE EXPECTATIONS

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	0.44	0.22	0.28	0.68
Within Groups	875	699.50	0.79		
Total	877	699.94			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	6.26	3.13	4.11	0.01
Within Groups	877	668.34	0.76		
Total	879	674.60			

Appendix G (continued)

GOAL   9:   DUE PROCESS

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	9.90	4.95	5.31	0.00
Within Groups	875	815.37	0.93		
Total	877	825.27			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	7.48	3.74	4.32	0.01
Within Groups	887	768.65	0.86		
Total	889	776.14			

GOAL   10 :   ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	21.30	10.65	10.68	0.00
Within Groups	918	916.16	0.99		
Total	920	937.47			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	1.50	0.75	0.96	0.38
Within Groups	921	722.59	0.78		
Total	923	724.09			

Appendix G (continued)

GOAL 11: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	20.16	10.08	13.05	0.00
Within Groups	904	698.66	0.77		
Total	906	718.83			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	11.31	5.65	7.15	0.00
Within Groups	914	723.05	0.79		
Total	916	734.36			

GOAL 12 : MAINTENANCE OF FACILITIES

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	9.87	4.93	6.33	0.00
Within Groups	928	724.75	0.78		
Total	930	734.63			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	1.08	0.54	1.07	0.34
Within Groups	918	465.94	0.50		
Total	920	467.03			

Appendix G (continued)

GOAL 13: INFORMATION SYSTEMS

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	0.46	0.23	0.30	0.68
Within Groups	892	687.27	0.77		
Total	894	687.74			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	5.00	2.50	3.50	0.03
Within Groups	894	641.24	0.71		
Total	896	646.25			

GOAL 14: LEARNING RESOURCES

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	2.81	1.40	1.77	0.16
Within Groups	931	741.67	0.79		
Total	933	744.49			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	4.22	2.11	3.65	0.02
Within Groups	915	529.47	0.57		
Total	917	533.69			

Appendix G (continued)

GOAL 15: ACCREDITATION

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	32.36	16.18	22.13	0.00
Within Groups	868	634.72	0.73		
Total	870	667.08			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	0.30	0.15	0.20	0.67
Within Groups	867	665.53	0.76		
Total	869	665.84			

GOAL 16 : OPEN DOOR ADMISSIONS

Present Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	38.45	19.22	21.78	0.00
Within Groups	896	790.88	0.88		
Total	898	829.33			

Preferred Perceptions

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	10.98	5.49	5.97	0.00
Within Groups	894	822.78	0.92		
Total	896	833.76			

THE PRIORITY STATUS OF GOALS IN RURAL

VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES AS

PERCEIVED BY STUDENTS, FACULTY,

AND ADMINISTRATORS

by

William C. B. Berghaus

(ABSTRACT)

1. Purpose of the Study. The purpose of this study
was to examine the priority status of institutional goals
as perceived by students, faculty, and administrators in
Virginia rural community colleges. The research questions
were (1) What are the student, faculty, and administrator
perceptions of the present ("is") priority of community
college goals?; (2) What are the student, faculty, and
administrator perceptions of the preferred ("should be")
priority of community college goals?; and (3) What
differences exist between the three reference groups between
present and preferred perceptions of the priority status
of goals?

2. Methods and Procedures. A questionnaire, based
upon the Virginia Community College System stated goals,
was developed to gather answers pertinent to the research.
A random sample of 821 students and 91 faculty and all 70
administrators from six rural community colleges in Virginia
responded to the questionnaire.

Each respondent was asked to rate each of the 24 goals in terms of its present ("is") and preferred ("should be") importance along a continuum. Responses could vary along a five-point scale from a rating of one ("of no importance") to five ("of extremely high importance").

CONCLUSIONS

1. In general rural Virginia community college students, faculty, and administrators differed in their perceptions of the present and preferred priority status of the Educational Program and Operational Goals. Based upon this general finding, this study indicates a lack of widespread support for the priority of the institutional goals as developed by the Virginia Community College System.

2. All three reference groups indicated that nearly all of the goals should be of greater importance than they were perceived to be at the time of the study. This general finding supports the conclusion that goals are desired states which are not totally attainable.

3. To the extent that goal hiatus, as one component of Martorana and Kuhns Interactive Forces Theory accurately explains academic change, it appears that several goal priorities for the rural colleges within the Virginia Community College System are in a position to be rearranged.